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Rather, deep conceptual changes are being enabled, accelerated and influenced in iterative ways by digital technologies.

The past and present of computers in History is not primarily about historians and technology.

Rather, preliminary research suggests that the use of computers in History reflects the changing meaning in the discipline of:

1. Numbers - “quantitative”
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1950s-1980s (Histoire 1.0)
1980s-1990s (Histoire 2.0)
2000s-présent (Histoire 3.0)
Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie (1968):

“L'historien de demain sera programmeur ou ne sera plus”

Le Roy Ladurie, *Le territoire de l'historien*, p. 14

“Like the fountain pen and the typewriter before it, the computer is now accepted as a tool that can make a historian's life more pleasant and more productive.”

“It should be noted at the outset that it is impossible for any person to any longer keep track of, let alone digest, all of the computer-assisted research in all fields of history. At best we can note high points and report trend.”

“In the 1960s, historians self-consciously experimented and learned about the utility of computers for their own research. That period now seems past. Computer-assisted historical research appears to have hit its stride, become more ‘normal’ and much less self-conscious.”
“Quantitative research in history remains controversial. There are still occasional emotional reactions against playing with computers at all, or a grumpy comment that the resources expended have not produced commensurate concrete results. More pointedly, a number of historians are apprehensive that relying on quantitative analysis and computer technology will cause a fundamental change in the nature of history itself.”

Robert Zemsky called in 1969 for historians to “invent a methodology – including computer programs – of our own, a methodology designed to cope with the peculiar kinds of evidence with which we deal.”

Robert Swierenga defined this need in 1970 as “the vital task of the next generation....Borrowing from other disciplines is not the solution” (since historians deal with different kinds of evidence that call for different statistics and computer programs)
The True & Tragical History of 'Time on the Cross'

“The book may have a longer life than it deserves because of the awesome financial and institutional apparatus that stands behind it. Time on the Cross is a product of factory scholarship and we know what happens to artisans who compete with factories. The production line for Time on the Cross was subsidized by government grant money and manned by dozens of graduate research assistants who are now fiercely loyal to their company and its products.”

“...to raise methodological questions, to criticize sources and to provide evidence to support our contention that the manuscript census has some very serious limitations for the study of literacy...”

Literacy and Social Structure in Nineteenth Century Ontario: An Exercise in Historical Methodology

“...the book's greatest deficiency is that it is not at all about the people of Hamilton. It is about what quantitative data can say about aggregates of people. There is a very real difference.”
“To a graduate student such as myself, engaged in the labourious task of researching and writing a thesis, the collaborative efforts of a team of scholars, generously funded, and immersed in their sources for five years, promises much.”

“Quite separate are the "scientific historians," the cliometricians, who are defined by a methodology rather than by any particular subject-matter or interpretation of the nature of historical change. They are historians who build paradigmatic models, sometimes counter-factual ones about worlds which never existed in real life, and who test the validity of the models by the most sophisticated mathematical and algebraical formulae applied to very large quantities of electronically processed data.”

“The revival of narrative: reflections on a new old history*

Lawrence Stone

Past & Present, No. 85 (Nov., 1979), pp. 3-24

“There is, however, a difference in kind between the artisan quantification done by a single researcher totting up figures on a hand-calculator and producing simple tables and percentages, and the work of the cliometricians. The latter specialize in the assembling of vast quantities of data by teams of assistants, the use of the electronic computer to process it all, and the application of highly sophisticated mathematical procedures to the results obtained. Doubts have been cast on all stages of this procedure.”
“It is just those projects that have been the most lavishly funded, the most ambitious in the assembly of vast quantities of data by armies of paid researchers, the most scientifically processed by the very latest in computer technology, the most mathematically sophisticated in presentation, which have so far turned out to be the most disappointing.

Today, two decades and millions of dollars, pounds and francs later, there are only rather modest results to show for the expenditure of so much time, effort and money. There are huge piles of greenish print-out gathering dust in scholars’ offices; there are many turgid and excruciatingly dull tomes full of tables of figures, abstruse algebraic equations and percentages given to two decimal places.”

“Quantitative history has gained few converts, social science methodology remains suspect, and theory – begged, borrowed or invented – is steadfastly ignored in the interests of narration untrammelled by either speculation about or commitment to a systematic theory of social discontinuity.”

Robert P. Swierenga,
"Historians and Computers: Has the Love Affair Gone Sour?"

OAH Newsletter 12 (Nov. 1984), Special Supplement, 2-3.

Vannevar Bush
As We May Think
By Vannevar Bush

originally written in 1939, first published in July 1945

Consider a future device for individual use, which is a sort of mechanized private file and library. It needs a name, and, to coin one at random, “memex” will do. A memex is a device in which an individual stores all his books, records, and communications, and which is mechanized so that it may be consulted with exceeding speed and flexibility. It is an enlarged intimate supplement to his memory.

The historian, with a vast chronological account of a people, parallels it with a skip trail which stops only on the salient items, and can follow at any time contemporary trails which lead him all over civilization at a particular epoch. There is a new profession of trail blazers, those who find delight in the task of establishing useful trails through the enormous mass of the common record. The inheritance from the master becomes, not only his additions to the world’s record, but for his disciples the entire scaffolding by which they were erected.
“...research libraries are becoming choked from the proliferation of publication, and that the resulting problems are not of a kind that respond to merely more of the same – ever and ever larger bookstacks and ever and ever more complicated catalogues.”
“Quantitative social history’ is now old hat in Canada, though it was shiny and new only twelve years ago……The interesting development is not that from qualitative to quantitative history…Rather, it is the impact of large-scale, collaborative research in social history on the practices of historical research as a whole.”

Ian Winchester (1980)
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1989-
In Fall 1994, Roy Rosenzweig founded the Center for History and New Media (CHNM) in the Department of History and Art History at George Mason University (GMU).

The Center’s origins lay in an agreement between the American Social History Project (ASHP) and GMU in 1990 that provided time for Roy to work with his longtime ASHP collaborators Steve Brier and Josh Brown on a CD-ROM edition of ASHP’s Who Built America? text book. After the first disk was finished, in August 1993, Roy proposed establishing a Center for History and New Media at GMU. The Center’s first funded projects were collaborations with ASHP and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), beginning in 1995 with a second Who Built America? CD-ROM, followed in 1997 by Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, and in 1998 by History Matters.

The Center was first located in Roy’s office in Dickinson Hall on the Fairfax Campus, with computers in the lobby of the Department’s offices. Michael O’Malley, who joined the Department the same semester that Roy launched the Center, became Roy’s main collaborator, and, in 1995, formally CHNM’s Associate Director. Elena Ratzlaff, who began a PhD at GMU in 1995, joined the Center as its first staff member, working ten hours a week. When the Department moved to Robinson Hall in 1997, CHNM expanded to two offices connected by a lobby area, which contained computers and a printer – not dedicated equipment for the Center, but available for general use by the Department. A postdoctoral fellow, Greg Brown, arrived in 1993, to work on Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. In 1998, three Graduate Research Assistants (GRAA) from the History Department joined the Center staff, together with a webmaster.
“There are signs of changing times, growing awareness, genuine interest, but also conservatism reaction, and resistance in traditional disciplines and, at the core of their research, to information technology for its own sake.”

p. 241
Rethinking Interdisciplinarity in History

Pervasive technological change, instantaneous communications and globalized exchange networks have redrawn the contours of our discipline in recent years. Historical documents that were once exclusively owned by specialists are now available on many portals that provide mind-boggling quantities of information. Today, growing numbers of people who previously had little or no contact with the discipline, are interested in history and are redefining the boundaries of the past. Moreover, collections in museums, archives and institutions responsible for preserving the memory of peoples and communities are coming to light. This has led to a fragmentation of audiences, segmentation based on stated interests and adaptations according to the cultural or linguistic origins of visitors. On our screens at home, in the cinemas and at commemorative sites, history is occupying a growing place and is constantly drawing new audiences. Meanwhile, back on our campuses, university students are registering for courses with increasingly varied intellectual and conceptual backgrounds, as disciplines collide. Over the course of their university careers—particularly at the graduate level—students are confronted with a vast array of data and research methods, many of which do not derive from traditional history.
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Questions about the past, present and future:

To what extent are we, as historians, actively engaging with the “digital”?

To what extent are we contributing to the development of “methodology designed to cope with the peculiar kinds of evidence with which we deal” (as Robert Zemsky called for in 1969) since exclusively “Borrowing from other disciplines is not the solution” (as Robert Swierenga pointed out in 1970)?

To what extent are we fulfilling the expectation that a digitally-enabled historian would establish “a skip trail which stops only on the salient items, and can follow at any time contemporary trails which lead...all over the civilization at a particular epoch” (as Vannevar Bush wrote in 1939)?

To what extent are undergraduate History students acquiring digital literacies? And graduate students being educated as digitally-enabled historians?
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To what extent is digitally-enabled History being defined by historians – not as transformative – but as a faster and more efficient version of the 20th century print-culture-based historical discipline?
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