



Towards a queer heritage: Challenges and opportunities

Celmara Pocock¹, Steve Brown² and Robert Mason³

1 Centre for Heritage + Culture, University of Southern Queensland, Celmara.Pocock@unisq.edu.au

2 Centre for Creative and Cultural Research, University of Canberra, steve.brown@canberra.edu.au

3 School of Humanities, Languages and Social Science, Griffith University, r.mason@griffith.edu.au

Photo: Speakers at the Pride Heritage session, GA2023. (Source: Celmara Pocock)

Abstract

The 2023 ICOMOS General Assembly scientific symposium in Sydney was groundbreaking for including an inaugural session on LGBTQIA+ heritage. This paper outlines the impetus and direction of the session and contextualises the contributions to the special issue of *Historic Environment*. It discusses queer heritage as both heritage places and heritage practices, and outlines a rationale for why LGBTQIA+ heritage should be recognised, conserved and managed, as well as some of the challenges of doing so. Queer histories are often hidden and neglected due to stigma, shame and persecution and the identification of queer heritage must recognise significant suffering as well as the celebration of freedoms and rights, where they exist. Queer rights are not universal or certain, and the recognition of queer heritage brings inherent risks for queer people and practices.

Queer Heritage GA2023

This special issue follows an inaugural session on queer heritage held at the ICOMOS 21st General Assembly and Scientific Symposium (GA2023) in Sydney, September 2023. The session was the culmination of conversations among queer heritage practitioners and researchers over many decades. A more concrete plan came to life when Steve Brown and Celmara Pocock submitted a proposal to host a session on LGBTQI+ heritage (Brown & Vileikis 2023: 260-262) when Australia was selected to host the 20th ICOMOS General Assembly and Scientific Symposium for the first time in 2020. The event was postponed due to the global Covid-19 pandemic, but survived to emerge stronger and bolder in 2023.

The GA2023 session (Vileikis & Brown 2023: 273-274) aimed to begin a conversation to encourage ICOMOS to recognise and engage with LGBTQI+ heritage as an important field of conservation; identify the particular complexities of LGBTQI+ heritage and the specialist approaches required for its identification, documentation and management; and to create a network of ICOMOS practitioners with an interest in LGBTQI+ heritage to implement this plan.

Our session formed part of the GA2023 Scientific Symposium and took place in the Heritage Exposition—a select part of the GA2023 proceedings open to the general public, and comprised of an open display of heritage stalls, exhibitions and informal meeting spaces where anyone could walk by, stop to listen or contribute (Figure 1). The location of the queer heritage session in an open meeting space (and specifically the space designated as the ‘Knowledge Café’) had some great advantages, not least the large audience the session attracted, which we estimated as over 70 people. The audience was at capacity, with many people sitting on the floor, leaning against walls or pillars, or resting on the eclectic mix of vintage props that decorated the meeting space. We like to imagine that in this open space some vulnerable queer and queer-curious delegates may have dropped by or listened in without any overt

risk of being associated with the theme, even those from nations notoriously hostile and dangerous to LGBTQI+ people.

The audience provided lively discussion and thought-provoking questions, and there was a strong sense that it was time for ICOMOS to begin thinking about LGBTQI+ heritage. This sense of buoyancy was shared. The downside of the open session was that we had little idea of who all the participants were, unless they followed up in person with one of us after the panel. We are nevertheless grateful for the contributions of everyone, and hope that through this special issue of *Historic Environment* we might reengage with the many people who so enthusiastically embraced the session.



Figure 1: Pride Heritage speakers and audience gathering in the Knowledge Café, ICOMOS General Assembly, Sydney, 2023. (Photo credit: Andrew Sneddon)

In early conversations we considered not only the places associated with queer histories, but the significant contribution of Lesbian and Gay heritage practitioners to our field. And we were privileged to have some of these highly respected individuals lead the discussions. The session '*LGBTQI Heritage: Unnatural Histories, Ephemeral Places, Future Challenges*' opened with presentations by Steve Brown, Celmara Pocock, Matt Devine, Amilcar Vargas, Alison Oram and Denis Byrne with responses from Robert Mason and Eleanor Casella (for bios, see 'Guest editors and contributors' section of this volume). The session was drawn together by panel discussant and heritage doyenne Sharon Sullivan.

The possibility of hosting a LGBTQI+ session at the GA2023, and the warm welcome it received from many quarters, demonstrates the remarkable gains that have been achieved in the recognition of diverse sexualities in a relatively short period. There is much to celebrate. But it is also important to remember that this acceptance, recognition and acknowledgement remains out of reach for many, including many of the delegates at the GA2023. The ICOMOS delegates comprised a large and diverse international audience of some 1,800 people from 83 countries, including countries where being queer is illegal and where punishments and persecutions remain extreme. There are many more nations where LGBTQI+ people remain marginalised. And alarmingly, there are a number of countries, including Russia and the United States of America, where queer rights are being rolled back. In Australia too, religious groups are protesting with some success for the exclusion of queer materials in public libraries in both capital cities and regional towns including Sydney, and the small coastal town of Albany in Western Australia. Rights therefore remain an important theme for this volume, as does remaining sensitive to how the rights and freedoms that we enjoy in major liberal democracies, are not afforded to people globally.



Figure 2: Speakers in the Pride Heritage session at GA2023. Back, Left to Right: Robert Mason, Matt Devine, Celmara Pocock, Steve Brown, Cristina Garduño Freeman; Marco Antonio A. Chavez-Aguayo; Front, Left to Right: Eleanor Casella, Amilcar Vargas, Denis Byrne, Sharon Sullivan. (Source: Celmara Pocock)

In looking back on our queer histories, violence, marginalisation, persecution, vilification and discrimination are prevalent. Broader community acceptance, recognition and celebration have largely been achieved in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. For many of us, painful histories are part of our living memories. They continue to reverberate in our selves and our relationships with others. They shape who we are, how we negotiate the world and how we create alternative forms of belonging. We live with fear and discomfort and are forced to be bold and brave. For many more queer people, these are not recent history, but everyday experiences of the present. The unequal distribution of LGBTQI+ rights across the world is not only seen between liberal democracies and conservative autocracies, but within and between regions and communities. Despite hosting the Sydney Mardi Gras, one of the world's most celebrated LGBTQI+ events, coming out or being LGBTQI+ remains difficult and dangerous in much of regional, rural and remote Australia. Openly expressing a queer identity remains difficult for individuals in religious or conservative families, on the margins of our cities, and elsewhere where there are no support networks or gay enclaves to offer sanctuary and support.

Why queer

We have adopted the term queer both as shorthand for LGBTQI+, and for its ability to reflect diverse, fluid and intersectional sexualities over time and space. We use the term as it has been reclaimed by community and research, but nonetheless recognise that for a long time 'queer' was a slur used to belittle and discriminate against homosexuals, and particularly for older gay men the term is associated with significant pain. Queer can, however, be a helpfully encompassing term that recognises diverse, emerging and changing sexualities. Not all same-sex relationships in the past could be classified as gay or lesbian, and equally, there are many cultures in the world where same-sex relationships form part of society, but where the terminology of LGBTQI+ would be problematic. So we use the term queer not as an exclusionary device, but as a means to acknowledge diversity of sexuality and gender within different eras and different cultures, and to reflect the continuing emergence of new expressions of sexuality in the twenty-first century.

While adopting umbrella terms, the papers in this volume also refer to more specific forms of sexuality, such as lesbian or gay, both as they relate to particular research cases, and in recognising distinctions between particular identities. While grouped together in recognition of shared experiences of discrimination and celebration, particular queer identities also manifest with unique histories. For instance, the draconian laws and widespread discrimination experienced by lesbians or homosexual men in much of the European and colonial world, and the consequent campaigns for gay rights in the late twentieth century, shape these histories, and provide a foundation for the emergence of greater recognition for bisexual and transgender issues in the twenty-first century.

The term queer is further adopted for its links to queer theory which draws on feminist and queer studies to challenge ideas of heteronormativity and gives precedence to those who have been marginalised by mainstream society (e.g. Giffney & O'Rourke 2018). Some of the ideas and principles that emerge from queer theory underpin the ideas explored in this volume. This includes challenges to gender and sexual binaries in favour of understanding how identities are fluid and performative. Significantly too, queer theory highlights the need for diversity, including within LGBTQI+ communities, and recognises how intersectionality underpins unique experiences of privilege, marginalisation and oppression. Intersectionality diversifies our understanding of LGBTQI+ identities by recognising that sexuality is only one aspect of identity. LGBTQI+ identities are experienced very differently for people whose sexuality intersects with other aspects of their identity, particularly for those who also belong to other marginalised identities, including women, people of colour, transgender people, and those from culturally and linguistically diverse communities, Indigenous or First Nations people, and people who live with disability including those who are ageing. Significantly, many of these forms of discrimination manifest within LGBTQI+ communities. Queer theory also opens the idea of 'queering'—a critical approach that challenges conventional norms by seeking to reveal underlying meanings in the analysis of cultural texts including literature, film and art, and as this volume explores, cultural heritage.

What is queer heritage?

Queer heritage might be understood most directly as the heritage places associated with the histories, events and places of significance to queer people. Like other heritage sites, these can be recognised through the established heritage practices. As such, queer heritage places can be assessed against established criteria to demonstrate how they are representative, exemplary, aesthetic and/ or have special association with a queer community or individual. The heritage system has enough flexibility and capacity to recognise and incorporate queerness as another dimension of the increasing diversity of heritage registers. However, the capacity of the system is not necessarily well aligned with the political willingness to implement such directions, as is demonstrated by the persistent biases and imbalances in many heritage registers.

Queer heritage is grossly underrepresented, and largely absent, in many formal heritage registers, policies and programs globally. The reasons are perhaps obvious when considering issues of discrimination, victimisation, stigma and shame that beleaguers queer life. Despite political advances in recognition of rights in many liberal democracies, these issues remain a widespread problem, and state-sanctioned violence and persecution remains a threat for many. The effect of such vulnerability is that sites of queer practice and history are largely ephemeral or deliberately hidden. Many places of queer practice are clandestine, private and transitory (see Byrne, this volume).

Underrepresentation also comes from the challenges of intersectionality and the diversity in LGBTQI+ histories, experiences and identities. The ephemeral and temporary nature of queer heritage reflects a response to persecution and the everchanging and creative nature of queer identity-making, but the latter can be difficult to accommodate in existing heritage processes. Questions of race/Indigeneity, gender, age, class, and sex within and between

groups who identify as LGBTQI+ can be problematic for the divisions between categories of representativeness. And the constant remaking of queer identities challenges and contests ideas of continuity central to so much of the established heritage framework. This brings to the fore issues with how we identify, manage and conserve heritage. For instance, Oxford Street in Sydney is recollected and celebrated as the centre of Australian gay and lesbian culture, illustrated by an array of LGBTQI+ clubs, bookshops, sex on premises businesses, and a visible population of openly gay people, as well as being the locale of the annual Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras. It is clear that the heritage significance of Oxford Street cannot be understood through its built heritage alone, but draws from gay interactions, exchanges, activities, performances and celebrations. Queer heritage therefore highlights one of the most vexing challenges for heritage practice that remains focused on fabric rather than practice, and how this challenges traditional ideas of conservation. Conservation of practice or action as heritage remains elusive and listing often records what has already been lost (Pocock 2006). For instance, the Sydney Mardi Gras Parade Route has been included in the NSW State Heritage Inventory, in recognition of its ‘historic, associative, research, representative and rarity values, as the focus and the evolving site of Sydney’s Mardi Gras parades from their beginning in 1978’ (NSW Government 2022). The listing of the parade route is novel, and seeks to recognise the streets along the route as a ‘window into alternative Sydney subcultures, a landscape where political protests, cultural festivals, shops, services and celebration of diversity have been made the most public’. And yet, despite this effort, a recent newspaper article suggests that Oxford Street is losing its LGBTQI+ character as gentrification and social change bring new communities to the area, and queer folk either move away, create new spaces or are absorbed into mainstream venues (*Sydney Morning Herald* 2024, 11 August).

The heritage system is largely a conservative one—the demographics of heritage visitors and representative heritage largely reflect an older, middle-class, white population, struggling to engage younger and more diverse sectors of society (Bajec 2019). It may therefore seem like a radical step for ICOMOS to develop a program for the recognition and conservation of queer heritage. However, there are clear precedents for increased diversity. Other marginalised groups, notably Indigenous, non-British migrants and women in Australia, have challenged heritage systems to be more representative of cultural diversity, to recognise change as well as continuity, and to be respectful of community perspectives and rights. Responses to these challenges have contributed directly to Australia’s reputation as a global leader in heritage, particularly regarding First Nations inclusion (Silliman 2005; Atalay 2006; Meskell 2009; Jokilehto 2011; Gfeller 2015; Pocock & Lilley 2017). Significantly, several queer identifying individuals among the most influential Australian heritage scholars and practitioners have contributed to these discussions and brought about change. It is possible then to suggest that some of the innovation in Australian heritage has come about through a hitherto unrecognised queering.

Liberation, unhappy heritage and remaining queer

Ironically, queer heritage is now at risk of invisibility because of the successes of LGBTQI+ liberation movements and greater acceptance of LGBTQI people within mainstream society. The increasing acceptance of LGBTQI+ people in contemporary societies means that queer culture is not only subsumed into the mainstream, but becomes part of the mainstream, frequently mimicking the heterosexual world. LGBTQI+ Comedian and activist, Eddie Izzard has been reported as saying that ‘When LGBT is boring we’ve made it!’. But what might the cost be of becoming boring? For heritage, the challenge might be how we continue to create and maintain our identities through heritage.

Our heritage may include a reinterpretation of existing heritage places, but should also include distinctive places, objects and practices. And these values should be foregrounded rather than remaining a secondary interpretation (see Byrne this volume).

An important theme in the discussions leading up to and through the ICOMOS GA2023 session, was the recognition that not all queer histories can, or should, be cast as celebratory. While there is a desire to recognise achievements of liberation, the histories leading to these moments are often associated with places where queer folk have experienced pain, fear, and trauma, as well as stigma and shame. In this regard, queer heritage might be regarded as a form of 'dark heritage' (Lennon & Foley 2000), or as Pocock and Mason (forthcoming 2025) have argued elsewhere, might constitute 'unhappy heritage' in which everyday suffering stems from insidious forms of structural and social violence, and is less easily recognised as violence. The recognition and interpretation of such places as heritage, requires sensitive engagement and the respect for rights of LGBTQI+ people past and present.

It is important that queer communities are recognised as part of the world's cultural diversity, and that we conserve and present this heritage for the future. In societies where queer equality appears achievable, the darker aspects of this heritage must be remembered, lest we lose our rights again. Recognition also offers hope to those who continue to live in fear of their lives while surviving intolerant and draconian systems. And as with other forms of cultural diversity, acceptance, tolerance and celebration of queer people should not be on the condition of heteronormativity. We have the right to be diverse, distinctive and to maintain our own cultural practices.

The contributions to this volume address many of these issues, and they offer both conceptual and applied ways to consider the future of queer heritage.

Papers in the volume

Lucas Lixinski's article opens the volume with a reminder that heritage is a powerful vehicle for identity and an important tool for marginalised groups to leverage political, social and cultural processes. He therefore argues that queer heritage can advance the status of queer people in society and regards the recognition of queer heritage as part of queer liberation. This extends to empowering queer people in the identification and interpretation of heritage, including the reinterpretation of how others have portrayed us.

Lixinski argues that queer heritage extends to action and that, by queering heritage, heritage practice can be reimagined for everyone. This process provides an opportunity to reinvent what heritage is, what it does and for whom. Queering can therefore help to question heritage assumptions for some more obvious things such as what a regular household might be, or how queer languages might form an intangible heritage. Lixinski also points to the importance of intersectionality in discussing and thinking about queer heritage, and suggests, for instance, that through intersectionality we can challenge common binaries that permeate heritage thinking such as divisions between tangible and intangible, or Indigenous and non-Indigenous heritage that bring about power inequalities.

These ideas of queer heritage as both noun and verb, or object and action, are taken up in other papers in the volume, especially by Denis Byrne in his exploration of gay cruising as heritage. He reminds us of the challenges of moving beyond sites and places to think about practices or what is often called social significance (Byrne, Brayshaw & Ireland 2001; Jones 2017) or intangible heritage as assessed under social value criteria in some heritage regimes (e.g. Australia ICOMOS 2013). Byrne gives an account of gay men cruising as a heritage practice, as an immersion in the more-than-human environment, drawing on examples from the waterfronts of Manhattan Island, New York and Elizabeth Bay in Sydney. He argues that while cruising is often locality based, it also includes practices that are not confined to specific places.

Byrne reminds us that while queer spaces might remain outside the visible eye of mainstream society, they are simultaneously public. They are also known and seen by those who share this cultural knowledge. But such places remain ephemeral, coming to be as it were, only in the space-time when they are less frequented by mainstream society. Rather than being recorded on paper, these places are mapped in the minds of gay men, and to recognise or

understand them relies on oral testimony, and re-reading and queering of texts. Byrne thus cautions that if we only recognise queer heritage as the fabric of sites or locations, queer histories and associations will remain obscured. While he recognises why the feelings of liberation associated with openly expressing sexuality in the 1960s and 1970s have become a key reason why people want to remember, celebrate and make associated locations heritage, the many stories held by gay and lesbian people are held in place as memories.

Contrary to references to a shared heritage or multiple associations with the same place, Byrne's discussion of gay knowledge and sensuous engagement with the piers in New York is a powerful evocation that the same space is not just a collection of overlapping or competing associations, but produces discrete and defined places that may be entirely invisible to one another. The incarnation of piers as cruising sites is, for gay experience, all-encompassing rather than layered, and to recognise these sites primarily as another form of heritage—in this case as shipyards—denies the very centrality of how they are experienced, known and recollected in gay memory. Queering can thus be a form of heritage practice—drawing us away from the preoccupation with fabric to foreground stories and affect (Pocock et al. 2015). If we really want to out hidden queer histories, then we require a heritage activism that resists the status quo. Why do we need to only consider aesthetic or social values as secondary in our listing processes? Why can these not drive our heritage?

Byrne questions in a time of overburdened registers whether we need yet another category of heritage place (Harrison 2013), but recognises that to remain outside the system risks remaining invisible or enduring the rendering of queer histories from a heterosexual standpoint. As Lixinski also argues, if these histories are to be known, recognised and even celebrated, then we should inscribe them for ourselves. The papers by Lixinski and Byrne both question whether becoming mainstream is the best way to achieve liberation or whether queer heritage should aspire to be more. While it is possible to consider this as a choice because we have already achieved a degree of liberation, our liberation should not come at the expense of our distinctiveness. Byrne suggests that to resist absorption into the mainstream we must become heritage makers rather than 'passive consumers of status quo heritage' and create a heritage that may be less comfortable than a straight recognition of acceptable and well-regarded queer individuals, histories and places.

The potential of queer heritage to unsettle is important in ensuring that histories of queer oppression and suffering are not relegated to the past, but are recognised as having continuing legacies in queer communities, given that past acts of violence continue to reverberate in the queer lives today. Smaal and Mason write of Australia's diverse gay male carceral heritage, including gay men incarcerated in mental institutions and prisons because of their sexuality, the vulnerabilities of sexual relationships between incarcerated men, and the vulnerability of gay men to violence within carceral institutions. Their paper illustrates horrendous acts of cruelty, exclusion and violence perpetrated on gay men. They suggest that sites of incarceration are often erased from heritage discourses in favour of more celebratory narratives of queer solidarity and political resistance. Smaal and Mason argue that interpretation of deliberate state-based intimidation is often marginalised, even in LGBTQI+ museums which tend to favour narratives of 'radical queer politics that affirm agency and liberation'. They suggest that while there is value in affirming and celebrating queer resistance, it is equally important to recognise unjust violence and deaths that arise from such cruelty. However, they point to a silence that surrounds the structures of violence that operate across diverse Australian carceral settings, which continues to impact gay men.

Despite recent decriminalisation of homosexuality and official apologies to men who were wrongfully criminalised, violent prejudice continues to impact successive generations of queer youth. Coincidentally, the suffering of queer men incarcerated at Wolston Park Mental Hospital in Queensland, is now also the subject of an Australian Broadcasting Corporation expose on the continuing affects and suffering for these men and their families in the present (Gillespie 2024). For Smaal and Mason, the way in which past violence continues to reverberate in the present, and continues to be perpetrated on new generations of queers, creates a strong impetus for heritage work to recognise sites of queer suffering and memories

to challenge prejudices and silences within heritage registers. As such they argue for heritage to become a form of activism, in raising public awareness of state injustices towards queer inmates in both the past and the present. They propose a novel extension of the sites of conscience to consider how heritage places might act as ‘sites of consciousness-raising,’ by centring carceral sites as a catalyst in social, legal and political action. They suggest that in contrast with traditional dark tourism that maintains a division between us and them for visitors and inmates, ‘consciousness-raising’ can challenge the distinction drawn between queer prisoners in the past and present. They suggest this can directly address the silences around queer experience that have been erased from public histories. Smaal and Mason’s contribution thus offers another example of how the dual interpretations of queer heritage, as recognition of queer pasts and queering what heritage is and does, can both work to achieve greater social justice for LGBTQI+ individuals and communities.

Alison Oram’s contribution to this volume, provides an example of how a state agency can begin to develop approaches that address some of these aims for queer heritage. The Pride of Place project grew out of Historic England’s (formerly English Heritage) efforts to increase equality and diversity within its heritage register. When the project commenced, Historic England recognised queer associations for very few heritage places in its official listings and interpretation. Oram suggests that in general heritage operators and curators exhibited an unease about including queer themes or topics, and the few examples of queer heritage could be attributed to the ‘bravery’ of individual curators or practitioners. This discomfort with queer heritage is nevertheless an important aspect of queer heritage, and both Oram and Byrne highlight that sex and lust are aspects of queer heritage that unsettle the mainstream. The queering of approaches advocated throughout this volume, is present in Pride of Place community-centred approach in which queer communities were invited to identify places of significance to them. These places are not predicated on pre-existing heritage attributes, but through a crowd-sourced interactive online map that invited the public to identify buildings and places in England that were significant to LGBTQI+ heritage. This produced a range of homes and public places recollected as sites of same-sex desire, gender-crossing and political activism.

Despite recognising a number of important locations through this mapping project, Oram identifies how traditional heritage processes that privilege built features and architectural attributes over social history or community association, mean that even those places known



Figure 3: ICOMOS GA2023 delegates participated in a tour of Sydney’s iconic Oxford Street. Although heritage listed for its association with the Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras, the future of Oxford Street as a queer space is threatened by gentrification and even heritagisation of fabric over community. (Photo credit: Gabriel Caballero, 2023)

to have significant queer associations may not meet the threshold for listing. For instance, some potential queer listings were determined as lacking integrity because the building had been modified even though its significant queer history was demonstrable. This highlights the problem of how fabric is privileged over social significance, but also the very particular vulnerabilities of invisibility of queer heritage. Secrecy, shame and fear mean that significant queer places have not been openly recognised. And in failing to recognise them as significant places, both their fabric and social history are vulnerable to destruction and loss.

While a queer heritage may be new for ICOMOS, the work builds from and contributes to a growing body of queer heritage making research and practice. LGBTQI+ museums and archives are appearing in many countries, including as part of state sanctioned collections. Some of this research is highlighted in the three book reviews included in this volume. An edited volume on the history of preservation of LGBTQI+ heritage places in the USA, reviewed by Sharon Sullivan, demonstrates the range of these projects in the USA which offer both precedents and exemplars for how LGBTQI+ heritage might develop in Australia. And Michael Stockwell's review of *Queer Spaces: An Atlas of LGBTQI+ Places and Stories* picks up the theme of how spaces can be queered. Ursula Frederick's review of the Victorian Government Queer Archive publication *Out and Proud in Queer Victoria: A History of LGBTQI+ Victoria in 100 Places and Objects* raises questions about how we can be more inclusive of regional, younger and more recent histories and the challenges and opportunities of including ephemeral collections.

Towards a manifesto

The ICOMOS GA2023 Pride Heritage session and the papers in this volume are the beginning of a conversation about what types of heritage places are capable of recording and representing queer histories, and exploring some of the challenges of creating and recognising an LGBTQI+ heritage. In advocating for queer heritage as action, queer heritage intersects with many of the key issues and challenges for contemporary heritage practice. While we might have contributed to any of the Themes of the ICOMOS GA2023 Scientific Symposium—Resilience, Responsibility, Rights and Relationships—our placement in the Rights Theme was particularly fitting. Queer rights remain contested and insecure globally, and while we are only just beginning to consider what a queer heritage might be and do, it can play a role in achieving greater rights and recognition for queer communities in all generations.

In responding to the presentations, each panel member was asked to consider whether it would be helpful to develop a Queer Manifesto for heritage conservation, and if so, what key issues should be included, and how this would form a call to action. The response was a qualified 'yes'. Recognising that we could not speak for all queer people, there was still value in developing a manifesto if it could provide impetus for ICOMOS to play a lead role in the recognition, conservation, promotion and support of LGBTQI+ heritages and rights. The volume therefore sets out an initial manifesto for queer heritage that can evolve in response to greater inclusion and change in the ever-evolving space of queer identity making and heritage recognition.

Acknowledgements

We thank the Co-Chairs of the GA2023 Rights Theme—Cristina Garduño Freeman, Marco Antonio Chávez Aguayo, and Aishwarya Deshmukh—for their support for the LGBTQI session, and Cristina for taking notes during it. Thanks to the audience for their participations, support and enthusiasm, and to individuals who reached out after the session to offer their insights. Other contributors to the development of the session and volume, including Amilcar Vargas, Eleanor Casella, Daniel Keenan, Sharon Sullivan. Thanks to all reviewers, and to the *Historic Environment* editors (Tracy Ireland, Amy Clarke, and Rebecca Hawcroft) for their support for this special issue.

References

- Atalay, S. 2006, 'Indigenous archaeology as decolonizing practice', *The American Indian Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 280-310.
- Australia ICOMOS 2013, *The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter)*, Australia ICOMOS, Burwood.
- Brown, S. & Vileikis, O. (eds) 2023, *ICOMOS GA2020 Scientific Symposium, Sydney, Australia, 5-9 October 2020: Selected Abstracts*, ICOMOS International, Charenton-le-Pont, available at, <https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Secretariat/2022/GA2020/ICOMOS_GA2020_Abstracts_FINAL_20220621.pdf>.
- Bajec, J.F. 2019, 'The interpretation and utilization of cultural heritage and its values by young people in Slovenia. Is heritage really boring and uninteresting?', *Etnološka tribina*, no. 42, pp. 173-193, 275.
- Byrne, D., Brayshaw, H. & Ireland, T. 2001, *Social significance: A discussion paper*, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Hurstville.
- Gfeller, A. 2015, 'Anthropologizing and Indigenizing heritage: The origins of the UNESCO Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List', *Journal of Social Archaeology*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 366-386.
- Giffney, N. & O'Rourke, M. 2016, *The Ashgate Research Companion to Queer Theory*, Routledge, London.
- Gillespie, E. 2024, 'Former patients, staff and families welcome investigation into historical abuse allegations at Wolston Park Mental Hospital', ABC News 9 August, viewed 6 September 2024, <<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2024-08-09/wolston-park-mental-hospital-abuse-allegations-investigation/104199734>>.
- Harrison, R. 2013, 'Forgetting to remember, remembering to forget: Late modern heritage practices, sustainability and the "crisis" of accumulation of the past', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 579-595.
- Jones, S. 2017, 'Wrestling with the social value of heritage: Problems, dilemmas and opportunities', *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 21-37.
- Jokilehto, J. 2011, 'World heritage: Observations on decisions related to cultural heritage', *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 61-74.
- Lennon, J. & Foley, M. 2000, *Dark Tourism*, Continuum, London.
- Meskel, L. 2009, 'Introduction: Cosmopolitan heritage ethics', in L. Meskel (ed.), *Cosmopolitan archaeologies*, Duke University Press, Durham, pp. 1-27.
- NSW Government 2022, 'State Heritage Inventory: Sydney Mardi Gras Parade Route', viewed 6 September 2024, <<https://www.hms.heritage.nsw.gov.au/App/Item/ViewItem?itemId=5068034>>.
- Pocock, C. 2006, 'Authenticity in cultural heritage management and tourism', *Historic Environment*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 3-8.
- Pocock, C. & Lilley, I. 2017, 'Who benefits? World Heritage and Indigenous people', *Heritage & Society*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 171-190.
- Pocock, C. & Mason, R. Forthcoming, 2025 'Heritage tourism and the ethics of bearing witness', in A. Pantazatos, et al. (eds), *Routledge Handbook of Heritage Ethics*, Routledge, London.
- Pocock, C., Collett, D. & Baulch, L. 2015, 'Assessing stories before sites: Identifying the tangible from the intangible', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 962-982.
- Silliman, S. 2005, 'Culture contact or colonialism? Challenges in the archaeology of native North America', *American Antiquity*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 55-74.

Sydney Morning Herald. 2024, "'Sad state': Warning that Oxford Street risks losing LGBTQ character', 11 August, viewed 6 September 2024, <<https://www.smh.com.au/national/nsw/sad-state-warning-that-oxford-street-risks-losing-lgbtq-character-20240717-p5juic.html>>.

Vileikis, O. & Brown, S. (eds) 2023, *ICOMOS 2023 Scientific Symposium Sydney, Australia, 1-8 September 2023: Book of Abstracts*, ICOMOS International, Charenton-le-Pont, available at, <https://openarchive.icomos.org/id/eprint/2878/1/ICOMOS_ScSy2023_Book_of_Abstracts_v20230901.pdf>.

Endnotes

- 1 For instance, LGBTIQ+ communities have been identified as priority populations under The National Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Agreement (Commonwealth of Australia, 2022) and for data development as part of the National Suicide and Self-harm Monitoring System.

See Commonwealth of Australia 2022, The National Mental Health and Suicide Prevention Agreement, viewed 16 August 2024, <https://federalfinancialrelations.gov.au/sites/federalfinancialrelations.gov.au/files/2022-03/nmh_suicide_prevention_agreement.pdf>.
- 2 As with terminology to describe LGBTQIA+ individuals and groups, many marginalised identities have preferences for how they are described and named, and these preferences are often contextual and personal. Here we have tried to reflect current preferences but recognise that these are not universal or uncontested.