

**Archival Bodies:  
The American Market for Literary Collections since 1944**  
Amy Hildreth Chen, PhD

**Content and Focus**

In February 2016, John Updike's trash went up for auction for \$20,000. It failed to sell.<sup>1</sup> But who put Updike's garbage up for sale? What was in it? Why was it supposed to be worth so much? And why did no one buy it?

The story of Updike's trash begins in May 2006, when a man named Paul Moran was biking along a suburban road in Massachusetts. He saw Updike walk out of his house and place several bags on the curb. In the bags were his honorary degrees. Moran paused as he realized the degrees were valuable. He immediately returned to Updike's house with his car and collected the garbage. Struck by his idea, and his luck, he stopped by Updike's house frequently over the next several years, only ceasing to visit when Updike died in January 2009. While Updike knew what Moran did, he never gave him permission. During this time, Moran gathered letters, photographs, clothing, and many other items related to Updike's daily life and literary career. Moran then decided to publicize his collection. He created a website in 2009 called The Other John Updike Archive,<sup>2</sup> where he blogged about his finds. He wrote an article, "Finding John Updike: And Taking his Trash," for the *Texas Monthly* in 2014 to showcase the collection's value.<sup>3</sup> He even approached Updike's colleagues seeking their blessing for his actions; he hoped to win British novelist Ian McEwan over with a scavenged gift—a pair of Updike's glasses.<sup>4</sup>

Although Updike is a major twentieth century American writer, it would be reasonable to assume that Moran simply got greedy when he went to sell Updike's belongings. After all, asking \$20,000 for trash seems like a bit much. Maybe the problem was the price. But Updike's official literary collection, also comprised of letters, photographs, drafts, and other "personal miscellany,"<sup>5</sup> sold to Harvard University's Houghton Library for \$3 million dollars.<sup>6</sup> In comparison, Moran's collection was a steal. The problem was many people thought Moran *did* steal. He may have been entitled to whatever he found on the curb legally,<sup>7</sup> but his family, literary agent, repository, archivists, and biographer all agreed that what Moran did was unethical.

Whether or not it was unethical for Paul Moran to collect John Updike's trash and then try to sell it raises a pressing question: who controls literary history? Scholars write literary history by consulting primary sources found in literary collections. While scholars frequently *use* literary collections, they rarely consider *how* these papers became accessible to them. Scholars do not question whether the documents they study came from authorized or unauthorized sources; what matters to them is their ability to learn about a writer's life and creative process from a collection's documents.

*Archival Bodies* argues that literary history begins to be written long before a scholar reaches his or her sources. Rather, literary history begins within the literary collections market, which controls what papers become available to researchers. Comprised of five stakeholders, the literary collections market includes: authors, executors, institutions, archivists, and scholars. Each stakeholder performs a role. Authors create, executors sell, institutions buy, archivists provide access, and scholars investigate.

But the story is not that simple. Each stakeholder's incentives and disincentives shape how they behave. When authors enter the literary collections market, they compete against their peers to get the highest payment for their papers. Authors who choose to sell rather than donate their papers must go through appraisal, which many find uncomfortable. After all, learning what your corpus is worth can sometimes be a disappointing experience. Authors also must choose to represent themselves, select a family member to represent them, or hire a professional executor who can help them locate which repository will pay the most for their collection. Executors hope to convince authors that they would do better with representation than on their own; after all, they stand to make a commission. However, executors are not inclined to take on authors whose papers are not likely to net a high appraised price; their time would be better spent on more profitable writers. Institutions compete too; they must vie against each other to obtain the most prestigious collections for their repositories at the lowest prices. Archivists are invested in the research, rather than the financial value of writers' papers. Archivists may not be selling, negotiating, or buying on the literary collections market, but their curation of these papers shapes what scholars see when they begin their inquiry. Together, these actors direct the market.

Updike's trash reveals that the market is just as defined by what it keeps out as what it permits. Those who participate in the market determine who gets to be considered an author, who is allowed to sell papers, which universities may buy collections, what papers can be accessed, and what scholarship is allowed.

According to the literary collections market, Moran earned none of these rights. He knew he was not an author; instead, Moran argued he was a postmodern artist, inspired by the Dadaists and Surrealists. He cited Joseph Bueys, René Margiette, Joseph Cornell, and Marcel Duchamp to no avail. What he described as an assemblage, others perceived ephemera.<sup>8</sup> Likewise, Moran might have been the legal owner of Updike's trash, but the market only cared that he was not Andrew Wylie, Updike's literary agent. Furthermore, Harvard did not wish to add Moran's papers to their Houghton Library collection<sup>9</sup> curated by Leslie Morris and processed by a team of archivists and students under the direction of Jennifer Lyons.<sup>10</sup> Morris defended her decision to decline to seek Moran's papers by arguing "an archival collection derives meaning in part from what a person chooses to cull from it."<sup>11</sup> Finally, Moran was not an official biographer; that honor went to Adam Begley, author of *Updike* (2014). The only collection that was supposed to exist in the literary collections market was the official one, approved by Updike, managed by Wylie, bought by Morris, processed by

Lyons, and researched by Begley. Moran may have created a research collection on one of the most important twentieth century writers, but he ran afoul of the literary collection market's behavioral norms. As a result, Moran's collection did not meet its reserve.

As literary history is constructed by sources authorized by the literary collections market, scholars who fail to understand how the market works—including who participates and why—will fail to perceive how their research is shaped by these stakeholders' interests. For example, while Updike studies would benefit from Paul Moran's collection, the literary collections market determined that an unauthorized set of papers cannot be allowed to sell. As a result, scholars have lost the opportunity to access his collection. It may be true that what is left by history gains value from what is discarded, but even Morris admitted that what gets "thrown away" can later prove "fascinating."<sup>12</sup> Moran's auction highlights that the market is determined by stakeholders whose values are said to support research, but whose actions do not always align with those ideals.

As a result, the literary collections market behaves independently from current intellectual inclinations. Rather than reacting to researchers' demand, the market's other four stakeholders shape their appetites. For this reason, the market does not support scholars, it feeds them.

As the first book to consider the literary collections market, *Archival Bodies: The American Literary Collections Market since 1944* employs a mixed method and interdisciplinary approach to introduce readers to this trade, outline the competing objectives of its stakeholders, and argue why the market determines how scholars write literary history. Qualitative and empirical quantitative research enrich archival and academic perspectives in order to demonstrate to literary studies the financial, scholarly, and public value of the twentieth century American literary collections marketplace.

### **Annotated Table of Contents**

#### *Introduction: Stakes*

The introduction invites readers to consider the stakes of the literary collection marketplace with a case study involving John Updike's papers. Updike's widow sold his official collection to Harvard University's Houghton Library in 2009, less than a year after his death. But this collection is not the only set of papers attributed to Updike. A collector named Paul Moran legally created a second set of Updike papers by gathering Updike's trash between 2006 and 2009. Moran offered the collection to the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas at Austin in 2014 and then attempted to sell it on the open market through an auction in 2015. Although the Ransom Center declined and the auction failed, comparing the provenance of Updike's official and unofficial papers illuminates how the literary collections market adjudicates authors' financial compensation, who serves as an executor, which institutions bid for papers, what archivists process, and what scholars see.

#### *Chapter One: Market*

Why are literary collections, unlike most other types of personal papers, able to be sold to repositories? The literary collections market exist because writers have the option to sell rather than donate their papers. Although some writers do donate their papers, the majority prefer to sell. Chapter one argues that increasing scholarly demand for literary collections and the rise of public interest allows authors not only to sell their collections, but also to net extremely high prices.

#### *Chapter Two: Authors*

What author characteristics are important to the literary collections market? Demographics, age, and collection size influence how institutions approach authors. Chapter two's case studies highlight how these variables appear in the following writers: Randall Jarrell, Arthur Miller, N. Scott Momaday, Gerald Vizenor, Theodore Roethke, Eudora Welty, Jhumpa Lahiri, Ursula Le Guin, Art Spiegelman, Li-Young Lee, Richard Powers, Max Apple, Sylvia Plath, Gwendolyn Brooks, Lorine Niedecker, and Flannery O'Connor.

#### *Chapter Three: Executors*

Who helps authors find repositories for their papers in the literary collections market? Writers either choose to represent themselves or to be assisted by a family member or a bookseller. After discussing how the placement of literary collections is influenced by either self-representation or family, chapter three discusses Glenn Horowitz and Ken Lopez, two booksellers who control some of the most prestigious authors' papers to emerge in the market, yet their outsized role as intermediaries remains undocumented in literary criticism.<sup>13</sup>

#### *Chapter Four: Institutions*

Which institutions compete to obtain writers' papers on the literary collections market? Authors' behaviors indicate four factors account for their decision of where to place their collection: when they look for a repository; whether they want that repository to be affiliated with a university, public library, or historical society; if they prefer a university, what personal connections to honor and which to ignore; and how highly ranked that repository is according to the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) index. Chapter four determines that these factors historically determined which institutions possessed the most important repositories; now, these repositories are attempting to control the trade in writers' papers for their future benefit.

#### *Chapter Five: Archivists*

How do archivists contribute to the literary collections market? As archivists manage both paper-based and born digital content, they are on the front lines of how the digital age is changing the range of information in authors' papers and reshaping the market's financial and scholarly landscape accordingly. New areas of expertise are arising in order to meet the preservation and access needs of digital holdings, but this does not mean that the market agrees that digital content is as valuable as information found in print. Likewise, new modes of research are emerging in the digital humanities to address opportunities provided by wider information landscapes.

Chapter five asserts that archivists' training, interests, and advocacy will direct how the literary collections market copes with technological change and the development of digital humanities.

#### *Chapter Six: Scholars*

How do scholars interact with the literary collections market? Currently, scholars see literary collections either when they research particular authors or when they document aspects of print culture. While one branch of literary studies unabashedly prefers to highlight the role of individual writers and the other asserts the primacy of readers and the way in which these audiences reflect historical, social, technological, and political contexts, chapter six outlines that these two preoccupations are different sides of the same coin. True, the literary canon is influenced by authors' aptitude and readers' circumstances, but both of these scholarly focuses are shaped by what resources the literary collections market provides to researchers.

#### *Conclusion: Interdisciplinary*

How should we document the literary collections market in the future? To take a phrase from Paul Ricoeur, echoed in the works of Martin Heidegger and Jacques Derrida, we must acknowledge the fact that the archive is "always already" mediated. Authors' collections are not pure representations of writers going about their life and work. Rather, these papers pass through a market which curates these collections by authorizing whose papers, and which sources for those papers, can determine the future of scholarship. Therefore, *Archival Bodies* concludes that the best literary history must be interdisciplinary in order to depict how this market controls what information becomes available to researchers. However, understanding the literary collections market requires apprehending authors' motivations, executors' businesses, institutions' needs, and archivists' attitudes. Only by synthesizing these incentives and disincentives can we recognize how stakeholders in the literary collections market shape academic inquiry.

#### Appendices

##### *Appendix 1: Methods*

Appendix 1 includes a full discussion of the book's interdisciplinary methodology, which combines quantitative descriptive analysis, oral histories, and primary source research. Quantitative descriptive analysis represents the literary collection placement decisions of the 102 authors found in the seventh edition of the *Norton Anthology of American Literature*, Volume E, Since 1945. Many writers working within interdisciplinary fields prefer to leave methodology discussions for an appendix, rather than breaking up the flow of prose by including it in individual chapters.

##### *Appendix 2: Recommendations*

Appendix 2 provides a set of questions in a checklist format that writers should answer in order to learn how to properly preserve to an appropriate archival standard their papers/electronic files before looking for a housing repository. This appendix would be predicated on the invited talk I gave to the Iowa Writers' Workshop in April 2016.

## **Length**

The introduction, six chapters, and conclusion will each be around 6,500 words, adding to an estimated total of 52,000 words. Notes, bibliography, and two appendices will bring the total length of the book to approximately 90,000 words. The amount of illustrations included in this book is negotiable.

## **Market**

Scholarship using literary collections is well established, but scholarship on literary collections themselves is rare. No books exist on American literary collections, only British or Canadian papers. Additionally, no books discuss the literary collection acquisition as a marketplace from a quantitative as well as a qualitative approach. As a result, the potential market for *Archival Bodies* includes: literary scholars; library and archives students and professionals; writers; and humanities graduate students in methodology or professional development courses.

Currently, the two books that address literary collections are *The Boundaries of the Literary Archive: Reclamation and Representation* (2013), edited by Carrie Smith and Lisa Stead, and *The Story Behind the Book: Preserving Authors' and Publishers' Archives* (2009), by Laura Millar. While these volumes make early, substantial contributions to the field of literary collections studies, they leave ample room for future work. *The Boundaries of the Literary Archive* is an edited volume comprised of twelve essays. Each of these essays represent different authors with different professional viewpoints. As a result, readers still need a seamless and fully interdisciplinary introduction to the topic. *The Story Behind the Book* is a single-author volume, like the one I propose, but its contribution is more suited to the perspective of archivists, not humanities students and scholars. Millar includes chapters on topics like negotiating archival agreements and managing electronic records. Both volumes focus on non-American papers: Smith and Stead represents British writers while Millar emphasizes Canadian collections.

*Archival Bodies'* discussion of the literary collections marketplace will attract four types of readers. Literary critics are the first audience for this book. Currently, literary studies displays a competing interest in the author on the one hand and the reader on the other. Focusing on authors allows scholars to consider how particular individuals achieve their acclaim through their mastery of genre and form, while readership and print culture studies permits academics to note how audiences influence which writers become most influential in the first place. *Archival Bodies* appeals to both fields.

Literary collections bolster scholarship on the techniques used by individual writers by providing researchers with drafts and other materials that portray their editorial decisions. The value literary collections command depends, however, not just on a writers' technical brilliance but on their celebrity status with a general public. *Archival Bodies* will give studies on these authors the added weight of quantitative analysis. To give an example, only the most significant writers have texts devoted to teaching their work. *The Cambridge Companion to John Updike* (2006) is an example of a pedagogical volume that institutes Updike as a canonical figure within the

American literary tradition. The *Companion* only begins to introduce students to Updike criticism: many more books and articles are written on Updike's novels. However, none of them consider the way in which Updike's decision regarding his literary collection compares to those of his contemporaries statistically. Readership studies imagine how authors become cultural linchpins. The market for literary collections highlights that cultural significance does correlate to financial value. So a study like Loren Glass' *Authors Inc.: Literary Celebrity in the Modern United States, 1880-1980* (2004) shows how writers' popular appeal changes their canonical status, but *Archival Bodies* highlights that when a writer becomes canonical, they can demand higher prices for their papers. In fact, the canon itself can be subdivided by how much authors are able to net on the literary collections market. As a result, *Archival Bodies* is most likely to be used in undergraduate proseminars or graduate courses devoted to either twentieth century American print culture or individual authors discussed in the book (those named in the *Norton Anthology of American Literature*).

*Archival Bodies* also is of interest to scholars and students studying the history of English as a discipline, American higher education, or libraries. Books in these fields include David R. Shumway's *Disciplining English: Alternative Histories, Critical Perspectives* (2012), John Thelin's *A History of American Higher Education* (2011), and *The Social Life of Libraries in the United States* (2007), edited by Thomas Augst and Kenneth Carpenter. Introductions to Graduate Studies in English would find it useful to use *Archival Bodies* to show how the finances of American research libraries control the direction of intellectual inquiry.

*Archival Bodies'* second audience is the information disciplines of library and archives studies. Neither field has a book on American literary collections. As a result, a significant, interdisciplinary hole remains in the field of special collections. The Rare Book and Manuscript Section (RBMS) of the American Library Association does not run a press. The Society of American Archivists (SAA) does run its own press, but it has not published a book on literary collections. As a result, students enrolled in archives programs would find it valuable to read all or portions of *Archival Bodies* to understand why they would want literary collections at their repository; what types of authors are repositories are most likely to attract demographically, based on historical and projected trends in acquisition; and how to use this information to inform collection development policies. *U.S. News and World Report* lists 13 schools with a specialty in archives.<sup>14</sup> Classes on archives are far from the only type of course which would find *Archival Bodies* appealing as a potential text. Additional library courses that could use *Archival Bodies* would be those devoted to special libraries, book history, media history, collection development, humanities liaison work, and research methodology. For example, see the following list of universities with courses devoted to topics found in this volume:

Palmer School of Library & Information Science

- "Collection Development"
- "Archives & Manuscripts"

University of Iowa

- “Conceptual Foundations – College and University Libraries”
- “Topics in Book Studies”
- “Topics in Archives and Media, and Stewardship of Information and Collections”

University of Michigan

- “Collection Development and Management”

University of North Carolina

- “Selected Topics” (at Introductory, Intermediate, or Advanced Levels)
- “History of Libraries and Other Information-Related Cultural Institutions”
- “Research Methods Overview”
- “Humanities Information”
- “Copyright and Intellectual Property Issues in Archives”

University of Texas at Austin

- “Special Topics in Information Science: Media, Memory & the Archive”
- “Materials in Libraries, Archives, and Museums”

University of Washington

- “The Question of Information”

Although *Archival Bodies* will begin to address the importance of literary collections as a unique type of record within the field of donor relations, significant additional research remains to be done. This monograph will foster additional inquiry by professionals in a variety of library and archives sub-fields such as Public Services, Outreach, Instruction, Curation, Digital Curation, and Rare Books, especially at universities with significant holdings in literary collections. According to my *Norton Anthology of American Literature* data set, this would include over thirty universities. Furthermore, with the recent publication of Matthew G. Kirschenbaum’s *Track Changes: A Literary History of Word Processing* (2016), and the increase of library students in digital humanities programs, the archives and library fields are prime to begin to imagine how digital content will pose new challenges within the arrangement and description of writers’ papers, which often are their most costly collections.

Authors are the third audience for *Archival Bodies*. Authors need to understand how their papers are financial investment. Late career writers would benefit from reading about the options they face rather than entering into the market blindly or only based on their colleagues’ experiences. Early career writers, particularly those attending MFA programs, need to begin to consider how to preserve and prepare their papers in order to be in the best position later in life to advocate for their collection’s value. The Iowa Writers’ Workshop already had me speak to their students in April 2016 because they realized this gap in their professional development offerings. Both late and early career writers would benefit from understanding how their papers will likely be taught and studied. These authors also must consider how issues regarding representation, privacy, and digital media will impact their financial future.

History or English departments are the fourth audience for *Archival Bodies*. These humanities disciplines can use *Archival Bodies* to teach how to combine qualitative or quantitative analysis.

Most books discussing humanities methodologies focus on how to do archival research, conduct oral histories, or conduct digital humanities projects, but do not showcase how to synthesize all three. Handbooks on these approaches include: Jenny L. Presnell's *The Information Literate Historian* (2012), *The Oxford Handbook of Oral History* (2010), or *A Companion to Digital Humanities* (2007). Books that introduce quantitative analysis for humanists include: Franco Moretti's *Distant Reading* (2013); Willie van Peer, Frank Hakemulder and Sonia Zyngier's *Scientific Methods for the Humanities* (2012); and Franco Moretti's *Graphs, Maps, and Trees: Abstract Models for Literary History* (2007). *Archival Bodies* would pair well with any of these texts as a way to demonstrate these methods in action.

Humanities departments also need examples of work produced by PhDs in alternative academic roles as the difficult job market continues to reshape expectations regarding graduate student placement. As I am on the steering committee of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) grant for the Next Generation PhD at Iowa, I watched as my colleagues search for examples of PhDs conducting innovative research while in non-traditional jobs. They have found few examples. Often, they revert to inviting speakers doing new types of research within tenure-track roles. I offer a contrast: I am able to do innovative work methodologically because of my job, not in spite of it. I already speak to graduate placement classes in English and History; I realize that these students need me as an example to know what is possible. Likewise, doctoral programs in English and History can use *Archival Bodies* to showcase the research potential provided even when accepting alternative-academic roles.

### **Timetable**

I ask for a year and a half to complete this manuscript. I already wrote *Archival Bodies*' Chapter 1 and drafted substantial portions of the Introduction, Chapters 1-5, Conclusion, and both appendices.

Fall 2016

- ~~Proposal~~
- ~~Chapter 1~~

Spring 2017

- ~~Introduction~~
- ~~Chapter 2~~

Summer 2017

- ~~Chapter 4~~
- Chapter 5
- Chapter 6

Fall 2017

- Conclusion
- Review Statistics in Ch 2, 4, 5
- Add Donor Relations to Introduction
- Interview Executors for Ch 3

Spring 2018

- Chapter 3
- Add Historical Overview to Ch 1 and Publishers to Ch 2
- Add Appraisers to Ch 3 and Curators to Ch 4
- Add Appendix 1 and Acknowledgements

Summer 2018

- Proof Manuscript
- Submit Manuscript in August 2018

### **Author Qualifications**

I am qualified to write *Archival Bodies* as I am both a special collections librarian and literary scholar. My interdisciplinary perspective is essential; understanding twentieth century American literary collections market requires perceiving the history, theory, and practice of both librarians/archivists and academics.

I sought an interdisciplinary focus during my graduate education. At Emory University, I took my doctoral exams in twentieth century American literature, twentieth century Irish literature, and archival theory and then wrote a dissertation on Emory's acquisition of British, Irish, and American literary collections. At Emory, I also began my career in special collections when I worked under archivist Laura Carroll. She supervised my arrangement and description of the literary papers of Salman Rushdie and Alice Walker. I then supported the acquisition of literary collections for three years under poet and former Raymond Danowski Poetry Library curator Kevin Young. Young now is the director of the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture. In 2013, I received my PhD in English.

Following my doctorate, I continued to develop an interdisciplinary mindset. I spent two years as a Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) Postdoctoral Fellow in the Division of Special Collections at the University of Alabama, where I directed their outreach, exhibition, and instruction programs. Since June 2015, I have served as the Special Collections Instruction Librarian at the University of Iowa. Both Iowa and Emory are known for their investment in literature. Iowa founded the first creative writing MFA in the United States and is home to strong masters' programs in nonfiction, translation, and playwriting. Emory is one of the foremost universities collecting literary papers. My time at these institutions enriches my project immeasurably: I worked with authors placing their papers at Emory, saw the management of these collections at Emory's Rose Library, and advised graduate students at the Iowa Writers' Workshop on how to think about managing their papers for the future.

As a result of this dual focus, I have a wide range of previous publications including articles on literary collections, book chapters on special collections pedagogy, and a forthcoming book on a donor's collection. As this book is not a revision of my dissertation, although it has a similar title, I already published revisions of two of my three dissertation chapters in peer-reviewed journals: "Possessing 'An Inner History': Curators, Donors, and Affective Stewardship," with

*Collections: A Journal for Museum and Archives Professionals* in Summer 2016 and “The Perils of Literary Celebrity: The Archival Stories of Ted Hughes and Sylvia Plath,” in the *Ted Hughes Society Journal* in Winter 2011. I also have a series of peer-reviewed, co-authored publications related to special collections in books: *Undergraduate Research and the Academic Librarian* forthcoming in 2017, and *New Directions for Special Collections* in 2016, *The Process of Discovery* and *Innovative Practices in Archives and Special Collections*, both in 2015. Finally, I wrote a book for the University of Alabama forthcoming from New South Press, *Miracle and Mystery: A Guide to the Wade Hall Collection*, which explores the holdings of Alabama’s largest collection of rare books, manuscripts, photographs, music, and quilts.

My combination of observing the work environment of writers and archivists at three universities, my academic training in twentieth century literature, and my record of prior publications gives me a deep knowledge of my subject. I look forward to completing *Archival Bodies: The American Market for Twentieth Century Literary Collections Since 1944* for the University of Massachusetts Press series Studies in Print Culture and the History of the Book.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rebecca Rego Barry, “Updike’s ‘Trash’ at Auction,” *Fine Books & Collections*, February 17, 2016, [https://www.finebooksmagazine.com/fine\\_books\\_blog/2016/02/updikes-trash-at-auction.phtml](https://www.finebooksmagazine.com/fine_books_blog/2016/02/updikes-trash-at-auction.phtml).

<sup>2</sup> The Other John Updike Archive ([johnupdikearchive.com](http://johnupdikearchive.com)) existed only between 2009 and 2014. Now it must be accessed through the Wayback Machine.

<sup>3</sup> Paul Moran, “Finding John Updike: And Taking His Trash,” *Texas Monthly*, November 19, 2014, <http://www.texasmonthly.com/the-culture/finding-john-updike/>.

<sup>4</sup> Francesca Mari, “Texas Man Treasures Finds in Updike’s Trash,” *The New York Times*, November 22, 2014, [http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/23/us/texas-man-treasures-finds-in-updikes-trash.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/23/us/texas-man-treasures-finds-in-updikes-trash.html?_r=0).

<sup>5</sup> See Arrangement: John Updike Papers, 1940-2009, (MS AM 1793), Houghton Library, Harvard University, [http://oasis.lib.harvard.edu/oasis/deliver/deepLink?\\_collection=oasis&uniqueId=hou01365](http://oasis.lib.harvard.edu/oasis/deliver/deepLink?_collection=oasis&uniqueId=hou01365).

<sup>6</sup> Adrienne Lafrance, “The Man Who Made off with John Updike’s Trash,” *The Atlantic*, August 28, 2014, <http://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2014/08/the-man-who-made-off-with-john-updikes-trash/379213/>.

<sup>7</sup> *Due to California v. Greenwood*, a case in 1988 which established the right to search and seize garbage left outside a home’s curtilage (the land surrounding it). A curb is not included in a house’s curtilage. See: “California v. Greenwood, 486 U.S. 35 (1988),” Justia, US Supreme Court, 1988, <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/486/35/case.html>.

<sup>8</sup> Paul Moran, “Talking Heads ’77,” The Other John Updike Archive, Wayback Machine, February 15, 2015 capture, <https://web-beta.archive.org/web/20150215192437/http://johnupdikearchive.com/talking-heads-77/>.

<sup>9</sup> Lafrance, “The Man Who Made off with John Updike’s Trash,” n. pag.

<sup>10</sup> See Processing Information: John Updike Papers, 1940-2009, (MS AM 1793), Houghton Library, Harvard University, [http://oasis.lib.harvard.edu/oasis/deliver/deepLink?\\_collection=oasis&uniqueId=hou01365](http://oasis.lib.harvard.edu/oasis/deliver/deepLink?_collection=oasis&uniqueId=hou01365).

<sup>11</sup> Adrienne Lafrance, “The Man Who Made off with John Updike’s Trash,” *The Atlantic*, August 28, 2014, <http://www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2014/08/the-man-who-made-off-with-john-updikes-trash/379213/>.

<sup>12</sup> Lafrance, “The Man Who Made off with John Updike’s Trash,” N. Pag.

<sup>13</sup> Rachel Donadio, “The Papers Chase,” *The New York Times*, March 25, 2007, [http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/25/books/review/Donadio.t.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/25/books/review/Donadio.t.html?_r=0).

---

<sup>14</sup> “Archives and Preservation, Part of Library and Information Studies,” Best Grad Schools, U.S. News and World Report Rankings, 2013, <http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-library-information-science-programs/library-preservation-rankings>.