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ABSTRACT

This project uses the body as a framework to understand and re-imagine the archives (here referring to the professionally managed repository). It argues that the archives as a body of knowledge, like the human body, does not and cannot fit into normative stable categories. Tracing the shift in archival paradigms from modern to postmodern, I employ the posthuman to argue for a concomitant shift in understanding of the archival body, which I conceive of as comprising both human and non-human corpora of knowledge and knowledge-making practices. These corpora are simultaneously becoming and unbecoming as multiply-situated identities, technologies, representations, and timescapes. Using temporality as a key element in analyzing archival productions, I consider how this body might sediment. This research, written from my insider perspective as an archivist, implements a transdisciplinary approach that draws from the disciplines of archival and queer studies as well as from somatechnics, embodiment and affect studies, and decolonizing methodologies to advocate for a proposed Queer/ed Archival Methodology, Q/M, that is designed to trouble the concepts of archival theory and production. It also employed on-site observation and interviews at the Transgender Archives in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, observation and narrative analysis of recordings held by the Arizona Queer Archives and the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project, and online interviews with the developer of the Skeivt Arkiv, Norway’s first state-sanctioned queer archives.

Three overarching questions guided the research:
1) How can archives simultaneously hold normative and non-normative stories, materials and practices together as both complementary and also contradictory without subordinating or otherwise invalidating either and so that each can still be considered worthy of archival attention?
2) How might a Q/M be a radical intervention into normative archival practices and structures and to what ends?
3) What might it mean and look like for a queer(ed) archives to be a radically open space? For whom?

As we encounter multiply-situated subjects in the postmodern approach and follow traces in order to interrogate the force and function of respectability politics within the archival body, the modern and anthropocentric Cartesian statement ‘Je pense, donc je suis’ (I think, therefore I am) can no longer support the human and records as the central theme of archival endeavors. The posthuman approach offers many possibilities. Through the understanding that human bodies are relational and contingent in complex ways to non-human bodies and each to bodies of knowledges, human and non-human bodies come together in complex relations and assemblages within the archives. Archival productions can thus represent new and emerging thoughts on lived experiences as these are situated in various structures and systems. The Q/M offers a way of thinking and acting with, about, through, among, and at times in spite of traditional as well as emerging archival practices and processes in order to facilitate new, imaginative, irrational, and unpredictable re-configurations of bodies and archives and the many histories and records therein. Its flexible foundation in the theories employed in the research support Q/M’s seven key approaches: 1) Participatory Ethos, 2) Connectivity, 3) Storytelling, 4) Intervention, 5) Re-framing, 6) Re-imagining, and 7) Flexibility & Dynamism.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: A QUEER/ED APPROACH TO ARCHIVAL BODIES

Power can be invisible, it can be fantastic, it can be dull and routine. It can be obvious, it can reach you by the baton of the police, it can speak the language of your thoughts and desires. It can feel like remote control, it can exhilarate like liberation, it can travel through time, and it can drown you in the present. It is dense and superficial, it can cause you bodily injury, and it can harm you without seeming ever to touch you. It is systemic and it is particularistic and it is often both at the same time. It causes dreams to live and dreams to die.

--Avery F. Gordon

Breaking out of the borders is like choosing to go outside, into the margins, to argue or expose that which no one will risk… It means traversing new territories and disciplines, mapping fresh terrains…

--Emma Pérez

A Queer/ed Approach: Queering and Querying

Introduction

Conversations about queering the archive are not new and are, in fact, taking place internationally. At the 2012 International Archives, Libraries, Museums, and Special Collections (ALMS) Conference on the Future of LGBTQI Histories, which took place at the Amsterdam Public Library, archivists, museum directors, curators, librarians, community practitioners, and scholars presented on

---


the ways that they are identifying and acknowledging previously overlooked lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer, LGBTQ-identified materials and histories. Their presentations and stories about their practices of visibilization were told alongside the visuals of the material findings themselves that highlighted the potential for new histories. Therefore, *queering*, in this sense, meant that they were making the collections newly queer through identifying and making visible distinct LGBTQ-identified materials in the midst of their ongoing collections, collection strategies, and standardized archival practices. I am interested in *queering* as an act of subversion beyond queer- and LGBTQ-identified archives in order to challenge the ongoing default settings of everyday archival practices and productions from the collection development policies and practices to appraisal and selection as well as description practices for physical and digital collections.

What makes my project distinct within these conversations is that I am undertaking radical interrogations of the archival body in order to theorize archival practices so as to delve into the archival structures that have been in place for centuries. I utilize the term *radical* through its Latin tracings *radix* and *radic-*-, meaning *root*,\(^3\) in order to indicate my focus on the root and especially what has been considered the fundamental and inherent nature of the archives\(^4\) through its

\( ^3 \) Oxford English Dictionary (online).

\( ^4 \) Although the discussion is beyond the scope of this dissertation research project, I use ‘archives’ in its plural form to indicate the archives as imagined through archival practice and theory and ‘archive’ in its singular form to indicate the metaphorical body as critiqued by poststructural social critics. I recognize that there is an ongoing debate within archival studies and amongst practicing archivists surrounding the plural and singular uses of the word and their implications within conversations about professional versus amateur archivists. In her book
practices and productions. More specifically, I am interested in the changing nature of archives, archivists, and records as I consider the archival paradigmatic shifts from modernist to postmodernist to posthumanist perspectives. Throughout this work I approach the archives and archival body through transdisciplinary theoretical frameworks in order to develop what I am calling a Queer/ed Archival Methodology, Q/M, to frame the questions that archivists have about working with, for, and about communities, especially those non-normative multiply-situated communities that have been traditionally excluded from archival contexts or merely included through colonizing and neocolonizing practices. The Q/M that I am proposing is an approach that could be implemented beyond LGBTQ-identified archival contexts in order to help to identify and define new

---

Ephemeral Material: Queering the Archive, Alana Kumbier describes her first archives course in “library school” in which the professor highlighted the preferred term when referring to a repository as ‘archives.’ I agree with Kumbier’s suggestion that this “professional demarcation enables some things: it is an assertion of expertise, a signal of membership in a particular discourse community, and a means of discerning who speaks as an archivist and who speaks from a different, external position” (10). As I consider my research as situated at the intersections of community and institution, I am attentive to the practices, productions, and language practices as they unsettle, bump up against one another, and, at times and even momentarily, overlap and replace one another during my work to establish the Arizona Queer Archives as a queer/ed archival production.

5 I have selected Q/M as a shortened way to name the Queer/ed Archival Methodology. I use the forward slash in queer/ed to highlight the ease and agility of moving between a present and past tense verb and to highlight the multiple ways to understand the adjective, verb, and noun simultaneously. Importantly for my project, this word choice is a deliberate move towards the verb to queer as a way to subvert the normative. The slash ‘/’ for me also represents the taking apart and simultaneous coming together which I consider through the somatechnical lens and implications on embodiment. I also like the potentials for Q/M to look like the acronyms for sadomasochism (S/M) because of the intentional and accidental intersections of pleasure, pain, erotics, deviancy, normal, and questions of ‘what is proper?’

6 In the past I have used the term “marginalized,” but realize that its use automatically positions a subject as inside or outside while Adela C. Licona’s term helps me to understand the different spaces and places where we each may carry varying weight of privilege(s) based on our assembling and overlapping identity categories. See Adela C. Licona, Zines in Third Space: Radical Cooperation and Borderlands Rhetoric (Albany, NY: State University New York Press, 2012), 12.
archival structures and standards that must arise in order for archives to hold competing stories, multiple voices, and multimodal texts. With social justice and a participatory ethos as urgent priorities, the Q/M could be applicable within archives that work with and for distinctly underrepresented peoples so as to deliberately incorporate multiple histories of pleasure and pain while being attentive to the ways power is circulated and produced within archival contexts.

In this chapter, I highlight my journey into and offer a broad conception of this research project. Then, I define relevant terms, present chosen theoretical frameworks, and describe my methodology, data collection, and analytical processes that inform this dissertation. Through a blend of theoretical considerations with empirical observations, I will be interpreting, queering, and querying the practices, processes, and stories that make up archival collections and storytelling techniques that are embodied in archival collections, technologies, as well as bodies themselves. Ultimately, this chapter will introduce that work by tracing subsequent chapters and gesturing toward the project of developing the Q/M.

The Journey into this Study on the Archival Body

This dissertation project emerges from my work with the Institute for LGBT Studies at the University of Arizona to develop the Arizona Queer Archives, the statewide lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) archives. The Arizona Queer Archives’ cornerstone collection and programmatic
focus is the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project, which I founded in 2008 as Arizona’s first LGBTQ archives and queer oral history collection.

When I first moved to Tucson from Minneapolis-St. Paul in 2007, I learned that there were no LGBTQ-named archives or LGBTQ-focused memory projects to collect stories in Arizona. Further, I was informed by a Wingspan volunteer whom I met while volunteering for the 2007 Wingspan Annual Dinner, that there was an “immediate need” to record the histories of elders throughout the community.7 Wingspan, Southern Arizona’s LGBT Community Center, initiated a Senior Pride program titled “A Colorful Life” through which well-known LGBT seniors shared their life histories as public presentations. With access to my own video production equipment, I immediately started to document the presentations while training community members on video production so that they would be able to continue recording these important and relevant events.

While engaging in these early recordings, I became increasingly curious about differential treatment within communities and across groups. I began to question whose stories were being privileged and presented as a “colorful life,” and I wondered about those who might be considered by others as less worthy of documentation. In addition, I became concerned about the storytellers themselves, wondering about those who did not consider themselves important or who did not view their lives or stories as worth recording. Therefore, with grant funding through the Alliance Fund of Southern Arizona and my development of the

7 Special thanks to MJ Talbot for telling me stories about the Tucson LGBTQ communities and for making initial introductions to those elders he described as part of this “immediate need.”
Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project, I spent my first year collecting the oral histories of those seniors who deemed their lives ordinary, not so “colorful,” and perhaps not worthy of collecting. I purposely sought participants who were not initially forthcoming. This was a difficult process and took much more time to connect with and meet those who seemed more interested in remaining hidden and quiet. Through the Senior Pride program, I set up video production training opportunities with seniors to work hands-on with camera set-up, share media literacy concepts about shot composition and interview set-up, and practice one-on-one interviewing skills directed specifically toward listening and engagement.

During the next four years, I expanded the project to include all ages while working to connect with communities of color and trans-identified communities. Through this process, I came to learn more about the complicated and contradictory histories that a diverse and heterogeneous community embodies as well as my own embodied assumptions underpinning the work. Tracing my own practices of oral history production and the ways I developed even the interview questions from the Storytelling Project’s inception in 2008 to today, I have come to better understand the urges toward normalcy, whether it emerges through storytelling techniques in front of the camera or even through my normative line of questioning from behind the camera. Normativity palpably circulates throughout the oral history interview—the coming together of interviewer, interviewee, and the standardized digital video production equipment. I began to consider the importance of acknowledging the non-normative and recording the
complications, the contradictions, and the competing histories that are present in any given community.

I immediately recognized the challenge of producing and consuming such recordings, especially given the context in Arizona where the state was seeking to secure a singular and dominant version of history, for example, with the passing of HB2281, the 2010 legislation that effectively banned ethnic studies curriculum in the public school classroom. This particular historical and contextual moment pulled me into graduate school. I had become increasingly curious about notions of developing archives in the *proper* and *legitimate* way, and for the *right* reasons. Questions residing at the intersections of traditional archival theories and practices as well as my interests in transdisciplinary perspectives and methodological approaches were solidified for me as I aimed to critically interrogate connections between queer theory and related ideas— notions of queer temporalities, multiply-situated subjectivities, differential consciousness, embodiment, somatechnics, as well as contemporary archival work.

Connecting archival theory and practice with queer theory to challenge the archival norms— those considered *proper* and *legitimate*— might make room for competing perspectives as well as for a greater number of historic actors who hold and embody contradictory and complementary histories from their distinct locations. Through conducting hands-on archival development, I carefully examine what archival practices are in place and how, through archival production, these practices may reproduce the exclusions and inclusions through
what institutions, society, and the state have deemed normative and *proper* within its authorized and official practices, collections, and histories.

**Relevant Terms and Theoretical Lenses**

Throughout this dissertation, I utilize a variety of terms drawn from across the academy and continue to define them throughout as I connect theory to practice. Though this work is nested in a critical cultural approach (i.e., meaning, this work interrogates humans and non-humans intertwined in relationships with distinct power dynamics that undergird societal structures and especially those structures that uphold the archives and archival productions), this project employs terms drawn from, and is applicable for readers from, across disciplines. *Transdisciplinarity* is thus a strong driving influence for this project, given that transdisciplinary work pulls from familiar methods, methodologies, and theoretical frameworks within and across disciplines while also simultaneously breaking apart those familiar containers to hold potential for new and re-imagined methods, methodologies, and theoretical frameworks. Transdisciplinarity is vital to this research project as I work to bring together multiple knowledges that are produced and circulate beyond specific disciplines. As I work to develop the Q/M based on practical and theoretical archival bodies of knowledge, a more holistic approach is necessary to reside in a generative and open space. Multi- and interdisciplinary approaches would not work in this instance as they rely on the specific disciplinary frameworks within which they reside. As I am interested in
generating new frameworks through which to produce and subsequently consume archives and archival bodies of knowledges, transdisciplinarity is essential throughout this research project.

As I am interrogating the archives as bodies of knowledges, I consider then the posthuman archives as that which is open to making visible and known the connections and interconnections of human and non-human bodies. Much like the work of assemblage theory, through which archival parts and pieces diverge, converge, and merge without being strictly tied to progress narratives, chronological and historical telos, or their subversions, which I will cover more in-depth in Chapter 3, the posthuman archives is one in which the organizing structures of the archives as a whole unifying system with human-centered materials that represent human activity as its focus has become obsolete. Moreover, the posthuman archives only works in assemblage with and in relation to the machines—human and non-human—producing the records, the collections, the descriptions, the layout, the online components, and many more things that are overlooked because of their situated-ness in everyday experiences. If we de-center and foreground the human within the archives while shining a light on all of the other active and inactive parts therein, we can see the social, cultural, economic, technical, and technological nodes of connections that encompass a

---


greater multimodal awareness of the complex nature of histories, memories, identities—individual and collective. Tensions arise about particular methods and timing in archival studies about product and process as evidenced by the Digital Curation Life Cycle Model as a record or ‘data’ is created and then curated through numerous processes until the life of that record or ‘data’ has run out and then it must take on a new form and move through the processes again as a new record or ‘data.’ However, in the posthuman archives, product and process are intertwined and, as an example, might fit flexibly within the Australian Records Continuum Model as, within this archival paradigm, product and process are always interacting and always in states of becoming.

Broadly speaking, and beyond its maintenance of a transdisciplinary and posthuman approach, this project is interpretive and qualitative in nature. Through its chapters, this work threads the theoretical and analytical together in order to build its case as well as develop a foundation for an emergent methodology. Indeed, in an ongoing way, I weave scholarly ideas through empirical data while being guided by a variety of concepts and theories to be introduced next.

Archives as Location and Practice


Following Chela Sandoval, Aimee Carrillo Rowe and Adela C. Licona, I consider the archives as both a location and a practice. As a location, archives are a place—physical and virtual—where archival collections are organized, contained, preserved, and made accessible. Importantly though, for my research, I see the archives as located and situated in, perhaps, a dominant narrative. However, I also understand the archives as always contingent and shifting as space and location. Furthermore, as a practice, the archives and the acts of archiving, are the techniques used to collect, organize, and make accessible in ways that might perform histories, knowledges, relations, and memories.

Normative/Normativity

The Oxford English Dictionary defines normative as an adjective “establishing, relating to, or deriving from a standard or norm, especially of behavior.” Questioning practices and behaviors to dislodge the power structures therein is a key piece of this project. Therefore, I use these terms often to suggest

---

12 See Chela Sandoval, Methodology of the Oppressed, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 10. Utilizing her methodology of the oppressed as a “deregulating system” as it “represents a lapse in the sovereignty, training, and laws that regulate disciplines” is important in this project to radically interrogate the archives because disciplinary boundaries, bodily boundaries, definitional certainties, along with regulatory concepts of time will be challenged and unsettled.

13 See Aimee Carrillo Rowe and Adela C. Licona, “Moving Locations: The Politics of Identities in Motion,” NWSA Journal 17, no. 2 (2005), 11. Carrillo Rowe and Licona urge feminist scholars and activists to break free from static identity practices that have served as the unexamined foundation of the feminist alliance base that, as I posit throughout this project, that utilizing entrenched traditional archival practices, such as appraisal and description, without critical interrogation, risks reproducing the same exclusions that archivists seek to remedy by focusing on inclusion in collection policies and strategies.

that certain archival practices, as *normative*, have become invisibilized and
standardized through everyday use. Bodies and bodies of knowledges might also
be considered normative through everyday performances and practices. As normal
and normalized behaviors become inculcated and assimilated, bodies are put into
perilous situations as it becomes necessary to continue to perform as normal or
risk being pushed to the margins and creases. Jasbir Puar in *Terrorist
Assemblages* highlights the nation-state formations as reliant on such normative
structures and the production of *good* and *bad* citizens in order to proceed with
disciplining bodies and biopolitical regulations in order to keep bodies contained
and in their places.\(^\text{15}\) I am interested in how the archives, then, fits into these
distinct formations of *good* and *bad* citizens and I employ *queer* as a practice of
unhinging and challenging containment into such categories.

**Queer and Queer/ed**

Drawing from Nikki Sullivan’s work on Queer Theory, I deploy the term
*queer* as a practice and a politics. I use ‘to queer’ as a verb working on and within
the archives as an act of intervention, an upsetting of the normative archival
structures that continue to uphold and reproduce the hegemonic power dynamics
at work to exclude.\(^\text{16}\) For this project, queer, then, emphasizes the *doing* rather
than the *being* that often works as sedimenting and normalizing over time, which

---


\(^{16}\) Nikki Sullivan, *A Critical Introduction to Queer Theory*, (New York University Press,
2003), vi.
then in effect becomes no longer queer. As a politics, especially related to the power dynamics within archives, *queer* might work to resist definition, thus, challenging the central tenets of archiving and archivalization: appraisal and description. Consider *queer* as a practice and a politics of mis/recognizing, critiquing, and challenging the stable categories of collection, recollection, notions of identity, and ideas of belonging as they have become embodied, invisibilized, and normativized. I use the forward slash, ‘/’, in queer/ed to highlight the ease and agility of moving between a present and past tense verb. As queer is the verb in this case, moving between and through the collapsing of past, present, and future along with hegemonic *chrononormative*—what Elizabeth Freeman defines as the “interlocking temporal schemes necessary for genealogies of descent and for the mundane workings of domestic life”17—markers opens up ways of being and knowing in the world.

**Embodiment & Focus on (Un)Becoming**

By *embodiment*, I mean the ways in which we know and move in the world as enfleshed beings and knowings through our becoming and unbecoming. I begin from Sullivan’s and Susan Stryker’s engagement with the concept of “bodily being-in-the-world.”18 I, therefore, understand embodiment as a process—not a given. I particularly attend to those transdisciplinary literatures


that focus on the (un)becoming, the simultaneous becoming and unbecoming, that influences the ways we become culturally legible through time and space.\textsuperscript{19} I also treat the knowledges that are contained in archives as bodies of knowledges also with particular histories and processes of production – not givens. In terms of the archives, I mean for embodiment to signal the processes and practices that are collected and stored during the act of archiving whether consciously, unconsciously, or nonconsciously. These can then be accessed again and again like default settings. In writing out (un)becoming, I use parentheses, ‘( ),’ to establish a visual cue to the idea of containment and the sedimentation that tethers us momentarily into a fixed node of identity. This momentary containment and holding-in-place is integral to the inquiry I am making into embodied storytelling practices and what constitutes the archives.

\textbf{Techné}

I deploy the term \textit{techné}, following Martin Heidegger and Sullivan, to convey a sense of the “techniques and/or orientations (ways of seeing, knowing, feeling, moving, being, acting, and so on), which are learned with a particular tradition or ontological context (situated), and functions (often tacitly) to craft \textit{(un)}becoming within very specific ways.”\textsuperscript{20} Technés are not simply tools that the already-constituted body-subject manipulates to its own end, but are the

\textsuperscript{19} Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, \textit{A Thousand Plateaus} (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 88.

practical/technical knowledges of *doing* something. While episteme constitutes more formal knowing, especially surrounding the knowing of what is truth and what is right, techné constitutes the more practical knowing and is often the focus within the *arts of war* as Giorgio Agamben notes in his introduction to *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Agamben argues through Michel Foucault’s work on biopolitics that “power penetrates bodies and forms of life” while technés are strictly utilized to organize the *polis* in order to create regulated and self-regulated populations that, through self-becoming, are always part of the state’s strategy of *normalizing* through producing norms and the normal. Understanding the normalization that permeates bodies as bodies of knowledges can then elicit critical inquiry into archival structuring in ways to recognize and reimagine the practices that go unnoticed. For example, the act of sitting in a chair—as the chair itself might dictate and as society might normalize—holds embodied archivable technés; one’s bottom rests on the horizontal piece of the structured chair while one’s back leans into the vertical piece with one’s feet on the floor. If one sits in a chair in any other fashion, one might be upsetting the norm and especially the environment in which one is sitting. In effect, technés are collected and deployed again and again as always complex and contingent dis/articulations as bodies come into being.

**Somatechnics**

---

By *somatechnics*, I mean a particular analytical approach to the body and technés (technology and technique) to be understood as always already connected and intertwined intra-relationally—within and during the body itself. Productive. Consider embodied technology and technologized body as the always-already-connected human and non-human body as well as the archival record and archival body of knowledge. I draw primarily from Sullivan, Stryker, Michael O’Rourke, and Noreen Giffney for this definition. Through my ideas of (un)becoming, a somatechnics approach helps me to consider what and how bodily comportments and ways of knowing get collected, stored, and preserved along with how they are made legible or culturally intelligible and accessible in and through archival practice.

**Politics of Respectability**

*Politics of respectability*, especially throughout the LGBTQ communities, represent a particular form of entrenched and embodied normativizing strategies linked to the shift away from radical left politics and the push for social transformation towards gay rights politics oriented towards inclusion. According to Deborah Gould in *Moving Politics: Emotion and ACT UP’s Fight Against AIDS*, “respectability, on a straight society’s terms, was the price for admission.” The politics of respectability, therefore, becomes the means of assimilating differences within diverse groups along with self-regulating in order to be considered *good* citizens and *good* members of the group. Such a politics

---

uses respectability while also requires that subjects are to be judged by it. As a
gatekeeping function, it reinforces status distinctions and, within the archival
bodies of knowledges where private and public come together, vulnerable spaces
emerge and are made visible urging archivists to actively attend to the records in
order to recognize injustices and work with communities to open potential
pathways for social justice within the archives.

**Radically Open/Radical Openness**

I draw on bell hooks’ “Choosing the Margin as a Space of Radical
Openness” to expand my understanding of *radical openness* as integral spaces
through which we are able to “conceptualize alternatives, often improvised”\(^\text{23}\) as acts of survival. In this work, *open* does not indicate when the archives is open for
visitors nor does it indicate that all records should be made accessible with
disregard to distinct privacy requirements as laid out by donors who do not wish
their materials accessible.\(^\text{24}\) Open is about flexibility and a way of thinking that
the Queer/ed Archival Methodology situates within archival productions. Through
aligning radical openness and queer theory, this project, therefore, supports
emerging spaces that may be both home spaces as well as spaces for resistance for
non-normative peoples.


\(^{24}\) Anne Gilliland’s current research work investigates how open access might be troublesome and detrimental for certain marginalized populations who, especially in war-torn
countries, remain vulnerable. I also consider Giorgio Agamben’s work on *bare life* to question the
spaces where the vulnerable exist and are visible in their existence, but where the nation-state
enacts particular biopolitical regulations to keep certain populations as only expendable bodies.
Methodology

My own journey into the archives and the practices and processes of developing archives for, with, and about non-normative communities highlighted the need to be critical throughout this work or, as an archivist, I might run the risk of reproducing the same power dynamics that I was trying to intervene in. As I established Arizona’s first LGBTQ archive, the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project, and returned to graduate school to learn how to develop an archives, I questioned my own assumptions as well as the very practical how-to manuals that laid out concrete steps for me to follow. Next, I adopted a queer theoretical perspective to look more closely at the archival methods and practices that were at play in my further development of the Arizona Queer Archives and migration of the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project into this greater archival project as its programmatic focus on stories and storytelling. As my own perspective shifted through this archiving work with heterogeneous LGBTQ communities, I questioned how archives might function as sites that simultaneously not only collect and preserve, but also highlight normative and non-normative stories, materials, and practices together. Many archives do collect and preserve disparate stories, materials, and practices, but often what emerges as most visible are those considered dominant and normative. As normative and non-normative histories collide and crash into one another within archival collections, what archival methodologies might be understood and implemented as means for, first,
recognizing hierarchical structuring of records and collections and, second, identifying and highlighting the generative spaces that allow histories to be both complementary and also contradictory without invalidating one or the other.

These questions led me to conduct this qualitative study on archives and archival productions in order to develop a Queer/ed Archival Methodology, Q/M, which I see as a reflexive and critical engagement with the ‘archiving archives.’ The Q/M is not intended to resolve archival issues per se, but can be applied as a way of thinking that might elucidate the techniques, methods, technologies, practices, and processes that are often naturalized and normalized through everyday use but are working to keep the archives flexible and attentive to the changing nature of what constitutes the archives and how.

This theoretical and qualitative study explores the archives using the body as a framework to understand and re-imagine the archives, then, as a body of knowledge that, like the body itself, does not and cannot fit into normative stable categories. Using temporality as a key element in analyzing archival productions, I interrogate how the body and bodies of knowledge might settle and sediment into a particular identity or category albeit temporarily, contingently, and without guarantee. From an insider’s perspective, as an archivist, I have structured this research project to implement a transdisciplinary approach theoretically drawing from the disciplines of archival studies and queer studies as well as somatechnics, embodiment, affect studies, and through decolonizing methodologies.

As a researcher, I used participatory observation through my work as the archivist developing the Arizona Queer Archives along with my field notes and
journals as I connect archival theory and practice within my own hands-on archival productions. Importantly, I am biased toward building the archives the ‘right’ way and for the ‘right’ reasons. To me, as a social justice filmmaker, this means that the archival productions align with social justice media productions in order to be relevant to the communities the archives portends to represent. As filmmaker and oral historian, I also recognize the power of personal stories to highlight the multiple and lived truths that we each embody. The stories and truths that are told through digital video oral history interviews, photographs, documents, ephemera, and distinct materiality that is present in each archival collection change and shift in time and through multimodal representations. The archives and what constitutes them—human and non-human—are not static.

Data Collection, Analytical Processes, and Research Questions

Data collection sites and procedures involved two main locations: 1) the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project as part of the Arizona Queer Archives, which I have been developing through the Institute for LGBT Studies at the University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, U.S.A. and 2) the Transgender Archives at the University of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. Data collection also took place virtually through the Skeivt Arkiv in Bergen, Norway where the development of the first Norwegian state-sanctioned queer archives is just getting underway.
Analytically, and throughout my inquiry, I reflected on my early practices collecting oral histories as part of the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project. In doing so, I recognized normalizing practices within my own oral history interviewing and storytelling processes and questioned the power of the archives to be *radically open*. By *radically open*, I mean the reimagined production of the historically foundational archival structures re/configured through a queer/ed politics and practice—a Queer/ed Archival Methodology—in order to recognize the potentials for the archives to hold many heterogeneous stories that we may know and have yet to know. As archives are always themselves in states of becoming, I have come to understand the precariousness of settling, of becoming fixed and subsequently rigidly structured; once settled, the archives then holds the potential to enact hierarchical power differentials rather than remaining open and flexible. Even with queer theory, there is a potential and possibility that one settles into one’s queerness. Considering a new language and paradigm to talk about and think about archives, this precarious instability holds affective potential and may become the catalyst for recovering those stories and voices that are often overlooked so that archivists might establish questions and queries to open up the archives and keep it alert and agile and ready for ongoing change. For me, *radically open* can tell of the (un)becomings that influence the ways we move, relate, and become culturally legible through time—past, present, future—and space.25 This concept—this notion of process—underpins my entire project as it is

engaged through archival theory and practice and as it relates to and intersects with queer theoretical perspectives and somatechnics.

Through critically engaging the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project’s digital video oral history interviews and their accompanying transcripts, I analyzed storytelling and interviewing practices and how the *politics of respectability*, specifically the normalizing techniques of remembering and forgetting in order to be read as *proper* and *good*, are often at play in the questions archivists ask and in the answers interviewees offer. Understanding my own practical experiences of connecting with community members who were interested in having their oral histories recorded and preserved in the archives, I recognized that the initial process of coming forward instantiated the politics of respectability at play before the camera was even rolling. I turned to theories of

---


27 During the 1950s and 1960s, the politics of respectability as well as heteronormativity were at play in the development and growth of the early homophile organizations such as The Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis. As Nan Alamilla Boyd (2003) highlights in her book, *Wide Open Town: a history of Queer San Francisco to 1965*, there existed a tension between bar owners/bar goers and the homophile activists because the former were concerned with securing the right to public space for lesbian and gay people while the latter were concerned with acceptance and especially assimilation. Although they shared the public space of bars and found mutual interests empowering, the homophile activist organizations in San Francisco were working towards an “assimilationist project of social uplift, using language of integration and often time expressing disdain for queer and gender-transgressive qualities of bar-based communities” (162). Gay and lesbian visibility at this time produced high levels of fear and stress for those who were visible as well as those who were not visible. One of the main concerns for the Daughters of Bilitis was how they each would build their own self-esteem and self-worth while trying to build a community. These homophile activists worked to project respectable images of lesbians and gay men into the eyes of public opinion and at times turned their backs on the diversity of the lesbian and gay community in order to be accepted into the mainstream.
embodiment and somatechnics to better understand how the organizing principles of a politics of respectability are at play in the archival production and process and how they might function to promote a kind of exceptionalism and to exclude fuller.accountings of the lives of LGBTQ people. Although collection policies detail what will be included in the archives, there is, in effect, always some sort of exclusion. As archivists might identify whom to ‘capture’ for the archives, the interviewees from the Arizona LGBQ Storytelling Project, too, identify which stories are worthy for ‘capture’ in the archives. Recognizing the scales of inclusion and exclusion as our perspectives zoom in and out makes it clear that digital video oral history interviews are most efficient and effective as technologies of collecting and disseminating so that more stories might be collected, seen, and heard through digital modes. Through a series of close readings and close viewings of the select oral history interviews, I analyzed emerging themes such as 1) described relational intimacies and the relationships to same-sex marriage; 2) trans and transgender shifting identities and the relationships within the contexts of past, present, and future; and 3) lastly, subjects’ relationships to time and temporalities as they are connected to records. In effect, I recognized the shifting positionalities of subjects, records, archivists, and archives as especially poignant in my understanding of posthuman perspectives of the human and non-human influences on and in the archives. The move into posthuman is particularly fitting through the oral history interview as there are many participants—human and non-human—in the assembled event from the interviewer, the interviewee, the camera, tripod, and other recording
technologies along with the setting, environment, as well as the hum of the refrigerator in the next room. The concept of ‘contributing subjects’ and ‘records creators’ can, thus, expand notions of time and many hands that connect to the records through the continuum of archival productions. Considering archival practice and archival production as forms of knowledge production, I argue that interrogating the archival body, especially through a queer theoretical lens, can teach both academics and archival practitioners something integral about historical, cultural, political, and social (re)configurations as they continue to introduce uncertainties in everyday archival practices that are oriented in time, space, and the body.

Beyond reflection and interrogation of the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project’s digital video oral history interviews and their accompanying transcripts, this project involved analysis across archival contexts. Questioning entrenched and embodied archival practices is important for my work as I come to understand archivists and the contributors to the archives as multiply-situated subjects. To engage in this part of the project, then, and in broadening my analysis from the level of individual to community and then to include institutionalized practices across archival contexts, I challenge what constitutes a record. I do this by, as part of my analysis, engaging transdisciplinary approaches to temporality that work to conjure fragmented identities, fragmented realities, that might be real, but a real

---

that is in question. By grounding archival production and practice in a queer/ed and radically open ethos, the Arizona Queer Archives and the LGBTQ-focused histories that constitute it can perhaps recognize, challenge, and re-mix the normative functions that continue to further include and exclude even within the stories that each of us tells.

With a strong emphasis on queer theoretical perspectives, my dissertation research involved interpretive analyses of both individual stories as well as discourses emerging from archival sites across international borders. By interpretive, I referred to my own recognition of subjectivities in the research process and the importance of ongoing reflexivity as a scholar and archivist. By focusing on archival practices—professional/non-professional or amateur and institutional/community—across archival sites, I considered the complexities involved in archival theories, practices, and productions as they are always already entangled with peoples, peoples’ stories, as well as the non-human elements that may ‘fix’ and ‘capture’ these intimate memories, movements, and machinations.

First, I focused on specific digital video oral history interviews drawn from the emerging archives in Arizona. Utilizing film/video analysis as an archival research method, I interpretively explored both the videos themselves along with related textual transcripts to consider the queering potentials of oral history production in and for the archives. I listened and looked to understand the sideways glances, stares, pauses, rhythms, silences, cadences, and gaps as techniques/technés of storytelling that are connected to remembering and
forgetting while also connected to embodied normalizing practices that LGBTQ peoples have historically processed and produced in order to be included in the archives. I am interested in the ways some oral history interviewees upend dominant narratives while others adhere to them. Utilizing three distinct approaches to temporality—haunting, decolonizing, and queering—I critically interrogated the embodied technologies of digital media, other nonlinear engagements, the implications of storytelling for individuals, cultures, communities, and society, as well as the issues of access tied to such historical productions.

Second, this project involved an interpretive analysis from observations I made at distinct research sites to inquire as to each archives’ practices in order to consider the im/possibilities for a radical openness as an indication of the queering potentials of their practices. While my initial inquiry was open-ended, I investigated and documented each site’s treatment of their collections and communities for evidence of engagement with heterogeneity and non-normativity, and, therefore, the possibility of embodied contradictions. Utilizing digital video oral history techniques, I interviewed the archivists working at the site while I also analyzed documents related to the site, and observed archival practices at the site. Overall, I looked at what general discourses were constructed by each archives and how they told their stories about their LGBTQ- and Trans*-identified archives as well as the LGBTQ communities in particular.

---

29 I am questioning using Trans* rather than Trans in these descriptions, but will use what those at my research sites are using. Trans* is currently used to describe the many iterations and identity markers that fall under shifting gender self-knowing and self-expression. Quoting Hugh
Through a transdisciplinary lens, I approach the archives as a concept, a location, and a practice. As I work towards developing a Queer/ed Archival Methodology, Q/M, while building the Arizona Queer Archives, and while analyzing the individual stories and contextual narratives emerging from that archival work, I am guided by three overarching questions:

(1) How can archives simultaneously hold normative and non-normative stories, materials, and practices together as both complementary and also contradictory without subordinating or otherwise invalidating either and so that each can still be considered worthy of our archival attention?

(2) Can a Queer/ed Archival Methodology, Q/M, be a radical intervention into normative archival practices and structures and to what ends?

(3) What does it mean and what does it look like for queer/ed archives to be radically open spaces?

Broadly conceived and working across my three research questions stated above is a focus on what gets accomplished when related and intersecting literatures are synthesized to inform archival theory, practice, and understanding. With my data—digital video interviews from each site’s archivist, observation field notes, comparisons of the discourses from each archives, and Arizona-focused oral

---

Ryan, the founder of the Queer Pop-Up Museum, from an article on slate.com, “The label in question is trans*, and the asterisk stems from common computing usage wherein it represents a wildcard—any number of other characters attached to the original prefix. Thus, a computer search for trans* might pull up transmission, transitory, or transsexual. But in this neologism, the * is used metaphorically to capture all the identities—from drag queen to genderqueer—that fall outside traditional gender norms. (The asterisk usually goes unpronounced in spoken English, though some users do say “trans star” or “trans asterisk” for clarity’s sake.)"
history interviews—analyzed, I have developed a flexible and adaptable foundation that supports the notion of a Q/M, which, as a methodological argument with direct material archival implications, can only be pushed forward by this research project. Indeed, through this project, key principles and guiding questions tied to Q/M are put forth for future scholars and practitioners to call upon when needed, especially in cases of new queer/ed archival development for and with multiply-situated subjects so as to meet the particular needs of distinct communities.

The Big Picture and Chapters to Follow

The major focus of my research project is the development of the Queer/ed Archival Methodology, Q/M. Re-thinking the constraints of a socially constructed dichotomy that often divides the professional archivists and the non-professional archivists is important to queer/ed archival practices because it moves archivists and their collections beyond the proper, the legitimate, and the normative to an understanding that archival strategies can inform in multiple directions. This is especially important to those archivists who are interested in the mundane, the ordinary, the queer, and, particularly, the non-normative. For those of us committed to critically intervening in the traditional archival constructs and practices of collecting and documenting, we can see how traditional practices can run the risk of reproducing sexual normativities and social divisions in the name of dominant and/or singular versions of lived
histories. The Q/M might be best understood as a commitment to the journey towards a radical openness that suggests that the archives is never complete. Because consistency is important in archival practices, this project rests on the assumption – and is motivated by the idea – that developing a Q/M can help to ensure that even complex, contradictory, and non-normative histories (and elements of any given history) have their places in society’s record.

To build a case for the development of an emerging methodology, I explored differing spaces that hold the potential for archives to house queer/ed histories—spaces that exist in varying international and cultural contexts—as well as interrogated oral histories garnered as part of my ongoing archival project in Arizona specifically. That is, beyond an examination of contextual and cultural norms, practices, and influences across archives, this work interrogated the potential for visitors to the archives to be able to engage in a queer/ed reading or listening of the digital video oral histories that constitutes the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project. To do so, I analyzed discourses within and emerging from oral histories, critically engaging in the ways that heteronormativity, homonormativity, and the politics of respectability come together in these digital narratives. As part of this work, I considered how memories are sometimes disciplined to produce normative narratives about queer pasts. I looked and listened for the queering potentials in these stories while also being alert to the queering potentials of digital, participatory, archival, and nonlinear technologies. Overall, I considered how dominant ideology haunts LGBTQ peoples and their archival collections and practices as well as the theories, assumptions, and
perspectives that ungird these practices. My interpretive analytical approach and focus on individual narratives, then, is in line with my theoretical and methodological emphasis on the queer/ed archive which situates the archive as always in motion—forming and re-forming itself as we constitute and re-member and re-interpret its collections. An interpretive analytic process can and should be an ongoing part of the queering process, practice, and methodology, or Q/M.

Ultimately, this project pulls together archival studies literatures relating to both theory and practice along with a transdisciplinary queer theoretical lens to establish the Q/M in order to trouble the terms and concepts of archival theory and production, namely archives, record, and archivist. The purpose of this work might be to expand on what I call the archival spectrum of legibility—the spaces that hold recognizable archival characteristics, practices, performances, and methods that help archives, whether community-based or institutionally-based, become legible and intelligible as ‘archives’—to reimagine and allow for more complicated stories and interpretations to emerge in and around the archives. This project blends my interests and passions in varying archival theories and practices and in queer theory as it’s articulated across disciplines in the academy.

Following archival literatures that have traced archival theory and practice from the modern to the postmodern, this project argues for and instantiates an archival shift into the posthuman, as bodies, stories, and practices that are simultaneously becoming and unbecoming within multiply-situated locations, identities, and timescapes. In the next chapter, I offer a literature review to trace the tensions surrounding the shifting paradigms from the modern through the
postmodern and into the posthuman. I begin to set out the foundation towards developing a Queer/ed Archival Methodology, Q/M. In Chapter 3, I approach the archives as embodied and, therefore, use the body as a framework to imagine and understand the archive as a body of knowledge and, importantly, bodies of multiple knowledges that do not and cannot fit into normative stable categories as dictated by dominant discourse and ideology. I argue that individual embodiment can be considered an archival practice and that archival practice can itself be considered an embodied act. In Chapter 4, I reconsider and reimagine the record and its recordness through transdisciplinary approaches to temporality that challenge the archives as bodies of knowledges in ways that push the boundaries of how archivists and archival theorists might understand the changing nature of the record. In Chapter 5, I make manifest the application of the Q/M in the Arizona Queer Archives holdings and offer it as a flexible framework that can be taken up to produce new archives and to reinterpret established ones.
CHAPTER TWO

WHAT IS AN ARCHIVES? SHIFTING PARADIGMS TOWARD RADICAL OPENNESS

I know that space is curved but my brain has been cordoned by habit to grow in a straight line. What I call light is my own blend of darkness.

-- Jeannette Winterson

Introduction

A number of key debates that are taking place within archival studies are grounded in the paradigmatic shift from modern to postmodern approaches to the archives and, relatedly, to the interrogation of their theoretical and practical implications for holdings from diverse communities. Post-structural cultural theorists, such as Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault, started the widely acknowledged questioning of the archive—as metaphor and as material—in order to look at the power circulating therein. Transdisciplinary scholars, such as Gayatri Spivak, Diana Taylor, Ann Cvetkovich, and other queer and feminist theorists, look into the archive from their situated academic locations in order to better understand the cultural, social, political, and economic consequences of archival power. Over the past twenty years, their work has been influencing

---


archival theorists and scholars who are working to reimagine the power of the archives for reconciliation, redress, and justice. In their socially-just quests, archival scholars Verne Harris, Terry Cook, Randall Jimerson, Anne Gilliland, Jeannette Bastian, Andrew Flinn, Sue McKemmish, and Eric Ketelaar have been identifying debates within archival studies about how to define the archives, how to define a record, and how to understand the roles that professional archivists and non-professional—everyday—archivists play in the processes and productions of archives. This research project works from a postmodern framework in which there are multiple voices and multiple truths for which the traditional archival contexts, standards, and practices may be incapable of structuring and containing and, then, a posthuman framework in which the multiplicities of human and non-human bodies are inextricably linked to the processes, politics, and productions of archives, archival collections, and archival records.

In this chapter, I will call on a number of archival scholars to trace the tensions surrounding the shifting definition of the archives from modernist and postmodernist perspectives. I will consider, more specifically, the role of the archivist as being implicated in the changing nature of the archives and, so, I will focus on the archival practices—or “scripts”\(^\text{32}\)—that might have become embodied, invisibilized, and normativized through repeated performances of what is proper archiving. I am interested in ways to reimagine how queer, feminist, decolonizing, and somatechnical theoretical frameworks might (radically) open up alternate modes of archival practice so that the ideas of what archives produces

in and with communities they portend to represent are reconfigured to be legitimate, relevant, and legible for diverse and heterogeneous communities.

One significant debate in the literature on archival theory revolves around the question: “what is an archives?” This debate has emerged between those in the discipline who define archives more concretely as “the public place where records are deposited…so that they remain uncorrupted and capable of…constituting proof of whatever they were about” and, since the 1980s, those who understand archives, instead, as spaces and processes in a perpetual state of “becoming,” and “beyond the walls of official buildings.” These more recent understandings of what an archives is hold the potential to support both evidence and culture within collections that are interdependent and already attentive to shifting societal, cultural, and technological contexts.


In the modern approach to archives, records are themselves considered static, recognizable, physical objects while the postmodern approach emphasizes that records are dynamic concepts and do not necessarily fit the form as records. Archives, from a modernist perspective and in keeping with what Theodore R. Schellenberg envisioned in *Modern Archives*, are understood as efficient machines through which the archivist becomes a competent “contributing partner to the corporate management team…,” the structuring idea that was rooted in nineteenth-century positivism with its concepts of records as “static physical objects.” Archives from a postmodern perspective, and according to expanding definitions of archives and archival purposes, are understood as more fluid and conceptual spaces opening up to diverse peoples, collective memories, as well as understandings of records as “dynamic virtual concepts.” Definitions of the archives then are implicated within—betwixt and between—this shift from modern to postmodern approaches to understanding archives as definitions continually adjust and navigate the emphases of meaning-making from positivist notions of evidence to the layers of context and perspective that shift the meanings of evidence. Positivist scientific thought continues to haunt the


40 Ibid., 1.

41 Ibid., 2.
perceived role of the archivist through an emphasis on neutrality and objectivity as the means to add evidentiary value to the records themselves whereas postmodern thought embraces that everything within the archives—from records to their contexts—are socially constructed with their il/legitimacy\textsuperscript{42} being always already questioned. Archivists, then, have become entrenched and entangled in the shifting meanings and purposes of archives and their records. Therefore, I use queer theory and the concept of embodiment to approach the archives as embodied. Throughout the remaining chapters, I will use the body as a framework to understand the archives as a body of knowledge and expand this to, importantly, imagine the archives through the postmodern paradigm as bodies of multiple knowledges that, in this multiplicity, cannot fit into prescriptive and normative ‘stable’ categories as dictated by dominant discourse and ideology that shifts over time. In this chapter, heeding the call from archival theorist Terry Cook for “professional rebirth,”\textsuperscript{43} I will argue for an archival shift to the posthuman to radically redefine the human subject away from the Cartesian approach and “humanist notion that subjectivity must coincide with conscious agency”\textsuperscript{44} as I consider bodies, stories, archival records, archival technologies, and archival practices—conscious, unconscious, and non-conscious—as

\textsuperscript{42} I use the forward slash ‘/’ to indicate the precarious tension between what might be thought of as legitimate and illegitimate. The slash offers a sort of movement to suggest that one might be both of these simultaneously which fits my overall research project and notions of (un)becoming.

\textsuperscript{43} Terry Cook, “Fashionable Nonsense or Professional Rebirth: Postmodernism and the Practice of Archives,” \textit{Archivaria 51} (2001): 35.

simultaneously becoming and unbecoming within multiply-situated locations, identities, and timescapes.

Archivist INACTION: The Modern Archives

Tracings of archival state and government focus go back to classical Greece, where the concept of *archive* was intricately tied to the location and exercise of power.\(^{45}\) In *Archive Fever*, Derrida highlights the etymology of the word *archive* as it comes from the Greek *arkheion*, “initially a house, a domicile, an address, the residence of the superior magistrates, the *archons*, those who commanded.”\(^{46}\) He points out the role of the *archons* as the documents’ guardians who “do not only ensure the physical security of what is deposited…also accorded the hermeneutic right and competence. They have the power to interpret the archives. Entrusted to such archons, these documents in effect speak the law: they recall the law and call on or impose the law.”\(^{47}\) Terry Cook reminds us that archives traditionally were “founded by the state, to serve the state, as part of the state’s hierarchical structures and organizational culture.”\(^{48}\) Moreover, archives were used in these contexts to support dominant ideologies and, therefore,


\(^{47}\) Ibid., 2.

perform as an apparatus of the state to create and reflect the authorized and normalized narratives of what it was to be a good citizen. Modern archives and subsequent archival theory and principles emerged during a time when technologies were shifting in ways that produced large quantities of records that required trustworthy recordkeeping to support proper accountability for emerging bureaucratic organizations. Although state record-keepers work within a different environment than archivists within historical and manuscripts traditions, the modern traditional archival paradigms still permeate practices and understandings of the roles and definitions of archives, archivists, and records. Employed in London’s Public Record Office in 1906, Sir Hilary Jenkinson, following the UK tradition of naming the archivists as Keepers, emphasized the archivist role as the ‘keeper’ of the records and shied away from notions of appraisal because of its connotation of partiality and the active role of the archivist in making selection decisions, thus, creating an archives that consists no longer of ‘natural,’ ‘authentic,’ and ‘complete’ archival documents. On the other hand, Schellenberg suggested that archives were those “records of any public or private institution which are adjudged worthy of permanent preservation for reference and research...”\(^49\) Although there were differences in archival processes between the US and the UK, through using the word *adjudged*, it’s implied that *someone* would be judging the records as worthy. Although Schellenberg’s appraisal theory emphasizes the role of archivists as “active shapers of the archival heritage,”\(^50\) his

\(^{49}\) Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, 16.
discursive strategy continued to keep the archivist in a passive role, which aligned
with the modern approach to archives as spaces of objectivity. The person, the
archon, the archivist, who is given the trust and authority collects, organizes,
stores, and protects such important memories objectively and passively keeps the
records; within the modernist paradigm, then, their work to organize and care for
the records is assumed to not have an impact upon the records or the records’
ability to perform as permanent evidence.

Following in the Jenkinsonian positivist line of thinking that Derrida
considers and questions, archival theorist, Luciana Duranti asserts “the documents
entering this restricted zone would live forever in their own time of creation, in
their own context, as stable and immutable entities, untouchable by political or
social events, interests, trends, or influences.” In this statement, one can see that
the human hands working in, on, and for the archives are invisible and the
documents themselves seem to permanently hold agency and authority. Critically
recognizing the absent archivist in Duranti’s statement as an invisible presence,
archival theorist Anne Gilliland points out that Duranti touches upon a major

50 Terry Cook, “Evidence, Memory, Identity, and Community: Four Shifting Archival

51 As I research Jenkinson’s and Schellenberg’s contributions to archival theory and
practice, I recognize that there are overlapping definitions and roles of archivists and record
keepers and, therefore, in order to delineate between the two, I draw on the International Council
on Archives statement that “both (are) responsible for the survival and use of archives. However,
in some organizations and countries there is the record keeper who is responsible for the survival
from creation of the record through to the archive stage, whereas the archivist tends to be
responsible for the record at the point at which it becomes an archive. Both will have the same
skills set and knowledge to ensure the physical survival and intellectual integrity of the archive.”
(www.ica.org/125/about-records-archives-and-the-profession/discover-archives-and-our-
profession.html accessed 10 February 2015)

52 Duranti, “Archives as a Place,” 449.
axiom that lies at the heart of archival practice, which is that “professional neutrality is an essential requirement to ensure that archives and archivists resist politicization and be trusted by society to retain its records and make them available without alteration into the future.”

Like positivist sciences in general, archives and archivists gain credibility as trust is established through the notion of objectivity, which Gilliland defines as a “philosophical position that actions can be based upon a factual truth discernable or attainable through the scientific method and independent of human beliefs, which should be distrusted.”

In the last twenty years, archival theorists have been actively questioning the scientific methods used to develop principles of practice from within the archival field.

Within traditional archival contexts, professionalized neutrality and assumed objectivity has invisibilized the information professional’s perspective and standpoint that is already practiced, produced, and embodied—normalized and naturalized—without opportunities for acknowledging and critically interrogating the lived knowledges, assumptions, and experiences that are carried into decision-making processes and hands-on work within archival productions. Such a default setting within archival practice and research may prove to be problematic and, for non-normative communities, even treacherous. In fact, transdisciplinary feminist theorists have accessed archives, digital archival databases, and other collections and have offered forceful and persuasive critiques


54 Ibid., 197.
of marginalizing and colonizing practices of selection, appraisal, and classification. Key debates that are taking place within and across the areas of scientific research highlight the question that feminist science scholar, Sandra Harding, first asked in her 1986 book, *The Science Question in Feminism*: “Whose science is this?” Following Harding’s move toward understanding the power behind “objective” science as legitimate, official, and true, I ask: Whose archives are these?

As archivist, activist, and scholar, I question my role within and across these situated locations. Distinct archival approaches urge me to question my privileges, identities, and notions of belonging that are always contingent in time and space. As a fractured postmodern subject with subjective knowledges and/or a posthuman subject with “its bodily forms that are recognizable because they occupy the overlap between the now and the then, the here and the always,” what do the archives tell? The archives that I help build, the records I collect, the queries I make, the stories I tell, and the ways I perform my own embodied practices and knowledges are all implicated in the question: Whose archives are these? And, in expanding on this question, archivists might ask: Who and what

---

55 See Gayatri Spivak’s *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* in which she raises concerns about the archives being considered a repository of facts and the urgency to enter the archives with the intention to “read” them as representations and constructed histories. She argues “this is ‘literature’ in the general sense—the archives selectively preserving the changeover of the episteme—as its condition’ with ‘literature in the narrow sense—all the genres—as its effect.” (1999), 203.


are being included/excluded? What and whose stories are being recorded within archival collections? How? And how might these stories fit into the greater normative narrative that situates and is situated within the archives?

As Cook has been emphasizing since the early 1990s about the initial traces of postmodernism within archival studies, John Ridener continues to suggest that the discourse of selecting (subjectivity) and keeping (objectivity) the archives is still fueling tensions within the debates surrounding the definition of the archives. He asserts, “archival theory has accepted each paradigm change cumulatively rather than successively.” Cook and Joan Schwartz argue that archivists along with classic archival texts have continually shaped archival practice. The archivist, even as a presumably passive keeper of official information, has had an influence on archival tradition for centuries.

Archivist IN ACTION: The Postmodern Archives

‘The archive’, in short, is all around us; it is on us and inside us.
--Verne Harris

In the shift from the modern to postmodern, archival paradigms also shifted. Archival theorists identified key areas where changes were occurring.

58 John Ridener, From Polders to Postmodernism: A Concise History of Archival Theory (Duluth, MN: Litwin Books, 2009), 144. Terry Cook also argues that archivists and archival theory has shifted with changing paradigms and suggests that “… ‘paradigms’ are better styled as frameworks for thinking about archives, or archival mindsets, ways of imagining archives and archiving.” Terry Cook, “Evidence, memory, identity, and community: four shifting archival paradigms.” Archival Science 13 (2013): 97.

Following Cook’s research into postmodernism’s influence on archival theory, practices, as well as archival records themselves, Gilliland and Kelvin White, in “Perpetuating and Extending the Archival Paradigm: The Historical and Contemporary Roles of Professional Education and Pedagogy,” offer a clear list that highlights the shift from product to process, from structure to function, and from archives to archiving. As concepts, then, records, like the archives themselves, are further understood as consciously constructed and actively mediated archivisation while the modern approach considered the record as “natural residue” or passive by-product of administrative activity. The shift from modern to postmodern reanimated the notion of stasis into a moving assemblage of parts that may denote a variety of contextual elements beyond the moment of record creation.

The postmodern, defined simply by Jean-François Lyotard as “incredulity toward metanarratives,” and, therefore, the postmodern approach to archives moved theorists into thinking more deeply about archival practices, such as selection and appraisal, that archivists perform everyday along with the ways the archives themselves influence the peoples who populate and access their

---


collections. Postmodern archival theorists and archivists began to question the nature of the archives, collection development, arrangement and description, technologies that preserve and make accessible, and the role of power to shape and tell the sometimes competing histories of diverse communities. Postmodernism questioned certain central claims of the profession. Alexandrina Buchanan highlights perspectives of the archives that, in fact, emanate from within the archives and records management field as well as from outside: “Traditional archives (the ‘organic,’ institutional, or bureaucratic archives upheld by Jenkinson as the pinnacle of documentary objectivity), in particular, have been censured for their exclusions, their silencings, and their active involvement in oppression.” Archives are not neutral, even the “order and language imposed on records through archival arrangement and description” are not value-free. Archival theorist Francis X. Blouin, Jr., in defining *archives* through a postmodern lens in order to expand on the many ways the archives are influenced, notes “Archives are seen as a product of culture, reflective of our politics, our biases, and our preoccupations.” Archives are no longer simply the spaces where research takes place about life outside of the archives; archives are now

---


subjects of investigation from within the archival and records management field as well as from across the academy.

The postmodern archives, with its gaze looking into the silences and issues of power, underrepresented groups, along with issues of race, gender, sexuality, ability, etc., has highlighted the importance of questioning the archival collections to find those who have been invisibilized and held captive in a distinct hegemonic narrative through colonizing and neocolonizing archival practices. Importantly for the archives, modes of self-representations and re-writing the silences has opened up the archives to multiple histories so as to decolonize and offer generative spaces of being and knowing.\footnote{The postcolonial archival project is beyond the scope of this dissertation research project, but an important issue that I would like to pursue further in my future work. For integral works related to postcoloniality as it relates to and in the archives, see Anjali R. Arondekar For the Record: On Sexuality and the Colonial Archive in India (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009); Emily S. Lee, ed. Living Alterities: Phenomenology, Embodiment, and Race (SUNY Press, 2014); and Ann Laura Stoler, ed. Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).}

Cook and Schwartz suggest, “the deep suspicion of metanarratives and universals, which is integral to postmodern inquiry, requires that we consider the historicity and specificity of archives as institutions, as records, and as a profession.”\footnote{Cook and Schwartz, 13.}

If archival scholars and archivists consider the historicity of archives and especially the archival paradigms that structure and uphold past and still embodied archival practices and understandings, a move into the posthuman might then assist in a holistic and transdisciplinary understanding of archives—especially those postmodern archives—by creating generative spaces in which, according to N. Katherine Hayles, “emergence replaces teleology; reflexive
epistemology replaces objectivism; distributed cognition replaces autonomous will; embodiment replaces a body seen as a support system for the mind; and a dynamic partnership between humans and intelligent machines replaces the liberal humanist subject’s manifest destiny to dominate and control nature.”\textsuperscript{69} Jack Halberstam also notes the relation between the posthuman and the postmodern as relying on a new technological order “with the body at its helm and a troubling relationship to history”\textsuperscript{70} through which new potential futures are fast approaching and might then create a crisis in what archives might present and offer as bits and pieces of histories that might not keep up to the changing nature of bodies, records, technologies, and archival bodies of knowledges.

Postmodernism is deeply entangled with posthumanism in their work to open up previously limited and limiting spaces. Postmodernism continues to reanimate the static constructs that have largely defined the archival profession since \textit{The Dutch Manual}. Posthumanism might also animate archival constructs, but importantly in ways that allow for new understandings of bodies and archival bodies of knowledges that “do not belong to a linear history, but are of the past and future lived as present crisis.”\textsuperscript{71} Through these shifting paradigms, archival theorists and practitioners might be able to look at hands-on archival work to open up lines of questions about what has become normativized within archival structures, collections, and memories. At the interstices of the changes are

\textsuperscript{69} N. Katherine Hayles, \textit{How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics}. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 288.

\textsuperscript{70} Halberstam and Livingston, 3.

\textsuperscript{71} Halberstam and Livingston, 4.
generative spaces where theoretical approaches can suggest possible alternate futures for records, collections, and the peoples that constitute them.

**The Posthuman Archives**

Through my hands-on work to develop the Arizona Queer Archives, I have come to know and question the archives as bodies of knowledges. Strict adherence to disciplinary methods of research and knowledge production suggest that the archives, then, might perform as most legitimate with clear and crisp demarcations and containers to hold records and stories. However, through my research at the Transgender Archives, the Skeivt Arkiv, the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project, and the Arizona Queer Archives, I have found that archives as bodies of knowledges are rarely possible to contain. Bodies of knowledges are unruly and cannot settle within one location for long. The boundaries between bodies and technologies are blurry, and the many stories situated within archives are messy and contradict and complement one another. The archives are not complete, rather they are ongoing, and continue to hold and produce records and collections and stories. Archival spaces are physical and virtual. With this in mind, records and their recordness may continue be more frequently acknowledged as physically *fixed* and *captured* onto some medium in order to cross the threshold into the archives, but records are also conceptually understood with their validity questioned.
I suggest that the modern and postmodern approaches to archives have become embodied within archives, archivists, records, and users of the archives so that any previously adhered to boundaries and borders are contingent and shifting. Therefore, I propose the move to the posthuman approach to archives in order to suggest that no one body—human and non-human—might be privileged as a priori, as I argue in Chapter 4, so that temporality might be reimagined in ways to instantiate that past, present, and future and what came first are always blurring lines. The archives, as situated within temporalities understood and yet loosely identified as past, present, and future, might then hold bodies as they circulate in margins, creases, and centers of histories. All are connected and intertwined so that archives might perform the multimodal ways that time and space are always (un)becoming and stories so far.72 Moreover, lives, technés, and technologies of bodies become enmeshed in the archival practices themselves. Chrononormativity is a notion that aids in understanding the influence of time. As defined by Elizabeth Freeman, chrononormativity is “the use of time to organize individual human bodies toward maximum productivity.”73 Such an understanding of time, its productions and politics, might elucidate how archivists shape particular collections and bodies of knowledges within greater archival narratives. Users of the archives, too, are shaped by their assumptions and the hegemonic self-

72 Adela C. Licona’s April 2013 keynote addressed titled “Mi’ja, just say you’re a feminist like you used to…”: Pa/trolling & Performing Queer Rhetorics in the Everyday at the Queering Spaces/Queering Borders Queer Studies Conference at University of North Carolina-Asheville. She, like feminist geographer, Doreen Massey, suggest that bodies and space might be considered as “stories so far.”

regulatory technologies\textsuperscript{74} as they access collections and make meaning of records through distinct journeys with keywords and metadata searches that might or might not relate to the archivists’ work. Utilizing Margaret Hedstrom’s idea of \textit{interfaces}\textsuperscript{75} as the “spaces of the loci of power of the present to control what the future will know of the past,”\textsuperscript{76} Cook and Schwartz note that archives have always been at intersections of past, present, and future. Notions of navigating these interstices within postmodernism beg archivists to be prepared and agile in responding to “both continuity and change in society’s concepts of, needs for, and uses of the past, memory, information, knowledge, for ultimately what is at stake is the relevance of archives in society, the power of the record, and the present strength and future vitality of the archival profession.”\textsuperscript{77} Posthuman bodies as well as bodies of knowledges are “the causes and effects of postmodern relations of power and pleasure, virtuality and reality, sex and its consequences. The posthuman body is a technology, a screen, a projected image; it is a body under the sign of AIDS, a contaminated body, a deadly body, a techno-body; it is, as we shall see, a queer body.”\textsuperscript{78} The posthuman body produces and is produced by technologies of race, class, gender, and sexuality as they intersect and at times

\textsuperscript{74} See Foucault’s “Docile Bodies” in \textit{Discipline and Punish} and also Thomas Lemke’s \textit{Biopolitics: An Advanced Introduction}.

\textsuperscript{75} Margaret Hedstrom. “Archives, Memory, and Interfaces with the Past.” \textit{Archival Science} 2 no. 102 (2002): 21-43.

\textsuperscript{76} Cook and Schwartz, 3.

\textsuperscript{77} Cook and Schwartz, 13.

\textsuperscript{78} Halberstam and Livingston, 3
collide with social, cultural, economic, and political structures. The move to posthuman, then, offers the instability of collapsible timeframes and scattered genealogy along with an “unfolding of new rules of the game.”

Freeman builds on Pierre Bourdieu’s work on embodiment to suggest that temporal manipulations, the move beyond mere repetition, such as the ways bodies have mastered cultural norms of delay, surprise, pause, “institutionally and culturally enforced rhythms, or timings, shape flesh into legible, acceptable embodiment.” As archivists and archival theorists are increasingly concerned about the archives’ adherence to master narratives, I consider temporality and embodiment as integral to challenging archival structures and constructs. Posthuman bodies, and I suggest archival bodies and bodies of knowledges, emerge at nodes where bodies, bodies of discourse, and discourses of bodies intersect to foreclose any easy distinction between actor and stage, between sender/receiver, channel, code, message, context. Posthuman embodiment, like Haraway’s ‘feminist embodiment, then, is not about fixed location in a reified body, female or otherwise, but about nodes in fields, inflections in orientations…Embodiment is significant prosthesis.’

Technologies as embodied then perform and work as prosthesis, variably produced and constructed limbs at play in performance, at play in remembering and forgetting. As bodies perform in space and time, I emphasize contingency in the assemblage of parts that constitute the whole that might remain always in question. In the next two chapters, I will argue for understandings of archival

79 Braidotti, 163.

80 Freeman, Time Binds, 4.

81 Halberstam and Livingston, 2.
embodiment in order to theorize and instantiate bodies as archives and archives as bodies while then questioning approaches to temporality that challenge archival understandings of the record and its recordness.

**Transdisciplinarity: Orienting Toward Radical Openness**

Ultimately, I have been persuaded by the postmodern approach to archives and archiving while moving toward and emphasizing the posthuman as a related perspective. Postmodernism aids us in viewing archives as constituted by heterogeneous communities and multiply-situated contributors—all in contingent and complex relationships and assemblages. Archival theorists have written about how archivists are interrogating the absences in the archives and negotiating with excluded communities to identify records, memories, and histories and even produce new records for the archives in order to establish a presence. Randall C. Jimerson has written *Archives Power: Memory, Accountability, and Social Justice* to offer an account of what is possible within the archives when one looks closely at the ways individuals and communities remember. He suggests that incorporating justice is an archivist’s and archival educator’s professional responsibility. With Jimerson’s call to look closely at remembering while incorporating justice, I argue that the posthuman approach to archives and archiving with its methodological grounding being outside of and across and through numerous disciplines is important to queering and radically opening up the archives to new ways of becoming, being, and making meaning.
Transdisciplinarity, which “affects the very structure of thought and enacts a rhizomatic embrace of conceptual diversity in scholarship,”\(^{82}\) is ideal within posthuman approaches to the archives alongside the theoretical frameworks that I am using throughout this research project as I gesture towards breaking free from containers, containment, and moving towards openness.

Notions of social justice look, act, and feel different in specific moments and locations. Therefore, archivists can better understand the politics of memory and the importance of collecting and sharing multiple histories and memories even though they may be complex, messy, and contradictory. Social justice within the archives can shine light on the biopolitics implicated in state-sanctioned collections that give way to surveillance of citizens and elicit an urgency or fear surrounding the need to be normalized.

Layers of context are embedded within records and collections that archivists work with everyday. These layers, according to Verne Harris, “range from the idioms of language and psychologies of those generating information to the contingencies of place and time informing information retrieval, from the biographies of information managers to the modes of knowledge construction available to the users.”\(^ {83}\) Harris suggests that the archives has become an apparatus of power for state ideologies, which may even corrupt spaces of collective memory as well as individual memory. In order to understand justice from a broad perspective to the extreme close-up, the archives and records
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\(^{82}\) Braidotti, 169.

\(^{83}\) Harris, “Archons, Aliens, and Angels,” 108.
management scholarly field of research must consider that the relevant question to ask is how to find a just politics along with an “ethics which constitutes not a codification of principle, but a praxis providing guidance on how to ask the right questions and on what to do with them in the hurly-burly of action in the archive.”

Shifting paradigms from modern to postmodern has, in a way, given theorists a certain permission to cross borders and interrogate culture, performance, and queer temporalities as shifting concepts with re-imagined meanings again and again. For example, Jeannette Bastian challenges readers to rethink which records are recognizable by archivists and worthy of collecting. She argues that archivists should embrace new ways of seeing and understanding records. Harris offers thinking similar to Bastian, drawing from Derrida’s Archive Fever to consider an embodied notion of archives when he suggests:

…the act of remembering by an individual human being does not involve a space we can name ‘archive’: ‘the archive doesn’t consist simply in remembering, in living memory, in anamnesis; but in consigning, in inscribing a trace in some external location---there is no archive without…some space outside.’ That ‘space outside’ could be someone else’s psyche—in sharing one’s remembering, one’s living memory, with another or with others, one inscribes a trance in (an) external location(s).”

Through transdisciplinary thinking that crosses borders of performance studies, anthropology, and cultural studies, Bastian is offering a theoretical framework to show how a culture, especially as situated and practiced within a designated event
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84 Ibid., 118.
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space of Carnival, might be considered an archives. Moving towards an openness that elicits new lines of questions and understandings of records and their performative natures benefits the archives as bodies of knowledges in order to represent human and non-human records creators in relevant and meaningful ways.

Kimberly Anderson, too, embraces transdisciplinarity in “The Footprint and the Stepping Foot: Archival Records, Evidence, and Time” as she questions the Western concepts of time within the archives as oppressive. Anderson proposes a records schema to “recognize the recordness of existing cultural forms rather than to identify a narrow standard which cultural forms must meet in order to qualify as records.”

Her work is integral to shifting archival practices through which archivists may focus on asset-driven approaches to records and recognize what a community creates rather than to look in community for the types of records that the archives collects. Following Australian archivral theorist Frank Upward’s foundational work behind the Records Continuum Model, Anderson too considers the shifting nature of the archives and questions ‘fixity and capture,’ which are seemingly necessary because the externalized records are traditionally seen as those that may count as truth. “Many social transactions are not physically captured, and thus, the records retained in the archive will tend to emphasize institutions or communities that communicate or conduct interactions that can be


captured.88 There is a stoppage of time within the record and Anderson points out that if records can be considered dynamic and virtual concepts,89 then archivists must question concepts of stability and re-imagine what is collectible. Incorporating heterogeneous concepts of records—all of which can support evidence of processes and living—offers the means for archives to better support diverse worldviews from those Western linear models of time to those that disrupt the Western model but are relevant to communities that may already have distinct recordkeeping practices in place. Non-linear thought, a strength of the posthuman approach, might open up dynamic spaces and time. Braidotti suggests

“creativity and critique proceed together in the quest for affirmative alternatives which rest on a non-linear vision of memory as imagination, creation as becoming. Instead of deference to the authority of the past, we have the fleeting co-presence of multiple time zones, in a continuum that activates and de-territorializes stable identities and fractures temporal linearity. This dynamic vision of time enlists the creative resources of the imagination to the task of reconnecting to the past.”90

Questioning time and space in these ways lends the archives legitimacy and relevancy to non-normative multiply-situated peoples, thus challenging the normative structures that have been used to oppress and further marginalize. Justice prevails in these moments and spaces by promoting multiple historical narratives that subvert and challenge dominant power structures.

88 Ibid., 7.
89 Gilliland and White, “Perpetuating and Extending the Archival Paradigm,” 15-16.
90 Braidotti, 165.
Conclusion: Influencing the Field

Following Gilliland, White, Cook, Jimerson, and those archival theorists and educators who are critically reflecting on archival work in general, I argue that, as archival theory and practice shift and expand within the posthuman approach and beyond, so too must archival education. Indeed, contemporary scholars and practitioners need to continue to ask and be able to contend with these important sets of questions of the archives and records management field. Cook reminds archival educators “…the principal justification for archives to most users…rests on archives being able to offer citizens a sense of identity, locality, history, culture, and personal and collective memory.”  

Gilliland, too, shares her questioning of the politics of collective memory on and in the archives and writes about her experiences within the Department of Information Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles, to suggest pedagogical approaches that can “raise and address diversity and social justice concerns in archival practice thereby helping students, as future practitioners and scholars, to engage critically, reflexively, and meaningfully with these issues in ways that support the public trust in archives and the archival profession.”  

The UCLA iSchool is the first and only to adopt a social justice mandate that permeates learning engagements throughout the curriculum. Gilliland recounts challenges the iSchool had to work
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through creatively to integrate the mandate and mission: “Our work is guided by the principles of individual responsibility and social justice, an ethic of caring, and commitment to the communities we serve.” As an act of transparency, overall, the social justice mandate has surfaced many issues that are relevant to the “role of education, pedagogical innovation, the goals of professional education, the place of activism in both the academy and the profession, and the cultivation of leadership among future archival professionals.”

Returning to the question of what an archives is, the archives should be able to be spaces for many, and even contradictory, voices that might support and/or debunk dominant narratives that circulate therein – remembering and forgetting are always contested projects. Archives and records management as a field of scholarly research must interrogate the requirements of professionalism within the field to acknowledge that shifting and expanding ideas about archives can, in fact, still support ways for records to be created, exist, be organized, named, and shared and still be trustworthy, evidential, accountable, beneficial for the public good, accessible for multiple communities, and justice-oriented.

Recognizing and understanding the shifting paradigms and approaches to producing and consuming archives are integral to opening the archives in radical ways to support the ability “to conceptualize alternatives, often improvised.”

93 Ibid., 201.
94 Ibid., 203.
From passive to subjective to complexly and contingently interconnected, the archivists benefit from inquiring into the historicity of the archives. Gathering bodies and bodies of knowledges while also being attentive to the processes of (un)becoming will influence the archives and its sustainability as spaces for remembering and forgetting for years to come and for the time being.
CHAPTER THREE

BODIES AS ARCHIVES / ARCHIVES AS BODIES:
ACCESSING MULTIPLICITIES THROUGH HUMAN/NON-HUMAN
COMPORTMENTS

Small acts of cunning endowed with a great power of diffusion, subtle
arrangements, apparently innocent, but profoundly suspicious,
mechanisms that obeyed economies too shameful to be acknowledged, or
pursued petty forms of coercion…discipline is a political anatomy of
detail.

--Michel Foucault\textsuperscript{96}

As stanza is Italian for room, we inhabit poems as we inhabit books. And
paragraph is from the Greek, παράγραφος, where a break in meaning
occurs and something new begins. Space intervenes. Only by separating
like from like can we discern order. Books are exceptionally durable as
technologies go. I could sit in this room for years and I would decay
before either wall or page would…The body made book. The book not
accommodating of the body’s need to read it, margins, etc., but made of
body, gathered together around a spine, bound in one kind of flesh or
another, our favorite leather bindings, the leaves’ dried pulp of bush and
stump. We use the language of the body for the book. The body of the
text. This room is rectangular, like the page, the pine box coffin. It is a
container for my speech, for my silence, for the line of nothingness that
keeps them apart.

--Ander Monson\textsuperscript{97}

\textbf{The Body. Reverberations. Re/collections.}

Introduction

\textsuperscript{96} Michel Foucault, “Docile Bodies, \textit{Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison}
(Vintage Books, 1977), 139.

\textsuperscript{97} Ander Monson, \textit{Vanishing Point: Not A Memoir} (Minneapolis, MN: Graywolf Press,
2010), 75.
In developing archival collections through my hands-on oral history productions for the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project of the Arizona Queer Archives, I have experienced the shifting histories of living embodied individuals whose processes of telling also expand and contract the potential of the stories themselves. One story with competing histories and multiple bodies offers an instantiation of the argument I am making in this chapter for theorizing individual embodiment as archival practice and archival practice as embodied act. This understanding of bodies-as-archives and archives-as-bodies is revealed in the oral history interview of TC Tolbert, a gender-queer poet who, in his story of becoming/unbecoming/becoming, describes his transition from female to male. His narration is not linear and neat, but rather a messy one of multiplicities and incompleteness. In his story of ongoing unbecoming and transition, although he recognizes the lived experiences that have structured his understandings and performances as female and also as male, he refuses to locate himself precisely on one point of the spectrum of gender, sexuality, anatomy, and desire. He will not erase the female/woman within and continues instead to ground himself and his stories within his lived history as an embodied female. Embodied subjectivities that are shared in ways that subvert the assumed dominant structures of archives and body can open up radical possibilities and decolonial imaginaries,98 much like the rhizomatic work of somatechnics, which I will cover thoroughly in this

98 Emma Peréz, *The Decolonial Imaginary: Writing Chicanas into History*, (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1999), 4. Peréz offers the decolonial imaginary as a political project for reconceptualizing histories alongside a theory of Chicano/a historical consciousness that can be considered an alternative model for conceptualizing “a subaltern and self-consciously oppositional Chicano/a historiography that can account for issues of the modern and the postmodern, immigrations and diasporas, and genders and sexuality.”
chapter. The radical possibilities of ongoing shifting histories and the instabilities of (un)becoming are at play in the stories and records of the archives. To make the story accessible and culturally legible, this storyteller and contributor states:

So, in terms of my gender-queer identity, for me, that’s really about feeling very happy to have been born in the body that I was born in, which is female, and incredible grateful for my experience as a woman—growing up as a woman, living as a woman. And really feeling like my transition, which has just been taking testosterone, has just allowed me to foreground another part of myself without, hopefully without erasing what came before. And so, for me, I feel pretty comfortably situated in both genders, even though I know the world sees me as a guy.99

In his oral history interview, he demonstrates how the body is an archives—an archiving archives and always in motion. In terms of archival practice as embodiment, the archives is revealed as a space that can hold this living history that is (un)becoming—even as it has been collected, appraised, preserved, and accessed—that only an archives conceived as (un)becoming could hold.

99 Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project, oral history archive. Interview with TC Tolbert from 30 April 2010.
The body, like the archives, contains and preserves the stories. The body tells the stories through markings and distinct contextual specificities as recognized and interpreted in complex networks of body—human and non-human—, time, and space.

**Configurations and (Un)Becomings: Bodies as Archives / Archives as Bodies**

**Thinking Through the Body**

As I come to understand bodies as archives and archives as bodies, I recognize the (re)configurations taking place through space and time as each body and each archives performs and produces momentary stability through such basic archival practices as collection, appraisal, and preservation. Cultural theorist Joseph Pugliese draws from photographer Alan Sekula’s concept of the *shadow archive* to highlight the “historical reservoir of images that functions to construct the enabling conditions for the emergence and cultural intelligibility of any image.”100 Similar to Judith Butler’s concept of *performativity*, which she defines as “a repetition and a ritual, which achieves its effects through its naturalization in the context of a body, understood, in part, as a culturally sustained temporal duration,”101 Pugliese suggests that the ways in which the archives, in its structuring and archiving processes and practices, becomes naturalized and barely

---


perceived—as a shadow. Pugliese then turns Sekula’s ideas away from the archives as a source—a reservoir focused on institutional settings and, specifically, what might be considered the traditional archives—and towards the body to suggest that bodies are themselves “inscribed by shadow archives that escape intelligibility precisely because they constitute the corporeal infrastructure of our everyday thoughts and practices.”102 Bodies, therefore, do not and cannot identify and recognize the everyday thoughts and practices as they have settled into a bodily repertoire of default settings. In line with both Butler and Pugliese, individual embodiment can be considered an archival practice and location. Further, I argue that, through radical interrogations of the archival body, archival practice can be considered an embodied act, which has implications for the performative nature of the archives as bodies of knowledges.

As archivist and archival scholar working inside and outside of the archives, I engage Ann Laura Stoler’s call to scholars to move from “archive-as-source to archive-as-subject”103 in order to interrogate the archives as both source and subject and simultaneously so. Through poststructuralist and transdisciplinary frames, this project situates the archives as a concept, a location, and a practice. Such an approach allows an emphasis on the particular—embodied—ways in which the human record is conceived, collected, organized, and preserved.

102 Pugliese, “Embodied Archives,” 2.

Qualitative Interrogations of the Archival Body

The focus of this project is a question of individual embodiment as archival practice and by its reversal. In this chapter, I draw from critical cultural theorists while pulling together transdisciplinary literatures that trace embodiment and bodily ways of knowing to theorize the archives as archival bodies of multiple knowledges. Through oral history qualitative methods and queer, feminist, and decolonizing methodologies to thematically interpret and analyze the visual and textual, I recognize that the stories, storytellers, and storytelling techniques and technologies can tell many distinct histories that constitute archival bodies of evidence.

Utilizing the seventy-five hours of digital video oral history interviews that comprise the archival body of the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project of the Arizona Queer Archives, I selected ten oral history interviews on which I participated as interviewer and/or camera operator while I trained a community member on conducting interviews. The ten interviews took place between September 2008 and March 2012 and tell histories of: lesbian-identified white Jewish woman (Eve); gay political activist and gay rodeo enthusiast (Les); gay Christian-identified man (Jon); white gender-queer poet and teacher (TC); white female-to-male ‘trans man’ (Michael); white gay HIV-positive man (Steve); white gay elder originally from Ireland (Peter); Latino gay philanthropist whose father died of AIDS (James); white gay elder who is in a relationship with a younger married man (Don); and white gay elder couple (Merlin and Lee). I engaged these
interviews in video form as well as textual transcripts in order to determine emerging themes that each interviewee most related to in their stories and their storytelling techniques. I turned to theories of embodiment to better grasp how the organizing principles of a politics of respectability—one’s desire to be respectable and ‘good’—can be at play in these oral history productions and how the politics of respectability, in fact, might function to promote a kind of exceptionalism and, subsequently, work to exclude broader accountings of the lived histories. Through analyzing emerging themes, such as 1) described relational intimacies and relationships as they may or may not lead to same-sex marriage; 2) shifting identities, specifically related to trans and transgender, and the relationships with the contexts of past, present, and future; and 3) interviewees’ relationships to time and temporalities as they are connected to records, I made connections to the concepts of individual embodiment as archival practice and archival practice itself as embodied act. Theorizing the archival and bodily comportments and practices supports my emergent Queer/ed Archival Methodology, Q/M, as a flexible framework that might work to be attentive to the implications that embodiment holds for the archival body. This project is about configurations, reconfigurations, and (un)becoming, by which I mean the simultaneous becoming and unbecoming that influence the ways we move, relate, know, and remember.

**Embodiment as Archival Practice: Bodies as Archives**
The theorization of bodies as archives is significant for archival studies—the archives as source and subject—because the archives are themselves constituted by bodies, both human and non-human. Interrogating the archival body, then, might elucidate the complexities and multiplicities of histories and contexts. As archivists move through appraisal and description practices, an openness and ease about human and non-human complexities and multiplicities will influence: the stories that the archives collects; how the stories are organized and structured in relation to the micro-stories as well as to the whole of the archival body of knowledges; and the representative descriptions and access points that are meaningful to diverse populations of producers and users of archival records. As I considered all of the oral history interviews that I had collected since 2008, I returned to my journey into this project as, first, community activist and oral historian, and then as an everyday archivist, to today as a professional archivist. Within this spectrum of learning, I recognized my own shifting identities in relation to the archives alongside my internal shifting identities as I moved through knowing myself as lesbian, lesbian feminist, and then also as queer. Identity politics are complicated and beyond the scope of this dissertation project, but recognizing the shifting identificatory spaces, intersections, and assemblages as they relate to race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, etc., supports the urgency and the need for a radically open and queer/ed methodology that can be applicable to archives and archival bodies. Looking closely at the body itself as an archiving archives will closely tie the overall aim of my dissertation research and the development of a Q/M as a politically queer,
queer/ed, and radically open methodological project that works to uncover the untold, the unknown, while disidentify the known and stifling in order to make spaces to re-imagine possibilities to re-weave the narratives.

Martin Heidegger suggests that “technology is a mode of revealing”¹⁰⁴ and, therefore, the concept techné, as I defined in Chapter 1, is a mode of doing and acting, which ultimately reveals a sense of knowing. With these ways of doing, acting, and knowing, I suggest that technés can be equated to archival records within the archives as they produce and are produced by memory and collective memory and subsequently reveal how humans know their bodily being in the world and, therefore, within the archival collections. As technés are collected and stored in the body and then accessed in specific situations and queries, embodiment can be considered an archival practice. Although social, political, cultural, and theoretical changes have influenced the ways bodies and bodies of knowledge come together to be legible and readily accessed, rudimentary archival applications can be considered in order to understand how bodies and archives are related, evolving, and always already in process.

Poststructural and postmodern thought have influenced perceptions of people, shifting from the Cartesian, clearly outlined, unified and mindful being to the fractured subject, which, according to Fredric Jameson, has broken our “diachronic sensibilities, the sense of history that links a civilization’s comprehension of itself to its past and future.”¹⁰⁵ Projecting the ideas of the

---
fractured subject onto and into the archive, in *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, Jacques Derrida tackles the changing nature of the archive by looking at what constitutes the driving principle of gathering together:

Consignation (in the archive) aims to coordinate a single corpus, in a system or a synchrony in which all the elements articulate the unity of an ideal configuration. In an archive, there should not be any absolute dissociations, any heterogeneity or secret, which could separate, or partition, in an absolute manner.¹⁰⁶

This project is unique in its aim to connect postmodern and poststructural thought to posthuman thought to most fully consider the archives as no longer, as Derrida suggests, “an ideal configuration.” The posthuman perspective enables me to critically consider the body and the archives as similar in their comportments—visible and invisible practices of remembering, forgetting, and performing. Drawing from N. Katherine Hayles’ work, I turn to the processes of (un)becoming body as well as (un)becoming archives to highlight the distributed ways of knowing and being that may be in only tenuous communication with one another. Hayles argues that this “distributed cognition of the posthuman complicates individual agency. If ‘human essence is freedom from the wills of others,’ the posthuman is ‘post’ not because it is necessarily unfree but because there is no a priori way to identify a self-will that can be clearly distinguished
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from an other-will.” Inter- and intra-relationality becomes difficult to delineate as the networks and assemblages of connections are agentic. Thus, technés emerge and simultaneously reveal the visible in the archival body and the embodied archives that might operate as functions of self and others as well as ontological being in the world.

The oral history interviews that I analyzed offer the common ‘coming out’ narratives that have come to define LGBTQ experiences as traumatic revealing and vulnerable positioning; however, through closer examination, the ‘coming out’ narrative subsequently becomes a techné itself of the storytelling process as the interviewer and interviewee come together during the interview in order to narrate one’s living as LGBTQ. As technés reveal and are revealed within the context of the oral history interview, multiple truths and multiple histories emerge as part of the archival record. The bodies perform and present modes of knowing with gaps and silences that tell parts of the stories as well. The archives, then, is not stable nor can it perform stability when it holds fragmented and fragmenting histories. The bodies of fragmented and fragmenting histories are themselves fragmented or multiply-situated, which suggests a locatedness that is both dominant and non-dominant, normative and non-normative, proper and improper, legitimate and illegitimate. Bodies, then, are always in the process of becoming. Archives too, and their related practices, can twist and turn to mediate the sense of stability and knowing in and out of the archives, in and out of the body.

I turn to Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s book, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, to draw from their deep understandings of the rhizome as integral to decentering the one unified subject as multiply-situated through a principle of multiplicity that suggests when “multiple is effectively treated as a substantive, ‘multiplicity,’” that it ceases to have any relation to the One as subject or object, nature or spiritual reality, image and world. Multiplicities are rhizomatic, and expose arborescent pseudomultiplicities for what they are.”  

The process of becoming and unbecoming, then, untethers the subject from more direct placement within a substantive and concrete space and time identified as “multiplicity.” What becomes stable in the many processes and momentary states of “multiplicities” is the rhizomatic plasticity of embodiment as archival located practice, thus, presenting different ways to think about and organize the body and (bodies of) knowledge. Within multiplicities, then, disidentification with the normative opens radical possibilities. Butler notes “…it may be precisely through practices that underscore disidentification with those regulatory norms by which sexual difference is materialized that both feminist and queer politics are mobilized. Such collective disidentification can facilitate a reconceptualization of which bodies matter, and which bodies are yet to emerge as critical matters of concern.”  

I return to TC’s oral history interview as he instantiates the disidentification and his knowing his queer location in the midst of and overlapping female and male. He says that when he “came out,” he was a very visible dyke and proudly
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identified as a dyke. However, in his (un)becoming, he recognizes the multiplicities in performing along with reading male and female:

*What I notices now is, um, is really (raises his hands emphatically) it’s the way that (pause) as a guy (hands motion toward his chest), there aren’t many visual cutes. I know that those visual cues for women can be very limiting. Certainly, for anyone, visual cues can be limiting. But they’re also a nice handy shortcut when you’re in the grocery story (laughs). You know, you get the sort of ‘dyke nod’ (nods and laughs), you know, or whatever that is. So, I don’t experience that anymore. It’s very rare that I will be walking down the street and I’ll see any number of queer folks who will assume that I’m queer. Whereas before, having short hair and that kind of thing, that was an assumption. Again, I can see how that is limiting to a lot of folks and certainly doesn’t allow a lot folks in through those visual cues. Femme-identified women and masculine men, right? But going from someone who was assumed to be queer right away to now not having that assumption is always baffling to me. And I find myself (long pause). Hmmm…I was gonna say alone or lonely in some instances and I think that’s true, but I think that’s also a part of the gendered expectations for men in terms of interpersonal connections. And so, it’s not that people don’t talk to me or (laughs) that I am not talking to people. But the levels of intimacy, there are just different expectations for men and women that I knew theoretically as a woman and now I feel experientially as a guy.*

TC’s past knowing and bodily being informs his thoughtful characterizing of his new experiences as a ‘guy’ and simultaneously reveals and disidentifies Butler’s performative and reiterative frameworks of what it means to be a female and male. Later in his interview, TC mentions how his changing body is now able to perform the pull-up, which highlights a distinct performance that has acquired a sense of normativity as a definitional characteristic of ‘manly’ or masculine. The pull-up becomes a show of strength that some women and some men can do, but it most closely denotes manliness. Performance and presentation as reiterated again and again solidifies into something legible and recognizable. However, the

---

110 Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project, oral history archive. Interview with TC Tolbert from 30 April 2010.
body is changing. Humans and non-humans are changing, are (un)becoming, as stories-so-far and bodies-so-far. Sedimentation, then, as revealed and legible becomes the ghosts of past iterations that might be recognizable as well as telling, but also ephemeral historical movements and memories. In the revealing, there is the fading—(un)becoming.

Put simply, the body is becoming and is unstable and conceivably contradictory, ambiguous, as well as necessarily dynamic. Through a somatechnical lens and utilizing queer theory, the technologies and technés materialize and hold us in place momentarily. It is through a sort of tethering archival practice—such as arrangement and/or description—that the body is made legible or intelligible, accessible, and locatable in time and space. The major and most visible site of research defining the embodied and complex systems of becoming intelligible and producing intelligibility is the body.

The Body

A Somatechnics Approach to Archiving Bodies

A somatechnics approach interrogates the body-technology inter-relationality (an exterior approach that suggests connections between, together, and reciprocally) and intra-relationality (an interior approach that suggests the move into the within, between the layers of and a focus on the temporal understanding of during) that draws on poststructuralist theory to understand the ways in which embodiment is always already technologized. As an approach that blurs the boundaries of outside and inside, I draw on Deleuze and Guattari’s
understanding of a rhizome as the “middle” through which “any point of a rhizome can be connected to anything other, and must be”\textsuperscript{111} to suggest that somatechnics, then, highlights the multiple modes of connecting in time and space without requiring a fixity of order, a concrete and static tethering, to “semiotic chains”\textsuperscript{112} but simultaneously acknowledging the ongoing process of meaning-making. The term *semiotic chain* is significant for multimodality as it “draws attention to ongoing processes of semiosis in which meanings are materialized and fixed across time, and to the ways in which the modes used to fix these processes transform the meanings that are made.”\textsuperscript{113} Outside and inside—through inter- and/or intra-relationality—are called forth or revealed in certain moments for certain reasons, all parts of the notion of the assemblages of the body and its position within a system of assemblages.

The term *somatechnics* was coined in 2005 in an attempt to “highlight the inextricability of soma and techné, of ‘the body’ (as a culturally intelligible construct) and the techniques (*dispositifs* and ‘hard technologies’) in and through

\begin{itemize}
  \item[\textsuperscript{111}] Deleuze & Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 7.
  \item[\textsuperscript{112}] Deleuze & Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 7. Deleuze and Guattari suggest that “a semiotic chain is like a tuber agglomerating very diverse acts, not only linguistic, but also perceptive, mimetic, gestural, and cognitive: there is not language in itself, nor are there any linguistic universals. Only a throng of dialects, patois, slangs, and specialized languages.”
\end{itemize}
which corporealities are formed and transformed.”\textsuperscript{114} Michael O’Rourke and Noreen Giffney argue that “somatechnics, a constellatory critical neologism cognizant of the mutual enfleshment of technologies and technologization of embodied subjectivities, enacts a double process...an awareness of the ways in which the technological (the object) and the body (the human or nonhuman) are (in)formed of and by the other.”\textsuperscript{115} Bodies form and are formed and informed by the archives and vice versa. It is this double process that is at play here as I discuss and instantiate my thoughts about individual embodiment as archival practice and archival practice as acts of embodiment.

The two theoretical perspectives that feed into somatechnics are: 1) the Derridian deconstructive technique in which binaries are broken down and spaces open up in new ways; and 2) the Foucauldian biopolitical thought in which the relationship between techniques of and on the individual are questioned to consider and critique how their normalized forces function. Derrida’s influence suggests that through deconstruction, there is no end as it is an ongoing function of critique; however, in this work is the potential to re-conceive the differences between binaries, thus, moving toward pursuits of justice.\textsuperscript{116} Foucault’s 

\textit{biopolitics} evolved into two forms—two poles of development that were “linked

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{114} Sullivan & Murray, “Originary Somatechnicity,” 3.
\item \textsuperscript{115} Michael O’Rourke and Noreen Giffney, “Originary Somatechnicity, introduction” in \textit{Somatechnics: Queering the Technologization of Bodies}, (Ashgate, 2009), xi.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
together by a whole intermediary cluster of relations,”117 that are always interrelated through contingent, material, historical, and transformable relations. The first pole concentrated on the body as a machine: “its disciplining, the optimization of its capabilities, the extortion of its forces, the parallel increase of its efficient and economic controls, all this was ensured by the procedures of power that characterized the disciplines: an anatomo-politics of the human body.”118 Here, embodiment is the focal point for techniques of subjectification and individuation. These techniques, insofar as they are collected, stored, and made legible for normalized and proper subjectivity can be understood as archival practices of sorts.

The second pole of Foucault’s biopolitics forms the basic element of the population for which techniques emerge at certain times to control and regulate through, for example, census and demography. The time and space where the two poles come together form the somatechnic, the breezeway, and according to Stryker, Currah, and Moore, the capillary space of connection and circulation between the macropolitical structurations of power and micropolitical techniques through which the lives of bodies become enmeshed in the lives of nations, states, and capital formations, the site where current forms of capital and sovereign power seek to reproduce themselves—but where we might also being to materialize and enact new social ontologies.119

117 Michel Foucault, “Right of Death and Power over Life” in The History of Sexuality (Vintage, 1978), 139.

118 Ibid., 139.

Somatechnologies, then, can hold possibilities for “disruptions, counter-actualizations, destabilizations, and for the creation of new selves, affinities, kinship relations, and cultural possibilities.” Here, the body—human and non-human—and the technés may escape intelligibility precisely because they have become so integrated and inculcated into the corporeal infrastructure of the everyday.

Informing this perspective is the recognition of third space and related possibilities. Through Licona’s work to highlight the potentially generative third space, which I understand is not just a location, but a relational space of shared understanding and meaning-making, somatechnics again reinforces that there is no outside or inside, just complex connections and assemblages that (un)become. In this (un)becoming, then, is the space where I have come to understand the body as an archiving archives.

**Assemblages**

As bodies and bodies of knowledge are ongoing assemblages that are contingent and ephemeral, I look closely into the relations of interiority and exteriority—inside/outside—to consider Deleuze and Guattari’s assemblage theory as a way to read and interpret (un)becoming. In “I am an Idea-Thief,”

---

120 O’Rourke & Giffney, xi.

Guattari explains how he and Deleuze came up with the concept of *agencement* *(arrangement* as translated by Brian Massumi*) as a broad all-encompassing notion that designates an unconscious formation, but also:

relates to imaginary representations, to language chains, to economic, political, aesthetic, microsocial, etc., semiotics. Compared to ‘complex’ it is a notion whose comprehension is weaker, but whose extension is greater, enabling categories of diverse origins not to be excluded from the ‘complex’ field, which in turn graft onto other concepts, like ‘machine.’ Thus, we speak of ‘machinic arrangements’ for an eventual association with ‘collective arrangements of enunciation.’

In this moment, there is no longer the subject and object and the representation or signification. Returning to the word *agencement*, there is agency (the doer of this) and -ment as the structure of this agency (the doing). Assemblage theory, then, ties together the doer and the doing to highlight that there is no agency within the parts that make up the assemblage at a particular moment, but the agency comes from the assemblage itself. Thus, the body is understood as an assemblage constituted by many assemblages—coming together, coming apart, re-making meaning, breathing, knowing, moving about in the world—all similar to the archival body and the archival practices of appraisal, description, preservation, and making accessible. Inside the assemblage, the parts—the technés—are related to the whole and have no function without the whole; outside the assemblage, the power of the assemblage can re-assemble things. The whole of the assemblage is characterized by relations of exteriority, which according to Manuel DeLanda, “imply that a component part of an assemblage may be detached from it and
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plugged into a different assemblage in which its interactions are different” and also “imply that the properties of the component parts can never explain the relations which constitute a whole.”123 In this assemblage—at this time and place—there is simultaneous deterritorialization (moving from), and reterritorialization (moving to) as stabilizing and destabilizing impacts the whole without knowing the outcome in that very next moment. Consider again TC’s oral history interview and his third space location as the multiply-situated subject with its fragmented and fragmenting histories as the body, then, becomes and unbecomes simultaneously. The body as the archiving archive collects the moments of being to store and recall later in processes of remembering and forgetting. This is the (un)becoming that the embodied subject is and produces just as the archives and all of its collections make meaning as a whole, but also as contingent parts in relation to records, records creators, and users of the archives. However, assemblages and (un)becomings are not as explicitly legible and recognized as bodies and bodies of knowledge within archives. Humans—records creators, users of the archives, and archivists—project a semblance of order onto the parts, pieces, and little machines to help to define them as situated and located in that moment, but in the next moment, the definition shifts. Context shifts. Considering the archives, then, as a dwelling of sorts, the archival practices as demonstrated through embodiment might be what stabilize the archives, the body, the collections, and the records.

123 Ibid., 10-11.
Technologies of the body\textsuperscript{124} are embodied and often naturalized through their everyday use. In the 1930s, Marcel Mauss\textsuperscript{125} introduces readers to the contemporary usage of the concept \textit{habitus} as those aspects of culture that are anchored in the body or daily practices of individuals, groups, societies, and nations. He questions how from society to society people know how to use their bodies, how to live in their bodies. He describes the way people walk and swing their arms for balance while also knowing how to hold their hands still and politely. Pierre Bourdieu, in 1967, continues this work on habitus and Foucault, in 1975, highlights the ways that nation and government use the notion of habitus to develop docile bodies—bodies that may be used, transformed, and improved through strict disciplinary acts\textsuperscript{126}—in order to regulate their polis, their body of citizens.

For my argument throughout this chapter, it is helpful for me to consider Bourdieu’s notion of \textit{habitus} and its conservative connotation as the learned repetition of behaviors that holds people (and, for me, knowledges) in the patterns that are subsequently sedimented over time. The sedimentation process can create a slog through which too much sameness—sedimentation of layer upon layer—

\textsuperscript{124} Technologies of the body have been considered and theorized since the late 1880s by Henri Bergson, Marcel Mauss, Martin Heidegger, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Pierre Bourdieu, and Michel Foucault. Covering all of their contributions is beyond the scope of this research project, but will be expanded upon in my future research on embodied archives and archival embodiments as I work to further implement the Queer/ed Archival Methodology in diverse archival productions.

\textsuperscript{125} Marcel Mauss, \textit{The Body Techniques}. 2001. (\textquotedblleft\textit{Les Techniques du corps}, Journal de Psychologies 32 (3-4), 1934.)

erases the historicity, but, related to the archivization process within and for the archives, sedimentation may also become a tether to hold bodies and bodies of knowledge in place as bodies. In *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of “Sex,”* Butler examines the construction of gender that “operates through exclusionary means, such that the human is not only produced over and against the inhuman, but through a set of foreclosures, radical erasures, that are, strictly speaking, refused the possibility of cultural articulation.”¹²⁷ Performativity and the making natural of certain ways of being and knowing through sedimentation is also at play through categories of race, class, sexuality, ability, etc. as the assemblages and intersections of lived experiences are revealed. The sedimentation might, in effect, be the projection of a semblance of order that highlights one ordering in time and space while effaces other situated possibilities. These ideas call me to consider whether, without the sedimentation, there can even be a body or a body of knowledge. If we recognize and identify the sedimentation process and the habits or default settings that have sedimented these over time, are bodies and archives able to embody multiple subjectivities and ways of being and knowing that can enable and sustain (un)becoming? Or will sedimentation processes, perhaps, work as forces of assimilation that further discourage haphazard and unscripted rhizomatic (un)becomings?

**Container Technologies: The Contained and Containing Body**

The body is porous and holds the technés and technologies of lived experiences and everyday social and cultural normalizing strategies that are often invisibilized through everyday use. The body is a container of technés. However, the body is also contained and bound by these same technés. In his essay on “The Thing,” Heidegger meditates on a jug and argues that the jug for him is not just an object that he looks at and ponders, but a “thing in itself which has been created in a process of making” with its character “as a thing” residing in its being “qua vessel,” that is, its capacity as a container. The body, too, is an active container that collects, stores, and shares experiences that also reinforces the outer dermis—the façade—and, through re-sourcing and becoming a source itself, gushes forth and makes the body intelligible culturally and socially.

The bodily façade—specifically but not exclusively, the face—is a sort of container that holds the signifier and the signified, but importantly for the body and notions of embodiment as archival practice, the face is machinic as it produces itself and “it performs the facialization of the entire body and all its surroundings and objects, and the landscapification of all worlds and milieus.”

The movements, processes, and temporalities of timing, speed, and pace of deterritorialization and reterritorialization are integral in (un)becomings as

---


bodies—human and non-human—and archival bodies of knowledge are called into question about how they are marked and coded as particular beings.

Markings take their places on the white screen—what might be considered the *tabula rasa*—of the face and produce itself as facialized while signifying a particular way of being and knowing. The white screen is an active agent of containment and display for the ongoing deterritorialization and reterritorialization that tell certain stories in and of moments passed. I consider the face and expressive white screen politically charged. For the body and its subjacent face, reterritorialization inescapably suggests a “set of artifices by which one element, itself deterritorialized, serves as a new territoriality for another, which had lost its territoriality as well”\(^{131}\) while the framing and scale of the white screen itself accentuates distinct subjectivities even while the body yoyo yos back and forth between what it produces and how it produces itself perhaps through what might be considered non-normative performance. Whiteness and the white screen have political implications that require further consideration as I work to queer those default standardized and normativized archival practices and structures.

Recalling my experiences in film/video, broadcast TV, and design, I connect the ways that white has related to some sort of default setting. From the camera’s white balance and white point to white on the color spectrum as well as to ideas of white noise, white plays a significant role. In this naming, white holds the hum and reflects the true color against which other colors and sounds can be

qualified. It’s as if white is the status quo and is that against which all can be measured. White as default setting is embodied, inculcated, taught, learned, and continues to be that which constitutes power, sovereignty, colonization, assimilation, and normativization.

Sara Ahmed, in her article “Declarations of Whiteness: The Non-Performativity of Anti-Racism,” urges us to critically engage with whiteness and offers a discursive look at how affect and emotion work as tools and technés of reinscribing whiteness through declarations and announcements as shame-turned-to-pride—a return to the default setting. Whiteness is invisible to those who inhabit it, but blaringly bright for those who do not. Ahmed turns to the bodies themselves and highlights the ways that racism operates to shape the surfaces of bodies:

…race, like sex, is sticky; it sticks to us, or we become ‘us’ as an effect of how it sticks, even when we think we are beyond it. Beginning to live with that stickiness, to think it, feel it, do it, is about creating a space to deal with the effects of racism…Racism has effects, including the diminishing of capacities for action, which is another way of describing the existential and material realities of race…Racism is a way of describing histories of struggle, repeated over time and with force, that have produced the very substance or matter we call inadequately ‘race’.  

Pugliese and Stryker suggest that racism works as a somatechnology in the waging of colonial and imperial wars and urge that we must work to disclose and materialize the following: whiteness as (racial) invisibility (that is, as a category that at once insists on objectifying and rendering its others in racialized terms, even as it effaces its own racial status); and whiteness as normative priori, a position of power that at once renders

---

Returning to the idea of the *shadow archives* from the beginning of this chapter, I argue that the images—the ephemeral projected states of being and knowing—that are produced facially might in effect create the cultural intelligibility of the body itself. If race and sex are sticky and stick to bodies, bodies then are in a sort of captivity through which our very conception of the body becomes invisibilized. Furthermore, the embodied and archived corporeal collection of lived experiences function as a priori determination as moments pass from moment to moment and the earlier moment becomes that foundation to build upon. This presumed static node of time in which we ‘are being’ and the move to we ‘have been’ is that moment that remains invisible to us as we are simultaneously situated in ‘are being.’ The ongoing movements, therefore, liberate the subject from the reliance on the overcoded images and frames that offer a more concrete material representation that might stabilize the subject, but also contain the body.

The invisibility of our *shadow archives* and our very states of being is “enabled, paradoxically, by the very materiality of the body—in other words, a repertoire of gestures, expressions, and practices become invisibilized through the process of lived embodiment.” Reconsider the default settings that the body has archived and marked for easy recall and access. Without the conscious

---


markings, our bodily ways of being are not recognized or recognizable, thus, making those pieces unintelligible. As archival practices relating to appraisal and description, then, the practices of embodiment may not discern according to bodily disposition, but may be collected in an unconscious and haphazard way that may relate more to notions of affect. In fact, the face and facialization of the body ties importantly to performativity and access to emotions and affects. Particular affects link to modes of embodiment through which each form of the body then creates it own milieu so that the body makes and re-makes the world and its existence in the world in a particular way so that the idea of bodily difference—specifically, (un)becomings—might give us a new perspective on the world.

Accessing the Body of Knowledge

*Archives,* as multiply-situated and always (un)becoming, should not be equated with *memory* because, keeping in mind the multimodalities of archival collection, organization, preservation, and accessibility through bodily comportments, such an equivalence might elicit further inquiries into definitions of memory that take fragmented subjective bodies—human and non-human—and bodies of knowledges—those that constitute archives—into consideration, which might delimit this project’s move towards posthuman perspectives on archives.

Working within the field of memory studies is beyond the scope of this chapter, but a space from which to remind ourselves that the scope of memory studies builds out “from how individuals remember in isolation, to how the larger social and cultural context influences individual memories, to how groups and communities forge a common ‘social’ or ‘collective’ memory.”\textsuperscript{136} The body’s archival reservoir of images, experiences, and technés is accessed in conscious and unconscious performance, performativity, remembering, and forgetting.

Archival theorists, Terry Cook, Joan Schwartz, and Eric Ketelaar\textsuperscript{137} call us to question the scripts—the tacit knowledges—that inform the stories being told and those that we subsequently tell ourselves. They suggest that these \textit{scripts} have been performed over and over again so many times that they’ve become invisible and, therefore, naturalized and normativized. These same scripts can become dominant narratives that can inform archival practices and collections.

Radical interrogations of the archival body might, therefore, elucidate the scripts and normalized archival practices and practices of embodiment in order to highlight the somatechnical \textit{capillary} spaces through which transdisciplinary methodologies can emerge as part of a Queer/ed Archival Methodology that I will spell out in Chapter 5. Throughout this chapter, I have argued for the ways that individual embodiment might be considered an archival practice and archival practice an embodied act. Understanding the technés and technologies that bodies

\textsuperscript{136} Hedstrom, “Archives and Collective Memory,” 165.

collect, store, and perform is important when questioning how we access the body as body of knowledge—as the archives.

**Practical Engagements with Bodies of Knowledge through the Politics of Respectability**

Through my hands-on work collecting oral history interviews for the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project as part of the development of the Arizona Queer Archives, I have observed bodies in motion as bodies (human and non-human), identities, and stories are all in flux, in ongoing states of becoming and unbecoming. Braidotti builds on Deleuze and Guattari’s notion of the *nomadic subject* and argues these patterns of becoming can be visualized alternatively as sequential modes of affirmative deconstruction of the dominant subject-position (masculine/white/heterosexual/speaking a standard language/property-owning/urbanize), or else, as stepping stones to a complex and open-ended process of de-personalization of the subject.\(^{138}\)

Bodies—human and non-human—move through different stages or levels of becoming that trace an itinerary that consists of erasing and recomposing the former boundaries between self and others. Here, I come to understand my own internal and ongoing inclusion and exclusion. Bodies witness their own multiply-situated subjectivities again and again. What can the *scripts* tell us in these shifting and ever-changing metamorphoses?

As I have noted elsewhere, LGBTQ historians Michael Bronski, Vicki L. Eaklor, and Stryker\textsuperscript{139} identify the controlling of bodies through cultivating good traits while eliminating the bad as part of the state project to normalize populations.\textsuperscript{140} Through bio-political strategies, bodies and their non-normative desires and identities continue to exist, but they are disciplined and managed, and such disciplining is implicated in the histories that are told and shared for the archives. For example, shame, guilt, fear, and other self-effacing emotions have also permeated the processes of telling by those in the LGBTQ communities. In order to interrogate the production of stories and especially oral histories that comprise the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project, I use the concept of \textit{politics of respectability} that Deborah Gould deploys in \textit{Moving Politics: Emotion and ACT UP’s Fight Against AIDS} to describe the ways that LGBTQ individuals might perform within and apart form their larger community contexts. She defines \textit{politics of respectability} as “concerned above all with social acceptance, while it entails efforts of some members of a marginalized group both to disprove dominant stereotypes about the group and to regulate and ‘improve’ the behavior of its members in live with socially approved norms.”\textsuperscript{141} As we consider our


bodies as bodies of evidence, the politics of respectability might support a certain adherence to notions (and projects, I might add) of the normative. Generally, these socially approved norms are heteronormative, which Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner define as:

the institutions, structures of understanding, and practical orientations that make heterosexuality seem not only coherent—that is, organized as a sexuality—but also privileged. Its coherence is always provisional, and its privilege can take several (sometimes contradictory) forms; unmarked, as the basic idiom of the personal and the social; or marked, as a natural state; or projected as an ideal or moral accomplishment.¹⁴²

Queer/ed bodies—queer/ed archives—, then, might address and complicate the enduring force of such politics through practices that open up the potentiality of new narratives and re-imagined ways of living, being, and knowing. Non-normative bodies and bodies of knowledges circulate in creases and margins, thus, going unnoticed and becoming invisiblized. A queer/ed archives acknowledges the re-imagined stories and spaces that are in processes of (un)becoming.

Reconsidering Foucault’s quote leading into the chapter and the effects of disciplining on bodies—regulatory and self-regulatory—, Pugliese’s work informs this project by describing the perpetual work of “regimes of assimilation and normativity on bodies.”¹⁴³ Therefore, through the politics of respectability, we can


identify the practices that we each have collected and made accessible in order to fulfill desires of belonging to a collective body.

Although situated in complex networks of space and time, human and non-human,

our bodies are marked by an infinity of traces that, in having been so fully absorbed into our everyday practices are largely invisible—they are practices without an inventory. Thinking about our bodies as living archives would compel us...to begin to materialize this invisible inventory and to begin to name and identify the forces that have worked so assiduously to create those lacunae and omissions that constitute our lived histories.\(^\text{144}\)

The politics of respectability work against—and with, in some ways—bodies and bodies of knowledges through layers of multimodalities and (un)becomings. Therefore, our embodied archives might be the official archives as the machinic assemblage of technés for the production of subjugated knowledges as sets of knowledges that have been “disqualified as nonconceptual knowledge”\(^\text{145}\) as it expresses other ways of being and knowing. The embodied subject may be an alternative to the traditionally understood official archives, but in effect is also a part of and constituted by the official archives.

Findings in the Archives: Hauntings of Normativity

As a project committed to queer/ed and transdisciplinary approaches, interrogating the archival body and bodies of knowledges might require the

\(^{144}\) Ibid., 4.

\(^{145}\) Ibid., 4.
conscious recognition of the force and function of the politics of respectability at play in selective remembering and forgetting. I draw from Avery F. Gordon’s book, *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*, and her concept of *haunting* to critically engage select oral history interviews from the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project of the Arizona Queer Archives to consider those spaces where *ghostly matter* linger within the constructions and reconstructions that interviewees move through in their life’s narration as they select and deselect what they feel needs to be remembered and what needs to be forgotten. Aspirations to normalcy are normativizing strategies that regulate stories, bodies, desires, and the spaces through which we make meaning. One strategy for such a recognition is to be attuned to the complicated ways of being, knowing, and living in order to create spaces of access that can be creative, ambivalent, fearful, hopeful, and even incongruent.\(^{146}\)

Through careful discourse and thematic analysis of the videos and transcripts of the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project’s oral history interviews that I have collected since 2008, I observe the variety of ways that interviewees demonstrate how *normal* they are and speak about being “the best they can be.” Utilizing auto-ethnographic field notes and careful observation, I have come to better understand this storytelling practice through the politics of respectability together with the concept of *homonormativity*, which Lisa Duggan defines as “a politics that does not contest dominant heteronormative assumptions and institutions, but upholds and sustains them, while promising the possibility of a

\(^{146}\) Lee. “Beyond Pillars of Evidence.”
demobilized gay constituency and a privatized, depoliticized gay culture anchored in domesticity and consumption”¹⁴⁷—which goes hand-in-hand with invitations to and complacency in “good citizenship” and the US nation-state formation. In the 1956 Mattachine Society brochure, the push to be “good” in order to be accepted by society is emphasized: “…For only as they make positive contributions to the general welfare can they expect acceptance and full assimilation into the communities in which they live.”¹⁴⁸ However, as Sullivan points out and what I find as indicative of bodies and bodies of knowledges as (un)becoming through a generative third space, LGBTQ historian Martin Meeker claims the Mattachine Society adopted “a practice of dissimulation, rather than simply promoting assimilation, donning a ‘Janus-faced mask of respectability’ which enabled them to ‘speak’ simultaneously to homosexuals and homophobic heterosexuals and to communicate very different ideas to each population, during a time when the latter exerted considerable power over the former’.”¹⁴⁹ Heteronormativity and homonormativity along with the politics of respectability create a very narrow threshold for non-dominant national ideals along with hauntings of practices of self-regulation, which further challenge notions of authenticity and truth, but highlight for me the potential of a Queer/ed Archival Methodology to hold such contested and contradictory stories as multiple truths.


¹⁴⁸ Mattachine Society brochure, 1956.

One common theme that has emerged within interviews is that of same-sex marriage. The majority of interviewees mention it with ideas about finally “belonging” and “being accepted” while just a few subvert the notions of marriage altogether. In support of same-sex marriage, Eve Rifkin, in her 30 September 2009 interview, explains that she and her partner have not had a ceremony. We have talked about having a ceremony once we have a child and doing kind of a family ceremony. We’re—we’ve both been married. Neither of us are interested necessarily in getting married again, although I think we’ve changed a little over time. At this point, we’re not interested in having a ceremony in the state of Arizona. If we want to get married, then—and we’re also not interested in going to a state, getting married, and coming back to Arizona. I think that if we, um, I think that if things don’t change in the state of Arizona within the next three to five years, then we probably will leave and move to a place that recognizes same-sex couples as real human beings.\footnote{Eve Rifkin oral history interview, 30 September 2009}

As becomes apparent in Eve’s testimony, she and her partner have been contemplating marriage, but feel thwarted by anti-gay legislation in the state of Arizona. Her last sentence instantiates the hauntings of the dehumanizing biopolitical strategies that, as Scott Lauria Morgenson argues in “Settler Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler
Colonialism within Queer Modernities,” have been “terrorizing” LGBTQ bodies since the later 19th century. The haunting here shows traces of the liberal, neoliberal, and rights-based movement that started in the 1970s and also extended backward into the earlier ideas of assimilation during the development of the homophile movement of the 1950s and 1960s with groups such as the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis. Today, this aspiration for normalized civil rights has become deeply embedded in LGBTQ lives and, furthermore, communities have become inculcated in these desires for acceptance so that many embody homonormativity.

In the event of the oral history interview, heteronormativity and homonormativity also haunt the exchange through the interviewer’s lived experiences and entrenched normativities. In his 10 April 2010 interview, Les Krambeal, for example, states that he and his partner, Gordon, have been together for twenty years, “I mean, how more married can you be? I have straight friends that were not even married half that time.” However, throughout his interview Les mentions another man named Juan who has been a rock for him through his cancer treatments. At the end of the interview, Ryn, the heterosexual male interviewer, asks “I’m kind of curious about your relationship—Juan, Gordon, and yourself. How do you negotiate that?”


152 Les Krambeal oral history interview, 10 April 2010.
Here is an excerpt from the oral history transcript that highlights for me the ways that even interviewers bring their own shadow archives and embodiments to shape questions in particular ways:

**KRAMBEAL:** How do we negotiate what?

**RYN (INTERVIEWER):** Are you all physically and romantically involved with each other?

**KRAMBEAL:** The three of us? Yes.

**RYN:** That’s a very interesting dynamic. I think there’s a lot of folks that are interested, how do you negotiate time and jealousy?

**KRAMBEAL:** Jealousy has never been an issue.

**RYN:** Really? How are you able to overcome that?

**KRAMBEAL:** I don’t know that I had to overcome it. I have no doubt in my mind or in my soul that Gordon loves me. I know he does. His actions every day tell me so. Juan has been with us now for four years. And the same would be true for Juan. He’s a very kind, gentle, and loving person. He wouldn’t do anything to make you jealous. He is as attentive to Gordon as he is to me. Certainly my attention is to both of them. It’s an interesting dynamic because I’m attracted to older men. Gordon has always been attracted to younger men. I sort of feel like I was really lucky to get his attention because I’m only ten years younger.
than him. But it works for us and it works very well. If you saw our master bedroom, we have the biggest bed you’ve ever seen because it’s a bed for three. (CHUCKLES)

The haunting can only be recovered in this instance because the recorded dialogue—not only testimony of interviewee—and its verbatim transcript in its entirety reside in the queer/ed archives. At times, there seems to be a missing public narrative within which to frame how this non-normative relational knowledge is further understood, interpreted, and translated. Les, Gordon, and Juan and how they together define their relationship requires a space in the archival body alongside Eve and her partner who await legal marriage opportunities to symbolize their belonging. The archival bodies and bodies of knowledges instantiate the multiplicities of lived experiences, desires, and meaning.

I turn now to Jon Stetson’s oral history interview conducted on 2 December 2008 at Saint Francis in the Foothills Methodist Church. The interview event—the assemblage of interviewer, interviewee, and camera—took place in Jon’s selected location, which had become a safe space for him to feel loved and accepted. He felt like he was supposed to be there. “It was God’s purpose” for him to be gay and to be in the church as an openly gay Christian man.

Jon shared a traumatic history. Early in his oral history interview, Jon told of how the church had rejected him and was used as fodder for his family and friends to further reject him. He explained how he was proud of himself for “not allowing society to take away my faith. As an eight-year-old boy with polio, I
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153 Les Krambeal oral history interview, 10 April 2010.
asked God ‘why am I here?’” Jon initially summed up his coming out as a tremendous loss of his wife, kids, and lover and he followed up with his own feelings of death. “I lost it all,” he cried. “I didn’t know how to start all over again. I was depressed and suicidal.”

Later in our interview, he told the more detailed story of “coming out” to his wife and mother. In this response, Jon was emotional, but was more emphatic and retrospectively could identify and share the humor of his family’s response. Watching the video oral history shows the embodied knowing of the experiences themselves as well as the new becomings of telling his stories in front of a video camera with an interviewer sitting three feet from him. Having an audience known (me) and unknown (online access through the Arizona Queer Archives web presence) right there in the narthex of his church moved him into an animated state of storytelling techniques. His wife was shocked and then immediately told Jon that he would have to tell his mother. Here is the excerpt from Jon’s interview:

My mother had a lot of problems with it...it was the same day that I had come out to my wife because my mother happened to be visiting in an RV outside our door. My wife’s response was...when I came out to my wife, it was relatively easy because it was so in front of her that I just thought she knew and wasn’t talking about. (Quietly) So, I said, “I am sure you know, but I think it’s time we had it out in the open.” And her response was, (Loudly. Smiling. Waves his arms in a large gesture away from his body.) “Well, I didn’t know, but your mother has to know” and she ran outside and got my mother and brought her back in. And coming out to my mother was a lot more difficult than coming out to my wife and I kept breaking down and crying and breaking down and crying. My mother said, “Jon, what is this awful demon that is possessing you? Nothing is that bad. Nothing is that bad. I’m your mother. I love you. You can tell me. Just tell me what is bothering you so much.” (Loudly and with a quivering voice) “Mom, I’m gay!” (Throws his arms into the air and leans back in his
“Oh, my God, it is that bad!” (Laughter with arms still above his head) “Oh, no. No. No, it’s okay. We can pray and get you over that.” (Pause)

I will never forget her response as long as I live. She denies that that’s how she responded to that, but that’s how she did. Later in the day, she came to me and told me, she says (Moves from sitting erect in his chair to leaning forward and slumped with hands folded on the table) “Jon, I know that you’ve not had a good marriage, but you will meet the right girl and this will all be behind us. And we will work with God and get you over this.” So, religiously she had a real hard time with it and for three years, uh, my very very close relationship with my mother no longer existed. (Pause with a hard swallow because he is starting to cry) My mother and I were very close because of my bout with polio and she was a registered nurse and was right by my side every minute and played a major role in keeping me alive. (Long pause) So, after she learned of that, you know, we spent three years where we just kept drifting further and further apart...Well, it got her thinking about all of this and now she is a gay rights activist.

The ongoing processes of (un)becoming in Jon’s stories highlights the episodic nature of lives, recorded lived histories, and subsequently the oral history interviews as evidentiary records in the archives ready for access. The video oral
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154 Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project, oral history archive. Interview with Jon Stetson from 2 December 2008.
history interview displays the bodies in the telling of the story so that affect and emotion are revealed as our memories and ways we recount them might change and/or override one another so that one is more readily accessible for the viewer. As the interviewer and active participant in this oral history interview process, I also consider the MiniDV tapes as containers of lived histories that will enter into the archives. I, too, am a container holding the memories of this event and exchange and, as archivist, will carry these shadow archives\footnote{Joseph Pugliese, “Embodied Archives.”} into my hands-on work to make Jon’s story contextually connected to other stories in the collection while also accessible in meaningful ways for visitors to the archives. As our stories are organized within bodies and then let out, looking and listening closely might assist in recognizing the ways that the archives also tells through the embodiment and practices of collecting, preserving, and making accessible.

**Archival Practice as Embodied Act**

They were nothing more than people by themselves. Even paired, any pairing, they were nothing more than people by themselves. But in a group, they formed the heart and muscle and mind of something perilous and new. Something strange and growing and great. Together, all together, they are the instruments of change.

--Keri Hulme\footnote{Keri Hulme, *The Bone People*, (Picador, 1986).}

Just as individual embodiment can be considered an archival practice, so, too can archival practice be considered an embodied act. While the archives functions as a container and the archivalization process as a techné that is
embodied and accessed in everyday archival development, the body of knowledge, too, is in standing-reserve—“characterizing the manner in which everything commanded into place and ordered according to the challenging demand ruling in modern technology presences as revealed”\(^{157}\)—to connect, envelop, ingest, weed, discard, or gush forth the ways of knowing that may come and go within the assemblage of (un)becoming in the archives. In “Container Technologies,” Zoë Sofia argues that space, meaning unfilled and in standing-reserve, is not passive and feminine, but as reconfigured into containment as an (inter)active process. She offers examples of embodied identities that are contingent on their container and containment functions\(^{158}\) and statuses within the flow of embodiment and its (un)becoming moments. The archives and the body wait in standing-reserve, much like Foucault’s *docile bodies* that actively await direction and action.

The archives, as concept, location, and practice, ingests peoples’ memories and histories and, in the process of archivalization, can make accessible those assembled histories that may reinforce the dominant narratives and more sedimented lived knowledges. By contrast, the process of archivalization may also or instead highlight those assembled histories that resist normativizing forces to reveal those less normative or altogether non-normative records—bodies of knowledges—that may be more intimate, queered, non-dominant. The archives,


as the body within the process of (un)becoming, negotiates the inside/outside terrain to sift through and make visible normalized knowledges as well as those subjugated knowledges. Normalized knowledges are called upon and accessed again and again as they have been incorporated into bodies as the bodies’ histories and, therefore, form the structures through which possibilities and new social imaginaries might be structured and understood. Subjugated knowledges require deeper inquiry as they are often invisibilized within such a symbolic social ordering. Archival practice might consider those spaces in which the bodies of knowledges—normalized and subjugated—can each be legible and accessible.

Although archival practice becomes sedimented in its everyday use, it can also be unsettled in everyday use. In her article “A Voice Without Organs: Interviewing in Posthumanist Research,” Liza A. Mazzei also deploys Deleuze and Guattari’s assemblage to expand on their definition as a desiring machine, “that which provides connections for plugging in forces, flows, and intensities…with no subjectivity or center, the machine is a hub of connections and productions…that offers the possibility of transformation, proliferation, and becoming.” Looking at and approaching the archives from the somatechnic perspective sheds light on its rudimentary inter- and intra-connection with memory and the body belonging to its own assemblage of (un)becomings. The stories that the archives tells, then, reflects the performative nature of bodies in

---

motion still connected to their histories, but also with momentum gathering in the
disorganized and unscripted interstices of past, present, and future.

The Body

Interest in notions of a single past, an unattainable but real sense of historical truth, has been displaced by a sense of past plural and of past imperfect, a past that emphasizes the ‘becoming’ rather than the ‘became.’ History, then, is a series of spaces where each individual is free to determine a past—some based on archives and some not.

--Francis X. Blouin, Jr.\textsuperscript{160}

The archives is comprised of bodies of knowledges that are collected, structured, and organized in multiple ways through archival practices that create access points and various nodes of connections. Bodies of knowledges are constituted by collections, records, along with series and subseries, metadata and a plethora of description standards that tell the stories not only of the bodies of knowledges themselves, but of the archiving archives as the structuring body. The archives is the corporeal body in its physical and digital presence. The archives tells of its machinic assemblages of archival structuring principles which often are sedimented within representational practices along with material repercussions that might normalize the parts of the bodies of knowledges so as to adhere to a particular socially accepted status. Considering archival practice, then, as an embodied act, I recognize that adherence might be risky as archivists work toward

\textsuperscript{160} Francis X. Blouin, Jr., “Archivists, Mediation, and Constructs of Social Memory,” \textit{Archival Issues} 24, no. 2 (1999): 110.
inclusivity. Adherence to socially accepted statuses also implicates distinct archival practices related to documentation and collection strategies that are influenced by three particular archival models: 1) the *Total Archives* approach in Canada\(^{161}\) that emphasizes the inclusive documentation strategy; 2) the *Life Cycle* model\(^{162}\) for managing records implemented predominantly in the US that emphasizes a linear and modern approach to recordkeeping and archival practices; and 3) the *Records Continuum* theory and model to understand archival records as having continuing value, which was developed in Australia.\(^{163}\) Each approach might participate in the archival legibility as the relationships between the internal machinic assemblages and the greater structuring body form a particular bodily being as archives. Archival performance and performativity then is intelligible as
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\(^161\) Total Archives is a documentation strategy developed in Canada as an attempt to document the political and social history of the country. Total archives emphasizes the collection of records, both public and private, in a wide range of media, including architectural drawings, cartographic material, audio-visual records, and microfilm. Although the strategy evolved over a period of more than one hundred years, the concept of Total Archives was not formally articulated until 1980 in a report to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (Ottawa, 1980). The report explains Total Archives as an “attempt to document all aspects of historical development, seeking the records not just of officialdom or of a governing elite but of all segments of a community...” by “combining official administrative records and related private files, architectural drawings, maps, microfilm, and other documentary forms all touching on the development of the organization or region” (The Consultative Group on Canadian Archives, 63-64).


\(^162\) The life cycle model for managing records, as articulated by Theodore Schellenberg and others, has been the prominent model for North American archivists and records managers since at least the 1960s. This model portrays the life of a record as going through various stages or periods, much like a living organism. This model is very linear and progression-oriented which follows the modern approaches to archives, but is still relevant and embodied in U.S. contemporary recordkeeping practices today. See the Society of American Archivists website: [http://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/l/life-cycle](http://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/l/life-cycle).

\(^163\) See Sue McKemmish, “Placing Records Continuum Theory and Practice,” *Archival Science* 1 (2002). McKemmish and Frank Upward were instrumental in the development of the Records Continuum, which is still in practice and ongoing reimagining as they consider the various and multiple relationships between records, records creators, power, and time.
memories, histories, and records—the bits and pieces of archives—is sedimented and, therefore, representational in the larger archival endeavor whether one culls together all archives, follows the record through distinct life stages, or in what I might consider a posthumanist manner, acknowledges the participants—human and non-human—of records creation throughout an ongoing—(un)becoming—process through time and space. Following Stryker and Sullivan, the relationships between the “collective body politic and the individual corporeality”\textsuperscript{164} is representational and material. Feminist philosopher Rosalyn Diprose expands on this:

The regimes of social regulation, which dictate the right way to live, implicitly or explicitly seek to preserve the integrity of every body such that we are compatible with the social body. Not only do these thereby dictate which embodied existences can be transformed by whom and to what end but, as it is here that comparisons are made and values born, not all bodies are counted as socially viable. In short, the privilege of a stable place within that social and political place we call the ‘common good’ is secured at the cost of denigrating and excluding others.\textsuperscript{165}

The archives dictates, through its organizational embodiment, the structuring structures of bodies and bodies of knowledges so that some are legible while others remain invisibilized. Again, like bodies, consider the archives, then, as one of Heidegger’s \textit{things}, through which the archives as a container technology holds records and then shares them through an outpouring of sorts. This process is what is produced by and what produces the archives. The nature of the archives as the

\textsuperscript{164} Susan Stryker and Nikki Sullivan, “King’s Member, Queen’s Body: Transsexual Surgery, Self-Demand Amputation and the Somatechnics of Sovereign Power,” \textit{Somatechnics: Queering the Technologisation of Bodies}. Ashgate: 2009, 52.

structuring body to hold, organize, and share records is concealed along with the individual embodied practices that the archivists and other archival laborers enact on a regular basis. Therefore, the archival practices become embodied acts through the larger archives as body as well as the archival machinic assemblages of archivists, records, technologies, records creators, and users of the archives. Much like the Records Continuum theory and approach, the archives as body is constituted by many human and non-human participants through time and space.

**Accessing the Body of Knowledge**

Bluetooth. Wireless signals haunting my office and moving in, around, and through me. QWERTY language dictating my digits and digital access to communicating right now and with whomever has signal. Words and images hold the space of the shadow archives and many traces of historicity transport the archives user to memories, feelings, sensational—sensate knowing of and tethering to life lived and living in constant contact with the human and non-human material world. The archival façade—its interface, its point of contact—is an opening that shifts in ways to reveal its own inner workings so as to reflexively see the archival self and its machinic productions. Queer theorists, Jack Halberstam and Ira Livingston note through their work highlighting the multimodalities and multiplicities within their own critique of transnational culture and capital that “Posthumanity is not about making an authentic culture or an organic community but about multiple viabilities.”\footnote{166} Performance studies scholar, Diana Taylor critically engages Judith Butler’s notion of performativity, which suggests a process of socialization that produces identities through regulating, citational, and discursive practices, to highlight that through normalization the process is, therefore, rendered invisible\footnote{167} and performativity, then, must be untangled from its tightly integrated realm of discourse as hierarchically more viable than performance. In the posthuman approach to archives, the idea of multiple viabilities as performative is the key inquiry into the


archiving archives and the bits and pieces that have gone missing or at least have become sedimented and invisibilized in their everyday uses. Taylor suggests that we use a word from the contemporary Spanish usage of performance—

“performático or performatic in English—to denote the adjectival form of the nondiscursive realm of performance...because it is vital to signal the performatic, digital, and visual fields as separate form, though always embroiled with, the discursive one so privileged by Western logocentrism.”

As performative and discursive in its archival enactment, the archives presents its access points, its interfaces, through physical and virtual connection. The door may open up and visitors may enter. Or the computational digital programming may collect necessary regulatory data to give specific access to collections and records.

The digital video-produced oral history interview is a key example of the multimodalities of accessing the body as an archival body of knowledge. Halberstam and Livingston urge us, as scholars and practitioners, to ask: “what is happening to your body?” There are bodily master narratives that authorize a very narrow range of responses and these are often constituted in the default settings of bodily habitus as well as the archival practices that archivists perform while archiving the archives. Responses to the question then will highlight the stages within the process from living to dying along with the empirical markings, such as weight, age, size, and the more obvious events of sickness. Through opening up the possible responses to bodily modifications such as ear piercing

---


and tattooing, relevant lived experiences might be expressed, especially the changing of gender or sexuality so that “my sexual practices are re-configuring my body.” Importantly for the posthuman and somatechnic approaches to bodies and archives, the body is “becoming variously cyborgized (re-integrated with machine parts or across various networks). It is changing its dimensions, not by getting smaller or larger, but by being rhythmed across different sets of relations.” The archives as body and bodies of knowledges, then, might experience such bodily modifications if it is open to shifting terrain that engaging in a posthuman approach might elicit through its recognition of the human/non-human assemblages as parts of the ever evolving records continuum process and archives as always becoming.

**Bodies as Archives / Archives as Bodies: A Queer/ed Instantiation**

Archives are always in a state of becoming; they are always in transition. --Anne Gilliland

Bodies (un)become, just as archives do, always already in relation to the technés that have formed and reformed their bodily ways they work in the world. Marlene Manoff, in “Theories of the Archive from Across the Disciplines,”

---

170 Halberstam, 18.

171 Halberstam, 18.

recognizes that the methods for transmitting information shape the nature of the knowledge that can be produced. For example, the archival technology, and, I argue, the technés involved in archival practice, determine what can be archived and therefore accessed. Thus, Derrida claims “archivization produces as much as it records the event.”

The archives as constituted by bodies of knowledges, all working machinic assemblages of locatedness and lived knowledges, shares with bodies themselves the processes of selection and arrangement to make legible and visible only certain parts of the whole, but with the knowing that the whole is also a container with traces and ghosts of previous and future moments and movements.

Archival practices that are embodied can recognize the inside/outside terrain of what and how history is always already a negotiated and contested/contestable space and practice. Through a somatechnics approach, bodies and bodies of knowledge can be understood as always (un)becoming. Embodied archival practice and embodiment as an archival practice can work together to change ways of knowing along with the archival paradigms that are working towards radical openness. The Queer/ed Archival Methodology, therefore, must necessarily be robust and open to the changing nature of bodies of knowledges and the episodic and ephemeral contextual interconnectedness.

---

 CHAPTER FOUR

THE RECORD AND ITS RECORDNESS:
RE-IMAGINING TEMPORALITIES TO CHALLENGE THE ARCHIVES AS
BODY OF KNOWLEDGE

Newton visualized time as an arrow flying towards its target. Einstein understood time as a river, moving forward, forceful, directed, but also bowed, curved, sometimes subterranean, not ending but pouring itself into a greater sea. A river cannot flow against its current, but it can flow in circles; its eddies and whirlpools regularly break up its strong press forward. The river's run is maverick, there is a high chance of cross-current, a snag of time that returns without warning to a place we thought we had sailed through long since.

--Jeanette Winterson\textsuperscript{174}

History—like the future—is a medium for dreaming about the transformation of social life. Such dreams bear little resemblance to the predictions of a scientific Marxism: they are wild dreams, desires so powerful that they disrupt the linear temporality of progressive history.

--Heather Love\textsuperscript{175}

Archival Temporalities

Introduction

Recent decades have witnessed an ongoing shifting and reimagining of archival practice, from static processes and locations toward evolving spaces that are being reimagined and reconstructed as open and dynamic in potent and


generative ways. As archives have been entrenched in modern notions of objectivity, truth, and the static nature of records since *The Dutch Manual*, archival theories and practices today are considered “a reflection of and often justification for the society that creates them.”\(^{176}\) In efforts to identify the layers of context—the intentionally situated as well as the accidentally accumulated—that constitute, serpentine through, and haunt archival collections (physical and digital), many archivists are frequently looking towards transdisciplinary approaches and methodological practices.

Sue McKemmish and Anne Gilliland identify two prevalent methodologies in the archival world. The first is a set of ideas articulated about “Archive Science since the Enlightenment and influenced by modern, scientific thinking and positivism” that archives are “unconscious and therefore objective by-products of bureaucratic activity, that records follow a predictable lifecycle, and that custody is integral to archival management.”\(^{177}\) The second methodology is much more cognizant of its temporal implications and focuses on the Australian Records Continuum approach,\(^{178}\) which, influenced by postmodern thinking, views “recordkeeping as a continually interacting and evolving set of contingent
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activities with individual, institutional, and societal aspects.”¹⁷⁹ In their article titled “Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory,” Joan M. Schwartz and Terry Cook highlight the archival/historical trajectory in order to point out the role power plays within the archives and the stories it tells:

Historians since the mid-nineteenth century, in pursuing the new scientific history, needed an archive that was a neutral repository of facts. Until very recently, archivists obliged by extolling their own professional myth of impartiality, neutrality, and objectivity. Yet archives are established by the powerful to protect or enhance their position in society. Through archives, the past is controlled. Certain stories are privileged and others marginalized. And archivists are an integral part of this story-telling.¹⁸⁰

Schwartz and Cook emphasize the power that circulates and resides in the hands of the archivist to include and exclude, shape and control the past, and actively participate in the stories that the archives tells.

In addition to differing methodologies among archivists, thinking about the nature of archives has also evolved in recent years. Historically, archival education has been pragmatic in the instruction of archival practice. According to one instructional manual which circulates widely in many beginning archival studies classrooms, the archival mission has three elements: “1) to identify records of enduring value, 2) to preserve them, and 3) to make them available to patrons.”¹⁸¹ Only recently has the term ‘enduring’ replaced the term ‘permanent’
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because archivists know that most records will not last forever.\footnote{Ibid., 3.} Considering the paradigm shift from modern to postmodern, replacing the finite term, ‘permanent,’ with a gerund, ‘enduring,’ ending with ‘-ing’ to denote movement, provides indication of evolving shifts in thinking among archivists as well as provides opportunity to consider the opening up of the archival view of the record and its recordness or what constitutes a record. Archivists, through a queer, queering, and queer/ed archival approach, might recognize, then, that archives contain “different histories of transition between old and new modes of representation.”\footnote{Jack Halberstam, \textit{In a Queer Time & Place: Transgender Bodies, Subcultural Lives.} (New York: New York University Press, 2005), 104.} Therefore, considering that the record can be further enriched by an understanding of the influential nature of temporal perspectives, an archival paradigm that acknowledges distinct and diverse temporal perspectives can thus elicit transdisciplinary and generative understandings of even the normativized—what has become normal and normative through repetition and consent—progressions of time, everyday rhythms, and those markers that the traditional archival records might embody.

In movement, questions unsettle and settle the known and that yet to be known. I consider these paradigmatic moves as those that promote inventory taking of archival practices, structures, collections, as well as the records themselves. The paradigmatic move from a fixed position to one that is moving indicates, following queer theorist Elizabeth Freeman’s work in \textit{Time Binds:}
Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories, the revealing of “the ligaments binding the past and the present.” Consider the ligament as that flexible yet steadying part. As Walter Benjamin suggests “a historical materialist cannot do without the notion of a present which is not a transition, but in which time stands still and has come to stop.” As the records—physical and digital—of our lives multiply within archival collections, people may come to think that we know ourselves in time, when, according to Carolyn Steedman in Dust: The Archive and Cultural History, “all we know is a sequence of fixations in the spaces of the being’s stability—a being who does not want to melt away, and who, even in the past, wants time to ‘suspend’ its flight.” The bodies and bodies of knowledges that constitute the archival collections embody those moments of fixation and are tethered only fleetingly. Indeed, records creators—producers and consumers of the archives—can benefit from moving archives, specifically, those not tethered in perpetuity, as well as from the becoming and unbecoming records therein.

My greater research project, thus, pushes at contemporary boundaries of archival theory and practice by focusing on archives in ways that simultaneously embrace turbulence and destabilize chrononormativity, what Freeman defines as the normative ways that time is used to organize and structure human bodies in

---

184 Elizabeth Freeman, Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories (Duke University Press, 2010), 155.


order to promote maximum productivity. Such a project to interrogate the archival body and bodies of knowledges therein is provoked by an anticipatory temporality, which Jasbir Puar defines in *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonalism in Queer Times*, as “a modality that seeks to catch a small hold of many futures, to invite futurity even as it refuses to script it.” If the ligament between past, present, and future is loosely secure, the script might be somewhat visible, but it’s the ligament’s flexibility and dynamism that can open the archives to the potential of many futures. As I consider and develop the Queer/ed Archival Methodology throughout this project, creating spaces for possible futures to emerge is key to queer world-making efforts through which one might “imagine a remade public sphere in which minoritarian subject’s eyes are no longer marginal.” Transdisciplinary approaches – those that burst through traditional academic and disciplinary boundaries in order to generate new and re-imagined spaces and practices – provide avenues for considering temporality in ways that are in line with the guiding principles of this greater research project which considers archives, bodies, practices, records, and stories as simultaneously becoming and unbecoming within multiply-situated locations, identities, and timescapes. Indeed, notions of temporality as described in this chapter can challenge the archives as a body of knowledge in ways that have pushed the
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boundaries of how archivists and archival theorists understand the changing nature of the record along with the stories that the record tells. In this chapter, I draw from my research at the Transgender Archives in Canada alongside my hands-on practical research and archival development in the Arizona Queer Archives to argue that approaches to temporality, with a focus on queering, haunting, and decolonizing, not only challenge understandings of the archives as a static body of knowledge, but also influence the basic foundations for what enters the archives and how it can be read and understood.

The Record
A Reflexive Spatial and Temporal Interpretation

The archival record has had a place throughout many disciplines as archivists have worked to add value to their collections within archives by highlighting their validity and their role in telling the real story. In the past, the record has been identified as something that would provide evidence for generations across generations while it represented the Western “desire to find or locate, or possess that moment of origin as the beginning of things.” Following the notions of evidence, proof, and accountability, the Society of American Archivists defines record as

1. A written or printed work of a legal or official nature that may be used as evidence or proof; a document.
2. Data or information that has been fixed on some medium; that has content, context, and structure; and that is

\(^{190}\) Steedman, 3
used as an extension of human memory or to demonstrate accountability. 

3. Data or information in a fixed form that is created or received in the course of individual or institutional activity and set aside (preserved) as evidence of that activity for future reference.191

With the influx of born-digital records and questions of “the fixed form” along with shifts within the custodial paradigm, thus, eliciting questions as to how original materials may not (ever) represent authenticity, McKemmish suggests that “the loss of physicality that occurs when records are captured electronically is forcing archivists to reassess basic understandings about the nature of the records…and their qualities as evidence. Even when they are captured in a medium that can be felt and touched, records as conceptual constructs do not coincide with records as physical objects.”192 In the archives, digital and physical records interact with one another through provenance, description, and access. Consider their contextual landscapes interacting to then co-construct new contexts together. With this accidental assembling within the archives, archivists might highlight for visitors to the archives that even records as physical objects are always conceptual constructs. Records—digital and physical—exist in the archives to commingle yet, through archival description, might remain set apart as disparate forms in order for users to best understand their evidentiary value.


In her recent book *Conceptualizing 21st-Century Archives*, Gilliland pulls together international research from David Bearman and McKemmish\textsuperscript{193} to warn archivists and record-keepers of the ways that even definitions of such common concepts as the *record* may, in fact, constitute inherent national contingencies\textsuperscript{194} which inevitably need to be addressed as archival research crosses international borders. My research within the Transgender Archives at the University of Victoria in British Columbia, Canada, highlighted for me the privileged role and visibility of whiteness in a global scale along with the more traditional definitions of the record as paper- and document-focused throughout their collections. However, my hands-on work developing the Arizona Queer Archives along the U.S./Mexico border offered a process-focused records collection advocacy within distinct and multiply-situated non-normative communities that has opened archival and community ideas about what constitutes a record in ways that are seemingly incongruent with what is being collected and how records are being collected in Canada. In this instantiation of Gilliland’s heed to archivists working in global contexts, the Transgender Archives (Canada)—self-identified as “the world’s largest representing 17 countries”\textsuperscript{195}—and the Arizona Queer Archives (US)—representing the state of Arizona—carry distinct considerations of records and their recordness as determined by community contexts ranging in scope from


\textsuperscript{195} Brochure from the Transgender Archives, March 2014.
global to local, and, moreover, determined by the archives’ and archivists’ relationship with the communities themselves and what knowledges—material and psychic—circulate and might be collected in relevant and respectful ways.

Similarly, and in a more localized context, I argue that archival attention is required for research that crosses the shifting and often times ambiguous borders of distinct communities as well as bodies that have often been lumped together under one umbrella term, often an assimilating naming category. According to Kimberly Anderson in her article “The Footprint and the Stepping Foot: Archival Records, Evidence, and Time,” the legal definition of evidence is situated within Western ways of knowing, especially knowing space and time, which is “usually grounded in a physical rather than religion or spiritual cosmology.”

Challenging chrononormativity, then, might further identify the ways that everyday lives are situated in distinct rhythms related to familial structures within heteronormativity as well as homonormativity. Furthermore, when records and evidence are understood as physical entities that reflect only Western concepts of time and rhythm, then their evidence excludes other ways of knowing, such as those knowledges and bodies of knowledges that circulate within and across multiply-situated non-normative communities. Evidentiary value of the record is contingent and relevant in shifting terrain and may never be guaranteed.

Situating Records as Practical Engagements

---

My own archival practice informs this teasing apart of and reimagining of records. Rethinking the form and function of the record through conversations with the donors of the records, often also problematically considered in isolation the ‘records creators,’¹⁹⁷ is integral in opening the archives to ways of knowing that might not constitute the usual and normative structuring principles of the record. Through my hands-on archival development of the Arizona Queer Archives since September 2011, I have worked closely with the LGBTQ communities throughout mainly the metropolitan areas of Arizona, as they were the constituencies who were more readily available to attend community meetings held in Tucson where we discussed overall archival development. In my role as archivist, oral historian, academic, and researcher, I regularly challenged community members to think about and brainstorm ideas about the records that LGBTQ communities were creating and how we should consider their enduring—and endearing¹⁹⁸—value for collecting. After putting together a very basic vision & mission statement, I revised it with community members who wanted to

¹⁹⁷ Identifying a distinct records creator is contradictory to the records continuum’s expanded definition that includes the many and multiple participants that have shaped records form, function, and context over time. In the posthuman archives, I suggest that we must also take into account the many technologies, structures, and those non-human entities that come together in assemblage in time and space to produce as well as consume records in meaningful ways.

¹⁹⁸ In November 2013, community members gathered to walk through the collection and vision policy as well as the collection development policy. I read definitions from the Hunter book on making archives and we talked about the emotional and affective connections that they each had with certain materials that they might consider donating. It was in these conversations that we decided to add ‘endearing’ to the ways we understood value of our material lives. As archivist, I understand the power of records to hold and animate certain emotional and affective registers that almost become a signifier of the material itself. As a description and contextual element, the emotional and affective connections offer glimpses into the greater narrative of our indicial lives always in relation to the human and non-human entities that traverse the path with us towards (un)becoming. Again and again.
participate in the structuring of the Arizona Queer Archives. Our collaborative second draft, dated 11.18.13, highlighted the distinct communities that would constitute this particular archives along with ideas about what records might cross the archival threshold. The *Vision & Mission* reads:

The Arizona Queer Archives of the Institute for LGBT Studies at the University of Arizona works in collaboration with the heterogeneous lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer (LGBTQ), gender non-conforming, and Two Spirit communities throughout Arizona to identify, preserve, and make available records, papers, and ephemera of enduring (and endearing) value that document the distinct histories of these communities. Its mission is twofold:

- to collect and maintain individual stories, papers, photos, videos, oral histories, home movies, artwork, apparel, leathers, mapping/geographies, and other distinct multi-dimensional records that highlight lived insights and knowledges. Areas of collecting interest are specified in a separate Collection Development Policy.

- to collect and maintain records and geographies of enduring value from organizations, community groups, safe spaces, and identified organizational efforts to support LGBTQ lives throughout Arizona.

The Arizona Queer Archives recognizes that the LGBTQ communities are diverse and heterogeneous and hold complicated, contradictory, as well as complementary histories that can all come together here as valid everyday knowledges and truths. The Arizona Queer Archives works to engage with communities to creatively collect, preserve, and share these many histories and memories.

The records tell their own stories of place, space, and time within the contextual elements laid out by their creators as well as the archivists who appraise and describe what constitutes the overall collection. Considering the non/human parts that make up the story’s whole, the pieces may animate distinct evidentiary value.

---

199 Arizona Queer Archives, Vision & Mission Statement developed 11.18.13.
that is situated outside of the traditional archival purview. Jeannette Bastian argues that if archives are going to collect and preserve the “minor narratives, the untold stories, the traces, the whispers, and the expressions of marginalized identities…their success may depend on the availability of evidence…and also the ability of archivists to recognize and accept this evidence into the archives.”

Diana Taylor, in *The Archive and the Repertoire*, asks that if we were to “look through the lens of performed, embodied behaviors, what would we know that we do not know now? Whose stories, memories, and struggles might become visible?” Through a transdisciplinary lens, one that involves moving beyond prescribed containers and containment that I examined as bodies of knowledges in the previous chapter, I argue that archivists might re-imagine their answers to the question: *What is a record?*

**Dis/em/body: Records, Archives, and Constellations of Knowledges**

Following the ideas I set forth in Chapter 3 about understanding archives as bodies and bodies as archives as they are always (un)becoming, I expand more fully on the archival body as temporally situated and yet also always in motion. The archives as a body of knowledge holds a monolithic presence that can be fractured by transdisciplinary approaches to temporality. Such approaches provide
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for the re-envisioning of archives and their records from a body of knowledge to bodies of knowledge and on to bodies of multiple or multiply-situated knowledges. Similar to cultural theorists with their assembly of social ‘texts’ to analyze, the archives holds many ‘texts’ that can be read by many people in many ways. Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, for example, see the archive as a “central metaphorical construct upon which to fashion their perspectives on human knowledge, memory, and power, and a quest for justice.”

Schwartz and Cook draw upon Foucault and suggest that information, like power, does not exist in a vacuum. Steedman argues that the archive is a way of seeing and a way of knowing. Information, therefore, is conflated with power. The archives, its records, and the stories it tells of power—what might be legible and illegible to archivists and patrons alike—may perhaps support and reinforce the distinct social and hegemonic systems and hierarchies and/or perhaps subtly or overtly subvert power structures. Furthermore, Thomas Richards, in The Imperial Archive, discusses the archive as “a utopian space of comprehensive knowledge…not a building, nor even a collection of texts, but the collectively imagined junction of all that was known or knowable,” and seeks to demonstrate how “the imperial archive was a fantasy knowledge collected and united in the service of state and Empire.” As bodies of knowledges, the archives, then, can hold sets of concepts, terms, and experiences that may make up specific domains.

---
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204 Thomas Richards, The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire (London and New York, 1993), 73, 11, 6.
while also connecting and representing the diverse ontologies that can denote the knowledge(s) as sets with identified relationships (i.e., power or otherwise) between those concepts.

In the discipline of information studies, ontologies “are similar to both subject heading lists and thesauri in bringing together all of the variant ways of expressing a concept in showing the relationships of a concept to broader, narrower, and related concepts. They are different, however, in that they do not select one term to be the preferred or authorized term.”205 In archival work, ontologies are distinct parts of working with controlled vocabularies in order to assist archivists and users of archives with discovery and retrieval. The non-hierarchical influence of ontologies on the archives, therefore, follows the notion of metamorphoses206—the (un)becoming—that is indicative of transdisciplinary logic and the reimagined archival approaches that influence the central tenet and tenant of the archives: the record.

Following Brien Brothman’s207 discussion about the changing nature of the record and its recordness, I argue that the paradigmatic shift to a posthuman approach to archives, as I explore in earlier chapters, will de-center the human, or
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as Jürgen Habermas and Rosi Braidotti contend, “the ‘Man’”\textsuperscript{208} as the measure of all things. If, as Braidotti suggests, posthuman theory is a generative tool—as both genealogical and navigational—“to help us re-think the basic unit of reference for the human…and the basic tenets of our interaction with both human and non-human agents on a planetary scale,”\textsuperscript{209} it is urgent for archives and archivists to revisit Brothman’s dichotomous distinctions of conceptions of the record as \textit{strong sense}—limiting and exclusionary criteria of the record—and \textit{weak sense}—“less rigidity, an openness to multiple constructions, to the possibility of contextually determined theories and methodologies, and truth”\textsuperscript{210}—to critically and creatively \textit{read} the non/human records along with their human and non/human creators to consider who we are and what we are in the process of (un)becoming. The \textit{strong sense} is something that is constructed in appraisal and description that sediments and tethers the record to the archivists’ assumptions about its evidentiary value; whereas, the \textit{weak sense} can be liberating in its attentiveness to the relationships between communities and institutions, societies and technologies, as well as humans, non/humans, and the earth. Similar to my push for radical openness in, with, and for the archives, the \textit{weak sense} can then be determined incrementally, accidentally, and in contingent relations with imbricating and numerous points of becoming and belonging.
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Archival theorists, such as Cook, Geoffrey Yeo, Gilliland, McKemmish, Frank Upward, and Eric Ketelaar are interrogating the archival field to consider ways to reimagine the record as something that may not have to be “fixed on some medium” or frozen in the moment, in order to cross the threshold into the archives. If the archives is to constitute bodies of knowledge(s), archivists must re-imagine the records that communities create to exist beyond the traditional boundaries of recordness and especially fixity—in time and in meaning. Since, as Freeman points out, time is a modality of power and has been used to regulate peoples, communities, and nations, it is integral that archivists break apart the qualities of recordness, the distinct qualities that seemingly indicate—or I might add, bestow—a record’s evidentiary value, in order to understand how peoples make meaning and what of this process and
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performance might enter into the archives. An exploration into the productions and processes of a transgender-focused archives existing outside of my U.S. context might lend insight into how a more globally-situated collection, vision, and mission can instantiate how archives influence their own bodies of knowledges, but also those who access its collections in unforeseen ways.

**Radical Encounters with Cultural Debris: Making Idiosyncratic Piles**

As I take up residence in the reading room of the University Archives and Special Collections at the University of Victoria in British Columbia, Canada, where the Transgender Archives is held, I scan the first seven Hollinger boxes pulled and stacked on the rolling cart near my chair. Numerical order with clear handwriting in pencil. Browns and grays. An archival preservation standard of acid-free cradling and care. A color palette of reliable neutrality and static blandness. A daunting specimen of past, present, and future as I consider my charge to interrogate temporality and
its influences on the archival body of knowledge that constitutes this world’s largest transgender archive representing 17 countries.\textsuperscript{219} A quiet Monday morning and the reading room now open for the week. I watch as Nada, the office administrator, prepares the room in order to invite visitors. She is humming while she moves behind her desk and prepares the copy machine and other duplication and computer retrieval technologies for the day. Her hum blends with the technological hum of machine to create a soothing non/human white noise that resonates throughout the room. The sun filters into the wall of windows and the students pass by the glass alone and silent with their white headphone cords diving down into their scarves and blouses.

The first box I examine is part of the Rikki Swin collection—specifically, \textit{BOX 2008-006 1/24 007/01/025}—and holds folders labeled \textit{Joseph De Maio}s.

Rikki Swin was the collector who acquired the materials to establish this collection through her work developing the Rikki Swin Institute: Gender Education, Research, Library and Archives (RSI), which was dedicated to transgender research and education. Rikki donated her entire RSI archival collection to the Transgender Archives. In this particular account, Joseph is the central character in this set of archived material. The folders are not organized chronologically, but thematically which looks to
\footnote{\textsuperscript{219} Transgender Archives, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. \url{http://transgenderarchives.uvic.ca/}}
carry forward the provenance—“a promise of future relevance based on archivists’ ‘unique perspective’”—of the archivist along with the collector and records creator: Joseph. The first folder is filled with Correspondence—general, newspaper clippings, photographs, 1966-1969 and holds his résumés for teaching math in Rome along with his Greek travel documents. He had dark wavy hair, dark eyes, smooth skin, and a prominent and angular chin. He was a poet and scientist. His portraits appeared on numerous government-issued nametags and documentation. He looked comfortable, pleased and pleasing, and self-confident. The following questions flood the mind: Who was Joseph? Why was he here in the Transgender Archives? What was his story?

His subsequent folders preserved first a list of what basics—“mineral oil, magnesia, Pepto Bismol, Anacin, Aspirin, Corcidin, bandaids, Epsom salts, and also ANTIHISTAMINES”—one might pick up in order to start a residence in a new place; letters from Sandi, his soon-to-be ex-wife; and what seemed like

---


221 Box 1.13 Joseph De Maios Correspondence, 1960-1962, Transgender Archives, University of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
intimate love letters from Tom. Sandi’s correspondences do not dilly-dally, but get to the point about their dwindling relationship and feel laden in punctuation, namely, the period. Tom’s correspondences stretch out in ways that highlight the pleasures of quotidian life juxtaposed with wild dreams and philosophical meanderings that question humanity. These distinctions call me to consider that each of these letter writers may have been situated in slightly different relations to space and time, especially relations to pace and rhythm—convergences and assemblages of space and time that are always contingent—within lived experiences. This seemingly messy constellation of points of coming together and coming apart—Joseph’s ambiguous (un)becoming and his holding on to these memories in an apparent resistance towards closure—inspires me to inquire into why I might question who Joseph was or who he identified as at various points in time. His record in the Transgender Archives tells me of Joseph’s (un)becoming, but the records and their limited and limiting contextual storytelling about the processes of (un)becoming challenge me, as researcher, to look closely at my own need to fill in the blanks of the narrative with my own assumptions of what a sequence of events might look like. As Jack Halberstam suggests in *In A Queer Time & Place: Transgender Bodies, Subcultural Lives*, “queer uses of time and space develop, at least in part, in opposition to the institutions of family, heterosexuality, and reproduction. They also develop

according to other logics of location, movement, and identification.”

From wife to lover, woman to man, U.S.A. to Greece, Joseph emerged in a number of stories and contexts that marked those temporal nodes to tether him into historical narratives for the time being and that led me to inquire further into his relation to the Transgender Archives and, at times, to jump to certain conclusions.

As I continue flipping through the folders in this first box, I recognize that Tom’s letters were persistent in his efforts to maintain thoughtful connections to Joseph through readings and philosophers he quoted along with appeals to a desire to know Joseph and, through certain discursive practices, an explicit expression and pleasure of already knowing Joseph. In his 13 April 1961 letter to Joseph, Tom writes

...I was reading Huxley the other night—that book of essays I have, and came across this, which made me think of you: ‘He (man) is the inhabitant of a kind of psychological Woolworth Building; you never know—he never knows himself—which floor he’ll step out at tomorrow, nor even whether, a minute from now, he won’t take it into his head to jump into the elevator and shoot up a dozen or down perhaps twenty stories into a totally different mode of being.’ He goes on to say, however, ‘Now the body particularizes and separates, the mind unites.’ I have a few of my own speculations on this whole point, which I many never have brought out to you, and I won’t do it now, certainly. There aren’t 8,256 ½ pages to write on—which is the main reason...

Tom expresses a spatialized understanding of temporal shifts that might correspond to transgendering as a dynamic experience that implies uncertainty
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and degrees of impermanence. His handwriting, storytelling, salutation, and signature were comfortable and his message seemingly comforting to Joseph who held onto these particular correspondences for decades before donating them. As records situated within this collection and this body of knowledge related to transgender histories, time and non-sequential forms of time and the daily banality—including poetry, phone numbers, sketches, ticket stubs, love letters, grocery lists, and photographs with friends—found within Joseph’s archival folders “can also fold subjects into structures of belonging and duration that may be invisible to the historicist eye.”\cite{Freeman225} As authentic records, the letters from Sandi and Tom, with their handwritten dates and scribbles of certain intimate knowledges of and for Joseph, tell of the overlapping affections and identities along with the stops and starts that everyday lived experiences hold.

The next day and after perusing an additional archival box labeled *Joseph De Maios*, I discovered that Joseph De Maios, the man, became the woman, Ariadne Kane (Ari Kane). The archival collection and related finding aids do not refer to Joseph’s/Ari’s transition or any timeframe of the transition; the boxes are numbered and labeled from 1-Joseph De Maios to 2-Joseph De Maios to 3-Ari Kane with folders labeled as Joseph from 1960 to 1966 and labeled as Ari from 1977 through the 1990s. Considering the site of my inquiry was the Transgender Archives, I rather easily made the jump from Joseph to Ari and understood that a transition, a transforming, had occurred. The boxes do not hold accounts of Joseph’s or Ari’s personal reflections of transformation, but I questioned my own  

\cite{Freeman225} Freeman, xi.
desire to return to the earlier boxes to see if I would re-read the records differently and through a differently knowing lens than I had before I learned of Joseph’s transformation. My assumptions and my experiences with knowing LGBTQ-identified and trans-identified peoples might guide me through filling in the blanks before me.

I carefully retraced my steps each evening through my field notes and photographs to inquire into my own affective and haptic responses to this shift from Joseph to Ari. As queer archivist, and thus as a kind of participating observer in my role as researcher, I reflexively monitored my own involvement in this work. Indeed, I recognize my role to animate the records with contextual description and collocating relational markings while also inviting what Freeman built from the conceptual work that Eve Sedgwick had named *reparative criticism* as a mode of understanding that we cannot know in advance, but “only retrospectively if even then, what is queer and what is not, we gather and combine eclectically, dragging a bunch of cultural debris around us and stacking it in idiosyncratic piles ‘not necessarily like any preexisting whole,’ though composed of what preexists.”  

The gaps that appear in collected records tell stories that can complement and contradict the stories that the records themselves tell of time and for the time being.

Based on my observational research in Canada as well as on my scholarly focus and simultaneous participation as an archivist in Arizona, I question the records that constitute the archives in order to consider the gaps, silences, and...
illuminations, and “cultural debris” that make up bodies of knowledges alongside
the distinct qualities of recordness that authorize the record to enter. Through
three specific approaches—haunting, decolonizing, and queering—I will show the
connections that they have to each other as well as to dominant systems of
thought that produce and are produced by the structures of the archiving archives.
The notions of haunting, decolonizing, and queering comprise what I consider a
transdisciplinary set of ideas that underpin this work. Also informing this project
are scholarly thoughts on imperialism and colonialism – processes that have
played significant roles in establishing categorical and regulatory archival
practices that marginalize and silence certain bodies and bodies of knowledges
while promoting more mainstream and legitimate accounts of histories. I inquire
about what factors are at play in the modern, postmodern, and posthuman
understandings of archives. As I move through these ideas, I will put forth
questions to consider that interrogate the systems of thought related to archival
records and the processes of defining the record. Ultimately, this chapter
culminates with considerations of who and what, under what conditions, might
enter into the archives as record to become archived.

Re-imagining Temporalities to Challenge the Archives as Body of
Knowledge: Haunting, Decolonizing, and Queering

Haunting
The past comes with us and occasionally kidnaps the present, so that the distinctions we depend on for safety, for sanity, disappear. Past. Present. Future. When this happens we are no longer sure who we are, or perhaps we can no longer pretend to be sure who we are.

If time is a river then we shall all meet death by water.
--Jeannette Winterson

As I use transdisciplinarity to consider temporal approaches to archives and their collections, it is the haunting that influences the affective nature of records from appraisal through access. Contemplate the records that move you. Consider affect to indicate “nonconscious and unnamed, but nevertheless registered, experiences of bodily energy and intensity that arise in response to stimuli impinging on the body.” Haunting extends temporality. The ghostly matter haunt the archives by appearing and reappearing intermittently while also always there, but lying in wait to be noticed. According to Avery Gordon, haunting “is an animated state in which a repressed or unresolved social violence is making itself known, sometimes very directly, sometimes more obliquely.” Haunting is linked to the experiences of being oppressed or traumatized, but it is not these experiences. She uses haunting to describe those “singular yet repetitive instances when…your bearings on the world lose direction, when the over-and-done-with comes alive…”—all moments when one loses their place in time and
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past, present, and future become disjointed. Ann Laura Stoler also uses *to haunt* to mean “to frequent, resort to, to be familiar with, to bear a threatening presence, to invisibly occupy, to take on changing form.” Haunting can, therefore, influence records and the qualities that might constitute a record in conscious, subconscious, and—importantly for affective and embodied ways of knowing in Deleuzian posthuman nodes of connections—non-conscious ways that call for a listen, a peek, a moment of pause. The archivist cradles the record while its variegated recordness tells and silences the many histories and narratives that circulate within multiple temporalities to highlight the ghost that is “not simply a dead or a missing person, but a social figure, and investigating it can lead to that dense site where history and subjectivity make social life.” Halberstam suggests that, with ghosts, “trans methods” might open up spaces of knowing through the “encounter, confrontation, transformation,” which align with Puar’s urgency towards anticipatory temporalities in order to positively entice “unknowable political futures into our wake, taking risks rather than guarding against them.” Haunting is implicated in the role of the archivist to contextualize the record along some sort of recognition with the ghostly matter that lingers in our stories, our voices, our rhythm, our gestures, our body language, and our words. Archivists may be invited to take risks through their
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hands-on practice to subvert modern archival standards in ways that make the ghosts that are haunting the archives something that reorganizes the stories that make up the bodies of knowledges so that decolonizing and queering of the records can occur. All of this constitutes the micronarratives and metanarratives that work against the master narrative that has traditionally formed the framework in which all stories and records are supposed to fit.

Often the master narrative utilizes progress and forward momentum in time and space as truth. Queer theorist Heather Love argues that, instead of moving on, we need to look backward and consider how LGBTQ history and especially the ghostly matter that lingers there “(aspects of historical gay culture that have been so closely associated with trauma, shame, sadness, and the pain of the closet) continues to affect us in the present as still a part of identity.”\textsuperscript{234} Love also engages the idea that “hope for alternative forms of relation and community is an important affect in the present, particularly as queers try to articulate alternatives to marriage as the dominant form of social life.”\textsuperscript{235} Ann Cvetkovich in \textit{Archive of Feelings: Trauma, Sexuality, and Lesbian Public Cultures} suggests that social structures are indeed haunting lived experiences affectively as records with deep human entanglement thus elicit sensational stories and haptic remembering and forgetting.\textsuperscript{236} Affective connections to social structures that


\textsuperscript{235} Ibid., 98.
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have marginalized and pathologized may not lead to trauma, but also into conflicting and contradictory spaces of pleasure and pain. The records animate affective relational understandings of self and distinct nodes of convergences of time and space that return again and again, but with different responses each time. Like queering, the folds of time and the return of the ghostly matter that lingers and instigates certain disjointedness unsettles temporality and how archives have come to know and describe the record. Archivists might also acknowledge those records created that reflect alternative forms of social life that do not fit neatly into the chrononormative pattern so that the archives can expand to be relevant to diverse communities.

In fact, chrononormativity and other biopolitical regulatory practices may haunt archives, collections, and the stories therein as the peoples who create the records interact with normative strategies in their everyday whether they fall in line with them, bump up against them, radically oppose and subvert them, and/or just consent to them unconsciously. Benjamin proposes, “it is not by burying the past but rather by being haunted that one can change the course of history.”

Haunting holds the tension between waiting for the expected, a practice assumed by chrononormativity, and waiting in a state of expectancy, a practice in which haunting is implicated. Therefore, haunting, along with queer temporalities, create generative spaces where the possibility for hope may reside.

Decolonizing

237 Love, quoting Walter Benjamin, 140.
The problem is that constant efforts by governments, states, societies, and institutions to deny the historical formations of such conditions have simultaneously denied our claims to humanity, to having a history, and to all sense of hope. To acquiesce is to lose ourselves entirely and implicitly agree with all that has been said about us. To resist is to retrench in the margins, retrieve what we were and remake ourselves. The past, our stories local and global, the present, our communities, cultures, languages, and social practices—all may be spaces of marginalization, but they have also become spaces of resistance and hope.

--Linda Tuhiwai Smith

Decolonizing, as an important theoretical lens and approach to permeate the archives, can intervene in their neocolonizing effects from what constitutes the record to what constitutes the archival bodies of knowledges. Following Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s work in Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples, I suggest that archiving, like research, is not an objective and innocent process, but “an activity that has something at stake and that occurs in a set of political and social conditions.” The archives and traditional archival practices are implicated in imperialism and the ways that colonialism has troubled and enacted fatal violence against non-dominant peoples. Smith argues that within a decolonizing framework, deconstruction is a key part of a much larger project:

Taking apart the story, revealing underlying texts, and giving voice to things that are often known intuitively does not help people to improve their current conditions. It provides words, perhaps, an insight that explains certain experiences—but it does not prevent someone from dying.

---
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Decolonizing within the archives in an ongoing critical process for archivists to commit to in their everyday and over time. In Chapter 5, the Queer/ed Archival Methodology that I develop might work to radically open archival approaches in order to identify those who have been held captive in a colonial and neocolonizing historical narrative. Once identified, archivists, in collaboration with communities of records creators, can work to release those records, memories, and histories in captivity. Utilizing a decolonizing approach to temporality to interrogate the record and its recordness offers promise for opening the archives to multiple bodies of knowledges while also calling for a deeper understanding of the systems of knowledge and structures of remembering and forgetting that circulate within society.

In archival accounts, we find absences that continue to invisibilize and eliminate certain peoples. Nikki Sullivan, in *A Critical Introduction to Queer Theory*, notes, “…as theorists such as Linda Garber (2001), Chela Sandoval (1991), and the Combahee River Collective (1983) have pointed out, black, Chicana, Jewish, Third World, and working-class women played crucial roles in such movements from their inception, but their participation is often obscured in and through the (re)production of homogenizing accounts of complex, political, geographies, and ideological histories…”241 Highlighting the writing of history and considering the role that the archives plays in historiography, collective memory of imperialism may be more clearly understood as “…perpetuated
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through the ways in which knowledge about indigenous peoples was collected, classified, and then represented in various ways back to the West, and then, through the eyes of the West, back to those who have been colonized."\textsuperscript{242} The records in the archives tell marginalized communities about their histories and especially through the distinct records that are invited across the archival threshold—“fixed” and “captured” information on paper such as birth certificates, marriage licenses, passports, identification, arrest warrants, and other state-sanctioned and regulatory records. In \textit{The Decolonial Imaginary: Writing Chicanas Into History}, Emma Pérez troubles Jacques Lacan’s “mirror state” to argue for the imaginary when certain colonized subjects look into the mirror, the object—their visions of themselves—are clouded and shadowed by coloniality. Coloniality becomes the lens through which certain colonized subjects see and know themselves, but an archival approach to decolonize the lens, the subject, and the scene opens new ways of seeing the collections and records therein. This space between the subject and the object is a generative space in which “kaleidoscopic identities are burst open and where the colonial self and the colonized other both become elements of multiple, mobile categoric identities."\textsuperscript{243}

Might the queer/ed archives, then, be sites of counter-stories as powerful forms of resistance to the dominant narratives? And radically open spaces with multiple bodies of knowledges that tell of archival processes of appraisal and description in
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order to not fall into the normative and non-normative binary, but open up categories of possibilities?

Remembering that the systems of thought that have patterned our social and political lives and our archives “predispose us to a predictable beginning, middle, and end to untold stories,” Pérez introduces the concept of the *decolonial imaginary* as a rupturing space and a “tool for uncovering the hidden voices of Chicanas that have been relegated silences, to passivity, to that third space where agency is enacted through third space feminism.” Stoler urges us to destabilize notions of empire so that one might start “with a notion of empire that puts movement and oscillation at the center: to see them instead as states of becoming (and, for those ruled, as states of deferral), as polities with protean rather than fixed taxonomies and mobile populations whose designated borders at any one time were not necessarily the force fields in which they operated or even their sovereign limits. ”

Much like haunting as a temporal approach, the decolonizing approach works to enact agency and conjure (and remix, as Freeman suggests) fragmented identities, fragmented realities, that are “real,” but a real that is in question. I return to TC’s oral history example from Chapter 3 to highlight how he describes his transition from female to male as an opportunity to focus on another part of himself without erasing what came before. As the Arizona Queer Archives continues to expand to include more voices, it will also expand to
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include the same voice but with new perspectives through (un)becoming and being no longer captive by the static nature of the record and history itself. The decolonial imaginary—with its shadows and ghosts—can open up generative and radical potentials of the archives with records and records creation that can help to write a history that contests and is contested and that decolonizes otherness.\textsuperscript{247}

Moving beyond the notion of \textit{writing a history}, archivists might use Diana Taylor’s \textit{scenarios}, a reimagined and repeatable “colonial encounter,”\textsuperscript{248} and an episodic and portable framework to subvert the serial progress-oriented and storytelling technés to expand on Jeannette Bastian’s research to build a theoretical framework that assists archivists with ways to acknowledge the recordness of cultural performances and makes a claim for their consideration as embodied archives.\textsuperscript{249} As cultural identity is often imbricating and interlocking, thus, creating multiply-situated subjects, record keeping practices will vary from location to location and across space and time. In such instances, asset-driven approaches of collection development can function in community-focused archives to work collectively, cooperatively, and reciprocally as everyday experts emerge to share in the determination of recordness and relevancy. Furthermore, archives might then be interested in simultaneous assemblages of archival practices along with embodied technologies of remembering and forgetting as well as their effects while re-imagining and opening up the nodes and pathways of
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knowledge production that might then be considered the multiple contexts that bestow archival records with evidentiary value. Like both *haunting* and *decolonizing* as temporal methods of producing and consuming archives, *queering* provides a means for re-imagining normative assumptions within archives and about the bodies of knowledges therein, as discussed in the next section.

Queering

Queering the record in the queer/ed archives can intervene in straight/forward storytelling that relies on chrono-, hetero-, and homonormative practices and expectations to reflect voices and peoples in their everyday within a range of emotions, experiences, and knowledges, rather than only as marginalized peoples situated within the dominant master narrative—with a concrete start and finish—to tell their stories. In *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Foucault demonstrates how ongoing and repetitive master narratives, or normalizing discourses, constitute difference solely in terms of degrees of difference from the norm which has been constructed and situated in time and space as ideal. It is this sort of logic that creates and legitimizes the representation of homosexuality as an aberration from heterosexuality.\(^{250}\) Considering the tempo of *always becoming* as ongoing in syncopated rhythm, then the idea of “telos, the unilateral directionality, and the cyclical pattern of stability and rupture,” suggests that, according to Achille Mbembe, although time is nonlinear and nonlinearity

\(^{250}\) Sullivan 40
has been embraced by chaos, we must seek to “destabilize the opposition between
stability and chaos, such that chaos is discharged from its semiotic resonance with
violence, upheaval, anarchy.”\textsuperscript{251} I suggest that temporal capacities exist in a
relational configuration in which the historical thrust of sequential and
progressive events unfolding would constitute the norm while any shifts in
temporal structures and their intelligibility would unsettle and reside in the non-
normative. Within the non-normative and the seeming messiness of chaos, there is
generative potential\textsuperscript{252} and the archives can benefit from what it might produce
“rather than to seek the antidote that would suppress it.”\textsuperscript{253} The non-normative is
the queer; oftentimes the antidote that is sought to repress the unsettled is what
also marks certain bodies—bodies of knowledge(s) too—as expendable.\textsuperscript{254} The
margins hold many things—human and non-human—each expendable just for the
time being, an ephemeral and fleeting expendability and ‘otherness’ that may
carry, in its contingency and unsettled motions, the agency to enact animated push
and pull. The margins in and beyond the archives, then, hold—and hide—records
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and stories that are a part of legitimate and illegitimate bodies of knowledges that rub up against and unsettle the larger authorized narratives that have become normalized through their ongoing visibility and telling.

For this scholarly work, *queer* is utilized as a verb, a set of actions for subversion or protest or resistance—“to make strange, to frustrate, to counteract, to delegitimize, to camp up”255—and, importantly for the archives and the archival record, to rupture the chrononormative positivist modes of time and telling time. Following Halberstam, I consider *archive* in the Foucauldian sense to suggest a structure of thinking through which shifting temporalities highlight the multiple modes of individuals and communities marking experiences as enduring and endearing emphasizing the haptic and sensational remembering and forgetting that elicit trauma, pleasure, desire, longing, belonging, abjection, as well as ambivalence. The records, in queer time, are then telling of moments and movements that are always already transitioning—(un)becoming—and active participants in assemblages of the non/human in time and space. According to David Halperin, queer is by definition “an identity without an essence. ‘Queer’ then, demarcates not a positivity but a positionality *vis-à-vis* the normative…[Queer] describes a horizon of possibility whose precise extent and heterogeneous scope cannot in principle be delimited in advance.”256

Through non-normative logics and understanding the distinct and unpredictable ways that individuals and communities come together and come
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apart, queer temporality may, therefore, challenge the frames of “bourgeois reproduction and family, and longevity, risk/safety, and inheritance.” Lisa Duggan argues that queer theory does not simply develop new labels for old boxes, but rather, carries with it “the promise of new meanings, new ways of thinking and acting politically—a promise sometimes realized, sometimes not.” Freeman further queers the past, present, and future and upends the work of master narratives within the archives through reparative criticism, which “takes up the materials of a traumatic past and remixes them in the interests of new possibilities for being and knowing.” In “The Will to Remember: The Lesbian Herstory Archives of New York,” Joan Nestle, the co-founder of the Lesbian Herstory Archives, suggests that for many, “remembering is an act of will, a conscious battle against ordained emptiness. For us, remembering is alchemy, transforming dirty jokes, limp wrists, wetted pinkies into bodies loved, communities liberated.” Unbound constructions and re-imaginings of temporal structures make it possible to remix our pasts, although still painful to remember, into queer and pleasurable understandings. Through queer temporality, records may then emerge and animate outside of pathologized and normalized discourses and hegemonic social structures to subvert “compression and annihilation” and
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move into the “potentiality of a life unscripted”\textsuperscript{261} so that the archivist might shed light on a temporal landscape that offers affective modalities—speed, duration, and pace\textsuperscript{262}—through which the records and their temporalities of production and consumption might then be understood from multiple perspectives, glances, and stares.

The archives and archival records embody queer time through stories of distinct entitlement and access to resources that shift over time and in relation to economies of desire—“those systems of material and symbolic power which structure experiences of yearning for and seduction by ‘the past’”\textsuperscript{263} which is at the heart of archival encounters and the event-ness of user connecting with record.

Through working within LGBTQ communities on outreach and acquisition for the Arizona Queer Archives and the Storytelling Project, I have observed a distinct timeline indicating who has come forward first with their stories and materials and who later follows, a timeline that is becoming more and more obvious over the past six years of conducting oral history interviews. For the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project, white, middle-class, older gay men were the first demographic eager to contribute personal stories for the archives – they continue to be the most active in pushing the sense urgency for the overall archival development.

\textsuperscript{261} Halberstam, 2.

\textsuperscript{262} Puar, xxii.

Representation and especially self-representation in the archives is thus a focus for this project with diversity as integral for this work. In the Transgender Archives in Canada, there were individual and organizational records connected to male-to-female and cross-dressing trans-identified individuals, one female-to-male trans-identified individual or trans man, and no people of color. During my on-camera interview with Aaron Devor, the Founder and Academic Director of the Transgender Archives, I asked him about the high numbers of male-to-female trans-identified people in their collections and whether or not there was an active collection mandate to change the uneven representation. Devor mentioned the archivist at the Jean-Nickolaus Tretter Collection in Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies in the University of Minnesota’s Special Collections who suggested that collections looked a certain way because of access to financial resources. Devor responded

There are certain people who had the resources to produce documentation and to retain that documentation. And that’s what we see when a collection starts out. We see what the people who had the resources to put out the newsletters, to put on the conferences, to—whatever it is that we have—to start organizations, and sustain organizations, and which people had the resources to collect those materials and to preserve them because all of that takes resources. Then those are the people that turn around and donate here. That’s what our collection right now represents. That’s more in the male-to-female community and, among the male-to-female community, it’s more in the cross-dresser aspect…and it’s certainly more
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264 For this research project, the Institution Review Board, IRB, agreed that the interviews I conducted with archives founders, archivists, and archival assistants do not constitute “Human Research” as these interviews focus solely on the processes and productions of their professional positions with the archives and using archival practices in daily job performances. Research conducted is not specific to the individual and will not involve personal information as defined as ‘human subject.’ I also have signed Informed Consent Forms by all participants giving permission to use their interviews and likeness as part of this dissertation project. As part of my own ethical research methodology, I regularly gather more explicit approvals of my writings and productions from even those oral history participants that years ago consented to their histories being streamed and accessible through the virtual online archives presence.
His response echoed my own observations of white, gay males, but in his case, white and born-male trans-identified women. The ways people might be tethered to previous identity formations influence the ways that past, present, and future may be perceived and conceived as static and linear. Considering the notion of (un)becoming, the male-to-female populations, whether cross-dresser-, transvestite-, transgender-, and/or transsexual-identified, are still connected in ways to their pasts which may still offer certain access to or remnants of economic and social privileges given to males. Acknowledging how people struggled historically as part of a trans identity, Lara Wilson, Head Archivist for the Transgender Archives and Special Collections, explained the constitution of the Transgender Archives as strongly representing—processed and unprocessed—“male cross-dressing material…as obviously the economic power resided in that section of the trans spectrum.” In this instance, having the power to produce certain ‘archivable’ records subsequently led to power in the archives. I wonder, then, about how visibility might represent power when visibility might also create higher degrees of vulnerability, which might explain the gaps in Joseph’s and Ari’s collection.
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266 24 March 2014, Interview with Lara Wilson on digital video in Wilson’s office in the Special Collections, University of Victoria Library, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
As part of the larger inaugural Rikki Swin Institute collection at the Transgender Archives, the individual sub-collection of Virginia Prince highlighted and showcased moments of vulnerability while also demonstrated her work as a self-identified heterosexual transvestite, her research on transvestism, her founding of the Society of the Second Self, Tri-Ess, and especially her magazine, *Transvestia*, which she started publishing in 1960. Prince’s records highlighted the ways that Prince as Virginia the woman and Charles the man performed certain roles at academic presentations in order to inform and educate social workers and nurses in their work with “other patients who have problems in gender identity.”

The gender roles performed at the time of Prince’s regular presentations in the early 1960s also played out in the
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letters Prince received from many “transvestites”—or “TV”—who were struggling with their secrets along with women’s clothing, body size, a feminine bosom, frustrated wives, and the pleasures they felt dressing and performing as women. The records indicate perhaps a torn or pulled ligament which stretches time and ontological understandings of self in positions of man and woman and the in between. The disjointedness unsettles and yet is a desired and desirable space of potentiality.

The temporal ordering on which heteronormativity depends for its intelligible, yet sedimented, structures and power “can be contested only with an equally forceful commitment to thinking queer pleasures” which means that queer pleasures are at the heart of “matters of the body, matters of timing, and tropes for encountering, witnessing and transforming history.”

If we consider linear time as an unmade and messy bedsheet, the folds and creases hold the queerness of temporality with past, present, and future coming upon one another precariously and pleasurably. Freeman argues “pleasure, then, is the immanent point of tangency between our bodies and the force of desire…It is only deep from within the folds of such a temporality that one can begin to ask what the body can do, what a revolutionary and liberated body might be.”

268 Freeman, 58
its disjointed bodies of knowledges might then embody such a liberated and revolutionary potential with its animating and assembling records as evidentiary value—proving human and non-human existence and (un)becoming. Therefore, eradicating the linear thrust of tragedy and presenting events intermittently assembles a temporal landscape that offers stories as extending, overlapping, and rippling outward.

Taylor’s *scenarios* may influence the archives similarly so as to incorporate a multitude of voices and quotidian performances of being that may further subvert the narratives of trauma that commonly become master narratives within archives about non-dominant peoples. For example, LGBTQ archives may benefit from an alternate method to recovering lost histories and marginalized pasts, what Freeman calls *erotohistoriography*, a term that “can capture the centrality of pleasure, especially sexual pleasure, in queer practices of encountering and documenting the past.”

Records in the queer/ed archives can, then, reflect voices and peoples in their everyday within a range of emotions and desires.

Anderson introduces the problems with ‘fixity’ and ‘capture,’ two important qualities of the traditional fixed and physical record. Capturing an event for recordkeeping purposes is “possible only with selected forms of recordkeeping, it allows for the separation of record and record-creator…and it is tied to a notion of time that can be frozen rather than time that is ever
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unfolding.” Fixity is problematic as remembering and forgetting rely on collapsible/expandable frames of past, present, and future. To subvert the strictly adhered-to concept of a record and the privileging of texts and narratives over alternative performance-based transactional memories, Taylor suggests that we consider scenarios as meaning-making paradigms that structure social environments, behaviors, and potential outcomes…giving particulars of the scenes, situations, etc., like performance, means never for the first time… Its portable framework bears the weight of accumulative repeats and allows for many possible ‘endings.’

Queering temporality—subverting the progressive historical push—makes spaces for the voices in the creases and in the margins. In the way that haunting and decolonizing can function as potentialities for archival practice, queering allows and creates opportunities for complex knowledge production, circulation, and consumption. Through queer/ed timescapes, agency in the defining of a record comes to play in new ways, spaces, and hands.

**Conclusion: Always Emerging Approaches**

The archive is not simply a repository; it is also a theory of cultural relevance, a construction of collective memory, and a complex record of queer activity.

--Jack Halberstam
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Society changes rapidly and archives must reflect these changes in conscious and critical ways. Archival studies are experiencing shifts towards multiplicity, social justice, and inclusion. In order to make necessary adjustments in practice and pedagogical approaches within archival education, archival theorists are studying existing archival practices within community engagements to establish new methodologies that are “influenced by postcolonial, post-conflict, and subaltern approaches…with concerns about decolonizing and pluralizing the Archive.”

Understanding and utilizing haunting, decolonizing, and queering as ways to approach, produce, read, and listen to the archives might open up those in-between spaces that emerge from troubling the temporal, spatial, and historic boundary between the static and the dynamic archives. Archival holdings might be spaces for records, experiences, and lived everyday truths and knowledges that can make change outside of the master narrative’s notion of progress. Pérez proposes

If history is the way in which people understand themselves through a collective, common past where events are chronicled and heroes are constructed, then historical consciousness is the system of thought that leads to a normative understanding of past events. Historical knowledge is the production of normative history through discursive practice. Metahistory, then, does not record or re-create that accepted past; rather, it is the study of thought in which an intrinsic philosophy of history arises.
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Reimagined records and records creators make archives the spaces where the metahistories—whether as episodes or scenarios or ephemeral performances that are quickly vanished, but live on in memory—can weave alongside and up against the master narrative in order to tell the contested and competing histories of those who have been often excluded from society’s record. Archival theories and methodologies that are attentive to the reimagined recordness of records are those that can critically and consciously explore and interrogate the spaces between archives, records, and power, and the surrounding social and cultural and technological contexts in which they exist. The final chapter will consider, argue for, and, in fact, set out a Queer/ed Archival Methodology, Q/M, providing a means for imagining and practicing archival work that is to a certain extent relevant, reflexive, and meaningful for those multiply-situated non-normative individuals and communities.
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CHAPTER FIVE

A QUEER/ED ARCHIVAL METHODOLOGY:
TOWARDS A RADICAL OPENNESS IN COLLECTING, PRESERVING,
AND ACCESSING

The past, our stories local and global, the present, our
communities, cultures, languages and social practices—all may be
spaces of marginalization, but they have also become spaces of
resistance and home.

--Linda Tuhiwai Smith\textsuperscript{277}

The present is not enough. It is impoverished and toxic for queers
and other people who do not feel the privilege of majoritarian
belonging, normative tastes, and ‘rational’ expectations… Let me
be clear that the idea is not simply to turn away from the present.
One cannot afford such a maneuver, and if one thinks one can, one
has resisted the present in favor of folly. The present must be
known in relation to the alternative temporal and spatial maps
provided by a perception of past and future affective worlds.

--José Esteban Muñoz\textsuperscript{278}

A Queer/ed Archival Methodology

Introduction & Summary of the Study

This dissertation project traces archival paradigms that have structured
definitions of the archives, archivists, and records from the modern to the

\textsuperscript{277} Linda Tuhiwai Smith, \textit{Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples}

\textsuperscript{278} José Esteban Muñoz, \textit{Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity}
postmodern. Throughout, I engage broad views of archives and of archival activity in order to consider the methodological and practical implications of a move toward a posthuman perspective on and within archives. It is through the posthuman lens that the archives can embody the multiplicities of bodies and bodies of knowledges found within the postmodern paradigm but that are inter- and intra-related to contexts known and yet to emerge along with the techniques and technologies that structure social and political lives. The posthuman perspective relates to queer in ways that I propose challenges the organizing structures of the archives as a whole to also render the need for such a strict organization obsolete. The posthuman and queer suggest the emergence of the uncommon. This study also works toward a broad re-imagining and a radical openness to intervene in neocolonizing practices that can function to sediment and suture archival productions. Neocolonizing practices are those that uphold the hierarchies and power differentials within the archival collections. Often invisibilized, unnoticed, and normalized within the archivist’s everyday archival productions, neocolonizing practices take place without questioning the politics and effects of those practices on the stories that the archives tells and the multiply-situated subjects therein. Broadly conceived, then, this project interrogates the human and nonhuman bodies at work in contemporary archival practices, approaches, and definitions. This work aims to move archival traditions toward increasingly dynamic, radical, and open processes and it does so through a queer and posthuman lens.
Utilizing a queer perspective throughout this dissertation project necessitates the understanding of the breadth and, at times, ambiguity of such a theoretical underpinning as queer theorists and queer scholars as well as queer archivists grapple with the tensions surrounding the naming of something queer and the fluidity, instability, and the perpetual becoming status of queer. As I have noted in Chapter 1, I consider queer both a practice and a politics of mis/recognizing and intervening in the normative, whether, in this case, it be traditional archival structures or sexual/gender identities or neocolonizing practices that perpetuate hierarchical understandings of un/belonging to the archives and archival bodies. This project is queer because of the voices it calls forward—LGBTQ voices, but with an expansiveness for many distinct non-normative multiply-situated peoples and communities. This project is queer because it follows the queer anti-identitarian move to unhinge taken-for-granted and reductive assumptions about identity. This project is queer in that it unhinges the archives (and the stories therein) to be a space of radical openness resisting containment. Such a move is similar to Kath Browne and Catherine J. Nash’s unhinging of the concept ‘queer’ so as to offer inconclusive framing (containment and sedimentation) of definitional understandings to amplify the multiple possibilities that transdisciplinary queer work produces. Theorizing the body and temporality throughout this project, I suggest that unhinging the hierarchies of knowledge, the record, and the expert and the everyday archivist,

produces and activates queer and queer/ed imaginings as integral to the Queer/ed Archival Methodology. All of those acts together make it an action-oriented space of dis/assembly and always in relation to queer. Again, this project emerges from the Arizona Queer Archives, an LGBTQ space through which this Queer/ed Archival Methodology was first imagined, established and implemented as a world-making and home-making space of sorts. As queer/ed archival work consists of world-making practices, archivists can co-create that home space for distinct and non-normative voices and histories to settle and unsettle. Queer/ed archival spaces, therefore, can create and sustain distinct community sociality, experiences, and ways of knowing. In that way, I propose such a multiply-pronged approach to a queer project and through a queer methodology and, as I argued in Chapter 3 for bodies as archives and archives as bodies, suggest a Queer/ed Archival Methodology would have to have multiple and competing voices while being both committed and resistant to containment so as to support radical openness. Queer/ed archival spaces, therefore, will be treated here as spaces of both home and resistance for non-normative multiply-situated peoples and communities.

Utilizing a posthuman perspective requires a disidentification from anthropocentric thought—those typical ways of thinking that emphasize the human experience over multiple others. For example, consider the human relationships with non-human entities such as animals, technologies, and systemic
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structures that humans have at times had a hand in developing, but have become invisibilized in the structures as entities themselves. Here, I draw on José Esteban Muñoz’s definition of disidentification as “a mode of understanding the movements and circulation of identificatory force...that would always foreground that lost object of identification; it would establish new possibilities while at the same time echoing the materially prescriptive cultural locus of any identification.”

Through a disidentification of human-centered thought, the ‘lost’ approach of understanding archives still focuses on humans and the material of lives lived, but offers new possibilities for archival productions as well as queer world-making, as I stated above. Furthermore, a posthuman approach highlights for me the roles that space and time play in how peoples come to know themselves through interconnected webs of relations between other peoples as well as the non-human organisms and systems such as archival records—papers, letters, photographs, videotapes, tattoos, kites, quilts, boas, leather jackets, and so on—, collections, technologies, technés, cultures, communities, environments, nation-states, and timescapes. The posthuman archives, then, can produce more fully a ‘remix’ of what stories constitute and are constituted by the collections in a nonlinear and episodic manner that might further and more radically open transdisciplinary models of conceptual diversity in archival understandings, narratives, and inquiries.

Archives have many categories into which bodies and bodies of knowledges are intended to fit, but ‘categories’ as they are typically conceived are
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unable to contain bodies and bodies of knowledges that are, as this project conveys, might always and continually be emerging and evolving. Through the Australian Records Continuum paradigm and theoretical development, Sue McKemmish and Frank Upward argue that the records exist in a state of becoming. Anne Gilliland, too, suggests that archives are “always in a state of becoming.”282 In Chapter 3, I argue that archives and bodies are distinctly related through notions of embodiment alongside archival practices which tell of the (un)becoming—the simultaneous becoming and unbecoming—process that each is engaged in as ‘bodies so far’ and ‘stories so far.’283 My analysis of select oral history interviews from the Arizona LGBTQ Storytelling Project at the Arizona Queer Archives leads me to a process of looking and listening to understand the techniques and technés of storytelling that are connected to remembering and forgetting while also connected to embodied both normalizing and non-normative practices that LGBTQ peoples have historically processed and produced in order to be included in the archives. The complex oral history productions—bodies and bodies of knowledges, interviewer, interviewee, chairs, camera, video tape, memory card, digital video editor, computers, streaming media video producer, bandwidth, online media cataloger, and users, just to name a few of the human and non-human components—produce multiple and multiply-situated records


283 Adela C. Licona’s April 2013 keynote address titled “Mi’ja, just say you’re a feminist like you used to…”: Pa/trolling & Performing Queer Rhetorics in the Everyday at the Queering Spaces/Queering Borders Queer Studies Conference at the University of North Carolina-Asheville.
creators who move sometimes rather seamlessly between dominant and non-dominant inquiries and response narratives. It is this complexity of relationships to the dominant and the normative in these oral history productions that makes urgent the development of the Queer/ed Archival Methodology, Q/M. In Chapter 4, I utilize three distinct approaches to temporality—haunting, decolonizing, and queering—to critically interrogate temporalities and reimagine the record and its recordness—its evidentiary qualities—in order to challenge the archives as they tend to be historically situated. It is in this fourth chapter that I situate archives as bodies of knowledges suggesting a push on the boundaries of how archivists and archival theorists might understand the changing nature of the record. I argue that reconsidering the archival notions of ‘fixity’ and ‘capture’ can move archival productions into ongoing interrogations of conventional practices and assumptions that have often challenged the archives’ ability to hold and care for records and all of their historical, emotional, technological, social, and cultural entanglements.

This research project interrogates the many normalizing practices and modes of thinking with regard to archives and archival practice and productions. Research into the archival body aims to open up scholarly thought and day-to-day
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284 I have selected Q/M as a shortened way to name Queer/ed Archival Methodology. I use the forward slash in queer/ed to highlight the ease and agility that some have in moving between a present and past tense verb and to highlight the multiple ways to understand the adjective, verb, and noun simultaneously. Importantly for my project, this word choice is a deliberate move towards the verb to queer as a way to subvert or at least tinker with the normative. The slash ‘/’ for me also represents the taking apart and simultaneous coming together which I consider through the somatechnical lens and implications on embodiment. I also like the potentials for Q/M to look like the acronyms for sadomasochism because of the intentional and accidental intersections of pleasure, pain, erotics, deviancy, normal, and questions of ‘what is proper?’
considerations about the power circulating therein regarding privilege, knowledges, and related structures of the archiving archives through time. Through my project to develop the Queer/ed Archival Methodology, Q/M, I situated my research in LGBTQ and Transgender archives and archival productions to interrogate bodies of knowledges that are distinctly connected to bodies as always in the processes of (un)becoming and time which, as socially constructed, situates bodies in particular modes of everyday life; however, the Q/M is a methodology that can be utilized with many multiply-situated communities and in a variety of archival contexts. I see the Q/M, most primarily, as an approach to archival work within communities that may be underrepresented in more traditional archives. Certainly the historicity of archives suggests that those in more powerful and privileged normative social positioning create, constitute, and even consume the dominant archival perspectives on who and what is authorized and allowed to cross the threshold into the archives. The archives, then, might hold the supporting documents as well as the detritus of the privileged and powerful as well as maintain the narratives about what has been conquered—a past, a present, and a future. Thus, archives as dominant material and historical spaces have rightly been considered neocolonizing spaces that continue to re-enact conquest and dominance in violent, physical, discursive, embodied, and haunting ways of memorializing and remembering. However, as I have argued throughout earlier chapters, archives as bodies of knowledges hold multiple truths of multiply-situated subjects and subjectivities. In fact, even those neocolonizing archives hold many histories but perhaps only legible and
intelligible through distinct perspectives of the colonizers, those in powerful and privileged positions. Shifts in this colonizing gaze and the opening of spaces for new and emerging perspectives is urgent.

Many archives—community-based and institutional—utilize distinct methods for working within groups, communities, and special collections with social justice in mind; certainly there are conscientious archivists working toward ends similar to the goals of this particular research project. Although my contribution means to suggest that embodied archives and archival bodies collect, preserve, and make accessible those practices that through repetition have become invisibilized, naturalized, and normalized, I recognize that everyday archivists and professional archivists continue to consciously expand that archival repertoire. Q/M aims to aid these conscientious archivists and scholars by offering a dynamic and flexible framework for use in new archival productions that are attentive to contradictions, elisions, and erasures.

In addition to offering up a usable framework and mode of thinking for contemporary archival work and study, Q/M is proposed to function as a means for critique and re-configuration of already existing archives. In relation to existing archives, the development of a Q/M has implications for history and, especially, keeping in mind archival endeavors produced with, for, and about non-normative and non-dominant peoples, multiple and even competing histories. Through implementing the Q/M, the collecting, preserving, and making accessible physical and digital materiality of lived lives, can expand the multiple accountings and lineages of meaning-making practices and knowledge productions in order to
support archival constructions as spaces for the potentials for equity and social justice. In this chapter, I draw on my research and hands-on practical archival work with the Arizona Queer Archives in order to outline the Queer/ed Archival Methodology as it developed through consideration of theoretical perspectives, qualitative research in the field, as well as archival practices and practiced applications. Through my analyses of potential methods and practices, I connect the archival body to shifting notions of temporality to suggest processes that might support a radically open archival production.

**Purpose Statement and Research Questions**

The major focus of this research project is the development of a Q/M alongside the development of the Arizona Queer Archives. Re-thinking the constraints of a dichotomy that divides the professional and the non-professional or amateur archivist is important to queer/ed archives and queer/ed archival practices because such a dichotomy forecloses the possibilities of moving archivists and their collections beyond what is considered the proper, the legitimate, and the normative to an understanding that archival strategies can inform in multiple directions—from the institution to the community as well as from the community to the institution. I began as an unauthorized archivist and end as an authorized one. With a twist. Experiences within community archival contexts as well as through connections to institutional archives have suggested that the institution is often called upon to provide a certain expertise for the community work. However, it is rare that community is called upon in the same
ways but instead is invited as subjects within the archival contexts. Through the Q/M, archives will benefit from the expanded scope of the spectrum of legibility—that margin of maneuverability where the community and institutional archives can remain mobile and continue to be legible and intelligible or even pass as archives from multiple directions. Reciprocal and multidirectional knowledge sharing is especially important to those archivists who are interested in the mundane, the ordinary, the non-normative especially as these constitute the queer.

As I considered the greater project of developing the Q/M, and as mentioned previously in Chapter 1, I was guided by three overarching questions throughout this research endeavor:

(1) How can archives simultaneously hold normative and non-normative stories, materials, and practices together as both complementary and also contradictory without subordinating or otherwise invalidating either and so that each can still be considered worthy of archival attention?

(2) How might a Q/M be a radical intervention into normative archival practices and structures and to what ends?

(3) What might it mean and look like for a queer/ed archives to be radically open spaces? For whom?

Broadly conceived and with my three research questions in mind, I focused on what gets accomplished when related and intersecting literatures are brought together in these ways to challenge and inform the archives as bodies of
knowledges. As intimated earlier in this final chapter, my entire project means to propose a methodological framework aimed to cast contemporary thinking about archives and archival work in particular and dynamic ways; such a framework meant to aid archivists currently wrangling with socially just practices as well as to inspire emergent thinking about archival work and archives as evolving, living, and (un)becomings.

**A Queer/ed Archival Methodology: Research as Praxis**

When I started the development of the Arizona Queer Archives in 2011, I returned to how-to manuals about building archives and paid attention to the key steps in the process. As I read further and jotted my notes into a red Moleskin notebook that would become my own little handbook that I now affectionately call *Test Kitchen Recipes*, I asked myself: at which step would this archives be a ‘real’ archives? What does a ‘real’ archives look and act like? And how will I recognize this moment? Who is to say?

My project has led to additional questions about archives and archival work, and what I have learned about my ‘test kitchen’ questions specifically is that I don’t know the answers. The archives, like bodies, perform and are read by others. The others, from their positioning, assumptions, pre-conceived notions, and multiply-situated subjectivities, then, read and interpret the archives and the bodies of knowledges therein. Those from the institutional archival contexts may read and interpret much differently than those from the community archival
contexts and it is this schism that interests me, this space, this margin of maneuverability in which the archives and the defining characteristics of the archives can move, change, and be reimagined and still be legible, intelligible, and read as archives in multiple directions. The idea of ‘real’ is always in question as archives take many shapes and hold many bodies.

This concern with the ‘real’ and a focus on what can be ‘queer,’ ‘queered,’ and ‘most radically open’ has carried this project and motivated the work throughout the process. At the start of this project, for example, I wanted to build archives in the ‘right’ way and for the ‘right’ reasons. I felt the urgency for self-representation, participation, social justice, and equity and these parts fit well with the LGBTQ communities toward whom my work was focused. I wanted to include many individual narratives, perspectives, and materials that might tell many stories. I was wary of the ideas of just one history and one major narrative, but while I interviewed LGBTQ people for the oral history collection, I found myself falling into the simple line of questioning that elicits responses that seemed to fit a kind of dominant and, therefore, normative model. In this moment of self-awareness, I then began to question my own steps and methods that I was already beginning to put in place to build the Arizona Queer Archives. Upon reflection, it was imbued with dominant structures, traditions, paradigms, and pressures pushing at the recording and archiving processes themselves. These pressures are often not easily recognized, but through ongoing reflection and consideration of dominant structures and patterns of presentation and representation, we, as archivists and scholars, can push back on and resist these
and similar dominating constraints. My desire for a queer/ed radical openness emerged for me from a realization that normative practices can haunt the archival collections and oral history recordings as well as the appraisal, organization, and making the collections accessible. I wanted the archives I produced to hold more than singular narratives to include competing ideas of what it means – has meant – to be LGBTQ across time and space. I learned the most from my engagement with the transgender and queer community. I learned that one story could hold competing histories and bodies (un)becoming. I was called to imagine a space and a practice open enough not to foreclose the possibilities of an ongoing queer world-making space simply because I could not see it or imagine it; collaborating in and with the communities that constitute the collections is integral to a queer/ed radically open archives. I also learned by being attentive to the ways interviewers reproduced normative assumptions that sometimes silenced and sometimes highlighted the non-normative. I watched and listened to internal self-regulated neocolonizing storytelling practices that must call the archives to interrogate the imbricating layers of context—ghostly matter—linked to power, but with the potential to be remixed and re-imagined as decolonized and no longer captivating.

As the archives moves, changes, and is reimagined, the need exists for a Queer/ed Archival Methodology, Q/M, to help guide archivists along with their staff, communities, contributors, and volunteers through the unsettling technological, societal, cultural, and archival shifts in what might be considered normal and standardized concepts and practices of archival productions. As a methodology, the Q/M works as a flexible framework that might then open up
conversations and decisions about distinct practical applications and methods that archivists can put into practice even if it’s for a trial run to inquire into the efficacy of such methods. Through the Q/M, consider making the processes of archiving into a function and form of archives. If archivists are attentive to communities within which their archives collects and circulates, certain methods might, in fact, be more effective for conveying and enacting the archival mission and vision. My aim is to offer, instead of a set of methods or tools, a way of thinking about knowledges and communities that can underpin archival scholarship, notions of archives, and approaches to archival work. A methodology, therefore, is an integral piece of research in general and, importantly, this greater research project as it relates to working in archives. I believe that a methodology—any methodology—is fundamental to archival productions and archives development as a guide through the “logic that links the project’s ontological and epistemological approaches to the selection and deployment of these (archival) methods.”

Sandra Harding suggests that, methodology and method are distinguished by their scope given that “a research methodology is a theory and analysis of how research does or should proceed...” and, “a research method is a technique for (or way of proceeding in) gathering evidence.”

Linda Tuhiwai Smith argues “methodology is important because it frames the questions being asked, determines the set of instruments and methods
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to be employed and shapes the analyses." Relating to the archives and the archival processes, methodology serpentine both through the thinking about and the doing of archives. The methodology is present throughout and supports the policy creation and the methods that the archival staff, advisors, and volunteers have deemed necessary for this work.

The development of the Q/M creates a flexible framework for archival thought and action that will be robust and able to respond to changes in local as well as global contexts – as a robust way of thinking and approaching the doing of and study on archives and archival work, the Q/M must necessarily change. Drawing from queer theory along with posthumanist thought, the Q/M can be attentive to human and non-human stories and histories that can animate archives and as they may be recognized and recognizable in multimodal materials from physical to digital as well as to the non-linear and the ephemeral. Queer theory suggests that stories and records should be questioned in order to be mis/recognized and understood as complex and non-linear and always relational. The queer pushes archivists to produce, read, and interpret archives in ways that challenge assumptions and the normative categories that bodies—human and non-human—are often subjected to. Bodies and archives have markings and categories that contain and constrain them. Gloria Anzaldúa argues that:

Marking is always ‘marking down.’ While I advocate putting Chicana, *tejana*, working-class, dyke-feminist poet, writer-theorist in front of my name, I do so for reasons different than those of the dominant culture. Their reasons are to marginalize, confine, and contain. My labeling of myself is so that the Chicana and lesbian and all the other persons in me.

---

don’t get erased, omitted, or killed. Naming is how I make my presence known, how I assert who and what I am and want to be known as. Naming myself is a survival tactic.\textsuperscript{288}

I invoke Anzaldúa here as a reminder of the commitment the Q/M has to multiply-situated subjectivities and resisting erasure through naming one’s self. Self-representation influences the potential histories and emergent imaginaries to be found in the archives. The posthuman approach offers the “opportunity to empower the pursuit of alternative schemes of thought, knowledge, and self-presentation.”\textsuperscript{289} Through understandings that there are bodies as human and bodies as non-human that come together in complex relations and assemblages within the archives, the archival productions can represent new and emerging thoughts on lived experiences as situated in environments, structures, and systems. Humans create records. Records represent human activities. However, bodies as configurations and (un)becomings include these techniques, technologies, contexts, and structures. Each of these holds agency within the relationship, the coming together and apart, that makes urgent my arguments about re-mixing and re-configuring temporalities in order to understand more clearly the important and at times disorienting information that records and archives can hold. As we conjure fragmented identities in the postmodern approach and follow traces towards interrogating the force and function of respectability politics within the archival body, the modern and anthropocentric


Cartesian statement ‘Je pense, que donc je suis’ (I think, therefore I am) can no longer support the human as the central theme of archival endeavors. Human bodies, therefore, are relational and contingent in complex ways to non-human bodies. The Q/M offers an attentive plurality in narrative and potential interpretive contexts.

Within a queer theoretical framework and one that is attuned to archival embodiment and embodied archives, the Q/M, as I outline next, blends queer, social justice, feminist, and decolonizing methodological approaches. To reiterate, the methodological considerations are about a framework for thinking about and approaching archival productions and scholarship, the methods are those things we ‘do’ when going about the collecting, organizing, preserving, and making accessible human/non-human stories and ‘stuff.’ All of this can inform archivists’ attentions and re-situating of existing archives and related practices as they exist within a spectrum of archival contexts as described next.

The Approaches

As I have moved through the earlier chapters to highlight the existing theories that have offered me distinct and emerging perspectives on and approaches to archives, I have supported and explained what I am developing as a transdisciplinary and queer/ed methodology through analyses of stories, storytelling techniques and technologies, lived materialities, oral history productions and processes, as well as archival developments and collections that
reside on the borders of community and institution and as bodies that are (un)becoming. In the following paragraphs, I outline the Queer/ed Archival Methodology and offer examples from my practical archival work to support this methodology.

1.1 Participatory Ethos

Whether an archivist is working in an institutional or a community context or somewhere in between, participation can work in many ways and benefit the archival productions. I consider the participatory ethos as the space of sharing knowledge and skills, a space that is reciprocal and respectful. An archivist might consider the following questions: What is brought to the archival project? How does identity and/or community affiliation inform perspective and thinking? In what structures and institutions are you, as archivist, situated? One might consider their own tools, resources, funding, histories, and connections, continually engaging in reflexive thoughts on one’s own relationships to and through distinct communities. Relationships and connections may be only for a short time, a one time connection, or ongoing; duration and pace of participation will vary in each instance. What does participation look like? How is participation meaningful for the archival production at hand? How do you, as archivist, find, make, and produce meaning in the archival work? How might the community find, make, and produce meaning in the archival work, processes, and outcomes? How are related activities aligned with notions of Q/M and with the desired outcome of establishing a queer/ed archive?
Participant action research, PAR, is an important approach to research that involves the community as well as the lived knowledges and experiences that circulate within communities. As a set of beliefs about knowledge, PAR investigates where knowledge comes from and how it is validated in and beyond community. According to Eve Tuck,

“PAR aims to return to the people the legitimacy of the knowledge they are capable of producing through their own verification systems...as a guide to their own actions... PAR involves the belief that people have deep knowledge about their own lives, and the communities and institutions they inhabit. PAR anticipates that ‘those who have been most systematically excluded, oppressed, or denied carry specifically revealing wisdom about the history, structure, consequences, and the fracture points in unjust social arrangements’.”

As archives are those spaces where researchers dive into collections and records to better understand and also serve community, I argue that archival development must involve communities in order to be relevant and tell of the multiple histories that emerge from community spaces and everyday lives. They must be meaningful and accessible to the communities (always understood as heterogeneous) being archived. As a queer-identified archivist, I recognize that I position myself as one member of the complex and diverse network of communities that make up the LGBTQ category. Building the Arizona Queer Archives and developing the Q/M, then, holds direct relevance for my life and my family. At meetings and conferences, I often hear of archives ‘giving voice’ to those who are often erased from, hidden in, or pushed out of archival projects, but I urge archives to make spaces for these voices that already exist and are already

speaking to and about these erasures in ways that archives might not be attuned to hearing. Participation, then, is urgent from community as well as from those developing the archives. Participation is reciprocal.

Reciprocity is an important addition to this participatory ethos and is best understood as the “willingness to be present to the histories of others.”\(^{291}\) Being present to the histories of others may be linked to acts and processes of listening, but presence should elicit openness to multiple histories while participating in conversations that can engage reciprocal processes of storytelling and archival productions. Michelle Caswell identifies participation as one of the five principles of a community-centric approach to archives along with shared stewardship, multiplicity, archival activism, and reflexivity. She argues, “all…records are subject to and made meaningful through archival intervention via appraisal, selection, description, digitization, preservation, and outreach.”\(^{292}\) Katie Shilton and Ramesh Srinivasan suggest that a “participatory design” that focuses on appraisal, arrangement, and description will certainly be time-consuming for the archivist and archival staff, but the benefits of expanding community ontologies\(^{293}\) with community members suggest long-term sustainability for the archives and participating community. Although beneficial, participatory design as delineated by Shilton and Srinivasan might foreclose the possibilities of radical openness because of their community-focused consensus-like processes that do
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\(^{291}\) Adela Licona’s 2014 Watson Conference presentation on the concept of ‘responsivity.


\(^{293}\) Katie Shilton and Ramesh Srinivasan, “Participatory Appraisal and Arrangement for Multicultural Archival Collections,” *Archivaria* 63 (Spring 2007), 99.
not offer multiplicity of perspectives and lived knowledges, but search for community input and participation as more singular. Therefore, participatory design might work to foreclose radical openness as it forces the community to consent to one or two possibilities rather than staying open to what possibilities are known and what are yet to be known.

A literature review conducted by Christopher Kelly, Aaron Panofsky, Morgan Currie, Roderic Crooks, Seth Erickson, Patricia Garcia, Michael Wartenbe, and Stacy Wood highlights the dimensions of contemporary participation to suggest that there are numerous meanings and implementations of participation throughout information studies. One key point that they make about the dimensions of participation is the need for feedback from all stakeholders in such a participatory structure so that the structure can reflect the structures of the entities involved. Understanding structures and their degrees of control is helpful when considering the role of the archivist as a steward, especially co-steward, of records and collections while also addressing the tensions around naming practices, organization, and circulation when non-normative peoples and communities are active participants. Anne Gilliland and Sue McKemmish argue that the archives, through participatory approaches, become negotiated spaces in which there is shared stewardship. Archives, then, are “created by, for, and with multiple communities according to and respectful of community values, practices,

beliefs, and needs”—much like the 25 Projects that Linda Tuhiwai Smith establishes in *Decolonizing Methodologies*. Through a participatory ethos, then, meaning is derived through many perspectives, lived knowledges, knowledge systems, and hands through which many subjects and subjectivities are able to cross the archival threshold and be represented meaningfully.

The Australian Records Continuum theory and paradigm offers webs of connections that might elicit a broader interrogation into the many ways that participation is evidenced in records, collections, and archives. McKemmish suggests

> “the continuum worldview enables different ways of thinking about how records and their persistently linked recordkeeping process and contextual metadata (*wherever, whenever, and however* it may be captured and managed) might be “bounded”. It suggests that it is possible to integrate the ideas recently articulated by Tom Nesmith about a record being ‘…an evolving mediation of understanding about some phenomenon—a mediation created by social and technical processes of inscription, transmission, and contextualisation’ and archives as ‘…an ongoing mediation of understanding of records (and thus phenomena) or that aspect of record making which shapes this understanding through such functions as records appraisal, processing, and description, and the implementation of processes for making records accessible.’”

With webs in space and time made up of many records creators, post-custodial and shared efforts are necessary in archival production to collect and preserve materials whether physical or digital. As an archivist implementing the Q/M, how
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might one consider notions of ownership from the perspective of the records creators in order to understand the ethics of controlling our own representations within the archives while also being ethically bound to others representing themselves? With a mix and mess of records from personal, governmental, and institutional, what does meaningful participation look like? When archives are being developed and expanded with, for, and by underrepresented and multiply-situated non-normative communities, what does meaningful participation look like and produce?

In her opening remarks at UCLA’s 2013 Human Rights Archives Symposium, Anne Gilliland argues “all archives are human rights archives.” As I highlighted in earlier chapters, power circulates within archives in many ways that archivists must recognize and be attentive to. The Q/M is a framework that might assist in opening up and reimagining new practices and methods to intervene in enacting further harm within archival productions. Caswell suggests “In order for archives to meet this role (as human rights archives), they mush actively forge a path ahead that leads to meaningful and contentious dialogue and debate, that promotes the rights of victims, that might favor forgetting and elision over memory and commemoration, and that helps societies acknowledge painful pasts and reconceptualize the future.”

I see Caswell’s suggestions as linked to my earlier work on temporality through which, utilizing Elizabeth Freeman’s and Heather Love’s notions of reparative criticism and ideas of remix, I propose nonlinear and episodic frameworks to conjure reimaginaries that don’t necessarily

heal past wrongs, but move archivists in their archival productions towards a radical openness in which new voices, new histories, counter-histories, and anti-histories might emerge and exist in complex and contradictory tensions. The Q/M supports the archives to not need to reconcile and heal wounds, but acknowledges the ongoing wound and leaves the next steps to the communities of contributors and visitors to consider the as of yet unimagined.

1.2 Participatory Ethos in its Practical Application

In my work to develop the Arizona Queer Archives, I worked directly with communities to discuss the big picture of such a queer/ed and LGBTQ-focused archival project. I held two public community meetings in which we discussed an overall vision for the Arizona Queer Archives alongside the community’s multiple definitions of ‘archives’ and the many purposes that they imagined the archives fulfilling. What became apparent in these meetings were the multiplicities within the LGBTQ communities and the diverse perspectives of what an archives might hold and do for communities in the present and through the future. Together, we implemented the Q/M to: 1) develop the Mission and Vision Statements, 2) develop the Collection Policy, and 3) to question and identify the various notions of Archival Ownership and the Arizona Queer Archives’ location within the spectrum of institutional and community contexts. What emerged were ongoing conversations and subsequent identifications of potential material understandings of lived histories as distinctly lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer peoples. Through participation and ongoing
conversations about the archival vision, mission, and collection policy, what might constitute an archival collection is opened up to such things as leather clothing, love letters, kites, body modifications, tattoos, artwork, maps, and even football cards.

Other questions that emerged for me as the founder and archivist of the Arizona Queer Archives are:

1) In such collaborations, what is the role of the archivist? Interpreter? Translator? Collaborator? Steward of stories? How might the community come together to help inform this perspective and relationship with the records, collections, communities, as well as past, present, and future? How might stories be made more meaningful through community involvement? Where and how might the archivist draw the line on participation in order to maintain efficacy of archival standards, methods, and best practices? How does each distinct archives make the Q/M work for their needs so that, as a queer/ed and robust methodology, the Q/M remains flexible and open to ongoing reimaginings and not become something closed down and sedimemted because ‘now it works’ or ‘that’s too much participation’?

2) With the implementation of the Q/M and its participatory ethos, is the ‘founder’s syndrome’—that feeling of deep ownership or having given birth to the archival project—alleviated? What happens when people participate? Agree? Disagree? How might the community help to identify the potential affordance and limitations of such a participatory relationship?
3) Through a participatory ethos, how are records then identified, created, collected, described, and shared? As stories and storytelling are integral to the Q/M, participatory methods must emerge and be flexible enough to tell many multiple and contradictory stories. Queer and feminist oral history methods are important to a participatory ethos of archival productions as they include: open-ended interviews, participant feedback, collaborative question development, intent listening, and ongoing collaborative and ethical representation. Through training on digital/analog video and audio equipment along with media literacies detailing shot composition and storytelling techniques, oral history productions can become efforts towards community storytelling and capturing distinct histories and counter-histories from multiple communities that make up the greater archival community. What might also emerge in these community formations and relational reconfigurations instantiates what games scholar and video game archivists, Ken McAllister calls ‘preservation through play’ and what I consider meaningful memory-making and sharing.

As participation takes place in physical and virtual spaces, how might the physical and the virtual be connected to exhibits and collections in multiple directions? What do visitors to the archives find and how? How might they make meaning and how might the archives recognize and mark the meaning-making? Will the archives incorporate folksonomies and distinct collaborative metadata schematics? Tag clouds? Featured topics? Trending records and collections? Might archives also integrate the linking capabilities that are found online into the physical collections and exhibit spaces? How? Certainly in archival productions,
questions continually arise and the Q/M is not meant to answer them, but to, rather, serve to guide archivists—everyday archivists and professional archivists—in their work with and for communities.

2.1 Connectivity

Like the notion of remix, connectivity too constitutes connection, disconnection, and re-connection to contexts, histories, spaces, as well as to time and temporality in ways that emphasize the role of impermanence through which spaces open up where and when social change can happen and is expected to happen. In Chapter 3, I argue for and through archival and bodily (un)becomings as ongoing metamorphoses as simultaneously becoming and unbecoming. Records creators and records themselves exist in this (un)becoming through time and space and through which the archives then must be attentive to shifting relationships and networks of humans and non-humans. In effect, archivists and archives might encounter distinctly how the relationship between community and institution is precarious as the liminal space where fears of further erasure and historical contexts collide with hopes and dreams for equity and belonging. The Q/M—through connection to the urgency of remixing and understanding histories as episodes in lived knowledges as opposed to definitional master narratives—might open up home spaces through which records creators might describe how “specific forms of knowing, being, belonging, and embodying are prevented from emerging in the first place.”298 As a queer world-making project, then, the
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queer/ed archives may become spaces for emerging connections to longing, belonging, desire, and erotics as archival records and collections intersect and bodies of knowledges as well as bodies themselves encounter one another. There may be tensions with the establishment and institutional archival contexts as grassroots archives fight for funding and modes of sustainability while underrepresented groups fighting for equality might also feel a sense of belonging when invited into such institutional archival contexts. Both things—being situated in and out of institutional archival contexts while recognizing the inextricable connections between institution and community—can be true.

Through drawing on a posthuman approach that I highlight throughout my earlier chapters, I urge archivists to make technologies and techniques visible and transparent in ways to suggest that the forms and functions of archival productions include multimodal structures of expression, materiality, and communication technologies as active participants. Humans do not work in isolation, but are inter- and intra-connected to many networks and assemblages that highlight the queer/ed and shifting temporalities within the archival structures. Understanding the bigger picture of how humans and non-humans are connected can, again, open up creative imaginaries that support new ideas of what constitutes records, further decolonizing practices, and spaces for ongoing contextual shifts in archival appraisal and description. Through collecting and disseminating, technologies play a role and connect human to non-human in emotionally, socially, and culturally significant ways.
2.2 Connectivity in its Practical Application

Through the work to develop the Arizona Queer Archives, I have interrogated the archival processes and structures in order to better understand the impermanence in connecting and re-connecting with communities, stories, and technologies and techniques of archival productions. Questions related to connectivity through archival work include: 1) As an institutional archives, how is the archives connected to community? 2) As a community archives, how is the archives connected to institution? 3) As a ‘both/and’ institutional and community archives, what does this relationship look like? 4) Is there flexibility built in to these relationships so that change can occur? 5) Is there flexibility built in to these relationships so that records creators have a say in how their records are collected, produced, named, preserved, and shared? How are new records contributed? How are records accessed and maintained? And can records creators change their minds?

3.1 Storytelling

Storytelling and the archival emphasis on stories and ‘stories so far’ highlight for me the intersections and intricate webs of space and time through which multiplicity is instantiated in human and non-human relationships as overlapping, hybridized, layered, and imbricated existences that tell distinct stories from numerous positions. Through stories, connections and participation occur through many modes and many lineages. Linda Tuhiwai Smith notes
“for many indigenous writers stories are ways of passing down the beliefs and values of a culture in the hope that the new generations will treasure them and pass the story down further. The story and the story teller both serve to connect the past with the future, one generation with the other, the land with the people and the people with the story…as a way of representing the diversities of truth within which the story teller rather than the researcher retains control.”

Through stories change can take place. Chris Atton proposes that social justice media and alternative media have created new spaces for non-dominant voices that provide a focus for specific community interests as well as the contrary, subversive, and I add, the creative. The archives projects that I have undertaken embody the goals of social justice media—media that is interested in social change and is produced as a gesture of solidarity with community members and activists, and as a way to disseminate the tools and practices of media production, lived insights, and commitments to justice and the powerful potential in storytelling. Michelle Caswell, too, lists storytelling as one of the five principles within the community-centric approach to archives. Importantly, within institutional settings multiply-situated peoples and their normative and non-normative stories are collected and preserved in these shifting contexts as well. The archivists must recognize that when contexts change the stories and storytelling techniques might also change and, therefore, the archives must remain flexible and dynamic. The Q/M, then, might prove integral to collecting and telling stories that are made meaningful in the lives of records creators and visitors to the archives.
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I return to notions of power and emphasize the ways that even in storytelling, peoples utilize techniques of telling to belong to particular bodies of knowledges. In fact, the politics of respectability and the urgency for understanding human and non-human multiplicity is also stitched and woven throughout each story. For LGBTQ peoples, fear and erasure are inscribed in embodiment and, so, stories will speak to these fears and insecurities while also tell of hope and love. An archives as a human rights and socially just archives might consider the multimodal ways to represent multiple subjectivities as keys to promoting equity to work toward remix and reparative criticism in episodic storytelling me.

3.2 Storytelling in its Practical Application

As a scholar, archivist, writer, and filmmaker, I have been drawn to storytelling and have called on oral history methods as a principle mode of archival productions for the Arizona Queer Archives. Utilizing the Q/M shifts the focus of such storytelling productions towards a collaborative and community effort by shifting our eyes away from the story as artifact toward a more dynamic and contextualized representation of lived and embodied experiences. Collecting oral history interviews calls me to consider the event of oral history production and the coming together of the human and non-human elements that make up the stories and storytelling techniques. According to Jeff Friedman in “Spiraling Desire: Recovering the Lesbian Embodied Self in Oral History Narrative,” often “social hierarchies overdetermine the interview event, especially between elites
and nonelites. Perceived power differences between academic researchers and their nonelite narrators force lower status participants to construct an ‘official’ story for the elite interviewer. I suggest that before beginning, the interviewer should sit with the interviewee to create the list of questions together. This could be done in a pre-interview, but is most effective when done in an informal conversational setting in which power dynamics might be flattened in ways that ease the question and answer format for the interviewee. In fact, the Participatory Ethos permeates this approach within the Q/M as the sharing of video production skills and expertise becomes an integral reciprocal process of archival development. Therefore, the interviewer might also be a member of the same distinct community as the interviewer making the power dynamics shift in ways that might open up possibilities for a fuller accounting of lives and histories.

During the interview process, build in flexibility so as to move organically through questions and storytelling techniques in order to be respectful and to further understand that the oral history interview is an event, an assemblage of different parts coming together. Work to ensure a safe space on and off the camera. Consider the importance of the interview environment as a participant in the interview. Where would the interviewee like to be interviewed? Remain open to the variety of possibilities and consider safety, privacy, and comfort. Be aware of the power one has when one wields a camera and all of its recording accessories. Take the necessary time to first identify the backdrop and location the
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interviewee is most comfortable to be interviewed in and then set up the camera equipment. I like to talk through the process and tell the interviewee a bit about myself while getting to know the interviewee during this setting up of the tripod, camera, lights, and microphones. Pay attention to the shot composition because even the camera angle is a way that power is conveyed and interpreted through the image and also the sound beyond the actual story. Storytelling is important and especially as it is tied to Participatory Ethos and Connectivity.

Narrating personal records and collections is another way to incorporate storytelling into archival productions. Through implementing the Q/M, this might take place through an oral history interview on camera or audio alone as the donor or records creators describe the materials in their collections and why they are meaningful to them. Narration might also take place textually as an annotation to a virtual record or collection as well as through the archival colophon, metadata, and comments through which archivists and visitors to the archives might add meaningful information to distinct collections. Through conversations with archival scholars, I learned that such narration is being used in Yosemite National Park archival description as well as through the development of the Plateau Peoples Web Portal and the open-source archival platform, Mukurtu, that allows for multiple knowledge systems to overlap and complement one another in the storytelling. Narration and storytelling is being used more and more often and is a great tool for contextualizing and incorporating perspective.

4.1 Intervention
The Q/M promotes a kind of intervention that makes urgent the revisiting of one’s collections to use close reading and listening so as to expand contextual understandings of materials. I think about the numerous ways that I am able to look and listen to the same oral history interviews and identify new information that comes from my connection and interaction with the materials in new spaces and new times. I consider the ways that I read and re-read Joseph De Maios' letters from the Transgender Archives from different perspectives to see more clearly the couched double entendrés and how his letters might be playful and relate to distinct intimacies and relationships that might otherwise go unnoticed. The revisiting and new ways of looking and listening might intervene in the sedimented assumptions that accumulate over time. Interventions, then, have implications for the greater archives and all of its collections so that they might be interacted with in new ways to produce new knowledges and to elicit meaningful participation in such archival endeavors.

4.2 Intervention in its Practical Application

My first suggestion is to get to know the collections being worked on and those already processed. Consider steps that might be put into place so that archivists can embark on a collaborative process of interrogating and knowing the collections alongside the community it portends to represent. I advise archivists to return to the ghostly matter and what haunts the collections. Consider carefully the stories that are being told. What stories are being silenced in the not telling? Reflect on the silences, not to fill them with something else, but to recognize these
spaces as such. What strategies might archivists consider to expand contextual knowledge about historical matters that might contain and constrain bodies in ways that might be harmful in the long run and might go unnoticed in the immediate?

One practical example to think about focuses on finding aids and how collections are described. Archivists might interrogate their own work by asking whether collections might be ‘described’ or ‘prescribed’; meaning, are these descriptions that recognize assumption and pre-conceived notions about the materials and their contexts? Or are the finding aids spelling out the assumptions as if they are ‘real’ and ‘true’? According to KJ Rawson, “finding aids might attend to language practices, the perceived audiences(s), and the political and cultural contexts of the documents.”

I offer an example of the approach of intervening in assumptive practices in which I reflexively deployed the Q/M’s Participatory Ethos within the Arizona Queer Archives and through the description of the newly acquired Fly Away Zine Mobile collection. I collaborated with Adela C. Licona, Professor of Rhetoric, Composition and the Teaching of English at the University of Arizona, to call on her Rhetorical Studies students who were also zinesters to annotate the zines, self-published magazines, during archival processing. After digitally scanning the zine’s cover for identification within the virtual Omeka archives website, students wrote up a full annotation of the entire zine while also highlighting ways that each zine might be used within certain classroom contexts considering the content, form, context,
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and, importantly, how each of these volunteer rhetoric students identified with the material they were handling as produced specifically by and about queer (Q) and queer people of color (QPOC) zinesters, zine designers and creators.

5.1 Re-framing

Re-framing is an intervention, but I want to highlight here its critical work within the archives itself. Re-framing is a key approach that draws from queering and decolonizing, as I argued earlier, to relate to temporalities and multiple understandings of archival structures as impermanent and as bodies so far.

When I began my work to develop the Arizona Queer Archives, I read archival literatures and met with a number of community members to better understand how people thought about and understood archives. My copious notes describe again and again visions of archives as ‘solid structures’ with boxes and boxes and ‘no dust.’ Assumptions held about the archivist were much the same—solid structure along with the keen abilities to objectively organize things into boxes. Again, ‘no dust.’ In the anonymous survey that I handed out to those who attended our initial Arizona Queer Archives Community Conversation, participants identified the archives as the place “full of stories,” “where people can find themselves reflected in recorded history regardless of their minority status,” that “not only preserves but displays the collection of histories,” that “is open to growing,” and “collects and retains materials of unique, rare, and
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culturally pertinent.” In Chapter 2, I reviewed literatures that tell of the modern approach to archives and how this understanding emerged around record keeping practices, especially in nation-state governmental holdings. I, as archivist, also held onto some of these assumptions of objectivity and neutrality, but my education had taught me to know better. Critical inquiry drove me to watching and listening how community members started to re-frame and re-imagine their understandings about archives while realizing that there could, in fact, be many iterations. As I revisit my notes, I consider how we change our minds, our perspectives and come to understand that, through the efforts to re-frame, alternate and emerging histories emerge from spaces that had often been overlooked and quieted by notions of authorized practice and access. The visions of spaces for community tell of possibility through which entering the archives was not by invitation only. The archives could be re-framed in ways to hold many stories—contradictory and complicated—while still being solid and yet flexible and adaptable. Solid did not have to mean rigid and unbending. Solid could mean here presently, but always in a state of (un)becoming.

As (un)becoming archives and (un)becoming bodies of knowledges, I inquire into how the posthuman approach and influence on methods might also shape and re-shape materiality of the archives. Digital and physical spaces might be set up integratively and organically connected rather than only identified as in dichotomous relations. What if archivists and communities expand and re-frame
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the items that we produce for the archive? Consider archival and performance studies theorists Jeannette Bastian, Janet Ceja, and Diana Taylor and their work to look into community and performance as valuable archives albeit ephemeral and, so, only for the time being. Return to McAllister’s adage ‘preservation through play’ that re-frames notions of preservation as connected to practices of remembering and forgetting. Overall, imagine the ways that archival work, when performed and understood through a posthuman approach, aligns with the shifting temporal understandings of past, present, and future and McAllister’s work incorporate play and especially the hands-on practical understandings of archival materiality. As the Q/M is implemented within and through archival contexts, the approach of re-framing is integral in efforts towards radical openness as establishing a generative space through which archivists alongside community and institutional stakeholders might re-consider and deploy creative modes of archival practice as linked always to emerging archival theory. above.

5.2 Re-framing in its Practical Application

As archivist, consider re-framing as a practice to look and re-look at the many angles of the contextual situated-ness of records and records creators in order to expose the threads and structures that have upheld certain categories of belonging. First, I suggest that naming is the first step to re-framing. Caswell notes “Trust and transparency as guiding principles for describing sensitive records and building metadata models.” With the archival approaches, such as,

---

304 Michelle Caswell, 211.
respect des fonds, original order, and provenance, archivists are already working to read the collections in ways to make meaning of them. How might re-framing shift the power of classification so that a radical openness to archival productions might break open the archive to expanded ways of thinking about multiply-situated non-normative peoples and communities? For example, the principle of provenance is critiqued by Terry Eastwood and Heather MacNeil in *Currents of Archival Thinking* to “focus on how to effectively represent the fluid and changing nature of both the external and internal structure of archival aggregations…disjunction between logical order based on administrative structure and the physical order that records assume over time…recognition of this disjunction has caused archivist to re-envision the archival fonds or aggregation as a conceptual rather than physical entity.”

In the practice of Re-framing, then, the archivist invigorates the potential of a radical openness in the archives so that the recordness of the record along with the roles that the archivist plays might also be (un)becoming and stories so far.

Questions that I suggest posing through the implementation of Q/M: How do archivists physically arrange a collection to make sense? What is the role of the archivists? What is the role of the communities? And makes sense to whom? Considering that power circulating through archives produce and is produced through areas of vulnerability, the Q/M can, therefore, move archivists and their archival work towards an openness for social justice and equity.
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6.1 Re-imagining

Re-imagining is the Q/M approach that exemplifies why transdisciplinarity is important throughout my entire research project. Transdisciplinarity draws from a number of disciplines to re-imagine complex pasts along with new possibilities that don’t fit into disciplinary frames, but open up new and generative spaces for radical openness making it integral to be change-oriented while changing. As a queer politic inextricably woven through such a radical openness, the Q/M challenges us to also call forth the experiences of failure and exile so that the archives might create what Heather Love calls a “‘homeopathic’ approach to political subjectivity that incorporates rather than disavows the causes of social inequality.”306 In the states of (un)becoming, the archives, archival bodies of knowledges must be critical and change-oriented in order to open archives up to re-imaginings and creative interpretations and productions. As categories get implemented consciously, unconsciously, and nonconsciously in archival productions, the ability and space to re-imagine and re-configure categories makes ways for the archives to be attentive to sexuality, race, class, gender, sex, ability, and geography so as to be wary of shifts in meanings as Anne Gilliland suggests we look at how records and their definitions shift in international contexts. If archives are human rights archives, then equity in the archives must always be attuned to practices of social justice.

7.1 Flexible & Dynamic

The last approach that I want to highlight is the one that involves the importance of queer theory to the Q/M as a flexible and dynamic framework. First, as archival bodies and bodies of knowledges that are stories so far, traditional chrononormative perspectives and understandings do not work within the archives, the queer(ed) archives. Challenging the positivist and progress narratives that archives attempt to follow, archivists, in their work with and for communities, might consider the episodic framework with no beginning, no middle, and no end. Unending and ongoing as (un)becoming bodies might then challenge archival notions of the recordness of the record so as to radically open the possibility for new and emerging or even contradictory evidentiary qualities that are relevant for distinct communities of records creators, but cannot be guaranteed for all of them. In postcustodial efforts, especially through creative collaborations with community and institution, there are multiple ways to recognize materiality through applying the Q/M.

One important question I might ask is: What is an ideal configuration? As the Q/M is intended to be flexible and dynamic, please keep in mind that you will be re-configuring this shape and structure in order to keep it relevant to communities, technologies, timescapes, emotions, and social, technical, cultural formations. The normative and non-normative will shift. The archive holds stories of relational configurations that are complex and complicated and at times considered outside of the norm. Jasbir Puar in *Terrorist Assemblages*, Wendy Brown in *States of Injury*, and Margot Canaday in *The Straight State* highlight for me the push-pull movements as rights are assigned to particular people based on
distinct classificatory qualifications. People are pulled toward the center, into the mainstream, into belonging to society. Simultaneously those who do not exhibit these qualifications are pushed further away from the center, are made more deviant, placed under critical surveillance, and considered expendable. As expendable lives, there is that space where desire grows for the center, the acceptance, belonging. In this space, fear and hope reside to push people to be ‘normal’ and ‘good.’ The force and function of what Deborah Gould, in *Moving Politics*, refers to as a politics of respectability leads to storytelling techniques—as well as interviewing and interpretative strategies—that work as discursive self-regulation and normalizing strategies that are affectively driven by urgency to belong. With bodies shifting and always in motion as stories so far, the Q/M itself must be robust to acknowledge and assist to re-evaluate the archives in question.

Implementing the Q/M produces the archive as a shapeshifter. Consider a puzzle with many pieces that have edges that are not rigid, but moveable and adjustable, even able to be fit in different locations, in order to understand the changing nature of the greater puzzle itself as it carries many stories and histories. The Q/M is responsive to these shifts. An archive that implements the Q/M, too, is responsive, flexible, and dynamic.

7.2 Flexible & Dynamic Archives in its Practical Application: Performance Review

The implementation of the Q/M as a development tool for a new archives or as an analytical tool for an existing archives should highlight a list of processes
that archives and archival staff regularly go through in the assessment of more specific job roles and tasks. Consider zooming out and looking at the bigger picture of the archives to pinpoint directly what areas we, as archivists, must look more closely at. As an archives that has adopted a participatory ethos along with queer and social justice-oriented theoretical approaches, how then does the Q/M influence: 1) the scope and scale of the (potential) collections; 2) the vision and mission of the archives; 3) the collection policy; 4) collection processes; 5) outreach; 6) access; 7) preservation; 8) resources and sustainability strategies; and 9) prioritizing. The principles of the archive must run throughout the methodology.

Considering the archives, then, as body made up of tiny machines coming together in ways to maintain ongoing (un)becoming, I draw on Heidegger’s work that suggests “questioning builds a way…the way is a way of thinking.” As a way of thinking about the archives, how might the archivists question the archives and their hands-on archival productions so as to not fix attention on a certain part of the archives, but inspect the archives holistically? How might relationships to the archives be radically open and ‘free’ in ways that open up creative new possibilities while being attentive to limits and potential failures as well as those approaches that have already been tried? As a queer/ed politic of critical archives, archivists might question urges and needs for control over the techniques and technologies, as I have described throughout earlier chapters of this dissertation,

in order to imagine a productive and generative (third space) relationship with the many assembling parts of archival productions.

I suggest implementing an annual performance review for the archives itself as a way to establish a regular inventory-taking. Consider this a check-up. What are the vitals? What are archivists looking for? What data might cause alarm? How do archivists know to recognize such alarming results of these questions? What might participation look like at this point of an archives life? How might the archivist tweak things and keep the Queer/ed Archival Methodology also flexible and dynamic? What questions might you ask? Look for the elements/approaches and interrogate the scale and scope of these activities and practices. Next establish a sort of mapping that might visibilize the spaces that you think are working and those not working. Create a list of practices and processes that are currently in place and work with archivists, staff, and community participants to re-imagine how these might work differently and in concert with the archives mission and vision so as to support equity and social justice.

Conclusions

The Queer/ed Archival Methodology names a way of thinking and acting with, about, through, among, and at times in spite of traditional as well as emerging archival practices and processes in order to facilitate new, imaginative, irrational, and unpredictable (re)configurations of bodies and archives and the
many histories and records therein. When implemented, the Queer/ed Archival Methodology can play an integral role in the development and the maintenance of archives whether they are community-focused or institutionally-situated, or a blend of the two. As the methodology itself is queer/ed as I have established its principle tenets following the practices and politics of queer theory, the Q/M can be implemented within diverse archival contexts and not just those related to LGBTQ-identified communities. Through my research for this project, I have identified and worked specifically with multiply-situated non-normative communities as models within such a queer/ed methodology to subvert assumptions that desiring to be accepted is all that non-normative communities want. The oral histories and records that I have analyzed throughout this project tell multiple histories and truths about structures of belonging in order to highlight the distinct techniques of storytelling that might first identify that the structures of belonging exist and, importantly, that records creators have different relationships to belonging and at different times.

Throughout this research through archives as bodies as situated within episodic storytelling and multiple historical perspectives, it has become increasingly apparent that there are no tidy narratives that fit the progress-oriented and positivist perspectives most closely tied to the modern approach to archives. Storytelling is episodic as there are no neat beginnings, middles, and ends; stories are ongoing and nonlinear. The Q/M captures the unsettled and unsettling histories while working to make space for meaning-making within the archives. Human and non-human relationships are messy and constitute the intricately
entangled and incomplete archives that are always constructed by and through memories and emotions and multiple histories. The archivist works as steward of multiple histories and might think of the archives, then, as a pedagogical and epistemological tool. The archives does not need necessarily to be a closet; there do not need to be boxes hidden away. Unfortunately there is not a clear and easy to take up ‘tool kit’ for Q/M archival work.

However, transparency in and through the archival practices and productions radically opens up the spaces where participation, intervention, re-framing, and re-imagining can take place – the central tenants of Q/M can, in fact be negotiated through an ongoing sense of openness and reflexivity to the work. The archives is not a confessional, but a safe place to offer life stories and lived knowledges. As human rights archives, as Anne Gilliland suggests, vulnerable populations hold agency over their own histories through the Q/M’s participatory ethos. The archives is not a soap box, but spaces for multiple social positionings and efforts towards social justice. The archives is all of these and none of these at once. The archives is (un)becoming and represents multiply-situated peoples and communities through their (un)becomings. These then can be the radically open spaces of ongoing and shifting relational reconfigurations.

Recommendations for Further Research

I recognize the spaces where further study will assist me in my ongoing development of the Queer/ed Archival Methodology. Incorporating decolonizing
into my thinking on temporality and the shifting definitions of the record as connected to ‘fixity’ and ‘capture’ has made urgent to me the greater connection to the postcolonial archival project which is beyond the scope of this dissertation but will be integral to my future research. I also foresee more in-depth research into my initial inquiries into queering and queer/ed technologies and techniques of oral history productions that will more distinctly identify assemblage theory as it relates to feminist and queer methods alongside the collapsible frames of past, present, and future. Lastly, I intend to conduct further research on the force and function of the politics of respectability and how the Q/M can be further applied transnationally to multiply-situated, community and institutional archives as they are situated in and across nation-state formations. With this dissertation I offer Q/M as a means for thinking about archives and archival work, but I view this work as an initial step toward the ongoing considerations across archivists about what it means to be radically open in spite of pressures to ‘normalize’ and piece together a prescribed and easy-to-swallow story about people and their embodied experiences.

Concluding Remarks

Critical archival collections are being established regularly as multiply-situated non-normative peoples come together as valuable voices and histories to be collected, preserved, and shared. Archives hold the potential to be generative and radically open spaces through which agency in the productions and processes
of archives might then hold the tensions of pluralistic ways of knowing, being, and making meaning of the everyday. Queer, feminist and decolonizing methodologies are often a mix of existing methodological approaches and, as they relate to this research project, archival methods and tactics that are imbued with queer, feminist, and decolonizing practices. The mix reflects the various lineages and timescapes of training, which, for archival productions, often continues to emanate from the academy, the institution, but with socially-just strategies to be informed by the communities that the archives are intended to represent. Therefore, the Queer/ed Archival Methodology can inform the archival productions and processes in order for archives, archivists, records, and records creators to be active participants in and through the configurations and reconfigurations of the expert/everyday expert, proper/improper, and legitimate/illegitimate as histories, counter-histories, and anti-histories come together and tell of multiple truths and an expanded accounting of lives being lived. The Queer/ed Archival Methodology is not intended to resolve all archival dilemmas. The Queer/ed Archival Methodology is not a toolbox of practices and methods for contemporary archivists. Rather, the Queer/ed Archival Methodology offers a methodological approach alongside a theoretical lens that can guide current work in archival collections, can emphasize openness and reflexivity in archival work, and can cast scholarly work toward further interrogation of prescriptive archival productions and their alternates.
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