This paper is a case study illuminating the hopes and concerns of a sample of the LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered) population in regards to their personal and organizational materials. Through a series of interviews with an archivist, a current donor to an archives, and four potential donors who are LGBT activists, the researcher compiles various reactions to themes arising in archival literature about LGBT collections. Using community archives as a model, the researcher and interviewees delineate ways in which archives can respond to LGBT donors' needs and concerns, both pre- and post-donation.
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“From my involvement in this work, I have been struck by the active interrelationships among lesbians and gay activists, archivists, and scholars. Each of these groups contributes to creating historical records, to finding materials that should be preserved, to placing them in an archival home, and to interpreting and telling the stories of our lives. Queer history is created by networks of people.”

Brenda Marston, “Archivists, Activists, and Scholars”

“History saves lives by validating lesbian, gay, and queer peoples’ right to live a full and rich life free from oppression and censure.”

Elise Chenier, “Preserving Lesbian Oral History in Canada”

**INTRODUCTION**

Traditionally, Western history has consisted of the recounted stories of great men and powerful governments, the actions of influential families and the results of wars. However, the American social movements of the 1960s ushered in a shift in historical thought, as historians began to consider history as a discipline encompassing various types of people and organizations—the powerful as well as the powerless—and the stories of history as those including both the prestigious and the downtrodden, the records of great events as well as the documentation of everyday, domestic activities. With a sharp rise in the early 1980s, historians began to construct these “social histories” in earnest, writing the narrative of history from the bottom up based on ordinary lives.

One of the major implications of this shift was the representation of immigrants, women, minorities, and other underrepresented groups in written history, as well as in the
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1 Marston, “Archivists, Activists, and Scholars,” 139.
archives to which historians looked for source material. These decades also saw the birth of specific academic disciplines focusing on these marginalized members of society, including women's studies, Black studies, and gay studies (now often referred to as sexuality studies or queer studies). The greater visibility of the American gay rights movement, beginning with the 1969 Stonewall riots and continuing through the explosion of gay studies programs in the 1990s, coupled with the rise of social history focusing on everyday lives, has led to an ever-growing scholarly interest in LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered) history, an interest to which archivists have responded with fair success.

Using the same or similar techniques as with other potential donors, archivists have targeted potential LGBT donors with outreach methods such as telephone calls and meetings, “show and tell” events, or institutional tours. While these approaches are appropriate for some segments of the LGBT population, they can fail to address the unique concerns of many other potential LGBT donors. From increased privacy needs to an inherent distrust of large institutions, the desires of members of the LGBT community who possess personal or institutional papers can differ greatly from more mainstream (as well as from their other marginalized) counterparts. In addition to needs or concerns, many LGBT archival donors have additional goals and motivations, such as a desire to increase visibility or to create a diverse legacy to encourage and inspire younger or more isolated members of the LGBT population.

Practiced archival outreach methods assume that donors are more likely to donate to an institution when they know of its existence and consider it a trusted repository for their personal or organizational papers. While these assumptions are reasonable, many
archivists have invested little time in understanding the needs and concerns of their target populations. This project aims to illuminate common concerns among the LGBT community regarding ownership and control over their records. Many potential LGBT donors, well aware of the existence of institutions that would value their personal or organizational papers, still choose not to donate, or not to engage with archivists whose outreach methods fails to address their specific concerns. An understanding of the motivations of members of the LGBT population can help archivists develop targeted and successful outreach methods for potential LGBT donors, while also helping to guide education and outreach efforts in ways that will help LGBT donors fulfill their goals in depositing their papers in an archives and greatly improve donor relations, while also attracting future donors by creating a public face that reflects an understanding of and attention to the needs of the communities represented within a repository.

Of course, as a very large, diverse, geographically-dispersed population, the LGBT community does not share one straightforward, single set of needs or goals. With this in mind, this project focuses specifically on the concerns about their records or papers of members of the southeastern LGBT community who engage in LGBT activist or advocacy work. LGBT activists and advocates, as organizers in a community with a strong focus on creating internal and alternative infrastructure, frequently have given thought to the historical significance of their work, and their records are an integral part of LGBT history. By working outside of mainstream structures, community organizers often have an advanced analysis of power structures and forces that lead to marginalization and exclusion; they also tend to be, know, or feel an affiliation with the people who form community archives or community memory projects, and as such, are
particularly equipped to discuss their strategies and motivations as well as potential areas for cooperation with mainstream archives.

By exploring in detail the thoughts and concerns of a small segment of this population, this paper strives to begin a conversation within the archival community about questions that affect all repositories which are building collections of LGBT materials: How are these donors distinct from other donors, including those from other marginalized groups? What are the concerns of this population, and why are they choosing to deposit their materials in an archives? Finally, what is the role of the archivist—through outreach, community awareness, or education—within the larger LGBT-rights movement?

A note on terminology

While working definitions for this study are discussed later, it is worth noting a few key terms here, as they will arise throughout this paper. LGBT is an acronym standing for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered. (Transgendered refers to individuals who identify with a gender other than that assigned to them at birth.) This acronym can appear in other forms, such as GLBT (Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgendered), LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, and Queer/Questioning), LGBTTQI (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, Transsexual, Queer, and Intersex), or, less commonly, the less-inclusive term lesbigay. The term queer may also appear in this study; while once a derogatory term, many (especially younger) members of the LGBT community may use it positively to refer to people of sexualities or gender identities outside of the heterosexual, male/female norm. Queer is generally
considered to be more inclusive, and also more politically-charged, than the term LGBT. While I hope to include anyone who identifies with this community, for the purposes of this study I will refer to the population as LGBT.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Archival literature offers numerous models for outreach to potential donors of personal papers or organizational records. When an archivist is collecting materials from members of the LGBT population, these outreach techniques must be considered in light of other issues arising in archival literature, such as power relationships and the needs of marginalized communities. Numerous authors address the relationships between archives and power, including the ways in which archives act as cultural enforcers. Community archives—created, housed, and staffed by members of the LGBT community—often strive to overturn or offer an alternative to formal archives. By empowering members of the community whose materials they collect, community archives integrate elements that can be reproduced in other types of repositories: visibility, self-determination, accessibility, privacy, accountability, and trust.

Considering the community archives model leads the archivist to questions of outreach to researchers outside of the archives' traditional user community. Outreach to users, broadly defined, allows numerous possibilities for community-building and for the integration of some of the elements mentioned above. User outreach can be a form of positive publicity, informing the public about the repository's holdings and attracting new users. User outreach can also take the form of programming, serving as a natural outgrowth of archival reference, or of explicit user education, ensuring that members of represented communities have the knowledge and ability to access their own histories within archives. In order to integrate elements of the community archives model, archivists may also wish to consider opportunities for cooperation or partnerships between archives, community archives, and other organizations.
ARCHIVAL OUTREACH

Literature on archival outreach is extensive, although this broad topic encompasses two fairly different activities: reaching out to current and potential archival donors, with the hopes of securing the donation of their personal or organizational papers, and interacting with current and potential archival users, increasing the user base and informing the public of current holdings and access techniques. Here we will focus primarily on the former, addressing outreach to users in a later discussion about access to collections.

The collection development literature addressing outreach to potential donors tends to proffer methods relying on a fairly simple model, assuming that positive contact with potential users or donors will directly impact the chances of building a relationship with them, while neglecting to take into account the fact that many members of marginalized groups have actively chosen not to affiliate themselves—or their historical documents—with institutions that they see as instruments of the power that has created their very marginalized status.

A growing body of literature addresses the specific challenges of reaching out to donors in historically marginalized groups, especially within the African-American population. Lila Teresa Church's (1998) paper on the motivations of African-American donors to archival repositories identifies one common theme within donors from marginalized populations, namely a sense that “no one would care about my papers.” This is echoed by R. N. Juliani in a 1976 article about the growth of social history, although he is speaking specifically about immigrant representation in archives:
many people who have participated only as bit-players in the great drama of human history frequently do not appreciate the importance of what they might be able to tell us or what their personal artifacts—letters, diaries, legal documents, photographs, newspapers—might reveal to us. Consequently, if there are personal documents of value for historical research... lying stashed away in forgotten corners it is likely that these materials will remain indefinitely right where they are, unless we all begin to do a better job of communicating some sense of their importance to the general public (p. 477).

Topher Campbell, in an interview about the United Kingdom's rukus! archive (X, 2009, p. 286), encapsulates the process of communicating importance or significance to donors; while collection-building, Campbell notes that donors would often say “‘I mean, there's nothing here,'” while Campbell and his fellow collectors were wildly enthused about the donor's materials. The very process of selection, then, can help the donor recognize the potential significance of his or her materials. For an interesting model of outreach to potential donors within the African-American community and the identification of significance in personal papers, see Aronson and Ford's (2006) article on collecting artifacts for the University of Mississippi's 40th anniversary of integration; among other simple and effective techniques, the University of Mississippi's Special Collections issued a call for donations through local newspapers, radio programs, web sites, and publications.

While instilling significance in historically neglected materials may seem universally positive, and like a simple way to combat a sense of personal insignificance among members of marginalized groups, Annemaree Lloyd (2007) notes that selection is a particularly sensitive aspect of the collection-building process, as “the process of identifying an item as significant is a subjectively constituted practice that constructs a social reality and produces a collective consciousness” (p. 55). Lloyd's paper focuses upon the assignment of significance as a political act, and the assignment of significance
by members of the mainstream as yet another action that silences those “with different or contested stories to tell and, consequently, different memories to preserve” (p. 55). From Lloyd's perspective, then, the assignment of value to particular items or histories by those outside of the represented communities can further the disempowerment of historically marginalized groups.

Lloyd's point about disempowerment through selection does not leave archivists at an impasse, however; instead, it produces the need for strategies that reflect the bottom-up structure of social history. Elise Chenier (2009), discussing the rise of oral histories within the Canadian LGBT community in the late 1980s and early 1990s, notes that “insisting on the historical significance of the lives of everyday people was the first step taken. Next was finding creative ways to document the lives of those people whose experiences were not recorded in official records” (p. 251), including the creation of oral histories by researchers who “often strongly identified” with their interviewees.

However, the creation of materials such as oral histories does little to address problems of lack of representation within archives and historical writings if materials still are retained primarily by the records creators. Chenier describes a frequent lack of foresight among those creating oral histories; aside from this problem, and outside of Juliani’s recommendation to communicate “some sense of importance,” is the fact that even after some members of the LGBT community recognize the historical importance of their documents, they still will choose not to donate them to mainstream archives.

A primary reason that some potential donors choose to retain their documents is the sense of alienation from mainstream institutions that many members of marginalized groups feel. These communities often have focused on the creation of internal networks
and alternatives as they have systematically been excluded from locations and positions of power. Additionally, the very act of not donating to a mainstream archives can be empowering, subverting the power structure wherein archivists and historians, for many generations, deemed such materials historically worthless. Simply, “the people whose records were once not preserved now themselves choose to withhold their records from being deposited into public archives” (Barriault, 2009, p. 226). Some communities, especially the LGBT and African-American communities, have used this internal reclaiming of power alongside internally-produced and -controlled alternatives as a central part of identity-building and pride.

Before exploring identity-building in more detail, let us briefly examine the relationship between archives and power—although theoretical, it sheds important light on some of the structures that LGBT community members may be trying to subvert.

**ARCHIVES AND POWER**

While many library employees think of themselves as great supporters of freedom, and while the American Library Association focuses on the freedom to read and the privacy of library users, librarians and archivists still work within bureaucratic settings and act as cultural enforcers (Cooper, 1998). The structures of these organizations ultimately restrict employees' actions, as “bureaucracies and institutions reward employees for not bringing attention to themselves, not asking embarrassing questions, and not articulating long-range implications of silence about the major issues of our time” (Cooper, 1998, p. 114).

On the most concrete level, archives can be construed as instruments of power
inasmuch as they are frequently associated with universities or state/federal governments. Through this alignment with decision-making institutions, archives can be seen as enforcing the status quo in terms of representation, oppression, visibility, access, and the like. Additionally, the archivist him- or herself exercises significant power—as already mentioned, archivists have the ability to determine significance (or lack thereof) through selection, description, interpretation, provision of access, reference services, public programming, exhibits, outreach efforts, and collection-building. Marcel Barriault (2009) adds that archivists can exert significant power over their holdings through the designation of items as “controversial,” especially when access to those documents is then limited through physical segregation or an additional request or registration process. Additionally, the archivist who is processing or describing material, through the ability to determine access points, bears significant power over how and why materials will be used by researchers. As Rawson (2009) notes, the archivist must situate him- or herself in relation to both users and descriptive tools and make decisions based on an understanding of this power dynamic (p. 132).

Steven Maynard's 2009 article entitled “Police/Archives” delineates some of the most abstract notions central to archives and power. His title derives from the concept of archivist as police, enforcing governmental legislation regarding access while also “regulating the archival traffic between the public and the past” and maintaining the integrity of documents (p. 171). The enforcement of federal legislation restricting access to documents describing historical repression of the LGBT community “functions to uphold the historical and discursive constructions of queers as dangerous and threatening to national security simply by restricting access to documents that reveal security
practices taken against them” (Gentile, 2009, p. 149). Within the brokered relationship between the researcher and the document, the archivist holds ultimate sway; aside from playing an integral role in the often-complex archival research process by identifying potentially useful collections and helping the user to navigate finding aids and other access tools, the archivist must also physically retrieve the document and deliver it to the researcher, who is then subject to surveillance while using it. By instituting such a relationship, the researcher must essentially ask the archivist's permission to access documents. Referring to Foucault's panopticon³, Maynard notes that the physical layout of the archive itself further enforces this power, inasmuch as it “orders individuals in space so as to create a generalized and constant surveillance” (p. 168).

This sense of surveillance may be particularly uncomfortable to older members of the LGBT community who have visceral personal memories of state surveillance of LGBT lifestyles or sexual acts. For example, Dick (2009) describes the city of Edmonton's 1942 trials of men accused of participating in same-sex acts, while Maynard (2009) recalls the Canadian removal of gays and lesbians from governmental positions in the 1950s. A deep discomfort with needing to ask “permission” to view potentially sensitive materials creates what Huffine (1998) describes as a “population seeking information without human interaction, or, if past attitudes are any guide, the possibility of social confrontation...” (p. 213). This discomfort will be especially acute if the archivist does not appear to be part of the LGBT community nor visibly sympathetic. “It is always uncomfortable to approach someone different from oneself in some sensitive fundamental way... for help, and this is especially true in libraries” (Huffine, 1998, p. 213-214). Even researchers who are not personally members of the LGBT community
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may feel some discomfort requesting sexually explicit materials or materials that they believe the archivist may consider controversial.

Understanding that archives can be construed as an instrument of power, even when they are not directly aligned with the state, one begins to understand the complex and often uneasy relationship between archives and marginalized or oppressed communities. Not only are archives part of the complex apparatus creating and enforcing cultural power dynamics, but they also have a long-standing past of under-representing the histories (and historical documents) of all but society's most influential citizens. As McDonald (2008) writes, “preservation does not automatically follow creation; what is preserved... is what the will of the dominant culture chooses to preserve” (p. 3). When minorities or members of oppressed groups are represented in repositories, it is often not in their own voices, but rather through the lens of the powerful: records from census collectors, missionaries, and government agencies (Chenier, 2009, Flinn, 2007, and Viola, 1978). For instance, American Indian records are often surveys or studies conducted by white Americans. As Lloyd (2007) succinctly states, “History is written by victors” (p. 54).

This lack of identification with the subjects of many archival documents is directly linked to the lack of a sense of personal historicity, as mentioned above. Additionally, as many members of marginalized communities (not unrealistically) conflate archives with universities and the state, their mistrust of the state as a tool of repression transfers to a general mistrust of all powerful institutions. As Barriault (2009) succinctly states, “many queer people continue to have an inherent mistrust of the State; since public archives are, by definition, institutions that fall under the purview of the
government, the mistrust that many queers have toward the State has often carried over to these institutionalized extensions of government” (p. 226).

Members of the LGBT community often take one of two approaches to dealing with the uneven power dynamics inherent in the structure of archives: either they subvert the power structures in order to re-build and reclaim them, or they build their own, more democratic or non-hierarchical alternatives. Using LGBT models to disrupt power structures is a popular element of modern queer theory, resulting in the use of “queer” as more than just a reclamation of a once-derogatory term, but also as a verb, meaning to disrupt, subvert, or consider in alternate ways. This subversion can be seen in LGBT culture in instances ranging from the homosexualizing of authority figures in gay erotica (Barriault, 2009, p. 238) to the creation of extensive oral history projects where the interviewer strives to eradicate the typical researcher-research subject dichotomy (Chenier, 2009, p. 251). Numerous articles refer to “queering archives” as a process of recreating the foundations of archival practice, such as Gentile's “Resisted Access?” (2009). Others describe LGBT subversion of archival practice using more playful terms, such as Topher Campbell's comment that “There's always a bit of mischievousness in us. rukus! is the finger up at the same time as the embrace and the kiss... We're not far away from the punk generation of the seventies, so there's a kind of shiftiness and abrasiveness about the way that we are” (X, 2009, p. 292-293). Rawson (2009) extends this subversion of archival practice to an entire re-imagining of the research process, describing a situation where browsing and spontaneous discovery are encouraged through “a queer imagining of a new historiographic method of archival research, one that carefully accounts for a researcher's body moving through the space of the archives” (p. 137).
Rawson uses “queer logics” to shift the idea of successful research to one in which the collection itself has desires and the movement of bodies through space can lead to the fulfillment of those desires in a “queer revision of traditional historiographic method that grants desire only to the researcher” (p. 137).

LGBT community members do not just “queer” the practice of existing archives, but also subvert the entire notion that only professionals can adequately document history through the creation of extensive LGBT community archives.

COMMUNITY (AND) ARCHIVES

Community archives are spaces where historical documents (either primary or secondary sources or a combination of both, and often including ephemera or museum objects) are housed within the community that created them. They are often physically located within a community through geographic location, but are also located within a community in that they are designed, run, and staffed by the same group whose history is documented within. While these archives were founded in response to the dearth of documentation representing the lives of those outside the elite within archives and libraries, and were essentially the formalization of personal, grassroots-level collecting (Parris, 2005), they became more popular with the public and local history movements of the 1970s and 1980s. LGBT community archives are widespread throughout North America, with some of the largest and most well-known including the Lesbian Herstory Archives in New York, the Canadian Gay and Lesbian Archive in Toronto, the Gerber/Hart Library in Chicago, and the ONE Institute and Archives in West Hollywood. These community archives play an important role in the larger LGBT community; not
only do they provide an alternative to often exclusionary archives, but they also allow a greater focus on community-building and identity-building within the archives through the reclamation and self-production of history.

History itself plays a very specific role within oppressed communities as part of identity-building, as part of a move to claim and occupy space. Bill Lukenbill (2002) remarks that “identities are developed through experience, and the community of identity is constituted through historical experience. This theory is particularly useful in explaining the importance of gay and lesbian libraries and archives... such collections are needed to help define and clarify historical experiences” (p. 95). Brittany Parris similarly notes that “the collection and promotion of materials relevant to these identities is one way this community can assert its worth and can claim respect” (Parris, 2005). As part of a desire to build identity and create an activism of visibility, many LGBT groups have built community archives to counter the historical silencing and obscuring of LGBT histories (Parris, 2005).

Additionally, community archives frequently serve as community spaces, with room for meetings and comfortable space for relaxing or browsing materials. While this is not universally the case, it is often part of a move toward accessibility for community members and a reaction to the hierarchy and ongoing surveillance in traditional archives. This communal space allows people to come together and also to meet and connect with others who share their values or lifestyles. Pecoskie (2005) notes that participants in her study on lesbians and reading “found community in their interactions between themselves and other individuals and between themselves and physical spaces” (p. 338). Rothbauer (2004) discusses a similar role for LGBT bookstores, where “investing in a vibrant local
literary community was... a way to enact a public and shared understanding of what it meant to claim a lesbian or queer identity” (p. 66). Rothbauer's study focuses specifically on the act of reading in creating LGBT identity in young women, but notes that her participants “recognized and valued the guidance and support of people who acted as role models and gatekeepers to gay and lesbian culture” (p. 67). Archivists can, and often do, fulfill this same role in the community; while creating a sense of historicity through collection-development and cooperation through less-hierarchical archival repositories, they also serve as role models and active participants in the development of LGBT culture and community.

Since many LGBT community archives have open stacks or items on display in reading areas, visitors are surrounded by representations of LGBT culture and varied images of LGBT identity and lifestyle. Just as Pecoskie (2005) describes how lesbian women develop a sense of community and perform social exploration through reading, so do visitors to community archives develop a sense of a larger community through interaction with varied representations of LGBT culture (including documents from people outside of their immediate social circles) and perform social exploration through interaction with various representations of what it can mean to live as an LGBT individual. Interaction with these texts and historical documents can lead to social learning (Pecoskie, 2005, p. 342).

The role of social learning in the development of a concept of a larger “imagined community⁴” can be especially important for young people or people who are just joining the LGBT community. Not only do these people rely on social learning as they develop
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an LGBT identity and learn to situate themselves within a larger LGBT community, but they also may find great comfort in physical spaces where they feel accepted and less isolated. In an article on outreach to LGBT youth, Hughes-Hassell (2001) discusses the need for safe spaces for youth who “usually come of age in communities where few gay adults are visible, attend schools with no openly gay staff, and interact with peers who use 'fag' and 'dyke' as the favored insult...” (p. 39). By providing youth and other isolated members of the LGBT community with “access to virtual communities” through resources, space, or documents, people who work in LGBT community archives can provide essential support and a safe space for personal development (Hughes-Hassell, 2001, p. 39).

Part of the essential role of archives within community-building is the development of historical memory and shared memory, especially within marginalized groups whose history has been neglected or under-documented. Mary Stevens (X, 2009) describes archives as “part of the process of fostering a shared memory that emerges only through dialogue” between members of a larger community (p. 272). Part of this dialogue surfaces through the process of witnessing events and lives that have been ignored by history and frequently forgotten by the modern LGBT community. By documenting the stories of repression and hurt within the LGBT community, these archives can allow for a process of “witnessing and retelling” (X, 2009, p. 276). Bringing a painful past to light can be legitimizing in that it allows community members to recognize and mourn for ways in which their predecessors have been harmed, while producing accountability for governments and social forces that have persecuted LGBT people throughout history. The archival record can be especially important in terms of accountability for abuses, through
police records or descriptions of experiences of persecution, allowing researchers to “shine the light of history on these dark corners of our past” (Dick, 2009, p. 217).

While forgetting painful events can be an essential part of a survival strategy for leaving traumatic events behind, recalling those very events can help construct the past, allowing individual pain to be re-formed into collective memory and community history (Gentile, 2009, p. 155-156). Archives also can allow contemporary community members to mourn for people and events that helped shape the larger narrative of oppression and judgment of the LGBT community while recognizing the progress that has been made and the freedoms that are now enjoyed. Recognizing the pain of the past can legitimize it, and community members can access and share in that pain. “There is a level on which pain and memory are very interlinked,” states Campbell (X, 2009, p. 283). “This pain, the pain of lived experience is not recognized, and so there's a need to hold it, and store it, and keep it as precious.” A connection to the pain of one's LGBT ancestors can be an important element of an LGBT identity; as Lynn Sipe, the former president of the One Institute and Archives' Board of Directors, states, “It is terribly important that gay people and those who are interested in gay life and history know that we do have a rich and varied history—much of it painful but much of it worth celebrating as well” (Gallagher, 2001, p. 53).

The development of collective memory also allows for intergenerational work, wherein members of the LGBT community actively build a visible and inspirational legacy for young people. Topher Campbell (X, 2009) describes the importance of passing on history to the next generation, even (and especially) within a geographically disparate LGBT community, where older community members have “seen their heritage pass
before their eyes, so there is a personal stake in this... Our generation wants to see its experiences placed in the mainstream” (p. 280). Isolated members of the LGBT population, whether isolated through geography, family background, race, or other elements, may feel a complete disconnect from the lives of others who have shared their experiences and lifestyles. Gentile (2009) notes that “many people lack a historical sense about their own lives since they have been denied access to languages of social and historical literacy. The lack of a historical memory makes it difficult to remember certain aspects of the past and the implication of this past in the present” (p. 155). Legacy work, like the creation of LGBT community archives, helps isolated community members connect to a larger narrative of the lives of LGBT people. “In the future when someone says, 'Black gay history, what is it? There isn't any,' or people from our own community say, 'We have no legacy,' we'll be able to point to the archive and say, 'This happened or that happened.' And share that with friends in our circle or family members who are twenty years younger or twenty years older” (X, 2009, p. 281).

K. J. Rawson (2009) discusses interactions with LGBT archival items as an emotional experience as a person engages with the community's past and reacts to the intersections of those experiences with his or her own life. Focusing on actual physical touch as an essential element of the interaction, Rawson notes that “touching artifacts is a desirable and pleasurable experience. But queer archival encounters can be painful as well. [Heather] Love's work is again useful to substantiate this claim; she writes, 'The experience of queer historical subjects is not at a safe distance from contemporary experience; rather, their social marginality and abjection mirror our own.’” (p. 140).

These intensely emotional encounters with the historical documents of the LGBT
community echo larger discussions of archival repositories as “archives of feeling.” Maynard (2009) describes this concept as archives as a metaphorical construct, based in emotions documented within as well as the longing within archival users and the responses they feel when interacting with materials. Arguing that archives are much more than a physical space housing documents, Gentile (2009) discusses Cvetkovich's concept of “memories based in love, guilt, shame, or trauma as monuments to the unrecorded pasts of subaltern peoples and the formation of public cultures” (p. 145). In a greater culture that wants to bury its painful actions and conceal traumatic histories, the act of acknowledging and sharing memory can feel liberatory. Mary Stevens (X, 2009) adds that community archives are especially significant in LGBT communities “where the excess of affect, generated by an archiving practice that is about so much more than the anesthetic process of preservation” serves purposes much broader than simple academic research, playing essential roles within the community and within the process of creating social change.

The concept of an “archives of feeling” shifts the focus away from static, dusty records in a holding repository toward a dynamic model in which an archives can actively create change in its users and in society. This is especially true in situations where members of the LGBT community are proactively documenting and creating history. Flinn (2007) describes community archives as “the grassroots activities of documenting, recording and exploring community heritage in which community participation, control and ownership of the project is essential” (p. 153), literally depicting archives as an activity rather than a place.
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Various different conceptions of archives construe the creation of archives, and the production of history through those archives, as politically-infused acts. Topher Campbell (X, 2009, p. 279) describes hearing LGBT people's stories about their experiences and beginning to “realize that the collected memory is not getting stored anywhere. We wanted to reclaim the history and put it centre stage. Reclaiming that history is a political act.” Reclaiming history is not only a social act, a creating of shared memory, but also a way of recognizing and claiming stories that have been denied to members of marginalized communities. Chenier (2009) roots this attitude in the social movements of the 1960s wherein “history was regarded as a tool for the liberation of the oppressed” (p. 251). By challenging mainstream beliefs and attitudes, the documentation of LGBT history “was a way to write gay and lesbian experience into existence, to challenge heterosexism and traditional history, and to engender pride within a community long forced to live on the social, economic, and political margins of society” (Chenier, 2009, p. 252).

Performing research in LGBT archives, whether for personal, academic, or political purposes, can also be construed politically. It is the process of encounter with and sharing of historical information that creates the possibility for broader change. Maynard (2009) describes the rise of marginal knowledge through research in archives, referring to Foucault's “insurrection of subjugated knowledges” (p. 181) and its possibility for illuminating historical struggles. Gentile (2009) notes that many activist researchers are journalists who are disseminating hidden information. Additionally, historians and scholars whose research is affected by access legislation often become activists who begin to work for the creation of sustainable, accessible, long-term
repositories for LGBT materials (Gentile, 2009, p. 152).

Finally, the very work of community-building described above can be considered an activist endeavor; by bridging gaps, creating networks, and improving lives, it can significantly change the lives of members of the LGBT community. Members of UK's rukus! (X, 2009) believe that programming is an important aspect of archives as activist endeavor: “People see and hear what we are doing and that makes it a living archive and not just stuck in a corner, not doing anything... Our focus is on events because each event is a political act, an intervention in its own right” (p. 290).

MODELS FOR LGBT ARCHIVES

While many aspects of community archives have developed in response to perceived lacks within current formal archival practice, an understanding of the motivations of these community archives, and a careful examination of those elements of their operation that are deeply valued by the LGBT community, can help archivists in formal settings develop models for archives that meet the needs, desires, and expectations of LGBT donors and users. Additionally, this examination can open the door for mutually-productive partnerships or cooperative collection development. Let us examine some elements of LGBT archival work, often displayed in community archives, that can be integrated into formal archival work.

Visibility

An essential element of LGBT archives is their ability to create visibility for a large and historically repressed population. By countering silencing (including what Dick
(2009) deems “historiographical silence”), archives can create a newly-defined model of the LGBT community. This is especially essential for an “invisible” group like the LGBT community, where community members are not necessarily readily identifiable through visual cues or even personal acquaintance.

Tapping into the common theme of “gay pride,” archives can serve as a venue for a joyful visibility developed on the LGBT community's own terms. Rather than the forcible outing described by Dick (2009) in his article about Edmonton's 1942 same-sex trials, community-defined visibility can be a form of self-expression and of legitimizing the LGBT community's place in greater society. Topher Campbell (X, 2009) describes this process in the rukus! archive by saying that “rukus! is not about saying we're victims; we're very much about redefining and replacing ourselves publicly” (p. 278). This reclamation and redefinition of identity echoes the embrace, by some segments of the community, of the term “queer” as a positive label describing the possibility of a re-imagined identity and society.

**Self-determination**

Community-based collections address broader concerns such as the fear of tokenization or the questions of ownership and cooptation. By retaining control over selection, description, and access of materials, members of the LGBT community maintain ownership of their own histories rather than letting others determine how and by whom their materials will be used. For a historically disenfranchised group, self-determination is an essential element of empowerment, as well as a politically-charged activity.
Recalling Annemaree Lloyd's (2007) concept of the assigning of significance to materials as a political act, the desire for self-determination indicates a desire to act politically and to assign significance to one's own life and the lives within one's community. The founders of the Lesbian Herstory Archives address the concept of significance (and those who have the power to assign it) when stating that “Our collection policy has been that the community defines what is important to preserve about their lives” (Wolfe, 1998). This community determination and definition also means that archives are filling a community-defined need and desire for documentation; the very repository is designed based on community need, rather than outsider interest.

Self-determination also allows community archives to re-invent traditional, hierarchical archival structures and to create archives that match community needs. Ajamu X (2009) addresses this free-form archival design as a model allowing creativity and flexibility, in both design and in action. By acting in response to community desire, community archives have the ability to act with fluidity and imagination, allowing repositories to constantly reinvent themselves.

Self-determined collecting helps members of the LGBT community access their own histories which, through silencing, have historically been taken from them. As the Statement of Purpose for the Lesbian Herstory Archives asserts, community collecting of histories provides access to “our herstory denied to us previously by patriarchal historians in the interests of the culture which they serve” (quoted in Parris, 2005, p. 10). Parris defines this language as “self-protective,” a response to historic wrongs perpetuated by systems of power, of which the formal archives is perceived as an agent. Polly Thistlethwaite echoes this in a 1995 *Gay Community News* article in which she states that
members of the LGBT community do not want to “turn over control of our history and memory to a system still structured to work against us” (Parris, 2005, p. 19). While this separatism may seem alarmist or counterproductive to some, James Carmichael points out that its focus on “integrity, safety, and collective will” is essential to many LGBT donors, and these concerns are ones that all archives, community and formal alike, would be wise to address (Parris, 2005).

Accessibility

By placing initiative and ownership in the hands of the community itself, LGBT community archives allow a focus on self-determination and the desire to maintain accessibility and comfort for members of the community. Accessibility is a particularly important aspect for many LGBT donors whose motivations for documentation generally incorporate a desire to create and record history for other members of their communities.

As mentioned previously, LGBT archives serve an important role in community-building and identity-building. Many members of the LGBT community donate materials to archives with the hopes of making them accessible for their immediate communities as well as the larger LGBT community, and especially to new or isolated community members for whom they can act as an important anchor and source of identification.

One important aspect of increased accessibility, described by Rawson (2009), is methods for making the archival experience more comfortable for transgendered researchers. Noting potential (and generally unintentional) exclusionary elements of many archives, such as single-sex bathrooms and archivists who do not use a patron's desired pronoun, Rawson describes ways that archives can create a welcoming
environment for all patrons. While this type of accessibility may seem unnecessary to an archivist who believes that he or she has very few transgender users, one must recall many donors' desire to create a body of materials for the use of their own communities, and thus the real need to create a space that can be accessed and used by those communities.

As Maynard (2009) notes, denying or discouraging accessibility is “the ultimate police/archives tool” (p. 178). For the LGBT user, bureaucratic registration processes, a fear of not receiving “permission” to view documents, or even a lack of visible representations of the LGBT community through images, photographs, or staff presence may create such discomfort that the user may feel unwelcome or unable to make use of the collection.

Additionally, a lack of adequate descriptive tools may make it impossible for users to discover or access LGBT materials. While a lengthy discussion of descriptive tools for LGBT materials is beyond the scope of this paper, it is worth noting the many authors who point to the need for better description if such materials are to be used and accessed—and the integral role that creating accessibility plays in demonstrating a repository's positive attitudes toward the value of LGBT materials. Adequate description also demonstrates a refusal to obscure LGBT materials or to consider them “controversial.” Dick (2009) emphasizes the importance of this attitude, noting that accessibility “obliges an attitude favouring openness rather than secrecy, developing useful inventories and descriptive finding aids rather than unusable numbered file lists, working with minority constituencies to disseminate the presence and value of legal and other records for sexual minority research, and generally facilitating research into this
important but neglected area” (p. 217).

Finding aids may not adequately describe collections with significant LGBT content, due to their focus on provenance rather than topical content. Rather, a focus on subject headings or other controlled vocabulary can help identify themes within the content and identify collections relating to particular lifestyles or social movements (Beattie, 1997). Numerous authors also indicate the importance of the terminology used within descriptive materials and its relationship to internally-defined vocabulary as well as more mainstream terms for different components of LGBT community and culture (Chenier, 2009, p. 263, and Rawson, 2009, p. 130). For an in-depth discussion of LGBT materials and subject access, see Grant Campbell's 2009 article entitled “Queer Theory and the Creation of Contextual Subject Access Tools for Gay and Lesbian Communities,” which includes discussions of “aboutness” versus “meaning” and a consideration of the very fine distinctions made in description by community members. This discussion asks important questions that bear heavily upon community access to LGBT materials, since members of a marginalized community will often search differently or using different terms than an outsider.

Privacy

Elements of accessibility and self-determination can make members of the LGBT community, including donors, feel comfortable in an archives. Another important aspect of comfort is a sense of trust in the people who are creating and making pivotal decisions in the repository. This sense of trust makes a user feel comfortable entering the space and requesting materials, and it also makes a donor feel that he or she has made a good
decision in choosing to donate his or her materials.

An important aspect of trust is a very tangible sense of a safety, which is a concern to many potential LGBT donors. While one may not think of an archives as a place that could be “unsafe,” it can be a place with palpable feelings of distrust or discomfort. One very concrete way to increase the comfort of donors, especially, is through a significant focus on personal privacy. While sexual and gender identity are important aspects of people's public lives, many of their papers revolve around personal relationships and deal with sex and sexuality. Additionally, the archivist cannot assume that everyone mentioned within a donor's papers is “out” in all aspects of his or her life; for instance, a person may openly claim his gay identity among friends, but may strive to keep this identity secret in professional contexts. “Outing” someone, or revealing his or her sexual identity against his or her will, can be viewed as a very serious violation of privacy. James Carmichael (2000) puts it well when he says that “outing anyone against their will is a perpetuation of the kind of emotional violence to which people of earlier generations were routinely subjected” (p. 94). Respecting a person's desires regarding his or her sexuality shows sensitivity and respect for the donor's decisions.

Opinions about the need to respect people's closeted identities vary widely throughout the LGBT community. For instance, Dick (2009) believes in striving for as much openness as possible in regards to public records, noting that “public archival documents bearing on the historical experience of minorities hold a collective importance extending beyond the privacy rights of individuals. Protecting individual privacy is essential, but this principle should not negate the equally valid principle that the common good must be served through appropriate access to records bearing on human rights and
other important issues of public policy” (p. 216). From this vantage point, an unnecessary focus on privacy can actually further issues of repression. Conversely, Chenier (2009) focuses on legitimizing the privacy needs of those documented in oral histories, stating that “understandably, these narrators have heightened concerns over privacy, and often feel the need to protect their own reputation as well as their family's. In some cases, narrators have reason to be concerned that if placed in the wrong hands, their testimony could compromise their personal safety and security in the present day” (p. 259). Others feel that only through openness and a loving acceptance of people's lives and identities can the LGBT community build visibility and pride and erase shame and oppression.

**Accountability**

The image of archivists as advocates for—and as ultimately accountable to—marginalized populations is widespread within community archives, reflected explicitly in statements such as that of the Lesbian Herstory Archives that “we aim to be totally accountable to our community and to be a diverse, inclusive reflection of lesbians in the US and around the world” (Wolfe, 1998). While the notion of activist librarians is in direct opposition to the mythical “neutral,” objective librarian or archivist, it offers a model for those who wish to build strong LGBT collections with the support of the community (Parris, 2005). As Carmichael (2000) notes, “Library historians and archivists are in a unique position to discover and publicize gay archives... they should be pioneers rather than followers in establishing acceptable historical standards... [and] addressing the professional antipathy to the sexual nature of biographical subjects” (p. 99). Pateman (2002) furthers this call to activism by asking librarians to feel emotionally moved by
historical mistreatment of marginalized groups and use this energy to work for inclusion and representation. “What we need, as a profession,” he writes, “is a collective anger for the rights of the oppressed and the discriminated” (p. 18). (For an interesting history of activism in the American archivist profession, see Laura Micham's (1997) “A Repository of One's Own: An Examination of Activism with the General Field of Archivy as Exemplified by Women's Studies Archivy.”)

Archives themselves can also create greater, societal accountability by holding governments and other powerful institutions responsible for their earlier abuses of the LGBT population (Maynard, 2009, p. 179). By making records of the LGBT population accessible, and by making the experiences of members of this population visible, archives can increase accountability through truth-telling.

Importantly, many community archives do not just emphasize their archivists' responsibility to the greater community, but also emphasize the community's role in maintaining the archives. Many, if not most, community archives have predominantly volunteer staffs, and community members play essential roles in decision-making. The ONE Institute and Archives, in a 2001 fundraising campaign, even emphasized this community responsibility in terms of financial investment, saying that “It's the responsibility of the community to preserve its heritage” (Gallagher, 2001, p. 55).

**Trust**

The model of archivist as advocate, as someone who works for the best interests of the LGBT community, also addresses the responsibility of the archivist to those communities whose history he or she chooses to collect. By housing histories “owned” by
others, the archivist takes on accountability to these populations. Accountability means, among other things, an investment in LGBT history that transcends simple scholarly trends and the personal affinities of archivists through institutional commitments. Marston (1998) points to donor's desire to feel secure that institutions are committed to their papers in the long-term, “beyond the current set of players” (p. 141). By trusting an archivist, a member of the LGBT community may choose to donate his or her papers, but by trusting a greater institution or repository and its goals and intentions, a donor may feel a longer-term security in his or her decision.

This commitment to the larger cause of LGBT history challenges the notion of “collecting,” and rather focuses on the importance of connecting donors with repositories that meet their needs and desires and in which their collections will be preserved with the most integrity (Parris, 2005). The archivist collecting LGBT materials must learn to work in concert with others who are invested in the creation of queer histories, within the “active interrelationships among lesbian and gay activists, archivists, and scholars” who form a network that creates queer history and challenges exclusiveness and exclusion (Marston, 1998, p. 139). When activism is “combined with the traditional role of the archivist, the result is a proactive archivist, concerned both with the archives itself and with working toward the promotion of the ideals of the constituents being served... it is an idea far removed from any kind of concept of the archivist's role as that of the passive organizer and gatherer...” (Parris, 2005, p. 13).

Additionally, this form of deeper involvement in the creation of LGBT history can build trust directly between the archivist and/or repository and members of the LGBT community. Especially if he or she is affiliated with a larger organization that bears
significant societal power or influence, the archivist should respect potential donors' distrust of his or her intentions as grounded in a long history of repression, and work to create positive relationships and trust as part and parcel of collection-building. Maynard (2009) ties this need for trust to the longstanding power relationships inherent in the traditional archival model: “uneasy histories between the police and some of the communities they are supposed to serve underline the need for archivists to establish a high level of faith with researchers that archivists are indeed working in the interests of the public and not the police/archives” (p. 171).

An archivist's focus on involvement in and commitment to the LGBT community, whether as a community member himself or as an ally, can demonstrate a desire to further the community's needs, to recognize their concerns, and to maintain awareness of current trends and issues. Archivists should become what Pateman (2002) calls “passionate advocates” who “need to be angry either through personal experience or by getting involved with excluded people” (p. 19). In a population with high privacy needs and frequent suspicion of those in positions of power, this personal relationship can build faith and allow for collection-building based on personal networks, reflecting the true diversity and true interests of the LGBT community. In combination with a successful track record of documenting LGBT history, personal involvement in community issues can demonstrate necessary investment.

OUTREACH AND EDUCATION

As mentioned above, a central concern for many LGBT donors to archives is the desire to build histories that are accessible to members of their own communities. While
some members of the LGBT community are certainly part of archives' traditional user base, such as academics and historians, others lie far outside the traditional user community, such as those with little education, isolated rural dwellers, and people with no internet access. The need to create accessibility for these non-traditional users, in order to satisfy one of the central desires of LGBT donors, has significant implications for user outreach and education.

**Outreach as publicity**

First, reaching users outside of academia (aside from genealogists) requires a good deal of outreach in the form of publicity. For those who may not have used archives before, the archives need to bring their history and presence to the public rather than expecting the public to show up at their doors. Chenier (2009) describes this as “a belief that it [is] essential to bring history to the public rather than expect the public to come to [you]” (p. 253).

Other methods of outreach as publicity can occur through partnerships with community organizations, including community centers, senior centers, or even schools. Zieman (2009) describes a model wherein the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives in Toronto found ways to integrate their work with the local schools' curricula, supporting classroom anti-homophobia education through presentations in schools and the provision of educational materials to teachers. This type of outreach involving younger community members can also fulfill the role of outreach to isolated youth emphasized by many authors and donors, combating the negative school environments described by Hughes-Hassell and Hinckley (2001).
Publicity also can occur through presence at community events; for instance, the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives has created exhibits for display at local LGBT events, and maintain an information booth at Toronto Gay Pride (Zieman, 2009).

**Programming as outreach**

When archives cannot or do not desire to perform outreach in the broader community, they may wish to focus on programming held in the repository as a method for bringing in new potential donors and users. Freivogel (1978) focuses on outreach as a central administrative function in archives, with programming framed as an ongoing, integrated program rather than an isolated event or disconnected series of events. While this type of programming as outreach may seem to be beyond the scope of archivists' responsibility, Freivogel notes that it “is first of all an extension of reference work, and as we use the word it generally describes any activity that brings the records or the means of using them closer to the public, multiplying in some way the effectiveness of the records or access to them” (p. 148). To create an integrated outreach program, archivists must recognize their users as a “series of publics” and develop formats that reach each public at its appropriate level of sophistication and in its appropriate mode (Freivogel, 1978).

**Outreach as user education**

Recognizing the different needs of user bases, including the incredibly varied members of the LGBT community, we reach the final type of user outreach: outreach as user education, teaching members of communities how they can access their own histories within an archives. If an archives desires to collect a marginalized group's
history in order to make it visible and accessible to the entire public, rather than simply
taking away a group's documents and making them accessible only to elite researchers
and scholars, then the repository should find ways to ensure that members of represented
groups are learning how to access their own histories.

This type of user education is an essential component of overturning historical
power dynamics wherein archives often have served the needs of academics at the
expense of marginalized and oppressed communities. While user education may seem,
again, like something that falls outside of the archivist's job description, consider Joan
Krizack's observation (quoted in McDonald, 2008) that after a decade of documenting
minority social movements at Northeastern University, “‘surprisingly few requests for
[manuscript collections] have been made by the organizations that created the
collections’” (p. 15). While this may, of course, simply indicate that those groups do not
feel the need to examine historical documents, it more likely represents a lack of
knowledge about the whereabouts of their communities' own records or a lack of
knowledge about how to access them. If the archivist wishes to help communities
preserve their own histories, ensuring that these communities can and do access them is
an important part of the process.

As an example of a groundbreaking and effective model for user education, let us
turn to a somewhat unlikely source: the American Indian Cultural Resources Training
Program at the Smithsonian Institution (Viola, 1978). Recognizing that their “collections
are not the playthings of a special segment of the population; the collections belong to all
people from all backgrounds” (Viola, 1978, p. 143), the Smithsonian decided in 1973 to
institute a program where members of the American Indian community could travel to
Washington, DC and receive instruction in how to access the Smithsonian's rich holdings documenting American Indian history. What made this program so unique was its focus on the desires of American Indians themselves; participants were selected by tribal groups, and one of the goals of their participation was for them to communicate their tribes' needs and desires to Smithsonian employees, thus “establishing direct and informal channels of communication” (Viola, 1978, p. 146). Participants not only gained knowledge of the Smithsonian's vast holdings; they also learned how to access and use materials and brought that knowledge back to their home communities. Finally, the program allowed participants to begin the work of writing their communities' own histories through these historical documents, rather than leaving the work of history creation to non-Indian outsiders. Lending a sense of empowerment surrounding documentation, the program was “designed to interest Indian Americans in becoming professional archivists and historians, and to instill in them a desire to learn more about their heritage and to share this knowledge with all Americans by publishing and preserving the surviving records of their past” (Viola, 1978, p. 144).

**COOPERATIVE MODELS**

Cooperative models like the American Indian Cultural Resources Training Program show how user education and outreach can have significant effects, building strong, open relationships between archives and marginalized groups that respect both parties' needs, desires, and limitations. These direct relationships with members of the LGBT community can be complemented by cooperation with existing LGBT community archives and libraries. Collaboration with (rather than competition with, or dismissal of)
community or informal archives is a necessary key to the future of LGBT archival collections; for as long as this group continues to be oppressed, “the continued existence of [community] archives is crucial for the respective communities that they serve” (Parris, 2005, p. 8). This cooperation may be simple, such as a community archives housing some very fragile documents in a formal archives' climate-controlled stacks as a “deposit” while retaining ultimate control and ownership over those materials (X, 2009, p. 291). The cooperative relationship may also be more complex, with the two archives building collective documentation strategies and maintaining open lines of communication in terms of which repository will focus on which aspects of local LGBT history.

Brenda Marston (1990) believes that cooperation, or even partnerships, between mainstream and community archives can in fact benefit the queer community in ways that are greater than the sum of each type of repository’s individual efforts (Parris, 2005). Marston embodies this collaborative spirit in her work at Cornell's Human Sexuality Collection, where she “work[s] every day... with the people at community-run archives, with other archivists and librarians at mainstream repositories, with lesbian and gay activists, and with scholars to find good homes for queer archival material” (Marston, 1998, p. 139).

Flinn (2007) believes that the challenge presented by the success of community archives is for archivists to re-examine their traditional “top-down custodial view of professional activity” in the face of “creators and custodians of these community archives, who often distrust or are at least wary of the intentions of heritage professionals and may wish to prevent the transfer of their papers and social memory to professional,
non-community organizations” (p. 163). As community archives point to gaps and lacks within current archival practice, close and sincere communication with those working in community archives can lead to necessary shifts in archival professional practice (especially within description and access), and ultimately guide archivists through a shift to a post-custodial model where formal organizations and loci of power do not remove ownership of histories or historical objects from communities, but rather work alongside them to create and care for multifaceted and rich historical records.

Cooperation is not as simple as a friendly phone call or proposal; the strong personal and political mission of community archives, as well as their creation as a response to perceived lacks in formal archives, can at times create an oppositional relationship between mainstream and community repositories. As Thistlethwaite (1998) notes, “mainstream institutions, hopping on a multi-cultural bandwagon, may present themselves as wonderlands to their newly recognized gay and lesbian constituencies and markets, but in doing so threaten to appropriate the work, recognition, and funding of grass-roots institutions” (p. 170). This appearance (real or perceived) of insincerity or tokenism is one that archivists should address honestly and carefully; one way that this can be countered is through a strongly expressed commitment to the mission of creating and preserving LGBT histories, as well as an acknowledgment of the advocacy roles that the archivist can fill.

**QUESTIONS AND NEXT STEPS**

While one cannot deny that some, perhaps even many, members of the LGBT community share in certain types of societal privilege, whether racial, educational, or
socioeconomic, they are still a group that is often hidden, silenced, and disempowered. In order to perform effective outreach with this population, archivists would benefit from better understanding and addressing some of the concerns listed above; case studies such as this one hopefully can pave the way for challenging and productive dialogue. The very motivations that lead to the creation of community archives or alternative historical repositories can also lead to future relationships in which archivists and their greater institutions work together with the LGBT community and other historically marginalized groups to build large, networked, multi-faceted histories that are determined by and accessible to those being represented within them.

As part of a desire to work cooperatively with members of the LGBT community to understand their thoughts, needs, and desires in terms of documentation and history, the next section of this paper focuses on a series of interviews with members of the LGBT community in and around Durham, North Carolina. Interview questions focus on themes from this literature review and gather additional information about community members' thoughts on these topics. In response to McDonald's (2008) statement that “a systematic portrait of communities of potential archival donors is also warranted” if archives are to truly reflect the diversity of our culture, this study strives to capture the voices of central North Carolina's LGBT community and begin to paint a portrait of the community's wants and needs.
METHODOLOGY

This project aims to illuminate successful archival outreach methods for potential LGBT donors, as well as to identify areas for growth or challenges for archivists who wish to build their effectiveness with this population. To this end, research took the form of an explanatory case study of the Sallie Bingham Center in the Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Special Collections Library at Duke University. While the Bingham Center's collection focuses specifically on “published and unpublished materials that reflect the public and private lives of women, past and present” (About the Center, 2009), it has a substantial number of collections from LGBT women or from organizations with primarily LGBT membership, and their collection policy specifically mentions women's sexuality and gender expression.

Through a series of flexible, in-depth interviews with an archivist, a donor, and several members of the southeastern LGBT community, this study illuminates some of the real-world opinions and practices surrounding the creation and maintenance of LGBT history in the southeastern United States. Data from interviews is considered in light of the available theoretical literature, and areas of agreement as well as discrepancies are identified.

Definitions

Aside from the archivist, research subjects are people who self-identify as “members of the LGBT community”; for this study, self-identification is both appropriate and necessary, since LGBT identification is difficult to measure objectively.

For the purposes of this study, archivists refers to people who have a master's
degree in library science and are employed in an archives or archival repository. *Archives* or *repositories* refers to collections that house mainly primary-source, non-circulating documents; these may be broad archives or special collections, such as those at a university, or specialized collections, such as an archives associated with a particular organization or historical figure. The specific archives at the center of this case study are associated with a large university. This project also frequently mentions *community archives*, referring to collections where selection, processing, description, and other archival tasks, as well as decision-making and administrative tasks, are performed by people who belong to the community whose historical documents are being collected. Community archives are not associated with a larger institution, and can be housed in private homes or in public spaces.

*LGBT history,* broadly, is the history of LGBT individuals, organizations, events, and movements. *Donors or potential donors* are people who have personal papers that would be of value to an archives with an interest in collecting LGBT materials. Donors or potential donors may also be people who belong to and have influence within LGBT organizations, and can make decisions about the donation of the organization's records.

**Methodology**

Data was collected through a series of interviews, seeking to gather information from people with various roles within the process of documenting LGBT history at the Bingham Center: the center's Director, an archivist who has had success in outreach to LGBT donors; a current donor who is a grassroots LGBT activist and has chosen to donate her papers to the Bingham Center; and four LGBT activists and community
organizers who have not donated their papers to the Bingham Center or to any other formal archives. Lists of questions for each of the two individuals (archivist and donor) differed slightly from those for the members of the latter group in order to gather information most appropriate to each person's role. For instance, the archivist answered questions about performing outreach, while the potential donors addressed questions about being on the receiving end of outreach (See Appendices E-G).

The case study is an appropriate research design for the purposes of this study because the research involves in-depth exploration of a complex issue; as Yin (1994) writes, “the distinctive need for case studies arises out of the desire to understand complex social phenomena... the case study allows an investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events” (p. 3). A case study helps shed light on some of the deep complexities inherent in documenting the lives and work of members of the LGBT community.

Selection of participants

The Bingham Center was selected for study because it is a well-known repository, and holds papers from both LGBT individuals and LGBT organizations; additionally, Duke University plays a significant role in the local community. Laura Micham, the Director of the Bingham Center, has necessarily developed some effective techniques for outreach to potential LGBT donors, but certainly has discovered areas for improvement, as well. Micham's interview questions centered around successful and unsuccessful outreach techniques, relationships between archives and community archives, and what she believes are common concerns among the LGBT population.
The current donor for this study, Mandy Carter, was identified by Laura Micham; Carter is a prominent activist and member of the LGBT community who has donated her personal papers to the Bingham Center. Micham forwarded a recruitment email with the researcher's contact information to Carter, who then contacted the researcher directly. Carter's conversation clarified the experience of being on the receiving end of the Center's outreach. Discussion with Carter centered around her concerns, reasons for donating, things she considered before donating, and what concrete actions she believes would increase donations. As a current LGBT donor to this repository, she was selected because, presumably, her concerns were adequately addressed through the archivist's outreach methods prior to donation. Additionally, as an insider and an influential member within the southeastern LGBT community, she has insight into the motivations and concerns of those around her.

Finally, the researcher interviewed four LGBT community organizers or grassroots activists who have not donated to the Bingham Center or to other repositories. These potential donors were identified through their participation in one of two events: the 2010 Southerners on New Ground Organizing School, a four-day workshop for LGBTQ activists held in Durham, North Carolina, or the 2010 Southeast Regional Unity Conference, an annual gathering of southeastern LGBT people and allies held in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Contact information was collected during personal contact at the events outlining the general goals of this study, and follow-up emails were sent further describing the study and inviting participation in interviews. All of the potential donors live and work in the southeastern United States, making their papers clearly fall under the collecting interests of the Bingham Center which include Southern women and women's
sexuality and gender expression. Conversations with potential donors centered around whether they have considered donating their papers, their concerns and priorities for the documentation of LGBT history, what they would want to know prior to donating, and what they would expect post-donation. As mentioned previously, this study is based on the assumption that LGBT activists are likely to have insight into the things that motivate donors to select community archives rather than formal archives, and the concerns that are specific to donation to archives associated with a larger institution such as a university.

All interviews lasted approximately one hour, and were conducted between February and June of 2010. Interviews were conducted in person, with the exception of one interview which was conducted via telephone, and were audio recorded and then transcribed. Interview questions, as listed in Appendices E-G, were used as a framework for a dialogue centering around LGBT history, archives, and outreach. Transcriptions were analyzed for common themes and for responses addressing major subject areas mentioned in this paper's literature review.

Members of the LGBT community, as mentioned in the literature review, have high privacy needs, and some LGBT materials may deal with sensitive subjects such as sex and sexuality. Additionally, many members of this group have experienced or live in fear of harassment or violence due to their sexuality or gender expression. Finally, some members of the community are not “out” to all people in their lives, and as such, do not wish to be publicly identified as LGBT. In order to address these possible concerns, this study aimed to maintain the confidentiality of research subjects to the greatest degree possible.
Due to the public nature of her role, the Director of the Sallie Bingham Center is identified by name. Likewise, the current donor, through the donation of her papers, has chosen to publicly label herself as a member of the LGBT community, and therefore she is mentioned by name (with her permission) in this paper. While this identification may limit their abilities to answer all questions with complete honesty, obscuring their identities is not feasible within this study.

The remarks of the four potential donors in audio recordings, notes, and written transcripts were labeled with unique alpha-numeric identifiers (PD1 - PD4) rather than with names. The alpha-numeric identifiers were created to protect the interviewees as members of a potentially vulnerable population, to increase their comfort in discussing sexuality as a potential sensitive topic, and to increase their comfort in answering questions honestly. (I refer to these codings as confidential rather than anonymous because, due to the small sample size and the in-depth nature of the questions, the identities of research subjects were obvious to the researcher during analysis, but were not recorded in any concrete manner.)

**Analysis**

All interviews were transcribed based on audio recordings. Common themes were identified, along with commonly used terms. These common terms were identified within the group of potential donors as well as across groups, taking into account linguistic differences between interviewees and differences in terminology for similar concepts. Analysis was done by hand rather than with analytic software.

Through analysis of interviews and the identification of common concerns and
responses, the researcher has compiled a detailed discussion of the thoughts and feelings of a subset of members of the LGBT community about some of the overarching concepts from the archival and theoretical literature discussed earlier. Additionally, this study uses the discussion to derive recommendations for the archival field in terms of outreach that addresses these common concerns.

**Limitations**

While this study resulted in some limited quantitative data, the sample size is insufficient to generate any broadly applicable quantitative results. Additionally, the sampling process, while simple and effective, may not have resulted in a sample that is representative of the entire state of North Carolina's LGBT population; for instance, the Unity Conference tends to attract participants who are in some way affiliated with local universities, thus skewing the sample toward more educated or university-affiliated members of the LGBT community. Additionally, while I strove to find participants who represented various activist interests and educational, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds, these criteria were not considered as a basis for selection, nor was this demographic information collected and taken into account during analysis.

This study was geographically-defined, focusing on the southeastern United States, with a particular focus on central North Carolina, an area with an active LGBT culture and rich LGBT history. Naturally, LGBT individuals have grown up within (and sometimes in opposition to) their own cultures--racial, socioeconomic, and geographical. The experiences of an LGBT individual in the southeast will differ from that of an LGBT individual in the urban northeast, the rural midwest, or the suburban southwest, and
therefore the opinions of this study's research subjects may not apply neatly across all geographical areas of the United States. Without similar studies in other geographic areas, it is not entirely possible to determine the universality of these findings.

As the Bingham Center collects materials dealing with women's sexuality and gender expression, this case study focuses on donors who identify as female, who belong to organizations or possess materials that are somehow related to women's sexuality. Therefore, interviewees' opinions, as expressed in this study, may not generalize to male sexuality or gender expression, nor to male segments of the LGBT population. This limitation is due to the nature of the repository selected for this case study.

A final limitation of this study is the lack of anonymity for the archivist and donor during the interview process. Due to the inherent politics of a managerial position within an institution, the Director of the Bingham Center clearly could not express opinions that could potentially offend co-workers, colleagues, or donors, real or potential. Additionally, the donor to the Bingham Center may have tempered her opinions in order to avoid offending any Bingham Center staff who may read this paper.

While these limitations—geographic, gender-based, and sampling—limit the ability to generalize this study's results to the entire LGBT population, these findings are applicable to similar archival contexts. Additionally, they may form the basis for additional, similar studies in order to create a broader picture of LGBT concerns, nationally or even internationally, in regards to archives and history.
**FINDINGS**

Interview questions were roughly organized around the themes in this study's literature review, with slightly different interview questions for each interviewee or set of interviewees (that is, archivist, current donor, and four potential donors; see Appendices E-G for interview questions). Interviewees spoke at length, often animatedly, about these topics, indicating that they have considered and often have strong feelings related to each of these themes. While, naturally, interviewee's comments are frequently more concrete and less theoretical than much of the literature, they tend to agree on topics of power relationships, visibility, and accessibility.

One major area of difference between interviewees and archival literature regards the issue of privacy. The current donor reported little to no concern about her personal privacy, despite the fact that LGBT privacy is a major concern of archival literature and a focus of the archivist interviewed for this project. Two of four potential donors, likewise, reported little concern about personal privacy, although all interviewees addressed issues of third-party privacy. However, these findings should be considered in light of the study sample; LGBT activists are more likely to be publicly identified as members of the LGBT population and to be comfortable with this openness, and LGBT people who wish to avoid the public eye are likely to avoid affiliation with social movements. Additionally, members of the LGBT population who are not comfortable publicly identifying as such are not likely to respond to an invitation to participate in a research study on LGBT archives and history. Interviewees' discussion of third-party privacy concerns indicates an awareness that not all members of their community or population share their attitudes about public identity and openness.
The people and the materials

Laura Micham is not only the Director of the Sallie Bingham Center for Women's History and Culture, but also Duke University's Librarian for Women's History and the Curator of Sexuality and Gender History Collections. Micham collects materials from the LGBT community within all of these professional roles, and she states that Duke focuses on LGBT materials as an essential part of the diversification of all their collections. Asked about the Bingham Center's greatest collection strength, Micham identified the “social movement aspect of the collection,” which is manifest in “the papers of activists, the records of organizations that would describe themselves as engaged in activism, and the printed materials of the movement.” She stressed that the Center documents “LGBT rights movements, plural,” ranging from the 1950s to the present, with the strongest regional representation from the southeastern United States.

Mandy Carter, the current donor interviewed for this research project, is an activist who has worked with numerous groups including the War Resister's League, Human Rights Campaign, National Black Lesbian and Gay Leadership Forum, and North Carolina Mobilization 1996, and has served on the planning committees for numerous North Carolina LGBT Pride Marches. Carter's papers consist of records of her activist work, as well as personal papers including speeches and correspondence.

Other interviewees possess personal and organizational papers in a range of formats, covering a range of subjects, including oral histories, zines, personal papers, organizational papers, records of social movements, and printed materials. All of their materials fall within the general collection policy of the Bingham Center, with foci
including but not limited to local LGBT history, black feminist thought, lesbian print culture, LGBT rights, trans rights, and LGBT health issues. While demographic information was not collected from interviewees, during the selection process the researcher made an effort to contact potential interviewees with varied backgrounds, ages, races, interests, and gender identifications. Of the four potential donors interviewed, two identify as female, one identifies as transgendered, and one identifies as male, although their activist interests vary from general LGBT rights to lesbian- or trans-specific issues.

Outreach to potential donors

Micham's preferred method for first contact with a potential donor is “good, old-fashioned snail-mail letter.” She stated that physical letters are rare enough that they serve as a gesture; additionally, they get people to “slow down, to look, to read, to think about what we have to offer as a repository and an institution.” With organizations, she generally tries to “get myself invited to a board meeting” where she can present her case and answer any questions from the organization's board members. She said, “I want them to feel like they're challenging me, and I want to rise to the challenge, because I feel like if I can, then I can inspire their confidence, and that's really what this is about.” She also tries to have one-on-one conversations with individuals from the organization. These conversations are an opportunity for her to tell them about how she thinks donating their records will benefit the organization and the greater LGBT community, as well as an opportunity for the organization's members to present their concerns and for mutual trust to be established.
Additionally, Micham said that public programming such as talks and symposia that draws community members can also attract potential donors. Referring to an event about LGBT community history sponsored by the Bingham Center, Micham said that “we got a lot of people coming up to us afterwards saying, 'Wow, I never really thought about letting anybody have my records, but now that I've heard you talk, and seen what you do, and seen your enthusiasm and your commitment, now I feel like maybe it's possible.'” These events also can show that the archivist understands the issues that interest or concern members of the community, “making it clear that you understand there's not just one movement, there's not one way to be queer.”

In terms of reluctant donors, Micham stressed that, due to the rise of interest in LGBT history, “your history will be written” with or without your materials' contribution. “Do you want it to be written on the strength of what people believe about you, without a documentary record, or do you want it to be on the strength of having a documentary record available?” she asked. She believes that a documentary record gives members of the LGBT community some “leverage” for discrediting people who warp or misinterpret history. She also stressed the importance of collective memory, noting that “the healthiest organizations have a sense of their own history, and that the project of choosing an archives and putting their materials in an archives often gives rise to a sort of connected project of writing their own history or somehow compiling their own history for their own use and their own benefit.”

Mandy Carter, as an influential member of the LGBT community, often has conversations with friends and colleagues about documenting their work through archives. She noted that some reluctance comes from donors of color who do not wish to
align themselves with predominantly-white universities, recalling the literature about alienation from archives (Lloyd, 2007, Barriault, 2009, and Maynard, 2009). Carter emphasizes to reluctant donors that their papers can serve to diversify a collection. While she has “had people come up to me as people of color and dared to say, 'Why are you working for anything white? We don't want to have anything to do with them,'” she replies that “that's just not how I operate.” She also pointed out that, for instance, the New York Public Library's Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture did not hold any materials from the black LGBT population until writer Steven Fulwood approached them and they willingly accepted his materials.

Speaking specifically to the Bingham Center's outreach techniques, Carter stated that she was pleased with all her early contact with Bingham Center staff and felt that her needs were thoroughly addressed. (The reader should recall that Carter was not speaking anonymously during this interview, and as such, she was unlikely to express negative views about colleagues or about the Bingham Center.) Her only suggestion is that she thinks it would have been helpful to get something like “a little book... a primer on 'If you're going to donate your stuff to Sallie Bingham, here's a little book for you.”

Creating value

Some of this study's interviewees share the feeling that “no one could care about my papers” (Church, 1998, and Julianni, 1976), despite the fact that they feel they and their activist colleagues are actively creating history. For instance, Mandy Carter, whose activist work commenced before the LGBT rights movement, never had the intention to create a collection to be housed in an archival repository. She said that she began saving
materials for her own personal reference, as well as for documenting the rise of the social movements in which she is involved. Carter first began saving materials when working with the War Resisters League during the Vietnam War era. This practice, she maintained, was unusual at the time, and as such it changed her mindset toward maintaining records.

“I must tell you that back in the 60s, not a whole lot of people were interested in keeping stuff, so to have an organization where that was part of their infrastructure, let's just try to track our own history as a pacifist organization, that really got me on that kick.” It was only in the past few years that she began to think of her papers less for personal reference and more for public documentation.

The potential donors interviewed for this study (labeled PD1 – PD4 in these findings for purposes of confidentiality) seemed well aware of the ability of archives—formal or community-based—to create a sense of value by conveying to members of the LGBT community that their papers can and often should be saved. PD1 discussed the role of community archives in this process, saying that part of what they do “is actually to create a sense of value and revolutionize what it is that people value. Because I think that often those of us who are in marginalized and oppressed communities are not taught to value our own lives while we're living them, the things that we do, the evidence that we create.” By building a sense of community identity, community archives can show the value of their members, and their efforts at collecting can change people's relationships to their own records. “There's a way that community archives are responsible for teaching that, and for promoting that, for actually having people think differently about, 'Oh, what I have done is valuable, or what people have done before is really valuable,’ to the extent that people will really support it with their time and with their labor and with whatever
resources that they have,” PD1 added. Of course, the act of imbuing papers and life stories with value is not exclusive to community archives, and while PD1 asserted that universities can create and convey value through what they deem important enough for preservation and study, “there are major limits to how much of a role of radically revaluing the meaning of life a university can actually do, or an individual can actually do within a university without being punished for it.”

While archives can, and often do, produce radical shifts in the concept of intellectual value, PD2 noted that collection development often still reflects societal priorities, and that more privileged segments of the LGBT community are still most heavily documented. “Even within the LGBTQ community, what is seen as valuable?” she asked. PD4 agreed, noting that groups that are more societally marginalized will likewise be marginalized in any formal repositories. “There's a lot about gay men everywhere, a lot about lesbians, not so much about bi, less about trans, even less about intersex, you know?” PD2 believes that this intensifies the need for the archivist to be involved in the community. “If so much of the queer community that exists is not getting highlighted or [is not] even visible, where does an archivist go to find them? Well, they're probably going to have to be queer, or in the queer community as an ally, embedded. Cause otherwise, they're going to get a pretty privileged snapshot of what history looks like.”

A sense of the historical value of one's own documents, or of one's own work, is not necessarily reflected in whether or not interviewees have considered donating their materials to an archival repository. As Mandy Carter said, she realized the importance of documentation, and yet only began thinking of her papers as a potential part of the public
record recently. PD2, likewise, had “never thought about contributing any documents that I've been a part of making” to an archives, although she is “a shameless extrovert, and a promoter of many things, so I think I would probably be really excited” if an archivist approached her. Instead of a sense of historicity, her motivating force for saving documents was that “they're like keepsakes.” PD3 has a strong interest in finding an archival home for LGBT oral histories that he has created, although uncertainty about the value of his personal papers means that he has never considered donating the latter materials. He specifically discussed historicity in his reluctance, stating that “it's not so much a question of confidentiality or being worried about folks digging in my privacy or whatever; it's more kind of wondering what I have to offer that will be meaningful, historically or on a community level. And not being sure what the criteria are for determining if something would be useful.” PD1 has a stronger sense of what would be useful, as someone who has used others' personal papers extensively in academic and personal research. As for what she has saved and why, she simply stated that, “I save stuff, thinking that maybe it's stuff that I would have wanted to have, to look at, if I was not me.” In a slightly different vein, PD4 has never personally approached an archives about the records of the organizations with which she works, although she has asked other members of these organizations what they plan to do with their records. She has “been interested in documentation and memory, institutional memory,” and advocates for organizations saving their historical materials. She has been approached by an archivist from a local repository about her personal papers. “She asked me the question. I haven't answered yet. I mean, for all different reasons. I would consider doing that, since it is the only solution I know to my issue about community memory.”
Returning to Mandy Carter and her growing awareness of the value of her personal papers, she described how she was approached by the former Bingham Center Director; while she had not previously considered donating her papers to an archives, she had a history with and a connection to the Bingham Center, and thus the request was one that she immediately considered. Due to a personal connection to Sallie Bingham, as well as a deep connection with Durham's activist community, the Bingham Center felt like a logical choice. Finally, some of Carter's friends and respected colleagues had already chosen to house their papers at the Bingham Center, leading her to believe that it was a trusted repository where her materials could be viewed in context. She emphasized that “it certainly was the direct connection that made the difference.”

Community versus formal archives – finding an appropriate home

All four potential donors noted both strengths and weaknesses of community archives and formal archives; while some expressed a preference for one or the other, others said that personal connections to archivists, a sense of connection to a repository’s location, and interrelationships between their materials and a repository's current holdings would be greater deciding factors. PD2 noted that formal archives have the benefit of being comparatively permanent: “I think the pro of a university or formal archival system is that... it's going to actually be kept up with. And it will be, on some level, always accessible to a certain amount of, to a small group of people. It also contributes to... history, things like that.” The downside of formal archives is that “most folks I know who are activists don't go to universities to pull documents,” meaning that the documents' creators and others in their communities likely will not use them once they are housed in
the archives. An additional downside is that, “when you're putting these documents in as formal documents for people to use for their research, then who knows what they're going to do with your material? Who knows how they might interpret it? And that feels a little unsafe.” Recognizing that archivists act as mediators between researchers and archival material, she prefers an arrangement where access in mediated through mechanisms in which she feels trust. Some of the positive aspects of community archives, she believes, are that materials are “totally accessible,” and also that they often can be borrowed or reproduced, thus disseminating information throughout the community. Unfortunately, “the majority of community resource centers... don't stay together. They fold... then what happens is a lot of times the [materials] end up in a box in somebody's house... and then your community doesn't have that resource anymore.” While community archives may seem more accessible in the short term, since they are housed in community spaces or seem less intimidating, they may actually be less accessible in the long term as spaces close or reorganize.

PD3 stated that finding an appropriate archival home for his materials would necessitate an evaluation of his physical location and the kinds of work he was doing, although “I would definitely say that I have a fondness for community-based archives. And my reasoning for that has to do with my understanding of access, where I would imagine that for many community archives... access is determined much more... on kind of collective will and the desires of the participants, more so than whatever standards and regulations and protocol universities have in place.” However, the ultimate decision would rest on where his materials could best be viewed within context, alongside the materials of others doing similar types of work, and where they would make the largest
contribution. PD3 also discussed his mixed feelings about LGBT materials being housed in university archives. Referring to the records of *RFD Magazine*, a magazine stemming from the Radical Faeries movement and currently housed at Emory University, he said:

> [Emory] purchasing the collection brought in some much-needed money to help keep the magazine going, and it ensured that sort of stable, formal home for the materials so that researchers and others can access them in the future, which is so much better than the moldy barn that they were in previously. But part of me also feels a little uncertainty or sadness about it being in this formal, predominantly-straight university context where there's going to be all these restrictions on who can access them.

PD1 also stressed accessibility as the main factor in her decision of the type of archives in which she would wish to house her papers. Another large factor for her is the ability of an archives to preserve her materials long-term; she acknowledged that not all community archives have staying power: “I've seen, just from my own archival research, that there are really awesome community archives that get locked out of the space they're using because they can't pay rent, or there's some other kind of damage... there are ways certainly that archives change and move.” Mixed feelings about longevity and accessibility seemed to play heavily into the considerations of all interviewees.

PD4's concerns about formal archives are less based in accessibility and longevity, and more in what universities, as instruments of power, represent to some members of her community. She said that “I lament very much the fact that there isn't a [community-based repository] locally... not everyone likes to be involved with this more public place [at a university]. I immediately see the issue of privacy, particularly for people who are not out.” For her colleagues, part of privacy is the idea that their stories will not be thrust into the public sphere unless they are comfortable with that move. Another part of their concerns with formal archives is that “from my own experience, [I think] that some people, particularly people of color, may not want to be part of an effort that is, sounds
from the outside as very white, as to what the university looks like.”

When asked for general concerns about donating, few interviewees had additional worries. Mandy Carter said it occurred to her that “all the stuff I had kept, it was down in a basement that was damp,” but Bingham Center staff members assured her that papers could be organized and dried during processing. PD2 stated concerns about contemporary records documenting ongoing activist work, especially in the face of government surveillance and the fact that “the government is a little uneasy about folks who think and... propagate ideas that undermine hierarchical and oppressive systems.” An additional concern for her is that her documents could be misinterpreted or misunderstood out of their original, embedded context. While PD4 understands that her papers, if donated, would be processed and organized, she wants time to sort through her records herself, organizing them into a “decent” personal archives rather than a pile of papers and files in disarray before she considers donation.

Privacy concerns

Echoing the privacy issues described in much of the archival literature discussing LGBT history (Carmichael, 2000, Chenier, 2009, and Dick, 2009), Micham focused upon her donors' confidentiality needs. Citing privacy as the most common concern among her actual and potential donors, she said, “it's either about their own privacy or the privacy of the people who appear in their collections, that is to say, the people whose correspondence they received, or whose writings they have, their ex-lovers, et cetera.”

While she may not represent the typical donor to the Bingham Center, Mandy Carter noted that she did not have any privacy concerns upon donating her collection. Of
course, as she pointed out, the fact that she had been filing materials with an eye toward long-term preservation meant that her public papers and her more private papers were never intermixed in the first place. “If you think about it, when you file something, you know, you're putting it somewhere, so you're more likely to self-censor what you might not put in there in the beginning.” Similarly, PD4 said that if and when her materials are ready for donation, any potentially private materials already will have been removed. In her own organization process, she will “piece out the personal and the public,” donating more public materials to an archives while keeping private or personal records for her own family. This is based partly on third-party privacy concerns for family members, and partly on the sensitivity of modern collections inasmuch as they are records of the present rather than the past; she has ongoing stresses and sensitive issues within her own family, and she said that sharing too much family information with the public could unnecessarily exacerbate tensions.

Other interviewees, rather than feeling a lack of privacy concerns due to self-motivated sorting, feel little concern about sharing information that they have already made public. PD2, as someone who has written and spoken extensively as an LGBT activist and is comfortably out in both personal and professional settings, acknowledged that her own privacy is not a major concern. Much like Carter, she believes that as part of a creator's historical intention, “responsibility starts with whoever authors the documents in the first place.” Likewise, PD1 identified herself as a very open person, and stated that she documents her life heavily in public forums and on the Internet.

As someone who has documented the lives of others within his community through oral histories, PD3 discussed ethics involving informed consent for participants
in documentary projects. For him, following this set of ethics is essential for “folks who may feel like they have a lot at stake in revealing their histories, and since queer and trans folks have been marginalized legally and socially and politically in so many ways, it definitely is an important thing to navigate confidentiality and privacy within those contexts.” While he acknowledged that many of his participants may have deep privacy concerns, he said that those concerns have been addressed carefully during the act of creating oral histories, and need not be considered further upon donation.

Third-party privacy concerns among interviewees deviate somewhat from their general lack of concern about personal privacy, indicating that they are aware that some members of their community maintain a desire for confidentiality or are not as open as they are about issues regarding their sexualities. Again, Micham said of her donors that “they're very concerned about third-party privacy rights, to a larger degree than some other living donors might be, because they're a targeted community.” This reluctance is balanced, she maintained, by “a greater sense of urgency about their desire to document themselves and other members of their community, because they realize that they're history makers, and they realize that it's only in the recent past that their history has been taken seriously enough by the academy such that people like me would exist to preserve it.” To respect these concerns, she and her staff maintain awareness of potentially sensitive materials during processing and use. Micham said, we “bring to their attention what we consider to be materials of potential sensitivity, specifically related to third-party privacy rights, and give the donor a chance to decide whether or not the material should be restricted.” Additionally, for donors with specific privacy needs, Micham believes that archivists must “process at a more granular level to make sure that we are taking into
account the privacy needs of the members of the community."

While Carter has not deeply considered third-party privacy concerns, she wondered, “do you have to get clearance from everyone?... It's almost like it's a unique area that's so relatively new, you almost have to come up with guidelines” for both archivists and donors. Like other interviewees, Carter said that archivist and donor hold equal responsibility for third-party privacy: the donor has a responsibility to be cognizant of what he or she is donating and to remove or inform the archivist about potentially sensitive materials, and the archivist has to respect the donor's desires, especially in processing. PD3 likewise wondered about standards for contacting parties mentioned within one's collection, and actually is concerned about standards that are so high that they are difficult to implement. “That could be really complicated, if it was a really strict standard of any person who has identifiable information has to be contacted and have their consent obtained, because that would be both unlikely and possibly even impossible, logistically.”

Other potential donors were proactively prepared to address third-party privacy concerns with people mentioned in their collections prior to donating, rather than expecting the archivist to do most of the work of identifying and dealing with these needs. PD2 said that she “would feel most comfortable contacting folks that I worked together with and saying, 'Okay, Duke or whoever wants this stuff. What do we think about that?'” She recognizes that the transgender community has particularly significant privacy concerns, and that “especially for trans folks, transgendered people, employment is such a huge obstacle” during their lifetimes. In order to respect the privacy needs of her activist colleagues, “if I was submitting anything that had any identifying information of
other transgendered folks, I would have to majorly get lots of okay from them.” PD1's concerns revolved around family issues, much like those expressed by PD4 above. “There's a difference between me choosing to be public about my own life and putting my family members out,” she stated. While the desire to be private about one's family life resonates with her, she insisted that the issue is more complicated. While she knows that third-party privacy can definitely be an issue for some people, she said, “I'm not super committed to the perpetuation of someone's closeting, even beyond their lifetime. Not to say that I'm insensitive to someone's wishes about their own publicity or privacy, but I don't feel a deep investment in protecting people from being known to have had whatever kind of diverse set of experiences they've had.” While these statements do not make vigilance like Micham's unnecessary, they do show that privacy concerns are not the same across the spectrum of LGBT donors, and that ongoing conversations with donors may be necessary to continue to understand and address their needs.

Another interesting facet of privacy considerations is the belief of several interviewees, including PD1 and PD2, that the archival profession needs to develop broad standards and best practices regarding privacy to lessen the need for each repository to develop its own standards. PD2 noted that these types of privacy concerns are “something that other folks don't have to think about when they're submitting their work to an archive.”

Additionally, PD2 maintained that archivists can address privacy concerns by showing that they understand the community's needs and values, through ongoing involvement and self-education. Similarly, PD3 found the archivist's attitude the most important part of addressing privacy concerns. “I would say that consent is just the
guiding principle. Making sure that people know what they're agreeing to as clearly as possible, and giving them the option to opt in and opt out of different levels of access.”

He stated that a thorough explanation of available restrictions is essential, as well as “having it be clear how those [restrictions] can be revisited” if circumstances change and restrictions can be eased. PD1 also wants clear communication about restrictions, and said that archivists should “let [donors] know every option for what they can have sealed, and for how long,” while acknowledging the limitations of restrictions and also acknowledging what the archivist can and cannot do to protect donors' privacy. All said, PD1 believes that a strong alignment between a donor and a repository's vision and stewardship is more important than specific privacy methods. If a donor believes in an archives' vision, she will believe in its staff's ability to manage her papers responsibly and with respect for her life and needs.

**Other concerns**

Interviewees broached some other concerns that they think affect members of the LGBT population—only some of which are mentioned in this study's literature review. Carter noted that some donors may feel discomfort about donating sexually-oriented or explicit materials, due to a societal discomfort with these topics (see Huffine, 1998, Dick, 2009, and Barriault, 2009). Further along the spectrum of societal discomfort, PD3 discussed the possibly serious ramifications of revealing someone's HIV (Human Immunodeficiency Virus) status, including legal and medical implications as well as social stigma for those carrying the virus. Also, despite the legalization of two-person
consensual sodomy following the 2003 Lawrence v. Texas case⁶, he noted that some sex acts still carry legal ramifications, making some people reluctant to share materials that may divulge their sexual preferences or practices.

Addressing a very concrete concern for many LGBT community members, PD1 described the complications of estate management and posthumous donation in a country where most LGBT people do not have the legal benefits of marriage. “We still live in a society where property and patriarchal family are very much linked, like the norms of how people's property is managed, especially after they pass on or are incapacitated. [Property] is usually navigated through the logic of patriarchal family that a lot of LGBT folks... don't fit inside of or have rejected or just exceed.” Biological families also can try to “clean up” their family member's collections, erasing traces of their LGBT identity “to try to silence that out of some other sense of honor.” To fight that whitewashed documentation, she said, some people whom she knows “are donating their papers... to multiple institutions, or making massive amounts of copies.... Digital access is important to them because they feel even more pressure to have their stories out there and have the information of their lives out there.”

PD4 did not cite any greater concerns for the LGBT population in general, but noted that she was pleased that “there seems to be more of a conscience [than in the past] about the need for documentation in general” within LGBT organizations. She understands “the incredible value of maintaining and disseminating LGBTQ stuff;” and supports the increased push for personal and organizational record-keeping.

**Deciding to donate**

As already mentioned, Carter said that context and a commitment on the part of the Bingham Center to responsibly and thoroughly documenting the LGBT community increased her enthusiasm about donation. She also emphasized that staff members “just made it so easy for me, without having to go through a lot of trauma.” She said they asked very little of her: “it was almost like a one-sided thing... Short of them telling me what the do's and don't's were, and the how and wherefore, I was never asked anything back from me.” Additionally, she was impressed with “the technology, what they were able to actually do with the stuff.” Like many donors, Carter has a concern for the accessibility of her materials, especially to other members of the black and LGBT communities, and as such, Duke's ability to digitize materials, get materials off of obsolete media formats like floppy disks, and put finding aids on the Internet was “a real plus.”

Other motivations for donation could include financial compensation from repositories that can afford to pay for collections, noted PD3. Additionally, echoing Carter's emphasis on personal connection, he noted a collection from an organization with which he was loosely affiliated which was donated through efforts “facilitated by sympathetic, queer-identified people within the institution, who were certainly a minority within the institution, but able to exercise some kind of influence within it.”

Archives, visibility, and LGBT identity

All interviewees strongly stated the essential role of archives in increasing and validating LGBT visibility. Micham paraphrased a statement from a prominent activist who said that “one of the only marches on the mall in Washington that has had any effect
to change the minds of... legislators was the first LGBT Rights March. He said that's a community that before that was invisible, and by virtue of filling the mall in DC became visible in a way that he believes [legislators] could not even begin to imagine.” While “most other communities are visible by virtue of race being a visible marker, or by virtue of some other visible marker,” people in the LGBT community are not identifiable as such until they choose to publicly claim that identity. “One way to do it is a march,” Micham said. “Another way to do it is to come out. Another way to do it is to put your records in an archives.” Archives are a way of publicly claiming LGBT identity, which, while at the root of privacy issues in LGBT collections, is also at the root of the role of archives in creating LGBT visibility.

Nearly all interviewees mentioned emotional moments of connection with historical documents and the pivotal role that this connection played in their personal development. Carter remembered her sense of isolation before discovering LGBT role models of color like poet and activist Audre Lord, and hopes that she and her counterparts can serve as role models for younger community members. “I remember when I was first coming out, there was no one, not one person that I was aware of that was a black gay or lesbian role model for me, no one. And to come out in a predominantly white movement, and you're looking around trying to get your own identity, that was very hard for me.”

PD3 described his experience seeing photographs from the 1979 Spiritual Conference of Radical Faeries and “feeling like I was connected, and my experiences were connected, to this historical trajectory.” He also had been moved by looking through the archives of *RFD Magazine* and seeing “the way that folks were conceiving of their identity then, and the way that folks were answering some of the same questions that I'm
asking myself now, and folks in the queer movement now are asking, [which] was such a breath of fresh air for me, and so exciting.” PD1 likewise has been moved by stories of people who have engaged in work similar to her own. “I know I’ve definitely had experiences in the archives where being able to identify with somebody in the past for lots of reasons—I mean, because they were committed to love, because they were overworked and overdriven, because of whatever—being able to identify with somebody living in a different time has been actually really incredible to my spiritual practice, to feeling like I have a spiritual legacy that I can participate in.” PD4 did not have an emotional interaction with a particular document, but rather felt strongly about the experience of seeing an enormous amount of materials at the Lesbian Herstory Archives. “Just the fact that it exists is such a comforting circumstance, to me. And the way it has been housed now... [in] a three-story brownstone... it's there just for that purpose” of documenting lesbian history.

As for the role of archives in creating history, Carter called it “absolutely essential.” She wishes that she could tell people who are not intentional about records management that “You don't realize it, but without having a historical footprint of where did we begin, how did we get here, what does it all mean, it would be such a shame if we didn't have that. And if it's in your head or you want to talk about it, [that's fine,] but what happens when you pass on?” Also, Carter stated that by documenting your work, especially in social movements where you're “doing something no one's ever done before,” you can “give people a sense of hope and opportunity.”

Other interviewees recognized the importance of intergenerational dialogue, even when it is not taking place explicitly to combat isolation, but rather to understand the
community's past. PD2 recalled that “my queer identity and my experience of being in the queer community is so very different from people even 10 or 15 years older than me. And so it's super important for me to kind of be able to keep in touch with that.” PD3 identified “a real kind of heartbreaking lack of intergenerational community and intergenerational dialogue” in the LGBT community, and said that “one of the ways that I'm really excited to see that change is through younger generations and younger folks learning the stories of older folks and older generations, and I think archives have a really exciting role to play in that.” Mirroring Carter's description of her own isolation, PD3 described how “so, so many accounts of lives of people who grew up before Stonewall... have talked about this sort of desperate, thirsty search for knowledge when there were no role models, no way of seeing oneself reflected or seeing one's experience or desires reflected around one in media, books, things like that.” Archives, of course, can serve as one of those mirrors, reflecting the experiences of the LGBT population and providing role models for those developing their identities in a world with increasing visibility.

Intergenerational dialogue benefits not only younger community members, but also older members who feel that their lives and experiences are valued. Micham said, “it's good for the people who are still around, the sort of founding mothers and fathers, to be able to feel like the latest generation of people in the organization have a clear understanding of how the organization got started and why, and it's good for the youngest members to have a full picture. A full context.”

Marginalized groups and archives as instruments of power

---

7 PD3 is referring to the 1969 Stonewall riots in New York City, in which LGBT patrons of the Stonewall Inn responded violently to a police raid of the bar. The Stonewall riots are generally considered one of the formative events of the American LGBT Rights Movement.
While all interviewees expressed that archives play an essential role in the documentation of LGBT history, many also expressed an awareness of or discomfort with the power imbued in the function of value creation, as well as in the role of steward or gatekeeper. PD2 explicitly discussed the physical space of archives and their power dynamics, with the hierarchy of archivist over researcher reflected in the physical layout of the research room:

First of all, you have to ask someone who's a professional, who's automatically an 'other,' unless you yourself are a librarian or an academic. So you have to ask permission, and you have to know what you're asking for... There's a desk. And there's a person on the other side who's the expert, and you're the layperson. So that feels very different, because that automatically creates hierarchy. That feels very different from going into a community space where everyone, hopefully, to the best we can, is on the same level.

Particularly for activists who are working to eliminate hierarchies within their own communities, non-hierarchical spaces can feel more comfortable. As PD2 explained, “you kind of have to walk into an academic setting with a sense of entitlement to get what you need and what you're looking for, and that kind of goes against a lot of the ways that we [as radical activists] think.”

While acknowledging that universities and government agencies are decidedly instruments of power, PD3 noted that relationships between these organizations and marginalized communities can differ greatly based on the organization and the community. For instance, historically black colleges and universities often have archives, which will have decidedly different relationships with black communities than the archives at predominantly-white universities. “And there are other marginalized groups that don't have universities and colleges that are specifically oriented toward their population or their demographics.” As an example of a potentially problematic relationship, he identified Duke University, which he said has money “because James
Duke was a... tobacco captain of industry who made tons of money off of enslaved labor of Africans, and made so much money that he was able to be a philanthropist and underwrite this university... So I can definitely see how creating an archive where a predominantly white university gets to control the black community's access to its own stories and documents would definitely be reinforcing that [kind of] history.” This does not mean that these power dynamics are insurmountable, but rather that “as institutions of power in a community, that control information and access and including but not limited to archives, part of that process of truth and reconciliation is figuring out how to interrogate and break down that power and democratize its use.”

Micham used a similar tactic, describing the potential subversiveness of documenting social movements at what may seem like a highly traditional institution of higher education. “Duke might appear to be a super-traditional, white, heterosexual male place, but if you can fill it with boundary-crossers and people who transgress in positive ways, then you can use the substantial resources that might have caused the power inequity to begin with to remedy it.” By using the resources at their disposal, sympathetic archivists can benefit communities and social movements.

Part of the interrogation of power mentioned by PD3 is the explicit acknowledgment of historical power relationships. PD1 mentioned the need for universities to openly and directly address power relationships with marginalized communities that they now wish to document. “I think there's a lot of distrust, and I think that it's justified... A lot of people understand their archival legacy to be a version of their life, and some people, because of their politics, wouldn't want to spend their lives affiliated to [a particular] organization, so the logic goes that they wouldn't want their
legacy on paper to be there, either... I think that those institutions need to really think
about that and address that.” With that in mind, however, she also pointed out that once
we exit the theoretical realm, all people have some affiliation with institutions like
nation-states, and that sometimes compromises are necessary to “allow some kind of
version of survival” and visibility.

Compromise of this sort can take several forms: donating papers to formal
repositories, even if there is slight discomfort, or creating alternatives within the
community. PD2 noted that formally preserving papers opens them up to broader
historical use. The academics researching in formal archives “are creating, in so many
ways, creating knowledge that has the most power in the mainstream.” Allowing
documents from the LGBT activist community to be housed in formal archives means
that the community can “have some of our documents legitimated and given voice and
given power.” PD4 focused, instead, on her impression that formal archives are still
designed primarily for use by academics; therefore, “the main point” of discussions about
archives and power is that “the mostly white, academic gaze, in terms of the LGBT
community, will possibly be reinforced.” She believes that the counterpoint to this
outsiders’ gaze is creating “alternatives... using archives that are more friendly to, for
instance, people of color.” She knows that for many people, despite desires for bridge-
building, they feel like they will be “sleeping in the enemy's bedroom, by putting your
memories in these places” that serve as loci of power.

Additionally, while she has had significant success as a bridge-builder, Micham
recognizes the limitations created by these power dynamics. Speaking about segments of
the LGBT population who are challenging to document, Micham said, “it's not hard for
me to understand why it's difficult for me to connect to working-class, queer communities, and queer communities of color, because I'm coming from Duke, and I can't claim working-class status, I'm obviously not a person of color. Duke is not the bastion of either one, although we're getting better in both categories. So there's just a basic sort of credibility issue there.”

Tied to the “credibility issue” is potential donors' suspicion about the archivist's motivation for documenting their communities in the first place. Suspicion may stem from a distrust of what PD4 called the “white, academic gaze,” which does not differ so dramatically from Dick's (2009) or Maynard's (2009) descriptions of government surveillance. Suspicion may also stem from a feeling that records from marginalized groups are being collected arbitrarily, in order to create “diversity,” without a regard for the community's real needs or motivations. Asked whether she was worried about tokenization during the early days of documentation of LGBT people or people of color in archives, Carter simply replied, “No, it wasn't [a concern] at all. Nope.” Others believe that the drive to diversify, for the archives' sake, exists, and while it may not be an ideal motive from the donor's perspective, it does result in the documentation of historically oppressed communities. PD1 noted that the urge to diversify is ultimately beneficial; as someone who has personally “benefited from tokenization my whole life,” she thinks it ultimately boils down to marginalized groups “having a strategic relationship to that.”

“You know, from a pragmatic point of view, if that's what got [archives] to focus on those papers and devote resources to having them accessible, at the end of the day, whatever their motives were, it's still valuable to me that it happened.” Additionally, she said that most people will not donate to archives where their work will not be placed within a “rich
context,” so tokenization is not a great issue when considering donation.

Like Carter, Micham has not worried about tokenization during her career; she thinks that it could possibly crop up as part of the “flurry of activity and sense of guilt” when collections are suddenly trying to document African-American communities, but she does not think that Special Collections libraries tend to have the “institutionalized homophobia” that would keep archivists from documenting the LGBT population carefully and thoughtfully. She noted that “the community that runs the risk [of tokenization] right now, and I work on this myself personally and I know other archivists do, is the trans community.” She stressed the need for archivists to self-educate about transgender issues in an ongoing way, or else “we run the risk of looking like well-meaning progressives who really are just bumbling idiots.”

Community archives and LGBT history

In order to sidestep some of these concerns about tokenization and power dynamics, members of the LGBT community often create community-based repositories for storing and documenting their own histories (Flinn, 2007). Interviewees discussed community archives as mixed-use spaces that incorporated safety, comfort, self-determination, and accessibility.

PD2 noted that despite the LGBT community's desire to create societal change, there is also “something kind of nice about the insular nature of communities, and queer communities in particular. And the kind of underground exchange of writing” that is compromised when materials are placed in a larger archives and open to all researchers. Community archives feel comfortable and safe, partly because they serve not only as
research centers, but also as social spaces. “It's the place where people go to meet each other. It's the place where people who are new to town go, it's the place where people who are visiting go, it's the place where friends go to get together and have meetings for their activist organizations.” Archival materials within this social space are “readily accessible,” and can be fortuitously discovered during browsing or engaging in other activities in the space. As social spaces stemming from community needs and desires, they are also places of shared values. “There's something really nice about having your organization, for you, and your people. Things get tricky when you open things wide-open and anyone can come. Things change. Safety gets undermined, [although] great things come with it, too.”

PD3 asserted that “community archives have the capacity to avoid some of those problems [of exploitation] because of the sort of self-selecting, grassroots nature that I understand most community archives operate from. Where from within the community, there is a recognized need for archival preservation, and so folks come together, and issues of access are not as complicated.” He discussed a specific visit to the Gerber/Hart Library, an LGBT information resource and archives in Chicago. Despite the fact that he has no history or affiliation with the midwest, he felt deeply excited that “some of the elders were going to have their stories preserved, and some of the younger folks growing up there would be able to, if they wanted to, access some of those histories to be able to find out what the history of queer activism in Chicago was, and how folks in the past grappled with the same questions that are coming up now.”

Others discussed community archives not as a move toward self-segregation or even safety, but rather as a way for the LGBT community to take responsibility for the
maintenance and creation of its own history (Gallagher, 2001). PD1 explicitly referred to community archives as a way that a community can take responsibility “for its own history and legacy, have intergenerational accountability for members of its community. You know, I think that can be a very loving act.” She also noted that they can be an explicit manifestation of community memory.

PD2 furthered this statement, saying that strong community archives, as social spaces, not only serve as a manifestation of community memory, but also can serve to change the community itself in lasting ways. “I think any time you have a community center and can make it last,” she said, “you are creating visibility, and you are creating history.” She described her time co-founding and working at a community center with extensive transgender resources, and the ways in which it created a welcoming space for transgendered people where they felt represented and supported. “A lot of things were happening at that time, I would say, that changed the culture [of our city], but I believe that that [community center] was a big part of it.”

Speaking both to community archives as social spaces and as a mechanism for communities to take responsibility for their histories, Micham said, “like any other kind of community archive, [LGBT community archives] serve multiple purposes, more than just as a research or academic enterprise.” They place value on “bringing the community together, bringing the records of the community together.” Like others, she noted that people's dedication to these spaces speaks of their commitment to each other and to the importance of the space of community archives in their lives. Also, while many community archives only last a brief time, due to staffing or space challenges, others have lasted for decades. “The longevity and relative health of some of the community
archives in existence right now is a testament to the longevity and health of the communities that they represent and document.” Additionally, as long as the LGBT population continues to be targeted or oppressed, the need for community archives will remain. “It's hard for me to imagine a future in which there won't be some portion of the population of LGBTQ people that would only put their materials in a community archives,” she said.

PD4 believes in the proactivity of community-based repositories; in fact, she imagines alternative intra-community models for creating and maintaining community memory, including wikis with an editorial board, as “a proactive way of maintaining community memory.” Her only experience with community archives stemmed from a visit to the Lesbian Herstory Archives. She saw it as a strong community space, with events like poetry readings, and a space that represented the health and dedication of the community. “It was I guess for me solid, in terms of having such a strong physical presence, strong building, careful volunteers who talk to you, offer you a cup of tea. And it's comforting to think that there's a future there, too, not just a repository of history, but it's a projection into the future.”

Community archives also allow members of the community to feel a sense of ownership over their histories (Flinn, 2007). This is consistent with PD2's observation that many of the people who maintain, preserve, or otherwise create LGBT history are “people with pretty high levels of education, and personal financial success.” While this privilege is not inherently a problem, “getting the variety of voices to represent the variety of experiences in the LGBT community... would require someone to really work really hard at making that happen.” PD1 stated that LGBT history is built by people who
identify and live as LGBT, as well as those who understand history through that lens. Preservation happens through “scholars and historians and media makers who disseminate that stuff, and who facilitate a process of storytelling and story sharing,” as well as through the work of both independent and trained archivists.

While interviewees generally expressed positive feelings about community archives, they did not necessarily express corresponding negative feelings about formal archives. In fact, they often stated that the two types of repositories work cooperatively on a larger, shared project of documenting LGBT history rather than acting competitively. In Micham's experience, “it's more like we're all on a team.” She does not think that the LGBT community documenting its own history in community archives lessens the need for LGBT collections in formal archives, either. “We each have our role to play,” she said, “and we all respect each other.”

Carter also pointed out the limitations to community archives—inasmuch as the very things that make them feel safe and comfortable to community members may make them feel less comfortable or accessible to outsiders. She feels special concern for allies of marginalized populations. Recalling the struggle for inclusiveness in the LGBT community, as lesbians, bisexual people, and trans people became involved in a mutual fight for rights and recognition, she noted that “I'm much more into being as inclusive as possible and as accessible as possible.”

PD3 stated that this competition, if it exists, could be healthy, by “encourag[ing] university and other more formal archiving institutions to take it more seriously....” If scholars are researching LGBT history through community archives “because that's where the rich material is,” presumably universities will follow suit and begin building
strong, diverse LGBT collections. Focusing on donation to community archives as a potential act of self-segregation, of self-exclusion from non-LGBT spaces, PD1 said, “I don't think that by existing as that type of [community] space they’re perpetuating self-segregation... I wouldn't say that there's a commutative equation there, you know?” PD4 noted the “distinction between an academic location... and a community one. They're very different [in] idea and atmosphere.” She did not say that community archives necessarily detract from the health of formal archives.

**Integrating self-determination into formal archives**

Interviewees had various suggestions about how self-determination can be integrated into formal archives, as well as varying opinions about the degree to which this integration is feasible. On one end of the spectrum, Carter, when asked about self-determination, reiterated that she believes the most important issue is not control over history, but rather accessibility. Also, she believes in the good intentions of the Bingham Center and its staff. “In fact, I almost felt like, once they have it, it's gone, nothing I can do. But there was an element of trust.” While PD1 believes that the true integration of self-determination in formal archives would “require a major structural shift” and is “incredibly unlikely,” universities can still make great strides by demonstrating accountability to their donors. Additionally, while no employee remains at an organization indefinitely, “it's important to have people there who are, by affinity, accountable to communities they love and feel a part of and feel loyal to,” despite the fact that working as an employee of an organization means that a person must also be accountable to the institution and “might have to answer to somebody who will not
always support their vision.” PD4 stated that self-determination is largely dependent upon the archivist's desire and ability to fight university administration and reinvent the archival model. “It will probably depend, to a great extent, on how much of an activist its director wants to be, or how much passion is there for making the visibility of this kind of place a priority, and fighting the university for funding to have this happen.”

Further along the spectrum, PD2 stated that any formal archives that are seriously working to build LGBT collections need to find ways to integrate self-determination and help the LGBT community maintain some control. She mentioned the possibility of a task force, as well as the archivist asking community members questions about responsibility and motivation, and archivists developing best practices for the maintenance of LGBT history. This balance of community control, she believes, can help counteract the possible feeling of entitlement when archivists enter communities and take away their materials. Otherwise, she said, it can feel as if archivists are saying, “Give us your documents. We're a library. Of course you want to give us your documents!”

Considering the need for donors to feel a sense of control over their own papers, PD3 said that self-determination could take the form of “revising the intake procedures and the consent forms and practices of consent around taking in archives.” Specifically, he wishes donors could define access and design their own consent forms or donor agreements. He also envisioned community discussions. “In the case of the LGBT community, if some university was going to open an LGBT archive, then they should have a series of public discussions that are advertised within the media and forums of that community, to say, 'Hey, we're creating this archive. What can we do to be accountable to the community that's being documented? What policies of access make the most sense?"
How can we be respectful of privacy and confidentiality concerns?”

Micham's approach integrates several of these suggestions: “We get them involved in the whole process, from how and when they document themselves to even how and when materials are used by researchers.” Additionally, community members are welcome to join in the Bingham Center's efforts as volunteers, and the repository has had community members work in processing and all other aspects of their work.

**Accessibility**

Another donor concern, aside from self-determination, is that of accessibility. Thinking about how researchers would even begin to look for materials, Carter expressed a desire to house her materials in multiple repositories: community spaces, black spaces, and LGBT spaces, taking into account the complexity of her identity. “I'm black, I'm a woman, I'm a lesbian, I'm a southerner, so why can't I... make that accessible to others in addition to always [having] to come here” to the Bingham Center? In addition to housing materials in multiple physical locations, she mentioned a desire to increase accessibility through technology, especially through the Internet. “Not a lot of people are going to be able to get to Duke,” she explained, “and they might not even have a computer. So you're trying to think... and also as a black lesbian who's out in the South, I think... how do we reach that segment of the community, and how are they likely to want to get this information?”

Remembering her own isolation during her early coming-out experiences, she is especially concerned with being able to serve as a role model, remaining cognizant of “anyone coming behind us. How do we make sure that people who are just looking
around and wouldn't necessarily know where to look, how can they bump into [our history] or have easy access to it?” Carter believes that internet accessibility can be especially important for the privacy of researchers, lending them a sense of safety “if you don't want to be out and visible, particularly in communities of color.”

Like Carter, PD1 expressed a desire to house her materials in as many places and in as many ways as possible. In her desire to maximize visibility, she said, “whatever type of impact I want to have on the world, whatever possibility I want to leave in my wake, can be done with a multiplicity of institutions, and outside of institutions, and with relationships to people, and with stories, and with memories, and with feelings.” She feels that increasingly, digital access and interconnectedness make individual repositories' collections less important than history as a greater body of work. “It is not what physical archive has such-and-such stuff, it's like what's the relationship between all the different places.”

Carter also is concerned about accessibility of archives to people who are not in academia, especially in “communities like Durham where you have such a tight connection between the campus and the off-campus community in terms of organizing.” By maintaining that connection, those involved in organizing could benefit from accessing the papers of the organizations within which they work. PD2 echoed Carter's ideal of community accessibility, saying that universities should ensure that if they are documenting marginalized communities, they should make sure that materials are “totally accessible,” even to people from outside of academia.

PD3 also felt strongly about community access to archival collections, and not restricting use to those with academic sponsorship or university affiliation. “I think that's
one of the lines along which research and scholarship and storytelling gets restricted and condensed along class lines, and also along other lines of privilege versus marginalization. And I would be really excited to see universities make it clear in their policies that anybody who has an interest, whether scholarly or otherwise, in accessing archives should be able to do so, of course within the guidelines of respecting how they're preserved.” PD3 is uncertain about his own ability to access his community's records when he is working on research projects as someone without a university affiliation. He asked, “is that going to make it more difficult for me to access that collection?”

Comparing his experiences at a university archives and at a community-based archives, he contrasted the university where “I'd have to fill out lots of forms, and deal with lots of straight bureaucrats,” and the community archives where “I could just walk in off the street and look at it, and... I knew that I could just talk to the friendly queer person who was staffing the desk and find out what I would need to do if I wanted to access that.” He noted that in his experience (which he acknowledged was limited), the community archives “seemed more accessible, it seemed more queer-focused and queer-friendly.”

**Outreach as user education**

Part of accessibility is ensuring that members of documented communities know how to access materials, instead of wondering, like PD3, whether they are allowed to access collections. Carter, perhaps surprisingly, has never actually visited the Bingham Center to see her own papers or those of her colleagues. “I thought at one point,” she said, “I should really come over here. I thought, 'Well... where's my stuff?''' While she trusts the repository, “that would have been kind of neat to have said, 'Yeah, why don't
you come look and see where we're keeping your stuff?” While she did not extensively address methods for educating community members about using archival materials, she did mention that exposure to the archival profession could inspire young members of the LGBT community to do that work, work which she considers essential to the movement.

Much like Carter, PD1 said that “there are community archive models that make the act of archiving and relating to archives more attractive to a wider range of people. So I think it's helpful in awakening the desire to be an archivist in folks that might not otherwise have ever considered that.” Additionally, she imagined a model of accountability where archives invite “kids and elders and folks of different ages and folks of different geographic communities, all different types of communities” to spend time in the repository. Increasing the number of young LGBT people interested in archival work could increase community documentation; it would also reflect Viola's (1978) description of the American Indian Cultural Resources Training Program, which, among other goals, wished to build an interest in archival work within the American Indian population.

**Cooperation between community and formal archives**

Aside from simply learning from some of the valued elements of the community archives model, formal archives also can search for ways to collaborate with community archives, both locally and nationally. Part of this involves acknowledging the cooperative nature of the two types of institutions' work, as Micham did when she said that “I think that all of us working together are doing a great job collectively, to de-marginalize the community, to make the community and its history more front and center, not less.” She believes that the two models can learn from and work with each other. “I'm absolutely in
favor of learning anything and everything I possibly can from the community archives model, and importing those methodologies and ideals into my practice.”

Carter focused on cooperation between *all* types of cultural institutions: libraries, formal archives, community archives, and museums. In her vision, this cooperation could take the form of archives and museums, for instance, working together to house a person's materials that consist of both papers and physical objects such as mugs or T-shirts. It could also take the form of institutions that are willing to house duplicates of materials held in other locations, in order to increase access and to allow donors to be represented in multiple locations and through multiple facets of their identities. Micham noted that these relationships of sharing do occur, and that when her institution receives duplicates of printed materials such as books or journals, they “not only think of other academic institutions as potential recipients of those, but also think about community archives.” In this same vein, PD3 imagined collaborations between all different types of archives so that, for instance, an African-American archive can be sure to represent the LGBT experience, and an LGBT archive can mirror the true racial diversity of the local LGBT population.

PD1 envisioned further partnerships, such as those between archives and public schools or community organizations. Again mentioning the greater resources of formal archives, she joked that “larger archives should just give money to community archives.” On a more serious level, she described collaborative programming, archivists finding internships at community archives during their training, cooperative exhibits, and “strategic plans that have to do with shared areas of interest, or periods or geographic regions.”
PD3 found possibility for collaboration in day-to-day work, wherein trained archivists could work with volunteers in a community archive “to make sure that their practices are good, and that they're properly preserving things, and helping them deal with questions around indexing and all that kind of stuff.” He did clarify, however, that he thinks this partnership should take place on the community archive's terms, at their invitation, for the purpose of sharing a set of skills and reaching a common goal rather than because the formal archives wants to “fix” the community archives' practices. (Of course, the partnership must be on mutually agreeable terms, such that it also benefits the formal archives or archivists.) Additionally, he imagined opportunities for co-funding, in which formal archives share information about fundraising, and possibly even provide fiscal sponsorship so that community archives can apply for grants.

PD2 stated that cooperation provides opportunities for a more balanced and less exploitative relationship between formal archives and the communities that they document. She said that a truly cooperative relationship means that a university archives would not just take materials as historical resources from a community, but would also put resources back into that community. Perhaps referring to the practice of paying for archival collections, she said that “donations need to be made to these organizations that are providing this information. I think that would be a really great way to show... how these institutions value these grassroots organizations who are creating history.” Aside from financial contributions, universities could sponsor community events or could lend space for meetings or programs. This would show that instead of just “going into low-wealth, under-resourced communities and trying to take from them,” they're trying to create cooperative, equal relationships. While purchasing every collection is not feasible
for most repositories, PD2's comments do raise questions of resource exchange and how a repository best can demonstrate that they value a grassroots organization's collection.

Of all interviewees, only PD4 expressed skepticism about the fruitfulness of these collaborations: “in my mind, that is certainly a desirable coalition, or collaboration... Given the deep political beliefs maintained in communities around academia to begin with, and to certain academic units that don't seem to be very diverse, I can see contentious issues coming up... I think it's more about separate and complimentary than deeply intertwined.” She did not say that this is necessarily a negative segmentation, but rather one that is somewhat inevitable, since “the bottom line is possibly very different political assessment of the local reality, the larger reality of the country.”

Building trust

Differences in values, and differing political assessments, increase the need for establishing solid trust between archives and LGBT donors (Barriault, 2009). Interviewees frequently acknowledged feeling distrust of formal archives, or discussed seeing such distrust of formal archives among their colleagues. For PD2, this mistrust stems from a history of those in power taking knowledge and materials away from those in marginalized communities. She acknowledged that “there's a lot of fear, and rightfully so, of others, especially the most privileged people, coming and trying to get information about your little niche culture that's been horribly oppressed for generations, and still are.” This increases the need for trust, and for the archivist to demonstrate that he or she understands the community's needs and values.

But how can one build that trust? As Carter described, a person can have trust in
an institution because his or her friends or colleagues have chosen to house their materials there. Not only did she trust the Bingham Center because her friends had their papers there, but she also has seen others follow suit based on her own trust of the Bingham Center. “Sometimes people look at you to see what you're doing, and not [at] the institution,” she said. “You're almost sending out your own values, or your own code of 'Yeah, that must be okay, because Mandy's doing it.’”

PD2 noted that the archivist can build trust through the use of terminology reflecting the community's values and own, internal language. Additionally, “librarians or archivists need to get involved in that community... if you were building this archives, and going into different communities, you would be listening to people's concerns, people would be comfortable to share them with you.” Much like Mandy Carter, she mentioned that she is, and would be, more likely to trust people whom she has seen at community events or with whom she feels some sense of connection. Referring to a specific librarian in New York who is heavily involved in activist communities, she said, “she has a face, she has a heart, and people know her. And what I think can feel weird about museums and libraries and stuff like that is it's like 'Gimme, gimme, gimme, we're collecting history.'” Investment in the community demonstrates a more reciprocal relationship.

PD1 also asserted that archivists can, and often should, be involved in communities that they are documenting, even if they are not otherwise parts of those communities. “Somebody who's committed to collecting the stories of a community that they don't identify as a part of could be an ally. They could not be an ally; they could be a voyeur, they could be exploitative. They could be all sorts of things, but I think ideally, if an archivist was doing that work as an ally, then they would do what all allies would do.”
Working in solidarity, this involves asking the community what kinds of involvement are useful and allowing them to draw the line if one oversteps one's bounds.

Micham acknowledged this need to be careful about boundaries; she “definitely” has attended events sponsored by organizations whose papers she wants to preserve, but she is always careful to “be very clear about why [I'm] there.” She states her intentions “so that they don't think I am being deceptive.” When doing out-of-work activism or attending events within the LGBT community, she likewise is very clear about her professional role so that no one ever feels like she is overstepping her bounds or like she has misled them. She stated that transparency and honest conversations can build trust. Micham noted that when trust needs to be established with a community with which Duke has a historically shaky or absent relationship, she often depends on people who can act as intermediaries. “You find the person that's associated with Duke and part of the Duke community, and also a part of that community, and that believes in your cause, your archival cause, to go into the community first and sort of fly your flag and see what happens.” This resonates with Carter's statement that she implicitly trusted the Bingham Center because members of her community trusted it, as well.

PD4 stated her belief that people building LGBT collections or archives likely already are involved with the community. “It will be very hard for me to think of someone who is not somehow LGBT him- or herself, or extremely LGBT friendly, who would embark in such an enterprise.” She mentioned that the archivist who approached her about her papers is someone she knows from other activities within the community. She met her “not as an activist in the library, but as an activist within the community.” They served on an LGBT task force together, “which tells me, tells us that the sort of
activist fire is there to begin with.”

Archivist's responsibility – to individual donors and to the LGBT community

Archivists, then, can build trust by involvement in the LGBT community, and they can maintain that trust through responsibility to their donors and to their represented communities. The researcher asked interviewees about what that responsibility looks like to them; most conveyed that responsibility to individuals involves good communication and ongoing relationships. Carter expressed that the archivist's primary responsibility to donors is “staying in touch, giving some sense of is anyone looking at this stuff... not being like, 'Okay, we got it, goodbye, never see you again,' but more of an ongoing relationship in a way.” PD3 did not disagree, but noted that responsibility depends on the donor's needs and expectations. Some may require significant attention or expect an ongoing relationship, while others may be content to donate materials and then essentially forget about them.

PD1 also expressed a need for clear communication, although she focused more on the archivist sharing relevant information about the institution. She said that responsibility requires “really, clearly communicating with an individual about the structure and politics of that institution, like literally what happens with their stuff... who goes in the archive... revealing as much about itself institutionally as the person is revealing about themselves personally, with all these records of their lives. I think that... something as close to reciprocity on those terms... is how the archive is responsible to that individual.”

In terms of responsibility to the greater LGBT community, Micham believes that
her obligations are multifaceted. “I'm responsible for being as familiar with the community I'm documenting as possible,” she said. This means the need to “be literate,” to “know what's going on and what people are doing and where the organizations are going.” She tries to keep up with the names of people in leadership roles within LGBT organizations and to understand the community's history, as well as the researcher interest in different aspects of that history. “I try to have a sense of what the community might describe as their biggest challenges or biggest problems or biggest tension points, what their biggest achievements are, their biggest points of pride.” Striving to be a “responsible documentarian,” she believes, boils down to the need “to be knowledgeable about the community, but never to make the assumption necessarily that you're a member of the community.”

PD2 asserted that part of the archivist's responsibility, and one that is closely tied to familiarity, is that “any archivist who's working with this kind of [LGBT] material needs to be up on their stuff, as far as LGBTQI sensitivity and understanding, and knowing, learning, and self-educating, not expecting the queer community to do all of it. And learning to be a good ally.” Additionally, archivists with strong collections should ensure that “something awesome should be done with them.” This helps increase visibility and educate the public, “as opposed to this hoarding feeling.”

One of the results of understanding a community's intricacies can be the ability to accurately represent and document it within one's repository. PD3 described responsibility as “figuring out what that [LGBT identity] means to people, and then getting as wide of a sample as possible within the scope of LGBT identity and community. And that means across other lines of difference, including racial, including
geographic, including class lines, including gender, and all those sorts of things.”

Additionally, an archives at a university should examine its own relationship and power dynamics in relation to communities that it chooses to document. For instance, if a university has a history of exploiting the local African-American community, to be able to document that community within its archives, it must be “able to confront the history of the institution in relation to that group or that marginalized group, and name that, and be up front about that.” If the history is adequately addressed, it can have strong positive effects “as a process of restitution, a process of reparation,” despite the fact that “when an institution like a university has been involved directly in the marginalization of different communities, that places them in a complicated relationship to the creation and maintenance of archives that could play a role in alleviating that marginalization.”

Another way that archivists can demonstrate accountability to the community, and a sincere desire to address their concerns, is through education—both education about records management, and education about access and use of archives. Carter indicated that one important role the archivist could play within the LGBT community, as well as in communities of color, is emphasizing the importance of saving documents, perhaps by “having a relationship or partnership that would instill [records management] as part of the value of being an LGBT activist,” communicating that “you need to keep all this stuff, and why you should, and how you do it.” Another responsibility, both to researchers from the LGBT community and to the donors, is finding appropriate cataloging and cross-references to represent the multiplicity of donors’ identities, “because a lot of us are not just one thing. We're a little bit more complex.”

PD1 agreed that quality user education can be a form of community
accountability. Similarly, directing resources such as money for visiting scholars “to people who are certainly doing intellectual labor who are *not* thought of as scholars or whose scholarship is not based within the university would demonstrate accountability, to me.” She also imagined traveling exhibits and other ways of sharing information with the greater community, all focused around access: “transparency, and outreach, and access on multiple levels, like access to using the archives, access to whatever forms of decision-making could happen, access to everything.”

**Archivist as advocate**

Taking archivist responsibility one step further, interviewees addressed ways that archivists can actively advocate for the LGBT community, helping to further community goals, increasing visibility, and helping harness necessary resources. Many felt that the act of creating or maintaining LGBT archives is a strong act of advocacy; PD3 posited that “transparent, accountable archive creation and maintenance in and of itself is a form of advocacy” by “giving folks access to their histories and their stories and their grandmother's and grandfather's, literally or figuratively within the context of the community; histories and stories [are] a really crucial form of advocacy.” Similarly, according to PD1, the act of highlighting the place of LGBT lives in the broader historical narrative, “bringing that person's work into conversation with other people's work in a way that is useful, could be a form of advocacy... I think that kind of visibility is a form of advocacy.” PD4 added that “the subtext for setting up any archive involves advocacy.” She stated that working as an archivist with LGBT collections “is a matter of a personal project. It could be an institutional one, but certainly... there's essentially
advocacy in the act of creating such an archive.”

Advocacy, for Micham, can take multiple forms. She believes that she is advocating for the community when she explains or interprets documents for students and scholars. She also advocates for the LGBT community by representing “the importance of the collection to the hierarchy to which the archivist reports in order to solicit more funds internally, institutionally, and other kinds of resources and support.” In general, she said, “one of the roles the archivist can play is to make it clear, to make the importance of the cause abundantly clear.”

PD2 stated that for an archivist to be a true advocate, “you also need to be an advocate of LGBTQ activism and events outside of the workplace.” This demonstrates a true investment in the community's best interests, that “it's not just that you want resources to document and to trace history, that you actually really care about this community outside of work.” Micham also strives to maintain “professional distance.” She said, “I try to draw a line between making it clear that I know how to advocate for their materials here because I'm sympathetic to the work that they do, without revealing anything about myself personally, and revealing as little as I can about myself politically.” While discussing whether or not she identifies as part of the LGBT community could play a role in establishing trust with a potential donor, she avoids this conversation and emphasizes her work and its possibility for creating social change.

Archivist as activist

Activism, like advocacy, is something that interviewees believe is embedded in the archivist's role. Micham maintained that the archivist is always doing political work.
“It's completely disingenuous to claim neutrality,” she said. “I think that the very act of archiving, of preserving materials, comes from an activist urge.” This same activist urge led to the documentation of marginalized groups and social movements through archives in the first place. Another activist activity, in Micham's eyes, is her ability to “marshal the resources, the substantial resources at Duke in support of the community.”

Carter situated the role of the archivist within the spectrum of other activist roles and activities. She said that when people tell her, “Well, I'm an activist,” she asks, “Well, how are you an activist? Are you an in the street kind of activist? Are you a writing a letter kind of activist? Are you an archive activist? We should create [that role.]” Just as she integrated records management into her activist workflow, she said that the archivist's work can and should be integrated into a social movement's or organization's work.

PD4 believes that a proactive, creative archivist can be doing activist work within his or her repository. She has seen a friend who is an archivist doing activities, exhibits, book presentations, readings, and training interns. She said that these activities, as well as “the care and feeding of academics,” make both the archivist and the archives a resource—and serve as an activist enterprise within the community. An archivist can be an activist, said PD2, if they truly highlight the documents in their repositories, as “that could be a form of really creating visibility, tracing history.” They also should ensure that the true diversity of the LGBT community is represented in their archives; by truly reflecting the community, they can fight multiple forms of oppression and begin to truly reflect the diversity of LGBT history. PD1 stated that, while the archivist can use his or her role in order to create social change, “that would be a major commitment.” In her mind, instead of practicing activism within his or her repository, to be an activist the
archivist “could certainly work as a partner with a group of people organizing for their own liberation or for some kind of change,” but this would involve steps like “that archivists would be at all the meetings... and they would be specifically accountable for whatever tasks or whatever types of leveraging or positioning that would take.”

Much like advocacy involves user education, PD3 stated that archival activism should integrate programming encouraging younger members of the LGBT population to access and understand their own histories. Discussing isolation, he noted that “specifically in a community like the LGBT community, it's unique in that what history means, and foremothership and forefathership, is not defined through bloodlines, and is not defined through descent through families in that same way.” Because of the LGBT redefinition of ancestorship, younger community members “don't have access to a lot of the kinds of informal or immaterial archiving that happens through families.” Because of the lack of family context, archival records gain increased importance. “The archivist can be an asset to the community by encouraging us to understand ourselves as part of the historical trajectory.” Finally, let us end with PD3's reflection on the archivist's role in the creation of LGBT history:

For me, growing up and coming out as queer, my parents aren't queer, my siblings aren't queer, no one else in my family is, that I know of, and so if it wasn't for meeting elders in the community... and then reading tons of books and having access to other kinds of history such as archives, I would have thought of myself as totally isolated and broken from history rather than being part of it. And so the archivist, in a way, is sort of a weaver who takes these disparate threads of history and myth and experience and story and helps weave them together into a fabric where we can see ourselves as part of a coherent history. And that weaving process is largely taken for granted for communities that run through families of blood, families of biological relation, whereas for queer folks we don't have that, so we have to find new modes of weaving, and new weavers.
CONCLUSION

Members of the LGBT population share many of the concerns of other donors to archival repositories; they also have unique considerations, including personal privacy concerns, questions of third-party privacy, and considerations about the power dynamics between archives as instruments of power and members of the marginalized LGBT community. To perform successful outreach to members of the LGBT community, archivists should understand and address these considerations.

Significant archival literature addresses the theoretical aspects of LGBT archives, while this study ties the literature to real-world archival practices and to the expressed needs and expectations of a small sample of the southeastern LGBT community. Interviews with an archivist at a repository with extensive LGBT holdings, a current donor to that same repository, and four LGBT activists with papers or records reflecting the repository's collecting interests demonstrate successful outreach techniques and illuminate the thoughts of a segment of the LGBT population regarding issues set forth in archival literature, including access, trust, privacy, and the role of archives and archivists in creating and maintaining LGBT history. These interviews also address questions about the relationship between LGBT community archives and formal archives, and support a model in which formal archives can emulate some aspects of community archives that are particularly valued by the LGBT community.

The current donor interviewed did not save her papers with the intention of donating them to an archives; likewise, two of four potential donors had not saved personal papers with any thoughts about housing them in an archival repository. Concerns about donating ranged from government surveillance issues regarding ongoing
activist work to the perceived lack of racial and socioeconomic diversity in the larger institutions, such as universities, to which archives belong. As expected, all interviewees also expressed concerns about privacy. The archivist described methods for addressing donors' privacy concerns, while the current donor wanted to know about professional best practices surrounding third-party privacy. Two potential donors expressed concerns about personal privacy, and all potential donors discussed varying third-party privacy concerns, for family members as well as activist colleagues.

All interviewees expressed appreciation for community archives, with all potential donors focusing on community archives' approachability and accessibility as integral positive aspects. Additionally, five of six interviewees described potential scenarios for mutually beneficial collaboration between community archives and formal archives. One potential donor did not envision possibilities for cooperative work, but noted that community and formal archives are doing separate but complimentary work.

Privacy concerns and questions about power dynamics raise the issue of trust in archivists and in archives themselves. Interviewees discussed methods for building trust and subverting traditional power structures in order to use current archival structures to create change both within archives and in society at large. Suggestions included donor-authored gift agreements, clear communication about (and flexibility regarding) possibilities for restricting access to all or parts of collections, open and ongoing communication with donors, and archivist commitment to understanding the LGBT population and its ongoing issues and concerns. The current donor as well as potential donors expressed increased trust in archivists with whom they have had personal contact at LGBT events outside of the archival setting, which demonstrated the archivist's
commitment to and understanding of the community.

Finally, in terms of community involvement, interviewees discussed ways in which the archivist can and should be involved in the LGBT community, and emphasized the important roles that the archivist can play, through creating a sense of value around LGBT history, through advocating for the community, and through education and outreach to inform the broader population about LGBT issues and to ensure that members of the LGBT community have free access to their own histories.
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APPENDIX A: RECRUITMENT FLYER

Study on Archives and LGBT History

- Are you part of the LGBT community?
- Do you engage in activist or advocacy work?
- Do you have personal or organizational papers that may be of historical value?

If so, you may be eligible to participate in a research study about archives and LGBT history.

The purpose of this study is to learn about the unique motivations, concerns, and priorities of members of the LGBT community in regards to their historical documents. Research subjects will be asked to participate in a 30 – 60 minute interview.

This study is being conducted through the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill.

Please contact Angela DiVeglia at diveglia@email.unc.edu or [phone number] for more information.
APPENDIX B: RECRUITMENT LETTER, ARCHIVIST

Dear Ms. Micham,

My name is Angela DiVeglia, and I am a master's student in library science at the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill. I am writing to request your participation in an interview as part of a research study about archives and LGBT history. I obtained your name and contact information from the Bingham Center website.

This research study is my master's paper; its purpose is to learn about the unique motivations, concerns, and priorities of potential LGBT donors to archival repositories, with the goal of improving archival outreach to this population and increasing LGBT donors' comfort and satisfaction with repositories. Research will take place through a series of interviews: one interview with an archivist who works with LGBT donors, one interview with a current LGBT donor to an archival repository, and 3-5 interviews with potential LGBT donors who have not donated their papers to an archival repository.

Interviews will last approximately 30 to 60 minutes, and will take place at a time and place that is convenient to you.

If you are interested in participating in this research study, please call or email me and I can provide further information, including details of the study's goals, methodology, and means for protecting your rights and privacy. I can be reached at [phone number] or at diveglia@email.unc.edu.

Sincerely,

Angela L. DiVeglia
MSLS Student
Dear [Current donor name],

My name is Angela DiVeglia, and I am a master's student in library science at the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill. I am writing to request your participation in an interview as part of a research study about archives and LGBT history. I obtained your name and contact information from Laura Micham, Director of the Sallie Bingham Center for Women's History and Culture, who has contacted you previously about this study and to whom you gave permission to pass along your contact information.

This research study is my master's paper; its purpose is to learn about the unique motivations, concerns, and priorities of potential LGBT donors to archival repositories, with the goal of improving archival outreach to this population and increasing LGBT donors' comfort and satisfaction with repositories. Research will take place through a series of interviews: one interview with an archivist who works with LGBT donors, one interview with a current LGBT donor to an archival repository, and interviews with 3-5 potential LGBT donors who have not donated their papers to an archival repository. While this study uses the Bingham Center as a case study, the research study itself is in no way affiliated with the Bingham Center.

Interviews will last approximately 30 to 60 minutes, and will take place at a time and place that is convenient to you.

If you are interested in participating in this research study, please call or email me and I can provide further information, including details of the study's goals, methodology, and means for protecting your rights and privacy. I can be reached at [phone number] or at diveglia@email.unc.edu.

Sincerely,

Angela L. DiVeglia
MSLS Student
APPENDIX D: RECRUITMENT LETTER, POTENTIAL DONOR

Dear [Potential donor name],

My name is Angela DiVeglia, and I am a master's student in library science at the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill. I am writing to request your participation in an interview as part of a research study about archives and LGBT history. I obtained your name and contact information when you responded to a recruitment flier about this study. [Alternate text for research subjects who are contacted directly: I obtained your name and contact information through our previous contact at the SONG Organizing School/the Southeastern Regional Unity Conference.]

This research study is my master's paper; its purpose is to learn about the unique motivations, concerns, and priorities of potential LGBT donors to archival repositories, with the goal of improving archival outreach to this population and increasing LGBT donors' comfort and satisfaction with repositories. Research will take place through a series of interviews: one interview with an archivist who works with LGBT donors at the Sallie Bingham Center for Women's History and Culture, one interview with a current LGBT donor to an archival repository, and interviews with 3-5 potential LGBT donors who have not donated their papers to an archival repository. While this study uses the Bingham Center as a case study, the research study itself is in no way affiliated with the Bingham Center.

Interviews will last approximately 30 to 60 minutes, and will take place at a time and place that is convenient to you. Interviews will be confidential: you will not be identified by name or other identifying information in any documentation of this interview, nor will you be identified in the final report of this research study.

If you are interested in participating in this research study, please call or email me and I can provide further information, including details of the study's goals, methodology, and means for protecting your rights and privacy. I can be reached at [phone number] or at diveglia@email.unc.edu.

Sincerely,

Angela L. DiVeglia
MSLS Student
APPENDIX E: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS, ARCHIVIST

The following questions formed the framework of a semi-structured interview with an archivist who works with a sizable collection of LGBT materials.

To begin with, please describe the nature of your collection. What is your role in building and maintaining this collection?

What are your greatest collection strengths?

In what areas do you wish to strengthen your collection?

What are some common concerns among all actual and potential donors to your collection?

Do you think there are any concerns that are specific to LGBT donors to your collection?

Can you discuss some of the outreach methods that you would use to get a person to consider donating to your repository?

Can you discuss some of the outreach methods that you would use with someone who had expressed reluctance to donate their materials to any repository?

What are some outreach methods that you have found to be very effective?

What are some outreach methods that you have found to be ineffective?

What are some areas for growth or further investigation in terms of outreach to LGBT donors?

What are sub-groups of LGBT donors that you wish you could better reach or whose collections you wish were better represented in your repository?

Speaking more generally, many people have written about the roles of history and visibility in the creation of LGBT identity. What do you think is the role of archives in creating LGBT history?

Most formal archives are associated with larger institutions, such as universities. Some members of marginalized groups feel that these larger institutions perpetuate power relationships that created the groups' marginalized statuses in the first place. What do you think about this analysis?

In response to the exclusion of LGBT people from many mainstream archives, some
people have created community archives where members of the LGBT community have control over that community's records. What do you think is the role of community archives in creating LGBT history?

How do you think community archives affect the exclusion of LGBT people from mainstream archives? Are these two related?

One benefit of community archives are the elements of self-determination and control over one's own records. Do you think that these elements can be integrated into formal archives?

Can you briefly address the issues of tokenization of and cooptation of LGBT history when included in broader collections?

Conversations about the histories of marginalized groups often raise questions of ownership, namely who owns history. Do you have any thoughts about the ownership of LGBT history, in terms of creation, maintenance, and preservation?

Can you address possibilities for cooperation between community archives and formal archives?

What do you think are the responsibilities of the archivist to an individual donor? What do you think are the responsibilities of the archivist to a group that is represented within an archive? (For instance, what would your responsibility to an LGBT donor be? What would your responsibility to the entire LGBT community be?)

While we're discussing responsibility, can you address some of the questions about safety and privacy that affect LGBT donors? For instance, many donors have concerns about outing people against their will.

What do you think LGBT donors need in order to feel that their privacy needs are properly addressed?

Can you speak briefly to the possibilities of the archivist as an advocate for the marginalized groups represented in his or her archive? How do you think an archivist can act as an advocate for the LGBT community?

Can you speak briefly about the concept of the archivist as activist? How do you think an archivist can act as an activist for the LGBT community?

Anything else that you would like to add?
The following questions formed the framework of a semi-structured interview with a member of the LGBT community who has donated her personal or organizational papers to an archives with a sizable collection of LGBT materials.

To begin with, please describe the collection that you donated. Did it consist of personal or organizational papers? What types of materials did it contain?

Why did you save these materials? Did you consider their historical value? Did you consider their possible value to an archives?

Describe your first interaction with the archives. Did you approach them about donating, or did they approach you?

Can you remember any specific things that the archivist said during your first interaction that made you feel positively about the possibility of donating to their collection?

Can you remember any specific concerns that you had about donating to their collection? Can you remember any specific concerns that you had about donating to any collection?

Did you have any privacy concerns regarding your collection? Did the archivist address those concerns? If so, how?

Can you think of any specific concerns that you think apply to LGBT donors in general? Can you think of any specific privacy concerns that apply to LGBT donors in general?

Please describe the main factors in your decision to donate your collection.

Speaking more generally, many people have written about the roles of history and visibility in the creation of LGBT identity. What do you think is the role of archives in creating LGBT history?

Most formal archives are associated with larger institutions, such as universities. Some members of marginalized groups feel that these larger institutions perpetuate power relationships that created the groups' marginalized statuses in the first place. What do you think about this analysis?

In response to the exclusion of LGBT people from many mainstream archives, some people have created community archives where members of the LGBT community have control over that community's records. What do you think is the role of community archives in creating LGBT history?

How do you think community archives affect the exclusion of LGBT people from
mainstream archives? Are these two related?

One benefit of community archives are the elements of self-determination and control over one's own records. Do you think that these elements can be integrated into formal archives?

Can you briefly address the issues of tokenization of and cooptation of LGBT history when included in broader collections?

Conversations about the histories of marginalized groups often raise questions of ownership, namely who owns history. Do you have any thoughts about the ownership of LGBT history, in terms of creation, maintenance, and preservation?

Can you address possibilities for cooperation between community archives and formal archives?

What do you think are the responsibilities of the archivist to an individual donor? What do you think are the responsibilities of the archivist to a group that is represented within an archive? (For instance, what would an archivist's responsibility to an LGBT donor be? What would an archivist's responsibility to the entire LGBT community be?)

While we're discussing responsibility, can you address some of the questions about safety and privacy that affect LGBT donors? For instance, many donors have concerns about outing people against their will.

What do you think LGBT donors need in order to feel that their privacy needs are properly addressed?

Can you speak briefly to the possibilities of the archivist as an advocate for the marginalized groups represented in his or her archive? How do you think an archivist can act as an advocate for the LGBT community?

Can you speak briefly about the concept of the archivist as activist? How do you think an archivist can act as an activist for the LGBT community?

Anything else that you would like to add?
APPENDIX G: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS, POTENTIAL DONOR

The following questions formed the framework of a semi-structured interview with a member of the LGBT community who has not donated his or her personal or organizational papers to an archives, either formal or community-based.

To begin with, I'm going to define some terms that will come up during the interview today. When I talk about archives, I'm referring to collections, generally housed in libraries, that contain primary source documents such as letters, diaries, flyers, photographs, and other original documents and manuscripts. Most archives are associated with larger institutions, such as the libraries at universities. Community archives, on the other hand, are archives that are not associated with larger institutions, and are generally created, organized, and staffed by members of the community whose documents they contain.

First, have you ever considered approaching an archives to see if they are interested in your papers? Has an archivist or librarian ever contacted you about donating your papers?

If you have ever had contact with an archivist about donating your papers, what were the factors in your decision not to donate?

If you have not had contact with an archivist about donating your papers, would you consider doing so? Would you prefer to house your papers in a formal archives, such as that at a university, or in a community-based archives?

What are your specific concerns about donating your papers to an archives?

Do you have any privacy concerns regarding your collection? How do you think an archivist could best address these concerns? What could they say or do that would set your mind at ease?

Can you think of any specific concerns that you think apply to LGBT donors in general? Can you think of any specific privacy concerns that apply to LGBT donors in general?

Speaking more generally, many people have written about the roles of history and visibility in the creation of LGBT identity. What do you think is the role of archives in creating LGBT history?

Most formal archives are associated with larger institutions, such as universities. Some members of marginalized groups feel that these larger institutions perpetuate power relationships that created the groups' marginalized statuses in the first place. What do you think about this analysis?

In response to the exclusion of LGBT people from many mainstream archives, some
people have created community archives where members of the LGBT community have control over that community's records. What do you think is the role of community archives in creating LGBT history?

How do you think community archives affect the exclusion of LGBT people from mainstream archives? Are these two related?

One benefit of community archives are the elements of self-determination and control over one's own records. Do you think that these elements can be integrated into formal archives?

Can you briefly address the issues of tokenization of and cooptation of LGBT history when included in broader collections?

Conversations about the histories of marginalized groups often raise questions of ownership, namely who owns history. Do you have any thoughts about the ownership of LGBT history, in terms of creation, maintenance, and preservation?

Can you address possibilities for cooperation between community archives and formal archives?

What do you think are the responsibilities of the archivist to an individual donor? What do you think are the responsibilities of the archivist to a group that is represented within an archive? (For instance, what would an archivist's responsibility to an LGBT donor be? What would an archivist's responsibility to the entire LGBT community be?)

While we're discussing responsibility, can you address some of the questions about safety and privacy that affect LGBT donors? For instance, many donors have concerns about outing people against their will.

What do you think LGBT donors need in order to feel that their privacy needs are properly addressed?

Can you speak briefly to the possibilities of the archivist as an advocate for the marginalized groups represented in his or her archive? How do you think an archivist can act as an advocate for the LGBT community?

Can you speak briefly about the concept of the archivist as activist? How do you think an archivist can act as an activist for the LGBT community?

Anything else that you would like to add?