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ABSTRACT
This essay examines the haunted relationality of ethnographic archives and anthropology, and the potential for multimodal installations to highlight these tensions while bringing anthropology toward new audiences and new types of collaborations. We argue that experimental ethnographic installations can be used to foreground complex relations among fieldwork, archives, re/dislocation, and aspiration, through nonlinear forms of argumentation and engagement. The particular cases considered are as follows: (1) Vidali’s corpus of material collected in Zambia (1986–90) and (2) Phillips and Vidali’s remixed and relocated “radio program” based on these materials and installed as a multisensorial, multimodal ethnographic exhibition in Washington, DC, Paris, and London.
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Introduction

The problem of the ethnographic archive is a problem of anthropological modes of being. Both archives and anthropology are inherently about relations, responsibilities, voices, bodies, legacies, and publics. In this article, we highlight the haunted relationality and dislocations/relocations of ethnographic archives and anthropology. We leverage M. M. Bakhtin’s (1981) theory of centripetal and centrifugal forces to dissect and lay bare the forces that impinge on archive-making and archive-imagining. Such forces reverberate through our two overlapping projects. These projects are as follows: (1) Vidali’s corpus of audio-recorded material in the Bemba language, collected during fieldwork in Zambia (1986–90); and (2) Phillips and Vidali’s remixed and relocated Bemba-language “radio program” based on original fieldwork materials, produced and installed as a multimodal ethnographic exhibit. Through the following narrative exposé about these projects, we argue that the body of “the archive” is never fixed or bounded; it is permanently in process of creation and dispersal with agency and materiality that simultaneously pull toward a centralized coherence and a decentered diversity. We introduce the term multi-inhabited to highlight how archives, like anthropological projects, are deeply resonant and vibrant. They are never single-voiced or single-bodied. And they are often haunted.

Joining the growing field of multimodal anthropology (Collins, Durington, and Gill 2017; Dattatreyan and Marrero-Guillamón 2019), we explain how creative ethnographic installations can work to foreground these complex relations, through nonlinear forms of argumentation and engagement. The ethnographic installation itself invites further possibilities for building and re/dislocating the archive through the bodies, voices, memories, and tactile engagements of installation visitors. Below, we each write from our own perspectives as well as jointly, echoing the collaborative process and the experimental ethnographic products in the projects themselves.

An Aspirational Archive / A Defiant Archive / A Multi-inhabited Archive — Vidali

Many anthropologists have what might be called an “aspirational archive,” a collection of ethnographic material in various states from mild to moderate to severe disarray that is believed to be in need of better organization and preservation (Figure 1). Our usual approach is to embark on long-term ethnographic fieldwork and collect massive amounts of material. We are pack rats: busy accumulators with little training in materials...
management. We hoard files of fading notes, stacks of recordings in technologically obsolete formats, and ephemera such as personal letters, photographs, pamphlets, newspaper clippings, outdated currency, and government documents. After publishing from the primary research has tapered off, most anthropologists close off such material in boxes and files that sit untouched for years, even decades. As the time from past fieldwork to present disarray increases, a concern about what to do with this research material might be felt more urgently. Words and phrases like old, rare, unpublished, inactive, loss, aging anthropologist, and deceased speaker might also haunt the archive, or an aspiration toward one. At the same time, however, the reality is that “most anthropologists want neither to destroy their field material nor to archive it” in a rigorous way (Zeitlyn 2012, 471). Ambivalence and paradox plague the relationship.

The classical concept of the ethnographic archive is intimidating for most researchers. A singular repository, sealed off, protected, finitely categorized: a prison of sorts (Derrida 1995). This closed and organized status—even when imagined as such—defies the messy reality of collection, meaning, and relationality; the very things that shaped and continue to linger around the fact that an individual with opportunity, power, passion, relations, and biography (The Anthropologist) was able to take items into her possession. Indeed, the acquisitory nature of ethnographic inquiry is its own type of ghost, haunting collected material brought back from the field and pulling it toward both coherence and chaos.

Deploying Bakhtin’s concept of centripetal and centrifugal forces (1981), we propose viewing this tension as more than
a battle between order and chaos. There is a multidimensional pull of various forces. While the phenomenon under consideration for Bakhtin is human language, not ethnographic archives or fieldwork material, the concept of centralizing and decentralizing forces and drivers (sociopolitical, experiential, economic, ideological, psychological, material, and so on) provides a rich theoretical framework for understanding the living dynamism of things that live between an idea(l) of fixity and a multiplicity of other meaning-laden practices. Most human constructs are these kinds of “things” that are not things.

For Bakhtin, a linguist and literary critic, human language is a living “thing” that resides in the oscillation between official regimes of language standardization and normativity and the everyday realities of linguistic diversity (or sociolinguistic heteroglossia). The former (state discourse, grammar books, and the like) exert a centripetal pull on language as it lives a life, and the latter (professional registers, dialects, individual biography, gendered and generational differences, and more) exert a centrifugal pull. There are pulls inward and pulls outward. For “the archive,” understood as a building, as a corpus, and/or as a collection, there are ideals of normativity and order that pull inward toward fixity and organization. Crisscrossing these centripetal pulls, there is a field of other vectors going in various directions, with varying velocities, vibrations, agencies, wills, intents, memories, and so on. In this manner, the “body” of the archive is never fixed or bounded. The archival “body” is defiant even when the categories of cataloging look as if they control and fix meaning (Figure 2).

Our application of Bakhtin’s concept of centripetal and centrifugal forces differs from a widely used metaphor in archival studies that is also framed in terms of vectors: reading archives “against the grain” versus “along the grain.” Crucially, the two pairs of vectors—“centrifugal/centripetal” and “against/along the grain”—are neither identical nor incompatible. They are of different ontological orders. The former is about types of forces that impinge on the construal of “things” (e.g., archives or languages), while the latter is about types of approaches to reading archives. They are not directly mappable onto each other because dynamics of coherence and stability (centripetal forces) and unpredictability and variation (centrifugal forces) can be found when one reads archives both against and along the grain.

Different nonhuman forces in the archive can also be seen as reverberations of what Hennessy and Smith, following Bennett (2010), call “vibrant matter” (2018, 131). With any element in the archive, there are lingering and tugging resonances, echoes, hauntings, associations, traces, and the like. Just as language is “shot through with intentions and accents” (Bakhtin 1981, 293),
archives themselves carry reverberations of vibrant matter. While Hennessey and Smith focus on what they call the nonhuman agency of active forces and presences in the archive (the shifting materialities of smells, textures, color, shapes, containers, and so on), particularly when it comes to audio recordings, a myriad of human agentive forces are also present. For example, there is the agency of speakers whose voices are trapped on magnetized plastic. There is the agency of the collector and the relationality of collector and speaker. These reverberate through the recorded material, its case, its label, and its imagined state of being properly archived. There are what anthropologist Ann Stoler terms “systems of expectation” (2009) in connection to the human labor at all steps of material engagement. Because of these layered resonances and forms of agency, the archive is best understood as “multi-inhabited.” It is never single-voiced or single-bodied, even if it is limited to material from a single speaker or single typological category.

Release from Capture / Further Dimensions of Unruliness and Order ___ Vidali

What anthropologist Jean Jackson describes as the “unruly feelings about fieldnotes” that anthropologists have (1990, 9)
also applies to feelings about fieldwork collections more generally, whether they are archived or not. Ambivalence and paradox plague the relationship in great part due to the “liminal qualities of fieldnotes” as residing between worlds, between selves, and between words (Jackson 1990, 10). The same unsettled status is true of fieldwork collections. Archives, or aspirations toward them, lie in a liminal zone between memory and forgetting (Zeitlyn 2012, 485). As material created, captured, and/or separated from context by the fieldworker and brought back from the field, their status is perpetually between worlds, between selves. They are also charged with a certain form of power, one that, in a Foucauldian sense, is part of the disciplining of the discipline of Anthropology. While Jackson’s focus is mainly on psychological dimensions of liminality, not discipline or power, the comments of the anthropologists whom she interviewed are deeply revealing of these latter relations. Consider these remarks from two different interviewees:

Looking at them [fieldnotes], when I see this dirt, blood, and spit, it’s an external tangible sign of my legitimacy as an anthropologist.

Yes, the only physical stuff you have from fieldwork, it made you an anthropologist … and the only evidence was the stuff you brought back. (1990, 11)

This is an artificial and uncomfortable form of power. As such, we might say that the audacity of the anthropological project haunts the ethnographic archive. From a decolonizing perspective, the very act of collection is considered a potential violation and violence, one with a questionable legitimacy of appropriation, capture, extraction, and possession as well as a questionable authority to speak definitively about the objects captured (cf. Smith 2012). It is no surprise, then, that while fieldwork material indexes “the field” and some human authority of having been there, many ethnographers feel this indexical connection as “alienating and wrong” (Jackson 1990, 12). There is both the pride and burden of possession, as well as “ambivalent feelings about future value” (1990, 34). Says one interviewee:

I don’t know, I have moods of thinking I’d burn the whole lot before I die, and then moods of thinking that would be quite irresponsible, and then moods of thinking, “what makes you think they’re so important anyway?” (1990, 34)
For years, I have grappled with many of these questions and paradoxes regarding the fate and legitimate home of the over 150 hours of audio-recorded material from my work in Zambia. At the base of this has been the question of just **what type of archive was called for, who had interest and stakes in seeing it become a “thing,” and who had the energy and resources to create it.**

During the period 1986–90, I conducted anthropological and linguistic fieldwork in Zambia as a PhD student from the University of Chicago.\(^5\) Research focused on the Bemba language and the social and cultural impact of Zambian radio broadcasting, with an emphasis on radio culture, media publics, national identity, modernity, and Bemba radio genres. I conducted research at the state-run Zambia National Broadcasting Corporation (ZNBC) with radio broadcasters and media executives, and did research with radio listeners in Kasama, kwaChitimukulu, Kitwe, and Lusaka. Much of the material is in the Bemba language, including radio programs recorded through an old-school boom box as well as interviews and conversations with people in both urban and rural settings. I believe much of it is rare and valuable. The ZNBC had limited archiving capacity during the 1980s, and in the decades preceding. Reels of tape were in short supply and were routinely pulled from the sound library to be used to make new recordings. As such, many prerecorded programs had a very brief lifetime on tape. Furthermore, live programs such as newscasts were rarely recorded.

The journey in wanting to organize, preserve, and/or repatriate the material has occurred on several fronts and through different phases. I have reached out to the ZNBC, Zambian linguists, media professionals, and cultural heritage advocates who might have potential interest in the material. Some forays toward connection and collaboration have drifted into silent spaces; others are still ongoing but with no definitive plan to date. I have also wondered about how to locate the living descendants of people recorded on the tapes, and either give the material to them or ask what they would like me to do. Like Caplan, I have thought about archiving as a way of “giving back” (2010, 17). At every step, I have been thinking about the ethical dimensions of consent, respect, ownership, stewardship, legacy, and propriety. Lingering behind this has also been the more general disciplinary responsibility to make data available as a way of ethically and respectably honoring the investments made by individual people and communities, grant agencies, institutions, governments, and even me, in the success of the research (Zeityln 2012). In all of these ways, the “body” of the aspirational archive reads, and pulls, as a kind of vibrant matter in varying directions: past supporters, imagined future users and stewards, living descendants of speakers.
captured on tape, and doing right by anthropological and community ethics.

Significantly, there are a number of ways that the body of the archive has weight as an archive of a certain type. In the realm of language and communication studies, types of archives vary. They can be created and ordered as sociolinguistic archives, linguistic databases, archives of folklore/oral traditions, archives housed by the original media outlet (e.g., a radio station), or archives linked to a region, a culture, or an individual researcher’s housed collection.

For a short period (1999–2000), I explored the field of sociolinguistically oriented corpus linguistics as a model that preserved and honored the phenomenal diversity inherent in human speech. Around that time, I built an online comparative linguistics textbook/workbook (the Digital Polyglot), which had an extensive Bemba section and included some streaming audio excerpts from research material. In 2000, two Zambian colleagues, Dr. Alexander Raymond Makasa Kasonde and Mr. Fenson Mwape, and I sketched out an idea for a dynamic hub for materials, entitled the Multi-Media Bemba Language Archive (MMBLA). For a few months, we considered a purely linguistic community, and especially digitally minded linguists, as a community with whom material could be stored or linked, mainly because they were at the forefront of linguistic archiving work. While this was the beginning of something very interesting and important in 2000, it was ultimately not for us. It was not a sociolinguistically or culturally sensitive approach to linguistic archive building. It pulled toward decontextualization and disembodiment, in the service of maximal cross-linguistic commensurability and universal metadata categories. We held on to the MMBLA idea as a more vibrant and ethically engaged kind of hub for Bemba-language-based materials, but the effort lost momentum due to other professional demands on the three of us.

In 2014, a new momentum was sparked when Ben Kangwa, a former ZNBC broadcaster and then Zambian diplomat in Washington, DC, renewed our correspondence after a two-year lapse. The connection spurred me to again think about my materials and their future. After exploring ideas with the Emory University Center for Digital Scholarship, and with the help of Ben Kangwa, his family, other Zambian colleagues, and an undergraduate research assistant, I initiated the Bemba Online Project (https://scholarblogs.emory.edu/bemba/), a placeholder for an archive-yet-to-come and a hub for a variety of materials, including earlier work from the Digital Polyglot (Figure 3).

Following this, I returned to work with what is to me the most powerful part of the research collection: materials on one
of Zambia’s most famous radio personalities, David Yumba (1923–90). David Yumba was the creator and producer of the Bemba-language radio program *Kabusha Takolelwe Bowa*. The program’s title is a Bemba proverb meaning “The Person Who Inquires First, Is Not Poisoned by a Mushroom” or “The One Who Asks Questions, Never Goes Wrong.” In the program, Yumba provided advice and answers to listeners’ letters, as the letters were read out loud by the program cohost, Emelda Yumbe. Letter topics ranged across politics, society, family, and current events. The show ran for over 25 years on Radio Zambia and was one of the most popular radio programs in Zambian history, up to the time of Yumba’s death in 1990. David Yumba was completely unique; there is no comparison. If analogies need to be made, one might imagine a jovial, compassionate, brilliant, and devout hybrid of Michael Moore, Ralph Waldo “Petey” Greene Jr., Judge Judy, and Garrison
Keillor, tinged with a bit of a Dear Abby and Doctor Ruth personal advisory tone, all overlaid by a characteristically Bemba oratorical style of a razor-sharp griot and trickster. And this is where the collaboration with Kwame Phillips began as an effort to activate the archive and to produce a multimodal, nonlinear form of argumentation about it. In doing so, it necessarily also became a nonlinear, embodied form of ethnographic representation and argument about Zambian radio culture circa 1989.

**Remix as Artistic Intervention ____ Phillips**

So is this program all a thing of the past? Gone. Contained to a moment of Zambian history. Sealed in the Bemba language. What happens when the archived recordings are reactivated, spliced, and opened up to new questions? (Phillips and Vidali 2017)

Complicating the sentiment of the aspirational archive is the reality that “the archive is never finished” (Rizk 2018). Debra and I began speaking about ways to create something new from the digitized Bemba materials, to reshape the liminal zone between memory and forgetting, to upend the ideas of ownership, fixity, and control, and to push it toward the creation of new meanings. My immediate idea, as a multimedia and sound art scholar, was to “remix” the archive. If a myriad of human agentive forces impinge upon and pull apart the archives, I wanted that force to be us, explicitly. What better way for the body of the archive to come alive than to re-create and rebirth the radio program from the archived materials? In order to truly have the archive speak for itself, it should be made to speak for itself.

As stated above, *Kabusha Takolelwe Bowa* was a tremendously popular Radio Zambia talk show. The program’s format consisted of a dynamic activation of listeners’ letters by cohost Emelda Yumbe and dialogic commentary from the sagacious host, David Yumba, interspersed with religious music, sponsored ads, and banter between the two hosts. Eight recordings of the *Kabusha* radio program, from a total of 48 original recordings, were used as sources for the remix project. What resulted was a remixed, reinvented, and resurrected “radio program” emulating the format of the original program. Excerpts of Yumba’s answers from past programs were used to answer new questions scripted by Debra as coming from members of the Bemba Online Project team and “anonymous” letter writers about current Zambian and global politics. To “invent” answers to the “invented” letter writers, I took the digitized recordings and respective translated transcripts, and chopped up Yumba’s digitized voice in a digital...
audio workstation, sometimes in longer phrases, often in single words or utterances, and methodically stitched them together to create answers to the new questions.

Just as Debra scripted letters to emulate the typical letter writer’s style, I spliced and remixed “new” answers to emulate Yumba’s rhetorical style of providing sage advice. We recorded London-based Christine Matanga-Mukuka in November 2014 to read the scripted letters. Into the mix of these new letters and Yumba’s archived commentary, I added recordings of other elements that featured in previous Kabusha programs such as Christian hymns and advertisements by the program sponsor, Zambia National Commercial Bank. In addition, I included clips from programs and announcements that typically preceded and followed airings of Kabusha Takolelewe Bowa. This was done in order to give the sense that what was being heard in the remix was what you would hear if you tuned in to the original program itself. I then transferred this digital remix back onto an analogue audio cassette tape to further imitate the original archive material. The digitized became undigitized. The anarchived reached back into an archival form.

This became the Kabusha Radio Remix, operating as a digital hypertext to analogue ephemera. The remix troubles the analysis and the data, and the new possibilities that this creates are, in part, brought about by the idea of collisions. In a recent sound publication (Phillips and Vidali 2017), we discuss how the idea of collisions is brought to bear in the remix—as objects striking against each other, as two or more records being assigned the same identifier or location in memory, and as the energy-exchanging meeting of bodies where each exerts a force upon the other. Through the remix’s creation, the preserved sound of the digital form collides with the tenuous tactility of the analogue form. The imperfections of human memory interplay with the relative digital perfection of new media archives. Energetic exchanges occur between the aspirational fixity of the archive and the artistic unruliness of intervention.

This collisive intervention of the artist in archives is seen in other works such as Basma al Sharif’s video project, We Began by Measuring Distance, which uses archival footage from Palestine to create a video that weaves together still frames, text, language, and sound to respond to the filmmaker’s “frustration with history, facts and the impossibility to reconcile tragedy with [their] own experience of a lifetime of witnessing tragedy from a physical distance to Palestine” (Sharjah Art Foundation 2009). Heba Amin’s project, Speak2Tweet, is both a research project and a growing
archive of experimental films that utilizes archived voicemail messages, recorded on a platform called Speak2Tweet created after Egyptian authorities shut down the country’s international Internet access points in response to growing protests in January 2011 (Amin 2018).

In both these cases, collisions between history and memory connect embodied experiences with encoded data. The archive is thus not an end point—it is an extension and an exchange. Similarly, through the Kabusha remix project, beyond having an artistically remixed audiotape, we endeavored to artistically remix a place of media production and reception: a physical space where new listeners could sit down and hear the reactivated voice of David Yumba and come in some simulated proximity to his workspace. In this physical installation, visitors hear an audiotape on a cassette deck in a space that recalls what it might have been like to listen to the radio program during its original run, echoing 1980s Zambia and harkening back to an analogue past, thus remixing sound, time, people, and space. This project is titled Kabusha Radio Remix: Your Questions Answered by Pioneering Zambian Talk Show Host David Yumba (1923–1990), a multimedia interactive 3’ x 3’ x 2’ physical installation with 30 items and a 45’ audio loop (https://scholarblogs.emory.edu/bemba/kabusha-radio-remix/).

Breaking Open the Archive by Writing to “The Archive”

At the core of the remix project was the idea that old recordings of David Yumba providing advice would be used to answer new questions. Following the format of the original show, I composed eight letters addressed to the program. I used my corpus of original transcripts and archive of David Yumba’s scripts and listeners’ letters to create a set of letters that emulated the rhetorical styles and compositional elements found in real letters aired on the program when it was in existence. In four letters, the advisor is presented with “problems” typical of archive workers, and specific to the Bemba Online Project. In this way, I used the letters to infiltrate the archive and interrogate the process of archiving.

This move is analogous to the way that other artists have creatively engaged with archives to reveal or create new relations with material otherwise seen as static objects of the past. As Nimis (2015) shows in her close review of contemporary visual artists’ reappropriations of photographic archives from Africa, such work necessarily has complex and layered relations between elements of historical research, material preservation, ethnographic veracity, interpretation, elaboration,
creative license, and fabrication. In addition, the very intervention of artist as third party is a further element that may or may not be foregrounded within the reappropriated work itself. In our case with the Kabusha remix project, Kwame Phillips’s presence is relatively invisible; mine is not. Similar to the very heightened way that Dutch photographer Andrea Stultiens embeds her relationship with the Kaddu Wasswa archive through photographs of her hands holding the archival photographs (Nimis 2015; Stultiens, Wasswe, and Kisitu 2010), I created letters to the remixed radio program that directly show my presence and the presence of other members of the Bemba archive team. Two letters bear my signature and tell a story about my own relation to Yumba and the collected material. One letter is from an anonymous assistant on the project, and another is from the team as a whole (Figure 4). These four letters are used not just to infiltrate the archive, but to highlight the deep relationality and precarity of archive-making and imagining in a recursive and personal way. The affective tone of the original Kabusha radio program as a place for confessions, distress, and yearning for answers allows for this intimate connection.

The specific issues raised in the invented letters are the lack of professional reward for being an archivist in anthropology, headaches with IT people in archive creation, incomplete linguistic competency in archive management, and the political ramifications of supporting one language in a context of highly charged ethnolinguistic diversity (Figure 4). With the exception of the last topic, these were not themes on actual Kabusha radio programs. The other four letters in the remix project do echo themes frequently found on Kabusha programs: socioeconomic inequality, press freedom, the state and future of the nation, and the legitimacy of political leaders. All fabricated letters are similar in moral and emotional tone to letters that appeared on the original radio program. They express personal dilemmas or doubts, frustration about incompetency or corruption, outrage, bewilderment, philosophical bemusement, and deep respect for the advisor. Here, we share examples of two letters for a closer look.

Figure 4 shows an original typed letter and envelope fictionally sent to the program at the ZNBC mailing address. In the physical installation, this letter and envelope are in the inbox tray on the desk, along with numerous other letters. In the audio remix, it is the first letter read and answered on the program. Many elements in this fictional letter are verbatim utterances from conversations held with Bemba Online Project team members in May 2014. The phrase “One Zambia, One Nation” is the national motto and encapsulates the challenge of nation-building in the context of ethnolinguistic pluralism.

---

**FIG. 4** Letter from archive team. Photo by Debra Vidali. [This figure appears in color in the online issue.]
(Spitulnik 1998). The letter’s salutation, “Kuli Ba Mba na bBa Mbe” was a common form of address used in listeners’ letters to the Kabusha program. It literally means “To Honorific (Yu-) Mba and Honorific (Yu-)Mbe.” It builds on a popular nickname

May 6, 2014

Kuli Ba Mba na Ba Mbe,

An archive is an institutional record. It is also a way to preserve and transfer material. We are dedicated to this work. But we are worried. If we are spending all of our time to build up an archive of Bemba language materials, what’s to prevent people from judging us as tribalists? Will the project backfire? There are dozens of languages in Zambia. How do you create unity (“One Zambia, One Nation”) when you choose to support one language over all the others?

Thank you for your wisdom on these matters!

Bemba Archive team
Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia

FIG. 4
for the program’s hosts, a play on words that creatively elides the common first syllable of the two hosts’ surnames, Yu-.

Figure 5 illustrates how fabricated letters are incorporated in the remixed program. The letter harkens back to many of the themes of haunting, paradox, and unease that open this article. As with the original Kabusha show, the letter is activated by a letter reader, in this case Christine Makanga-Mukuka emulating the role of original cohost Emelda Yumbe. The letter is dynamically answered by the sampled voice of David Yumba, as if a real conversation is taking place. Yumba’s commentary continues for approximately four minutes beyond the excerpt shown in Figure 5. The full remix script/transcript, complete with the invented answers to these letters, is available online here: https://scholarblogs.emory.edu/bemba/files/2015/10/Kabusha-Transcript-Nov-28-2014-ET-Installation.pdf.

Ethnographic Installation as New Form of Archive Inhabitance ___ Phillips

Debra Vidali’s work with David Yumba as he went about his daily routines of program production, as well as her documentation of the everyday realities of Zambian radio culture (Spitulnik 2002), formed the basis for the initial working model of our physical installation. Together we brainstormed about the interactive ways in which visitors could inhabit the archive via the remix, as well as ways to deepen the ethnographic texture of the installation. The left side of the exhibit is designed as Yumba’s workspace, the center area is designed to house the remix technology, and the right side is designed as the radio listener’s context where a letter to the program might be written (Figure 6). The installation draws heavily on nostalgia: There are family photos, a photo of Yumba himself, copies of actual letters received by Yumba, a coffee cup, some writing materials, and the radio cassette player. Several items are manufactured archival elements, such as a calendar from 1989 and Zambian postage stamps created from web images of actual stamps. These elements harness the disparate meanings of “being David Yumba, a radio program host” and “being a Zambian radio listener,” circa 1989, together into one location as a fabricated “archive” experience. All sit on a table with our 27-page transcript of the remixed radio program and a set of headphones next to blank paper and envelopes, inviting new letter writers to write to the remixed radio program.

The project was first installed in 2014 in the Hierarchy Gallery, Washington, DC, in the Ethnographic Terminalia exhibition entitled, “Bureau of Memories: Archives and Ephemera,” guest curated by Thomas Miller in collaboration
with the Ethnographic Terminalia Collective. In 2016, the project was installed at Le Cube in Paris, France, at an exhibition curated by Anthropologies Numériques, Les Écrans de la Liberté, and Freie Universität (Berlin) Visual and Media Anthropology Program (Figures 7 and 8). In 2017, it was featured during the Sound of Memory Symposium held at Goldsmiths, University
In these various locations, further letters have been written by viewers/listeners who engage with the installation. With chairs, pens, paper, and objects to handle, the installation intentionally calls for engagement, beyond a singular visual observation. Edinger (2015) highlights the multisensorial aspects of such activation:

One of the great challenges for contemporary ethnographers and artists … is to re-awaken our tactile sense of the past, to create multi-sensorial spaces in which the stories of the past are told and retold, understood and comprehended anew through prisms of sound, scent, movement, and touch.

Collisions become reverberations, in both senses of the word, as resonances and as repercussions. Returning then to the Bakhtian-inspired model proposed above, of “the archive” as a “thing” existing at the intersection of centripetal and centrifugal forces, we can say the reverberations of memories...
and associations in this remix space both anchor and displace a sense of fixity of the radio program as part of a legitimate archive. As the installation is exhibited and also digitally hosted on the Bemba Online Project website and a Facebook page, new letters to Kabusha come in, so “the archive” grows. Significantly, the genre-based recognizability and productiveness of the radio show as a stable, canonical model with participatory letter writing means that its fixity demands its open-endedness. Letters are meant to (and should) always come in.

A necessary interdependence of centripetal and centrifugal forces also plays out through intertextual genre association. For listeners familiar with other radio programs or print media columns based on advice-seeking letter writers, memory works through intertextual activation: The body of the archive becomes connected to other instances of advice seeking, even ones in distant locations and other languages. Engaging our artistic interaction with the archive allows for yet another level of audience participation and production, through the prolongation and resonance that results from that engagement. Much of this is unpredictable and even intangible. As the Ethnographic Terminalia Curatorial Collective and Miller state, reimagining and repositioning archives as sites and concepts capable of producing and contesting historical memory “generate[s] significant blind spots, fuel[s] fantasies, and foster[s] tenuous and indeterminate indices to the past” (2015). Future iterations of the project may take an even fuller physical form such as a period room that mimics a Zambian middle-class home and operates as the installation space.

Analogous to how the body of a cassette tape is the corpus (and centripetal locus) for the remixed digitized material of a Bemba-language archive, we envision the body of a home extending the body of installation, to truly create a multifaceted archival arena that engages multisensorial experience in a multi-inhabited space. With a hand-drawn floor plan and old photographs from Debra, I reached out to a friend, Charles Marshall, design director at the Manhattan firm Parc Office, to design the space (Figure 9). The design echoes similar installations, such as Do Ho Suh’s Perfect Home II, a full-scale fabric sculpture made to look like “an ethereal apparition of a Chelsea apartment,” as well as the perfectly preserved Michael Graves postmodern 1970s/1980s apartment, both in the Brooklyn Museum (Budds 2018). Whereas Eugenie Tsai, senior curator of contemporary art at the Brooklyn Museum, argues that such installations encapsulate “a certain time,” our reimagined remix home space is one of release. It rejects boundedness. It resonates memory. It releases time.
The concept of the Remix Period Room connects to other similar immersive ethnographic installations that seek to alter the way audiences interact with ethnographic archives, and supports multi-inhabited engagement with archival bodies. One notable example is theater designer Luke Cantarella and anthropologist Christine Hegel’s project, 214 Sq. Ft., a mobile, full-scale, open-ended participatory re-creation of a motel room as inhabited by a fictional family of six. Images and narratives of motel life, appropriated from Pelosi’s 2010 documentary Homeless: The Motel Kids of Orange County, are embedded in the space through both analogue and digital media. Fragments of narratives are textually overlaid onto physical objects such as bedding, wallpaper, and food labels (Hegel, Cantarella, and Marcus 2019).

Another such work is Lydia Nakashima Degarrod’s Atlas of Dreams, an installation series of artistic maps and audio recordings of narrated dreams in San Francisco that merges ethnographic aspects of everyday life with the practices of art. The immersion is generated by having the audience listen to audio narratives as they view maps displayed on a wall. Influenced by Nicholas Bourriaud’s concept of relational aesthetics (2002), the artworks and their installation create a model for the audience to engage in the living world. Degarrod argues that the exhibits act as “forms of public ethnography, providing the audiences with sensorial and personal forms of understanding … in a social setting” (2017).
The immersed audience in relational art, envisaged as a community, changes the dynamic between viewer and object, and instead produces encounters between people. This coproduces embodied knowledge where meaning is elaborated collectively, rather than in the space of individual consumption. Visitors thus act more as research co-creators and participants than as readers of a text (Bourriaud 2002; Hartblay 2018). The materiality and immersive nature of our envisioned period room, rather than resolving or avoiding issues of temporal distance, appropriation, and loss, confronts them by altering the engagement of viewer and object. Further, this coproduction of embodied knowledge supports archival heteroglossia, by placing bodies within the “body” of the archive, dislocating and interrupting the centralizing and decentralizing forces that pull on the archive. The value of this mode of ethnography, as Hartblay (2018) maintains, is that “ethnographic installation” as both a part of the ethnographic process and a potential ethnographic output, “is generative as well as representational, and challenges ethnographers to think by doing … disrupting the typical epistemological mode characterized by a single ethnographer interpreting through the production of written text” (153). As a radical form of empiricism that defies textocentrism, “the aliveness of interactive engagement requires the touch, smell, sights, and sounds of physical, bodily contact free from the mediations of distance and detachment” (Madison 2012, as cited in Hartblay 2018, 176).

Conclusion ___ Vidali & Phillips

A Remix Period Room of this order is by no means an unmediated, simple mimetic space for simulated ethnographic immersion. Rather, it is a broader and more layered space for listener interaction and archive inhabitance: one that ultimately pushes the body of “the archive” outward to the edges of the lived experience of radio, not inward toward an ordered catalogue of digitized material. For us, both separately as individuals and together as collaborators, the driving interest in our projects has not been about fixing the body of the archive, but about making aspects of it more accessible, engaging, celebrated, and theorized.

The interactivity and layered recursivity of our projects heighten questions about what rightfully belongs in the archive and to the anthropologist. This is part of the intentional design. Questions of ownership are inherent in “the collection” and will never dissipate. These are only further amplified when the central body of the remix project is a brilliant, trickster-like advisor (David Yumba) and his accomplice (Emelda Yumbe) who themselves animate and remix voices of critique.
and distress on the centralized state-run airwaves. The lingering and even disorienting pulls of the vibrant matter (scratchy audio sounds, faded paper, family photo collages, hybrid language) in the physical installation foreground the unruliness of ethnographic archives. Haunted relationality, multiple agencies, and material resonances pull the archive toward both coherence and entropy. We have unpacked the impact of these processes on our own work and have discussed how creative ethnographic installations are one way of foregrounding these dynamic relations, through a nonlinear form of argumentation, experience, and engagement. In doing so, our project exemplifies new, multisensorial, multimodal directions within anthropology that seek to bring it toward new audiences and new types of collaborations, while directly engaging with its complex legacies.

Notes

1. Similarly, Stoler characterizes her approach to colonial archives as working to undo “the certainty that archives are stable ‘things’ with ready-made and neatly drawn boundaries” (2009, 51).

2. A few names for these vectors might be the acquisitory nature of ethnographic inquiry, the relationality of ethnographic work, the liminality of ethnographic work, and the political economy of knowledge production.

3. As Stoler explains, critical studies of colonial archives typically take an “against the grain” approach, seeking to restore greater agency to colonial subjects and to uncover how political and rhetorical distortions in official documents work to erase or condone colonial violence (2009, 46–50). By contrast, “along the grain” approaches focus on the archive as more mundane forms of information collection fundamental to “colonial statecraft” (2009, 50).

4. See Gordon (1997) and Stewart (2007) for extensive discussions of how hauntings, feelings of being unsettled, and/or the sensing of lingering and sometimes vague associations are important forms of sensuous knowledge and everyday subjectivity.

5. Vidali was affiliated with the University of Zambia, at the Institute for African Studies, now Institute of Economic and Social Research (INESOR). Her research was funded by the Social Science Research Council, the National Science Foundation, and Fulbright-Hays.

6. The Linguistic Data Consortium (LDC) and the Open Language Archives Community (OLAC) were the ones thinking about large, searchable, open-access collections and frameworks for linking those collections.

7. An original program script with original listeners’ letters appears in the home page banner of the Bemba Online Project (Figure 3).


9. The remix “transcript” in Figure 5 provides an English translation of David Yumba’s advising, so that visitors to the installation can more easily grasp the content of the program. As with the original program, David Yumba’s voice is in the Bemba language on the remix audio. Periodically, Yumba used English words and phrases within the flow of his commentary. These are characteristic of urban varieties of Bemba, and they are demarcated in the remix “transcript” with italics.
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