

HISTORY AT LARGE

Queer is Here? Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Histories and Public Culture

by Robert Mills

In a newspaper article in 2004, the activist Peter Tatchell posed the question ‘What would be in a queer museum?’ and responded with absolute conviction: it would contain ‘the same kinds of thing as in any other museum. Noteworthy letters, diaries, photographs, drawings, sculptures and personal possessions of famous homosexuals and bisexuals’. Among the roll call of figures that Tatchell subsequently announces under the heading of ‘famous homosexuals’ are Lord Mountbatten, Florence Nightingale, Lawrence of Arabia, Catherine Cookson, Winston Churchill and William Shakespeare. Churchill, whom Tatchell includes on the basis that he had a ‘fling’ with Ivor Novello, stands for those who ‘had only one-off gay encounters’. Others are there because they are ‘gay by orientation’: Edward II, Richard the Lionheart and James I, for instance, find themselves appropriated as key personalities in a proposed exhibition on ‘The Queer Kings of England and Scotland’.¹

Right now, in the UK, a significant discourse is emerging on the staging of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) history for the British public. Scholars engaged in queer historical work would do well to sit up and take note. For the second year running, a series of events was organized in February under the heading ‘LGBT History Month’. Particularly designed to address issues of homophobic bullying and negative discrimination in institutions such as schools, and building on the success of Black History Month (which has been celebrated in the UK since 1987), the series set out ‘to mark and celebrate the lives and achievements of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered people’ through a range of activities such as exhibitions, study days, living-memory workshops, walking tours, readings, performances and film screenings.² Coinciding with LGBT History Month (as well as returning for a brief stint during this summer’s Europride celebrations) was a small display in the foyer of the Museum of London called ‘Queer is Here’, which focused on the shifting fortunes of London’s lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered communities since the decriminalization of homosexuality in 1967. The Museum has also now posted information on its website about queer-themed objects in its collections, in an effort to begin charting histories of Londoners that have been previously

hidden or ignored.³ Every Sunday afternoon, courtesy of the health-promotion agency Kairos, it's currently possible to go on historical walking tours of lesbian and gay Soho in London, taking in the haunts of queer icons such as Oscar Wilde, Radclyffe Hall and Derek Jarman, as well as lesser-known figures like Geoffrey, a receptionist at a club in Rupert Court who kept members amused in the 1960s and 1970s with his outlandish collection of hats.⁴ Finally, at the end of 2005 a national survey of museums, libraries and archives in Britain – the 'Proud Nation Survey' – was launched by the group Proud Heritage, with the aim of constructing a single national database of Britain's LGBT-related holdings. This project, which is endorsed by the MDA (Museum Documentation Association), has already apparently turned up some important 'discoveries': the director of Proud Heritage, Jack Gilbert, reports that one of the organization's Board Members recently came across the door to Oscar Wilde's cell in Reading Gaol in the archive of HM Prisons.⁵

There are a number of reasons why a public discourse on queer history is becoming more prominent in the UK at the present time. Perhaps most significant has been the repeal in 2003 of Section 28 of the Local Government Act of 1988, a law which banned the 'promotion' of homosexuality by local authorities and which had the effect of causing a number of public institutions, museums included, to shy away from endorsing or actively fostering LGBT-related activities. Although no successful prosecution was ever brought under the provision, there are signs that the arguments used to justify Section 28's retention continue to linger in segments of the British media. This climate of nostalgia especially manifests itself in the guise of tirades against the pervasion of queer sex, affect and experience, commonly marked by tabloid pundits as the 'private' activities of 'consenting adults', into what might be termed public culture – the convergence of organizations, institutions and identities in the public sphere. To this end, in January 2005, the *Sun* ran a series of articles on the first LGBT History Month in February of that year. These included a news item on how the enterprise, 'funded with taxpayers' cash', will encourage school pupils to study 'famous gay Brits'; an opinion piece by the right-wing columnist Richard Littlejohn railing against what he calls 'the history of poverty through the ages'; and a leader column declaring the project 'not wanted'. LGBT History Month 'is a blatant exercise in social and sexual engineering', the editorial splutters, 'people's sexual preferences... are a private matter, not a badge to be worn nor a propaganda weapon with which to influence young minds'.⁶

Although rearguard actions of this sort are perfectly unsurprising – the *Sun* has a long and disreputable record of peddling homophobic responses to the question of what counts as legitimate public culture – the frameworks within which queer histories are being constructed and reconstructed by projects such as LGBT History Month should nonetheless give scholars pause for thought. After all it is only by entering into a critical dialogue with

these frameworks that academic historians will be able to have a role in shaping and transforming them. In what follows, I review some of the activities associated with this year's History Month, with a particular focus on the Museum of London exhibition and on some of the project's web-based initiatives. In the course of this discussion, I will also confront the implications of the entry of queer history into public culture for the styles of presentation adopted by archives and museums.

'Queer is Here' is a modest exhibition which aims to place a small number of issues of concern to London's LGBT communities in a historical perspective. The exhibition consists of a series of narrative panels addressing issues such as political activism, health, coming out, the experience of LGBT people in the public eye, bullying in schools, the power of the pink pound, civil partnership legislation and celebrations of Gay Pride. Roughly half of the space is taken up by a chronology of events deemed significant in the struggle for LGBT equality. The timeline begins with the decriminalization of male homosexuality in 1967 and ends with the launch of the second LGBT History Month in 2006. One is immediately struck by the grand narrative that the timeline sets in motion. Not only is the outness of queer individuals documented repeatedly – whether it's the 1994 'outing' of eight Church of England bishops by Outrage!, or the voluntary coming out of MPs such as Chris Smith – but the rhetoric of the exhibition itself bespeaks a climate of increasing outness, visibility and exposure. The story 'Queer is Here' tells is motivated above all by an epistemology of the closet, one in which issues of sexual identity (the arrest and subsequent coming out of singer George Michael in 1998), cultural visibility (the representation of LGBT people in films and on television) and political advances (the founding of the Gay Liberation Front) rub up against moments of tragedy (the suicide of the footballer Justin Fashanu), homophobic violence (the Admiral Duncan bombing) and legal repression (Section 28 and the Age of Consent).

It is difficult for LGBT public cultures to resist coming-out narratives of this sort, or to avoid the temptations of what philosopher Michel Foucault called the 'repressive hypothesis' – the notion that Western cultures are characterized by a stiflingly Victorian attitude to sex that has been progressively unravelling since the 1960s.⁷ To a lesser or greater extent, all those who self-identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender have stories to tell about the complex paths they've followed from desire to identity to community to political consciousness, and about the levels of silencing, victimization and hate that they've endured along the way. But we also need to reckon with the affects that motivate these stories and the exclusions effected as a result. In our desire for communities across time – be it communities formed from the achievements of generations of activists, or those fashioned out of an identification with lives lived in opposition to sexual or gender norms – we need to recognize that we are not necessarily, in the words of Carolyn Dinshaw, 'a feel-good collectivity of happy homos'.⁸

By the same token, ours are not *simply* histories constructed out of confrontations with homophobia and gender policing. When historians of a Foucauldian persuasion document the connections between industrialization, urbanization and emergent concepts of homosexual identity in the nineteenth century or earlier, this is not to say that they don't also admit other expressions of sexuality and gender nonconformity that resist categorization within the heterosexual-homosexual matrix. As John Howard shows in his groundbreaking study of male homosexualities and transgender identities in Mississippi from 1945 to 1985, this script leaves certain dimensions of queer experience untold – specifically rural queer sexualities and desires that don't chart a neat course to or from gay identity and being. Studying both men *like that* (that's to say, self-identified gay males) and men *who like that* (that's to say males engaged in queer sex but who don't necessarily view themselves as gay), Howard resists the tendency to fashion queer history simply as a story of progression from repression to visibility and outness.

In presenting LGBT history as a diachronic tale of homophobia, outing and community formation, 'Queer is Here' has difficulty confronting multiple temporalities of sex and gender within a single moment – ongoing synchronic tensions within and across communities and cultures that fail to cohere around the motif of being 'in' or 'out'. This exhibition is small in scale, designed also as a touring display that will appear in certain London libraries in the coming months. As such it would be unrealistic to expect a more extensive display tracing London's queer history over many centuries. At the same time, even within the short temporal span seized on by the Museum, it should be possible to tell other stories, document other lives.

Of particular concern is the marginalization of transgender as an interpretive lens. Activists within the trans community are more aware than most of the fact that the T in 'LGBT' is often a fake T. While the exhibition makes occasional reference to the issues that affect trans people (for instance, listing the Gender Recognition Act in 2004), transgender mainly comes into view as a subcategory of sexual identity rather than as a mode of identification that is experientially prior. Just as there is the potential for queer desire, defined by same-sex object choice, to be experienced by *all* human beings in all times and places (witness Tatchell's trite but telling appropriation of Churchill as an unlikely 'gay' role model), so transgender identification, defined by powerful desire for a particular gendered selfhood that may be queerly at odds with one's sex, has been a powerful force for much of human history. In recovering this history, attention needs to be drawn to the manifold ways in which trans people accomplish what they experience as their true gendered selves. But transgender also potentially encompasses identity-positions that remain fraught with contradiction. Those defined as 'inverts' in the nineteenth century – people with a deviant gender identity, sensibility, presentation and

style, one aspect of which might be a desire for queer sex – have been called various names across time. Male inverters in classical Rome were termed *cinaedi*, in medieval court culture ‘catamites’, in eighteenth-century London bars ‘mollies’, in living memory ‘fairies’; female masculinities have been identified with labels such as the Amazon, the tribade and the stone butch (to invoke just a few relevant classifications).⁹ The medieval category of sodomy, influential even into modern times, frequently disparaged unnatural sex acts that disrupted binary gender; but sexual object choice, in the sense of orientation, appears to have been a much less powerful interpretive force.¹⁰ Same-sex object choice is a subcategory of gender identity in these contexts, not the other way round.

Alan Sinfield has recently addressed these issues in the context of gay liberation in metropolitan milieux since the 1970s. In order to better understand the shifting relationship between gender and sexuality in queer communities across time, he makes a case for historical analyses that deploy a principled distinction between gender identity (desire to be) and sexual orientation (desire for). Rather than simply eliding inverters with homosexuals, he suggests, historians need to develop more sophisticated tools for understanding the active tensions between sexuality and gender in a given context. From a post-Stonewall perspective, this is difficult to do. Says Sinfield: ‘While our forebears held a confused idea of same-sex passion because they tried to incorporate it into gender identity, we have found it hard to see transgender clearly because we have tried to read it as a subcategory of les/bi/gay identities’.¹¹ His point is first that gay liberation movements have foregrounded sexual orientation over gender, and second that this produces a set of boundaries and omissions.

Who, when we liberated ourselves, came out?... Not exactly the man who presented an effeminate identity. He was always visible... What actually happened [after Stonewall] is that ‘homosexual’, ‘lesbian’, and ‘gay’ came to be defined in terms of sexual orientation and gender identity was subsumed, more or less uneasily, into that... For many people, this approach made good sense, personally and politically. By the same token, people whose primary sense of themselves was firmly grounded in gender dissidence were marginalised: effeminate men, butch women, transvestites, transsexuals, and transgendered people. They were anomalous even among gays; they hardly figured, or figured only as incidental, out-of-date, embarrassing.¹²

We catch glimpses of these excluded categories in the ‘Queer is Here’ exhibition: a television monitor to one side of the main narrative panels presents photographs by Peter Marshall documenting Pride between 1993 and 2002. Pride marches are a moment in London’s queer calendar where gender dissidence is arguably embraced more stridently as a mode of identification across LGBT communities. But the framework of outness and

repression fails to capture fully the role that transgender plays in the everyday lives of London's queers since the 1960s.

Indeed those quotidian queer experiences, *lived in London*, are inadequately represented in this exhibition. One might ask where Londoners actually figure as Londoners, in this inventory of activists, celebrities and politicians. Sure, many of the legal reforms that had an impact on gay liberation were effected in London, but these were changes of national importance: what's largely missing from the main display is a sense of the impact that these changes have had on ordinary Londoners, as well as on the localities in which they live. A series of oral-history recordings drawn from the British Sound Archive begins to redress the balance, as do four small display cases featuring objects recently acquired by the Museum of London for its collections. The recordings convey a lively sense of generational differences, outlook and experience. In one excerpt a woman born in 1976 muses 'Sometimes I just feel I'm not actually in the real world because my whole life is gay' – a powerful witness to the explanatory force of the hetero/homo binary in modern London. Indeed perhaps the most promising events in this year's LGBT History Month were those that strove to capture the lives and experiences of queer people through the oral transmission of memories: these included a moderated discussion of 'Living Memories' across different generations, a drag show interspersed with the performer's reminiscences about his involvement with the Gay Liberation Front in the 1970s, and storytelling evenings led by OurStory Scotland, a charity dedicated to collecting, archiving and presenting the stories of queer communities north of the border. The display cabinets in the 'Queer is Here' exhibition contain items associated mainly with gay-rights activism and the consolidation of gay identity, and are less successful at conveying a sense of heterogeneity among London's queer communities. Greetings cards celebrating civil partnerships compete for attention with a CD of music by the 'out' gay singer Will Young and a campaign pamphlet containing a message for voters from the Labour party leader Michael Foot, urging them to support Peter Tatchell in the 1983 Bermondsey by-election. It's only in the case devoted to campaign literature and magazines produced by and for London's black, Asian and Middle Eastern LGBT communities that the shaping effects of race and place on the city's queers get brought into sharper focus.

Intersections of race and class with gender and sexuality risk being articulated poorly when viewed through the lens of sexual orientation and its exposure, as do experiences that don't fit neatly into the homo/hetero binary, notably bisexuality. (If the T in LGBT is a 'fake T', it's surely the case that the B is often even more vigorously suppressed.) Metropolitan gay culture tends to normalize a particular form of gay identity and culture, and to marginalize those who experience queer desires but who are less willing or able to identify as gay in the sense of an enduring or pre-eminent orientation. The phenomenon of the pink pound, which the Museum of

London exhibition documents, makes assumptions about the disposable income and superior wealth of supposedly childless lesbian and gay couples, but tacitly overlooks queer lives crafted through alternative networks of association. Within some London communities, indeed, 'coming out' is potentially a much less powerful analogy. Once again Howard's category of people '*who like that*' may help draw attention to the multiple experiences of gender and sexuality encountered in the city in the last forty years. While the accomplishments of gay identity politics are an important part of that history, part should not stand for whole. Queer histories should also be alert to the role of queer identifications and desires of all kinds in the daily life of the city.

One way of doing this would be to focus on sexual practices themselves. Queer history has occasionally been berated for being too obsessed with same-sex genital contact and its regulation, and academic research has lately witnessed a resurgence of interest in discourses of same-sex love and friendship, especially following the publication of Alan Bray's *The Friend*.¹³ Yet even acknowledging the force of such critiques, queer sexual connections still need to be understood historically and presented as such. Museums may shy away from discussions of explicit sexual activity out of a concern for decorum and 'public opinion', but initiatives that seek to erode the distinctions between public and private implicit in the tabloid press's confrontations with homosexuality may also have the effect of transforming our understanding of what constitutes history in the public sphere. Michael Warner has suggested that the sexual cultures of lesbians or gay men may constitute a kind of 'counterpublic' – one defined in tension with the larger fiction of publicness encountered in modern mass culture. In the context of counterpublics, he says, 'the visceral intensity of gender, of sexuality, or of corporeal style in general no longer needs to be understood as private. Publicness itself has a visceral resonance'.¹⁴ If the time isn't yet right for museums to make such intensities public in the narrow sense defined by the British media, it's nonetheless worth thinking through the implications of including sexual activity in the archive, as well as enabling queer counterpublics to genuinely transform institutional collecting frameworks. Modes of queer interaction subjected to historical inquiry in recent years have included cruising and online dating – sexual practices that are part of the fabric of daily life for some individuals in modern metropolitan settings.¹⁵ In this context, we also need to reckon with the migration of individuals and groups to and from urban settings, in search of spaces where the visceral meanings of gender and sexuality can be differently engaged. Museums are getting better at addressing the migration of peoples against the backdrop of race, ethnicity and religion – notably the Museum of London's 'Peopling of London' exhibition in 1993, which traced the history of migration back to prehistoric times – but notions of a homogenous LGBT community may well obscure the sheer variety of sexual networks that have developed in the city in the last few decades.

This raises general questions about the structure of the archives and the collections from which exhibitions of this sort necessarily draw. The still nascent field of queer archaeology has barely even begun to attend to the complexity of locating queerness in material culture.¹⁶ In the current historical moment, it may be straightforward enough to collate objects that speak to the impact of gay identity politics on the modern city – an activist’s collection of pin badges, for instance, or a copy of a gay lifestyle magazine – but what kinds of objects might stand in, metonymically, for the queerness of desire itself? Museums necessarily build stories around objects, but they need to find ways of interpreting objects queerly without at the same time monumentalizing gay identity, or treating it as a universal given. This is especially important for periods of history where sexual orientation, in the identity-forging sense, was a less significant interpretive force. Historians disagree on the extent to which sexual identities are historically motivated. Yet even Rictor Norton’s polemical attack on the dominance of social-constructionism in the history of homosexuality, which argues for the existence of a ‘core’ of queer desire, one that is transcultural and transhistorical, supports the view that queer desire has been expressed in a variety of ways throughout history.¹⁷ We don’t have to agree with Norton’s statement that ‘like countless others, I can recognize a gay man at fifty feet, by sight or by sound’,¹⁸ to concede that queer history contains areas of resemblance as well as disjunction. But these resemblances are best presented as partial and fragmented, discursive and desirous, rather than as manifestations of some objective homosexual essence.¹⁹

One way of disrupting a unified narrative of LGBT history in the public sphere would be to queer the styles of presentation themselves, challenging not only the limitations of linear, self-evident history but also drawing attention explicitly to the ways in which we, as a museum-going public, desire our history. LGBT History Month attests to the continuing popular interest in assigning sexual identities to historical figures, despite the widespread suspicion of straightforward biographical approaches in queer histories produced since at least the early 1990s. The History Month website includes listings of ‘biographies of famous LGBT people’, and invites users to vote for their ‘favourite LGBT person from history’. Recently Judith Halberstam has drawn attention to the pitfalls of what she calls the ‘representative individual’ model of minority history for writing trans histories, and for exploring intersections between gender, sexuality, race and class.²⁰ Despite the gestures of inclusivity on the History Month site – separate sections have been marked out for ‘black LGBT people’, ‘inspirational trans people’ and ‘inspiring lesbians’ – the version of history promoted by such lists is seriously limited. Not only is it temporally curtailed – it’s far easier to ‘out’ individuals in the twentieth century, for whom the epistemology of the closet may make a certain amount of sense – but gender and sexuality are also refracted through the lenses of fame and celebrity, concepts that are themselves historically contingent.

One way of engaging with this strategy of buttressing queer identities in the present by appropriating positive role models from the past would be to draw attention to its status *as a strategy*. Instead of generating our own polls and biographical sketches, it might be more instructive to analyse analogous lists produced by figures in the past, historicizing the tactic and exposing it for what it is: a discourse of desire and identification, rather than a reflection of transhistorical cultural unity. Oscar Wilde famously exploited the strategy in his ‘Love that dare not speak its name’ speech, as have countless others before and since, to establish a sense of cultural belonging. But the question ‘Who was queer in history?’ needs to morph into discussions of *why* and *how* we find queers in history, if the narrative isn’t simply to get bogged down in a rhetoric of outing.²¹

This is not to say that, as an overall project, LGBT History Month is without merit. It is worth acknowledging the real potential such initiatives have to mould and even transform history in the public sphere. After all, the month does attempt to create a forum for open debate and discussion: anyone can publicize events on the LGBT History Month calendar. Venues for this year’s activities included bars, libraries, town halls and art galleries, as well as museums and lecture halls. That historical concerns have been raised in such contexts bodes well for the potential accessibility of the events, as well as making it possible for the diversity of queer expression – in principle, at least – to be articulated. One of the deficiencies in this year’s programme was the lack of scholarly input. Although the ‘Queer is Here’ exhibition launched with a ‘Queer London’ study day, which included talks by a number of academics, for the most part scholars have failed to contribute to the website or to the programme of events. There may be reasons for this. Funded mainly by the Department for Education and Skills, the project also has close ties with Schools OUT, an organization which campaigns for LGBT equality in education. Given the emphasis Schools OUT places on schools and further-education colleges, it’s possible that the university sector hasn’t been targeted consistently by LGBT History Month’s organizers. It is also important to recognize that some of the most groundbreaking research on queer history is currently being conducted in departments of literature and language, American studies, film, visual culture and geography, as well as in departments of history. As public discourse on queer history becomes more prominent, scholars need to find ways of engaging creatively with that discourse, whether it’s through direct collaborations with projects like LGBT History Month or through the sharing of knowledge and advice.

Ideally, in a broader sense, translating queer history into the language of public culture will involve a contestation of the very norms in which museums and other ‘popular’ history narratives are currently embedded. (We might include, in this category, television history, which still often depends on the premise of objectivity and self-evident scientific ‘facts’.) In such a contestatory project, the closet will be exposed as a product of

modern, hetero-normative presumption, rather than a barrier to authentic self-expression – a product that doesn't have the same weight and symbolic import in all times and places. Linear-progress narratives will be abandoned in favour of stories that take as their point of departure sexual intensities, tastes and roles, gender dissonances, dispositions and styles, queer feelings, emotions and desires. Queer-history exhibitions will adopt a style of presentation partly modelled on scrapbooks and collage; in place of the representative 'object', they will appropriate fragments, snippets of gossip, speculations, irreverent half-truths. Museum-goers will be invited to consume their histories queerly – interacting with exhibits that self-consciously resist grand narratives and categorical assertions. It will be a mode of display, collecting and curating driven not by a desire for a petrified 'history as it really was' but by the recognition that interpretations change and that our encounters with archives are saturated with desire.²² Should the queer museum contain the same kinds of thing as any other museum? I sincerely hope not.

Robert Mills is a lecturer in English at King's College London. His research is interdisciplinary, spanning literary studies, art history, religious history and cultural studies. Recent publications include *Suspended Animation: Pain, Pleasure and Punishment in Medieval Culture*, 2005, *Troubled Vision: Gender, Sexuality, and Sight in Medieval Text and Image*, ed. with Emma Campbell, 2004 and *The Monstrous Middle Ages*, ed. with Bettina Bildhauer, 2003. He has also contributed a chapter on male-male love and sex in the Middle Ages to *A Gay History of Britain*, ed. Matt Cook, forthcoming 2007. He is currently working on a study of same-sex intimacy in medieval devotion.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Many thanks to Matt Cook, John Howard, Mark Turner and Neil Young for their comments on a draft.

1 Peter Tatchell, 'Inside the Gay Museum', *Guardian*, G2: Arts, 8 June 2004, p. 14.

2 A detailed website, outlining the rationale for the project, as well as a calendar of events, is available at <http://www.lgbthistorymonth.org.uk> (last accessed 15 June 2006).

3 See <http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk> (last accessed 20 June 2006).

4 For details of the tours, see <http://www.kairosinsoho.org.uk/tours.asp> (last accessed 15 June 2006).

5 Jack Gilbert, 'National Pride', *Museums Journal* 106: 2, 2006, pp. 18–19. Information about Proud Heritage is available at <http://www.proudheritage.org> (last accessed 10 July 2006). A 'virtual museum' of proud heritage will be posted on the website from 14 July 2006.

6 George Pascoe-Watson, 'Outrage Over Gay Month in Schools', Richard Littlejohn, 'Schools Encouraged to Celebrate Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Month – Opinion', and Anon., 'The Sun Says – Not Wanted', *Sun*, 21 Jan. 2005. Press coverage of the 2006 LGBT History Month included Steve Doughty's similarly insensitive article, 'Lessons in Gay History for Pupils Aged Seven', *Daily Mail*, 4 Jan. 2006.

7 Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*, Berkeley, 1990; Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, *An Introduction*, transl. Robert Hurley, London, 1978.

8 Carolyn Dinshaw, 'Got Medieval?', *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 10: 2, 2001, pp. 202–12 (p. 204).

9 On male inversion, see David M. Halperin, *How to Do the History of Homosexuality*, Chicago, 2002, pp. 121–30; for a discussion of female masculinities in pre modern cultures, see Karma Lochrie, *Heterosyncrasies: Female Sexuality When Normal Wasn't*, Minneapolis, 2005.

10 Karma Lochrie, 'Presumptive Sodomy and its Exclusions', *Textual Practice* 13: 2, 1999, pp. 295–310.

11 Alan Sinfield, 'Transgender and Les/Bi/Gay Identities', in *Territories of Desire in Queer Culture: Refiguring Contemporary Boundaries*, ed. David Alderson and Linda Anderson, Manchester, 2000, pp. 150–65 (p. 157).

12 Alan Sinfield, 'The Challenge of Transgender, the Moment of Stonewall, and Neil Bartlett', *GLQ* 10: 2, 2004, pp. 267–72 (pp. 268–9).

13 Alan Bray, *The Friend*, Chicago, 2003. For analyses of the turn to friendship in queer history, see Halperin, *How to Do the History of Homosexuality*, pp. 117–21; *Love, Sex, Intimacy, and Friendship Between Men, 1550–1800*, ed. Katherine O'Donnell and Michael O'Rourke, Basingstoke and New York, 2003; *The Work of Friendship: In Memoriam Alan Bray*, ed. Jody Greene, special issue of *GLQ* 10: 3, 2004; *Love, Friendship and Faith in Europe, 1300–1800*, ed. Laura Gowing, Michael Hunter and Miri Rubin, Basingstoke and New York, 2005.

14 Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics*, New York, 2002, p. 63.

15 For example, see Mark W. Turner, *Backward Glances: Cruising the Queer Streets of London and New York*, London, 2003.

16 See *Queer Archaeologies*, ed. Thomas A. Dowson, special issue of *World Archaeology* 32: 2, 2000, which nonetheless remains grounded for the most part in challenging the 'presumptive heterosexuality' of archaeological scholarship, rather than deepening the critique to explore the ways in which material culture itself resonates queerly.

17 Rictor Norton, *The Myth of the Modern Homosexual: Queer History and the Search for Cultural Unity*, London, 1997.

18 Norton, *Myth of the Modern Homosexual*, p. 21.

19 For a detailed engagement with these issues, see Halperin, *How to Do the History of Homosexuality*, pp. 13–17.

20 Judith Halberstam, *In a Queer Time and Place: Transgender Bodies, Subcultural Lives*, New York, 2005, pp. 44–5.

21 Norton presents a detailed analysis of such lists in *Myth of the Modern Homosexual*, pp. 219–26, but misreads them as expressions of actual cultural unity. For analyses that present them as theoretical strategies rather than objective embodiments of reality, see Neil Bartlett, *Who Was That Man? A Present for Oscar Wilde*, London, 1988, pp. 197–200, and Alan Stewart, 'Homosexuals in History: A. L. Rowse and the Queer Archive', in *Love, Sex, Intimacy, and Friendship*, ed. O'Donnell and O'Rourke, pp. 53–69.

22 For a comparable analysis of the possibilities for exhibitions with a feminist slant, see Gaby Porter, 'Seeing Through Solidity: a Feminist Perspective on Museums', in *Museum Studies: an Anthology of Contexts*, ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell, Oxford, 2004, pp. 104–16. On the creation of queer public cultures through an archive of emotional experience and memory, see Ann Cvetkovich, *An Archive of Feeling: Trauma, Sexuality, and Lesbian Public Cultures*, Durham, NC, 2003.