

PRISING OPEN THE
MUSEUM'S CLOSETS

MAURA REILLY

Museums are storehouses – and, like most storehouses, they are full of closets.

– James Saslow¹

Museums have historically struggled with how to deal with and acknowledge non-heteronormative sexualities. By relegating lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ+)² materials to the museum's 'closets', hidden along with other objects considered 'obscene' or 'abominable',³ LGBTQ+ experiences have largely been ignored, marginalised or rendered insignificant. This institutional lesbo-homo-trans-phobia and curatorial bias has maintained the belief that heterosexuality is the default, preferred or 'normal' mode of sexual orientation and, within the museum context, privileged such histories and perspectives. As an example of this, in 2013 the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) presented an exhibition of the work of Jasper Johns and Robert Rauschenberg from the mid to late 1950s that made no mention of the fact that the two artists were lovers during a six-year period of artistic triumph, when they were moving away from Abstract Expressionism towards Pop Art. Instead, the introductory placard described them as 'friends' who were 'in dialogue with one another' during this period.

As museologists and anthropologists Renaud Chantraine and Bruno Brulon Soares have argued, the concept of heritage, so central to cultural institutions, is itself heteropatriarchal, given that patrimony 'refers to a patriarchal logic of transmission of goods and legal rights from fathers to sons'.⁴ The dominant culture's vertical transmission of history differs radically from what artist, author and curator Michael Petry calls 'horizontal history', a term that describes how stories, memories, or information have passed from one same-sex lover to another.⁵ Given that LGBTQ+ people are the only minorities whose culture is not transmitted through familial relations, they have had to devise 'alternative means of keeping their excluded history viable'.⁶ As such, the documentation of LGBTQ+ lives has been all the more difficult logistically. LGBTQ+ people have

historically self-censored for fear of exposure, surviving friends and relatives have destroyed evidence posthumously – covering up what they perceived to be embarrassing information – and historians, curators and archivists have suppressed material or inaccurately catalogued and interpreted it. (One need only think of Emily Dickinson for an example of suppressed material.) What this means is that there is a dearth of information about the LGBTQ+ community in comparison with the overabundance of material about heterosexuals. Moreover, institutional reluctance to put on display objects that may make museum visitors feel uneasy, or that may impact funding, has also greatly affected the representation of LGBTQ+ peoples. Given this, how is a museum to make significant a minority community that has historically been rendered insignificant? How can a museum excavate material hidden within its storage units that reflects this history? And, if there is not enough material, can it reinterpret and re-present its collection with a ‘queer eye’? What does ‘queer’ mean, anyway?

Meant to encompass the full diversity of non-heterosexual individuals, ‘queer’ is an umbrella term delineating those who might have been called – at different times and locations and in different cultures – lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, sodomite, sapphist, homosexual, fairy, fag, invert, trans, dyke, drag king, pansy, bumboy, polyamorous, hermaphrodite, drag queen, cupcake, tranny, M2F, poofter, maricón, and a range of other, often-derogatory terms associated with sexual dissidence. It embodies and accounts for all of these beings and identities. Queer can also function as a verb – to queer – as in ‘to make strange, to frustrate, to counteract, to delegitimize’, as academic Nikki Sullivan has theorised.⁷ To queer a museum is to challenge, query and critique the institution itself as an always already heteropatriarchal institution. In sum, queering contests heteronormativity.⁸ Or, as academic Elizabeth Freeman has argued, queering is a form of ‘talking back’ to history.⁹ It is a form of misbehaving.

Curators can perform interventions in existing collections that challenge heteronormativity by highlighting LGBTQ+ stories and themes, presenting queer readings of works of art and exploring hidden histories and truth-telling in didactics to also target and promote LGBTQ+ themes in educational and public programming – marketed to queers and non-queers alike. Curators can also organise exhibitions exclusively dedicated to LGBTQ+ histories and visual cul-

ture. There have been countless examples of the latter since the 1970s, including canonical museum exhibitions in Australia like *Becoming Visible: Lesbian & Male Homosexuals* (Constitutional Museum, Adelaide, 1982); *Imaging AIDS* (Australian Centre for Contemporary Art and Linden Gallery, Melbourne, 1989); *Prejudice and Pride: Lesbian and Gay Communities* (Australian Museum, Sydney, 1994); *Don't Leave Me This Way: Art in the Age of AIDS* (National Gallery of Australia, Canberra, 1994); *Prejudice and Pride* (Museum of Brisbane, 2010); and *HIV and AIDS: 30 Years On: The Australian Story* (Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, Sydney, 2012), among others. Examples have ranged from solo exhibitions of LGBTQ+ artists to blockbuster group exhibitions. But to queer a museum's permanent collection is a different curatorial project insofar as it entails a systemic examination of a museum's relationship to histories of non-heteronormative sexualities as manifest in its own collection holdings.

The Gay Museum, curated by Jo Darbyshire for the Western Australian Museum, Perth, in 2003, was one of the first exhibitions to queer a museum, in this instance a social history museum. For this exhibition, Darbyshire appropriated and recontextualised seemingly unrelated LGBTQ+ and non-queer objects from the museum collection and queered them through carefully conceptualised juxtapositions and snippets of written text (dictionary definitions, quotations drawn from newspapers, oral history interviews, scholarly articles). One display case, for instance, featured a mannequin in a fancy dinner suit, whose jacket was open at the front to reveal bounded breasts, accompanied by a text on lesbian butch-femme practice. Another case presented a powder puff next to a text about the etymology of the word ‘poofter’. In another, small fragments of used hand soap and other artefacts were displayed alongside an electric-shock machine accompanied by a didactic about changing homosexual orientation through treatment. In this instance, as one reviewer noted, ‘The associations of dirt, guilt, the body, and technology collide and linger’.¹⁰ To Darbyshire, the accompanying texts and didactic labels were critical, as it allowed her to move away from the guiding voice of the museum's authoritative narrator towards a more experiential, personal and subjective voice – one that allowed visitors to participate actively in the process of interpreting the objects queerly. Since *The Gay Museum*, the queering of museums has become a conventional approach to dealing with the exclusion of LGBTQ+ lives from the historical record. There

have been other permanent collection interventions at the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (2008), Birmingham Museum of Art (2010), the National Museum of Poland (2010) and the Tate Britain (2017), among others.¹¹

The NGV's *Queer* exhibition fits neatly into this historiography. In queering its permanent collection, the museum has opened up new ways of looking at and interpreting the collection, isolating over 400 objects for presentation. It is not an exhibition of visual art by exclusively queer artists. Indeed, not all of the artists portrayed in *Queer* are LGBTQ+, nor are the subjects depicted necessarily queer in content. Instead, we encounter heterosexual artists representing LGBTQ+ figures and subjects; LGBTQ+ artists representing heterosexual figures and subjects; LGBTQ+ artists representing LGBTQ+ figures and subjects; heterosexual artists representing LGBTQ+ figures and subjects with queer references, and other variations. As such, queerness functions as an allusive category, one with no single definition or aesthetic. Such an approach foregrounds the myriad ways in which both people and works might be interpreted as queer. The exhibition is less about who was/is queer; rather, as Robert Mills has argued, the question here is 'why and how one finds queerness historically or culturally'.¹²

Here the didactic label, like the notes in the margins, becomes the salient entry point. Take, for example, two objects that demonstrate the slipperiness of the term 'queer': one is a photograph by the heterosexual portrait photographer Athol Shmith of heterosexual gay icon Elizabeth Taylor; the other is a portrait by heterosexual photographer André Kertész of bisexual author Colette. Similarly, an image of the heterosexual Napoleon Bonaparte is accompanied by a label that informs us that during his reign the decriminalisation of homosexuality, begun during the French Revolution, was officially made law. And a simple photograph of St James's Park in London by William Thomas Owen, dated 1926, is accompanied by advice that at the turn of the nineteenth century, Hyde Park and St James's Park were locked at night to prevent 'scandalous practices'. Similarly, alongside an etching depicting a large gathering of men at The Royal Exchange in London, dated 1821, it is noted that its arcades were known as a buggery haunt.

The majority of the objects in the exhibition are overtly queer. Some involve 'household (LGBTQ+) names' like Andy Warhol, Duncan Grant, Edward Burra, Noël Coward, David Hockney, Nan Goldin, Robert Mapplethorpe, William Yang, Agnes Goodsir, David McDiarmid and Margaret Preston. Gay icons abound (Judy

Garland, Elizabeth Taylor, Madonna, Kylie Minogue, Colette, Jean Cocteau, Greta Garbo, Isadora Duncan and Leigh Bowery). Other objects present undeniably queer subject matter, as in kabuki theatre, costumes from gay fashion houses, portraits of the notoriously bisexual Bloomsbury Circle and images of Saint Sebastian. But the 'smoking gun' is not always evident. Often there are historical references that have led curators to believe the individuals may have been LGBTQ+. Parts of the exhibition are particularly provocative in this regard, claiming a variety of historical characters as members of the queer tribe: King Richard I of England, Henri III of France, Louis XIII of France, Christina of Sweden, King Gustav III of Sweden, and Sardanapalus. In other sections of the exhibition, ostensibly un-queerable figures – like Julius Caesar, Nero and Petronius – have been queered. We also encounter images of and by artists, or of subjects, whose sexual identities are uncertain or debatable – for example, Sandro Botticelli, Leonardo da Vinci, Shakespeare, Joan of Arc, Michelangelo – to challenge the historical heterosexual filter.

The research has also uncovered some wonderful revelations about sitters' identities that function to 'out' individuals. That Alastair Cary-Elwes's 1887 portrait of Rupert Bunny is indeed a depiction of his lover is a prime example. Or that Charles Laughton, featured in a 1958 portrait by Bryan Kneale, was the bisexual husband of the actor Elsa Lanchester, is another. These findings are invaluable in their affirmation of LGBTQ+ lives lived in the museum's archives and closets, lives now retrieved. As Anna Conlan has explained, 'Omission from the museum does not simply mean marginalisation; it formally classifies certain lives, histories and practices as insignificant'.¹³ Hence the importance of archival research that offers new insights. All information about LGBTQ+ lives lived is proof of existence and significance.

There are many extraordinary objects sourced from the NGV's holdings that demonstrate the extensive curatorial research undertaken in order to collect queer references, annotations and observations that might otherwise remain hidden and undetectable to the non-LGBTQ+ viewer. André Kertész's *Grande Boulevard, Paris*, 1934, for example, is a seemingly quotidian photograph of a street scene in Paris showing a woman resting on a bench while, behind her, a man walks by wall posters advertising a then-popular aperitif, Dubonnet. However, upon closer inspection, we notice that at the centre of the composition

is a cut-out silhouette of a gender non-conforming individual in a suit and top hat, literally attached to the bench, which is advertising a film called *Georges et Georgette*. The seated woman appears to have no interest in any of this. The film is the French-language version of the film *Victor and Victoria* (1933), wherein a woman pretends to be a male female impersonator and, after enjoying great success on the stage, has trouble concealing her secret when she falls in love with a man. It takes queer vision on the part of curators to notice and re-present these details, allowing for a queer reading of a now-canonical image. To demonstrate how LGBTQ+ content like this is generally overlooked in museums or how queer interpretations are thwarted, the Metropolitan Museum's (New York) wall label for the same photograph describes the top-hatted silhouetted figure as a 'fellow' – a male – whose 'inviting smile' the seated woman is oblivious to.¹⁴ The Met has assumed this to be a heteronormative image.

Strong curatorial research and accompanying didactic materials have highlighted the queer content of another unlikely image in the exhibition. In his 1810 etching *Chaucer's Canterbury pilgrims* the artist William Blake has chosen to depict, among the other pilgrims, a portrait of The Pardoner, who is shown on horseback just centre right of the composition. The figure is described in Chaucer's text as a man of slight build, beardless, with wispy blond locks and a high-pitched voice. As Peter Ackroyd in *Queer City* has explained: "The narrator of *The Canterbury Tales* eventually declares that "I believe he was a gelding or a mare" – that, literally, he was either a eunuch or a woman. But "mare" was also used as a term for effeminate men."¹⁵ Ackroyd proclaims Chaucer's literary character as 'one of the first portraits, or caricatures, of a London queer'.¹⁶ A heteronormative label would not have focused on the queer character – and might indeed have left his description out of any corresponding didactic. It requires a LGBTQ+ lens to focus on this specific pilgrim, amid all of the other characters. In both of these examples – the Kertész photograph and the Blake etching – it is clear that it takes a 'queer eye' to uncover (or perhaps *want to* discover), reinterpret and re-present LGBTQ+ content.

Some of the most profound works encountered in the *Queer* exhibition remind us that LGBTQ+ persons have been persecuted across time and place and that lesbo-homo-trans phobia has always run deep. Via a careful selection of works and smartly written didactics, we learn of the arrests for homosexuality

of artists Angus McBean and Simeon Solomon, of Thomas Hart Benton's disdain for homosexual men, and of James Stuart MacDonald's outright condemnation of 'degenerates and perverts' who he insisted had invaded the fine art realm (MacDonald served as NGV director 1936–40). We learn also of many other historical figures who were vicious homophobes, including Justinian, Emperor of the Byzantine Empire, who believed that homosexually inclined men were responsible for earthquakes, and that, for this reason, should be 'burned alive'.¹⁷ A label alongside a portrait of King Henry VIII explains that he was the first to criminalise sexual activity between men when he codified the *Buggery Act* of 1533, and a didactic accompanying an image of Thomas Cromwell, the Earl of Essex, states that Cromwell was beheaded alongside one of the first men executed in London for buggery, in 1540. An etching of Newgate Prison, London is accompanied by a didactic that explains that queers were hung at this prison for the crime of sodomy.

What the exhibition makes clear is that the condemnations and executions for non-conformist sexuality were specific to men. Lesbianism appears not to have been a threat – except in passing, for instance, with Marie-Antoinette's unsubstantiated relationship with Princess Lamballe. Indeed, lesbianism has never (to my knowledge) been outlawed, because, as Judith Butler has explained, a lesbian is an 'unviable (un)subject',¹⁸ a cipher with no meaning outside of the heterosexual matrix – hence the nineteenth-century French synonym for lesbians, *faut de mieux* ('for lack of something better'). A phallogocentric understanding of lesbianism precludes its existence, as in the notion of a Boston Marriage.¹⁹ Indeed, when an image is lesbo-erotic – as in the case of Diana and her nymphs, who are typically shown naked with bodies tipped towards the viewer – it is clear it is constructed so as to maximise heterosexual male visual consumption. Only a few images in the exhibition are unambiguously lesbian in content – for example, two photographs by Ponch Hawkes. And, except for several images of drag queens, one of the only reference to the gender non-conformist community is the famous 1932 Brassai photograph of *Le Monocle*, which depicts a grouping of butch-femme lesbians in a bar in the Montmartre neighbourhood of Paris, a few of whom don 'masculine' attire.

Intersectionality is always a challenge for museums, and *Queer* highlights this, considering its own limitations. Our collecting institutions suffer from a dearth of historical material by women artists, and scant examples

of artists of colour, persons with disabilities or those of other marginalised social groups. It is exciting to be on the cusp of a period of change, in which difference is finally being celebrated across the sector. But, as with *Queer*, no exhibition can be all things to all people. It must be said that most LGBTQ+ exhibitions are themselves homonormative, which means they normalise white middle-class cis men in gay communities and their histories. Differences of race, ethnicity, class and gender are often overlooked. This criticism has been levelled at blockbuster queer exhibitions like *Hide/Seek* (Brooklyn Museum, New York, 2012) and *Ars Homoerotica* (The National Museum, Warsaw, 2010). Clare Barlow, curator of the recent *Queer British Art* at the Tate, has written of her struggle with these issues, considering the limitations of a historical exhibition. She states: 'This lack of surviving material reflects power dynamics within society that were replicated in the queer community and the art markets'.²⁰ 'Long histories of racism, misogyny, transphobia, and class prejudice', she continued, 'have not only caused works to be lost but also stifled careers before they could flourish'.²¹ Indeed, one of the most difficult aspects of curating an exhibition with queer content from the past is that history itself is homo-lesbo-trans-phobic. The task of a curator is to make those absences visible. Not to do so runs the risk of essentialising dissident sexualities – as if all LGBTQ+ experience is the same regardless of the myriad differences among and between individuals. As academic Carolyn Dinshaw has explained, we are not 'a feel-good collectivity of happy homos'.²² What differentiates the NGV's *Queer* from these other exhibitions is that it does not purport to speak for all members of the LGBTQ+ community. Rather, it adopts the queer lens to internalise the perspective in a focus on the collection itself. It is a useful model, as the curators are not presenting the LGBTQ+ community in a monolithic form.²³ Here, the strength of 'queer' as a concept is its flexibility. This curatorial strategy follows on from Fred Wilson's landmark exhibition *Mining the Museum* (1992), which drew attention to the racial blind spots in the collections of the Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore. Like Wilson's strategy, 'exposing a legacy of violence, exclusion and selective looking',²⁴ *Queer* is a form of institutional critique that presents museum artefacts – some of which had little to do with LGBTQ+ lives – as stand-ins for the unrecorded and multidimensional experiences of LGBTQ+ communities, past and present.

With many identity-based exhibitions there remains the danger of ghettoisation. As I argued in my book *Curatorial Activism: Towards an Ethics of Curating*, to organise an exhibition focused exclusively on sexuality (as with race, ethnicity, gender, religion) is to take on a separatist or 'area studies' approach to curating. Such a tactic is revisionist and additive; it seeks to produce new canons and/or to supplement the discourse of art history or museum displays by focusing on under-represented communities. Separatist exhibitions (for example, women artists, African American artists, First Nations artists, Muslim artists and so on) are valuable precisely because they democratise the art historical canon by focusing on constituencies overlooked by mainstream (white, cis male, heteronormative) museums. While we all long for a moment when there is no longer a need for exhibitions like 'queer artists', or 'women artists', for that matter, we are not there yet. After all, 'greatness' in the art world has been defined, in the West, since antiquity, as privileged, Western, heterosexual and above all white, cis male.²⁵ Not much has changed. Non-heteronormative artists have made great strides, but we still have a long way to go. Most usefully, *Queer* functions as a curatorial corrective to the traditional canon of art history and to mainstream museum displays; these artists and subjects can no longer be ignored. Until there is equality of representation for LGBTQ+ individuals, such exhibitions remain necessary. We are not yet living in a post-queer world. Lesbo-homo-trans phobia has not been overcome or defeated. The fight for a society livable for all continues in the present.

In his seminal essay, 'Queering the museum', Robert Mills argues that 'the objective, narratorial voice of museum authority is not the only voice to be heard'.²⁶ In their drive towards democratisation and inclusivity, museums must continue to challenge their exclusionary practices by reconciling with colonisation, sexism, racism, classism, ableism, Western-centrism and, yes, heteronormativity. As museums like the NGV enact LGBTQ+ initiatives, one must ask if systemic change is even possible without a complete reconfiguration of the inner workings of the museum. The queer turn, after all, is not just a change in content; it must also simultaneously decentre institutional authority and intensify accountability. To truly queer a museum also necessitates avoiding tokenistic gestures, which only serve to reinforce power hierarchies without confronting complicities and silences. Challenging heteronormativity must

be an ongoing and sustained project. What the NGV's *Queer* exhibition reveals is that museums are capable of acting productively upon contemporary social issues and concerns; that they are capable of challenging the heteronormativity intrinsic to cultural institutions. Museums have the unique potential to act differently, to tackle prejudice and foster more respectful ways of seeing difference; to build support for progressive values and equality for all. Cultural organisations of all kinds have both an ethical responsibility and rich untapped opportunities to stimulate and support progressive social change. The NGV has proven that museums are capable of doing the hard work of confronting institutional biases – and with astounding results.

1. James Saslow, 'Closets and the museum: homophobia and art history', in Karla Jay & Allen Young (eds), *Lavender Culture*, New York University Press, New York, 1978, p. 226. • 2. The 2015 glossary compiled by the Van Abbemuseum (Eindhoven, Netherlands) compares the acronym LGBTQ+ to alternatives, like LGBTQQP2SAA, 'which includes a second Q for questioning (i.e. people currently questioning their sexual orientation), P for pansexual people, a second A for (straight) allies and 2S for Two-Spirit people. 2S refers to Native Americans, whose culture believes that a masculine and feminine spirit can be present in one person simultaneously. However, it is legitimate to question whether inclusivity can be obtained through acronyms. When would this stretching and adding become meaningless, and even laughable or useless?' *ibid.*, p. 13. Throughout this essay, I have chosen the acronym LGBTQ+ as an all-inclusive term for any and all non-heteronormative sexualities, believing the '+' to accommodate all identities. I agree with the Van Abbemuseum's glossary that to continue to add letters to LGBTQ+ is 'meaningless, and even laughable or useless'. • 3. See David Gaimster, 'Sex and sensibility at The British Museum', *History Today*, Sep. 2000, pp. 10–15. • 4. See Renaud Chantraine & Bruno Brulon Soares, 'Introduction', *Museum International*, vol. 72, no. 3–4, 2020, p. 5. • 5. Michael Petry, 'Hidden histories: the experience of curating a male same-sex exhibition and the problems encountered', in Amy K. Levin (ed.), *Gender, Sexuality and Museums: A Routledge Reader*, Routledge, London and New York, 2010, pp. 153–4. • 6. *ibid.* • 7. Nikki Sullivan, *A Critical Introduction to Queer Theory*, New York University, New York, 2003, p. vi. • 8. James H. Sanders, 'Queering the museums', *Culture Work: A Periodic Broadside for Arts and Culture Workers*, no. 1, 2007, p. 3. Sanders argues that queering a museum is not just about putting marginalised sexual subjects into the focus of the curator. Rather, the aim of queering a museum collection should be 'to disrupt those socio-sexual assumptions that have been thoughtlessly reenacted. Through this repeated practice of queerly (un)naming and opening history and artworks to multiple readings, one may reinvest in the museum as an institution and its objects' ongoing (re) production, relevancy and vitality.' • 9. Elizabeth Freeman, *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*, Duke University Press, Durham NC, 2010, p. xxi. • 10. Josephine Wilson, 'Jo Darbyshire: The Gay Museum', *Artlink*, June 2003. • 11. See, for instance, *Queer: Desire, Power and Identity*, curated by Veronica Hejdelind and Patrik Steorn at the Nationalmuseum in Stockholm (2008); *Queering the Museum*, curated by Matt Smith at Birmingham Museum of Art (2010); *Ars Homoerotica*, curated by Paweł Leszkowicz at the National Museum of Poland (2010); and *Queer British Art: 1861–1967*, curated by Clare Barlow at the Tate Britain (2017), among others. • 12. Robert Mills, 'Theorizing the queer museum', *Museum & Social Issues*, vol. 3, no. 1, Spring 2008, p. 50. • 13. Anna Conlan, 'Representing possibility: mourning, memorial, and queer museology', in Levin, p. 257. • 14. The full label copy from the Metropolitan Museum of Art reads as follow: 'A. M. Cassandre's famous poster plays with the name of the aperitif: Dubo (du beau, "beautiful"), Dubon (du bon, "good"), Dubonnet. The solitary woman is as oblivious to this jaunty refrain as she is to the inviting smile of the top-hatted fellow at her shoulder. Kertész saw these inapposite conjunctions and in the same instant knew that the pedestrian departing the poignant scene should

not be allowed to make his getaway.' See 'On the boulevards, Paris, 1934', *The Metropolitan Museum of Art*, <<https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/265597>>, accessed 25 June 2021. • 15. Peter Ackroyd, *Queer City: Gay London from the Romans to the Present Day*, Chatto & Windus, London, 2017, p. 35. • 16. *ibid.* • 17. As cited in Randy P. Conner, *Cassell's Encyclopedia of Queer Myth, Symbol, and Spirit*, Cassell, London, 1997, p. 128. • 18. Judith Butler, 'Imitation and gender insubordination', in Diana Fuss (ed.), *Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories, Gay Theories*, Routledge, New York, 1991, p. 20. • 19. A 'Boston Marriage' refers to two wealthy women maintaining a household together, especially in nineteenth-century New England. These relationships were often romantic in nature, but weren't necessarily so. • 20. Clare Barlow, 'Rejecting normal: curating *Queer British Art, 1861–1967* at Tate Britain and *Being Human* at Wellcome Collection, London', *The Garage Journal: Studies in Art, Museums & Culture*, no. 1, p. 272. • 21. *ibid.* • 22. Carolyn Dinshaw, 'Got medieval?', *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2001, p. 204. • 23. Gloria Anzaldúa has advised that 'even when we shelter under [the term queer], we must not forget that it homogenizes, erases our differences'; see Gloria Anzaldúa, *The Gloria Anzaldúa Reader*, Duke University Press, Durham NC, 2009, p. 164. • 24. Kerr Houston, 'How *Mining the Museum* changed the art world', 3 May 2017, *BmoreArt*, <<https://bmoreart.com/2017/05/how-mining-the-museum-changed-the-art-world.html>>, accessed 25 June 2021. • 25. Linda Nochlin, 'Why have there been no great women artists?', in *Women Artists: The Linda Nochlin Reader*, Thames & Hudson, London, 2015, p. 46. • 26. Mills, p. 48.