It is perhaps stating the obvious to note that cultural, institutional, familial, and individual memories are temporally and spatially contingent. Less readily apparent may be the ways in which how we remember and forget can be shaped by archival representation. Training a critical lens on descriptive practices and their authors is essential, therefore, in assessing, challenging, and potentially refiguring representation as well as surfacing the ways in which it reflects archival bias and legitimates the authorities and mandates under which archives operate.

Focusing predominantly on visual archives and also the visual nature of archival materials, this special issue has its origins in presentations given at the Kenneth Karmiole Symposium in Archival Studies, which was held at UCLA's Information Studies Department in January, 2018. Both the symposium and this special issue brought together individuals from a range of academic, artistic, activist, and other backgrounds whose work addresses some conceptualization of the Archive or archives (Caswell 2016). More specifically, it highlights how each of the authors endeavors through their work to explore, reimagine and emancipate the representation of the voices and agency of those who are the subjects of archival material, who have historically had limited to no ability to influence how they are portrayed in either archival description or indeed in the archival material itself.

The professional field of archival science has historically been at pains to distinguish how its practical as well as theoretical approaches to archives and the work of archiving are different from those of fields such as history and anthropology that have traditionally seen the archives either as the locus of their archival work (i.e., as the places in, and the data upon which their research is based), or as the place where they deposit their data. Today in light of the so-called "archival turns" (Ketelaar, 2017) in many fields in the arts, humanities and social sciences, this distinction seems a little passé given a growing degree of proximity not just in vocabulary, but between the intellectual preoccupations of all of these fields. This is incontestably evidenced by the range of disciplinary and professional backgrounds of the authors writing for this special issue, and the ways in which their critical preoccupations have coalesced, almost unbidden, around certain rubrics. But inasmuch as we might welcome and celebrate this convergence and the new consciousness it displays pertaining to archives as place, material and process (Pearce-Moses 2005), we should not congratulate ourselves too much. Archives remain saturated with the power relations and bigotries along all of the axes that have divided and subordinated societies, generations, and practices; and even though, by-and-large, they know better, both archival professionals and scholars and the infrastructures within which they function are still predominantly responsible for this status quo. Forty-five years ago, American historian William T. Hagan exhorted archivists, historians and anthropologists to consider and alter the roles they played in representing those whose lives, cultures, beliefs and freedoms were contained within archives: "think of the damage we can do to the Indians. The historical Indian may be the captive of the archives, but the key to those archives is in the hands of the non-Indian historians and

ethno-historians." (138) In 1989, in her article "Who Owns the Past: Aborigines as Captives of the Archives," Australian Indigenous rights activist and academic Henrietta Fourmile picks up Hagan's argument, illustrating not only the structures of control non-Indigenous people continued to exercise over Indigenous materials but also the ways in which seemingly "neutral" archival practices such as "institutional language" creates barriers to access.

This special issue explicitly identifies how interpretations created by archivists through descriptive practices, curators through exhibition practices, artists through creative and aesthetic practices, and scholars through methodological and narrative practices have rendered and continue to render subordinated and subaltern people archival captives; and suggests some ways in which the effects of such structures and practices might be critically exposed, prevented or countered. The issue addresses several critical questions relating to representation in archives, including but not limited to the following: How can archiving practices [re]produce contestable narratives? How can we [re]think polyvocality in forms of representation that are created for archival materials? How might we [re]imagine authorship and subjecthood within archived records? How might we acknowledge and dissect the power inherent in visual archival materials and [re]purpose it towards social justice? Reflecting the structure of the symposium as well as the topics of the resulting articles, the issue is organized under four rubrics: *[mis]representation*, *[dis]memory*, *[re]figuring*, and *[re]alizing*. These rubrics begin with problematizing and disentangling concepts of representation and then move towards potential interventions.

The concept of *[mis]representation* considers inaccuracies, multiplicities, duplicities and power in archival portrayals. Building upon these aspects, Marianna Hovhannisyan's piece, "Speculative Classification: Tracing a Disputed Portrait Between the Archives of Malvina Hoffman and Sergey Merkurov", reflects on the archival collections of American sculptor Malvina Hoffman (1885-1966) and Armenian-Greek sculptor Sergeĭ Merkurov (1881-1952), exposing how museum archives produce and re-inscribe indexical absences when their holdings are organized using universal categorization systems. Yvonne Eadon's "'Useful Information Turned into Something Useless': Archival Silences, Imagined Records, and Suspicion of Mediated Information in the JFK Assassination Collection", uses the The President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection at the US National Archives as a case study to analyze canonical scholarship on conspiracy theories while introducing the new notion of *suspicion of mediated information.* Eadon critically assesses the effects that such scholarship and ideas might have upon archivists applying two theoretical propositions: archival silences (Trouillot, 1997) and archival imaginaries (Gilliland and Caswell, 2016). Finally, in her article, "Representation, Affect, and the Archives: A Shrine to Lon Chaney", Samantha Blanco engages with visual archival representations of silent film actor Lon Chaney by applying affect theory as a way both to understand how power circulates through records and archives, and to reimagine A.Y. Owen's scrapbook of Lon Chaney—and its racial stereotypes—as a visual "shrine." Taken

together, these three pieces critically consider the politics and ethics of archival representations when misinformation or lack of context directly affect the documentation and organization of visual archives within institutions.

[dis]memory addresses how what we can know and remember is influenced through what we witness in archival materials as well as how we might counteract remembering and forgetting. Catherine Czacki's "Logical Horses: Or Several Historical, Aesthetic, Allegorical, and Mythical Vignettes" amplifies how to narrate and perform absences as well as hierarchies through placing historical accounts in conversation with personal storytelling, science fiction, and visual culture. Vacillating between a wide array of structures, histories and institutions, Czacki analyzes the hierarchies of "authentic producers" of art and culture and the resulting polarities that create conflicting histories. Finally, Nick Flessa, in "Case Number 87-447: An Image Essay in 12 Parts", visually pieces together a family history. Complicating the official archive—through presenting his mother's legal work and participation as the Assistant Prosecutor on the 1987 trial of Jerome Henderson, a death penalty case—Flessa brings together public and personal records to reflect on his mother, her death, and his own relations to Henderson. His creation of this "personal archive" complicates history and critically addresses the function of the judicial system and the cultural contexts of mental illness, gender and race in the United States. These articles each address some facet of bearing witness to archival absences, hierarchies, and the affective impacts of conflicting memory, knowledge, and history.

Moving further towards addressing absences, inaccuracies, and partialities, *[re]figuring* focuses on reworking, expanding, and reimagining archival foci and futures. Christina Lehua Hummel-Colla, in her piece, "Doling out Colonialism: Refiguring Archival Memory of Settler Colonialism in the Hawaiian Islands", sheds light on colonial archives through examining The Dole Family Papers, an archival fond that documents the family's history in Hawai'i where they came as missionaries, owned sugar plantations, and one member even held the position of president of the Republic of Hawaii. In addressing the perspective of the papers and how their narratives conflict with those of Native Hawaiian communities, Hummel-Colla identifies ways of re-presenting the Dole Family Papers in a manner that rejects narratives of American imperialism and encourages contending with settler colonialism in relation to Native Hawaiian culture and sovereignty. Confronting the limited and limiting discourses around national identity within the 1967 International and Universal Exposition (Expo67) in Montreal, Patricia Ciccone, in "Cheryl Sim's Un jour, Un jour: Imagining potential futures in the fragmented archives of Expo67", uses the work of curator Cheryl Sim as a critical and theoretical tool for understanding media archiving projects. Ciccone highlights how Sim uses personal records, videos and photographs from her parents' visit to the Fair to demonstrate how such methods can be used to reclaim the absences of immigrant, indigenous and marginalized communities within the Expo's archives. Lastly, Gabriel Peters-Lazaro takes advantage of the expansive space of spherical, or

VR, video to create an immersive narrative of personal media collections in “Spherical Memory: Shaping Immersive Narratives From Personal Media Collections”. Peters-Lazaro invites readers to witness his reflections on identity formation as well as the blurriness between personal and professional practices of knowledge creation using footage from his video archive—which spans 15 years—and overlaying audio recorded at UCLA in January 2018. Readers are encouraged to download the file for use with a VR headset or simply to open the Vimeo link to click and drag through the immersive visual essay. Collectively, Hummel-Colla, Ciccone and Peters-Lazaro take us through archival interventions, the theoretical and practical ways in which interpretations can be put in conversation with archival material in order to complicate archives and offer avenues for archival material to be refigured into more nuanced narratives.

Finally, having reimagined archival focuses and futures, *[re]alizing* looks to ground responsibilities and accountabilities for archival practices and approaches. Michelle Caswell’s piece, “Troubling Accounts of the Archives” reflects on ideas of incompletion, fragmentation, and imposition that can lead to what she calls *archival mysteries*. These mysteries are elicited by the distance of a record from both the context of its creation and the instant in which it is created. By looking at the Sharanjit Singh Dhillonn photo collection held at the South Asian American Digital Archive (SAADA), Caswell reflects on how to read photographic records when little information is provided, and how lack of context and metadata can trouble our senses of agency, and understandings of race, gender and sexuality, defying any easy interpretations of visual archives. In their collaborative piece, “Collecting Contested Identities: The Ambiguity of National Culture in the Israeli Digital National Collection,” Yair Agmon and Lihi Levy look at the formation and politics of Israel’s National Digital Collection—a digital stewardship project focused on cataloging and digitizing archival materials, and making them accessible—in order to demonstrate how the genesis of the Israeli state, as it collapsed multiculturalism in favor of a new ethno-nationalism for the Jewish People, provided social boundaries that are reflected in the cultural knowledge production of this national collection. Lastly, Ruth Livier introduces LOUD, a Latinx-lead grassroots activist group created by entertainment professionals in response to the US Government’s policy regarding asylum seekers and other migrants at the southern U.S. border. In “A LOUD response to Zero Tolerance,” Livier analyzes the various ways in which LOUD has used social media and digital tools to co-create records, thereby exposing the need for more appropriate data collection and records management systems for supporting human rights needs and migrant communities specifically. Taken together, the three pieces address ways in which both community- and state-led archival projects can be examined generatively, suggesting possible tools and solutions for more just and responsible ways of bringing together archival theory and praxis.

The problems that these authors raise are perpetuated through many different kinds of hegemonic systems--law and policy; professional conventions and best practices; education; research norms;

institutional hierarchies, to name just a few. They will need to be tackled simultaneously and critically on many fronts. It is our hope that this volume will not only offer provocative food for thought, but will also encourage important reflexive and generative inter-disciplinary dialog about the political nature not just of archives or of visual materials, but also of the many and varied ways that representation functions as a mediator of our understandings, beliefs and identities.

References

Caswell, M. L. (2016). *'The Archive' Is Not an Archives: On Acknowledging the Intellectual Contributions of Archival Studies*. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7bn4v1fk

Gilliland, Anne J., and Michelle Caswell. 2016. "Records and Their Imaginaries: Imagining the Impossible, Making Possible the Imagined." *Archival Science* 16: 53–75. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-015-9259-z.

Gordon, A. F. (2008). *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination* (2nd edition). Minneapolis: Univ Of Minnesota Press.

Fourmile, H. (1989). Who Owns the Past? - Aborigines as captives of the archives. *Aboriginal History*, *13*(1/2), 1–8. Retrieved from JSTOR.

Hagan, W. T. (2012). *American Indians: Fourth Edition*. University of Chicago Press.

Ketelaar, E. (2017). Archival Turns and Returns. In A. J. Gilliland, S. McKemmish, & A. J. Lau (Eds.), *Research in the Archival Multiverse* (pp. 228–268). Clayton, Vic: Monash University Publishing.

Pearce-Moses, R. (2005). *A Glossary of Archival & Records Terminology.* Society of American Archivists. Retrieved from https://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/a/archives

Trouillot, Michel-Rolphe. 1997. Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press.