

Provocations from the Humanities for Generative AI Research

LAUREN KLEIN, Emory University, USA

MEREDITH MARTIN, Princeton University, USA

ANDRE BROCK, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA

MARIA ANTONIAK, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

MELANIE WALSH, University of Washington, USA

JESSICA MARIE JOHNSON, Johns Hopkins University, USA

LAUREN TILTON, University of Richmond, USA

DAVID MIMNO, Cornell University, USA

This paper presents a set of provocations for considering the uses, impact, and harms of generative AI from the perspective of humanities researchers. We provide a working definition of humanities research, summarize some of its most salient theories and methods, and apply these theories and methods to the current landscape of AI. Drawing from foundational work in critical data studies, along with relevant humanities scholarship, we elaborate eight claims with broad applicability to current conversations about generative AI: 1) Models make words, but people make meaning; 2) Generative AI requires an expanded definition of culture; 3) Generative AI can never be representative; 4) Bigger models are not always better models; 5) Not all training data is equivalent; 6) Openness is not an easy fix; 7) Limited access to compute enables corporate capture; and 8) AI universalism creates narrow human subjects. We conclude with a discussion of the importance of resisting the extraction of humanities research by computer science and related fields.

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → **Artificial intelligence**; • **Applied computing** → **Arts and humanities**; • **Human-centered computing** → *HCI theory, concepts and models*.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: humanities research, humanities theory, humanities methods, humanistic approaches, digital humanities, digital pedagogy, media studies, critical data studies

1 Introduction

As humanities researchers with long histories of engaging with computational technologies, who are currently witnessing the proliferation of AI (and AI “hype”) across nearly every aspect of society, we care deeply about its uses, impact, and harms. Whether we must learn to inhabit physical and social landscapes forever changed by AI, or whether we will soon be required to contend with the residue of a burst AI bubble, many important questions have come to the fore: What are the social, political, and historical conditions that have brought us to this point? What are the boundaries between social, political, economic, and technical systems? How are the ideas of “culture” and “community” being redefined by AI researchers or the models they develop? How can we ensure that communities in the world are helped and not harmed by these models? Is scholar-driven or community-led work even possible in a research environment dominated by corporations? And what of the environmental impact of these (and our) research efforts? Is any future that might be enhanced by new developments in AI doomed to fail because of outsized corporate power? Because of the extreme environmental footprint of data centers or the exploitation of data workers? Because of narrow or unreflective assumptions about what human intelligence truly entails?

Authors' Contact Information: Lauren Klein, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA, lauren.klein@emory.edu; Meredith Martin, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA, mm4@princeton.edu; Andre Brock, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA, andre.brock@lmc.gatech.edu; Maria Antoniak, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Capital, Denmark, maria.antoniak@colorado.edu; Melanie Walsh, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA, melwalsh@uw.edu; Jessica Marie Johnson, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA, jmj@jhu.edu; Lauren Tilton, University of Richmond, Richmond, VA, USA, ltilton@richmond.edu; David Mimno, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA, mimno@cornell.edu.

Many AI researchers feel little obligation to truly grapple with questions of this level of complexity and scope, choosing instead to enact what philosopher Charles Mills has described as an “epistemology of ignorance” [94]. This is the worldview that results from an intentional avoidance of frameworks that challenge normative beliefs, and serves to reinforce dominant perspectives. In the context of AI research, we see this especially in papers making broad claims about language, culture, and values, as well as in systems designed to serve a universal user or “fix” a complex social issue. Even work that purports to engage with humanistic ways of thinking tends to demonstrate a limited engagement with work coming out of actual humanities disciplines—English and other languages, history and art history, American, African American, and ethnic studies, musicology and philosophy, women’s and gender studies, and more. As a result, the deep expertise that humanities researchers possess—our knowledge about the past, our ability to conduct detailed analyses within and between cultures, and our command of meaning-making practices past and present, among others—has not been leveraged in this pivotal field.

This may be the result of disciplinary differences in our research methods and outputs. In the humanities, we build up our systems-level analyses from specific objects of culture. A poem or an artwork, a community on Twitter, an interview with a local elder, a historical newspaper or court transcript, or even a large language model, might function as the focal point of an analysis that leads to an interpretive model. We call these models “theories,” but not in the sense that technical disciplines use this term. Our theories, grounded in specificity, help us better understand, navigate, and posit potential answers to questions that are otherwise too big, too complex, or too intractable to be able to resolve with any precision.

In this paper, we enlist this expertise in the service of the big questions about AI posed just above. Our contribution is a set of eight provocations about AI—and about generative AI models in particular—as they are currently developed, employed, and discussed in technical fields. We draw from the framework employed by danah boyd and Kate Crawford 2012 in “Critical Questions for Big Data,” in which they present a similar set of provocations, drawing from their own expertise in the humanities and social sciences, for what was then the new landscape of Big Data. Inspired by this work and its transformative impact, we offer a new set of provocations that encompass the broader set of questions engaged by generative AI. Our provocations are as follows: 1) Language makes meaning in multiple ways; 2) Generative AI requires an expanded definition of culture; 3) Generative AI can never be representative; 4) Bigger models are not always better models; 5) Not all training data is equivalent; 6) Openness is not an easy fix; 7) Limited access to compute enables corporate capture; and 8) AI universalism creates narrow human subjects. Each provocation consists of an assertion that is elaborated through current humanities research, and is intended to encourage technical AI researchers to more fully consider how their work could be enriched by incorporating humanistic expertise.

Before moving forward, it is important to clarify that the end result of humanities research—including the work presented here—is very rarely a simple conclusion. Rather, the goal is a deeper understanding of the “big question” that frames the work. This is what classicist Gregory Crane, in the context of a discussion of the relationship between AI and the humanities, describes as an augmentation of our own intelligence 2019. Put more directly, what humanities researchers can contribute to the current conversation about AI, its present uses, its incontrovertible harms, and its future possibilities, is additional clarity about the stakes of engaging AI in an age of techno-capital. This contribution enables our work with (or against) AI to progress because it enables us to conduct more informed, more accurate, and more humane research (in the sense of “people-centered”). In this spirit, we position our provocations as bridges and not walls. It is our collective belief that we need a more complex understanding of AI and we also need a more complex understanding of human culture.

2 Background: What are the humanities anyway?

The humanities have an extensive institutional and disciplinary history [26, 109, 126], but here we focus on humanities research as it is practiced in the present: to study the humanities is to investigate the human: to investigate people and groups, and the cultural objects they create [67, 117]. We do so in order to understand how these cultural objects create or reflect new forms of knowledge. In order to do so, we are trained in the history of knowledge production within our individual and overlapping fields of expertise. We are also trained in multiple languages and are trained to translate cultural and historical meaning across objects, audiences, and in an array of forms.

Humanities research requires both minute specificity and sweeping breadth. To engage with Claude McKay’s “Constab Ballads” (1912), a researcher must first read both normative English and Jamaican dialect filled with elisions and diacritical marks. They must then be able to analyze poetry in the context of Caribbean history, American literature, and Black studies. They must know both the material culture that informs the work’s physical form as well as text encoding and web development. The humanities encompass the range of cultural objects that humanities researchers analyze, including language, history, philosophy, theory, aesthetics, and phenomena. Humanities researchers are trained to understand these concepts by examining and interpreting specific examples, and by asking what ways of knowing and thinking (individually and collectively) might have gone into their creation [4].

What methods do we employ to conduct this work? Methods shared across humanities fields include theorization, interpretation, contextualization—and, increasingly but not universally, collaboration. Some concrete examples might include: archival research, textual explication, disciplinary techniques such as close reading (literary studies), historical synthesis (historical fields), and media-specific analysis (film and media studies), among others. These methods are what generate the bulk of the evidence that appears in humanities scholarship. However, what more commonly travels to technical fields are the theories that this evidence points towards. These are humanistic theories: written articulations of complex ideas that, until that point, we did not yet fully understand (or we thought we did, but the evidence shows that there is still more to learn). In this paper, we summarize and synthesize many of these theories. We encourage readers who want to learn more about the methods and mechanisms of humanities research to consult the original books and papers in which they appear.

As should be clear, we reject formulations of humanistic thinking that have been proffered by scholars in computer science as, for example, “basically a style or mode” [17]. As outlined above, our methods are instilled through rigorous training, refined through ongoing, reflection-driven interpretation, and grounded in the history of how that object or culture or concept has been interpreted to that point. Like the sciences, the humanities are also iterative; humanities disciplines build on past knowledge and they grow and they change. And the impact of this research is substantial. Humanities research teaches us what specific cultural objects might have represented to the people who created them or used them, and about the cultures that gave rise to them. These objects and cultures, in turn, point to how humans have existed in cultural and social contexts, both past and present, and how these contexts are part of what defines us at any given moment. Also key to these contexts is an understanding of how they consist of that which has not yet been discovered, digitized, transcribed, or annotated, as well as the of unrecoverable voices, the silenced narratives, and the stolen artifacts that have become symbols of empire. Humanities researchers track these complex meanings across time and place, and we share a commitment to protecting the stories of the few over the many. As part of this work we study technologies to understand how they affect societies and cultures [23, 69, 96, 111] and we use technologies in order to tell

new stories and make new discoveries about the past [55]. We have learned how interpretations of the past become the subject of future interpretations, which is why we are so invested in an understanding of generative AI, its conceptual underpinnings, its inputs, and its outputs, that is informed by humanistic expertise.

3 Related Work

3.1 Humanities Research at FAccT

Historically, humanities research has not featured prominently within the FAccT conference. Most mentions of the humanities that appear in FAccT publications appear in the umbrella term of “social science and humanities research,” or because of the ACM category of “arts and humanities” in which papers on ML, AI, and artistic practice appear. There has been a consistent acknowledgment of the unique perspectives and areas of expertise brought by humanities researchers, however, e.g. Ganesh et al.’s paper documenting a workshop in which researchers from different disciplines were brought together to discuss issues of AI fairness [56], Lünich and Keller’s paper documenting a similar workshop on the topic of explainable AI [89], Bates et al.’s auto-ethnographic account of incorporating critical data studies perspectives into the computer science classroom [19], and Dotan et al.’s survey of approaches to incorporating generative AI responsibly in the classroom [48]. Most pointedly, and ironically, Raji et al.’s quantitative analysis of AI ethics syllabi across the academy, “You Can’t Sit With Us’: Exclusionary Pedagogy in AI Ethics Education,” makes explicit mention of multiple humanities fields in the service of an argument about how, in refusing to look outside the discipline of computer science for their assigned readings, AI ethics courses are reproducing existing academic hierarchies [107].

An exception is philosophy, which is one of the core disciplines of the FAccT community. A recent retrospective of the FAccT conference categorized 11% of papers presented at FAccT as belonging to philosophy, and philosophy was the only humanities discipline prominent enough to be categorized individually Laufer et al. [84]. But why is philosophy privileged in this way, not only in publications at FAccT but also in public discourse about AI? Unlike other humanities disciplines, which, as discussed above, prioritize the human and the specific, philosophy can allow researchers to abstract away from the messiness of real humans toward scenarios that isolate variables of interest and are more easily interpretable; a tempting proposition for scientists who value more tractable theories of knowing, and a useful method that can more easily mesh with mathematical and technical solutions. We can see this pattern reflected in works published at FAccT which have brought philosophical approaches to algorithmic decision making [39, 71, 120]. The contributions of philosophy to FAccT and to the field of AI have been significant, but we clarify that the humanities has much more to offer than philosophy alone.

With that said, concepts and ideas from the humanities have consistently made their way into papers published at FAccT, often in substantive and impactful ways. A 2020 CRAFT workshop centered on speculative, queer, and feminist engagements with archives [106] while that same year saw Jo and Gebru’s “Lessons from Archives: Strategies for Collecting Sociocultural Data in Machine Learning,” a paper that has only grown in significance as the issue of LLM training data has entered broad consciousness [72]. Additional papers have focused on specific theoretical constructs from the humanities, using them to question core concepts in ML/AI research (e.g. Corbett and Denton on transparency [40] and Stark on animation [119]), and to imagine alternatives to existing approaches (e.g. Klumbyté et al., who explore the feminist and Black feminist concepts of situatedness, figuration, diffraction, and critical fabulation to think beyond existing modeling approaches [81]). Indeed, feminist and gender theories have perhaps received the most substantial

attention at FAccT, e.g. [46] and [80]. But engagement with other humanities fields and practices—most notably, art history and art practice, can be found as well, e.g. [70], [47], and [118]. We contribute to this work by documenting the core methods and contributions of humanities research and synthesizing the major concepts that carry across its fields.

3.2 Humanities Research on AI

The launch of ChatGPT, in November 2022, brought humanities researchers to the forefront of national conversations about generative AI and its impact on research, writing and creativity (e.g. [30, 43, 74, 113, 124, 128]). Those in the fields of digital humanities, digital pedagogy, and the history of technology, in particular—fields that require both technical and humanistic expertise—became some of the earliest expositors of its limitations and its potential e.g. ([77, 79, 110]). While these fields continue to lead within the humanities—for example, the task force convened jointly by the MLA and CCCC in Spring 2023 that has since published a series of working papers on AI and writing ([1, 2, 34])—the national conversation about AI has been usurped by corporate spokespeople parroting AI hype, whose claims in turn convince academic administrators to adopt costly and potentially harmful AI systems [114]. In fact, the increasingly politicized relationship between for-profit corporations, public resources, public institutions (like universities and research centers) and political power should make humanists, computer scientists, and researchers broadly alarmed.

At the same time, humanities researchers have continued to push forward research about and/or involving AI in their own fields. This includes new journals (e.g. *Critical AI*, edited by two literary scholars [60]), and themed sections and special issues of flagship humanities journals (e.g. *American Literature*'s special issue on “Critical AI: A Field in Formation” [108]) and PMLA's themed section on “AI and the University as Service” [78]. It includes monographs (e.g. [62, 76, 102, 122]) and long-form essays that theorize the language [116] and images [133] generated by LLMs, historicize and critique ML approaches such as sentiment analysis [38], topic modeling [25], and image generation [101], analyze the output of generative AI according to literary critical [132] and art historical expertise [90], and more. However, this valuable work is rarely read outside of humanities disciplines. The goal of this paper is to argue that this important work should have a direct impact on the development of this technology.

4 Provocations from the Humanities for AI Research

In the sections that follow, we employ boyd and Crawford's framework of “provocations” for big data 2012 to develop a new set of provocations that encompass the expanded research landscape of generative AI. Ours are intended to establish a stronger foundation for future AI research and cross-disciplinary collaboration, to allow for the development of more informed research questions, and to prevent non-experts from making thin claims about the full breadth of human culture, past and present. We list the full set of provocations in Table 1.

1. Models make words, but people make meaning
2. AI requires an understanding of culture
3. AI can never be “representative”
4. Bigger models are not always better models
5. Not all training data is equivalent
6. Openness is not an easy fix
7. Limited access to compute enables corporate capture
8. AI universalism creates narrow human subjects

Table 1. The full list of provocations from the humanities for generative AI research.

4.1 Models make words, but people make meaning

Humanists have wrestled for decades with the interplay between language and intention. What is the implication of language that is produced in a way that is—by construction—devoid of human intention? The field of natural language processing has been shaped by decades of research in both machine learning and linguistics. This has led to explanations (and rejections) of the language generated by LLMs and related AI systems that rely on linguistic theories of “communicative intent” [20]. This framing remains essential for understanding the output of these models in conversational contexts, but there are additional theories from the humanities that can be used to understand the broader significance (or lack thereof) of the language these models produce.

More concretely, the theories of meaning-making first developed by literary scholars in the 1960s and 1970s offer ways of making sense of AI-generated language that are not dependent upon being able to identify any particular speaker or source. As early as 1967, philosopher Roland Barthes proposed that the meaning of any particular text is determined not by the author’s intention, but by the reader’s interpretation [18]. Literary theorist Jacques Derrida 1998 articulated a similar sentiment in his critique of logocentrism, or the idea that words are bound to a static meaning in the world. Scholars in the fields of Black studies, ethnic studies, gender and sexuality studies, and more, see the literal grammar of the English language, which has long functioned to deny people their humanity, as something that must be challenged wholesale. Far from enabling a descent into relativism, theories such as these become the basis for an expansion of the sources of meaning, as well as the techniques we can employ (or ourselves develop) for making sense of the range of writing we encounter in the world.

Consider how LLMs generate text by predicting sequences of words. These predictions are based on both observed patterns and on human preferences and feedback. The result is often output that is factually wrong yet linguistically fluent and seemingly coherent—these are the “hallucinations” that have become a topic of research interest [82] and (justifiable) public concern. The theories cited above allow us to understand how the human tendency to create meaning through the interpretive expectations of intention and care can confer the illusion that the model “knows” something or someone. This is compounded by our current climate of “AI hype” and the nonconsensual infusion of AI into our lives, which have together naturalized artificial “knowing” over the complicated, messy, and polyrhythmic meaning-making conducted by humans when using language (oral, written, and otherwise) in social contexts. Humanities scholars have already been at the forefront of analyzing the output of genAI models, both text and image, not for what they “know” but for what meaning their output elicits about the cultures from which they emerged.

Meaning is always people-fueled, socially-driven, irreverent, and impossible to map consistently. Especially in the context of the Global Minority, making meaning from language also requires an awareness of the history of evading and erasing dominant meanings, and extracting additional meaning from guarded words. Take for example the work of the Translation Lab, which set out to translate a famed interview with Ousmane Sembène, the Senegalese filmmaker, using SmartCat, a professional AI translation platform. The team quickly found that there were few Twi and Wolof terms on suggestion, and the terms that were suggested varied widely from the meaning expressed in the original French. As humanists, we are not surprised. AI “knowing” is an easier solution to a complicated reality of meaning forged between language, place, time, and social relations.

4.2 AI requires an understanding of culture

Several years after the release of generative AI models to the public, we have ample evidence of how the text and images that they produce do not perform well in the context of non-dominant

cultures, and at times actively harm them (e.g. [20, 35, 36, 105]). Admirably, the technical community has recognized the problem and has proposed solutions such as improved training data [103], additional fine-tuning processes [91], enhanced prompting strategies [12], and new benchmarks [112]. These interventions are framed under the broader category of systems that improve users' acceptance of AI output: "cultural alignment" [12] or "cultural inclusion" [75, 130].

And yet much of the work on these topics does not ask what "culture" is, or seek involvement from the many humanities fields that are defined by that question. (There is increasingly involvement from the social sciences, especially anthropology [11, 68, 103]. The result is a narrow definition of culture that rests on the terms of European modernity—e.g. a geographic region or a unifying nationality, language, or racial/ethnic/religious identity. This definition is far more rigid than how humanities scholars understand the term. In the humanities, "culture" may be used to refer to "the way of life of a people, group, or humanity in general," but it can also be employed to describe "the works and practices of intellectual and artistic activity" that emerge from a particular community or group [5, 135]. These complementary yet distinct definitions are important to keep in mind, since it is not only that, for example, a model's training data might be produced by people from different cultures, in the first sense of the word, but are that the training data is itself an expressions of culture, as in the second sense of the word, as is the model itself.

The distinction between people as cultures and objects or expressions of culture, and our awareness of how both definitions are engaged by genAI models, is crucial for our understanding of their development and their output. Understanding how training data both reflects cultures, and consists of expressions of those cultures, can lead to more intentional data curation practices. In the commercial arena, we have seen how EleutherAI has developed the Pile with heightened attention to scientific cultures, as evidenced by their inclusion of data from PubMed and arXiv, among others [57], and how Pleias recently focused its Common Corpus on cultural heritage (e.g., newspapers, monographs) and under-resourced languages [7]. This expanded definition of culture can also lead to new ideas for model development, as in recent works that treat pretraining datasets as curations worthy of examination and have studied the spread of books, poetry, and other creative content in these datasets [37, 50, 131], in work that considers the creative outputs of large models [87], or in work that trains models with capabilities tuned for historical languages [136].

This expanded definition of culture also opens up the possibility for understanding cultural objects as expressions of larger structures of power, or as active challenges to those structures. In fact, when humanities scholars study culture, we analyze each of these dimensions of culture and more. Carried over to the context of AI, we can not only better understand for example how and why certain perspectives end up captured in training data and others do not, but how and why the models themselves must be understood as cultural objects and analyzed accordingly, meaningful both for the text and other media that they produce, and as expressions of contemporary tech culture in and of themselves.

4.3 AI can never be "representative"

A recognition of the cultural complexity of historical sources, including training data, also offers a fundamentally different way to approach the issue of bias. As is widely recognized, gaps in training data, coupled with the range of biases embedded in existing training datasets, have contributed to a range of harms perpetuated by AI systems [33, 52, 99]. In response, researchers and government agencies alike often call for strategies of bias mitigation, ranging from attempts to "de-bias" datasets and AI systems [28], to improved documentation of both datasets [59] and models [95], to research into model interpretability [24] and explainability [44]. Each of these interventions are necessary, but the issue of bias reflects a deeper structural problem, one that will never be fixed unless the power differentials that cause structural inequalities are challenged at their source.

Here is where additional concepts and strategies from the humanities enter in. Among them, we might draw from theories and practices that emerge from feminist, Black feminist, and archival theory, which offer examples of how to engage with historical sources that contain biases—what humanities researchers would call silences [125] or absences [65]—that can never be “de-biased” or modeled away [27]. Reframing bias not as “bad data” but as an effect of unequal structural power redirects our attention to the social, historical, and political conditions that gave rise to the biased data, as well as to the spaces of indeterminacy, and to the irrecoverably missing parts, of any dataset past or present [115]. In an algorithmic context, this raises new research questions: what new methods might be required in order to mark missing data, or intentionally amplify the significance of sparse data, rather than merely pass over these silences or gaps? This view also raises questions of personal responsibility: are we informed enough about, or connected enough to the people or cultures that the data represents in order to make these decisions? Have we read until we understand? [61].

Humanities researchers devote significant amounts of time and energy to supplementing our own knowledge, expanding our shared archives, and contributing to a collective understanding, but we do not deceive ourselves into thinking that there is ever an end-point to this process. We know we will never have all of the “data,” so to speak, so as to fully understand the past. How do we grapple with this lack of complete representativeness? What are some lessons we might carry over to our work with AI? We might seek to learn from scholars of the archive of slavery who have spent decades developing strategies for making meaning from damaged archival records. We might look to the technique of critical fabulation as conceived by Saidiya Hartman, for example, which seeks to amplify the significance of sparse and at times violent archival records with narrative detail [66]; we might model our work after the mode of historically-informed speculation as illustrated by Marisa Fuentes, who posits questions about what might have happened on the basis of historical fact [53]; or we might look to Jessica Marie Johnson’s theorization of the “null value,”—the same concept as in the relational database—which she employs to hold space for the people whose stories that cannot be recovered at all [73]. We can see some of these approaches already being applied to the output of biased models in the present, as in Curry Hackett’s use of text-to-image models to generate images of city streetscapes inspired by examples of twentieth-century African American art [6]. But we are eager to see them applied to the construction and framing of models themselves.

There is an additional, broader set of lessons to be learned about the impossibility of complete knowledge and the need for technical researchers to come to terms with that fact: any act of dataset creation is a political act. This is true because our datasets represent languages, peoples, and cultures, which are in themselves embedded in larger structures of power. Here we can look to the work of statistician Taylor Arnold and visual culture scholar Lauren Tilton and their approach of distant viewing [14]. Using AI to analyze photographs from the US National Archives, they show how the very process of assigning an annotation to an image entails a set of political as well as social and cultural decisions. Put another way, there is always a perspective that is shaped by training data, annotations, parameters, and prompts. Rather than chasing a “representative” dataset—which, of course, can never be achieved—we would be better served by acknowledging that there are always perspectives encoded in our models, and by taking the time to document and name them.

4.4 Bigger models are not always better models

As boyd and Crawford assert in their original provocations, “bigger data is not always better data” [29]. This applies to models as well. For the first several years of LLM development, the growth in numbers of parameters was rivaled only by the growth in the number of charts documenting the rising number of those parameters. But the axiom that bigger is better has now met its match.

Increasingly, studies have found that more data, more parameters, and more compute no longer lead to more accurate output (e.g. ([92, 137]. These findings have raised interesting technical questions, as well as anxieties that we are "running out of data" [9]. But to humanities researchers, these findings serve to prove a more philosophical point: that the goal of a single universal source of "intelligence" is a fraught endeavor. More than that, it will never lead to complete knowledge, as feminist philosophers as early as the seventeenth century have shown [51, 63, 97].

Arguably, the humanities' most universal commitment is to the diversity and complexity of the human experience. More than that, centuries of humanities scholarship has confirmed the asymptotic relationship between increased understanding and complete knowledge. The idea that we could ever build a model of artificial "general" intelligence is not only a fool's errand; it is uninformed by how intelligence actually works. Somewhat paradoxically, this same body of work—that is to say, humanities scholarship—offers the clearest path forward. Smaller models, with intentionally-curated datasets, and trained or fine-tuned for precise tasks, promise to bring us closer to a goal we all share: of more informed, more accurate, and more precise knowledge. In the field of computational humanities, this work has already begun. For example, Giselle Gonzalez Garcia and Christian Weilbach brought their respective backgrounds in the fields of history and computer science to customize an LLM for research assistant in the field of Irish migration studies [58]. Ted Underwood and collaborators at UIUC are currently training an LLM from scratch on only nineteenth-century English-language writing, so as to be able to run counterfactual experiments on the past.

The promise of smaller, more bespoke models also points to the need for a shift in thinking. Rather than being driven by the "bigger is better" agenda that characterizes much of the current corporate research landscape, we might reestablish a research agenda born of hundreds of years of humanities scholarship, and informed by the evidence of thousands of years of actual human experience. This will lead us to value the expertise of domain experts—not only as prompt engineers, as has been the case thus far, but as collaborators in model development. And it will lead to a goal we all share: of more informed, more accurate, and more precise knowledge.

4.5 Not all training data is equivalent

A related point to the previous provocation has to do with the nature of training data. Up until very recently, advances in generative AI have relied upon vast, heterogeneous pretraining datasets. These draw from a wide range of sources: internet content, copyrighted books, scientific articles, and now even synthetic data from other AI models, not to mention a variety (but to be clear, not the entirety) of languages, time periods, communities, and genres [13, 32, 100]. Despite this range, pretraining data is often treated as a homogenous, undifferentiated resource—often likened to "oil"—where individual pieces of data are assumed to be interchangeable and valued primarily for their downstream utility. When individual points within these massive datasets are considered, they are typically evaluated through metrics like "toxicity" or "quality" [88], framings that prioritize how the data will impact a model's performance. This shallow approach to pretraining data is further compounded by "documentation debt" [16]; the actual contents of pretraining data and why specific sources are chosen are rarely disclosed.

This reduction and obfuscation of training data is now widely recognized as an ethical problem as well as a technical one. Inspired by practices in the electronics industry, the influential "Datasheets for Datasets" [59] paradigm introduced a structured approach to documenting machine learning datasets, which has been implemented for high-profile data repositories such as HuggingFace. We have also increasingly seen empirical tests that assess how different factors such as dataset age, degree of toxicity, and quality level, impact model performance [86]. " While these

are urgent and necessary interventions, approaching pretraining data from a humanistic perspective can offer additional affordances. For example, the development of rich metadata can help to ensure that datasets more accurately represent the contents they seek to include. For a dataset of books, this might include both computationally and manually derived metadata like the book’s title, publication date, genre, author, and perhaps even demographic information about the author like race, gender, and geography, as in a recent project aimed at improving the analysis of the more than 17 million volumes of digitized text in the HathiTrust Digital Library [127, 129].

Humanities researchers are also keenly aware that both metadata and data curation choices radically impact any downstream task, and have developed several detailed strategies for documenting these choices and their potential impact. For example, digital archeologies of datasets place specific data sources in the broader context of the conditions of their creation, revealing biases and limitations [54, 85]. Data narratives seek to situate datasets in human contexts and social histories beyond their immediate technical use [104]. Another recent approach used by initiatives such as Post45 Data Collective, the Nineteenth Century Data Collective, and Responsible Datasets in Context Project, is the data essay. These longform works describe the data’s historical context, collection and curation, limitations, and ethical considerations, build on important prior work like “datasheets” but expand to include more abstract considerations of how any dataset is shaped by, and must be considered in light of, history, society, power, and specific cultural phenomena.

What these examples all point towards is how a consideration of a dataset’s conceptual characteristics, in addition to its technical characteristic and downstream utility, can improve the transparency and accountability of AI models and have other benefits. Knowing more about training data can help model developers avoid the perpetual cycle of after-the-fact fixes, such as guardrails, RLHF, post-hoc content moderation, and other patchwork solutions. Knowing more about where data actually came from and who it belongs to can help developers address ongoing intellectual property issues. And knowing more about training data can even lead to innovation. Because most developers have not cared to understand their training data in great depth, how models are influenced by finer features of training data remains underexplored.

4.6 Openness is not an easy fix

As an increasing number of open and open-source models have been released for public use, many researchers in both technical and humanistic fields have moved on from the issues surrounding black-boxed, proprietary, and pay-for-access models. But the question of openness—both what it means and what it implies—remains unresolved. In short: there are no easy fixes when working with objects of culture (which include both training data and models, as has been explained). In this section we introduce some key considerations from the humanities aimed at illustrating how questions of openness, ownership, and access, rarely have yes-or-no answers and must be consistently reevaluated as contexts and conditions change.

It may be obvious at this point to assert that Meta’s “open” models, while available for use, remain closed in terms of information about their underlying data and training processes. They also still require significant computational resources, which becomes economically restrictive as discussed more in the next section. This limitation also holds for open-source models such as AI2’s OLMo models, and while we welcome additional entries in this area, as well as the proliferation of smaller desktop models, the questions of which and whose data and models should be open, for which purposes, and for whose goals, remains unresolved. Consider current debates over the inclusion of copyrighted content in training data. On the surface, this would seem to have an easy answer: individuals should control access to their data, including their creative content, and if they do not want it included in training data, it should not be. But consider the downstream effects on scholarship aimed at understanding those people and their cultures. If their data is not included

in the model, future researchers cannot employ it to learn about the past. Set against the backdrop of corporate extraction, this use case may not be the most important one to consider. (And to be clear, preserving the ability of writers and artists to create their art and be fairly compensated for it should remain paramount). But there are examples from computational research in the humanities that point to how this work can be done on a case-by-case basis. For example, [15] use fair use exceptions and an exemption to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) to create one of the largest digitized collections of copyrighted films. The HathiTrust Digital Library, which consists of over 18 million digitized books, offers derivative data and virtual environments that enable researchers to access and analyze copyright-restricted materials for educational purposes [8]. However, the time, labor, and cost involved in maintaining this environment is substantial, and it is unclear if it will be able to continue into the future.

In addition, there remain questions of access to data from communities that have not or cannot provide consent. These questions apply to community data that might even technically be “open” and scrapeable from the web. For example, fanfiction writers and readers often operate with an expectation of privacy, participating in intimate, close-knit communities, despite their work being openly published online. But because of the ease of collecting data from the web, users’ stories and interactions can be gathered and shared even without their knowledge or consent, violating their expectations and community norms. According to Dym and Fiesler [49], members of fanfiction communities have expressed concerns about the potential negative repercussions of their data being shared with broader audiences, such as being outed or facing professional consequences. Similarly, the Documenting the Now project has highlighted the potential harms that can arise when social media data, especially data related to protests like the Black Lives Matter movement, is archived or shared. These concerns must also be placed in the larger context of the history of data, and of data extraction, both of which can be traced to specific and violent pasts. We discuss this further in the section below.

There are also deeper questions that emerge from the use of synthetic data, as well as from the ability of models to generate “new” content that would seem to circumvent these real-world harms. Beyond banning specific keywords, we must consider the impact of our ability to prompt models to generate what Saidiya Hartman would describe as “scenes of subjection”—text and images that, in restaging scenes of historical violence, even through computational means, introduces questions of our own complicity—even with respect to cultures or phenomena that we might simply seek to learn more about. We must also contend with the underlying motivation—and very often, the final use case—of much of the research on minoritized groups. As we survey the devastation that has been brought upon Ukraine and Gaza, in part due to AI technologies [10, 123], we must remind ourselves that the end goal of much of AI research is the surveillance of people and communities—and at times, their outright destruction—even if these are not the goals that compel us forward in our research.

4.7 Limited access to compute enables corporate capture

There is no question that the capabilities of AI systems have grown tremendously, especially over the past 3-5 years. As noted by Whittaker [134], however, much of this epochal growth in capability has been fueled not by new insights, but by the concentration of resources. While the capabilities of these new models are qualitatively different, the change that enabled it is almost purely quantitative: massive datasets, massive computation clusters, and massive neural network models that are well-adapted to take advantage of current hardware. Universities and even governments have difficulty participating in this resource-intensive computing ecosystem; individual scholars have no chance.

Ironically, current AI models' dependency on massive scale presents a nightmare for corporate interests—one that in turn further motivates the consolidation of resources in corporate hands. For most of the history of computing, there has been a one-way march towards greater capability for lower cost and higher efficiency. The success of AI has inverted this curve. The cost to achieve minimal gains in performance is now growing exponentially. The environmental impact in terms of carbon emissions and water consumption is horrifying to those who must endure its direct consequences, as it is to all those seeking to work towards climate justice. But it is also worth observing that these costs are ruinously expensive for companies as well, since they must find a way to pay for these fixed costs in a market that has no fundamental barriers to entry (beyond vast sums of money). Because of the clear environmental harms, this less visible reality is often unremarked upon. But it is important to acknowledge because it illuminates yet another dimension of the corporate investment in AI. It is not just that companies may attempt to control AI; their very solvency depends on it.

What these corporate forces all point towards is the phase of late capitalism that characterizes the world in which we all live. While the term “late capitalism” has become a convenient catchphrase to describe the range of injustices we face today—from minor indignities of data-based ad tracking, to the incontrovertible harms of collusion between governments and corporations—we believe that here again, humanities research can serve as a guide. This work allows us to understand the economic mechanisms of late capitalism with more precision, so as to push back against them and to envision alternatives. For example, we might look to Ulises Mejias and Nick Couldry's theory of data colonialism [41], which explains how corporations have actively worked to separate the data generated by web browsing and social media sites from the people who produce it, enabling it to become a form of “surplus value” that can be monetized by corporations without compensation for the people who produce it. Coupled with observations by scholars such as Paola Ricaurte, Mary Gray, and Siddarth Suri, among others, about how the patterns of exploitative digital labor (data cleaning and labeling, content moderation, and the like) parallel historical patterns of colonial labor exploitation, we can more fully understand how we have arrived at a time and place in which decisions of global significance are being made by five US-based tech CEOs, and how their power has been enabled by and continues to depend upon the further extraction and exploitation of the resources and labor of everyone else.

While these forces may feel difficult to confront, placing them within a longer history of known forces and mechanisms—as histories and theories of labor, colonialism, racial capitalism, and more, enable us to do—also enrich and strengthen our strategies of resistance. We might look backwards to early twentieth century examples of community organizing in the wake of reconstruction, or further back to nineteenth-century strategies of mutual aid, as with the person-to-person and community-based networks that emerged among Black Americans, enslaved and free, as they supported those seeking freedom and economic justice [3]. We might also look to ourselves to imagine futures outside of the constraints of capitalism, or at least less determined by the logics of capital. Examples of Indigenous data futures [31, 64] and viral justice [21] provide glimpses of what is possible when we use our imagination to “push us beyond the constraints of what we think, and are told, is politically possible” [22].

4.8 AI universalism creates narrow human subjects

Generative AI has further embroiled society in a “data episteme” [83], where we know ourselves through the acquisition of data and our knowledge can only be validated by gathering more and more data. Where we began with indexing ourselves, our economies, and our institutions, we are now in a moment where culture is “content”; moments of ingenuity, mundanity, and deviance

abstracted to records of human activity suitable for extraction. Statistical and algorithmic interpretations of the world—models and training data corpora—are aggressively promoted as “reality”, absent acknowledgement of the libidinal tensions suffusing the economic and political ends for which these representations are being deployed.

A concern with the moral, expressive, and contemplative aspects of living [93] are central to humanistic inquiry. But AI recenters inquiry as the interpretation and synthesis of data, rather than a contemplation of the world. This recentring depends on the data episteme’s enactment of the premises of European modernity: the abstraction of resources—including being—in order to yield quantifiable measures of progress, efficiency at someone else’s expense. For example, Amazon’s practice of algorithmically monitoring workers fosters dreadful work conditions in pursuit of “frictionless”, “timely” deliveries.

Charles Mills (2021), writing on antiblackness, offers a startling assessment of what it means to be modern. For Mills, antiblackness is foundational to the systematized racial subordination of chattel slavery that is essential to European modernity’s function and structure. He writes, “race becomes the signifier of full or diminished humanity, a signifier that is enforced by material practices in a modern racialized world” (2018, 28). The Enlightenment project of equality, liberalism, capital, and democracy was structured by antiblackness and colonialism, shaping the modern world by demarcating who is human through information, commerce, and citizenship. Ramon Amaro (Amaro) (cite) expands antiblackness to computer vision, writing “By regressing complex environmental data into a generalized pattern, the lived and multivalent specificities of black lives are represented “as if” the visual matrix maintains no connections to historical category, stereotype, or a moral imaginary” (2019, 4). As a result, “research in computation is an adaptation of the fictive and compulsive ordering of human attributes into a single coherent image of species” (Amaro 2019, 5).

The internet’s early days featured similar promises of liberal ideals: freedom of expression, freedom of identity, freedom of association. As Silicon Valley sought venture capital, however, their promises of free speech and expression were by the dictates of Wall Streets, but the last decade has seen those aesthetic, inventive, and quotidian digital expressions be reframed as “content”. Where AI vision reduces the visual complexity of humanity, LLMs similarly distort the inventive and cultural capacities of culture to “content”. These abstractions afford AI the coercive claim that they are a ‘universal knowledge’ machine, rather than a statistical enactment of the ideology that “one can improve – control – a deviant subpopulation by enumeration and classification” (Hacking 1990/2013, (Hacking 2013, page 3)

While AI proponents declaim that “creativity” and “freedom of speech” are essential to artificial general intelligence, their theft and expropriation of copyrighted works, public and private discourse, and user-generated multimedia as “data” should not be solely understood as neoliberal capitalism (although that certainly applies). Instead, humanistic inquiry offers us the alternative of seeing AI’s libidinal economic enterprise; where in addition to inheriting the antiblack capacities of Western arts, letters, and public discourse, the AI being proffered to us is deeply anti-human.

Humanities inquiry illuminates AI’s reordering of society as a network of relations between abstraction, acquisition, informational and material violence. Although the genie is out of the bottle, humanities scholars work to redirect AI to become a convivial technology, one in service to society and culture.

5 Conclusion: Against Humanities Extraction

Against the dispiriting backdrop of late capitalism and its fueling of the corporate capture of technical research, it has been heartening to see how the substance if not the development of this research has brought attention to the role and importance of humanistic thinking in ways that

we, the authors, have not experienced in our near two-decade long involvement at the forefront of computational humanities research. This has opened up new possibilities for conversation and collaboration between computing, engineering, and the humanities. Humanities scholars are needed to augment a wide range of computational research conversations, policy debates, and public-facing social and cultural AI products. This has been demonstrated by a trend within many sub-fields of computer science to turn to histories and theories developed within the humanities for additional context, fresh inspiration, and new ideas. Recognizing these contributions, some information schools have begun to hire researchers with humanities PhDs into faculty positions.

These are all welcome developments. However, placed against the backdrop of the continued defunding and devaluation of humanities disciplines that has taken place since the Obama administration, combined with the assault on the humanities adding vitriol to culture wars we face the ever-increasing risk of another form of extraction: the stripping of humanities expertise from the disciplines that produce it, as well as—more distressingly—from the disciplinary structures that can ensure the continued development of this expertise. This phenomenon is akin to the phenomenon of “elite capture” as theorized by Olúfẹmi Táíwò [121]: the simultaneous valorization of certain groups and their contributions (here “humanities research”) while taking control of the resources required to sustain them—and therefore taking credit for these contributions while depriving the original group of the ability to chart any future course.

This leads us to two final sets of observations: first, a set of practical suggestions for pushing back against these forms of capture and control; and second, a set of general conclusions about the value and significance of humanities research for the present moment in AI. First, some practical suggestions. For one, humanities scholars must be brought to the table as equal partners with technical researchers. This means bringing humanities scholars into research projects in the initial phases of research collaboration, crediting them as coauthors, and not simply asking for feedback after the fact. For this to be possible, technical researchers must recognize the institutional asymmetries that exist between their own disciplines and humanities fields. Put plainly: humanities researchers teach more and are compensated less. They have less administrative support and fewer funding mechanisms available to them. For humanities scholars and technical researchers to meet as equal partners when conducting AI research, their time, participation, students, and staff must be funded like their technical counterparts. This funding must come from sources that fund technical work, since funding for humanities research are capped at several orders of magnitude less than what is available to technical researchers [98]. Furthermore, when new institutional initiatives are announced that make claims to engage with history and culture, they must include humanities researchers in their leadership structures. If humanities scholars are not included, it becomes incumbent upon the technical researchers already involved to call this out. Otherwise, in spite of any amount of increased attention to or value of the work of the humanities, it will simply not be able to continue into the future at the level required to sustain the production of new ideas and new researchers who can carry the work forward.

Second, a more general observation. Much of the advance in AI technology has come from stochastic optimization, data management, and GPU coding. It is reasonable to expect that experts in those fields should have a place of influence. But we argue that both the capabilities and the challenges of contemporary AI look increasingly familiar to the humanities: collating archives, developing theories, identifying nuance, and generating new arguments, all through the lens of power, production, interpretation, and preservation. It is equally reasonable to expect that experts in these fields should have similar input. By acknowledging the expertise of humanities scholars and by taking active steps to ensure the continuity of humanities research, we see the best hope of employing AI technologies to improve our understanding of the human condition and its range of cultures, and enlisting them in support of a future—or futures—in which all of us can thrive.

With this work, we seek to spark conversations across technical and humanities fields about the uses and limits of AI. We write in the spirit of true interdisciplinary collaboration and exchange, and we hope this work serves as an invitation to scholars across varied fields to join together on the basis of mutual respect, working towards a goal of building AI systems that enhance our collective knowledge of human experiences and cultures when appropriate, while resisting the extractive and outright harmful AI systems that have been provided to us.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank the Data + Feminism lab and the Liberatory AI Ecosystems working group for feedback on this paper. This project has also benefited from conversations with members of the Atlanta Interdisciplinary AI Network and LifexCode: Digital Humanities Against Enclosure.

Work on this paper has been supported by the following grants: Mellon Foundation G-2211-14240.

References

- [1] [n. d.]. ([n. d.]).
- [2] [n. d.]. ([n. d.]).
- [3] [n. d.]. <https://www.neh.gov/project/colored-conventions>
- [4] [n. d.]. Claude McKay's Early Poetry (1911-1922): Claude McKay's Early Poetry (1912-1922). <https://scalar.lehigh.edu/mckay/index>
- [5] 2014. (second edition. ed.). New York University Press, New York, 68–72.
- [6] 2023. An Architect Uses AI to Explore Surreal Black Worlds. *Bloomberg.com* (Sept. 2023). <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2023-09-23/with-ai-an-architect-imagines-a-world-that-centers-blackness>
- [7] 2024. Releasing Common Corpus: the largest public domain dataset for training LLMs. <https://huggingface.co/blog/Pclanglais/common-corpus>
- [8] 2025. HathiTrust Research Center – HathiTrust Digital Library. <https://www.hathitrust.org/about/research-center/>
- [9] 2025. OpenAI cofounder Ilya Sutskever predicts the end of AI pre-training - The Verge. <https://www.theverge.com/2024/12/13/24320811/what-ilya-sutskever-sees-openai-model-data-training>
- [10] 2025. Tech Companies Turned Ukraine Into an AI War Lab | TIME. <https://time.com/6691662/ai-ukraine-war-palantir/>
- [11] Muhammad Farid Adilazuarda, Sagnik Mukherjee, Pradhyumna Lavania, Siddhant Shivdutt Singh, Alham Fikri Aji, Jacki O'Neill, Ashutosh Modi, and Monojit Choudhury. 2024. Towards Measuring and Modeling "Culture" in LLMs: A Survey. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Miami, Florida, USA, 15763–15784. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.882
- [12] Badr AlKhamissi, Muhammad ElNokrashy, Mai Alkhamissi, and Mona Diab. 2024. Investigating Cultural Alignment of Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 12404–12422. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.671
- [13] Rohan Anil, Andrew M. Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, Eric Chu, Jonathan H. Clark, Laurent El Shafey, Yanping Huang, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Gaurav Mishra, Erica Moreira, Mark Omernick, Kevin Robinson, Sebastian Ruder, Yi Tay, Kefan Xiao, Yuanzhong Xu, Yujing Zhang, Gustavo Hernandez Abrego, Junwhan Ahn, Jacob Austin, Paul Barham, Jan Botha, James Bradbury, Siddhartha Brahma, Kevin Brooks, Michele Catasta, Yong Cheng, Colin Cherry, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Clément Crepy, Shachi Dave, Mostafa Dehghani, Sunipa Dev, Jacob Devlin, Mark Diaz, Nan Du, Ethan Dyer, Vlad Feinberg, Fangxiaoyu Feng, Vlad Fienber, Markus Freitag, Xavier Garcia, Sebastian Gehrmann, Lucas Gonzalez, Guy Gur-Ari, Steven Hand, Hadi Hashemi, Le Hou, Joshua Howland, Andrea Hu, Jeffrey Hui, Jeremy Hurwitz, Michael Isard, Abe Ittycheriah, Matthew Jagielski, Wenhao Jia, Kathleen Kenealy, Maxim Krikun, Sneha Kudugunta, Chang Lan, Katherine Lee, Benjamin Lee, Eric Li, Music Li, Wei Li, YaGuang Li, Jian Li, Hyeontaek Lim, Hanzhao Lin, Zhongtao Liu, Frederick Liu, Marcello Maggioni, Aroma Mahendru, Joshua Maynez, Vedant Misra, Maysam Moussalem, Zachary Nado, John Nham, Eric Ni, Andrew Nystrom, Alicia Parrish, Marie Pellat, Martin Polacek, Alex Polozov, Reiner Pope, Siyuan Qiao, Emily Reif, Bryan Richter, Parker Riley, Alex Castro Ros, Aurko Roy, Brennan Saeta, Rajkumar Samuel, Renee Shelby, Ambrose Slone, Daniel Smilkov, David R. So, Daniel Sohn, Simon Tokumine, Dasha Valter, Vijay Vasudevan, Kiran Vodrahalli, Xuezhi Wang,

- Pidong Wang, Zirui Wang, Tao Wang, John Wieting, Yuhuai Wu, Kelvin Xu, Yunhan Xu, Linting Xue, Pengcheng Yin, Jiahui Yu, Qiao Zhang, Steven Zheng, Ce Zheng, Weikang Zhou, Denny Zhou, Slav Petrov, and Yonghui Wu. 2023. PaLM 2 Technical Report. arXiv:2305.10403 (Sept. 2023). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2305.10403 arXiv:2305.10403 [cs].
- [14] Taylor Arnold. 2023. *Distant viewing: computational exploration of digital images*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- [15] David Bamman, Rachael Samberg, Richard Jean So, and Naitian Zhou. 2024. Measuring diversity in Hollywood through the large-scale computational analysis of film. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 121, 46 (Nov. 2024), e2409770121. doi:10.1073/pnas.2409770121
- [16] Jack Bandy and Nicholas Vincent. 2021. Addressing “Documentation Debt” in Machine Learning Research: A Retrospective Datasheet for BookCorpus. arXiv:2105.05241 (May 2021). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2105.05241 arXiv:2105.05241 [cs].
- [17] Jeffrey Bardzell and Shaowen Bardzell. 2015. *Humanistic HCI*. Springer International Publishing, Cham. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-02214-2
- [18] R. Barthes and S. Heath. 1977. *Image, Music, Text*. Fontana Press. https://books.google.com/books?id=U_8yYj9h7aIC
- [19] Jo Bates, David Cameron, Alessandro Checco, Paul Clough, Frank Hopfgartner, Suvodeep Mazumdar, Laura Sbaffi, Peter Stordy, and Antonio de la Vega de León. 2020. Integrating FATE/critical data studies into data science curricula: where are we going and how do we get there?. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT* ’20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 425–435. doi:10.1145/3351095.3372832
- [20] Emily M. Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. 2021. On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT ’21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 610–623. doi:10.1145/3442188.3445922
- [21] Ruha Benjamin. 2022. *Viral justice : how we grow the world we want*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- [22] Ruha Benjamin. 2024. *Imagination : a manifesto* (first edition. ed.). W.W. Norton & Company, New York, NY.
- [23] Ruha Benjamin. 2024. *Imagination: a manifesto* (first edition. ed.). W.W. Norton & Company, New York, NY.
- [24] Umang Bhatt, Pradeep Ravikumar, and Jos´e M. F. Moura. 2019. Building Human-Machine Trust via Interpretability. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 33, 0101 (July 2019), 9919–9920. doi:10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33019919
- [25] Jeffrey M. Binder. 2016. *Alien Reading: Text Mining, Language Standardization, and the Humanities*. <https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/read/untitled/section/4b276a04-c110-4cba-b93d-4ded8fcfafc9>
- [26] Rens Bod. 2016. *A New History of the Humanities: The Search for Principles and Patterns from Antiquity to the Present* (reprint edition ed.). Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [27] Katherine Bode. 2020. Why You Can’t Model Away Bias. *Modern Language Quarterly* 81, 1 (March 2020), 95–124. doi:10.1215/00267929-7933102
- [28] Tolga Bolukbasi, Kai-Wei Chang, James Y Zou, Venkatesh Saligrama, and Adam T Kalai. 2016. Man is to Computer Programmer as Woman is to Homemaker? Debiasing Word Embeddings. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 29. Curran Associates, Inc. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2016/hash/a486cd07e4ac3d270571622f4f316ec5-Abstract.html
- [29] danah boyd and Kate Crawford. 2012. Critical Questions for Big Data: Provocations for a cultural, technological, and scholarly phenomenon. *Information, Communication & Society* 15, 5 (June 2012), 662–679. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2012.678878
- [30] Meredith Broussard. 2023. *More than a Glitch: Confronting Race, Gender, and Ability Bias in Tech*. MIT Press.
- [31] MICHELLE LEE BROWN, HEMI WHAANGA, and JASON EDWARD LEWIS. 2023. *Relation-Oriented AI: Why Indigenous Protocols Matter for the Digital Humanities*. University of Minnesota Press, 74–83. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctv345pd4p.7>
- [32] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2005.14165 arXiv:2005.14165 [cs].
- [33] Joy Buolamwini and Timnit Gebru. 2018. Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification. In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*. PMLR, 77–91. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v81/buolamwini18a.html>
- [34] Antonio Byrd and Leonardo Flores. [n. d.]. MLA-CCCC Joint Task Force on Writing and AI Members. ([n. d.]).

- [35] Yong Cao, Li Zhou, Seolhwa Lee, Laura Cabello, Min Chen, and Daniel Hershcovich. 2023. Assessing Cross-Cultural Alignment between ChatGPT and Human Societies: An Empirical Study. arXiv:2303.17466 (March 2023). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2303.17466 arXiv:2303.17466 [cs].
- [36] Eva Cetinic. 2022. The Myth of Culturally Agnostic AI Models. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2211.15271 arXiv:2211.15271 [cs].
- [37] Kent Chang, Mackenzie Cramer, Sandeep Soni, and David Bamman. 2023. Speak, Memory: An Archaeology of Books Known to ChatGPT/GPT-4. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 7312–7327. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.453
- [38] Wendy Hui Kyong Chun, Grace Kyungwon Hong, and Lisa Nakamura. 2024. “Understanding” Asians: Anti-Asian Racism, Sentimentality, Sentiment Analysis, and Digital Surveillance. *Critical Inquiry* 50, 3 (March 2024), 425–451. doi:10.1086/728946
- [39] A. Feder Cooper, Emanuel Moss, Benjamin Laufer, and Helen Nissenbaum. 2022. Accountability in an Algorithmic Society: Relationality, Responsibility, and Robustness in Machine Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT ’22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 864–876. doi:10.1145/3531146.3533150
- [40] Eric Corbett and Emily Denton. 2023. Interrogating the T in FAccT. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT ’23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1624–1634. doi:10.1145/3593013.3594104
- [41] Nick Couldry and Ulises A. Mejias. 2019. Data Colonialism: Rethinking Big Data’s Relation to the Contemporary Subject. *Television & New Media* 20, 4 (May 2019), 336–349. doi:10.1177/1527476418796632
- [42] Gregory Crane. 2019. AI, Language, and the Humanities. *Harvard Data Science Review* 1, 1 (July 2019). doi:10.1162/99608f92.e32f6dec
- [43] Kate Crawford. 2023. Archeologies of Datasets. *The American Historical Review* 128, 3 (Sept. 2023), 1368–1371. doi:10.1093/ahr/rhad364
- [44] Marina Danilevsky, Kun Qian, Ranit Aharonov, Yannis Katsis, Ban Kawas, and Prithviraj Sen. 2020. A Survey of the State of Explainable AI for Natural Language Processing. In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 10th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, Kam-Fai Wong, Kevin Knight, and Hua Wu (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Suzhou, China, 447–459. doi:10.18653/v1/2020.aacl-main.46
- [45] Jacques Derrida. 1998. *Of grammatology* (corrected edition. ed.). Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- [46] Hannah Devinney, Jenny Björklund, and Henrik Björklund. 2022. Theories of “Gender” in NLP Bias Research. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT ’22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2083–2102. doi:10.1145/3531146.3534627
- [47] Ajay Divakaran, Aparna Sridhar, and Ramya Srinivasan. 2023. Broadening AI Ethics Narratives: An Indic Art View. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT ’23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2–11. doi:10.1145/3593013.3593971
- [48] Ravit Dotan, Lisa S. Parker, and John Radzilowicz. 2024. Responsible Adoption of Generative AI in Higher Education: Developing a “Points to Consider” Approach Based on Faculty Perspectives. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT ’24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2033–2046. doi:10.1145/3630106.3659023
- [49] Brianna Dym and Casey Fiesler. 2020. Ethical and privacy considerations for research using online fandom data. *Transformative Works and Cultures* 33 (June 2020). doi:10.3983/twc.2020.1733
- [50] Lyra D’Souza and David Mimno. [n. d.]. The Chatbot and the Canon: Poetry Memorization in LLMs. ([n. d.]).
- [51] Buchi Emecheta. 1983. *Double yoke* (first edition. ed.). Braziller, New York.
- [52] Virginia Eubanks. 2018. *Automating inequality: how high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor* (first edition. ed.). St. Martin’s Press, New York, NY.
- [53] Marisa J. Fuentes. 2016. *Dispossessed Lives Enslaved Women, Violence, and the Archive*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- [54] Paul Fyfe. 2016. An Archaeology of Victorian Newspapers. *Victorian Periodicals Review* 49, 4 (2016), 546–577. <https://muse.jhu.edu/pub/1/article/644183> Publisher: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- [55] Kim Gallon. 2016. Chapter 4 Making a Case for the Black Digital Humanities from Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016 on JSTOR. In *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2016*. University of Minnesota Press. <https://www-jstor-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/stable/10.5749/j.ctt1cn6thb.7?searchText=gallon+%22making+a+case+for+the+bl>
- [56] Maya Indira Ganesh, Francien Dechesne, and Zeerak Waseem. 2020. Two computer scientists and a cultural scientist get hit by a driver-less car: a method for situating knowledge in the cross-disciplinary study of F-A-T in machine learning: translation tutorial. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT ’20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 707. doi:10.1145/3351095.3375663

- [57] Leo Gao, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Laurence Golding, Travis Hoppe, Charles Foster, Jason Phang, Horace He, Anish Thite, Noa Nabeshima, Shawn Presser, and Connor Leahy. 2020. The Pile: An 800GB Dataset of Diverse Text for Language Modeling. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2101.00027 arXiv:2101.00027 [cs].
- [58] Giselle Gonzalez Garcia and Christian Weilbach. [n. d.]. If the Sources Could Talk: Evaluating Large Language Models for Research Assistance in History. ([n. d.]).
- [59] Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daumé III, and Kate Crawford. 2021. Datasheets for Datasets. arXiv:1803.09010 (Dec. 2021). doi:10.48550/arXiv.1803.09010 arXiv:1803.09010 [cs].
- [60] Lauren M. E. Goodlad. 2023. Editor’s Introduction: Humanities in the Loop. *Critical AI* 1, 1–2 (Oct. 2023). doi:10.1215/2834703X-10734016
- [61] Farah Jasmine Griffin. 2021. *Read until you understand: the profound wisdom of Black life and literature* (first edition. ed.). W. W. Norton & Company, New York, NY.
- [62] David J. Gunkel. 2012. *The machine question: critical perspectives on AI, robots, and ethics*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- [63] Donna Haraway. 1988. Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14, 3 (1988), 575–599. doi:10.2307/3178066
- [64] Laura Harjo. 2019. *Spiral to the Stars : Myskoke Tools of Futurity*. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- [65] Saidiya Hartman. 2008. Venus in Two Acts. *Small axe: a journal of criticism* 12, 2 (2008), 1–14. doi:10.1215/-12-2-1
- [66] Saidiya V. Hartman. 2020. *Wayward lives, beautiful experiments: intimate histories of riotous black girls, troublesome women, and queer radicals*. W.W. Norton & Company, New York, NY.
- [67] Chris Haufe. 2024. *Do the Humanities Create Knowledge?* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge New York (N.Y.).
- [68] Daniel Hershcovich, Stella Frank, Heather Lent, Miryam de Lhoneux, Mostafa Abdou, Stephanie Brandl, Emanuele Bugliarello, Laura Cabello Piqueras, Ilias Chalkidis, Ruixiang Cui, Constanza Fierro, Katerina Margatina, Phillip Rust, and Anders Søgaard. 2022. Challenges and Strategies in Cross-Cultural NLP. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland, 6997–7013. doi:10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.482
- [69] Dan Hicks. 2020. *The brutish museums: the Benin bronzes, colonial violence and cultural restitution*. Pluto Press, London.
- [70] Han-Yin Huang and Cynthia C. S. Liem. 2022. Social Inclusion in Curated Contexts: Insights from Museum Practices. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAcT ’22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 300–309. doi:10.1145/3531146.3533095
- [71] Shomik Jain, Vinith Suriyakumar, Kathleen Creel, and Ashia Wilson. 2024. Algorithmic Pluralism: A Structural Approach To Equal Opportunity. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAcT ’24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 197–206. doi:10.1145/3630106.3658899
- [72] Eun Seo Jo and Timnit Gebru. 2020. Lessons from archives: strategies for collecting sociocultural data in machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT* ’20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 306–316. doi:10.1145/3351095.3372829
- [73] Jessica Marie Johnson. 2020. *Wicked flesh: black women, intimacy, and freedom in the Atlantic world* (1st edition. ed.). University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- [74] Matthew L. Jones. 2023. AI in History. *The American Historical Review* 128, 3 (Sept. 2023), 1360–1367. doi:10.1093/ahr/rhad361
- [75] Antonia Karamolegkou, Phillip Rust, Ruixiang Cui, Yong Cao, Anders Søgaard, and Daniel Hershcovich. 2024. Vision-Language Models under Cultural and Inclusive Considerations. In *Proceedings of the 1st Human-Centered Large Language Modeling Workshop*, Nikita Soni, Lucie Flek, Ashish Sharma, Diyi Yang, Sara Hooker, and H. Andrew Schwartz (Eds.). ACL, TBD, 53–66. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.hucllm-1.5
- [76] Yarden Katz. 2020. *Artificial whiteness: politics and ideology in artificial intelligence*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- [77] Matthew Kirschenbaum. 2023. AI Is Ushering in a Textpocalypse. *The Atlantic* (March 2023). <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2023/03/ai-chatgpt-writing-language-models/673318/>
- [78] Matthew Kirschenbaum and Rita Raley. 2024. AI and the University as a Service. *PMLA* 139, 3 (May 2024), 504–515. doi:10.1632/S003081292400052X
- [79] Lauren Klein. 2022. Are Large Language Models Our Limit Case? *Startwords* 3 (Aug. 2022). doi:10.5281/zenodo.6567985
- [80] Lauren Klein and Catherine D’Ignazio. 2024. Data Feminism for AI. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAcT ’24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA,

- 100–112. doi:10.1145/3630106.3658543
- [81] Goda Klumbyté, Claude Draude, and Alex S. Taylor. 2022. Critical Tools for Machine Learning: Working with Intersectional Critical Concepts in Machine Learning Systems Design. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAcCT '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1528–1541. doi:10.1145/3531146.3533207
- [82] Allison Koenecke, Anna Seo Gyeong Choi, Katelyn X. Mei, Hilke Schellmann, and Mona Sloane. 2024. Careless Whisper: Speech-to-Text Hallucination Harms. In *The 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 1672–1681. doi:10.1145/3630106.3658996 arXiv:2402.08021 [cs].
- [83] Colin Koopman. 2019. *How we became our data: A genealogy of the informational person*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- [84] Benjamin Laufer, Sameer Jain, A. Feder Cooper, Jon Kleinberg, and Hoda Heidari. 2022. Four Years of FAcCT: A Reflexive, Mixed-Methods Analysis of Research Contributions, Shortcomings, and Future Prospects. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAcCT '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 401–426. doi:10.1145/3531146.3533107
- [85] Benjamin Lee. 2021. Compounded Mediation: A Data Archaeology of the Newspaper Navigator Dataset. *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 15, 4 (2021). <https://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/15/4/000578/000578.html>
- [86] Shayne Longpre, Gregory Yauney, Emily Reif, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Barret Zoph, Denny Zhou, Jason Wei, Kevin Robinson, David Mimno, and Daphne Ippolito. 2024. A Pretrainer’s Guide to Training Data: Measuring the Effects of Data Age, Domain Coverage, Quality, & Toxicity. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Mexico City, Mexico, 3245–3276. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.naacl-long.179
- [87] Li Lucy and David Bamman. 2021. Gender and Representation Bias in GPT-3 Generated Stories. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Narrative Understanding*, Nader Akoury, Faeze Brahman, Snigdha Chaturvedi, Elizabeth Clark, Mohit Iyyer, and Lara J. Martin (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Virtual, 48–55. doi:10.18653/v1/2021.nuse-1.5
- [88] Li Lucy, Suchin Gururangan, Luca Soldaini, Emma Strubell, David Bamman, Lauren Klein, and Jesse Dodge. 2024. AboutMe: Using Self-Descriptions in Webpages to Document the Effects of English Pretraining Data Filters. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 7393–7420. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.400
- [89] Marco Lünich and Birte Keller. 2024. Explainable Artificial Intelligence for Academic Performance Prediction. An Experimental Study on the Impact of Accuracy and Simplicity of Decision Trees on Causability and Fairness Perceptions. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAcCT '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1031–1042. doi:10.1145/3630106.3658953
- [90] Nicolas Malevé and Katrina Sluis. 2023. The Photographic Pipeline of Machine Vision; or, Machine Vision’s Latent Photographic Theory. *Critical AI* 1, 1–2 (Oct. 2023). doi:10.1215/2834703X-10734066
- [91] Reem I. Masoud, Ziquan Liu, Martin Ferianc, Philip Treleaven, and Miguel Rodrigues. 2024. Cultural Alignment in Large Language Models: An Explanatory Analysis Based on Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions. arXiv:2309.12342 (May 2024). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2309.12342 arXiv:2309.12342 [cs].
- [92] Ian R. McKenzie, Alexander Lyzhov, Michael Pieler, Alicia Parrish, Aaron Mueller, Ameya Prabhu, Euan McLean, Aaron Kirtland, Alexis Ross, Alisa Liu, Andrew Gritsevskiy, Daniel Wurgaft, Derik Kauffman, Gabriel Recchia, Jiacheng Liu, Joe Cavanagh, Max Weiss, Sicong Huang, The Floating Droid, Tom Tseng, Tomasz Korbak, Xudong Shen, Yuhui Zhang, Zhengping Zhou, Najoung Kim, Samuel R. Bowman, and Ethan Perez. 2024. Inverse Scaling: When Bigger Isn’t Better. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2306.09479 arXiv:2306.09479 [cs].
- [93] E.G. Mesthene. [n. d.]. Technology and human values. *Science Journal* 5A, 4 ([n. d.]), 45–50.
- [94] Charles W. (Charles Wade) Mills. 1999. *The racial contract*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.
- [95] Margaret Mitchell, Simone Wu, Andrew Zaldivar, Parker Barnes, Lucy Vasserman, Ben Hutchinson, Elena Spitzer, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, and Timnit Gebru. 2019. Model Cards for Model Reporting. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT* '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 220–229. doi:10.1145/3287560.3287596
- [96] Jennifer L. (Jennifer Lyle) Morgan. 2021. *Reckoning with slavery: gender, kinship, and capitalism in the early Black Atlantic*. Duke University Press, Durham.
- [97] Margaret Cavendish Newcastle. 2019. *Margaret Cavendish: essential writings*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- [98] Christopher Newfield. 2025. Humanities Decline in Darkness: How Humanities Research Funding Works. *Public Humanities* 1 (Jan. 2025), e31. doi:10.1017/pub.2024.39

- [99] Safiya Umoja Noble. 2018. *Algorithms of oppression: how search engines reinforce racism*. New York University Press, New York.
- [100] nostalgebraist. 2022. chinchilla’s wild implications. (July 2022). <https://www.alignmentforum.org/posts/6Fpvch8RR29qLEWNH/chinchilla>
- [101] Fabian Offert and Thao Phan. 2024. A sign that spells: Machinic concepts and the racial politics of generative AI. *Journal of Digital Social Research* 6, 44 (Dec. 2024), 49–59. doi:10.33621/jdsr.v6i440462
- [102] Matteo Pasquinelli. [n. d.]. *The Eye of the Master*. Verso. <https://www.versobooks.com/products/735-the-eye-of-the-master>
- [103] Siddhesh Pawar, Junyeong Park, Jiho Jin, Arnav Arora, Junho Myung, Srishti Yadav, Faiz Ghifari Haznitrana, Inhwa Song, Alice Oh, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2024. Survey of Cultural Awareness in Language Models: Text and Beyond. arXiv:2411.00860 (Oct. 2024). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2411.00860 arXiv:2411.00860 [cs].
- [104] Line Pouchard, Amy Barton, and Lisa Zilinski. 2014. Data narratives: Increasing scholarly value. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 51, 1 (2014), 1–4. doi:10.1002/meet.2014.14505101088_eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/meet.2014.14505101088>
- [105] Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Rida Qadri, and Ben Hutchinson. 2022. Cultural Incongruencies in Artificial Intelligence. arXiv:2211.13069 (Nov. 2022). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2211.13069 arXiv:2211.13069 [cs].
- [106] Helen Pritchard, Eric Snodgrass, Romi Ron Morrison, Loren Britton, and Joana Moll. 2020. Burn, dream and reboot! speculating backwards for the missing archive on non-coercive computing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT* ’20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 683. doi:10.1145/3351095.3375697
- [107] Inioluwa Deborah Raji, Morgan Klaus Scheuerman, and Razvan Amironesei. 2021. You Can’t Sit With Us: Exclusionary Pedagogy in AI Ethics Education. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAcT ’21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 515–525. doi:10.1145/3442188.3445914
- [108] Rita Raley and Jennifer Rhee. 2023. Critical AI: A Field in Formation. *American Literature* 95, 2 (June 2023), 185–204. doi:10.1215/00029831-10575021
- [109] Paul Reitter and Chad Wellmon. 2021. *Permanent Crisis: The Humanities in a Disenchanted Age* (first edition ed.). University of Chicago Press, Chicago London.
- [110] Adam Rogers. 2023. Forget Sam Altman. America’s greatest AI visionary is... an English professor in Illinois. *Business Insider* (Dec. 2023). <https://www.businessinsider.com/ted-underwood-ai-optimist-humanities-language-literature-research-bill-gates-2023-12>
- [111] Caitlin Rosenthal. 2018. *Accounting for slavery: masters and management*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- [112] Shibani Santurkar, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Cino Lee, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. 2023. Whose Opinions Do Language Models Reflect? arXiv:2303.17548 (March 2023). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2303.17548 arXiv:2303.17548 [cs].
- [113] Benjamin Schmidt. 2023. Representation Learning. *The American Historical Review* 128, 3 (Sept. 2023), 1350–1353. doi:10.1093/ahr/rhad363
- [114] Matt Seybold. 2023. Ed Tech, AI, & The Unbundling of Research & Teaching (Criticism LTD, Episode #13) with Bibliography. <https://theamericanvandal.substack.com/p/ed-tech-ai-and-the-unbundling-of>
- [115] Jihan Sherman, Romi Morrison, Lauren Klein, and Daniela Rosner. 2024. The Power of Absence: Thinking with Archival Theory in Algorithmic Design. In *Designing Interactive Systems Conference*. ACM, IT University of Copenhagen Denmark, 214–223. doi:10.1145/3643834.3660690
- [116] Avery Slater. 2024. Phantoms of Citation: AI and the Death of the Author-Function. *Poetics Today* 45, 2 (June 2024), 223–231. doi:10.1215/0335372-11092818
- [117] Helen Small. 2013. Introduction. In *The Value of the Humanities*, Helen Small (Ed.). Oxford University Press, 0. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199683864.003.0001
- [118] Ramya Srinivasan. 2024. To See or Not to See: Understanding the Tensions of Algorithmic Curation for Visual Arts. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAcT ’24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 444–455. doi:10.1145/3630106.3658917
- [119] Luke Stark. 2024. Animation and Artificial Intelligence. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAcT ’24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1663–1671. doi:10.1145/3630106.3658995
- [120] Daniel Susser. 2022. Decision Time: Normative Dimensions of Algorithmic Speed. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAcT ’22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1410–1420. doi:10.1145/3531146.3533198
- [121] Olufemi O. Taiwo. 2022. *Elite capture : how the powerful took over identity politics (and everything else)*. Haymarket Books, Chicago, Illinois.

- [122] Dennis Tenen. 2024. *Literary theory for robots: how computers learned to write*. W. W. Norton & Company, Inc, New York, NY.
- [123] Ishaan Tharoor. 2024. Analysis | Israel offers a glimpse into the terrifying world of military AI. *Washington Post* (April 2024). <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2024/04/05/israel-idf-lavender-ai-militarytarget/>
- [124] Lauren Tilton. 2023. Relating to Historical Sources. *The American Historical Review* 128, 3 (Sept. 2023), 1354–1359. doi:10.1093/ahr/rhad365
- [125] Michel-Rolph Trouillot. 2015. *Silencing the past : power and the production of history*. Beacon Press, Boston.
- [126] James Turner. 2015. *Philology: The Forgotten Origins of the Modern Humanities*. Princeton University Press.
- [127] Ted Underwood. 2014. Page-Level Genre Metadata for English-Language Volumes in HathiTrust, 1700-1922. doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.1279201.v1
- [128] Ted Underwood. 2022. Mapping the Latent Spaces of Culture. *Startwords* 3 (Aug. 2022). doi:10.5281/zenodo.6567481 Publisher: Center for Digital Humanities, Princeton University Section: issues.
- [129] Ted Underwood, Patrick Kimutis, and Jessica Witte. 2020. NovelTM Datasets for English-Language Fiction, 1700-2009. *Journal of Cultural Analytics* 5, 2 (May 2020). doi:10.22148/001c.13147 Citation Key: Underwood2020NovelTM.
- [130] 66687 Wadern, Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik GmbH. [n. d.]. Dagstuhl Seminar 25022: Towards a Multidisciplinary Vision for Culturally Inclusive Generative AI. <https://www.dagstuhl.de/en/seminars/seminar-calendar/seminar-details/25022>
- [131] Melanie Walsh, Anna Preus, and Maria Antoniak. 2024. Sonnet or Not, Bot? Poetry Evaluation for Large Models and Datasets. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2406.18906 arXiv:2406.18906 [cs].
- [132] Melanie Walsh, Anna Preus, and Elizabeth Gronski. 2024. Does ChatGPT Have a Poetic Style? arXiv:2410.15299 (Oct. 2024). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2410.15299 arXiv:2410.15299 [cs].
- [133] Amanda Wasielewski. 2024. Unnatural Images: On AI-Generated Photographs. *Critical Inquiry* 51, 1 (Sept. 2024), 1–29. doi:10.1086/731729
- [134] Meredith Whittaker. 2021. The steep cost of capture. *Interactions* 28, 6 (Nov. 2021), 50–55. doi:10.1145/3488666
- [135] Raymond Williams. 1976. *Keywords: a vocabulary of culture and society*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- [136] Ivan P. Yamshchikov, Alexey Tikhonov, Yorgos Pantis, Charlotte Schubert, and Jürgen Jost. 2022. BERT in Plutarch’s Shadows. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 6071–6080. doi:10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.407
- [137] Lexin Zhou, Wout Schellaert, Fernando Martínez-Plumed, Yael Moros-Daval, Cèsar Ferri, and José Hernández-Orallo. 2024. Larger and more instructable language models become less reliable. *Nature* 634, 8032 (Oct. 2024), 61–68. doi:10.1038/s41586-024-07930-y

Received 22 January 2025