On Unpublishing: Fugitive Materiality and the Future of the Anthropocene Book



Paul Benzon



Fig. 1. *Future Library*, 2014–2114. Photo: © Katie Paterson, 2015. Commissioned by Bjørvika Utvikling.

The Undeath of the Book

> Funes remembered not only every leaf of every tree of every wood, but also every one of the times he had perceived or imagined it.
>
> **Jorge Luis Borges, "Funes the Memorious"**[1]

This is an essay, in a volume on publishing as artistic practice, about a corpus of unpublished works of fiction: texts that are to-date mostly virtual and imagined, texts that remain to be read and to be written, texts that in large part do not exist—yet. These texts will comprise the end output of Scottish artist Katie Paterson's *Future Library*,[2] a project started in 2014 with the planting of one thousand trees in Nordmarka, a forest outside of Oslo, Norway, and in progress until 2114, when the resulting paper will be used to print a series of books.[3] Every year between now and then, one author will be chosen by the Future Library Trust—a group composed of Paterson alongside various figures involved in publishing, the literary prize market, and library development—to contribute a text to the project. Canadian speculative fiction author Margaret Atwood, best known for her dystopian feminist novel *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985) and for her recent trilogy of novels on climate change and genetic engineering (*Oryx and Crake*, 2003; *The Year of the Flood*, 2009; *MaddAddam*, 2013[4]), was selected for the project's inaugural year, and handed over her manuscript on May 26, 2015. Until 2114, when all 100 texts are published, each text will be securely stored as it is written in a specially designed room in the New Public Library in Oslo. This room, designed by Paterson, will be constructed from wood derived from the trees in Nordmarka that were cleared to make room for the thousand trees that will in turn eventually provide the material for the coming books themselves.

Circulating and reverberating across time and space, Paterson's *Future Library* offers a speculative glimpse of the possibilities of publication in the twenty-second century—of the complex, contingent ways in which

print writing might persist within an uncertain future. Projecting old media into new history, the project is, among other things, a complex statement in the ongoing cultural conversation about the future of the book. The death of the book in the face of electronic and digital media has been a common trope of literary discourse at least since Robert Coover's essay "The End of Books" in 1992.[5] These conversations inevitably betray the ideological and technological preoccupations of those involved, whether they be nostalgic or futurist. Paterson's project, by contrast, imagines a future media ecology different from either of those binary reactions, one defined neither by the death of the book nor by its digital afterlife or rebirth. On the contrary, the *Future Library* constitutes an extended meditation—indeed a meditation by way of extension—on the long, deep time of the book,[6] on the complexly recursive ways in which the paper codex circulates through time across a wide range of storage sites, substrates, and potentialities, coming into contact with a varied array of authors, editors, institutions, and infrastructures. Stretching the lifespan of the book ever so slightly toward geological time through the extended delay of storage time between writing and circulation, Paterson opens up a critical pleat in the temporalities of publishing technology, imagining a potential future not through the seemingly abstract futurity of the digital but rather by means of the radical elongation of paper. Her project stages a leveraged play upon the charged material relations between codex, archive, and environment that at once both suggests new temporalities and material configurations of publication and also throws those categories into question as historically overdetermined and profoundly contingent. In this essay, I trace Atwood's as-yet-unpublished and unread text across the spaces that comprise *Future Library*'s complex, delicate ecology—the document, the library, and the forest—in order to offer a theory of how print publication might provide critical purchase on questions of digitization, of its own obsolescence and persistence, and of the place of artistic practice within a space and time increasingly marked by the imminent possibilities of environmental crisis.

The Later Age of Print: Document, Object, Fugitive

> The new radicalism is paper. [...] Publish it on a printed page and no one will ever know about it.
>
> **Kenneth Goldsmith, "If It Doesn't Exist"[7]**

The external face of the *Future Library* is resolutely analog, rooted in the tangible, visible materiality of wood and paper. These old-media trappings are at once both aesthetic and technological: the living forest, the bound paper copies, and the wooden interior of the library room that collectively compose the project seem to speak strongly on behalf of the analog as a format with the capability to persist long after the obsolescence of any single given digital format. The *Library* imagines the old medium of paper growing older, its

historical trajectory elongated into the future in a manner that outlasts the newness of the digital. Indeed, this singular persistence seems intended to supersede and upend the networked materiality and circulation of the digital. Out of the infinite reproducibility of the digital, Paterson seems to suggest, what will remain most secure a century from now is the singularity of the typescripts stored in the *Library*. In a further extension of the project's textual ecology, Paterson has designed a certificate that entitles the bearer to a complete set of the *Library*'s texts in 2114, but even these are only available in a limited edition—far fewer than the traditional print run of a notable author's work—and presumably at considerable cost. Thus in both of these instances, print authorship and publication yield rare artifacts, objects that take on a kind of renewed Benjaminian aura against the backdrop of contemporary digital replication and circulation.

Yet such a conceit elides the underlying digital backstory of the texts in question, at least in the instance of Atwood's inaugural volume. In 1998, N. Katherine Hayles noted that "[a]ll but a handful of books printed in the United States and Europe ... will be digitized during some phase of their existence. ... [E]ven print texts cannot escape being affected by information technologies,"[8] a claim that has surely become true for an even larger percentage of books since Hayles first made it more than fifteen years ago. Indeed, the robust presence of both artist and author on social media, and in particular Atwood's extensive engagement with writing technologies such as the digital publishing platform Wattpad and the remote robotic signing technology LongPen (her own invention) would strongly suggest that the multivalent trajectory Hayles describes applies to this first contribution to the *Library* as well.[9] Thus while the finished product will rest *in situ* in the *Library* as a hard-copy print typescript, handed over as such by Atwood, we have to assume that it existed first (and indeed still exists) as a digital file created by Atwood. The presumably born-digital status of this insistently paper text raises crucial yet unanswerable questions about its materiality and provenance: where does this text reside and circulate—where does it exist besides the hallowed, auratic singularity of the volume placed under lock and key in Oslo for the next hundred years? On Atwood's hard drive? On Paterson's? What other individuals involved with the project or the Trust have accessed it, and in what forms? How might such an origin story complicate the status of the printed text in Oslo, adding layers to its material historicity that augment and complicate its status as a print object rather than detracting from it?

As these questions suggest, Atwood's text occupies a strangely paradoxical state as a media object. A work by a prolific major author widely publicized but paradigmatically not published in any conventional sense of the term, it exists, at least for the next hundred years, in a highly inaccessible print run of one.[10] Its publication status and its technological format simultaneously shape one another and throw one another into relief: the digital version of the text, seemingly infinitely replicable, remains paradoxically secure and all but singular, possessed only by the small group directly involved with

the project. Yet the paper version, the object ultimately destined for publication, is nearly equally singular, strangely no more or less publicly accessible than the digital. Either form could circulate more widely, particularly the digital, of course, yet it is central and definitive to the project that neither form does—that the varied material reproducibility of these parallel textual objects is underscored precisely by being subverted and short-circuited.

In both formats, then, Atwood's text exemplifies what Mark Sample imagines as the category of fugitive texts, "fading away before our eyes, slipping away in the dark, texts we apprehend only in glimpses and glances. Texts that remind us what it means to disappear completely forever. The fugitive text stands in defiant opposition to the archive. The fugitive text exists only as … a trace, a lingering presence that confirms the absence of a presence."[11] One of the key models for Sample's theory of the fugitive text is Don DeLillo's novel *Mao II*, in which the reclusive novelist Bill Gray withholds his ever-expanding novel from publication as a means of distinction and resistance against "the always-available logic of the marketplace."[12] In his notes for the novel, DeLillo writes that "[i]n the world of glut + bloat, the withheld work of art becomes the only meaningful object."[13] In its flickering presence, intensely discussed but barely seen, Atwood's contribution to the *Library* resembles Gray's novel as a withheld fugitive text, an exception within and against the constant streams of contemporary media culture that exerts presence by way of its absence. Yet the crucial difference between the two texts is that Gray's is a wholly print and paper object, produced on typewriter (like DeLillo's works themselves) and existing nowhere other than in the author's basement, while Atwood's text presumably has a digital origin point. However, the infinite reproducibility and accessibility made possible by such an origin ultimately constitutes a kind of material null set, leading through the constraints of the project back to singularity, absence, and fugitivity, conditions that are thrown all the more into relief against the digital moment in which Paterson's project takes place.

In this sense, both Atwood's single text and the project as a whole constitute an extreme instance of what Jessica Pressman describes as "the fetishized focus on textuality and the book-bound reading object"[14] that characterizes the early twenty-first century's aesthetic of bookishness. For Pressman, contemporary bookishness

> "is not merely another form of postmodern reflexivity in which the author toys with the reader in a layered process of simulacra. … [T]his iteration of the aesthetic of bookishness differs from bookish aesthetics of the past. The novel projects digital technologies into the book format as a means of combating the simultaneous peril of information loss and the ideology of transcendental data that constitute discourse network 2000."[15]

Viewed from the perspective of Pressman's theory, Atwood's text is perhaps the most bookish book imaginable. The analog materiality of this media object within the digital world collapses the distinctions between information loss and transcendental data that Pressman notes. It verges on a kind of

technological sublime not because of its transcendent, ubiquitous accessibility but rather through a profoundly immanent absence, the inaccessibility of the text in either print or digital form. Atwood's text registers as most bookish precisely in its status as a fugitive text, and conversely underscores bookishness as defined most urgently in terms of material extremity—the ways in which the presence and absence of a textual object become dually charged and radicalized within a culture of information. Thus Paterson's bookishness goes beyond referentiality or reflexivity, the simulational hall of mirrors Pressman notes as characteristic of an earlier moment. It raises the question of how the extremes of technological reproducibility and singularity lie uneasily alongside and within one another across time as markers of a constantly shifting media culture that is always already split and scattered between analog and digital modes. The future imagined by *Future Library* exists in print, a technology designed for ongoing accessibility and compatibility—qualities that become increasingly difficult for digital texts to sustain over time as they face obsolescence and decay. Yet at least for the present moment, this print archive cannot help but speak of the digital as well, even and especially through omission. It carries the digital into the future as an absent presence haunting paper, one medium tracing and leaving traces upon the other, the fugitive origin of a fugitive text.

Discourse Networks 1614/2114: Archive, Unpublication, Archaeology, Silence

> The absent library takes part in an uncanny accounting: ordering and tabulating every addition to a catalogue by a subtractive deduction; sketching a pinax of absence; and bartering ruthlessly in a general economy of anticipatory and permanent deaccession.
>
> **Craig Dworkin, *The Perverse Library*[16]**

Can we consider Atwood's text—or any text, for that matter—a publication if it remains private and inaccessible to the public for the foreseeable natural lives of the author, the artist, and the vast majority of the reading public alive at the time of its printing? What might it mean to reimagine publishing—the making public of written work—as by definition a private act? Is Paterson Atwood's future publisher? Her future archivist, editor, curator? Where does she place these roles within the field of public and private action? In his seminal essay "What Is an Author?" Michel Foucault raises a series of dually "theoretical and technical" questions regarding the boundaries of an author's *oeuvre*:

> "When undertaking the publication of Nietzsche's works, for example, where should one stop? Surely everything must be published, but what is 'everything'? Everything that Nietzsche himself published, certainly. And what about the rough drafts for his works? Obviously. The plans

> for his aphorisms? Yes. The deleted passages and the notes at the bottom of the page? Yes. What if, within a workbook filled with aphorisms, one finds a reference, the notation of a meeting or of an address, or a laundry list: Is it a work, or not? Why not? And so on, ad infinitum."[17]

Foucault's questions here are designed to stretch the bounds of authorship past the breaking point, to imagine an archive that includes everything—published, unpublished, deleted, ephemeral, incidental—and in doing so overwhelms and overwrites the very conception of the author. Yet gazing at the locked door of the *Future Library*, unable to access its single text, we find ourselves staring down the inverse of these provocations: while Foucault asks the overarching question of how far we can expand the scope of an author's work, Paterson asks what possibilities and questions emerge through the circumscription of publication. What is a publisher when she does not publish? Rather than imagining an inquiry into "everything," Paterson calls upon us to consider void, absence, and delay.

Should we understand this text as part of Atwood's bibliography, and if so, how? And when? Surely it is a work written by her, but if we take Foucault at his word, so is everything she commits to paper, disk, drive, or network. Paterson's deep concern with literary history and the archive in *Future Library* challenges us to imagine a more granular approach to authorial time at the same time that it dissolves the possibility of such an approach back into time. Should this text appear on the "also by Margaret Atwood" page in the front matter of her next (published) text? If not then, perhaps upon publication a century from now, its author long dead, perhaps no longer even in print? How would such crisscrossing expansions to her catalog—one proleptic, one retrospective—complicate how we understand the temporality of her career? These questions seem trivial, mired in the minutiae of bibliography and biography, yet I raise them precisely for that reason: the extreme Nietzschean archival proliferation that Foucault imagines finds its uncanny double in the extreme withdrawal of this unseen text, its absent presence as a fugitive text in the authorial archive.

Indeed, as much as these are authorial questions, they are also profoundly archival and bibliographical ones, bound up with and within the locked space of the library. Thus as a way of framing the archival stakes of the *Library*, and of turning to the physical space of the library itself, I want to offer the deceptively simple proposition that Atwood's text is unpublished. I mean this not in the simple, literal sense of being not published, written but never publicly circulated, as in the case of the Nietzschean manuscripts Foucault imagines. The unpublication I have in mind here is more dramatic and radical. Whereas Nietzsche's unpublished writings are unpublished as an indirect, incidental byproduct of a larger authorial career, the *Library*'s unpublication is the very center of the project. Indeed, by unpublication I mean not the absence or deferral of publication but its utter inverse: the printing of texts in order to be secreted, held from view, and circulated in the secure space of the library room. Conceptual poet Kenneth Goldsmith, whom I quote in the epigraph to the previous section of this essay, has famously declared that "If it doesn't exist on the internet, it doesn't exist."[18] If we take Goldsmith's provocation at face value, the *Library*'s space of sequestration becomes visible as the key vehicle in keeping its texts from existing, retaining them within absence and secrecy. The century-long deferral, the secured space, the isolated codex—all of these elements of the project function together to subvert the conventional trajectories of publication, replacing them with absence and with the blankness of enduring space and time, an unseen text locked within an all-but-empty textual space.

Both in spite of and because of the project's name, the library of *Future Library* is a deeply retro space, a library of the past as much as of the future. In addition to the space's focus on printed paper texts and its carefully sourced wooden construction, it also includes a printing press. Given the spatial constraints of the library and Paterson's comment that the project will "hold[] workshops for the next generations in printing and binding books,"[19] it seems likely that this press will be a fairly small and technologically primitive one. These deliberate anachronisms, destined to be all the more anachronistic a century from now, frame *Future Library* as a multilayered project of media archaeology. Jussi Parikka describes this critical and artistic discipline as

> "a way to investigate the new media cultures through insights from past new media, often with an emphasis on the forgotten, the quirky, the non-obvious apparatuses, practices and interventions. [...] Media archaeology sees media cultures as sedimented and layered, a fold of time and materiality where the past might be suddenly discovered anew, and the new technologies grow obsolete increasingly fast."[20]

Indeed, as much as the space of the library preserves the texts chosen for the project, it also preserves an imminently anachronistic scene and practice of reading, providing the apparatus by which future readers might project themselves back doubly in time to the moment of print culture. Writing on the history of storage media, Leah Marcus compares the discursive characteristics of three different technological moments: the mutable noise and collective reading practices of manuscript culture, the silence of the archive and the library in the moment of early print, and the return to the noise of cyberspace in the emergence of the digital. She argues that in contrast to the noisy, dynamic modalities of premodern and postmodern inscription and storage, "so obviously mutable and 'alive,' so vulnerable to alteration and loss," "[w]e associate libraries, collections of knowledge, and systems for memory retrieval with silence and hence with permanence."[21] In keeping with this sensibility, the *Library* resurrects a rapidly receding past for the future, dramatically rehearsing and preserving the very silence that Marcus suggests must accompany and characterize any stable preservation effort.

Yet the temporalized space of the library is not simply a space of return, but also a space of deferral and anticipation. The *Library*'s archaic recuperation of the past is inseparable from its speculative projection into the future. Through the near-empty space of the *Library*, the time of the project becomes

dramatically stretched beyond the lifespans of its initial creators: Paterson remarks, "[w]hen I had the idea for *Future Library* I knew instantly it would outlive me (and most of us alive today). It is important that I do not see it fully realised—it is a work conceived for an unknown, future generation."[22] This space, then, is proleptically haunted by the future, paradoxically filled by both the absent presence of the books to come, and the gradual, inevitable disappearance of those texts' mortal writers, selectors, and readers. Its silence is not the silence of solitary, modern print reading, but rather the silence of the unread, of the untimely absence of reading—the silence of a space occupied not by reading humans, but by unread books.

@wood: Place, Trees, Economies, Ecologies

> There was a lot of trash cluttering the streets—burnt things, broken things. Not only cars and trucks. Glass—a lot of that. Shackie said we had to be careful which buildings we went into: they'd been right near one when it collapsed. We should stay away from the tall ones because the fires could have eaten away at them, and if the glass windows fell on you, goodbye head. It would be safer in a forest than a city now. Which was the reverse of what people used to think.
>
> **Margaret Atwood, *Year of the Flood***

The complex, delicate ecology of *Future Library*'s components invokes the equally delicate, deeply contingent ecology that the project resides within. Both Paterson and Atwood have remarked on the project's direct confrontation of an uncertain environmental future: Atwood states, "This project, at least, believes the human race will still be around in a hundred years!"[23] a proclamation that seems almost to protest too much. Paterson, when asked in an interview, "Are you pessimistic about the future? Or does art give you hope?" answers with a sharply hedged description of the *Library*'s physical defenses:

> "The room I'm designing for the Oslo Library that will hold the manuscripts will be on the fifth floor, among the special collections and archives. So they will be kept safe, even if the fjords pour into the land. Which could happen. Margaret even said that, in 100 years, Norway may not even exist as a country. Perhaps these futures that are being written now will come true in 100 years. I don't know who'll read them. Maybe they'll be like the characters in Margaret's books."[24]

Here Paterson imagines the speculative dimension of the *Library* as particularly charged, the projection of literary reading and writing not only into a profoundly uncertain future, but also indeed a future characterized by precisely the uncertainty that has long preoccupied its first contributor. In this sense, Paterson's choice of Atwood as the *Library*'s first author foregrounds the project's self-conscious engagement with the possibility of environmental crisis; after all, if any living author is aware of the possibilities for radical social upheaval around environmental change in the next century, it is Atwood herself. How, then, to leverage against this imminent threat? How to protect the words, ideas, and materials of the project from the very same ecological crises that they themselves might imagine?

Future Library engages these problems through an uncanny discursive conservation of mass: Paterson's initial clearing of the forest space in Oslo provides wood for the construction of the library room, which will eventually be filled with books produced from trees growing in the repopulated initial space—a kind of Möbius strip between the space of the forest and the space of the library over the next century.[25] Yet Paterson's work is not merely a simple restoration through replanting, as if in some defanged, print culture version of the neoliberal carbon offset. On the contrary, by leaving the texts of the *Library* radically unpublished for as long as 100 years, planting trees that replace the ones she has cut and will only later serve as material for the *Library*'s books, she inverts the conventional terms of this ecological/textual transaction. The project replenishes and accumulates wood in advance, in a manner that simultaneously repays the environmental debt incurred by the library and saves toward the future moment of publication. Here again the self-referentiality from which Pressman distinguishes contemporary bookishness gives way to a complex interdependence between the narrative possibilities of the text and the material and environmental concerns of the project. However much Atwood's text might blur the bounds between fiction and reality, imagining the conditions of the future that it waits to be read within, its position within the *Library* is not a mere metafiction detached from material reality, but rather part of the project's complex reflection on the stakes of its own material and environmental context—a conservational project in both the archival and environmental senses of the word.

My use of economic language—transaction, debt, repayment—to describe the ecology of normal print publishing above is deliberate, and intended to resonate on a number of levels. Most broadly, as recent conversations regarding the temporal boundaries of the Anthropocene period have shown, climate change is inextricably bound up with the *longue durée* of globalization and market capitalism, whether grounded in the moment of European arrival in the Americas, the Industrial Revolution, the emergence of nuclear weapons, or another event.[26] But the economics of climate change also inform *Future Library* in particular given the project's location in Norway, a nation that has been at the forefront of REDD (reduced emissions from deforestation and forest degradation) transactions, in which developed nations pay aid to developing nations in return for an agreement to slow or cease deforestation.[27] A full discussion of the geopolitical, economic, and ecological stakes of the REDD market is beyond the scope of my work here, but the presence of such a history in Norway resonates powerfully against the material, technological, and ecological poetics of Paterson's *Future Library*; in this context, then, the forest of the project stands in not only for other texts and

moments across time, but also for other global spaces within an economically and ecologically uneven present.

Like the library space itself, then, this forest is layered with the uncertainty of human time both there and elsewhere. Indeed, notwithstanding the belief and hope that Atwood and Paterson mention in the passages above, the expanded duration of the *Library* means that the project may not have a chance to end, at least as planned—that some texts may end up unpublished not by choice but by contingency, as well as perhaps altogether unchosen and unwritten, left virtual and latent in the silent forest. Yet uncannily, *Future Library*'s intrinsic silence and emptiness limns this possible end precisely as the project leverages against it, investing now in the unpublished and the unread in order to retrieve new texts through ancient means in the future, storing and sequestering books in the hope of readers. This tension raises an aporia that cuts across time, textuality, medium, and environment: How can literature invest in the future of the planet, not in discursive, linguistic terms, but in material, technological ones? Perhaps, Paterson suggests, only by remaining out of sight and out of reach, locked in the library and latent in the silent forest, teasing and testing us with the challenge of its fugitive inaccessibility. Perhaps, then, literature might remain only by disappearing—at least for now.



Fig. 2. *Future Library*, 2014–2114.
Photo: © Bjørvika Utvikling by Kristin von Hirsch, 2015.
Commissioned by Bjørvika Utvikling.

1 I would like to thank Katie Paterson and Siobhan Maguire for generously providing information and images to support this essay, and Annette Gilbert and Kristen Mueller for their thoughtful comments on an earlier version of the text. Jorge Luis Borges, "Funes the Memorious," in *Labyrinths*, trans. James E. Irby (New York: New Directions Press, 1962).

2 Katie Paterson, *Future Library – Framtidsbiblioteket – Katie Paterson*, accessed April 1, 2015, http://futurelibrary.no/.

3 The finite number of trees planted for the project raises a complex set of questions regarding how many pages such a forest could yield, and how many sets of the *Library*'s books such an archive could consequently allow for. All of the variables in play here (pages per tree, pages per book, and number of sets) are moving targets: the number of pages per book is of course determined by each individual author (inaugural author Margaret Atwood has noted that each contribution can be "one word. It can be a poem. It can be a story. It can be a novel" [Ed Finn, "An Interview With Margaret Atwood," *Slate*, February 6, 2015, accessed May 11, 2015, http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/future_tense/2015/02/margaret_atwood_interview_the_author_speaks_on_hope_science_and_the_future.html]), and Paterson's website describes the number of sets only as "limited." Different sources also offer different conceptions of the number of pages of paper yielded by a tree. The Sierra Club, an American conservation organization, offers an estimate of between 10,000 and 20,000 sheets of 8½×11" paper per tree (Bob Schildgen, "Green Life: How Much Paper Does One Tree Produce?" *Sierra*, July 4, 2014, accessed May 11, 2015, http://www.sierraclub.org/sierra/2014-4-july-august/green-life/how-much-paper-does-one-tree-produce).

4 Margaret Atwood, *The Handmaid's Tale* (New York: Ballantine, 1986); *Oryx and Crake* (New York: Nan A. Talese, 2003); *The Year of the Flood* (New York: Nan A. Talese, 2009); *MaddAddam* (New York: Nan A. Talese, 2013).

5 Robert Coover, "The End of Books," *New York Times Review of Books*, June 21, 1992, 23–25. On the more recent wave of conversations regarding the death and life of the book, see Jessica Pressman, "The Aesthetic of Bookishness in Twenty-First-Century Literature," *Michigan Quarterly Review* 48, no. 4 (fall 2009), accessed August 17, 2015, http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.act2080.0048.402.

6 See Siegfried Zielinski, *Deep Time of the Media: Toward an Archaeology of Hearing and Seeing by Technical Means* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006).

7 Kenneth Goldsmith, "If It Doesn't Exist on the Internet, It Doesn't Exist," September 27, 2005, accessed April 15, 2015, http://epc.buffalo.edu/authors/goldsmith/if_it_doesnt_exist.html.

8 N. Katherine Hayles, *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 43.

9 See, for example, Atwood's active Twitter account *Margaret E. Atwood (@MargaretAtwood)*, accessed April 14, 2015; her article "Why Wattpad Works," *The Guardian*, July 6, 2012, accessed April 12, 2015, http://www.theguardian.com/books/2012/jul/06/margaret-atwood-wattpad-online-writing; and André Voshart, "Robotic arm extends authors' signatures over cyberspace," *Design Engineering*, April 17, 2009, accessed May 12, 2015, http://www.design-engineering.com/motion-control/robotic-arm-extend-authors-signatures-over-cyberspace-10411/.

10 For a record of this unpublished publicity, see the "Press" page of the *Library* website.

11 Mark Sample, "The Archive or the Trace: Cultural Permanence and the Fugitive Text," January 18, 2010, accessed August 17, 2015, http://www.samplereality.com/2010/01/18/the-archive-or-the-trace-cultural-permanence-and-the-fugitive-text/.

12 Ibid.

13 Quoted in ibid.

14 Pressman, "The Aesthetic of Bookishness in Twenty-First-Century Literature."

15 Ibid.

16 Craig Dworkin, *The Perverse Library* (York: Information as Material, 2010).

17 Michel Foucault, "What is an Author?" in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (London: Penguin Books 1991), 103–104. For a different extrapolation of Foucault's argument into the digital, see Matthew Kirschenbaum, "What Is an @uthor?" *Los Angeles Review of Books*, February 6, 2015, accessed October 18, 2015, https://lareviewofbooks.org/essay/uthor.

18 Goldsmith, "If It Doesn't Exist on the Internet, It Doesn't Exist."

19 Mariann Enge, "In a Hundred Years All Will Be Revealed," *Kunstkritikk*, June 30, 2014, accessed October 16, 2015, http://www.kunstkritikk.com/nyheter/in-a-hundred-years-all-will-be-revealed.

20 Jussi Parikka, *What is Media Archaeology?* (Cambridge, UK and Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2012), 3.

21 Leah S. Marcus, "The Silence of the Archive and the Noise of Cyberspace," in *The Renaissance Computer: Knowledge Technology in the First Age of Print*, ed. Neil Rhodes and Jonathan Sawday (London: Routledge, 2000), 24.

22 Enge, "In a Hundred Years."

23 M. H. Miller, "Margaret Atwood Joins Katie Paterson's Public Art Project, 'Future Library,'" *ArtNews*, September 5, 2014, accessed April 15, 2015, http://www.artnews.com/2014/09/05/margaret-atwood-joins-katie-patersons-public-art-project-future-library.

24 Neal Frizzell, "An Artist Is Growing a Forest That'll Become a Library of Books in 100 Years," *Vice*, October 22, 2014, accessed April 14, 2015, https://www.vice.com/en_uk/read/an-artist-is-growing-an-entire-forest-in-norway-to-become-a-book-anthology-in-100-years-916.

25 Paterson also sees this kind of material resonance and return at the microscopic level of the project: "The idea to grow the trees to print the books arose for me initially through making a connection with tree rings—to chapters, the material nature of paper, pulp, words, books—and imagining the writer's thoughts infusing themselves, 'becoming' the trees. Almost as if the trees absorb the writer's words like air or water, and the tree rings become chapters, spaced out over the years to come," eventually becoming pages and books that will themselves hold the authors' words. Enge, "In a Hundred Years."

26 See Simon Lewis and Mark A. Maslin, "Defining the Anthropocene," *Nature* 519 (March 12, 2015): 171–180 for one recent, if debated, discussion of the periodization of the Anthropocene.

27 Norway has brokered REDD deals with Brazil, Guyana, Indonesia, and Liberia. For a fuller discussion of the ethics and economics of REDD, see Filipa Ioannou, "Norway Gives Liberia $150 Million to Stop Cutting Down Trees," *Slate*, September 23, 2014, accessed April 17, 2015, http://www.slate.com/blogs/the_slatest/2014/09/23/norway_liberia_deforestation_money_aid_for_promise_to_save_trees.html and James Surowiecki, "Climate Trades," *The New Yorker*, October 13, 2014, accessed August 17, 2015, http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/10/13/climate-trades.