Bethel University

Spark

Librarian Publications and Presentations | Library and Archives

1-2023

Digital Archives as Socially and Civically Just Public Resources

Kent Gerber
Bethel University, kent-gerber@bethel.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://spark.bethel.edu/librarian-publications

Part of the Archival Science Commons, Digital Humanities Commons, Race, Ethnicity and Post-Colonial Studies Commons, and the Scholarly Publishing Commons

Recommended Citation

Gerber, Kent, "Digital Archives as Socially and Civically Just Public Resources" (2023). *Librarian Publications and Presentations*. 7.
https://spark.bethel.edu/librarian-publications/7

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Library and Archives at Spark. It has been accepted for inclusion in Librarian Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of Spark.

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX

Digital Archives as Socially and Civically Just Public Resources

KENT GERBER (BETHEL UNIVERSITY)

How can the digital humanities community ensure that its digital archives are public resources that live up to the best potential of digital humanities without repeating or perpetuating power imbalances, silences, or injustice? A framework for anti-racist action, the "ARC of racial justice," developed by historian Jemar Tisby in his study of the complicity of the Christian church in perpetuating racism in the United States, is one way that this goal can be accomplished. The ARC is an acronym for three kinds of interrelated and interdependent kinds of actions one can take to fight racism and work for change: Awareness (building knowledge), Relationships (building connections in community), and Commitment (systemic change and a way of life) (2019, 194–7). This chapter applies Tisby's ARC framework to the context of publicly available digital archives and how they can become more socially and civically just by making sure the "silences in the archive" are identified, the variety of stories are told, and injustices are addressed (Thomas, Fowler, and Johnson 2017). The interaction between digital humanities scholars, community members, and cultural heritage professionals, such as librarians, archivists, and museum curators, is an important dynamic for digital archives that serve as public resources. When digital humanities projects result in digital archives they are often the result of collaboration and conversations between digital humanities scholars and cultural heritage professionals because of shared core values of these professions and their institutions to provide wide and equitable access, as well as to "advance knowledge, foster innovation, and serve the public" (Spiro 2012; Vandegrift and Varner 2013; Gerber 2017). The public-facing function of these collections and projects is also deepened by the engagement with the public humanities and public history communities (Brennan 2016, "Public History Roots").

AWARENESS

One central concept that drives librarians involved in these public-facing collections is the mission "to improve society through facilitating knowledge creation in their communities" (Lankes 2011, 15). In order to improve society through public resources and community engagement that is more just, inclusive, and mutually beneficial, it is important to be informed by the A, Awareness, of Tisby's ARC. To begin, we must be self-aware of how our personal identities and social positions within our institutions shape how we act and are perceived by our colleagues and community

partners, especially with historically marginalized or exploited communities (Earhart 2018). With this in mind, I am a librarian who specializes in creating and managing the digital library, or digital archive, of the cultural heritage and scholarship of a mid-sized private liberal arts university located in the United States. The personal and social identities that influence my perspective and context include being white, straight, Christian, middle-class, cis-male, and located in the Global North, all placing me within a social context with privileges, blind spots, or vulnerabilities. These professional, institutional, social, and personal contexts are important to name and acknowledge in order to authentically discuss the role that perspective and power dynamics play in this topic. If digital archives are going to be a public good that more fully address inequality and are mutually beneficial to the communities they serve, those who create them must be aware of their biases and context.

There is a rich body of intersectional, critical work surveyed by Roopika Risam that engages how the digital humanities interact with the theoretical and practical factors of "race, gender, disability, class, sexuality, or a combination thereof" and colonialism (2015, para. 4; 2018b) that can be drawn upon to notice the silences in the archive. There is also a rich body of work in the *Debates in the Digital Humanities* series[1] in which the first two chapters of the 2019 edition discuss "Gender and Cultural Analytics" by Lisa Mandell and "Critical Black Digital Humanities" by Safiya Umoja Noble. Additionally, the volume *Bodies of Information* is a collection of chapters centered on Intersectional Feminism in the Digital Humanities (Wernimont and Losh 2018). Unfortunately, too many in the digital humanities and cultural heritage community have overlooked these bodies of work. One notable example regarding digital archives was triggered by a digital humanities conference keynote by a white male that ignored these works resulting in the affective labor of expressions of anger, sadness, and frustration on social media and the collaborative development of "angry bibliographies" like the "Justice and Digital Archive Bibliography"[2] by Jaqueline Wernimont to demonstrate that the resources do exist (Risam 2018a). As a white male, it is important for me (and colleagues like me) to engage with these resources and learn from them in order to avoid these past mistakes and to also ensure that my theory and practice is informed by these perspectives in order to recognize "one's own experience in relationship to complex positionality is crucial to understanding how we, as digital humanities scholars, might work in ethical, nonexploitive ways, attending to what might be missteps due to lack of consideration" (Earhart 2018). These critical treatments can lead to better ways of doing digital humanities. In *Digital Community Engagement*, digital humanities and public history scholars Wingo, Heppler, and Schadewald believe "that digital humanities has the capacity to positively shape the study of the arts, culture, and social sciences. We believe it can do so while promoting inclusion, justice, and recovery with beneficial impact for communities" (2020, "Introduction").

Just like the term Digital Humanities has a varied and elusive definition,[3] the definition of digital archive varies based on the people and organizations that are responsible for its creation and its purpose. For the purposes of this chapter, "digital archives" will represent the variety of digital humanities projects that result in collections involving various interactions between cultural heritage institutions, researchers investigating a particular theme or "thematic research collections" (Palmer 2004) and collaborations with community groups or an archive as "an ecosystem of individuals, communities, and institutions that care for and use these materials" (Hubbard 2020, "Communities, Individuals, and Institutions: Building Archives Through Relationships with Care"). This definition will include a spectrum bounded by the narrowest definition on one end—a digital version of the

holdings of one particular cultural heritage institution, research group, or governmental body—and including a variety of digital collections that are collaborations between the above-mentioned groups and have shared meaning and purpose between them beyond a single collector. The limit of the broader definition of digital archive stops short of being "random collections of objects and documents that bring pleasure to the collector but have little or no impact on the larger order of things" (Eichhorn 2008). While I make some effort to broaden my perspective beyond examples based in the United States, the majority of the archives covered in this chapter are US-focused.

Digital archives as public resources can include some digital archives that are developed for a specific academic audience, like the *Networked Infrastructure for Nineteenth Century Electronic Scholarship* or *NINES*[4] that features nineteenth-century British and American literature, or for a specific purpose like addressing the injustice of slavery with the *Georgetown Slavery Archive*,[5] but are still considered public resources because they are still open for anyone to access on the web without charge. I am excluding projects or archives that are commercially generated or have barriers to access such as subscription fees or require a user to sign in for access. Others are intentionally designed to be public resources through collaboration with the community like the *Remembering Rondo History Harvest*[6] or for a general audience centered on a geographic region like the *Digital Library of the Caribbean*.[7] Because digital archives in this definition all have some connection with institutions like universities and cultural heritage organizations who are collaborating with communities it is important to point out that these same institutions can often perpetuate or exacerbate exploitation, oppression, or marginalization in these projects instead of improving these conditions (Earhart 2018). Also, how can we make sure that we are aware of the "frozen social orders" in the archives themselves and that the innovations that we foster are "sociological as well as technological" (Nell Smith 2014, 404)?

The future of digital archives is also shaped by the items and the tools that are used to curate them. Some content management software tools have been developed with the digital humanities values of access, openness, and humanities-focused inquiry and narratives in mind, like Omeka, and Scalar,[8] and have made creating projects and digital archives much easier (Leon 2017, 47). In order to avoid past mistakes of colonialism and exploitation, creators of the archive must be more aware of how an item or piece of data is embedded in communities, and ultimately connected to human beings and shape the archive around this condition (Nell Smith 2014; Earhart 2018; Risam 2018b). For example, some of these existing content management systems did not meet the needs of the Warumungu community, an indigenous group in Australia, when they were working on creating a digital archive with a team from Washington State University. The Warumungu community needed "cultural protocol driven metadata fields, differential user access based on cultural and social relationships, and functionality to include layered narratives at the item level" which was also a conclusion reached by communicating with US Native communities by the Smithsonian Institution National Museum of the American Indian (Christen, Merrill, and Wynne 2017, section 1). Mukurtu[9] was the result of this design relationship with the community and led to these important system requirements that were built in to work under the framework of these community needs and protocols. This relationship and development process is a good model to consider as we choose tools or develop new ones, even if they challenge some of the values of providing the widest access possible due to important community values such as indigenous groups or activists who are concerned about public exposure. We need to continue to explore partnerships

like this to bring the influence of the humanities and particular knowledge of our communities to shape our practice and our tools.

Items in digital space depend on the technology of file formats and it is important to be aware of the variety of formats that an item in a digital archive can take. The Library of Congress' Recommended Formats Statement for Preservation[10] is one important tool to keep track of those changes and applying these changes into practices and tools that ensure that these archives will last as public resources for traditional materials like text and images while also addressing newer forms like 3D objects, datasets, and video games and how these new forms might meet community needs. We will need to continue to learn how to manage and represent these kinds of digital objects in our practice as the way that information is shared and represented continues to change. As we push boundaries with technology we also need to be aware of how accessible these items and archives are for people with disabilities and how to implement universal design principles in our projects, especially with tools that have been developed to help with this like Scripto and Anthologize (Williams 2012).

We each have our circles of influence and we can build awareness on several levels as discussed above. One can engage with the literature and conversations with colleagues to learn more deeply about the variety of perspectives and identities in the digital humanities and shape our theory and practices accordingly. It is important to acknowledge the predominance of whiteness in digital humanities (McPherson 2012) and cultural heritage fields (Hathcock 2015; Schlesselman-Tarango 2017; Leung and López-McKnight 2021) and take critiques like the ones represented by #ArchivesSoWhite seriously so that we can improve our practice, hiring, and training, "From the collections our repositories acquire to the outreach we conduct, exhibits we mount, and classes we teach, a fundamental shift in how archivists conceptualize their mandate is coming. In addition, we need to re-evaluate how we train, hire, support, and retain diverse staff who truly represent the materials for which they care" (Oswald et al. 2016). Archivists must be aware of their own biases and the power dynamics involved as Calahan explains:

> The archivist's role in deciding what is kept as part of the historical record for society is more crucial with the accrual of digital records, and it is important to be aware of the implication of making acquisition and appraisal decisions in a profession that is predominantly white, in which decision makers are in positions of political, social, and economic power.
>
> (2019, 5)

The community around the Archives for Black Lives in Philadelphia[11] is a project inspired by Jarrett Drake,[12] former archivist at Princeton and PhD candidate in anthropology, and is a good model of how awareness can lead to action in archival practice.

Beyond our own awareness of our personal and professional biases and the context of our tools and materials we also need to continue to raise the public's awareness of the existence of these archives and how they can find them. A large barrier between the public and archive is due to the scattered and opaque nature of the institutions that create and host archives. Once users actually find a digital archive there is an additional issue of how much they actually understand how to use and navigate the website, and if necessary, the traditional finding aid. One solution is to more deeply involve the users in the creation of an archive's web presence and address the four main concerns: "archival terminology, hierarchical structure of descriptions, searching tools,

and content visualisation" (Feliciati 2018, 131). Further muddying the waters is the relationship between multiple libraries, archives, and museums and what a casual searcher may find on the web. Digital projects can also be scattered across the web and also receive lower priority in search results than commercial or more "popular" sources of information. Collaborative networked efforts like the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA)[13] and its regional hubs or Europeana[14] help ensure a wider spread of the items in an archive and allow for a larger scope of coverage and themes than a single institution or regional center could hold. The DPLA and the University of Minnesota also developed a tool to pull together disparate sources about African American history and search for them in the *Umbra Search*[15] platform. Networked collaborations like this with attention to metadata, content, and interface design can help to broaden the scope and access to items, emphasize certain themes within larger collections, or provide some context to an item in a digital archive or found on the web.

Whether an archive is digital or not it is a necessary skill to understand not only the holdings of an archive but also its "silences" including "the absence of records from the public view, the absence of certain details in records that are available, or the absence of records altogether" often as a result of privileging written records, informality (not creating records), conflict and oppression, selection policies, privileging the powerful and rich over the ordinary and marginalized, secrecy, and intentional destruction of records (Fowler 2017; Gilliland 2017, xv). If digital humanists can recognize these silences in digital archives they can address them by filling gaps or creating new archives altogether.

One model for addressing these silences with digital archives is to collect items that are ephemeral and would otherwise be lost to the public record especially in spaces of conflict and crisis like the protests after George Floyd was killed by police in Minneapolis. The *George Floyd & Anti-Racist Street Art Archive*[16] was created by professors and students who are part of the Urban Art Mapping Research Project at the University of St. Thomas in Saint Paul, Minnesota and collects images of street art from around the world responding to the call for justice and equality. Much of the items in the archive are already physically gone from their original locations or erased and this archive preserves the energy, art, and expressions of the immediate aftermath for others to view. A few years earlier in 2015 *A People's Archive of Police Violence in Cleveland*[17] (PAPVC) was created in response to the killing of twelve-year-old Tamir Rice by Cleveland police and to document the community's experiences and fill the silence that was in the police, government, and local news narrative. The *Mapping Police Violence Archive*[18] is another example of this same theme that was created to track and visualize incidents of police violence across the United States from 2013 to the present. We can continue to learn from the content of these archives and also from the process in which they were made to create new archives that continue to address more silences and create counter-narratives.

We can raise public awareness of issues of representation, justice, and technology in our role as educators by intentionally engaging our students and guiding them through archives with these issues in mind. As McPherson pointed out, we need "graduate and undergraduate education that hone[s] both critical and digital literacies" (2012, "Moving Beyond Our Boxes") and Miriam Posner's generous sharing of her tutorials and curriculum materials[19] are a model of this combination of literacies. Risam, Snow and Edwards have created an undergraduate digital humanities program at Salem State University that is marked by "a strong commitment to social justice through attention to the ethics of library and faculty collaboration, student labor, and public

scholarship that seeks to tell stories that are underrepresented in local history" and to serve as a good model for smaller, teaching-focused institutions in contrast to the more prevalent models in larger research institutions (2017, 342). They do this through two "interwoven initiatives—Digital Salem, a university-wide umbrella digital humanities project to house digital scholarship by faculty and students on the history, culture, and literature of Salem, Massachusetts, and the Digital Scholars Program, an undergraduate research program that introduced students to digital humanities using the university's archival holdings" (Risam, Snow, and Edwards 2017, 341). In the Bethel University Digital Humanities program, which is also a collaboration between a librarian, archivist, and digital humanities scholar, students are introduced to the physical archive by the archivist and then, as the librarian, I teach them the concepts and process of assigning metadata and introduce them to the technology and process of digitizing materials for a digital archive (Gerber, Goldberg, and Magnuson 2019). I also discuss who gets to create a narrative of the archive and how certain narratives are constructed. As a predominantly white campus, meaning the student body is 50 percent white or more, it is important to expose these students to groups different from them so they are assigned to explore archives that emphasize the stories of BIPOC people like the DPLA and Minnesota Digital Library's *History of Survivance: Upper Midwest 19th-Century Native American Narratives* exhibit[20] featuring the Dakota and Anishinaabe (Ojibwe) people on whose homelands Minnesota is located, help transcribe Rosa Parks' papers in the Library of Congress,[21] explore a counter-narrative timeline of our institution's history of discrimination and racism,[22] or explore gender and the overlooked history of the creation of the web by reading and encoding a chapter in TEI XML about computer scientist and hypertext researcher, Dame Wendy Hall,[23] in addition to Tim Berners-Lee who is usually credited with creating the web without further context (Evans 2018, 153–74). Engaging our students with these concepts, communities, and ways of working will hopefully produce citizens who have both critical and digital literacies and are more able to see silences as they use or create digital archives.

We also need to study and learn from digital archives that were created as a response to critical public needs in the US for information about the spread of the coronavirus or on social media. Organizations like Johns Hopkins University[24] and the *New York Times*[25] stepped in to create the publicly available archives that the federal government entities like the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) were not willing or able to do. Projects like the *COVID Racial Data Tracker*[26] by *The COVID Tracking Project at The Atlantic* called out the need for racial data to be able to understand the impact on different sections of the community. These projects used technical tools like GitHub for the data repository and a variety of visualization tools and dashboards to quickly and clearly communicate the archive's contents and critical tools to understand the social and political, and ultimately human, impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. Rieger (2020) surveyed the institutional and individual efforts of researchers and archivists to document the pandemic for the near future as well as future generations in the early stages of the pandemic, and the digital humanities community and digital archives community will need to continue to analyze and compare these efforts to seek meaning from this rich and challenging time in the world's history. While collecting items from social media is out of scope for this chapter it is important to know about the distributed digital archive model exemplified by the collaborative project between archivists and activists, *Documenting the Now*,[27] which explains on its homepage that it is "a tool and a community developed around supporting the ethical collection, use, and preservation of social media content."

RELATIONSHIPS

The next phase in Tisby's ARC framework is Relationships. To enact change for more socially and civically just digital archives, awareness is not enough. One must take what they now know and enact it within their community and within relationships. Hubbard proposes that we must understand archives as part of an "ecosystem" and integrate the "individuals, communities, and institutions" more deeply into LIS professional development and education training. Hubbard continues that we should center that view of an ecosystem "when we think about archival custody and stewardship we move away from the binary construction of institutional or community ownership and control" (2020).

Efforts within the archival community to broaden the participation in selecting and describing the items and collections are a start to a more collaborative integration of individuals, communities, and institutions. For instance, Fowler explains how collecting policies "favoured the acquisition of records that reflected the perspective of governments or rich and powerful organizations, families and individuals. Only from the 1970s has there been a genuine desire at most archival institutions to reflect wider aspects of the society outside the reading room door, by interacting with groups which do not traditionally use the archive" (Fowler 2017, 34). Fowler goes on to describe efforts to further include users of archives in the description process for National Archive in the UK that seek to move beyond limited feedback to catalogers to include oral history or witness statements to add to records about people who are included in the archives and to make the archives more user-friendly (2017, 57).

One step further in the relationship with communities is for institutions to share or even release ownership of materials in digital archives back to their original owners in a process called "digital repatriation." The largest example of this by the United States federal government is when the Library of Congress gave digitized recordings of wax cylinders to the Passamaquoddy tribe located in what is now the state of Maine and adjusted any remaining access to the wishes of the tribe (Kim 2019). New projects could go even further and start from a place of shared, reciprocal responsibility or even with the community taking the lead while institutions follow. Wingo, Heppler, and Schadewald in their edited volume, *Digital Community Engagement*, have published an equitable model resource for any organization seeking to partner with their community and also for any community seeking to partner with a university. In chapter 2 of *Digital Community Engagement* Hubbard explains in more detail how the *People's Archive of Police Violence* in Cleveland began with archivists offering their services to the community after the killing of Tamir Rice and taking the lead from community organization's needs and agreeing to do whatever the community asked without a preconceived agenda (2020). Chapter 3 of this volume explains how a clear, equal partnership from the beginning between Macalester College and the community organization, Rondo Ave. Inc in Saint Paul, MN, led to a fruitful relationship that created the *Remembering Rondo History Harvest* program and digital archive that was truly a public resource shaped by and useful to the community (Anderson and Wingo 2020). Community leader and project partner Marvin Anderson explained that he was looking for three main things in a college partner: "a. depth of understanding about Rondo's unique history, b. level of advance preparation, and c. clarity of course objectives" (2020). These kinds of partnerships should be more of the model for existing and future digital archives that are meant to be a public resource of any kind.

COMMITMENT

The last phase of Tisby's ARC framework is Commitment. To show commitment to these efforts for more socially and civically just digital archives, changes must be informed by awareness, made in relationship, but must ultimately be implemented in systematic ways that impact policy and have longevity. Engaging with the kind of critical literature and conversations, of which a small sample is included in this chapter and volume, should be a regular part of professional and academic training for digital humanities scholars and cultural heritage professionals. If we are to improve society through our digital archives as public resources we should emphasize the full breadth of communities and experiences while also acknowledging the disproportional presence of whiteness in order to recognize the silences that white supremacy and colonialism have produced. We should make it a life habit and regular practice to listen and learn from the voices speaking into this gap and take the opportunity to grow. This effort does not come without challenge or without cost as most of the resources cited here are in response to backlash or resistance to wider representation, inclusion, or social and civic change.

We can also embed some of these ideas and practices into our tools and follow the example of the Mukurtu project. One example is how the software built in shared authority integrates institutional records alongside tribal metadata for the same digital item and each has independent authority to manage their own version of the records exemplified in the *Plateau People's Web portal*[28] (Christen, Merrill, and Wynne 2017, section 2). The software also incorporates the Traditional Knowledge Labels created by the *Local Contexts project*[29] that were developed in intimate collaboration with indigenous communities that "reflect ongoing relationships and authority including proper use, guidelines for action, or responsible stewardship and re-use." The challenge is to continue to develop and share the ways that we can continue to build or modify digital tools that are compassionate, just, and humanities-influenced resources for the public.

Commitment also implies longevity and projects and digital archives that engage the public long-term can lead to change in public policy. The *Mapping Prejudice Project*[30] initially raised awareness of the systematic practice of adding racist language to housing deeds that excluded people of color from buying the home in the future by creating a digital archive of those deeds and layering them on top of the map of Minneapolis. This arrangement of materials visualized how the practice of redlining in partnership with these racial covenants shaped where people of color could live in the city. In order to process all of the deeds the project invited the public to help identify and tag the language of the racial covenants in the deed documents. Although the language in these deeds was ruled unenforceable in 1948 and illegal in 1968 there was no way to remove the covenants from the deed unless the person who added it was contacted and agreed to remove it. After years of this work, the Minnesota state legislature passed a law in 2019 to enable current property owners to legally discharge the language which then led to the *Just Deeds Project*,[31] which provides free legal services to permanently discharge the racial covenants. While these are small steps in housing equity it serves as a public education resource as well as working to repair an unjust practice. This kind of digital archive is one that does improve society on the awareness level as well as the more systematic commitment to change public policy and legal structures.

There is a remaining challenge of the tension between having space for community groups and members to lead and own their materials and projects including their digital items and spaces while ensuring the preservation and persistence of a digital archive. In the case of the *Remembering Rondo History Harvest* the community was given ownership of the web space but that web domain,

rememberrondo.org, at the writing of this chapter is no longer active and is only available through a snapshot from the Internet Archive Wayback Machine.[32] The Omeka-based archive is still available in the Macalester technical infrastructure and this kind of technical and management issue remains a challenge for smaller community organizations that do not want to or do not have the resources to maintain a public web presence for the long-term. This is an opportunity to serve our communities by committing our resources for sustainability but without pushing our own agenda over the needs of the community. An earlier example of this situation is the *September 11 Digital Archive*,[33] which was initially a project of the Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media built with Omeka to document people's responses to the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center buildings in New York City and the Pentagon in Washington DC in 2001. The archive was acquired by the Library of Congress in 2003 and now is held there for long-term access and preservation. The many digital archives considered in this chapter and in this volume will also have decisions to make regarding sustainability to consider how to manage the archive and how to ensure long-term access for the public. Often when a project does not involve a cultural heritage professional or institution there is an increased risk that the metadata strategy overlooks standards and multi-disciplinary vocabularies and that the items in the archive, or the whole archive, are not part of a long-term preservation strategy. This will have to be navigated in a way that respects the needs and concerns of the communities that created them or are a part of the archive ecosystem. Colleges, universities, and cultural heritage institutions will need to consider how they will systematically commit resources to support community and public initiatives like these in their staffing, training, and budget through the whole ARC framework of awareness, relationships, and commitment.

CONCLUSION

Moving through Tisby's ARC framework for racial justice of Awareness, Relationships, and Commitment can help the ecosystem of individuals, communities, and institutions adjust existing digital archives and create new ones that address silences and are more socially and civically just. Practitioners and scholars, particularly ones like myself who are situated in socially dominant identities (white, cis-male), can engage with the rich, intersectional literature and projects to grow our awareness and inform our actions as well as listen to and center colleagues who speak from a variety of traditionally marginalized, non-dominant social identities. Through a deeper awareness of ourselves, our professions and institutions, and our communities we can seek out and deepen relationships that include multiple narratives and create more inclusive and mutually beneficial digital archives using some of these models of community engagement and education. We can establish an awareness-informed and relationship-informed Commitment by seeking ways to make sure that we encourage and challenge our institutions to develop systems and policies that ensure the sustainability of these digital humanities projects and practices in the form of digital archives.

NOTES

1. https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/.
2. https://jwernimont.com/justice-and-digital-archives-a-working-bibliography/.
3. What is Digital Humanities? Made by Jason Heppler and contains 817 definitions submitted by digital humanities scholars and practitioners, https://whatisdigitalhumanities.com/.

4. https://nines.org/about/what-is-nines/.
5. https://slaveryarchive.georgetown.edu/.
6. https://omeka.macalester.edu/rondo/.
7. https://www.dloc.com.
8. The Alliance for Networking Visual Culture, https://scalar.me/anvc/scalar/.
9. Mukurtu Content Management System, https://mukurtu.org/about/.
10. https://www.loc.gov/preservation/resources/rfs/TOC.html.
11. Archives For Black Lives: Archivists responding to Black Lives Matter, https://archivesforblacklives.wordpress.com/.
12. Jarrett Drake's Harvard PhD Candidate page, https://scholar.harvard.edu/drake; Jarrett M. Drake's Writings on Medium, https://medium.com/@jmddrake.
13. dp.la.
14. https://www.europeana.eu/en.
15. https://www.umbrasearch.org/.
16. https://georgefloydstreetart.omeka.net/about.
17. https://www.archivingpoliceviolence.org/.
18. https://mappingpoliceviolence.org/.
19. Miriam Posner's Blog, Tutorials and Other Curricular Material, http://miriamposner.com/blog/tutorials-ive-written/.
20. https://dp.la/exhibitions/history-of-survivance.
21. Rosa Parks: In Her Own Words Crowdsourced Transcription Project, https://crowd.loc.gov/campaigns/rosa-parks-in-her-own-words/.
22. Looking Back to Move Forward Timeline: Selected Clarion Articles about Discrimination, Inequality, Race, and Social Justice at Bethel University 1959–1993, https://cdm16120.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15186coll6/custom/looking-back-timeline1.
23. Wendy Hall was also a digital humanities pioneer with the archivist at the University of Southampton when they collaborated to create an interlinked multimedia digital archive of the Mountbatten collection in 1989.
24. Covid-19 Dashboard by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University (JHU), https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html.
25. *New York Times* GitHub Ongoing Repository of Data on Coronavirus Cases and Deaths in the U.S., https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data.
26. https://covidtracking.com/race.
27. https://www.docnow.io/.
28. Example of a multiple perspective record of the Chemawa School Bakery, *c*. 1909 in the Plateau Peoples' Web Portal, https://plateauportal.libraries.wsu.edu/digital-heritage/chemawa-school-bakery-circa-1909.
29. https://localcontexts.org/.
30. https://mappingprejudice.umn.edu/index.html.
31. https://justdeeds.org/.
32. https://web.archive.org/web/20180903043142/; http://omeka.rememberingrondo.org/.
33. https://911digitalarchive.org/.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Marvin Roger and Rebecca S. Wingo. 2020. "Harvesting History, Remembering Rondo." In *Digital Community Engagement: Partnering Communities with the Academy*, edited by Rebecca S. Wingo, Jason A. Heppler and Paul Schadewald, Ch. 3. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati Press.

Brennan, Sheila A. 2016. *Public, First*. *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016*, edited by Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/read/untitled/section/11b9805a-a8e0-42e3-9a1c-fad46e4b78e5#ch32.

Calahan, Lisa. 2019. "Acquisitions, Appraisal, and Arrangement." In *The Digital Archives Handbook: A Guide to Creation, Management, and Preservation*, edited by Aaron D. Purcell, 3–18. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Christen, Kimberly, Alex Merrill, and Michael Wynne. 2017. "A Community of Relations: Mukurtu Hubs and Spokes." *D-Lib Magazine* 23 (5/6) (May/June). https://doi.org/10.1045/may2017-christen.

Earhart, Amy E. 2018. "Can we Trust the University? Digital Humanities Collaborations with Historically Exploited Cultural Communities." In *Bodies of Information: Intersectional Feminism and Digital Humanities*, edited by Elizabeth M. Losh and Jaqueline Wernimont, chap. 20. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Eichhorn, Kate. 2008. "Archival Genres: Gathering Texts and Reading Spaces." *Invisible Culture: An Electronic Journal for Visual Studies* (12). http://hdl.handle.net/1802/5788.

Evans, Claire Lisa. 2018. *Broad Band: The Untold Story of the Women Who made the Internet*. New York, NY: Portfolio/Penguin.

Feliciati, Pierluigi. 2018. "Access to Digital Archives: Studying Users' Expectations and Behaviours." In *Digital Archives: Management, access and use*, edited by Milena Dobreva, 121–36. London: Facet Publishing.

Fowler, Simon. 2017. "Enforced Silences." In *The Silence of the Archive*, edited by David Thomas, Simon Fowler, and Valerie Johnson, 1–39. Chicago, IL: ALA Neal-Schuman.

Gerber, Kent. 2017. "Conversation as a Model to Build the Relationship among Libraries, Digital Humanities, and Campus Leadership." *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 24 (2–4): 418–33. DOI: 10.1080/10691316.2017.1328296.

Gerber, Kent, Charlie Goldberg, and Diana Magnuson. 2019. "Creating Dynamic Undergraduate Learning Laboratories through Collaboration between Archives, Libraries, and Digital Humanities." *The Journal of Interactive Technology and Pedagogy* (15). https://jitp.commons.gc.cuny.edu/creating-dynamic-undergraduate-learning-laboratories-through-collaboration-between-archives-libraries-and-digital-humanities/.

Gilliland, Anne J. 2017. "Foreword." In *The Silence of the Archive*, edited by David Thomas, Simon Fowler and Valerie Johnson, xv–xvii. Chicago, IL: ALA Neal-Schuman.

Hathcock, April. 2015. "White Librarianship in Blackface: Diversity Initiatives in LIS." *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*. http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2015/lis-diversity/.

Hubbard, Melissa A. 2020. "Archival Resistance to Structural Racism: A People's Archive of Police Violence in Cleveland." In *Digital Community Engagement: Partnering Communities with the Academy*, edited by Rebecca S. Wingo, Jason A. Heppler and Paul Schadewald, chap. 2. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati Press.

Kim, E. Tammy. 2019. "The Passamaquoddy Reclaim their Culture through Digital Repatriation." *The New Yorker*, January 30.

Lankes, R. David. 2011. *The Atlas of New Librarianship*. Cambridge, MA; [Chicago]: MIT Press; Association of College & Research Libraries.

Leon, Sharon. 2017. "Complexity and Collaboration: Doing Public History in Digital Environments." In *The Oxford Handbook of Public History*, 1st edn, edited by Paula Hamilton and James B. Gardner, 44–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leung, Sofia Y. and Jorge R. López-McKnight. 2021. "Introduction: This is Only the Beginning." In *Knowledge Justice: Disrupting Library and Information Studies through Critical Race Theory*, edited by Sofia Y. Leung and Jorge R. López-McKnight, 1–41. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McPherson, Tara. 2012. "Why are the Digital Humanities so White? Or Thinking the Histories of Race and Computation." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold, chap. 9. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/read/untitled-88c11800-9446-469b-a3be-3fdb36bfbd1e/section/20df8acd-9ab9-4f35-8a5d-e91aa5f4a0ea.

Nell Smith, Martha. 2014. "Frozen Social Relations and Time for a Thaw: Visibility, Exclusions, and Consideration for Postcolonial Digital Archives." *Journal of Victorian Culture* 19 (3): 403–10. doi: 10.1080/13555502.2014.947189.

Noble, Safiya Umoja. 2019. “Toward a Critical Black Digital Humanities.” In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein, chap. 2. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Oswald, Heather, Christine Anne George, Stephanie Bennett, Maureen Harlow, Linda Reynolds, and Kristen Weischedel. 2016. *#ArchivesSoWhite Intro & Bibliography*. Issues & Advocacy. Society of American Archivists. https://issuesandadvocacy.wordpress.com/2016/04/18/archivessowhite-intro-bibliography/.

Palmer, Carole L. 2004. “Thematic Research Collections.” In *A Companion to Digital Humanities*, edited by Ray Siemens, Susan Schreibman, and John Unsworth, 348–65. Hoboken, NJ: Blackwell Publishing.

Rieger, Oya Y. 2020. *Documenting the COVID-19 Pandemic: Archiving the Present for Future Research*. Ithaka S+R. https://sr.ithaka.org/blog/documenting-the-covid-19-pandemic/.

Risam, Roopika. 2015. “Beyond the Margins: Intersectionality and the Digital Humanities.” *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 9 (2). www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/9/2/000208/000208.html.

Risam, Roopika. 2018a. “Diversity Work and Digital Carework in Higher Education.” *First Monday* 23 (3). DOI: 10.5210/fm.v23i3.8241.

Risam, Roopika. 2018b. *New Digital Worlds: Postcolonial Digital Humanities in Theory, Praxis, and Pedagogy*. Chicago, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Risam, Roopika, Justin Snow, and Susan Edwards. 2017. “Building an Ethical Digital Humanities Community: Librarian, Faculty, and Student Collaboration.” *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 24 (2–4): 337–49. DOI: 10.1080/10691316.2017.1337530.

Schlesselman-Tarango, Gina. 2017. *Topographies of Whiteness: Mapping Whiteness in Library and Information Science*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

Spiro, Lisa. 2012. “This is Why We Fight: Defining the Values of the Digital Humanities.” In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold, chap. 3. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Thomas, David, Simon Fowler, and Valerie Johnson. 2017. *The Silence of the Archive: Principles and Practice in Records Management and Archives*. Chicago, IL: Neal-Schuman, an imprint of the American Library Association.

Tisby, Jemar. 2019. *The Color of Compromise: The Truth about the American Church’s Complicity in Racism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Vandegrift, Micah and Stewart Varner. 2013. “Evolving in Common: Creating Mutually Supportive Relationships between Libraries and the Digital Humanities.” *Journal of Library Administration* 53 (1): 67–78.

Wernimont, Jacqueline and Elizabeth Losh, eds. 2018. *Bodies of Information: Intersectional Feminism and Digital Humanities*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Williams, George H. 2012. “Disability, Universal Design, and the Digital Humanities.” In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold, chap. 12. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Wingo, Rebecca S., Jason A. Heppler, and Paul Schadewald, eds. 2020. *Digital Community Engagement: Partnering Communities with the Academy*. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati Press. https://ucincinnatipress.manifoldapp.org/read/digital-community-engagement/section/26d4ed07-2e29-420a-bebd-9b6204763802.