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Interrogating Trans* Identities in the Archives

Liam Oliver Lair

Christine Jorgensen is undoubtedly one of the most famous trans-identified people in U.S. history. Her story created a media frenzy in 1952 when the New York Daily News declared “Ex-GI Becomes Blond Beauty.” Following the headline that December, news outlets nationwide began publishing the details of her story, which would become one of the first widely known sex change surgeries in the United States. Her fame and legacy resulted from the novelty and exoticization of transsexualism during her lifetime as well as her social location as a white, upper-middle-class transwoman. My relationship to Jorgensen, as a transmasculine scholar in the twenty-first century living over fifty years after she was outed to the nation, is a complex one. I am drawn to her story and find myself both frustrated and inspired by her life and how her narrative unfolded during the 1950s. I am frustrated by her adherence to binaried identity categories and her firm rejection of homosexuality as a viable way of life. Yet at the same time, I find myself inspired by her courage to medically transition when she did and to claim her place as a woman despite the ridicule she faced. After all, Jorgensen did provide a space for trans* people across the United States to begin to articulate why they were “different.” Jorgensen’s canonical placement in American trans* histories is thus not unwarranted, and I must reckon with my complex relationship to her.
Part of my frustration with Jorgensen's primacy in American trans* historiography is how a focus on her story elides not only the multiple trans* narratives that existed within the same historical context, but also how it denies the complexity of the relationship between sex and knowledge production around historical and contemporary understandings of sex, gender, and other aspects of identity. Speaking to this deficit in the scholarship, notable trans* studies scholars, including Susan Stryker and Bobby Noble, have articulated the urgent need for a deeper engagement of transgender studies with the “complex interplay between race, ethnicity, and transgender phenomenon.” Noble, in particular, has highlighted the “limitations of a predominantly white referent for transgender subjectivity as currently represented in critical theory,” and draws our attention to queer-of-color critique in relation to current figurations of trans* subjectivity. However, few scholarly projects interrogate the historical and genealogical nature of these particular figurations of trans-ness. My larger project makes this intervention, employing an intersectional approach and focusing on the centrality of race to constructions of and anxieties around the relationships of sex, gender, and sexuality. My research looks at the emergence of the terms transvestite and transsexual in the first half of the twentieth century, and I seek to answer the questions of how and why these terms emerged when they did, and how they came to be differentiated from one another and from other diagnoses of sexual and gendered deviance. In particular, I focus on how eugenic ideology, and its attendant racism, is embedded in these concepts.

In this essay, I discuss my research trip to the archives at the Kinsey Institute for Sex, Gender, and Reproduction (hereafter referred to as KI) and how these visits relate both to my scholarship and to my identity as a white, middle-class transman. I then present theories of the archive by Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Sara Ahmed, exploring how they relate to my project. I discuss my research in relation to Derrida’s understanding of the archive and its power for creating historical narratives. Foucault’s understanding of the archive helps me to broaden my understanding of what “counts” as archival material. Foucault argues that these materials, these historical artifacts of the past, inform our present context, requiring that I explore how this archive of trans* history informs mid-twentieth century discourses about sex, gender, sexuality, and politics. Feminist theorist Sara Ahmed’s work concerning the centrality of emotion in intellectual work also informs my understanding of archival research as I challenge the dichotomy of “intellect” and “emotion.” Sharing my own experiences at the KI will demonstrate the ways
emotionality enriches archival scholarship. Following the discussion of Derrida, Foucault, and Ahmed, I reflect on the simultaneous expansion of my identity and the archive in relation to how I conceive of, and interrogate, the KI, its collections, and its existence in the academic imaginary. It is crucial in my research to question knowledge production in the KI, as well as the limitations, silences, and organization of the collections housed there. Throughout this essay, I will reflect on my subject position as researcher in the archive, specifically as one who is queer and trans-feminist. Indeed, my experience at the KI led me to question how I am moved to understand my own trans* identity in relation to the varied trans* identities present in the archives.

Creating space for multiple and complex trans* narratives historically does justice not only to the women whose stories are found in the archive but also to those engaged in queer justice struggles today. In his newest book, *Normal Life*, activist-scholar Dean Spade argues for a move toward a “critical trans politics,” an epistemology that “demands more than legal recognition and inclusion, seeking instead to transform current logics of state, civil society security, and social equality.” This call to action must also include a recognition of the narratives and stories of trans* individuals who were and are denied an authentic claim to trans* identity because their narrative does not “fit.” These are the moments of recognition that, following Judith Butler, present us as scholar-activists with the potential to make lives more livable for trans* individuals, regardless of their identity, desire, or narrative. Recognizing that individuals, desires, and embodiments exist in the interstices of “approved stories” discourse calls attention to those who are not represented in our political and activist movements, and demands that we theorize with these individuals and communities in ways that are more just, inclusive, and affirming.

The Kinsey Institute Archives

My research questions as a scholar in the fields of sexuality studies, trans-gender studies, and queer theory led me to the collections at the renowned Kinsey Institute’s archives. The KI exists in the academic imaginary as an archival *institution*, one that bestows a particular amount of legitimacy to scholars who publish based on their findings there. This institutional mythos begets particular relations of power, which can make it difficult to challenge the authority that purportedly emerges from the KI. Precisely because scholars often see the KI as having “the answers” to their research
questions, it is all the more important to interrogate the power dynamics of this institution. Multiple truths and narratives emerge from the vast array of materials housed in the KI, and approaching the KI as another site of knowledge production, one that is never more “right” or “truthful” than the other sites that produce knowledge, is crucial to remaining reflexive as a researcher.

Founded in 1947 by Indiana University biologist Alfred Kinsey, the original collection focused solely on questions of human sexuality. Eventually, Kinsey’s interests expanded to include questions of gender and gender nonconformity, and he and his colleagues then collected histories of individuals who self-identified as transvestites and transsexuals. Today, the KI holds materials in the areas of sexuality, gender, and reproduction from six continents, and materials spanning more than 2000 years of human history. My original research questions focused on how trans* people during the 1950s came to articulate their particular identities. I was interested in how they constructed their narratives outside of the medical community when they weren’t trying to convince authority figures that they should have access to gender-affirming medical care (hormones, surgery, etc.). I hoped that the KI would house some correspondence that would address my questions.

The holdings of the Kinsey Institute are extensive. Unfortunately, finding information online about the collections proved difficult. The online catalog is easy to navigate but provides little detailed information about the collections that I was interested in researching. Reading texts by scholars who relied heavily on the KI archives proved invaluable. Joanne Meyerowitz’s bibliography and footnotes in How Sex Changed: A History of Transsexuality in the United States served as more of a finding aid than KI’s own online catalog, because our lines of inquiry overlap. Through Meyerowitz’s research and references, I was able to determine that two collections in particular would be helpful in my work: the Louise Lawrence Collection and the Harry Benjamin Collection. Through the limited information in the archive list, I knew I also wanted to look at both the Edythe Ferguson Collection and the A. B. Gottlober Collection. The information available on these collections indicated that they might house correspondence between transwomen, as well as autobiographical writings by transwomen.

The Lawrence Collection is a unique assemblage of writings by and among transvestites and transsexuals. It was not until the late 1940s that Kinsey’s research began to include the study of transvestism and transsexualism, two “conditions” that until that point had undergone little or
no systematic or scientific investigation. In the early 1940s Kinsey did “not yet see cross-dressing or cross-gender identification as significant independent sexological categories,” and he believed transvestism was relatively rare.12 Meeting Louise Lawrence in 1948 significantly altered his understanding of this issue.13 She had organized an extensive national network of transvestites and cross-dressers. Corresponding with hundreds of people across the nation, Lawrence provided Kinsey with contacts and helped him navigate his research trips over the next several years. Both Kinsey and Lawrence provided their papers to the collection. My initial focus was on the correspondence between Lawrence and other transvestite and transsexual women, including several who explicitly disclosed their trans* identities as well as how they came to identify as such.14

The Harry Benjamin Collection is the largest of the four I used in my research. Harry Benjamin, an endocrinologist, sex researcher, and well-known doctor whose patient list consisted largely of transsexuals, donated many of his papers (both professional and personal) to the Kinsey Institute. His collection consists of 1,400 archival folders and nine additional boxes of personal and professional correspondence from 1922 to 1986. As colleagues, Benjamin and Kinsey worked closely together on several cases. Benjamin was particularly sympathetic to the difficulties facing transvestite and transsexual individuals, perhaps even more so than Kinsey.15 Benjamin was uniquely engaged with his patients and their desires, and I was particularly interested in his correspondence with trans-identified people. Specifically I was drawn to one folder that contained autobiographies varying from two to sixty pages in length; the writings span from the early 1950s to 1976.16 These autobiographies documented the life journeys of individuals who were assigned male at birth and later identified as either transvestite or transsexual. These autobiographies would become, unexpectedly, the main focus of my original research trip; I found them to be much richer in content than the disparate correspondence among transwomen.

The two other collections I examined were the Edythe Ferguson and A. B. Gottlober Collections. The Edythe Ferguson Collection consists of a single bound book and a folder, the contents of which span from 1951 to 1956. The bound book contains a series of lectures written by Ferguson, a self-identified transvestite, which instructed individuals in “legitimate female impersonation,” and other papers she wrote concerning transvestite and transsexual identity.17 The folder primarily contains correspondence between Ferguson and Kinsey. The A. B. Gottlober Collection consists of a single folder with correspondence from a self-identified transvestite.
(using the pseudonym Marilynne) to other transvestites; these letters were written in 1951 and 1952.\textsuperscript{18} Abraham B. Gottlober was a psychologist in the early twentieth century. There is no indication in the finding guide or on the Kinsey website as to why this collection was named after him, but one might speculate that he came to possess the letters from one of his clients.

Archives, Authority, and Discourse

To complicate trans* narratives, narratives that are rooted in the development of transvestism and transsexualism as medicalized and pathologized conditions, I must redefine how I understand the archive and its relationship to history, memory, and emotion. Three scholars, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Sara Ahmed outline unique approaches to archival research that allow for different, noncanonical stories to be told that challenge a singular narrative of history. Using their work also provides a context in which to push back against concepts of trans* identity that have been deemed illegitimate, either by sexologists or trans* people themselves.

In his dense but provocative essay \textit{Archive Fever}, French philosopher Jacques Derrida interrogated the archive in multiple ways: as a word, as a place, and as a space where power emerges. He traced the development and establishment of state power—a power that finds its authority in the archives and in the knowledge and authority that the archives create for the state. Using a Freudian framework, Derrida argued that the we have an “archive drive,” a “drive to collect, organize, and conserve the human record.”\textsuperscript{19} He understood this drive to be in competition with a death drive characterized as “archive destroying.” The death drive “incites forgetfulness, amnesia, the annihilation of memory . . . but also . . . the eradications . . . of . . . the archive.”\textsuperscript{20} The negotiation of these drives results in the construction of the historical record (the archive) that is at once “revolutionary and traditional.”\textsuperscript{21} Derrida recognized the ways in which “the archive determines what can be archived,” and that history and memory are shaped by the technical methods of what he calls “archivization.” He argued that this process “produces as much as it records the event.”\textsuperscript{22}

As a transfeminist scholar, I must recognize the role the archive plays in shaping the knowledge around any event in our histories, which in turn affects our futures. When confronting the intimidating and awe-inspiring KI, I initially struggled to recognize and admit the subjectivity
and constructed nature of this research site. As a scholar of gender studies and queer theory, I always imagined the KI as an objective place of truths, ones that I simply had to uncover. I believed that the KI “collect[ed], organize[d], and conserve[d]” the histories of transwomen. I failed to fully recognize the subjective nature of archives generally, how they are constructed and fallible, as are all spaces of knowledge production. Failing to recognize the KI as constructed and subjective would affect the story I would eventually tell based on my findings, and would prevent me from recognizing the memories that had been annihilated. Because archives “preserve the records of the past,” they also “embod[ys] the promise of the present to the future.” Rather than looking to the archive as the keeper of secrets, of a single transvestite or transsexual past, I instead intended to examine how its complexity creates opportunities for multiple trans* narratives, both then and now.

In *Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault offers a broader understanding of the “archive,” one which extends beyond material objects. According to Foucault, discourse is also an archive, one that is comprised of historical statements. The archive of a culture is “a general system of the formation and transformation of statements” into what comes be known as “history.” Rather than examining historical artifacts and attempting to figure out what they were “really” saying, Foucault would insist that we instead seek out what made that particular statement possible. In other words, the task is to piece together the historical context from which a particular statement emerged. Once scholars examine Foucault’s archive, they are obliged to recognize multiples histories and knowledges—histories that are contingent upon particular contexts. Using Foucault, I was free to seek out the multiple stories and knowledges of transvestites and transsexuals in the KI archives. Thinking through a Foucauldian framework, I could engage not only the institutionalization of the archive, but also understand the emergence of statements and discourses about transvestism and transsexualism within their particular historical context.

Finally, Sara Ahmed further complicates the “archive” by acknowledging both contact and emotions. She offers a definition of the archive as an “effect of multiple forms of contact.” This contact is inextricable from emotions, and our emotions shape our experiences. Following Ahmed, attending to my emotions is necessary to explore how I am shaped by my experience in the archives, because “emotions work to shape the ‘surfaces’ of individual and collective bodies . . . [and] bodies take the shape of the very contact they have with objects and others.” Attending to our emotions, she continues, “might show us how all actions are reactions, in the
sense that what we do is shaped by the contact we have with others.” I am shaped by my engagement and contact with the archive, the artifacts, the archivists, and by every person and object I come into contact with, which in turn shapes my position as a researcher as well as the products of my research, particularly because I am personally invested in the cultural archive of trans* communities. A recognition of my personal investment and of how I am shaped by my experience as a trans* person falls in line with the ways in which Ahmed hopes for us to complicate and reframe “the archive.”

Bringing Derrida, Foucault, and Ahmed together provides a framework for understanding the multiple levels of “the archive.” Rethinking the archive allows me to consider both historical context and discourses as archival material; it also allows me to place as much emphasis on context and discourse as I would on artifacts from institutional archives. The Derridian approach emphasizes the negotiation between the archive drive and the death drive in institutionalized archives. Foucault’s concerns move beyond the material objects that are collected, and instead focus on how these objects and our encounters with them create conditions of emergence for new artifacts, statements, and discourses. Ahmed provides space for an affectual account of how the experience in the archive moves me to understand myself not only in relation to terms, individuals, and discourses, but in relation to understanding my commitment to being self-reflexive throughout the research process. Accounting for affect allows me to explore how emotions are always already present in other accounts or experience, even when they are not named. Approaching the Kinsey archives with these approaches and theorists in mind creates space to engage the archive proper, as well as the historical contexts in which this archive and its contents emerged. This approach also allows me as a scholar to provide legitimacy to trans* narratives that do not necessarily fit the “official” historical records—narratives that challenge the dominant historical understandings of what it meant to be a legitimate “transsexual” or “transvestite.”

With this complicated understanding of archival research in mind, I prepared for my trip to the KI. Prior to my visit, I read about other scholars’ experience conducting research in archives nationwide. Having their stories to ground my work gave me the insight I needed to see beyond the KI as an infallible space holding “Truths” with a capital T. Despite this preparation, I was anxious about confronting a history that I felt so personally connected to. How might this trip alter my own memories of the history of transvestites and transsexuals? How might my own
personal “archive drive” recuperate stories of trans* individuals, and how might this influence, even in small ways, institutional gender narratives? I am committed to expanding the available narratives of transvestites and transsexuals beyond a linear “born in the wrong body” narrative. Many trans* people, even today, are coerced into telling a very linear narrative to claim a medically legitimized trans* identity, a narrative about “being born in the wrong body” and “having always felt this way.” While this narrative is true for some, for many it is not. Yet it continues to influence how trans* people understand themselves, and what doctors expect to hear from those seeking medical intervention. Virginia Prince, one of the best-known transvestites of the mid to late twentieth century, critiqued this formulaic narrative as early as the late 1970s, arguing that it was often provided to doctors based on the hope that if it worked for one person, it might work for another. This dominant trans* narrative continues to be not only a dominant image, but a “dominating image, describing the parameters within which” trans* people are “measured and declared to be, or not to be,” legitimately trans*. I wanted to move away from this dominating image. But what if the historical record preserved in the KI only reified this dominant narrative? What if these were the only stories I could find?

Serendipity in the Archive: Finding Multiple Narratives

I began my research hoping to discover and understand how transwomen in the early twentieth century personally understood their trans* identities, as opposed to how they were defined by the medical establishment. As I searched through the finding guides during my first morning at the KI, I wanted to focus on the folders and boxes that contained correspondence; I wanted to read letters between patients and doctors, but I was primarily interested in letters transwomen wrote to each other. I was curious about the truths that were created between transwomen, rather than under the watchful and authoritative eyes of the sexologists. I requested twenty-six folders from the Harry Benjamin and Louise Lawrence Collections and began reading and taking notes. In the reading room at the KI, I touched and held letters by transwomen I had read about for years: Christine Jorgensen, Virginia Prince, and Louise Lawrence. I also held and read letters from Harry Benjamin to these women, and their responses to him. I felt the awe that often occurs when researchers sit among and interact with the artifacts they had only read about in other scholars’ works. It
was an intimate and humbling experience to be among the papers of the women and doctors who pioneered identities and medical procedures that I have a deep connection with today as a transperson. While the correspondence I read was interesting and somewhat relevant to my research questions, I was more drawn to the autobiographical writing of transvestites and transsexuals. Both the Harry Benjamin and the Louise Lawrence Collections had entire folders dedicated to autobiographical writings. As I read through the autobiographies, I saw that some were labeled as “transsexual” and others as “transvestite.” My interest was piqued. Some of the individuals’ writing and self-definitions did not align with the sexologists’ (specifically Harry Benjamin’s) understandings of transvestites and transsexuals. The transwomen had unique and often conflicting understandings of who “counted” as a transvestite or a transsexual. For the sexologists of the 1950s and 1960s, the desire for genital surgery or the desire to live full-time as a woman were the defining factors for diagnosing an individual with “transsexualism” rather than “transvestism.” Yet many individuals who self-identified as transsexuals did not want surgery, and many transvestites expressed a desire to live full-time as women. Virginia Prince, a well-known transvestite during the time, believed that it was “perfectly possible to . . . be a woman without having sex surgery.”

The 1940s to the 1970s were formative years for defining transvestism and transsexualism as categories of diagnosis. Despite the sexologists’ attempts to make clear and distinct definitions, transvestite and transsexual terminology is difficult to parse out. However, with the 1966 publication of The Transsexual Phenomenon, Benjamin articulated a distinction between the two terms. As a result, sexologists came to understand transvestism as a “rather frequent occurrence” and a transvestite as a man wanting to cross-dress, or don the attire normally associated with women. A transsexual was defined as a male or female who “is deeply unhappy as a member of the sex (or gender) to which he or she was assigned,” and who has the desire to physically alter their body through surgery and the use of hormones. Among transwomen, however, the definitions of transvestism and transsexualism continued to vary greatly. At times, transvestite was used as an umbrella term, and transsexualism was considered an “extreme or rare form of transvestism.” By contrast, some sexologists believed that the term transvestite was inadequate to describe those who desired to change their sex. Many of the writings labeled transvestite in the KI archives could have easily been labeled transsexual and vice-versa. While at first I found this to be a curious side-note,
the question of naming and diagnosing emerged as a more relevant and pressing issue as I read through the materials.

The conflicting definitions of transvestism and transsexualism in the writings by transwomen provide insight into the imprecision of medical diagnoses. As these inconsistencies became more apparent, I began to explore the varied definitions of these terms. One self-identified transvestite believed that “with the right kind of man I could let myself sink completely into the feminine role and make for such a man the kind of adoring, understanding, helpful ‘wife’ that all men dream of having.” She was anxious that this would implicate her as a “latent homosexual” for thinking or expressing these desires, but she longed to dress in a bridal gown and live her life as a woman. According to sexologists, their understanding of transvestites indicated that these individuals only desired to cross-dress, not to be women or be consistently feminine. This individual expressed no interest in accessing medical care in relation to the desire to be feminine, but the desire to be “completely” feminine contradicts the sexologists’ distinctions between “transvestite” and “transsexual,” where (at most) transvestites may be “accepted as women” but whose true “gender feeling” was masculine. Transwoman Edythe Ferguson argued that “the so-called ‘normal’ transvestist knows full well that he is a man but feels sorry that he has to be one and would be a lot happier were he a woman.” Again, this explicitly contradicts general sexological understandings in the 1960s of the distinction between transvestites and transsexuals. What narratives were denied? What details of people’s stories were cast aside as unimportant because they did not fit? The creation of transvestism and transsexualism as clear and distinct diagnoses denied the complexity of trans* experience then, and the lingering effect of these diagnoses continues to deny this complexity to this day.

Even though American sexologists strove for a clear delineation between transvestism and transsexualism, the inconsistency in classification during the 1950s and ’60s undermined this goal, as the stories many women told and the emotions they expressed were all incredibly similar across classification. Stories by individuals labeled as “transvestite” or “transsexual” are difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish from one another. Louise Lawrence, for example, highlighted the inconsistency with which these terms were used. Responding to an ad in a magazine using the term “transvestite” she exposed the ambiguity of the terminology when she asked, “Do you refer to a male who adores female clothing or to a male who lives completely as a female? There seem to be so many different interpretations of what a ‘true’ or ‘genuine’ transvestite
Another autobiography provides the story of an individual who desired gender-affirming surgery. She revealed that “I don’t think there is anything that I want more than to be a woman.” Despite her desire for surgery, sexologists labeled this particular person a transvestite because of her association with other transvestites.

One folder from the Harry Benjamin Collection, called “Transvestites & Transsexuals Biographies and Autobiographies,” contained seven documents ranging in length from two to fifty-six pages or consisted of letters written to sexologists in which individuals shared their life stories. Of these seven, only one autobiography was labeled “transvestite,” but when I compared each of these narratives I was surprised to find that each individual’s story contained similar identity-shaping desires. Each narrative contained at least one mention of: (1) the individual dressing in women’s or girl’s clothing at a young age, (2) either heterosexual desire or the outright, definitive affirmation that they were not homosexual, and (3) a recognition of their male body (sex) with a persistent desire to be feminine or female. Although the narratives varied in the specifics, the sexological distinctions between transvestism and transsexualism could not be easily applied to these individuals. Most of these transwomen possessed characteristics found in various iterations of both transvestite and transsexual diagnoses.

My original goal in the archive was to locate letters that would provide insight into how trans* people identified in ways that challenged sexologists’ understandings of trans* desire and identity, but new questions began to shape the direction of my research. I was pulled in unexpected directions once I found the numerous autobiographical writings. I had never thought to question how these individuals discussed and used terminology; now it was one of my central concerns. The documents and discussions preserved in the archive shaped the histories I knew, but I began to recognize some of the gaps. I became interested in the social, political, and cultural context that allowed for the emergence of “transsexual” and “transvestite” as categories of diagnosis and identification.

To pursue these interests, it was crucial that I use the discourses circulating during that time as an archive, and explore how these discourses inform our present understanding of transsexualism and transvestism. I began looking for the ways in which doctors distinguished these two terms, and to ask if this delineation differed from those of the individuals who claimed these identities, and also what these distinctions might
tell me about cultural understandings of race, gender, and sexuality more broadly. What were the sociopolitical investments of the sexologists who defined and created these terms? Many well-known sexologists were also heavily involved in the eugenics movement. How did eugenic ideology influence their understandings and definitions of transvestism and transsexualism? These questions led me to reflect on my own identity. Why do I choose the term transsexual? How could I, following Ahmed, attend to my contact with the archival materials and the affective experience resulting from that contact? Why is my experience as a white, middle-class, transmasculine individual seemingly separate and distinct from those who identify as cross-dressers? Why do our identities so often keep us in different political and activist circles when many of our goals are the same? What caused this schism that arose out of a history where the two communities overlapped during Prince's time, when publications were aimed at both the transvestite and the transsexual communities (e.g., TV/TS Tapestry)? Has the term transgender furthered this separation? What are the racial and class implications of this terminology? Where do I fit into these histories?

While claiming a trans* identity is affirming for me in many ways, through this research I have begun to understand more thoroughly how this claiming also subjects me to commodification and regulation. For example, the diagnosis of “transsexual,” developed during the time of Jorgensen and the other transwomen I am researching, attaches itself to me and shapes how I understand my body and my identity. The diagnosis continues to influence medical professionals and what they consider to be a “legitimate” trans* narrative. A desire to “be a man,” and for some a “heterosexual man,” along with a desire to medically alter my body is required to access medical intervention. An explanation of my identity is already contingent on an explanation of how “trans*” is different than “gay” or of the distinction between sex and gender. I want to reject the effort of doctors to attach a particular set of understandings onto my body and my identity—the same doctors who attach a diagnosis to me while simultaneously conferring normalcy onto other bodies. I am constantly battling both socially and politically to distinguish myself from a pathologized identity, refusing the diagnosis of “transsexualism” at the doctor’s office. Yet, as much as I refuse this attachment, I am always already attached in certain ways to its history. How is my story adding to the archive of trans* history? In reference to Derrida, is my story both radical and traditional? Regardless of the answers, I am part of the
archive. This is apparent in the connections I find with the women I read about in the KI, and apparent in the ways that their histories inform my present context.

Creating My Own Archive and Looking to the Future

In the archives, scholars can find both the stories and voices to produce narratives, as well as the silences and absences that inform how those narratives are shaped. Sometimes, the gaps and silences are even more telling than the material objects preserved. My goal as a queer researcher in any archive is to interrogate whose voices are privileged and whose voices are left out. I want to fight the death drive, the urge to forget and annihilate the complexity of our histories. I am interested not only in challenging the “truths” told about our histories but also in offering an understanding of how individuals claim trans identities today as a result of these histories.

The production of transvestite and transsexual identities is largely told through the lens of the medical field, and thus focuses on causes, cures, and pathologies of gender in relation to these individuals. Alfred Kinsey believed that he and his contemporaries were “the recorders and reporters of facts—not the judges of behaviors we describe.” In part because of their commitment to honoring Kinsey and the other sexologists, the archivists at the KI do not explicitly interrogate these terms and their application, nor do they explicitly critique or question the categorization of individuals within the archival organization—or if and when they do, the archival processes do not provide space for them to communicate these interrogations. While I recognize the limitations for archivists in creating finding guides or organizing an overwhelming amount of documentation, these silences shape how researchers create counterhistories or find the ruptures within dominant histories. What is collected and conserved never represents the whole story, and what is missing also informs how we remember the previous generations of trans* pioneers.

The silences around the development of transvestism and transsexualism as diagnostic categories affect the evolution of these terms, especially when the very people whose lives these histories influence have little to no access to documents that have been, and continue to be, incredibly influential both inside and outside of the academy.

After revisiting my notes from the KI and trying to create narratives from my research, I realized that not only would I need to return to the KI, I would need to visit several other archives and use different pri-
mary and secondary sources than I had originally planned. In particular, I would need to continue expanding my understanding of the “archive” by including historical contexts, discourses, and silences that exist both inside and outside of institutions. I hope to supplement my research from the KI by examining the discourses of gender, psychoanalysis, eugenics, and politics during the mid-twentieth century. As I mentioned above, many twentieth-century sexologists also supported eugenics, and I believe this influenced their ideas about race, gender, and genetics. Conducting research at other archives will help me complicate the historical narratives by and about trans* individuals at the KI.\(^5\) Recognizing the limitations of the KI was a transformative moment in my research, and I know that expanding my understanding of the archive, using Derrida, Foucault, and Ahmed, will allow me to interrogate the emergence of these terms in relation to not only the documents found in institutional archives, but also to the larger sociopolitical context in which they emerged.

As I expand the context of my research, I will explore how these diagnoses and the community formations that followed their emergence shifted over time. Early community formations affect us today in terms of how trans* activists organize and who we consider “community.” Even though trans* people have historically faced tremendous obstacles in finding sympathetic doctors and family members (many of these obstacles still exist today), the commitment to a politics of justice and affirmation speaks volumes for where we are headed. While not every trans* person identifies as queer, a particular kind of queerness can be found in doing archival research that seeks to do justice to historically oppressed groups, particularly in the interest of Spade’s call for a critical trans* politics. Ahmed reminds us that “the hope of queer” is found in how bodies, memories, and interactions are reshaped, and that this reshaping “can ‘impress’ differently upon the surfaces of social space.”\(^5\) This reshaping creates possibilities not only for new social forms, but also for how we understand our embodiment and memory, as well as how we conceive of ourselves as trans* people and allies. If we attend to these forms of reshaping in relation to how we create and engage with history, we will be able to explore in new ways where we have been and how we got to where we are today, and also to assess what might be the best way to move forward in queer, radical, and affirming ways.

As a transfeminist researcher in the archive, I have a personal investment in how the terminology used to diagnose trans* people developed. These narratives and histories affect current material and metaphysical realities for trans* people. I feel a responsibility to do justice to
those whose lives are institutionalized in this archive, and to challenge
the dominant narratives that have emerged from these documents to
fight against the death drive that results in our community’s erasure. I
am responsible to trans* histories and am committed to recognizing my
own subjectivity as part of my feminist praxis and scholarship. Moving
forward, I must attend to the multiple narratives within trans* studies
and the knowledge production that has, at times, resulted in the dele-
itigimation of individuals’ experiences. An engagement with Derrida’s,
Foucault’s, and Ahmed’s refiguring of the “archive” provides a refresh-
ing approach to archival research, one that far exceeds any institutional
and emotional walls. This approach also allows and even encourages
researchers to embrace “queer feelings” and “embrace a sense of discom-
fort . . . along with an excitement in the face of uncertainty of where the
discomfort may take us.” A commitment to this approach will allow me
to seek out new truths in our histories and to recognize how knowledge
production over the past fifty years shapes not only how we approach
the archive now, but fundamentally informs how we create more just,
inclusive, and affirming knowledges about trans*-identified people in our
current historical moment.

Notes

1952.
2. See Emily Skidmore, “Constructing the ‘Good Transsexual’: Christine
Jorgensen, Whiteness, and Heteronormativity in the Mid-Twentieth-Century
3. The symbol “*” following the word “trans” is used to indicate the mul-
tiple ways to inhabit and declare an embodiment, expression, or identity attached
to the prefix “trans,” such as transman, transwoman, transmasculine, transgender,
transsexual, and transfeminine.
4. Susan Stryker, “(De)Subjugated Knowledges: An Introduction to
Transgender Studies,” in The Transgender Studies Reader, eds. Susan Stryker and
5. Matt Richardson and Leisa Meyer, “Introduction,” “Special Issue: Race
and Transgender Studies,” Feminist Studies 37, no. 2 (Summer 2011): 247.
6. Ibid., 247.
7. I use the term transvestite here because it is the term most widely used
in the archives by both researchers and individuals who self-identified as such. It
is important to recognize that this term is now largely understood as a negative
Interrogating Trans* Identity in the Archives

While some still claim and use this term in an affirming way, it is largely used today as a derogatory word that very few people in the trans* community use with any frequency outside of academic settings.


9. Archive Collections List, in *The Kinsey Institute Library & Special Collections*, ed. the Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender, and Reproduction (Bloomington: Indiana University, 2012). The information provided online is limited partly due to the KI’s commitment to confidentiality. Many of the materials reveal the identities of transvestite and transsexual individuals, and the KI is committed to protecting these identities, especially in light of the fact that trans identity of any kind is still highly pathologized even today. The archive collections are divided into three groups: Fifty-six collections are grouped under the heading “Homosexuality, Polyamory, Transgender, Asia Sexuality & Erotica collections,” twenty-three under “Sex Researchers” collections, and 27 under the heading of “Sex Educators’ & Sex Organizations’ collections.”


11. The Louise Lawrence Collection consists of eight boxes containing 106 folders.

12. By the late 1940s, Kinsey had created a categorical distinction between homosexuality and transvestism, see: Kinsey to Lawrence, 10 October 1949, folder: Alfred C. Kinsey, Lawrence Collection. These distinctions would later be codified in Harry Benjamin’s famous text *The Transsexual Phenomenon*. The two worked closely together, as evidenced, in part, through their correspondence. See: Correspondence Folder, in the Christine Jorgensen Folder (Kinsey Correspondence: Kinsey Institute).


14. Louise Lawrence sent ephemera and correspondence to the collection at the KI until her death in 1976.

15. Meyerowitz, “Sex Research at the Borders.” According to Meyerowitz, Kinsey was never fully able to support the desire to alter one’s genitals, despite his incredible openness in most other areas of sex, gender, and sexuality.

16. Transvestites & Transsexuals Biographies and Autobiographies, in the Harry Benjamin Collection (Kinsey Institute).

17. Edythe Ferguson, Lectures on Legitimate Female Impersonation, in the Edythe Ferguson Collection (Kinsey Institute, 1956). Ms. Ferguson provided at least 162 lectures that the KI has record of. Some examples: “Poise; Basic Stance
or Position” and “Curves! Proportion! Balance! Charm! Beauty!,” among others. Many were also focused on vocal training for transfeminine individuals.

18. Some of the letters from Marilynne were written to a person using the pseudonym Muriel, and this person is believed to be Virginia Prince, one of the most famous transvestites of the twentieth century.


21. Ibid., 12.


26. Ibid., 1, 4.

27. In line with Ahmed’s assertions about contact and emotion, scholar Ann Cvetkovich discusses cultural traces. She argues that (counter)publics are “hard to archive because they are lived experiences, and the cultural traces they leave are frequently inadequate to the task of documentation.” Cultural traces, emotion, and affect are difficult to document, and too often, these things are dismissed as important aspects of academic work. See Ann Cvetkovich, An Archive of Feelings: Trauma, Sexuality, and Lesbian Public Cultures, Series Q (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003), 9.

28. Foucault’s project of history is distinctly different from his project of archaeology. What I am referencing here would fall more in line with “archaeology” than with what Foucault names as “the history of ideas.”


30. Virginia Prince, “Transsexuals and Pseudotranssexuals,” Archives of Sexual Behavior 7, no. 4 (1978): 264. Prince’s views on gender affirmation surgery were controversial, but her resistance to the hegemonic views of the medical establishment were consistent and well articulated.


32. Many of the doctors working with transwomen acted as “border guards,” individuals who wielded their power over trans*-identified individuals in sometimes exploitative ways. While several doctors were sympathetic (namely Harry Benjamin), the relationships between patients and doctors were often fraught with anxiety and desperation. Benjamin, the most sympathetic doctor during this time
period, helped many patients access medical care. However, these patients still had to construct particular and convincing narratives of trans* experience to convince any doctor that they needed affirming medical care. I hoped that searching the archive for evidence of these contentious relationships would provide me with evidence to construct a narrative about these women’s experience.

33. I was not allowed to copy or take pictures of any personal correspondence, for reasons of confidentiality.

34. Transvestites & Transsexuals Biographies and Autobiographies, in Harry Benjamin Collection (Kinsey Institute). Several folders contain autobiographical stories in the Louise Lawrence Collection.

35. Sexologists varied in their understanding of the specifics of transvestism and transsexualism. In *The Transsexual Phenomenon*, Benjamin outlined three stages of transvestism, ranging from “Pseudo-transvestite” to “High Intensity True Transsexual.” While his explanation of these stages allows for overlap between transvestism and transsexualism regarding medical intervention (hormones, specifically) and the desire to be a woman full time, the most common distinction made between transvestites and transsexuals during this time was based on the notion that transvestites “request[,] nothing from the medical profession” and transsexuals “want to undergo corrective surgery, a so-called ‘conversion operation,’ so that their bodies would at least resemble those of the sex to which they feel they belong and to which they ardently want to belong.” This distinction became so prevalent that Richard Green and John Money’s book *Transsexualism and Sex Reassignment*, published just three years after Benjamin’s book, focused solely on transsexualism and medical intervention. See Harry Benjamin, *The Transsexual Phenomenon* (New York: Julian Press, 1966), 22, 13; Richard Green and John Money, *Transsexualism and Sex Reassignment* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969).

36. Virginia Prince is one example of a person who later in life pursued some body-affirming modifications but never identified as a transsexual. She instead self-identified as a transvestite or a *femmiphile* (a term she preferred to transvestite), and lived full-time as a woman. See Dave King and Richard Ekins, “Pioneers of Transgendering: The Life and Work of Virginia Prince,” in GENDYS 2000, The Fourth International Gender Dysphoria Conference (Manchester, U.K.: 2000).


38. Benjamin, *The Transsexual Phenomenon*, 11. This definition is almost exclusively used to diagnose men; women wearing men’s clothing does not carry the same pathologization.

39. Ibid., 11.


42. Correspondence, Rita to Marilyn, in Gottlober Collection (Kinsey Institute, 1952). Emphasis in original.


45. Correspondence, Louise Lawrence to La Plume, in Louise Lawrence Collection (Kinsey Institute, 1967).

46. John Vogellus (Gail), Autobiography, in Harry Benjamin Collection (Kinsey Institute), 7.


48. Michel Foucault, Archaeology of Knowledge, 130.

49. I am particularly interested in the intersection of the sexologists’ commitment to eugenics, as well as their investments in psychoanalysis, gender binaries, and racial purification and how these investments affect the development of their terminology for gendered inversion, deviance, and perversion.

50. The Kinsey Institute, Library & Special Collections, the Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender, and Reproduction.

51. Several archives hold promise for this project, such as the Transgender Collection at Yale University Library, the National Transgender Library and Archives at the University of Michigan, the Transgender Foundation of America’s archive in Houston, Texas, and the Transgender Archives at the University of Victoria in Vancouver, British Columbia.


53. Ibid., 155.
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