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ABSTRACT

THE MAKING AND MEANING OF GAY SPACE:
THE CASE OF THE CASTRO IN SAN FRANCISCO

by

Scott Richard Lesher

Architecture is more than the history, design and construction of buildings; it is also the creation, defining, redefining, and use of space. An understanding of these non-brick-and-mortar aspects includes how the use and meaning of that space changes over time. Gay space, specifically gay male space, is studied as both material space and social space. Material space is the ‘brick and mortar’ space designed for this purpose or created out of existing space, such as a room, building or neighborhood. Social spaces are the areas where human interaction occurs, such as block parties and festivals; it is more about the activities that occur than the places where they are held, even when those spaces have symbolic meanings. Gay space is studied in the context of material and social ‘space’ in general; the Castro is looked at in the context of gay space. The knowledge thus gained can be used by urban and social planners and in heritage preservation and tourism.

The Castro is an internationally recognized gay ghetto, continuing a tradition in the city dating back at least 100 years. It is also a living, changing neighborhood, subject to the same pressures as other districts. There are two periods to the Castro as gay space: the pre-AIDS and AIDS periods. Social, economic, and political factors operate in both periods, with the neighborhood’s material and social space changing as mainstream gay and non-gay society changes. As the Castro evolves a new type of gay space is created, that of myth, imagination and remembrance; this space is both material and social.
With alternate futures possible, it is not clear whether a gay ghetto is even needed in San Francisco anymore. However, what has been learned by studying the Castro is useful in understanding and creating gay and specialized spaces elsewhere.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objectives

In popular thought architecture is often associated with actual buildings or recognizable styles. It is not always understood that architecture also includes the creating, defining, redefining, and use of space. An understanding of these non-brick-and-mortar aspects includes how the use and meaning of space changes over time. This thesis examines one type of space -- gay space, specifically gay male space. This can be physical space that is designed for this purpose or created out of existing space, such as a room, building or neighborhood. Gay space is social space as well; block parties and gay pride festivals are more about human interactions than about the places where they are held, even when those spaces have symbolic meanings.

This thesis will show that, regardless of architectural and planning goals, when minority groups use space designed and built by a majority group, they are the ones who ultimately determine what those goals are and how that space is used in achieving them. These changes in goals and spatial use are evolutionary, sometimes hidden, and at times subvert the current and/or intended use of the space; they are tied to the material space itself. At times, the minority culture can even take over the architecture and planning of space from the majority culture.
1.2 Organization of the Thesis

The thesis contains five parts: an introduction (Chapter One) followed by three chapters, and a conclusion. The Introduction gives an outline of the thesis, defines the terms used throughout the paper, and discusses research methods. The next chapter builds on the introduction, defines the meaning of space in the context of the thesis, and proceeds to a discussion of gay space. Chapter Three focuses on the pre-1981 (pre-AIDS) history of the San Francisco's Castro district, while Chapter Four investigates the contemporary Castro (here defined as post-1981: the AIDS era). The fifth chapter discusses if the Castro is still gay, possible future trends in the Castro (including preservation), and suggests further avenues of research.

The temporal division of the Castro into pre- and post-AIDS eras reflects the magnitude of this disease's impact on the gay community: an event with social, political, economic and spatial and architectural repercussions, as Chapters Three and Four detail. In some ways AIDS can be seen as the event that changed "mainstream" gay male popular culture from being hedonistic and separate from mainstream society to being more sober (if not somber) and more interactive with the larger society of which it has always been a part. The AIDS pandemic also accelerated trends already evident within the gay community, such as increasing political, social and spatial integration with society as a whole. The ravages of this disease caused the gay community to seek out medical, financial and political help from outside itself while at the same time fostering a stronger sense of community, service and purpose within that community. Chapter Four
will discuss these changes as they are evident in the Castro, be it in changing demographics, commerce, adaptive reuse of extant architecture or new construction.

1.3 The Castro as a Case Study

San Francisco’s Castro district was specifically chosen as the primary case study because it is an internationally recognized gay ghetto, both historically and in the present. The term “ghetto” is a culturally loaded term; a short history and description is necessary to put it into context for a study of gay space.

1.3.1 Origins of the Term “Ghetto”

“Ghetto” originally referred to a section of Venice (the *Ghetto Novo* or New Ghetto) where, by decree of March 29, 1516, all Jews of the city were forced to live; this resettlement was accompanied by loss of citizenship. Entry to and exit from this ghetto was restricted to two gates, which were closed and locked at night “...in order to prevent them (the Jews) from roaming around at night.” although residents were allowed into the rest of the city during the day in order to work. In addition to the specific points of entry to and egress from this area, the doors and windows of buildings facing outwards were bricked over, and boats patrolled the canals nearby to catch anyone found outside the restricted area at night. Besides being forced to live in a designated quarter, the Jews themselves had to pay for the expenses to Venice that this entailed. Thus, the four gate guards (all Christian), and the patrol boats were all paid for by the ghetto’s inhabitants. The establishment of this ghetto was the culmination of a push that had started in the 1300s to settle the Venetian Jews in a fixed section of the city. The New Ghetto was this desire made real not just through law but through architectural and urban planning as
well. It was also a new phase in the uneasy relationship between Christian Europe and European Jews, one that pushed the Christian social bias that Jews were somehow ‘different’ and dangerous to a new level. Now the restrictions placed on a group of people as a whole included physical isolation in addition to social isolation.

The official decree ending the ghetto came on July 7, 1797; this legal act was accompanied by the physical act of removing the gates that kept the inhabitants of Venice as a whole and the ghetto architecturally separated.\textsuperscript{iv}

1.3.2 The Dangers and Evolution of Ghettos

The “protection” of the majority (Christians) from the minority (Jews) by keeping the smaller group, already deemed different, separate from the population at large by restricting them to a specific part of the city continued throughout Europe, with Jewish quarters appearing in a number of cities.\textsuperscript{v} While ostensibly this protected the majority of the population from a minority, the physical segregation made it easier not only to control contact between the two groups, but also made it easier for the group outside of the ghetto to attack those who were inside.

The concept and realization of a Jewish ghetto evolved from medieval and Renaissance Venetian idea of a specific material space in which this segment of the population was forced to live (and later to any part of a city to which Jews were restricted) to perhaps the most infamous of all -- the Warsaw Ghetto during the Nazi occupation of Poland. Then the ghetto became not just a place where Jews were forced to live and die but also a place where they were kept prior to deportation elsewhere to be exterminated.
While now also used to refer to a run-down section of a city characterized by poverty, lack of social opportunities or escape, and minority occupants (more correctly named a slum), the term “ghetto” can also designate a specific area of a city where the majority of residents has, or is perceived to have, one or more common identifying characteristics. These characteristics themselves can also lend a certain look or “feel” to the area. Such a neighborhood is usually understood as a type of ghetto, or space apart, by both residents and non-residents alike. The common factor, when referring to Jewish Ghettos or to slums, is that they are places where a certain segment of the populace is forced to live, either by law or by economic segregation. When “ghetto” refers to other groups who have chosen to live in close proximity to each other, the negative connotation is diminished and sometimes inverted. For example, one of the safer, upper class neighborhoods in Philadelphia was referred to for a time as the “Gilded Ghetto.” The factors separating the inhabitants from the rest of Philadelphia were economic and social, not legal. A gay ghetto is not a place where the inhabitants are forced to live by law but rather where they choose to live. There are no physical boundaries such as gates and walls; gays can move in or out at will. Movement is restricted instead by social boundaries, either self-imposed or from the rest of society; these will be discussed in more detail in this thesis.

One negative side effect of living in such a ghetto is the same for gays as it was for Jews; it is easier to find them in order to control or attack them. This is what happened during the White Night demonstrations, discussed in Chapter 3. In this instance, the police knew where to find a large number of gays to harass following gay protesters overpowering the police elsewhere in the city.
1.3.3 The Castro as a Gay Ghetto

The Castro remains one of the best-known gay ghettos in the United States, if not the world. It exists in a city known for its tolerance of citizens who do not fit into the "normal" social mores and norms of the country at large. It is also the inheritor of a long tradition of gay spaces and neighborhoods in San Francisco; as such, its own history is built upon a longer history of gay life in the City. While a symbol of gay pride, strength, political and economic clout, and fulfilling the basic need for gays to feel a part of a community, the Castro is mainly for gay men. Others in the Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgender (GLBT) community have formed their own enclaves elsewhere in the city or surrounding areas.

1.3.4 Geographic Location and Type of Neighborhood

Although Castro Street stretches on a north/south axis for many blocks, the term "The Castro" in common parlance refers to an approximately three-block area running roughly from where 17th Street intersects Market Street at Castro Street on the north to 20th Street on the south. It also includes the surrounding blocks off Castro Street to the east and west and approximately one block north to 16th Street (Maps 1 and 2). It is on these blocks that the majority of gay bars and gay-oriented businesses are located. Map 2 does not indicate any set boundary; it only highlights the general area. The difficulty of assigning set, fixed boundaries to the area, either social or geographical, is discussed in Chapters Three and Four. Maps and photographs in these chapters will illustrate possible boundaries.

Within the gay community the Castro is the perceived center of gay life in San Francisco, if not the West Coast. Jane Jacobs, in *The Death and Life of Great American*
Cities, defines three types of neighborhoods in a city, based on neighborhoods as political
tentities that advance self-government. In ascending order they are the Street, the District
(composed of many Street neighborhoods, and containing approximately 100,000
people), and the City as whole (consisting of all the Districts).\textsuperscript{VII} The Castro meets the
requirements of a street neighborhood under Ms. Jacob’s definition. It contains “webs of
public surveillance” that “protect strangers as well as” residents, has “networks of small-
scale, everyday public life and thus of trust and social control,” “help assimilate children
into reasonably responsible and tolerant city life,” and can, as a neighborhood, “draw
effectively on help when trouble comes along that is too big for the street to handle.”\textsuperscript{VIII}
The Castro also has enough specialized commercial, social and cultural offerings to
attract people from outside other neighborhoods, just as other neighborhoods have their
own unique offerings to attract residents of the Castro to them. All these attributes Ms.
Jacobs considers important to keep any neighborhood alive. Differences between various
street neighborhoods produce cross-use with other street neighborhoods; this cross-use
keeps areas lively and active.\textsuperscript{IX} How the Castro fulfills these functions will be discussed
in the body of this thesis, and they will be highlighted in the final chapter.

Jane Jacobs’ description of a street neighborhood highlights an additional aspect
of the Castro: it is more than the visible street and buildings. It has multiple layers:
historical, architectural, social, economic and political. Architecturally, it is an
unremarkable street of 19\textsuperscript{th} century buildings housing a mix of commercial and
residential uses. Its architectural importance is as the backdrop against which the
activities of everyday life are acted out because this neighborhood is more than the
commercial, political and social uses to which the buildings are put. It is a place of
collective and individual memory, and the primarily gay social milieu that is evoked by the term “The Castro.” Although referring to an actual place, these aspects are not place specific, but conjure up images in both the GLBT and straight communities throughout the world. “The Castro” calls to mind a gay Mecca, a way of life, and a social and political bloc. In all, the Castro is a rich tapestry of past and present, seen and unseen, social and physical, tangible and intangible. It is also a neighborhood in transition as economic, social, political and health factors alter the socio-economic make-up of its residents and visitors.

Since the 1980’s the GLBT community has been steadily integrating into the mainstream power and social structures of San Francisco. Along with this integration has come the fragmentation of various gay enclaves as members of the GLBT community relocate from them into other, traditionally “mainstream” neighborhoods. This spatial redistribution is occurring at the same time as the social, political, and economic facets of gay life have grown and diversified, and gays have joined what was formerly seen as “mainstream” power and social structures. Even with this disjuncture between the GLBT community and its spatial enclaves, the Castro still has a special place, both geographically and socially, in the GLBT community. This “specialness” involves both the historical Castro and its current realities. This Castro is still a place of collective and individual memories and of important social and political events, as it was in the past. At the same time, it is a symbol of hope for the present and future of the GLBT community. All of this makes the Castro a logical choice for a case study of gay space.
1.4 Research Methods

Four methods of research were used in the preparation of this thesis: a review of current and historical literature; archival research; a survey concerning the Castro; and personal interviews with survey respondents and others.

1.4.1 Literature Review

The literature review included literature on space in general, gay space in particular, the Castro (historical and contemporary) and San Francisco. To help put the Castro in a larger context of gay space, comparisons with other gay neighborhoods are made where appropriate: the lesbian community of Buffalo, NY and the West Village in New York City.

1.4.2 Archival Research

Archival research concentrated on both historical and contemporary San Francisco and the Castro. It covered both what people themselves recorded as well as how the mainstream and specialized news media viewed and reported events.

The four main archives used are all in San Francisco: the GLBT Historical Society, the James C. Hormel Gay and Lesbian Center and the San Francisco History Center (both of which are divisions within the San Francisco Public Library) and the California Historical Society. These archives include newspaper clippings, original pamphlets and flyers of gay-oriented history organizations and other organized gay groups, recorded and/or written interviews and memoirs, videos, photographs, books and other items, all relating to the GLBT experience in the San Francisco Bay area.
1.4.3 The Survey

The survey used was anonymous and confidential (see Appendix 1). To reach the greatest number and diversity of respondents (including geographical diversity), it was distributed through gay chat rooms on the web, by hand to specific people, both at random and selected, and by mail to acquaintances across the country. Anyone who received a survey was asked to pass copies on to others to broaden the pool. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was included with all questionnaires given out, so that there were no indicators of from whom the returned questionnaire came (beyond the postmark). Questionnaires distributed via the web had a return e-mail address provided. A space on the questionnaire allowed a respondent to be contacted for a follow-up interview, if so desired.

For analytic purposes, each questionnaire was marked with a letter indicating the method of distribution: ‘H’ for handed out or mailed out by request; ‘SF’ for distributed in San Francisco in general, excluding the Castro; ‘C’ for those surveys distributed in the Castro specifically, and ‘E’ for those sent by e-mail. Other than this marking, the questionnaires were all identical. As the surveys were returned, they were numbered in order of receipt within each category of distribution method, i.e. C-1 is the first survey returned that had been handed out in the Castro; likewise, SF-1 is the first survey returned that had been handed out in San Francisco.
The following table displays the number of each type of survey distributed and returned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Castro</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>E-Mailed</th>
<th>By Hand</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distributed</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Returned</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage Returned</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The low response rate, especially for those questionnaires handed out in person might be attributed to the behavior of people when confronted with a stranger asking for a favor – in this instance filling out a four-page survey. They will politely take the survey to get out of an awkward or unusual situation, and then discard it later. The higher rate of return of e-mailed questionnaires may be because of increased anonymity and a more controlled exchange environment; there is no face-to-face interaction. The length and content of the survey may also explain why only one in five surveys was returned. When the recipient read the questionnaire, the content of the questions and/or length of the questionnaire might have caused them to not respond.

Throughout this thesis when surveys and survey respondents are mentioned, the reference is to these questionnaires.

1.4.3.1. Interviews

Interviews were not limited to survey respondents who requested them. They also included interviews with members of the gay community who did not complete a survey as well as with acquaintances and friends who offered something to broaden the
understanding of gay space and the Castro, either in general conversations or reminiscences. These interviews were conducted by phone, face-to-face where possible, and by e-mail.

1.5 Terminology

Because the terms *gay*, *homosexual* and *queer* have different meanings to different people, and since this paper is about gay space, some standardized definitions are supplied in this section. Various definitions of the term *gay* are explored here, ending with a final synthesized definition. While some observers might concentrate on stereotypical behavior (regardless of the sexual orientation of the person) or the purely sexual aspect, a more in-depth definition is needed. *Gay* is preferable to *homosexual* as a general term; *homosexual* is too clinical a term to describe the full human aspect of the preference for same-sex relationships outside of the specific physical act.

There are also other considerations when defining “gay”, explicated by Randall L. Sell, an Assistant Professor at the Joseph L. Mailman School of Public Health at Columbia, on PBS’s *Frontline: Assault on Gay America*. The first is a mental state, best described as an emotional attachment/preference. The second is the physical act -- the actual sexual activity. Thus, it is possible for a person who has sexual contact with members of the same sex not to consider himself or herself gay because of a lack of emotional attachment or connection to those partners. Similarly, a man or woman may be attracted to persons of the same sex, even consider himself or herself gay, but not act sexually on those feelings. The person either has sexual relations exclusively with the opposite sex or abstains from sex altogether. The former is more common among
married men while the latter can be the case with teenagers coming to terms with their own sexuality. Chat-room conversations and phone sex are gray areas, for even if there is an emotional preference, there is no actual physical contact.

1.5.1 Gay, Homosexual, Straight and Bisexual

For the purpose of this thesis, “gay” refers to men who identify themselves as emotionally and sexually attracted to other men whether or not they act on those desires. Similarly, “homosexual” and “homosexual behavior” refers to both a man who has sex with other men and the sexual act, respectively. Thus a man who has sex with other men for the physical act only (regardless of frequency) is viewed as homosexual for the duration of the act whether or not he self-identifies as gay, straight or bisexual. In keeping with the factors used to define gay, “straight” defines men or women who are emotionally attached and physically attracted to members of the opposite sex while a bisexual is a man or woman who is emotionally attached and physically attracted to members of both sexes, regardless of the frequency of acting on either impulse.

1.5.2 Use of the Terms

Gay is not a catchall term for sexual minorities in general; nor is it interchangeable with homosexual, as some gay activists use it. Jim Andris, retired professor in the Department of Education at the Southern University of Illinois at Edwardsville, uses the term gay in a broad sense. In discussions of gay rights he uses gay instead of queer or homosexual. He decided that it was a generic term that had “…broad currency and a relatively clear designation in the public mind.” He states that homosexual is too clinical and refers mainly to sex while queer indicates oddness rather than a reflection of normal human
diversity. He has chosen *gay* because he feels that in the popular mind it is more inclusive (including lesbians, transsexual, transgender and bisexual people) and has a rather neutral connotation. Not all in the gay community accept this though. Andrew Sullivan, a gay activist and author, for instance, uses *homosexual* to describe someone who is “…constitutively, emotionally and sexually, attracted to the same sex,”XIII much as the term *gay* is used in this paper.XIV

The use of the words *queer* and *gay* present a problem since many writers use the term *queer*, and there is a divide in the gay male community over this term. For gay men who came of age before the 1980’s and the Age of AIDS, the accepted term for a self-avowed male homosexual is *gay*; *queer* is considered a slightly derogative term, rooted in its meaning as “not normal.” Since sexual variation seems to be an inherent quality in humans, there is nothing “queer” about being gay, straight, bisexual or asexual. For the generation that came of age in the 1980’s though, *queer* has become the word of choice. This could represent a trend away from a strict classification of people as either gay or straight or bisexual for this word recognizes a greater variation in human sexuality and gender identity than the all-or-nothing categories of “gay”, “straight” and “bisexual.” *Queer* seems to cover this by meaning anything out of the socially accepted Western heterosexual paradigm. That paradigm itself though does not correspond to reality as it does not recognize a blurring of boundaries between categories. It stresses a “we” versus “them” mentality where social norms and certain actions, such as marriage and raising children, are done by straight men and women, while people who question these norms and actions (regardless of their sexual orientation), as well as the GLBT community, are labeled “them.”
The word *gay* is used throughout this paper due to wide recognition of it both within and without the GLBT community and to the personal preference of the author; the term *queer* will not be used in this paper except in direct quotes from sources or people.

1.5.3 Queer Space and Gay Space

Similarly, the terms *queer space* and *gay space* are both used, depending on the context. While frequently interchangeable, "gay space" is used more specifically for a space claimed by gays as their own, or that is used predominantly by gay men, possibly to the exclusion of other sexual minorities, while "queer space" is more inclusive, adding to the "gay space" definition the use of the same space by other sexual minorities.

This thesis concentrates more on specifically gay male space than on the more inclusive space used by other members of the GLBT community. Perhaps homosexual spaces and neighborhoods are usually associated with gay men because they are more visible to society at large. There could also be natural or social conditioning at work. To quote Manuel Castells, "Men have sought to dominate, and one expression of this domination has been spatial... so when gay men try to liberate themselves from cultural and sexual oppression, they need a physical space from which to strike out."\textsuperscript{xv} He feels that "...women have rarely had these territorial aspirations: their world attaches more importance to relationships and their networks are ones of solidarity and affection."\textsuperscript{xvi}

I posit that the importance of relationships and networks holds true in the gay community as well, especially during the AIDS epidemic, as new acquaintances are made and older ones die or move away. By using the Castro as an example, Castells seems to indicate that these spaces do not have to be designed and built, but can already exist and
be taken over. However, his comment about women building non-spatially defined relationships and networks can be an interesting point of departure for a discussion of networks becoming trans-spatial, something that can connect people who are physically separated to an actual physical space. This is discussed further in the chapters on the Castro.

1.6 Significance of the thesis

The study of gay male space in this thesis will add to the understanding of the social use of the designed and built environment, and will also help in guiding the design of spaces for specific social groups. The use of material space— space designed and planned for specific uses and then appropriated for uses not originally intended is important to help understand changing urban environments.

While the case study concentrates on one neighborhood -- the Castro in San Francisco -- the discussion and findings can be useful in understanding other specialized urban spaces. This is important in today’s multi-cultural and multi-ethnic society where diversity leads not just to political activism but to the establishment and development of specific neighborhood identities. Architects, urban and infrastructure planners will continue to design and construct buildings and spaces according to current and projected needs, but the permanency of these constructions can outlast the needs which gave rise to them. After, and even before, those needs have been met, users of these spaces can alter the intended functions, and by so doing change the direction and outcome of the previous social and spatial planning. Like an Hegelian pendulum swinging from thesis to antithesis and settling at synthesis (which then becomes the new thesis, setting the pendulum in motion again), architects, planners and social scientists can review what
functions these planned spaces and structures actually fulfill, and then use the knowledge gained to alter future phases of design and construction. Such a review presupposes that some form of planning is necessary; the actual uses of the planned space are much more spontaneous than the planned-for activities and represent the mutual adaptation of people to their physical environment and the adaptation by users of this environment to suit their current needs.

By studying the aspects of a specific neighborhood contributions can be made to other areas of study, highlighting the interconnections between physical and social spatial studies with other disciplines, such as history, urban development (in general and specific to San Francisco), and minority and gay studies. The contributions from those studies can then act as points of departure for additional study concentrating on one or more areas.
CHAPTER 2

SPACE AND GAY SPACE

He promised her a new and better life,
Out in Arizona.
Underneath the blue never ending sky,
Swore that he was gonna
Get things in order; he’d send for her.
When he left her behind, it never crossed her mind
There is no Arizona, no painted desert, no Sedona.
If there was a Grand Canyon, she could fill it up with the lies he’s told her.
But they don’t exist, those dreams he sold her.
She’ll wake up and find
There is no Arizona.
****
Each day the sun sets into the west, her heart sinks lower in her chest,
And friends keep asking when she’s goin’
Finally she tells them “Don’t you know, there is no Arizona...”

2.1 Space

Before an examination of gay space is undertaken, some aspects of space in general must be examined. As Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann have explained, there is a “reality” and “knowledge” of space. An average person lives in “a world that is ‘real’ to him...and he ‘knows,’ with different degrees of confidence, that this world processes
such and such characteristics." The authors go on to explain that "reality" and "knowledge" are themselves social constructions and that the meanings of what is real and what is known vary from society to society; similarly, societies as a group take "knowledge" and make it "reality." Within a society, what is observed and what is understood about a space may vary according the individual observer’s understanding. Any actual, physical space has layers of meaning. Not all layers of meaning may be understood, or even "seen" by all users of, or visitors to, it. Some meanings may be so esoteric or personal that they might apply only to a few individuals. An example could be a warehouse. One person looking at this structure sees a specific type of commercial building; another sees a place where his father was employed, while still another sees a physical representation of a business that might soon cease to exist due to the shifting of jobs to other parts of the country or overseas. When expanded to the scale of a neighborhood, such as will be done in this thesis with the Castro, the layers and types of meanings increase, especially as different types of people visit or live there.

Maurice Halbwachs also sees space as multi-faceted, and uses London as an example of the visual, physical and memory aspects of a city. He walked around London numerous times with different companions (an architect, artist and historian). By "seeing" the same physical city from the different, not always physical-based viewpoints of his various companions, he could more easily remember his trips. He felt that city spaces may appear unchanging over time because the collective memories associated with them were "...always...embedded in a spatial framework." In this way a city neighborhood can change over time, but previous users’ views of that space will always affect how they view the neighborhood.
Jean-Ulrick Desert provides a simple definition: space can be seen as "...a loosely delineated or loosely bounded area occupied cognitively or physically."

2.1.1 Material and Social Components of Space

One way of studying space is to consider it as consisting of two major components: material aspects of space -- the actual physical reality of rooms, buildings, streets, sidewalks, parks, etc, and the social construct of space -- the meanings invested in and overlain on this material space. But even this latter definition of space is too limiting for studying active neighborhoods. In addition to the meanings assigned to material space, Henri Lefebvre's definition of social space is more encompassing, even when given in its Marxist-Leninist context of production. For him, "(Social) space is not a thing among other things, nor a product among other products: rather, it subsumes things produced, and encompasses their interrelationship in their coexistence and simultaneity – their (relative) order and/or (relative) disorder. It is the outcome of a sequence and set of operations, and thus cannot be reduced to the rank of a simple object. At the same time there is nothing imagined, unreal or 'ideal' about it as compared, for example, with science, representations, ideas or dreams. Itself the outcome of past actions, social space is what permits fresh actions to occur, while suggesting others and prohibiting yet others."  

In addition, "Social space implies a great diversity of knowledge." This is a more vibrant definition, seeing social space as something that is not just rooted in the past, or just existing in the present, but indicating future possibilities and changes. The combination of this definition of social space -- meanings invested in and overlaid on
material space -- and Lefebvre's view that it is a space of interrelationships and an outcome of past actions is the definition used in this thesis. It is comprehensive and flexible; with it, social space is seen as something that not only permits new actions to occur but, at the same time, "suggest(s) others" and "prohibit(s) yet others." While this last aspect might seem restrictive, gay social space, especially in the context of the Castro, may be better understood by both what happens or does not happen there and what might be prohibited or discouraged. This flexibility is also a useful tool when studying spatial boundaries.

2.1.2 Additional Aspects of Space

There are two additional aspects of both material and social spaces: the private/public aspects and the boundaries. The public/private division of space can be marked, as with a sign prohibiting entry only by authorized people, or it can be "understood" by a community as having one or the other designation, or even by a blurring of the boundary. An example of this is the ambiguous quality of a front yard; it acts as the mediator between the public realm of the street and the private realm of the house. It is a zone of transition. This designation of public/private might vary with the users of, or the perceived use of, that space. Both the public and private zones also contain some form of boundary, whether physical or social, or both. These boundaries might vary from person to person or group to group, according to how the space is experienced over time.

2.1.2.1 Boundaries

Boundaries are an important aspect of space. The amorphous, fluctuating, and sometimes fixed boundary areas contain some of the most important attributes by which boundaries are defined and understood. Boundaries both moderate the interactions between different
spaces and help to define the spaces by the nature of such interactions. Sometimes the meaning of a space can be discovered by what it is not. In leaving one type of space and entering another, some of the meanings of the new space can be understood in contrast to the space just left. The changing nature of boundaries can be due to changes in the material space, change in social views concerning one or more aspects of the space, and attitudes of the experiencer.

2.1.2.2 A Case Study in Boundaries

Swati Chattopadhyay explores how perceived boundaries vary according the beliefs of the viewer. She studied the White Town/Black Town division in 19th century Calcutta in which the European, mainly British, colonizers sought to differentiate themselves and their occupied area of the city (White Town) from the indigenous population’s areas (Black Town).\textsuperscript{xxiv} The concept of separate zones for the occupier and the occupied, distinct because of architecture, layout and/or social activities, was part of a larger program of justifying and reinforcing the occupation of a foreign territory by the colonial power. The concept broke down in actual practice though. Ms. Chattopadhyay highlights this when she states "...the critical aspect of colonial cities resided not in the clarity of this duality, but in the tension of blurred boundaries between the two."\textsuperscript{xxv}

Architecturally, regardless of where in the city they were located, buildings inhabited by European could be owned by either Indians or Europeans; the same held true for those occupied by indigenes.\textsuperscript{xxvi} Even the terms “White Town” and “Black Town” are English; Bengalis viewed divided the city into the geographical subdivisions of \textit{paras}, \textit{tolas} and \textit{tulis}, with a \textit{paras} measuring approximately one-quarter by one-half mile -- a
walkable area. This area was not a legal division, nor was its boundaries fixed; rather, it was seen as having an identity. XXVII

Even when boundaries between the European and Native areas were unclear, it was clear to many observers from both groups what characteristics defined the area occupied by the indigenous population. In Calcutta the Hooghly River acted as one of the principle physical demarcations. The original European-built and occupied area was started in the early 1700s and spread out from the east bank. It centered on Fort William and its greenbelt (the Maidan), and included the primary government buildings. The structures here were European, not indigenous, in style with the neo-classical predominant, although in the 19th century Gothic-style buildings were erected, such as the Cathedral, completed in 1847 XXVIII and the High Court, completed in 1872 and modeled on Ypres’ Town Hall. XXIX The whole district was planned by the British, including the street layout. In 1903 Lord Curzon, the Viceroy, commented that “... a glance at the buildings of the town, at the river and the roar and smoke, is sufficient to show that Calcutta is in reality a European city set down upon Asiatic soil.” XXX This area was in turn surrounded by areas inhabited by the native population.

Spreading out from the west bank of the Hooghly River, however, was a purely native-inhabited area. In contrast to the European settlement and its surrounding areas, this Indian Calcutta, which included some of the east bank areas, stretched “... away almost unimaginably into the flat brown hinterland, over the muddy river, district after district, slum after slum, far beyond the country houses of Alipur and Garden Reach, up the pot-holed track of the Grand Trunk Road and the railway line to the interior, where in
an immense confusion of mills, factories and shanty-towns Calcutta petered out at last into the Ganges plain."

Europeans living in Calcutta commented on these differences in living conditions as early as 1803, when a committee in commented that “In those quarters of the town occupied principally by the native inhabitants the houses have been built without order or regularity and the streets and lanes have been formed without attention to the health, convenience or safety of the inhabitants.” In 1863 a native, Girish Chandra Ghosh, commented that the European part of Calcutta had ‘...streets as smooth as bowling-greens, wide dustless and dry, where even the lamp-posts seem weekly varnished...” while in the surrounding native district his “…affrighted horse will obstinately back from pits in the thoroughfares wide enough to bury all the rubbish in the adjoining houses.” It is not clear if Girish Chandra Ghosh was aligned socially and economically with the British, but he did recognize the physical aspects of the two different Calcuttas. Similarly, writing from the European viewpoint in the 1880s, Rudyard Kipling commented that all of native-occupied Calcutta was “a surfeited muck-heap.” While this indicates that population density in Black Town was higher than that in White Town, in reality much of White Town had higher densities and a closer-knit urban fabric.

Boundaries were not just between the colonizers and the colonized. Within the confines of expatriate English society, there was a disintegrating boundary between what they had known in England and what they were experiencing in India. As one English resident wrote after a ball at which everything she was familiar with in the home country was different in India, “It is something like what I expected, and yet not the least, at
present, as far as externals go: it seems to me that we are acting a long opera. "\textsuperscript{XXXVI} In this way some sense could be made of what was expected and what the reality was. Only by play-acting "…could the hybrid juxtaposition of figures and artifacts make sense -- juxtapositions that dissolved the boundaries between that which was familiar and that which was foreign."\textsuperscript{XXXVII}

In the domestic sphere the boundaries between served/servant and private/public can be read in different ways. In the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries distinct spatial and architectural separation of served/servant spaces were common in India. Most European-occupied houses had outbuildings at the perimeter of the property lot where the servants performed their duties and frequently lived, separate from the European-occupied main house. At the same time, this dichotomy between servant and served composed a distinct social unit- it was the private sphere of family life (colonizer family and servants) isolated and distinct from the public sphere of the street. Architectural boundaries, such as walls and gates, kept this social unit separate from the public sphere.\textsuperscript{XXXVIII} The physical separation of Europeans and Indians into different domestic spheres is illustrated by Great Eastern Hotel in the British section of Calcutta. Here, the hotel itself was situated somewhat like “a fortified citadel of comfort in a city beginning to fell the threat and pressure of the Indian multitudes all around”\textsuperscript{XXXIX} Similarly, another hotel, the Grand Hotel, was physically isolated from the public life of the street by the buildings surrounding it. It was only by passing through a long, store-lined corridor that a guest reached the street. The main door was guarded by a doorman.\textsuperscript{XL} Even within some hotels, it was possible for a European visitor to never meet the indigene servants due to
architectural planning—rooms had a separate entrance for the servants, who could draw
the bath and leave breakfast without being seen.\textsuperscript{XL\textsubscript{I}}

Using the built environment to highlight the duality between European/indigene
was not always clear-cut or easy; social as well as material lines were shifting and thus
crossed over. Although the British used a system of social classification that social,
arquiteudonal and geographical boundaries then reflected, the “landscape of colonial
Calcutta was too complex to be usefully described” by their black town/white town
duality.\textsuperscript{XL\textsubscript{II}} Due to this shifting, fluctuating geographical and social landscape, spatial
delimitation became more important; seen in this way, the use of European architectural
styles, walled compounds and guarded hotel doors reflects and reinforces a practice of
exclusion. While the colonizers felt they were excluding the native population, they were
excluding themselves from mixing with the indigenes.

Socially, the boundaries between Europeans and indigenes were harder to
understand. Again, Ms. Chattopadhyay notes that the attempts at delineation between
occupier and occupied was not just in the permeable boundaries of urban layout and
house design. It was more difficult to delineate foreign and native influences in the
British residents’ identity, regardless of the actual space occupied; “…hybridity was a
troubling presence in the formation of their own identity, an ambivalent space that they
themselves occupied and whose impact they deeply felt.”\textsuperscript{XL\textsubscript{III}} Taken altogether, the need
for some form of understood boundaries between ‘white town and black town’ and
European and native social practices had to be kept up, regardless of the extent that these
boundaries reflected the reality of the situation. All of this created a need for an
“…obsessive articulation of delimiting practices, even when such territorial markings
inhibited the ……desire for a sovereign space and when, in fact, the boundaries did little
to prevent permeability.”

This need to highlight the differences between the colonizers and the colonized in
the Sub-Continent was not limited to Calcutta. In 1903 a Durbar was held in Delhi to
celebrate the coronation of Edward VII, the new Emperor of India, which Consuelo
Vanderbilt Balsan, then the Duchess of Marlboro, attended. In her memoirs she describes
how all the European guests were housed together, but separate from the native
population, in a “double row of beautiful tents” lining a wide avenue. The tents
themselves were divided into rooms, just as in Britain, with a salon for an antechamber,
bedrooms behind that, and a small room for bathing. The majority of the servants,
however, were natives. In one instance highlighting the cultural differences, Mrs. Balsan
mentions a native male servant walking in on her in her bathtub; he let out a “squeal of
agony” because if he had walked in on a native woman in the same situation, “his
punishment would have been severe.” She herself seemed more bothered by his
scream than by his walking in on her, subtly distinguishing the more sophisticated and
tolerant social behavior of the colonizing Europeans over the more brutal native
traditions.

Just as the guests tents were clustered together, separate from the existing
buildings, the Viceroy himself lived “in secluded grandeur,” away from the other
Europeans. A ball at the vice regal palace where the Europeans mingled with the native
princes provided a chance to blur, if not break down, the artificial social distinctions
between colonizer and colonized. However, the European women were told not to dance
with them, since their own wives were “not allowed out of purdah and such intimacy
might be misconstrued”. This act of reticence in deference to supposed native feelings worked both ways; the maharajas felt that the Viceroy “dissdained” them. According to Mrs. Balsan, these majorajas also disliked the European legislative reforms that curbed their power. One of these princes, at the Durbar itself, “in an insolent turn, refused the obeisance he owed his Emperor.” By these examples, the Duchess highlights Ms. Chattopadhyay’s assertion that the European masters had to delineate architectural and cultural differences in order to retain their own sense of a separate, superior identity. The refusal of one maharajah to perform an act of obedience to the representatives of his colonial master seems to have had negative connotations to the Duchess because it questioned this new order in which Europeans were considered superior.

The same delineations Ms. Chattopadhyay discusses can exist in American cities, where the concept of ‘neighborhood’ is as much a social one as a geographical one. The two are not always the same. For example, in Philadelphia, known as a city of neighborhoods, the mention of the ‘Greater Northeast’ conjures up an idea of the type of person and way of life of that large section of the city, as well as the actual geographical area. The same can be said of California’s Hollywood. There is the Hollywood of streets and houses, regardless of the diversity of housing stock and socio-economic status of inhabitants, and there is the Hollywood of “Tinsel Town,” which is less a geographical space than a social-commercial construct. This “Tinsel Town” Hollywood is the glitz and glamour of the movie industry, a “place” where dreams of becoming a star can come true.
On a smaller scale, there are a number of small parks throughout Philadelphia’s center city area. Residents of the areas surrounding each of those parks generally feel that it ‘belongs’ to them, and that anyone not from the area using “their” park is out of place. While this monitoring of local surroundings by residents can help fight crime, it can also make the law-abiding “observed” feel, and act, like interlopers.

2.1.2.3 Other Types of Boundaries

Boundaries can be as personal as crossing social boundaries when role playing, or as social and geographical as public/private divisions, including the behavior appropriate for each type of space. Personal, social and geographic boundary crossings are highlighted by Elizabeth Kennedy and Madeline Davis in their discussion of the working class lesbian community in Buffalo, NY in the 1940’s and 1950’s. Their research reveals two types of boundary-crossing during this time period. The first was the distinction within the lesbian community between “butch” and “fem,” and gender-crossing dress styles adopted by the “butch” lesbian; within the bars and house parties of the time, this distinction between “butch” and “fem” women identified a woman’s role in the lesbian community.

The second type of boundary-crossing involved appearing in the public realm, where the masculine dress of the butch lesbian out-ed her to the straight community. This obvious flaunting of socially appropriate dress and behavior for women in public led to fights with straight men (the feminine lesbian was much less likely to be harassed, as she could pass as straight by her appearance). Here, the gender crossing style, so accepted in private, took on a different meaning in public spaces such as streets. The boundaries between public and private spaces were fairly clear-cut; bars and house
parties were private lesbian social spaces, the home was lesbian private space, and pretty much all else was public space. In the words of one lesbian who lived through that time period, “...We just didn’t have any ground except for what we fought for. Especially like Iris and Sandy for instance, on the street people just stared at them. I would see people’s reactions, I would see them to me if I was alone too, but I would see reactions when I was with my friends, and the only safe place was in a gay bar, or in your own, if you had your own apartment. Out on the street you were fair game.”

There is, however, a type of space that has no true boundaries; it is neither material nor even social. That is the effanescent world of the internet, the media (both published and broadcast), and even novels that use a space, or a particular interpretation of the space in question. In its broadest sense this can include individual memories relating to this space. This will be examined throughout this thesis; in the conclusion it will be studied as a way of preserving the gay male space of the Castro.

2.1.3 Memory and Space

Memories, linked through practices and uses, are important to the meanings given to the physical reality and the social construction of space. The meanings include the “proper” use of such space, the memories of events that have occurred there, and “emotions” connected with the space, either based on the physical elements or on the use of that space. Preservation of space, both of individual buildings and neighborhoods, is an allied topic and is explored in discussing the Castro and the future of that neighborhood. On the subject of preservation, Delores Hayden, in *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History*, describes a debate in the *New York Times* between Herbert J. Gans and Ada Louise Huxtable concerning “…the public meaning of the built past,...” specifically
the New York Landmarks Preservation Commission and their designation policies. Herbert Gans felt that the Commission concentrated mainly on mansions and buildings designed by famous architects. As an urban sociologist, he felt that the Commission’s concentration on buildings designed for the upper class neglected the architecture of the rest of society, that the “…policy distorts the real, exaggerates affluence and grandeur, and denigrates the past.” Ada Huxtable replied that the Commission’s work was admirable, that the famous buildings were an important and “irreplaceable part of civilization.” In addition, she pointed out that the Landmarks Preservation Commission had also designated 26 historic districts that included 11,000 buildings, most of them “vernacular.” Mr. Gans believed that a broader approach to architectural history was needed. In his own words, “Private citizens are of course entitled to save their own past, but when preservation becomes a public act, supported with public funds, it must attend to everyone’s past.” At the same time he pointed out that 17 of the designated neighborhoods were “neighborhoods of the affluent.” Here economics, both of the money behind the construction of the designated buildings and of the public funds being spent on their preservation, plays a vital role.

Delores Hayden points out that the primary problem with this debate was semantic. As an urban sociologist, Gans used the word “architecture” to mean all buildings and the whole built environment; “vernacular” referred to social use, and a neighborhood was a “complex network of social as well as spatial ties, and implied a working-class population,” while the interpretation of a designated historical district’s past meant different things for different people, but that all interpretations were equally valid in social terms. Huxtable, an architectural critic and preservationist, saw
"vernacular" as buildings where the architect was unknown, and a neighborhood was actual physical space defined and bounded by a designated demarcation line. Gans's neighborhood had ambiguous and amorphous boundaries, defined less by the actual physical space and more by social use and connections. This is an important point that is brought up in the chapters discussing the Castro, which is both a designated physical space and a social construction defined by use and demographics -- gay men creating and re-defining an existing urban area.

2.1.4 Additional Aspects of Space

Another component of social and physical space is "place attachment," as defined by environmental psychologists Setha Low and Irvin Altman. Along with the psychological attachment people may have to a place, place attachment includes social, material and ideological dimensions and participation in the public life of the place, based on the development and growth of ties to both family and the larger community.

Kennedy, Davis, Gans, and Huxtable's descriptions of physical and social space leave out two other components -- the use of all five senses and the importance of memory in experiencing a space. People experience life through all five senses; the experience of a specific space is no different, it too involves all five senses, be it experiencing the smells of the woods, fields and restaurants, or the sound of the local church clock ringing out the hours. Familiar sights of the space offer visual clues to what has changed and what has stayed the same. Similarly, memories can tie a person to a place whether or not the person is actually there. Pierre Nora, in his general introduction to Volume 1 of Realms of Memory, discusses both the lieu de memoire and the milieux de memoire. The first is a place where a "...residual sense of continuity remains..."; the
second is a "…setting in which memory is a part of everyday experience." By these definitions both a *lieu de memoire* and *milieux de memoire* indicate some form of memory, and thus of history. In this way, space can be seen as having some form of collective importance tied to historical events. In *Realms of Memory*, Volume I, Chapter 9, *The Museum of the Desert: The Protestant Minority*, Phillippe Joutard describes how a group of French Protestants links sites of their martyrdom and resistance to their history. Mr. Nora describes a display in the Museum of the Desert where "…individual, family, and collective identities come together." The same applies to neighborhoods, not just to museums.

Looking again at physical space and how it is experienced and remembered by its users, Kevin Lynch, for his book *The Image of the City*, asked inhabitants of Boston, Jersey City, NJ and Los Angeles to draw maps (from memory) and maps showing directions to specific places. The differences in maps between people who were more familiar and less familiar with the areas were noticeable, but even more so was a comparison of these mental images to an accurate map of the city. Frequently the personal maps bore little relationship to the actual city, instead concentrating on the personal experience of the drawer. In this way, buildings frequently visited were drawn as closer together than they were in actuality. This phenomenon is not just limited to modern inhabitants of urban spaces. As discovered by Lewis and Clark on their expedition of 1804-06, Native American populations drew maps not so much to reproduce an accurate representation of the physical landscape, but rather as a way to give directions from one place to another, and to show their society’s relationship to the land.
2.1.5 Transformation of Space

Transformation of space can include the destruction of the physical space itself or of buildings that give it a particular character. The razing of Manhattan’s Pennsylvania Station did not just destroy an important building, it also altered the nature of the surrounding space as well. Where once stood a monument to the power of the railroads and an important gateway to the city now existed an empty lot. The loss was emphasized by the complimentary Post Office building which still stood (and stands) to the west of Pennsylvania Station. The lost station was replaced with a new station and sports/events complex (a new Madison Square Garden, the old one at Madison Square having been demolished already). While operating again as a gateway to the city, the very nature of that gateway had been redefined. As Vincent Scully points out, where once commuters and visitors entered Manhattan like kings (through the old Penn Station), they now scurried like rats (through the underground warren of corridors and rooms). Another impact on the neighborhood was the changing of the physical fabric. Looking at the main Post Office, a sister building across the avenue from the now-razed Penn Station, it is easy to envision how majestic this area once looked -- where distinctive buildings were constructed to complement each other and define a section of the city. The neighborhood changes caused by the razing of the original Penn Station and its replacement by a combined-use complex illustrate a change in economics: the railroads were going bankrupt and no longer needed the visual statement of their former power and grandeur that their old monumental stations provided. The land upon which they stood could be used to greater profit by redefining its use.
The announcement that Penn Station was to be razed, and the actual demolition, galvanized a segment of the population to preserve what they saw as a valuable symbol and structure. Some people saw the razing as a struggle between the rights of property owners who lacked the former sense of duty and obligation to the cities they served, and the rights of the general population to have a greater say in changes to their city. In the end, the Penn Central Corporation won this battle, but the preservationists won the war; the razing of Penn Station led directly to New York City’s historic preservation laws and the establishment of the New York Historic Landmarks Preservation Commission. The new laws withstood legal challenges (the most famous of them the challenge made by the owners of Grand Central Terminal to either demolish, or build above, the station). By surviving this challenge, the public interest won out over the right of a private owner to alter, and thus re-define, a city space, a space that is inherently public.

2.2 Gay Space

Homophobe: “They should take all the fags and put ‘em on an island somewhere.”

Gay Respondent: “They did. It’s called Manhattan.”

2.2.1 Definitions

In the context of these approaches to space -- as a public utility, a place of memory, something to be preserved and interpreted, its center and boundaries -- the question remains of what is gay space. There are three main, not entirely oppositional views on this, as given in definitions by Aaron Betsky, George Chauncey, and Jean-Ulrick Desert.
The first two of these definitions concentrate on the current use of actual space, not its physical characteristics (excepting, as well be shown, Mr. Betsky's ultimate orgasmic freespace aspect of personal gay space). They both also imply that gay space is an appropriation of spaces designed for other purposes, and used in ways not intended by the designers and builders. However, both ignore actual spaces designed specifically for gay uses, although Mr. Desert moves closer toward this by referencing the built/unbuilt aspects of space in his definition.

2.2.1.1 First Definition

The first definition is that gay space is a specific area only for gay experiences; it is urban, and can be temporally defined, rather than being a permanent entity. This definition does not define what might make an experience "gay," except that it seems to involve gay people and is a space of "pure artifice". Although this definition was originally applied to Studio 54 in the 1970's, it is a good general description of gay space. As expressed by Aaron Betsky: "It is a kind of space I find liberating, and that I think might help us avoid some of the imprisoning characteristics of the modern city. It is a useless, amoral, and sensual space that lives only in and for experience. It is a space of spectacle, consumption, dance, and obscenity. It is a misuse or deformation of a place, an appropriation of the buildings and codes of the city for perverse purposes. It is a space between the body and technology, a space of pure artifice." He continues: Gay space is "...unreal space with no endurance, and yet is very real." Because of this immateriality, queer space isn't built, but implied; it is usually invisible.
Mr. Betsky also feels that “queer space” consists of three parts: the inner self; the mirror in which a gay man appears; and the orgasm, with the orgasm the goal of queer space.

Because Mr. Betsky feels that the goal of ‘queer space’ is orgasm, ‘queer space’ “…appropriates certain aspects of the material world in which we live, composes them into an unreal or artificial space, and uses this counterconstruction to create the freespace of orgasm that dissolves the material world.”\textsuperscript{LXVI}

2.2.1.2 Second Definition

The second definition continues this theme but is broader. It too posits gay space as any space that is distinguished by its use by gays, but it is not limited to urban space.\textsuperscript{LXVII} This definition does not concentrate only on the positive and reinforcing values Mr. Betsky mentions but rather stresses the meaning and use of the space as defined not only by its users at the time, but by its original creators as well. Because of its broader definition, this is the view that this thesis builds upon for a more complete definition of gay space. As stated by George Chauncey: “There is no queer space; there are only spaces used by queers or put to queer use. Space has no natural character, no inherent meaning, no intrinsic status as public or private. As Michel de Certeau has argued, it is always invested with meaning by its users as well as its creators, and even when its creators have the power to define its official and dominant meaning, its users are usually able to develop tactics that allow them to use the space in alternative, even oppositional ways that confound the designs of its creators.”\textsuperscript{LXVIII}

This echoes William J. Mitchell who, in a different context (\textit{City of Bits: Space, Politics and the Infobahn}) makes the distinction between \textit{civitas} and \textit{urb}: between,
respectively, a social group/community that is not related to any physical space and the actual urban space built and lived in. Mr. Chauncey does not concentrate on the orgasm as the ultimate goal of gay space, as Mr. Betsky does.

Mr. Betsky implies that that once the space has served its purpose it no longer exists; Mr. Mitchell implies that the social group that gives rise and meaning to a space is not tied to that, or any other specific, space. In the context of this thesis and of gay space generally, Mr. Mitchell's implication lends weight to the concept that as a group gay men can make any neighborhood a gay ghetto, and that gay men as a social group do not need to be tied to any one neighborhood. This theme is treated more fully in the discussion of the present-day Castro and its future in Chapters 4 and 5.

2.2.1.3 Third Definition

The third definition, seemingly allied with both Mr. Betsky's and Mr. Chauncey's definitions, is that of Jean-Ulrick Desert. Mr. Desert argues that "queer space"...

"...crosses, engages, and transgresses social, spiritual, and aesthetic locations, all of which is articulated in the realm of the public/private, the built/unbuilt environments, including decoration." He also specifically rejects the "orgasm" aspect of Aaron Betsky's definition. While accepting the erotic nature of space, no matter how difficult that aspect is to categorize, he does note "The definition of queer space by erotic program would be as limiting as the word homosexual." Mr. Desert also raises, and questions, the point of seeing gay space in opposition to straight space; i.e. the mistaken belief that spaces other than gay spaces are straight ones. Rather, he believes that the view of a space as gay space is due to a "complicit act of faith," where "wishful thinking" by users and observers alike serves to support a generally-held belief that a certain area is gay, that
queer activities "dominate a (heterocentric) norm," regardless of how widespread those activities are, or for how long they persist.\textsuperscript{LXXII}

2.2.1.4 A New Definition

I propose a more comprehensive definition of gay space made by combining the salient features of all three of the previous definitions, taking George Chauncy's views and elaborating on the "alternative...even oppositional" uses along the lines of Aaron Betsky, and then adding the physical aspects of that space, whether originally intended for some other use or designed specifically for gay use. In other words, gay space is not just space designed for non-gay purposes and then appropriated for gay use, but can be physical space specifically designed or redesigned for gay purposes. This design is generally on a smaller scale, such as an individual building, certain rooms in a building, or even an outdoor space, but by extension, a group of gay spaces in close proximity can be considered to compose a larger gay area, such as a city block or blocks. In this instance, the uses to which the public space outside the buildings becomes as important as the private space inside the buildings themselves. This public space can include sidewalk, parks, alleyways and subway stations.

As with both Mr. Betsky's and Mr. Chauncey's definitions, this gay space might, in the future, end up being used for something entirely different through adaptive reuse, in much the same way as an empty bank is converted into a restaurant, or a warehouse into a nightclub.\textsuperscript{LXXIII} Adaptive reuse is already occurring in building rehabilitation, where older structures are restored to their former beauty, but altered in ways that make them usable by a 21st century population. The new use of a structure can be radically
different from the intended use planned for by the original builder. Thus, today's back-
room bar might become tomorrow's trendy boutique.\textsuperscript{LXXIV}

2.2.1.5 Time-Oriented Use of Space

George Chauncey comments on the temporal use of space rather than on a "permanent" location, such as a ghetto or neighborhood. He explores how, excluded from, or relegated to, commercial and private spaces, gay men took to the streets and parks, claiming them as venues for cruising and socializing. "Cruising" is gay men looking for other men, usually for consensual sex. The population at large also uses these same public spaces for other purposes; frequently the non-gay users are unaware of the "other" uses to which these spaces are put, although sometimes non-gay users are aware, and accepting, of these "taboo" uses.\textsuperscript{LXXV} This adds another variable to the use of space -- that of overlapping uses of space. However, usually it is the "normal," or planned for, set of users that is unaware of the uses to which other groups -- the 'subversive' groups -- put the space in question. The "subversive" group is always aware of the "accepted" uses of this space. However, even if the space is understood in general to be "gay space," different groups might have different views of it. As Lawrence Knopp states when discussing concentrations of sub-cultures in urban space, "outsiders" might not view the space as those who claim the space view it. While gays in San Francisco might view certain gay neighborhoods as comfortable places to call their own, "outsiders" might view them [in this case The Castro] as "a center of hedonism and self-indulgence, of other gay entertainment areas (sic) (such as San Francisco's South-of-Market, a.k.a. SoMa) as dangerous sadomasochistic underworlds."\textsuperscript{LXXVI}
Unfortunately, Mr. Knopp only discusses the entertainment and sexual aspects of spatial use rather than the complete range of social uses that these neighborhoods contain. While the Castro and SoMa neighborhoods might be viewed in the same way by the gay community as they are by the “outsiders,” they are also more multi-faceted than just “entertainment areas.” A less sexually-oriented example of an “outsider” view of gay space can be found in a 1992 tourist guide to San Francisco. In it, the Castro is only mentioned for the Castro Theater at 429 Castro Street. No mention is made of the surrounding neighborhood and its social standing as a predominantly gay area.

Aaron Betsky feels that the appropriation of space for queer purposes started with, and mirrored, the creation of middle class space starting in the mid-nineteenth century. This middle class space itself was an artificial world, a world that was removed from nature and ordered on more rational principles. For this reason, gay space was in urban areas. Gays mirrored this creation of middle class space, both public and private, both in the creation of their own personal spaces, such as the interiors of their houses, and in the use of public spaces. Gay use of space was also subversive -- gays cruising public boulevards and rest rooms, for instance. Gays trying to pass as straight also created a different type of space -- the mental space of “the closet.” The creation of, or use of space as, gay also helped the emerging gay culture validate itself.

The three original definitions of gay space provided in sections 2.2.1.1 through 2.2.1.3 in this chapter overlooked two important aspects of a neighborhood as gay space: the economic and political clout they can represent. The political clout becomes evident in a large portion of the neighborhood voting a certain way, thus having a direct effect on local elections or donations to political causes. The economic clout can be the creation of
businesses within the neighborhood, the courting of gay dollars by marketing products specifically to the gay market, and increased tax revenue from restored and re-inhabited buildings (when the gay neighborhood develops out of a decaying area). These aspects are gone into more fully in the case study of the Castro.

Returning again to the temporal aspect of gay space, as the Connie Francis song Where the Boys Are suggests in a somewhat different context, gay space can be seen as anywhere that gay men are using space for their own purposes. It can be a transitory space (by really concentrating only on the use to which any space is put at a specific time), as well as an established neighborhood or even an individual building. It can be time sensitive as well, lasting for an instant or for decades. Time as a variable in understanding gay space is something else to explore. For instance, is there a minimum amount of time that a space must be put to gay use, or a critical mass of gays using the space, to make it truly gay space? The answer might be solely up to the parties involved in those specific acts at that time.

2.3 Conclusion

There are many important factors contributing to the creation of gay space, including time, memory, actual physical space, and social use of that space (which includes commercial and political activities). These variables combine to make two main types of gay space: one that is time and place specific, such as gay ghettos, gay bars and gay clubs, bath houses, back-room bars, and sex clubs; and one more transient -- that of the passing moment when a gay man or men occupies a space and use it specifically for a
gay purpose, whatever that might be. Some examples of the latter would be the place a tryst takes place (be it a bed, arbor, or alleyway), the place where a kiss is stolen (in the car before getting out, under the mistletoe at a “straight” party, or at the departure point at an airport), or even something more public, such as a gay rights demonstration in a city park.

More open to interpretation, outside the subject of this thesis but still important, is one other aspect: the already-mentioned “immaterial” space of the Internet (cyberspace), the media, and the views of a particular person. Immaterial spaces are gray areas: are chat rooms or the personals page of a gay website gay space, when there is no actual space, just “internet space?” There are gay activities occurring there, but the real action is in the actual rooms where the visitors are using their computers to access cyberspace. However, the interactions of these flesh-and-blood people are taking place in the virtual space of cyberspace.

Based on these criteria, gay space is more defined by its characteristics than by actual geographical boundaries (which are nonetheless important as the structure upon which social activities take place). The boundaries of gay space can be multi-leveled, where the geographical boundaries do not exactly match the social boundaries. However, as with all physical space, planned uses (whether gay or straight) can be, and usually are, subverted in time. That is the joy of a definition of gay space like George Chauncey’s -- it is a gloriously invented use of space, possibly for the long haul, and possibly just for the moment. The sadness is that it is also transitory. As Mr. Betsky wonders, as gays become more mainstreamed, will gay space die out? Or will there be other possibilities yet to be explored? While we cannot see into the future, we can take a closer look at
a gay neighborhood that has changed over time, and continues to change. By studying and understanding the evolution of a "gay" neighborhood, the future of gay space might, at best, be shaped, or at minimum, be understood in the context of the continuum of gay spaces.
CHAPTER 3

THE HISTORICAL CASTRO: BEGINNINGS TO THE OUTBREAK OF AIDS

Newland Archer: “I want—I want somehow to get away with you into a world where words like that—categories like that—won’t exist. Where we shall be simply two human beings who love each other, who are the whole of life to each other; and nothing else on earth shall matter.”

Madame Olenska: “Oh, my dear—where is that country? Have you ever been there?”

3.1 Reasons for Gay Ghettos

While not referring to gay space in general or the Castro in particular, the above dialogue does indicate one reason for the existence of gay ghettos. They are a place where the conventions of the “straight” world are broken, where gay men and lesbians no longer need to pass as straight, or always be on-guard against societal constraints and even physical abuse. Although many major cities have had enclaves where gays congregated, and although those enclaves have moved around the city over time, the truly open and visible gay ghetto is more a post-Stonewall phenomenon, not occurring in a vacuum but as part of the wider civil rights movements of the 1960’s which made visible many “hidden” groups and issues.

With these various liberation movements in the 1960’s came more public discussion of variations in human sexual behavior, and with this came the revelation that there were certain neighborhoods in a variety of cities where gay men congregated --
neighborhoods that became known as “gay ghettos.” Here, businesses, bars and landlords catered to, or at least tolerated, an openly gay clientele. These were also places where gay men lived. In a way, they were places, or spaces that, even if gay men could not call them their own, at least they could be the identifying force in them. None of this is to suggest that there was no gay liberation movement before the Stonewall riots of 1969, LXXXIII or that there were no gay neighborhoods. Rather, the gay rights movement had been in existence since at least the 1890’s. It became more visible in the 1960’s when other “rights movements” -- most notably the civil rights movement -- came to national attention.

3.2 Gay Bars: The Building Blocks of Gay Culture

Although the Castro is not the first (and probably will not be the last) gay ghetto in San Francisco, it is currently the most widely known. It followed a series of gay enclaves in that city, but these precursors were not always neighborhoods. Before there were entire neighborhoods identified as gay, there were bars, nightclubs and the immediately surrounding areas -- places were gays and straights mixed, drank, ate, were entertained, cruised and had sex. These bars were seen as gay spaces, places where gay men could be gay without hiding it from a hostile society; they were places of camaraderie with other gays. LXXXIV As such, they could also be seen as defensible spaces, with distinct social and physical boundaries. LXXXV The physical boundaries were locked and/or hidden entrances, a second door that had to be opened after going through the first door, or the absence of signs advertising the existence or the type of establishment operating inside the building. The social boundaries could be: a bouncer at the door with the power (both
physical and social) to turn away undesirable would-be patrons, a “cold shoulder” or aloof attitude towards clients seen as outsiders by the rest of the bar’s patrons, and/or repeatedly asking an undesired patron for a numerous forms of identification.\textsuperscript{LXXXVI}

Sociologist Sherri Cavan studied ways that gays protecting their public space of the bars; she classified four types of patrons at one San Francisco gay nightclub that showcased female impersonators -- homosexual regulars, non-homosexual regulars, homosexual tourists, non-homosexual tourists.\textsuperscript{LXXXVII} People in the final group were considered “outsiders” because they had no steady connection with the establishment: gay tourists were in a gay bar, and non-homosexual regulars were already comfortable there. In an effort both to defend the gay space of the bar and to assimilate newcomers into a different type of environment, the performers and waiters would call attention to these people, engage them in banter, and sometimes jokingly hint that they might be visiting because they might be homosexual themselves. This not only defined/reinforced and defended gay space against perceived outsiders, but also, as Ms. Cavan points out, “betrayed the straight outsider’s expectation that he or she would be inconspicuous, a watcher or a judge”\textsuperscript{LXXXVIII} and at the same time helped gays to realize that they could be both gay and unashamed, that in that bar being gay was acceptable, normal behavior.

\subsection*{3.2.1 Location of Gay Bars}

The physical marginalization of gay gathering and meeting places to the less desirable areas of San Francisco, which occurred up through the 1930’s in the Barbary Coast/North Beach district, was shared by other socially outcast institutions -- brothels, flophouses and gambling dens. Sometimes patrons and employees of these other institutions shared bars with gays, either mixing together, or with one group using the bar during the day,
and the other using it at night.\textsuperscript{LXXXIX} On a larger scale, the neighborhood in which the bar was located could be active by day, being used as a nine-to-five business area or commercial strip, and then host outsiders (the gays) at night. Thus, the spatial marginalization of the gay bars could be seen as a reflection of the social marginalization of gays. This phenomenon was still very much in evidence as late as 1980, and in some smaller towns it still operates today.\textsuperscript{XC} Barbara Weightman studied gay and lesbian bars in the western United States, avoiding what she referred to as the ‘known and noteworthy’ gay neighborhoods of larger cities, including the Castro.\textsuperscript{XCI} Her research focused more on these less visible bars, looking at how they blended into their marginalized neighborhoods, yet had subtle clues that advertised themselves to passing gays as gay spaces.\textsuperscript{XCII}

3.2.1.1 Locations of Early Gay Bars

The earliest traceable bars in San Francisco catering to a gay clientele were in the Barbary Coast section of the city, a rather seedy waterfront district near the present-day Embarcadero; this area, as well as the area inland from it, is now known as North Beach.\textsuperscript{XCIII} Unfortunately, records of the names and addresses of many of these establishments are scant. Map 3\textsuperscript{XCIV} shows the location of these early bars as well as bars existing before the 1960’s, when the modern gay rights movement and increased visibility of gays and gay-related activities started. The early bars, very specific gay spaces, could be specialized, with each bar catering to a specific clientele, be it prostitution, drag, shows, or a combination of these.

The first such bar for which a definite date can be found, the Dash, opened in 1908 on the site of the Seattle Saloon and Dance Hall, which had been an establishment
catering to the heterosexual sex trade. The Dash employed female impersonators and homosexual prostitutes. Like many other establishments catering to illegal or socially unacceptable activities, to continue operations the Dash was involved in graft and corruption with the police and City government. Another bar, the Black Cat, opened in Barbary Coast in 1906 but at the time was not specifically gay; however, when it reopened in a new location at the end of Prohibition it was as a restaurant with drag shows that catered to a varied clientele -- gay, non-gay, tourist and local. In 1961 Jose Serria became the first openly gay candidate to run for the Board of Supervisors; he had worked at both the Black Cat and the Beige Room (another nightclub offering drag shows).

While there were bars catering specifically to homosexuals, the Black Cat demonstrates that some public gay nightlife occurred in socially accepted venues that allowed a mixed gay and straight clientele — “legitimate” bars and showplaces, with the showplaces featuring female impersonators. The three most frequently mentioned in memoirs, archives and books are the Black Cat (both its pre- and post-Prohibition locations), Finocchio’s, and the Beige Room. All of these establishments offered drag shows, but at the Black Cat the waiters sometimes dressed in drag.

Unlike the Castro, which became a predominantly gay male neighborhood complete with men’s bars, the Embarcadero/North Beach was a residential and entertainment area for both lesbians and gay men. There were bars specifically catering to gay men or to lesbians as well as a number of bars that hosted a mixed clientele. Some of these bars, though, some had a preponderance of lesbians over gay men, and others catered more to men than to women. Recollections of the time indicate that most of these
bars featured drag entertainment, either drag queens or drag kings (women dressing as men). Bars in the latter category included Mona's 440 Club, while bars in the former category included the Beige Room. While these bars did have a tourist draw, Finocchio's was better known as a specifically tourist-oriented bar.

By the 1930's the Barbary Coast/North Beach area was home to many gay bars and nightclubs,\textsuperscript{XCvii} and by the 1950's North Beach was commonly known as a gay area, although the gay lifestyle there was seen as blending together with the Beat Generation culture.\textsuperscript{XCIX} In reality, the two cultures did not mix freely, with the Beatniks frequently becoming hostile, although it seems that gays might have frequented the same establishments as the Beatniks. It was not solely a gay neighborhood, as the Castro became, but rather a part of the city where gays were apt to live along with others. By the 1960s the number of known gay bars in North Beach had decreased (Map 4).\textsuperscript{C}

As is discussed in Chapter 3, other areas of the city had gay enclaves that paralleled the development of larger gay or gay-oriented enclaves; these were in existence at the same time. The difference between the Castro and these other areas was the diversity of activities in neighborhoods like the Castro, and the specialized uses of these other areas (usually entertainment-oriented businesses).

During all this time, along with the bars, a different type of gay nightlife existed. This nightlife did not take place openly, nor was it socially acceptable. It was cruising for sex. By the 1920's this activity was most known as occurring in the public areas of the Embarcadero, around the waterfront at the eastern end of Market Street.\textsuperscript{Cl} By the 1970's it was the Castro.
3.2.2 Other Aspects of Gay Bars

The early use of bars as meeting places for gays continued to be a feature of San Francisco gay life. By the 1960’s bars were not just places to drink, feel part of a group, and perhaps meet someone. They also acted as community resources before the advent of a large number of gay-specific social and political clubs and organizations. It was through the bars that information was spread concerning police harassment at other bars, the locations of other meeting places, and which professionals, such as lawyers or doctors, accepted clients with homosexual concerns.

3.2.2.1 Harassment of Gay Bars and Their Clients

Unfortunately, by being known as gathering places for gays, bars also became the focus of police and other types of harassment. The dangers faced by operators and patrons of bars catering to a gay clientele included blackmail, bribery and crackdowns by the California Board of Equalization (the State’s liquor control agency) and later by California’s Alcoholic Beverage Commission (ABC), since it was illegal to serve alcohol to known homosexuals until the California State Supreme Court overturned that law in 1951. In that case, Stoumen v. Reilly, the Court ruled that because there was no evidence of “illegal or immoral conduct on the premises” (i.e. homosexual sex, prostitution or drug use) at the Black Cat Cafe, the presence of homosexuals in the bar was not illegal; it was protected as a right of public assembly. So the Café was allowed to keep its liquor license. The ABC again tried to revoke the liquor license of a homosexual bar, this time the lesbian bar Mary’s First and Last Chance in Oakland. The case reached the California State Supreme Court in 1959 as Vallerga v. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control; Vallerga (the owner of Mary’s First and Last Chance bar)
won. The Court ruled that Section 24200(e) of the California Business and Professions Code, which stated that having homosexuals on the premises was ground for revoking the bar’s liquor license, was unconstitutional.\textsuperscript{CVI} Section 24200(e) had been passed by the State Legislature in 1953 in response to \textit{Stoumen v. Reilly}.

This did not immediately stop police harassment of gay bars, which continued until the 1970’s. The dangers of blackmail and bribery applied not just to men being seen in such a bar, but also to those seen near one. The climate of fear during the McCarthy era made both founded and unfounded accusations possible, and even lucrative, for extortionists. Being accused of homosexuality could ruin a person’s professional and private lives. This is one reason why even today, bars that cater to, or tolerate, a gay clientele are either located in the less desirable sections of some towns or do not have large signs advertising their presence.

The dynamics between gay bars and the surrounding neighborhoods and between gays and the population at large changed dramatically during World War II. The population of San Francisco rapidly increased with the entry of the United States into the Second World War. Many of the newcomers were soldiers and sailors (San Francisco was a major naval port and also housed a large number of Army personnel), workers coming for the security and pay of war work, and others looking to improve their lives in a major city. Not all of these people were straight. Away from the traditional surroundings and strictures of smaller towns and social codes of behavior, some of these people now had not only the venues to explore their sexuality but also a larger pool of people in the same situation who were also looking to explore.
Still, restrictions were placed on gay bars even with the higher level of tolerance for social variability that the social restructuring the country underwent during wartime. During World War II military personnel were forbidden to enter bars that were frequented by prostitutes (due to health issues alone, such as the spread of sexually transmitted diseases), and gay bars or bars known to have a large percentage of alleged homosexuals (a socially undesirable group). However, the combined efforts of the military police and ABC to list certain bars as “off limits” to men in uniform had an ironic turn. Usually bars declared off-limits indicated a bar catering to prostitutes and/or homosexuals. By posting large warning signs on the doors of these establishments to keep military personnel in uniform from entering, the authorities unwittingly advertised gay bars to anyone who was unsure where they were. This also led to some of these bars having second, less visible entrances that allowed patrons to enter the bar without being noticed, and also allowed for a quick, unnoticed escape should there be a raid.

These prohibitions against being in gay bars continued the stereotype of gay spaces as being somehow spaces that were forbidden by and to society at large. The stigma of being caught in one, or of being seen in one, had serious consequences both before and after the McCarthy era. In the former case (a police raid, for instance), the names of the arrestees were published in newspapers. This alone could lead to loss of employment or loss of an apartment lease. The latter case could lead to blackmail, whether or not the victim was actually in the bar, or was actually a homosexual. Such were the strictures and onus placed on the gay community before the civil rights movements of the 1960's. Legal recourse to stop this harassment was limited. In this
way gay spaces had effects reaching far beyond the actual spaces themselves: being
captured in one could alter all aspects of a person’s life.

3.3 The Transition from Bars to Neighborhoods

The peregrinations of gay neighborhoods around San Francisco were paralleled by
increased participation of gays and lesbians in the political life of the city and the
emergence of organizations specifically for the gay and lesbian community. This
included the relocation to San Francisco in 1955 of two early gay and lesbian rights
organizations: the Matachine Society (founded in 1950 in Los Angeles) and the founding
of the Daughters of Bilitous. The former was an organization dedicated to the
advancement of homosexual rights (but was founded and run by men); the latter
advanced lesbian rights. In the political sphere, Jose Serria ran for the Board of
Supervisors in 1961 as an openly gay candidate, the first candidate to do so. Although he
lost the election, he received 5600 votes, an indication of the potential political clout of
the GLBT community. By 1980 the San Francisco gay community was large enough
to support at least seven newspapers catering to its needs, an indication of its size and
variety. These publications ranged from the liberal to the conservative and covered
local, regional and national news.

3.3.1. The Castro Becomes Recognized as a Gay Neighborhood

By the early 1970’s the Castro became identified as the newest gay neighborhood. When
discussing the Castro is it important to remember that there is more to the neighborhood
than the visible street and buildings. There are the divisions between the public space of

the streets and sidewalks and the private areas behind the building facades. This demarcation based on the “bricks and mortar” space of the neighborhood was paralleled by the blatant mixing of behavior accepted as “normal” by society at large in a public space with behavior considered best done in private. This can be as minor as same-sex couples walking hand-in-hand and kissing to the more risqué sexual acts occurring in public spaces such as alleyways. Looked at in this way, the whole idea of a gay neighborhood is a mixing of the traditional (straight) world and the taboo (gay) world; where once gays were closeted, hidden, and trying to pass as straight, now there was a very public demonstration of homosexuality. This was so public that by the early 1970s the Castro was an unabashed neighborhood proudly advertising itself as gay. Part of what Henri Lefebvre states as a characteristic of a city, that it is a space “…fashioned, shaped and invested with social activities during a finite historical period” can be applied to the Castro as a gay neighborhood. It is one of the aspects that have turned an otherwise non-descript looking district into a recognized gay ghetto. The acts that make it thus occur in “…a space which is not produced as such.”

3.3.1.1 Why and When the Castro?

There is no information as to why the neighborhood know as the Eureka Valley/Castro attracted gay bars and gays, but popular tradition has it that The Castro was known by insiders as a gay neighborhood shortly after the Second World War, when gays who had served in the Pacific Theater opted to stay in San Francisco after being discharged at the end of the war. Until the 1970s it was a “run-down, largely Irish part of town” that happened to have some gay bars, with what some view as the first on -- The Gem -- established in the late 1960s.
Although it is not possible to establish the exact date that the Castro became "The Castro," it is generally stated that during the period between 1969 (the year of the Stonewall Riots in New York City, popularly viewed as the beginning of the contemporary, visible gay rights movement) and about 1972 his neighborhood became a recognized gay ghetto. In the June 1989 edition of The Bay Area Reporter, marking the 20th anniversary of the Stonewall Riots, a reporter wrote about the area from his arrival in 1966 until 1989. He felt that the "establishment of the Pendulum in or about 1969 was really the ceremonial baptism of Eureka Valley as both a developing gay residential area and a locality whose gay bars attracted gay men from neighborhoods throughout San Francisco and the rest of the San Francisco Bay area." Although the Pendulum was a gay bar, it was not the first one in the Castro. Along with The Gem, by 1966 the then-named Eureka Valley (the earlier name of the Castro District) had at least two gay bars: the Missouri Mule (by 1989 renamed the Detour) and the Mistake (by 1989 known as the Men's Room). Map 5 shows the locations of gay bars from the 1960s. Map 6 illustrates the location of gay bars from the same time in the South of Market (SoMa) district; the Castro was not the only neighborhood at that time with a concentration of gay bars. The difference was that the Castro was a residential neighborhood, offering all the services usually found in such places (such as grocery stores, drug stores and laundromats), SoMa offered none of these. It was not a residential area; if gays went there it was only for the bars and/or the sex that could be had in the alleyways.

The 1970s saw the change of the Castro neighborhood into an internationally recognized gay icon. By 1975 this transformation was well underway, with the Victorian
buildings being bought and renovated by (predominantly middle-class white) gay men.\textsuperscript{CXXIX} It was the slightly seedy aspect of this neighborhood that might have attracted some of the gay pioneers. Aside from the popular belief that gays are among the first group to gentrify a neighborhood, be it for affordable housing or to isolate themselves, there might have been socio-political elements at play. As an example, in the early 1970s many of the commercial building facades had a "distressed or even dilapidated quality."\textsuperscript{CXX} It was this aspect that gave the neighborhood an "emblem of authenticity"\textsuperscript{CXXI} and was a symbol of the "...righteousness of the oppressed homosexual cause."\textsuperscript{CXXII} According to Randy Shilts, the case of the "Castro 14"\textsuperscript{CXXIII} in 1974 "sealed the neighborhood's reputation as the new homosexual hot spot."\textsuperscript{CXXIV} At this time The Castro was also seen as all male; lesbians in the Bay Area at that time, for a number of reasons, staked out their territory in Oakland and Berkeley.\textsuperscript{CXXV} It was not an inclusive all-male gay enclave though; it was a white all-male gay enclave. An early gay black resident, performance artist Brian Freeman, felt that rather than being the "promised land," the Castro was "a vanilla neighborhood."\textsuperscript{CXXVI} Peter Stein, producer of a 1997 public television documentary entitled "The Castro" commented on this exclusivity. He calls the early gay Castro "a white enclave" that was not accepting of non-whites and "lesbians of any color."\textsuperscript{CXXVII} This feeling was commented on by a lesbian survey respondent, who stated that "I (sic) was a place for gay men in the 70's and lesbians were often ignored or harassed there!" This respondent has been a Bay Area resident since 1975.\textsuperscript{CXXVIII} While it is not clear why the budding gay ghetto was the domain predominantly of white gay men, it might have been based on economic as well as social factors. Economically, white men had more disposable income to buy and renovate
existing building stock and to invest in new commercial undertakings. Socially, it could be that self-separation was a deciding factor; within the gay community white men gravitated to other white men, leading to an exclusionary feel that kept non-whites from deciding to reside with them.

3.4 Boundaries

The actual demographics and geographical boundaries of the gay Castro area in pre-AIDS days are hard to determine with any certainty, just as they are now, due to natural population fluxes and the concomitant changes in what people perceive as the geographical borders of socially used space. Complicating this task is that not all viewers see boundaries in the same way. Some look at geographical and physical boundaries, i.e. streets, intersections, hills and valleys, while others looks at economic, social and/or political activities. Still others might look at the demographic aspect -- what is the ratio of gays to straights in any area of the city. There can also the reputation of an area as having certain characteristics; this area might have no set boundary.

Trevor Hailey, who leads walking tours of the Castro that highlight both its historical and current aspects, states that by the mid-1970s, after the transformation into a gay neighborhood was well underway, there were 20,000 gay men living there. A contemporary report put the number at 30% of the population; another put it at 100% of the people living in the 20-block area that comprised the Castro neighborhood. Based on 1970 population count of 62,653 for the supervisory district that includes the Castro, 32% (20,040 people) of the population described in this survey were single
people between the ages of 25 and 44.\textsuperscript{CXXII} Although this does not mean that all of these singles were gay men and lesbians, it was the largest percentage of singles in any of the supervisory districts. In the days before gay civil unions and marriage, this could be taken as an indication of single gays clustering together

The reputation of the Castro as a gay neighborhood was well-enough established by the late 1970s that the \textit{San Francisco Examiner} ran a feature article on it as an attraction for locals and tourists. This article confirmed that ‘....the gay “takeover” of Castro Street’ had begun in the late 1960’s.\textsuperscript{CXXXIII} It not only described the social, economic, shopping and architectural aspects of the neighborhood, but also discussed the stereotypes of gays as well. As a guide meant for a quick tour of the Castro, the author purposely or unwittingly touches on a number of issues raised in this thesis -- from stereotypes of gays to definitions of space to economic clout. Almost as an aside, the author mentions that the stereotype of gays as “....limp-wristed interior decorators...” was changing to that of “....the so-called “Castro Clones”.\textsuperscript{CXXXIV} Touching on the nature-vs.-nurture debate of what creates a homosexual, the author mentions one gay merchant’s statement that a local straight restaurateur changed as the neighborhood did, divorcing his wife and taking up with a man. While perhaps apocryphal, this man’s restaurant was part of a larger trend: a five-to-one ratio of gay to straight businesses within a three-block radius (although the article does not make clear where the radius is centered). Not stated outright was the “common wisdom” that gays have higher disposable incomes than their married-with-children counterparts, thus fueling a gay business boom.
This article also unconsciously touches on the distinction between the physical boundaries and the social boundaries of a given space. Its author limns the geographical boundaries of the Castro as being “From 21st and Church Streets to Market and Church Streets, up both sides of Market to 17th and Douglass, then across Douglass to 21st Street.”\textsuperscript{CXXXV} (Map 7). In contrast, tour guide Trevor Hailey feels that the geographical boundaries of Eureka Valley/Castro encompasses a 44 square block area composed of Castro Street between 16th and 22nd Streets and the five blocks east to Delores Street and west to Douglass Street.\textsuperscript{CXXXVI} (Map 8) Although Ms. Hailey’s comments were made in 2001, a comparison of the \textit{San Francisco Examiner}’s pre-AIDS boundaries and Ms. Hailey’s post-AIDS boundaries share a large overlap (Maps 9 and 10). Given the decimation of San Francisco’s gay population before effective AIDS medications, it is interesting that the area encompassed in Map 8 is still so large compared to over 20 years previously. Whether or not that is because Ms. Hailey is including an area of historical significance within her boundaries, or because it is based on her perception of the current gay ghetto is not clear. How current residents and visitors define the boundaries is discussed in Chapter 4.

3.4.1 Other Names for the Castro

Although generally referred to as “The Castro” in contemporary gay writing, including travel guides, the name was not immediately applied to this San Francisco district as it evolved into a gay neighborhood. It had a variety of names before that, most recently the Eureka Valley; it was, however, known as the Castro District in the 1920s. In advertisements of the time, this designated the geographical area of Castro Street between
17th and 19th Streets and along the 4000 to 4500 blocks of 18th Street.\textsuperscript{CXXXVII} That area corresponds to a good part of today’s Castro, as defined by Trevor Hailey. In about 1972 Harvey Milk (later the first openly gay city Supervisor) founded the Castro Village Association for gay-owned and gay-friendly businesses. His term for the area was “Castro Village.”\textsuperscript{CXXXVIII} That term was shortened to “The Castro.”

\textbf{3.4.2 Invasion and Displacement}

The “gay space” of the Castro came at a cost though. As with any gentrification, gains by one group were bought at a price to some other group. Frances FitzGerald, in \textit{Cities on a Hill} notes that: “[The new gay migrants] might be refugees from oppression, but they were also, by and large, young white men who had arrived in town at the very moment to begin careers. In practice they were taking professional and managerial jobs, or they were staffing the numerous new service industries, or they were starting businesses of their own. In many ways there were proving a boon to the city...But in settling the poor neighborhoods, they were pushing up real-estate prices and pushing out black and Hispanic families.”\textsuperscript{CXXXIX}

Further reinforcing the newness of the Castro as the gay ghetto it was to become, the established working class residents referred to the gay newcomers as “invaders.”\textsuperscript{CXL} This feeling of outsiders moving in was still strong as late as 1997. In that year KQED, San Francisco’s public television station, aired \textit{The Castro}, a 95 minute documentary about the re-making of the Castro into a gay neighborhood.\textsuperscript{CXLI} This documentary includes parts of an interview with members of the Eureka Valley Alumni Association (a group of 60 and up year-old men who lived there before the gay flourishing). These men still voiced their disapproval of their childhood neighborhood’s change into a gay ghetto.
Interestingly, the program shows similarities between the gay Castro and the straight towns or neighborhoods the new gay residents had moved away from. The producer of “The Castro” states that this was due in part to the large numbers of gays from Middle America who were there from the beginning; they re-created some of the ‘small-town’ aspects here that they had liked in the towns they had left behind.\textsuperscript{CXLII}

Just as some of the earlier, established residents were unhappy about ‘the invaders’ changing the character of their neighborhood, not all gay residents of the Castro were happy with the transition from a non-descript neighborhood to a gay ghetto. In 1973, with the transformation of the Castro in full swing, the City Board of Permit Appeals upheld the police department’s refusal to issue a dance permit to an existing bar that wanted to change its name and expand its patron services.\textsuperscript{CXLIII} Some female residents described the neighborhood as “family-style” and expressed their concern for the safety of children playing in the nearby recreation facility on Collingwood Street. They were joined in opposing the permit by at least one self-proclaimed “conservative and active homosexual” who lived near the bar. His view was that the area around 18\textsuperscript{th} and Castro Streets, the bar’s location, had already “reached a saturation point in vehicular, pedestrian, gay bar and other activities, all of which present real and potential police problems.”\textsuperscript{CXLIV} It seems that not only were some of the established, presumably straight, residents trying to ignore, or at least have some control over the changes occurring, but also that not all gay residents were in favor of the unregulated transition to a gay ghetto.\textsuperscript{CXLV}
3.4.2.1 Other Examples of ‘Outsiders’ versus ‘Us’

The working class residents of the Castro were not alone in their belief that the new residents were invaders; this is a cross-cultural phenomenon. In Realms of Memory, Chapters 10 and 11 in Volume I and II, respectively, explore this topic of “outsiders” in our midst. Although using France as an example, the topics discussed in each are relevant here. In Chapter 10, “Gregoire, Dreyfus, Drancy and the Rue Copernic: Jews at the Heart of French History,” Pierre Birnbaum examines how individuals and groups, in this case Jews, while having citizenship in a larger political and/or social group (France), are still seen as “outsiders,” frequently with their own agendas. They are seen as an assimilated, but still active, enemy of the ‘true’ French. In much the same way, gays are frequently seen as subverters of the ‘normal’ order, be it social, sexual or political. To put this in a spatial context, Alain Corbin, in “Paris-Province,” looks at the real and perceived distinctions between urban/provincial areas, and how these blur and change over time. While detailing two geographically separate areas of France, the issues discussed can be applied to a small area of a larger city, especially when that area is considered a place apart, such as a gay ghetto.

3.4.2.2 ‘Them’ versus ‘Us’: Gays, the Castro, and San Francisco

Non-Jewish French citizens considering Jewish French citizens being somehow different and dangerous compared the “true” French, as described by Mr. Birnbaum, is similar to the view that gays are something less than full citizens with full rights. This was demonstrated on May 21, 1979 when, in response to sometimes violent gay protests around City Hall over the Dan White trial verdict, police from six cruisers attacked patrons of The Elephant Walk bar at Castro and 18th Street, although this location was
nowhere near the City Hall demonstrations. In the Elephant Walk incident, police invaded the bar and indiscriminately attacked peaceful patrons, hitting them with chairs and nightsticks. Afterwards, Supervisor Harry Britt commented that “the police generally tend to treat gay people as ‘less than human beings.’” That police overreacted to a person outside the bar who threw a rock at them (and was arrested with no protests from the bystanders) is further indicated by the remarks of a victim. Darryl Fine, a former member of the National Guard (in the 1960s) said that then, even under fire, the “untrained soldiers” of the National Guard acted professionally under sniper fire while the professionally trained police did not. He went on to compare the police actions that night: “If the untrained soldier could act professionally, I want to know why trained police officers could not have acted professionally.” At the time this was seen as police revenge for having been overpowered by the gays at the City Hall riots. When the Elephant Walk incident happened, some in the GLTB community saw it as part of a larger danger to their very existence.

At the time, lesbian Phyllis Burke thought “We’ll never be able to take our place at the table. They’ll just kill us.” When she witnessed the GLBT community come together as more of a united group after this, she concluded that the Castro was and is “a cornerstone for gay and lesbian liberation. It will always be that way.” In 1995 the 1910 Mission-style police station that services the northern part of the Castro neighborhood was renovated. The police themselves alluded to the at times uneasy relationship of the police and civilian population by stating that “The Station is now an efficient, functional and secure place for officers, as well as a non-intimidating building
for the residents and visitors on (sic) the surrounding neighborhoods." (The italics are this author's.)

3.5 Politics and Economics

The 1970s also showed the political power of the new gay ghetto with the election of openly gay candidate Harvey Milk to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 1977. Milk was known as the unofficial mayor of Castro Street, and this ghetto became his power base. This illustrates another aspect of gay space -- the power to organize not just spatially but politically as well. Gay economic power was also a factor in defining the Castro as gay. It was exemplified by the revitalization of the Castro Village Association (CVA) -- an association of gay-oriented businesses (re)formed after the Eureka Valley Merchants Association (EVMA) refused to let the new gay businesses in the area join it.

This economic aspect was reported on in the popular press. In the September 1980 issue of "San Francisco Magazine," one of the articles concerned gays in business. Subtitled "The Prejudice and the Power," it explored the world of gays in prominent professions and businesses in San Francisco as well as gay-owned and operated businesses. This article sought to dispel the myths that all gays were hairdressers or effeminate by demonstrating that instead gays were well integrated into the business and economic structure of the city; it also implied that they were not acting effeminately. Moreover, a number of these men and women decided to be 'out' at work, in part a response to the increasing backlash against the GLBT community.
Politically, the Castro as a power base is a specific example of what John D’Emilio feels is important about the concept of community and place. Mr. D’Emilio studied the post-World War II relationship between community development and political mobilization, including the interactions between community life and politics. This is a theme also taken up by Manuel Castells, who feels that the development of the Castro as a gay neighborhood is linked to the development of a gay social movement. He speaks only of gay men, not of lesbians. By using the Castro as an example, he seems to indicate that these spaces do not have to be designed and built but rather can be existing space that is taken over.

3.5.1 Integration, Dispersal and the Importance of Space

By the 1990s the GLBT community had become integrated enough into the power and social structures of San Francisco that the spatial “ghettoization” of the community around Castro Street had begun to disintegrate, while the social aspects grew and diversified. Even with this disjuncture, the Castro kept, and keeps, a special place, both physically and socially, in the GLBT community. This involves both the historical Castro and the current realities. It is not just a place of collective and individual memories and of important social and political events, both past and present. It is also a symbol of hope for the present and future of the GLBT community. As a symbol, the “queer space” of the Castro is no longer just an actual area but a memory-driven construct. It is the idea of the Castro as a place-based “queer space”. In this sense, it has something in common with Jacques and Mona Ozouf’s description of the book La Tour de France par Deux Enfants. They see this book not as something to be read, but rather as “…a book with memories pressed between its pages, a crystal ball filled with dark
pine forests, busy ports, aqueducts, and sewing machines, the Orleanais and the Camargue, dusty highways, cool meadows, the sounds of Paris...”

This shows how an object, or for this thesis an area, can represent more than just the physical space itself. Similarly, in Chapter Two of the same volume, “The Cathedral,” Andre Vauchez explains how for individuals and society a physical structure and space can have multiple meanings and memories and how these lead to a consensus that the structure/space needs to be preserved. It also highlights that the intended use of the structure can be ignored or lost in these meanings. In this instance, the religious nature of the cathedral is sometimes superseded by the political and social uses to which it is also put. The same can be said of The Castro. On the surface it is just a streetscape in one of many similar neighborhoods in San Francisco, but its value as a gay place lies in the use of the public space and the meanings attached to it by “insiders” and “outsiders” alike. The San Francisco Pride Parade illustrates that the physical space of the Castro is not always as important as its social meaning.

The precursor to the organized parade was a march on June 27, 1970 of 20 to 30 people down Polk Street from Aquatic Park to City Hall; the next day a “Gay In” was held in Golden Gate Park. In 1972 this march was re-named the Gay Freedom Day Parade; a rival Festival of Gay Liberation was held at the same time at the Civic Center. The non-profit Pride Foundation was formed that same year to “coordinate future events and avoid similar conflicts.” The newly organized annual parade started in 1974. Since these events took place in the early days of The Castro’s full-scale transition to a gay neighborhood, it is understandable that they were not held in or near there. However, the current parade does not go near the Castro, either. Rather, it follows a larger and
longer route down a rainbow flag bordered Market Street from the Embarcadero to the Civic Center/City Hall Plaza. In this way, it can be seen as representing the mainstreaming of gays in San Francisco as well as the expansion of “gay space” from The Castro to the city at large. It also terminates in a street fair in front of the architectural representation of municipal power -- City Hall -- as did the earliest marches. There is, however, a street party later in the evening on Castro Street which is blocked to vehicular traffic.

The Gay Pride parade’s meaning is not bounded by physical space; it contains marchers and floats from other cities and countries and thus ignores the local topography by proclaiming the “pride” of gays elsewhere. The AIDS Memorial Quilt Project offers a similar example. While started and still based in San Francisco, the quilt accepts panels for all people who have died from AIDS. In this way, geographic boundaries become meaningless while the symbolism of San Francisco as an activist center and memorial base is highlighted. The AIDS Memorial Quilt Project is discussed in more depth in Chapter 4.

3.6 The Castro as Gay Space

Referring back to the comprehensive definition of gay space presented in Chapter Two, the Castro meets the definition of gay space. The area was not designed as gay space but was appropriated for that use; it is understood by gays and non-gays alike as a gay ghetto, and is definitely a place of orgasm, whether in the public realm of bars and alleyways or the private spaces behind the building facades. There is also “place attachment,” as defined by Setha Low and Irvin Altman. The Castro has the social, material and
ideological dimensions and participation in the public life of the place, based on the
development and growth of ties to both family and the larger community, that constitute
place attachment. From a negative point of view, enough anti-gay literature and rallies
make mention of the Castro to merit its designation as gay space. Just as important, the
Castro is also seen as a neighborhood, as defined by Jane Jacobs; the Castro is a place
that offers all the goods and services necessary for survival, as well and the amenities to
make life enjoyable. It is genuinely a place of community, at least for gays.

3.7 Other Areas Paralleling the Castro

In October 1973 the Kalendar, the forerunner of The Bay Area Reporter, published maps
indicating the locations of gay bars and gay-owned businesses. The terms used were
“Downtown,” “Polk-Larkin,” “Folsom’s Miracle Mile-Valencia Valley,” “East Bay”
(including Oakland and Hayward), “North Beach” and, for the Eureka Valley, “Castro
Village,” showing that Milk’s moniker for the area had taken. The naming of an area
is one way of demarcating the area as somehow different or special. By having an
agreed-upon name, the “space” becomes a “place.” Although not included in the
Kalendar’s list, SoMa is a term in popular usage in San Francisco. As already discussed,
unlike the Castro, SoMa is not a primarily residential area. It is a warehouse/light
industrial area in which gay bars are located. Most of these bars cater to the
Levi/Leather/Biker/Bear crowd.

To illustrate the parallel development of the Castro and SoMa (which was also
evolving as a gay entertainment area) Maps 11 and 12 show the locations of gay
bars in both these neighborhoods during the 1970s and 1980s, when they were in full
swing as a recognized gay neighborhoods. The 1970s and 1980s have been combined on both of these maps, reflecting the heyday of the Castro (and by extension gay life in general in San Francisco) from its “founding” as a gay ghetto to when the effects of AIDS on the area was shown through the closing of bars.

3.8 The End of One Era and the Beginning of Another

In 1978, three years before the outbreak of the AIDS epidemic, the Castro was established as a gay neighborhood; within the gay subculture it was recognized and marketed as such. The gay community at least recognized that the change from the Castro area to “The Castro” did not happen overnight; it was an evolutionary process. San Francisco Frontiers newsmagazine, a gay-oriented publication, ran an article in June 1999 entitled “How the Castro Became San Francisco’s Gay Neighborhood,” with a teaser sub-heading of “Ever wonder how a few square blocks near the geographical center of San Francisco became known as ‘The Castro,’ (sic) the symbolic main street of the city’s queer community and an emblem of gay pride around the world?” With the outbreak of AIDS, the question now became, “what would happen to the Castro?” Could it remain the iconic gay ghetto it had become? This was quickly followed by the question “Should it?” and then by the realization that no matter what, things would change.
...a man returning after years of absence would have known, with his eyes shut, that he was in... Cities can be recognized by their pace just as people can by their walk. Opening his eyes, he would recognize it all again by the way the general movement pulsed through the streets, far sooner than he would discover it from any characteristic detail. And even if he only imagined he could do so- what does it matter?\textsuperscript{CLXVIII}

4.1 AIDS and San Francisco

When the disease now known as AIDS was first reported in 1981, most of the cases seen were in New York City and San Francisco. From the initial eight reported cases, by the end of 2002 AIDS had claimed the lives of 501,669 people in the United States alone.\textsuperscript{CLXIX} Originally referred to as GRID (Gay-Related Immune Deficiency), its impact on the gay community nation-wide, and on San Francisco’s gay population in particular, has been devastating. As a consequence, the Castro has undergone immense transformations. In the first years of the AIDS epidemic the Castro was still seen as a gay ghetto, albeit one under siege, as indicated by a flier from Coming Home, a support service group for lesbians and gay men with "live (sic) threatening illness."\textsuperscript{CLXX} The 1985 Castro Street Fair, "Coming Home," advertised the sale of t-shirts to raise money.
Their flyer specifically stated that the “…community extravaganza (was) planned to demonstrate that Castro (sic) is still the thriving center of San Francisco’s powerful and socially active gay and lesbian population.” Proceeds from these t-shirt sales were to be divided between four non-profit organizations serving people with AIDS.\textsuperscript{CLXXI}

4.1.1 AIDS and GLBT History

The devastation caused by AIDS and the “natural” deaths of older gay men and lesbians meant the loss of historical memories and living links to the history of the gay community, both non-spatially and as related to the Castro. To claim, and in some cases to reclaim,\textsuperscript{CLXXII} a vanishing past, concerned lesbians and gay men in San Francisco decided to start collecting any information they could to preserve the GLBT past, both gay life in general and that past linked to specific spaces and sites. These collections were both broad-based and of very narrow focus. An early broad-based collection is the San Francisco Gay and Lesbian History Project.\textsuperscript{CLXXIII}

Examples of more specialized collections include the Harvey Milk Archives,\textsuperscript{CLXXIV} started after Milk’s death in 1978 and donated in 1996 to the San Francisco Public Library, and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Transgender Historical Society of Northern California (GLBTHSNO), founded in 1985.\textsuperscript{CLXXV} This interest in San Francisco’s GLBT history includes a focus on the Castro as the geographical location where gay history was made and lived. This history is not just composed of high profile events, such as protests and street fairs, but also of everyday events that make a specific geographic area a social neighborhood.

Respondents to the survey conducted for this thesis indicated that history in, and of, the Castro is important to gays and non-gays alike. This history includes the historical
structures and historic neighborhood as well as gay and lesbian social and political history.

4.1.1.1 Survey Respondents and the Importance of the Castro

Survey respondents who indicated that the Castro was still important to the gay community by answering ‘yes’ to Question 9 (Do you feel that the Castro is still important to the gay community?) were asked by Question 10 to rate ten aspects using a 1 through 5 scale, with 1 being important and 5 not important. Two of the choices were “Its (the Castro’s) History” and “Historic Structures”. Thirty three out of 38 respondents (86.8%) answered yes to Question 9; their ranking of these two aspects of the Castro reinforce the importance of GLBT history and its architectural setting. Overall, 24 of the 33 respondents who answered Question 10 ranked “Its History” with a 1 (important) and four respondents ranked it with a 2 (somewhat important). No one ranked it with a 3 (neutral) or a 4 (not very important); only one person ranked it with a 5 (not important).

“Historic Structures,” while seen as important, did not rank as highly as history. Only 11 of the 33 survey takers who responded ranked it as 1 (important); eight ranked it 2 (somewhat important); five were neutral on this, choosing to rank it with a 3; and three chose a 4 ranking (not very important). As with the selection of “Its History” as being important to the Castro, only one person ranked “Historical Structures” with a 5 (not important). Even so, the survey results indicate that more, rather than fewer people familiar with the Castro feel that the “brick and mortar” backdrop of the Castro is important.
4.1.2 AIDS and the Castro

There were signs after 1981 that the Castro in the Age of AIDS was changing into a less-gay, if not actually non-gay area. In 1996 the *San Francisco Chronicle* ran an article titled "There Goes the Neighborhood", subtitled "After 25 years at the heart of the gay movement, San Francisco’s Castro district is going mainstream." In its section on the Castro, a 2002 walking tour guide, *Historic Walks in San Francisco*, mentions the changing demographics of this neighborhood. Pinning the beginning of the change on the devastation wrought by AIDS, the guide points out that the Castro’s changing demography is only partially because of the loss of gays to the disease; it is also that San Francisco gays now feel accepted enough to live in other parts of the city, not just in a gay ghetto. This guide states that now families with young children are moving into the area, drawn by the sense of community and the feeling of safety. The change is not just demographic, it is economic as well. Speaking of the remaining gays, the guide continues "Gay residents today complain more about the high rents that are displacing small local businesses with chain store outlets than about straights moving in."

The death of the gay Castro has been delayed, regardless of these headlines and articles. In 1992, just four years before the *San Francisco Chronicle* ran their article, plans fell through for a gay and lesbian community center to be located in the newly vacant Bank of America building at Harvey Milk Plaza. Just as important as the Center was to be for the GLBT community was this proposed location for it. As Supervisor Carole Midgen said, "Symbolically (the property) is the gateway to the Castro, to San Francisco’s gay and lesbian community." One of the main reasons the Center did not move into this prime space was a testament to the strength of the GLBT community --
the space was too small for the needs of a center. Instead, it opened at 1800 Market Street. CLXXXIX

At the urging of the Board of Supervisors, the Bank of America did want a community-based tenant; having the GLBT community center in their building at below market rent could also help the bank improve relations with the gay and lesbian community after a 1992 gay and lesbian boycott, a boycott started after the Bank of America reinstated funding to the Boy Scouts of America, an organization that discriminates against openly gay members. Originally the bank was not going to resume funding, but under pressure from conservative Christian groups decided to reinstate it. CLXXX

Even though the Center did not take over the space, there was still hope from the Supervisors’ Committee that a gay and lesbian focused group could become the tenant. CLXXXI One did.

4.1.2.1 The Castro Responds to AIDS

In 1995 a comprehensive AIDS center opened in the Castro. Until then, there had not been such a service center in what was still seen as a gay district. CLXXXII The location was 400 Castro Street, the Bank of America building that just three years earlier had been the planned home of a gay and lesbian community center. This building was still seen as “...the heart of The City’s gay and lesbian community” CLXXXIII and was still considered a “pivotal” location, according to Joanna Rinaldi, deputy director for the AIDS Health Project. CLXXXIV As the Center’s Director Carl Yoshimoto stated, “We hope that the accessibility and convenience that this location provides and will help bring in those individuals who are infected, or affected....by the HIV virus.” CLXXXV This new center
offered individual psychotherapy, anonymous testing, group support sessions for people with HIV and AIDS, and doctor referrals, all for free. It was run under the auspices of the UC-San Francisco AIDS Health Project, who felt that the center would serve approximately 300 clients per week. CLXXXVI

A second, larger clinic (including a pharmacy) was scheduled to open 18 months later, a few blocks away; it was planned as a “one-stop shop” for AIDS/HIV services; the center at 400 Castro Street would then merge with this new clinic. Upon moving out, the center’s lease would then be taken over by Golden Gate Performing Arts, Inc., an organization representing gay and lesbian performing arts groups. CLXXXVII Again, this symbolically and geographically important address was expected to serve the gay and lesbian community, whether or not the neighborhood remained a gay ghetto.

The AIDS center did move out of 400 Castro Street, but Golden Gate Performing Arts, Inc. did not move in. Instead, the space finally ended up being rented to a non-gay tenant -- a Diesel clothing store.

4.1.2.2 Religion and the Castro

Even if the Castro did not have an AIDS center before 1995, there were other places to go for social, medical and religious support. One of these was the Metropolitan Community Church (MCC) in the Castro, a member congregation of the Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches, a Protestant organization. Showing that there is more to a gay ghetto than an undifferentiated bloc of gay men, at the end of his pastoral duties, Reverend Jim Mitulski, pastor from 1985 to 2000, stated, “The goal of the church has been to build community.” CLXXXVIII In this sense, a community is not just a population in a geographically bounded space but is also a relationship between a group
of people and God. The MCC is more than just a place of worship; Reverend Mitulski made it a center of social activism and, on a small scale, a provider of medical relief for people with AIDS. On the social side, the church distributed medical marijuana for AIDS patients and became a place where the homeless could get food. Due to some of these programs, relations with the surrounding community have not always been smooth; the church was firebombed twice. While AIDS brought Reverend Mitulski to this church (he was committed to doing AIDS work), AIDS is also the cause for his leaving. After over 500 funerals of AIDS victims (and on a brighter note, about the same number of gay weddings) he states, “I’m committed to do AIDS work, but I need a change of scenery. I don’t want my life to be defined by the grief I feel for having lived through those years.”

Aside from a gay-specific ministry such as MCC, a congregation of a mainstream Protestant denomination, the Bethany United Methodist Church, started constructing a community ministry center at the corner of Market and Sanchez Streets in 2004, just east of Castro Street (Figures 1 and 2). The small billboard at the site promises that the center will be a place that is “dedicated to Christ’s all-inclusive love,” but gives no anticipated completion date. The church’s webpage specifically states that it continues to be “...a Reconciling Congregation”, meaning that they “...affirm and welcome all men and women without regard to gender orientation or sexual preference.” That such a ministry is not only situated in the Castro but is expanding indicates that the neighborhood in 2004 was home to a large enough GLTB population to warrant this.
Figure 1  The rainbow motif on this Bethany United Methodist Church sign indicates the acceptance of the GLBT community by this congregation.
4.1.2.3 The AIDS Memorial Quilt and the AIDS Memorial Grove

Another form of working through the pain of AIDS deaths, and related to AIDS and its affect on the Castro, is the AIDS Memorial Quilt/The Names Project Foundation. This got its start in San Francisco and was originally housed in the Castro. The Quilt is a memorial to all those lost to AIDS, consisting of individual panels submitted by survivors of the dead. It was started in 1985 by gay activist Cleve Jones as an almost spontaneous act of mourning for the dead. After a candle-light march to mark the deaths of Harvey Milk and Mayor George Moscone, Jones asked that those present write the name on a
placard of someone they knew who had died from AIDS; these placards were then taped to the San Francisco Federal Building, making it look like a giant quilt; by 1987 this concept had become the actual quilt project.\textsuperscript{CXCI}

Started as a local memorial project, the quilt now has panels from over 30 countries; every state in the United States has submitted panels and is the largest community art project in the world.\textsuperscript{CXCII} In this way the Castro can be seen to have a link, through an AIDS memorial, to an international community already hit by AIDS. In a similar vein, the National AIDS Memorial Grove is located in San Francisco’s Golden Gate Park. Calling itself “a place for remembrance and renewal,”\textsuperscript{CXCIV} it started as a grass-roots project, just like the AIDS Memorial Quilt/The Names Project Foundation. It was created by San Francisco residents who wanted a natural space in which all could “remember lives lost to AIDS.”\textsuperscript{CXCV} While not in the Castro or any other neighborhood (space and growing conditions make this almost impossible), it is still in San Francisco. While AIDS is not a disease restricted to gays, and the Quilt and Grove are not gay-specific, their location in San Francisco highlights that city’s status as one of the first US cities affected by the disease, a disease that even by its earliest name, GRID (Gay Related Immune Deficiency) was linked to the gay male population.

4.1.2.4 AIDS Housing in the Castro

The Planning Commission’s approval (in a six-to-one vote) in 2000 of a transitional-housing facility in the former City Athletic Club building at 2500 Market Street indicates the effects of AIDS on the Castro’s demographics. Targeting gay homeless youths specifically, this facility was chartered to run for two years. This shelter was not for one-night stays; users had to sign a contract to stay for at least 90 days. At the time, the
operators felt that the average stay would actually be three to six months. Instead of just a place to shower and sleep, the shelter gave residents referrals to social services agencies for help with finding jobs, some kind of more permanent housing, and drug treatment. While local residents in the area were divided about having this institution, the general feeling was that it would address an existing problem rather than bring in homeless from elsewhere in the city. Again, this example highlights the area residents' feeling that the Castro is a distinct area. It is unusual, though, that while there was no desire to bring in down-and-out people from elsewhere in the city, there was a willingness to help neighborhood undesirables and, interestingly enough, newly arriving gays from anywhere who were down on their luck.

This facility helps point out the continuing strength of the Castro's reputation as a gay Mecca; these homeless youths specifically came to the Castro to start a new life. At the time of the article in 2000, at least one facility resident already held a job but could not afford rent on an apartment. He stated that by having the shelter, he could sleep and maintain his appearance, thus allowing him to keep his job and get back on his feet. As intended, this shelter has addressed social issues that affected the local neighborhood, thus keeping some stability in a transitional economic and social period. At the same time, it could also be seen as keeping a gay element alive in this neighborhood. Since these new residents are gay, if they stay in the Castro they will be part of a newer, younger generation staking out the Castro as their own (gay) neighborhood.

The dislike of having the destitute in the neighborhood is echoed in the 18 surveys returned from those handed out in the Castro and in San Francisco. Of the six respondents who answered Question 7, which asks respondents to indicate things that
give the Castro a negative character, three stated specifically “the homeless.” Only one respondent in the 20 other returned surveys mentioned the homeless, regardless of how often the respondents visited the area.

4.2 Economics

Economics are still a strong force defining the Castro. Even with the demographic changes wrought by AIDS, the Castro still remained a living, thriving neighborhood. As an article in the *San Francisco Examiner* pointed out in 1993, the Castro was still “recession proof” after 20 years of “consistently strong retail sales,” even as the rest of San Francisco’s neighborhoods were harmed by the real estate slump and recession of the time.\textsuperscript{CXCVIII} This same article indirectly comments on the changing characteristics of the people who visit the Castro, although the neighborhood itself is still seen as a gay neighborhood. This gay public space at that time offered trendy shopping for everyone. As the article states, there are gays in the bars, tourists during the weekends, and “moneyed residents who live nearby” who spend money in the many and varied types of shops.\textsuperscript{CXCIX} A downside is the types of stores there for tourists. A local resident feels that there are now “Too many gaudy tourist-oriented businesses (e.g. cheesy sex shops).”\textsuperscript{CC}

There is a second type of economic power here, only touched on in the *Examiner* article: that of the money being spent to renovate and improve the commercial spaces. This continued economic powerhouse continues to the present, and is not just confined to newer stores; older ones are updating stock to cater to a more affluent clientele, whether they live in the neighborhood or not. This mixing and mingling of different types of
people was made possible by the “gayness” of the neighborhood -- it was viewed as a desirable place to shop.

4.2.1 Chain Stores and Local Merchants

Although chain stores have moved in (major banks have had a presence for years\textsuperscript{CCI}), places like Pottery Barn, although decried by many local residents as heralding the beginning of the end of the Castro’s individuality, are still being challenged by local businesses, such as Cliff’s Hardware -- a long-time institution on Castro Street. With the increased business that came with the building renovations and restorations that started in the 1970’s and continues today, Cliff’s has remained not only a popular store with all area residents, regardless of sexuality, gender or age; it has expanded both physically and in the range of items carried. Originally a combination of a five-and-dime and hardware store, the original Cliff’s has taken over the adjacent store and made it into a design center. Their always entertaining store displays still underscore the gay sensibility of the locals (Figures 3 and 4).
Figure 3  Cliff's Variety store on Castro Street. This is a locally owned business that has adapted to changes in the neighborhood.
Figure 4  Window display in Cliff's Variety store. The quirky humor can be seen as reflective of neighborhood sensibilities.

However much local residents fought to keep the Castro filled with small local businesses, in 2001 a Pottery Barn opened on the north-east intersection of Castro, 17th, and Market Streets, diagonally across from the Castro Street MUNI station. South of this intersection is the beginning of the Castro neighborhood, thus, the Pottery Barn can be seen symbolically as the outside, non-personal, straight-oriented corporate world getting ready to storm a bastion of independent, individual-oriented living and shopping, where independent store owners are patronized by the locals, who in turn are happy to support the neighborhood businesses. The Pottery Barn has other symbolism as well, although almost certainly not intended: it is located next to the site of one of the Castro’s first gay
bars, the Missouri Mule. The Diesel clothing store can also be seen as symbolic- it occupies the space previously occupied by the first comprehensive AIDS center in the Castro. This site is also at the intersection that is considered the gateway to the Castro; it is also the first building people coming out of the MUNI station in the Castro see. But for the large rainbow flag flying overhead, the name of the plaza (Harvey Milk Plaza) and the well-marked Twin Peaks gay bar situated across Castro Street, the Diesel store makes this area look like any other commercial intersection, not one that is the heart of the gay Castro.

Chain stores at nearby locations can also be seen as giving the Castro community more shopping choices, of opening up another link between a specialized neighborhood/space and the larger, non-bounded world of international merchandizing. Two more examples are a small Ben and Jerry’s Ice Cream Parlor and a Ritz Camera, both on Castro Street; they have incorporated the rainbow flag into their signs as a way of recognizing the gayness of their neighborhood (Figures 5 and 6).
Figure 5  Rainbow flag iconography incorporated in Ben and Jerry’s sign on Castro Street: note the ampersand.
This is not to say that gays in the Castro did not shop at big-name stores previously, just that before they had to go outside the Castro, or shop by catalogue or through the Internet. Now this can be done within sight of the independent storeowners across the intersection. Of course, in a free-market system, the customer can always choose not to shop in a big-name store and instead give his or her dollars to the local stores, thus keeping the neighborhood independent of the faceless corporate world. One survey respondent felt that franchise businesses should be limited, as it homogenizes the neighborhood and causes gentrification. Another stated that as “...the businesses, the renters/owners in the Castro neighborhood become much less gay centered, another
neighborhood will take its place. I would be sad, but a large part of my gay dollars would be spent in the new neighborhood. In the case of the Pottery Barn though, as one long-time resident explained it, when it first opened, everyone swore that they would not shop there, saying that it meant the end of the special neighborhood that is the Castro. However, as time went on, locals did shop there, albeit with guilty feelings. That this was change for the worse is summed up by one Castro resident in her answer to survey Question 5 (Has the Castro changed?): “Pottery Barn? Need I say more...”, and by a former resident who responded to the same question with “Just say “NO” to Starbucks, Old Navy, etc.”

Efforts to block a chain store from opening in the gay ghetto are not new. In 1995 Noah’s Bagels, a local Emeryville-based chain, fought to win approval for a store in the empty Bank of America building adjacent to the Castro Street MUNI Station. What made this fight interesting was that Noah’s had to get a special amendment from San Francisco’s Planning Commission to do this. Ten years previously the city had passed an ordinance that forbade any new food establishment in this neighborhood from opening in any space not just vacated by a food establishment. Originally, this law was designed to appease the local merchants, who felt that chain stores would change the character of the Castro in a negative way, as well as put them out of business. By enacting the ordinance, the city government recognized that the Castro District was a unique neighborhood that needed to be preserved, or at least needed its economic life preserved. In the end, the store was approved and opened in the spring of 1995. At that time this same Noah’s Bagels became a financial supporter of the first AIDS center to open in the Castro, contributing $420,000. As previously discussed, this AIDS center opened in the
same building that housed Noah’s Bagels. Even though Noah’s Bagels was not a strictly local business, it still funded a gay-oriented organization in the Castro, recognizing what type of neighborhood it operated in. By 2004 Noah’s Bagels had been bought by the New World Restaurant Group, and that shop is no longer there.\textsuperscript{ccvii}

The continuing debate centers not just on the commercial factors that make the Castro a gay space, but on the social ones they affect as well. Most of the debate concerns which components should be protected and which should be determined by the larger world of free-market capitalism. Henri Lefebvre recognized economics as a prime factor in any social space, gay or straight, when he stated that “social space is produced and reproduced in connection with the forces of production (and with the relations of production). And these forces, as they develop, are not taking over a pre-existing, empty or neutral space, or a space determined solely by geography, climate, anthropology, or some other comparable consideration.”\textsuperscript{ccviii} It is the continuing production and altering of space that makes the debate so important; as the economic bases of the Castro change, so does its social space.

4.2.2 Tourism

The gay Castro is marketed as a tourist destination, but at the same time that tourist guidebooks and guided tours highlight the gayness of the neighborhood to gays and non-gays alike, gay publications are pushing not just the Castro but the rest of San Francisco (outside the Castro and other gay districts) to gay travelers. In the free magazine \textit{Out in Jersey}, Andrew Collins writes that if gay tourists look at San Francisco as a “been there, done that” destination, they should try and explore the less advertised areas and try new experiences there, such as biking around the city and dining in non-tourist
restaurants. He also feels that gays, rather than avoid the Castro on such a visit, should rather look at it in a different way than just as a place to party. These visitors should try shopping in the Castro/Market Street Corridor areas. This shopping should not just be for souvenirs, but also for antiques, clothing and books. Similarly, in *Historic Walks in San Francisco*, the section on The Castro/Eureka Valley mentions that this is the gay ghetto and then goes on to lead you through not just the gay things to see but also other things that are non-gay, such as sites of now-demolished historic buildings and other buildings. In effect, this layering of the current status of the Castro as gay is placed in the context of the longer history of the Castro/Eureka Valley before the 1960s.

Marketing the Castro as a gay space is not new. Early in the AIDS epidemic (and before its concomitant ravaging of the social and economic structure in this gay neighborhood), a *Map and Guide: Upper Market, Church and Castro Streets*, a free gay and lesbian-oriented map/guide to the neighborhood, indicated 34 establishments in this area. Although these are not all gay-specific establishments, their advertising in a gay-oriented guide does indicate the willingness of these advertisers to tap into the gay section of the market. Given who sponsored the guide, this map appears to be an attempt to blur the boundaries between gay and straight businesses. While sponsored by the Eureka Valley/Upper Market Planning Commission, it is endorsed by six other organizations, including two specifically gay entities: the San Francisco Gay Tourist and Visitors Bureau and the Golden Gate Business Association. This latter organization took out an ad in the guide describing itself as the “nation’s largest gay and lesbian business organization representing professionals, tradespeople, merchants and other business owners…” This mixing of gay and straight visitors in the early 1980’s
foreshadowed the larger mixing that would happen in the late 1990s and continues into the 21st century.

4.2.3 Marketing Other Gay Neighborhoods

The marketing of a neighborhood as gay is not unique to San Francisco. In January 2005 AOL News ran an article on efforts in Spokane, Washington to do the same thing there.\textsuperscript{CCXIV} While that effort is being proposed by the Inland Northwest Business Alliance (an association of gay and gay-friendly businesses) as an economic revitalization plan, the city government is neither pushing nor hindering the idea. The development of the area will not use public funds; the developers will finance it. Two major differences between this type of development and the Castro are that the Castro was already a gay neighborhood when the city government and business organizations started marketing it as such, and the Castro did not start out as a planned gay neighborhood. No location for Spokane’s proposed district has been announced, indicating that developers and planners will chose an area and develop it as gay, essentially hoping to create gay space where perhaps none existed before. Although economic gain seems to be the driving force, the owner of a local graphic design firm also feels that there will be a social benefit. He said that “It would help youth struggling with their sexuality to realize they don’t have to go away ...to be gay. You can be gay right here in Spokane.”\textsuperscript{CCXV}
4.3 Bars and the Castro

Barbara Weightman might be overstating the case when she states that gay bars are “the most important social and cultural institution in the gay world,” but she is correct in identifying the space in a gay bar as being designed as defensible gay space. Since she wrote about gay bars in 1980, the space could be seen as not just physically defensible from individuals going ‘queer bashing,’ but defensible as a social space as well. Even today, though, gay bars are one of the most visible gay spaces to gays and non-gays alike. If people are coming into the Castro for partying and gay bars, because it is a gay ghetto, there have been some changes since the pre-AIDS height of the Castro as a bar area. In a recent edition of *Odyssey*, a free booklet highlighting gay entertainment events and available in any bar, there is only one advertised bar, the Detour, that is in the Castro district. In a general calendar of bar listings and events, however, more are to be found. These listings by themselves are not an accurate portrait of the gay scene, however. The booklet is geared more towards circuit queens (gay young males who go from major party to major party). The company that publishes this booklet is located on Castro Street though.

Another free publication, *Columbia Fun Maps*, also available in bars, is more encompassing in its offerings because it is not geared towards any one gay subgroup, such as younger gays, the leather or bear communities, or retirees. It is published as a part of a series of general gay guides to a number of U.S. cities and regions; there is one specifically for San Francisco and the Russian River area. This guide has a map of San Francisco and then a separate map of the Castro. This separate map indicates 25 establishments in the Castro that are gay or gay-friendly. Even this is not a complete
picture of the current state of the Castro, as the individual maps in *Columbia Fun Maps* only indicate establishments that advertise with them. In a general listing of more businesses within the same publication, whether or not they are advertisers, there are eight bars listed for the Castro.

The *GayPocket San Francisco* guide, which advertises itself as “Your GLBT Guide to San Francisco/For Visitors and Locals Too” lists many gay and gay-friendly establishments in the Castro District/Upper Market Street Corridor. In addition, the introduction to this guide states that the Castro is still “known worldwide as a gay neighborhood.” It continues “but we also have many gay establishments on Polk Street, in SoMa ...in the Mission and various other gay businesses and venues sprinkled throughout the city.” The booklet is divided into eight sections, each concentrating on a specific topic or neighborhood. The three main gay neighborhoods/districts are the Castro, SoMa (South of Market) and the Polk Street area. Aside from making the guide easier to use, the different sections also highlight that there are more than one district that is considered gay or gay-oriented. Also of note is that these three districts are each different, indicating that even with gay space, there are subcategories.

The Castro is an active, living mixed residential/commercial neighborhood. The other two are more specialized than the Castro and cater more towards the entertainment needs of the gay community; they are not considered residential neighborhoods. Rather, like the earliest areas where gay bars were located (such as the waterfront in the 1890’s), SoMA and Polk Street were marginalized areas when the first bars opened. In a way, these areas outside of the Castro mirrored the specialized types of bars located in them. While the Castro for the most part had ‘mainstream’ bars, SoMa was, and still is, known
more for the Levi/leather, S&M, B&D bars and, lately, sex clubs. SoMa also came into being as a gay entertainment district at the same time that the Castro came into being as a gay neighborhood, although gay bars existed there before the 1970s, just as they did in the Castro. Polk Street is also known for bars and sex clubs, although it is not specifically seen as gay-oriented.

Although AIDS was first reported on in the early 1980s, the bar scene as measured by the number of bars in operation was not immediately affected. This can be seen by looking at the dates bars opened and closed in the Castro during these two decades. It is apparent in maps 11 and 12 that while bars opened, closed and changed names, the locations did not always change. Instead, while a bar might close, a new one took over the same space with a new name. Maps 13 and 14 show the bars operating in the Castro and SoMa in 2004. While not as many bars are operating in the Castro in the beginning of the 21st century as were in the 1970s and 1980s (29 then, 23 now), it is mainly Market Street that has suffered the loss. This does not mean that the types of bars currently operating are the same as were open in the past (i.e. Levi/leather, neighborhood taps, hustler bars, etc.), but only that the area is still gay as far as the original basic building block of gay culture -- the bar -- goes. SoMa, on the other hand, has lost one third of its bars, going from 12 in the 1970s and 1980s to eight in the early 2000s.

The spring 2004 GayPocket San Francisco map for the Castro indicates 20 bars in the Castro/Market Street corridor, four community-oriented establishments, six restaurants, two arts establishments, five services (in this case, they’re all retail shops), and two sex clubs. Although some of these establishments are over six blocks from
Castro Street, they are still considered part of the general area, at least as far as advertising goes. SoMa, on the other hand, has six bars listed (at least three of these are Levi/Leather bars), three clubs, four sex clubs and only one restaurant. There are, though, two arts establishments and three shops. The shops all specialize in leather clothes, accessories and adult toys. The section on Polk Street only lists five bars, one community-oriented establishment, and one store (an art gallery). Even though these listings are not complete (some gay and gay-friendly establishments are not listed), they do show the diversity of the Castro and the specialization of the other gay districts. In a move that echoes the earlier days of gay bars, when bars acted as community centers dispensing information of interest to their clientele (including names of sympathetic physicians), the bars listed in this guide have a symbol next to their names if they dispense free condoms. The STOP AIDS Project provides the condoms, continuing of one of the social functions of gay bars before the modern gay liberation movement when medical advice, even if only for the names of physicians who treated gay patients, was passed around through the bar network. Today, along with the condoms available in bars, the City of San Francisco posts public advertisements about safer sex and the prevention and treatment of sexually transmitted diseases; billboards in the MUNI stations are part of this project, including the Castro Street station (Figure 7).
4.4 Boundaries

Boundaries of the Castro are still important, just as they were in pre-AIDS days. In the early 2000s, as then, boundaries can be fluctuating and permeable, well defined or “understood” by users, expanding and contracting, geographically specific or socially defined. Visible and invisible boundaries may be different depending on which aspect of a space is being described. Geographical boundaries can be a series of streets delineating a certain neighborhood or those selected to define a district for voting and representation in City Hall. Invisible boundaries can define the public areas of the Castro that are
understood by users to be gay. Sources defining boundaries of the contemporary Castro are many, including travel guides (gay and straight), Chamber of Commerce-sponsored business improvement districts, which help market the Castro as a unique neighborhood, the City visitor and tourist board, local residents, and visible symbols demarking it as a gay ghetto.

Section 4.4.3 discussed the survey responses to a question about the Castro’s boundaries.

4.4.1 Visually Marking the Boundaries

Currently, the Castro is still visually marked as a gay neighborhood. Rainbow flags (the semi-official gay flag) are displayed in windows up and down Castro Street near its intersection with Market Street, and the streets running off of it; it is even painted on buildings (Figures 8 and 9). Flyers posted on telephone poles and plastered on walls advertise gay-oriented events and carry political messages. While these are individual displays based on the displayer’s/poster’s perceived gayness of the neighborhood, there are also other, officially sanctioned, visual markers.
Figure 8  An example of an individual visually marking their window on Market Street. A stained-glass rainbow flag incorporating a pink triangle and a number of political posters/newspaper clippings meant for passersby to notice.
Figure 9  Private initiative led to the painting of these stairs on Castro Street in an example of advertising the building as housing something gay-related.

Rainbow banner flags hang from lampposts on Market Street from its intersection with the Castro at 17th Street east to Delores Street, put there by the city government. This roughly demarks the newly-restored upscale shopping area on Market Street, which
signs refer to as the Upper Market Street Corridor or shopping area. These banners mark a processional way to/recessional path from the Castro only from this direction, since they end at Castro and 17th Streets without continuing further west on Market Street. These same banners continue south down Castro Street to 19th Street, and on 17th and 18th Streets eastward two blocks (Figure 10). They do not continue across on Castro Street north of its intersection with Market Street, although there are still gay bars and gay-oriented business on these blocks. Map 15 shows the streets the city government has hung with these banners.

Figure 10  View south on Castro Street: City-placed rainbow banners hanging from street posts mark the area as gay.
Rainbow flags, however, hang from individual buildings on those blocks that are not officially ‘flagged,’ just as they hang on the ‘officially flagged’ blocks (Figure 11). Maps 16 and 17 juxtapose these flag-bordered streets with the areas considered to be ‘gay’ by Trevor Hailey and the San Francisco Examiner (refer to Maps 9 and 10). These maps illustrate that the City-placed flags ignore large areas that are considered gay, while extending into areas not considered gay by either the San Francisco Examiner or Trevor Hailey. They do, however, correspond to the area of Market Street that during the 1970s and 1980s did have a number of gay bars (Map 18) and that today still hosts gays bars (Map 19). What is being ‘flagged’ is not just the new shopping area, but the Castro at its
pre-AIDs heyday. Whether consciously or unconsciously, the City has outlined a shadow in their attempts to demarcate what they consider the current gay district.

San Francisco is not the only city to mark off a section of the city as gay by using the rainbow image. In April 2007 Philadelphia attached rainbow flags to 36 street signs as the official demarcation of that city's 'gayborhood,' the part of Center City bounded by Chestnut and Pine Streets on the north and south and 11th and Broad Streets on the east and west. Gay-friendly businesses, bars, restaurants, clubs and coffee shops are concentrated in this area.\textsuperscript{ccxxv} This was a two-year effort undertaken by the Philadelphia Gay Caucus (PGC), Washington Square Civic Association and City Councilman Frank DiCicco. Economics was partially behind this action- the PGC wants to tap into the $54 billion gay travel market.\textsuperscript{ccxxvi}

4.4.2 Boundaries as Beacons

Returning to the delineation of the Castro/Upper Market Street area with rainbow flags, there is another rainbow flag that is independent of the smaller lamppost flags. It too marks the area as gay space. This is the large flag flying from a tall flagpole at Harvey Milk Plaza next to the MUNI station (itself named after Harvey Milk, the first openly gay City Supervisor [figure 12]) at Market and Castro Streets.
The plaque at Harvey Milk Plaza/MUNI station at the intersection of Market, Castro and 17th Streets.

Map 20 shows this flag in relation to streets hung with rainbow banners and the areas described as being gay by the San Francisco Examiner and Trevor Hailey. The large flag is visible from all over Castro Street, both north and south of Market Street, as well as
from the side streets (Figures 13 and 14), and is spot-lit at night, highlighting it even after
dark and making its presence felt 24 hours a day (Figure 15). The flag is both a beacon
and a marker for pedestrian and auto traffic traveling west on Market Street. Although
not in the geographical center of the gay Castro, its inescapable presence seems to serve
as the anchor of this area, and in fact it flies over the intersection known as “The Gateway
to the Castro.”

Thus this gateway, by definition an opening in a boundary that
allows outsiders in and insiders out, also becomes the symbolic heart of the Castro. Even
at night this intersection glows with the rainbow colors from the neon sign over the Twin
Peaks bar (Figure 16).

Figure 13  The large rainbow flag over the Harvey Milk Memorial Plaza/Muni Station,
viewed from Market Street looking west.
Figure 14 Looking north up Castro Street. The large rainbow flag flying over the Harvey Milk Memorial Plaza is in the upper left. Lining Castro Street are the City-placed rainbow banners. Both the large flags and the banners mark the area as gay.
Figure 15  The large rainbow flag flying over the Harvey Milk Memorial Plaza at night. Illuminated, it is visible 24 hours a day.

Figure 16  The neon signs surrounding Twin Peaks bar at the intersection of Castro and 17th Streets at night. With the illuminated large rainbow flag flying over the MUNI station across Castro Street, this intersection becomes the glowing gateway to the Castro at night.
4.4.3 Survey Respondents’ Perceptions of the Castro’s Boundaries

Regardless of the official markings, survey question 15 allowed people to give their own answers; 21 respondents did. The geographical answers ranged from specific to vague, running the gamut from general boundaries (“...the immediate area around Castro Street...”\(^{cCXXVII}\)) through ‘not sure’ to small hand-drawn maps. Map 21 illustrates the seven answers that provided specific geographical boundaries,\(^{cCXXIX}\) while Map 22 outlines their shared, overlapping areas. There are two sections highlighted -- the area south of Market Street -- that all respondents included, and a smaller area to the north that the majority of respondents included in their descriptions. This reflects earlier divisions already discussed in this thesis: that while the streets north of the intersection of Castro, Market and 17\(^{th}\) streets still have gay-oriented businesses and gay residents, the area south of this intersection has a larger concentration of gays and gay-oriented establishments. Map 23 shows the relationship between the survey respondents, Trevor Hailey and the San Francisco Examiner, the City-marked streets, and the large rainbow flag flying over Harvey Milk Plaza. The two block section of Castro Street, 17\(^{th}\) and 18\(^{th}\) Streets, and part of Market Street designated by City-hung rainbow banners is common to them all, and Harvey Milk Plaza and its rainbow flag are placed as both a gateway to, and the heart of, the gay Castro.

The non-geographic boundaries survey respondents gave were also wide-ranging. They included short, undefined answers such as “Image”\(^{CCXXX}\) and “Yes- social and geographical”\(^{CCXXXI}\) as well as descriptive, contextual references and personal, emotional responses. These, just as geographical answers, can be very specific. For
example, a 38-year-old white gay male gave a contextual answer: “…sections of S(an) Francisco there (sic) have been segregated into communities such as Chinatown. Castro is an example of this prior segregation. Those walls have crumbled with the changes that have occurred to (sic) all cities.”

A 55-year-old white gay male wrote a personal reminiscence. For him, the boundary was “Emotional- resulting from the feeling you got standing on the corner at Market and Castro, about to walk into Twin Peaks Bar, “We did it – this is ours.”

4.4.4 Economics, Tourism and Boundaries

Both private and City-hung rainbow flags denote the Castro/Upper Market area as gay-identified, although there is the possibility that the City flags were put up as much for economic and tourist reasons as for historical and social reasons, as indicated by their overlapping with the Market Street commercial strip. What is being highlighted is not only the ‘gayness’ of the area, but also the economic opportunities, either working or shopping, that are open to all. Some of the advertising on Market Street seems to be geared to the gay population, though (Figure 17). It is also a ploy by the city/business association to mark off certain city blocks for special treatment (these can be tax breaks, street cleaning, town watch programs, etc.). One City action indicates that commercial interests might be at play with this demarcation. By 1996 the City of San Francisco had rejuvenated the F-line street cars, which run up and down Market Street. These streetcars were intended to link the Embarcadero area with the commercial areas of Market Street to the west. Castro Street is a stop on this line.
Figure 17  A prominent billboard on Market Street near Castro Street. The iconography is homoerotic - trim and buff men posing against phallic surfboards.

Along with spurring on the commercial interests of the neighborhood by bringing potential shoppers to the area, advertising the Castro as a distinct area can also bring in tourists. An information board on at a downtown MUNI station shows the Castro as a “Popular Regional Destination” accessible by mass transit (Figures 18 and 19).
To speed underground to your Castro Street destination, take the Muni Metro K, L, or M (outbound) train from this station. Get off at the Castro Street Station and walk upstairs. If you wish to ride above ground, take the F Market Streetcar (outbound) and get off at the end of the line. (Consult the nearby bus boarding map.)

**Figure 18** Castro Street is featured as one of six popular destinations within San Francisco, all accessible by mass transit.

**Figure 19** Close-up of the Castro Street section from Figure 16. Although this billboard is still standing, the image used of Castro Street can be dated by the cars in it to the 1970s, when the Castro was solidly gay.
While this might be a good way of breaking down barriers between a gay neighborhood and the city at large, and of continuing the mixing of gays and straights on the streets, it can also have a negative impact on the gay space of this part of Castro Street. Rather than breaking down social boundaries, creating an amalgam of gays and straights in the gay space of the Castro, it can backfire. There is a chance that some of these tourists might come less for mixing, mingling and shopping and more to look at gays ‘in their native habitat,’ an attitude whereby the gay space becomes less of a vital part of the city and more of a living history museum and exhibition, with an ever-changing cast of characters.

4.4.5 Permeability and Mutability of Boundaries

The boundaries of the Castro are more permeable than ever. What was once viewed as a homosexual ‘safe zone’ is now opening up to the non-gay world. This permeability of boundaries works both ways: as the Castro is assimilated more and more into the city and its residents at large, the rest of San Francisco is also seen as belonging more and more to the GLBT community for everyday activities. In the words of Supervisor Susan Leal, “San Francisco has grown up and matured, and that includes the gay and lesbian community. We feel more secure, so there isn’t the need for such close-knit support. All over the city, people are seeing two people showing affection for each other not as a gay and lesbian or a straight thing, but as people just living their lives.”

More transient than the built environment of the Castro are the social actions that occur there. These include same-sex couples walking hand-in-hand up and down the
street, kissing each other hello and goodbye; gay men hanging out in front of the local Starbucks discussing the latest Levi/Leather events; and the ever-present cruising. In the 1970s this cruising, especially at night, frequently led to sex in the semi-deserted side streets, recalling the private use of public areas for gay sex commented on by George Chauncey earlier in this thesis. These spontaneous actions taken as a whole, occurring over time in the same space, help make the Castro a socially-defined and recognized gay space. These behaviors, if transferred to another neighborhood, could also be seen as defining this new geographical space as gay as well. In the Castro, however, they are part of a longer continuum, rooted in the past and most likely continuing into the future.

4.4.5.1 Permanently Marking the Castro as Gay

This longer continuum will continue into the future because, regardless of demographic, social and economic changes, the Castro has been marked as gay space in another, more permanent way - the redesign of the MUNI station plaza at the intersection of Castro, Market and 17th Streets. This is the same space considered as both the gateway and the heart of the Castro. Currently named the Harvey Milk Memorial Plaza it will become home to a permanent built memorial to its namesake gay rights activist and slain city supervisor. Sponsored by the San Francisco Arts Commission, the new design is meant to honor Milk (who lived and worked nearby), beautify the Plaza, and to be a permanent marker of the Castro as a gay neighborhood. While this intersection is considered by some to be nondescript, with almost no reminders of Milk’s death, it is still the symbolic center of the Castro. In contrast to the brutal death of Supervisor Milk, the planned memorial is supposed to reflect the “celebratory rather than somber side of the Milk legacy.”

Supervisor Tom Ammiano, who proposed the Memorial in 1995
sees it not just as a reminder of Milk’s murder, but also of something more long-lasting. At the unveiling of the winning designs he said, “You honor his memory and memorialize his murder, but you also say there is more, you’re honoring the future.”

On Thursday, September 14, 2000 the two grand-prize winning designs, as well as the three Special Recognition winners, were announced. The two winning projects, though different in appearance, share the recurring theme of individual reflection. Christian Werthman, in cooperation with LOMA architects of Berkeley, envisioned a web of 100 high-pressure water jets suspended 20 feet above the busy intersection of MUNI lines at Castro and Market Streets. The mist from these jets would then be illuminated in different color combinations by lights suspended with the water jets. The resultant ever-changing cloud, likened by some to San Francisco’s fog, would be open to interpretation, according to Mr. Werthman. He states, “There are many associations with clouds. It has a transcendental aspect to it. You must be very intuitive. What would be your interpretation?”

He continues, “The clouds have a very poetic dimension. They can stand for dreams and optimism. To me, the whole gay and lesbian movement is driven by that vision.”

While newspaper reports and public comments seem to concentrate on the cloud, this plan also includes new landscaping for Market Street, closing Castro Street to vehicular traffic (except for transit vehicles and bicycles), and a community exhibition gallery constructed of redwood over the underground MUNI metro station.

The other grand prize winning proposal, submitted by Heidi Sokolowsky of John Winder Architects, San Francisco, is for a 60-foot tall ‘vision tower’ displaying images of
Harvey Milk and local events information, located in the Market Street median. Ms. Sokolowsky wants the tower to be a counterpoint to the Ferry Building at the east end of Market Street. The anchors of this major street would then be the building that at one time linked the city, both symbolically and actually, with the outside world, and a new memorial that links the gay part of the city with its past and future. Flanking this tower would be two new public vest pocket parks, created on two diagonal corners of the intersection currently occupied by gas stations. A contemplation space is planned for underneath the tower; this space would be visible through skylights at street level.

This last feature opens the issues associated with a space designed for a specific function, in this case a space for contemplation. What is to keep this space from being used for other purposes? As already discussed in this thesis, users are constantly adapting spaces designed for one thing to other uses. By definition, contemplation is a private act. Will users feel contemplative when they themselves are on display through the skylights? While viewers of the cloud are also being asked to be contemplative in that most public of spaces -- a busy street -- they are not placing themselves in a place specifically designated for that purpose. Instead, they are walking and, hopefully, contemplating the memorial. Thus, both by actual memorials and private memories, the Castro as a gay space will continue in some form long after the area has become something else.

Regardless of what happens to the Castro, other neighborhoods can inherit its torch as a gay ghetto. After all, the architecture and social acts that make any neighborhood gay can always occupy, as Henri Lefebvre noted, “...a space which is not produced as such.”
CHAPTER 5

IS THE CASTRO STILL A GAY NEIGHBORHOOD?

“Remarkable, the persistence of memory, even when we think we’ve forgotten.”

5.1 Is the Castro Still a Gay Neighborhood?

According to the definitions presented in Chapter One, the Castro is still a gay neighborhood/space, albeit one of many areas of the city with a gay presence. The characteristics of gay space are all apparent today: it is not just material space designed for non-gay purposes and appropriated for gay use (the 19th century housing and commercial stock), but also includes actual spaces specifically designed or redesigned for gay purposes (such as the Harvey Milk Memorial). In keeping with both Aaron Betsky’s and George Chauncey’s definitions, this space might, in the future, be used for something entirely different (as with the space that was the Missouri Mule becoming a Pottery Barn) and, as far as social space is concerned, it the Castro meets Henri Lefebvre’s criteria by being comprehensive and flexible; the social space not only permits new actions to occur, but at the same time “suggest(s) others” and “prohibit(s) yet others.” It is also a space of orgasm, that function so important in Mr. Betsky’s definition of gay space. The sex leading to orgasm takes place in bars, in alleyways, and even in the privacy of the apartments lining Castro Street.
5.2 Boundaries

The Castro is still a space with multiple boundaries. The geographical boundaries are in flux, despite the attempts to try and fix them in place with rainbow banners. Along with the geographical boundaries the Castro has more amorphous edges as well. One type of edge is demographic, where the ratio of gay to non-gay residents shifts from predominantly gay to predominantly non-gay; this is different from constantly changing demography of the transitory population of tourists and shoppers. This transitory population is a subject of further research that could involve investigating the attributes of, and reasons for, people visiting the area.

Economic boundaries are more difficult to define. It is not possible to track whether or not the money spent in the Castro comes from gay consumers, although an attempt has been made by individuals stamping bills “Queer $$” and “Gay Dollar”. These stamps are available in the Castro. By displaying a rainbow flag and/or Human Rights Campaign (HRC) sticker, some businesses advertise that they cater to a gay clientele, or are that they are at least gay-friendly.

Further research on the economic life of the Castro could include a study of how much money is spent there and on what. An analysis of the tax revenue collected from the district could be examined to determine what was purchased. This could be broken down by the type of establishment (bar, restaurant, clothing store, home furnishing, etc.) where the taxes were collected. Determining where the money came from would be more difficult, although credit card companies might be able to give a general number of
purchases made with their cards, and break it down by geographic areas of where the card
users are billed. This information would then give a partial portrait of what percentage of
credit card users live outside of the Castro.

There are also political boundaries, evidenced by how this district votes in Board
of Supervisor elections (on a local scale) and in state and federal elections (on a larger
scale). The larger scale voter issues concern not just the gays in the neighborhood, but all
residents of the Eureka Valley/Castro neighborhood.

Political campaigns keep records of how residents of neighborhoods have voted in
the past (this information is used to forecast future voting patterns) and of how the
residents actually behave at the polls, as evidenced by election results. A study of these
records can give an insight into the political clout welded by the residents of the Castro.
Such a study could also explore how important to the electorate the stands taken on
specific issues by candidates are, and the weight accorded them at the ballot box.

5.2.1 Neighborhood

Using Jane Jacob's description of a street neighborhood, explained in the Introduction,
both the pre- and post-AIDS era Castro fills the requirements of a street neighborhood. It
still attracts users from outside; residents also still travel to other neighborhoods; it is a
political power base for local as well as district and city-wide concerns; and residents and
their children learn to become reasonable and responsible citizens (the different types of
lifestyles and peoples living side-by-side help show tolerance in action). The Castro is
still a safe place for residents and strangers alike. While no comparative statistics for the
Castro in particular exist (it is part of the Mission Police Precinct, which includes the
Mission area), the San Francisco Police Department's Crime Map offers an insight into
how the area within a ¼ mile radius from the intersection of Castro and Market Streets compares with the same size circle centered on intersections in neighboring areas and other districts throughout the city (Map 24). For the 30 day period ending October 10, 2005, the delineated section of the Castro witnessed 106 reported offenses. Within the same ¼ mile radius at the other intersections the total crimes reported were: Haight and Asbury Streets (Haight-Asbury District)- 93 crimes; 19th and Valencia Streets (Mission District)- 168 crimes; Sunset and Noriega Streets (Sunset District) - 19 crimes; Grant Avenue and Washington Street (Chinatown)- 180 crimes; Greene Street and Grant Avenue (North Beach/Telegraph Hill)- 128 crimes. These numbers, however, do not tell the entire story. The Castro had the third lowest numbers for larceny and theft as well as for assaults. It was second lowest for robbery. Unfortunately, it was the second highest for burglary.

In-depth comparative studies of police records over set periods of time for the Mission Police Precinct and other districts of San Francisco would give a clearer picture of how safe the Castro is based on reported crimes. How safe it seems to residents and visitors could be determined through further surveys, although the concept of how people perceive levels of safety, a key variable, would also have to be studied.

5.3 The Changing Castro

Overarching all the shifting boundaries and the changes they represent is the sense, both within and without of the GLBT community, that the Castro is a gay neighborhood, regardless of who lives there. This feeling, seemingly ignoring any demographic trends,
leads to another point about the Castro as gay space. It is recognized as a changing neighborhood by survey respondents.

5.3.1 Survey Respondents’ Perception of Change

Survey question 5 asked respondents “If you are familiar with the Castro, do you feel it has changed during your lifetime?” giving them the choice of three answers: “Yes”, “No” and “Not Sure”. This was followed by a blank area for them to explain these changes, if they so desired. Users of the Castro feel that it has changed.

5.3.2.1 Survey Respondents in the Castro

Of the twelve surveys handed out on the Castro that were returned, seven respondents (six gay white males and one straight white female) felt that it had changed, one (a straight white man who lives in San Francisco) felt it hadn’t, three respondents weren’t sure (including a first-time gay white visitor from Australia) and one (another gay white first-time visitor from Australia) did not answer the question.

In the space given on the survey for explaining these changes, three respondents stated commercialization as a factor in the change, specifically the introduction of chain stores at the expense of small owner-operated businesses. Two felt that the “feel” of the neighborhood was the reason. Both felt it was not as “fun” and “vibrant”, although one (the straight female) felt that might be because she did not go out as much as she did 10 years ago. Another person (a gay white male) explained that it was now a “well-integrated community of all sorts of people” and that the “dominance of gay and gay owned business has dwindled”, and that many gay and straight residents had been forced out by the “stratospheric housing costs.”
Thus, slightly more that half of the respondents who were actually experiencing the Castro when they were given their questionnaires felt that the neighborhood had changed. Those changes were seen as a move away from a fun, specialized local area to one that is less distinct; one that now is less defined by businesses catering to gay residents. The comment concerning housing costs indicates that one of the reasons for change was not necessarily due to the desire to move, but having to move because for economic reasons. These economic reasons are not just limited to the Castro; they are at play in all areas of San Francisco. It is not yet clear if gay residents will migrate as a group to a more affordable neighborhood, in effect starting a new Castro, or if, for reasons already discussed, they will integrate into the larger social and spatial world of San Francisco, no longer feeling the need to live as a distinct community.

5.3.2.2 Survey Respondents from the Rest of San Francisco

This feeling of change was also remarked on in five of the six questionnaires returned that had been handed out in San Francisco (excluding the Castro). Four of these respondents live in San Francisco or the Castro; one lives in the Bay Area (Berkeley), and one lives in Los Angeles.

The changes seen were not always considered positive (the encroachment of chain stores was mentioned twice), although one positive note was sounded by a gay white man who wrote that AIDS services had improved and that now people of all orientations were pulling together.

One gay man who lives in the Noe Valley south of the Castro tied the changes to commerce. He noted that “Definitely more big name banks and businesses have moved in the late 80’s”, but still felt that “…otherwise I believe the area has retained its gay
identity strongly in the 16 years I’ve known it." The only lesbian to respond “yes” lives in Berkeley, across San Francisco Bay. While not commenting specifically on the current situation, she notes that the Castro was “… a place for gay men in the 70’s and lesbians were often ignored or harassed there!"

The respondent who lives in Los Angeles did not comment on why he answered ‘yes.’

These responses and their reasons indicate that while the Castro is changing, it is changing for both better and worse. Because all the people who gave opinions about these changes live in the area, they are more familiar with San Francisco as a whole, and can see how the gay Castro has changed in relation to the changing City. This might explain the differences between their attitudes and those given by the other survey groups. Those who received the survey in the Castro were not always residents, and thus their responses could be due to their immediate impressions, while those who were given the survey by e-mail and by hand did not have the geographic advantage of being in or near the Castro while filling in their answers. One such person, a friend of the author who lives in a different part of San Francisco, but visits the Castro, commented on the shooting of some celebrants at the annual Castro Street Halloween Party in 2006. According to him, “The Castro Halloween party has attracted more and more of a very young crowd, and a small percentage of them are murderous. Sad, isn’t it?”

5.3.2.3 Questionnaires Distributed by E-mail

Nineteen people received their questionnaires by e-mail; ten responded. All ten self-identified as gay males, with a breakdown of eight Caucasian, one Caucasian/Native American, and one ‘American’.
Four felt that the Castro had changed, while two weren’t sure; two felt it had not changed, and two did not answer the question. The four people who answered ‘yes’ were Caucasian. Interestingly, not all of them had visited the Castro. One of them had never been there but still responded ‘yes,’ commenting that he had read about it. He “also enjoyed the Amistead (sic) Maupin books that used the Castro as a back drop in a lot of the scenes.” Based on this he seems to be comparing a fictional Castro from the past (regardless of how accurate that fictional representation is) with his views of today’s world. He did not comment if this was a positive or negative change. Another person checked ‘yes’, but did not write why, leaving it an open question if the change was positive or negative.

One respondent who lives on the East Coast viewed the changes as negative, commenting that “I have watched a vibrant gay community spread across the city and deteriorate. Most of the social venues still remain but the community that kept it whole seems not to be there anymore.” Although he stated that he visits the Castro less than once a year, it is not clear for how many years he has witnessed the evolution of the neighborhood; it was enough to notice the negative changes, though. The final ‘yes’ answer included the observation that “It seems to be more lively and there are more stores and restaurants opening up there. It feels rather safe.” While this is seemingly positive, it is not clear if means that the area is still a gay neighborhood.

One of the two respondents who checked ‘no’ has visited the Castro five or more times a year since 2002. He gave no contact information for a follow-up interview, so it was not possible to ask him if his response was because the area had stabilized before he became familiar with it, and he therefore has nothing to compare it to. However, he is a
gay white male, and indicated elsewhere on the questionnaire that he likes the social aspects of the Castro and the chance to meet people there. Based on this, and the fact that in his response to Question 8 he sees the Castro as still a gay or gay-oriented neighborhood, it can be inferred that in his experience the gay Castro he knows is still active and noticeable.

The other respondent who gave a ‘no’ answer gave the reason that he had “…only visited the area once, so I have no other visit to compare it to.” However, from his one visit he felt that the neighborhood was still important to the gay community.

5.3.2.4 Questionnaires Distributed by Hand

Ten questionnaires were returned out of the thirty six handed out, mainly in Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Maine. Five of these respondents (all gay white men) answered ‘yes’ to the question “If you are familiar with the Castro, do you feel it has changed during your lifetime?” The single ‘no’ also came from a gay white male. One of the ‘yes’ answers came with the comment that “It (the Castro) has become like a gay mall (not a good thing in my opinion).” Only one other ‘yes’ answer included a comment and that was from a man who had lived there in 1984. He felt that “The Castro seems less like the center of the gay universe than it used to.” He did not elaborate on whether this was positive or negative.

In a similar vein, a friend of this author who did not complete a questionnaire, but was willing to discuss his experience in the Castro when he last visited it in 2001 commented that the Castro was “…not the Gay (sic) heaven I had expected. And the boys were not friendly at all.” When I asked him to elaborate, he commented that “I guess just to (sic) much Attitude (sic). I didn’t bring a resume or bank statement.” He
was also not sure if he would visit the Castro again. When, a few weeks later he visited Palm Springs, another gay California travel destination, though, he “had a great time.”

5.4 The “Unreal” Castro

Use of space and the making of space do not have to be restricted to reality. As distinct from ‘real’ history there are ‘artificial,’ or imagined, histories. ‘Real’ history is history as generally understood, represented in part by what actually occurred in a certain space at a certain time. ‘Artificial/Imagined’ history of gay space is revealed in literature, movies and plays, and builds on, and reinforces, the idea of space as special. Gay and gay-oriented fiction frequently uses gay neighborhoods, such as Key West, Provincetown on Cape Cod, New York City’s Christopher Street, San Francisco in general, and the Castro in particular, as a setting. Part of the success of this literature relies on the readers’ shared understanding of a city or neighborhood as having a special place in the gay community and collective memory. Readers then layer their own memories and concepts onto these fictionalized accounts. These literary works, while fiction, still reflect an author’s view of gay space and GLTB life and document how both a space and an idea can cast a spell that is in turn interpreted in personal and individual ways by the reader. Thus, the Castro becomes a queer space of memory, both ‘genuine’ and ‘imagined’. It is also one way in which the Castro will continue to live on as gay space long after the actual social reality might have changed, and the neighborhood is no longer viewed, or even self-identified, as gay.
5.5 Preserving the Castro

One of the delights of the Castro is that it is not a preserved, historic neighborhood, such as Williamsburg, Virginia. Rather than trying to ‘freeze’ this whole neighborhood as it was at some point in time, preservation seems restricted to the domain of individual building and business owners, and of individuals who want the Gay Memorial to be there because of the Castro’s significance in modern gay history. The area is subject to the push and pull of the forces that shape any city or neighborhood. This does not mean that the gay Castro should not or cannot be preserved. It means that as the neighborhood becomes less gay-oriented, preservation will most likely be of the symbolic role of this gay space instead of the material space. This is already happening with the Harvey Milk Memorial; rather than preserve his camera shop a new structure is being built to honor his contributions to the modern gay rights movement and to his memory. In another way the walking tours geared toward the GLBT community also preserve the ‘gayness’ of the area by highlighting what happened in the material space of the Castro. Rather than learn about the area in books, participants in these tours experience the neighborhood first hand, even if it is as spectators.

5.5.1 The Castro as Gay Neighborhood and Gay Symbol

Survey Question 11 asked if the preservation of the Castro as a gay neighborhood is important. Of the 37 returned surveys, 31 respondents answered ‘Yes’ to question 11 (only two said ‘No’[one a straight white man who lives in San Francisco, the other a gay while man who lives in the Castro area]; the others answered ‘Not Sure’). Question 12 asked if the preservation of the Castro as a gay symbol is important. Thirty two said
'Yes' to Question 12 (one responded ‘No’ [the same straight white man who responded ‘no’ to question 11], but four said ‘Not Sure’ and one did not answer the question.)

Respondent SF-1 wrote in explaining why he answered yes to Question 12: “It is a living document…” Another respondent sounded a cautionary note; he answered ‘yes’ to both question 11 and 12 but felt it should be preserved “…as long as ‘preservation’ does not denote an artificial effort—‘Castro’ needs to remain something vibrant & alive, not “preserved.” This can occur as long as users continue to define the space; if the GLBT community continues to use the Castro, it will continue to be a gay space of some sort. This could be solely as a place of entertainment, a place where gays continue to come for the bar scene, but not much else. In this respect, it would echo SoMa and the early gay bars of the Barbary Coast; people specifically visited or continue to visit those areas solely for entertainment.

5.5.1.1 Preservation Techniques and Methods

Survey question 13 (If you feel that the Castro should be preserved as a gay neighborhood and/or symbol, how do you think this can be done?) let respondents state their thoughts as to how any preservation goals can be accomplished. Very few respondents wrote anything, but those who took the time all sounded hopeful that somehow the gay Castro could be preserved. Those questionnaires returned from the Castro and San Francisco included very specific answers and comments; three themes ran through them. They dealt mainly with history, economics and social life.

Those who felt that history was important wanted it linked to the present. As respondent C-11 stated it: “Perhaps a small historical center with some exhibits and information, though honestly those of us who call it home are its best preservationists and
docents.” This was echoed by respondent C-3, who specifically pointed out that “It is tricky to think of artificially “preserving” the atmosphere which once prevailed in the Castro and made it symbolic in the first place, but it is strange that there are really no museums or landmark sites or public commemorations of its historical significance.” Tied in with this are the remarks of C-10 and SF-1, who wrote: “By acknowledging it’s (sic) gay history and it’s (sic) gay “present”.” and “Support for GLBT Historical Society, Museum. Perhaps a local exhibit in (a) community center, or even (the) Castro Theater.”, respectively. All of these can be summed up by C-7’s answer: “Through education”.

Related to the economic and social life of the Castro, C-2 stated “Rent stabilization for small gay-owned business would help to keep mega stores out.”. Respondent C-1 tied in with his answer to 12, in which he wrote that “The gay community for around the world sees SF as its capital. It should be the largest and most exciting in the world. It is not.” To 13, he wrote “Allow and encourage a more vibrant nightlife + daytime social/café culture”.

5.5.2 Importance of the Castro to Other Communities

The question of whether the Castro is important to other communities besides the gay one (Question 14) drew few responses, and they were mixed. Those respondents who explained their ‘yes’ answer to this question all felt that the Castro was important to other groups and people. Questionnaires returned from the Castro and San Francisco in general (completed by people who are familiar with the Castro and the City as a whole), included these explanations: “Straight people in S.F. also enjoy the Castro.” “It is an important meeting place for escapists.” and “Working class community that predates queer Castro.”
5.5.3. Is the Castro Still Gay and Important to the Gay Community

Whether or not, or how, the Castro is preserved as a gay neighborhood, survey respondents overwhelmingly feel that it still a gay oriented neighborhood, as evidenced by the answers to Question 8 (Do you feel that the Castro is still a gay or gay-oriented neighborhood?). Out of the thirty seven returned questionnaires, thirty three respondents felt that the Castro is still a gay or gay-oriented neighborhood; the other four were not sure. They also agree that is still important to the gay community, based on their responses to Question 9 (Do you feel that the Castro is still important to the gay community?). Thirty three answered ‘yes’ to this question, the others all answered ‘not sure’.

Respondents who felt that the Castro is still important to the gay community were given a list of nine reasons why and were asked to rate each on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 was important, 2 somewhat important, 3 neutral, 4 not very important, and 5 not important. They could also choose ‘Other’, state what that was, and rate it, as well. None of the respondents chose ‘Other.’ ‘History’ was always rated as ‘1’ or ‘2’, with one exception (a ‘5’). Meeting people and social life were also considered important. Commerce, for all the comments on the encroaching chain stores, was ranked very important by those who were given the questionnaires in the Castro. Five said it was important or somewhat important, and two were neutral. None said commerce was not very important or not important.

Those who were given the questionnaire elsewhere in San Francisco were more evenly distributed as a subset on the question of commerce’s importance; ‘3’ (neutral) received two responses, while the other levels of importance/non importance received
one response each. Those responding by e-mail felt that it was either important or somewhat important only. Of those handed out in person anywhere else, four respondents were neutral on the issue, two ranked it as important, two as somewhat important, and one as not very important. Perhaps those who were in the Castro proper were shopping, and that was considered important to them; while those who were elsewhere in San Francisco did not have shopping uppermost in their minds. Those who received the surveys by e-mail or by hand might have considered shopping a major draw when they visit the Castro.

Regardless of the answers to survey questions, of how various factors about the Castro were ranked in importance, of how important the neighborhood is to the GLBT and other communities, or even how to preserve the gay aspects of the Castro (if they should be preserved), the surveys indicate that all the people who took the time to respond felt that there was something important about the Castro, and were willing to discuss it. They all also felt that the Castro was a distinct area, albeit one that was in a state of flux.

5.6 In Closing

The unpredictable future is best summed up by one resident (business owner Dennis Ziebell). He stated in an interview with the San Francisco Chronicle: “I would hate to see the Castro lose its identity as a gay neighborhood.” Recognizing that the Castro was not always a gay neighborhood, and that it, like other neighborhoods are products of, and subject to, change, he continued: “But it went from Irish-Catholic to gay, so who knows? I’m the type to say let’s wait and see.”
APPENDIX A

The Survey
Thank you for taking time to complete this four-page survey. Its purpose is to research how people understand public and private spaces, and how their understanding can change. An entire neighborhood has been chosen for this survey- the Castro in San Francisco, because it has been considered a gay ghetto for at least three generations, even though it has always been changing. If you’d like to explain any of your answers, there is space after each question to use, or you can use the back of the survey. Your answers will be used for statistical analysis as part of a master's thesis. Your anonymity is assured.

1) Where do you live?

2) Have you ever lived in the San Francisco Bay area? If so, when?

3) How often do you visit the Castro?
   __ Have never visited   ____ First time visitor  ____ Less than once a year  ____ 1-2 times a year  
   ____ 3-4 times a year  ____ 5 or more times a year  ____ live in the Castro

4) Why do you visit the Castro? (Please check all that apply)
   __ Social Reasons  ____ Business  ____ Live in the Castro  ____ Shopping  ____ Not applicable
   ____ Other (Please explain in the space below)

5) If you are familiar with the Castro, do you feel it has changed during your lifetime?
   __ Yes  ____ No  ____ Not Sure
   If you’d like to explain, please do so here:

6) Which of the following do you think gives the Castro a positive ‘character’? (Please check all that apply)
   ____ Streetscape  ____ Cultural Events
7) Which of the following do you think gives the Castro a negative ‘character’? (Please check all that apply)

___ Streetscape  ___ Cultural Events
___ Chance to Meet People  ___ New Developments
___ Historic District/Structures  ___ Not Applicable
___ Politics  ___ Location
___ Other (Please explain in the space below)

8) Do you feel that the Castro is still a gay or gay-oriented neighborhood?

___ Yes  ___ No  ___ Not Sure

9) Do you feel that the Castro is still important to the gay community?

___ Yes  ___ No  ___ Not Sure

10) If you answered ‘Yes’ to Question #9, please rank the importance of each of the following using the scale of: 1- important; 2- somewhat important; 3- neutral; 4- not very important; 5- not important.

___ Its History  ___ Commercial/Retail Opportunities
___ Chance to Meet People  ___ Location
___ Social Life  ___ Cultural Events
___ Political Home Base  ___ New Developments
___ Historic Structures  ___ Other (Please explain)

If you want to explain any of your answers, please do so here.
11) Do you feel that preservation of the Castro as a gay neighborhood is important?

__Yes  __No  __Not Sure
If you want to explain your answer, please do so here:

12) Do you feel that preservation of the Castro as a gay symbol is important?

__Yes  __No  __Not Sure
If you want to explain your answer, please do so here:

13) If you feel that the Castro should be preserved as a gay neighborhood and/or symbol, how do you think this can be done?

14) Do you feel that The Castro is important to other communities besides the gay community (including, but not limited to, the Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgender and/or straight communities)?

__Yes  __No  __Not Sure

15) What do you think are the boundaries of the Castro? (These can be social, geographical and/or something else.)

16) Your age:

17) Your gender:  __Male  __Female  __Transgendered

18) Do you identify yourself primarily as:

__Gay Male  __Lesbian  __Bisexual  __Transgendered  __Straight  __Other
19) What is your ethnicity?

20) What is your annual income?

   ___Below $20,000  ___$20-25,000  ___$25-30,000  ___$30-40,000  ___$40-50,000
   ___$50-60,000  ___Above $60,000

If there anything else you’d like to add about the Castro, or this survey, please do so here. This can include any of your personal experiences or memories.

If you’d like to follow-up this survey with an interview, please provide a way to contact you, either by telephone or e-mail.

   Thank you again for your time and effort in completing this survey. Please use the addressed and pre-stamped envelope to return it, or e-mail it to BuckscottPA@aol.com. If the envelope is missing, please return it to Survey, P.O. Box 143, Holicong, PA 18928-0143.
Map 1. San Francisco, CA

(City of San Francisco Map: Microsoft, 2004)
Map 2. The Castro area, San Francisco, CA.
Map 3. North Beach/Embarcadero area, showing gay/gay-friendly bars in existence from the early 1900s to approximately 1960.
Map 4. North Beach/Embarcadero with the addition of bars from the 1960s.
Map 6. Gay bars in the South of Market (SoMa) area in the 1960s.

(City of San Francisco Map: Microsoft, 2004)
Map 9. The *San Francisco Examiner*’s and Trevor Hailey’s bounded areas juxtaposed on each other.
Map 10. The area held in common as gay by both the San Francisco Examiner and Trevor Hailey.
Map 11. The Castro. Gay bars from the 1970s and 1980s. Also included are the gay bars from the 1960s to illustrate continuity and change.
Map 12. South of Market (SOMA) district gay bars during the 1970s and 1980s.
Bars from the 1960s are included for comparison.
Map 13. The Castro. Gay Bars operating from the 1990s to the present. Also illustrated are the bars from previous decades for comparison.
Map 14. The locations of bars still operating in SoMa, with bars from previous decades shown for comparison.
Map 15. The streets highlighted in red are bordered by the City-hung rainbow banners. San Francisco has thus designated, and is marketing this area, as officially gay.
Map 16. The streets bordered with City-hung rainbow banners in relation to the areas described as gay by both the *San Francisco Examiner* and Trevor Hailey.
Map 17. The streets bordered with City-hung rainbow banners in relation to the area held in common as gay by both the *San Francisco Examiner* and Trevor Hailey.
Map 18. The streets marked with rainbow banners demarcate the areas that in the 1970s and 1980s were home to a number of gay bars.
Map 19. The streets marked with rainbow banners demarcate the areas that still today are home to a number of gay bars.
Map 20. The relation of the large rainbow flag flying above Harvey Milk Plaza to the streets hung with City-placed rainbow banners and the areas felt to be gay by the San Francisco Examiner and Trevor Hailey.
Map 21. The Castro. Boundaries described by the seven survey respondents who gave them in answer to survey question 15.
Map 22. The areas held in common by the seven responses shown in Map 21. The darker green was held in common by all seven respondents; the lighter green was held in common by a majority of respondents.
Map 23. The relationships between different areas felt to be gay by different groups.

(City of San Francisco Map: Microsoft, 2004)
Map 24. Areas around the city chosen for crime statistics comparison with the Castro.
Although these ghettos are associated with the urban landscape, sometimes the concept of isolation extended to a geographical region, such as the Pale of Jewish Settlement in the Russian Empire.

Unless otherwise indicated, all photographs were taken by the author. Appearing in these photographs does not indicate a person’s sexual orientation.

The area considered the Castro when handing out the survey was bounded by Church and Market Streets to the east, 16th and Castro Streets to the north, Diamond and Market Streets to the west, and 20th and Castro Streets to the south.

First aired on February 15, 2000; as reported on http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/assault/context/defining.html

Andris, Jim; http://www.siue.edu/~jandris/gay/gay.html; December 1, 1995.


There are other definitions in use, but they are more semantic in their views. One such view is that gay is a modern word, and that people who performed homosexual acts before the advent of the word were not gay, regardless of their emotional orientation. Another disavows the origin of the word, concentrating rather on the act itself- that regardless of the term(s) (or lack of them) used, the act and desires of the participants in the relationship are what we now call ‘gay’. With this definition, ‘gay’ defines any person who performs homosexual acts, regardless of the terminology used at the time. This does not necessarily cover how the performers viewed themselves, regardless of whether or not society at the time sanctioned the act as ‘normal’ behavior. The labeling of homosexual acts and the sexual participants in different ways, generally in relation to societal norms, allowed general society to accept homosexual behavior. Men who took the active role in same-sex experiences might not be seen as being gay (or the equivalent term of the day), while the passive might considered gay or homosexual. In the same manner, a man who was effeminate was seen as gay, whether or not he had sex with men or women, because his appearance was not masculine, as defined at that time.

The Simpsons put the difference between expected behavior and reality in a nutshell for mass consumption. In an episode with guest voice John Waters, Marge explains to Homer that John is gay (much to Homer’s surprise). His response to Marge is: “He deceived me. I’m a man of simple tastes, Marge. I like my beer cold, my music loud and my homosexuals flaming.”


This author has had personal experience with this phenomenon. I lived near one of these parks in the early 1980s. One day a friend from a few blocks away and I had lunch in that park, and she commented that she never came to it alone, as it wasn’t ‘her’ park; her park was the one closer to her own apartment. When she mentioned this, I remember commenting that I always felt that way about ‘her’ park— I liked it, and used it as a short cut, but never felt comfortable sitting in it alone.


Gay spaces do not have to be urban, although a large percentage of the writings on gay spaces deal with urban spaces. An exception to this is Jerry Lee Kramer’s writing on gay and lesbian identities and communities in rural North Dakota. [Bell, David and Gill Valentine, editors; Mapping Desire, Routledge Press, London and New York, 1995. Pages 200 – 213.]


Examples are the Bank of the Metropolis on Manhattan’s Union Square, re-opened as the Metropolis Café in the late 1980’s, or the Girard/Mellon Bank on South Broad Street in Philadelphia, now converted to the Ritz-Carlton Restaurant. In this latter case, the vault was converted into a cigar bar.

This happened to two of Manhattan’s most notorious back-room bars, the Mineshaft and the Lure, which are now both upscale boutiques in the ‘discovered’ meatpacking district of the West Village.

Be
d,,


The Stonewall riots in Manhattan’s West Village started early in the morning on June 28, 1969, following a raid on the Stonewall Inn, a gay bar. While the initial riot was over in about an hour, there were sporadic outbursts for the next two days. The riots are generally considered to mark the beginning of the modern gay rights movement.

On a trip to College Station, Texas in the late 1990’s this author had first-hand experience with this. The only gay/lesbian bar near College Station is in the nearby town of Bryan. This bar was literally on the wrong side of the tracks, in a run-down part of town, with one of the neighboring businesses being The Happy Bailer (a bail-bondsman operation). The windows and door of the bar were blacked out with film, and the only sign was an 8.5 by 11” piece of paper taped at the bottom of the door, with the bar’s name on it and package delivery instructions.

Sources for the names and locations of these bars are: Boyd, Nan Alamilla; Wide Open Town: A History of Queer San Francisco to 1965, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA; 2003 and Stryker, Susan, and Jim Van Buskirk; Gay by the Bay: A History of Queer Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area, Chronicle Books, San Francisco, CA; 1996.
This link of gay bars to graft, corruption and criminality in order to survive continued at least through the 1970’s in New York City, at least as a possible urban legend. The author of this thesis was told when he first moved to New York that until gays had legal protections in New York City and gay bars could legitimately operate as such, it was possible to tell which gay bars had Mafia protection by the whether or not there was a cigarette machine on the premises. If there was, the bar paid the Mafia for protection.

While San Francisco has a long history of tolerating eccentric behavior, openly homosexual behavior without the cover of a theatrical performance or other such ‘legitimization’ was not socially acceptable.

Sources for the names and locations of these bars are: Boyd, Nan Alamilla; Wide-Open Town: A History of Queer San Francisco to 1965, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA; 2003 and Stryker, Susan, and Jim Van Buskirk; Gay by the Bay: A History of Queer Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area, Chronicle Books, San Francisco, CA; 1996.


Oral history/tradition has it that it was better to live in San Francisco- a city with a history of tolerance- than to return to the more oppressive and repressive small towns from whence many of them came. It was an example of “How ya’ gonna to keep ‘em down on the farm after they’ve seen Par-ee?”

CXVIII Sources for the names and locations of these bars are: Boyd, Nan Alamilla; Wide-Open Town: A History of Queer San Francisco to 1965, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA; 2003 and Stryker, Susan, and Jim Van Buskirk; Gay by the Bay: A History of Queer Culture in the San Francisco Bay Area, Chronicle Books, San Francisco, CA; 1996.


CXXIII A case of police brutality in which 14 men were beaten and arrested by San Francisco police on Labor Day after leaving a gay bar. The charge was obstructing a sidewalk, although it is not clear if this charge was made before or after the police threw the men to the ground and clubbed them with nightsticks.


CXXVII Survey SF-6.


CXXXIV The classic Castro Clone was a 20ish to 40ish white, in-shape man with close-cropped hair and a trim moustache. The standard outfit was a tight pair of Levi's 501 (button fly) jeans with the crotch area slightly more faded than the rest of the pants, and a tight-fitting polo shirt or flannel shirt with a t-shirt on underneath, depending on the season.


CXXXIX Quoted in Out of the Past, page 400.

CXL Shilts, Randy; The Mayor of Castro Street, St. Martin's Press, New York, NY; 1982. Page 82.


CXLV It seems that the Board was not taking sides between gay and straight bars. In a related permit issue at the same meeting, the Board also denied a permit to a bar that wanted to add partitions to create stalls where male clients could pay to sit down talk with nude female employees. Ibid.
Dan White was a Supervisor who murdered both Mayor Moscone and Supervisor Harvey Milk, feeling that they had ruined his political career. Using the now infamous ‘Twinkie Defense’- that eating too much junk food had caused him to think less than clearly, Mr. White received what was considered by many in the gay community an unreasonably light sentence. The riots were in reaction to this.


As already mentioned, the area that includes The Castro is alternately known as the Eureka Valley.


As reported by the Detroit Free Press; Friday, November 16, 1984; Page 4A. This integration with the rest of the city was a gradual progression, as not all gay men lived in the Castro; the demographics indicate that the Castro could not physically accommodate the entire gay male population of the city. In 1984, a survey by Research and Decisions Corporation (and commissioned by the city-financed San Francisco AIDS Foundation) showed that 40% of single men in San Francisco were gay. Aside from the potential of being a powerful political block, this group was an economic block as well. The survey stated that most of these men were well-educated (no definition of this was indicated) and earned over $20,000 a year. It also pointed out that out of the total San Francisco population of 706,900 almost 10% (69,690) were homosexual males. Not quite half of these men were self-declared out-of-the-closet gays.


Reclaim because of bias that can occur in any historical records, in this case within 'mainstream' historical records. As with any historical research, the archives and artifacts that survive can slant the view of 'what actually occurred'. To leave as much oral and written history as possible can counterbalance this bias. It also leaves a more rounded record for use by current and future researchers.

Organized early in 1985, a February 1985 flyer in the California Historical Society, North Baker Research Library, ‘Homosexuals’ section, Folder #1 announced the intention of six men to start a broad-based and multi-disciplinary Bay Area historical society, with a charter meeting scheduled for March 16th, 1985. This flyer also gives the basic credentials of the founders (they are active in history groups and/or work in historic preservation), acknowledges that other groups and individuals already are active in this area, and promises to act with other groups as well as connect interested groups with each other. Specifically, "social, political, professional and advocacy groups" are seen as having much "to offer as well as to receive" by becoming active in the historical society. The flyer further states that the founders realize that they only represent part of the multi-faceted GLBT community, and that they want a broader base of active individuals and groups...so that the Society will be founded with the energy and vision and experience of us all.” One of their later undated flyers specifically states that “Our letters were burned, our names blotted out, our books censored, or love declared unspeakable, our very existence denied. The time has come to take back our past as we claim our present and future.” Oral interviews, "old photographs, clippings, scrapbooks" diaries or letters” were sought for the project. This message was reiterated in another undated flyer, which not only stated what the SFLBHP does (research, record oral histories, publish information [including cataloging holdings and annotating them], furnishing speakers, and presentations), but also listed what they needed (documents, personal stories and funding).

This flyer for the Harvey Milk Archives also highlights the interconnection of various organizations and/or the need for a more discrete incorporated name. The flyer asks that checks for the Archives be made out the Castro Street Fair, Inc. The previously mentioned flyer for the San Francisco Gay and Lesbian History Project asks that checks be made out to the Capp Street Foundation.

This organization concentrates on northern California with two exceptions- they will accept donations for any area if it is pre-1970 and for under-represented groups (minorities, socio-economic classes not well-represented are two types of under-represented groups for which information is actively sought). There are no geographical restrictions for these two large categories. Part of their mission is to record oral histories. The Society trains the volunteers on how to record an oral history, but leaves the subject and subject matter to the recorder. The GLBTHSNC disseminates, through a newsletter and open archives, information gathered. It has also donated part of its collections to the James C. Hormel Center of the San Francisco Public Library. This donation was prompted by a desire to reach a larger audience, to de-accession information peripheral to the Society’s main mission, and because of lack of proper storage space. To train the next generation of GLBT historians, the GLBT Historical Society of Northern California also awards scholarships, as related during an oral telephone interview with the Director in October, 2001.

This is true for other gay neighborhoods in San Francisco. In response to a question of whether a personal friend (and long-time San Francisco resident) of this thesis’s author was going to the Folsom Street Fair- a Levi/leather, predominantly gay street fair, he responded that he “...didn’t go, actually. Who needs to, when they’re all just walking around the city!” In his experience, this Levi/leather subdivision of
the gay population no longer felt confined to SoMa/Folsom Street. 26 September 2006 instant message conversation on Bear411.com between YuppyPuppySF and the author.


Pages 1 and 3.

http://www.sfccenter.org/aboutus.php


Pages 1 and 3.


www.bethanysf.org, under the “About Us” tab.

http://www.aidsquilt.org/history.htm

http://www.aidsquilt.org/history.htm


Survey respondent C-3, a straight white female.

An example is Bank of America, which had a branch at Market and Castro Streets. After merging with Security Pacific Bank, it moved its branch one block further south on Castro Street. As reported in Gordon, Rachel, *Castro Center Dreams Fading; San Francisco Independent*, November 17, 1992. Page 1.


Survey E-6, response to Question 13. Interestingly, the respondent feels that franchises will lead to gentrification, although by most accounts the Castro was gentrified by the gays who moved in during the early 1970’s, and has been gentrified ever since.

Respondent C-12, writing in his own answer to Question 12.
Related to this author by Tom McQueen, a 10-year resident of the Castro, during a conversation on Monday, April 19, 2004.


As stated on the Noah’s Bagels, website: www.noahs.com


While undated, this guide can be safely dated to 1983 due to an ad for the Atlas Savings and Loan Association. Atlas was the first gay/lesbian savings and loan in the country. Founded in 1983, it collapsed the same year. While banking is not limited to one neighborhood, Atlas did have a branch on Castro Street.


http://aolsvc.news.aol.com/news/article.adp?id=200501220999001&_cc=5&cid=842


http://aolsvc.news.aol.com/news/article.adp?id=200501220999001&_cc=5&cid=842


*GayPocket San Francisco*; PMB #500, 2215-R Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94114; Kim Larson, Publisher. Issue 14/Spring 04.

*San Francisco Examiner*, undated, but post-1992; Article staring on Page 1.
Survey C-3. Survey respondent H-1 answered in a similar vein with “Geographical area where most gays have apartments/houses. Survey respondent E-8 is even more succinct, answering only ‘geographical’.

Answers such as “Between 17st and Market” or “The streets immediately surrounding the area.” have not been illustrated.

Survey H-6.

Survey E-2.

Survey H-8.


Ryan, Kim, *Milk memorial designs picked; Plans to honor slain supervisor will be reviewed by public before being included in final form, article in the San Francisco Examiner*; September 14, 2000.


Ryan, Kim, *Milk memorial designs picked; Plans to honor slain supervisor will be reviewed by public before being included in final form, article in the San Francisco Examiner*; September 14, 2000.

Ryan, Kim, *Milk memorial designs picked; Plans to honor slain supervisor will be reviewed by public before being included in final form, article in the San Francisco Examiner*; September 14, 2000, and Levy, Dan, ‘Pink Cloud’ Envisioned for Castro, article in the *San Francisco Chronicle*; September 14, 2000, page A18.


Harvey Milk is remembered in other ways, as well. The International Museum of GLBT History (part of the GLBT Historical Society) recently mounted an exhibition entitled *Saint Harvey: The Life and Afterlife of a Modern Gay Martyr* commemorating the 25th anniversary of his assassination. It was on display from June 6, 2003 through April, 2004. The Museum is at 657 Mission Street #300, San Francisco, CA 94105.


Respondent C-3 (a straight white female) notes that the official rainbow flags hanging from the lampposts extending south down Market Street from Castro Street are “psychologically extending the area.”

Some gay-owned businesses, however, are involved in stamping bills. As related by Lennie Calabrese during an oral interview on September 17, 2005, the Philadelphia gay bar *Key West* stamped all bills in the daily bank deposits “Gay Dollar”. Mr. Calabrese was the then technical manager of that bar.

The display of these symbols might not represent the views of the owners/employees, but merely mean that gay money is welcome at that establishment- an attitude possibly related to the myth that gays have more disposable income than non-gays.
All of the following examples show that, in some form or another, the Castro will always be a gay space in someone’s personal reality. Written works that use the Castro as fictionalized gay space and as a setting include:

- Armistead Maupin’s Tales of the City. Rather than one book, this is a fictional series chronicling the lives and adventures of gay and straight characters in San Francisco from the 1970’s through the 1990’s. It illustrates how gay and straight life has evolved in tandem in the same spatial setting of San Francisco, including the Castro.

- Ethan Morden’s novel How Long Has This Been Going On? chronicles gay life in Los Angeles, San Francisco and New York City from 1949 to 1995. The parts set in San Francisco (predominantly with the Castro as a backdrop) offer revealing views of gay culture before and during the AIDS epidemic. In this novel, rather than destroying the Castro, AIDS has added just another dimension to it. (St. Martin’s Press, New York, NY, 1995.)

- Christopher Coe’s novel Such Times, while not set in the Castro, does have San Francisco as one of many settings during the 1970’s and early 1980’s, during which two men define, and re-define, their relationship. (Penguin Books USA, New York, NY, 1993.)

- Felice Picano’s Like People in History offers a look at the art gallery world of San Francisco in the 1970’s through the eyes of gay men and straight women. While not the main part of the novel, the action in the galleries act as an important component in a bisexual and gay man’s development, which takes place in spaces seen as gay. (Penguin Books USA, New York, NY, 1995.)