

Chapter Title: Doing Justice to the Archive: Beyond Literature

Chapter Author(s): SHELLEY STREEBY

Book Title: Unsettled States

Book Subtitle: Nineteenth-Century American Literary Studies

Book Editor(s): Dana Luciano, Ivy G. Wilson

Published by: NYU Press. (2014)

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt9qfnjm.7>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



NYU Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Unsettled States*

JSTOR

Doing Justice to the Archive

Beyond Literature

SHELLEY STREEBY

In 1913, Lucy Parsons, whose career as a radical writer, speaker, editor, and publisher spanned the labor wars of the long-19th-century and early-20th-century world wars and revolutions, was arrested on the streets of Los Angeles and charged with selling literature without a license. The literature in question was *The Famous Speeches of the Eight Chicago Anarchists in Court*, according to William C. Owen, the editor of the English page of *Regeneración*, a bilingual newspaper published by Mexican revolutionaries living in exile in Los Angeles. Parsons, a black, Indian, and Mexican woman who was probably born a slave in Texas, became a leader of the Chicago anarchist movement in the 1880s along with her husband, Albert Parsons, a former Confederate soldier turned Radical Republican who was threatened with lynching after the Civil War when he tried to register black voters in Texas, where he met Lucy. In 1887 Albert was infamously executed, along with four others, for the murder of a police officer, who was killed by the blast of a bomb of unknown origin in Chicago's Haymarket Square. In the years that

followed, Lucy Parsons compiled and self-published several editions of a slim volume of the Haymarket anarchists' speeches in court. On the 20th anniversary of the event, however, as she issued a new memorial edition, she worried in the preface that the anarchists' words "remained in the archives of history, almost forgotten."

Was this slim volume of speeches literature? According to the LAPD and the law, it was, though it was punitively demarcated as a kind of outlaw literature. In this context and according to these definitions, the *Famous Speeches* are what Jacques Derrida calls literature as "public writing": that which is published.¹ If, in its broader significance literature is, for Derrida, following Hélène Cixous, "Omnipotence-Other," the "undecidable writing for which as yet no complete formalization exists" (15), then *Famous Speeches* also counts as literature within this frame. But Derrida also wonders about the problem of drawing the line between "literature and the others," between literature and "non-literature, between the material and the form, private and public, secret and not-secret, the decipherable and the undecipherable, decidable and undecidable" (24). It is precisely the investment in drawing the line of literary value that distinguishes these more expansive definitions of literature from the narrower ones demarcated by the literary apparatus of the time and our time—by the institutions, periodicals, syllabi, publishing houses, marketing categories, prizes, and so forth that shape and alter the meanings of literature at particular moments. In the 1910s, *Famous Speeches* was not valued by the literary institutions of the day and would not have been taught as literature in schools, which raises questions about how the category of the literary is constructed in relation to state power and ideas about policing more broadly. It might have been considered "propaganda," though that word did not have the negative connotations it has now during the early-20th-century period of its emergence.² Today, the *Famous Speeches* would still be an unusual choice in an English or literature class, though a more capacious definition of the literary might include it within the category of notable speeches or crime literature. More likely, however, it would be viewed as belonging, like history, with those "others" of literature—those texts that the literary apparatus cannot or decides not to value within the category of literature.

But we might also ask: what is history and what is an archive? When Lucy Parsons worried that the *Famous Speeches* remained in the archives of history, almost forgotten, what kind of archives and history did she mean? Was she referring to the archives of the state, which classified the Haymarket anarchists as murderous criminals? Was her labor as a publisher part of an effort to push the men's words from the state's juridical and punitive archive into another kind of archive where what happened might be remembered differently and where the past might cross back over into the present and the future rather than remaining safely encased in its containers? Should we call this archive "literature," even though the gate-keeping guardians of the aesthetic, whose predictable jeremiads intermittently warn that only they are capable of analyzing form, have rarely included it within that category? What forms might these archives take other than literature? Are they part of history, that strange space where Parsons imagines memories are stored away and "almost forgotten"?

For Parsons, the space of history is both danger and consolation, for if the radical past is almost forgotten there in the archives, it is also retained for a future when another movement might reanimate its meanings for the present. Perhaps this dialectical view of the archives of history was shaped by her own losses over the years when police and detectives raided the offices of newspapers she wrote for and groups she organized, often disappearing or destroying what they seized. In a final blow to the archives of radical memory, after Parsons died in 1942 in a Chicago house fire, police seized her papers as well as the library of more than 1,500 books and newspapers that she had collected over her long lifetime; because of earlier raids, it was already only a remnant of a once much larger whole. The role of state and corporate power in all this archival destruction and preservation, as well as their investments in defining history, should not go unnoticed. While with Ann Laura Stoler we may wish to avoid fetishizing the "finite boundaries of the official state archives" in order to explore "their surplus production, what defines their interior ridges and porous seams, what closures are transgressed by unanticipated exposition and writerly forms," we must also acknowledge the limits and regulatory frames that official archives impose upon the subjects of history.³

But what is history, anyway? Like literature, it has multiple meanings. Within literary studies, history is sometimes viewed as the bad other, a realm of facticity that literature transcends, or a discipline that privileges other kinds of evidence, thereby marginalizing literature or deeming it suspect and insufficient. And yet, if we consider history as an apparatus, it is also, like literature, a heterogeneous ensemble of institutions, texts, syllabi, and so forth, many versions of which now both draw on literary and cultural texts and question the linear, progressive historicisms famously critiqued by Walter Benjamin and the subaltern studies historiographers, among others. Indeed, the disciplines of English/literature and history have shared this tendency to regulate and exclude and to establish privileged canons of value that shore up progressive, linear, national, and nationalist histories.

This is one of the historical limits of disciplinary thinking, and one of many reasons it is important, especially at this moment of danger when formations with closer relationships to social movements, such as ethnic studies and women's/gender studies, are under attack in the neoliberal university, to foster robustly interdisciplinary methods and formations. While the incorporation of the demands of social movements into universities has been a complex and contradictory process, the last decade of shock-doctrine downsizing of higher education has altered the terrain of struggle and we are now in a different moment than the late 1990s/early 2000s, when the incorporation of difference appeared to be the main problem confronting scholars and teachers committed to social justice. Although traditional humanities disciplines are also under attack, interdisciplinary formations, especially those that challenge the neoliberal university's ways of doing academic business, are now often most vulnerable to cuts and elimination. Thus, despite the limits of the repressive hypothesis, there is indeed some repression going on as neoliberal cuts, downsizing, and the violent police response to student movements throughout the University of California, for example, have clarified in the last few years. While as Rod Ferguson suggests it is imperative to attend to and bring to crisis the "networks of power that align minority difference with institutional dominance," a "reinvigorated interdisciplinary life" is also necessary to "disrupt dominant forms of institutionality" and interrupt the detachment and withdrawal of higher education from movements pressing for change.⁴

For disciplinary ways of seeing and institutional hierarchies of knowledge production and management of difference may encircle objects of memory in ways that isolate them from social conflicts, movements, and struggles and thereby both diminish our understanding of them and radically shrink the boundaries of the “we” who participate in defining and shaping the contradictory project of higher education.

How does the scholar in the archive decide where literature begins and ends? What effects does the encircling of the literary in the archive have, if the scholar desires to encircle it and if it even can be encircled? How are its boundaries drawn and what gets cut off and detached in the process? And how might different kinds of archives challenge the boundaries of the apparatuses of English/literature and history?

Each of the excellent essays in the “Archives Unbound” section begins with a problem in the present that is connected to the racial past and future of the United States, thereby refusing the static historicisms and linear, progressive temporality that organize many discipline-bound literary and empiricist histories. Each also raises questions about what counts as history, as literature, and as an archive. Lloyd Pratt analyzes a recent novel, Edward P. Jones’s *The Known World*, in order to explore the solutions African American writers have imagined to the problem of representing historical traumas such as the Middle Passage and slavery. Instead of “[subordinating] the spread of detail inherent to the archive into a coherent linear narrative of cause, effect, and transformation,” Pratt writes, African American writers often turned to other representational modes, such as the historical romance, to “write a history of totality in a world of partial vision.” Rodrigo Lazo, on the other hand, focuses on scholars of “Hispanic/Latino literature” who hope to document the “often-overlooked participation of Hispanics in U.S. historical events,” but end up finding “unexpected discoveries” and “uncomfortable histories” in the “capacious and messy Hispanic archive,” such as evidence of Hispanic “Confederates in the Attic.” Although Latina/o scholars may wish to “posit continuity from people in the past to the present,” Lazo warns that such linear continuities are “likely to clash against some of the material that is ultimately gathered within the archive,” and disturb the formation of Latina/o studies as a field that “has gained momentum in the last thirty years from the work of scholars who sought to challenge exclusion and white supremacy

in U.S. society.” Finally, Tavia Nyong’o speculates on the 2011 reading aloud of the U.S. Constitution on the floor of the House of Representatives in hopes that performance studies’ “attunement to the present and subjective encounter with the past” may foreground “what history takes pride in delegating to other disciplines.” Swerving around in time, Nyong’o reads David Walker’s 1829 *Appeal* in relation to debates over the expurgation of the three-fifths clause and readings of the 13th and 14th amendments in order to expose an “abolitionist legacy” of the “profanation” of citizenship as a critique of constitutionalism. All three essays take issue with the writing of history as a linear narrative of national progress and all three turn to other kinds of archives, representational modes, and temporalities to reimagine the relations among past, present, and future.

In thinking critically about history making as a cultural activity of the present, however, Nyong’o suggests that simply mixing up different times is not enough, since lingering in the past can align with conservative historicism rather than historical materialism. In the case of many reenactors of the Civil War and the Tea Party, such time bending may rather serve as a “bastion of white male identity politics,” promoting the idealization of a historical period prior to black citizenship and foreclosing “a reckoning with the black radical strivings that are immanent to but never fully contained by the nation’s story.” Calling for a 19th-century studies interested “less in the question of how time passes, and more in the question of how time accumulates—in and as forms of (racial and national) property,” Nyong’o appeals to the “dispossessive force” of a radical black countermemory that he finds in Walker’s *Appeal* and the performance of the Constitution. Pratt also explores how what he calls the “black intellectual and expressive traditions” of “African diasporic culture” challenge the ordering of time in dominant history-writing, especially in an emergent liberal historiography. But rather than giving up on the ideal of imagining historical totality, Pratt argues, African American writers were on the contrary more adept at “producing an anti-reifying and totalizing historicization such as Lukács describes in *History and Class Consciousness*.” Asking questions about how time accumulates and imagining a historical totality, then, remain relevant and urgent for Nyong’o and Pratt as they were for the writers and cultural producers they discuss in their essays.

If for Nyong'o and Pratt other archives of the black diaspora and other modes of representation such as Walker's *Appeal*, the performance of the Constitution, and African American history writing and historical romances enable a fuller, more critical reckoning with U.S. history and the accumulation of time as racialized national property, however, Lazo emphasizes how archives may resist the stories the scholar wants to tell. When Latina/o studies scholars are confronted in the archive with discoveries they did not expect to make, for instance, such as the existence of Hispanic Confederates, their findings may call into crisis, Lazo suggests, the "hopeful recuperation" of an elided Hispanic past that is the "hallmark of Latino studies" and that "drives research agendas." Lazo understands the "archive" both as "a repository of documents" and as "an analogy for the collection of information that sustains an academic field" and an "identity." He defines the "mega-Hispanic archive" as the domain where "popular representation and media circulation meet academic research: an accumulation of information, discourses, and texts that motivate a problem of subjectivity." He also isolates a second meaning of "Hispanic archive": "the accumulation of knowledge as a result of fields of study that emerge from the ethnic labels Hispanic/Latino, in other words the scholarly collection of texts that make up the historical record," including the Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage Project as well as "various scholarly and critical projects that contribute to the Hispanic archive." Ultimately Lazo urges scholars to attend to the "contradictions that emerge" when archives clash with their frames of study and archival concepts (e.g., the nation), which are animated by the intricate nexus of desire and investment that draws the scholar to the archive in the first place.

Here Lazo joins other scholars such as Kirsten Silva Gruesz in confronting what she calls the "vexed question at the heart of the endeavor of Latino studies: what are the outer limits of Latino identity?"⁵ Lazo privileges the terms "Hispanic" and "Latino" even as he notes that they are sometimes used "interchangeably" (thereby generating "contradictions") and distinguishes "Latino" as "a contemporary term linked to university-based programs and post-Civil Rights social movements" from "Hispanic" as "an ethnic label for people of Spanish and Latin American descent." Calling the field that has emerged in the last 30 years Hispanic/Latino studies, however, elides some of the other names

that have contributed to this project, such as Chicana/o studies, Puerto Rican and Nuyorican studies, Cuban American studies, and Dominican American studies:⁶ in other words, the study of the “Latino subgroups,” which map onto different spaces and nations of origin and which was the dominant way what today often goes by the name of Latina/o studies began to be institutionalized in the “later years of the Civil Rights movement” in response “to minoritarian political pressures,” as Gruesz helpfully reminds us. During this period of war, decolonization, and racial unrest, educational activists and social movements pressed for changes in school curricula, which often happened at the local or state level in response to specific struggles, such as California State University, Los Angeles’s founding of the first Chicano studies department in 1968 in the wake of the L.A. Blowouts, when students walked out of L.A. high schools to express their dissatisfaction with the education system.⁷ It is also worth noting that the formations aligning with what we now call Latina/o studies were interdisciplinary in their origins; the titles of early journals, such as *El Grito: A Journal of Contemporary Mexican American Thought* (UC Berkeley) and *Aztlan: A Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and the Arts* (UCLA), are revealing in this regard.

In the late 1980s and 1990s, traditional disciplines such as English and history were slowly affected by these changes, as Latina/o texts sometimes appeared on syllabi in the wake of the archival and revisionary work of a generation of scholars, including Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita, who “recovered” the novels and letters of María Amparo Ruiz de Burton that Lazo discusses at length in his essay. During the same years, partly in response to demographic shifts, marketing appeals, and official categories, “Latino” began to organize fields of study, a shift marked by the proliferation of projects in the late 1990s under that name. Many scholars who now, like Lazo and Gruesz, prefer the umbrella term “Latino,” despite what she calls its “suspect legacy as a term of governmental power,” seek “the still invisible linkages among different populations” and points of intersection and comparison rather than emphasizing the distinct particularity of “the different remnants” of Spain’s empire (118). Many also criticize the limits of the ethnic nationalisms of the 1960s and 1970s as articulated by the Chicano Movement and other movements out of which the push to institutionalize what is now Latina/o studies initially emerged. They emphasize

a multiplicity of experiences instead of looking for what some characterize as a reductive counter-narrative of resistance that they argue has dominated past scholarly discussions. More and more, these scholars work in history, English, and literature departments as well as in Spanish departments and interdisciplinary formations such as Latina/o studies, Chicana/o studies, ethnic studies, American studies, and so forth.

Even as “Latino studies” moves into traditional disciplines, however, what we might call the Latina/o literary archive pressures narrow definitions of literature, as Lazo recognizes when he observes that some of the evidence in the Latina/o literary archive, such as Ambrosio Gonzales’s pamphlet *Manifesto on Cuban Affairs* (1853), “would not be classified as Literature by aesthetic archivists.” This problem is a familiar one for many Latina/o studies scholars, who have grown accustomed to doing the hard work of archival retrieval and then also having to educate colleagues with narrow understandings of aesthetics about the particular significance of form, genre, and language in the Latina/o archive. At the same time, many remain committed, like the earlier generation, to doing such archival work: Gruesz argues that this labor is necessary to counter the “foreshortening of the Latino past” (130) and “the denial of coevalness in past time” (132), which assume “all Latinos are ‘recent arrivals’ in the United States” and thereby deny them “the common occupation of past time with other U.S. Americans” (121). This helps to explain why what Lazo calls a “critical archive” quickly formed around the work of Ruiz de Burton when her novels were republished in the 1990s. As Lazo remembers, scholars “in the field of Latino studies as well as those more generally interested in American literature published a variety of articles, and she became a keystone in the Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage Project.”

Even though Ruiz de Burton wrote novels in English that have been reissued in readily available modern editions, however, her status in relation to the 19th-century U.S. literary field remains relatively tenuous compared to Nathaniel Hawthorne or Henry James, which is why Lazo calls her, along with José Martí, “the only other Hispanic writer who has approached canonical status in nineteenth-century U.S. literary studies.” Lazo’s refusal to situate Ruiz de Burton squarely within the realm of the canonical registers ongoing struggles over the boundaries of the canon and the significance of diverse aesthetics for U.S. literary history.

Nonetheless, these novels helped make a place for Latina/o studies in 19th-century American literary studies and many scholars of Latina/o literature have written about them. Many of this generation of Latina/o literary scholars, like José Aranda, cited by both Lazo and Gruesz, focus on how Ruiz de Burton embodies the contradictions in what Lazo calls “the Hispanic archive.” Pita and Sánchez initially claimed Ruiz de Burton “as part of a Hispanic past,” according to Lazo, by emphasizing her dispossession as a “Latina,” “a Catholic,” a “Spanish speaker,” and an “outsider in Yankee territory.” But the “contours of Ruiz de Burton’s life soon raised complications” and Lazo suggests critics such as Aranda “called our attention to the problems of heritage by questioning the critical investment in framing an upper-class light-skinned woman as a writer of resistance to white hegemony.” In this scholarly genealogy, the new generation corrects the mistakes of the past: this logic suggests that while Pita and Sánchez did not probe these “problems of heritage” and framed Ruiz de Burton, despite her upper-class status and light skin, as a “writer of resistance to white hegemony,” 21st-century Latina/o literary scholars can now read the novels more critically, as examples of how “Hispanic literary history’s claim to a counter-narrative can stumble across its own troublesome past.”

I wonder, though, whether this rather linear genealogy of “Hispanic literary history” depends upon authorizing Latina/o literary studies as a distinctive endeavor and encircling the literary in ways that detach the novels from other fields, texts, and contexts that give them meaning. Even back in 1995, three years before Aranda’s *American Literature* essay appeared, in their preface to *Who Would Have Thought It?*, Pita and Sánchez were already calling our attention to how Ruiz de Burton imagined “a construction of upper-class Latinos/as as white, a perhaps defensive—though not defensible—move . . . in view of the fact that Congressional records of the period refer to Mexicans in the southwest as a ‘mongrel race.’”⁸ Their interest in complexities of class and race becomes even more apparent when we move from the novel prefaces to their wider body of writing and scholarship, especially Sánchez’s *Telling Identities: The Californio Testimonios* (1995), where she situates Ruiz de Burton in relation to the elite class of Mexican-origin settlers of California who lost most of their land and power in the wake of the U.S.-Mexico War of 1846–1848. Sánchez devotes big chunks of the book

to analyzing the complexities of class and racial formations and constructions of ethnicity as well as the hierarchies and power relations of settler colonialism, specifically the dispossession of Indians through force and liberal land laws and their exploitation in the missions, even as she argues that the Californios themselves were rendered subaltern in relation to the Anglo invaders after 1848. Sánchez situates Ruiz de Burton in relation to historically changing, complex vectors of class, race, and colonialism as she explains how the Californios appealed to the “construct of *criollismo*” in “an attempt to appear on the same racial plane with the Yankee invaders, as if national origin and race could be wielded as a strategic discourse to combat racist representations of the conquered Californios as half-civilized Indians” (59). *Telling Identities* is not as widely read in literary circles as the prefaces to Ruiz de Burton’s novels, perhaps because its main focus is on the *testimonio*, a genre in which, as Sánchez puts it, “literary and nonliterary, popular and elite, historical and fictional discourses overlap and intersect” in ways that require an “interdisciplinary methodology” (xi) to understand. If we rally around the literary and privilege the novel as a form, we risk detaching Ruiz de Burton’s writing from these other fields, contexts, forms, and histories. Broadening the purview of Latina/o studies beyond the literary narrowly conceived, as many Latina/o studies scholars have taken the lead in doing, on the other hand, illuminates diverse genealogies for the field that disrupt linear histories of scholarly progress and enlightenment and make visible the heterogeneous, often interdisciplinary work of earlier generations and its affiliations with the present.

A wide range of cultural forms that push disciplinary boundaries are also central to what Pratt calls “the black intellectual and expressive traditions” of “African diasporic culture” and what Nyong’o names “black collective memory.” Although Pratt focuses on the writing of history and especially the historical romance as it “descended from Sir Walter Scott,” he recognizes that literature is only of the forms through which African Americans have imagined alternative approaches to historical representation. In response to what is missing in the archive, to the “exclusion of African Americans from the documentary trail of evidence, except as entries in chattel bookkeeping or the emerging scriptive technologies of the American judicial system,” as well as the problem of

representing historical traumas such as slavery and the Middle Passage that resisted representation, what Ernest Hall refers to as “oral, vernacular, and commemorative culture and historical memory” emerged as important forms through which African Americans reenvisioned their past. Pratt emphasizes that African American literature, a significant “archive of past experience rearticulated in the present moment,” is also essential to any such list of cultural forms that respond to history. To do so, he critically engages Madhu Dubey’s claim that writers of African American speculative fiction “turn away from history” to “more fully” address “the truth of the past” by “way of an antirealist literary imagination that can fluidly cross temporal boundaries and affectively immerse readers into the world of slavery.” While Pratt concludes that Dubey ultimately implies that such speculative fictions propose that “the inequities of the past have rendered the past a useless resource,” however, I wonder whether instead she suggests that speculative fiction turns away from the past only as it has been reductively imagined in more conventional forms of history writing and thereby rejects not a confrontation with time and history as such but rather the limits of linear, progressive narratives of liberal historiography.

But although Pratt focuses on how Jones’s *The Known World* embraces the idea of a “totalizing history” in contrast to what he sees as black speculative fiction’s turning away from the past and history, he also emphasizes how Jones’s novel acknowledges and values connections between different forms of expressive culture through its focus on “Alice’s creations,” which are central to the novel’s representation of the world. Alice’s multimedia maps are a mode of historical representation that the novel incorporates by registering the impossibility of ever fully doing so, in a scene of “ekphrasis” or “the verbal description of visual art forms,” as Pratt explains. The novel’s insistence on this impossibility suggests not only that the “history writer might in the end find herself required to work in a variety of different representational modes if she is to achieve the goal of a total history,” but that the historical romance and canonical literature are, by themselves, inadequate ways of responding to the problems of representing the history of the African diaspora and that other expressive and speculative forms, sometimes with lower and less respectable genealogies, are also necessary.

If Pratt encircles the historical romance in his analysis even as he remarks on the broad range of expressive forms through which African Americans have responded to gaps in the archives and the trauma of history, Nyong'o foregrounds his interdisciplinary method in reading the U.S. Constitution as political theater in relation to what we now call an important work of early African American literature, Walker's *Appeal*. Walker is a late addition to U.S. literary anthologies partly because African American literature has only relatively recently been accorded value by the literary apparatus. And although the pamphlet and the appeal, like the Constitution, count as literature within early republican definitions of the literary, these texts have more often been consigned to history by a discipline that privileges novels, short stories, and poetry. Nyong'o's interdisciplinary method, on the other hand, is sparked by insights from feminist social and cultural history, political theory, social movement scholarship, and especially performance studies. In speculating on how the black radical tradition has imagined alternate modes of historical representation, Nyong'o also uses tools from U.S. literary studies, analyzing Walker's *Appeal* as a jeremiad with a difference, whose meaning is determined not only by that classic American literary form, but also by other texts and contexts beyond its boundaries, which together articulate "a negative cosmopolitanism that sets up black collective memory as a counter-apparatus to sovereign subjectification." That is, if the jeremiad form always brings U.S. Americans back to the sovereignty of sacred nation-time and the citizen/alien binarism after a ritualized recognition of a problem or declension in the present,⁹ Walker's *Appeal* opens up onto a broader and more heterogeneous black radical tradition that both draws on and transmits an abolitionist legacy of profaning citizenship as it voices "strivings that are immanent to but never fully contained by the nation's story."

Although Nyong'o warns that we cannot simply privilege the repertoire and embodied forms of knowing over texts and the archive, he concludes that a "performance genealogy" is necessary to restore the full ambiguity of this evocation of the black world as a counter-apparatus to the sovereign subjectification of sacred nation-time. These evocations come in many different forms, including literature, although we may miss their manifold ambiguities, associations, connections,

meanings, and larger significance if we discipline the archive by encircling the literary. For it takes an interdisciplinary methodology to begin to do justice to what Nyong'o calls the "dispossessive force" of a radical black countermemory, and perhaps, also, to 19th-century American literature, whatever that may be.

NOTES

1. Jacques Derrida, *Geneses, Genealogies, Genres, and Genius: The Secrets of the Archive*, trans. Beverley Bie Brahic (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 23. Hereafter cited in text. In "The Future of the Profession," Derrida also connects literature to public space and "the right to say everything publicly, or to keep it secret, if only in the form of fiction." Quoted in McQuillan, "Foreword: 'What is Called Literature,'" *Geneses*, vii.
2. For more on how literature was imagined in relation to transnational anarchist cultures and state power during this period, see Streeby, *Radical Sensations: World Movements, Violence, and Visual Culture* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2013). Chapter 2 situates Parsons in relation to Mexican anarchists who were imprisoned in the U.S. after they were judged guilty of obscenity for the content of their newspaper, *Regeneración*.
3. Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 14.
4. Roderick A. Ferguson, *The Reorder of Things: The University and its Pedagogies of Minority Difference* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 231, 230.
5. Kirsten Silva Gruesz, "The Once and Future Latino: Notes Toward a Literary History Todavía Para Llegar," *Contemporary U.S. Latino/a Literary Criticism*, ed. Lyn Sandin and Richard Perez (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 116. Hereafter cited in text.
6. The term "Latina/o Studies" can also elide the related yet distinct trajectories of an emergent Central American studies, and the complicated significance of blackness and indigeneity that cuts across such fields.
7. See Melissa Hidalgo, "Schooling La Raza: A Chicana/o Cultural History of Education, 1968-2008," Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, San Diego, 2011.
8. Beatrice Pita and Rosaura Sánchez, "Introduction" to María Amparo Ruiz de Burton, *Who Would Have Thought It?* (Houston: Arte Publico Press, 1995), xx.
9. Sacvan Bercovitch, *The American Jeremiad* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978).