



King's Research Portal

Document Version

Version created as part of publication process; publisher's layout; not normally made publicly available

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Smithies, J. (2022). The Dark Side of DH. In J. O'Sullivan (Ed.), *Bloomsbury Handbook to the Digital Humanities* Bloomsbury Publishing.

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

The Dark Side of DH

JAMES SMITHIES (KING'S COLLEGE LONDON)

Despite being a relatively new field, Digital Humanities (DH) has an intellectual history with much the same richness as history, classics, or literary studies. This includes many positive elements related to epistemological and methodological growth, but it also (naturally enough) includes periods of disagreement and conflict. This is heightened by its association with contemporary issues of substantial importance to everyday life: digital tools and methods are loaded with cultural, ethical, and moral implications. During the late twentieth and early twenty-first-century, technology was viewed by many commentators as an existential threat to the humanities, resulting from the corrosive importation of instrumentalist thinking and hyper-rationalism into a world of emotion, aesthetics, and interpretative complexity. Such perspectives still exist today in various forms, although they have been quietened by the growing ubiquity of technology and enforced communion with digital tools.

It is reasonable to suggest that DH has become a floating signifier for these broader tensions between the core humanities disciplines and global digital culture (Gold and Klein 2016). As the leading digital practice in the humanities, DH often acts as a lightning rod for anxiety about not only the future of the humanities but the effect of digital capitalism on self and society. In 2013 these issues coalesced in discussion of “The Dark Side of DH” (Chun and Rhody 2014; Grusin 2014), establishing criticism of the field that has yet to be resolved. This chapter argues that it is important the dark side of DH continues to be explored, to ensure the field retains its intellectual edge and nurtures a tradition of criticism and critique. Encouraging dissenting opinion and honestly appraising the complexities a union of technology and the humanities creates needs to be as integral to DH as its technical tools and methods.

THE VALUE OF DISSENT

Disciplinary attitudes to criticism and critique are profoundly important. Modern humanities disciplines have evolved through processes of sometimes vigorous intellectual revolution and reaction, against internal as well as external dissent. The basic narrative is well-known. Giambattista Vico established the foundations of the (European) humanities in the seventeenth century in opposition to Cartesianism. Later, Vico was critiqued by Enlightenment thinkers such as Voltaire and Condorcet (Bod 2014, 174). The evolution of history from philosophy, English from history, and cultural studies from English all involved intellectual dispute alongside polite disagreement. Without intellectual dissent to sharpen its sense of identity and purpose DH will

remain an opaque practice, perhaps degrading into a service activity that exists only to serve more established humanities fields.

Openness to dissent is thus a prerequisite for the development of an intellectually mature field. I have suggested elsewhere that DH needs to search for “critical and methodological approaches to digital research in the humanities *grounded in the nature of computing technology and capable of guiding technical development as well as critical and historical analysis*” (Smithies 2017, 3; emphasis in original) but it is equally important to welcome differences of opinion. Humanities disciplines evolve through the controlled interplay of agreement and dissent, via implicitly and explicitly agreed rules governing rhetorical interaction (Wittgenstein 1958).

The related practices of criticism and critique are central to this process, the first subjecting publications to considered review, the second positioning them in their wider context and subjecting them to more robust epistemological consideration (Davis and Schleiffer 1991, 22–6). Works such as Pierre Bayle’s *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique* (1697) and Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781) established a rhetorical and epistemological playing field supporting the interplay of myriad opposing intellectual tendencies within and across disciplines, from mathematics to poetry, pure mathematics to applied mathematics, epic poetry to modern poetry and so on (Benhabib 1986). Criticism and critique are important intellectual and ideological mechanisms within a long-established system of knowledge production, one that encourages dissent from received opinion to ensure quality of thought. The writing discussed in this chapter, whether positive or negative in its attitude towards DH, contributes to that rich intellectual context and should be valued because of it.

THE DARK SIDE OF DH

The root of the current intellectual crisis in DH developed in the 1990s, amidst the first cyberutopian flourish of the World Wide Web. Anti-technological discourse, rooted in the twentieth-century criticism of figures such as Jacques Ellul (1964) and Herbert Mumford (1970), informed a backlash against the growth of electronic media and the Internet and culminated in full-throated rejections of Silicon Valley capitalism as a scourge that threatened the very foundations of culture and society.¹ Humanists and publishers felt “under siege” (Birkerts 1995, 5) by shadowy neoliberal forces determined to instrumentalize their world of “myths and references and shared assumptions” (Birkerts 1995, 18). In its guise as Humanities Computing—viewed as an unthreatening backroom activity for technical boffins by some people—DH largely avoided this criticism. Slowly, however, as it grew in popularity and started to attract research funding and media attention, critics began to question DH’s purpose and conceptual basis, and the motivations of its practitioners and administrative supporters.

Criticism increased after DH was positioned as a key field by the American National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) in 2006. Interest increased amongst policymakers and institutions at the same time as support for established humanities disciplines waned, resulting in declining budgets and successive rounds of redundancies. It seemed obvious to many commentators that digital technology was little more than a Trojan horse enabling the hollowing out of intellectual culture and the dumbing down of society by technocratic administrators (Bauerlein 2008; Golumbia 2009).

These arguments culminated in a series of debates following the 2011 Modern Language Association (MLA) meeting. The conference had experienced efflorescent growth of digital literary

studies papers confidently proclaiming the emergence of new methods of computational and cultural analysis, with discussion broadcast on Twitter (which was in the process of being adopted, and heavily criticized, across academia). Despite not attending the conference, literary and legal scholar Stanley Fish took the opportunity to excoriate digital humanities in a series of opinion pieces in the *New York Times*, claiming they naively applied digital methods to texts in a way that had little place “for the likes of me and for the kind of criticism I practice” (Fish 2011, 2012a, 2012b). Fish was met with robust rejoinders from an aggrieved DH community² who believed he had misrepresented the nature and intent of the field and wrongly tarred it with allegiances to corporate forces in the higher education sector (Ramsay 2012). The debate was many faceted and an interesting example of the intellectual disruption that resulted from the introduction of technology to higher education.

A close reading of the many statements and rejoinders to DH in this period is needed, but outside the scope of this chapter. For our purposes it is enough to note that the debate was highly productive, especially when researchers with experience of commercial software programming and digital media studies became involved. Their awareness of the quotidian realities of software engineering and maintenance, and the complex relationships between digital technology, the labor market, and capitalist economics, forced the DH community to confront potentially negative sides to their activities. The conversation gained focus at the 2013 MLA, in a roundtable talk titled “The Dark Side of Digital Humanities” by Richard Grusin, Wendy Hui Kyong Chun, Patrick Jagoda, and Rita Raley. The event was held in a packed room in Boston and generated significant comment on Twitter and the blogosphere. Their stated goal was to explore whether DH was implicated in the neoliberal logic of the American higher education sector. More significantly, their goal was to explore if it was possible “to envisage a model of digital humanities that is not rooted in technocratic rationality or neoliberal economic calculus but rather that emerges from as well as informs traditional practices of humanist inquiry” (Chun et al. 2016).

In her talk, Chun enlisted Martin Heidegger’s notion of the enframing nature of technology (Heidegger 1970) to enable this conceptual shift, suggesting that technology does not exist outside human experience (as a tool to be acted upon) but is always already constituted as part and parcel of human experience, deforming our view of the world, politics, religion (etc.) and bringing enabling ideologies such as neoliberalism with it as it travels from context to context. To transform the debate from one of simple rejection or acceptance of technology use in the humanities she suggested that

the dark side—what is now considered to be the dark side—may be where we need to be. The dark side, after all, is the side of passion. The dark side, or what has been made dark, is what all that bright talk has been turning away from (critical theory, critical race studies—all that fabulous work that transform DH is doing).

The implication was that the DH community was uniformly and dangerously naïve, but also that they were engaged in practices with potentially transformative potential.

The debate suffered from intellectual myopia (and arrogance) to observers outside literary studies who objected to the conflation of “digital literary studies” and “digital humanities” but that was a function of other disciplinary issues: from this point on, and particularly in North America, DH was permanently entangled with the discourse of critical and media theory. Some people returned to the relative intellectual safety of sub-disciplines such as digital history to avoid being drawn into

what they viewed as irrelevant or ideological debates but the scholarly impact of the argument and its entanglement with increasingly complex socio-cultural and political transformations meant the die was cast: digital humanities had evolved into a floating signifier.

Whether we view this as evidence of the imperialistic nature of critical theory or a natural result of disciplinary dynamics, DH was positioned as the poster child for all that was wrong with the American higher education sector. Similar but perhaps less forceful critiques were taken up in the United Kingdom, Australasia, and to a lesser extent Europe. It is worth noting that digital humanists based in Europe, Asia, and Australasia did not engage with the MLA debates in the same way as Americans, drawing on different socio-political and intellectual traditions and sometimes resiling from what they viewed as ideological posturing by a small group of critical media theorists, but the same currents were present in those regions too.

Chun's reference to the #transformDH Twitter hashtag was telling. The hashtag was established by Moya Bailey, Anne Cong-Huyen, Alexis Lothian, and Amanda Phillips in response to celebrations of "Big Tent DH" in 2011, which sought to present the community as inclusive and open to all disciplines and people regardless of their background or level of technical skill. As laudable as it appeared on the surface, wrapped up with the rhetoric of Silicon Valley IT culture, #transformDH noted that the claim rang hollow to people from gender and queer studies, race and ethnic studies, and disability studies. "Instead, DH seemed to be replicating many traditional practices of the ivory tower, those that privileged the white, heteronormative, phallogocentric view of culture that our home disciplines had long critiqued. The cost of entry for many of us—material demands, additional training, and cultural capital—as queer people and women of color was high" (Bailey et al. 2016). Stephen Ramsay's provocative paper at the 2011 MLA, "Who's [in](#) and Who's Out" (Ramsay 2016) seemed to them to be indicative of a field blindly replicating modes of privilege they were determined to consign to the past: seeing them imported into the humanities through DH at the very moment optimists felt the structures were weakening was demoralizing, to say the least.

This was a penetrating and necessary analysis, but the situation was more complicated than it appeared. Ramsay's paper was prompted by an earlier debate in DH about "hack versus yack," centered on whether people needed to be able to program to identify as digital humanists. Although not articulated in that way at the time, the debate was related to labor rights and hierarchies of power in the university sector. As the humanities computing tradition evolved towards DH and more people became interested in the field, community members with programming skills who had always felt like second-class citizens in the humanities—quietly working on their data modeling and web development outside the spotlight—became concerned their decades of effort were being undermined by newcomers who wanted to benefit from their efforts but did not value their work. Asking whether digital humanists needed to be able to code, or have a degree of technical understanding, was a way of pushing back and carving out a space for technical practice against perceived intellectual colonization by powerful and ideologically motivated forces. The issue has never been resolved and exists today in the development of the Computational Humanities Group in 2020 and ongoing efforts to develop viable career paths in research software engineering (RSE) for technical staff involved in DH projects.

If we view the "hack versus [yack](#)" debate as a labor issue we can continue to benefit from its potential to produce positive change, but neither side of the debate read it that way at the time. On the contrary, figures such as Ramsay viewed it in a primarily methodological and epistemological sense, and groups such as [#transformdh](#) viewed it as evidence of a monocultural, gendered, and technocratic field. This miscommunication, or inability to properly contextualize the debate,

should have been a wake-up call for the community, but it was overtaken by events. To outsiders, early-twenty-first-century DH was ideologically indistinguishable from Silicon Valley cultures that presented digital tools and methods as emancipatory at the same time as they reproduced white masculinist working cultures and fundamentally biased products.

The establishment of the #dhpoco hashtag and associated Postcolonial Digital Humanities website by Adeline Koh and Roopika Risam in 2013 aimed to address this by critiquing the lack of diversity in the DH community, and its tendency to prioritize technical subjects that perpetuated the situation by creating barriers to participation. As the conversation evolved, they acknowledged the significant history of humanities computing and DH that *did* attend to issues of race, class, gender, disability, but their focus remained tactical and broadly radical. These were difficult topics to raise in a community that had been comfortably insular for several decades and experiencing cultural and intellectual relevance for the first time. Many people in the DH community were (and still are) affronted by the suggestion they perpetuate sexism, structural racism, and other forms of discrimination. The situation is complicated by the fact that these “reactionaries” appear to inhabit the liberal (or at least center-left) side of the political spectrum.

It is important to remember, in this context, that debates about the dark side of DH reflect the politics of the higher education sector, combined with generational change, more than the politics of the street. DH’s intellectual history pits the radicals of 1968 against the radicals of 2006, 1990s cyberutopians against the 99 percent. Cultural conservatives, in the real world rather than scholarly sense, are hard to find. Initiatives such as THATCamp, which helped people organize community events introducing people to DH is a case in point. The initiative was laudably open and progressive compared to the existing academic and tech-sector culture, emphasizing equality regardless of career status, warmly reaching out to GLAM sector and IT colleagues despite them normally being reduced to a service role in academic culture, and aiming to empower people regardless of gender or technical ability. But in hindsight there were obvious blind spots and THATCamp events undoubtedly reflected the normative white middle-class cultures at the heart of global academia. #dhpoco’s use of cartoons to critique THATCamp ~~were~~ highly effective in that sense, using guerrilla tactics to destabilize the community’s accepted norms.

The first phase in the critique of DH culminated in 2016 with the publication of an article in the *LA Review of Books* titled “Neoliberal Tools (and Archives): A Political History of Digital Humanities,” by Daniel Allington, Sarah Brouillette, and David Golumbia. The article was in many ways a summation of the previous few years’ criticism of DH, adopting a festival-like tone of confident moral, intellectual, and political condemnation. DH was positioned as the prime example of a mode of neoliberalism in higher education which prioritized measurable “outputs” and “impact” ahead of less easily quantifiable notions of scholarly quality. The authors accused the DH community of fetishizing code and data and producing research that resembled “a slapdash form of computational linguistics adorned with theoretical claims that would never pass muster within computational linguistics itself.” Their claims were based on a narrow history of the field focused on the University of Virginia literary studies community, provoking outrage and consternation from people associated with it.

“Neoliberal Tools ~~and Archives~~” is a totemic example of what happens when analysis of the dark side of DH becomes entangled with personal and professional as well as intellectual issues, but it represented an exceptionally important moment for DH. Its visceral polemic, its focus on literary studies at the expense of other fields, its personal and professional commentary, its identification of labor rights issues, and its tight association of DH with the corporate university (and indeed

global neoliberal economics) reflected the field's centrality to global scholarly discourse and its role as a lightning rod for wider grievances. DH practitioners convincingly argued that issues with computational methods were widely known and being slowly attended to but, as the authors noted, Alan Liu had asked "Where is Cultural Criticism in the Digital Humanities?" in 2012 to little practical effect. As arguable as many of the article's claims were, it seems clear in hindsight that the community's lack of attention (or intellectual interest) in the political context to their work led first to #transformDH and #dhpoco, and eventually "Neoliberal Tools."

Given the inherent complexity of the situation even these critiques were insufficient, of course. By 2016 it had become obvious that DH (its supporters as well as its critics) was dominated by Northern Hemisphere, elite concerns. Even #dhpoco initially presented a mode of postcolonialism that—while laudable—appeared narrowly North American to the present author (Smithies 2013). Such issues tend to even out, however: like historiography (the "history of history," including analysis of theory and method) theoretical perspectives on DH have evolved over time. In the case of #dhpoco this resulted in a wider global focus and significance culminating in the publication of Risam's *New digital worlds: Postcolonial digital humanities in theory, praxis, and pedagogy* (2018). A similar, and similarly unsurprising in the context of intellectual history, evolution has occurred with the Alliance of Digital Humanities Organisations (ADHO), a global organization that initially struggled to manage rapid international growth in digital humanities and evolve in ways that did justice to its new constituents. The Global Outlook DH ADHO Special Interest Group (SIG) was largely a response to this, encouraging and facilitating focus on issues of representation, multilingualism, and cultural and infrastructural diversity.

A FALSE DAWN

The positive reception of Risam's monograph, the success of projects such as Torn Apart/Separados (Ahmed 2018), which mapped detention centers for asylum seekers at the height of the 2018 humanitarian crisis, the increasing attention to indigenous DH by funding bodies and growing sophistication of their methods (Walter 2020; Chan et al. 2021), the willingness of ADHO to make clear statements about Black Lives Matter and structural racism and their support for GO::DH, and the regular publication of articles and chapters related to the "dark side" of DH might suggest a corner has been turned, but to radicals it is a false dawn. There is no reason to condemn the field in its entirety anymore (if there ever was), but it is obvious to many people that structural issues inherited from Western higher education systems and the technology industry are woven through the warp and weft of DH as a field. They cannot be resolved with a handful of impactful but still in many ways tactical (as opposed to mainstream) initiatives.

The furor over the long-standing *Humanist* email listserv in 2020, prompted by the publication of a post referring to "anti-white racism" demonstrated this clearly.³ Younger scholars were angry and confused that such a comment could be published in a reputable scholarly publishing venue and were confounded by the subsequent decision not to publish a reply (later reversed) and what appeared to be a general lack of understanding, empathy, and support, across a wide sector of their community (Tovey-Walsh 2020). Much the same fault lines were activated as in the debates surrounding #transformdh and #dhpoco years earlier. Awareness of structural racism was higher because of the Black Lives Matter movement, which was in full flight at the time following the death of George Floyd, but resolution was not straightforward. These are not topics that can be resolved

in a single chapter in a DH handbook, of course, although I hope my position is sufficiently clear. The key point is that DH benefits from criticism and critique, and sometimes dissent and targeted tactical or guerrilla activity. Open discussion of political and ethical issues must be considered a *sine qua non* of intellectual engagement regardless of topic (technical or otherwise).

Natalia Cecire's response to the [#transformdh](#) movement in 2012 retains relevance here. Balancing support for the initiative with a call for more theory and cultural criticism, she pointed out that DH does in fact contain within itself—precisely in its focus on digital tools and methods—the potential for positive socio-political outcomes. Citing Tim Sherratt's widely celebrated project *The Real Face of White Australia* she noted that “~~that~~ the jolt of the oppositional can be powerful, when it is rooted in a critical activism that builds on the little-t theories that have preceded and exist alongside it, rather than manifesting as nerdy beleagueredness” (Cecire 2012).

Cecire and Sherratt identify the vanishing point of digital humanities here: the point at which cultural, intellectual, political, ideological, and technical affordances and constraints cohere in a digital artifact. It strengthens my claim that DH needs to search for critical and methodological approaches to digital research in the humanities grounded in the nature of computing technology and capable of guiding technical development as well as critical and historical analysis, not as a statement of “nerdy beleagueredness” or in order to privilege engineering over theory and culture, but through intellectual recognition of the powerful dialectics at work in contemporary society *at precisely that nexus*. If the intra and extra-disciplinary conflicts associated with the dark side of DH teach us anything, it is that the union of technology with the humanities is productive of powerful (and I would claim, ultimately positive) socio-cultural and intellectual effects.

It is also a reminder that the cultural and political issues associated with the dark side of DH are in some sense dwarfed by technical issues related to database design, indigenous rights and the representation of cultural knowledge, licensing and copyright law, labor rights, environmentalism, and safeguarding cultural data. Signs of progress are present there too, but the problems are of planetary scale and function at the level of global cyberinfrastructure, in all its dimensions and technical complexity. In 2013 Melissa Terras explained how difficult it was to update one key field in the TEI-XML schema to reflect non-binary gender identity, suggesting the scale of the task (Terras 2013). Seven years later she was involved in a study of Google's Art Project with similarly sobering results, finding that the six million high-resolution images collected from around the world were heavily skewed towards collecting institutions based in the United States (Kizhner et al. 2020). The transition is instructive: in the space of seven years, the dark side of DH moved from field-level struggles with granular representation of information, through conflicts about theory and culture, to tight entanglement with global modes of surveillance capitalism. DH is no longer a field where cultures of nerdy beleagueredness thrive, but neither has it extricated itself from its dark side.

Indeed, cyberutopian claims that digital technology has a naturally emancipatory and democratizing effect have been replaced by a dystopian focus on surveillance capitalism, misinformation, algorithmic bias, hate speech, slave labor, and environmental damage. These certainly require scholarly attention, but it is important that some humanists focus on practical technical interventions that can effect positive change too. Often these changes will be hardly noticeable but they are fundamental to the values and political orientation of a large proportion of the humanities community and worthwhile in and of themselves: teaching DH using minimal computers (Dillen and Schäuble 2020), a machine-learning analysis that takes indigenous knowledge into account (Chan et al. 2021), digitization of Sudanese cultural artifacts (Deegan and Musa 2013), development of open methods to combat hate speech (Kennedy et al. 2020).

There is considerable moral hazard in exposure and criticism of the dark side of DH, if campaigns against managerialism, neoliberalism, and technocracy undermine the delicate green shoots of digital activism. Campaigns against new digital methods, such as that launched by the literary scholar Nan Da against the use of machine learning in literary studies (Da 2019), entail such risks despite being important additions to the field's critical history: ethical responsibility runs both ways. Work in artificial intelligence and machine learning require robust critique to identify inadequate methods and find ways to manage the many known issues with humanities datasets, but it is important not to over-compensate and perceive intellectual degradation in place of merely inadequate and evolving theory or method. This is the fine line DH practitioners *and their critics* need to traverse: neither side can escape the necessity for robust engagement with the full scope of DH literature, tools, and methods.

PRACTICAL NIHILISM AND HUMAN GROWTH

It is possible to discern a truly dark tradition at work in “the dark side of DH,” reflective of humanistic traditions of radicalism, dissent, and free will that reach back to the ancient Greeks. In this sense, all sides of the debates are united and contributing to the development of the humanities in the twenty-first century in similar ways: engagement in what Nietzsche referred to as a “thoroughgoing *practical nihilism*” (Stellino 2013) born of deep dissatisfaction with either the status quo or emerging trends. Humanistic nihilism, in this reading, is an expression of free will informed by existential concern for self and society. Whether consciously or subconsciously, the stakes are deemed high enough for criticism and critique to be buttressed with clarion calls for active intervention along revolutionary or reactionary lines.

Expressions of this state of mind are various enough that a single example will never suffice, but we could go no better than the entanglement of DH with the vertiginous, algorithmically enabled mob that stormed the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021. The spectacle of a human mob roused by a president empowered by social media and manipulated by the algorithmic logic of the Q-anon movement and white supremacists is a new symbol of the dark side of DH. Human suffering and outrage blended with alien intelligence in that moment in a way that demonstrates the hopelessness of humanist positions that refuse to engage with technology or position it as somehow beyond the pale of scholarly activity, as if “human” and “humanist” experience are not practically as well as conceptually entangled. It is beyond doubt now that the full range of humanist response, from socio-political critique to technical development, is needed to rehabilitate the public sphere, political economy, and everyday life.

As dissonant as it may seem, then, it is now a truism that human experience of digital technology has reached troubling heights and contributes to significant political, cultural, and economic discord and environmental degradation *and also* that advanced research methods enabled by digital tools and methods have the potential to relieve suffering on a mass scale, heal the planet, and contribute to global peace and well-being. This grand, epochal, contradiction now lies at that heart of DH as a field. As a floating signifier for that remarkable array of baggage (technical, intellectual, psychological, political) digital humanists must expect to be periodically buffeted by intellectual and cultural crises from within and outside their community. As Wendy Chun noted in 2013, a focus on the dark side of DH is not necessarily a negative undertaking in that sense, but

a prophylactic activity that protects the field from collapse in the face of the profound historical moment it inhabits, reflects, and contributes to.

For that to occur we need to focus on people ahead of politics, culture, ideology, or technology. A focus on people is the only sure way to protect our community from the dark side of DH and maximize the insights it offers; the task has become so immense that we can only succeed by enabling what might seem to some people as radical levels of diversity and inclusion. Numerical gender equality is no longer enough; we need equality of seniority, pay, and influence. Public commitment to racial equality and efforts to enable indigenous DH are no longer enough; we need properly diverse departments and teams and major projects decolonizing archives at a national and international scale. Cultural critique of the digital world is no longer enough; we need a generation of humanists trained to contribute to the development of global cyberinfrastructure. A desire to collaborate with technical staff is not enough; it needs to be done on an equal basis and take into account their workload and career goals, backed with permanent roles and high-quality tools and infrastructure. Pedagogy needs to change from grafting basic technical skills onto humanities degrees to providing careful scaffolding of skills throughout the undergraduate and postgraduate curricula, and to enable renewed focus on the basic tools and methods developed from the humanities computing tradition.

These are grand goals, but nothing less than that demanded by critics of DH for the past decade. The challenge is immense, but it is necessary for the development and indeed the survival of the field. Criticism, critique, dissent, and dark analyses of the human condition are common to all of the major humanities disciplines: the maturation of the tradition in DH should be celebrated and encouraged.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Roopika Risam, Alex Gil, Arianna Ciula, and Daniel Allington for offering reflections and comments on this chapter. All errors of fact and failures of interpretation rest with the author.

NOTES

1. For a more detailed description of this period in intellectual history, see Smithies (2017).
2. Including the present author. See Smithies (2021).
3. Disclaimer: The author was Director of King's Digital Lab, the web host of *Humanist* at the time of the incident. The Lab's statement on the issue can be found on its blog, <https://kdl.kcl.ac.uk/blog/joint-statement-about-humanist-project/>.

REFERENCES

- Manen, Ahmed et al. 2018. "Torn Apart/Separados." Text, June 25. <http://xpmethod.columbia.edu/torn-apart/volume/1/>.
- Allington, Daniel, Sarah Brouillette, and David Golumbia. 2016. "Neoliberal Tools (and Archives): A Political History of Digital Humanities." *Los Angeles Review of Books*, May 1. <https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/neoliberal-tools-archives-political-history-digital-humanities/>.

- Bailey, Moya et al. 2016. "Reflections on a Movement: #transformDH, Growing Up." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein, 71–80. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bauerlein, Mark. 2008. *The Dumbest Generation: How the Digital Age Stupefies Young Americans and Jeopardizes Our Future (or, Don't Trust Anyone under 30)*. New York, NY: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Penguin.
- Benhabib, Seyla. 1986. *Critique, Norm, and Utopia: A Study of the Foundations of Critical Theory*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Birkerts, Sven. 1995. *The Gutenberg Elegies: The Fate of Reading in an Electronic Age*. New York, NY: Fawcett Columbine.
- Bod, Rens. 2014. *A New History of the Humanities: The Search for Principles and Patterns from Antiquity to the Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cecire, Natalia. 2012. "In Defense of Transforming DH." *Works Cited* (blog), January 8. <https://nataliacecire.blogspot.com/2012/01/in-defense-of-transforming-dh.html>.
- Chan, Valerie et al. 2021. "Indigenous Frameworks for Data-Intensive Humanities: Recalibrating the Past through Knowledge Engineering and Generative Modelling." *Journal of Data Mining & Digital Humanities* (January 8). <https://jdmhdh.episciences.org/7018/pdf>.
- Chun, Wendy Hui Kyong et al. 2016. "The Dark Side of the Digital Humanities (2013)." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein, 493–509. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Chun, Wendy Hui Kyong and Lisa Marie Rhody. 2014. "Working the Digital Humanities: Uncovering Shadows between the Dark and the Light." *differences* 25 (1): 1–25.
- Da, Nan Z. 2019. "The Computational Case against Computational Literary Studies." *Critical Inquiry* 45 (3) (March 1): 601–39.
- Davis, Robert and Ronald Schleiffer. 1991. *Criticism and Culture: The Role of Critique in Modern Literary Theory*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Deegan, M. and B. E. Musa. 2013. "Preserving the Cultural Heritage of Sudan through Digitization: Developing Digital Sudan." In *Digital Heritage International Congress (DigitalHeritage)* 2: 485–7.
- Dillen, Wout and Joshua Schäuble. 2020. "Teaching Digital Humanities on Raspberry Pi. A Minimal Computing Approach to Digital Pedagogy." In DH 2020 Abstracts. <https://dh2020.adho.org/abstracts/>.
- Ellul, Jacques. 1964. *The Technological Society*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Fish, Stanley. 2011. "The Old Order Changeth." *New York Times*, December 26. <https://web.archive.org/web/20220131090004/https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/12/26/the-old-order-changeth/>.
- Fish, Stanley. 2012a. "The Digital Humanities and the Transcending of Mortality." January 9. <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/01/09/the-digital-humanities-and-the-transcending-of-mortality/>.
- Fish, Stanley. 2012b. "Mind Your P's and B's: The Digital Humanities and Interpretation." *New York Times*, January 23. <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/01/23/mind-your-ps-and-bs-the-digital-humanities-and-interpretation/>.
- Golumbia, David. 2009. *The Cultural Logic of Computation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grusin, Richard. 2014. "The Dark Side of Digital Humanities: Dispatches from Two Recent MLA Conventions." *differences* 25 (1) (~~January~~): 79–92.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1970. "The Question Concerning Technology (1949)." In *Basic Writings*, 283–317. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kennedy, Chris J. et al. 2020. "Constructing Interval Variables via Faceted Rasch Measurement and Multitask Deep Learning: A Hate Speech Application." *ArXiv:2009.10277 [Cs]*, September 21.
- Kizhner, Inna et al. 2020. "Digital Cultural Colonialism: Measuring Bias in Aggregated Digitized Content Held in Google Arts and Culture." *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* 36 (3) (~~December 19~~): 607–40. <https://doi.org/10.1093/lc/fqaa055>.
- Klein, Lauren F. and Matthew K. Gold. 2016. "Introduction: Digital Humanities: The Expanded Field." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein, ix–xvi. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Koh, Adeline and Roopika Risam. 2013–14. "Postcolonial Digital Humanities." *Postcolonial Digital Humanities*. <https://dhpoco.org/blog>.

- Liu, Alan. 2011. "Where Is Cultural Criticism in the Digital Humanities?" *Alan Liu*, January 7. <https://liu.english.ucsb.edu/where-is-cultural-criticism-in-the-digital-humanities/>.
- McGillivray, Barbara et al. 2020. "The Challenges and Prospects of the Intersection of Humanities and Data Science: A White Paper from The Alan Turing Institute." <https://doi.org/10.6084/M9.FIGSHARE.12732164>.
- Mumford, Herbert. 1970. *The Myth of the Machine – The Pentagon of Power*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Ramsay, Stephen. 2012. "Stanley and Me." *Stephen Ramsay*. [This blog post has been removed from the web. The earliest Wayback Machine version is available at <https://web.archive.org/web/20130706054201/http://stephenramsay.us/text/2012/11/08/stanley-and-me.html>, presumably taken a few months after the author deleted his blog.]
- Ramsay, Stephen. 2016. "Who's In and Who's Out? [2011]." In *Defining Digital Humanities: A Reader*, edited by Melissa Terras, Julianne Nyhan, and Edward Vanhoutte, 239–42. London: Routledge.
- Risam, Roopika. 2018. *New Digital Worlds: Postcolonial Digital Humanities in Theory, Praxis, and Pedagogy*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Sherratt, Tim. 2011. "The Real Face of White Australia." *Discontents* (blog), September 21. <https://web.archive.org/web/20110926085510/http://discontents.com.au/shoebox/archives-shoebox/the-real-face-of-white-australia>.
- Smithies, James. 2013. "Speaking Back to America, Localizing DH Postcolonialism." *James Smithies*, September 4. <https://jamesmithies.org/blog/2013/09/04/speaking-back-to-america-localizing-dh-postcolonialism/>.
- Smithies, James. 2017. *The Digital Humanities and the Digital Modern*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smithies, James. 2021. "Introduction to Digital Humanities." *James Smithies*. March 14. <https://jamesmithies.org/blog/2012/03/14/introduction-to-digital-humanities/>.
- Stellino, Paolo. 2013. "Nietzsche on Suicide." *Nietzsche-Studien* 42 (1) (November 1): 151–77. <https://doi.org/10.1515/niet.2013.42.1.151>.
- Terras, Melissa. 2013. "On Changing the Rules of Digital Humanities from the Inside." *Melissa Terras' Blog*, May 27. <http://melissaterras.blogspot.com/2013/05/on-changing-rules-of-digital-humanities.html>.
- Tovey-Walsh, Bethan. 2020. "Leaving Humanist." *Lingua Celta*, August 10. <https://linguacelta.com/blog/2020/08/Humanist.html>.
- Walter, Maggie et al. 2020. *Indigenous Data Sovereignty and Policy*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429273957>.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1958. *Philosophical Investigations*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

