

# People, protest and place: Advancing research on the emplacement of LGBTQ+ urban activisms

Amin Ghaziani 

University of British Columbia, Canada

*Urban Studies*  
2021, Vol. 58(7) 1529–1540  
© Urban Studies Journal Limited 2021  
Article reuse guidelines:  
sagepub.com/journals-permissions  
DOI: 10.1177/0042098020986064  
journals.sagepub.com/home/usj  


## Abstract

There is a vibrant literature on LGBTQ+ urban geographies, as well as established traditions in sociology and political science on collective action, but research infrequently brings these interdisciplinary fields of sexualities, social movements and urban studies together to explore the emplacement of LGBTQ+ urban activism. In this article, I use contributions from this special issue of *Urban Studies* to propose two pathways, conceptualised as analytic shifts, that can advance the field: (1) *scalar shifts* (modulating from a national and structural focus of mobilisation to local, grounded and quotidian acts and interactions between activists); and (2) *spatial shifts* (using conventional and queer methods to study spatial plurality and the commensurability of places where people protest). Together, these proposals form an integrative framework for the study of LGBTQ+ urban protest and placemaking.

## Keywords

activism, cities, gaybourhoods, LGBTQ+, placemaking, queer methods, social movements

## 摘要

有大量关于男女同性恋、双性恋、变性人、酷儿群体 (LGBTQ+) 城市地理, 以及关于集体行动的社会学和政治学既定传统的文献, 但研究很少将这些性科学、社会运动和城市研究的跨学科领域结合在一起, 以探索LGBTQ+城市激进主义的定位。在本文中, 我利用本期《城市研究》的文章提出了两条被概念化为分析转移的途径, 可以推进这一领域: (1) 标量转移 (从动员的国家和结构焦点调整到地方、基础和日常行为以及激进主义者之间的互动); 和 (2) 空间转移 (使用传统和另类的方法来研究空间多元化和人们抗议的地方的可公度性)。这些建议共同构成了一个研究LGBTQ+城市抗议和地方营造的综合框架。

## 关键词

激进主义、城市、同性恋村、男女同性恋、双性恋、变性人、酷儿群体 (LGBTQ+)、地方营造、另类方法、社会运动

Received September 2020; accepted October 2020

## Introduction

The study of sexualities, social movements and urban places each has an intellectually fecund history, that much is certain. Equally certain is that the spatial expressions of LGBTQ+ lives are remarkably diverse. Less certain, however, is how placed perspectives might contribute to studies of queer urban social movements. In this commentary, I use articles in this special issue to reflect on the role of place in shaping LGBTQ+ associational life and collective action. Two themes, which I express as scalar and spatial shifts, emerge across the articles: first, we must redirect our focus from the structural analysis of national protest events to strategic deliberations and interactions between activists on the ground; and second, we need to expand our repertoire to examine a broader collection of places where protest occurs. I address each shift in turn, and conclude with general remarks about emplacing queer urban activism.

### Scalar shifts: From national protest events to everyday, emplaced acts of resistance

Why do people protest? This question is the *sine qua non* of social movements research. Early approaches, called classical models, dwelt on structural factors to account for the emergence of mass movements (Gusfield, 1968). Researchers hypothesised that urbanisation creates pressures on isolated individuals, who respond with a 'crowd mentality' (Le Bon, 1896: 6) – think rumours, panics and mass hysteria – to ease their anxieties and anomie. Variations of this model, including relative deprivation (Gurr, 1970), mass society (Kornhauser, 1959) and

collective behaviour (Blumer, 1951), assume that movements reflect 'structural strain' (Smelser, 1963), a phrase that scholars use to denote the underlying weaknesses of a society that produce disruptive psychological states. This insistence on structure narrowed the conceptual imagination of contention to 'action without actors' (Melucci, 1988: 329).

Several corrections have been proposed over the years, including resource mobilisation (McCarthy and Zald, 1977), political process (McAdam, 1982) and a multi-institutional approach (Armstrong and Bernstein, 2008). These frameworks rejected assumptions of irrationality and psychopathology that characterised classical models, but scholars still favoured macro units of analysis, including organisations (Morris, 1984), political opportunities (Meyer, 2004) and mobilising structures (McAdam et al., 1996). These concepts better capture the environments in which activists operate, but they reproduce 'structural distortions' (Goodwin and Jasper, 1999: 28) by proposing explanations for protest that lie 'outside the control of movement actors' (Goodwin and Jasper, 1999: 29).

The most compelling response to this perennial bias comes from movement scholars who prioritise people by examining their consciousness (Mansbridge and Morris, 2001) and emotions (Jasper, 2018), like the angry street activism that animated ACT UP (Gould, 2002). But even these cultural theories (Johnston and Klandermans, 1995) elide questions that the contributors of this special issue address with urgency: what happens when we combine people and protest with place, that is, when we *emplace* LGBTQ+ urban activism? By locating activism on the ground, in everyday acts and

---

#### Corresponding author:

Amin Ghaziani, Department of Sociology, University of British Columbia, 6303 NW Marine Drive, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1, Canada.

Email: amin.ghaziani@ubc.ca

interactions that occur among activists who operate in specific urban places, we can finally see actions with actors.

Consider Rosenberg (2021), who walks us along the streets of Toronto's gaybourhood. Rather than centring the experiences of cis, white, affluent gay men, as some existing work does, Rosenberg focuses on homeless Black queer and trans youth who perform 'spatial acts of resistance' on the streets. These are 'informal, unrecognised, unintentional and (semi-)private acts of resistance that manifest against structures of power in everyday queer lives'.

Structure appears in this definition – as it must when we talk about exclusionary racist practices – but Rosenberg refuses to lose sight of the actors involved. Rosenberg shows us photographs of two Black queer youths who climb on top of an art installation of metallic cubes. These cubes resemble a miniature city and are situated in front of a condominium, 'a familiar symbol of wealth and gentrification'. The Black queer youths' 'assertive bodily interruption' in front of a 'symbol of economic exclusion and racist geographies' invites the reader to see how locating protest in a particular place can redefine its meaning. In Toronto, activists inserted themselves into the 'creases and folds' of the local gaybourhood to challenge the racial profiling, criminalisation and violence that they encounter on its streets.

Ramdas (2021) also examines creases and folds by locating activism on 'the margins' of urban life. The peripheral parts of a city are a 'place of refusal' where activists contest hegemonic power, and a place of 'radical openness' where they cultivate protest. To make this argument about the 'spatial politics of the margin', Ramdas takes us to Singapore, where the State has criminalised homosexuality with Section 377A of the Penal Code. Despite codifying discrimination, the State says it will not punish

LGBTQ+ people, provided they do not demand their rights. How can activists accomplish change in this contradictory climate? Ramdas first examines Pink Dot, the annual LGBTQ+ Pride event. The activists who organise it do 'not present an outright proclamation of homosexual interests in Singapore'. Instead, they protest for 'love as a universal right'. Ramdas next analyses Sayoni to understand the plight of LGBTQ+ women, noting that although the State again will not champion queer interests, it did respond to their pleas for 'protection from violence'. Pink Dot and Sayoni activists mobilised from the margins, where they made demands that aligned with the State's promotion of the family unit.

Johnston and Waitt's (2021) study of Proud to Play, an inaugural regional Pride multi-sporting event in Auckland, shows how emotions fuel activism. By examining the expectation that LGBTQ+ athletes should 'be happy' to participate in Pride events, Johnston and Waitt show how global cities exploit Pride to market themselves as 'gay friendly'. The emotional work behind this marketing plan obscures how disembodied concepts like colonialism, neoliberalism, heteronormativity and pink-washing conceal everyday forms of violence, discrimination, exclusion and non-recognition – hence Johnston and Waitt's call to focus on how places produce happiness *and* the analytic power of unhappiness. A range of emotions incite activism, but unhappiness uniquely reveals how the structural dynamics of exclusion are embodied and emplaced in interactions.

By examining the mutually constitutive relationship between people, protest and place, these articles remedy some of the structural bias in our understanding of social movements. They do not abandon structure entirely, but rather explain how systemic inequalities are expressed as subjectively

experienced discontent. Reading between their lines, I see two ways to implement a scalar shift: frame emplacement and an attention to collective identities.

### *Frame emplacement*

The idea of a ‘frame’ comes from Goffman (1974), who was keen to understand the cognitive mechanisms underlying how we make sense of events. Social movement theorists integrated his insights to argue that collective action requires activists to engage in a process of ‘frame alignment’ (Snow et al., 1986). To respond to a situation, people must first define what it means. As a mode of constructing meaning, collective action frames point to the dynamic process by which activists manufacture reality. Snow and Benford (1988) argue that activists engage in three framing tasks: diagnosis (what is the problem, and who is to blame?); prognosis (what are the most viable strategies, tactics and targets?); and motivation (what is the most compelling rationale for action?).

Places, like meanings, are complex, fabricated and multivocal. Activists thus face a fourth framing task, one that Snow and Benford (1988) missed: *emplacement*. Because ‘places are not inert containers’ (Rodman, 1992: 641), activists must engage in signifying work that links their interests and goals with a place – its politics, cultures, histories and traditions – to inspire protest. But how exactly does frame emplacement occur?

Ramdas (2021) finds that LGBTQ+ women in Sayoni were not successful when they demanded rights as members of a queer minority; they had to reframe their concerns as related to ‘safety and security’ or ‘care and protection’. These conceptions, while more limited, better fit with how the State viewed its responsibilities towards its citizens (‘care and protection’) and its patriarchal definitions of womanhood (‘safety and

security’). Pink Dot activists used a similar strategy when they framed ‘love’ as a ‘universal right’. Their frame resonated with the State’s ‘core values of family’. In both cases, I saw activists using frame emplacement to make demands across the spectrum of power. For ‘colonised’ LGBTQ+ people in Singapore, frame emplacement requires them to ‘speak a language the coloniser can understand’. Addressing power in this way can challenge that power, and LGBTQ+ Singaporeans used frame emplacement to do so from the urban margins.

### *Collective identities*

A second way that activists translate structural inequalities into experiential discontent is through the construction of collective identities. This concept addresses the contours of who we think we are. Rather than treating grievances as structurally given, assumed and invariant in a society, movement scholars use collective identity to understand how interests emerge, how they are defined and how activists draw boundaries (Ghaziani, 2011; Ghaziani et al., 2016). The analytic challenge is to determine how places produce distinct configurations between identities and interests, strategies and politics (Polletta and Jasper, 2001).

In their study of lesbian feminist mobilisation, Taylor and Whittier (1992) propose that activists construct collective identities in three ways: they establish social, psychological and physical boundaries between themselves and dominant groups (e.g. lesbian feminists created separate institutions such as health care and rape crisis centres); they cultivate a unique consciousness, or interpretive frameworks that define group interests (e.g. activists expressed the relationship between feminism and lesbianism with the slogan ‘feminism is the theory and lesbianism is the practice’); and they negotiate how to use everyday actions to resist structures

of domination (e.g. because activists perceived traditionally feminine appearance as the source of women's oppression, they adopted alternative styles of gender display). These factors – boundaries, consciousness and negotiation – echo my call for a scalar shift from structures to interactions.

But what about place? The contributors suggest several mechanisms by which places inform collective identities: places nurture distinct sexual cultures (worldmaking practices); places allow LGBTQ+ people to heal from trauma (commemorative practices); and places promote multiple care networks (re-centring practices).

The first of these is evident in the gay, bisexual and transgender men in Andrucki's (2021) article who engage in worldmaking practices that range from cruising and non-monogamous public sex to serving meals at a homeless shelter. By having sex, and by caring for vulnerable members of their community, activists make and remake the streets of the gaybourhood, and resist the violence of erasure that gentrification produces in San Francisco. Because these worldmaking practices are spatially situated, activists use them to craft distinct sex cultures (Ghaziani, 2017) and styles of political engagement (Ghaziani, 2015b). Worldmaking thus evokes an overlooked aspect of collective identity: who we are is a function of where we are.

Hartal and Misgav's (2021) work on traumatic events in Israel shows that commemorative practices comprise a form of urban activism – and a second way to link places with collective identities. They describe a nightclub shooting in Tel Aviv and a stabbing during Jerusalem Pride as forms of 'queer urban trauma'. These injuries are more than a psychological response to distressing experiences; they also provide a basis for mobilisation. Sociologists have shown that cultural trauma and collective identities are closely connected (Alexander

et al., 2004). Activists go to great efforts to ensure that traumatic events are not forgotten, often by emplacing their remembrances as memorials. How this happens, though, varies by place. Tel Aviv is a destination for global gay tourism, whereas Jerusalem is understood as a holy city with a history of antagonism towards LGBTQ+ presence. This difference in place reputations explains why activists in Tel Aviv were able to organise a mass memorial rally one short week after they experienced trauma, as well as why the municipality and national politicians expressed support for the LGBTQ+ community. In Jerusalem, there was no public event to help the LGBTQ+ community cope with their trauma. The first major memorialisation occurred one year later.

Catungal et al. (2021) re-centre narratives of the HIV/AIDS epidemic on long-term survivors (LTS) who lived outside Vancouver's gaybourhood. LTS travelled in the distinct social worlds of the Downtown Eastside. Catungal et al. use differences in places to demonstrate the pernicious consequences of centring LGBTQ+ collective identities in one part the city. Doing so conceals 'diverse geographies of stigma and the politics of socio-spatial exclusions'. Vancouver had multiple care networks that were dispersed across geographical centres of HIV/AIDS. Places, therefore, bind communities with care networks in ways that can reinforce inequalities.

Material resources like money and organisations, along with political opportunities, provide the structural potential for activism to occur, but everyday interactions and meaning-making processes that are situated in specific places mediate between opportunity and action. The contributors show that activists often work in peripheral or otherwise overlooked urban contexts to cultivate responses to the situations they face. In the movements literature, concepts like 'submerged networks' (Melucci, 1989), 'halfway



houses' (Morris, 1984), 'free spaces' (Evans and Boyte, 1986), 'safe spaces' (Gamson, 1996), 'sequestered social sites' (Scott, 1990), 'abeyance structures' (Rupp and Taylor, 1987) and 'underground rivers' (Podmore and Tremblay, 2015) similarly draw attention to the mobilisation potential of the margins. Because these places are physically and culturally removed from dominant groups, activists can experiment with frame emplacement strategies and counterhegemonic collective identities as a way to incite action.

### **Spatial shifts: Strategies for studying the plurality and commensurability of places**

Similar to movement theorists who focus on national protest events, like marches on Washington in the United States (Ghaziani, 2008; Ghaziani and Baldassarri, 2011), some urbanists study the gaybourhood (Brown, 2014; Ghaziani, 2014) in global cities. This literature sometimes assumes spatial singularity, or the idea that LGBTQ+ political and urban life is located in one part of the city. Elsewhere, I proposed that urbanists should balance the study of big-city gay districts with a broader range of LGBTQ+ 'cultural archipelagos' (Ghaziani, 2019). This special issue advances research on archipelagos by covering a vast number of places: Auckland, Chilpancingo, Jerusalem, New Westminster, San Francisco, Singapore, Surrey, Sydney, Tel Aviv, Toronto, Vancouver and Ypsilanti. In doing so, the contributors raise two conundrums that arise from a commitment to spatial plurality: how to combine locally situated and globally circulating political tactics, and the commensurability of places.

#### *The global–local tension*

How do LGBTQ+ activists link the local context in which they operate with a global

spatial imagination? Ruez (2021) uses queer activism in Sydney to examine the fraught relationship between Australia, Asia and the West. He offers 'worlding' as a way to understand how LGBTQ+ urban activism is variably emplaced in Australia. Worlding involves imaginatively and materially linking some places to others. During his conversations with racialised queer migrants in Sydney, some of Ruez's respondents worlded Sydney as 'Asian', others positioned it as 'Western', while others still worlded Australia and Asia together as a 'shared Pacific region'. Clearly, Australia is not a static or geographically invariant place: activists construct Australia as 'part of the Anglo-American centre', as 'peripherally down-under' or as 'inescapably Asian'.

Variations in worlding practices shape models of LGBTQ+ urban activism. For example, the most common way that racialised queer migrants in Sydney connected Australia with Asia was by referencing Pink Dot activism in Singapore, rather than North American-styled gay Pride parades. The worlding of Australia and Asia also enabled Ruez's respondents to centre Indigenous histories and thus unsettle Australia's whiteness and colonial geographies. The intuition here is that places, global and local alike, are accomplished (Molotch et al., 2000) as people relocate, reworlding the places they know and with which they feel attachments.

Payne (2021) examines Pride parades outside the global North – in Latin America, specifically. Some scholars see these events as a 'foreign' cultural practice (Encarnación, 2016). When they examine them in the global South, researchers generally locate them in the national capitals or world cities. Missing from this literature is a study of Pride in smaller cities in the global South. Enter Payne's work, which contributes to recent mandates to theorise 'from the middle' by studying smaller cities (Forstie, 2020:

153–154). By focusing on places outside the global North, Payne documents what I, in another context, call a ‘global–local tension’ (Ghaziani and Ventresca, 2005). Applied to protest and urban places, the global–local tension describes how activists configure place-specific and place-spanning properties of political action. Payne shows that LGBTQ+ urban activists borrow the transnational tactic of Pride parades to create broad awareness about their lives – but they inflect these events with specific local qualities.

For the first Pride march in Chilpancingo in June 2002, activists chose the Statue of Liberty as their primary symbol, and they flanked it with two people holding a rainbow flag. At the back of the float were images of an AIDS ribbon and a smiling condom figure. Without a closer look, this might suggest that LGBTQ+ activists in small Mexican cities emulate globally circulating images. But such a conclusion would miss the significance of local place cultures. Mexican activists exploited a tradition of using public processions in plazas to bring attention to their grievances. They deliberately staged the first Pride event in Chilpancingo’s central plaza, the Plaza Cívica Primer Congreso de Anáhuac, a site that is ‘imbued with profound cultural history and social meaning’. As they organised the parade, activists mixed transnational (e.g. rainbow flags, AIDS ribbons and the Statue of Liberty) and local symbols (e.g. a map of Mexico, the murder of a local activist and traditional Catholic penitential symbolism) to communicate their message. Thus, the analysis of cultural archipelagos must go beyond surface-level similarities across places. Payne’s article shows that activists manage the global–local tension in their mobilisation efforts by emplacing transnational discourses about human rights in locally significant spatial traditions.

Currans (2021) examines intersectional, social justice, queer-affirming and feminist organising practices in a small city of Michigan. The piece examines Love, Resilience, Action Ypsilanti (LRAY), a group of activists working to stage a local demonstration to correspond with the national Women’s Marches on 21 January 2017. LRAY activists experience a sense of acceptance in the surrounding Ypsilanti area. Rather than promoting queer interests, this motivates them to craft an ‘affinity-based’ activist community in which the expression of specific identities was ‘not the focus of connection or organisation’.

The resemblances between affinity-based and ‘post-gay’ politics (Ghaziani, 2011, 2015a) are striking, and Currans’ (2021) piece demonstrates their unexpectedly ‘radical potential’ (Ghaziani, 2015c). Post-gay politics can counterintuitively create space for coalitional, intersectional and social justice work. Activists in Ypsilanti used this mode of political engagement to foreground love and resilience as core emplaced frames of collective action. For Currans’ respondents, post-gay politics acquired a radical character as the result of two conditions: activists used a local organisational structure that had a post-gay ethos to respond to a hostile national political climate; and their mobilisation efforts occurred in a small city with a liberal reputation. Large urban environments can disrupt the ability of activists to work across identity lines, which restates a need to examine place variations.

### *Comparative analysis*

By thinking critically about cultural archipelagos and place variations, we confront a question about commensuration, or the comparison of different places according to a common metric (Espeland and Stevens, 1998). Many contributors, like Misgav,

Hartal, Ruez, Payne and Currans, emphasise place specificity, uniqueness and the locally contingent. Can we compare such places, or are they irreducibly idiographic?

Bain and Podmore (2021) examine Surrey and New Westminster, peripheral locations outside the Vancouver core, to show how non-metropolitan placemaking is a function of resource landscapes, political opportunities and inter-organisational relations. They use these variables to explain why New Westminster has a reputation as a 'progressive suburb' or 'compassionate city', while Surrey is a 'hotbed of homophobia'. Bain and Podmore cautiously suggest that 'urbane activist ideals and practices are not easily translated into peripheral areas such as rural small towns, smaller more ordinary cities or suburban areas' but also offer, in their own words, a 'comparative case study approach' that enables nomothetic reasoning.

Comparative analysis can weave together the scalar and spatial components of the framework I have proposed in this commentary. Comparisons draw attention to the spatial pluralism of cultural archipelagos, but they also open up possibilities for examining the mobilisation potential of peripheral places. This is reminiscent of Ramdas's (2021) arguments about organising from the margins; Catungal et al.'s (2021) sensitivity to multiple geographical centres of care networks; and Rosenberg's (2021) deep dive into the creases and folds of LGBTQ+ urban activisms.

Rather than offering a descriptive account of each study, in isolation from the others, a comparative lens inspires connections and conversations across articles. For example, scholars can ask about the 'prototypical characteristics of constructs' (Shadish et al., 2002: 464) like the 'margins', 'cultural archipelagos' and 'frame emplacement'. This enterprise of construct specification, common in the social sciences, is not the principal objective of any contributor, but

thinking in this way – identifying transferable features of the sensitising concepts (Blumer, 1954) that animate this special issue – can help us identify the portable attributes of LGBTQ+ urban activisms. It is plausible, for instance, that the frame emplacement strategies that Sayoni activists in Singapore used could guide LGBTQ+ activists in Tel Aviv as they demand a municipal response to their experiences of trauma.

The emerging field of 'queer methods' (Ghaziani and Brim, 2019) can also promote the comparative analysis of LGBTQ+ people, urban protest and places. The idea of queer methods evokes an 'apparent incommensurability' (Brim and Ghaziani, 2016: 16) – the work can be untidy – but this is precisely its generative potential: augmenting ways of knowing. Although the contributors are not explicitly engaged in a conversation about queer methods any more than they endeavour to identify the prototypical features of concepts about the people–protest–place nexus, their work implies several proposals in my mind. One set of articles offers conceptual tools. Ruez's (2021) notion of 'worlding' is an approach that researchers can use to compare how activists socially construct a place, especially in relation to its metronormative, colonial and temporal character. Catungal et al. (2021) instruct researchers to use 're-centring' as a queer methodological strategy to document the counter-remembering of historical narratives across neighbourhoods.

A second collection of articles proposes strategies for data collection and case selection. Knopp and Brown (2021) use Damron guides to understand the 'politics of cataloguing': LGBTQ+ people use them to territorially claim urban spaces and to situate them in an 'epistemological grid'. The guidebooks are thus forms and facilitators of activism that can dismantle the isolating and invisibilising effects of the closet. From a



methodological standpoint, the guides blend conventional and queer methods by providing a data set that researchers can use to measure concepts like the ‘gaybourhood’, ‘spatial imaginaries’ and ‘placemaking’ while comparing the emplacement of those concepts. Rosenberg’s (2021) auto-photographic walking interviews with Black queer homeless youths in Toronto offer a method of data collection that also blends conventional and queer methods by combining corporeal movements, interviewing and visual approaches to reveal the ‘spatialisation of queer racism’ in urban gay districts. Finally, Payne’s (2021) use of a photojournalistic visual archive draws attention to the temporary occupation of urban public spaces as a way for activists to ‘bend local politics’ to accomplish their objectives. The queer methodological insight here is about case selection: the ‘fleeting moments’ (Muñoz, 1996: 6) represented by events like the Pride parades that Payne studies, or the pop-ups featured by other urban sexualities researchers (Ghaziani and Stillwagon, 2018; Stillwagon and Ghaziani, 2019), reveal the unexpectedly enduring effects of ephemeral events.

All the contributors make a point about the practice of research that is worth stating directly: the data we use to study the people–protest–place nexus are not objective entities for us to collect at arm’s length. Every time we gather our data, and in each moment of analysis, we are also engaging in a political act.

## Conclusion

I have used insights from this special issue to identify two avenues that can advance research on the emplacement of LGBTQ+ urban activisms. First, researchers would be wise to modulate more judiciously between the structural analysis of national protest events, about which movement theorists

have produced considerable insights, and that of lesser-studied actions and interactions among activists that are locally situated. Disembodied concepts like ‘mobilising structures’ (McAdam et al., 1996) or ‘political opportunity structures’ (Tarrow, 1998), favoured for decades by social movement researchers, have produced useful outlines of activism, but it is time to shift our attention to everyday actions on the ground. Although this move may appear at first to capture only quotidian acts, these are in fact vital to advance the field. Relocating analytic attention from abstract *structural* concepts to concrete *acts and interactions* among actual people is compatible with idiographic and nomothetic styles of reasoning as well.

Second, if scholars cannot better balance their interest in the gaybourhood of global cities with more ordinary cities, smaller cities, peri-urban areas and the suburbs, our understanding of the contours of emplaced LGBTQ+ urban activisms will be limited, if not distorted. When we make this shift, some places may appear as belonging only on the margins of LGBTQ+ urban life, but those places are in fact central to understanding the interconnections between people, protest and placemaking.

Cutting across the two shifts is a question of comparing places. Researchers can use conventional and queer methods to access comparative insights into the people–protest–place nexus. Conventional approaches, such as identifying the prototypical features of concepts, are well-established in the social sciences. The idea of ‘queer methods’ is newer. It may seem at first undefined, if not contradictory – the celebrated messiness of queer work may reject organised methodologies – but queer methods are in fact well-suited for ‘making space for what is’ (Love et al., 2012: 144).

I find it fitting to use the image of ‘making space’ to close my remarks, as it is a

companion to the call the editors make to examine the 'elsewhere and otherwise'. In the pages of this special issue, we can find plentiful ways to advance a research programme on people, place and queer urban protest.

### Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the editors for inviting me to be in conversation with the contributors of this provocative special issue.


### Declaration of conflicting interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

### ORCID iD

Amin Ghaziani  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7118-0809>

### References

- Alexander JC, Eyerman R, Giesen B, et al. (2004) *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Andrucki M (2021) Queering social reproduction: Sex, care and activism in San Francisco. *Urban Studies* 58(7): 1364–1379.
- Armstrong EA and Bernstein M (2008) Culture, power, and institutions: A multi-institutional politics approach to social movements. *Sociological Theory* 26(1): 74–99.
- Bain AL and Podmore JA (2021) (Re)locating queer: Suburban LGBTQ2S activism in the Vancouver city-region. *Urban Studies* 58(7): 1364–1379.
- Blumer H (1951) Collective behavior. In: Lee AM (ed.) *New Outline of the Principles of Sociology*. New York, NY: Barnes and Noble, pp. 166–222.
- Blumer H (1954) What is wrong with social theory? *American Sociological Review* 19(1): 3–10.
- Brim M and Ghaziani A (2016) Introduction: Queer methods. *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly* 44(3–4): 14–27.
- Brown M (2014) Gender and sexuality II: There goes the gayborhood? *Progress in Human Geography* 38(3): 457–465.
- Catungal JP, Klassen B, Ablenas R, et al. (2021) Organising care and community in the era of the 'gay disease': Insights on urban sexual minority activist geographies from long-term survivors of HIV/AIDS. *Urban Studies* 58(7): 1346–1363.
- Currans E (2021) 'Creating the community I want to be part of': Integrationist queer feminist organising in a small city. *Urban Studies* 58(7): 1484–1499.
- Encarnación OG (2016) *Out in the Periphery: Latin America's Gay Rights Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Espeland WN and Stevens ML (1998) Commensuration as a social process. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 313–343.
- Evans SM and Boyte HC (1986) *Free Spaces: The Sources of Democratic Change in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Forstie C (2020) Theory making from the middle: Researching LGBTQ communities in small cities. *City & Community* 19(1): 153–168.
- Gamson WA (1996) Safe spaces and social movements. *Perspectives on Social Problems* 8: 27–38.
- Ghaziani A (2008) *The Dividends of Dissent: How Conflict and Culture Work in Lesbian and Gay Marches on Washington*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ghaziani A (2011) Post-gay collective identity construction. *Social Problems* 58(1): 99–125.
- Ghaziani A (2014) *There Goes the Gayborhood?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ghaziani A (2015a) 'Gay enclaves face prospect of being passé': How assimilation affects the spatial expressions of sexuality in the United States. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39(4): 756–771.
- Ghaziani A (2015b) The queer metropolis. In: DeLamater J and Plante RF (eds) *Handbook of the Sociology of Sexualities*. New York, NY: Springer, pp. 305–330.
- Ghaziani A (2015c) The radical potential of post-gay politics in the city. *Environment and Planning A* 47: 2409–2426.

- Ghaziani A (2017) *Sex Cultures*. Boston, MA: Polity Press.
- Ghaziani A (2019) Cultural archipelagos: New directions in the study of sexuality and space. *City & Community* 18(1): 4–22.
- Ghaziani A and Baldassarri D (2011) Cultural anchors and the organization of differences: A multi-method analysis of LGBT marches on Washington. *American Sociological Review* 76(2): 179–206.
- Ghaziani A and Brim M (2019) Queer methods: Four provocations for an emerging field. In: Ghaziani A and Brim M (eds) *Imagining Queer Methods*. New York, NY: NYU Press, pp. 3–27.
- Ghaziani A and Stillwagon R (2018) Queer pop-ups. *Contexts* 17(1): 78–80.
- Ghaziani A and Ventresca M (2005) Keywords and cultural change: Frame analysis of ‘business model’ public talk, 1975–2000. *Sociological Forum* 20(4): 523–559.
- Ghaziani A, Taylor V and Stone A (2016) Cycles of sameness and difference in LGBT social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology* 42: 165–183.
- Goffman E (1974) *Frame Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goodwin J and Jasper JM (1999) Caught in a winding, snarling vine: The structural bias of political process theory. *Sociological Forum* 14(1): 27–54.
- Gould DB (2002) Life during wartime: Emotions and the development of ACT UP. *Mobilization* 7(2): 177–200.
- Gurr T (1970) *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gusfield JR (1968) The study of social movements. In: Sills DL (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Macmillan, pp. 445–452.
- Hartal G and Misgav C (2021) Queer urban trauma and its spatial politics: A lesson from social movements in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem. *Urban Studies* 58(7): 1463–1483.
- Jasper JM (2018) *The Emotions of Protest*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Johnston H and Klandermans B (1995) *Social Movements and Culture*. Volume 4 in series Social Movements, Protest, and Contention. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Johnston L and Waitt G (2021) Play, protest and pride: Un/happy queers of Proud to Play in Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand. *Urban Studies* 58(7): 1431–1447.
- Knopp L and Brown M (2021) Travel guides, urban spatial imaginaries and LGBTQ+ activism: The case of Damron guides. *Urban Studies* 58(7): 1380–1396.
- Kornhauser W (1959) *The Politics of Mass Society*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Le Bon G (1896) *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*. London: Ernest Benn.
- Love H, Crosby C, Duggan L, et al. (2012) Queer studies, materialism, and crisis: A roundtable discussion. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 18(1): 127–147.
- McAdam D (1982) *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- McAdam D, McCarthy JD and Zald MN (1996) *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy JD and Zald MN (1977) Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 82: 1212–1241.
- Mansbridge J and Morris A (2001) *Oppositional Consciousness: The Subjective Roots of Social Protest*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Melucci A (1988) Getting involved: Identity and mobilization in social movements. *International Social Movement Research* 1: 329–348.
- Melucci A (1989) *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Meyer DS (2004) Protest and political opportunities. *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 125–145.
- Molotch H, Freudenburg W and Paulsen KE (2000) History repeats itself, but how? City character, urban tradition, and the accomplishment of place. *American Sociological Review* 65(6): 791–823.
- Morris A (1984) *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change*. New York, NY: Free Press.

- Muñoz JE (1996) Ephemera as evidence: Introductory notes to queer acts. *Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory* 8(2): 5–16.
- Payne W (2021) Queer urban activism under state impunity: Encountering an LGBTTTTI pride archive in Chilpancingo, Mexico. *Urban Studies* 58(7): 1327–1345.
- Podmore J and Tremblay M (2015) Lesbians, second-wave feminism and gay liberation. In: Paternotte D and Tremblay M (eds) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Lesbian and Gay Activism*. London and New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 121–134.
- Polletta F and Jasper JM (2001) Collective identity and social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 283–305.
- Ramdas K (2021) Negotiating LGBTQ rights in Singapore: The margin as a place of refusal. *Urban Studies* 58(7): 1448–1462.
- Rodman MC (1992) Empowering place: Multilocality and multivocality. *American Anthropologist* 94(3): 640–656.
- Rosenberg RD (2021) Negotiating racialised (un)belonging: Black LGBTQ resistance in Toronto's gay village. *Urban Studies* 58(7): 1397–1413.
- Ruez D (2021) We're in Asia: Worlding LGBTQI+ activism otherwise in Sydney. *Urban Studies* 58(7): 1414–1430.
- Rupp LJ and Taylor V (1987) *Survival in the Doll-dolls: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to the 1960s*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Scott JC (1990) *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Shadish WR, Cook TD and Campbell DT (2002) *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Smelser NJ (1963) *Theory of Collective Behavior*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Snow DA and Benford RD (1988) Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. *International Social Movement Research* 1: 197–217.
- Snow DA, Rochford EB Jr, Worden SK, et al. (1986) Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review* 51(4): 464–481.
- Stillwagon R and Ghaziani A (2019) Queer pop-ups: A cultural innovation in urban life. *City & Community* 18(3): 874–895.
- Tarrow S (1998) *Power in Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor V and Whittier NE (1992) Collective identity in social movement communities. In: Morris AD and McClurg C (eds) *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, pp. 104–129.