FIONA M. BARNETT

The Brave Side of Digital Humanities

A Genealogy of Provocations

*W*hile standing against the wall in a windowless conference room and scrolling through the tweets for the "Dark Side of the Digital Humanities" conference session, the tone of the real-time digital conversation was so counter to my understanding of the panelists' discussion that I briefly wondered if I was in the wrong room or following the wrong Twitter stream. Even after confirming the correct hashtag for the session, the uncertainty persisted until I recognized the same scholars in the room and in the Twitter stream. The concept of recognition and misrecognition has provided a useful framework for many questions in feminist theory, gender studies, and political theory, and it continues to offer a useful framework for considering disciplinary boundaries and the conversations that take place in the lore of field formation. In keeping with the theme of provocations offered by the speakers at the MLA panel, I'd like to offer this recognition/misrecognition as one of the principles that continues to foster some of the more thorny debates over what constitutes the field of digital humanities, who can best relay its genealogy, and perhaps most critically, how the field will be shaped in the years to come. As the MLA panelists declared in the session itself, the

crux of the conversation about the parameters of DH is simultaneously its bright side, its dark side, and, I'd like to offer, its brave side (Bailey).

The panelists, Wendy Chun, Richard Grusin, Patrick Jagoda, and Rita Raley, were channeling the genre of "provocations," as they considered and critiqued the discourse about digital humanities in our contemporary moment. The four speakers came from different departments, disciplines, institutions, and career stages and have all worked on digital media throughout their careers. They offered critically engaged commentary regarding the discursive position of digital humanities in the academy, including the much maligned buzzwords of moocs (Massive Open Online Courses), online learning, gamification, and the specter of the neoliberal educational system primarily focused on profits and identifiable markers of success.

They critiqued the embrace of a techno-utopianism that, as Chun pointed out, keeps us trapped in what Laurent Berlant calls "cruel optimism" as we continually justify our existence in terms that are not our own. Cruel optimism allows us to see the only salvation as situational rather than structural (we just need funding for *xyz* project), or it "allows us to believe that the problem facing our students and our profession is a lack of technical savvy rather than an economic system that undermines the future of our students" (Chun).

Many audience members took their disagreement to Twitter to lament that these topics were not sufficient representations of projects in digital humanities, and furthermore, they were not only misrepresentations, they came as an affront to some. The conversation on Twitter zeroed in on the notion that moocs, online learning, and the fetishization of technology were not at the heart of most DH projects and that the panelists were mistaking these glossy narratives for "real" digital humanities projects, such as those that build tools (like archival platforms and mechanisms for studying texts or for developing new texts), engage with a critical analysis of the code itself, challenge the ways that knowledge is shared or used, or a whole host of other projects that would presumably have been more readily understood as representative of the scholarly DH ecosystem.

One tweet summed up the audience's reaction by saying, "I suppose an antiDH backlash was inevitable—I'm just sad that some in the packed [room] might think these are fair characterizations" (Cordell). As another tweet reminded us, "moocs are not DH to DHers. Neither is Online learning" (Templeton). The question of whether moocs and online learning might be considered part of the history of digital humanities within the academy has been well discussed (Alvarado), but the doubt around this specific content

interests me less than the structure of the critique itself. The critique was based on a measure of recognition or, more aptly, misrecognition, and the alleged connection between DH and these cultural objects was apparently so unrecognizable that they were disturbing in their radical dissociation.

At the end of the panel, one audience member brought up this problem of not recognizing the projects under consideration as falling into the category of digital humanities. One tweet, documenting this question, provides some insight into the tone of the inquiry: "'I didn't recognize DH in what the panel was discussing' (oh snap!)" (Harris). Another tweet redirects our attention to the duality of recognition: "I didn't recognize a lot of what I recognize as DH in what [the speakers] have talked about in the panel" (Kirschenbaum). Oh snap, indeed.

Though the panel raised a number of excellent questions, there was an overwhelming consensus on Twitter that whatever the panel members were discussing, it wasn't academic DH. As one response emphasized, "it's not that they're unfair [characterizations], per se, just largely unconnected to much actual academic practice of DH." In an attempt to steer the conversation toward the larger stakes of the argument, I posed a somewhat rhetorical question in response: "I don't think they're anti-DH. Bringing up [questions] of field formation isn't exactly the same as being against the field, no?" (Barnett). This double misrecognition—between some of the audience members and the panelists, and between my own understanding of the panel and others' responses to it—contributed to the fairly tense discussion on Twitter. For me, in that moment, the interesting questions were not whether or not moocs are a part of the intellectual heritage of digital humanities, but why folks in the audience were so insistent that any level of engagement with moocs was tantamount to an endorsement, and most importantly, why such a challenge to the boundaries of DH was met with such derision. My next interjection tried to clarify that the panel was less an expression of wholesale distrust of DH and more of a performance of how DH has been appropriated and triumphed as the universal salve to the broken system of higher education. As I offered the brief explanation—"It should probably be clarified that sometimes folks say 'Digital Humanities' when they mean 'the discourse ABOUT DH'" (Barnett)—it seemed evident that the stakes of the conversation were laid bare. The dispute wasn't merely about semantics, but about decoding tensions in the formation of a field and of deciphering the field's imaginary (Wiegman 25).

Why has the self-developed genealogy of the origins of DH culminated in a systemic need to secure its status against various types of

critique? What contributed to some folks in the audience being unable to recognize the panelists' presentations as a critique of the way DH has been used in higher education, and not primarily an attack of DH itself? Again, the interplay between recognition and misrecognition might offer us a useful framing device. As Natalia Cecire added, "1. DHers usually don't see dh as panacea. 2. Admins often do. 3. DHers often need for admins to have this erroneous belief." The field itself, in some ways, can trace this tension back to its nomenclature: digital humanities as the disciplinary merging of the digital (which presumably did not contain the humanities) and the humanities (which presumably were not synonymous with digital work). The field emerged out of apparent contradictions and regularly confronts ostensible discrepancies between technical architecture and literary form, between narrative devices and hardware interfaces, between user engagements and the practice of reading. Even as DH takes pride in its capacity to balance and blend disparate forms of inquiry, however, it continually reaffirms certain approaches as incongruent and outside of its own scope of focus.

This paper engages with conference panels from two different events as a way of calling attention to the influential conversations in these spaces of academic inquiry. As a young field, DH is a space where many of the contours, keywords, and structures for debate are literally hashed out in real time over Twitter, blogs, and in the "fleshy avatar" space of conference rooms. Of course, important contributions are also articulated in longer-form blogs, scholarship aggregators such as *Digital Humanities Now*, and many journals, monographs, and edited collections; but taking into consideration the conversations at conference panels allows us to consider the process of field formation, shifts, and diversions in ways that are simply not replicable in longer timeframes or more formal modes of scholarship.

Recognizable Patterns

At the heart of DH is a kind of misrecognition, a merging of attention to technologies that have been deemed extraneous to the humanities with tools (and objects of study) that have been more familiar to the disciplinary conventions in the humanities. As always, the process of recognition can be an important component of building a community—academic or otherwise—and it can be especially critical in the process of building a transformative scholarship by trying to piece new parts together, to examine them with a new type of lens, or to put them in conversation with something else. But this recognition is a double-edged sword: it admits into the fold at

the same time it excludes (Sedgwick). The question of "what counts?" is, of course, important to community formation and digital identity and to eking out resources of all kinds in this academic ecosystem. But what happens when the conversation is not about recognizing similarity across differences or disparity, but about declaring something to be unrecognizable as such?

Patterns. Patterning. What is made in the shape of a pattern, what becomes the mold, what becomes its default? This is important in terms not only of the objects of inquiry but also of the cultural and political agencies giving rise to specific possibilities of that inquiry.

What is the effect when an "always already" understood set of origin stories determines inclusion? How does this determination hinge not only on which projects might be considered within the scope of digital humanities but on which scholars are considered to be inherently invested in DH, or to take a step further toward identity, to be considered as digital humanists? What is the effect of a conversation that seeks to establish the types of questions or projects that can be considered within a field as a foregone conclusion? What is the link between making a categorical refusal to recognize one type of project or inquiry and more general policing to establish the field as a coherent, viable, and recognizable entity? This is about more than a specific comment or reaction; it is a desire for commensurability. At stake is not only the politics of inclusion and representation (see Cecire, "Tacit") but of building new political realities, new forms of the humanities as much as new forms of the digital.

What gets counted as DH is a form of construction, practice, and praxis that can certainly be useful in terms of building new projects and eking out resources in overburdened academic budgets. What would it mean to reorient our origin story away from one with a set of specific, often-cited scholars and conferences and toward a set of projects that mobilizes the conflicting possibilities of hardware and software, bioware and biology, proceduralism and possibility? As a member of the loose collective known as #TransformDH, I have found that these types of questions have been foundational to our understanding of what it means to decode digital humanities and how we can pay attention to the cultural and political realities within the projects, alliances, teams, centers, and affiliations that construct the "big tent" of digital humanities.[1] As Alexis Lothian and Amanda Phillips remind us in their article, "Can Digital Humanities Mean Transformative Critique?" these questions have a long tradition, anteceding the rise of DH itself: "The bright lights and marching bands of the so-called big tent outshine less marketable histories of engagement with technology that have

emerged from standpoints that critique the privileging of certain gendered, racialized, classed, able-bodied, Western-centric productions of knowledge." Indeed, as Moya Bailey writes in "All the Digital Humanists Are White, All the Nerds Are Men, but Some of Us Are Brave," transforming the field of DH requires more than paying lip service to diversity. There is a difference between "making room in our tent" and meeting other folks where they are: different priorities and different focuses can lead to different types of projects. Practicality and recognition aren't always the driving aspirations behind a project. Sometimes ambitions are braver, simultaneously broader and more finite: they're about transforming the field, transforming the way we might know the past, and how we might come to learn our own future.

Alter Egos, New Media, and Black/Queer Performativity

Two months before the MLA panel, far away from the frigid Boston wind, the American Studies Association (ASA) held its annual conference in San Juan, Puerto Rico, for the first time. Many panels touched on the conference theme of Dimensions of Empire and Resistance: Past, Present, and Future, including those addressed to cultural objects and points of intervention in decolonial, postcolonial, and anticolonialist spaces. Digital humanities had been visibly present at ASA for several years and seemed to reach a crescendo at this year's meeting, including a THATcamp that met several days before the conference. In a panel titled "I'm a MuthaFking Monster: Alter Egos, New Media, and Black/Queer Performativity," three scholars opened a conversation on projects with intersections between new media, performance studies, cultural studies, and academic life in 2013. The primary thread among the three presentations was the notion of "alter egos": the production, development, and experimentation with alternate identities, both in their objects of inquiry and in their own performances and practices of strategic identification.

As I sat in on the MLA panel several months later, watching the debate about the limits of DH, one question preoccupied my attention: would the Alter Egos panel have been recognizable as DH to the audience members here? If not, was it because the projects were too ensconced in a particular type of theoretical and performative inquiry? Or were their critical archives not familiar to DH practitioners? Or perhaps their academic genealogies weren't technical enough? And beyond this particular panel, why are so few DH panels headlined by scholars of color, particularly women of color, especially in panels where the primary focus was not race? If DH is so overtly

focused on concepts such as community-driven development, open-source communities, and open-access resources, why are the corresponding questions about the limits of that openness often met with such disbelief or indifference? Does the presumed openness contribute to making the questioning of its "neutrality" even more difficult? These questions might be rhetorical, but they point to the breakdown of a larger systemic method for building a field that is (like many fields and disciplines) based on recognition, including personal invitations to panels, submissions to journals, and pairing up to apply for major grant applications.

The Alter Ego panelists, Uri McMillan, Treva Lindsay, and Jessica Marie Johnson, opened a conversation on race, blackness, pop culture, cultural appropriation, the music industry, and new media practices of both production and consumption. Perhaps most critically, the panelists were invested in questions focused on cultural objects and methods of inquiry, as well as on their own experiences navigating academic life while inhabiting bodies marked by power relations. These two threads were woven together in the discussion of deliberate tactics used to perform certain roles or achieve certain goals, depending on the context. "I'm a MuthaFking Monster" is a lyric from a Kanye West song featuring Nicki Minaj, and it provided the panel with a critical lexicon for the practice of assembling, disassembling, borrowing, and reappropriating the components of "self" in the academy.

Each of the papers thoughtfully applied critical analysis to the digital media produced by/for cultural icons such as Sasha Fierce/Beyoncé and Nicki Minaj, especially in terms of feminist iconography and the black queer aesthetic that is often deliberately deployed or showcased to differing effect. The final paper, "On Alter Egos and Infinite Literacies, Part 2 (An #AntiJemimas Imperative)," was given by Jessica Marie Johnson and was one of the most radically imagined and executed DH projects I had seen in quite some time. Johnson, writing as "Kismet Nuñez," founded the #AntiJemimas universe of blogs, Tumblrs, and Twitter accounts, "committed to the very hard work of building a real gyrl of color in a world of new media" ("#AntiJemimas"). Established in 2008 as a project called "Self Care: Revise, Revise, Revise," the #AntiJemimas ecosystem is "an experiment in digital autobiography and archive" ("I Need"). This multimodal #AntiJemimas universe is not just self-documentation; it's self-creating, self-habituating, self-negating, and self-developing. Each of the four alter egos has its own digital production space and identity, and collectively, they form the #AntiJemimas universe.

It is important to emphasize the simultaneous project at work: it is an archive of notes, images, quotations, documents, media files, and images, but it is also the imagination of a self and a radical community of selves coming together to be both archived and imagined into being at the same time. Through a process of self-recognition and misrecognition, Kismet Nuñez constructs the documentation of her life at the same time as she constructs a radical fantasy of her process of becoming. The "about" page on her site Nunez Daughter explains more: "Kismet Nuñez, (#*AntiJemimas* Founder and Creative Director), deploys 21st century forms of art, autobiography, and performance against the discursive terrain of race, sex and personality. With the help of new media, Kismet breaks herself into pieces to become more than her parts in a revolutionary act of defiance, affirmation & self-care" (Johnson, "#AntiJemimas").

The collective also operates under the moniker "iwannalive productions," which calls attention to both its self-creation as a digital media project and as a radical act of self-sustaining and self-development in the face of destructive power relations, histories, and ongoing violence. Part proclamation and part manifesto, the introduction to iwannalive productions states:

> *We believe black womyn's voices are sheltered, altered, silenced, distanced, mangled, strangled, violated, disrupted, imploded and eroded.*
> *We believe in telling our stories anyway. And in this 21st century age of new media, if we* STILL *can't be human . . .*
> *We will be cyborgs. (Johnson, "About")*

The effect of the #AntiJemimas project is to call attention to the structures within which we are created, constructed, torn apart, damaged, and made whole again. The #AntiJemimas roster includes four alter egos, each with a distinct media platform and voice: Kismet Nuñez, the Sable Fan Gyrl, Zora Walker, and Pretty Magnolia. The first, Kismet herself, undertakes her archive/development on three different platforms: her blog, Twitter, and Tumblr. Kismet is the primary alter ego and is most often a voice for the "fleshy avatar" of Jessica Marie Johnson herself. Kismet's voice on Twitter "includes my own original thoughts, links and shares, retweets and modified retweets from people whose words I care deeply about—primarily queer cis and trans-gender women of color doing work on the prison industrial complex, violence against WOC, demilitarization, afrolatinidad, fandom

(science fiction, fantasy, speculative fiction, afrofuturism), and black images in media" ("On Alter Egos").

The Tumblr blog for the second alter ego, Sable Fan Gyrl, has the tagline "random musings from an afrofuturist wanna-be" (Johnson, *Confessions*). Sable Fan Gyrl remixes images and other media related to "racebending in fandom, images of people of color in science fiction and fantasy, and equity in the publishing industry. She is childlike and playful, quite nerdy, quite awkward, a bit of a recluse and something of a romantic" (Johnson, "On Alter Egos"). When she took over the Nuñez Daughter blog for a week, Sable Fan Gyrl offered this invitation:

> *[Kismet Nuñez is] torn, you see. Between so many identities. Spaces, places. I can't help but laugh when she tumbles around the web asking her childish questions: What is slavery? Why be mixed-race? How do we stop violence against women? How do we live sex-full lives? The truth?*
> *We have already seen this world made and destroyed many times over. And we survive deep in its recess, in the black quiet of its refuse.*
> *What do questions of this world matter when there are so many more to explore? (Johnson, "It's Sable")*

Sable Fan Gyrl curates a collection of fan tribute art, quotes and images from speculative fiction, stills from science fiction films, notes on *Vampire Diaries* and *True Blood*, and occasionally appears on the Nuñez Daughter blog with longer-form posts.

Zora Walker, the third alter ego, introduces herself with this note: "I am @KismetNuñez's Politics. They call me Zora Walker" (Johnson, *Zora*). She is a Mestizaje, a cyborg love child created by Zora Neale Hurston and Alice Walker, and she works to remix art as politics through contemporary political events and cultural texts. Her Tumblr is filled with a mixture of images, poetry, and quotations, such as stories on violence against undocumented workers; photographs of civil-rights–era youth; comments on the Hiphop Archive at Harvard; the analysis of an Internet meme that photoshopped Frida Kahlo's face onto vintage nude portraits (McKenzie); and a photography project that documents disenfranchised voters. One particularly striking post is an in-depth response to an anonymous question submitted to her Tumblr. The anonymous questioner poses a question about the concept of "Juan Crow" as a Latino appropriation of African American suffering; in this moment, as in many Q&A threads and in the comments,

Sable Fan Gyrl performs many alter egos at the same time: pedagog, professor, survivor, historian, mentor, and pastor. She answers the question with grace while letting there be no ambiguity about the systemic underpinnings of Jim Crow and the history of other segregationist laws: "My oppression is not a badge of honor. The system that terrorized my people is not a badge of honor. No one can appropriate it from me because I don't want that shit" (Johnson, "Who Cares"). The Tumblr Q&A feature allows this kind of anonymous question to be met with a semianonymous response in a public forum open to other readers and eyes. How would this kind of community interaction transfer to a funded, "recognizable" DH project on a distinct website without the context of Sable Fan Gyrl's posts and the #AntiJemimas collective waiting in the wings? The possibility for interaction is based on the long-standing community engagement of Sable Fan Gyrl and Kismet Nuñez, and it hinges on the recognizable and familiar technological platform for her readers. The personal is not just political, it is public and performative, haunting digital spaces, academic halls, and intimate conversations.

The fourth alter ego, Pretty Magnolia, is introduced on her Tumblr page with the tagline "Your favorite feminist's favorite womanist's orgasm" (Johnson, *Pretty*). Pretty Magnolia is the libido of Kismet Nuñez, the performance of corporeal desire and an erotic spectacle of digital prurience. She plays with the assumed limits of respectability, pours out queer affection and queer affiliation, tries on various forms of sexual power and the rawness of corporeal desire. With posts on Erykah Badu's public performance of nudity, erotic photography (including Carrie Mae Weems's "Untitled" from Kitchen Table Series, 1989–90), and discussion of the concept of "ho tapes" (Renina), Pretty Magnolia is an archive of the possibility of pleasure, but it is more: it is the deliberate production of a queer, black, visible, and vocal sexuality. Pretty Magnolia asks the question, "What would it mean to make visible some of the erotic images, references and concepts of black feminist or queer desire, as embodied and performed, as imagined and realized?" In the process of asking this question and other variations, in dozens of posts and reposts, the answer becomes both apparent and evasive, obvious and invisible, again and again.

Practice Makes Perfect

The process of determining whether or not a project counts within the rubric of digital humanities is a calculus of determining the scope, tools, outcomes, investments, and intentions. But what counts as a

project? Is it a documented methodology or an approach to a set of objects? Is it contingent on having a team of interdisciplinary scholars working together? Is it having a set of goals, or that neoliberal promise of the deliverable? Is it something other than independent scholarly writing? If many of the projects in the digital humanities are built on "soft money"—grants tied to specific development projects rather than a self-sustaining organization—what origin story of DH would include the #AntiJemimas project? What happens if the outcome is a project with a complicated relationship to categories like use-value or applicability and has no "deliverable" to offer other practitioners? What happens when the outcome is a sustainable practice, a sustainable self in academia, a lifeline to others as a way of imagining a future together?

One of the most prevalent dichotomies in the discussion of digital humanities as a field is the conflict between hack versus yack.[2] The "hack" refers to the concept of making: this might include developing a game, prioritizing a pedagogical practice that includes teaching students how to develop a tool, coding an archival project, soldering circuits together for an art installation, or developing a new tool for scholarly publishing. The oppositional "yack" is perhaps more recognizable to most humanities scholars. It refers to the acts of theorization by writing or speaking, usually in solitary exercises, or at times on a conference panel or scholarly collaboration.

What does it mean to be a "hacker" or a "maker" when the project is developing a space for your own academic voice, creating a digital space where the disjointed components of self can come together in incoherent brilliance? If hack is the "new" formulation bequeathed to the humanities from the innovation of the digital, what does it mean that *to yack* is still a political move in many academic spaces, especially when the "yacker" does not occupy a position of power within the academy? What does it mean when the *yack* is an act of *hack* in a given political or academic setting?

In preparation for the panel, Johnson posted a blog thinking about some of these questions and about how to confront the implications and specifics of connecting the alter egos with her professional identity:

> *I'm presenting with Fleshy Prof but I'll basically be playing myself [. . .]. And the entire family is invited: Zora Walker, the Sable Fan Gyrl, the WOC Survival Kit—even Pretty Magnolia's fine ass. This little intellectual endeavor comes at a difficult time. Personally and professionally, I am heavy, struggling to find my voice and stake my claim. Balancing, consolidating, and exposing the alters*

will be like walking into a cold classroom filled with hostile, con-descending adults and stripping down to a bright red thong. It will be sexy, nerve-wracking, and vaguely reminiscent of slavery. ("Preparing")

Johnson presented her project at the conference, but the project itself is the practice of building and transforming her own infinite selves. As the developer, coder, creator, and inhabitant of the four alter egos, Johnson explains, "[T]he #AntiJemimas are more than a project. They are a lifestyle [. . .] and a survival imperative" ("Preparing"). Furthermore, it is "a struggle to present a practice, not just a project," and it is an ongoing question. She has experimented with "present[ing] a performance of self created through digital spaces and fleshy avatars, but how does one literally practice the practice in public?"[5] The practice itself is the project: the practice of documenting the performance of her self, of imagining a genealogical connection to parts of herself, of promising digital alter egos while walking through the world as "Fleshy Prof," of documenting both the desire and the inability for a unified self: "cruel optimism" rears its head again. And again.

On MuthaFking Monsters and Patchwork Girls

These alter egos make possible a future imaginary, but they also have the potential to reimagine the field formation. Along with identifying future alter egos, this expansive, transformative vision of digital humanities extends to recognizing (and identifying) alternative genealogies: the making and remaking of self, community, narrative, and histories. The alter egos are multiple and contain multitudes, and their genealogies are not restricted to a unified thread. By tugging on one of these strings, for example, the genealogical traditions of the MuthaFking Monsters and Alter Egos might be traced to one of the most formative electronic hypertext stories, Patchwork Girl. Written in 1995 by Shelley Jackson, an experimental, feminist author-artist hacker-yacker, Patchwork Girl mobilized the nonlinear, multimedia capacities of the Storyspace system to develop a fictional world full of multiplicities, alter egos, alter endings, and alter worlds. Patchwork Girl was a patchwork of traditions from zines, choose-your-own-adventure stories, early computer games, and feminist storytelling. It was part manifesto and part how-to manual for the digital grrrl of the late 1990s. Inspired by Frankenstein, the story featured a female monster constructed and imagined by Mary Shelley, and the Storyspace software made it possible to remix literary genealogies,

the story's narrative, and the reader's relationship to the text, at the same time building and dissecting the Patchwork Girl. Jackson played with these dueling tensions between creating a narrative and creating herself, between authoring a story and writing herself into being: "My birth takes place more than once. In the plea of a bygone monster; from a muddy hole by corpse-light; under the needle, and under the pen. Or it took place not at all. But if I hope to tell a good story, I must leapfrog out of the muddle of my several births to the day I parted for the last time with the author of my being, and set out to write my own destiny" (Jackson, *Patchwork*). Jackson also theorized the power of links, both hypertext and otherwise: links were not simply a functional connection. Links have a narrative arc and can make arguments by their act of connecting otherwise disparate bits of texts or images. We can see this history playing out today in the reblogging and reposting traditions on Tumblr, where tracing the origins of a snippet of text or of an image is partially visible, partially obscure, and always incomplete. The act of curating relies on this argument constructed by the links themselves. Jackson recalls: "When I first started writing hypertext I discovered that the link was not neutral, but was itself a kind of argument, one that I should not duplicate in my prose. I had to learn to allow the link to make points that I would formerly have spelled out in words. In this sense, programming is not just a substrate but an active part of the writing" (Jackson and Raley).

What happens when we shift difference away from a deficit that must be managed and amended (with nods in the direction of diversity) and toward understanding difference as our operating system, our thesis, our inspiration, our goal? From this perspective, highlighting the brave side of digital humanities isn't an act of transformative resolution, but is about reframing and recognizing which links were already there and which links are yet to be made.

FIONA M. BARNETT is a PhD candidate in the Literature Program and Women's Studies at Duke University, where she is completing her dissertation, "Turning the Body Inside Out." She is also the director of the HASTAC Scholars program at www.hastac.org.

Notes

1   There are numerous essays on the notion of the "big tent" of digital humanities. For a start, see Svennson; and Terras.

2   There are many blogs and articles on the "hack vs. yack" question. For some orientation toward the questions at stake, see Cecire, "When"; and Koh.

3   This last quotation is from Johnson's unpublished notes, to which she kindly allowed me access.

Works Cited   Alvarado, Rafael. "Are MOOCs Part of the Digital Humanities?" *The Transducer* (blog). 5 Jan. 2013. http://transducer.ontoligent.com/?p=992.

Bailey, Moya Z. "All the Digital Humanists Are White, All the Nerds Are Men, but Some of Us Are Brave." *Journal of Digital Humanities* 1.1 (Winter 2011). http://journalofdigitalhumanities .org/1-1/all-the-digital-humanists-are-white-all-the-nerds-are-men-but-some-of-us -are-brave-by-moya-z-bailey/ (accessed 11 Nov. 2013).

Barnett, Fiona (@HASTACscholars). ".@ryancordell I don't think they're anti-DH. Bringing up q's of field formation isn't exactly the same as being against the field, no?" 4 Jan. 2013, 11:17 a.m. Tweet.

───────── (@HASTACscholars). "It should probably be clarified that sometimes folks say 'Digital Humanities' when they mean 'the discourse ABOUT DH' #mla13 #s307." 4 Jan. 2013, 11:33 a.m. Tweet.

Cecire, Natalia (@nataliacesire). "1. DHers usually don't see dh as panacea. 2. Admins often do. 3. DHers often need for admins to have this erroneous belief. #mla13 #s307." 4 Jan. 2013, 11:43 a.m. Tweet.

──────────. "Tacit." *Works Cited* (blog). 10 Aug. 2013. http://nataliacecire.blogspot.com/2013 /08/tacit.html.

──────────. "When Digital Humanities Was in Vogue." *Journal of Digital Humanities* 1.1 (Winter 2011). http://journalofdigitalhumanities.org/1-1/when-digital-humanities-was-in -vogue-by-natalia-cecire/ (accessed 27 Oct. 2013).

Chun, Wendy Hui Kyong. "The Dark Side of the Digital Humanities—Part 1." *Center for 21st Century Studies.* 9 Jan. 2013. http://www.c21uwm.com/2013/01/09/the-dark-side-of-the-digital -humanities-part-1/.

Cordell, Ryan (@ryancordell). "I suppose an antiDH backlash was inevitable—I'm just sad that some in the packed #mla13 #s307 might think these are fair characterizations." 4 Jan. 2013, 11:15 a.m. Tweet.

Golumbia, David (@dgolumbia). "to get here, must say HASTAC not DH RT @eetempleton: #mla13 #s307 @amandafrench MOOCs are not DH to DHers. Neither is Online learning." 4 Jan. 2013, 11:39 a.m. Tweet.

Harris, Katherine D. (@triproftri). "@amandafrench starts with 'I didn't recognize DH in what the panel was discussing' #s307 #mla13 (oh snap!)." 4 Jan. 2013, 11:36 a.m. Tweet.

Jackson, Shelley. *Patchwork Girl.* Watertown: Eastgate Systems, 1995.

Jackson, Shelley, and Rita Raley. "Of Dolls and Monsters: An Interview with Shelley Jackson by Rita Raley." *Iowa Review* (Winter 2002). http://iowareview.uiowa.edu/TIRW/TIRW_Archive /tirweb/feature/jackson/interview.html (accessed 11 Nov. 2013).

Johnson, Jessica Marie. "About iwannalive productions." *. . . iwannalive productions . . .* (blog). 20 May 2011. http://iwannalive.wordpress.com/about-iwannalive-productions/.

──────────. "#AntiJemimas (or How to Build a Real Gyrl in 3 Easy Steps)." *The AntiJemima Life* (blog). http://nunezdaughter.wordpress.com/iwannalive-productions/ (accessed 27 Oct. 2013).

──────────. *Confessions of a Sable Fan Gyrl* (blog). http://confessionsofasablefangyrl .tumblr.com (accessed 27 Oct. 2013).

──────────. "I Need to Write (the 'About' Page)." *The AntiJemima Life* (blog). http://nunez daughter.wordpress.com/about/ (accessed 27 Oct. 2013).

──────────. "It's Sable Fan Gyrl Week @NuñezDaughter." *The AntiJemima Life* (blog). 10 June 2011. http://nunezdaughter.wordpress.com/2011/06/10/its-sable-fan-gyrl-week -nunezdaughter/.

──────────. "On Alter Egos and Infinite Literacies, Part 2 (An #AntiJemimas Imperative)." Paper presented at the American Studies Association Annual Meeting. San Juan, Puerto Rico. 4 Oct. 2012.

──────────. "Preparing. . . ." *The AntiJemima Life* (blog). 12 Nov. 2012. http://nunezdaughter .wordpress.com/2012/11/08/preparing/.

──────────. *Pretty Magnolia* (blog). http://prettymagnolia.tumblr.com/ (accessed 27 Oct. 2013).

──────────. "The nudity I think. . . ." *Pretty Magnolia* (blog). http://prettymagnolia.tumblr .com/post/35355935934/the-nudity-i-think-scares-the-nation-as-a-whole (accessed 27 Oct. 2013).

──────────. "Who Cares If Many Latinos Are Black?" *Zora Walker* (blog). 15 July 2012. http:// theycallmezorawalker.tumblr.com/post/27290226266/who-cares-if-many-latinos-are-black -juan-crow-is-still.

──────────. *Zora Walker* (blog). http://theycallmezorawalker.tumblr.com/ (accessed 27 Oct. 2013).

Kirschenbaum, Matthew (@mkirschenbaum). "@ryancordell it's not that they're unfair, per se, just largely unconnected to much actual academic practice of DH. #s307 #mla13." 4 Jan. 2013, 11:17 a.m. Tweet.

Koh, Adeline. "More Hack, Less Yack? Modularity, Theory, and Habitus in the Digital Humanities." *Adeline Koh* (blog). 21 May 2012. http://www.adelinekoh.org/blog/2012/05/21 /more-hack-less-yack-modularity-theory-and-habitus-in-the-digital-humanities/.

Lothian, Alexis, and Amanda Phillips. "Can Digital Humanities Mean Transformative Critique?" *Journal of e-Media Studies* 3.1 (2013). http://journals.dartmouth.edu/cgi-bin/Web Objects/Journals.woa/xmlpage/4/article/425 (accessed 10 June 2013).

McKenzie, Mia. "Her Body Is Not Your Playground: Why the Photoshopped Frida Nudes Are Not Okay." *Zora Walker* (blog). 25 Oct. 2012. http://theycallmezorawalker.tumblr.com /post/35510285463/her-body-is-not-your-playground-why-the-photoshopped.

Renina. "Can You Explain to Me What a 'Ho Tape' Is?" *New Model Minority* (blog). 17 Oct. 2013. http://newmodelminority.com/2012/10/17/can-you-explain-to-me-what-a-ho-tape-is/.

Sedgwick, Eve. "Privilege of Unknowing: Diderot's *The Nun.*" *Tendencies.* Durham: Duke UP, 1993. 23–51.

Svennson, Patrick. "Beyond the Big Tent." *Debates in the Digital Humanities.* Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2012. http://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/debates/text/22 (accessed 10 Oct. 2013).

Templeton, Erin (@eetempleton). "#mla13 #s307 @amandafrench says 'I didn't recognize a lot of what I recognize as DH in what [the speakers] have talked about in the panel.'" 4 Jan. 2013, 11:36 a.m. Tweet.

Terras, Melissa. "Peering inside the Big Tent: Digital Humanities and the Crisis of Inclusion." *Melissa Terras' Blog* (blog). 26 July 2011. http://melissaterras.blogspot.com/2011/07/peering -inside-big-tent-digital.html.

Wiegman, Robyn. *Object Lessons.* Durham: Duke UP, 2012.