Abstract

This thesis analyses the ways in which histories of same-sex love are presented to the public. It provides an original overview of the themes, strengths and limitations encountered in representations of same-sex love across multiple institutions and examples of public history. This thesis argues that positively, there have been many developments in archives, museums, historic houses, monuments and digital public history that make histories of same-sex love more accessible to the public, and that these forms of public history have evolved to be participatory and inclusive of marginalised communities and histories. It highlights ways that Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans*, Queer (LGBTQ) communities have contributed to public histories of same-sex love and thus argues that public history can play a significant role in the formation of personal and group identities. It also argues that despite this progression, there are many ways in which histories of same-sex love remain excluded from, or are represented with significant limitations, in public history. This thesis shows that the themes of balancing trauma and celebration, limited intersectionality, complex terminology, shared authority and the ghettoisation of same-sex love have emerged across a variety of public history types and institutions. It discusses examples of successful and limited representations of same-sex love in order to suggest ways that public history can move forward and better represent such histories.
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Introduction

From the depths of Reading Gaol in 1897, Oscar Wilde penned a lengthy letter to his lover, Lord Alfred ‘Bosie’ Douglas, whilst serving two years of hard labour for ‘gross indecency’. The letter was never sent to Lord Douglas but was later published as *De Profundis* by Wilde’s friend and sometime lover Robbie Ross in 1905. In *De Profundis*, Wilde reflected on his time in prison, his life with Lord Douglas, the recent death of his mother and his torment at his public disgrace. He wrote that he had disgraced the name his mother and father had bequeathed him. Wilde lamented that his parents had made the name ‘Wilde’, ‘noble and honoured, not merely in literature, art, archaeology, and science’, but also, ‘in the public history of my own country, in its evolution as a nation.’¹

Now, over a century since he was imprisoned, it is Wilde himself whose name is considered noble and honoured, in the public history of his own country, Ireland, the UK, and also in the public history of same-sex love. When Wilde wrote *De Profundis*, ‘public history’ was not an academic field. His referral to Ireland’s ‘evolution as a nation’ suggests that Wilde’s meaning of ‘public history’ was the popularly known history and shared cultural heritage of his place of birth. It signifies that who we are as individuals, communities, societies and nations is informed by our knowledge and understanding of the past.

This thesis analyses how histories of same-sex love, including Wilde’s, are presented to and created by non-academics, ‘the public’. In doing so, it shows that public

understandings of the past are, like Wilde’s interpretation of public history, tied up in our evolution as a nation. This thesis shows that public history has a role to play in telling, showing, and engaging members of the public in histories of same-sex love and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans*, Queer (LGBTQ) communities today. It uses examples of archives, museums, historic houses, monuments and digital technology to analyse the different ways that the public encounters histories of same-sex love. This is not an exhaustive analysis of all forms of public history, but aims to provide a comparison of representations of same-sex love. Other formats of public history that are not included are, for example, films, television and radio broadcasts and biographies. The examples of public history discussed are all visitable; from an archive to a website, they are all user focused.

This thesis argues that representations of same-sex love in public history matter. Equally the silences that exist in public histories of same-sex love matter. Both John Tosh and Gerda Lerner have discussed at length why history matters. Lerner in particular showed that not having a history mattered, that the invisibility of women’s history had (and often continues to have) a detrimental impact on women as individuals and as a collective group. In a similar way, not having a history of same-sex love in public history, whether a representation in a large museum or the smallest inscription on a monument, matters. Indeed, as Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick has argued, any form of modern Western culture that does not include any attempt to understand and critique sexualities is ‘not

merely incomplete, but damaged in its central substance. Returning to Wilde’s words, what does it say about our evolution as a nation, an inclusive and diverse society, when histories of same-sex love continue to be marginalised? This thesis highlights both positive developments and ways in which representations of same-sex love remain at best limited and, at worst, exclusive and wilfully ignorant. It analyses modern representations of same-sex love, and focuses on changes between 1999 and 2015.

Language

‘Same-sex love’ is used throughout to mean the many ways in which same-sex desire has been expressed; within relationships, with sexual acts and without sexual acts. It refers to historical examples of people who engaged in romantic or sexual same-sex relationships. This definition includes ‘romantic friendship’ (an intense and passionate relationship between two women, most of whom were wealthy and educated, and which may or may not have been sexual), erotic friendships and sexual acts. The use of this phrase seeks to show that same-sex love has taken place in different ways and contexts across different historical periods. It is shorthand for all types of non-heterosexual sexual, romantic and erotic relationships in a similar way to how Lillian Faderman uses ‘lesbian’ as an adjective ‘that describes intense woman-to-woman relating and commitment.’ Faderman explained that she might have achieved greater accuracy by subtitling her book To Believe in Women: What Lesbians Have Done for America – A History, as ‘What Women of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries, Whose Chief Sexual and/or Affectional

and Domestic Behaviors Would Have Been Called ‘Lesbian’ If They Had Been Observed in
the Years After 1920, Have Done for America. ⁵ Both Faderman’s choice of phrase and my
decision to use ‘same-sex love’ highlight a problem that exists in both academic and
public histories of sexuality: what to call sexual relationships and/or identities before the
construction of modern understandings of sexuality and sexual identity.

The decision to use the phrase ‘same-sex love’ in the title and body of this thesis
was not an easy one, nor did it start out this way. My initial use of the phrase ‘same-sex
sexuality’ was heavily influenced by Leila J. Rupp’s argument that, although flawed,
‘same-sex sexuality’ raises questions about different kinds of sex acts and desire over
history, in a way that ‘homosexual’, ‘gay’, ‘lesbian’ and ‘queer’ do not.⁶ As Rupp herself
acknowledged, manifestations of ‘same-sex sexuality’ should not always be labelled
either ‘same-sex’ or ‘sexuality’. Although I have continued to use ‘same-sex’, I chose to
use ‘same-sex love’ in order to broaden the examples of historical relationships that
challenged heteronormative and patriarchal norms, but might not necessarily have been
sexual. By using this phrase, I also want to draw explicit attention to the lack of same-sex
love between men, and an emphasis on romantic love between women in the
representations in public history discussed.

‘LGBTQ’ is also used when referring to LGBTQ people and communities today. The
use of ‘same-sex love’ and ‘LGBTQ’ highlights both historical distance, and a historical
continuum. It shows that same-sex acts and behaviours have existed throughout history,

⁵ Ibid.
⁶ See Leila J. Rupp, ‘Towards a Global History of Same-Sex Sexuality’ in The Feminist History
but that the concept of a sexual identity, and a community group who share this identity, is a modern one. Variations of LGBTQ such as LGBT and GLBT also appear as and when they are used by different organisations and institutions, such as LGBT History Month and the GLBT Museum. My choice to use LGBTQ rather than LGBT reflects a change in both LGBTQ culture and academic literature. Although this thesis does not address the representations of trans* histories specifically, a subject even more in its infancy than the histories of same-sex love, LGBTQ is used to refer to a range of communities whose commonality rests in their sexual and/or gender orientation being different from the heterosexual and cisgender norm.\(^7\) When LGBTQ and trans* are used, the asterisk serves as a way to include a range of gender identities, including transgender, transsexual and gender neutral. The ‘queer star’ has also been used by the Schwules Museum* to highlight the range of identities they seek to represent, which is discussed in Chapter Two. The phrase ‘queer’ is used predominantly as a verb rather than a sexual and/or gender identity. It is used to discuss how public history can be ‘queered’, meaning how public history can be used to challenge dominant heterosexist representations and spaces. I have also used the phrase ‘queer’ in defining ‘LGBTQ’ historical ‘heroes’ – ‘queeroes’ – who are regularly, and often uncritically, represented in public histories.

**Literature Review**

This thesis draws on existing literature from a wide range of academic disciplines. The emerging fields of public history are by nature interdisciplinary and take influence from social history, historiography, cultural theory, and a range of individual disciplines, such as museology, heritage studies and archival science. The academic study of public history in

\(^7\) ‘Cisgender’ refers to those whose self-gender identity is the same as their birth sex.
the UK is somewhat fragmented, especially in comparison to the US, where public history as a discipline is more visible in academic networks, university programmes and academic publications. For example, the first academic journal dedicated to public history, The Public Historian, was launched in the US in 1974. There remains no such UK based academic journal. Although there is not such a strongly identified ‘public history’ field in the UK, the individual disciplines that make up ‘public history’ have grown over the past few decades, and have, most significantly turned towards an analysis of the role and purpose of public history institutions such as archives and museums. The following section outlines the major themes that have developed in academic discussions of same-sex love in public history, beginning with a definition of ‘public history’.

**What is ‘public history’?**

Public history has a necessarily broad definition. Within this thesis, ‘public history’ refers to the way people, ‘the public’, encounter and engage with the past. It is a ‘chameleon like label’, an ‘umbrella term’ that can be applied to a range of mediums and institutions, including museums, archives, historical novels, public lectures and television. Public history can be the activities of the professional historian in public, it can be state sanctioned, or it can challenge both of these and take a radical, political and community-based approach that creates history that is ‘open to all and usable in political struggles’.8


It acknowledges that history is ‘a social form of knowledge’ that is created, encountered and consumed by ‘a thousand different hands’, whether they are of academics or small grass-roots community groups.\textsuperscript{10} At its core, public history is always about creating connections to the past. Moreover, public history uses the past for different purposes; entertainment, political ends and education, among others.\textsuperscript{11} The concept of public history as usable – and in turn, the histories within them as ‘usable pasts’ – is essential to how it reflects the past and informs the present. Public history is always in flux; it is ‘part of a living present constantly being re-created, contested and challenged.’\textsuperscript{12} For this reason, public history plays a significant part in how both the past and present are understood by the public.

Included in the umbrella term of ‘public history’ is ‘heritage’, which is also a contested and changing term.\textsuperscript{13} It has been defined simply as ‘a concern for the past’, but the term ‘heritage’ has several layers of meaning; it covers intangible and tangible


\textsuperscript{11} Jordanova, \textit{History in Practice}, pp. 131-134.


remnants of the past, can be cultural or natural, is set apart from the present by its vulnerability, and, like public history, ‘is formed in the present and reflects inherited and current concerns about the past.’ Heritage may refer to the way that tangible and intangible artefacts and traditions ‘become cultural, political and economic resources for the present.’ Heritage, thus, is politically charged and entwined with concepts of national, community and personal identity. The sites where heritage plays out – such as museums, archives, historic houses – are the ‘cultural tools that can facilitate’ the process of heritage, of making meaning of the past and present. As cultural tools, such public history institutions can play a significant role in the way that the public access and interact with the past. It is these ‘tools’, or public history institutions that are analysed within this thesis.

The forms of public history discussed all seek in some way to connect members of the public with the past. Some do this through the sharing of resources, such as archives, while others seek to create a more emotional connection to the past through remembrance, such as monuments. Central to all of these institutions and formats, however, is ‘the public’, as wide and diverse a group of people as possible.

---

Social Justice

The most prominent theme that has emerged from the literature about public history representations of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities is ‘social justice’. At its core, social justice is a set of ideas that are actively inclusive of diverse histories; it places diversity and inclusion at the centre of public history. Social justice ensures that public history institutions challenge their past representations of histories, and encourage visitors to challenge and be challenged. Ideas of social justice are based on the belief that public history institutions have the ‘capacity to shape as well as reflect social and political relations and to positively impact lived experiences of those who experience discrimination and prejudice’. Such ideas of social justice have emerged within a broader context emerging social inclusion policies. For example, the Department for Media, Culture and Sport (DCMS) policy guidelines ‘Centres for Social Change: Museums, Galleries and Archives for All’ (2000) encouraged local authority museums, galleries and archives to assess their social roles and take active steps towards social inclusion.

The concept of social justice encourages public history institutions to impact on the present and future as much as they reflect on and represent the past. The impact of social justice in public history has been identified by Richard Sandell as threefold. Sandell’s framework argues that museums can impact on individuals who are marginalized, that they can empower specific communities and finally, that they can

---

‘contribute to the creation of more equitable societies.’ A social justice approach, therefore, has the potential to impact on more than the lives of individual visitors. Most importantly, museums and other public history institutions can become agents of social change through an approach that espouses social justice. Social justice methods recognise that public history institutions have ‘the power to affect lives by opening up or closing down subjectivities, attitudes and feelings towards the self and others’, and act on this to make positive changes.

This turn to social justice is a relatively recent development that also reflects a change in museums as they have become more inclusive and politically engaged. David Fleming has formulated the idea of the ‘Great Museum Conspiracy’ to explain why museums in the past have not acknowledged their role as active agents for social change. This conspiracy is formed of four factors: who has run museums; what they contain; how they have been run; and for whom they have been run. The sum of these four factors ensured that museums, rather than acting as positive agents of social change,

---

'contributed to wider social processes of othering, disempowerment and oppression.'

As a result of this, marginalised histories and community groups have been excluded from representations in museums and in public history more generally. Social justice aims to reverse such exclusionary narratives and critique the role that museums have played in marginalising groups, historically and today.

Concepts of social justice also raise questions about access. A social justice approach is concerned with who accesses the past, and to whom public history is attractive. In the turn to social justice, museums have been critiqued for who they attract as much as what they contain. Museums and historic houses, for example, have been identified as appealing particularly to educated, white, middle-class audiences. In particular, the ‘heritage debates’ of the 1980s critiqued historic houses as the epitome of social exclusion that both represented and attracted elite, wealthy people. In these debates, heritage was identified as ‘a symbol of national decadence; a malignant growth which testified at once to the strength of this country’s ancien régime and to the weakness of radical alternatives to it.’

23 Sandell, ‘Constructing and communicating equality’, p. 185.
26 Samuel, Theatres of Memory, p. 261.
viewed as conservative and in turn, central to a conservative view of national identity. Following these debates, discussions about social justice and access to public history have advocated that it must become more accessible to and representative of a wider and more diverse range of people.

Furthermore, alongside discussions about the role of public history institutions in promoting social justice, the role of the public historian – the curator, the archivist, the guide – has been re-evaluated. Curators and archivists must make choices in the histories they tell and the histories they exclude. As such, they are ‘major players in the business of identity construction and identity politics’ whether they acknowledge it or not. Terry Cook has identified a distinct chronological change in the archivists’ role, which can also be applied to curators across other public history institutions. Archives have moved through four stages; from ‘juridical legacy to cultural memory to societal engagement to community archiving.’ In turn, the role of the archivist has moved from ‘passive curator to active appraiser to social mediator to community facilitator.’ These shifts are also visible in the role of the museum curator, who has responded to social justice by collaborating with communities. The curator and archivist are no longer neutral or passive, but are

---


activists. They are now ‘social campaigners, out there on the frontline, fighting for The People’, raising awareness of social exclusion in the past and present.

Identity and Communities

The topics of identity formation, identity politics, communities and the role of institutions in representing marginalised communities in public history literature are entwined with discussions about social justice and engagement. Museums, archives, historic houses, monuments and digital history have all been shown to have the capacity to consolidate both personal and group identities. Encountering histories of same-sex love ‘legitimates a stronger sense of personal and sexual identity’. Moreover, this ‘creates a sense of historical community’ and can build and strengthen ‘a contemporary group identity.’

The communities discussed are LGBTQ communities whose shared commonality is their sexual and/or gender identity. The concept of ‘community’ is disputed, but rests on

---


two defining characteristics: they are self-defined and they are unstable, with people belonging to multiple communities.\textsuperscript{33} That people belong to multiple communities and face different types of discrimination is central to this thesis. This thesis explores the concept of intersectionality to examine why women and people of colour, among other communities, remain less visible in histories of same-sex love.\textsuperscript{34}

Rhiannon Mason has identified six types of communities in relation to public history, each defined by different factors and experiences. They are communities defined by ‘shared historical or cultural experiences’; their ‘specialist knowledge’; ‘demographic/socio-economic factors’; their identities, such as sexuality, age and gender; their visiting practices and their ‘exclusion from other communities’.\textsuperscript{35} To these definitions, Sheila Watson added a seventh: ‘communities defined by location.’\textsuperscript{36} Within these definitions, LGBTQ communities are defined both by their shared sexual or gender identities and their exclusion from other communities.

\textsuperscript{33} See, for example, Sheila Watson, ‘Museums and their Communities’ in Museums and their Communities, ed. by Watson, pp. 1-23, pp. 3-4; and Flinn, ‘Archival Activism’.

\textsuperscript{34} The term ‘intersectionality’ was coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw. See Crenshaw, ‘Demarginalising the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Anti-discrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Politics’ in Framing Intersectionality: Debates on a Multi-Faceted Concept in Gender Studies, ed. by Helma Lutz, Maria Teresa Herrera Vivar and Linda Supik (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 25-42 (shortened version of original publication in The University of Chicago Legal Forum, 139 (1989), pp. 139-167).


\textsuperscript{36} Watson, ‘Museums and their Communities’, p. 7.
The impact of inclusion in public history has an effect on concepts of both personal and community identity. As noted, Sandell has argued that museums can impact positively on individuals, communities and societies. The impact on individuals includes an enhanced sense of place, which can cement both their personal identity, their sexual identity, and their place within a community, an LGBTQ community. Moreover, the impact on broader communities includes ‘enhanced community self-determination’ and a place within decision making in the representations of their own histories.\textsuperscript{37} Community involvement in decision making and representation has been shown to provide, or return, power to communities who have been previously marginalised. By working with communities, public history institutions can both broaden power sharing and make their outputs, for example, exhibitions, more relevant to more people.\textsuperscript{38} Furthermore, as Sandell and Ivan Karp have argued, public history institutions have a responsibility to share power and both challenge and represent concepts of identity; they have a ‘fundamental obligation to take sides in the struggle over identity (and indeed cannot avoid it).’\textsuperscript{39} Moreover, the role of public history is not just to represent communities, but also to reflect and produce them. Andrea Witcomb, for example, has argued that community galleries in museums are ‘as much about producing the notion of a culturally diverse community as they are about representing it.’\textsuperscript{40} The inclusion of diverse histories

\textsuperscript{37} Sandell, ‘Museums and the combating of social inequality’, pp. 5-7.

\textsuperscript{38} Watson, ‘Museums and their Communities’, p. 11.


\textsuperscript{40} Andrea Witcomb, “‘A Place for All of Us’? Museums and Communities’, in Museums and their Communities, ed. by Watson, pp. 134-156, (p. 136).
and voices in public history can have a profound and positive impact on public understandings of society and communities. Indeed, it can legitimate one’s place in society; understanding history and cultural heritage ‘is essential in the construction of individual and group identity.’

The building and consolidating of community identity in public history is not, however, the sole domain of institutions such as museums and historic houses. Grassroots, community-led heritage and public history projects also play a significant role in formations of personal and community identity. Such projects, for example, community archives, play a major role in the creation and production of ‘democratized and more inclusive histories.’ In whichever form they take, community-led public history projects ‘can be very powerful and, at the best of times, can inspire positive personal development and community change.’

Although the impact of community-based public history is significant and positive, it remains that LGBTQ histories suffer from what Lisa Duggan termed ‘intense ghettoization’; such histories are usually researched, presented and accessed by LGBTQ communities themselves. As such, non-LGBTQ communities and people do not have, or are not aware of, access to LGBTQ public histories. This not only impacts on how wider communities view the histories of same-sex love, but also on the way LGBTQ

---

42 Flinn, ‘Archival Activism’, p. 5.
communities are understood in the present. Moreover, the confinement of LGBTQ public history to LGBTQ audiences often means that they receive limited funding and resources.

**Engagement**

The ways through which members of the public engage with history have taken a prominent place in academic studies of the subject. Discussions about engagement are linked both to concepts of social justice and identity in public history, and they focus on how and why members of the public engage with public histories. In particular, questions about how visitors and members of the public can influence and play a role in presenting histories to the public have moved to the foreground both in academic studies of public history and in the methods used by public history institutions. The phrases ‘shared authority’, ‘co-curation’, ‘collaboration’, and ‘participatory’ appear throughout literature relating to engagement in public histories, as they do throughout this thesis. Each of these concepts relate to how visitors and members of the public can contribute to public history exhibitions, collections and projects.

Such methods acknowledge that all public history institutions, exhibitions and projects are participatory and that visitors bring their own histories and experiences to understand and interpret the interpretive information they are provided with.\(^{45}\) Participatory methods aim to increase the impact that visitors have on public history, and in turn, ensure they can engage meaningfully with the histories on display.

The term ‘shared authority’ was first coined by Michael Frisch in 1990. Frisch was concerned with questions about the true authorship of oral history, and consequently, public history.\textsuperscript{46} Is the interviewer or interviewee the author of an oral history? How can tensions between scholarly authority and cultural authority be resolved? The questions Frisch raised were as much about authorship as authority. These questions have since been taken up by scholars of public history more broadly. Who authors an exhibition, the curator or the community group that contributed their histories, objects and oral testimonies? A shared authority approach emphasises that there are different kinds of authority, and that the institutions, academics, partners and the public ‘must be understood to be authorities on topics of value’, and furthermore ‘must be understood to have the power and position to fully co-create.’\textsuperscript{47} These different kinds of authority are influenced by different experiences. A scholar has intellectual authority based on their professional expertise and research experience, while a curator, who might also have intellectual authority, has managerial authority over the outcome of a public history project. Community groups and public contributors have cultural authority, gained through their lived experience. Co-curation and collaborative methods in public history are essentially ‘sharing authority’ and emphasise the role of sharing knowledge in the creation of exhibitions and projects.

The model of the ‘participatory museum’ has moved these methods into a more


central role in museums, and can be used in other types of public history institutions. The ‘participatory’ model created by Nina Simon calls for museums to involve their visitors in their exhibitions and projects as part of their long-term goals. Participation can take different forms, including contributing to an exhibition before it opens, and whilst it is on display. A participatory museum is not ‘“about” something or “for” someone’, but is ‘created and managed “with” visitors.’ Embracing a fully participatory approach does not just mean asking members of the public to contribute their histories to an exhibition, but extends to putting their objects on display, responding meaningfully to visitor comments and speaking and listening to local communities about why they do or do not visit.

A participatory approach challenges what Laurajane Smith termed the ‘authorized heritage discourse’ (AHD), which privileges material objects and ‘expertise’ over intangible heritage and experience. AHD establishes a hierarchy of knowledge (and therefore, power) that works top down, with the ‘expert’ (for example, the historian or curator) passing on information to the passive visitor. Moreover, AHD privileges certain ‘heritage’ and histories over others; it presents a view of the past that is elite, upper and middle class and far from diverse. Participatory methods and the building of meaningful relationships between public history institutions and visitors that challenge AHD can have a significant impact on the way the past is not only represented, but also engaged with.

50 Laurajane Smith, The Uses of Heritage, see in particular pp. 29-34.
and created by non-experts and visitors.

This participatory vision is not limited to being carried out in museums and can influence participation in other forms of public history. For example, several of the monuments discussed in Chapter Four rely on the participation of the passer-by to complete them. In particular, ‘A Conversation with Oscar Wilde’ and ‘The Jurors’ have been described by their sculptors as incomplete without public interaction. It is the passers-by and visitors who bring meaning to the monuments, just as it is visitors who bring meaning to exhibitions. These methods of participation serve as reminders that public history inevitably does involve the public in some way, and that each visitor brings their own meaning and interpretation to public history representations.

The move towards a more participatory and collaborative public history has not occurred in a vacuum but has taken place alongside other academic and cultural changes. An increasing focus on the importance of foregrounding diverse histories in public history has taken influence from an academic turn to tracing and representing voices of the people, ‘history from below’. This approach focuses on the histories of people who have often been excluded from hegemonic representations and recordings of history. These histories, of the working class, women, people of colour, LGBTQ communities, people with disabilities and more, have emerged in discussions and representations of public histories, albeit slowly. Tied in with an increasing focus on ‘history from below’ has been a focus on listening to and incorporating the voices of those being represented. For example, some public history institutions have collected oral history testimonies in order

to represent their individual and personal histories in existing or new representations.

The increased focus on participatory public history has also been accelerated by digital technology.⁵² Online spaces such as websites and social media, and in-house technology have provided more opportunities for members of the public to comment on and contribute to the work that public history institutions do. Tim Boon has argued, as does Chapter Five, that digital technology has had a profound impact on the way that the public participates and contributes to public history. Advances in the use of digital technology in everyday life mean that more people ‘expect to participate actively in culture generally, to create as well as to consume.’⁵³ All of these methods – sharing authority, participation, digital technology – share the aim of changing the structure of public history to be a more democratic, shared practice.⁵⁴ It might seem unnecessary to highlight the importance of the public in public history, but these established and emerging methods mark a move towards a more inclusive, and essentially public, way of interpreting and accessing the past.

Another significant theme that has emerged from discussions about engagement with the past relates to intangible connections visitors can make to the past. Spiritual

---


⁵³ Boon, ‘Co-Curation and the Public History of Science and Technology’, (p. 384).

connections to the past, acts of pilgrimage and ghostliness have been identified as methods through which members of the public can connect with histories and historic figures. These debates have been influenced by discussions about hauntology and time, spectrality and otherness; they argue that events, moments and people of the past leave traces, spectres and ghosts in the present day. A spectral moment, as described by Jacques Derrida in *Specters of Marx*, is ‘a moment in time that no longer belongs to time’, which exists in the present and future as much as in the historical past.\(^5^5\) Tracing spectral moments and ‘ghostly apparition’ can challenge perceptions of the past and its relation to the present; it ‘reminds us that the past and the present are neither discrete nor sequential.’\(^5^6\) From cultural, literary and queer theory, discussions about spectrality and spiritual connections to the past have emerged in literature relating to public history, particularly historic houses and physical sites of memory. These historic sites contain traces of personal pasts, and they are ‘theatres of memory’ which retain ‘indelible traces of those who lived and used original objects.’ They are places where ‘ghosts can still be felt.’\(^5^7\)

\(^5^6\) Freccero, ‘Queer Spectrality’, p. 196.  
Most significantly, these traces of the past and the ghosts that can be felt and encountered can create a personal and spiritual connection to the past. In historic houses, ‘sentiment’ is a primary reason to visit for many visitors, because they have a ‘positive spiritual or communal feeling for the place.’\textsuperscript{58} Alison Oram has shown the profound effect that historical ghosts and acts of pilgrimage can have for LGBTQ visitors to historic houses relevant to histories of same-sex love. The ghosts found in these houses can present a continuum of sexual community, while at the same time mark a historical distance. Such historical ghosts are ‘both the same as us and different’\textsuperscript{59}. When spectral traces and ghosts are found in historic sites, they emerge from our present understanding of the past and yet ‘they also insist on their strangeness’, their difference from us and the way we live now.\textsuperscript{60} Encountering ghosts in this way can strengthen both the existence of historic same-sex love and a visitor’s own sexual identity and place within a wider sexual community.\textsuperscript{61}

This thesis examines ways that these spectral traces are made visible by interpretation and curatorial decisions in public history and will also highlight ways in which these spectral traces remain hidden. Derrida argued that the spectres of Marxism ‘represent a threat that some would like to believe is past and whose return it would be necessary, once again in the future, to conjure away’. In the past, the present and future,

\textsuperscript{58} Young, ‘Is There a Museum in the House?’, (p. 63).


\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., p. 190.

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., p. 193.
the spectre of communism posed and continues to pose a threat to the order of society.\textsuperscript{62} The same might be argued of representations of same-sex love. If same-sex relationships in the past were deemed to be a threat to the order of society, does representing them today also present some challenge to society and heteronormativity?

Historical walking tours and monuments have also been identified as carriers of spectral presences that help connect members of the public with the past. In walking tours, for example, spectres are visible between the present moment and architecture and the historical narrative being followed. Monuments also present a moment that is at once historical and also in and of the present. These shifts in time and space can make people ‘aware of connections not only with other places but also other times, as geographies and histories collide.’\textsuperscript{63} The ways in which traces of the historical past are left at such sites mark them as ‘les lieux de mémoire’, or sites of memory. They are places ‘where memory crystallizes and secretes itself.’\textsuperscript{64} All of the formats and institutions of public history discussed are effectively sites of memory, so defined by Pierre Nora. Archives, museums, historic houses, monuments and digital public history exist because of a will to remember; they are deliberate and ‘visible signs of what has been’.\textsuperscript{65} The concept of lieux de mémoire is applied specifically to monuments in order to highlight their roles within rituals of commemoration. These lieux de mémoire and the others discussed highlight that ‘without commemorative vigilance’ histories of same-sex love


\textsuperscript{65} Ibid., p. 13.
would remain marginalised and invisible.\textsuperscript{66}

This thesis also draws on the historiography of same-sex love and LGBTQ pasts. In particular, it explores ways that public histories of same-sex love have engaged with academic debates about the past. For example, debates on the place of sex in relationships between women take a prominent role in some exhibitions and in archive catalogue terminology. These debates centre on the significance of whether relationships between women in the past can be described as ‘lesbian history’ if there is no proof that any sexual contact occurred. Central to this is the concept of ‘romantic friendship’, an ideal model of passionate friendship between upper-class women of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. During the eighteenth century, ‘romantic friendships’ were ‘considered noble and virtuous in every way’.\textsuperscript{67} Academic analysis of ‘romantic friendships’ by Elizabeth Mavor and Lillian Faderman, among others, has since foregrounded ‘romantic friendship’ as a category through which to view, and represent, relationships between women that might now be labelled ‘lesbian’.\textsuperscript{68} Rather than adding to discussions about the nature of historic same-sex love, this thesis explores the ways that questions such as ‘does it matter if they did it?’, or ‘were they lovers?’ have influenced, or have the potential to influence, representations of same-sex love in public

\textsuperscript{66} Ibid., p. 12.


Methodology and Structure

This thesis draws on a range of case studies from archives, museums, historic houses, monuments and examples of digital public history to examine and discuss how histories of same-sex love are represented in public history. These formats and institutions of public history all represent histories of same-sex love in unique ways. This thesis highlights the many ways in which histories of same-sex love appear in public histories, and in turn, draws attention to themes that cross over these institutions. In doing so, this thesis shows ways that different public history institutions can learn from each other and discuss their representations of same-sex love.

The research for this thesis was conducted using a number of different sources. These sources include questionnaires, exhibitions, guidebooks, monuments, walks and tours of cities and towns and websites. Often the primary sources are simply gaps; silences in public history institutions and gaps in the narratives they present. This thesis draws on the experiences and encounters I had when visiting public history institutions and sites of memory across the UK, and internationally in the US, Germany and Amsterdam. As such, some of the sources are anecdotal and transient. That is the nature of public history. Many projects and exhibitions are temporary, and in public spaces and in public history institutions, experiences depend on other visitors, on the day of the

---

69 Sheila Jeffreys, ‘Does it matter if they did it?’, in The Feminist History Reader, ed. by Morgan, pp. 212-218.
week that one visits.

My methodology for such visitors initially drew on my experiences as an innocent visitor, rather than as a researcher. On visits to public history institutions, I acted first as a visitor, and if I asked staff or volunteers questions, I did so without explaining my research or intent. My aim in doing so was to experience, understand and analyse how a public visitor rather than an academic researcher would encounter histories of same-sex love.

The main body of the thesis begins where many historians start their research; in the archives. Chapter One discusses the ways in which archives preserve histories of same-sex love and make them accessible to their users. It shows that users of archives must learn to ‘truffle-hound’ the archives and learn the skills to search for hidden and valuable records relating to same-sex love. Such records are not easily found, and users must employ a range of methods and terminology to find them. This chapter uses case studies of non-LGBTQ specialist, or mainstream, archives and LGBTQ community archives. It aims, thus, to highlight the roles that different kinds of archives can play in revealing histories of same-sex love. It also shows that LGBTQ communities are in need of archives, and that personal, oral histories play an important part in preserving the histories of same-sex love. Such records and related ephemera can be used alongside mainstream archives and the records they contain, which are often about the legal and social perceptions of same-sex love rather than the lived experiences, to extend the range of histories available to archive users and LGBTQ communities. This chapter uses the examples of The National Archives (UK), rukus! Black Federation Archive (UK) and the Lesbian Herstory Archives (US) to show the different roles that different kinds of archives can play, and to highlight the importance of intersectionality in public history. Although most of the case studies used throughout this thesis are from the UK, some examples,
such as the Lesbian Herstory Archives, are used comparatively to show both similarities and differences in public history representations of same-sex love in the UK and US. It argues that although mainstream and community archives have separate aims and audiences, the two can work together to make histories of same-sex love more accessible to a greater number of people.

Chapter Two focuses on museums. The methodology is distinct from the remainder of this thesis. Alongside case study analysis, this chapter uses the results of research carried out by questionnaires sent to museums in 2012. This is to build on two previous surveys of museums and their representations carried out in 1994 and 2002. These studies by Gabrielle Bourn and Angela Vanegas respectively were carried out during the period that Section 28 of the Local Government Act was in effect. Section 28 prohibited local authorities, including public history institutions run by them, from intentionally promoting homosexuality or publishing material ‘with the intention of promoting homosexuality.’

Both of these studies focused on a small selection of museums across the UK. My study builds on this research and has extended its scope. While Bourn and Vanegas consulted twenty museums across the UK, 231 museums were contacted for this study. The 231 museums contacted were dispersed evenly across eleven districts identified by the Museums Association; Scotland, Wales, London, Yorkshire and Humberside, East Midlands, East of England, North East, North West, South West and West Midlands. The museums were selected at random from a complete list in Great Britain. Her Majesty’s Stationary Office (HMSO), *Local Government Act 1988*, Section 28: ‘Prohibition on promoting homosexuality by teaching or publishing material’, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/9/section/28> [accessed 03 August 2015]. Hereafter referred to as ‘Local Government Act 1988, Section 28’.
A total of 115 museums responded to the questionnaire. However, some of the museums replied that it was their policy to not complete research questionnaires, and some questionnaires were returned blank. A total of 104 museums answered at least one question on the questionnaire, and only answered questions have been included in the results discussed.

Alongside the results of this survey, Chapter Two uses examples of museums and exhibitions between 1999, when the first major exhibition on the history of same-sex love was held at the Museum of London, and 2015. The structure of this chapter follows that of an exhibition held in 2006 in Edinburgh. ‘Rainbow City’ focused on the themes of identity, activism, scene, people and culture. This chapter draws on these themes to highlight trends in representations of same-sex love in museums. I was able to visit a number of exhibitions discussed, while others that took place before 2012 are analysed using surviving sources found in museum archives, online and in existing literature. The examples cover a range of museums and exhibitions, including temporary exhibitions and the integration of histories of same-sex love in permanent displays. Although this chapter focuses on examples of museums and exhibitions across the UK, this chapter also turns to international examples so as to discuss their differences and question why the UK does not have an LGBTQ history museum while some other countries do. It argues that museums should not only integrate histories of same-sex love into their permanent collections, but that they should ensure that they do not privilege some historical voices and LGBTQ communities to the detriment of others.

---

Chapter Three moves to another distinct ‘species’ of museum; the historic house.\textsuperscript{72} This chapter identifies ways that histories of same-sex love are represented in historic houses across the UK. It shows that the echoes of the past can be found in many historic houses whose inhabitants engaged in same-sex love. It discusses firstly how histories of same-sex love are represented in historic houses. Through guidebooks, staff and out-of-hours tours, among others, historic houses use a range of methods to tell histories to the public and engage visitors with the past. This chapter discusses the successes and problems of these methods using case study examples. I visited each of the houses discussed; Shibden Hall, Plas Newydd, Sissinghurst Castle, Smallhythe Place, Ickworth House, Powderham Castle, Beckford’s Tower, Hampton Court Palace, Charleston and Tredegar House. There are many other historic houses across the UK that are also home to histories of same-sex love, but the use of these case studies show a range of histories of male and female same-sex love, of couples and of relationships shared among numerous people. The range of historic house case studies shows both the varied ways in which historic houses tell their stories to the public, and the different histories of same-sex love they tell. The second part of this chapter discusses \textit{which} histories of same-sex love are represented in historic houses and their interpretation. It shows how histories of families are represented in historic houses, and highlights some ways in which interpretation impacts on visitors’ perceptions of ‘family’ and same-sex relationships. This chapter also argues that histories of male same-sex love are regularly presented without context and that while female same-sex love is often represented as occurring within loving relationships, male same-sex love is not.

\textsuperscript{72} See Young, ‘Is There a Museum in the House?’. 
Chapter Four applies Nora’s concept of *lieux de mémoire* to specific sites, sites of commemoration and memory in the form of monuments. It discusses the role of monuments in public history and shows that they, as sites of memory, are at once material, symbolic and functional. It highlights particular monuments across the UK and discusses how they can tell a history of same-sex love with minimal interpretation. It also analyses international examples of monuments that represent same-sex love in order to highlight the important role of group commemoration. In the UK, there remains no public commemoration of LGBTQ communities and those who have been oppressed because of their sexualities in history. This chapter questions why this is the case, and puts forward international examples that the UK could look towards. It argues that monuments serve a crucial role in commemoration, in acts of mourning and of celebration.

Chapter Five looks to the future. It discusses the emerging role of digital public histories in representing histories of same-sex love. Examples of technology appear in many other forms of public history, and are discussed in other chapters. For example, the Museum of London has an audio/visual display of interviews with London activists, which is discussed in Chapter Two. Chapter Five however, discusses the role of such audio/visual displays as digital methods, and highlights ways that digital public history contributes to visitors’ engagement with histories at institutions, from their own homes and as they walk the streets. This chapter uses digital walking tours, mobile phone applications, web based projects and crowdsourcing, digital archives and digital museums to highlight the many ways in which digital technology can enhance public history collections and in turn, public experiences of history. It argues that digital public history is pushing towards a more democratic and shared history making, and that digital public history is bringing
histories of same-sex love to new audiences, in new and creative ways.

The scope and context of this thesis has changed significantly as it has been written. In the time it has taken to research and write many aspects of LGBTQ politics, culture and history have moved from the margins to the mainstream. Same-sex marriage became legal in the United Kingdom, Ireland, the US, New Zealand and France, among other countries. In 2013 the mathematician and codebreaker Alan Turing received a posthumous Royal Pardon for his conviction for gross indecency, and there are calls to extend this pardon to all men convicted under this same law. It is not just political changes that have had a significant impact on the context in which this thesis was written. Since 2012 several major and ongoing projects that aim to change the face of public history representations of same-sex love have been launched. In June 2015, Historic England (previously English Heritage) launched ‘Pride of Place: LGBTQ Heritage Project’. In the US, the National Park Service (NPS) also launched a project to record and make visible sites of LGBTQ significance across the country. The UK’s first National Festival of LGBT History was celebrated in 2015, and is rolling out on a much larger scale in 2016. Turing became a household and Hollywood name when the biopic of his life, *The Imitation Game* (2014) was released. The British film, *Pride* (2014), was a commercial and critical success, and brought the history of the Lesbians and Gays Support the Miners (LGSM) group to a mass and mainstream audience. On the small screen, the BBC has recently shown *Life in Squares* (2015), a three-part series that depicts the lives and loves, many of which were same-sex relationships, of the Bloomsbury Group. The range of events, films, exhibitions, events and websites on histories of same-sex love that are available to, indeed, directed at, members of the public, has grown exponentially over the past three years.
These developments, especially when considered together, seem profound. Yet there are many ways in which public histories of same-sex love are left wanting. There are many museums that have not, indeed would not, consider staging an exhibition on same-sex love. There remain historic houses in which the silences of the queer past can be heard loudly only by visitors in the know. There is no monument in the UK that recognises the centuries of oppression faced by those who have loved same-sex others, and that many LGBTQ people and communities still face today. This thesis shows that the balance of representing trauma and celebration, intersectionality, complex terminology, sharing authority and the ghettoisation of same-sex love are key themes and debates across a broad range of institutions and examples of public history. It further argues that although we may have evolved as a nation in regards to equality and diversity since Wilde’s imprisonment, there are many ways in which same-sex love and LGBTQ communities remain excluded from public histories.
Chapter One
‘Truffle-hounding’ for Same-Sex Love in Archives\textsuperscript{73}

A woman walks into a bar. Across the wall of the bar are photographs; copies of photographs donated by the local LGBTQ historical society and archive. In the Harvey Milk Bar in the Castro district of San Francisco, archival photographs donated by the GLBT Historical Society adorn the walls and tell drinkers, eaters and passers-by of the local LGBTQ history of the area. Leaflets left on the tables, which are placed alongside the menus, narrate a photographic history of the Castro and explain the context of the photographs. These photographs, archival records, have moved outside of the archive repository and found themselves performing public history in a public house. They are an example of how archives and the documents they collect, preserve and promote, can reach and engage with new audiences in a range of ways and places. Such records can be accessed by the public in bars, in documentary films, online and in archives themselves.

Archives are the places, physical or virtual, where documents, histories and lives are preserved for current and future generations. They hold the records of the past from which historians and the public alike form their knowledge of history.\textsuperscript{74} Archives serve a crucial role in public history and in the shaping of national, personal and community

\textsuperscript{73} Thanks to Jan Pimblett for this phrase, who discussed the need to ‘truffle-hound’ archives at the event ‘Challenging Histories’. A recording is available at Sutton House LGBT, \textit{Challenging Histories: what place do lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer identities have in museums and historic houses}, online recording of event at Sutton House 13 February 2014, Soundcloud (2014), \texttt{<http://soundcloud.com/sutton-house-lgbt/sutton-house-lgbt>} [accessed 04 August 2015].

identities because ‘we cling to archival materials in the hope of somehow connecting to a past we can never fully know.’

As such, archives have the power to reflect and produce history and identity as much as they contain the records of history and identities; ‘archivization produces as much as it records the events.’ The content and accessibility of archives impact on the histories that can be written and understood.

Archives are increasingly significant for members of the public who are searching for the past, especially those who have been historically marginalised, such as LGBTQ communities. Archives, as Oliver Morley has argued, can ‘help people, communities and nations make sense of the present and discover a shared sense of the past.’ Archives hold power over how people perceive the past, and in turn, their own sense of place in the present. Archives have both ‘the power to privilege and to marginalize’. How then can archives use their power to privilege, or at least represent, marginalised pasts, those of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities?

This chapter discusses how histories of same-sex love are found in archives; in non-LGBTQ specialist, or mainstream, archives and in LGBTQ community archives. It highlights the problems that are encountered when searching for and accessing records that relate to histories of same-sex love. This chapter argues that academics, archivists

75 Ibid., p. 17.
and the public alike must learn the skills and terminology needed to search through collections in order to find remnants of same-sex love in historical records, an activity that has been likened to ‘truffle-hounding’ and ‘digging for diamonds’. What sets archives apart from museums, which house similar objects and records, is that their contents are not usually on display to visitors, but must be searched for by their users. As such, and unlike objects and records on display in museums, archival records are largely presented without context, and certainly without a narrative. This chapter thus questions how archive institutions can make histories of same-sex love more accessible and provide guidance to all users on how to ‘truffle-hound’ their collections.

This chapter is split into two sections: the first focuses on non-LGBTQ or ‘mainstream’ archives, and the second focuses on LGBTQ specific archives. It thus questions how histories of same-sex love are found in different archival contexts, and among other collections. It analyses the two-way relationship between archives and the public. It does so by questioning the processes through which users can search and use archives (and how archive institutions can support users), and community public outreach methods used by archives, both mainstream and LGBTQ-specialist. It argues that community archiving practice, which places LGBTQ communities in a central role in creating, finding and using histories of same-sex love, has a significant role to play in both mainstream and LGBTQ community archives.

The first section analyses how histories of same-sex love are found in archives that collect, preserve and make accessible records that are not specific to histories of same-sex love. This section focuses on The National Archives (TNA) as it is the official government repository of the United Kingdom and holds our ‘national’ history. TNA, as such, contains mostly official histories of same-sex love: legislation, criminal records and government discussions of its legal and social status over many centuries. This section raises questions about how histories of same-sex love can be found among other records; how archives have promoted the use of LGBTQ-related records through policies, initiatives and research guides; and what terminology can be used to find histories of same-sex love. It shows that some archives have made significant attempts to not only promote the use of their archives for finding histories of same-sex love, but that they have also provided resources and guidance on how best to find them, and have made attempts to connect communities with archives. It shows that terminology remains a particular barrier to finding histories of same-sex love, and highlights tensions between using historical terminology and using contemporary identity labels (such as LGBTQ) that arise in the search for histories of same-sex love.

This chapter also focuses on communities: community outreach by mainstream archives and LGBTQ community archives. The last section of this chapter analyses community archives, archives whose sole purpose is to preserve histories of same-sex love and collect the stories of LGBTQ communities. It shows that community archives have a significant role to play in making the histories of same-sex love accessible to LGBTQ communities, researchers and the public. It also argues that LGBTQ communities are ‘en mal d’archive’, in need of archives, and that LGBTQ community archives enact Jacques Derrida’s concept of ‘archive fever’, a desire to find oneself in both records and
historical memory. The need for archives, or archive fever, is ‘never to rest, interminably, from searching for the archive...to run after the archive, even if there’s too much of it...to have a compulsive, repetitive, and nostalgic desire for the archive’.\(^8^0\) LGBTQ community archives support this desire to find a collective past through the collection of oral histories and accompanying photographs and ephemera, and although this does not redress silences in other historical records, ensures that future LGBTQ communities and researchers have access to records that preserve histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ culture.

This chapter argues that archives, whether they are well-funded, mainstream archives, or grass-roots community archives held and run by communities, have a significant role to play in representing histories of same-sex love and making them as accessible as possible to their users. Archives and the records they collect and preserve ‘have the potential to change people’s lives’ through personal and community identity formation and consolidation.\(^8^1\) Indeed, archives, like museums, can be bastions of social justice that ensure marginalised communities can find their histories in records, and preserve their present lives and experiences for the future.\(^8^2\)

**Truffle-hounding for same-sex love in mainstream archives**

\(^8^0\) Derrida, *Archive Fever*, (p. 57).


In order to find and access records relating to histories of same-sex love, archive users must develop skills to ‘truffle-hound’ collections. As such, archives that do not specialise in such records, mainstream archives, should provide guidance on how best to search for and contextualise histories of same-sex love. This guidance can come in the form of events, research guides or online resources, among others. TNA, for example, has put significant effort into making records that relate to histories of same-sex love more accessible through digital sources, outreach activities and the publication of a detailed research guide. TNA’s ongoing work to promote the use of such records has improved their accessibility, but it has also highlighted problems that continue to act as a barrier to finding diverse histories of same-sex love.

As well as being the official government archive of the UK, TNA is also responsible for archives across England, having taken over the role from the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council in 2011. As such, TNA’s approaches to outreach, policy making and making histories of marginalised communities accessible are particularly significant; it is expected to lead by example and to assess the work of all archives. As part of this role, TNA has issued Archives for the 21st Century, a guideline and action plan for archives across the UK to follow in developing their own policies and engagement projects. The most recent update of this document published to address issues between 2012-2015 builds on earlier publications in 2009 and 2010. Archives for the 21st Century in action: refreshed 2012-2015 presents recommendations for archives across the UK to follow. These include responding to digital cataloguing and born-digital documents to ensure that they can be accessed by future users, developing sustainable working partnerships across the archives sector and encouraging active participation to promote a sense of

84 Ibid., p. 17.

featured archives and events in order to reach a wider audience. As part of this project TNA produced information leaflets for LGBTQ collections in archives, including their own. For example, one poster included an image of the calling card left for Oscar Wilde by the Marquis of Queensbury, which is held in TNA’s collections. The leaflet explained that the presentation of the card, which called Wilde a ‘posing somdomite (sic)’, led to Wilde’s trial against Queensbury for libel. The leaflet also included a terminology ‘timeline’ that traced the evolution of language used in LGBTQ history, and a list of archives that hold material relating to LGBTQ history. The leaflet and ‘Explore Your Archive’ therefore aimed to highlight records that TNA holds and to provide some context and information about holdings of the archive sector as a whole.

TNA has also promoted the use of its records relating to histories of same-sex love in their digital spaces. Digitisation and digital archives are discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five, but it is necessary to briefly outline how TNA has utilised its digital space to promote greater access and community involvement in records that relate to histories of same-sex love. For example, it has hosted and recorded events on histories of same-sex love and made them accessible as podcasts online. It has also produced blog posts on

---

86 The National Archives, *Arch’I’ve Unearthed* poster. The posters were included in conference packs at the London Metropolitan Archives LGBTQ Conference 2013.
objects and records they hold that relate to histories of same-sex love. TNA has also
aimed to increase public engagement with their collections by encouraging users to ‘tag’
documents. The primary aim is that more documents are grouped together under a
subject tag, ‘LGBT’, to enable connections between records to be made and to make
them easier for users to find. The secondary aim is to encourage users themselves to
shape some of their collection: to highlight records that they know or see as relevant to
histories of same-sex love or LGBTQ communities. While ‘tagging’ records in this way has
great potential, its success is dependent on users having the skills, knowledge and time to
tag relevant records as ‘LGBT’. Yet there are currently only forty-six records linked
through this subject tag. Nevertheless, these examples of digital engagement with
records highlight several ways through which archives can connect with their digital users,
and make their collections more accessible to public users.

TNA is not alone in raising the profile of records they have relating to histories of
same-sex love in their collections. The London Metropolitan Archives (LMA) has also
taken significant steps to make its records more accessible, to promote the use of its
archives to the public and to make people aware of the importance of the histories of
same-sex love and LGBTQ communities to London and the nation. For example, the LMA

---

89 See Vicky Iglikowski, ‘Lady Austin’s camp boys’ on *The National Archives*, 5 February 2015,
<http://blog.nationalarchives.gov.uk/blog/lady-austins-camp-boys/> [accessed 03 August 2015]
and Patricia Reynolds, ‘LGBT History in the National Archives’ Library’, on *The National Archives*,

90 Number correct as of 09 November 2015.
has hosted an annual conference on archiving LGBTQ histories since 2003 and will be co-hosting the Archives, Libraries, Museums and Special Collections (ALMS) LGBTQ+ Conference in 2016. Whilst the conferences are largely attended by those working in the archive sector, academics and those involved in LGBTQ politics, the LMA also hosts a monthly LGBTQ History Club, which aims for a more diverse audience. The LMA’s Principal Development Officer, Jan Pimblett, has noted that the Club aims to be as public as possible and bring many people together to discuss LGBTQ history using records from the LMA’s collection. 91 The events encourage Londoners and visitors to explore their archive and they serve as a significant example of public engagement with archives and LGBTQ history.

The LMA has also recently launched an LGBTQ project to collect oral histories of London. The LMA has recognised that its existing collections ‘do not fully represent LGBTQ London history’, which Speak Out London seeks to address. 92 The aim of Speak Out London is to continue to add LGBTQ voices and histories to the collection, and to ensure that LGBTQ voices that are currently underrepresented and silent in the records are recorded and preserved for the future. There are five specific themes to the project: ‘What Does London Mean to Me?’; ‘Home Life, Sex and Relationships’; ‘Making Our Way’;

91 Jan Pimblett discussed the LMA’s LGBTQ History Club and annual conference at Sutton House LGBT, Challenging Histories.

‘Campaigning and Beliefs’; and ‘Out and About’. Thus, the project aims to address different elements of LGBTQ life and history in London. Speak Out London is an example of a lasting and meaningful project that involves members of LGBTQ communities as both contributors and as volunteers who help shape the project. Although some archives have celebrated LGBT History Month, for example, Surrey History Centre has hosted an LGBT History Month exhibition since 2010, the LMA LGBTQ History Club and Speak Out London show how archives can engage with and collaborate with LGBTQ communities throughout the year.

Moreover, these initiatives by TNA and the LMA highlight the role of the archivist as activist. As will be seen in the section on LGBTQ community archives, archivists who aim to promote marginalised histories and connect communities with their histories are activists. This role is not exclusive to those who work in community archives, but is also applicable to those in mainstream archives who work to make histories of same-sex love more accessible. The archivist in a mainstream archive has, as Terry Cook has argued, moved from being the ‘passive curator’, to now being a ‘community facilitator’. By hosting events, collecting oral histories and promoting the use of records by LGBTQ communities, activist archivists in mainstream institutions can, like LGBTQ community


archivists, and help communities to identify and understand their collective heritage identities.

Another way in which archives across the UK have promoted and advised on the use of their LGBTQ related records is through the publication of user research guides. Such research guides have been produced by TNA, the LMA, University of York’s Borthwick Institute for Archives, Surrey History Centre, Lancashire County Council Archives, and Manchester City Council.96 Research guides use a range of methods to promote the use of archives for finding the histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. These guides set out to provide context and further information by listing collections of interest, biographies of LGBTQ historical figures whose records, or records

that relate to them, exist in their collections, timelines and often, terminology. For example, the Manchester ‘LGBT Source Guide’ includes information on published and archive sources at Manchester Library, further information on two LGBTQ specific collections (Queerupnorth and the Lesbian and Gay Foundation), a list of other sources in the North West of the UK, a list of sources available nationally and ‘top tips’ for finding LGBTQ histories in archives. The ‘top tips’ section of the guide explains the difficulty of finding references to LGBTQ histories in collections and adds that users might ‘need to be creative and think of a range of different terms’. These guides provide both resource lists and contextual information, which often highlight major events in LGBTQ history and aim to help users gain some understanding of what they will find and what histories it will tell.

Many of these guides provide the additional function of a glossary and describe the foremost problem in finding the histories of same-sex love in mainstream archives: terminology. Terms most commonly used to refer to LGBTQ identities and communities today are modern, and therefore not necessarily applicable to, or used within, records dated before the mid-twentieth century. These terms include, among others; ‘gay’, ‘lesbian’, ‘bisexual’, ‘trans*’, ‘LGBTQ’, ‘queer’, and ‘homosexual’. The TNA guide on ‘Gay and Lesbian History’ is the most detailed of these user guides and includes an extensive list of suggested terminology, so it has been used here to highlight the particular problems of historical terminology that places histories of female same-sex love into a distinct blind spot, and that historicises male same-sex love as criminal and deviant. The

---

TNA guide addresses several problems relating to terminology and explains that the language used to describe LGBTQ people has changed throughout history, that ‘homosexuality’ was not used to describe sexual attraction to people of the same sex until the end of the nineteenth century, and that many terms used in historical records may be considered offensive today.98

Table 1.1 Search term results from The National Archives’ ‘Discovery’, 28/08/2015

The guide provides a range of search terms that relate to histories of same-sex love. These search terms and the search results they bring up in TNA’s catalogue ‘Discovery’ are listed in Table 1.1. The terms ‘homosexual’, ‘gay’, ‘lesbian’, ‘bisexual’, ‘LGBT’ and ‘LGBTQ’ are not listed as suggested search terms, but they have been used as additional examples of modern terminology for the purposes of this study. Table 1.1 also identifies how many records are categorised in the ‘Sex and Gender’ subject by ‘Discovery’.

98 The National Archives, Gay and lesbian history.
The TNA guide addresses several problems relating to terminology and explains that the language used to describe LGBTQ people has changed throughout history, that ‘homosexuality’ was not used to describe sexual attraction to people of the same sex until the end of the nineteenth century, and that many terms used in historical records may be considered offensive today. The guide provides a range of search terms that relate to histories of same-sex love. These search terms and the search results they bring up in TNA’s catalogue ‘Discovery’ are listed in Table 1.1. The terms ‘homosexual’, ‘gay’,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Term</th>
<th>‘Discovery’ Search Results</th>
<th>‘Sex and Gender’ Subject Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>3775</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character defect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immoral</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invert</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervert</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapphism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodomite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buggery</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly house</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross indecency</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importuning</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecency</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>1504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscenity</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual offences</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodomy</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliciting</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street offences</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnatural offences</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnatural act</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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‘lesbian’, ‘bisexual’, ‘LGBT’ and ‘LGBTQ’ are not listed as suggested search terms, but they have been used as additional examples of modern terminology for the purposes of this study. Table 1.1 also identifies how many records are categorised in the ‘Sex and Gender’ subject by ‘Discovery’.

The discrepancy between terms relating to same-sex love and those catalogued under ‘sex and gender’ has several explanations. The word ‘gay’ has been used since the mid-twentieth century as a term for a homosexual (usually, but not exclusively) male. However, ‘Gay’ is also a common surname and there are several places listed as ‘Gay’, or as a variation on the word. For example, the catalogue reference term for any records relating to Gaythorn Gas Station in Manchester is ‘GAY’. Similarly, the word ‘queer’, which has in recent decades been reclaimed by LGBTQ communities, does not return any results that relate to histories of same-sex love or LGBTQ communities. Instead, the 9 results returned from the search refer to documents that used the word ‘queer’ meaning ‘unusual’. They include, for example, the medal cards of three men with the surname McQueer, and ‘A Queer Mixture. Fur, Feathers and Fish’, a photograph that, rather ironically, sounds like an image depicting late twentieth-century and early twenty-first male drag culture, but instead shows two kittens, two pigeons and two goldfish.100

The imbalance between the results for ‘homosexual’, ‘sexual offences’ and ‘sodomy’ and the ‘Sex and Gender’ category highlight another problem in using search engines and catalogues for historical research. All of the results for these search terms related to histories of same-sex love but there were also a small number of results that were not included in the subject ‘Sex and Gender’. This could well be a human (or indeed digital) error and is an example of the extensive work it takes to make a hidden history visible.

The most glaring problem arising from the results returned for these search results, however, is the omission of love between women. This is not unique to the history of same-sex love: the experiences of women have been excluded from the historical record as a result of the systematic silencing of women’s voices that has privileged ‘mainstream masculine-dominated discourses’ over the personal accounts and lived experiences of women. Moreover, female same-sex love has never been criminalised in the UK, so while male same-sex love does appear in the records, at least in legislation and criminal records, female same-sex love does not, which the TNA guide explains to its readers.

The search terms suggested by the research guide that relate specifically to female same-sex love, ‘sapphism’ and ‘tribade’, returned no results in the search conducted.


102 The National Archives, Gay and lesbian history.
Only 13 results (out of 72) for the search term ‘lesbian’ related to same-sex love between women, and the earliest record of these is a condemnation of Radclyffe Hall’s novel *The Well of Loneliness* from 1928.\(^{103}\) The remaining results were documents that relate to a steam ship called ‘Lesbian’, or the Steam-ship Lesbian Company. It seems unlikely that steamships called ‘Lesbian’ have been more prevalent in history than sex and love between women, so how can users find these records if not with these search terms? The quest for historical lesbian sources has been likened to Gretel, ‘desperately searching for the bread-crumb trail leading out of the woods’, so how can archives provide this trail and make the histories of female same-sex love visible and accessible in their records?\(^{104}\)

One way of creating the trail of bread-crumbs is through the provision of additional historical context and biographical information. Another search using TNA’s ‘Discovery’ reveals existing knowledge to be one of the most important factors in finding histories of same-sex love in mainstream archives. Searching for ‘Ladies of Llangollen’ returns several records relating to Eleanor Butler and Sarah Ponsonby who lived together as ‘romantic friends’ in Llangollen, Wales in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Records relating to the Ladies of Llangollen at TNA include a portrait of their servant Mary Carrol and Butler’s will. The will, which is catalogued as ‘Will of Eleanor Butler commonly called Lady Eleanor Butler, Spinster of Llangollen, Denbighshire’, gives no hint of her significance to the history of same-sex love, nor who her benefactor was.

\(^{103}\) The earliest record returned in the search was ‘Obscene book imported: condemnation of The Well of Loneliness, author Miss Marguerite Radclyffe Hall’, 1928, The National Archives [UK]: CUST 49/1057.

was. Butler bequeathed everything to her ‘beloved friend Sarah Ponsonby’. This record is thus of great significance to the history of same-sex love both because it relates to the Ladies of Llangollen and it provides an example of ‘queer inheritance’. However, it can only be found by users if they already have existing knowledge of the Ladies. It is also worth noting that searching for ‘spinster’ in ‘Discovery’ returned 83,900 results, 11 of which are categorised under the subject ‘sex and gender’.

The difficulty of finding Butler’s will raises one of the greatest issues regarding the accessibility of archives as public history and highlights the importance of user guides produced by archives. To find many records that relate to histories of same-sex love, the user would need to know the background history and context of the subject, including notable figures, such as the Ladies of Llangollen, to find them. Many people who use archives search the catalogues with words they are already familiar with and thus documents that can only be found by using historic terminology are not easily found. It is here that the visitor must learn to ‘truffle-hound’, to search through the archives for hidden treasures. The user guides do go some way to aid visitors in this by providing historical context, suggested search terms and detailed information, but they are limited. In the case of the will of Eleanor Butler, adding the terms ‘romantic friendship’ or ‘lesbian’

106 For discussion on queer inheritance, see for example, Daniel Monk, ‘Queering Genealogy Through Wills’, Legal Information Management, 15:01 (2015), 12-15, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S147266961500080>. See also Justin Bengry, ‘The Case of the Sultry Mountie, or, We Need to Talk about Cecil’ on Notches: (re)marks on the history of sexuality, 26 May 2015, <http://notchesblog.com/2015/05/26/the-case-of-the-sultry-mountie-or-we-need-to-talk-about-cecil/> [accessed 24 August 2015].
to the catalogue would need further explanation, so that the user understands their relationship in the context of romantic friendship.

The Wellcome Library, however, has signposted records relating to the Ladies of Llangollen as relevant to ‘lesbian’ history, making them and lesbian history more accessible. Searching for ‘Ladies of Llangollen’ in the Wellcome Library’s online collection returns two images of Eleanor Butler and Sarah Ponsonby, both of which are listed under the term ‘Lesbians’ (and also, ‘recluses’).\textsuperscript{107} The Wellcome Library, although it does not engage in questions of anachronism or debates on the nature of the Ladies’ relationship, does signify in descriptions of both images, that ‘the sitters shared a “romantic friendship”’ and points the user to Chapter 5 of Elizabeth Mavor’s \textit{The Ladies of Llangollen, a Study in Romantic Friendship}, for further information.\textsuperscript{108} By describing the records in this way they are more immediately accessible to users and they are directed to further context, allowing them to engage with academic discussions about the Ladies of Llangollen, romantic friendship and its place in lesbian history.

The role of archives is to both preserve documents and to make them accessible to users today, whether they are academics with existing knowledge of historical terminologies or members of the public. Although the language and content of the

\textsuperscript{107} See Lady Mary Leighton / Richard James Lane, Sarah Ponsonby (left) and Lady Eleanor Butler, recluses known as the Ladies of Llangollen, seated in their library. Lithograph by R.J. Lane, ca. 1832, after Mary Parker (later Lady Leighton), 1828, Wellcome Library, Iconographic Collection: 2443i and Lady Mary Leighton / James Henry Lynch, Sarah Ponsonby (left) and Lady Eleanor Butler, known as the Ladies of Llangollen, outside with a dog. Lithograph by J.H. Lynch, 183-, after Mary Parker (later Lady Leighton), 1828, Wellcome Library, Iconographic Collection: 2444i.

\textsuperscript{108} See Mavor, \textit{The Ladies of Llangollen, a Study in Romantic Friendship}. 
records cannot be changed, archivists can make users aware that they might contain histories of same-sex love, as the Wellcome Library does in describing the Ladies as ‘lesbian’. This does, however, raise questions about reading records as relevant to histories of same-sex love when there is no evidence that they actually are so. The reading of histories as ‘queer’ when there is no explicit evidence that they are has been an ongoing debate in histories of same-sex love since the development of lesbian and gay studies in the 1970s. Debates have centred on the place of sexual activity in ‘lesbian history’ and the tensions between finding lesbian identity and ‘lesbian-like’ behaviour in the historical record.¹⁰⁹ If there is no proof of sex between women, should their history be interpreted as part of the history of same-sex love? If not, the history of love and sex between women would be almost non-existent. Instead, the silences of female same-sex love in the archive can be countered by an open reading of records and histories as ‘queer’, which as Donna Penn has argued, ‘might permit reading lesbianism where, initially, it doesn’t seem to be.’¹¹⁰ The Wellcome Library has done just this by highlighting that the Ladies are relevant to the history of same-sex love and providing users with reference to further information. The provision of access to the Ladies of Llangollen as potentially queer allows for users of the Wellcome Collection to develop their own opinion of their place in the history of same-sex love. Although categorising the Ladies as ‘lesbians’ raises issues so too does not categorising them as such. As Giffney et al. have


¹¹⁰ Penn, ‘Theorizing politics and history’, p.236.
argued, while using ‘lesbian’ to describe historical same-sex love between women ‘limits both vision and history’, not using this term ‘also limits understanding’ and most importantly for archives, limits recovery.\textsuperscript{111}

The LMA has recently begun to address the issue of terminology in its collections, which may offer a model for other archives to follow. Asking questions about how best to find, access and describe historical records that relate to same-sex love, the LMA has opened a discussion about terminology to participants of their LGBTQ History Club and more broadly to an online audience through their blog. The LMA’s intention is to add ‘enrichment descriptions’, which will assign modern terms such as ‘gay’ or ‘LGBTQ’ to historic records in order to make them easier to find.\textsuperscript{112} To do so, the LMA has invited members of the public to suggest ‘LGBTQ+ words’ that can be used to update the collections. Like the TNA project discussed previously, each relevant record can be ‘tagged’ using a modern term for same-sex love or LGBTQ identity. What marks the LMA project as different, however, is that they have opened a discussion about the uses of terminology, and encouraged debate about the usefulness and problems in labelling historic records with modern terminology. By directly asking ‘LGBTQ+ terminology: what words should we be using?’, the LMA has provided an opportunity for its users and

\begin{footnotesize}
\end{footnote}

\begin{footnote}{\textsuperscript{112} Rosemary Munro, ‘LGBTQ+ Terminology: What words should we be using?’, on \textit{Speak Out London: Diversity City}, 13 October 2015, \texttt{<https://speakoutlondon.wordpress.com/2015/10/13/lgbtq-terminology-what-words-should-we-be-using/>} [accessed 05 November 2015]. With additional thanks to Rosemary for sharing information about an LMA LGBTQ History Club event on this topic.}
\end{footnotesize}
LGBTQ communities to contribute to the way that records relating to same-sex love are catalogued and found.

There is, moreover, potential to queer and radicalise traditional cataloguing methods and terminology beyond employing academic interpretations of same-sex love. For example, The Feminist Library in London has created its own classification system, which speaks to and represents their collection and users.\footnote{\textit{As seen on visit to the Feminist Library, London, 31 January 2015.}} This radical classification has made marginalised histories easier to find: coloured dots are added to the spine of each book in their collection to identify books on black women and women of colour; working class women; women with disabilities; Jewish women; lesbians; and Irish women. Although this is an example of how classification has been radicalised in a library collection rather than archives, the archive sector could learn from this approach and consider how their cataloguing methods and practices silence some voices and histories.

It is also necessary to reconsider ways in which records that relate to male same-sex love can be read queerly, in the same way that Penn suggests of histories of female same-sex love. For example, just as histories of women sharing beds together can be read queerly, so too could histories of bed sharing between men. Single-sex bed sharing has been common in the past, where it was a normal part of some homosocial working spaces, but an open reading of records relating to bed sharing men could provide the potential to find queerness where it does not initially appear.\footnote{Orme, \textit{Digging for diamonds}.} Since the role of the archive and archivist is to make records accessible, contextual information explaining bed
sharing could be provided to make the record visible and allow the user to interpret the records as they see fit. However, as Jenni Orme has highlighted, marking records as containing histories of same-sex love where they may not be risks ‘distorting history’ and labelling records incorrectly.\textsuperscript{115} The tension between the accessibility and accuracy of records relating to same-sex love remains a significant problem that has yet to be resolved. Nevertheless, an open reading of records as potentially queer could provide the opportunity to expand the histories of same-sex love in mainstream archives beyond criminal records and legislation.

The histories and records found within TNA that relate to male same-sex love are easily and definitively labelled as such. Yet the search terms suggested by TNA highlight the nature of these histories as criminal acts: ‘pervert’, ‘unnatural offences’, ‘buggery’, ‘gross indecency’. Records that are found in archives that relate to male same-sex love often tell a history of physical acts, criminalisation, and medicalisation, which was oppressed and controlled by the government. Finding love, rather than criminalised sex, between men in the archive is as difficult as finding same-sex behaviour at all between women. Although some academics of male same-sex love, such as Alan Bray and George E. Heggarty, have focused on intimacy and love between men these debates have yet to have a significant impact on the way archives represent such histories.\textsuperscript{116} Instead, the

\textsuperscript{115} Ibid.

focus on legal proceedings and the criminal sexual acts of men ‘produces a legal history of homophobia, rather than the history of homosexuality.’ These archival records contain the brief histories of ‘the lives of infamous men’, to use Foucault’s phrase. In the archival documents and records that contain the histories of same-sex love, the lives of these men, ‘these lowly lives’, are ‘reduced to ashes in the few sentences that struck them down.’ The sentences imposed upon them for sexual offences, and the few sentences in which their lives have been recorded for posterity, mean their voices cannot easily be heard or found.

These histories of same-sex love are not just criminalised, but are also traumatic. Topher Campbell, co-founder with Ajamu X of rukus!, a black LGBTQ community archive which is discussed in the next section, has argued that one of the most significant barriers in archiving and researching LGBTQ histories is that much of it is an ‘unpalatable history.’ Campbell noted that such traumatic history ‘doesn’t sit easily in museums and community events. And it doesn’t sit easily with our memories either’, but they still need to be recorded, revealed and preserved. This is not an issue unique to archives, but emerges as a theme within other forms of public history. The histories that many of these archival records represent are akin to ‘homo-pessimism’, which emphasises histories of HIV/AIDS,

trauma and loss in museum exhibitions and which is discussed in the following chapter.\footnote{120}{Anna Conlan, ‘Representing Possibility: Mourning, Memorial, and Queer Museology’, in Gender, Sexuality, and Museums, ed. by Levin, pp. 253-263, (p. 259).}

However, records that contain traumatic histories of criminalised same-sex love can still be read against the grain to produce histories of the people of the past, rather than their criminal activities. Foucault argued that the names and brief histories of these infamous lives were only recorded because they encountered and challenged power.\footnote{121}{Foucault, ‘Lives of Infamous Men’ pp. 161-164.}

These records, then, provide an opportunity for archive users to challenge histories about same-sex love, and read them in a way that privileges the personal histories of those who were arrested, tried and convicted for their same-sex behaviour. As Norton has argued, by reading criminal records against the grain, ‘we can begin to perceive the homosexual subject rather than simply the object of prosecution, the person rather than the category.’\footnote{122}{Norton, ‘Recovering Gay History from the Old Bailey’, p. 42.}

Thus, mainstream archives and the records they contain can represent a history of same-sex love that is about those who have engaged in same-sex love in history, as well as the power structures they encountered. Archive users, public and academic alike, must truffle-hound the archive to find the documents, and equally, truffle-hound the contents of the records too.

**Community outreach in mainstream archives**

The final section of this chapter analyses the role of LGBTQ community archives in preserving and promoting the use of records that relate to histories of same-sex love, but it is also necessary to highlight ways that mainstream archives can reach out to
communities and involve them in the use and promotion of their records. There is an increasing awareness of the role of archives for communities, which is reflected in the production of specific research guides on women’s history, black history, disability history and LGBTQ history, among others. Moreover, some archives have recognised the importance of not just producing information for communities but also reaching out to communities to participate in using records for community building, and creative and educational purposes. For example, and as previously mentioned, TNA has hosted LGBTQ zine making workshops. Another example of creative engagement between communities and archives was evident in a community project led by the Iris Murdoch Archive Project (a collaboration between Kingston University Archive and the Centre for Iris Murdoch Studies), which ran from May 2012-July 2013. As a central part of this project, local community groups, including an LGBTQ group, were invited to visit the archive and create artwork based on their experiences and interpretation of the records to ‘break boundaries between academia and the local community,’ and make links between archives and public users.\(^{123}\) The artwork produced by community groups was then displayed as part of an exhibition, ‘Iris Murdoch and Philippa Foot: An Arc of Friendship’, held at Kingston Museum in May 2013. The exhibition focused on the relationship between Iris Murdoch and Philippa Foot, who shared an intense, and briefly physical, relationship during the twentieth century.

Kingston University Archive holds the Iris Murdoch Collection, which includes copies of works by the novelist and philosopher, as well as personal letters and correspondence. In 2012, Kingston University acquired 250 letters from Murdoch that she had written to fellow writer and philosopher Professor Philippa Foot between the 1940s and 1990s. The letters reveal a passionate, close and occasionally fraught life-long friendship during which they briefly had a sexual affair. Many of the letters reflect on their relationship, both their friendship and their sexualities. For example, in one letter, Murdoch explains to Foot that, ‘Given a fair field in early youth I suspect I might have become a pretty serious homosexual. However it’s too late to undo that damage now.’ These letters formed the basis of both the ‘Iris Murdoch and Philippa Foot: An Arc of Friendship’ exhibition and community project.

The Iris Murdoch Archive Project collaborated with local community groups (Adults with Learning Difficulties, Kingston Carers, Kingston LGBT Forum, the mental health charity Mind, and local secondary schools) for the development of the exhibition. The exhibition and accompanying guide highlighted that for many members of the groups, collaboration with the project marked their first time using an archive or indeed being inside a university. The inclusion of creative outputs from the community groups in the exhibition showed that archives can be used creatively to create different narratives of histories that are relevant to a range of community groups and individuals.

In relation to same-sex love, members of the community group Kingston LGBT Forum visited the archive, explored the letters, and included some of Murdoch’s more creative outputs.

124 Letter from Iris Murdoch to Philippa Foot 23 Feb 1964, Kingston University: KUAS100/2/7.
passionate letters to Foot in their own separate exhibition at Kingston Museum. This small-scale exhibition was displayed in the Community Case at the entrance of the museum for LGBT History Month 2013. It placed far more emphasis on the passionate relationship between Murdoch and Foot than ‘Iris Murdoch and Philippa Foot: An Arc of Friendship’, also held at Kingston Museum, which only briefly mentioned their physical affair. Although ‘Iris Murdoch and Philippa Foot: An Arc of Friendship’ did not focus on Murdoch and Foot’s sexual or romantic relationship, it did include it as part of a larger narrative, noting in one panel that ‘they resumed their closeness which briefly took physical expression (in 1968)’ and that the letters from this decade, the 1960s, are more intense and personal than letters from other periods of their friendship. The two representations of the same records highlight the aims and objectives of different exhibitions, and show that LGBTQ histories can fit into many strands of history, or stand alone as their own story.

The use of the letters in a separate community-led exhibition also highlight the potential for archives to connect communities with their shared heritage and local community. The ‘Iris Murdoch and Philippa Foot: An Arc of Friendship’ exhibition and project stand as examples of how archives can be used to introduce people to archives, to forge meaningful relationships between archives and communities, and to use archives and the records they house creatively through art. By inviting community groups to use the archives and form their own stories based on the letters, the engagement aspect of

---

the project was inherently two-way, intrinsically public, and furthermore, made steps to break down boundaries between an (academic) archive and members of the public.

LGBTQ Community Archives

This chapter has so far focused on archives that contain the histories of same-sex love alongside other histories, and whose main aim is not solely to promote these histories or specifically represent LGBTQ communities. This section explores those archives whose main purpose is solely to collect, preserve and promote the histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. These are LGBTQ community archives, which have often emerged out of grass-roots projects created through political and social activism. Indeed, the input of community groups in organising archives ‘reflects, and in part, creates, a high level of grassroots commitment to historical archiving.’ LGBTQ community archives contain records about histories of same-sex love, and, perhaps more importantly, they contain the voices of LGBTQ people and communities. Their aims and content thus differ to mainstream archives because they hold the histories chosen for preservation by LGBTQ communities themselves. Moreover, within a broader concept of an ‘LGBTQ community’, other identities and communities emerge, based on nationality, locality, gender identity, race and ethnic origin, and religion, among others.

A ‘community archive’ is a repository or collection that has the sole purpose of recording, collecting and preserving the histories of specific groups based on a shared characteristic, such as sexuality, race or gender. However, the concepts of ‘community’, ‘archive’ and ‘community archive’ are complex and dependent on a number of factors. As

Bastian and Alexander have argued, there is no one definition of ‘community’ or ‘archive’. Instead, both concepts depend on the context and content of archives and the individual and shared meaning of ‘community’.\(^{127}\) Andrew Flinn and Mary Stevens have added to this by emphasising that the definition of ‘community’ rests on the self-identity and self-definition as a community of the group in question.\(^{128}\) The LGBTQ community archives discussed in this section, therefore, are defined as ‘LGBTQ community archives’ because they have been identified as such by their founders, their aims and the communities whose histories they seek to collect and preserve.

Although this chapter has shown that histories of same-sex love can be found in a range of mainstream archives, there remains a need for community archives. To evoke Jacques Derrida, LGBTQ communities were, and are, ‘in need of archives’.\(^{129}\) Their histories are still located in a ‘blind spot’ within many archives and much of written history. Moreover, the recorded histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities rarely represent the voices, experiences and histories of those who identify as LGBTQ. As I have previously argued, the majority of records relating to same-sex love in mainstream archives were written, recorded and preserved by those who sought to criminalise, oppress and silence same-sex love. They are about rather than representative of experiences of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. LGBTQ community archives seek


\(^{128}\) Andrew Flinn and Mary Stevens, ‘“It is noh mistri, wi mekin histri.’ Telling our own story: independent and community archives in the UK, challenging and subverting the mainstream’, in *Community Archives*, ed. by Bastian and Alexander, pp. 3-27, (p. 5).

to redress this imbalance by collecting and preserving the histories of LGBTQ people themselves, their personal memories, their experiences, and their histories.

In representing personal memories, LGBTQ archives also highlight an emotional need for community archives. An emotional connection to the past has been highlighted as a significant element of heritage and public history. Connecting to the past can evoke positive and negative emotions, which can impact on our present and future. The real moment of heritage, Laurajane Smith has argued, is not in the possession of objects from the past, but is ‘in the act of passing on and receiving memories and knowledge. It also occurs in the way that we then use, reshape and recreate those memories and knowledge to help us make sense of and understand not only who we ‘are’, but also who we want to be.’ In a similar way, the collection of oral histories in archives can act as the passing on of memories and histories, and can, in turn, consolidate personal and community identities today.

Thus, the community archives discussed in this section ‘provide an emotional rather than narrowly intellectual experience’ in the histories they seek to collect and preserve. In contrast to mainstream archives, community archives highlight that personal documents and objects are worthy of preservation because of the emotional histories they represent. LGBTQ community archives, as Ann Cvetkovich has argued, seem ‘intimate and personal’ in comparison to mainstream archives, and ‘insist that every life is

---


worthy of preservation. They show that LGBTQ communities are not only in need of archives, but that they are in need of intimate, personal and emotional histories.

The development of community archives emerged over the latter part of the twentieth century, encouraged by a turn in academic history and ‘history from below’, civil rights movements and a growing recognition that archives, heritage institutions and public histories were not representative of many marginalised groups and individuals. As marginalised groups have made progress towards equality it has become clear that the histories of these communities have been oppressed. It has also become clear that their contemporary histories need to be collected and preserved, which mainstream archives have, on the whole, proved unsuccessful in doing. Flinn and Stevens have highlighted the role of, and indeed raison d’être for community archives is to combat inequality in heritage organisations. They argue that ‘most, if not all, community archivists are motivated and prompted to act by the (real or perceived) failure of mainstream heritage organisations to collect, preserve and make accessible collections and histories that properly reflect and accurately represent the stories of all society.’ This chapter has shown that there are ‘mainstream heritage organizations’ that do engage with and represent histories of same-sex love, but this is not the case across all archives in the UK. As a result of the under-representation of same-sex love in many ‘mainstream’ archives, the last few decades have seen a rise in LGBTQ specific collections and archives.

132 Ibid., p.269.
133 For discussion on the development of community archives, see David Mander, ‘Special, local and about us: the development of community archives in Britain’, in Community Archives, ed. by Bastian and Alexander, pp. 29-46.
134 Flinn and Stevens, ‘It is noh mistri, wi mekin histri.’, p. 6.
Community archives are thus a direct challenge to the ‘authorized heritage discourse’ (AHD) that pervades public history institutions and continues to marginalise and silence some histories and experiences. They challenge AHD by placing communities and ‘non-experts’ at the centre of the creation and preservation of their own histories. They redefine who ‘the legitimate spokespersons for the past’ are: no longer historians, archaeologists and curators, but community members.\(^{135}\) In this challenge to AHD then, how do community archives work to address the historic silencing of LGBTQ voices and histories? How do they challenge AHD by forming ‘history from below’ that does not simply ask community groups to ‘become “invited” to “learn”, “share” or become “educated”’, but create their own histories on their own terms?\(^{136}\)

One way through which community archives have sought to preserve the past and collect contemporary histories is through the collection of oral histories. This has also been carried out in museums, which are discussed in the next chapter. Oral histories have been used by a wide range of community archives and mainstream archives, historians and in other public history institutions, to record ‘history from below’, the voices of ordinary people whose voices are otherwise not heard in historical records. The LMA’s Speak Out London oral history project, for example, aims to record and preserve London LGBTQ voices and histories.

Although oral histories can successfully represent marginalised and silenced histories, they remain problematic. One particular problem is that oral histories are often

\(^{135}\) Laurajane Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, p. 29.

\(^{136}\) Ibid., p. 44.
recorded many years after events have taken place, events that may be remembered
differently by a range of people. Oral histories are essentially recorded memories, and so
they present a tension between ‘history’ and ‘memory’.\textsuperscript{137} Despite this problem, oral
histories remain fundamental to community archives because they aim to represent the
histories and voices and LGBTQ individuals and communities, regardless of whether they
are considered ‘history’ or ‘memory’ by academic scholars.

There have been several LGBTQ oral history projects and publications by LGBTQ
community archives that have aimed to fill the absence of LGBTQ voices in historical
records. For example, the Hall-Carpenter Archives (HCA) has produced two collections of
oral histories, \textit{Walking After Midnight: Gay Men’s Life Stories} (1989) and \textit{Inventing Ourselves: Lesbian Life Stories} (1989), both of which emphasised the importance of
recording the histories of ‘ordinary lesbians and gay men’.\textsuperscript{138}

The HCA has been housed at the London School of Economics (LSE) since 1988,
but began life as a community archive in 1980, originally as the Gay Monitoring and
Archive Project established by the Campaign for Homosexual Equality (CHE).\textsuperscript{139} The HCA
received a large grant from the Greater London Council (GLC), which resulted in the Oral
History Project (1985-1989) and the two publications that aimed to centre and represent
histories and voices that were marginalised within historical accounts of same-sex love:

\textsuperscript{137} For discussion on the roles (and limitations) of oral history, see for example Frisch, \textit{A Shared
Authority}, passim.

\textsuperscript{138} See Hall Carpenter Archives, \textit{Walking After Midnight: Gay Men’s Life Stories} (London:

\textsuperscript{139} For a detailed history of the Hall-Carpenter Archives see Sue Donnelly,
‘Coming out in the archives: the Hall-Carpenter Archives at the London School of Economics’,
older people, people with disabilities, working-class people and people of colour. The Oral History Project, and the two publications, therefore, served to expand the collections of the HCA to include a broader range of narratives, memories, and LGBTQ histories.

The emphasis of LGBTQ community archives on personal voices, marginalised histories and a desire to create community histories is reflected in the names of several archives. Brighton Ourstory, Liverpool Our Story and OurStory Scotland are community history projects whose aim is to preserve local LGBTQ histories. The emphasis on ownership, on ‘our stories’, highlights one of the aims of LGBTQ community archives: to claim ownership over the past, even as a diverse community. Moreover, ‘our story’ also emphasises that the LGBTQ histories collected are ones told by LGBTQ people, in their own voices. Although the histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities have been silenced in historical records, this approach ensures that LGBTQ histories are now told and recorded in their own voices.

In a similar way to the HCA, Brighton Ourstory has collected, preserved and published oral histories of LGBTQ life in Brighton to ensure that ‘our experience is preserved and made visible to the lesbian, gay and bisexual community.’ Brighton Ourstory collected and published such oral histories in *Daring Hearts: Lesbian and Gay*
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lives of 50s and 60s Brighton in 1992. Daring Hearts includes oral histories of lesbians and gay men who had lived in Brighton during this time, and an exhibition at Brighton Library was run in conjunction with the publication. The dedication in Daring Hearts, ‘for all the voices that will never be heard’, highlights that the collecting of oral testimonies by archives such as the HCA and Brighton Ourstory has allowed unheard voices to be both preserved and shared across several public history platforms, making the otherwise invisible histories of same-sex love accessible.

These oral history projects set out to preserve the voices and histories of LGBTQ communities. They do not aim to represent one collective history, but to preserve the voices and experiences of many in LGBTQ communities. It is essential that such oral history projects take an intersectional approach to the communities they represent, as the HCA set out to do by recording the histories of those marginalised within existing LGBTQ histories. The complexity of ‘identity’ and ‘community’ and the acknowledgement that individuals are likely to have several identities whose histories intersect is recognised by some LGBTQ community archives. This intersectional approach highlights that there are a range of different LGBTQ histories and experiences, and that LGBTQ community archives do not represent just one community, but rather LGBTQ communities. Just as LGBTQ histories remain a blind spot in some mainstream archives, some LGBTQ voices, histories and lives remain marginalised in LGBTQ community archives. The concept of ‘community’ is a complex one, and no one archive can aim to represent and collect the histories of all those who identify as being within that community. For example, the
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Lesbian Archives and Information Centre (LAIC) in Glasgow, the Lesbian Herstory Archives (LHA) in New York and rukus! Federation, a black LGBTQ archive based in London all represent specific histories of groups within broader LGBTQ communities. Women and people of colour, among other groups, remain hidden beneath several layers of oppression in the archives, in history and all too often, in the present day. These archives were founded to counteract the silences in historical records and archives by collecting and preserving histories of groups who otherwise remain marginalised. They also serve to preserve different histories of same-sex love and highlight that LGBTQ histories do not represent a singular experience. Both the LAIC and rukus! were set up independently but are now housed in larger archives, while the LHA has maintained its independence since its foundation in 1974. The consolidation of independent community archives will be discussed in detail shortly, but it is important to note how and why sub-community archives, archives that focus on a specific part of LGBTQ history, exist.

The LHA was founded (1974) because it was felt that women had been largely excluded from historical records by archives and the academic historians who used archives. The LHA looked to challenge this and to ‘end the silence of patriarchal history about us – women who loved women...we were tired of being the medical, legal and religious other.’ The formation of the archives, therefore, gave the LHA autonomy over its community’s past, present and future. The LHA is thus not only an archive, but a community centre for lesbian women ‘that creates a sense of a shared and meaningful

It is also a centre that informs the present and forms the future. This critical approach to the past, present and future of lesbian communities is central to the LHA’s methods and mission. The LHA’s statement of purpose made clear who it aimed to collect histories of, and who owned these histories:

1. ‘All women must have access to the archives
2. The collection must never be bartered or sold
3. The collection must be housed in a Lesbian community space and be staffed by Lesbians

Thus, the archives and its collection belong to lesbians, the communities the archives aim to serve and preserve the histories of. One of the co-founders, Joan Nestle added to this that, ‘we wanted our story to be told by us, shared by us and preserved by us’. Nestle explained that the LHA had to operate as a not-for-profit information resource centre, and they would take no money from the government, for reasons of autonomy and of principle. Taking funding from the government, Nestle argued ‘would be an exercise in neocolonialism’, and that the state, having controlled and oppressed lesbians and women, ‘should never be relied on to make it possible for us to exist.’ The LHA, therefore, represents political, social and cultural reasons for the need for a lesbian archive.

147 Ibid., p. 87.
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In a similar way, some thirty years after the foundation of the LHA in 2005, rukus! was formed to challenge mainstream and LGBTQ community archive representations of LGBTQ people and communities of colour. As the LHA has strived for better representation of women in the history of same-sex love, rukus! aims to collect, preserve and promote the histories of LGBTQ people of colour. One of the co-founders of rukus!, Topher Campbell, has explained that collecting, preserving and archiving material relating to black LGBTQ history ‘is a way of achieving some sort of visibility’, in black communities, in LGBTQ communities and in mainstream archives.149 The role of rukus! as a black LGBTQ archive, Campbell explained, is to provide answers to ‘Black history, what is it?’ rukus! shows that there is black LGBTQ history, that it can be found and studied, and that current and future black LGBTQ histories have a home, an archive, to be collected and preserved.

The archive is also representative of multi-layered and intersectional identities. Ajamu X, another co-founder of rukus!, has explained that there is often confusion about the identity and the role of rukus! itself, adding that he is often asked whether rukus! is a black archive, a gay archive or a London archive. It is all of these at once, and rukus! aims to not be about ‘either/or categories’.150 Instead, it is ‘about confusing the notion of simplicity’ that it serves one community or group.151 rukus! therefore highlights and helps to address the need for intersectional approaches to archiving LGBTQ histories, and shows that there are many LGBTQ histories, some more silenced than others. Moreover, both the LHA and rukus! are examples of the ‘living archive’, an ‘on-going, never-
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completed project.’ They actively seek memories, records and ephemera from their communities, and as such, their development is continuous.\textsuperscript{152} As their communities and histories change, so too the content of the archive develops and in turn, reflects on the present.

Local identities are also central to the formation of LGBTQ community archives. Although the majority of the archives discussed are located in London, there are several LGBTQ community archives across the UK that aim to collect, preserve and promote local LGBTQ histories. For example, Queerupnorth, which is based in Manchester, collects and preserves LGBTQ history relating specifically to the north of England, Gay Birmingham Back to Back collects gay histories of Birmingham, and Nottinghamshire’s Rainbow Heritage collects LGBTQ histories relating to Nottinghamshire. These local community archives can serve to consolidate LGBTQ and local communities. To discuss what local LGBTQ community archives can do to collect, preserve and promote local histories of same-sex love and engage with members of local communities, the following section has taken Plymouth LGBT Community Archive as a particular example.

Plymouth LGBT Community Archive was formed as a result of the Heritage Lottery Fund ‘Pride in our Past’ project, which aimed to collect and promote the histories of Plymouth LGBTQ communities. Plymouth LGBT Archive won the Community Archives and Heritage Group’s ‘Most Inspirational Community Archive’ in 2011, with judges praising the project for having ‘gathered the voices of and given a voice to often-ignored

communities.'\textsuperscript{153} ‘Pride in our Past’ aimed to record and collect the oral histories of the older members of LGBTQ communities; create a permanent archive of LGBTQ life in Plymouth that would be available physically and digitally; research histories of LGBTQ lives in Plymouth; train members of LGBTQ communities to act as oral historians; and to promote intergenerational learning of LGBTQ histories by working alongside schools and youth groups.\textsuperscript{154} In creating the archive, the project was able to collect local histories of LGBTQ communities that would not otherwise have been preserved. It was also able to use the histories collected in creative and engaging ways, working with schools and youth groups and contributing oral histories to \textit{Sailors and Sweethearts}, a play staged in Plymouth in 2013.\textsuperscript{155} The records were also used to create an exhibition, which was held at Plymouth Museum and Art Gallery in 2012. The use of archival documents collected by ‘Pride in our Past’ in schools, a theatre production and a museum exhibition highlights that there is room to move away from what Lisa Duggan has termed the ‘ghettoisation’ of LGBTQ history, while still allowing LGBTQ communities to collect and represent their own histories.\textsuperscript{156} Such projects ensure that LGBTQ histories are accessible and visible not only to LGBTQ communities, but also to the public as a whole. Duggan argued that LGBTQ history had been ‘confined to almost entirely lesbian and gay audiences’, which the


\textsuperscript{154} Alan Butler, \textit{Pride in Our Past Evaluation Report}, (unpublished report 2012). With thanks to Alan Butler for discussing the Pride in Our Past project and sending the report.


\textsuperscript{156} Duggan, ‘History’s Gay Ghetto’, p. 282.
The use of archives and archival records in broader public history, such as exhibitions, and as seen in the Harvey Milk Bar that introduced this chapter, can bring histories to broader, and not necessarily LGBTQ, audiences.

The lasting impact of ‘Pride in Our Past’, however, is in its online presence. It ensures that the histories and memories of LGBTQ people are preserved ‘for their own benefit, heritage and empowerment, and as a tool of education and engagement for the wider community.’\(^\text{158}\) The digital aspect of Plymouth LGBT Archive also highlights the role that virtual space can play in reaching new communities and individuals, with a range of media. The virtual archive has also been used to document and preserve the ongoing work of Plymouth LGBT Archive, with for example, a Flickr account that includes photographs of events and pop-up exhibitions. Such virtual archives mean that collections can reach broader audiences, and moreover, encourage interaction with the histories they tell. Digital archives are discussed at greater length in Chapter Five, but it is necessary to highlight here that they can promote the use of records, archives and histories to broader communities than the ones they directly serve. Such digital community archives can create a ‘virtual, disembodied community’, that ensures accessibility regardless of geographical location.\(^\text{159}\) Projects such as ‘Pride in Our Past’ ‘provide communities with spaces for reflection, consideration, self-definition and identity formation’, and these spaces can manifest tangibly, such as at exhibitions, or

\(^{157}\) Ibid., p. 282.
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virtually, through digital archives.¹⁶⁰

Digital archives, as well as increasing accessibility to collections, can provide a solution to one of the greatest problems that face archives: physical space in which to hold collections. The digital images that are shared by Plymouth LGBT Archives can exist only in digital form, although many of them are printed and catalogued too, to safeguard against any potential loss due to changes in software and technology. However, the digitisation of documents and their continued accessibility online depend on funding, and as such, many community archives simply do not have the resources to create virtual archives. As independent, often grass-roots archives, LGBTQ community archives often have limited external support and no official home for their collections. Several of the LGBTQ community archives discussed have been consolidated into mainstream collections; some remain proudly independent; and others are unfortunately still searching for a permanent home and financial support. Brighton Ourstory, for example, has been forced to discontinue its work and is still looking for a permanent home, although its website remains accessible.

Those LGBTQ community archives that have been deposited into mainstream collections raise questions about the relationships between community archives, the communities they serve, and the mainstream archives in which they are held. The dissolution of the GLC in 1986 resulted in a loss of funding for both the HCA and LAIC, both of which were eventually rehoused in other archive collections. While the entire LAIC collection was deposited at Glasgow Women’s Library in 1995, the HCA collection

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.
was dispersed across several collections. The HCA oral history recordings and transcripts that resulted in *Inventing Ourselves* and *Walking After Midnight*, were deposited in what is now the British Library Sound Archive, while ephemeral material and the collection of printed magazines and journals were housed at LSE, and the large selection of press clippings went to Middlesex University, where the Lesbian and Gay Newsmedia Archive (LAGNA) was eventually formed to accommodate them.\footnote{Donnelly, ‘Coming Out in the Archives: the Hall-Carpenter Archives at the London School of Economics’, p. 182.} LAGNA is now housed at the Bishopsgate Institute in London, and has continued to work alongside the HCA (at LSE) to create long-term public history projects, such as the travelling exhibition, ‘1967 And All That’. Although the dispersal of an archive’s collection across more than one location or host institution is not ideal, because there is a risk that the records are then read in a different context, it has, in the case of the HCA, ensured that their records and documents remain accessible to members of the public.

One of the key aspects of the consolidation of community and mainstream archives is the benefit of accessibility. Grass-roots collections and archives without official homes may contain a wealth of LGBTQ histories, but if they are not physically accessible to the public, their usefulness is extremely limited. A mainstream archive can provide accessibility, as well as correct storage facilities and staff to help researchers use the collection. However, as Ajamu X has argued, depositing a community archive in a mainstream collection raises questions about how it fits into other collections, and how the communities they represent can access them. Explaining that the Black Cultural Archives had no history of dealing with LGBTQ material, and the HCA had no history of...
dealing with black material, Ajamu X argued that the LMA’s holding of a major black archive (the Jessica and Eric Huntley archive) and LGBTQ material made it the repository best placed to make rukus! as accessible as possible.\(^\text{162}\)

Considering that many LGBTQ community archives began as grass-roots and often radical collections, these aspects are at risk of being eroded as a result of their consolidation into mainstream archives. There is a tension here between community archives and mainstream archives that lies in power: the power of the archive, the power of ‘community’, and the power of the archivist. Access to archives and the histories they contain are a mark of ‘effective democratization’; participation in the creation of, access to and interpretation of archives is a mark of political power.\(^\text{163}\) Returning to Foucault, it is necessary to remember that lives and histories are only recorded because of an interaction with power and authority.\(^\text{164}\) Records of these instances of power can be found in mainstream archives, where the power was ‘official’ and state-centred. Or these instances of power can be reflected in the power of the community itself, in the community archive that retains authority over what constitutes their community history.

There remains, however, a tension between types of power, especially when community archives are deposited within mainstream archives. As Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook have argued, mainstream archives should not ‘romanticize the marginalised’, and that archives and archivists should acknowledge that some marginalised groups do
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\(^{163}\) Derrida, Archive Fever, p. 11 (note 1).

not wish to be ‘rescued’ by mainstream archives. The LHA, for example, has no wish to be ‘rescued’ and has maintained its independence, and therefore autonomy over its collections, as set out in its original principles. Their extended statement of purpose adds that ‘funding shall be sought from within the communities the Archives serves, rather than from outside sources.’ This has given them the freedom to organise the archive as they wish, for the lesbian communities they represent. This community-based creation of the archive and resistance to mainstream and established archives also reasserts the role of power that rests in the archive and the collection of records and histories. As Richard Cox has argued, power and authority emanate from the creation and preservation of the documenting of one’s own, and community, histories.

However, other archives, such as rukus!, have gained more freedom by depositing their collections within host institutions. While LHA has autonomy, rukus! has improved accessibility and security. Moreover, their agreement with the LMA states that rukus! maintains ownership over the collection, ensuring that they have both support and hosting from the LMA, and continued ownership over their records. As Tamsin Bookey has argued, ‘those managing the community archives have an important responsibility to ensure their valuable collections will still be accessible far beyond their own lifetimes’.
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The hosting of rukus! at the LMA ensures this sustainability. The LHA, instead, has achieved this sustainability through radical archival methods by teaching archival skills to lesbian community members, from one generation to the next, ‘breaking the elitism of traditional archives.’\textsuperscript{169} Regardless of the methods used by community archives, whether through generational training or through the negotiation of terms with a host mainstream archive, it is clear that both ownership over the past and the safeguarding of that past for future generations remains integral to LGBTQ community archives. As \textit{Inventing Ourselves} asserted, LGBTQ community archives are working towards ensuring that for LGBTQ communities: ‘a small number of us are on the record, just, and we are not going away.’\textsuperscript{170}

The final point to make about LGBTQ community archives is that they are all, in some way, a form of activism. Indeed, community archives themselves are ‘social movements’ or act as elements of social movements.\textsuperscript{171} The LGBTQ community archives discussed were founded for a deliberate political reason: to record hidden histories of marginalised people, and make these previously silenced voices heard by other members of their communities, other archives, and the public. Indeed, as Diana K Wakimoto et al. have argued, ‘community archives are the embodiment of activism in the archives and are expanding our understanding of the role and mission of archivists and archives.’\textsuperscript{172}
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Community archives and the archivists who work with them are thus by nature activists, because they seek to preserve marginalised communities and their histories. Archivists select the records that their institution preserves and promotes, and thus shape the histories that the preserved records can tell. Because LGBTQ histories have been marginalised from mainstream discourse and official collections, archivists of such collections are also, effectively, activists.

By definition, the archivists and researchers working to promote and make visible histories of same-sex love in mainstream archives equally fulfil the role of activist. Wakimoto et al. have argued that activism is ‘challenging the status quo’, and archivists who do this, whether in a community archive or a mainstream archive, are effectively activists who use their power to challenge representations of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities in archives and the records they hold.¹⁷³ Three elements of the archivist as activist have been identified by Mark Green. The first is their agency, their ‘active shaping of the historical record’ that results in what is archived and how. Secondly, their ‘advocacy of archival issues and values’ including in relation to politics and identity politics. Thirdly, archivists are activists because of their conscious decisions to ‘give voice to the otherwise underdocumented individuals and communities’ in history and current society.¹⁷⁴ The decisions that archivists make about what and how to catalogue, collect and document have a profound impact on the way histories and meanings of

¹⁷³ Ibid., p. 295. See also Flinn, ‘Archival Activism’ and Cox, ‘Conclusion: the archivist and the community’, pp. 257-258.
contemporary society are accessed and understood. Thus, although the contents of mainstream and community archives differ, all archivists who work within them to promote social justice and the histories of under-documented and marginalised communities are activists.

Conclusion

Each type of archive discussed here, mainstream and LGBTQ community, show that there are many histories of same-sex love, all of which are equally valuable to academics and the public alike in terms of finding same-sex love in the past. Although the records found within mainstream archives often present a criminalised, medicalised and negative history about same-sex love in which the voices of people who engaged in same-sex love are silenced, many archives acknowledge this and advise users on how best to understand and contextualise them. LGBTQ community archives are limited in their historical time scope, but make significant contributions to modern histories of same-sex love and these contributions can aid the consolidation of historical identity for individuals and for LGBTQ communities.

Records and histories of same-sex love exist in a range of archives, and it is up to archivists to provide tools for their users to truffle-hound through them. The research guides, events and exhibitions discussed in this chapter highlight a range of ways to make these histories accessible. The donation of copies of archival material to local bars, as seen at the Harvey Milk Bar in San Francisco, is another way of ensuring records can reach a broad audience. All of these activities and initiatives can bring local and national histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities to far wider audiences, and potentially encourage members of the public to visit archives. Moreover, as we shall see
in the following chapters, the impact of the digitisation of records and increasing virtual access to them has further broadened access to and interaction with community histories.

The examples discussed in this chapter also show that relationships between archives and community groups are mutual and collaborative. Initiatives such as LMA’s LGBTQ History Club, TNA’s ‘tagging’ project, and the work of community archives can ensure that members of the public also have a role to play in the shaping of archives and the records and histories they contain. Projects such as these can serve as a way to challenge and potentially radicalise ideas about labelling and locating records that relate to same-sex love, they can create meaningful relationships between archivists and communities and, furthermore, they highlight the role of the archivist as activist. They are a challenge to the status quo of marginalised histories as hidden diamonds, as truffles to be hounded, and they place ideas of social justice as central to the work of archives in making histories of same-sex love more accessible. Although some of these projects and initiatives face significant limitations and some are still in development, they nevertheless highlight that the role of archives has moved from ‘juridical legacy to cultural memory to societal engagement to community archiving’. This move to community archiving, whether through LGBTQ community archives or through the work of mainstream archives with community groups, has great potential to ensure that LGBTQ communities are better connected with their histories, and that their living histories can be preserved for future generations to access.

______________________________

Chapter Two
Corridors of Fear and Social Justice: Representations of Same-Sex Love in Museums

Starting in a ‘Corridor of Fear’ that displayed homophobic headlines, slurs and personal fears of LGBTQ people, the 2006 exhibition ‘Rainbow City: Stories from Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Edinburgh’ led visitors through Edinburgh’s LGBTQ past. It challenged visitors to consider both a traumatic history of same-sex love, such as homophobia and oppressive legislation, and a celebratory history that traced positive changes and activism. Objects in the exhibition placed visitors in a 1970s activist flat, asked them to consider ‘what exactly is heterosexuality, and what causes it?’ and represented the ups and downs of LGBTQ histories with a game of snakes and ladders.176

‘Rainbow City’ was structured around five themes; Identity, Activism, Scene, People and Culture. These themes are not unique to the representation of same-sex love in this exhibition, or in Edinburgh, but are central to numerous interpretations and presentations of the topic to museum visitors. This chapter uses these themes as concepts and as categories of representation in order to examine how museums represent the histories of same-sex love in their collections and exhibitions.

This chapter charts and analyses examples of museums and exhibitions between 1999 – the year the Museum of London hosted ‘Pride and Prejudice: Lesbian and Gay London’, the first major exhibition on the history of same-sex love in Britain, and the British Museum acquired the Warren Cup – and 2015. Both ‘Pride and Prejudice’ and the

purchase of the Warren Cup marked a turn in museums towards the inclusion and representation of histories of same-sex love in their collections. Both were fairly high-profile events, and the purchase of the Warren Cup in particular was discussed in mainstream media. The Cup, which dates from c. AD 5-15, depicts two scenes of male lovers in sexual acts. The Cup sparked controversy not only because of its staggering price (£1.8 million) and because it depicted graphic scenes of male love-making, but also because of the ages of those depicted. One side of the Cup depicts an older, bearded man and a beardless youth, while the other depicts a beardless youth and a much younger boy. It is unapologetic in its frank display of sex between men (and boys) in history.¹⁷⁷

This chapter questions how museums have approached diverse LGBTQ histories, how they have engaged with LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ audiences, and how they have been effected by external factors, such as Section 28. It also places these questions in an international context, in order to draw comparisons between international and UK approaches to histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. It argues that although there has been a visible and positive change in the attitudes and actions of some UK museums, there remain limitations. In particular, it argues that the ‘ghettoisation’ of same-sex love into temporary and segregated exhibitions and displays remains a significant barrier to positive representations of same-sex love in museums.

The majority of the museum and exhibition case studies discussed in this chapter

are from Britain, but some international examples are used to draw comparisons and show similarities and differences across geographical boundaries and cultures. Alongside these case studies, responses to a questionnaire survey sent to museums across Britain in 2012 have been analysed to discuss how representatives from the museum sector view the place of same-sex love in public history. Respondents to the questionnaire were asked about their collections that relate to the history of same-sex love; what they have; what they are collecting and whether they have had an exhibition on the topic. Respondents were also asked their opinion on matters that relate to the collection, exhibition and representation of histories of same-sex love. They were asked about the difficulty of hosting exhibitions on the topic, how important it is to do so, and their opinion on the impact of Section 28. A total of 231 questionnaires were sent to museums across Great Britain, and 104 of these were returned with a response to at least one question. Because not all respondents answered each question, the results and statistics discussed relate to each specific answer, and the complete number of respondents to each question is highlighted where relevant. Although the responses are the opinions of individual museum staff rather than institutions, they provide an overview of the sector that will be used to discuss the view of curators and museum practitioners.

There have been two previous studies of the content and scope of exhibitions dealing with same-sex love, both of which were produced before the repeal of Section 28 of the Local Government Act (1988), which demanded that local authorities did not ‘intentionally promote homosexuality or publish material with the intention of promoting homosexuality’.178 Gabrielle Bourn’s 1994 study for her MA Dissertation questioned

178 ‘Local Government Act 1988, Section 28’. 
twenty social history museums in the United Kingdom on their collections policy and exhibition history, while Angela Vanegas contacted the same departments for her study in 2002.¹⁷⁹ Both studies found the representation of same-sex love in museums wanting, and showed that there was little improvement between 1994 and 2002 for either temporary exhibitions on histories of same-sex love, or the inclusion of the topic in mainstream narratives. Both Bourn and Vanegas identified Section 28 as a factor in the invisibility of same-sex love in museums. Bourn argued that it was a ‘convenient tool’ for museum staff to avoid discussing same-sex love, and Vanegas similarly argued that in 2002, Section 28 protected museum staff from the need to curate such exhibitions.¹⁸⁰ Vanegas’s study found that most museums had ‘not even attempted to portray lesbian and gay history’, while many others preferred to ‘ignore, or even lie about’ the sexualities of people and stories they represented.¹⁸¹ Section 28 was repealed in 2003 and LGBT History Month has been celebrated annually since 2005, which provides a specific opportunity for museums to address their representations of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. The research for this chapter has considered a broader range of museums than previous studies in order to provide a greater overview of the museum sector and to assess the degree of change since the repeal of Section 28.

The structure of this chapter echoes the structure of the ‘Rainbow City’ exhibition, and focuses on the same themes of identity, activism, scene, people and culture. The


section on ‘Identity’ is split into three sub-sections: intersectionality, labelling ‘LGBTQ objects’ and labelling ‘LGBTQ’ people from the past. It argues that ‘community identity’ is a complex theme for museums to approach and that representing intersectionality is shown to be a particular difficulty for museums. This section also argues that the ‘identity’ of objects as either LGBTQ or related to histories of same-sex love is a significant problem for museums, as is the identifying of historical figures as ‘LGBTQ’. The ‘Activism’ section discusses the long and short term effects of Section 28 and social justice. It argues that although no one was ever prosecuted under Section 28, the Act had a significant impact on museums and their approaches to the history of same-sex love. It also argues that museums are places for activism to be carried out today; as places which promote social justice and ensure that marginalised voices from the past and today are represented to a public audience.

The section on ‘Scene’ does not focus on the ‘LGBTQ scene’, the bars, clubs and social spaces that have been frequented by LGBTQ people and groups, but rather discusses space and scenes more broadly. The sub-sections of ‘Scene’ focus on the importance of local history, and methods of queering museum space. It argues that local histories are integral to museums in their interpretations and representations of same-sex love, but and shows that travelling exhibitions from other museums are a useful way to represent national and broader histories. It also discusses ways that museum space can be ‘queered’ by destabilising standard approaches to presenting the past. The section on ‘People’ discusses how the public appear in, co-curate, contribute to and visit exhibitions on the history of same-sex love. The sub-sections of ‘People’ analyse the use of shared authority and oral histories in museums, and lastly, the role of intended audiences and museum visitors. Discussions about shared authority and oral history reveal the
limitations of such methods, but argues that they have emerged as having an essential role in representations of same-sex love. This section also analyses tensions between the perceived sexual content of exhibitions on same-sex love and the family audience museums wish to attract. The final section, ‘Culture’, discusses how different cultures impact on different methodological approaches, interpretations and representations in museums. It argues that there are distinct differences between museum cultures in the UK and in the US; the former prioritises integrative methods, while the latter prioritises ‘the giving of voice’ with specialist museums that focus on particular identities.\textsuperscript{182} It argues that a combined approach, whereby museums give marginalised histories their own space, yet also integrate them within broader historical narratives, can bring such histories to a broader audience.

Drawing on Section 28, this chapter discusses ways that museums can, and do, ‘intentionally promote’ histories of same-sex love, and publish material and exhibitions ‘with the intention of promoting’ LGBTQ histories and communities. It shows that themes of identity, activism, scene, people and culture have developed across a range of museums and their representations of same-sex love since 1999, but ultimately, many limitations and barriers remain in place in 2015.

\section*{Identity}

The concept of identity raises several problems for museums, as well as for public history

institutions more generally, in their representations of same-sex love. Questions about what sexual identity is, what the LGBTQ community is (or rather, what LGBTQ communities are), how best to represent intersectionality, and how to identify an object or historical figure as ‘LGBTQ’ pose significant problems for museums, but they remain important questions for museums to directly engage with.

Representations of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities have the potential to recognise and assert multiple identities within LGBTQ communities. Museums risk further marginalising many of those who identify as LGBTQ if they do not discuss intersectionality in some way. An intersectional approach can ensure that white, male, gay, educated voices are heard but not to the detriment of other LGBTQ voices and histories of same-sex love. While there are many other voices that are marginalised in exhibitions on same-sex love, only race and bisexuality are discussed here as examples.

The invisibility of people of colour was highlighted as a problem for museums in the first major exhibition on the history of same-sex love in the UK. ‘Pride and Prejudice: Lesbian and Gay London’ was held at the Museum of London in 1999 and focused on the modern history of same-sex love in the capital. The exhibition included object cases, descriptive panels, an oral history section and an electronic questionnaire that asked visitors their opinion about both the exhibition and contemporary LGBTQ rights and communities. While the majority of visitor comments recorded were positive, several visitors noted the lack of material relating to LGBTQ people of colour. One visitor

argued that the exhibition marginalised the experiences of LGBTQ people of colour, and added that this was particularly surprising considering that 25 per cent of the population of London was non-white. The inclusion of people of colour in public histories of same-sex love has been described as ‘the most stubborn barrier to a fully democratic historical practice’. Lisa Duggan has argued that the efforts to include people of colour in public histories of same-sex love have constituted ‘a kind of ghetto-within-the-ghetto’ of LGBTQ history, in which LGBTQ people of colour are rendered invisible. The invisibility of people of colour, unfortunately, is not unique within representations of same-sex love. People of colour are marginalised from many representations of the past, as are other historically oppressed groups, many of whom still face daily prejudices in the twenty-first century. Histories and voices of people of colour and topics of race and slavery remain woefully underrepresented in museums and in the public history sector more generally in the UK.


184 Comment 4 – signed, Museum of London, Business Archive, Social History Exhibitions Records Box 3.23.
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Since exhibiting ‘Pride and Prejudice’, the Museum of London has sought to address the invisibility of LGBTQ people of colour in exhibitions. For example, the 2006 exhibition ‘Queer is Here’ included themed object cases, the first of which showcased material relating to black LGBTQ history.\textsuperscript{188} The case included leaflets and pamphlets such as ‘A guide to safer sex and health for black men who have sex with men’ and ephemera relating to \textit{Wickers and Bullers} magazine, the first commercial black LGBTQ publication in Europe. However, the exhibition was criticised for a tokenistic approach to black LGBTQ history, as it was \textit{only} in this object case that the ‘shaping effects of race and place’ were considered.\textsuperscript{189} The Museum of London Docklands also hosted ‘Outside Edge: a journey through black British lesbian and gay history’ in 2008, which was curated by rukus! co-founder, Ajamu X. The exhibition aimed to showcase the key moments that had shaped black LGBTQ history from the 1970s to the present day. An introductory interpretation panel explained that black LGBTQ experience is usually considered as either being black, or gay, and that both communities had ‘practiced social and cultural exclusion.’ Moreover it highlighted that the public history and heritage sectors ‘rarely cater for those of us whose identities do not sit easily within one category’, which ‘leads to a culture of exclusion.’\textsuperscript{190} ‘Outside Edge’ challenged this exclusion and highlighted campaigns and

\textsuperscript{188} Queer is Here: Object Lables (sic) Case 1: Black and Ethnic Scene, Museum of London, MBA Curatorial (Later Dept) Exhibitions, Queer is Here 2005 Records Box 3.26, (p. 1).
\textsuperscript{190} Museum of London, ‘Outside Edge: A Journey Through Black British Lesbian and Gay History’ was held at the Museum of London Docklands from 7 February – 4 April 2008. Some images of the exhibition can be seen at Flickr, Museum of London, \textit{Outside Edge: A Journey Through Black}
events in recent black LGBTQ history. The exhibition also marked another step forward for the Museum of London in their attempts to diversify their collections and exhibitions.

Although temporary exhibitions such as ‘Outside Edge’ are important ways for museums to represent more diverse communities, some museums have also begun to include these histories and narratives in their permanent collections and displays. For example, the Museum of London has taken further steps towards an intersectional approach in their permanent exhibition ‘World City: 1950s-Today’ (on display since 2010). In this display, the history of same-sex love is represented alongside the history of women’s liberation movements (as it also is in the permanent exhibition in Manchester’s People’s History Museum). The histories of LGBTQ and women’s equality movements are found next to an exhibition panel on ‘Race and Rights’, thus placing them in a much broader history of prejudice and social change in the late twentieth century. Included in the ‘World City’ exhibition is an interactive display called ‘London Liberationists’, which profiles and shows interviews with prominent London activists. The inclusion of oral histories of same-sex love is discussed in detail in the ‘People’ section, but it is necessary to highlight the intersectional voices represented in the display.

Those interviewed include Sue Sanders, founder of LGBT History Month; Christine Burns, MP and trans* activist; and Ajamu X, artist, activist and co-founder of rukus! black history archive, which was discussed in the previous chapter. In his interview, Ajamu X discussed black LGBTQ history and communities, and was asked, among other questions,
‘how does the wider gay community relate to the black LGBT community?’, and ‘why did you feel it was important to set up a black LGBT archive?’

Explaining that people of colour face racism within LGBTQ communities, Ajamu X answered that, ‘I think that people assume that because you’re black and gay and they’re white and gay, somehow you’re both equal. But basically racism does exist within kind of the wider gay community.’ In answer to why setting up a black LGBT archive was important, Ajamu X explained that rukus! ‘is one way of capturing who’s done what so far’ in the black LGBTQ community, and is about ‘challenging the invisibility within the black community and the wider gay community but also within the heritage sector as well.’ Moreover, he added that black LGBTQ communities are ‘not going to wait around for the mainstream community, whether it’s black or white, or straight or gay, to actually create those spaces’ for them.

The inclusion of Ajamu’s interview in ‘London Liberationists’ also goes some way to challenge the invisibility of LGBTQ people of colour within the heritage and museum sector. This interview, which highlights the different lived experiences of LGBTQ people of colour and white LGBTQ people, ensures that a range of identities are represented, and the topics discussed give a greater, albeit personal, context to histories that are often marginalised within representations of LGBTQ histories. It also raises challenging questions about the marginalisation of people of colour in both museums and in LGBTQ communities. The Museum of London has clearly taken on board criticisms from visitors, communities and academics, and has integrated diverse LGBTQ histories in their

---


permanent collection. From ‘Pride and Prejudice’ to ‘World City’, the representation of communities and identities has taken a prominent place in the Museum of London’s representations of same-sex love.

The lack of diverse LGBTQ voices was also highlighted as a particular problem for Manchester’s Museum of Science and Industry (MOSI) exhibition, ‘Behind the Scenes’. The exhibition, which ran from August 2012 to March 2013, explored the place of LGBTQ people and communities in Manchester’s history. Included in the exhibition were oral histories, video displays made by LGBTQ youth groups and a timeline of LGBTQ history. MOSI’s internal evaluation of the exhibition found that while most of the comments were positive, one visitor was disappointed to find that Manchester’s bisexual community had been ‘neglected’. The visitor noted that Manchester is home to the longest running bisexual community group in the UK, and that it had twice hosted BiCon, an annual bisexuality conference, and yet these were not included in the historical timeline.¹⁹³ The curators of the exhibition explained that this was because although they had worked with a number of local LGBTQ community groups, they had been unable to maintain contact with a group or groups representing bisexual communities.¹⁹⁴ Building better connections and engaging with more community groups, such as bisexual communities, was highlighted as a particular aim for future events and exhibitions in the internal

¹⁹³ Museum of Science and Industry (MOSI), *Evaluation report of MOSI’s community engagement project with Manchester’s LGBT communities and the creation of the community exhibition; Behind the Scene* (unpublished internal report, Museum of Science and Industry, 2013), (p. 9). With thanks to Josie Sykes and Meg McHugh for providing this evaluation.

¹⁹⁴ Personal communication between MOSI curators Josie Sykes and Meg McHugh and the author (08 February 2013).
This recommendation highlights both the difficulty of representing a community group – LGBTQ – and successfully representing as many lived experiences and histories as possible within such a group.

The increasing importance of recognising LGBTQ communities and intersectionality is not unique to UK museums. For example, The GLBT Museum in San Francisco (US) hosted ‘BiConic Flashpoints: Four Decades of Bay Area Bisexual Politics’ in their community gallery (May 2014-May 2015). The exhibition, curated with the help of the bisexual community in the Bay Area of San Francisco, highlighted the historic and contemporary marginalisation of bisexual politics, and also took steps to redress bisexual invisibility in their exhibitions. The Schwules Museum* in Berlin has also taken a conscious approach to the communities, rather than community, it both serves and represents. When the museum opened in 1986, it predominantly collected and exhibited the history of gay male art and culture. Its name reflected this, as ‘schwules’ means gay in German. In 2008, the museum officially added the ‘queer star’ to their name, signalling a more inclusive approach that includes the representation of other aspects of queer history and culture, including trans* histories, histories of women and of bisexuality.\(^{196}\)

It is not just concepts of identity and intersectionality that are problematic for museums and their representations of same-sex love. Questions about the identities of


\(^{196}\) Michael Fürst, From Backyard to Front Building – the Schwules Museum* Between Political Project and Museum Institution, online video recording of presentation at The Un-Straight Museum Conference 14 June 2014, Homotopia, <http://www.homotopia.net/the-un-straight-museum-live-broadcasts/> [accessed 04 August 2015].
objects and historical figures raise significant issues too. One of the major problems raised in responses to the survey conducted for this thesis was the difficulty of labelling an object as relevant to or representative of histories of same-sex love. In total, 33 of 99 respondents (33 per cent) answered that they did have objects relating to histories of same-sex love in their collections. However, some respondents argued that they have objects that were owned or created by people who might now identify as LGBTQ, but this was not a reason for collecting them, nor was this acknowledged in their classification or interpretation labels. For example, a respondent from Dumfries Museum explained that that their collections ‘reflect the lives of local people, some of whom may have been ‘gay’ etc but this will not in itself be the reason for collecting an item, and will not have been signalled by a note on the catalogue record.’

So what makes an object ‘queer’ and how can an object tell or represent a history of same-sex love?

There are broad categories of objects that relate to histories of same-sex love. Many objects overlap several of these categories but they can be described as: depictions (e.g. the Warren Cup); objects owned or created by ‘LGBTQ’ individuals; cultural and material history (e.g. badges); oral history and accompanying ephemera; legislation and criminal records; discussions (e.g. newspaper clippings); and objects of trauma (e.g. HIV/AIDS-related objects and documents). The last of these categories is especially problematic in its role in representations of same-sex love. Trauma, and in particular, HIV/AIDS, is a significant part of the recent history of same-sex love and LGBTQ

197 Results from questionnaire collected by the author (2012-2013). A copy of the questionnaire is located in Appendix Two. Hereafter, questionnaire results will be referenced by an identity number and name.
Questionnaire ID.35, Dumfries Museum.
communities, and is well recorded in terms of both contemporary documentation and commemoration. As such, it often takes a prominent role in exhibitions relating to histories of same-sex love. Angela Vanegas raised concerns about this in their 2002 survey, and highlighted that in several temporary exhibitions, gay men had appeared in the context of HIV/AIDS.\textsuperscript{198} Such a focus on HIV/AIDS risks perpetuating ‘homo-pessimism’, a representation that Anna Conlan has described as persistently associating LGBTQ lives with death and oppression.\textsuperscript{199} It is not that museums should not discuss HIV/AIDS in their representations of same-sex love, but, as Vanegas has also argued, they should ensure that it is not the only context in which histories of same-sex love and gay men appear.\textsuperscript{200}

While objects relating to HIV/AIDS are problematic, they are categorised as explicitly relevant to histories of same-sex love. Many other objects cannot be as clearly interpreted as relevant to its history. The British Museum’s trail of LGBTQ objects, ‘Desire and Diversity’, which is accessible online, raises significant questions about what makes an object relevant to histories of same-sex love.\textsuperscript{201} While the Warren Cup, which as

\textsuperscript{198} Vanegas, ‘Representing Lesbians and Gay Men in British Social History Museums’ p. 167.
\textsuperscript{199} Conlan, ‘Representing Possibility’ p. 259.
\textsuperscript{200} Vanegas, ‘Representing Lesbians and Gay Men in British Social History Museums’, p.167.
\textsuperscript{201} The ‘Desire and Diversity’ trail can be found on the British Museum’s website at British Museum, Desire and Diversity, \texttt{<http://www.britishmuseum.org/visiting/planning_your_visit/object_trails/desire_and_diversity.aspx#1>} [accessed 26 August 2015]. This is an updated version of the tour ‘LGBT Objects at the British Museum’, which was produced by Untold London in 2011. This physical trail is no longer available at the British Museum, but information about the trail is available at Untold London, Get Our Free LGBT Trail of the British Museum, 17 February 2011,
discussed depicts two scenes of men making love, is clearly relevant, there are several other objects included in the trail whose relevance to histories of same-sex love is not immediately obvious. For example, a letter of 1818 from Thomas Young to William Bankes is included. Bankes was arrested for ‘that detestable and abominable crime…called Buggery’ in 1841, but the letter does not mention the case or make any reference to sex or sexuality. Is this a tenuous link, or is this object ‘queer’? While the letter itself may not appear to be relevant, the intended recipient, William Bankes, is.

Similarly, another object included in the trail is a water jar (c. 450 BC) that depicts an image of a woman reading. The online trail explains that on such vases the woman is often identified as Sappho, an ancient Greek poet from the Isle of Lesbos who wrote poetry celebrating her love for women. This connection is not acknowledged in the interpretation panel in the British Museum, so visitors, unless they are following the tour online, are unaware that it is relevant.

These two objects may not immediately appear to be significant to histories of same-sex love, or represent LGBTQ histories, but they do serve an important purpose.


Both the letter and the water jar are an example of how museums can show that many objects represent a history of same-sex love even though they are not directly related to it. It also remains important for museums to acknowledge that not all exhibitions, objects or subjects relating to histories of same-sex love or LGBTQ communities are about sex or even sexuality. Museums are well placed to highlight the many ways that people who might now identify as LGBTQ have contributed to and lived in the past. One respondent to the survey conducted for this thesis argued this in their response, and explained that their preference was ‘to look at other aspects of LGBT life - looking for common ground, not what sets us apart.’\footnote{Questionnaire ID.37, National History Museum: St. Fagans.}

Considering that so few objects directly represent histories of same-sex love, an open interpretation and a consideration of common ground can make them visible where they would otherwise remain hidden. Furthermore, such an interpretation places histories of same-sex love within much broader histories, and shows that same-sex love and people who have loved others of the same sex have existed throughout all periods of history, and have not necessarily been recorded for this reason this alone.

In a similar way, the identification of historical figures as ‘LGBTQ’ can be a problem for museums and the interpretation of objects. For example, one respondent to the survey conducted for this thesis argued that their relevant objects ‘relate more to individuals with recognised LGB histories’ rather than objects themselves relating to same-sex love.\footnote{Questionnaire ID.3, Bolton Library and Museum Service.} Recognising such a history, however, remains complex. Same-sex love has existed for longer than ‘LGBTQ’ identities, and before the categories of ‘homosexual’
and ‘heterosexual’ were created, and the search for LGBTQ ancestors and famous figures remains a central interpretative method of museums and their representations of same-sex love. There remains, however, a tension between claiming historical figures as LGBTQ, and asking visitors to rethink their assumptions that historical figures were ‘heterosexual’. Although the potentially anachronistic approach of claiming historical figures as LGBTQ is problematic, the queering of historical figures by asking visitors to consider their sexualities in their historical contexts can open up discussions about histories of same-sex love and sexualities more generally.

Prominent LGBTQ activist Peter Tatchell espoused this approach when he argued in 2004 that the contents of a queer museum would include ‘the personal possessions of famous homosexuals and bisexuals.’ These famous people would include Lord Mountbatten, Florence Nightingale, Winston Churchill and William Shakespeare, among others. Tatchell argued that some of these were ‘only gay by orientation’ and remained celibate, while others (including Churchill) ‘appear to have had only one-off gay encounters’. He argued that as long as the queer museum made these distinctions clear, all of these figures should be included as relevant to histories of same-sex love.

Focusing on LGBTQ historical figures, as Tatchell suggested, raises the problem of heroism, which prioritises famous names, such as Oscar Wilde and Alan Turing, who are significant not just for their sexualities, but for their contributions to society. These queer

207 Ibid.
heroes, or queeroes, are regularly represented in exhibitions and displays as pioneers, of sexuality and in their careers. Despite the importance of recognising and celebrating queer ancestors, a focus on queeroes risks presenting an inaccurate history of same-sex love. These queeroes were well educated and wealthy, and their lives were well recorded by history; they are not particularly representative of the history of same-sex love, and yet they are the most prominent figures in its representation. Indeed, a focus on queeroes in museum representations of same-sex love has ‘privileged certain kind[s] of experiences at the expense of others.’\(^{208}\) Duggan has also critiqued the ‘excessive focus on “famous figures”’ in LGBTQ public history. At its best, Duggan argued, the focus on queeroes analyses the significance and impact of one person or small group and places this within a broader context. At worst, however, it ‘degenerates into historical gossip about who slept with whom, and who wore what where.’ Most significantly, a focus on famous figures is extremely limiting in its scope of class, gender and race.\(^{209}\)

Moreover, the search for queeroes and celebratory histories of same-sex love can result in an uncritical representation of their identity.\(^{210}\) For example, Wilde has been claimed as a ‘gay icon’ in LGBTQ public histories, and is one of the most celebrated and

widely recognised queeroes.\[211\] This leaves little room, however, to discuss his relationships with women or the nature of his relationships with young male prostitutes. His status as a proud, and tragic, martyred ‘gay icon’ and ‘queero’ leaves little space for his life and sexuality to be critiqued or challenged as anything other than a celebratory homosexual. Moreover, as Richard Dyer argued an essay to accompany the National Portrait Gallery’s 2006 exhibition ‘Gay Icons’, the use of the term ‘queer’ in itself stresses ‘fluidity and destabilisation’, whereas icons are ‘fixed as well as positive.’\[212\] The uncritical celebration of queeroes leaves little space for negative historical figures to become a significant part of public LGBTQ history, and does not encourage a critical analysis of positive figures, such as Wilde. The queero, then, is at once celebratory and oxymoronic; revelatory and uncritical.

Museums should take a more critical approach to the place of queeroes in exhibitions and displays on histories of same-sex love. Such a critical approach would be an ideal model so that museums do not present a history that is both ‘curatorially uncomplicated and wildly inaccurate.’\[213\] Such a critical approach would also encourage visitors to develop their own informed opinions about historical figures, and about the history of same-sex love.

\[211\] For example, Oscar Wilde was described as a ‘gay icon’ in the Museum of London’s ‘Pride and Prejudice’ exhibition. Pride and Prejudice, Lesbian and Gay London, Museum of London, MBA Curatorial (Later Dept), Exhibitions, Pride and Prejudice 1999, Box 3.22.


Activism

The history of activism in LGBTQ communities is a central theme of many exhibitions on histories of same-sex love. The majority of objects and histories are dated after the Sexual Offences Act of 1967 that partially decriminalised sex acts between men. For example, the Herbert Museum and Art Gallery in Coventry has a Pride march badge from 1985, a T-shirt with the slogan ‘HIV Safe Fun in the Sun’, another T-shirt with the slogan ‘E-Quality’ from a Stonewall campaign in the 1990s, and a 7-inch record single by Chumbawamba called ‘Smash Clause 28/Fight the Alton Bill’ (1988). Activism also took a prominent focus in ‘Rainbow City’, where visitors could sit in an ‘activist flat’ from the 1970s that included posters, T-shirts from various campaigns and a video made by the Scottish Minorities Group in the 1970s.

Activism in museums is not limited to displaying objects. Museums, like archives, can be places for activism to be carried out today. In one of the panels of ‘Pride and Prejudice’ called ‘A Darker Shade of Pink’ the Museum of London focused on setbacks that LGBTQ communities had faced in the 1980s, particularly with the AIDS crisis and Section 28. The interpretation panel explained that Section 28 was the first piece of anti-gay legislation to be passed for more than 103 years, and acknowledged that in putting on the exhibition, they were ‘risking prosecution’ under the Act. They were not prosecuted, indeed, no one was prosecuted under Section 28, but it had a significant impact on what museums thought they could display, and what they thought they had no right (or obligation) to represent. An electronic questionnaire, which was part of the

'Pride and Prejudice' exhibition, also drew the attention of visitors to Section 28, asking them if they thought that the Act should be repealed. 1067 visitors answered that the Act should be repealed. By contrast, only 107 visitors answered that it should not be repealed, while 618 visitors who interacted with the questionnaire chose not to answer this question.\footnote{Burdon, ‘Exhibiting Homosexuality’, p. 15. Burdon also commented that this question was both the most topical, and the most ‘unananswered’.
} The Museum of London, however, was one of very few museums that did discuss the history of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities during the years before Section 28 was repealed.\footnote{For more information on exhibitions before the repeal of Section 28, see Bourn, ‘Invisibility’, and Vanegas, ‘Representing Lesbians and Gay Men in British Social History Museums’.
}

The impact and lasting legacy of Section 28 was discussed in the survey conducted for this thesis. Although only local authority museums were \textit{directly} affected under the legislation, the inclusion of the topic aimed to raise questions about both the direct and indirect impact of Section 28. Respondents were asked whether their institution was affected by Section 28, either directly or indirectly, and whether there had been more freedom to exhibit material on LGBTQ histories since its nationwide repeal in 2003. Of the 95 respondents to this question, 51 (54 per cent) suggested that their museum was not affected, while 42 (44 per cent) answered that they were unsure. Only 2 respondents (2 per cent), both from local authority museums, directly answered that their museum had been affected by Section 28. Another respondent argued that wider society, and therefore all museums, were affected by Section 28.\footnote{Questionnaire ID.27, Manchester Museum.
} Similarly, respondents were overwhelmingly uncertain about whether they have had more freedom since the repeal

\footnote{Burdon, ‘Exhibiting Homosexuality’, p. 15. Burdon also commented that this question was both the most topical, and the most ‘unananswered’.
\footnote{For more information on exhibitions before the repeal of Section 28, see Bourn, ‘Invisibility’, and Vanegas, ‘Representing Lesbians and Gay Men in British Social History Museums’.
\footnote{Questionnaire ID.27, Manchester Museum.
}
of Section 28. Of the 89 respondents, 54 (60 per cent) answered that they were unsure of the legacy of Section 28. By contrast, 8 respondents (9 per cent) answered they now have more freedom to represent the history of same-sex love in their collections and exhibitions. One respondent argued that greater freedom had been achieved, not because of the repeal of Section 28, but ‘because of changing attitudes (the same changes that led to the repeal)’. A further 22 (25 per cent) answered that they had not gained any more freedom. For some, this was because they were not open prior to 2003, whilst others noted that the lack of change was because they had never been affected in the first place. Additionally, 5 respondents (6 per cent) added that the question was not applicable to them as they are non-local authority museums.

Overall, these results suggest that Section 28 had a limited direct impact on the ability of museums to represent same-sex love in their exhibitions. The legacy of Section 28 is thus difficult to measure, but it remains true that museums made very few attempts to address their representations of same-sex love before Section 28 was repealed, and it ‘undoubtedly constrained and delayed’ attempts to represent histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. Instead, the responses indicate that Section 28 was a symbolic Act, which effectively failed to place any direct restrictions on public history institutions. However, it did send a message to museums that they should not collect, exhibit and represent LGBTQ communities, which is reflected in the paucity of exhibitions before 2003. Hence, although the direct impact of Section 28 is unclear it did have an

218 Questionnaire ID.27, Manchester Museum.
indirect effect on museums and their representations of same-sex love before 2003.

During the twenty-first century so far, and in the wake of the repeal of Section 28, both academic debates and practice in museums have increasingly focused on museums as places that should provide alternative narratives, provoke debate, promote social justice and represent marginalised histories and lives. In particular, Richard Sandell’s work has argued that museums have ‘both the potential to contribute towards the combating of social inequality and a responsibility to do so.’ Critical approaches to the promotion of social justice can both reveal histories that are marginalised in mainstream narratives, and involve and engage social groups who are marginalised today. Within the museum sector itself, attitudes towards museums as places where ideas of social justice should be carried out are largely positive. In a poll conducted in 2013 by the Museums Association, for example, 81 per cent of those who took part (all of whom were registered as members) answered ‘yes’ to the question ‘should museums promote social justice?’

Also in 2013, the Social Justice Alliance for Museums (SJAM) group was founded. The group’s charter, which they encourage museums to sign, highlights their five main aims. They aim to celebrate the value of museums to society; to recognise that museums have a duty to enable everyone to learn; to support social justice; to acknowledge that museums have tended to cater for educated minorities rather than the wider and diverse public; and to lead the fight for access to museums for all, which they define as the

220 Richard Sandell, ‘Museums and the combating of social inequality’, p. 3.
‘essence of social justice.’ The increasing view in the museum sector that museums are political places in which social justice can be (or, should be) carried out is also reflected in the increasing number of exhibitions that deal with marginalised histories, in museum policies and in academic literature.

The UK Museums Association has increasingly promoted the role of museums in the UK as political spaces with the potential to change lives. Their vision of social justice has been most prominent with their project ‘Museums Change Lives’ (2013), which argues that museums can ‘enrich the lives of individuals, contribute to strong and resilient communities and help create a fair and just society.’ One of the case studies used in ‘Museums Change Lives’ focused on LGBTQ history, and showed that by approaching the subject, museums can address both the historical marginalisation of LGBTQ people, and prejudices that they continue to encounter today. As well as providing case studies, such as ‘Kütmaan: Exploring the realities of LGBT lives and culture in the Middle East’, which was held at Leighton House Museum in 2012, ‘Museums Change Lives’ also listed ten steps that museums can take to improve their ‘social impact’ and ensure that more diverse histories and lives are represented. The project, therefore, aimed not only to present case studies, but also to engage present long term, sustainable and achievable aims to make museums places of social justice.

___________________________

222 Social Justice Alliance for Museums, SJAM Charter, [accessed 03 August 2015].


224 Ibid., p. 15.
The sense that museums should have a social responsibility to represent marginalised groups and histories was also reflected in responses to the survey conducted for this thesis. For example, a respondent from Carmarthenshire County Museum argued that ‘it’s part of our job to promote equalities’, while a respondent from Cromer Museum argued that museums ‘are well placed to push boundaries and ask difficult questions.’ Some respondents also discussed the importance of diversity, both to their collections and of their visitors. For example, the respondent from Hackney Museum argued that ‘all members of our communities should have their voice heard’.

However, while some museums recognise that they have the potential and responsibility to combat social justice, this is not recognised or acted upon by all museums. For many, the responsibility to do so is dependent on several other factors, most notably concerns about who their audience is and what might be ‘suitable’ for them, which is discussed in the section on ‘People’.

Despite the increasing sector focus on museums as places which help further social justice, this view does not appear to be shared by members of the public. The poll conducted by the Museums Association, the SJAM, exhibitions that promote social justice, and the results from the survey conducted for this thesis are all in stark contrast to another Museums Association initiative on public perceptions of the purposes of museums in society.

A report, conducted by Britain Thinks for the Museums Association in 2013,

225 Questionnaire ID.53, Carmarthenshire County Museum, and Questionnaire ID.64, Cromer Museum.

226 Questionnaire ID.51, Hackney Museum.
revealed that those members of the public who participated not only disagreed that museums are places for social justice or forums for public debate, but also rejected these purposes entirely. Participants were ‘very hostile to the idea of museums being political, polemical, hectoring or didactic.’ The report explained that this was because participants ‘view museums as incredibly trustworthy and believe that they present balanced, accurate and objective “facts”, especially in contrast to other public institutions such as the government, businesses and the media. Instead, participants argued that museums should remain neutral in their politics and in their representations of the past and present.\(^{227}\) However, although it is understandable that the public are wary about museums playing political roles and presenting inaccurate or biased information, there was no acknowledgement in the report that museums do this on a daily basis in their interpretation panels, in their choices of exhibitions, in their collection policies and in their outreach work. As such, and although the report makes it clear that social justice is far from a priority for museum visitors, museums should work towards changing public views of what ‘social justice’ is. There is clearly a tension between what museums mean by social justice, the accessibility of museums and their collections for all, and better representations of diverse communities, and what the public understands ‘social justice’ to mean.

A recent exhibition at London’s Victoria and Albert (V&A) museum showed that, despite the views expressed in the *Britain Thinks* report, museum visitors can react

positively, and meaningfully, with politically motivated initiatives by museums. ‘Disobedient Objects’, which was held at the V&A in 2014-15, exhibited objects relating to protests from around the world, including LGBTQ protests. The final wall of the exhibition initially displayed a blank square, and explained underneath that, ‘new movements will grow during this exhibition. This space is held for future disobedient objects.’

Visitors to the exhibition took the wall as a space they could contribute to and protest materials, including stickers denouncing pay cuts to V&A staff, were attached to the wall and spread out across the exhibition. The material left by visitors has since been kept and catalogued by the V&A. The organic nature of the political material left by visitors, through which others could engage with and learn about contemporary politics, shows that visitors can react positively to museums as political places where ideas of social justice can be presented and put into practice.

Eithne Nightingale and Richard Sandell have argued that in the past two decades, discussions about social justice have moved ‘from the margins of museum thinking and practice, to the core.’ However, for the time being, social justice is core for some museums, but not all. Social justice may be part of discussions in museum thinking and academic studies, but the reality is that many museums do not have the resources, funding, or will to strive for social justice. There remains an imbalance between ‘pockets of innovation and experimentation’ and ‘widespread wariness, uncertainty, ambivalence or disinterest’ in the museum sector: major exhibitions and the integration of histories of

228 Victoria and Albert Museum, ‘Disobedient Objects’ exhibition, as seen on visit 24 September 2014.

same-sex love in mainstream narratives in museums remain the exception, not the rule.230

Scene

The history of LGBTQ social scenes has become an important and recurrent theme in exhibitions on histories of same-sex love. Its inclusion in exhibitions can show that LGBTQ social ‘scenes’ have existed in many forms, from the Molly Houses of early eighteenth-century London to the opening of Manto Bar in Manchester’s Canal Street in 1990 and Village Soho bar in London in 1991, the first LGBTQ bars to have glass windows (a symbolic ‘coming out’ of LGBTQ life).231 In ‘Rainbow City’, the LGBTQ scene was represented with objects and histories relating to Edinburgh’s LGBTQ nightlife. The LGBTQ scene has also been represented in ‘Pride and Prejudice’ (Museum of London) and ‘Behind the Scene’ (Museum of Science and Industry). For the purposes of this chapter, however, ‘scene’ has been understood much more broadly than the cultural and social scene. Other scenes: places, spaces and the local are important themes in of the history of same-sex love, and they are also significant to issues of its representation in museums. How is location important to representations of same-sex love? What part do local histories play in regional museums? How do museums make use of their spaces, and utilise other spaces, to represent the histories of same-sex love? These questions were raised in some questionnaire responses, and have been answered, to an extent, by


exhibitions that have taken innovative approaches to the way they represent histories of same-sex love.

In both the survey conducted for this thesis and in exhibition case studies, local history was a major factor in the decision to run an exhibition on the history of same-sex love. In responses to the survey, 18 of 97 respondents (19 per cent) answered that they had hosted an exhibition on same-sex love, and 12 of these were related to local history. These local connections were either collaborations with local LGBTQ community groups, or were focused on a local figure who is significant to the history of same-sex love. For example, the Herbert Museum and Art Gallery hosted ‘Queering Coventry’ (September 2012-September 2014), which displayed items and oral histories relating to the gay rights movement and LGBTQ people living in Coventry. At the National History Museum: St Fagan’s (Wales), local LGBTQ group Gay Ammanford were invited to display objects that they felt were important to them in the community gallery space in 2011. Manchester Museum hosted ‘Alan Turing and Life’s Enigma’ (2012), which explored his work at Manchester University and how it coincided with his arrest, conviction and lasting legacy, while at Dorset County Museum, Sylvia Townsend Warner (who settled in Dorset with her partner, Valentine Ackland) is represented in their permanent display.

The importance of local history also emerged in responses to the survey question on the collection policies of museums. Of the 96 who answered the question on collecting policies, only 17 (18 per cent) answered that they were doing so. However, a further 6 respondents argued that although they were not actively collecting such materials specifically, they would collect any local history that related to histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. For example, a respondent from Bolton Library and Museum
Service explained that they were not specifically collecting objects relating to same-sex love, but they focus on collecting objects relating to Bolton more generally. As such, ‘collecting LGBT related objects would only occur within this context if objects were offered for donation or spotted by a member of the collections team as a useful addition to the collections.’

Another respondent, from Harborough Museum, explained that although they were not actively collecting items relating to same-sex love, they ‘do seek to represent the whole community.’ Some respondents also highlighted that they were looking to collect items that represent LGBTQ experiences that are unique to the local area. For example, a respondent from the Museum of Liverpool explained that they were collecting ‘more personal objects and stories relating to diverse Liverpool community/individuals. Especially those which reveal a unique Liverpool experience.’

A connection to local history was thus marked as the most significant reason for museums to host exhibitions on the history of same-sex love. The respondent from Dorset County Museum noted their apprehension about ‘tokenistic approaches, which can lack integrity’, that local connections can avoid. A local connection ensures that it is relevant to the rest of the collection, the prime audience, and furthermore, places LGBTQ histories in broader historical narratives. A local connection can also result in a more meaningful connection with visitors. Local histories can be very specific, and local LGBTQ histories are of great importance in creating a sense of community. For example, the respondent from St Fagan’s Museum in Wales explained the importance of having

\[\text{Questionnaire ID.3, Bolton Library and Museum Service.}\]
\[\text{Questionnaire ID.2, Harborough Museum.}\]
\[\text{Questionnaire ID.19, Museum of Liverpool.}\]
\[\text{Questionnaire ID.82, Dorset County Museum.}\]
museum objects that represented a specifically Welsh history and experience in the Welsh language. They noted that since most literature on the topic is published in English, providing resources in Welsh ‘gives people permission, and confidence, to talk about sexuality in their mother tongue.’ In an exhibition for LGBT History Month 2011, one of the objects on display was a Stonewall T-shirt displaying the slogan ‘Mae rhai pobl yn hoyw. Deliwich â’r peth!’ (‘Some people are gay. Get over it!’) The display also included Welsh language Pride flags, which ensured that national, local, and sexual identities were represented.

Manchester’s Museum of Science and Industry (MOSI) exhibition ‘Behind the Scene’ also concentrated on representing LGBTQ histories as local history. The city has a long and celebratory history of LGBTQ culture, which MOSI aimed to demonstrate through this exhibition. One of the main objectives was to link their own collections, Manchester and LGBTQ communities, in order to ‘show diversity within our collections and a wide range of links between collections and people’s lives.’ Links to local history were displayed through a timeline, which showed national LGBTQ history in one colour, and events specific to Manchester LGBTQ history in another. This was successful in contextualising Manchester’s history within the UK’s and also showing the significance of LGBTQ contributions to local history. The timeline was interactive and encouraged visitors to ‘tag’ their own histories to the map with labels provided. Another installation in the exhibition, a fabric map of central Manchester, also showed personal local histories. Polaroid images with short descriptions were placed on specific locations on the map to
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highlight where events had happened, including where some had ‘come out’ for the first time, where they had shared their first kiss with their partner, and where they bought tickets for their first Pride event. The personal element of the timeline and the map showed that these personal histories were also significant to local history, and to LGBTQ history: all the histories represented were part of a much broader narrative of same-sex love.

Not all museums sampled in the questionnaire, however, felt they were able to represent the history of same-sex love on the basis of their geographical location. The social and political histories of locations, as well as their current populations, were highlighted as a problem within some questionnaire responses. For example, a respondent from Touchstones Rochdale explained that the ability to represent histories of same-sex love ‘depends on institution and audiences targeted.’ They argued that in ‘smaller towns that don’t have diverse audiences it is more difficult whereas larger places could find it easier to display exhibitions. Another anonymous respondent noted that they ‘have to plan displays that will attract visitors from the local area’ and that the history of same-sex love is ‘unlikely to be “attractive” to our population, and may offend some. We have to “play it safe.”’ In larger metropolitan cities, such as London, Manchester, Brighton and Edinburgh, it appears to be ‘easier’ to represent the histories of same-sex love. This is not unique to UK museums. Andrew Gorman-Murray has argued that this is also the case in Australia, where there is an ‘uneven representation and

238 Questionnaire ID.11, Touchstones Rochdale.
239 Questionnaire ID.17, Anonymous.
omission of geographical diversity in museum and gallery practice.'\textsuperscript{240} Gorman-Murray added that the lack of geographical diversity stands against the basic premise of museums in Australia, which is ‘to reach and educate the widest possible audience about the diversity of Australian cultures.'\textsuperscript{241} Gorman-Murray urged museums to pay greater heed to the ‘geography underpinning the distribution and thematic range’ of exhibitions on histories of same-sex love.\textsuperscript{242} A greater focus on geography would then allow for more diverse, and representative, histories to be told.

One way to resolve the problem of a lack of geographical diversity in representations of same-sex love is through the staging of travelling exhibitions and the loaning of objects. While some museums have the finance, expert knowledge and space to hold and exhibit many objects, many others do not. The lending of objects and exhibitions both fosters better relationships between museums, and can ensure that a much broader range of people across different geographical locations have access to the histories of same-sex love. For example, as part of the British Museum’s ongoing collaboration project with UK museums, the Warren Cup has been included in temporary exhibitions across the country, including at at Yorkshire Museum (December 2006-January 2007), at Nottingham Lakeside Arts Centre (January-April 2010), and at Plymouth City Museum and Art Gallery (April-June 2012).\textsuperscript{243} Travelling exhibitions can also ensure

\textsuperscript{241} Ibid., p. 71.
\textsuperscript{242} Ibid., p. 79.
that a broader range of publics can access contextualised histories of same-sex love. The Museum of London’s ‘Queer is Here’ exhibition, which was hosted at the Museum of London Docklands in 2006, also travelled to several libraries and small museums across London. Similarly, the US Holocaust Memorial Museum’s ‘Nazi Persecution of Homosexuals 1933-1945’ is both an online and physical travelling exhibition, which has been exhibited in states across the US. These travelling objects and exhibitions go some way towards resolving issues of holding space, staff and funding, and ensure that more people can access representations of same-sex love.

While travelling exhibitions do present opportunities to represent the history of same-sex love temporarily, some museums have begun to ‘queer’ their museum space more permanently. The British Museum’s ‘Desire and Diversity’ trail is one such example, as is Brighton Museum’s ‘Object Stories’. The ‘Object Stories’ trail, which was launched in 2013, was available as a printed leaflet form from the museum and continues to be available digitally. As well as indicating that the ten objects are related to LGBTQ history in the interpretation labels, by placing an ‘Object Stories’ rainbow symbol on interpretation, the project provides contextual information via the paper trail, website, a

cId=410332&partId=1> [accessed 09 March 2016] for further details of the history of the Warren Cup on display.

244 See Museum of London, MBA Curatorial (Later Dept) Exhibitions, Queer is Here 2005 Records Box 3.26.
downloadable mobile app, and accompanying videos. The videos, available via YouTube, include Brighton Museum staff discussing the individual objects at length. The crucial difference between ‘Desire and Diversity’ and ‘Object Stories’ is the integration of queer interpretation in the mainstream collection. At the British Museum, visitors are only made aware of the relevance of objects to same-sex love on the physical interpretation panels of the Warren Cup and the busts of Hadrian and Antinous. If visitors do not actively seek out ‘Desire and Diversity’ and follow the trail, they would be none the wiser about the significance of the object to histories of same-sex love. With ‘Object Stories’, however, a small rainbow symbol and reference points for more information on the objects’ relevance allows all visitors to encounter and interpret the object from a queer perspective.

Such trails, both inside and outside of physical museum spaces can also encourage a queer take on presentation. They can ensure that histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities are integrated throughout collections, and therefore became a permanent part of a museum’s narrative. Another example of ‘queering’ museum space was ‘Queering the Museum’ at Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery (BMAG). The exhibition, which took place between November 2010 and February 2011, consisted of a range of displays, or interventions, across the museum. It was integral to the exhibition that objects were displayed placed throughout the museum, rather than in one exhibition space. The curator, Matt Smith, explained that this approach placed ‘a queer seam throughout the museum displays’, and encouraged visitors to rethink both museum space

\(^{247}\) Ibid.
and the histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. Some of the interventions used existing objects or displays from the museum, while others were created specifically for the exhibition. For example, visitors to BMAG were greeted at the entrance by the statue ‘Lucifer’ by Jacob Epstein, which for the duration of the exhibition was draped with a cloak of green carnations, a flower worn by men to signify their homosexuality in the nineteenth-century. Smith also created a ceramic figure of the Ladies of Llangollen, which was designed to both blend in with other ceramic objects on display, and draw attention to their history and the history of same-sex love. Visitors could either collect a map that detailed all of the interventions, or they could find them organically as they walked through the museum. This approach ensured that more visitors encountered the interventions, and those that might not visit an exhibition on the history of same-sex love experienced the ‘queering’ of the museum as part of their visit.

‘Rainbow City’ extended the concept of the trail approach with walking tours taking place outside the museum space on the streets of Edinburgh. As part of the exhibition, a set of walking tours of Edinburgh called ‘LGBT Paths’ was produced. ‘LGBT Paths’ allowed the project to further connect with local history and, moreover, made it

249 Ibid., p. 90.
possible to cover histories that were not visible in the exhibition. \(^{251}\) ‘LGBT Paths’ consisted of seven tours that covered different areas of Edinburgh and were of varying lengths and difficulties. One particular tour addressed the ‘perennial issue’ of lesbian invisibility. \(^{252}\) ‘A Lesbian Special’ aimed to show how different the experiences, and thus historical landscape, of lesbian women and gay men had been. The book that accompanied the exhibition explained that ‘outdoor encounters have always played a significant part in gay male culture’, while lesbian landmarks have been ‘harder to find’ because of their historical invisibility and because historically, women have had ‘less spending power’ than men, as they have not had the same opportunities to earn money as men have. \(^{253}\) This issue was not directly addressed in the ‘Rainbow City’ exhibition, so ‘LGBT Paths’ served a crucial role in highlighting the invisibility of women, and providing a resource to bring some histories to life. It also succeeded in queering space outside of the museum by taking history to the streets and queering the landscape.

The way that museums use their space(s) is reflective of their attempts to represent and integrate histories of same-sex love. Some museum spaces have addressed their representation of same-sex love through their use of space; their spaces are ‘being reinvented’ and ‘becoming endowed with the potential to effect positive social change.’ \(^{254}\) Richard Sandell has identified three ways, or ‘spatial devices’ through which

\(^{251}\) The trail was available to pick up from the exhibition, and can also be found in the book that accompanied the exhibition; Ellen Galford and Ken Wilson (eds), *Rainbow City: Stories from Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Edinburgh*, (Edinburgh: Word Power Books, 2006).

\(^{252}\) Galford and Wilson (eds), *Rainbow City*, p. 123.

\(^{253}\) Ibid., p. 123.

\(^{254}\) Sandell, ‘Constructing and communicating equality’, p. 185.
museums accommodate and represent marginalised histories. They are compensatory, celebratory and pluralist. A compensatory museum space is a small-scale, temporary exhibition, often in a small community gallery or cabinet. The small exhibition in the Community Case of Kingston Museum for LGBT History Month 2013, mentioned in the previous chapter, is an example of this compensatory approach. A celebratory space takes more prominent space in the museum, and is generally positive and celebratory in tone. MOSI’s ‘Behind the Scene’ is an example of this device. Finally, a pluralist device is integrative and is found within permanent displays. Pluralist devices ‘suggest both similarities and (positive) differences between groups’, in order to challenge structures of inequality and power. The inclusion of LGBTQ histories in the Museum of London’s ‘World City’ permanent exhibition is an example of the pluralist technique. Exhibitions and interventions such as ‘Queering the Museum’ (BMAG), ‘Desire and Diversity’ (British Museum) and ‘Object Stories’ (Brighton Museum) present another kind of spatial device. They represent an interspersed approach, whereby the histories of same-sex love are found throughout and across museum spaces.

While the staging of separate exhibitions on histories of same-sex love is one way to represent histories of LGBTQ communities to the public, the queering of museum space in the way that ‘Queering the Museum’, ‘Desire and Diversity’ and ‘Object Stories’ have done, is integral to its future development. They disrupt the ‘unified narrative’ of same-sex love, so labelled by Robert Mills, who called for museums to ‘queer the styles of
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presentations themselves’. 257 To queer the museum scene and museum space is to do far more than stage a localised exhibition or to add an object. To queer the museum, as Amy K Levin has argued, ‘leads us to question every aspect of the institution’. Museums should, she says, consider how they can permanently ‘queer’ their collections by integrating the histories of same-sex love across the museum, as well by staging specific LGBTQ exhibitions. 258

**People**

There are many questions raised about ‘people’ in representations of same-sex love, ranging from whose voice is heard to who visits and hears those voices. This history of same-sex love is after all, a history of people, of their marginalisation and of their love lives. One of the major themes of relevant academic literature concerns ‘people’: members of the public and their contributions to museum collections and exhibitions. Most notably, Michael Frisch has drawn on methods used in collecting oral histories to discuss how public historians can share authority. 259 Questions continue to be raised about how authority can be shared between academic experts (scholarly authority), and the public (authority of experience and culture). How are ‘people’ involved in the process of representing histories of same-sex love? What role do LGBTQ communities play not only in preserving their histories, by providing their stories, their objects, to museums, but also in co-curating and providing a voice of authority? How can a museum become
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259 Frisch, A Shared Authority, passim. See also Duclos-Orsello, ‘Shared Authority’, passim.
what Nina Simon has termed a ‘participatory museum’ and in turn, ‘open up new ways for diverse people to express themselves’ and engage with museums? Questions about ‘shared authority’ have since moved from academic discussions to the heart of exhibitions on community histories and histories of same-sex love.

One example of ‘shared authority’ in practice is the People’s History Museum (PHM) project ‘Play Your Part’ (Manchester, 2013-2014). The project connected the museum to contemporary issues that were relevant to its local community, and provided an opportunity for the museum to listen to visitors and collect their objects and histories. The PHM has highlighted that one of the specific aims of ‘Play Your Part’ was to ‘engage our audience in co-curation, responding to our collections, creating their own content and sharing and debating ideas with each other.’ Co-curation is effectively sharing authority: the professional curators of the museum and the members of the public create an end-product, an exhibition, together. For ‘Play Your Part’, local LGBTQ groups were invited to contribute their histories and objects to the pop-up exhibition ‘Pride in Progress?’ and to help shape the exhibition itself. Contributors donated objects, stories and took part in workshops provided by the PHM to discuss what the exhibition should contain and what histories it should tell. This represents an ideal model for ‘sharing authority’ that takes on board the ideas and opinions as well as the histories and objects of collaborators and communities. In practice, however, it is not always possible for museums to practice ‘shared authority’ in this way, due to factors such as location, access, funding and staffing that are required to conduct such workshops and projects.

260 Simon, The Participatory Museum, p. 3.
Nevertheless, ‘Play Your Part’ remains an example of ‘shared authority’ for museums to aspire to.

There are also ways that visitors can participate with and contribute to exhibitions once they have opened. For example, at the Wellcome Collection’s ‘Institute of Sexology’ (2015), all visitors were asked to contribute to the exhibition in an installation called ‘WOULD YOU MIND?’ The ‘Institute of Sexology’ traced the origins of the scientific study of sex from the late nineteenth century to the present day, finishing with a display that announced, ‘And to end with...a few thoughts about sex these days’, and asking the visitor, ‘would you mind contributing a few of your own?’ The ‘WOULD YOU MIND?’ installation, by artist Neil Bartlett, also showed statistics and answers that other visitors had provided, noting, for example, that over the past seven days, 17 female visitors to the exhibition had ‘identified themselves as homosexual’, while 23 male visitors reported that their sex life was making them unhappy. Questionnaires were left on a large table so that visitors could sit down and answer ‘24 penetrating questions’ about sex and sexuality, and in turn contribute to the statistics used to update the installation weekly.

The questionnaire, and its impact on the exhibition, is a significant example of meaningful shared authority, an example of Nina Simon’s ‘participatory museum’, whereby museums find a way to convert the contributions of the visitor to action. Not only could visitors contribute to the final installation in the exhibition, but their

262 Wellcome Collection, ‘Institute of Sexology’ exhibition, as seen on visit 06 June 2015.
263 Sarah Jaffray, ‘WOULD YOU MIND?’, on Wellcome Collection, 03 June 2015, <http://blog.wellcomecollection.org/2015/06/03/would-you-mind/> [accessed 03 August 2015].
questionnaires were archived in the Wellcome Library, for the use of future researchers. Moreover, the questionnaire itself changed over the course of the exhibition, and each week it was updated to incorporate a new question, one asked by another visitor. The final question on the form asked them, ‘If you could ask the other people coming to this exhibition just one question of your own about sex, what would that question be?’ The questionnaire explained that eventually, all of the questions asked would be ones suggested by members of the public. As such, visitors shaped this installation from the beginning. They fully participated, contributed and determined the outcome of this part of the exhibition. They participated and shared authority in a meaningful way that not only impacted on the exhibition, but will also form the basis for future research. These examples at the PHM and the Wellcome Collection show how museums can successfully and meaningfully develop a participatory model, through which visitors can actively engage in developing exhibitions.

Another way that museums can both encourage and present ‘shared authority’ is through the collection and display of oral histories. Recorded interviews are one way to ensure that a range of voices are heard in exhibitions, and that the history of same-sex love is not limited to famous historical LGBTQ figures, as discussed previously. Although there are limitations to the use of oral histories because they represent individual memory rather than historical ‘fact’, and they are not wholly democratic because they...

265 The Wellcome Collection, ‘Excuse me, would you mind if I asked you a few personal questions about sex?’ exhibition questionnaire, as seen on visit 06 June 2015, (p. 8).

remain under the control of the curator, they remain a useful way to bring a range of voices to museum displays and collections.267

Oral history recordings are also often accompanied by relevant objects donated by the interviewee. For example, at the Merseyside Maritime Museum, oral histories and accompanying photographs provided by interviewees were collected as part of the ‘Sailing Proud’ project. These oral histories and related objects were displayed in the exhibition ‘Hello Sailor!’ (2006).268 Questionnaire responses also highlighted the use of oral histories in exhibitions at MOSI, the Museum of Liverpool, The Cardiff Story Museum and the Herbert Art Gallery and Museum, among others.

As previously mentioned, the Museum of London’s ‘London Liberationists’ display includes oral histories of prominent London activists. These visual and audio recordings of people’s voices bring not only their histories to an audience, but also their opinions, their reflections on their own histories and those of LGBTQ communities. However, oral history testimonies do not just preserve and promote voices that are well-known in LGBTQ history and activism, such as Tatchell and Sanders, they also preserve the voices of other,


unknown voices, people who play different roles in LGBTQ communities. The recording of oral histories is an example of ‘history from below’ that aims to make the voices of ordinary people heard. ‘Rainbow City’ serves as a significant example of shared authority and the importance of the public in co-curation. ‘Rainbow City’ came about after an Edinburgh resident wrote to the City of Edinburgh Council to explain that on visiting The People’s Story Museum, their own history and histories of LGBTQ communities had not been represented. The ‘people’s story’ was not their story. As a result the Council, with members of Edinburgh’s LGBTQ communities, museum staff and the Living Memory Association, addressed the issue with a full-scale collection of Edinburgh’s LGBTQ history that also became part of the permanent collection. The working group was keen to avoid only adding oral history testimonies to the existing collection and exhibition, perceiving this as a ‘token’ move. The Remember When project began to collect oral history testimonies from local LGBTQ communities, which have since been added to The People’s Story collection. Oral histories, ‘people’s stories’, were at the heart of the exhibition: the themes for the exhibition, and this chapter, were drawn from the content of these interviews.

People who are included in representations of same-sex love through oral histories and contemporary collecting are just one way that ‘people’ are central to ideas about its representation. The other key way that ‘people’ challenge representations of same-sex love is as visitors. When asked about the difficulty of representing histories of same-sex love in their museums, many respondents to the survey conducted for this

---

270 Ibid., p. 8.
thesis highlighted their visitors as a barrier to approaching the subject. Such responses emphasised that there is not just one visiting public, but *publics*, whose responses to exhibitions depend on a range of cultural, social and economic factors, among others.

In particular, some respondents highlighted the tension between the supposed ‘adult’ nature of exhibitions and the family audiences they aim to attract. Questions were raised about the appropriateness of exhibiting histories of same-sex love to a ‘family’ audience, and whether it was a suitable topic for children to encounter. A respondent argued that they ‘generally attract a very young audience and find it difficult to do displays about anything complex or adult.’\(^{271}\) Another argued that it ‘is not thought to be appropriate for children,’ while another respondent suggested that difficulty arose from either creating an exhibition that is suitable for all ages, or restricting access to exhibitions on adult topics to those of a certain age.\(^{272}\) One respondent responsible for a cluster of museums highlighted that their museums have different audiences and as such the difficulty of representing sexuality varied between them. The anonymous respondent answered that one of their museums is aimed towards a family audience, whereas another is more adult. As such, they argued, topics are treated differently depending on the intended audience.\(^{273}\) These concerns are not raised in relation to heterosexual histories of love, romance and indeed sex, in the same way. Instead, LGBTQ histories ‘continue to be perceived as pornographic or otherwise inappropriate’ and unlike heterosexual histories, which Amy K Levin has described as ‘ubiquitous in museum

\(^{271}\) Questionnaire ID.42, Hartlepool Museum.

\(^{272}\) Questionnaire ID.23, Borough Museum and Art Gallery and Questionnaire ID.5, Canterbury Museums and Galleries.

\(^{273}\) Questionnaire ID.46, Anonymous.
settings’, are often censored and displayed out of the reach of children.\textsuperscript{274}

Concerns about the ‘appropriateness’ of exhibitions are not only held by those who curate or run museums, but are also raised by visitors to museums. A visitor to ‘Pride and Prejudice’ (1999) argued that the Museum of London was ‘a wonderful museum spoilt by being greeted at the entrance by a display of homosexuals.’ They added that it was inappropriate for them and their children to have seen and that if it was ‘absolutely necessary’ for the museum to display such material, it should be ‘placed in some out of the way area where only those interested in such things would see it.’\textsuperscript{275} It is worth noting that this exhibition, the first in the UK to deal specifically with the history of same-sex love, was located at the front of the museum so all visitors to the museum had to pass it, whether they engaged with it or not. While the majority of visitors who left comments responded positively, it was nevertheless a bold move from the Museum of London. Such concerns about the appropriateness of displaying the history of same-sex love were not confined to the 1990s. A visitor to MOSI’s ‘Behind the Scene’, held between 2012 and 2013, asked ‘Is LGBT exhibition suitable for all ages? Families?’ They also added, ‘Innocence of a child needs to be reserved. Surely more suitable for older children.’\textsuperscript{276} So how can museums exhibit histories of same-sex love and represent LGBTQ communities while aiming to attract a ‘family audience’? While the history of same-sex love does involve adult subjects of sexuality and sex, it is also about culture and communities. The history of same-sex love is about far more than sex, so how can museums relate this to

\textsuperscript{274} Levin, ‘Unpacking Gender’, p. 158.

\textsuperscript{275} Comment 6 – signed, Museum of London, Business Archive, Social History Exhibitions Records Box: 3.23, (1999).

\textsuperscript{276} MOSI, Evaluation Report, p. 9.
diverse, especially family, audiences?

Despite the comment left by one visitor at MOSI, ‘Behind the Scene’ was directly inclusive of families and children, LGBTQ and otherwise, with an installation designed specifically for younger visitors. The exhibition included a doll’s house, which had a number of different dolls of different ‘sexes’ so that children could understand that not all families look alike, and that home could have two parents of the same-sex. MOSI also provided space for parents to sit down and read stories to their children about LGBTQ families, with a box of LGBTQ children’s books located next to the doll’s house. This family-friendly installation was not about the history of same-sex love per se, but it stood as a positive example of how museums can cater for families in LGBTQ exhibitions.

It is important to note that this installation was not just for children of differently sexed or gendered parents, but also for LGBTQ parents. Concerns about the innocence of children in relation to them seeing representations of same-sex love do not often take into account the children of LGBTQ parents, or children that may feel LGBTQ themselves. MOSI ensured that these groups and individuals were included in the exhibition too, as both subjects and as contributors. In the development of the exhibition, MOSI worked alongside a number of local community groups, including ‘Proud 2 Be Parents’, a group for LGBTQ parents and their children. Artwork created by group members and their children was also on display in ‘Behind the Scene’, and there was also a separate family-orientated launch of the exhibition. The evaluation report of ‘Behind the Scene’ highlighted that it had successfully appealed to MOSI’s prime audience: families. It acknowledged that not all families look alike, and many families are LGBTQ. The

\[277\] Ibid., p. 8.
importance of this approach was reflected in one visitor’s comment that, ‘as a lesbian with a family it’s so important to see our culture reflected around us.’ MOSI’s decision to ensure the inclusion of LGBTQ families and young people is a mark of change in representations of same-sex love in museums, and serves as a bold model for other museums to learn from.

The Schwules Museum* has also directly approached the subject of family-inclusive LGBTQ representations. In September 2014, they opened an exhibition aimed at families, children and young visitors. ‘The Magical World of the Moomins - a Troll Adventure at the Schwules Museum*’ was the first time that the museum had directly aimed an exhibition at a young audience. The exhibition celebrated the work of Tove Jansson, the Finnish-Swedish lesbian author of the ‘Moomin’ books, and also appealed to the childhood memories of adults, encouraging them to ‘meet some old friends from Moominvalley.’ The exhibition was participatory and visitors were asked to create artworks of their own Moomins, ensuring that families could experience the exhibition and contribute together. It is also worth noting that the museum gave free admission to children under 16 years old. ‘The Magical World of the Moomins’, as well as ‘Behind the Scenes’, shows that museums can represent histories of same-sex love not just in a way that is appropriate for children, but that is specifically for children and families, LGBTQ or otherwise.

278 Ibid., p. 8.
The culture of museums has a significant impact on their approaches to representing histories of same-sex love and other marginalised communities. There are distinct museum cultures in the UK and in the US, which each promote different methods of diversity and inclusion. This final section discusses the museum cultures of the UK and the US, and shows ways that these cultures are changing and influencing one another. The different political and social cultures of the UK and the US have dictated different approaches to museum methodology, which in turn has impacted on their representations of same-sex love. Andrea Witcomb has argued that museum approaches are dependent on national cultures and ‘ways of expressing identity’. Comparing the US and Australia, Witcomb explained that the US is ‘much stronger on identity politics’ than Australia, which has in turn meant that US public history prioritises ‘the giving of voice’ to marginalised identities through specialist museums. In Australia, she argued, individual and group identities are ‘embedded within the story about the nation’. Indeed, in 1994, Museums Australia produced a Gay and Lesbian Policy Guideline, which provided advice for museums on the best way to integrate LGBTQ histories into their collections and displays. Although there is no such policy in the UK, the emphasis here is also on integration, rather than segregation, of marginalised histories. The following section analyses how these two approaches have impacted on representations of same-sex love

---
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and argues that a combined approach that both emphasises marginalised voices in their own spaces and integrates them alongside national, and indeed local, histories, should be considered by museums as a way to better represent histories of same-sex love.

The majority of exhibitions on histories of same-sex love in the UK take place as temporary exhibitions, often for LGBT History Month. LGBT History Month, which has been held every February since 2005, has encouraged museums to represent the histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities, at least for one month a year. Events held during February aim to claim the LGBTQ past, celebrate its present and create its future. 2015 also saw the inaugural LGBT National History Festival, which is run by LGBT History Month, and aims to celebrate LGBTQ history in all its forms. Although LGBT History Month has been successful in promoting the importance of LGBTQ histories in the public history sector, its impact on events outside of February remains limited. This remains true of other ‘history months’, such as Black History Month, which is celebrated in October, and Women’s History Month, which is celebrated in March. Topics and histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities should ideally be visible in museums all year round, not just in February. Some respondents to the survey conducted for this thesis also raised concerns about the focus on LGBT History Month rather than integrating histories of same-sex love into permanent exhibitions. For example, one respondent argued that it is ‘important that diversity (racial, ethnic, sexual orientation) is included and celebrated. It’s even more important that its integrated not just 'exhibited' for one year a month.’

Another respondent added that, ‘it is important to represent same-sex sexuality within museums and exhibitions, but not necessarily in isolation as this can in some cases be

282 Questionnaire ID.39, Anonymous.
counter-productive by re-affirming difference rather than looking at the similarities we all share as people.\textsuperscript{283} Thus, while LGBT History Month does encourage museums to represent histories of same-sex love with temporary exhibitions and events, museums should also strive to represent these histories throughout the year.

Some museums have done just this, and integrated histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities into their permanent exhibitions. For example, the history of same-sex love is included in the Museum of London’s ‘World City’ display, and in the People’s History Museum’s permanent exhibition in a display on ‘Equality and Equal Rights’. These exhibitions appear in ‘mainstream’ museums: museums that focus on a range of histories, not just LGBTQ histories. There are very few specialist identity museums in the UK, with Jewish museums in London and Manchester, and Romany History museums in Kent and Lincolnshire. The Glasgow Women’s Library has also been recognised as an accredited museum since 2010. There have been attempts to open another women’s history museum over the past few years, most recently in reaction to a Jack the Ripper Museum that opened in August 2015 and which had initially been planned as a museum of the Women of the East End of London. In the backlash against the new museum, which profiles the anonymous male murderer of working-class East End women rather than the histories and achievements of women, East End Women’s Museum was set up to make England’s first women’s history museum a reality.\textsuperscript{284}

There was also a significant attempt to open a museum of LGBTQ history in

\textsuperscript{283} Questionnaire ID.7, Leeds Museum and Galleries.

\textsuperscript{284} See East End Women’s Museum, Home (2015), 
\texttt{<http://eastendwomensmuseum.weebly.com/>} [accessed 13 August 2015].
London between 2005 and 2009. The founding company of the museum, Proud Heritage, collected information from museums and archives across the UK about objects and records they had relating to LGBTQ history. In 2008, Proud Heritage launched an online museum, and intended to create a travelling exhibition, and eventually, a permanent national LGBTQ museum in London. However, the project has faded into obscurity; the website and virtual museum is no longer available and the vision for a physical museum was never realised.285

In the US, on the other hand, there is a greater focus on specialist museums that represent community histories as compared to the UK. There are specialist museums for African-American history, disability history, women’s history, Jewish history, American-Indian history, Italian-American history, Latino history, Pacific Asian history and LGBTQ history.

The specialist museum that represents LGBTQ histories in the US is the GLBT Museum, located in San Francisco. The GLBT Museum opened in 2011, becoming the second museum in the world dedicated to the history of same-sex love, after the Schwules Museum*. The GLBT Museum is sponsored by the GLBT Historical Society, which was founded in 1985. The Society aims to collect, preserve and promote the local history of San Francisco, and has an accessible archive of documents and ephemera. The main gallery in the GLBT Museum currently displays ‘Queer Past Becomes Present’, which opened in May 2014. There is also space for two other exhibitions in the museum, in the Front Gallery and the Community Gallery (where the exhibition on the local, social and political history of bisexuality, ‘BiConic Flashpoints’ was hosted). The content and themes of the displays aim to represent various histories, including those of women, people of colour and trans* people, all of which are often excluded from mainstream and community based histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities.

The Schwules Museum* pre-dates the GLBT Museum as the first LGBTQ-specific museum in the world. The Schwules Museum* opened in Berlin in 1986, but had originated from an exhibition held at the Berlin Museum (now the Märkisches Museum) in 1984. Michael Fürst of the Schwules Museum* noted that before the 1984 exhibition (‘Eldorado – the History, Everyday Life and Culture of Homosexual Women and Men 1850-1950’), histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities were (and to an extent
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remain) a ‘blind spot’ in Berlin museums. The Schwules Museum* has taken significant steps to correct this ‘blind spot’. Exhibition topics there have ranged from queer erotica and art, to the life stories of the composer Albert Becker (‘Life Stories 1 – Albert Becker’, 1994), and actresses Greta Garbo (‘The Divine One – homage to Greta Garbo on the occasion of her 100th Birthday’, 2005) and Marlene Dietrich (‘Marlene and the Third Sex: Homage on Marlene Dietrich’s 100th Birthday’, 2001-2002), and to the Jewish LGBT experience (‘lesbian. jewish. gay.’, 2013). The Schwules Museum* regularly hosts exhibitions reflecting on their own increasingly diverse collections, with for example, ‘Biographies of women and Berlin lesbian scene in the permanent exhibition: Schwules Museum becomes more and more lesbian’ (2009), which aimed to ‘give further evidence of the gradual remodelling of the permanent exhibition’ to be more inclusive of all members of LGBTQ communities. As mentioned previously, the Schwules Museum* has also recently appealed directly to families and young visitors as their audience with ‘The Magical World of the Moomins’.

While the Schwules Museum* and the GLBT Museum go some way ensuring representation of histories of same-sex love in public history institutions, they also raise questions about the usefulness of specialist LGBTQ museums and whether having such an
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institution further marginalises, or ‘ghettoizes’ the history of same-sex love. On the one hand, LGBTQ museums can present a range of subjects and emphasise complex and multi-layered histories for which there is often no room in permanent or temporary displays in mainstream exhibitions. They can ensure that a range of LGBTQ voices are heard. These can be historical voices or the voices of LGBTQ communities today. On the other hand, LGBTQ museums place the history of same-sex love in a vacuum, outside of mainstream museums, which tend to have a greater (and more diverse) footfall. A specialist LGBTQ history museum risks removing the histories of same-sex love from far wider historical context, and to an extent denies the impact that the histories of same-sex love have had on the rest of the social and political landscape and in turn, national histories.

The Schwules Museum* has taken steps to counteract some of these issues, by collaborating with a ‘mainstream’ museum. A joint exhibition between the Schwules Museum* and the Deutsches Historisches Museum (DHM) opened in June 2015. The exhibition, ‘Homosexuality_ies’, is on display in both museums, with the DHM hosting the historical developments of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities, and the Schwules Museum* hosting displays that explore the present and future of LGBTQ communities. An audio-guide has also been produced for the exhibition, which visitors are encouraged

290 For discussion on the ghettoisation of LGBTQ history, see Duggan, ‘History’s Gay Ghetto’.
to listen to as they travel between exhibition locations.\textsuperscript{292} Fürst has highlighted that for the Schwules Museum* itself, the collaborative exhibition is a sign of their professionalisation.\textsuperscript{293} Collaboration with the DHM is also a huge political step, but most importantly it will bring the history of same-sex love to a much wider audience, thanks to a significant budget and the status of the DHM.

Similarly in the US, there have been recent changes to integrate histories of same-sex love in mainstream collections, indicating a small but significant shift in museum culture. In August 2014 the Smithsonian National Museum of American History (NMAH) announced that it had begun collecting items relating to LGBTQ histories. The NMAH had previously represented LGBTQ history with small-scale exhibitions to mark the 25th and 40th anniversaries of the Stonewall riots and the 30th anniversary of HIV/AIDS, but the 2014 collection marks the first significant move towards embedding histories of same-sex love in their permanent collection. NMAH held a donation day in which a number of objects relating to LGBTQ history were given to the museum. These objects included a number of props from the American television show \textit{Will & Grace}, which ran between 1998 and 2006. \textit{Will & Grace} has been credited with positively influencing television audiences about LGBTQ equality and life, with several principal characters being openly gay. Katherine Ott, curator at the NMAH, highlighted that ‘in recent American history, there have been some events that have helped move cultural change along more rapidly’.


\textsuperscript{293} Fürst, \textit{From Backyard to Front Building – the Schwules Museum* Between Political Project and Museum Institution}. 
and *Will & Grace* was one of these. As such, the television programme and related props hold a significant place in the history of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities in America. Alongside objects from *Will & Grace*, the NMAH also received donations of the trans* pride flag, Pride-related photography and the diplomatic passports of Ambassador David Huebner and his husband. Ott noted on the day of donations that the objects are all ‘unquestionably part of LGBTQ history as well as larger narratives about life in the United States.’ Embedding such objects and therefore history in this way ensures that the history of same-sex love becomes part of a national history as much as it is a community history.

By combining both approaches of maintaining specialist spaces and embedding marginalised histories in national histories, the public history of same-sex love can become ‘better’ history that is contextualised within national, local and political histories and becomes more accessible to a wider audience. Individual and previously silenced voices can be heard, but not in a way that makes them suffer from ‘intense ghettoization’. Kylie Message has recently highlighted that in the 1960s and 1970s, a similar dialogue emerged from the African-American community, who were campaigning for better representation in US history museums. Message notes that many of the activists believed that there should be both a separate specialist museum on African-American history and a national museum that integrates their history with that of all Americans. This approach allows for both the recognition of unique cultural experiences and the understanding of the ways in which these experiences intersect with the broader national narrative.

---


American history, and also that the Smithsonian should ‘improve its representation of the
collection of African Americans to US History.’ By taking this approach to the history of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities too, public history institutions would be able to represent a history that is otherwise marginalised in its own space, and ensure that it becomes part of a national past, a collective narrative. As cultures have changed to become more inclusive of diverse sexualities and gender identities, so too should museums, whether specialist or ‘mainstream’.

**Conclusion**

Museums are, on the whole, no longer ‘corridors of fear’, places in which the history of same-sex love is ignored, invisible and irrelevant. In contrast to the studies carried out by Bourn in 1994 and Vanegas in 2002, the histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities are far better, and more frequently, represented by museums. The examples discussed highlight some of the innovative ways that museums have challenged the invisibility of LGBTQ histories in their collections, temporary exhibitions and permanent displays. While these changes are positive, and mark a turn towards museums as places where ideas of social justice can be meaningfully promoted, there remains work to be done.

This chapter has highlighted some of the ways that some museums have included histories of same-sex love, but there are many more museums that have not, or have no intention of, redressing the lack of diversity in their collections. It is worth returning to the responses to the survey conducted for this thesis, in which 79 of 97 of respondents

---

(81 per cent) said they had not held an exhibition on the history of same-sex love. Until more museums take responsibility for representing the history of same-sex love, it will remain marginalised, and considered a difficult subject that is irrelevant to many museums and their visitors.

There also remain significant limitations and barriers in those museums that have addressed and represented histories of same-sex love. This chapter has shown that particular issues are: a lack of intersectionality; concerns about the ‘appropriateness’ of same-sex love as a museum topic; and the ghettoisation of the subject with short-term temporary exhibitions, often for LGBT History Month.

Looking to the future of more inclusive museums, some of the examples discussed have shown that listening to others is essential to improving representations of same-sex love. For example, the Museum of London and MOSI responded to criticism of their exhibitions for their lack of diversity by committing to speak to more diverse communities, and including their voices and histories in future exhibitions. Similarly, the sharing of authority through projects such as the Manchester PHM’s ‘Play Your Part’ show how listening to community members can directly impact and shape exhibitions and in the longer term, permanent collections. Sharing and having conversations between museums and publics and between different institutions have the potential for a significant impact on the representation of same-sex love in public history. For example, ‘Homosexuality_ies’, the exhibition coordinated and hosted between the DHM and the Schwules Museum* shows how institutional collaboration can result in innovative representations of same-sex love.
Despite the barriers of funding and resources, and regardless of the potential problems encountered in sharing authority and enacting ideas of social justice, the examples discussed have shown that positive change can be achieved by seeking out and listening to diverse communities, and by museums openly discussing their representations of same-sex love with visitors and colleagues across the sector. By doing so, museums can ensure that histories of same-sex love become a visible part of the museum sector, and that the histories and voices of LGBTQ communities are incorporated and accessible to LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ visitors alike.
Chapter Three
Echoes of the Past in Historic Houses

At the newly acquired Stacpole House, the National Trust welcomes its first visitors. They ‘blunder around, half of them with headphones on, others watching a screen.’\(^{298}\) The screen displays a pornographic film, with the action taking place on a stately four-poster bed in that very room. The screening of this is explained by Dorothy Stacpoole, the live-in owner of the house as ‘the future...it’s what they call interactive. It’s fun.’\(^{299}\) This vision of the fictional Stacpole House, depicted in Alan Bennett’s 2012 play *People*, critiques and satirises the Trust. The character Ralph Lumsden, who represents the Trust, explains ‘ultimately, you see, there is nothing that cannot be said, nowhere that is not visitable.’ In this vision of the Trust, no history is untellable.\(^{300}\)

Moving from the fictional historic house to the real historic house, the screening of pornographic films in the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum (JAHHM) in Chicago, US had a different aim and audience to that at the opening of Stacpole House. At JAHHM, ‘LGBTQ advocates, students, sex workers, feminists, transgender and kinky folks, and other curious attendees’ have joined together for the annual Sex Positive Documentary Film Series (SEX++) since 2009.\(^{301}\)

---

\(^{298}\) Alan Bennett, *People* (London: Faber and Faber, 2012), p. 73. The play was first performed at the National Theatre in 2012.

\(^{299}\) Ibid., p. 74.

\(^{300}\) Ibid., p. 73.

\(^{301}\) Lisa Junkin, ‘Sex in the Museum – Building Relationships and Pushing Boundaries’, *Museum iD* (2015), <http://www.museum-id.com/idea-detail.asp?id=328> [accessed 03 August 2015]. The JAHHM has also hosted events that focus on immigration, labour history, women’s history and
Some of the films were pornographic, others were graphic, and all were sex positive. While Bennett's Stacpole House uses pornography to draw in visitors, the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum presented SEX+++ to utilise the history of the house 'as a counterpoint and opportunity for dialogue', and strives to be 'radically inclusive, incorporating pro-sex, pro-queer, and pro-kink films and highlighting communities that are often marginalized.'

Bennett's vision of the historic house as a place to screen pornographic films was, it turns out, not quite as radical or as unlikely as he believed.

Bennett explained that in creating Stacpole House, he had 'imagined the Trust as entirely without inhibition, ready to exploit any aspect of the property's recent history to draw the public, wholly unembarrassed by the seedy or the disreputable.' He was also surprised to find that he was one step behind the Trust itself, who had recently sponsored and produced a tour of Soho, 'the highlights of which are not architectural', but rather focus on the social histories of the area. Bennett was referring to the National Trust's 'Soho Stories' app, which is discussed in Chapter Five. The Trust, in People, is not concerned with architecture and the histories of chairs and dressers that occupy stately homes, but is 'concerned with people... [and]...access, in a word, sharing.' How much is this true of the less fictional National Trust? How much of Bennett's vision of National Trust historic houses, and indeed other historic houses, as places where there is no other often marginalised histories. It has also drawn attention to the potential same-sex relationship between Jane Addams and Mary Rozet Smith, which is discussed later in this chapter.
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history that cannot be told, is true? Short of screening pornographic films, how do historic houses in the UK tell their histories of sex and love? The image of the National Trust that Bennett paints is not so far from reality; although it has not presented a sex positive film series like the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum, the Trust-run Sutton House in Hackney, London, has (with the club night Amy Grimehouse) presented screenings of the films *Rocky Horror Picture Show* and *Paris is Burning*, both of which are emphatically queer, with themes of sexuality, same-sex love and LGBTQ culture as their focus.

This chapter examines how historic houses, including some of those run by the National Trust, tell their histories of same-sex love and make them accessible to visitors. To do so, this chapter is split into two sections; the first of which discusses how histories of same-sex love are represented; and the second of which analyses which histories of same-sex love are told.

The first section shows that historic houses can use a range of interpretation methods to bring these histories to visitors, and discusses the successes and failures of these methods. Historic houses need alternative means of telling narratives and displaying interpretation in a way that museums, for example, do not rely so heavily upon. Historic houses, on the whole, tend to have minimal interpretive information on display, so as to preserve the objects, structure and domestic atmosphere of the house.

---

With little interpretation available to the visitor, they rely instead upon audio-guides, guidebooks and tour guides among other methods to impart knowledge and historical context and create a forum for discussion. It is through these methods that visitors can understand and connect with the past. This section analyses five particular ways that historic houses tell their histories to their visitors: through room guides, audio guides, guidebooks, exhibitions and special events. This is not an exhaustive range of interpretive methodologies used in historic houses, but intends to give a broad overview of the ways that visitors can engage with historic houses and the histories they represent.

The second half of this chapter discusses which histories of same-sex love historic houses represent. It analyses how historic houses, as previous homes, have challenged or affirmed understandings of ‘family’ and relationships as taking place within the confines of heterosexual marriage. It argues that historic houses are well placed to subvert ideas of conventional domesticity by making different histories of family, intimacy and relationships visible. This section also shows that there is a distinct lack of context in relation to male same-sex love that does not explain the cultural, social and legal situations in which love and sex between men has historically taken place. Furthermore, it argues that while female same-sex love is often contextualised and framed as taking place within intimate and loving relationships, male same-sex love is characterised as same-sex sex that has taken place in isolation from tenderness, as well as other same-sex relationships.

Overall, this chapter shows that some historic houses are moving towards a representation of more diverse histories. More importantly, the examples used show that these diverse histories can be represented in diverse ways, which are moving away from
the traditional show-and-tell nature of historic houses where the visitor is a passive learner. Instead, visitors can engage with, ask questions, answer questions and develop their understanding of relevant histories of same-sex love, and potentially, the historical context in which they took place.

**Revealing and Hiding Histories through Interpretation**

How can historic houses reveal and tell histories of same-sex love when they are so restricted by space for interpretation? Despite a lack of space, historic houses have a number of methods of representing narratives to their visitors, which all serve different roles in bringing histories to the attention and understanding of visitors, yet they can also reveal a lack of cohesion in the narratives presented. This section examines a range of ways through which visitors can encounter histories of same-sex love in historic houses, and discusses the ways in which these interpretative methods can either complement or contradict each other. It analyses how these various methods have been used to bring histories of same-sex love to the attention of visitors, or by contrast, render them invisible.

Barbara Abramoff Levy has identified five different types of historic house tours; interpreter or guide led, self-guided, audio recorded, immersive first person (with actors portraying historical characters) and technology (video or virtual) based.\(^\text{307}\) Each method has its own strengths and weaknesses, and many of them are used in conjunction with each other. This following section discusses three of these methods in particular; guide-

---

led tours, self-guided tours and recorded tours in the form of audio guides.

Although there are other forms of interpretation in historic houses, guides often serve as the primary way through which visitors gain an understanding of the house, its contents and its past inhabitants. In some cases, such as at Powderham Castle in Devon (the previous home of William ‘Kitty’ Courtenay, later the Earl of Devon and alleged lover of novelist and art collector William Beckford), guides provide the only form of interpretation. Levy identified the tight control of what the visitors encounter as both the strength and the weakness of guide-led tours. On the one hand, the historic house and guide can control the content of the tour and as such, all visitors receive the same information; they are ‘exposed to the same basic ideas.’ On the other hand, because the content and direction of the tour is so tightly controlled, visitors cannot interject or influence the content of the tour and the history that is being represented. They are ‘captive, required to follow the interpreter through the rooms listening dutifully to the spiel.’ This is a particularly significant issue for historic houses that have the potential to represent histories of same-sex love; visitors may not be offered the opportunity, or the space in which they feel comfortable, to ask questions about the sexuality or relationships of past inhabitants and historical figures.

Moreover, guide-led tours rely on the knowledge of the guide and their willingness to discuss the personal lives of past inhabitants. If a guide is not comfortable discussing sexuality or perceives it to be inappropriate for the group they are guiding, visitors may not encounter any representation of same-sex love. By contrast, if a guide is

---
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open to discussing the relevant history of same-sex love and its historical context, visitors can come away from the experience with a greater understanding of the lives of the past inhabitants. The power of the guide became apparent on a visit to Powderham Castle in 2013. Powderham Castle, which is still inhabited and run by the Courtenay family, was the site where William Beckford and William ‘Kitty’ Courtenay were allegedly caught in a sexual act together in 1784. The affair between Beckford and Courtenay, who were distant cousins, has been described as ‘one of the most notorious scandals of the time’, and resulted in Beckford’s exile from the UK. Courtenay also went into exile later in his life as a result of the exposure of his sexuality.

The guide included this narrative as part of the description of Courtenay, who had inherited and lived in the castle in the late eighteenth century, and provided visitors with opportunities to ask questions about Courtenay’s life and the historical context in which his same-sex relationships took place. However, the context of the tour and those who took part in it raised some questions about the way in which histories of sexualities are shared in such tours. The small group of people that the guide led around during this tour were all adults, apart from a very young baby. The guide discussed the nature of Courtenay’s relationship with Beckford and his sexuality, explaining that at his twenty-first birthday party, Courtenay was ‘far more fond of the music than the ladies. Much more like Elton John if you catch my drift’. The guide also discussed Courtenay’s eventual exile as a result of his sexuality and the context in which this occurred.

---
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details of this are discussed in the following section of this chapter, but it is necessary to question here whether the guide would have so openly discussed Courtenay’s sexuality with a different group. If there were children or teenagers present, would the guide have felt as comfortable describing Courtenay as ‘like Elton John’? Moreover, it is worth highlighting the assumption that the guide made about visitors, who might understand the link between Courtenay and Elton John as their sexuality. On such guide-led tours, therefore, it is not only the guide who might influence the histories told, but also the visitors taking part in the tour.

Guides can also influence the information that visitors have access to in self-led tours, where visitors make their own way around the house but are greeted by guides in each room. Such self-guided tours are also commonly supplemented by guidebooks and interpretation panels, which are discussed in detail shortly. The benefit of self-guided tours is that visitors retain control over the experience, to an extent. They can shape the tour to meet their own needs and interests; such tours ‘naturally [give] visitors control over the experience.’\(^{312}\) However, this control, or freedom, is limited. It is limited by space; there are often roped off rooms they cannot enter; and it is limited by the other forms of interpretation needed to gain contextual information.\(^{313}\) The following section focuses on the impact that room guides have on such self-guided tours, and shows they play a significant part in the way that histories of same-sex love are represented to visitors.

\(^{312}\) Levy, ‘Historic House Tours That Succeed’, p. 199.

\(^{313}\) Ibid.
Two contrasting experiences with guides at the historic houses Ickworth and Beckford’s Tower highlight two very different visitor experiences of guides and their roles in the representation of same-sex love. Ickworth was the ancestral home of Lord John Hervey, an eighteenth century courtier and politician who had sexual affairs with both men and women. The Hervey family home at Ickworth, which is in Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, passed to the National Trust in 1956. Beckford’s Tower, a getaway location for William Beckford, William ‘Kitty’ Courtney’s alleged lover, has been run by the Bath Preservation Trust since 1972. At Ickworth, the guide openly discussed Hervey’s sexuality and relationship with Stephen Fox, while at Beckford’s Tower the guide rejected the question of Beckford’s relationship with Courtenay and shut down the opportunity to discuss his sexuality.

Lord John Hervey rose to political and social power during the reign of George II and Queen Caroline and his memoirs of his time at court are considered some of the most important contemporary writings on the court and political life. Hervey is also remembered by history as what might now be labelled bisexual. He was married to Molly Lepel, with whom he had eight children, and he also had several affairs and long-term relationships with men and women at court, most notably with fellow politician Stephen Fox. Hervey was satirised by Alexander Pope as exceptionally effeminate and accused by William Pulteney of engaging in a ‘certain, unnatural, reigning Vice (indecent and almost too shocking to mention)’ – homosexuality.314

Visitors have several opportunities to encounter Hervey’s sexuality at Ickworth, one of which is in the Smoking Room, which houses the painting *The Hervey Conversation Piece* (1738-1740) by William Hogarth, in which he is depicted alongside Fox and their friends. Visitors can access limited facts about the portrait in a folder of information left nearby. The written information does not go into detail about the relationship between Hervey and Fox, but does note that seated at the table is Fox, ‘with whom John Lord Hervey had a long-term sexual relationship’.\(^{315}\) The guide present in the room on a visit in 2013, however, openly explained and discussed the relationship between Fox and Hervey in far more depth, and argued that Hogarth’s image of Hervey might be representative of his sexuality.\(^ {316}\) They suggested that Hervey’s position in the portrait, in which he stands with one foot on the grass and one foot on the pavement, might represent that he ‘swings both ways’, especially as Stephen Fox is also depicted in the image.\(^ {317}\) Regardless of whether this was indeed Hogarth’s intention, this encounter provides an example of how integral guides are to visitors’ understandings of the house and the people who lived there. Without the room guide, visitors would have no way of gaining further information about, and openly discussing, the ‘long-term sexual relationship’ Hervey had with Fox.

This open discussion of Hervey’s sexuality is in stark contrast to that encountered

\(^{315}\) National Trust, *Ickworth House Illustrated Picture Guide*, p. 29.


\(^{317}\) Visit to Ickworth House, June 2013.
at Beckford’s Tower, where the volunteer guide rejected any notion that its previous owner, William Beckford, had sexual relationships with men. Beckford’s Tower will be discussed in more detail shortly, but it is necessary to draw attention to the role of the guide in contrast to Ickworth. On a visit there in 2013 the room guide responded to a question about Beckford’s reputedly sexual relationship with William ‘Kitty’ Courtenay, which resulted in Beckford’s exile in 1785, by explaining that Courtenay ‘was his cousin’, and that Beckford was married and had children. These two contrasting encounters highlight the role that guides can play in representing histories of same-sex love to the public. The guide at Ickworth offered an opportunity for a conversation about Hervey’s sexuality, while the guide at Beckford’s Tower shut down any opportunity to do so. This is potentially a personal issue, whereby the guide did not feel comfortable discussing sexuality, let alone speculative sexuality. Nevertheless, it remains an issue for historic houses as public history as there is much reliance on guides to help visitors learn about the house and its past inhabitants.

Two other forms of guides are available at historic houses: audio guides and guidebooks. The former is less common in historic houses, largely because of the funding required to create them and keep them accessible to visitors. Larger institutions, such as Hampton Court Palace, have audio guides available to visitors in a range of languages, but on the whole they are not commonplace. There are, however, some examples of how audio guides have been used by historic houses to represent histories of same-sex love to visitors. One example, at Plas Newydd in Wales, highlights the benefit of using an audio guide to navigate the house and narratives. Another example at Charleston, in Lewes, 318 Visit to Beckford’s Tower, May 2013.
Sussex, illustrates how they can be used by virtual visitors to listen to away from the house itself.

The audio guide at Plas Newydd, home to Eleanor Butler and Sarah Ponsonby, the Ladies of Llangollen, complements both the guidebook and the exhibition, discussed in detail shortly, to represent and contextualise the relationship the Ladies shared.\(^{319}\) It tells visitors about the history and design of the house and provides more information on the Ladies and their life at Plas Newydd. It also incorporates readings of contemporary writing about and by the Ladies. For example, at various points throughout the tour listeners can hear excerpts from Butler’s diaries.

The audio guide also provides specific opportunities for visitors to better understand the nature of the Ladies’ relationship. The guide describes that many people visited the Ladies because they were interested in their relationship, explains they shared a ‘romantic friendship’, and adds that it is not known whether they had a sexual relationship. The visitor is invited to continue the tour or to select an additional chapter on ‘lesbianism’ to hear more about romantic friendship and contemporary perceptions of the Ladies’ relationship. The flexibility of audio guides to present different strands of histories was identified by Levy as a particular strength. Where available, it allows visitors to select a semi-personalised tour that suits their interests.\(^{320}\) However, it must be added that this is not necessarily a benefit; some visitors may not be interested in listening to a

\(^{319}\) Plas Newydd, Audio guide, visit July 2015.
Eleanor Butler and Sarah Ponsonby, known as the Ladies of Llangollen, shared their home at Plas Newydd from 1780-1829. Plas Newydd is now owned and run by Denbighshire County Council.

\(^{320}\) Levy, ‘Historic House Tours That Succeed’, p. 203.
discussion about the Ladies’ place in the history of same-sex love and lesbianism. The option to dismiss this chapter presents an opportunity for visitors to remain ignorant about the Ladies’ significance to the history of same-sex love and the context in which they shared their relationship.

The ‘Lesbianism’ chapter is particularly useful because it discusses their relationship, contemporary understandings of sexuality and relationships between women. Additionally, it includes an excerpt of a letter that Anne Lister, a contemporary of the Ladies who kept diaries that detailed her life and love affairs with women, sent to her partner Marianne Lawton after a visit to Plas Newydd. The audio guide is the only place that visitors have the opportunity to hear about Lister’s visit to Plas Newydd since it is not mentioned in either the guidebook or the exhibition, ‘A Most Extraordinary Affair’.

The exhibition and guidebook have limited space and as such, there is little room to include all of the diary extracts and letters that are read to the visitor in the audio guide. Ideally, the exhibition and guidebook would also reference Lister’s visit to the Ladies, but the audio guide serves an important role of including this history when there is no space to reference it elsewhere. Outside of the exhibition room, the audio guide also serves as the primary form of interpretation; it walks the visitor through the house in a curated way by telling them which route to take and what to look at. It is therefore similar to a guide-led tour, but there is no opportunity for the visitor to ask questions and engage in a conversation. The audio guide, much like exhibition panels and guidebooks, provides information rather than an opportunity for discussion. Levy argued that this is the
weakness of audio guides; they present little opportunity for interaction. At Plas Newydd however, there are staff and guides outside the house, which provides the chance to ask and answer questions. As such, the mixed interpretive methods at Plas Newydd are an example of how different approaches of interpretation can complement each other. Each format has its own benefit and audio guides in this example serve to provide further information that there is otherwise no room for.

Audio guides can also be used to engage visitors with the history of houses outside of the place itself. As such, they can serve the role of extending the range of visitors from those who can physically visit the house to those at a distance or who cannot visit. For example, podcasts have been produced for virtual or physical visitors to Charleston, the home of Vanessa Bell and Duncan Grant and spiritual home of the Bloomsbury Group. The Bloomsbury Group was a set of artists, writers and intellectuals who were influential in the early-mid twentieth century, many of whom had same-sex relationships. Other members of the group included Virginia Woolf (Bell’s sister), Lytton Strachey and EM Forster. The ‘Gay Visitors Podcast’ was created to explore Duncan Grant’s place in the history of same-sex love and the role that Charleston played as a site of pilgrimage for gay men in the 1960s and 1970s while Grant was still living there.

321 Ibid.
322 Charleston, which is located in Lewes, Sussex, has been open to the public since 1986 and is run by The Charleston Trust. The Trust was set up in 1980 to restore and open Charleston to the public. See Charleston, About the Trust (2016), <http://www.charleston.org.uk/about-the-trust/the-charleston-trust/> [accessed 09 March 2016].
The podcast, which can be downloaded from Charleston’s website, walks the visitor through Charleston’s rooms. It also includes recordings of Duncan Grant and Quentin Bell (Vanessa’s son), and Simon Watney and Mark Rowlands, both of whom visited Grant there during the 1960s and 1970s. It is introduced as the ‘Gay Visitors Podcast’ but it is not made clear whether it is a podcast about gay visitors, or for gay visitors. It is certainly both, but the emphasis in the podcast is on the gay history of Charleston, and gay visitors during Grant’s time there. For LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ visitors alike it provides an insight to the gay past of Charleston that makes up such a significant part of its history.

The emphasis on past gay visitors to Charleston is an example of the historic house as a potential site of pilgrimage. Such acts of pilgrimage can serve to consolidate both individual and group identity and pilgrimages to historic houses of ‘LGBTQ’ figures have been shown as a ‘search for sexual parallels within a less troubled past’.

During such pilgrimages visitors can connect with the queer ghosts of the house and in turn connect their contemporary sexual identity with a concrete historical past. Oram has shown that when visitors imagine or ‘meet’ historical figures, (via audio guides or even possibly as visible, talkative ghosts), ‘we might see them like ourselves, as forerunners of our sexual or political identities.’ Through these ghosts, or spectral traces, visitors can create a symbolic and spiritual connection to the past. Just as Watney and Rowlands made queer pilgrimages to Charleston during the 1960s and 1970s, visitors today can make their own

325 Ibid., p. 190.
queer pilgrimage, either in person with a visit to the house or virtually, using the podcast. Through both of these methods, visitors can encounter the echoes of the past. The spectral traces of previous queer visitors remain as much a part of Charleston as the chairs and paintings that decorate the rooms; there remain ‘indelible traces of those who lived and used original objects’.  

The introduction to the podcast explains that it intends to ‘evoke the atmosphere of life at Charleston in Duncan Grant’s last decades’, and although the sections it is divided into correspond to the usual route that visitors take through in the house, ‘it is not intended as an audio tour and does not focus on particular objects.’ This raises a pertinent question about what an audio guide is and how it differs from a podcast that visitors can listen to as they walk through the house, or sit in their own home. An audio guide, such as the one available at Plas Newydd, directly guides the visitors around the house, asks them to look at particular material objects and explains their history, design and use. The ‘Gay Visitors Podcast’ at Charleston does walk the visitor through the house, but is more concerned with stories about past inhabitants than material culture and design. Moreover, the intention of the podcast is to evoke the atmosphere of Charleston for non-visitors, meaning that an object-centred approach would potentially alienate the virtual visitor from the house and its history.

Examining the content of the podcast also reveals a tension between the role of the historic house as a site of domesticity, or ‘home’, and as a museum. Simon Watney and Mark Rowlands, who visited and stayed at Charleston when Duncan Grant still lived

---

326 Risnicoff de Gorgas, ‘Reality as illusion, the historic houses that become museums’, p. 14.
327 Charleston, ‘Gay Visitors Podcast’.
there, explained the strange feeling of walking around and seeing objects that they now
could not touch, chairs they could not sit down on, books they could not read. There are
now ‘things that you can and can’t do’, because it is not a home, but a house museum,
where objects are metaphorically roped off and conserved. It is a ‘completely Edenic,
completely cleaned up, perfect vision of Charleston’, rather than the untidy, lived in place
it once was. 328 The podcast, then, serves to bring a more ‘lived in version’ of the house to
virtual and physical visitors. It attempts to dissolve the barrier between the past and the
present, and shows Charleston as it was, rather than as it is now.

Another way in which the temporal and tangible distance between historic houses
as homes and as house museums is evident is in the use of exhibitions and interpretation
panels and leaflets. They highlight the historic house as what Foucault termed
‘heterotopias’; they are ‘counter-sites’ in which other sites, utopias, ‘are simultaneously
represented, contested and inverted’. 329 They are linked to ‘slices in time’, and like
museums, they are places ‘in which time never stops building up and topping its own
summit.’ 330 Historic houses constantly evolve, first as domestic settings throughout
history, and secondly throughout their time as house museums. Visible interpretation in
historic houses represents its state of transition from dwelling to museum, through
which, as Oram has argued, the historic house ‘becomes a particular type of heterotopia
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329 Michel Foucault, ‘Of Other Spaces’, translated by Miskowiec, Jay, Diacritics, 16:1 (1986), 22-27,
in which the slices of time and space are transformed into “history”.

The use of exhibitions draws attention to the emphasis of historic houses as separate from their previous roles as domestic settings. Exhibition space serves a crucial role in historic houses where there is minimal interpretation throughout the majority of the house. Such space can serve the role of highlighting biographical information, and thus histories of same-sex love, when they might not be evident elsewhere in the house. Some of these exhibitions are small scale, consisting of only a few panels, while others are large-scale exhibitions that aim to provide in-depth biographical details or a specific narrative relating to the house.

A particularly useful example of the role that exhibitions can play is at Plas Newydd, which displays ‘A Most Extraordinary Affair’. The exhibition describes Butler and Ponsonby’s lives in Ireland, their elopement, and their life at Plas Newydd, including descriptions of their many visitors and the visitors’ perceptions of the Ladies’ relationship. The final panel in the exhibition discusses romantic friendship, explaining that there ‘has been much speculation over the precise relationship’ between the Ladies, and asks ‘was their relationship platonic?’ It does not provide any definitive answers but explains, like the audio guide, that the Ladies were horrified at the suggestion that they were ‘lesbians’ and that they considered suing the General Evening Post after it published an article that implied they were unnatural. It also adds that ‘renowned homosexuals of the period certainly considered the Ladies to be lesbian’, and includes an excerpt of a letter in which


Lord Byron implies that they had a sexual relationship.333

This exhibition serves a particularly crucial role at Plas Newydd because if visitors do not purchase the guidebook or audio guide there are very few other opportunities to learn about the Ladies. This became evident in a visit to Plas Newydd in July 2015, when a group of visitors who did not have a guidebook or audio guide entered the exhibition room and discussed whether the Ladies were sisters. After reading the exhibition panels about their elopement and speculation about their relationship as potentially ‘lesbian’, it became clear to them that they were, indeed, not sisters. Without this exhibition, these visitors might have left the house assuming that the two Ladies who shared their lives there were sisters, not companions, partners or even potentially lovers.

This exhibition is also particularly significant because it has been on display since Denbighshire Council took over Plas Newydd in the early 1990s whilst Section 28 was in effect.334 Despite being a local government-run historic house, Plas Newydd did represent the topic of same-sex love in the history of the Ladies, which is at odds with the approaches of museums as discussed in the previous chapter. Like the Museum of London’s ‘Pride and Prejudice’, ‘A Most Extraordinary Affair’ challenged Section 28 and afforded visitors some understanding of the Ladies’ place in the history of same-sex love.

While Plas Newydd was one of the first historic houses to directly represent histories of same-sex love in an exhibition, recent examples show that more historic
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houses are redressing their representations of same-sex love with exhibitions. For example, a small-scale exhibition at the National Trust’s Smallhythe Place has made histories of same-sex love more prominent in the interpretation of the house. The actress Ellen Terry lived at Smallhythe Place (in Tenterden, Kent) from 1899 until her death in 1928, and her daughter Edy Craig lived in the same grounds in the neighbouring Priest House in a *ménage a trois* with Christabel Marshall (Christopher St. John) and Clare (Tony) Atwood. Craig, along with St. John and Atwood, turned Smallhythe into an Ellen Terry museum shortly after her death, and also converted the garden barn into a theatre, where productions still take place today. The Barn Theatre is also home to three exhibition panels: on the Barn Theatre, on life at Priest House, and on Edy Craig.

The second of these exhibition panels, ‘Life at the Priest House: A ménage a trois’ describes the life that Craig, St. John and Atwood shared together. It explains that ‘they had many creative lesbian and homosexual friends from the literary and theatrical world who were afforded a freedom of thought and dress’ when visiting Smallhythe and Priest House.’ Hints of the nature of their relationship can be found at other parts of the house, with, for example, the placement of grave markers and a memorial plaque, which are discussed in the next chapter. The exhibition, however, marks a progressive change from previous representations of same-sex love at Smallhythe. For example, a more dated short biography of Craig available in the house and on the National Trust’s website explains that she shared the house with ‘her female friends’, and adds that ‘it is not clear whether Edith was lesbian or bi-sexual’. It also explains that ‘the trio were part of a
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335 Smallhythe Place, ‘Life at the Priest House: A ménage a trois’ exhibition panel, as seen on visit July 2013.
literary community that included Virginia Woolf, Vita-Sackville West, and the controversial lesbian author Radclyffe Hall.\footnote{336 National Trust, \textit{Edith Craig Biography}, \url{http://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/document-1355767027069/} [accessed 03 August 2015].} Although it notes that Radclyffe Hall was a lesbian author, it does not mention the sexualities of Woolf and Sackville-West, and ‘literary community’ only reads as ‘lesbian community’ to those in the know. The exhibition in the Barn Theatre, which was first displayed in 2009, thus highlights a positive shift in the use of language and direct acknowledgement of histories of same-sex love.

Such exhibitions usually contain similar historical, contextual and biographical information to that found in official guidebooks. Like exhibitions, guidebooks serve to provide visitors with information that is not necessarily on display in the house, and usually include a history of the house, biographies of the people who lived there, and often, a history of the house as it transitioned from a home to a house museum. However, although some of the guidebooks of the houses discussed reveal histories of same-sex love, others obscure these histories and or even contradict in-house representations of same-sex love. These contradictions reveal a lack of cohesion across the varied interpretive methodologies that historic houses use to engage visitors with the histories they represent.

One example of this lack of cohesion can be seen at Ickworth, where an exhibition panel provides a detailed and positive representation of Lord John Hervey’s place in the history of sexuality, while the official guidebook describes his sexuality in language that obscures the nature of his relationship with Stephen Fox. The exhibition panels at
Ickworth are located outside of the main part of the house as the visitor walks toward the restaurant and garden, and serve to provide details about past inhabitants, which are not immediately accessible elsewhere. The panel on Lord John Hervey focuses on his sexuality and presents his relationships with men and women as central to his history. It notes that Hervey was ‘pilloried by Pope as “Lord Fanny” and by Horace Walpole as “Fairy Hervey”’, and was ‘notorious for his bisexual relationships and effeminate style.’ The interpretation goes on to focus on Hervey’s sexuality, the second paragraph reading:

Such was the level of confusion about Hervey’s sexuality that Lady Mary Wortley Mongau came to the famous conclusion that there were three human species – ‘Men, Women and Herveys’. Hervey was a celebrated rake, sharing a mistress with the Prince of Wales, but he also maintained a ten-year affair with another man: Stephen Fox. Hervey’s loving relationship with Fox became an open secret, and left him with little time to spend with his wife, Molly Lepel, and their eight children, who were brought up at Ickworth.\[337\]

The panel represents Hervey’s relationship with Fox as a long-term, loving and serious relationship, rather than a sexual fling. The additional description of their relationship as ‘loving’ is a simple yet effective way of representing love, not just sex, between men, a topic discussed in the second part of this chapter. The view of Hervey from this panel is one of a man whose love for another man was a significant part of their life, and presents both a visible and positive representation of same-sex love.

\[337\] As seen on visit to Ickworth House, June 2013.
The guidebook, however, explains that Hervey was, ‘much talked of for his ambivalent sexuality, from his close friendship with Stephen Fox to his seduction of the Prince of Wales’s mistress.’\(^3^3^8^\) The language used in this interpretation of Hervey’s sexuality privileges active masculine heteronormativity over his intimate and loving relationship with Fox. In turn, it leaves the visitor with their own ‘ambivalent’ understanding of Hervey’s sexuality, in which it remains unclear whether his sexuality was what might now be described as ‘bisexual’. More surprisingly, the guidebook that so obscures Hervey’s sexuality was published in 2011, after the interpretation panels were first displayed in 2005. They were, however, written by different people. It must be asked of Ickworth why two such different representations of Hervey were used, and why a similar, open and frank, interpretation of Hervey’s sexuality could not be used in the official guide book.

One way in which guidebooks can subvert and challenge, instead of asserting heteronormative approaches, is through the use of family trees. For example, the Charleston guidebook uses a family tree to map out the complex relationships that members of the Bloomsbury Group shared.\(^3^3^9^\) It places non-heterosexual relationships within a familial framework, and, as Oram has asserted, ‘disrupts the heteronormative idea of genealogy.’\(^3^4^0^\) Thus, same-sex relationships are acknowledged as central to understandings of family and intimacy. Charleston, however, is somewhat unique in this approach, and the majority of official guidebooks do not include same-sex relationships in


\(^3^4^0^\) Oram, ‘Going on an Outing’, p. 201.
their family trees. The family tree included in the Smallhythe Place guidebook, for example, does not include Christopher St. John and Tony Atwood.\textsuperscript{341}

In the official guidebook for Shibden Hall in Halifax, Yorkshire, the former home of landowner and diarist Anne Lister, her union with Ann Walker is also excluded from the family tree.\textsuperscript{342} Apart from the omission of Walker from ‘The Lister Family Tree’, the Shibden Hall guidebook is open and detailed about Lister’s relationships with women, explaining that her relationship with Walker was ‘formalised’ when Walker moved into Shibden Hall with her.\textsuperscript{343} Lister and Walker also formalised their union by receiving a blessing together at the Holy Trinity Church in 1834, but this is not mentioned in the guidebook. It seems surprising then that Walker is excluded from the family tree. Is the family tree the final sacrosanct formal display of heteronormativity? Were it not for the example in Charleston’s guidebook, it would seem so. Charleston’s use of the family tree to display non-heterosexual relationships shows the potential for guidebooks to queer their representations and challenge assumptions about family, marriage, relationships and intimacy in the history of sexuality. Charleston’s guidebook represents an ideal model, which Shibden Hall and Smallhythe, among others, could also use to acknowledge their relevant histories of same-sex love.

\textsuperscript{341} Joy Melville, \textit{Ellen Terry and Smallhythe Place, Ken} (London: National Trust, 1997), p. 32.
\textsuperscript{342} Anne Lister inherited Shibden Hall in 1826. She kept detailed diaries of her affairs, both business and sexual, and was open about her relationships with women. She was later joined at Shibden by Ann Walker, who inherited Shibden after Lister’s death in 1840. Shibden Hall has been open to the public since 1934 and is owned and run by Calderdale Council. For further information, see Shibden Estate, \textit{Shibden Hall, Halifax: A Visitor’s Guide} (Halifax: Calderdale Council, 2010), p. 14.
\textsuperscript{343} Ibid., p. 14.
Finally, historic houses can also engage visitors in relevant histories of same-sex love by staging special events. These events are often transient attempts to represent histories of same-sex love, or they can complement existing interpretive methodologies. For example, Shibden Hall has hosted lectures and events such as the ‘The Anne Lister Weekend’ and ‘A Tour With Anne Lister’, which focus on Lister and her life and loves.344

The National Trust’s Sutton House in London has also hosted events that represent an increasing focus on histories of same-sex love. Although the house did not contain any obvious histories of same-sex love, Sutton House hosted LGBTQ exhibitions by Sean Curran during LGBT History Month in 2014 and 2015, and was the first National Trust property to recognize LGBT History Month. Sutton House also hosted an event to discuss and reflect on the place of LGBTQ histories in museums and historic houses in 2014.345 Sutton House has since launched a series of events to connect visitors to histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ culture. For example, in July 2015, Sutton House hosted screenings of Paris is Burning, a 1990 documentary film exploring New York’s LGBTQ and drag ball circuit. The series of events, ‘Paris is Burning: Tudor Realness’, which also included tours of the house, vogueing workshops and a club night, highlighted that ‘the frequenters of 90s drag balls had more in common with the Tudors than you would think’. This aimed to fuse the ‘fierce themes’ of fancy clothes, drink, an appreciation of ‘the finer things in life’ and the ‘Black Death’: in Tudor times, the plague, and in relation


345 See Challenging Histories to hear a recording of the event.
to ‘Paris is Burning’, HIV/AIDS. Sutton House also hosted ‘Tipping the Velvet – Drag Kings, Music Hall, Identity and Performance’ in July 2015, an event that celebrated Sarah Waters’ ‘lesbian’ historical novel, Tipping the Velvet. Both this event and ‘Paris is Burning’ were held as part of Sutton House’s first Women’s Season, an eight-month-long series of events to celebrate and highlight histories of women. Sutton House also hosted their first Queer Season in 2015, during which Sean Curran’s ‘126’ crowdsourced LGBTQ exhibition was displayed. Such events effectively queer the historic house, and show ways that historic houses can represent and include histories of same-sex love, even though there may be no direct historical link between the house and the event.

Hampton Court Palace, which is run by Historic Royal Palaces, has also represented its histories of same-sex love through temporary events, with tours of the palace called ‘Salacious Gossip’, which were open only to those who were over eighteen years old (summer, 2012 and 2013). Hampton Court contains several notable histories of same-sex love, including those of King James I and George Villiers; John Wilmot, the notorious Earl of Rochester; Queen Anne, whose intimate relationship with Sarah Churchill provoked much rumour at court; King William III, and Lord John Hervey. Indeed,


347 For further details on ‘126’ and Queer Season at Sutton House, see Sean Curran, “126’ and ‘Queer Season’ at Sutton House’, on Towards Queer, 8 January 2015, <http://towardsqueer.blogspot.co.uk/2015/01/126-and-queer-season-at-sutton-house.html> [accessed 14 August 2015].

the history of same-sex love is so integral to Hampton Court Palace that it was described in 1695 as the ‘château de derrière’, because people thought of William III, who was rumoured to be having a sexual affair with Arnold Joost van Keppel, the Earl of Albemarle, as ‘belonging to that brotherhood...’

However, these histories of same-sex love, including the not so subtle hint that William III practised sodomy with the Earl of Albemarle, were only presented to the visitor during the ‘Salacious Gossip’ tours, rather than during tours of the Palace during the day. Despite this, ‘Salacious Gossip’ tours marked a turning point in Hampton Court’s engagement with histories of same-sex love, and represented a selective ‘adult’ approach to such histories, which fused entertainment and history to reveal otherwise hidden stories.

The ‘Salacious Gossip’ tours, which were led by guides in period costume, covered the period from the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 to George III’s reign. They were an example of first-person interpretation tours, whereby guides ‘completely assume the role of historical characters’, in their costume and their language.

As Levy identified, a major strength of such tours is that they can be highly entertaining; ‘Salacious Gossip’ tours invited visitors to become part of the world of court gossip with the help of a rakish gentleman or a flirtatious lady-in-waiting guide. Topics on the tours included Lord Hervey’s rumoured homoerotic relationship with Prince Frederick; William III’s rumoured


affair with Albemarle; Queen Mary’s passionate love letters to Frances Apsley; and the Earl of Rochester’s sexual affairs and rakish poetry. The tours finished with the closing lines of Rochester’s poem, *Regime de Vivre*, a satirical take on his own life:

‘I storm and I roar, and I fall in a rage
And missing my whore, I bugger my page...’

During the ‘Salacious Gossip’ tours, these histories of same-sex love made up some of ‘the gossip we dare not tell you during the day’. Although it was progressive of Hampton Court Palace to represent histories of same-sex love, it remains problematic that they were framed as ‘risqué stories that are just too naughty for younger and more delicate ears, dealing with darker and more delicious themes.’ They raise similar issues to the discussions of ‘adult’ exhibitions and the need to be family friendly, as discussed in Chapter Two. The histories told on the ‘Salacious Gossip’ tours were, however, framed specifically as an entertaining evening for adults, and so the context of telling ‘risqué stories’ is different than representing such histories in a mainstream exhibition.

When the ‘Salacious Gossip’ tours took place during the summers of 2012 and 2013, the temporary exhibitions, ‘The Wild, the Beautiful and the Damned’ (2012), and ‘Secrets of the Royal Bedchamber’ (2013) formed the backdrops to many of the stories. However, the use of these exhibitions in ‘Salacious Gossip’ revealed several missed

351 Burzio, *Salacious Gossip Tour Script*, p. 16.
352 Historic Royal Palaces, *Salacious Gossip Tours*, <http://www.hrp.org.uk/HamptonCourtPalace/WhatsOn/SalaciousGossipTours> [accessed 09 August 2013]. This webpage is no longer available but an archived image of this page can be accessed with the above date via Internet Archive Wayback Machine, <https://archive.org/web/> [accessed 19 August 2015].
opportunities for Hampton Court Palace to engage visitors with histories of same-sex love. Although ‘Secrets of the Royal Bedchamber’ did explain that Lord John Hervey had ‘liaisons with both women and men at court’, the exhibition did not elaborate on this, or include any other narratives of same-sex love in an exhibition that explored the political and social power of the royal bedroom. Nevertheless, special tours and events such as ‘Salacious Gossip’ can provide a way for historic houses to engage visitors with histories of same-sex love in an entertaining and enlightening way. Ideally, such tours would be regular, rather than transient events and their content would also become a more permanent feature of Hampton Court’s interpretation and exhibitions.

**Historical Contexts and Narratives**

In exploring the various methods by which historic houses represent histories of same-sex love, different stories and narratives emerge. The following section discusses which histories of same-sex love historic houses represent. How are histories of male and female same-sex love contextualised? What place do these histories have in broader histories of love, family, intimacy, and domesticity? This section shows that a lack of context is the most significant aspect that is missing from representations of male same-sex love in particular, and questions how historic houses can better contextualise histories of same-sex love in a way that challenges visitors’ perceptions and understandings of same-sex love, both historically and today.

As historic houses, these sites are also historic places of domesticity. Thus, in various ways, visitors can connect with the place and the previous inhabitants because ‘a
residence is a universally understood place. The meaning of both home and family, however, has changed throughout history, and continues to change. Taking this into consideration, how can historic houses, as domestic settings, challenge the idea of same-sex relationships and domesticity as what Section 28 described as a ‘pretended family relationship’? The historic houses discussed show that same-sex unions and relationships have been the basis of family relationships for far longer than they have been legally recognised. For example, Lister and Walker lived together at Shibden Hall and the Ladies of Llangollen made Plas Newydd their home for over fifty years. Lord John Hervey and Stephen Fox also shared a home together although this was in London, rather than at Ickworth. Matt Cook’s recent research on queer domesticity has also highlighted a range of ways in which men shared their lives and homes together in the twentieth century, showing queer domesticity as central to formations and expressions of same-sex love. What kind of histories of domesticity, family and intimacy do historic houses represent?

Historic houses can utilise the space of the house itself to tell narratives of domesticity and family. The ‘Gay Visitors Podcast’ at Charleston, for example, presents an intimate history of male same-sex love and culture. By providing narratives of memory

354 ‘Local Government Act 1988, Section 28’.
and descriptions of spaces within the house as queer, the podcast allows visitors, both virtual and physical, to imagine the house as a queer home with queer spaces. The podcast presents a history of Charleston as a family home, not just of Grant and Bell and the Bloomsbury Group, but also of a broader queer family. The history presented at Charleston is thus one that challenges assumptions about what family and intimate relationships have looked like and meant throughout history.

At Shibden Hall, however, the use of space affirms, rather than challenges, the historical meaning of family as consisting of heterosexual marriage and the raising of children. As Oram has argued, the layout of Shibden privileges the nuclear, heteronormative family over Lister’s relationships with women. The ‘familiar layout as a family home’ at Shibden, which includes a children’s playroom, suggests ‘a bustling, multi-generational family’. Shibden also describes itself as ‘a family home from 1420-1933 and still a place for the whole family to enjoy today.’ This family-centred approach, coupled with the exclusion of Ann Walker from the guidebook family tree, pushes Anne Lister’s family, her female partner, into a blind spot. This is at odds with the history of Anne Lister as presented in the guidebook and in the lectures and events that Shibden. Plas Newydd, on the other hand, does subvert the concept of ‘family’, although it does not do so explicitly. As noted, the guidebook suggests the Ladies challenged the conventions of marriage and created their own space where ‘long-term human companionship apart from heterosexual marriage could be imagined’, which seems a

357 As seen on visit to Shibden Hall, July 2013.
rather long-winded way of saying they created a ‘family’. Moreover, an inscription on the side of Plas Newydd, which says ‘Sincerity, Fidelity and Industry’, refers to the Ladies and their servant, Mary Carryll, who also formed a significant part of their family. The Ladies’ devotion to Carryll is also seen in the memorial that they erected to her, where they also were also later buried. This three-sided memorial, discussed in the next chapter, stands as a marker of the Ladies and Carryll as a family, however unconventional it may have been. The commemoration of family in this way is also seen at Smallhythe, with the plaques commemorating Craig, St. John and Atwood. Although these representations of family are found outside of the historic houses themselves they nevertheless offer examples of how understandings of ‘family’ that step away from heterosexual marriage can be found at historic houses.

A recent exhibition at the National Trust-run Sissinghurst Castle in Kent, the former home of Vita Sackville-West and Harold Nicolson, has also taken steps to include a queer representation of family life and relationships. The exhibition, which has been on display in the Oast House since 2013, celebrates the centenary of their marriage and the ‘unconventional but enduring love’ that they shared at Sissinghurst. The exhibition paints a portrait of a relationship that existed within the perceived norm of heterosexual marriage, yet broke many conventions. A significant proportion of the exhibition details both of their same-sex affairs, which is in contrast to a previous exhibition at Sissinghurst
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361 Sissinghurst, centenary exhibition, as seen on visit June 2013. With thanks to Helen Davis for providing details about the exhibition.
in which Vita’s love affair with Virginia Woolf was ‘demoted to a mere friendship’. ³⁶²

The introductory panel to the section on Vita and Harold’s affairs explains that they ‘were serially unfaithful to one another throughout their marriage. Yet their love and understanding remained enduringly strong; each had a discreet acceptance of the other’s homosexuality’. It adds that only Vita’s affair with Violet Trefusis threatened the breakup of their marriage.³⁶³ The exhibition panels also display excerpts from letters between Vita and Harold that discuss their sexualities and affairs. For example, one letter from Vita to Harold reflects on their unconventional yet happy marriage. Vita wrote in 1941 that she had been reflecting on how queer it was that they had been ‘about as unfaithful to one another as one well could be from the conventional point of view, even worse than unfaithful if you add in the homosexuality, and yet I swear no two people could love one another more than we do after all these years.’ She added, ‘...I do think we have managed things cleverly.’³⁶⁴ Another letter from Harold to Vita, written in 1917, expressed his fear after contracting a sexually transmitted infection from another man: ‘It will be such an awful business if the [doctor’s] report is not satisfactory... Dear one – let’s face it together and bravely...’³⁶⁵ Other letters between Harold and Vita reference her affairs with both Violet Trefusis and Virginia Woolf, with Harold, for example, writing that it was ‘rather a fuss for me to have you there in London with that panther [Trefusis] sneaking about

³⁶³ Sissinghurst, centenary exhibition.
³⁶⁴ Sissinghurst, centenary exhibition, ‘Vita to Harold, 1941’.
³⁶⁵ Sissinghurst, centenary exhibition, ‘Harold to Vita, 1917, after contracting a venereal infection from another man’.
waiting to pounce on you.” The display of these frank and intimate letters highlight a relationship that worked for them, although it may not fit in with visitors’ own understandings of marriage and sexuality. Through this exhibition, Sissinghurst presents same-sex relationships as a central part of Vita and Harold’s family life and marriage. The letters show that Vita and Harold openly discussed their relationships and sexualities, which in turn provides an opportunity for visitors to openly read and discuss their sexualities in the same way.

These letters serve as historical objects through which visitors can learn about the same-sex relationships of Vita and Harold, and there are other objects through which histories of same-sex love can be presented to visitors. In particular, bedrooms and beds are spaces and objects that can be used by historic houses to signpost the place of intimacy and sex in same-sex relationships. For example, one of the rooms at Plas Newydd is the bedroom that the Ladies would have shared together and has been refurbished according to the contents of the 1832 Sale Catalogue for the house. The audio guide chapter for this room emphasises that it was common for women in romantic friendships to share beds without raising questions of their sexual intimacy and adds that ideas of privacy in the eighteenth century were very different to today. Nevertheless, the presentation of the bedroom that the Ladies shared can be read as an intimate and queer space. The bedroom that Anne Lister used at Shibden, however, is decorated as it was in the early twentieth century. The ‘Edwardian Bedroom’ presents a missed opportunity to queer this space, which Anne would have shared with her lovers. It also raises a practical
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issue with historic houses that set out to represent several generations of one family, as there are rich and varied histories in each room. However, bedrooms, as places where people shared intimacies and had sex, are potential sites where discussions of same-sex love can be presented to visitors.

Tredegar House, near Newport, Wales, is another example of a historic house that has the potential to use a bedroom to raise discussions of same-sex love, intimacy and family. Tredegar House, which is owned by the National Trust, was home to the Morgan family. This included Evan Morgan, who inherited the house in 1934 and lived there until his death in 1949. Morgan was gay and as the guidebook explains, he ‘concealed his homosexuality beneath two marriages of convenience.’\textsuperscript{368} An information leaflet in Morgan’s bedroom explains that the bedroom ‘was exclusively for Evan’, and that ‘although gay, he married twice.’ His first marriage to Lois Sturt, it explains, ‘provided him with respectability’ and also provided her ‘with a cover for her affairs.’\textsuperscript{369} This bedroom is thus a queer site, a room for the exclusive use of a man who loved men. Lois’ bedroom next door to Evan’s also raises questions about her role in the marriage of convenience, a marriage that represents another version of ‘family’. As a result of their seemingly conventional marriage, both were afforded a way to live out their unconventional lives and sexual relationships. This domestic setting and marriage thus highlights the complexities of the histories of sexuality, intimacy and the meaning of ‘family’. However, although the visitor learns that Morgan was gay, they are not informed about any of his relationships other than his marriages; there is no mention of who he might have shared

\textsuperscript{368} Emily Price and National Trust, \textit{Tredegar House} (Warrington: National Trust, 2012), p. 11.

\textsuperscript{369} National Trust, \textit{Tredegar House/The King’s Room} information leaflet, as seen on visit May 2013.
this bed with and the only people who are mentioned in regards to his sexuality are his two wives, Lois Sturt and Princess Olga Dolgorouky. Morgan’s sexuality is defined by his relationships with women, not by the sexual relationships he had with men.

Ideally, interpretation in this room and other forms of interpretation at Tredegar would include the names of these men. The exhibition at Sissinghurst provides an ideal model for the acknowledgement of sexual relationships because it notes the names of several men with whom Nicolson was involved, and thus allows the visitor a more personal insight. The omission of any details, as at Tredegar, presents a somewhat empty history, whereby there is acknowledgement of same-sex relationships, but the visitors learn nothing about them, who was sexually involved with Morgan, or the context in which these relationships took place.

Also missing from Tredegar House is any context as to why it was necessary for Morgan to marry for convenience; there is no explanation that his relationships with men put him at risk of arrest and conviction of ‘gross indecency’, since all sexual acts between men were illegal at the time. This highlights a significant problem in representations of male same-sex love in some historic houses; a lack of historical context with regards to the legal and social acceptability of male same-sex love. This is also the case at Ickworth, which places Hervey’s relationship with Fox as central to his life without explaining that sex between men was a capital crime in the eighteenth century. Moreover, at Beckford’s Tower, Beckford’s relationship with Courtenay is described as a ‘scandal’, but does not elaborate on what the scandal was or why it was considered so scandalous. A small exhibition panel explains that Beckford ‘was involved in a scandal with William ‘Kitty’ Courtenay at Powderham Castle in Devon.’ It adds that, ‘Beckford and his wife went into
There is no other mention of Beckford’s relationship with Courtenay, or his relationships with other men. To a visitor with no prior knowledge of Beckford or his sexuality this ‘scandal’ could have been financial or political, rather than sexual. The complete lack of context in this interpretation panel is exceptional in its avoidance of an explanation or mention of sexuality, but it highlights a broader question about which histories of same-sex love historic houses represent. With no explanation that same-sex acts between men were outlawed until their partial decriminalisation in 1967 with the Sexual Offences Act, visitors cannot fully understand the context in which sex between men historically took place. Neither Beckford nor Courtenay were legally prosecuted for their sexual affair, but it had serious repercussions on their lives and indeed their statuses in society. Beckford was forced into exile with his wife because sex between men was illegal, and he was at risk of prosecution and potentially, severe punishment, as a result of this ‘scandal’. The history that is represented to the public in this case is one without context or explanation of the history of same-sex love, either in the context of Beckford’s sexuality, or in the broader context of sex between men in the eighteenth century.

At two other historic houses, however, the context of same-sex love between men is explained, which provides visitors with a greater understanding of the previous inhabitants of the house, and of the historical context in which they lived. They stand as examples of the potential of historic houses to provide not just knowledge of same-sex love between men, but also nurture a greater understanding of its history. For example, as previously noted the tour guide at Powderham Castle did explain that Courtenay was
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370 Beckford’s Tower, ‘Beckford the Traveller, Writer and Collector’ exhibition panel, as seen on visit in May 2013.
forced into exile in his later years because he was accused of sodomy and feared that he
would be prosecuted. The exhibition at Sissinghurst also contextualises Harold
Nicolson’s affairs with other men, and explains why he needed to be more discreet about
his same-sex affairs than Vita was in her relationships with women. An exhibition panel
notes that Nicolson’s discretion was ‘essential as he grew to be a very public figure as a
broadcaster and politician’, adding that ‘male homosexuality was illegal in Britain until
1967’. This interpretation panel thus helps the visitor better understand the lives of
Sackville-West and Nicolson, as well as the broader social and legal history of same-sex
love in the twentieth century. These two examples, at Powderham Castle and
Sissinghurst, are ideal models for other historic houses, and indeed other public history
institutions, to follow in regards to contextualising same-sex love between men. Without
an understanding that sexual acts between men were illegal, it is difficult to understand
why secrecy and discretion were essential, and why some men were forced into exile as a
result of revelations or rumours of their sexuality.

The interpretations of male and female love in the representations discussed
present a difference in the context provided and in the nature of their relationships.
Representations of male same-sex love in history tend to focus on sexuality and sex, while
representations of women focus on romance, intimacy and companionship. With the
exception of Ickworth, historic houses represent male same-sex love as situated in sexual,
rather than loving relationships. It thus seems that it is easier to acknowledge and
represent the physical act of sex between men, rather than the context in which the sex

371 Powderham Castle, visit July 2013.
372 Sissinghurst, centenary exhibition.
occurred, or the intimacies and romantic relationships that men formed in these sexual relationships. Foucault argued that ‘to imagine a sexual act that doesn't conform to law or nature is not what disturbs people. But that individuals begin to love one another - there's the problem.’

The representations seen here reflect this, representing a history of male same-sex sex, rather than love. At Tredegar House visitors learn that Evan Morgan was gay, but we do not know whom he had relationships with. At both Beckford’s Tower and Powderham Castle there is no mention of the romantic relationships Beckford or Courtenay had with each other, or with other men. Instead, visitors learn about the ‘scandal’ and the sex, rather than the intimate relationships that these men shared. They are devoid of tenderness and affection.

This is in contrast to representations of female same-sex love, which tend to emphasise intimacy and companionship. In historic houses the histories of female same-sex love typically are presented as companionships, long-term loving relationships that were potentially sexual. They are also contextualised in a way that male same-sex love is not. For example, in the exhibition, audio guide and guidebook of Plas Newydd, the historical context of the Ladies’ relationship is emphasised, and as such, visitors gain a greater understanding of ‘romantic friendship’, as well as the Ladies’ relationship. The interpretation at Plas Newydd, rather than presenting answers about the potential sexual relationship they shared, poses questions and thus opens potential discussions about their relationship, asking directly, ‘were they lovers?’ The guidebook of Shibden Hall also provides extensive details about Lister’s relationships with women, explaining that


374 Plas Newydd, Plas Newydd, a brief history, p. 8.
her diary entries suggest that ‘it was not unusual for women to enjoy sexual
relationships.’ At Smallhythe Place too, the relationship between Craig, St. John and
Atwood is presented in the context of a broader community of queer people, including
Woolf and Sackville-West. None of the historic houses that represent histories of male
same-sex love, however, provide any context to the broader history of same-sex love.

While academic discussions of romantic friendship included in places such as Plas
Newydd provide greater context and can provoke discussion, none of the examples of
historic houses that represent male same-sex love have included any academic
discussions of male intimacy, sexuality and relationships in their interpretation. Historians
including Alan Bray and George E. Heggarty have published extensively on the history of
male intimacy and erotic friendship between men, which could be used in interpretation
in historic houses. The inclusion of male intimacy and love in history has the potential,
as Heggarty has argued, for ‘far broader cultural implications than have ever been
allowed,’ enabling male same-sex love to be represented as ‘complex in the ways that all
human relations are.’ Such research has shown there is potential to make love
between men a part of the history of sexuality and this could be applied to public history
too, in the same way that romantic friendship has become integral to public
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representations of the Ladies of Llangollen.

Although another example of female same-sex love, interpretation techniques used at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum (JAHMM) provide an example of how complex and contested histories can be both presented to, and interpreted by, visitors. Using shared authority and participatory methods, the JAHMM asked visitors to contribute to the interpretation of Jane Addams’ relationship with Mary Rozet-Smith. Visitors were presented with three interpretations of Addams’s relationship with Rozet-Smith and asked which they found most useful. One label described Rozet-Smith as Addams’ ‘companion’, and did not mention their emotional intimacy. Another label described her as Addams’ ‘life partner’ and added that due to the nature and intimacy of their letters, it is ‘hypothesized that they were lesbians’. It added that because of the different social context in which they lived, it is not possible to determine whether or not they were ‘lesbian’ in the modern sense of the word. The third label was far more detailed and frank in its interpretation of Rozet-Smith and Addams as ‘lesbians’. It described Rozet-Smith as Addams’ ‘partner’, and explained that ‘they shared a deep emotional attachment and affection for one another’. Moreover, it further added that many women at the time formed ‘emotional, romantic and practical attachments to other women’, often rejecting marriage in favour of sharing their lives with other women. It

explained that within letters Addams referred to herself and Rozet-Smith as ‘married’, and added that Addams eventually burned many of her letters from Rozet-Smith.\textsuperscript{381}

Each of the labels presented a different take on their relationship: as one that was steadfastly platonic, one that \textit{might} have been ‘lesbian’, and finally, one that was recognisably ‘lesbian’, indeed, an early form of same-sex marriage, so controversial that evidence about their love had to be destroyed by Addams. By asking visitors their opinion on different interpretations of their relationship, visitors became part of the exhibition process, and also took on the role of historian and curator, who must interpret and choose the best way to represent Addams and Smith’s relationship. This take on shared authority can bring visitors ‘into the historical process and welcome them to perform their own historical analyses’.\textsuperscript{382} As a form of co-curation it means that visitors can not only interpret but also inform the outcome of an exhibition. It was a bold move for a historic house museum, and has yet to be replicated in a UK-based historic house. Such a method could, for example, be used at Ickworth with the Hervey Conversation Piece. It could also be replicated at Plas Newydd or Smallhythe Place. It offers a significant example of how historic houses can present contested and potentially controversial histories of same-sex love in a way that directly involves their visitors. Not only does it better represent histories of same-sex love, but it offers visitors an insight into the contested nature of histories and their interpretation.

\textbf{Conclusion}

\textsuperscript{381} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{382} Ferentinos, ‘Lifting Our Skirts’.
This chapter has shown that historic houses can utilise a range of interpretive methods to make histories of same-sex love more visible. From screening sex-positive documentary films to including histories of same-sex love in exhibition panels, each method has the potential to help visitors connect with and better understand the history of the house, its previous inhabitants, and the history of same-sex love.

Moreover, the use of a mixed range of methods provides more opportunities for the inclusion of historical context, which can allow for visitors to learn more about the histories in question and broader histories of sexuality, family and intimacy. Plas Newydd and Sissinghurst Castle serve as examples of the importance of doing so. At Plas Newydd, visitors can learn about ‘romantic friendship’ and thus engage with the question, ‘were they lovers?’ At Sissinghurst, visitors can better understand Nicolson’s relationships with men, and indeed his relationship with Sackville-West, because they know why was more discreet about his sexuality. In turn, visitors can better understand sexual and romantic relationships and the historical context in which they occurred. In contrast to these representations, the use of obfuscating language and lack of context at Beckford’s Tower and in Ickworth’s guidebook, for example, ensure that histories of same-sex love remain, to paraphrase Joshua Adair, present, but not presented at some historic houses.383

It may be some time before historic houses in the UK host sex-positive film series, but it is clear that a move from displaying objects to telling stories is revealing histories of same-sex love that were not visible before. These historic houses, as homes, have played

significant roles in providing space for same-sex love, relationships and families to develop, and they continue to do so today as historic house museums. They have been, and still are, places of pilgrimage for LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ visitors. Moreover, they can also be places to celebrate same-sex love today. In People, Bennett compared the National Trust to the Church of England, with Dorothy exclaiming that ‘The Trust is a church, too, and in the piety and devotion of its members one that would rival the Anglicans were the membership not virtually the same.’

Unlike the Church of England, however, some historic houses have become places to share and formalise same-sex relationships with marriage ceremonies. Shibden Hall, for example, hosted its first wedding ceremony in 2015. That the first couple married there were a lesbian couple says much about the role that Shibden, and other historic houses, can have in the lives of visitors and their connections to the past. The use of Shibden Hall to celebrate same-sex marriage has opened a new chapter in its history of same-sex love, a chapter that reflects its past as well as its present. A newspaper report of the wedding at Shibden Hall highlighted that it symbolised ‘echoes of the past’. As wedding venues, as places of pilgrimage, as public history, and even as stages for sex-positive documentaries, the historic houses discussed here all contain such echoes of the past, and the choices they make in how to represent or ignore them can have a significant impact on how histories of same-sex love are accessed and understood.

384 Bennett, People, p. 68.

Chapter Four
Monuments as *les lieux de mémoire* of Same-Sex Love

In Père Lachaise Cemetery in Paris, lipstick marks adorn a glass partition on Oscar Wilde’s tomb. During Pride celebrations in Dublin, another statue of Wilde, one that overlooks his old home at Number One Merrion Square, holds a rainbow flag. On the anniversary of Alan Turing’s birth, 23rd June, flowers are placed in the arms of a statue of him in Sackville Park, Manchester. Memories have taken root and have been created in the materials that these monuments are composed of; they have become places ‘where memory crystallizes and secretes itself.’ These are visible memories of Wilde and Turing that commemorate their work, their contributions to literature and science, their legacy, their afterlives as ‘queeroes’, and the collective memories created by people who visit or pass by them today. These historical figures are commemorated and they are mythologised through these tangible, physical, public monuments to them. These monuments are what Pierre Nora termed ‘*les lieux de mémoire*,’ or ‘sites of memory.’ This chapter shows the role that monuments, and the rituals that accompany them, play to form meaningful acts of public engagement with the past, and argues that they are sites of memory where memories continue to crystalise and change.

Like the historic houses discussed previously, the sites of memory discussed in this chapter form part of the built environment of historic and current landscapes. However, they perform a different role to historic houses, whose primary function was as a domestic dwelling. Monuments, instead, are built for very different reasons, and perform
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different functions in public history. The term ‘monument’ is used to cover a broad range of sites of memory. These monuments include memorials, structures that have been created for the purpose of remembrance and commemoration and that are tinged with trauma and loss; commemorative plaques attached to buildings and other structures; statues and pieces of public art that represent individuals, groups and events.

The definitions of these types of monuments blur and change over time. For example, statues of individuals are often created during the lifetime of the individuals represented, but can become memorials after their deaths. One such example of this was seen through the use of public statues of Nelson Mandela in the days after his death. Mourners flocked to statues of Mandela on London’s South Bank and Parliament Square. The statues of Mandela became lost in a sea of flowers, placed there by people who wished to express their grief and pay their respects to the statesman in a visible, public, and shared way. These statues became memorials, even if temporarily. Such rituals of commemoration and remembrance are discussed and analysed in this chapter. In doing so, it shows that monuments, as sites of memory, can be places where people go to remember, and in turn create new, collective, memories of the person or event commemorated. It argues, therefore, that monuments represent a ‘usable past’, and are potential sites of pilgrimage, two themes of public history as discussed previously.\footnote{Jordanova, History in Practice, pp. 131-134 and Oram, ‘Going on an Outing’.

The first section discusses and analyses monuments of individuals in the history of same-sex love. It shows how monuments of Alan Turing and Oscar Wilde have been used by the public to commemorate these people and to create new memories. The examples
used show that although monuments can help members of the public engage meaningfully with the past there are limitations to their use, because they are often presented without context. It also argues that monuments to individuals can blur the lines between the lives and after-lives of historical figures. Thus, commemoration is as much about current understandings of historical figures and same-sex love as it is about the person being commemorated. This section also argues that as in many other examples of public history discussed, women are woefully underrepresented in monuments, but that personal interventions at some sites of memory have challenged their invisibility. It also discusses the role of commemorative plaques to individuals, and shows that although the history of same-sex love is often rendered invisible in official commemoration, unofficial and guerrilla memorialisation can serve an important function in bringing to light, and life, the histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities.

The second section analyses monuments that represent a group or event. It shows that HIV/AIDS memorials play a significant role in commemorating the history of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. In particular, it analyses the role of monuments in rituals of commemoration. It argues that monuments and ritual commemoration are a way for communities to encounter and represent their pasts, ‘whether in mourning loss or celebrating achievements.’\textsuperscript{389} It thus shows that monuments and rituals of commemoration can have ‘multiple meanings that can change over time and they can provoke great emotions.’\textsuperscript{390} This section also discusses international examples that commemorate histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities in group monuments.


\textsuperscript{390} Ibid.
It shows that the pink triangle symbol and the impact of the homosexual victims of the Holocaust have resonated across several countries, and have been used to commemorate historic oppression and act as a message of social justice and equality today. Finally, this chapter discusses the process through which sites of memory are connected to other sites of memory. It shows that walking tours can create a narrative across several sites, and in turn, make cities themselves sites of memory. Overall, this chapter argues that monuments serve a crucial role in public history, as individual sites and as sites where rituals of commemoration are performed.

Commemorating and memorialising ‘LGBTQ’ figures and ‘queeroes’

Public monuments both celebrate and commemorate those who have contributed to society in some way. Historical figures are commemorated for a broad range of reasons; as war heroes, as geniuses, as those who have made significant contributions to the way we live, what we read and what we understand. Walking through London, it is difficult to go far without seeing a monument to a past monarch or military hero. It is also very difficult to find monuments that represent women, people of colour, people with disabilities, or the history of same-sex love. As John Siblon has argued in his work on ‘monument mania’ and the lack of visible monuments of ethnic minorities in London’s landscape, monuments tend to represent the stories of ‘great men’ rather than the real experiences of ordinary people. To Siblon, monuments, which are supposed to represent national identity, appear ‘remote and exclusive.’

Displacement from such a national identity exists because white slave owners (such as William Beckford’s father, also

William), and white abolitionists (such as William Wilberforce) are represented, but the experiences and histories of those who were enslaved are not. However, he also argues that despite this, it is possible to read monuments and other sites of memory in London as both embodying the ‘glorification of imperial values and as moments of resistance to these same values’.\(^{392}\) Thus, by reinterpreting monuments, they can become tools for social justice to be carried out, and can reveal and represent marginalised histories alongside dominant ones.

How then, are the histories of same-sex love represented in monuments, and how can monuments be read against the grain to commemorate ‘moments of resistance’ to dominant, heteronormative values? This section discusses monuments to Alan Turing and Oscar Wilde, both of whom are commemorated at a number of sites of memory. Unfortunately, due to the invisibility of women, people of colour and the working class, among other groups, in the public landscape and in public history, the two examples of Wilde and Turing perpetuate a view of history as the lives of famous, white, educated men. As such, they are far from representative of experiences of same-sex love in history. They remain, however, useful figures for discussing the methods of commemorating historical figures in the history of same-sex love, precisely because they are commemorated at several different sites.

There are several monuments to Turing in the public landscape of the UK, including statues and memorials in London, Manchester, Surrey and Milton Keynes. Each monument has approached, and thus represented, Turing’s history in different ways. To
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discuss the varied ways in which monuments can represent, or avoid, histories of same-sex love, this following section focuses on monuments to Turing in London and Manchester.

The monument to Turing in London is found alongside two other monuments in St Mary’s Green, London (Fig. 4.1). The monuments were developed by Sustrans as part of the ‘Portrait Bench’ project (2013), which aims to highlight people, both historic and living, who are relevant to local areas, along walking and cycling routes. The monuments were designed to ‘become a natural part of the landscape’ of the walking and cycling routes they line. Their significance lies in their recognition and promotion of local community heritage. Each of the figures represented were suggested or voted for by members of the public, residents local to the installation. Turing was selected as one of the subjects for Westminster’s ‘Portrait Bench’ because he was born in the City of Westminster. The Portrait Bench is a self-described ‘national social history project’ that recognises local people ‘for the contribution they have made to local life, culture or history.’

Not all of the Portrait Bench series include specific people; they also recognise groups who have had a significant impact on local society and history. Groups commemorated by the Portrait Bench project include, for example, oyster fishermen at Whitstable, working women at Kirkby, and miners in the East Midlands.


The ‘portrait’ of Turing in St Mary’s Green stands between Michael Bond, the creator of Paddington Bear, and Mary Seacole, the Jamaican-born nurse who served the British during the Crimean War. The inclusion of Mary Seacole is also of great significance, because there has been minimal public commemoration or recognition of her. Moreover, both people of colour and women have been largely excluded from commemoration in public monuments.\(^{395}\) Seacole’s inclusion alongside Turing, whose history is also one of
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marginalisation and invisibility, makes this particular group of statues somewhat subversive. They represent a homosexual man, a woman of colour, and, rather more traditionally, a beloved children’s author. They do not, however, make this subversion, or the marginalised histories of Turing and Seacole clear.

Alongside the statues, as with other installations in the ‘Portrait Bench’ project, is a bench for the visitor or passer-by to sit on and reflect on the significance and history of these figures. The bench also serves as a place for interpretation in the placement of plaques, a pair on each side. As with museum interpretation panels, there is little room to fully elaborate on the history of the figure, and so the choice of words used is of great significance. One plaque notes the Sustrans project and explains that the local community chose the characters, and the second plaque gives some detail about the figures and their historical significance. Turing’s plaque describes him as the ‘Father of computer science, WWII code-breaker who led cryptanalysis of the Enigma Machine.’ It does not mention the other part of his history: that he was homosexual and persecuted by the very state he helped defend during World War Two. Thus, although Turing himself is represented, his significance for the history of same-sex love is rendered invisible. Moreover, in a leaflet produced to accompany the ‘Portrait Bench’, there is no mention of Turing’s sexuality, his prosecution, or his death. In a short description of Turing’s life, the pamphlet focuses on his contributions to the war effort and to computer science. The pamphlet, even more

396 For a detailed biography of Alan Turing, see Andrew Hodges, Alan Turing: The Enigma (London: Vintage, 1992).
so than the small interpretative plaque on the bench, stands as a missed opportunity to make Turing’s place in the history of same-sex love visible to the public.

In contrast, the ‘Alan Turing Memorial’ (2001) in Manchester, where he had once worked, does acknowledge Turing’s place in the history of same-sex love (Fig. 4.2). It sits in Sackville Park, which is opposite Manchester’s ‘Gay Village’ on Canal Street. Its placement here is of great significance, and other monuments in this park represent several aspects of the history of same-sex love. As well as the ‘Alan Turing Memorial’, the park is home to ‘The Beacon of Hope’ and ‘The Tree of Life’, memorials to those affected by HIV/AIDS, which will be discussed in detail shortly. Sackville Park is also home to the first Transgender Memorial in the UK.

Fig. 4.2, ‘Alan Turing Memorial’, Sackville Park (November 2013)
The ‘Alan Turing Memorial’, by artist Glyn Hughes, consists of a bronze statue of a suited Turing holding an apple and sitting on a bench facing towards the centre of the park. The apple is of great significance to the history of Turing, as well as the contemporary visual representation of his death. Turing’s death by cyanide poisoning is engulfed in myth, and it is widely believed (although not proven because the apple was not tested) that he administered the fatal dose by biting into a poisoned apple.  

The detailed panel next to the bench explains that his mother believed he had not washed his hands properly after experimenting with chemicals, and thus administered cyanide via the apple in this way. The sculptor explained in the panel that the apple ‘represents Newton, the tree of knowledge and forbidden love as well as being a reminder of Turing’s death.’ The apple in Turing’s hand has also been described as symbolic of sainthood and martyrdom. Laura Doan has asserted that it is, ‘reminiscent of shrines of venerated saints…the cyanide laced apple is a poignant reminder of how homophobia drove one of the world’s greatest minds to suicide.’ This one element of the monument, then, is a reminder of Nora’s description of sites of memory as at once, material, symbolic and functional. The physical representation of the apple symbolises his death, his ‘martyrdom’, knowledge and forbidden love, and serves the function of reminding the

399 ‘Alan Turing Memorial’ plaque, as seen on November 2013.
400 Laura Doan, On the Entanglement of Queer Memory and History: The Case of Alan Turing, online video recording of event at University of Southampton 13 February 2014, University of Southampton, <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/assets/imported/transforms/site/event/UsefulDownloads_Download/3D796409431C4375A7B905C9B36E0AEC/stonewall_lecture_13-2-14-hd+720p.mp4> [accessed 04 August 2015].
401 Nora, ‘Between Memory and History’, pp. 18-19
passer-by of his contributions to science, and of his suicide.

Further to the detailed descriptive panel, two plaques (see Fig. 4.3) that sit on the pavement at Turing’s feet clearly represent Turing as relevant to the history of same-sex love. Another plaque has been added more recently to allow users to ‘hear’ Alan talk. The ‘Alan Turing Memorial’ was one of the ‘Talking Statues’ (2014), a project that added digital access information to selected statues to allow passers-by to access a ‘phone-call’ from the statue’s subject. This element of the ‘Alan Turing Memorial’ will be discussed in the following chapter as an example of digital public history.

One of the plaques at Turing’s feet is a descriptive plaque and the other is a rainbow plaque. The descriptive plaque acknowledges him as having contributed to the development of the computer, as a significant codebreaker during World War II and also acknowledges his sexuality. Its use of language is very similar to the interpretative plaque of Turing’s ‘Portrait Bench’, but includes another line to represent his place in the history of same-sex love. It describes him as, ‘Father of Computer Science, Logician, Wartime Codebreaker, Victim of Prejudice.’ The addition of the last descriptor acknowledges his history and the history of same-sex love in general as having been oppressed and treated with prejudice and persecution. It is also a reminder that acts of commemoration are as much about the present as they are about the past. In the twenty-first century we recognise Turing as a ‘victim’ of the law, rather than as the criminal he was prosecuted as in 1952.402

402 For further discussion of this, see Doan, On the Entanglement of Queer Memory and History.
The blurring of the life and after-life of Turing, in the latter of which he is portrayed as a victim and martyr, is also evident at another monument to him. ‘The Turing Mosaic’ (2014), located outside an LGBTQ bar in Milton Keynes, makes both this veneration and the two lives of Turing, his life and after-life, visually clear. The mosaic depicts an image of Turing’s face, which is surrounded by a rainbow halo, a clear symbol for payment.

of his interpretation as a martyr. On each side of the image of Turing is a timeline of his history. On the left hand side, the timeline traces his life from birth to death, including his arrival at Bletchley Park and his arrest. On the right hand side of the image the timeline presents his after-life. It traces Turing’s history from the declassification of Bletchley Park documents in 1974 to the granting of his royal pardon in 2013. His after-life as presented in this way shows that our commemoration of him, and the way Turing has been used in contemporary politics to raise awareness of historical oppression, is central to our understanding of him as a historical figure. Turing’s history has become a community history, in which his current representation is as important as the historical narrative of the life he led. The presentation of Turing’s afterlife in ‘The Turing Mosaic’ and his representation as a ‘Victim of Prejudice’ in the ‘Alan Turing Memorial’ highlight how we use monuments to tell our modern story. These monuments represent a moment frozen in the twenty-first century as well as a remembrance of Turing’s life. In doing so, these monuments show how commemoration and public history can reflect on the present as much as represent the past.

These representations of Turing also highlight the role of monuments in collective commemoration and community identities. Both the ‘The Turing Mosaic’ and the ‘Alan Turing Memorial’ are an example of what Paul Ashton et al termed ‘retrospective memorials’. Such monuments aim to commemorate a person or event that has been ‘left out’ or ‘forgotten’. They are inherently linked to identity and community groups; they are ‘usually impelled by forms of identity politics and government policies of multiculturalism,
so they memorialise more culturally diverse individuals or places. The placement of flowers in Turing’s arms in Sackville Park, for example, highlights the role monuments can play in community identity and collective remembrance. The ‘Alan Turing Memorial’ is, as such, what Laura Doan has described as a ‘quintessential example of a “site of memory”’, that uses collective remembrance to consolidate contemporary LGBTQ community identity and remember the past.

In a similar way, Oscar Wilde’s tomb in Père Lachaise Cemetery has become a site of pilgrimage and remembrance. Although located in Paris the tomb provides a good example of the role of ritual acts at sites of memory. As his resting place, his tomb is directly associated with his death, but it has also become a site for celebration of his life. The tomb has remained somewhat controversial since its unveiling in 1914, fourteen years after Wilde’s death. The monument, by sculptor Jacob Epstein, was inspired by Wilde’s 1894 poem, _The Sphinx_, and depicted a male sphinx, complete with offending and protruding genitals. The front of the tomb bears only Wilde’s name, and the rear side includes a short biography detailing his birth, education and death. This inscription also includes a verse of scripture in Latin and the following lines from _The Ballad of Reading Gaol_, which allude to Wilde’s outcast status as a result of his imprisonment for gross

---


405 Doan, _On the Entanglement of Queer Memory and History_.

406 For a detailed history of Wilde’s tomb, see Michael Pennington, _An Angel for a Martyr: Jacob Epstein’s tomb for Oscar Wilde_, (Reading: Whiteknights Press, 1987).
indecency, and the outcast status of many of his mourners as gay men:

And alien tears will fill for him
Pity’s long broken urn.
For his mourners will be outcast men
And outcasts always mourn.\textsuperscript{407}

After much initial controversy over the visible genitals of the sphinx, during which it remained hidden under a cover, the tomb was unveiled with a plaque covering the offending parts. The plaque was soon removed, and the sphinx tomb remained as Epstein intended until 1961, when the genitals were chipped away from the statue in an act of vandalism. The genitals were not replaced until 2000, when a replacement was affixed and unveiled in a ceremony called ‘Re-Membering Wilde’.\textsuperscript{408} Wilde’s tomb has not just remained controversial because of its striking visual elements, but also because of the way it has become, and remained, a site of memory and pilgrimage.

Acts of pilgrimage and commemoration have long formed a significant part of interaction with this monument, and these acts draw attention to how we use and reuse the past for our own purposes and to represent our own beliefs and contemporary understandings of the past. Early rituals at the tomb can be seen as acts of pilgrimage to a gay martyr, carried out by men who loved men during the 1950s and early 1960s. Giles Robertson claimed that the sphinx’s ‘pendulous testicles’ were more polished than the rest of the tomb, which he believed was because of the touching of them by gay admirers

\textsuperscript{407} Ibid., p. 50.
of Wilde, ‘in worship and reverence to those parts of Oscar Wilde for which they believe he was martyred.’ More recent commemorative acts highlight a view of Wilde not only as a gay martyr, but also as a more widely recognised and adored wit and literary genius. During the late 1990s and early twenty-first century, the tomb was covered with lipstick kisses and graffiti, left as marks of respect and adoration for Wilde. This ritual grew organically to become part of this monument to Wilde. In 2011 a glass partition was placed around the tomb to limit damage, but visitors today continue to leave kisses, graffiti, flowers and letters on and around the glass partition.

This ritual has now become a significant part of public engagement with the monument, and in turn, it has become part of our understanding of Wilde and his place in history. As one critic of the partition explained, ‘a drooled and kissed over tomb is as much history as the man who’s resting there.’ These acts of commemoration, much like the flowers left for Alan Turing, have emerged as unofficial but now traditional ritual acts. They have become part of the landscape of the sites of memories, and can unite visitors with each other as they celebrate and commemorate collectively.

Further monuments of Oscar Wilde present different ways that visitors can interact with the past and raise questions about the provision, or lack, of contextual information that accompany monuments. One such monument, the ‘Oscar Wilde

409 Giles Robertson in conversation with Michael Pennington, as cited in Pennington, An Angel for a Martyr, p. 61.

Memorial Walk’ is accompanied by a panel that provides contextual information, while the statue ‘A Conversation with Oscar Wilde’ only provides minimal information about Wilde.

The ‘Oscar Wilde Memorial Walk’ (2000) is a 100m pathway located at the back of Reading Gaol, where Wilde was imprisoned in 1895, which encourages visitors to walk in his footsteps. Symbols along the pathway have several meanings: stone benches in the shape and size of the bed Wilde would have slept on represent the harshness of prison; inscriptions of ‘Oh Beautiful World’ on the gates represent his release from the gaol in 1897; and an impression on the gates represents Wilde visually. (Fig. 4.4).

Fig. 4.4 ‘Oscar Wilde Memorial Walk’ (December 2013)

A descriptive panel (2004) is located at the end of the walk, and provides some
information about Wilde and his relevance to Reading Gaol. The placement of such panels at monuments can be a useful way to provide contextual information about the person or event being commemorated. This particular example, however, does not provide any information about Wilde’s place in the history of same-sex love, despite the relevance of this to Wilde’s history at Reading Gaol.

The panel notes that Wilde wrote *De Profundis* whilst imprisoned at Reading Gaol, yet does not provide any information on the content of the letter or Wilde’s relationship with Lord Douglas. Moreover, it does not provide any contextual information on why Wilde was imprisoned. The panel notes that ‘Reading Gaol’s most well-known inmate was the playwright and wit Oscar Wilde who was sentenced to two years hard labour in 1895 (for gross indecency).’ It does not explain what ‘gross indecency’ was, nor does it provide any information about Wilde’s relationships with men, or the historical context in which they took place. In a similar way to the interpretation panels in historic houses discussed previously, the historical context of same-sex love is missing from this representation of Wilde’s history. Unless passers-by know what ‘gross indecency’ was they are left none the wiser as to the reasons behind Wilde’s imprisonment and his significance in the history of same-sex love. It is, as such, a missed opportunity to represent the history of same-sex love and provide information to help members of the public better understand this history.

411 As seen on visit, December 2013. The panel makes up a section an information point. Similar information points are located across Reading and are part of the ‘Reading Explorer’ project by Reading Borough Council and Living Reading. For more information, and for additional sites, see Living Reading, *Reading UK Pocket Map, Your Guide to Reading Town Centre* (2013), <http://www.livingreading.co.uk/public/explorer_pocket_map_2013_pdf.erb6smbpj1ckos8cso4sgswk8/explorer_pocket_map_2013.pdf> [accessed 02 February 2016].
Conversely, the monument ‘A Conversation With Oscar Wilde’ (1998), located next to London’s Charing Cross, deliberately makes little attempt to provide information about Wilde, but instead relies on the existing knowledge of the visitor or passer-by. The purpose of the monument is not to provide information about who Wilde was, or why he is worthy of commemoration, but to encourage a creative interaction between the idea of him and the passer-by. It is, as such, an example a monument that blurs the lines between public art and public history.

The statue depicts Wilde emerging from a sarcophagus, designed to invite the passer-by to sit and ‘have a conversation with him’. Inscriptions on the monument include its title, the dates of Wilde’s birth and death, and an engraving of a quote from his play, *Lady Windermere’s Fan*, ‘We are all in the gutter, but some of us are looking at the stars.’ The sculptor, Maggi Hambling, has explained that it is not ‘complete’ as it stands, but ‘is actually completed when a member of the public, a passer-by, choses to sit down and have a chat with him.’ It is down to the passer-by and the public to make this monument a ‘usable past’.

Although ‘A Conversation with Oscar Wilde’ is an example of how visitors can interact with monuments, it also reveals a significant limitation and raises issues around monuments as artwork and as public history with little contextual information. There is no sign on the monument asking visitors to sit. There is minimal information about Oscar Wilde. The monument can only really be ‘used’ as Hambling intended if the passer-by has

---

existing knowledge of Wilde, of his works, and of his place in the history of same-sex love. It is an example of the symbolic nature of monuments, of the way they are representative and open to interpretation rather than explicit. As pieces of public art as much as public history, monuments are, as Andrew Gorman-Murray has argued, ‘symbolic representations rather than didactic presentations’, and their intent may be unclear without explanation. 413

Another monument that requires visitors to interact with it to complete it provides some examples of how a lack of information can be solved. ‘The Jurors’, which was installed in Runnymede, Surrey, in 2015 to commemorate the sealing of the Magna Carta, is accompanied by printed and digital guides to inform visitors of its content, context and purpose. 414 Although this is not an option for all monuments, since such resources require funding and sustainable support, it nevertheless shows how contextual information about monuments and their subjects can be provided on site and virtually.

‘The Jurors’ is also a significant example of how the history of same-sex love, as well as other often marginalised histories, can be used to reflect on contemporary issues of justice and equality. The installation, which consists of twelve chairs that depict symbols of justice, law and freedom, includes representations of same-sex love. One of the chairs depicts a book cover of Wilde’s The Ballad of Reading Gaol and includes an image of the view seen from a prison window (see Fig 4.5). Another chair depicts a loudhailer that belonged to US gay rights campaigner and Supervisor of San Francisco,

414 The site in Runnymede marks the spot where the Magna Carta was sealed in 1215. The land is owned by the National Trust.
Harvey Milk (see Fig 4.6). The chair is not just symbolic of Milk, but also of ‘speaking out, loudly, without fear in public’.

A leaflet, available online and at the Runnymede site, a webpage dedicated to each chair and an audio guide all serve to provide this information, and further details about Milk himself, to the visitors.

Although these chairs directly represent Wilde and Milk, they also symbolise the

---


history and current politics of freedom of speech and justice. The sculptor, Hew Locke, has emphasised that the installation is neither a memorial, nor a collection of heroes, but a ‘collection of ideas’ steeped with symbols, rather than histories or representations of individuals alone.\textsuperscript{417} The histories of Wilde and Milk are thus used to encourage conversation about the broader history of same-sex love and LGBTQ equality today. This ‘collection of ideas’ includes symbols not only relating to the history of same-sex love, but also uses other marginalised histories to challenge and present ideas and histories of justice. In its international and intersectional approach, ‘The Jurors’ also includes representations of women, people of colour, aboriginal histories and a broad range of often invisible and hidden histories, making it truly intersectional in its use of symbols.

While ‘The Jurors’ uses a broad range of histories and represents diverse and often marginalised groups and histories, monuments remain largely representative of white, ‘great’, men. Women have been excluded from public commemoration as they have generally not held the same positions of power and influence as men (monarchs aside). As such, there are very few examples of monuments of women in the history of same-sex love. Perhaps even more so than the other forms of public history discussed, a lack of monuments renders the contributions, lives and histories of women invisible in public representations of the past.

The most significant reason that the few monuments that represent women and same-sex love do exist is the personal intervention of other women. They are examples of the act of commemoration as personal and emotional, evoking both the past and the

\textsuperscript{417} Huw Locke discusses his ideas behind ‘The Jurors’ in The Jurors, \textit{Audio Guide}. 
present. Three particular monuments, two of which are in Llangollen, Wales and one of which is located at Smallhythe Place, memorialise not just the individual women, but also the relationships they formed, and the meanings of these relationships to other people.

There are two monuments to Eleanor Butler and Sarah Ponsonby, the ‘Ladies of Llangollen’, at St Collen Parish Church in the village where they lived together. One, a memorial tombstone, also commemorates their servant, Mary Carryl. The three-sided monument was planned by the Ladies when Carryl passed away, and commemorates their family, as discussed previously. They rest in this tomb together, in death as they did in life, and the monument serves to make this unity clear to passers-by. The inscriptions on the individual plaques reference the friendship the three women shared, particularly of Butler and Ponsonby, emphasising the longevity of their ‘uninterrupted friendship’. This joint burial of women is not unique, and there are several examples of the joint burial and commemoration of same-sex couples. For example, Judith M. Bennett has identified the joint brass memorial of Elizabeth Etchingham and Agnes Oxenbridge, which was laid in the late fifteenth-century, as ‘lesbian-like’. The memorial indicates that both women were unmarried, and they are depicted moving towards each other, staring into each other’s eyes, evoking ‘fidelity, intimacy and affection.’

Although it is impossible to know anything about the relationship of Etchingham and Oxenbridge beyond the information the plaque provides, their joint burial and memorialisation ‘has a rightful place in lesbian history even without calling them lesbians.’

_________________________


419 Ibid., p. 140. See also Bennett, ‘Two Women and their Monumental Brass, c.1480’, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 161 (2008), 163-184,
Another monument represents Butler and Ponsonby in St Collen Church itself. The monument was given to the Church by Dr Mary Gordon in 1937, following visits she had made to Plas Newydd in previous years. The representations of the Ladies, however, are not modelled on Butler and Ponsonby, but on Gordon and her partner, and the sculptor of the monument, Violet Labouchere. This monument, thus, highlights the personal connection that Gordon and Labouchere had to the Ladies and their relationship. It is a site of memory of both the Ladies of Llangollen, and of Gordon and Labouchere, that commemorates female same-sex love as well as their individual relationships.

At Smallhythe Place, another personal intervention has become a site of memory to Edy Craig, Christopher St. John and Tony Atwood, who lived there in a ménage a trois. Craig had requested that her ashes be buried with those of St. John and Atwood when they passed away, but somehow, by the time of their deaths her ashes had been lost. St. John and Atwood were instead buried side by side, with their graves marked by small commemorative plaques. Until 2010, when Ann Rachlin organised a commemorative plaque to Craig to be placed with those of St. John and Atwood, there was no tangible

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/174767008x330572>. For further discussion of the joint burial and burial commemoration of same-sex friends and couples, particularly male examples, see Bray, The Friend.

420 See Oram, ‘Going on an outing’, for details of Mary Gordon’s visits to Plas Newydd and her ghostly meetings with the Ladies of Llangollen.

memorialisation of Craig, or their relationship. Rachlin commissioned a plaque to be placed above the grave markers of St. John and Atwood, which reads, ‘In memoriam. Edith Craig 1869-1947. Beloved Daughter of Ellen Terry. Cherished Friend of Chris and Tony’. Mirroring the three-sided memorial to the Ladies of Llangollen and Carryl at St Colleen, the collective commemoration of Craig, St. John and Atwood at Smallhythe makes their relationship, and family, visible. Significantly, each of these sites of memory were created by women: by Eleanor Butler and Sarah Ponsonby; Mary Gordon and Violet Labouchere; and Ann Rachlin. They are also, in multiple ways, created for women: for Mary Carryl and the Ladies; for the Ladies, Gordon and Labouchere; and for Edy Craig, who had not been commemorated elsewhere. In turn, they are examples of the multiple meanings and functions of sites of memory, and show both the personal affect and effect of commemoration.

A statue of Virginia Woolf in Tavistock Square, however, does not commemorate her relationships or personal her life, but instead celebrates her work. The statue was commissioned by the Virginia Woolf Society, and illustrates one of their main aims: ‘to present Virginia Woolf in her true light as a great novelist, essayist, publisher and woman

of letters.\textsuperscript{423} An interpretation panel in Tavistock Square, which is also home to
monuments of Gandhi, Dame Louisa Aldrich-Blake (one of the first women to practice
medicine in England), and a monument to conscientious objectors, explains the
significance of each memorial’s subject. The interpretation does not mention Woolf’s
relationship with Vita Sackville-West or the connection of this relationship to \textit{Orlando},
which is described in the panel as one of her greatest works of literature. In a similar way
to the descriptive panel located at the end of the ‘Oscar Wilde Memorial Walk’, this
representation of Woolf is a missed opportunity to highlight the history of same-sex love
and the significance of her relationship with Sackville-West to both her life and the
writing of \textit{Orlando}. For both Oscar Wilde and Virginia Woolf, their same-sex relationships
had a significant impact on their work, and yet this is not acknowledged on their
monuments.

Just off Gordon Square Gardens, which is next to Tavistock Square, Woolf is also
commemorated with a plaque marking where she lived alongside other members of the
Bloomsbury Group in the first half of the twentieth century. Many monuments have
plaques attached to them, but commemorative plaques can also be individual
monuments, placed on buildings to mark them as a site of memory. English Heritage’s
Blue Plaques in London are one such example, and there are several council-run plaque
schemes across the rest of the UK. Commemorative plaques are, much like interpretation
in museums, very limited in what they can say about the site, person, group or event
being commemorated, and as such, histories of same-sex love are rarely acknowledged.

\textsuperscript{423} Stephen Barkway, Virginia Woolf Society, \textit{A Message from the Society},
\url{http://www.virginiawoolfsociety.co.uk/vw_message.htm} [accessed 03 August 2015].
Plaques that commemorate individuals tend to list their name, their profession or contribution to society, their dates of birth and death, and the dates in which they occupied, or visited, the site of memory. For example, a London County Council commemorative plaque to Oscar Wilde in Kensington, London, says ‘Oscar Wilde, 1854-1900 wit and dramatist lived here’. Another commemorative plaque to Wilde at Babbacombe Cliff in Torquay is far more detailed, and yet also erases any reference to Wilde’s place in the history of same-sex love. Indeed, it presents him as a heterosexual man with a traditional family. The plaque, in full, reads:

Babbacombe Cliff. Home to one of Britain’s most famous playwrights during the winter of 1892-93. Oscar Wilde. Poet, self-styled leader of the aesthetic movement, wit, playwright and father. Born October 16th 1854 died November 30th 1900. Author of the famous play The Importance Of Being Ernest. 424

Wilde’s imprisonment for ‘gross indecency’ is not acknowledged, while his role as a father is. Although he was father to two children, Cyril and Vyvyan, this description erases his part in the history of same-sex love, as well as his imprisonment and the disgrace he faced as a result of it. Moreover, when Wilde stayed at Babbacombe Cliff during the winter of 1892/93, Lord Alfred Douglas, as well as several other young men, often went to stay with him. 425 This aspect of Wilde’s life at Babbacombe Cliff highlights it

as a site of memory, a site of *queer* memory, and yet this significance is erased by the choice of labels used to describe Wilde on the commemorative plaque.

In commemorative plaque schemes across the UK, the history of same-sex love is all too often erased in a similar way. Plaques to Radclyffe Hall describe her as a novelist and plaques to Alan Turing describe him as a mathematician, the founder of computer science and a cryptographer, but they do not mention their sexualities, which were so important to their lives and their histories, and the way in which they are remembered today. The few examples of plaques that actually mention the history of same-sex love are minimal, although there are many individuals related to such history who have been commemorated through plaques. Examples of plaques that do acknowledge the history of same-sex love include: one that commemorates the first gay rights demonstration, one that marks the lodgings of Ernest Boulton and Frederick Park, Victorian cross-dressers also known as Fanny and Stella (London); and a plaque that marks the house of human rights campaigner Peter Tatchell (London).426

While there are few examples of commemorative plaques that acknowledge the history of same-sex love, there are examples of commemoration that subvert the traditional commemorative plaque. One such example is the rainbow plaque placed at the feet of the ‘Alan Turing Memorial’ in Sackville Park, (Fig 4.3). This plaque was placed there as part of Manchester’s ‘Out in the Past’ walking tour of LGBTQ history. Rainbow plaques mark several sites of historical significance around Canal Street, although sites

---

outside of the ‘Gay Village’ bear no such plaques. Although the trail itself is no longer available online and there is no printed guide, the rainbow plaques that remain, such as the one at Turing’s feet, continue to serve as visual and symbolic markers of the history of same-sex love.  

Unofficial, guerrilla forms of commemoration that use plaques can also make the history of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities more visible. Unlike the ‘Out in the Past’ rainbow plaques, they are not permanent, or often realised in a tangible sense. For example, the 1986 publication *The Pink Plaque Guide to London* lists places in London where an individual in the history of same-sex love had lived, worked or stayed. Its greatest significance, aside from being a comprehensive list of sites, is showing what a significant part those who have engaged in same-sex love have played in the history of London.  

They have been artists, authors, mathematicians, politicians, philanthropists and much more, yet their sexuality or at least their inclination for same-sex love has been written out of, or ignored from their public histories. The mobile application ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ uses a similar methodology, but with virtual plaques. The app is discussed at length in the following chapter as a form of digital history that uses virtual plaques to commemorate the history of same-sex love.

There are also physical examples of such commemoration, whereby individuals

---


and groups have created their own plaques and placed them on sites of significance to the histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. During celebrations for LGBT History Month in 2015, for example, York Alternative History created their own rainbow plaques to be placed around York, on buildings and sites of memory related to the history of same-sex love. Some of the plaques were personal histories that, for example, commemorated where individuals had ‘come out’ to friends and family. Other plaques commemorated historic LGBTQ social spaces. Some plaques also highlighted local histories of well-known historical ‘LGBTQ figures’ such as Edward II, who had stayed at York Castle with Piers Gaveston. Two plaques commemorated Anne Lister; one at King Manor Girls’ School, which she had attended, and one at Holy Trinity Church, where she had celebrated her union with Ann Walker in an early example of same-sex marriage.

These plaques served both to highlight local histories of same-sex love, and subvert a traditional form of commemoration, from which they were excluded. The design of the plaques was significant too; they mirrored the design of English Heritage blue plaques, ‘with all its legitimating potential’, and with the addition of a rainbow colour scheme ‘visibly signalled the stories’ queerness.’ In this act of guerrilla memorialisation, these sites became marked sites of memory. They had indeed been sites of memory without the plaques, but the plaques served to make this clear, and to

429 The Tour, and images of the plaques, can be viewed at Historypin, York’s LGBT History: Rainbow Plaques, <https://www.historypin.org/channels/view/62293/#!tours/view/id/4582/title/York%27s%20LGBT%20History%20Rainbow%20Plaques> [accessed 03 August 2015].

highlight a marginalised history. As Laurajane Smith asserts, this represents heritage as a cultural process. The existence of sites of memory is not as significant as the process through which they are recognised; the ‘use of these sites [made] them heritage, not the mere fact of their existence.’ This community-driven form of commemoration made these monuments of and for local and LGBTQ communities. The York Plaque Scheme, *The Pink Plaque Guide to London* and ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ also show that communities and individuals have taken public commemoration of same-sex love into their own hands. They show that there are many sites of memory of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities across the UK, but that they have been excluded from mainstream representations and commemoration schemes.

**Group Commemoration and Collective Memory**

Monuments can be used in a collective act of commemoration, as the ‘Alan Turing Memorial’ in Sackville Park shows. While the collective use of this site of memory highlights monuments as places for acts of remembrance and the formation of a community heritage, the memorial itself does not aim to represent LGBTQ communities. The examples discussed so far are of monuments that aim to represent a person or event, rather than LGBTQ communities as a group. This following section analyses ways that LGBTQ communities are represented in monuments. To do so, it discusses the role of rituals of commemoration, particularly related to HIV/AIDS remembrance. It also discusses monuments from across the world that commemorate the historic oppression of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities, and asks why there is no such monument in the UK.

---

431 Laurajane Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, p. 46.
Collective memorials in the UK that relate to the history of same-sex love either commemorate specific events or HIV/AIDS. One of the events commemorated is the Admiral Duncan bombing. A memorial marks the names of the three people who were killed when a neo-Nazi acted alone in placing bombs at the Admiral Duncan pub in Old Compton Street, London, and also in Brixton and Brick Lane, in 1999. The memorial, located in St. Anne’s Churchyard Gardens nearby, consists of three connected benches in front of three trees; representing the three killed at the Admiral Duncan and also the three communities that were targeted by the bombings.432 Another plaque in Highbury Fields, also in London, marks the site and remembrance of the first gay rights march that took place in the UK. The inscription on the plaque, which was unveiled in 2000, explains that on 27th November 1970, ‘150 members of the Gay Liberation Front held a torchlight rally against police harassment’ on the site.433 The plaque is in the shape of a downward facing triangle, evoking the memory of men who were persecuted under the Nazi regime for their sexuality. However, the use of the pink triangle symbol, which will be discussed shortly, is not explained or made explicit in the inscription. Although these are important events that should indeed be remembered and commemorated, they remain representative of singular events, rather than a collective history.

There is, however, a way for commemorations of events to represent a broader
history and community. For example, in Utrecht in the Netherlands, a commemorative plaque marks the site of a ruined cathedral where, in the eighteenth century, eighteen men were arrested, and eventually hanged, for sodomy. The plaque has the following inscription, which ties links between the past and the present, a singular event and a community history and contemporary identity:

18th Century
Sodomy
Barend Blomsaet and 17 other men were convicted in Utrecht and strangled.
Their actions unspoken.

Today
Homosexuality
Men and women freely choose

This plaque, then, commemorates a specific and traumatic event, connects this past with the present, and asserts a message of remembrance and equality.

One way through which traumatic pasts, commemoration and community identity are brought together in the UK is through monuments relating to HIV/AIDS, and the rituals of commemoration that accompany them. HIV/AIDS had, and continues to have, a devastating effect on LGBTQ communities. Such histories of trauma and loss are not easily represented, and as noted, the prevalence of HIV/AIDS narratives in exhibitions on same-sex love has been seen as ‘homo-pessimistic’, because it risks equating the histories

---

of same-sex love with death, victimhood and trauma. However, HIV/AIDS remains an important part of the history of same-sex love, and it is through monuments to those lost to HIV/AIDS that rituals of commemoration can bring communities together in collective remembrance.

There are several monuments to those diagnosed with and lost to HIV/AIDS across the UK, including in Manchester, Edinburgh, and Brighton. None of these monuments represent or commemorate LGBTQ people or communities specifically, as they represent all those lost to HIV/AIDS, regardless of their sexuality. They aim to bring together all communities affected by HIV/AIDS. In Manchester, Sackville Park is home to ‘The Beacon of Hope’ (1997) and ‘The Tree of Life’ (1993), which sit alongside the ‘Alan Turing Memorial’. Together, these monuments to HIV/AIDS ‘describe a metaphorical journey through life, providing the opportunity for remembrance, contemplation and celebration.’

‘The Beacon of Hope’ also has several functions. The beacon rises from a podium, around which plaques serve as a timeline relating to the history of HIV/AIDS. The podium is also home to a time capsule, which is contained within it. This time capsule is updated annually as part of the ritual of World AIDS Day, and contains messages to loved and lost ones affected by HIV/AIDS today and in history. The podium also doubles as a stage from which rituals of commemoration, remembrance and celebration are led throughout the year and on World AIDS Day (1st December). On this day every year, at Sackville Park and at other monuments, including ‘Tay’ in Brighton, acts of

\[435\] Conlan, ‘Representing Possibility’, p. 259.

commemoration and reflection take place to remember those affected by HIV/AIDS.\textsuperscript{437} These sites of memory are not the only places such rituals of commemoration take place, but ceremonies and collective gatherings serve to highlight the role of monuments, again, as ‘usable’, functional, and of great significance to community and public engagement with the past.

Another form of commemoration through ritual acts is evident in the unveiling of the AIDS Quilt, which has become an important part of commemorating those who have suffered with HIV/AIDS. The Quilt is traditionally made up of fabric panels, each one representing and naming someone lost to HIV/AIDS, which Marita Sturken has likened to the importance of names on tombstones and the ‘un-naming’ of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.\textsuperscript{438} Even without a name, the soldier buried in the tomb is remembered by history. In the same way, the inclusion of names, or even of symbols and images representing a person, ensure that they are remembered by history, that they are not forgotten. The naming of people in this way can ensure that they are not solely remembered or represented as nameless victims. Instead, they are named people, named and remembered by their loved ones. Inclusion of images, art, names and symbols on individual quilt patches represent a person, their personality and their life. This approach combats one of the critiques of memorials: that they ‘represent people solely as victims’.


\textsuperscript{438} Marita Sturken, \textit{Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, the AIDS Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), p. 186.
and risk reducing people to their identity markers, such as LGBTQ, rather than their lived experiences.  

Naming is also a significant element of the commemorative act of unveiling the AIDS Quilt, during which names of those represented on the quilt are read aloud. This ritualistic naming, like the Quilt, is both a personal act of mourning and remembrance by friends and family, and a representation of shared, collective, grief. Robert Ariss has described the unveiling of the AIDS Quilt as, ‘collectivised mourning on a truly modern scale’, through which the ‘imposed silence on AIDS’ is resisted. For Ariss, the sites and acts of such rituals become sites not only of memory, but also sites ‘for the contestation and control of identity and community.’ Thus, the naming of those lost to HIV/AIDS has several functions. Naming of individuals ensures that they are remembered not just as victims, but as people. The act can be a personal one of mourning for loved ones; a shared act of commemoration; or a political act that ensures that HIV/AIDS victims are not silenced and forgotten by history.

The community act of remembrance is also present at the use of war memorials which, in the UK, exclude same-sex love. Until 2000, same-sex acts were illegal in the armed forces of the UK, and there remains no official commemorative recognition of

\[\text{Christiane Wilke, ‘Remembering Complexity? Memorials for Nazi Victims in Berlin’,}\]
\[\text{The International Journal of Transitional Justice, 7:1 (2013), 136-156,}\]
\[\text{<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ijtj/ijs035>, (p. 9).}\]
\[\text{Ibid., p.292.}\]
LGBTQ veterans and the prejudice they faced within the armed forces. In 1997 when the gay rights group OutRage! staged their own memorial service at the Cenotaph in London for the LGBTQ individuals who died in service, there was a significantly negative reaction. The British Legion ‘denounced the commemoration as “distasteful” and “offensive”.’\footnote{Gabriel Koureas, Memory, Masculinity and National Identity in British Visual Culture, 1914 – 1930: A Study of ‘Unconquerable Manhood’ (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), p. 1.} In 1999 when OutRage! again protested against the invisibility of lesbian, gay and bisexual individuals both in history and the present day, their protest was considered controversial and inappropriate. Retired Lieutenant Colonel Bobby Hanscomb said of the matter that ‘I don't think it is right to make a political point at a ceremony to mark the deaths of 1.7m people.’\footnote{Julia Hartley-Brewer, ‘Gays plan 'queer' Cenotaph tribute’, The Guardian, 13 November 1999, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/1999/nov/13/juliahartleymbrewer>, [accessed 03 August 2015].} However, such acts of commemoration make a political point by their exclusion of LGBTQ communities and veterans. Indeed, it is a political act to exclude as much as it is to include these histories and stories. In the US, on the other hand, there are several monuments that recognise the contributions of LGBTQ veterans to the armed forces, as well as the prejudice they faced and often continue to face. In 2015, for example, the first federally approved monument to LGBTQ veterans was unveiled in Chicago, dedicated in ‘memory and appreciation of their selfless service and sacrifice.’\footnote{For details about the LGBT Veterans monument, and to watch the unveiling ceremony, see Trudy Ring, ‘The First Federal Monument By and For LGBT Veterans’, Advocate, 26 May 2015, <http://www.advocate.com/politics/military/2015/05/26/watch-first-federal-monument-and-lgbt-veterans> [accessed 03 August 2015].} There are also monuments to LGBTQ Veterans in California and Arizona, and there are plans for a ‘National LGBT Veterans Memorial’ in Washington, D.C. There remain, however, no plans for any monument to LGBTQ veterans in the UK.
Histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities are not just excluded from war memorials in the UK. There is no public monument that recognises a collective history of same-sex love that has been, on the whole, characterised by oppression, persecution and marginalisation. There is, however, a memorial to homosexual victims of the Holocaust in the National Holocaust Centre and Museum in Nottinghamshire. Although the majority of case studies discussed are from the UK, it is necessary to highlight international monuments that, like the US LGBTQ veteran monuments mentioned above, commemorate histories of same-sex love. This section focuses on two such monuments. They are the ‘Homomonument’ in Amsterdam and the ‘Memorial to the Homosexuals Persecuted under the National Socialist Regime’ in Berlin, both of which serve to remember the past, inform the present, and shape the future. They are both sites of memory and sites of social justice.

Amsterdam’s ‘Homomonument’ (Fig. 4.7) is a particularly significant example of a monument to the history of same-sex love because it was one of the first monuments in the world to commemorate LGBTQ people in history, having been unveiled in 1987. It is worth remembering that this was a year before Section 28 was enacted in the UK, which outlawed local authorities from intentionally promoting homosexuality, or publishing material ‘with the intention of promoting homosexuality’. While the City of Amsterdam designated space for the ‘Homomonument’, and the Dutch government contributed to the funding of the monument, local government in the UK was shortly to be prohibited from ‘promoting homosexuality’. Perhaps this explains, although it does not justify, why

there remains no public monument in the UK that recognises the historic oppression and marginalisation of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities.

The ‘Homomonument’ is also particularly significant because of its use of symbols. It is made up of three pink triangles set up to make one larger triangle. The three triangles, which represent the past, present and future, each have a different design and different functions. One that represents the future faces the canal (Fig 4.7) and forms a set of steps that can be used as seating, or as a place to leave flowers. Another represents the present, and is raised so it can be used as a platform for speeches. A third triangle, which represents the past, lies flat, and bears lines from the poem, ‘To a Young Fisherman’, by Jacob Israel de Haan. It reads ‘Such an endless desire for friendship’ (translated from Dutch).
The pink triangle has come to be seen as the symbol of equal rights for LGBTQ communities through its emphasis on collective memory and remembrance of past oppressions. During the Holocaust, homosexual men were identifiable in Nazi concentration camps by an inverted pink triangle, in the same way that Jewish people were identified with the Star of David symbol. It is thus representative of this particular era and persecution, but has come to be used as a political and social tool just as much as a symbol of remembrance of those who suffered and lost their lives under the Nazi regime. Erik N. Jensen has argued that the pink triangle has come to symbolise a ‘continuum of legal persecution’ in Germany from the end of the Nazi regime to its emergence as a symbol in the 1970s, when a shared memory of the persecution of homosexuals under the Nazi regime only fully emerged in the ‘politicized context of gay liberation’. It has since been adopted by several monuments as a symbol of collective memory and as a symbol that past wrongs should not be forgotten but that society should work to ensure they do not happen again. The ‘Homomonument’ also makes subtler uses of symbols, in its three-part design to symbolise the past, present, and future, and in its considered recognition of other sites of memory. Each smaller triangle points towards a site of historical significance: to the Centre for the Struggle for Lesbian and Gay Liberation (COC); the Anne Frank House; and the National War Memorial. It is situated between significant sites of memory relating both to the historical oppression of same-sex love and contemporary initiatives fighting for equality based on sexuality and gender identity. This symbolic use of space places the ‘Homomonument’, and thus the

history of same-sex love, among broader histories, of trauma and loss, but also of celebratory commemoration. It is, as Christopher Reed has asserted, ‘not shy about alluding to oppression’, but it also carries a message of hope in its use of spatial and visual symbols.\textsuperscript{447}

The plaque that accompanies the ‘Homomonument’ explains its use of the past, the present and the future to convey a message of social justice. It declares that the memorial:

- Commemorates all women and men ever oppressed and persecuted because of their homosexuality.
- Supports the International Lesbian and Gay Movement in their struggle against contempt, discrimination and oppression.
- Demonstrates that we are not alone.
- Calls for Permanent Vigilance.

And that ‘Past, Present and Future are represented in the 3 triangles in this Square.’\textsuperscript{448}

The ‘Homomonument’ is thus a site of memory in itself, a self-declared ‘living monument’ that strives to be an inspiration to LGBTQ communities today, making it both inherently historical \textit{and} contemporarily political.\textsuperscript{449} One of the ways it promotes itself as a ‘living monument’ is through its use on the Dutch equivalent to our Remembrance Sunday, Remembrance of the Dead on 4\textsuperscript{th} May every year. On this day, the ‘Homomonument’ is used as a site to honour and remember homosexuals who died


\textsuperscript{448}‘Homomonument’ Plaque, as seen on visit October 2014.

\textsuperscript{449}Homomonument, ANBI, <http://homomonument.nl/anbi.php> [accessed 19 August 2015].
during World War II, where wreaths are laid and a two-minute silence is observed simultaneously with other sites of memory across Amsterdam.\(^{450}\) The monument is thus part of a wider national public history, as well as being a site of memory of a marginalised group.

The ‘Homomonument’ is also used as a place of personal commemoration. Throughout the year, flowers are placed on the monument (see Fig 4.8), dedicated to lost loved ones, in an act of solidarity that gives visitors ‘the sense that they are not alone.’\(^{451}\) This site of memory is therefore one of both personal and collective commemoration. It is also a site of, and for, celebration. On 30 April, Queen’s Day, and the day after Remembrance of the Dead, Liberation Day, the ‘Homomonument’ becomes a site of joyous and collective celebration. Bringing together past, present and future, and commemoration and celebration, the monument shows that ‘whilst the present matters, the past has not been forgotten’.\(^{452}\) The ‘Homomonument’ aims to ‘be equally grounded in the present and look to the future’, as well as reflect on the past.\(^{453}\) These multiple transformations, and multiple uses, mark the ‘Homomonument’ as a ‘living monument’, whose function is to be used in several ways, and by as many people as possible. It represents public history as a ‘usable past’ through which people can forge and


\(^{451}\) Pink Point and Homomonument Foundation, *Homomonument in the Centre of Amsterdam*, tourist information leaflet available from the Pink Point, located next to the ‘Homomonument’.

\(^{452}\) Ibid.

\(^{453}\) Ibid.
strengthen personal and community identities.

Fig 4.8 Flowers left on the ‘Homomonument’, each with a personal dedication

(October 2014)

The ‘Memorial to the Homosexuals Persecuted under the National Socialist Regime’ in Berlin also transcends boundaries of time and aims to represent the past, reflect on the present and enable future change. The monument is, like the ‘Homomonument’, as much a contemporary political tool of social justice as it is a site of memory and commemoration. The monument, which was unveiled in 2008, is located in the Tiergarten, opposite the ‘Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe’, and near to the
‘Memorial to the Murdered Sinti and Roma’. It takes the form of a concrete cube, with a small window on one side that reveals a video playing on loop (see Fig. 4.9), with an interpretation panel in both German and English nearby.

Fig. 4.9 View into the video loop playing ‘Neverending Kiss’ in the ‘Memorial to the Homosexuals Persecuted under the National Socialist Regime’ (August 2013).

Photograph reprinted with kind permission of Emma Knock.

When the monument was first unveiled in 2008, the video, which was by the same artists who created the monument, Elmgreen and Dragset, showed two men sharing a kiss. As part of the continuous development of the monument, the aim is for the loop to

454 For discussion on the problematic approach to commemorating group identities in separate monuments, and the lack of intersectionality this engages with, see Wilke, ‘Remembering Complexity?’. 
be replaced every two years, with a new video by new artists. Like the ‘Homomonument’, it is a ‘living monument’ that can change and evolve according to current social and political needs. There have been two videos shown at the monument since 2008, and the selection process for a replacement video is still underway. It remains unclear as to why this process is ongoing and a replacement has yet to be found. The original video by Elmgreen and Dragset has been on display for a second time since October 2014, when it replaced the 2012 installation. The second video that was installed at the monument aimed to be more representative than the first, which showed only one male couple. The ‘Neverending Kiss’ by artists Gerald Backhaus, Bernd Fisher and Ibrahim Gülnar, which was shown between 2012-2014, showed kisses between same-sex couples of mixed ethnic backgrounds, ages and sexes, including female same-sex kisses. As such, it aimed to be more representative of LGBTQ communities in Germany today.

The inclusion of diverse couples in the video sparked major debate, particularly because they depicted female same-sex couples. Although ‘Neverending Kiss’ aimed to represent a more diverse contemporary group, concerns were raised about the anachronism of including female couples in a monument to homosexual victims of the Holocaust. Women were not persecuted for their sexuality in the same visible or direct way or in such large numbers as men during the Nazi regime. As in the UK, same-sex activity between women was not outlawed in Germany (although it was in neighbouring Austria), so they were not officially persecuted in the same way. Organisers and the film makers were criticised for seemingly distorting the historical record and implying that women suffered as much as men at the hands of National Socialists because of their sexuality. The ‘Memorial to the Homosexuals Persecuted under the National Socialist Regime’, thus highlights a tension between remembrance and memory, and history and
‘fact’. It also presents a tension between the past and the present, and the ways that ‘usable pasts’ become realised. As a site of memory, the monument does not aim to represent a history of facts and statistics. Instead, it aims to represent a memory of the past; a shared traumatic past, and become a site where present day needs can be met too. Moreover, the monument does not solely represent the history of the National Socialist regime, but also the continued persecution and oppression faced by those who engaged in same-sex love. Monuments, which as previously noted, often blur the lines between public art and public history, use visual representations to represent a past and create a shared collective memory of this past. The monument also speaks to LGBTQ communities today, and like the ‘Homomonument’ shares a message of social justice.

The ‘Memorial to the Homosexuals Persecuted under the National Socialist Regime’ makes this aim, to represent a collective memory and to stand against contemporary oppression and prejudices, clear. The accompanying panel next to the monument highlights that Section 175 (the law that banned sexual acts between men) excluded women, and that female same-sex acts were not prosecuted. It does also note that although women were not directly prosecuted, they lived in fear and were under ‘constant pressure to hide their sexuality.’ More importantly, the official aims of the monument are not solely to be historically accurate in representing those who were persecuted by the Nazi regime. Instead, the aims and purposes of the memorial as stated on the interpretation panel highlight that the Federal Republic of Germany intended, through this memorial, ‘to honour the victims of persecution and murder, to keep alive the memory of this injustice, and to create a lasting symbol of opposition to enmity,
intolerance and the exclusion of gay men and lesbians.\textsuperscript{455} It also noted that homosexuality continued to be prosecuted for many years after the war, and that even then, homosexual victims of National Socialism had not been included in public commemoration. Because of this history, Germany as a nation ‘has a special responsibility to actively oppose the violation’ of gay men and lesbians.\textsuperscript{456} The monument, thus, has multiple functions and ‘constructs different visitor subjectivities.’\textsuperscript{457} Christiane Wilke has argued that the monument invites LGBTQ people to remember historic persecution and ‘be assured that the German state is devoted to their inclusion and toleration’, and invites those who do not identify as LGBTQ to be tolerant of LGBTQ people. Both LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ people, Wilke argued, ‘are invited to connect their identities and attitudes to the memory of the injustices.’\textsuperscript{458} This memorial then, as well as the ‘Homomonument’ in Amsterdam, is a clear example of how such a form of public history \textit{can}, and indeed should, be used as a contemporary political tool to promote social justice. Indeed, the purposes of the monument are as much a statement of contemporary political and social justice as they are historic remembrance.

The use of the pink triangle and remembrance of those who were persecuted for their sexuality during the Nazi regime is also evident in monuments located in places that are not directly related to this history. While the ‘Homomonument’ and the ‘Memorial to


\textsuperscript{456} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{457} Wilke, ‘Remembering Complexity?’ p. 10.

\textsuperscript{458} Ibid.
the Homosexuals Persecuted under the National Socialist Regime’ are located in places in which people were at risk of persecution under the Nazi regime, monuments that use the pink triangle are also found across the globe. Some of these monuments directly reference the homosexual victims of the Holocaust, while others use the symbol to remember all those who have been persecuted in history for their sexuality.

For example, there are monuments that commemorate the homosexual victims of the Holocaust in Sydney, Tel Aviv, Cologne and Rome, amongst others. There is also a ‘Pink Triangle Park’ in San Francisco, USA, dedicated (in text and Braille) ‘in remembrance of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender victims of the Nazi regime’ (Fig 4.10). The Park houses fifteen granite pylons, each of which represents 1,000 of the approximate 15,000 people persecuted for their sexuality during the Holocaust. Each pylon is topped with a pink triangle, and there is a large pink triangle in the centre of the site, which is filled with pieces of rose quartz. Much like the ‘Homomonument’, the location of the ‘Pink Triangle Park’ in the Castro is also steeped in symbolic meanings and memories. The pink triangle pylons look towards the Harvey Milk Plaza and the giant rainbow flag that marks it. These monuments highlight the importance of remembrance and the significance of the pink triangle as a symbol of both historic oppression and marginalisation, and current fights for justice, recognition and equality. The use of these other sites of memory, which are all connected to the history of same-sex love, creates a landscape of memory.
There are also monuments that use the pink triangle to show this that are not directly representative of the Holocaust. For example, in Barcelona’s Ciutadella Park a monument in the shape of a triangle, with a pink trim, is dedicated ‘En memòria dels gais, les lesbianes i les persones transsexuals que han patit persecució i repressió al llarg de la història, Barcelona 2011.’ (English translation from Catalan: ‘In memory of gay men, lesbians and transsexual people who have suffered persecution and repression throughout history, Barcelona 2011’). These pink triangle monuments provide examples of how to commemorate traumatic and difficult pasts in order to ensure there are sites and places where individuals and communities can commemorate events, people and pasts together. Those outside of locations directly related to the Holocaust, such as in Barcelona and San Francisco, also serve as examples that the UK could follow to represent
collective histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities that are otherwise invisible in our public monuments and landscapes.

**Connecting sites of memory**

Finally, while this chapter has discussed monuments as individual sites of memory, it is necessary to highlight the role of walking tours in linking both marked and unmarked sites of memory together. Digital walking tours are discussed in the following chapter, but their role in connecting members of the public with sites of memory must be highlighted as a crucial one.

Historical walking tours are an example of Raphael Samuel’s argument that history is an activity, rather than a profession; it is as much a leisure pursuit as it is a career. They also show history is ‘on the move’, having left the ivory tower of academia, libraries and even museums, ‘and taken to the streets’. Moreover, walking tours make significant use of oral histories and personal memories, which allow participants to make connections with the past. As such, history and memory become a ‘nomadic, mobile process’, a constant work in progress. Walking tours are able to evolve; new sites of memory and histories can be added to them, in a transient way by participants, or more permanently by the creators of the tour. This is one of the main objectives of Centred’s


LGBTQ Historical Tour of Soho. Centred is an LGBTQ charity that has a specific focus on intersectionality and the diverse experiences of LGBTQ communities, through which they continuously develop and change the narratives on their tour.

Centred’s tour takes a consciously intersectional approach; it covers the history of same-sex love and marginalised groups within LGBTQ communities, including trans* histories, bisexual histories, and the histories of people of colour. Moreover, Centred runs some tours in British Sign Language (BSL), which ensures that the walks, and the histories they represent, are accessible to a diverse range of people. Such an intersectional approach recognises that both in history and in contemporary society, the experiences of individuals are based not only on their sexuality, but on their race, gender, class, religion and physical abilities. It also recognises that there is not one experience of LGBTQ communities, either today or historically. The tour takes participants around sites of memory in the Soho district of London, where marginalised communities have congregated and been welcomed within the wider community for centuries. The tour narrates the histories of Chevalier D’eon, Josephine Baker, Oscar Wilde, Quentin Crisp and Old Compton Street, among other individuals and sites of memory. It covers approximately 300 years of history and represents many aspects of LGBTQ life throughout these years. The tour contextualises LGBTQ histories within the identity of Soho as a place of refuge for many groups throughout history, including the French Huguenots who fled persecution in Catholic France from the 1680s and made Soho their home. The tour also explains that the Soho Register records contain an unusually high number of Dutch male

---

462 For information on Centred’s tours, see Centred, LGBTQ Historical Tour Soho (2012), <http://www.centred.org.uk/content/lgbtq-historical-tour-soho> [accessed 09 March 2016].

463 Tour taken on 17 November 2013.
names around the 1730s, which could be linked to the extreme persecution, verging on genocide, of homosexuals in Holland at this time. The more recent histories are told through the use autobiographies and biographies that relate to specific sites of memory, such as Quentin Crisp’s retelling of his time at the Black Cat Café in the late 1920s and 1930s. The walking tour therefore links various sites of memory together, connecting histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. Moreover, it marks Soho in its entirety as a site of LGBTQ memory. In a similar way, Manchester’s ‘Out in the Past’ trail, mentioned previously, marked Manchester as a site of memory, and is a lasting mark of individual sites of memory across Manchester, including the ‘Alan Turing Memorial’. Historical walking tours can therefore play a vital role not only in revealing and marking sites of memory, but also in linking them together to produce a broader and more diverse history.

Sites of memory can also be connected together through other means of public history. One particularly innovative example was seen in Berlin during 2013 during ‘Zerstörte Vielfalt’ (‘Diversity Destroyed’), a year long, city-wide theme that marked the anniversaries of the Nazi accession to power in 1933 and the November pogroms of 1938. ‘Diversity Destroyed’ highlighted diverse histories relating to these events through a range of exhibitions, events, and most significantly, urban memorials and biographical portraits located throughout the city. It sought to commemorate those who had contributed to Berlin’s diversity, including writers, artists and academics. The memorials reflected on their contributions to Berlin society and diversity, and the prejudice,

marginalisation and persecution they faced after 1933. An urban memorial at Frankfurter Tor commemorated diversity and ‘underground culture’, including homosexuality, and included details about Magnus Hirschfeld. Hirschfeld was also commemorated at another urban memorial in the city, curated by the Schwules Museum* (see Fig 4.11).

Fig 4.11. ‘Diversity Destroyed’ urban memorial by the Schwules Museum*.

Photograph reprinted with kind permission of Emily Spacie (August 2013)

The urban memorial reflected and included histories from their ‘Diversity Destroyed’ exhibition, ‘lesbian. jewish. gay’. Also included in the memorial were references to Richard Plant, author of *The Pink Triangle: The Nazi War Against the Homosexuals* (1987) and Charlotte Wolff, sexologist and author of *Love Between Women* (1971). These urban memorials created, albeit temporarily, visual connections between sites of memory across the city. Moreover, in a similar way to Berlin’s memorial to homosexuals, ‘Diversity Destroyed’ served to represent diverse histories to visitors and the public, and to remind them that ‘openness, tolerance and pluralism are values which our society must both protect and consciously engage with time and again.’

**Conclusion**

The monuments discussed have shown different ways in which memories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities are presented to, and constructed and developed by the public. These monuments are sites of memory, pilgrimage, commemoration, mourning and celebration. However, they only become such sites when people, passers-by, interact with them. By ‘having conversations’ or interacting with monuments, passers-by change them into sites of memory, where they go to remember the past, reflect on the present, and create new memories of the historical subject or event being commemorated.

It is through such actions that monuments ‘acquire their meanings in conversation with visitors and their identities’, as passers-by leave their personal marks and reflections,

sometimes tangibly, but often invisibly and silently. The Oscar Wilde tomb is one example of this, and although some critics of the pilgrims to this monument view the kisses left for Wilde as vandalism, others see them as visual and symbolic interactions with the past, with Wilde’s past, and the LGBTQ past. The kisses left for Wilde, the flowers left for Alan Turing in Sackville Park, and the flowers left at the ‘Homomonument’, among other interactions, are evidence that monuments can hold a crucial role in creating meaningful, and often very personal, connections with the past. The way that people interact with monuments, whether by leaving kisses or flowers, or simply leaving thoughts and reflections, is as much a part of the monument as the person or event being commemorated.

Monuments are thus representative of both the past and the present. They can represent a historic person or event, but they are also informed by our present understanding of the past. ‘The Turing Mosaic’ (in Milton Keynes) is a specific example of how the present day informs the design and aim of monuments. By representing both the life and after-life of Turing, the mosaic responds to contemporary understandings of Turing as a victim and as a martyr. Moreover, such monuments can also inform the future through the message they send. The ‘Memorial to the Homosexuals Persecuted under the National Socialist Regime’ does this by aiming to create a lasting symbol of opposition to intolerance and homophobia. It is intended to continue to act as a form of social justice in the future just as much as in the present day. This chapter has shown that by speaking to the past, present and future, monuments can have an important role to play in commemorating traumatic pasts, continuing the fight for equality, and celebrating change.

---

and communities in the present and future.

The way in which monuments transcend such boundaries of time is also a reminder that they are sites ‘where memory crystallizes and secretes itself’ in an ongoing process. Memories of those who interact with a monument become part of the site of memory itself. This chapter has shown that as sites of memory, monuments are at once material, symbolic and functional. It has shown, moreover, that the symbols and functions of monuments can change meaning over time, or have several functions at one time. The ‘Homomonument’, for example, can serve the function of a site of mourning and remembrance, and of a site of celebration and joyful community gathering. Although the material of monuments may not change, their functions do, as memories connected with these sites of memory evolve each time a passer-by interacts with them. As such, monuments represent not just usable pasts, but reusable pasts, which can be used for specific present needs.

Although this chapter has argued that some monuments commemorate LGBTQ communities and espouse a message of social justice in the present and future, it is worth remembering that there is no such monument in the UK that has these aims. The international examples discussed in this chapter, however, provide suggestions that the UK could look towards in its present day and future. Looking to the Utrecht memorial to the eighteen men arrested and hanged for sodomy, perhaps Tyburn, a site of hangings in London, or Newgate Prison, where the last executions for sodomy took place in 1835, could commemorate this history and become marked sites of commemoration. Equally,

---

468 Nora, ‘Between Memory and History’, p. 7.
the Barcelona monument that commemorates all in LGBTQ communities who have been oppressed is an example that the UK could follow.

The recent call for the estimated 49,000 men who were convicted under the same law as Turing to be pardoned provides another opportunity for a site of memory to be created.\(^{469}\) The call to pardon Turing and others convicted of gross indecency has received criticism from some historians, including Justin Bengry and Matt Houlbrook.\(^ {470}\) Concerns have been raised that these pardons ‘might be good politics, but [are] certainly bad history’.\(^ {471}\) Although the aim of the pardon is to atone for damage done, pardoning those

\(^{469}\) See the petition online: Matthew Breen, ‘Pardon all of the estimated 49,000 men who, like Alan Turing, were convicted of consenting same-sex relations under the British “gross indecency” law (only repealed in 2003), and also all the other men convicted under other UK anti-gay laws’, on Change.Org (2015), <https://www.change.org/p/british-government-pardon-all-of-the-estimated-49-000-men-who-like-alan-turing-were-convicted-of-consenting-same-sex-relations-under-the-british-gross-indecency-law-only-repealed-in-2003-and-also-all-the-other-men-convicted-under-other-uk-anti-gay> [accessed 14 August 2015].
\(^{471}\) Houlbrook, ‘Pardoning Alan Turing might be good politics, but it’s certainly bad history’.
convicted for ‘gross indecency’ would offer ‘an opportunity for the state to strategically forget and erase history’. Instead, a monument to those convicted for gross indecency, and those who have been convicted under different laws in history for consensual same-sex sex and/or relationships, would serve as a permanent reminder of the past and a message for the future. It would provide an opportunity for the UK government to officially, tangibly and symbolically recognise the historic oppression and marginalisation of those in the history of same-sex love, and LGBTQ communities today who still face prejudice. Such a monument could, like the ‘Homomonument’ and the ‘Memorial to Homosexuals Persecuted under the National Socialist Regime’, act as a positive message of social justice in the past, present and future. The past is indeed everywhere, and there are many sites of memory in the UK that relate to the history of same-sex love. Monuments can ensure that these memories and the histories associated with them become usable pasts that also reflect and speak to the present day.
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472 Bengry, ‘Why I Oppose a General Pardon for Historical Convictions for Homosexual Offences’.
Standing in front of the Turing statue in Manchester’s Sackville Park, a mobile phone rings, the display announcing ‘Incoming call: Alan Turing.’ The stuttering voice of ‘Turing’ starts to speak: ‘Computer, you must make my meaning clear.’ He goes on to say, ‘my secret must be told as clearly as I cracked the German plan. I’m a man of sorts. Though never much like the other boys.’ The voice is not really that of Turing, but of the actor Russell Tovey, who speaks as Turing to his beloved computer, and in turn, the visitor standing by his statue. It is a representation of Turing, in the same way that the monument represents his history and our interpretation of him today. Near the rainbow and ‘Victim of Prejudice’ plaques at the feet of the ‘Alan Turing Memorial’, discussed in the previous chapter, another plaque reads, ‘Talking Statue. Hear Alan here’. A passer-by, following the prompts on the plaque, can use their smartphone to have ‘Alan’ call them and tell them his history. Digital technology has given a voice to Turing, and allowed the public to interact with him in a new, digital way.

The Talking Statues project, which includes thirty-four other statues in London and Manchester, is just one example of the way that digital public history can bring the past to life in innovative and interactive ways. Digital public history is changing the way that the public interact with the past: from receiving telephone calls from statues to visiting museums virtually from their homes. This chapter addresses some of the ways that digital

473 Talking Statues, ‘Alan Turing’, written by Mark Ravenhill and animated by Russell Tovey. The recording can be accessed via smartphone only on <speak2.mobi/Alan/main-ios.html> See also Talking Statues, Alan Turing Sackville Gardens, <http://www.talkingstatues.co.uk/turing.html> [accessed 03 August 2015].
technology has made the public history of same-sex love more accessible and interactive. It shows that in museums and on the streets, digital public history can create new ways to explore and represent history to broader audiences. It also argues that digital public history provides a new level of public participation in creating, writing and accessing history. Indeed, as Simon Bradley has argued, digital technology ‘extends the scope’ of shared authority, and has created a more collaborative public history.\(^{474}\)

Digital technology and its use in public history has the ability to not only provide access to the past for a greater number of people, but also to change the way that the public participates with and creates history. As such, digital public history echoes Raphael Samuel’s statement that history is an activity that belongs not to academics, but to everyone: history is the ‘work of a thousand hands’.\(^{475}\) Although public history institutions have long been developing ways to collaborate with the public and create projects with ‘shared authority’, digital platforms have provided a more direct way to connect with the public. As Meg Foster has argued, Frisch’s ideas of ‘shared authority’, history from below and people’s history museums have encouraged public participation, but ‘new technologies have accelerated this trend’.\(^{476}\) This chapter discusses digital walking tours, mobile phone applications, web-based digital projects and the use of digital technology by physical and virtual archives and museums to highlight ways that digital public history has accelerated and increased public collaboration in producing and sharing history. There are other forms of digital history that are not discussed in this chapter. For example, the way that historians use digital technology to analyse and write history is not

\(^{474}\) Bradley, ‘History to Go’, p. 107. See also Frisch, A Shared Authority, passim.

\(^{475}\) Samuel, Theatres of Memory, p. 8.

\(^{476}\) Foster, ‘Online and Plugged In?’, p. 4.
included because it is not digital public history. Instead, the topics discussed focus on how the public access the past through digital means.

The first section on digital walking tours discusses three case studies: ‘Soho Stories’ by the National Trust, ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ and ‘Walk on the Wilde Side of Reading’. In doing so, it shows that digital walking tours can subvert traditional forms of public history and heritage in order to present the history of same-sex love. All of these walking tours are accessible as mobile applications (apps), a digital platform that can also be used to create other forms of public history. The second section analyses app-based projects: ‘Quist’, ‘Polari’ and ‘Quilt Stories’, which use mixed media and collaborative methods to bring different aspects of the history of same-sex love to a public audience. The following section on web-based public history projects highlights different ways that the internet has provided access to the history of same-sex love to the public, and allowed them to become collaborators. In particular, it shows that crowdsourcing and digital mapping can involve members of the public, particularly LGBTQ communities, in developing, writing and accessing their own pasts. The next section shows that digital archives, like web-projects, can provide greater access to histories of same-sex love. It also shows that accessibility, the ability to access records from anywhere with an internet connection, does not always mean records relating to same-sex love are more visible. Finally, this chapter analyses ways that museums have used digital technology, both in-house and online, to create a more collaborative and open relationship with their visitors. It discusses the development of ‘virtual museums’, museums that exist online, and show that these are breaking down practical barriers that public history institutions face, including the limited space for interpretation and the geographical reach of their audiences.
Digital public history is inherently interdisciplinary. As Bradley argues, walking tours ‘readily merge public history, local history and oral history’ with other disciplines and mixed forms of art, ‘thus forming part of a general movement towards interdisciplinary collaboration.’\textsuperscript{477} Digital public history does not just encourage collaboration across different academic disciplines, but also encourages public engagement: it has created a platform for shared authority to flourish. Rosenzweig and Cohen argue that digital public history and media ‘transform the traditional, one way reader/writer, producer/consumer relationship,’ and as such, ‘the web offers an ideal medium’ for collaboration.\textsuperscript{478} Since Rosenzweig and Cohen’s early work on digital history, collaboration and shared authority have become central to its study and development. As noted, both Foster and Bradley have also argued that digital technology has accelerated and extended the concept of shared authority. Digital public history has more than the potential to create shared authority in public history: it can, and does, democratise the process of history writing by placing the public at the forefront of its creation. This is particularly significant for the history of same-sex love, as well as other marginalised histories. LGBTQ communities from across the world can be connected through the internet and contribute to digital public history projects. The collaborative nature of digital public history is providing more opportunities for the public, and LGBTQ communities, to contribute to the writing of their histories, and in turn better understand the history of same-sex love.

\textsuperscript{477} Bradley, ‘History to Go’, p. 100.

Digital Walking Tours

History walks and tours have long been a route for the public to access the past. Indeed, as Raphael Samuel argued, ‘the idea of the historical walk is as old as antiquarianism itself.’ Before the widespread use of the internet and smartphones, walking tours and trails were interactive, historical leisure activities, but they took place in different ways. Guide-led walking tours remain popular and the public can still find walking tours in printed publications, but digital technology has put walking tours in the hands of the public for them to experience in different ways.

The walking tours discussed in this section; the National Trust’s ‘Soho Stories’, ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’, and the Automobile Association (AA) tour, ‘Walk on the Wilde Side of Reading’, are all accessible as mobile applications (apps) but they use different methods to share history with the public. The first thing that should be noted about all of these tours is that they mark a digital turn away from mainstream and official histories. They all, in different ways, subvert a traditional form of public history, and thus in some way queer it. While the examples in this section are all based in the south of England, they are also accessible to those outside of their location. This highlights significant changes in the experience of public history: the public no longer need to physically experience a walking tour to find out about the history of a place: they can visit virtually. Digital walking tours make local histories accessible in new and creative ways, presenting local and regional histories of same-sex love to a wider geographical audience.

\footnote{Samuel, Theatres of Memory p. 182.}
'Soho Stories' was produced in 2012 by the National Trust and narrates over sixty years of Soho’s history using oral history testimonies, songs and readings of pamphlets, and literature relating to Soho. It was ‘Soho Stories’ that Bennett was referring to when he criticised the National Trust for their move away from representing architectural histories. While the app does not focus on the history of same-sex love and the LGBTQ community in Soho, it includes this as part of a much broader history of the area. Other histories that are included are the sex industry, migrant communities and political and artistic communities that have been drawn to Soho throughout its history. The stop that focuses on the history of same-sex love is Old Compton Street, where the user hears about the annual Pride celebrations that take over Soho. Barry Cryer, the lead narrator for the app, introduces Old Compton Street as the ‘gay high street of Europe’, a ‘self-contained zone of flamboyance, liberalism and socialising.’ Another narrator describes their experience of Soho on Pride day, explaining that all of Soho becomes a street party with a carnival atmosphere. Further oral testimonies describe Soho as ‘the pink zone’, a ‘centre of tolerance’, and a place that has always had a gay scene, one that particularly became visible after the partial decriminalisation of homosexuality in 1967. The narration also turns to the bombing of the Admiral Duncan pub, and a local resident describes the day of the bombing and what it was like to walk through Old Compton Street on that day. The local resident explains that despite the ‘awful incident of the nail bomb in the

481 Bennett, People, p. ix.
482 ‘Soho Stories’ app, Old Compton Street stop.
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pub’ and that it might look different, Soho’s spirit has not really changed. Oral history testimonies have been woven into walking tours since before the advent of the smartphone, and they remain an integral part of the way local histories are told. As Toby Butler has argued, walking tours and audio walks ‘quite literally give people a voice in the interpretation of their neighbourhood that are listened to in an active way.’ Soho Stories gives such a voice to residents of Soho, ensuring that their histories are heard alongside the history of the place itself.

‘Soho Stories’ marks a move away from the National Trust’s often conservative and traditional approach to heritage. It does this not only in content, by profiling Soho and its history of LGBTQ communities, sex work and multiculturalism, but also by using advanced technology that traces the exact location the user is in, and ‘whispers its hedonistic history’ to them. The app uses Global Positioning System (GPS) technology that begins to play the narration when the user is standing in the exact location and stops when they walk on. Moreover, the user can either listen in Soho using this GPS technology, or they can manually select locations to listen virtually, from anywhere in the world, thus bringing the history of Soho to a global audience.

Another digital walking tour, ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’, has also been designed so that users can access the information either during a physical walk or virtually via their

484 Ibid.
smartphone. ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ places virtual plaques on locations relevant to the history of same-sex love and the LGBTQ community, evoking and challenging official plaque schemes such as English Heritage Blue Plaques. The pink plaque is in the form of a triangle, in direct reference to the pink triangle that homosexuals were forced to wear in Nazi concentration camps during the Holocaust.

While ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ does not use GPS in the same way as ‘Soho Stories’ does by tracking their exact location, the user can select the ‘plaque’ they wish to view via a map whether or not they are physically present. As with ‘Soho Stories’, this function means that the app is not restricted by geographical barriers and physical accessibility. A virtual user can access information about each ‘plaque’ on the tour through their smartphone. This accessibility is reflected in the download locations of ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’: the original ‘Lite’ version was downloaded 649 times: 393 of these were from Europe; 133 from Latin America and the Caribbean; 44 from Africa, the Middle East and India; 41 from USA and Canada; and 38 from Asia Pacific. The updated version of the app (released 2011) has been downloaded 76 times in Europe; 31 in USA and Canada; 29 in Asia Pacific; 3 in Africa, the Middle East and India; and once from Latin America and the Caribbean. While it is not possible to find out whether these were downloaded ahead of a physical visit to Brighton, the global access to the app and therefore to Brighton’s LGBTQ history is clear. This global access, as well as virtual accessibility in other apps, is breaking down geographical boundaries for the heritage and tourism industry, as well as for global LGBTQ individuals and communities.

487 The app can be downloaded via iTunes at Black Tablet, Brighton Pink Plaques (2015), <http://www.blacktablet.co.uk/pink-plaques.html> [accessed 04 August 2015].

488 With thanks to Stephen Watson for providing these statistics (email to author 08 April 2015).
Fig. 5.1 and Fig 5.2, Screenshots of ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’, showing a selection of plaques (left) and The Grand Hotel entry (right). Images reproduced with kind permission of Rose Collis and Stephen Watson.

‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ is also innovative as a form of guerrilla heritage, presenting an unauthorised LGBTQ history on the streets of Brighton. In a similar way to the York Alternative History Rainbow Plaques discussed in the previous chapter, ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ takes an official and recognisable symbol, the heritage plaque, and queers it. By virtually placing commemorative plaques on places of significance to LGBTQ history, ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ directly challenges traditional heritage plaque schemes, which so rarely acknowledge diverse sexualities and genders. ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ further pushes this challenge by using the pink triangle as the plaque: it is a clear and visual statement that LGBTQ histories are relevant and should be visible. The information page for the app explains that,
In the UK, many buildings are recognised as being historically significant due to the people that lived there or events that took place there and of these some are commemorated by having a Blue Plaque visible outside the building. We felt that to commemorate the wonderful LGBT history of Brighton it would be good to have a similar form of recognition, albeit virtual...Maybe one day there will be physical ones too...489

‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ is not the first publication, digital or otherwise, to directly challenge the traditional heritage plaque: as previously noted, in 1988 The Pink Plaque Guide to London was published to list and detail locations relevant to LGBTQ histories in London.490 Both this publication and ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ make histories of same-sex love more visible through a traditional form of public history, and while they do not place physical plaques on locations they do challenge the dominant (heteronormative and patriarchal) narrative of official histories. ‘Black Plaques’ is another walking tour app that subverts the traditional plaque to highlight ‘memorials to misadventure’, including histories of crime, sex and tragedy in London.491 ‘Black Plaques’ and ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ both challenge traditional heritage and officially commemorated histories to highlight often marginalised histories and in turn make these histories more visible. These initiatives present a direct challenge to an ‘authorised heritage discourse’ (AHD) and are a virtual form of guerrilla commemoration. In a similar way to the York Alternative History rainbow plaques discussed in the previous chapter, these apps show that spaces can be marked as visible sites of memory in a way that challenges AHD, whether virtually or

489 Rose Collis, ‘Help and Copyright’, on ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ app V2.0 (2014), [accessed 04 August 2015].
Another digital walking tour that challenges traditional forms of public history, and leisure activities more generally, is the AA’s ‘Walk on the Wilde Side of Reading’. Better known as a car breakdown and insurance company, The AA has produced over 1,500 walking and cycle trails across the UK. While these walks are focused on the leisure activities of walking or cycling and the environmental landscape, background information and relevant historical context is provided along with directions and a map. The ‘Walk on the Wilde Side’ tour, which is available through their app ‘AA Walks’ and their website, takes the walker on a short tour of Reading, ending at Reading Gaol, where Oscar Wilde was imprisoned for gross indecency in 1895.\footnote{The AA, A Walk on the Wilde Side of Reading (2015), <http://www.theaa.com/walks/a-walk-on-the-wilde-side-of-reading-420103> [accessed 03 August 2015].}

The walk description explains that Wilde was imprisoned in Reading Gaol between November 1895 and 1897, and details how Queensbury’s case against him came to court, the context of the 1885 Criminal Law Amendment Act, and how he was ostracised by society while he was in prison. Although not particularly long or detailed, the description puts Wilde’s history into its historical context.\footnote{Ibid.} The walker learns about Wilde’s place in society as one who had sex with men. They learn that he was imprisoned as a result of the Law Amendment Act and ostracised by society, that his books were removed from shops and his name was removed from theatre posters, and that his reputation and life were left in ruins. Moreover, the app demonstrates how the history of Wilde is important to local Reading history too, as not only the place where he was jailed, but also where he wrote \textit{The Ballad of Reading Gaol}, which the tour description explains ‘gave him status as
a writer of serious merit.’ The walking tour thus presents a history of Wilde that is of interest to local history and the history of same-sex love.

Each of these digital walking tours takes a traditional form of public history or activity; the National Trust, the revered blue plaque, leisurely walking and cycling tours, and uses them to tell underrepresented and marginalised histories. They also do this in an accessible way, at least to those with a smartphone. Digital platforms have allowed these walking tours to do something different with traditional history and leisure activities, and in turn ‘queer’ them and make them more representative of the history of same-sex love. Although The Pink Plaque Guide to London had a similar aim in 1988, a digital platform for ‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ has made pink plaques accessible to a wider audience who can negotiate their way around a map, or the streets, to find virtual plaques. As Lauren Jae Gutterman has argued, while the history of same-sex love is marginalised from much public history, including in major museums, the Internet and digital platforms can ‘serve as a crucial public source’. In this way, digital walking tours bring the history of same-sex love onto the streets and a virtual world.

**Mobile Applications**

Digital walking tours are just one way that mobile apps have been used to make the history of same-sex love more accessible to a public audience. Mobile apps also provide a platform for history projects to reach a wide audience and engage them with the histories of LGBTQ communities. To explore what mobile apps can do to increase the visibility of
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494 Ibid.

and interaction with the history of same-sex love, this section discusses three different apps. ‘Quist’ uses a popular form of digital engagement with history based on the ‘on this day’ method; ‘Polari’ is a digital dictionary produced by the Polari Mission Project that aims to preserve Polari, a language used mostly by gay men in the mid-twentieth century; and ‘Quilt Stories’ uses mixed media to preserve the memories of individuals lost to AIDS. Each of these apps has the overall aim of introducing a public audience to history through digital means, but each does so in different ways.

‘Quist’ uses a popular form of digital engagement with history by highlighting particular events that took place on specific days in history. The ‘on this day’ approach is popular on social media and is used by public history institutions, historians and the public to highlight anniversaries of events. Posts relating to relevant anniversaries are collectively shared on social media, such as Twitter, with the hashtag (a search term or topic preceded and made searchable by ‘#’) #OTD or #OnThisDay, and are often accompanied by a relevant image or link to contextual and detailed information. ‘Quist’ takes a similar approach by highlighting global events in the history of same-sex love, LGBTQ communities and HIV/AIDS that happened on that day. The app uses images, text, video and external links to highlight events, with the homepage of the app showing the (often multiple) events for that day.\footnote{The app can be downloaded via iTunes at Quist, Home (2015), \url{http://www.quistapp.com/} [accessed 03 August 2015].} The app also allows users to search for histories by country, date or keyword. For example, searching for ‘Oscar Wilde’ returns entries for the day he was convicted of gross indecency (May 25 1895), opening dates of his trials and their coverage in newspapers, and the closing of The Oscar Wilde Memorial Bookstore in...
Greenwich Village, New York, in March 2009.

While the entries are not particularly detailed, each one contains a link to an external source where the user can find out more about the person or event in question. Although the majority of these external sources are not authored or produced by academics or experts, links to websites such as Wikipedia provide users with a starting point to learn more about the past and to find more resources, websites, projects and publications. This example of mixed media, with images, videos, text and links highlights the accessibility and factual, rather than contextual, nature of the ‘on this day’ approach. However, the ‘Quist’ website includes links to digital resources, including ‘Notches: (re)marks on the history of sexuality’, which is discussed later in this chapter, and digital versions of popular and academic history books. Although the ‘Quist’ app itself does not provide an in-depth look at the history of same-sex love, it does provide access to facts and contextual information, and signposts other resources such as blogs and publications through which further knowledge and understanding of the past can be gained. ‘Quist’ has provided a queer take of #OTD to a wide and global audience, having been downloaded over 20,000 times in over 100 countries. Although the majority of events listed took place in the US, ‘Quist’ is expanding their global outreach and content. For example, 66 per cent of the events that were added to the app’s content in 2014 were from outside the US, and many of these have been translated into other

497 Quist, Online Resources, <http://www.quistapp.com/online-resources/> [accessed 03 August 2015].
languages.\textsuperscript{499} The ‘Quist’ mission is ‘to educate the world about the roots of the LGBTQ community, make LGBTQ history more engaging and relevant, and let LGBTQ youth know that others have shared their struggle.’\textsuperscript{500}

‘Quist’ has also expanded its vision of sharing queer history with Version 2.0 of the app, which includes the additional feature of a geo-tagged map of LGBTQ history. The map, which covers the globe but features mostly US sites, includes five different types of locations: places where an event in LGBTQ history took place; LGBTQ and LGBTQ related museums; LGBTQ archives; LGBTQ monuments; and HIV/AIDS monuments. The map, like the National Park Service and Historic England projects that will be discussed shortly, marks a recent turn towards mapping LGBTQ histories for the public. They also highlight user contribution as central to their success, and ‘Quist’ asks its users to ‘submit a moment in history’ and submit details of historical events or sites that are missing from the app’s existing content.\textsuperscript{501} A digital platform makes this possible, and allows ‘Quist’ to reach a global audience. Unlike localised public history that aims to reach a physical audience, such as museums and historic houses, digital apps such as ‘Quist’ aim instead to reach beyond this. The effect is that LGBTQ communities from across the world can learn and interact with their shared history, even contributing their own entries.

The ‘Polari’ app also encourages users to interact with and contribute to the
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\textsuperscript{500} Quist, About, <http://www.quistapp.com/about/> [accessed 03 August 2015].

\textsuperscript{501} Quist, Submit Event, <http://www.quistapp.com/submit-event/> [accessed 03 August 2015].
history of same-sex love.\textsuperscript{502} ‘Polari’ aims to introduce the Polari language to a greater audience, preserve it and in turn make users ‘custodian[s] of the language, literally holding its future’ in their hands.\textsuperscript{503} The Polari language was predominantly spoken by gay men in the mid-twentieth century, and fell out of use after it became widely recognised after its inclusion in the BBC Radio show ‘Round the Horne’. Polari was used to conduct private conversations in public, which allowed gay men to discuss other men and their lifestyle without being understood by the heterosexual majority.\textsuperscript{504} The app takes the form of a translation dictionary, and users can choose a list of words either in Polari or English. Each entry includes further details about the chosen word, such as its origin. Users can also add missing entries to the list, or even create new words to be added to the lexicon. The app describes the history of Polari, and encourages the user to share in preserving the language and its use through their own interaction and sharing of phrases and words on social media.

The app serves as an example of the range of digital platforms that projects use to engage and collaborate with the public. It is part of a wider campaign, the Polari Mission Project, which like the app, aims to preserve and promote the history and use of the Polari language.\textsuperscript{505} Polari Mission Project has also produced Polari workshops and exhibitions, but the digital nature of the app means that anyone can contribute to and engage with the Polari language and the Project. It is also an example of the potential

\textsuperscript{502} The app can be downloaded via iTunes at Polari App, About (2014), <http://www.polariapp.com/#about> [accessed 04 August 2015].
\textsuperscript{503} Polari App, About.
collaborative power of digital public history that encourages interaction regardless of geographical location.

Apps and digital projects can have broader aims than just bringing facts and historical knowledge to the public: they can also act as sites of commemoration. ‘Quilt Stories’ is both a digital public history project and an act of remembrance and commemoration. The AIDS Memorial Quilt, as discussed in the previous chapter, names and remembers those lost to HIV/AIDS. ‘Quilt Stories’ further commemorates those remembered in the AIDS Memorial Quilt by narrating their individual histories through a digital platform. While not all of those commemorated on the AIDS Memorial Quilt were part of the LGBTQ community, many of them were, and the place of AIDS in the history of same-sex love is significant. The app provides images of individual memorial panels from the quilt, which are accompanied by a voiceover narrating the history of that person. The oral testimonies have been researched and produced by students at the Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD). The students use archival documents including letters, funeral programmes and photographs that accompany the memorial panels to narrate the lives of each individual as much as possible. The result is that those commemorated are not just names, but personalities, family members, friends and lovers.

‘Quilt Stories’ is just one example of a digital history project that has the purpose of commemoration. Digital memorials such as ‘Lives of the First War’ by the Imperial War

\[506\] The app can be downloaded via iTunes at Quilt Stories, Home, <http://quiltstories.org/> [accessed 03 August 2015].
Museum also aim to commemorate individual events and people and provide a platform for members of the public to contribute histories of their loved ones.\textsuperscript{507} In a similar way to the monuments discussed in the previous chapter, these digital memorials can function for the purpose of commemoration. As such, although they are not material, as Nora argued they must be, such digital memorials are nevertheless sites of memory; they exist because of a will to remember and preserve history.\textsuperscript{508}

‘Quist’, ‘Polari’ and ‘Quilt Stories’ all have an interactive web presence too, so those without smartphones can also engage with them. They all show in different ways how mobile applications can serve as encyclopaedias and dictionaries. They also show how mobile applications can preserve sub-cultures and promote acts of remembrance. Moreover, they do this in an interactive and collaborative way. Even those who cannot see the AIDS Memorial Quilt in person, much less see the archival documents provided with them, can access the stories of those being remembered, and contribute their own memories and histories too.

**Web Projects and Crowdsourcing**

Web-based digital public history projects use a range of ways to connect with the public, including mixed-media, online resources books and mapping to promote and preserve histories. Such digital public history projects have not just allowed academic and public historians and institutions to reach and educate a wider audience; like the mobile applications discussed, they have also provided a platform for collaboration with a wider

\textsuperscript{507} Imperial War Museums, *Lives of the First World War*, <https://livesofthefirstworldwar.org/> [accessed 03 August 2015].

\textsuperscript{508} See Nora, ‘Between Memory and History’.
For example, large website projects such as OutHistory.org, the LGBT History Project UK and glbtq.com, all of which are what Jerome de Groot termed ‘participatory publishing’, have presented the history of same-sex love to a broad online audience. Like Wikipedia, these websites allow for multiple contributors to add and edit entries. These online encyclopaedias include articles, images and references to build up an accessible history of same-sex love. Other platforms, such as homohistory.com, aim to present images of same-sex couples from the past. Images of historic same-sex couples (whether romantic, sexual or platonic) at once challenge ideas about what constitutes a ‘queer’ historical image, and raise issues about the authority and reliability of history online. However, there is no information about the context in which the photograph was taken, who took it, or indeed who its subject is. Ideally, these images would include contextual information, such as the date it was taken and the names of those in the photographs. Such information could provide users with an opportunity to find out more, to research the subjects of the photographs and discover more about their relationships.

All of these websites raise questions about the ‘gatekeeping’ of history and the management of shared authority. As Meg Foster has argued, while digital public history
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509 De Groot, Consuming History, p. 96.
See OutHistory, Home, <http://www.outhistory.org/> [accessed 14 August 2015] and
LGBT History Project UK, LGBT History Project (2015), <http://www.lgbthistoryuk.org/> [accessed 14 August 2015]. glbtq.com closed on 01 August 2015 but the contents of the website have been archived and are available to access on glbtq Archives, Home Page (2015), <http://www.glbtqarchive.com/> [accessed 14 August 2015].
facilitates ‘more open, democratic history making’, it also raises issues about ‘who has the right to speak for the past.’ The public do indeed have a ‘right’ to speak for the past, but historical accuracy, reliability and scholarly integrity remain important elements of presenting the past. Lauren Jae Gutterman has discussed these issues in particular relation to OutHistory.org. Gutterman, a project coordinator for the website, noted that in its development, compromise had to be reached between those who were wary about its similarity to Wikipedia, which they did not consider a reliable resource, and those who focused on the project’s ‘intention to democratize historical writing’ by providing an open platform for contribution. The solution was to create two categories for entries to the website that made it clear whether they were ‘protected’ entries approved by OutHistory.org staff which could not be edited by members of the public or ‘unprotected’, collaboratively written entries that could be edited by anyone. This compromise highlights that the issues of shared authority, collaboration and communities writing their own histories are equally problematic in the digital world as they have long been in public history institutions and projects. However, such websites do for now provide a platform for members of the public to contribute histories and writing, and will continue to raise important questions for academic and public historians, and the public, about who owns and writes histories.

The history of same-sex love is also widely showcased online in blogs, often by academics. For example, Matt Houlbrook and Jeffrey Meek, among others, have discussed their academic research on the history of same-sex love on their personal
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publicly accessible blogs.\footnote{See Matt Houlbrook, *The Trickster Prince*, <https://tricksterprince.wordpress.com/> [accessed 03 August 2015] and Jeffrey Meek, *Queer Scotland: Scottish Queer History and Culture*, <http://queerscotland.com/> [accessed 03 August 2015].} Blogs are, essentially, websites whose content is primarily in written form and that are regularly updated and displayed in reverse chronological order. Academic blogs are intended to be read both by academics and interested members of the public. Academic blogs can ‘build a community of engaged readers’ and can turn academic research, usually published in monographs or academic journals, into ‘a public performance, in dialog (sic) amongst ourselves, and with a wider public.’\footnote{Tim Hitchcock, ‘Doing it in public: Impact, blogging, social media and the academy’, on *Historyonics*, 15 July 2014, <http://historyonics.blogspot.co.uk/2014/07/doing-it-in-public-impact-blogging.html> [accessed 03 August 2015].} They can both inform and involve members of the public, and a wider range of academics than a traditional monograph would.

Edited and jointly authored blogs also offer a way for public and academic audiences alike to discover the history of same-sex love. In particular, *Notches: (re)marks on the history of sexuality* has provided access to a range of articles on the history of sexuality to a public audience.\footnote{See Justin Bengry and Gillian Frank (Managing Editors), *Notches: (re)marks on the history of sexuality* (2015), <http://notchesblog.com/> [accessed 02 August 2015].} *Notches*, which launched in 2014, received over 108,000 viewers in its first year, having published blog posts on a range of topics including male bed-sharing and sexuality in Medieval Europe, finding the pre-modern lesbian and Section 28.\footnote{With thanks to Justin Bengry for providing statistics for *Notches* views (email to author, 31 May 2015).} *Notches* was launched to coincide with the launch of an academic seminar series at the Institute of Historical Research, and shows the importance of digital public history in...
reaching new and different audiences. While fifteen people might turn up to each seminar, thousands of people, academics and the public, access *Notches* blog posts, bringing the history of sexuality to a much broader and more public audience. Blogs such as *Notches* and *The Many-Headed Monster*, co-authored by academic historians from a range of institutions, have also used their digital space to house online, publicly accessible, seminars. For example, *The Many-Headed Monster* hosted ‘The Voices of the People: an Online Symposium’ throughout July and August 2015. The online symposium, discussed on Twitter using the hashtag #voxpop2015, showcased twenty articles on reclaiming voices, including queer voices, from history and historical records. While symposiums, seminars and conferences usually take place in academic institutions, are often costly to attend and rarely involve contributions or comments from the public, blogging has allowed space for the debates discussed in the online symposium to reach, and involve, a far wider audience.

Blogs written by academics thus have the potential to represent a more open practice of history writing that invites commentary from members of the public that other forms of academic history, such as monographs and journal articles, do not. Blogs, when referenced and include links to external sources and primary documents, present an opportunity for members of the public to engage with history and the historian writing it. Members of the public are provided with ‘space to construct their own understanding of the past alongside historians.’ Moreover, blogs are not the preserve of the academic
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historian, and can be written and maintained by anyone with access to the internet. They are another example of the democratisation of public history as they can give members of the public a platform for their own voices, histories and narratives. They can enable ‘ordinary people a greater degree of participation in public history making.’ However, despite the potential of digital public history to erode barriers between historians and the public, limitations remain. Just as in other forms of public history discussed, issues of authority, collaboration and accuracy are, as Foster has argued, ‘as complex as they ever were.’

Blogging and other forms of digital public history have provided new platforms for members of the public to engage with and produce history, but they have not diffused existing tensions in public history. Nevertheless, blogs, whether written by members of the public or by academics for a public audience, show that the roles of the historian as ‘producer’ and the public as ‘audience’ is shifting and overlapping, and that historians and the public can create sustainable and meaningful dialogues through digital platforms.

Other forms of collaboration between academics, institutions and members of the public have been developed through crowdsourcing, which allows for community members to share their voices and histories for a specific project. By crowdsourcing I refer to the method of sharing authority that involves seeking out contributions and participation from the public. Crowdsourcing is not necessarily a form of digital public history; it is simply a method of sourcing information from a wide range of people. It is,


520 Foster, ‘Online and Plugged In?’, p. 3.

521 Ibid.
however, increasingly carried out online, because it allows for a greater number of people, across a broader geographical area to contribute. Crowdsourcing projects are beneficial to both the institution running the project and the public that it aims to involve or represent. Crowdsourced projects endorse public participation in the creation of histories, and they also, as Mia Ridge has argued, ‘encourage skills development and deeper engagement with cultural heritage’ through digital means.  

One example of a crowdsourced project that relates to the history of same-sex love is the ‘126’ exhibition that ran at the National Trust’s Sutton House in 2015. Building on an exhibition held in 2014 that used the voices of four LGBTQ-identified individuals to narrate four of Shakespeare’s sonnets, ‘126’ extended the idea to include all of Shakespeare’s Fair Youth sonnets. The aim of the project was to hear the sonnets, and thus queer heritage, through queer voices: 126 contributors who identify as LGBTQ were crowdsourced. They each recorded themselves reading an assigned sonnet and provided a short video clip to accompany it. The exhibition, in the form of a video with voiceovers, ran in Sutton House for their ‘Queer Season’ in 2015, and the recordings are now available online, preserving the exhibition and the voices, ensuring that they can be accessed beyond the running of the physical exhibition. Crowdsourcing in this case allowed for LGBTQ voices to be heard, recorded, presented and preserved for National Trust members, the public and online audiences.


An increasingly popular method of digital public history collaboration and
crowdsourcing is digital mapping. Two major public history projects in the US and UK by
the National Park Service (NPS) and Historic England (previously English Heritage) have
utilised digital and crowdsourced mapping as a way to preserve the history of same-sex
love and LGBTQ communities. Since then, other smaller scale and localised crowdsourced
mapping projects have been launched in Manchester and Cumbria. In a similar way to
‘Brighton Pink Plaques’ they provide a platform for the public to contribute sites that are
relevant to the history of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities, and add details of their
historical significance to a digital map.

The NPS launched the LGBTQ Heritage Initiative in 2014, which aims to build on
previous projects on American-Latino, Asian-American and Pacific Islander and women’s
histories. The LGBTQ Heritage Initiative aims to locate, promote and preserve sites
relating to LGBTQ histories in the US. Two of the specific aims of the initiative – to
identify, document and nominate ‘LGBTQ-associated sites as national historic landmarks’;
and to increase ‘the number of listings of LGBTQ-associated properties in the National
Register of Historic Places’ – will be reached through digital mapping and crowdsourced
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524 For information on the Manchester-based project ‘out!’, see Manchester Pride, out! (2015),
<http://www.manchesterpride.com/our-events/out> [accessed 17 August 2015] and Nicola Davis,
‘Manchester Pride explores the hidden history of a rainbow city’, on The Observer, 14 July 2015,
<http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2015/jul/14/manchester-pride-interactive-history>
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The NPS has produced a Google map of LGBTQ related historic places, to which anyone can suggest a location for inclusion.\textsuperscript{526}

Sites are identified on the map by pins, with differently coloured or shaped pins to highlight different levels of official recognition. These levels are: sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places or as a National Historic Landmark because of their significance to LGBTQ history; sites where LGBTQ history is mentioned in their official documentation; sites whose LGBTQ history is not mentioned in their official documentation; unlisted sites of significance to LGBTQ history; and demolished sites.

The map serves not only as a database, but also as a visual sign of how important this initiative is: there are seven sites registered because of their relevance to LGBTQ history, and a further three registered sites where LGBTQ history is mentioned in their nomination. By contrast, there are approximately 100 entries and 500 entries for registered sites whose LGBTQ history is not mentioned in their nomination, and those sites not registered as either NR or NHL. Thus over 600 sites have been registered as significant to LGBTQ histories in the US. Very few sites on the map will eventually be registered as NR or NHL, so the map serves a crucial role in recognising them as significant regardless of eventual official status, and as a visual acknowledgement of the amount and

\textsuperscript{525} National Park Service, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ) Heritage Initiative (2015), \textless http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageinitiatives/LGBThistory/index.html\textgreater [accessed 03 August 2015].

\textsuperscript{526} The map and an Excel spreadsheet that contains a comprehensive list of sites can be accessed via National Park Service, Places with LGBTQ Heritage (2015), \textless http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageinitiatives/LGBThistory/places.html\textgreater [accessed 19 August 2015].
Most entries on the map include a short explanation that details the site’s significance to the history of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. For example, the entry for Stonewall Inn, which is one of the six National Historic Landmarks, says, ‘The Stonewall Inn and nearby parks and streets where patrons rioted against police harassment. Commonly identified as the beginning of the Gay Rights Movement.’ The entry for Stonewall Inn also includes the details of when the riots took place and when the Inn became listed, as well as a link to the official nomination for its inclusion as a National Historic Landmark, which gives full details of the significance of the historic site.527 One site that is listed on the National Register or a National Historic Landmark, but whose LGBTQ history is omitted from official documentation, is Beauport, the Sleeper-McCann House in Massachusetts. Beauport was home to Henry Davis Sleeper, an interior designer, antiquarian and collector. The National Historic Landmark nomination refers to Sleeper and Abraham Piatt Andrew as ‘life-long bachelors and close friends.’528 However, as the National Park Magazine highlights in a report of the LGBTQ initiative, staff at the house have long believed that Sleeper was gay, but ‘were reluctant to discuss the subject without clear evidence.’ Once ‘bona fide proof’ of his sexuality was found in 2007, it


became part of the history of the house. Although Sleeper’s sexuality has become part of the narrative of Beauport, it remains invisible in official National Historic Landmark documentation. The NPS LGBTQ Heritage Initiative and map thus aim not only to find new sites of interest to LGBTQ history, but also to highlight the hidden stories in already existing National Historic Landmarks and ensure that LGBTQ histories are officially recognised as part of the site’s history, and thus US national history.

While many of the properties and sites pinned on the Google map will not formally be included on the National Register, the map itself will remain a catalogue of LGBTQ history sites in the US. As members of the public can nominate any site, many of them will be small historic sites of significance to the local community. As such, this project is inherently for the public, as much as being produced with the public. The NPS has produced a guide for members of the public to encourage and guide them in contributing entries and adding more information about existing entries. It provides information on how to identify and nominate places, add information, design a tour (walking, driving, or virtual), share knowledge and ideas, preserve objects and spread the word (in person, or on social media using #LGBTQhistory), among others. By providing advice and information on how to get involved both in person and digitally, the scope of potential involvement is great, and is inclusive of as many people as possible.
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Historic England, with Leeds Beckett University, has also launched a project to preserve, promote and map the history of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities in England. Conceptualised in a similar way to their other diverse history projects on the history of the slave trade and abolition, women’s history and disability history, ‘Pride of Place: LGBTQ Heritage Project’ aims to show that LGBTQ heritage is a ‘fundamental and fascinating part of our national heritage’.\(^{531}\) It also serves to extend Historic England’s responsibility to bring ‘the histories of marginalised, under-researched and under-represented groups’ to greater public attention.\(^{532}\) Part of this project involves finding and mapping places and sites that are relevant to LGBTQ heritage in England.\(^{533}\) Members of the public can locate and add sites of interest to the digital map, and add details of their historical significance. Contributors can also select a category for the site, including ‘Pubs and Clubs’, ‘Sex and Intimacy’, ‘LGBTQ People’, ‘Activism’, ‘Social Spaces’, ‘Domestic Spaces’, ‘Culture and Arts’, and ‘Crime and Law’.

Working with LGBTQ communities and the public is central to ‘Pride of Place’, and highlights the importance of crowdsourcing methods to community-based, digital public history. However, a series of workshops for the project revealed tensions created by crowdsourcing and collaboration between members of the public, and heritage and
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academic institutions. The workshops, which aimed to show members of the public and LGBTQ communities how to use the trial map and garner feedback, raised questions about the potential inaccuracy of information gathered from public contributions, and suggested a hierarchy that placed ‘historical fact’ over ‘memory’. These were not concerns unique to ‘Pride of Place’, but reveal wider tensions about crowdsourcing information from the public. Many of the entries on the map are based on the memories of contributors: where was that LGBTQ bar they used to go to in the 1970s? When did it open? Who was the primary clientele? Moreover, who decides on the significance of historical and contemporary sites? What is significant to some LGBTQ communities may not be to others. Additionally, many of the sites, particularly bars and clubs, have many layers of history and were owned and frequented by different groups of people at different times, and questions were raised about how best to include several narratives and histories on one entry.

Participants in the workshops discussed their concerns about these issues, and although no definitive solutions were put forward, it became clear that the two most important aspects of the map were that dates, addresses and details were as accurate as possible, but that it allowed multi-layered histories, and anecdotal histories to be included. Other concerns raised also related to crowdsourcing, collaborative and ‘shared authority’ in public history more generally. In particular, questions were asked over the curation of the map: although members of the public are contributing entries to the map, how are they selected and edited by the ‘Pride of Place’ team? This question is applicable to collaborative museum exhibitions as much as it is to digital crowdsourcing, and
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highlights the tension between the democratic process of making public history, and the final product which is edited and curated by the institution. It raises questions about shared authority, and highlights that ‘authority’ has several meanings. The authority of the final decision rests with the ‘Pride of Place’ team, but the experiences, memories and contributions of the public symbolise a different type of authority: cultural authority.\footnote{See Frisch, \textit{A Shared Authority}, and Duclos-Orsello, ‘Shared Authority’.}

Such collaborative processes recognise that contributions from the public in the form of cultural authority are essential to the final product, but that management, curatorial and institutional authority are also essential to ensure the project runs smoothly and is as accessible and readable as possible.

\begin{quote}
Despite these tensions, the collaborative nature of such crowdsourced projects does represent a ‘history from below’ and the sharing of voices and knowledge. Such digital history projects will also have a wider impact on academic and public understandings of the history of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. Digital maps, such as those by Historic England and NPS, can be used as a source to trace historical shifts, highlighting social mobility and wider socioeconomic change. Moreover, as shown by Jeffrey Meek’s work on Scotland’s ‘Queer Places and Spaces’, digital maps can be used as tools to bring academic research and historical data to a broader public audience.\footnote{Jeffrey Meek, \textquote{Scotland LGBT Historical Maps, 1885-1995}, on \textit{Queer Scotland: Scottish Queer History and Culture}, 16/07/2014, \texttt{http://queerscotland.com/scotland-lgbt-historical-map-1885-1995/} [accessed 03 August 2015].}

That such digital maps will have been created with, by and for LGBTQ communities is also central to their place in digital public history, and shows that digital methods have the power to make public history truly inclusive and shared, both in terms of collaboration...
Digital Archives

The increasing importance of digital public history to archives was recognised by TNA’s *Archives for the 21st Century*, which contains two recommendations relating specifically to digital records. It notes that the significance of digital records lies in how they are ‘transforming the way that researchers explore archives’, and how they make history accessible to ‘a generation which relies exclusively on the internet for the discovery of resources’.  

Many documents are now ‘born digital’, that is, created digitally rather than on paper, and as such archives must now accommodate this in their collections and public outreach programmes. TNA also notes that there are other types of digital records: digitised records that replace a physical record that no longer exists, and digital surrogates, copies of original documents. How can archives use these digital methods to increase awareness of, and accessibility to, records relating to same-sex love? Chapter One addressed a number of ways that archives are making their records more accessible to the public, and this section looks at how they have done this using digital methods.

Digitisation projects have presented a wealth of archival information to a public, and geographically widespread, audience. For example, the project ‘The Proceedings of the Old Bailey Online’ has provided free, world-wide and searchable access to all surviving records of the Old Bailey Proceedings and the Ordinary of Newgate’s Accounts, covering the period from 1674 to 1913. Users can search the criminal proceedings by entering
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names, dates, punishments and offences, among others. This is particularly significant for the history of same-sex love because it allows users to search for sexual offence records, including sodomy and assault with sodomitical offence, among others. Although women are still poorly represented in these records, which also present a negative history of ‘homophobia’ and criminal sexual acts, it is nevertheless an invaluable resource, particularly because it is a complete collection of all surviving records over such a wide historical period. There is also a guide for searching the proceedings for the history of same-sex love.\(^{539}\) Much like The National Archives research guide for lesbian and gay history, the guide to searching the proceedings includes information on historical context of same-sex love, and advice on how best to search for records and suggested reading.

Rictor Norton’s online sourcebook is another example of how digitisation and digital projects can help non-academic users to access primary historical resources. Norton’s ‘Homosexuality in Eighteenth-Century England’ sourcebook provides sources with contextual information, as well as extended essays relating to the history of same-sex love.\(^{540}\) It does not cover as broad a period as the Proceedings, but instead provides access to selected historical records between 1624 and 1799. Despite this limitation, the sourcebook is a useful tool for those interested in records relating to same-sex love and the historical context in which they were created.

Like ‘The Proceedings of the Old Bailey Online’, ‘Homosexuality in Eighteenth Century England’ aims to provide access to sources and further reading to both academic


and non-academic users. Moreover, both of these digitisation projects have removed barriers for members of the public in terms of practically reading historical records. Both projects include transcriptions of historical records, which ensure that anyone can easily read them, whether they are members of the public with an interest in history or academically trained historians with experience and an existing skill set in deciphering handwriting. Both of these projects serve to provide access to historical records, and moreover, provide further information about the significance and wider historical context of records relating to same-sex love. They are both examples of digital collections that can serve to make histories of same-sex love easier to find, and better contextualised, for non-academic users.

The benefit of globally and freely accessible records relating to same-sex love is also evident through the ONE National Gay and Lesbian Archives, based in the US. ONE holds the largest collection of LGBTQ records in the world, with over two million items catalogued, and has made some of these available online. For example, 1117 photographs from ONE’s collection can be accessed and downloaded online, as can 154 interviews, oral histories and recordings. Although this is a very small fraction of what ONE holds, a digital platform has allowed users from across the world to access and research these collections. This world-wide access to histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities is also reflected in the efforts of the Lesbian Herstory Archive (LHA) to digitise their collections. As discussed in Chapter One, the founding principles of the LHA address the
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accessibility of the collection and assert that, ‘All Lesbian women must have access to the archives.’ A move towards the digitisation of records thus highlights that digital access is ‘consistent with herstorical the LHA practice’ and ensures that lesbians all over the world have some level of access to the collections, and history, of the LHA. Digitisation of the LHA records remains a work in progress, but as of July 2015 there were almost 700 photographic records and over 250 audio/visual clips available online. Digitisation has allowed for the LHA to reach a much wider community than the onsite collection permitted, and stands as an example of the importance of digitisation to archives, particularly community archives. Moreover, the privacy that an online archive can afford its virtual visitors is a particularly significant benefit to digital collections relating to the history of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. While some people may not feel comfortable visiting a physical archive and requesting documents about the history of same-sex love, a digital archive allows them to research, view and analyse documents with a greater degree of anonymity. As such, an online archive ‘offers a way to reach others and gather information without fear of reprisal or repercussions’.


Conversely, the digitisation of records does not always make the history of same-sex love easier to find. For example, the Turing Digital Archive does not easily reveal records or contextual information relating to Alan Turing’s sexuality, or his arrest and conviction for gross indecency. The Turing Digital Archive is hosted by King’s College, Cambridge, where users can also access the physical version of the archive collection. The history of Turing at King’s College perhaps explains, though it certainly does not justify, why Turing’s sexuality is so hard to uncover in the Digital Archive. Turing attended King’s College as an undergraduate between 1931 and 1934, and went on to receive a fellowship there. A significant part of Turing’s history took place at King’s, and thus it is fitting that his records are kept and preserved there. The recorded history of Turing’s life at King’s is related to his work as a mathematician and his early work on computer technology, not to the later part of his life relating to his conviction of gross indecency. The archive does not just hold records relating to Turing’s life and work at King’s, however, and there are missed opportunities to represent his sexuality. For example, the biographical and contextual information presented to users could make reference to, highlight records relating to, and provide context regarding Turing’s sexuality, conviction and punishment.

One way to achieve an increased visibility of Turing’s sexuality would be to include additional information about Turing’s sexuality in the online biography. The existing biography notes Turing’s early life, including his school education and his direct family, and goes on to detail his mathematical work. There is no mention of his arrest and life in the few years before his death, how he died, or any suggestion that it was suicide. The details of the last few years of Turing’s life instead mention the last project he was working on, which ‘was left incomplete when he died, on 8 June 1954, at his house in
Wilmslow, Cheshire.  

Although Turing’s sexuality may have been irrelevant to his successes at King’s College and as a leading mathematician, it was significant to the later part of his life, as well as the way in which he is remembered and represented today in history, public or otherwise. The Turing Digital Archive thus highlights that although some records might be made more accessible by digitisation, the histories found within them, and the history of same-sex love in particular, is not necessarily more visible. For example, the Turing Digital Archive holds an-oft quoted letter from Alan Turing to his friend Norman Routledge, in which he addresses his arrest, something Turing writes he had ‘always considered to be quite a possibility’. Turing signed off this letter, ‘in distress’, with the lines:

‘Turing believes machines think
Turing lies with men
Therefore machines do not think’  

This significant letter, in which Turing discusses his feelings and concerns about his arrest and forthcoming trial, is not signposted within the archive as relevant to his sexuality, and cannot be found by using related search terms that a user interested in Turing’s sexuality might enter. Although the majority of records in the Turing Digital Archive, About Alan Turing, [http://www.turingarchive.org/about/] [accessed 03 August 2015].

Archive are presented with minimal contextual or descriptive information, some are
catalogued with a short sentence about what the contents regard. Such an indicator on
this record, as well as other letters and press clippings relating to Turing and his sexuality,
would make them more accessible to users looking for this part of his history. The Turing
Digital Archive is a valuable resource, and would be yet more valuable if records relating
to his sexuality were signposted and could be more easily found, and the biography
provided some context to his sexuality and final years.

The Turing Digital Archive also highlights a broader problem with digital archives
and the internet more generally. There is so much information available online that it is
difficult to know where to start, and how to find the records and information required.
The addition of contextual information, advice and research guides can play a vital role in
guiding public users through archives by signposting records and relevant information.
The research guides discussed in Chapter One, for example, aim to make research easier
for academic and public users alike. Some archives also have produced online content to
contextualise their collections and records. Podcasts and blogs have been used by some
archives to showcase certain records and objects they hold, or indeed projects that they
are carrying out. For example, The National Archives has recorded and made digitally
available several events they have held on the history of sexuality.\textsuperscript{547} These podcasts
cover a range of LGBTQ history topics, including on lesbianism and censorship in the early
twentieth century, Oscar Wilde’s trial and sexology. These podcasts serve to bring archive
records to life through discussion, and where possible, links to relevant records are

\textsuperscript{547} See The National Archives podcasts on LGBTQ history on The National Archives, \textit{Archives Media
August 2015].
TNA has also profiled records that contain histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities on their blog, predominantly during LGBT History Month. One such blog discusses the case of ‘Lady Austin’s Camp Boys’, while another is an annotated bibliography that provides details of secondary resources relating to LGBTQ history in TNA’s collection. These podcasts and blogs are particularly useful for users searching for the history of same-sex love in the archives, as they give full context to individual records and the subject. As discussed in Chapter One, TNA has also made efforts to increase public engagement and collaboration with their collections by asking users to ‘tag’ documents with a subject tag. Tagging has allowed users to help shape TNA’s collection itself by signposting records that are relevant to the history of same-sex love with the tag ‘LGBT’. Although the success of tagging remains limited, because it requires users to have previous knowledge of a document before it can be tagged, it remains a good example of how archives can engage their users and, in turn, highlight histories of same-sex love that might otherwise remain hidden. Thus, although in many cases, users of archives may have to visit the archive to see physical copies of documents, digitisation and digital outreach can connect archives with new users and communities, and provide them with both digital records, and contextual information, that they can access from anywhere in the world.
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548 See Iglikowski, ‘Lady Austin’s camp boys’ and Reynolds, ‘LGBT History in the National Archives’ Library’. (See note 77 for details).

549 See, for example, Tattershall, Genius on Trial and Dunton, The Scandalous Case of John Vassall. (See note 76 for details).
Digital Museums and Resources

Museums have also embraced digital technology to reach new audiences and establish stronger and more interactive connections with existing visitors. This section discusses ways that museums have reached new audiences and made the history of same-sex love more accessible, to LGBTQ communities and the public in general. Firstly, it analyses ways that established museums have reached audiences using digital technologies, online resources and social media. Secondly, it discusses the development and impact of virtual museums and virtually accessed collections. Both of these methods of engagement with digital technology have emerged as a useful tool for both audience reach and collaboration, and in turn have great potential to improve the representation of same-sex love both in museums and online by better connecting with LGBTQ visitors and providing access to more detailed and contextualised histories.

There are a number of ways that museums and other public history institutions can and do engage with visitors digitally. In-house digital technology includes audio guides, interactive displays and quick response (QR) codes that allow visitors to find out more about objects or collections through their smartphones. Such technology provides museums with more space to elaborate on details and contextual information for object and collections. Practical barriers in museum interpretation, such as word limits, can be overcome by digital technologies. For example, Brighton Museum has used QR codes to highlight LGBTQ-related objects in their collection, as discussed in Chapter Two. Visitors with a smartphone can access further information (and in this case, details about the object’s significance to LGBTQ history) by scanning the QR code, which will take them directly to a relevant webpage. Digital technology can also be used to bring fragile objects or documents to audiences, or include objects and documents not physically owned by
the museum. The Elizabeth Garrett Anderson Gallery in Euston, London is another example of the successful use of digital technology in museums. The gallery space is limited to one room, but digital technology has been used to ensure that there is a wealth of information available to visitors. The digital interpretive and interactive displays include detailed text, recorded readings of historical documents, images and videos. A large digital table in the centre of the gallery includes the biographies of over 100 influential women from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, presenting the histories of another marginalised group to a public audience despite a lack of physical space in which to do so.

Outside of physical museum spaces, digital public history has several purposes. Firstly, a digital presence allows museums and their visitors to connect with each other instantaneously. Using feedback forms on websites, Facebook, Twitter and blogs, visitors can ask questions and make comments in a more direct and instant way than with written comment cards that have long been provided by museums. This level of interaction between museums and their visitors reaches beyond the potential for higher visitor numbers. Indeed, the use of social media by museums can provoke social change and advocate social justice. Social media provides an opportunity for museums to reach visitors they would not otherwise be able to, and to engage with these visitors meaningfully. Amelia Wong has argued that some museums have used social media to ‘increase accessibility, openness, transparency, accountability and responsiveness; to attend to diversity; and to manifest “shared authority” with audiences.’ By forming
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better relationships with visitors online via social media, museums also have the potential to promote social justice in the physical museum and collections. The participatory element of social media, whereby users and virtual visitors can comment, link and like content is an example of the democratisation of public history, and furthermore, can draw those already-engaged people to visit the physical museum itself.

Secondly, museums can promote their collections to visitors, highlighting particular objects or themes. For example, on Valentine’s Day 2015 the British Museum posted images relating to love from their collections on Twitter, Facebook and Instagram. One of these images showed the busts of Emperor Hadrian and Antinous, accompanied by a note informing visitors that ‘Hadrian and his lover Antinous are side by side in Room 77.’

Links provided alongside images allow visitors to find out more about the objects, individuals and histories in question, and so heighten opportunities for visitors (virtual and physical) to engage with and better understand the museum’s collection. Many museums have embraced social media as a way to promote their collections. Online social media projects such as #MuseumWeek (on Twitter) have been used by public history institutions to connect with audiences in new ways. Sharing this hashtag on an organised week, museums have revealed museum secrets, discussed museum architecture and encouraged visitors to share ‘selfies’, photographs of themselves with objects or in museums. This level of interaction has increased the social element of museums both on and offline by encouraging visitors to be active participants.
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Thirdly, visitors can experience the collections, themes and objects of museums before, or even in lieu of, a visit. Visitors can also gain a different experience from an online museum presence as shown by the British Museum’s ‘Same-Sex Desire and Gender Identity’ theme page. As discussed in Chapter Two, the webpage includes ‘Desire and Diversity’, a digital trail of objects; a recording of Richard B. Parkinson discussing LGBTQ related objects in the collection; and several detailed theme pages on ‘Same-sex desire’, ‘Gender identity’ and ‘Changing attitudes’.

The V&A Museum has also used a digital platform to highlight LGBTQ histories in their collection. Their webpage ‘LGBTQ Histories in the V&A’ and blog ‘Out in the Museum’ blog profile objects that relate to LGBTQ histories, and promote LGBTQ-related events being held at the Museum.552 This digital platform has given the V&A LGBTQ Working Group a space to discuss and promote their work, which was not previously accessible to the public. While some museums have not developed their web presence beyond ‘glorified’ or ‘virtual’ information leaflets, the British Museum and the V&A are two clear examples of how a web presence can be used to enhance collections and the experience of visitors.553 As Helen Rogers has argued, blogging and utilising online space

553 Anne Lindsay and Lianne McTavish have both discussed ‘pamphlet’ museum websites that provide minimal information including opening times and access. See Anne Lindsay, ‘#VirtualTourist: Embracing Our Audience through Public History Web Experience’, The Public Historian, 35:1 (2013), 67-86,
can help academic and public historians to tackle the practical limitations of museum interpretation. By producing digital content in the forms of blogs, they can produce content ‘that encourages visitors to engage critically and imaginatively with exhibition material.’

Although it would be preferable for objects to be acknowledged as LGBTQ-related in both the digital and physical museum, it must be highlighted that this is one of the greatest benefits of digital public history in museums. Both in-house digital public history through the use of interactive screens and audio guides and online digital space provide more room for interpretation and detailed contextual information, and therefore more accessible and more representative public history.

Another major impact of digital public history on museums relates to their providing a platform for virtual museums: museums that exist as online collections, or virtual tours of physical museums. Virtual museums have several purposes: some virtual museums are stepping stones while enough funding and support to build a physical museum is found. For example, the US National Museum of Women’s History (NMWH) is an online museum and an ongoing project with the aim of building a women’s history museum on the National Mall in Washington DC.

---


hosts online exhibitions and curates travelling exhibitions and educational programmes, with the aim of continuing these once a physical building exists. Other virtual museums are digitally accessible collections of objects: from obscure collections such as the Museum of Russian Cheese Labels, to a collected list of online museums at the Museum of Online Museums. Virtual museums are also used to enhance access to physical collections, such as the virtual tours of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam or the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History, or with online exhibitions. The GLBT Museum in San Francisco has used their website to host online exhibitions, some of which build on past exhibitions they have hosted in the museum itself, and some of which were ‘born digital’, created and built online. For example, ‘Passionate Struggle: Dynamics of San Francisco’s GLBT History’ is an online version of a pop-up exhibition held in 2008-2009, while ‘Council on Religion and the Homosexual’ is a virtual exhibition co-curated online with the LGBT Religious Archives Network.

Videos can also be used to preserve exhibitions, ensuring that they are accessible to those who could not visit, and they can be accessed long after the exhibition has ended. This method of preservation and promotion of an exhibition was used for


'Rainbow City', as discussed in Chapter Two. The filmed walk through of the exhibition at Edinburgh City Art Centre, which is available on YouTube, has ensured that the exhibition can continue to reach new, virtual audiences.559 The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) has also hosted online exhibitions focusing on particular elements of Holocaust history and memory. One such exhibition is ‘Nazi Persecution of Homosexuals 1933-1945’, which is accessible both online and as a travelling exhibition.560 These digital exhibitions, whether ‘born digital’ or digital versions of physical exhibitions, ensure that museums can reach a wider audience, and that their exhibitions exist beyond the limitations of time and space in physical museums.

Such virtual museums and exhibitions challenge the idea of what a museum is, as well as how and by whom it is accessed. The definition of a ‘museum’ is not a building that houses a collection or objects, but is a space that hosts collections - a space that can be either tangible or virtual. By challenging the identity of the museum, virtual museums are well placed to challenge the content of museums, to challenge the heteronormative approach taken by many museums, both physical and virtual. As Lianne McTavish has argued, virtual museums ‘appear to be more accessible not only to visitors...but also those typically marginalized by museums.’561 Sine Nomine has also argued that virtual museums and repositories can provide ‘a place of support and advocacy’ for marginalised communities. Such virtual spaces can help those within marginalised communities, as well as those outside of such communities ‘to better understand the community itself and its

Virtual museums thus have the potential to not only reach, but also to engage new and often marginalised audiences, such as LGBTQ individuals.

One example of a virtual museum that challenges both the definition of ‘museum’ and heteronormativity is The Unstraight Museum. The Unstraight Museum was launched online in 2011 to collect donated images of objects related to the history of same-sex love and LGBTQ individuals and share the stories behind them. It defines itself as ‘an online space and museum dedicated to LGBTQI history in all its forms.’ The museum’s aim is to ‘make non-normative and unstraight stories and history visible’ through their catalogue and cultural projects. Moreover, there are no rigid boundaries around what makes an object ‘unstraight’. Instead, donors of the objects (digital images with interpretative text) identify them as ‘unstraight’ for a range of reasons. Objects in the collection include political badges, love tokens of wedding rings and love letters, and a food processor, given as a wedding gift to a same-sex couple. The reason given for donating the food processor as an ‘unstraight’ object is that it represented to the couple that their relationship was ‘fully respected’ by their family, and it was an important part of their ‘gay life’ because it had been used to prepare many dinners for their friends. This definition of ‘unstraight’ challenges what it means for an object to be considered representative of a marginalised identity. One of the common problems in representing same-sex love in museums is the question of what makes an object ‘queer’, what defines

an object as relating to or somehow representative of same-sex love. While the ‘unstraight’ approach of donor definition does not solve the problem of historical objects being interpreted as ‘queer’, it does allow for contemporary collecting to be defined by LGBTQ identified people.

The Unstraight Museum has argued that their collection ‘allows anyone to help define what unstraight is’ by sharing their own histories and objects. Furthermore, their ambition to create a space and museum ‘for everyone who feels excluded or neglected in the writing of our common history’ makes it clear that The Unstraight Museum provides a platform to those otherwise ignored by mainstream museums and public history representations. Any contribution can be an object, and in turn contribute to the global representation of same-sex love. Objects can be donated from anywhere in the world, which highlights the global nature of digital history projects. These ‘unstraight’ objects can also be accessed from anywhere in the world, which brings these histories to a broad and geographically diverse audience.

Digital public history and an online presence provide a greater opportunity for museums to speak to, and in turn react to, their visitors. The internet has had an unprecedented impact on museums, public history and the history of same-sex love, particularly in terms of participation and collaboration. Visitors have a more direct connection with museums, and in turn they have more opportunities to collaborate with the museums and contribute their own histories to museum collections. The purpose of virtual museums is not to replace, or even replicate, traditional museums, but to expand

565 The Unstraight Museum, About.
their potential in terms of both content and collaboration with the public.

Conclusion

Returning to Sackville Park and the phone call with Turing, it is remarkable how pertinent the development of digital public history is to the history of same-sex love. In that same phone call, Turing, ‘the Father of Computer Science’, tells his listener: ‘Even as compounds were injected, which would dull my longing for a man’s touch and render my genitals an enemy, I held close this thought. A man will invent a machine one day to explain all this. And here you are at last. My voice. Whispering to you, a computer. So like a human.’ Digital technology has allowed a representation of Turing’s voice to be heard by walkers, passers-by and members of the public. Although this is not directly Turing’s voice, and is instead an artistic interpretation, a historical fiction version of his voice, this digital intervention allows for passers-by to engage with and in some way communicate with Turing’s past. Like the exhibitions and monuments discussed, the ‘Talking Statue’ of Turing is a curated and created version of his past that exists for the purpose of engagement between the public and the past. Digital public history also provides ways for the public to have their own voices heard: by suggesting a location deserving of a ‘pink plaque’, a symbol of historical significance on a digital map; sharing a digital object that marks their self-identity as ‘unstraight’; contributing a memory of a loved one lost to AIDS; providing meaning to a word from a lost, secret, queer language.

There are limitations to digital public history, of course. Not everyone has access to smartphones, or even the internet, and the development of digital platforms requires

566 Talking Statues, ‘Alan Turing’.
substantial funding. Public history institutions and academic historians should also continue, or start, to represent the history of same-sex love in the real world, as well as the virtual world. But it remains the case that digital public history walking tours, apps, websites, and virtual museums are a marker of the future of public history. The democratisation of public history through meaningful interaction and collaboration; from comments on a museum’s Facebook post to submitting one’s house as a place of significance to LGBTQ history on Historic England’s digital map, is eroding the barriers between those who produce and those who consume history. Rosenzweig and Cohen predicted this in 2006, and it is now clear that digital public history can serve a purpose beyond academic walls. Digital technology and media can enhance the representation of same-sex love in public history by involving LGBTQ people in writing and presenting their own histories. It ensures that those LGBTQ people and the public can find local LGBTQ histories with their smartphones, that they can identify LGBTQ histories in museums, and that they can question academic and public historians about their research and findings on the history of same-sex love. This seems a rather fitting testament to Turing, ‘the father of computer science’, who believed that one day machines would think. They now play a significant role in bringing his history to the public.
Conclusion

She and my father had bequeathed me a name they had made noble and honoured, not merely in literature, art, archaeology, and science, but in the public history of my own country, in its evolution as a nation. I had disgraced that name eternally. I had made it a low by-word among low people. I had dragged it through the very mire. I had given it to brutes that they might make it brutal, and to fools that they might turn it into a synonym for folly.

Oscar Wilde, De Profundis

This thesis has shown the myriad ways in which members of the public encounter histories of same-sex love. From pubs to sex-positive film festivals, and talking statues to cemeteries, the places and ways that people interact with the past is in constant development. The ways that members of the public engage with histories has changed dramatically over the past few decades, influenced in particular by an increasing focus on ‘history from below’ and in turn, an emphasis on sharing authority, and technological advances. Members of the public have long engaged with, and been engaged by, public history institutions and heritage, but their access to information and participation with a few clicks of a button has made a significant difference the level of public interaction and engagement with the past.

There are also many means beyond technological advances through which the public engage with and create history and connections to the past. This thesis has highlighted several ways in which museums, historic houses, archives and sites of memory have represented histories of same-sex love, and more significantly, connected visitors with this history, whether they identify as LGBTQ or not. There are many reasons to reflect positively on the evolution and current state of representations of same-sex
love and LGBTQ communities in public history. The repeal of Section 28, the introduction of LGBT History Month, the increasing awareness of ideas of social justice and the development of collaborative projects between LGBTQ communities and mainstream institutions are all symbols of change. They are, to refer back to Wilde, signs of ‘our evolution as a nation’.567 The criminalisation of same-sex acts is firmly part of the UK’s national history, although it may not always be visible. Nevertheless, it remains significant that since Wilde wrote De Profundis, the door of the prison in which he wrote it has been displayed to members of the public at the Galleries of Justice in Nottingham. The historic oppression and marginalisation of same-sex love cannot be changed. However, the history of same-sex love can be discussed and represented, and in turn, used as a symbol of change that is representative of a present tolerant society and hope for the future.

Yet, despite many positive changes in public histories of same-sex love, silences, prejudice, and ignorance remain and there are serious limitations to existing representations of same-sex love. Particular issues and themes have emerged across the different types of public history discussed in this thesis: tensions between histories of trauma and ‘homo-pessimism’ and those of celebration; continued invisibility of diverse LGBTQ histories and intersectionality; choices of terminology in labelling and describing historic same-sex love; tensions between who creates and who consumes public history; and ‘ghettoisation’ of LGBTQ histories that are often initiated by LGBTQ individuals and groups, and accessed mainly by LGBTQ audiences. The following section pulls together the ways in which these issues have emerged, and puts forward potential solutions to them.

567 Wilde, De Profundis, p. 1010.
Histories of trauma and celebration

Histories of same-sex love, like many other marginalised histories, are difficult to represent. There are practical reasons for this: a lack of records and objects that relate specifically to this history; its criminalisation over many centuries; its assumed sexual and adult content. There are also emotional reasons why histories of same-sex love are difficult to represent. In particular, this thesis has argued that there are tensions between ‘homo-pessimism’ and the association of LGBTQ lives with death, victimhood and trauma, and linear, celebratory representations of ‘queeroes’ and positive changes. The chapter on archives argued that LGBTQ communities are in need of archives, and that emotional and traumatic personal histories are a significant part of this. Although many historical records in mainstream archives represent a traumatic past of criminalisation and, often, punishment, the same records can be read against the grain to recover a history of challenges to power and of changing attitudes.

However, this thesis also has shown that public history institutions and sites of memory can embrace and reflect both trauma and celebration simultaneously. In particular, monuments can be used as places to remember loved ones and historical injustices, but they can also be used as places of celebration and hope for the future. The ‘Homomonument’ achieves this through its aim to reflect past, present and future. On National Remembrance Day it is a site of mourning and remembrance, but on Queen’s Day and Liberation Day it is a site of celebration. The ‘Homomonument’, as well as other examples discussed, show that histories of trauma and celebration can co-exist. Many of the examples also show that although ‘homo-pessimism’ can pervade representations of
same-sex love, it is essential to include them. Returning to Topher Campbell’s argument, although traumatic histories are not easily represented in public history, and nor are they easily remembered by LGBTQ people, it is still important that they are recorded and represented alongside more celebratory histories. Public history should present a balance between the two aspects of the history of same-sex love. In doing so, it can acknowledge the difficult history and outline the ways in which change has progressed, and moreover, highlight existing prejudices that LGBTQ communities face.

**Intersectionality**

Within existing representations of histories of same-sex love, there remain significant limitations and further marginalisation. Too often the histories of women, bisexual people, trans* people and people of colour remain invisible or underrepresented in public histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. Chapter One highlighted ways that LGBTQ community archives address issues of intersectionality and represent communities rather than an LGBTQ community. Chapter Two provided examples of the exclusion of people of colour and bisexuality from exhibitions on the history of same-sex love. Both of these examples highlight the importance of community outreach, and connecting to diverse LGBTQ communities for input and feedback on existing representations and ongoing projects. The Museum of London in particular provides an ideal model of change; their first exhibitions on the history of same-sex love were criticised by visitors and academics alike, and their later exhibitions confronted these issues. By speaking to – or more importantly, listening to – communities, public history institutions can better serve the people they mean to represent. This highlights the importance of collaboration and

---
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crowdsourcing. Projects such as the NPS and Historic England LGBTQ maps seek to represent histories that have been contributed by a broad, geographically and socially diverse group of people. Such wide-reaching projects can help ensure that people with different backgrounds and experiences can contribute and have their voices heard.

Despite the potential of sharing authority and crowdsourcing, a lack of intersectionality and the privileging of some voices over others remains one of the most significant problems in public history today. Indeed, it impacts on all forms of public history, from Hollywood films to monuments. For example, in August 2015, the film Stonewall, a dramatisation of the events that led to the Stonewall Riots of 1969, faced calls for boycotts immediately after the release of the trailer. The film traces the history of Stonewall through the eyes of a fictional white, cisgender, gay man. The history of the Stonewall Riots has privileged the experiences of gay white men over the trans* women of colour who initiated the riots and subsequent extended protests. On June 28 1969, the riots were not started by a white gay man but by Marsha P. Johnson, and Silvia Rivera, two trans* women of colour. Before the film was released, it was heavily critiqued for ‘whitewashing’ the history of Stonewall and erasing the experiences of women, trans* women and people of colour. This remains a problem across many examples of public


history. Indeed, the monument outside the Stonewall Inn has been criticised for the same reason, in that it too represents a ‘whitewashed’ version of Stonewall. The ‘Gay Liberation Monument’, located in Christopher Park, outside the Stonewall Inn, depicts four figures, a male and a female couple, all of whom are painted entirely white. It has long received criticism, but in the few days after the release of the Stonewall film, activists redecorated it to symbolise and represent the trans* women of colour who were at the forefront of the protest.571 The erasure of marginalised people within LGBTQ communities and histories is evident in much of public history and in many of the archives, museum exhibitions, historic houses, and monuments discussed in this thesis. As public history institutions continue, or even begin, to develop their representations of same-sex love, it is essential that they acknowledge the many and diverse people who have engaged in same-sex love and are members of LGBTQ communities today.

Language

One of the most significant and pervading problems in the history of same-sex love spans academic and public histories: language and terminology. In the opening I explained why I had chosen to use the phrase ‘same-sex love’. My intention was to include a broad range of historical experiences of same-sex desire, attraction, companionship and sex. However, the examples of public history discussed throughout do not have the luxury of including long and reflective discussions of language. They are limited by how many words can fit on an object label or commemorative plaque, how a record was first catalogued and what a visitor or user will read.

Some examples discussed throughout have revealed how the choices of terminology used can either render histories of same-sex love invisible, or reveal them and provide a direct challenge to existing representations. Moreover, some of these examples co-exist at the same site of memory or institution. The contrasting interpretations of Lord Hervey’s sexuality in the exhibition panel and in the guidebook at Ickworth, for example, show how the choice of language can either positively represent or obscure the history of same-sex love. Both the obscuring of Hervey’s sexuality in the guidebook and lack of consistency across Ickworth’s different types of interpretation is problematic. Despite this, the language used in the exhibition panel, which presents his ‘bisexuality’ and loving relationship with Stephen Fox stands as an ideal and positive model for representing histories of same-sex love.

More positively, however, several examples discussed have approached the issue of terminology and balanced the anachronism of naming historical figures as LGBTQ against the need to connect visitors to something they recognise as a potential historical example of what might now be identified as ‘LGBTQ’. The Jane Addams Hull-House Museum (JAHM) in particular provides an ideal model of labelling that could be used in other exhibitions, historic houses and public history institutions. By creating a number of descriptions and labels that presented Addams’ sexuality and relationships in different ways, JAHM opened up a conversation about language and the involvement of visitors in asserting their own interpretations. Such approaches can not only make the history of same-sex love more visible, but can also encourage a greater understanding of the complexity of its history and place in public representations today.
Sharing authority, sharing histories

The JAHHM example also highlights the importance of sharing authority and creating a participatory model of public history. Throughout, I have argued that public history, especially in relation to communities and marginalised groups, should be participatory. Many of the examples discussed provide positive examples of participation and the sharing of authority. In particular, digital public history provides opportunities for a broad range of people to contribute to public histories, regardless of where they live.

Despite this, there remain tensions between the creation and consumption of public history and the power structures of who owns, creates, accesses and uses history. In particular, the chapter on archives and the example of the Lesbian Herstory Archives (LHA) highlighted the importance of retaining community ownership of histories. The LHA has succeeded in ensuring that its collection is accessed, recorded by, and contributed to by its communities. However, many other community archives do not have the funding or resources to ensure their independence, and rely instead on other institutions. The chapter on museums also highlighted a problem with sharing authority that impacts in turn on intersectionality and diverse representations. Despite the best intentions of some institutions in collaborating with broad and diverse communities, it is not always possible to build and sustain meaningful relationships with broad communities due to a lack of time, staff and funding, among other limitations.

Moreover, shared authority and collaboration can reveal tensions between different types of authority. The example of ‘Pride of Place’, the Historic England LGBTQ Project, showed that striking a balance between sharing intellectual authority and cultural authority is complex. Because collaborative projects involve often personal histories and
anecdotal memories, their level of historical accuracy can be called into question. What is important in such projects is the same as addressing intersectionality – speaking with and listening to community members and contributors to discuss concerns and ask questions. The workshops held for ‘Pride of Place’ and the People’s History Museum’s ‘Play Your Part’ project, discussed in Chapter Two, are examples of the need to speak to contributors and involve them in decision making. They show that sharing authority must involve discussions and collaborative planning, alongside the sharing of cultural authority with the donation of objects and personal histories.

Ghettoisation and Interventions

In many ways, the history of same-sex love remains ‘ghettoised’; there are very few museums across the UK where it can be found in permanent galleries, and many of the examples of public history discussed have been interventions, begun by members of the LGBTQ community themselves because they can see the gaps and silences where their histories should be. Some interventions are personal and some are community led. Although some are examples of the ghettoisation of the history of same-sex love, in that they are led by and accessed by LGBTQ individuals and groups rather than ‘mainstream’ institutions, they all challenge broader notions of public history and seek to address existing silences and gaps in official representations. Initiatives such as Rainbow Plaques in York challenge concepts of memorialisation. They are acts of guerrilla memorialisation, public history and above all, a refusal to accept the status quo.

The chapter on archives asserted that archiving community history constitutes a form of activism because it does just that: i.e., challenge the status quo. Community archives are a form of intervention; they mark an individual or a group challenging
existing representations. In museums, the example of Matt Smith’s ‘Queering the Museum’ showed the importance of interventions across museum collections and space. Interventions in historic houses include the ‘126’ exhibition held at the National Trust’s Sutton House. The use of historic houses for the officiation of same-sex unions is another form of intervention that effectively ‘queers’ the site and its history. Direct interventions in the form of guerrilla memorialisation and the ‘queering’ of commemorative plaques also challenge the marked histories of sites. The examples of monuments to the Ladies of Llangollen highlighted that the subversion and queering of memorialisation is not a modern phenomenon, but that individuals have been using commemoration to recognise and memorialise same-sex love for centuries. Such interventions can be seen in digital public history too; Brighton Pink Plaques is a digital version of intervention. These examples highlight that although the history of same-sex love may remain in some ways ghettoised, personal and activist interventions at various sites of memory have long resulted in creative and lasting forms of public history that recognise same-sex love.

Public history institutions also face practical as well as methodological issues in representing histories of same-sex love and including LGBTQ communities in collaboration and participation. In particular, funding, resources and staff are often limited, especially for smaller, independently run museums. Many of the examples discussed have been from well-funded institutions, which have access not only to relevant collections, but also to funding for new exhibitions, outreach programmes and digital technology and enhancement. Ideally, of course, all institutions would be able to access such support, but this is not practical or likely in reality. However, there are some solutions to this lack of access, including building partnerships between institutions, the loaning of objects and travelling exhibitions.
It is worth remembering that public history is as much about the present as it is about the past. Public history can also help form the future. Some public history institutions have created spaces for debate, politics and a reflection on the present, as well as the past. Although the following examples are not related to histories of same-sex love, they are active and activist approaches that highlight the role of public history in reacting to, and in turn, creating politics, in a public and participatory way. For example, in the build up to the General Election in May 2015, the People’s History Museum in Manchester ran a series of events that aimed to engage visitors with the election. In the US, some museums have used their spaces – physical and virtual – to raise awareness of histories of race and equality and contemporary events. For example, after the Baltimore Uprising in 2014, a response to numerous deaths of people of colour at the hands of the police, some museum workers launched an online conversation to discuss how museums should react to, and collect objects relating to, contemporary and ongoing political and social events and changes. Under the hashtag #MuseumsRespondtoFerguson, these conversations have addressed the role of museums in society, and have challenged too the idea that they should be politically neutral.

Public history institutions thus carry a significant role in society. Through projects such as #MuseumsRespondtoFerguson and many of the examples discussed throughout this thesis, public history institutions can provide opportunities for members of the public to learn, participate, debate and contribute. Public history institutions also carry a responsibility to represent diverse histories and engage with diverse communities and individuals. This responsibility is reflected, and enacted by, the trust that members of the public have in such institutions. In preparation for writing and presenting A Room of One’s
Own, Virginia Woolf asked, ‘If truth is not to be found on the shelves of the British Museum, where...is truth?’ Woolf was referring to the books that were then part of the British Museum (and are now the British Library), but the sentiment still stands. Museums and other public history institutions are trusted by the public. They are trusted to include, present and represent histories. They cannot do so if they choose to omit and marginalise some histories and privilege others.

Looking towards the future, there are several ways in which public history institutions have an opportunity to develop their representations of same-sex love. I suggested in Chapter Four that a monument which acknowledged the historic oppression of same-sex love (and indeed, gender diversity) throughout history would be a better way to honour and remember those who were convicted under historic laws. Such a monument could also be reflective of our present and our future; like the international monuments discussed, it could assert that there is no space for intolerance in contemporary society.

The year 2017, which will mark the fiftieth anniversary of the Sexual Offences Act, provides another opportunity for public history institutions to acknowledge and represent histories of same-sex love. It will therefore provide a timely opportunity for public history institutions to reflect not only on social, political and cultural changes since 1967, but could also be used to reflect on their own histories of representing same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. The following year, 2018, will mark thirty years since the introduction of Section 28, and fifteen years since its repeal. These are not such

significant anniversaries, but they could also be used as opportunities for public history institutions to reflect and discuss their past representations of same-sex love, and build plans for their future.

This thesis has analysed the successes and limitations of previous and existing public histories of same-sex love at length, and put forward some suggestions of how to solve, or reconsider, issues that affect histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities. I hope that the broad reach of the research conducted for this thesis – both in terms of public history institutions and geographical – mean it can be useful as guidance for a variety of public history institutions across the UK, and perhaps more broadly internationally. The research for this thesis has also shown that despite significant limitations, there have been creative, innovative and challenging representations of same-sex love since 1999.

This thesis began with a moment of ‘homo-pessimism’, speaking of Wilde’s incarceration for gross indecency. Although there remains much to be done in the fields of public history to better represent histories of same-sex love and LGBTQ communities, this thesis ends with some of Wilde’s less distressing words. This thesis has argued that although the representation of same-sex love in public history is deeply flawed, it has vastly improved over the past two decades and it continues to improve. Wilde offers up a lesson for those who do engage with histories of same-sex love; like the truth, it is rarely pure and never simple. It is complex and contested; both traumatic and celebratory. Public history that recognises the difficulty of representing same-sex love should not shy away from it, but embrace it. Public history institutions should not pretend that histories of same-sex love are simple, and they should provide a space in which conversations and debates can take place. Academic history does not assume that histories are simple, and
nor should public history. Despite the limitations imposed by the need to attract, engage 
with and inform diverse publics, public histories of same-sex love are well placed to 
challenge and educate, involve and learn from the public.
Appendix One – Questionnaire sent to museums in 2012

Kingston University London

July 2012

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Claire Hayward and I am a PhD student at Kingston University. For my thesis, I am investigating and analysing representations of same-sex sexuality in public history. As a museum, and therefore a highly visible and influential form of public history, I am inviting you to participate in this research study by completing the attached questionnaire.

Your response to this questionnaire will be used alongside data from other museums to gauge the representation of same-sex sexuality within museums across Great Britain. The data results will be used in my thesis, the current working title of which is ‘Representations of Same-Sex Sexuality in Public History.’ I am planning to explore how various institutions within the public history sector approach same-sex sexuality in the past, and whether the repeal of Section 28 has affected this. Copies of the results and subsequent thesis (estimated completion 2016) will be provided to Kingston University and an external examiner.

Also attached is a consent form, which I would be grateful if you could sign and return along with the questionnaire in the S.A.E provided. Please indicate on this form whether you would prefer for your museum to remain anonymous in the subsequent write up and analysis. Based on the results, I intend to analyse geographical differences of representations, and as such I would be grateful if you could put the name of your institution, even if you are to remain anonymous in the final write up.

Thank you for taking the time to assist me in this research. The data you supply will contribute greatly to my research and will provide very useful information regarding same-sex sexualities in museums and how their representation may have changed over the last ten years. I hope that this questionnaire and its results can help your institution to reflect on the inclusion of minority groups in your collection, as well as aid my research. At a time when same-sex marriage is openly debated by politicians and in the media, this research aims to encourage the public history sector to engage with the topic too. If you would like a summary copy of the results of this study, please indicate on the form below and I will forward this on to you as soon as possible.

The completion of the questionnaire should only take 10-15 minutes. If you require additional information or have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me on the number or email address listed below.

Claire Hayward  
07779977630 / k0709392@kingston.ac.uk

Dr. Nicola Phillips (Supervisor)  
02084172895 (xt: 62895) / n.phillips@kingston.ac.uk
Name of museum:

Type of museum (e.g. national, independent, local, university):

Your position:

Would you like a summary of results sent back? (Please circle)
Yes / No

Are you happy for your answers to used verbatim in my thesis, with full acknowledgement of your contribution?
Yes / No

Are you happy for your institution to be named in my discussion of the responses?
Yes / No

Date:

Signed:
This questionnaire is aimed at identifying museums’ attitudes towards representations of same-sex sexualities in the past. By same-sex sexualities, I mean sexualities that might otherwise be called ‘gay’, ‘lesbian’, ‘homosexual’, ‘queer’ or LGBT. LGBT refers to people who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender.

Please also note attached blank paper should you wish to answer in any more detail.

1. Within your collection, do you have items relating to same-sex sexuality? *(Please tick)*

   Yes  
   No  

   If yes, please give examples with catalogue numbers:
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

2. Do you have an archive within your museum?

   Yes  
   No  

   If yes, does it contain documents relating to same-sex sexuality?

   Yes  
   No  

3. Have you ever had an exhibition on same-sex sexuality?

   Yes  
   No  

If yes, please give details *(Name of exhibition, contents, duration etc.)*

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. Are you actively collecting items relating to same-sex sexuality?

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

If yes, please explain what you wish to acquire:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. On a scale of 1-5 (1 being not at all and 5 being very), how difficult do you think it is for museums and curators to display exhibitions about: *(Please circle)*

Sexuality in general?

1  2  3  4  5

Same-sex sexuality?

1  2  3  4  5

Please give a brief explanation of your opinion:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
6. The government act under Section 28 prohibited local authorities from ‘promoting homosexuality’ – was your institution either directly or indirectly affected by this?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Not Sure ☐

7. Since the repeal of Section 28 in 2003, has there been more freedom to exhibit material on same-sex sexuality within your institution?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Not Sure ☐

8. On a scale of 1-5 (1 being the least, and 5 the most), how important do you think it is to stage exhibitions on same-sex sexuality (please circle):

Within LGBT History Month (February)?
1 2 3 4 5

For the rest of the year?
1 2 3 4 5
Appendix Two – List of Respondents to Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Durham Light Infantry Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Harborough Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bolton Library and Museum Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Swaffham Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Canterbury Museums and Galleries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Leeds Museum and Galleries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Windsor and Royal Borough Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Herbert Art Gallery and Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Holbourne Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Touchstones Rochdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The Cardiff Story Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Galleries of Justice Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sandwell Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Museum of Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>People’s History Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Museum of Science and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Borough Museum and Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bridewell Museum Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Manchester Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Wellcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Tourquay Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Chelmsford Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Andrew Logan Museum of Sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>University of Aberdeen Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Salford Museum and Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Dumfries Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>National History Museum: St Fagans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Hawick Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Hartlepool Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Northampton Museums and Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Museum of Wimbledon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Winchester City Council Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Merseyside Maritime Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Durham Heritage Centre and Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Hackney Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Newark and Sherwood Museum Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Carmarthenshire County Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Bury Art Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Nuneaton Museum and Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Maidstone Museum and Bentlif Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Walsall Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Working Class Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Bognor Regis Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Towneley Hall Art Gallery and Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Cromer Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Hastings Museum and Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>North Lincolnshire Museum Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Edinburgh Museums and Galleries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Cartoon Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Chard and District Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Epping Forest District Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Discovery Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Ashby-De-La-Zuch Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Bexhill Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Erewash Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Roman Baths Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Mansfield Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Dacorum Heritage Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Dorset County Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Oundle Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Bassetlaw Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Powyslad Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Calderdale Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Eden Centre Modern History Theme Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Filey North Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Whitby Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Southend Museum Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Kingston Museum and Heritage Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Tate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Colchester and Ipswich Museum Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bibliography

Primary Sources


Bengry, Justin and Gillian Frank (Managing Editors), *Notches: (re)marks on the history of sexuality* (2015), <http://notchesblog.com/> [accessed 03 August 2015]

Bennett, Alan, *People*, (London: Faber and Faber, 2012)


——Home (2013), <http://www.brightonourstory.co.uk/> [accessed 03 August 2015]

Britain Thinks for the Museum Association, *Public Perceptions of – and attitudes to – the purposes of museums in society* (March 2013),  


<https://vimeo.com/album/3336302> [accessed 04 August 2015]
Department for Media, Culture and Sport, ‘Centres for Social Change: Museums, Galleries and Archives for All’ (May 2000),

Dunton, Mark, The Scandalous Case of John Vassall: Sexuality, Spying and the Civil Service, online audio recording, The National Archives, 17 December 2012,

East End Women’s Museum, Home (2015),
<http://eastendwomensmuseum.weebly.com/> [accessed 13 August 2015]

East Lothian Museums, ‘Rainbow City’, online video recording, YouTube, 10/09/2007,
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KCeOzwEJWlM> [accessed 04 August 2015]

Eventbrite, Paris is Burning - Tudor Realness -25 July (2015),
<http://www.eventbrite.co.uk/e/paris-is-burning-tudor-realness-25-july-tickets-17353475713> [accessed 03 August 2015]


Exploring Surrey's Past, LGBT History Month at Surrey History Centre, (2015),


Flickr, Museum of London, Outside Edge: A Journey Through Black British Lesbian and Gay History,
<https://www.flickr.com/photos/museumoflondon/sets/72157603904190189/detail/> [accessed 03 August 2015]


Garnett, Oliver (ed) and Catharine Pusey and Nino Strachey (Writers), Ickworth, (Wilts: Acorn Press for National Trust, 2011)


Hall-Carpenter Archives, Inventing Ourselves: Lesbian Life Stories (London: Routledge,


Historic Royal Palaces, Salacious Gossip Tours, <http://www.hrp.org.uk/HamptonCourtPalace/WhatsOn/SalaciousGossipTours> [accessed 09 August 2013]. (This webpage is no longer available but an archived image of this page can be accessed with the above date via Internet Archive Wayback Machine, <https://archive.org/web/> [accessed 19 August 2015])


Kingston University, Iris Murdoch Collections


Living Reading, *Reading UK Pocket Map, Your Guide to Reading Town Centre* (2013), 


London Remembers, *Memorial: Admiral Duncan Memorial*, 

Manchester City Council, *LGBT Source Guide* (2015), 
<http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/448/archives_and_local_history/520/lgbt_source_guide> [accessed 03 August 2015]

——— *Top Tips for Searching Archives* (2015), 
<http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/448/archives_and_local_history/520/lgbt_source_guide/> [accessed: 03 August 2015]


Map Me, *Pride of Place: England’s LGBTQ Heritage* (2015), 
<http://mapme.com/prideofplace> [accessed 03 August 2015]
Meek, Jeffrey, *Queer Scotland: Scottish Queer History and Culture*, <http://queerscotland.com/> [accessed 03 August 2015]

Melville, Joy *Ellen Terry and Smallhythe Place, Kent*, (London: National Trust, 1997)

Museum of London, *Business Archive Social History Exhibitions: 3.23*

— Business Archive, Design Department: 14.8

— MBA Curatorial (Later Dept) Records: 3.22-3.26


Museum of Science and Industry (MOSI), *Evaluation report of MOSI’s community engagement project with Manchester’s LGBT communities and the creation of the community exhibition; Behind the Scene*, (unpublished internal report, Museum of Science and Industry, 2013)


National Park Service, *Get Involved with the LGBTQ Heritage Initiative* (2015),
<http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageinitiatives/LGBThistory/involved.html> [accessed 03 August 2015]

—— *Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ) Heritage Initiative* (2015),
<http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageinitiatives/LGBThistory/index.html> [accessed 03 August 2015]

—— *Places with LGBTQ Heritage* (2015),
<http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageinitiatives/LGBThistory/places.html> [accessed 19 August 2015]

National Register of Historic Places, *National Historic Landmark Nomination - Beauport* *(Sleeper-McCann House)*, Record Number: 430224, 27 May 2003,
<http://pdfhost.focus.nps.gov/docs/NHLS/Text/03000641.pdf> [accessed 04 August 2015]


—— News, ‘Get your FREE Soho Stories app’ (12 February 2013),
<http://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/article-1356398419972/> [accessed 03 August 2015]

—— National Trust, *Ickworth House Illustrated Picture Guide*

—— *Tredegar House/The King’s Room* information leaflet


New York Heritage Digital Collections, *Lesbian Herstory Archives*,
<http://cdm16694.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/search/collection/p274401coll1> [accessed 03 August 2015]


— *Plaque No 3826*, <http://openplaques.org/plaques/3826> [accessed 02 February 2016]

— *Plaque No 6636*, <http://openplaques.org/plaques/6636> [accessed 03 August 2015]

— *Plaque No 8323*, <http://openplaques.org/plaques/8323> [accessed 03 August 2015]

— *Plaque No 12863* <http://openplaques.org/plaques/12863> [accessed 02 February 2016]

Our Story Liverpool, *Home*, <http://www.ourstoryliverpool.co.uk/> [accessed 03 August 2015]


Pink Point and Homomonument Foundation, *Homomonument in the Centre of Amsterdam*, (English)

Plas Newydd, *Plas Newydd, a brief history*, (Denbighshire: Denbighshire County Council, 2003)


Price, Emily and National Trust, *Tredegar House* (Warrington: National Trust, 2012)


— — *Online Resources*, <http://www.quistapp.com/online-resources/> [accessed 03 August 2015]


— — *Submit Event*, <http://www.quistapp.com/submit-event/> [accessed 03 August 2015]


<https://speakoutlondon.wordpress.com/> [accessed 19 August 2015]


—— *Portrait Bench, Westminster*,


Talking Statues, *Alan Turing Sackville Gardens*,
<http://www.talkingstatues.co.uk/turing.html> [accessed 03 August 2015]

Tattershall, Charles, *Genius on Trial: key sources relating to Oscar Wilde at The National Archives*, online audio recording, The National Archives, 03 July 2009,


The British Museum, *Desire and Diversity*,
<http://www.britishmuseum.org/visiting/planning_your_visit/object_trails/desire_and_diversity.aspx> [accessed 26 August 2015]

— — Collection Online: The Warren Cup (‘Exhibition History’ section),  


The National Archives [UK], Archives for the 21st Century in action: refreshed 2012-2015 (2012),  

— — Archives Media Player (2015),  

— — ArchI’ve Unearthed poster

— — Boards of Customs, Excise, and Customs and Excise, and HM Revenue and Customs, Central Administrative Records of the Board of Customs and Excise from 1909, CUST 49

— — Central Criminal Court, Proceedings in Court, CRIM 1

— — Copyright Office, Stationers’ Company, Copyright Office: Entry Forms, etc., COPY 1
—–*Gay and lesbian history*, <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/help-with-your-research/research-guides/gay-lesbian-history/> [accessed 03 August 2015]

—–Prerogative Court of Canterbury, Wills and Letters of Administration, PROB 11

—–War Office, Armed Forces, Judge Advocate General, and related bodies, Armed Forces Service Records, WO 372

The Turing Digital Archive, *About Alan Turing*, <http://www.turingarchive.org/about/> [accessed 03 August 2015]

—–Correspondence, AMT/D/14A


Wellcome Collection, ‘Excuse me, would you mind if I asked you a few personal questions about sex?’ exhibition questionnaire

Wellcome Library: Iconographic Collection, 2443i-2444i


Secondary Sources

Adair, Joshua G., ‘House museums or walk-in closets? The (non) representation of gay men in the museums they called home’, in Gender, Sexuality, and Museums, ed. by Amy K. Levin (Oxon: Routledge, 2010), pp. 264-278


Backdoor Broadcasting, Queer Homes at the Geffrye Museum, online recording of event at the Geffrye Museum 12 June 2013, <http://backdoorbroadcasting.net/2013/06/queer-homes/> [accessed 04 August 2015]


Bennett, Judith M., ‘‘Lesbian like’ and the social history of lesbianisms’, in *The Feminist History Reader*, ed. by Sue Morgan (Oxon: Routledge, 2006), pp. 244-259


—— ‘Two Women and their Monumental Brass, c.1480’, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 161 (2008), 163-184,
[accessed 02 August 2015]


Bradley, Simon ‘History to Go: oral history, audiowalks and mobile media’ in *Oral History* 40:1 (2012), 99-110


Breen, Matthew, ‘Pardon all of the estimated 49,000 men who, like Alan Turing, were


Crooke, Elizabeth, Museums and Community: Ideas, Issues and Challenges, (Oxon:
Routledge, 2007)

Curran, Sean, “‘126’ and ‘Queer Season’ at Sutton House’, on Towards Queer, 8 January 2015, <http://towardsqueer.blogspot.co.uk/2015/01/126-and-queer-season-at-sutton-house.html> [accessed 14 August 2015]


de Groot, Jerome, Consuming History: Historians and Heritage in Contemporary Popular Culture, (Oxon: Routledge, 2008)


Doan, Laura, On the Entanglement of Queer Memory and History: The Case of Alan Turing, online video recording of event at University of Southampton 13 February 2014, University of Southampton,


Faderman, Lillian, *Surpassing the Love of Men*, (London: The Women’s Press Limited,


Flinn, Andrew and Mary Stevens, ‘It is noh mistri, wi mekin histri.’ Telling our own story: independent and community archives in the UK, challenging and subverting the mainstream’, in Community Archives: The Shaping of Memory, ed. by Jeannette Bastian and Ben Alexander (London: Facet Publishing, 2009), pp. 3-27


Greene, Mark A. ‘The Power of the Archives: Archivists’ Values and Value in the Post-
Modern Age (with an Introduction by Dennis Meissner’), *The American Archivist*, 72:1 (2009), 13-41,
<http://americanarchivist.org/doi/pdf/10.17723/aarc.72.1.k0322x0p38v44l53> [accessed 18 August 2015]

Griffiths, Craig, ‘Between Triumph and Myth: Gay Heroes and Navigating the schwule Erfolgsgeschichte’, *helden. heroes. héros.*, 1 (2014), 54-60,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.6094/helden.heroes.heros./2014/QM/07>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/tph.2010.32.4.96>

<https://manyheadedmonster.wordpress.com/voices-of-the-people/> [accessed 03 August 2015].

Hall, Stuart, Constituting an Archive, *Third Text* 15: 54 (2001), 89-92,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09528820108576903>


<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2638975> [accessed 02 August 2015]


Jeffreys, Sheila, ‘Does it matter if they did it?’, in *The Feminist History Reader*, ed. by Sue Morgan (Oxon: Routledge, 2006), pp. 212-218


Litter, Jo and Roshni Naidoo (eds), The Politics of Heritage: The Legacies of ‘Race’, (Oxon:


Meek, Jeffrey, ‘Scotland LGBT Historical Maps, 1885-1995’, on *Queer Scotland: Scottish*


Netsel, Alison, ‘Utrecht’s Gay Rights Memorial’, on *A Flamingo in Utrecht*, 21 May 2012,


Pennington, Michael, An Angel for a Martyr: Jacob Epstein’s tomb for Oscar Wilde, (Reading: Whiteknights Press, 1987)


Ring, Trudy, ‘The First Federal Monument By and For LGBT Veterans’, *Advocate*, 26 May 2015,


<http://www.pbs.plymouth.ac.uk/solon/journal/vol.5%20issue1%202015/Rogers.pdf> [accessed 02 August 2015]


Smith, Matt, ‘Queering the Museum’ in *ICOM CE Digital*, 8 (2013), 86-92,
<http://issuu.com/icom-ce_librovirtual/docs/icom-ce_digital_08/86> [accessed 04 August 2015]


Tatchell, Peter, ‘Inside the Gay Museum’, *The Guardian*, 08 June 2004,


Vicinus, Martha, ‘Lesbian History: All theory and no facts or all facts and no theory?’, in *The Feminist History Reader*, ed. by Sue Morgan (Oxon: Routledge, 2006), pp. 219-231


Watson, Sheila, ‘Museums and their Communities’ in *Museums and their Communities*, ed. by Sheila Watson (Oxon: Routledge, 2007), pp. 1-23

Wilke, Christiane ‘Remembering Complexity? Memorials for Nazi Victims in Berlin’, 
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ijtj/ijs035>


Witcomb, Andrea, ‘“A Place for All of Us”? Museums and Communities’, in *Museums and their Communities*, ed. by Sheila Watson (Oxon: Routledge, 2007), pp. 134-156


X, Ajamu, T. Campbell and M. Stevens, ‘Love and Lubrication in the Archives, or rukus!: A Black Queer Archive for the United Kingdom’, *Archivaria*, 68 (2009), 271-294,  
[accessed 02 August 2015]

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10502-012-9187-0>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09647770701264952>