

Editors' Introduction

Queering Archives: Historical Unravelings

. . . I am here
to remember faces
I have never seen before
And I do
—Jewelle Gomez

Queer things cannot have straight histories. If queerness proves elusive or unstable in our historical scholarship, then it is little wonder that the archives we wrestle with through this work themselves become volatile under the pressure of the efforts we ask them to sustain. The queer archive is evasive and dynamic. Perhaps it is only fitting that in a catalog of queer archives you can find not only a listing of current gay and lesbian archives around the world but also a listing of those gay and lesbian archives that “no longer exist” and, most bewitchingly, a listing of those archives that “never existed.”¹ This makes explicit how the drama of existence is a central, compelling narrative or mystery inhering in queer archives, a drama borne out by countless scholars’ efforts to find lost queer things. What Gayle Rubin has called “the missing archive” shadows and structures the queer archival project.²

Queerness and the archival are structured by their own distinct habitual wranglings with absence and presence. When they are brought together in the formulation “queering archives,” each compounds the other’s persistent desire to know (to borrow a phrase from Joan Nestle) so that their coupling serves as an overstatement that, through its very insistence, draws attention to the constitution of this desire and the knowledge that is claimed. In this pressurized critical space, the queer and the archival offer conceptual illumination to each other, and it is in this spirit that our work here proceeds.

Radical History Review

Issue 120 (Fall 2014) DOI 10.1215/01636545-2703706

© 2014 by MARHO: The Radical Historians’ Organization, Inc.

Insofar as the archive serves as a site for historical accumulation, visitation, and recognition, it has become an exemplary space for academic, activist, and community contests over the proper or desirable boundaries of sex, gender, and knowledge. One builds and visits the archive and sees in it either the face of historical kin or the familiar face of a critical portrait: an object of study or an observance of erasure, normativity, or estrangement. The queer archive might be described, then, as a space where one collects or cobbles together historical understandings of sexuality and gender through an appraisal of presences and absences. Indeed, as some accounts would have it, the archive is a space where queer subjects put themselves together as historical subjects, even if done in the context of archival lack.

As technologies for fixing queer subjects in time and space, archives can seem unbounded, being as they are so many spaces, objects, and practices: everyday interactions; popular culture, art, and performance; state-administered collections; personal effects and recollections; intercepted materials apprehended in ad hoc ways; and archival collections specifically tasked with retrieving and preserving queer histories. It is, perhaps, this latter iteration that is often called to mind by the term *queer archives*. These “out” queer archives famously include organizations such as the Lesbian Herstory Archives, the ONE National Gay and Lesbian Archives, the Canadian Gay and Lesbian Archives, the Australian Lesbian and Gay Archives, the Hall-Carpenter Archives, and the Dutch Internationaal Homo/Lesbisch Informatiecentrum en Archief. The gay and lesbian archival projects that emerged during the 1970s liberationist wave of organization set the terms of much of the relevant research and scholarship that followed, even if the archival preservation of documents relating to dissident sexualities and genders was not an entirely new phenomenon.

Rubin recounted in her 2003 David R. Kessler Lecture the difficulties she experienced as a student at the University of Michigan trying to access lesbian texts in the late 1960s and the start of the 1970s: “The mechanisms for systematic impartation and acquisition of lesbian knowledge were at best rudimentary.”³ Through a discussion of the pioneering work of John D’Emilio and Jonathan Ned Katz, among others, Rubin outlines how the gay and lesbian historical and archival work occurring in the United States in the 1970s drew on earlier generations of “homophile scholarship, organizational records, and individual collections” (350). Rubin illustrates the queer archive through geologic metaphor in which “queer knowledges” appear as “sedimented layers”:

In the geologic record, certain strata are fossil rich, partly because of the conditions that produce luxuriant life forms and partly because of the conditions that favor their preservation in fossil form. Similarly, there seem to be periods in which social and political conditions have favored the abundant proliferation of queer knowledges, while other conditions dictate their preservation or destruction. And it us up to succeeding generations to

ensure that such sedimentary formations are identified, excavated, catalogued, and utilized to produce new knowledge. Unfortunately, because of the lack of durable structural mechanisms to secure the reliable transfer of queer knowledges, they are often instead lost, buried, and forgotten. (354)

As Rubin issues this call to action to support the queer archiving project, she simultaneously demonstrates how those ongoing liberationist archive-building efforts by volunteers and scholars are now themselves becoming artifactual layers requiring preservation.

Indeed, some of the thinking behind this issue of *Radical History Review* began years ago as a discussion between Nestle and coeditor Daniel Marshall about their experiences as volunteers at the Lesbian Herstory Archives and the Australian Lesbian and Gay Archives, respectively, and the implications attached to the fact that these archives were aging. Nestle and Marshall wondered what a history of queer archives might yield for illuminating pressing questions about the realities of organizational transition, while also helping us to think about the dynamic operation of intergenerational interactions and the consolidation of queer historical legacies that we saw these archival spaces as enabling. This early thinking played an important role in helping to develop the ideas for this issue, and so we are very grateful to Nestle for this early work as well as for the inspiration provided by her pathfinding work as an activist, writer, and scholar pioneering the fields of queer archive studies and histories of sexuality and gender.

As the practices of queer archiving that cohered in the 1970s become more explicitly historical, they foster historical-critical reflections on the political, material, discursive, and affective production of historical knowledge connected to sexuality and gender. The formulation “queering archives,” therefore, is about recalling and renewing the historical imperative to apply critical pressure to the type of knowledge we inherit in relation to sexuality and gender and the manner through which we inherit it. Nestle demonstrates this point in quoting a fragment from the Lesbian Herstory Archives’ newsletter, number 7, 1981:

If we ask decorous questions of history, we will get a genteel history. If we assume that because sex was a secret it did not exist, we will get a sexless history. If we assume that in periods of oppression, Lesbians lost their autonomy and acted as victims only, we destroy not only history but lives. For many years the psychologists told us we were both emotionally and physically deviant; they measured our nipples and clitorises to chart our queerness, they talked about how we wanted to be men and how our sexual styles were pathetic imitations of the real thing and all along under this barrage of hatred and fear, we loved. They told us that we should hate ourselves and sometimes we did, but we were also angry, resilient and creative. We were part of a community that took care of itself. And most of all we were Lesbian women, revolutionizing

each of these terms. We create history as much as we discover it. What we call history becomes history and since this is a naming time, we must be on guard against our own class prejudices and discomforts.⁴

“Since this is a naming time”: coextensive with the queer archival project has been the tension between the ephemeral thing (be it photograph, letter, or indexical residue, and so on) and the appropriate recognition of such a thing in language. Historicist and poststructuralist debates over correct terminological fit and against anachronism, and the critical dramas played out when language seeks to express things having to do with sexuality and gender, as have been demonstrated by feminist and queer theorists, are well rehearsed in the literature. And as has been demonstrated by work in the expanding field of queer archive studies, all of these concerns are only further amplified when researchers take the archive as their object of scrutiny. This is because the archive becomes legible as such through its facilitation of systems and practices that press sexuality and gender into some form of signification (usually language). It is the disciplined recognitions of sexuality and gender that are produced through these signifying practices that make the knowledge they constrain and preserve searchable and archivable. Archival practice inherently proceeds on the basis of delimiting the significance of that which is being archived, and practices of necessary delimitation and foreclosure inevitably foreshadow the instability of such knowledge-making techniques. The queer archive is built on acts that repeatedly raise questions about recognition and order through the very effort to instantiate such acts. These acts of cataloging, listing, indexing, describing, narrating provenance, determining acquisition criteria, and administering access to materials demonstrate that, in the archive, it is always “a naming time.”

Thus, alongside our interest in the contemporary transitional moment in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT, also GLBT) archives and what it might illustrate in terms of the relationship between history, memory, politics, and the conditions for scholarship and life, we are also keenly focused on how queer archives have come to frame key contemporary questions about the politics and practices of histories of sexuality and gender. Otherwise expressed, we query what are sustained as the proper objects and subjects of the queer archive and how the production of the proper proceeds. As Annamarie Jagose has argued:

For all the uncertainty that hangs across the question of whether or how sex might be political, there is no doubt as to which erotic practices or actors are invested with political potential. In queer theoretical considerations across any number of disciplinary perspectives, the sexual scenarios that catch the light of critical attention tend to the bent rather than the straight, the subcultural rather than the dominant, the urban rather than the suburban or rural, the anonymous rather than the monogamous. Consequently, understandings of how sex articulates with the political have tended to be shaped by the cast

of subaltern sexual protagonists—the cruisers, dyke bois, barebackers, and erotic vomiters—that much queer scholarly writing takes as its paradigmatic referents.⁵

“Queering archives,” then, has an interest in reflecting on how new normative orders and values of sexual and gendered knowledge have emerged from the queer archive. Correspondingly, this issue reflects an ambition to decenter some of the usual suspects and scripts of queer archive studies. It is in this spirit that we have structured the four sections that make up this volume. The first section, “Queer Archival Pasts,” gathers together three provocations that work to identify, and then fracture, the ways that archival and sexual knowledges have come together, coalesced, and hardened.

In the opening essay, Abram J. Lewis offers a meditation on how one might narrate an encounter with archival knowledge if, through such historical narration, distinguishing features of such knowledge are written out or overwritten. Lewis’s case is the Angela Douglas archive: “Replete with apparent psychosis, unverifiable and esoteric truths, supernatural and nonhuman agents, and myriad other bizarre experiences, it is an archive that would only reluctantly submit to the triumphalist impulse to recuperate Douglas as a transparently rational, politicized, and agential historical subject” (14). As Lewis suggests, the “truth” that the queer archive reveals is that the historical subjects, practices, and narratives it makes available defy the routine grammars and logics of rational thought, political action, and historical agency. These function across many accounts, constituting the perimeters of—and rationale for—the queer archival project. Lewis demonstrates that the purpose of this deconstructionist reading of archival knowledge is not to “proscribe history but to provincialize it” (28). Against the critical, scholarly, and political habit of figuring the queer archive as an “archive of absence,” Lewis presses us to pay attention to its “peculiar and capricious presences” even though, in such an archival encounter, the queer archive may not “submit to our engagements” (28).

Licia Fiol-Matta provides a portrait of the various ways that pressures are applied to archival knowledge to make it yield (to) a distinct array of often conflicting “engagements.” In “A Queer Mother for the Nation Redux: Gabriela Mistral in the Twenty-First Century,” Fiol-Matta revisits the career of Gabriela Mistral’s sexuality in Chilean politics and scholarship, demonstrating how archival knowledge pertaining to Mistral is used, by the state and in her own scholarship, to evince both heterosexist and antihomophobic Chilean histories. Perhaps counterintuitively, the Mistral archive sustains both homophobic and antihomophobic Chilean histories, drawing attention to the lability of queer archival knowledge and how the historical “facts” drawn from it are constituted in fragile and febrile ways.

This fragility of historical knowledge, and its reliance on practices of critical habit for its production, is the central focus of the final essay in this opening

section, Marc Stein's "Canonizing Homophile Sexual Respectability: Archives, History, and Memory." Similar to Fiol-Matta's piece, which situates the career of her 2002 monograph *A Queer Mother for the Nation* in relation to a broader legacy of the queer archival pasts, Stein's point of orientation is his own (now historical) research on *Drum* magazine and North American historical homosexual knowledges. These maneuvers by Fiol-Matta and Stein demonstrate how queer archival research is itself, along with the historical subjects, practices, and places such research addresses, constitutive of whatever might be bundled up in the grab bag of "queer archival pasts." Drawing on oral histories with pioneering scholar-activists Katz and D'Emilio, and his own analysis of their work, Stein raises questions about the conditions under which particular types of archival and historical knowledge get privileged. Reprising the meditation in Lewis on queer critical and historiographical habits, albeit in a different key, Stein queries the ways that scholars who followed the radical work of Katz and D'Emilio instituted on the back of their scholarship what Stein calls a historical "homophile sexual respectability," despite warnings by Katz and D'Emilio to the contrary.

Insofar as this first section addresses questions that emerge from the different ways the queer archival past is used to produce order, of one variety or another, the second section offers a more explicit engagement with order's other. Teasing out what Lewis calls "an unruliness that refutes the disciplining of the past" (29), the second section, "Archiving Disorder," more explicitly documents and theorizes fraying relations between sexuality, gender, order, and archival knowledge. Interrogating the usual suspects and scripts of queer archive studies, this section draws on an array of methodological techniques—ethnography, photography, and legal document analysis—to bring into focus and, in abbreviated form, archive those other than the typical subjects that often populate historical scholarship.

In Melissa Autumn White's essay, "Archives of Intimacy and Trauma: Queer Migration Documents as Technologies of Affect," queer archive studies is brought into dialogue with the political, spatial, temporal, and sexual displacements and longings of "undocumented" or "stateless" people. By detailing a range of cases to illustrate her abiding focus on "queer migration archives," White traces the material production and circulation of citizenship "papers," demonstrating how "queer migration archives, as archives, as technologies of desire, transference, and (mis)recognition, make possible a highly emotive affective encounter between migrants and the state" (88).

Recalling, although in a different context, Fiol-Matta's observations about how archives are assembled to sustain "fantasies of evidence" that expose, in the final analysis, "a disturbing state project" (42), White's piece explicitly demonstrates how stepping out of the perimeters of the queer archive brings into focus the relationship between normative sexual historical knowledges and the demarcation of state borders. Such observations raise pregnant questions about the role of queer

archives as sites for nation building, the archiving of legal-bureaucratic records of undocumented queers, and the extent to which the queer archival knowledges that do get preserved routinely reflect privileged citizenship status.

Martin F. Manalansan IV's contribution, "The 'Stuff' of Archives: Mess, Migration, and Queer Lives," continues the discussion about archiving, migration, and disorder through his ethnographic research with members of "undocumented" queer immigrants' households in New York City. Through thick description, Manalansan offers recollections of his fieldwork research as "a queer take on 'dwelling in the archives' as the quotidian becomes the fuel for animating capacious engagements with queer undocumented immigrants as 'impossible subjects' of history" (95). Through this focus on possibility, history, and the archive, Manalansan's essay provides a reflection on who routinely becomes the proper subject of queer archival inquiry and what types of queer histories get lost in a prevailing context that privileges "neat analytical categories" (99).

The focus on the domestic and the quotidian is elaborated in Rebecka Taves Sheffield's presentation of her curatorial project focusing on lesbian intimate domestic spaces, "The Bedside Table Archives: Archive Intervention and Lesbian Intimate Domestic Culture." Recounting her practice of photographing the bedside tables of lesbian and queer women in the greater Toronto area, Sheffield makes a case for recognizing the everyday disorder that constitutes people's erotic and affective lives as an "archive intervention" on the basis that it calls into question the purportedly "crisp" (116) divide between public and private that is routinely mobilized to regulate sexuality and gender, while also promoting a critical attentiveness to the ways that archives are actively produced through "traditional acquisition and appraisal methodologies" (116).

The interventionist approach Sheffield discusses foregrounds the constructedness of archival knowledge by recasting that knowledge in a different light. By adding something to it while also taking something away, it shifts the context and dramatizes a focus on the archival and the historical as things that are the result of a certain set of practices of production, interpretation, and reception. This focus on intervention through the use of artistic techniques is the emphasis of the volume's third section, "Exhibiting Archives / Archiving Exhibits." In "Archives Behaving Badly," Leah DeVun and Michael Jay McClure summarize the prospective yield of the interventionist impulse in their suggestion that "the most queer aspect of this queer archive might be its expanding set of reactivations" (128). To orient this essay's reflections on the dialectical tension between archiving and exhibition, the authors discuss a 2012 exhibition of photographs by DeVun, which was designed as a "photographic exploration of the ONE Archives" (122). This "exploration" included hanging DeVun's original photographs, which engage materials from the archives, "alongside historical photographs and albums from the collection" (122)—juxtaposing multiple queerly temporal and productively anachronistic representations of bodies, desires,

and documents. The cover image for the “Queering Archives” issue comes from this exhibition, for which we are very grateful to the artist, and in the pose of this portrait’s subject we are invited to consider pertinent questions such as: Who is reading what? What are the limits of the properly archival? And, perhaps most obviously, given the stark juxtaposition of print against flesh (and wallpaper against carpet), by what magic in our documenting and collecting practices, and in our research and writing, are we to sustain some meaningful correspondence between the texts that reside in the archive and the desires that reside in the body?

Questions connected to the documentary residue of historical GLBT life, its representation and interpretation, are picked up in Don Romesburg’s piece, “Presenting the Queer Past: A Case for the GLBT History Museum.” Describing the opening of San Francisco’s GLBT History Museum and subsequent exhibitions, Romesburg offers a reflection on the ways the rationale for the queer archival project, especially since liberationist times, has historically relied on arguments about the significance of exhibiting or making publicly visible queer history. Relatedly, Romesburg illustrates how the queer archival project is animated through enduring challenges for any such exhibited history to be “representative.” In Romesburg’s discussion, the significance of being “representative” is reflected in questions that he raises about what histories are preserved beyond the collections of “famous gays”: What about “the rest”? he asks (134). As a space for documenting “the rest”—the remainders of a queer public not confined within the interests of a narrow privileged elite—the queer archive comes into focus as a project that draws its political orientation more explicitly from a politics of class inequality than from sexual or gender difference. Throughout, Romesburg reflects on the tensile relationship that archiving exhibitions negotiate in relation to securing or undermining the expanding public “legitimacy” of sexual and gender difference in general and queer histories more specifically. Finally, exhibiting the archival is put forward by Romesburg as a tactical approach for queering people’s historical, sexual, and gendered imaginations; by exhibiting little-known histories, he contends, it is possible to encourage people to question why they did not know such a thing, thereby opening up “new possibilities for queer recognition beyond the normative frames with which they [exhibit attendees] arrived” (136). Such normative frames, however, shift over time and space.

Archiving exhibits (and exhibiting archives) can also elucidate relationships between power, gender, sexuality, and race, as seen in Margaret Stone and Dale Washkansky’s account of the *Swallow My Pride* exhibition, held in Cape Town in 2009–10. The authors describe how various artists sought to exhibit and thereby archive aspects of South Africa’s queer history—such as gay commercialization, corrective rape, and struggles over “national” culture. This contribution closes with a discussion of an installation that (re)created a fictional teenager’s bedroom in an Afrikaans small town, marked by “his emergent teenage homosexuality” (156),

which reprises earlier focuses on quotidian intimate spaces and on the importance of fiction for staging and making evident queer histories.

The fictionalization of information, the production of historical facts, the various technologies designed to do these things, and the strange careers of archival things as they get turned into different types of truth and lies, evidence and apocrypha, form the focus of the issue's fourth section. "Classification and the Limits of the Archive" features essays that explore issues highlighted by other authors throughout—namely, the problematic categories, classifications, and limitations of mainstream historical archives. The authors in this section all focus to an extent on what DeVun and McClure term the "uncategorized bodies" (122) of the archive. This section of "Queering Archives" begs us to pay close attention to the ways that scholars, performers, and activists have sought to queer national, state, municipal, and judicial archives.

Recalling DeVun and McClure's queer archival "reactivations," María Elena Martínez offers a reflection on how disciplinary and classificatory regimes within historical and archival scholarship routinely suppress queer archival knowledge. Martínez begins by focusing on an archival document: the 1803 medical report published by the male surgeon who probed the body parts of Juana Aguilar, a suspected hermaphrodite who was tried by the royal court in colonial Guatemala. Martínez, however, moves beyond the traditional colonial archive and typical historical methodologies by examining how Jesusa Rodríguez, a prominent political performance artist who is based in Mexico City and whose works critique homophobia and other forms of discrimination, has engaged with and performed this archival document. In doing so, Martínez productively merges history, performance, and imagination. Nonetheless, Martínez writes, "Some historians cringe at the thought of unleashing the imagination on the past," especially given that "the main fear is that having a 'political agenda' can contaminate history" (170). Through Martínez's work, the liberationist LGBT archiving project comes into focus as something irretrievably imaginative, political, and performative. In observing how the queer political project is marked thus with an indelible taint or stain produced by a normative set of mechanisms that produce valued historical knowledge, the implications for queering archives at the level of record collection, maintenance, access, and interpretation become clearer.

For Martínez, "the crux of the problem is that of exposing historical violence and power without reproducing their forms" (173), and we must pay "greater attention to bodies in history" (175). Such themes constitute the core concerns of Ben Cowan's piece, "'A Passive Homosexual Element': Digitized Archives and the Policing of Homosex in Cold War Brazil." As Cowan queries, to what extent is queerness produced through the very practice of archiving certain bodies and practices under particular thematic and topical entries in mainstream historical and nationalist archival databases? Recalling White's documentation of the incidental accumula-

tion of “queer migration archives,” Cowan similarly documents the emergence of an archive of homosex under the classificatory terms of those agents policing its occurrence. And recalling Lewis, Cowan demonstrates the significance of a “provincialized” approach to using digital archives, one that pays attention to *queer*’s mutability and infidelity so as to avoid replicating knowledge produced under the terms of the police and instead investigate the queer histories that the police did not classify under the terms of homosex per se. Highlighting the potential pitfalls and opportunities of increasingly digitized state archives, Cowan demonstrates that the classifications of the historical archive “create new complications in the ways that our research prisms (essentialized in search terms) limit our ability to see stories, especially queer stories” (184).

In the collection’s final essay, “Archiving Peripheral Taiwan: The Prodigy of the Human and Historical Narration,” Howard Chiang proposes that historiography and the very act of writing history itself can amount to a form of queer archiving. Such is his focus in the archiving of transgendered figures in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Taiwan, through the conceptual category of *renyao*—a mainland Chinese concept of transgenderism that is perhaps best translated as “human prodigy” (206). Chiang links the scholarship on *renyao* in extant historiography to the story of Zeng Qiu Huang, the most highly publicized *renyao* in 1950s Taiwan. Connecting the illegibility of Taiwan in Anglophone scholarship to the illegibility of queer subjects in the past, Chiang’s essay probes the liminality of the queer body, the very category of the human, and “the archival terms under which such things are collected and recalled” (207). In these engagements with the processes of archival collection, the authors of this section on the limits of the archive’s categorizations and classifications use print culture and archival documents to constructively create textual and analytical queer archives of the past, thus returning us to our starting point: loops upon loops of historical consolidation and unraveling.

As our opening epigraph concedes: “I am here / to remember faces / I have never seen before / And I do.”⁶ History becomes narratable when it achieves recognition. We come to assemble a vision of new things based on sketches we make from things we have already seen, known, and felt. In the face of strange queer archival pasts, it seems inevitable that we organize those things familiar to us by way of marking out the unfamiliar. Looking back is only sustained by a queer archival contemporary moment, one that is vibrant with departures from the past as are those reflected in the establishment of archival initiatives such as GALA in South Africa, rukus! Black LGBT Archive in the United Kingdom, and the Archivo Histórico Lésbico de México, América Latina y el Caribe “Nancy Cárdenas,” in Mexico City. As we look back at historical efforts to reflect on sexuality, gender, and archiving, such as the 1979 spring-summer issue of this journal or the groundbreaking work of people like Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy and Madeline Davis, and as we look forward to the ongoing organizing and archiving work occurring under the auspices of

projects as diverse as OutHistory and the LGBT Archives, Libraries, Museums, and Special Collections (ALMS) conferences, what accumulates is a deepening sense of the expanding scope, hunger, and desire for queering archives.

As we neared completion of this manuscript we, like so many people, were shocked and saddened by the death of José Esteban Muñoz. As is evident in the contributions to the “Queering Archives” issue, his scholarship is a touchstone for people working in this field (among others), and his loss is keenly felt. In *Cruising Utopia*, Muñoz imaginatively and productively read queerness through the notion of the ephemeral. It is in this sense that we would like to think of the very stuff of queer archives—the disparate bodies, stories, acts, and desires that make them up—“as trace, the remains, the things that are left, hanging in the air like rumor.”⁷ Alongside the inspiration of his work, Muñoz also supported this collection through his work as a reviewer, for which we are very grateful. We join with others in marking and mourning his passing. To honor Muñoz, his work, and his contributions—“things that are left” in the queer then and there, here and now—this collection is dedicated to him.

—Daniel Marshall, Kevin P. Murphy, and Zeb Tortorici

Notes

The epigraph at the beginning of this introduction is an excerpt from a poem by Jewelle Gomez written in the visitor’s book of the Lesbian Herstory Archives, 1983, and cited in Joan Nestle, “The Will to Remember: The Lesbian Herstory Archives of New York,” *Feminist Review* 34 (1990): 86–94. See page 94 for the Gomez fragment. Thanks to Joan Nestle for assistance with this reference.

1. Alan V. Miller, *Directory of the International Association of Lesbian and Gay Archives and Libraries* (Toronto: International Association of Lesbian and Gay Archives and Libraries, 1987), 164–68.
2. “The missing archive” is an extrapolation from Rubin’s discussion of her pursuit of “the missing [Renée] Vivien archive.” Gayle Rubin, *Deviations: A Gayle Rubin Reader* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011), 374.
3. *Ibid.*, 349.
4. Nestle, “The Will to Remember,” 91.
5. Annamarie Jagose, *Orgasmology* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013), 179–80.
6. Jewelle Gomez quoted in Nestle, “The Will to Remember,” 94.
7. José Esteban Muñoz, *Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity* (New York: New York University Press, 2009), 65.

