Queer Wallpaper
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The nearest Warhol print to which I have regular, free access is from his 1978 Sex Parts series of silk-screens. The image is a print of a pornographic photograph, a close-up of anal sex between men. Normally, this is a very difficult image to gain access to—recent large scale retrospectives of Warhol’s paintings and prints have excluded any example of this series. Very few Warhol catalogues include this work—as a result, very few people even know that Warhol made work like this. I came across it by accident.

This particular print hangs on the back wall of M.J.’s, a local gay bar in my neighborhood in Los Angeles. Because most of my friends are queer, and many of them are gay men, I sometimes go to M.J.’s for an evening cocktail (Figure 17.1). The print hangs on the wall with other “gay art”—art by gay men, depicting gay sexual life (far less graphically)—and with oversized posters for gladiator movies. There is no wall text explaining what you are looking at—it’s there as decoration, as the background for cruising, drinking, dancing, and more. As queer wallpaper.

The function of the word “queer” in writing about art is hard to pin down. But I am sure that the fact that a Warhol hangs in my local gay bar (not a hip gay bar, but an old neighborhood gay bar where it probably goes unrecognized by most of the bar’s patrons) is a queer thing.

When we use the word “queer” to describe art or criticism, we are certainly saying something about the importance of sexuality to art—but we are not always “ outing” the work of an artist or writer as “gay.” That Warhol’s image depicts sex between men may make it gay, but this doesn’t necessarily make it queer. We often use the word “queer” to signal the things that can come with being gay and lesbian, with being a member of a lesbian and gay community, but which are not exactly reducible to sexual identity. Thinking about queer visual culture, in other words, is more than thinking about art by gay men and lesbians. To pursue this line of inquiry is to ask questions about where and how
that art happens, about who that art addresses, how that art is visible in some contexts and invisible in others, about what kinds of things art makes possible. It is also to look differently at art in general – at the sexual politics of all art, at what art can tell us about the world, and at how the lines around the category “Art” are drawn. For me, counter-intuitively, what’s queer about that Warhol image is not exactly what it depicts, but where hangs – and what its location makes visible.

M.J.’s Sex Parts print is arguably one of the more accessible “real Warhols” in Southern California, requiring neither an entrance fee nor an invitation into a private mansion to see it. During business hours, anyone can walk into M.J.’s and check out the Warhol on the back wall, as long as he or she is willing to walk into a gay bar.

A straight person who crosses M.J.’s threshold but is not used to gay spaces might find himself wondering “Am I welcome here?” or thinking “I don’t belong here.” This is perhaps not entirely unlike the feeling that a lot of people have about museums. The grand institutions of art have a way of making many feel like outsiders. The unease of feeling unwelcome in such spaces is not entirely unlike how many queer scholars feel about the discipline of art history.
You can take a class on the history of art since 1945 and never hear a word about sexuality. You can attend a major museum exhibition on Andy Warhol and never learn that he was gay — never mind that homoerotic and explicitly sexual images animate the entire range of his artistic production. In fact, the particular de-gaying effect of “official” disciplinary rhetoric is perhaps most obvious in the history of critical writing about Warhol, who is also, paradoxically, in Richard Dyer’s words, “the most famous gay man who ever lived.” Mandy Merck writes, “as out as Warhol may have been, gay as [Warhol’s films] My Hustler, Lonesome Cowboys, Blow Job may seem, his assumption to the postmodern pantheon has been a surprisingly straight ascent, if only in its stem detachment from any form of commentary that could be construed as remotely sexy.” The full discussion of sexuality and art is a very recent development in art history — as central to art history as queer people are (as, for example, artists, critics, collectors, and curators), the subject of sexuality still remains outside the official boundaries of the field. Those writers (such as Jonathan Weinberg, Harmony Hammond, Gavin Butt, and Richard Meyer) who do take up sexuality in their work are, in essence, carving out a new field of scholarship. The long-standing hostility of art history to the subject of identity is the reason why so much of the most influential queer writing about art and visual culture comes from outside the discipline. Queer scholars in more politicized fields such as film (e.g., Richard Dyer), performance studies (Sue-Ellen Case, José Muñoz), visual/cultural studies (Douglas Crimp, Judith Halberstam), and critical theory (Judith Butler, Teresa de Lauretis, Michel Foucault, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick) have provoked dramatic shifts in how we understand some of the most significant artists of this period.

For those of us attached to queer subjects — such as Andy Warhol’s fascination with gay porn; the sexual radicalism of films by Jack Smith, Carolee Schneemann, and Cheryl Dunye; the coded queer subtexts embedded in the work of Robert Rauschenberg, Larry Rivers, and Jasper Johns; or the utopian drive of lesbian feminist artists like Harmony Hammond — the systematic negation of queer sexualities from art history’s official record can leave us feeling, well, as though we’ve walked into the wrong bar.

Queering Criticism

Writing about sexuality and art after 1945 differs from similar scholarship about other periods because unlike art preceding this era, many of its most famous figures (like Andy Warhol, David Hockney, Isaac Julien, Harmony Hammond, Catherine Opie) were and are openly and recognizably gay and lesbian. Toward the end of the 1960s, in the US and Western Europe gay men and lesbians formed new social and political movements around sexual identity, and began en masse to fight homophobia — in the US this movement was famously sparked by the Stonewall uprising, a protest led largely by Latina drag queens in response to a
1969 police raid on a gay bar in New York City. In late twentieth-century art, we see artists and audiences publicly identifying themselves as gay and lesbian, and we see curators organizing exhibitions that explore the idea of gay and lesbian identity and what it means to be a gay artist, as well as the history of representations of homoerotic bonds and identities. The word “queer” emerges as a key term in conversations about sexuality against this backdrop—in which, on the one hand, we see the proliferation of representations of queer communities in all their varieties and on a range of fronts (in film, performance, painting, photography, etc.) and, on the other, we nevertheless find the systematic exclusion of art and writing by gay and lesbian artists from art historical scholarship. In the 1980s, the AIDS crisis added a new level of urgency to the battle against homophobia—and it is at this moment that we begin to see the word “queer” circulating in academic writing, and in and around contemporary art. “Queer” was recuperated in the late 1980s from its more everyday use (often as a homophobic insult) by gay and lesbian activists working especially with ACT UP (AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power)—as in the rallying chant, “We’re Here, We’re Queer, Get Used to It!” A number of the intellectuals now associated with queer scholarship in art criticism and visual culture (such as Douglas Crimp and Simon Watney) have been deeply involved with AIDS activism, AIDS organizations, and ACT UP itself. The particular impact of AIDS on artists, on the art community, and on contemporary intellectual life cannot be understated, and the energy and political commitment that animates much writing about sexuality, art, and politics in the late 1980s and early 1990s should be understood in that context. The role of homophobia in state and public indifference to the AIDS epidemic made the project of anti-homophobic inquiry feel not just important, but a matter of life and death. Some of the most influential writings on sexuality and visual culture (such as Watney’s 1987 Policing Desire: Pornography, AIDS, and the Media) grew directly from the need to intervene against homophobic systems of representation. Artists, activists, and scholars found themselves asking questions such as: “How do we mourn the loss of people whose lives have already been ignored, erased, or stigmatized as degenerate?” and “How do we assert the importance of gay underground sexual culture in a society that associates same-sex and non-monogamous sexual practices with disease and death?” On the intellectual movement that formed in response to the AIDS crisis, Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner write, AIDS activism forced the issue of translating queerness into the national scene. AIDS made those of us who confronted it realize the deadly stakes of discourse; it made us realize the public and private unvoiceability of so much that mattered, about anger, mourning, and desire. AIDS also showed that rhetorics of expertise limit the circulation of knowledge, ultimately authorizing the technocratic administration of peoples’ lives. Finally, in a way that directly affects critics of polite letters, AIDS taught us the need to be disconcertingly explicit about things such as money and sexual practices, for as long as euphemism and indirection produce harm and privilege.
In their emphasis on the challenge the AIDS crisis posed to intellectuals, making their writing carry the urgency of the moment, Berlant and Warner gesture toward queer criticism's double edge: for not only does queer criticism bring sexuality and desire to the center of our attention; it sometimes also experiments with (and therefore "queers") the practice of criticism itself—often by injecting a personal or anecdotal voice into scholarly writing.\footnote{11}

In "Getting the Warhol We Deserve," Douglas Crimp gestures toward the relationship between the personal and the political in queer criticism when he writes,

That is one reason why an art such as [underground film-maker Jack] Smith's—and Warhol's—matters, why I want to make of it the art I need and the art I deserve—not because it reflects or refers to a historical gay identity and thus serves to confirm my own now, but because it defies and denies the coherence and stability of all sexual identity. That to me is the meaning of queer, and it is a meaning we need now, in all its historical richness, to counter both the normalization of sexuality and the historical reification of avant-garde genealogy.\footnote{12}

Crimp re-asserts one of the principle themes of queer criticism—its investment not in the articulation and production of concrete categories of sexuality and gender, but in the very real ways that queer art (be it a novel, a photograph, a film, a performance) can cut across and dismantle the attempt to produce sexual subjects as inevitable members of a "type," and, at the same time, call into question the disciplinary narratives that have formed around queer art that has been absorbed into the canonical record (such as work by Robert Rauschenberg, Jasper Johns, or Andy Warhol), or that stubbornly remains "underground" (such the films of Jack Smith, the performances of lesbian punk bands such as Tribe 8 or The Butchies, or the performances of the Los Angeles-based artist Ron Athey).

To approach the subject of sexuality and art from questions like these is to re-imagine the subject/object relation that structures much art historical scholarship. It is to push art historical writing beyond the rhetoric of connoisseurship and expertise. It is to place special emphasis on the character of the relationship between ourselves and our objects, photographs, paintings, and films—to ask what it is that we get out of our love for art. In paying attention to these artists we discover that their "queerness" resides not only in the domain of the sexual, but in how they make art, in the kinds of relationships between people and art they foster. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's 1993 essay "Queer and Now" thus speaks to how we become attached to certain works of art because they seem to speak to us, to speak about us—and because they seem, in particular, to speak to the experience of living at odd angles to dominant culture:

I think that for many of us in childhood the ability to attach intensely to a few cultural objects, objects of high culture or popular culture or both, objects whose meaning seemed mysterious, excessive, or oblique in relation to the codes most
readily available to us, became a prime resource for survival. We needed for there to be sites where the meanings didn’t line up tidily with each other, and we learned to invest those sites with fascination and love.13

We feel recognized in those sites where meanings don’t “line up tidily with each other,” in part because they mirror our struggles with those moments when, Sedgwick writes, “all institutions are speaking with one voice,” when “religion, state, capital, ideology, domesticity, the discourses of power and legitimacy” unite as a monolith around one word, such as “family” or “nation.”14 For those of us (which is probably most of us) who find ourselves living at odd angles with these monolithic structures (because we are, for example, gay, black, working class, an immigrant, etc.), art is not a luxury, but a necessity – queer readings of books, novels, films, paintings, and performances give us our maps, our user’s manuals for finding pleasure in a world more often than not organized around that pleasure’s annihilation. Robert Reid-Pharr thus writes that queer political work “must necessarily be the politics of the moment, the politics of action, the politics of bombast, the politics of innovation, and most especially the politics of joy.”15 Queer artists share this suspicion of the rhetoric of connoisseurship that defines art history, and have furthermore shaped their practices not around developing a presence in the gallery system, but around the cultivation of an alternative community. The London-based body artist Franko B, for example, describes his political commitment in the following words:

I try to work against the imposition of moral codes that dictate what is right or wrong. I started using my body as a “fuck you” to Section 28, to the age of consent, to the Spencer trial [three British legal sites that specifically criminalize gay and lesbian sex]. I said “fuck you” to the ignorance and bigotry around issues of desire, sexuality and race that thrive in institutions from the so-called liberal environment of the art academies and galleries to the tabloids and the right-wing rags. . . . My work is . . . rooted in the problems of protection, love, and freedom.16

At its best, queer art and queer art history is animated by exactly this blend of passion and commitment.

**Imaginative Genealogies: Visualizing Queer Art Histories**

Although queer criticism and theory coalesce as such in the late 1980s and early 1990s around the intense activist, intellectual, and creative energy of AIDS activism, it also has an immediate relationship to the identity-based movements of the 1970s and 1980s – to, for example, radical feminism, to the Stonewall uprising and gay liberation, to the civil rights movement – as well as to a range of critical schools of thought. This is to say that one might imagine multiple genealogies for queer scholarship and art. Given the importance of the intersection of different aspects of identity (like race and gender) to queer criticism
one might, for example, ground its intellectual history in the writings of lesbian feminists of color (such as Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa) and the groundbreaking anthology *This Bridge Called My Back* (1981), or in the black feminist radicalism of lesbian poet Audre Lorde.17 Much queer theory — such as Judith Butler’s seminal work on the nature of gender and sexual identity in *Gender Trouble* (1990) — is anchored in feminist theory, in the writings of Simone de Beauvoir (who famously declared “One is not born a woman” in *The Second Sex*), the philosophy of Monique Wittig (who declared in *The Straight Mind* that “Lesbians are not women”), and in the work of psychoanalytic theorists like Joan Riviere (whose 1929 essay “Womanliness as Masquerade” is crucial to psychoanalytic readings of the constructedness of gender difference).18 One of the foundational texts in queer theory, *Between Men* (1985), Eve Sedgwick’s analysis of the dynamics of homophobia and the social regulation of relations between men, begins with an assertion of the importance of materialist and radical feminism to the book’s project.

Many of the artists and intellectual leaders of gay, lesbian, and queer feminist communities have furthermore been Marxists — their political radicalism is not only about re-imagining family and forms of intimacy, but also about generating a critique of capitalism’s investment in hetero-patriarchy. For some of the artists most profoundly identified with queer art making the “queerness” of their ethos is directly linked to their antipathy toward consumer culture and the carcerism of the art world. Jack Smith not only filmed the camp classic *Flaming Creatures* (1963, arguably queer visual culture’s “filmic ur-text”), but penned inspired rants against “landlordism.”19 We can also look to the DIY (Do-It-Yourself) aesthetic of video artist George Kuchar (who has made hundreds of videocaps about everything from tornadoes to cats), queer ‘zine culture (e.g. Tammy Rae Carland’s *I Heart* Amy Carter (c. 1992–4)), Vaginal Davis’s *Fertile Latinah Jackson* (1982–91), and the collectively produced *LTTR* (2002–present) — “Lesbians to the Rescue” — as modes of art making that resist the market-driven ethics of official museum and gallery culture.

David Wojnarowicz explored the relationship between corporate greed, homophobia, and the AIDS crisis in his writings and in his art. *Untitled* (*Hijjar Dead*) (1988–9), for example, memorializes his friend (an artist who had died of AIDS) and considers “the deadly economics of the AIDS crisis.”20 *Untitled* consists of a collaged series of photographs of Hijjar’s corpse (images of his face, hands, and feet) underneath a layer of text. Nearly the entire surface is covered with a 46-line long paragraph, a single sentence which moves back and forth between despair and outrage — at the narrator’s own decline, at this high cost of healthcare, and, more pointedly, at the smug and murderous attitudes of public officials and corporate executives. The artist writes, “there’s a thin line a very thin line and as each T-cell disappears from my body it’s replaced by ten thousand pounds of rage... it’s been murder on a daily basis for eight count them eight long years and we’re expected to pay taxes to support this public and social murder and we’re expected to quietly and politely make house in this windstorm
of murder..." Hujar is buried beneath this breathless and moving single sentence and framing both the rant and the images of Hujar are dollar bills. Like Hujar, a number of the names we associate most often with queer art making (from Jack Smith to Andy Warhol to the Italian artist, film-maker, and poet Pier Paolo Passolini) often made capitalism and consumer culture as the subject of their work (as in Warhol’s silk-screens of Campbell’s soup cans and of celebrity icons like Marilyn Monroe).

We can construct other contexts and histories for contemporary queer art, or, better yet, we can look at the work of contemporary artists to see how they imagine alternative historical contexts for themselves. In part because so much of the history of gay and lesbian life is a history of exclusion and erasure, much queer art takes history (and even "Art History") as its subject. The Japanese artist Yasumasa Morimura, for example, performs a series of cross-racial, cross-cultural, and cross-historical identifications when he photographs himself in drag as Marilyn Monroe, as the Mexican artist Frida Kahlo, or as the white prostitute in Manet’s 1863 painting Olympia. The Black British artist Yinka Shonibare imagines himself in a series of photographs as a Victorian dandy – surrounded by dissipated bohemians in a bedroom orgy, or by dignified intellectuals in a masculine salon. As these artists identify with and re-work the past, they practice what Elizabeth Freeman has called “temporal drag.” The term “temporal drag” exploits the associations that the word “drag” has with cross gender performance and also “with all of the associations that the word drag has with regression, delay, and the pull of the past on the present.” Temporal drag, Freeman continues, is the “stubborn identification with a set of social coordinates that exceed[s] our own historical moment.” Freeman develops this term in her analysis of Shulie (1997), Elizabeth Subrin’s shot-by-shot recreation of a 1967 film of the same title about Shulamith Firestone. In 1967, Firestone was then a student at the Art Institute of Chicago, but later, in 1970, she would write The Dialectic of Sex, one of radical feminism’s most important manifestos. In recreating this film (which was suppressed by Firestone), Subrin asks “what Second Wave feminism might mean to those who did not live through it except possibly as children.” We see a similar deployment of temporal drag in David Wojnarowicz’s photographic series “Arthur Rimbaud in New York” (1978–9), in which the artist photographs a young man in a range of urban bohemian underground settings (on the subway, cruising for sex, shooting heroin, masturbating), all with a mask of the French poet covering his face.

Closely related to queer projects that imagine temporal slips and hauntings, that fill the present with the past (and vice versa), is work that explores the often overwhelming sense of loss that marks especially artists who were making work throughout the 1980s and 1990s, and were therefore grappling with the impact of AIDS on the artistic community. Wojnarowicz photographed himself almost completely buried in sand, produced images of Buffalo tumbling off a bluff, and, as noted, superimposed a rant against corporate greed and indifference over a photo collage of the corpse of his friend the photographer Peter Hujar, who had died of AIDS. Felix Gonzalez-Torres covered billboards with an enormous
and profoundly melancholic image of an empty bed (1991). Video artist Ming Yuen S. Ma’s *Stiff* (1997) shows the artist naked, crawling in a bed searching for the scent of an absent lover as the video image itself appears to disintegrate. One of the most influential works in this vein is Isaac Julien’s film *Looking for Langston* (1998), which at once articulates the importance of the Harlem Renaissance poet Langston Hughes as a black gay artist, mourns the erasure of homosexuality from representations of the Harlem Renaissance, and connects these subjects to the fragility of queer black queer bohemian communities today.

**Wall Text**

Several years ago (in 2002) a friend of mine got me into the press preview for the self-declared definitive retrospective of the work of Andy Warhol at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Los Angeles. I was already familiar with critiques of the show from my colleagues in London, who had seen it at the Tate, and were floored, as I would be, by the particularly cynical framing of the exhibition, which excluded huge sections of Warhol’s oeuvre—namely, anything visibly sexual—from its “survey” of his career. I walked through the exhibit, tried to keep an open mind, and then settled into the crowd gathered to hear the men responsible for the exhibition—the mayor, the curator, and the director of the museum—speak.

The mayor’s remarks at the press conference stayed well inside the museum’s official line on Warhol and Los Angeles—“Andy always did love Hollywood.”

It took a while for the shock of the spectacle to settle in: the mayor of Los Angeles delivered his rambling speech, most of which was about money—money donated, money the city hoped to squeeze out of art patrons visiting downtown Los Angeles for a glimpse of superstardom—all this was spoken at the foot of a giant Warhol portrait of Chairman Mao. The devastating political irony of the Mao portrait, which renders the face of Communist China into a “brand” (à la Campbell’s Soup or Coca-Cola), was, one suspected, lost on the museum and city officials behind this media event. For some, however, the image of Mao can never be fully emptied out of its historical force. If the museum had imagined its constituency as comprising, in part, the range of Asian communities that make up Los Angeles, it might not have been so casual in visually pairing the mayor and museum director with Chairman Mao, the iconic image of the Cultural Revolution, as they announced their desire to bring more money to the city.

The thoughtlessness of the pairing was a reflection of the exhibit’s perspective on Warhol’s work as an existential exercise in nothingness—which is, as it happens, one of the ways through which Warhol is “de-gayed” by museums. The “de-gaying” effect was reinforced by the fact that the exhibit had no wall text: the museum wanted to let the works “speak for themselves.”

Once the speeches were over, the museum director offered to take questions. Since I am a Warhol scholar who has written about the active refusal of museums to acknowledge the importance of Warhol’s sexuality to his work, I felt it
was up to me to be the loose canon and ask the “sex question.” Reluctantly, I stepped up to the mike and asked how it was possible that one could curate a survey of the career of one of the most famously gay men ever (an artist who, for instance, premiered his films in gay porn houses) and elide the subject of sexuality from all discussion of the importance and meaning of the work.

My voice seemed to disappear into the space of the gallery. I felt like I was talking in a room full of pillows. The mike wasn’t on (in fact, I’m not even sure it was even plugged in) and the room emptied out as I posed my awkward, and oddly academic, question. I forced myself to get to the end of my sentence, even though I felt with each word the increasing pointlessness of my intervention.

I heard myself: shrill, nervous, slightly hysterical. I saw myself, in that context, as small, and – most painfully – low-class. (To ask a question like that!) In my battered leather coat, jeans, and ponytail, I felt like an ANGRY WOMAN, and thought about Valerie Solanas, a radical lesbian who shot Warhol in 1968 and nearly killed the artist. I pictured her in her long leather coat, carrying a wrinkled paper bag hiding a gun and a sanitary napkin. A manifesto in one hand, a gun in the other, she was destined to an obscure form of infamy. A flash-image that expressed a fantasy about my own importance to this scene.

What response could be give? the museum director explained, slightly annoyed. Since I’d seen “it” (meaning the gay stuff) – “it” was in the work itself, and didn’t need any explanation. Which was as much as saying that if one doesn’t see “it,” “it” isn’t there either. And which, for me, felt about as good as hearing that I wasn’t there at all. And, on some level, I felt my critical love affair with Warhol come to an end. Why bother? “Why bother explaining what ‘it’ is, and what’s missing from the show to people who could care less?” I thought. And I let it go.

I am not sharing this anecdote because I think it represents a good example of a critical intervention. Quite the opposite. As much as I wanted to intervene in the mising out of Warhol, I knew in my heart I wasn’t in any position to pull off that intervention. My attempt to speak out in that context was ridiculous. It was not only ridiculous of me to think I might be heard, it was ridiculous even to think that the microphones were plugged in. A huge institution like MOCA, dependent on the good will of its most conservative constituents, is expert at avoiding the mess of subjects like Warhol’s queerness, and the long history of homophobic responses to that topic on the part of critics, historians, and museums. And, it is expert at managing our feelings – on making us think, “Why bother?”

We cannot underestimate the impact of this problem not only on critics, but on artists themselves. The economic pressures, the political forces that determine what goes in museums and galleries and gets printed in art journals, magazines, and newspapers are, for some, not just overwhelming, but annihilating – for some, figuring out how to make work in this environment isn’t a career problem, it’s a matter of survival.

And then one night, looking for a good place to have a cocktail with an old friend of mine who is a gay man, I wandered into M.J.’s, and saw the Warhol on
the back wall — exactly the kind of work that you never see in museums. And in M.J.'s, Warhol's Sex Parts doesn't need wall text explaining to bar patrons its art historical significance. No one is there looking for a lesson in art history.

     And I remembered: that — the integration of art into life — is just the sort of thing that queer art is all about.

Notes

1. See Doyle et al. (1996).
2. Dyer (1990), 149.
4. Some of the best examples of gay and lesbian studies in art history and visual studies include: Hammond (2000); Weinberg (1995); Meyer (2002); Burk (2005).
5. Some examples of influential scholarship on sexuality and visual culture produced by scholars trained and/or working outside of art history: Bad Object Choices (1991); Butler (1989); Case (1988–9); Cvetkovich (2003); Doan (1994); Dyer (1990); Foucault (1978); Halberstam (1998); de Laurits (1994); Mercer (1994); Merck (1993); Muñoz (1999); Newton (1979); Waugh (1996). The disciplinary locations of these works include art criticism, film studies, cultural studies, and performance studies.
6. For more on Stonewall and its relationship to the gay and lesbian rights movement, see McGarry et al. (1998) and Duberman (1993).
7. To name a few: Harmony Hammond's 1978 A Lesbian Show at Greene Street Workshop in New York; The Great American Lesbian Art Show (at the Women's Building in Los Angeles and cooperating galleries and spaces in the 1980s); 1982s Extended Sensibilities: Homosocial Presence in Contemporary Art at The New Museum in New York (organized by Dan Cameron); All But the Obvious: A Program in Lesbian Art at Los Angeles Contemporary Exhibitions (LACE). Catherine Lord and Harmony Hammond organized Gender, Fact and Fiction in 1996 for The Center for Contemporary Art in Seattle. Major museum exhibits which are not organized explicitly around gay and lesbian identity, but which are centered on queerness include Jennifer Blessing's 1997 "Rrose is Rrose is Rrose", Gender and Performance in Photography at The Guggenheim Museum; Russell Ferguson's 1999 exhibition for the Museum of Contemporary Art in Los Angeles, 'In Memory of My Feelings': The Art of Frank O'Hara and His Circle.
8. See Crimp and Rolston (1990) for a history and overview of ACT-UP initiatives and demonstrations; and Berlant and Freeman (1993) for a definitive statement on queer activism and politics in the early 1990s. See also Katz in this volume.
11. See, for example, de Laurits (1991); and Sedgwick (1993).