A Lost Cause:
Performance and the Free Speech Movement Digital Archive

Jane McGonigal
Department of Theater, Dance & Performance Studies
University of California at Berkeley
www.avantgame.com / janemcg@uclink.berkeley.edu

In his introduction to *The Digital Dialectic*, a 1999 anthology of essays on the (then) current state of digital communications technology, editor Peter Lunenfeld addresses the problem of creating scholarship of "lasting significance" about a highly transient medium with "always already dated qualities" (xx). He worries: "Nothing ages faster and becomes inaccessible quicker than electronic media. The silver oxide is falling off the tapes that constitute our archive of the pioneering era of video art. Good luck trying to find a system that can access computer files that are a mere decade old (especially if they were composed on now-abandoned operating systems)" (xx). There is a widespread concern among his fellow digital theorists, Lunenfeld suggests, that the objects of their studies will become obsolete and disappear, thereby making their own work irrelevant and opaque to future scholars. Lunenfeld's solution to this potentially anxiety-producing ephemerality is to import a bit of performance theory to the field of digital studies. "Rather than thinking of the digital media and environments mentioned herein as though they possessed the stability of painting or architecture, better to embrace their mercurial qualities and conceptualize them as being somehow evanescent, like theatrical performances or dance" (xx). He argues: "We accept performance's transience as no small part of its power. We should do the same for digital culture" (xx).

Lunenfeld advocates a new theoretical framework for critics *writing about* digital media, but it also suggests to me a possible intervention for professionals involved in the *production* and *maintenance of* digital media. After all, perhaps most deeply troubled and directly preoccupied with the inherent ephemerality of digital media are the historians and librarians currently charged with the duty of developing 21st-century archives. To archivists, digital technology presents itself simultaneously as a powerful tool for increased media accessibility and a dangerous threat to preservation efforts. In 1971, computer scientist Michael Hart launched Project Gutenberg, the first large-scale institutional digital conversion effort, by declaring: "The greatest value created by computers will not be computing, but the storage, retrieval, and searching of what was previously stored in our libraries" (Di Miceli [3]). After more than two decades of watching libraries across the country take up this challenge to "go digital", Hart predicted confidently in 1994 that "unlimited digital distribution of all public domain information will break the cycles of ignorance and illiteracy" (Hart [9]). Hart's optimistic claims were dramatically refuted, however, by Walt Crawford and Michael Gorman in their influential 1995 book *Future Libraries: Dreams, Madness & Reality*. Crawford and Gorman, both senior librarians at major research institutions, countered the widely hailed promise of digital archives with a range of perceived perils. They argued that the drive to use digital technology to make "all data, information, and recorded knowledge on all subjects available to everyone at all times and all locations… [is] an irresponsible, illogical and unworkable nightmare" (86-7). They warned of a variety of losses, including loss of aura and authenticity of the archived document (an ontological problem); loss of sensory engagement with original artifacts (a

phenomenological problem); loss of control over how information is distributed, modified or employed (a legal and economic problem); loss of completeness and accuracy (an epistemological problem); and, quite simply, loss of the Past (a moral problem), the defense against which is "the eternal mission of libraries" (89, 90, 160, 93, 121, 183). By so persuasively constructing loss as a primary concern, *Future Libraries* marked a significant turn in the digital discussion. It established loss not only as the central issue, but also the most powerful rhetorical strategy, in the digital archive debates.

Since *Future Libraries*, both proponents and detractors of digital conversion have framed their arguments in relation to loss and its prevention. "Preserving Digital Information: Report from the Task Force on Archiving of Digital Information," commissioned in 1996 by The Research Library Groups, Inc. and the Council on Libraries and Information Resources' Committee on Preservation and Access, was the pro-digitalization response of the industry to *Future Libraries*. A simple scan of its index reveals, however, that the report's structure prioritizes addressing potential losses over potential benefits, with sections entitled "The fragility of cultural memory in a digital age", "Technological obsolescence", "Loss of integrity of digital media," and so on. The task force positions itself in response to the widespread concern that through digitalization, "the United States is in danger of losing its memory" ("The Limits of Digital Technology" [4]). Although the report purports to address both "preservation and access," there is scant mention of the opportunities for increased diversity of audience, interpretation, and usage and *no* discussion of interfaces or infrastructures that might maximize this potential. They remark instead: "It is a problem of building the various systematic supports, or deep infrastructure, that will enable us to *tame anxieties* and move our cultural records… confidently into the future" ("The Need for Deep Infrastructure" [2], emphasis mine). The committee acknowledges: "Uncertainty and lack of confidence about our will and ability to carry digital information forward into the future exert a major inhibiting force in our disposition to fully exploit the digital medium to generate, publish and disseminate information" ("Legal and Organizational Issues" [3]). Even so,

the task force seems unable to disengage from the loss-centered debate.

It seems to me, then, that there is room for dramatic improvement in the construction and analysis of digital archives, in both sense of the word "dramatic": a significant and arresting change achieved through the infiltration of theatrical concepts. My inclination to extend Lunenfeld's theoretical intervention to the practice of contemporary archives is based not only on the traditional centrality of loss and ephemerality to both performance studies and archive practice, but also on the existence of a few tentative gestures to performance theory already made by digital information specialists. Consider, for example, the following invocation of performance as a guiding influence in the opening lines of the "Introduction" to the report from the Task Force on Archiving of Digital Information:

> Today we can only imagine the content of and audience reaction to the lost plays of Aeschylus. We do not know how Mozart sounded when performing his own music. We can have no direct experience of David Garrick on stage. Nor can we fully appreciate the power of Patrick Henry's oratory. Will future generations be able to encounter a Mikhail Baryshnikov ballet, a Barbara Jordan speech, a Walter Cronkite newscast, or an Ella Fitzgerald scat on an Ellington tune? ([1]).

How startling this rhetorical strategy is! Why should these media professionals choose to launch their discussions with an object list *exclusively* made up of performances lost? Part of the answer probably lies in the committees' belief that digital audio and video recording are more capable than text for capturing performance past. Therefore, the task force's logic seems to imply, live events especially depend on the development of robust digital archive strategies to escape erasure. But certainly this is not the entire explanation, for there are no doubt other examples more completely reliant on digital archiving — digital periodicals, much of the United States Government's Census data, and anything on the World Wide Web, for example. When the committee appeals to performance, what exactly is it appealing *for*? Justification? Guidance? I take

these unresolved questions as further encouragement to investigate the potential fruits of introducing performance theory into the digital archive debates.

Performance studies proves a somewhat recalcitrant participant in my plan, however, resisting an easy relationship with digital media, archival practice, and even loss. Although there has been considerable investigation of the Internet as a potential site for performance, both practitioners and theorists of performance have been cautious about fully embracing the online digital domain. For example, in "Media's Inexperience," Richard Schechner worries about the superficiality of "surfing" the Internet and addresses what he feels is the "disparity between spectating and experiencing," that is between electronic mediation and live happening (5). He therefore suggests to performance researchers a policy of "limiting time in front of screens and monitors" (5, 6). The Critical Art Ensemble, a group of politically motivated multi-media performance artists, take a more extreme position with their claim in *Digital Resistance* that "virtual theater is useless" and "the most profound testament to the nightmare of disembodiment" (106, 105). And Peggy Phelan demonstrates a particular wariness about digital archives in her introduction to *The Ends of Performance*:

> Performance studies, precisely because it has struggled so rigorously with the perils of preservation and the treacheries of transmission, is alert to the Net's potential to flatten and screen that which we might want most to remember, to love, to learn. We have created and studied a discipline based on that which disappears, art that cannot be preserved or posted. And we know performance knows things worth knowing. As the electronic paradigm moves into the center of universities, corporations, and other systems of power-knowledge, the 'knowing' that cannot be preserved or posted may well generate a mourning that transcends the current Luddite resistance to technology (8).

Further complicating my intended intervention, Diana Taylor's latest book *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* suggests that performance studies' unease extends from the digital to the concept of the archive in general. In the chapter "Acts of Transfer," Taylor argues that there is a powerful rift between knowledge that is transmitted by a variety of performance practices she calls "the repertoire," and knowledge that is stored in archives (5). Underlying this rift, she explains, are two fundamental differences. An archive is designed "to endure," while the repertoire is "ephemeral," and the archive privileges writing, while the repertoire privileges bodies (6). Taylor, like Phelan, is concerned with the potentially disembodying Internet, and she considers digital technology a particular threat to the performance-based repertoire. Taylor writes: "Now, on the brink of a digital revolution that threatens to displace writing, the body again seems poised to 'disappear' in a virtual space that eludes embodiment" (2).

Perhaps most troubling to a simple theoretical transplant is Jon McKenzie's *Perform or Else*, the most ambitious dialogue yet attempted between performance theory and digital studies. Far from rescuing the digital from its ephemerality anxieties, McKenzie's performance-inspired arguments actually re-inscribe digital technology in a constant battle against loss. McKenzie explores problems of obsolescence and evolution in digital technology by considering the expectation placed upon computers to perform. Citing post-modern theorist Jean-François Lyotard, McKenzie calls digital performance "a certain challenge, 'a certain level of terror, whether soft or hard: be operational… or disappear' " (14). Here, the performance theory relieves none of the anxiety, displaces none of the loss-centric discourse; instead, in a perfect parallel with the archive debates, it characterizes the threat of loss as a kind of "terror." This is hardly the celebratory stance toward ephemerality that Lunenfeld hopes to import to digital studies.

Lunenfeld's notion that performance studies fully embraces disappearance is further countered by the work of certain performance theorists and practitioners to develop, of all things, rigorous archival methods. Consider, for example, the recent collaboration of Mike Pearson, an artistic director and professor of performance studies,

and Michael Shanks, an archaeologist, to develop archaeologically-inspired preservation tactics for theatrical events. In their 2001 book *Theatre/Archaeology*, Pearson and Shanks claim to wish to perform "a rescue archaeology of the event," one that deliberately leaves *strategic*, rather than accidental, traces, so that it can "survive" and be "remembered and recalled" (57).

Clearly, then, there are already several dialogues in process among the fields of digital studies, performance theory and archival practice. This paper is an attempt to re-configure some of these conversations and to re-align some of its participants. In doing so, I hope, first, to examine more closely the function of a rhetoric of loss in digital archive debates and, second, to posit the digital archive as a potential site for historical performance. It is my intention to accomplish both of these goals by tracing the role of the organic in the notions of memory and mortality at play in both performance studies and archival practice.

Memory and Salvation

One of the most striking aspects of the digital archive debate is its insistent usage of organic metaphors to anticipate the effects of digitalization. This rhetoric is absolutely pervasive in the literature on digital archives. Crawford and Gorman, for example, lament in *Future Libraries* that digitalized information "will simply wither and die," as if data were some kind of living, breathing plant (87). They also write that "a library is a growing organism" and call digitalization "suicidal," likening conversion to a loss of life (7, 113). Similarly, in *Double Fold*, Baker decries the "wastage and mutilation" of digitalization and calls digitized texts "dead" (249, 82). Brand's "Written on the Wind" echoes this life and death rhetoric, posing the central problem of digital archives as a failure to achieve "immortality" ([3]). To describe digital obsolescence, Brand vividly likens outdated technology to rotting corpses. He evokes the image of a mass grave, noting "*a trail of bodies* of *extinct* computers, extinct storage media, extinct applications, extinct files" and observing that "*buried* with them are whole clans of programming languages, operating systems, storage formats, and countless *rotting* applications" ([6], emphasis mine). It is important to note here that it is not just hard-

copy holdings that are being described through organic metaphor, as in *Future Libraries* and *Double Fold*, but also their digital counterparts.

In "The Medium is the Memory," information specialist Florian Brody notes the common belief that "electronic texts have no body, only mind" (144). Disembodied information, he suggests, is not vulnerable to organic decay, and for this reason digital archives "have been put forward as a means to salvation. But what is it that we hope to save? I think that the hope for these technologies is that at base, they will serve as the ultimate memory machines that will help us store everything forever… we will create an eternity out of our collective memories" (144). The terms "salvation" and "eternity" conjure a kind of religious promise for eternal life beyond the wasting physical world. The simultaneity of organic rhetoric, a conjured afterlife, and loss-centered discourse reveals that underlying the professed fears of archival "death" and digital "decay" are actually anxieties about human mortality, displaced onto the object and bitmapped world.

Multimedia artist Noah Wardrip-Fruin posits a connection between death anxieties, religion and digital archives through his computer program "The Impermanence Agent," subtitled "Hypermedia and Eternal Life" and produced for the digital art festival SIGGRAPH 2000. In this conceptual art project, a downloaded "agent" acts as an archivist of an individual's Internet usage over time, promising to create a complete record of all documents accessed. The impermanence agent, however, has been programmed by Wardrip-Fruin to intentionally lose and misplace archived documents and to highlight the regularly occurring discontinuity of the World Wide Web, where — as Lunenfeld puts it — "bit rot is almost immediate... with sites popping up and falling away like flowers in the desert" (xx). The function of the impermanence agent, according to its creator, is to frustrate the user's attempt to create a virtual afterlife and then to "help the user through the Kubler-Ross stages of grief as 404 'file not found' errors are encountered during Web browsing--e.g., 'It must just be a typo. <pagename> can't really be gone.'" (63-64). By scripting his program to profess, "It must just be a typo," Wardrip-Fruin asks his agent to perform

the "denial stage" from psychologist Elisabeth Kubler-Ross's famous *On Death and Dying*, the quintessential self-help text on coming to terms with mortality. This witty intertextuality casts the digital experience as an embodied concern; that is, the digital document is mediated not only through computer technology but also through the flesh-and-blood bodies of its users. Accordingly, Wardrip-Fruin argues, the loss of data — which in "The Impermanence Agent" is traumatically denied its eternal afterlife in the digital realm — can be as painful and traumatic as the loss of human life, because it is both a metaphor for and a mediation of the ongoing human struggle with what it means to die.

Could performance studies help ameliorate the deadlock, so to speak, in current digital archive debates, serving as a theoretical role model through its own working out of death anxieties? Several prominent performance theorists have argued, after all, that a central function of "live" performance is, paradoxically, its continual allusion to death. In *Blooded Thought: Occasions of Theatre*, Herbert Blau writes: "In a very strict sense, it is the actor's mortality which is the actual subject [of performance], for he is right there dying in front of your eyes" (11). Similarly, in *Mourning Sex*, Peggy Phelan proposes: "It may well be that theatre and performance respond to a psychic need to rehearse for loss, and especially for death" (3). Phelan also creates an interesting theoretical matrix out of performance, digital media, loss of the organic, and a religious promise of immortality. She writes:

> As our cultural moment is buffeted on one side by claims of virtual reality and electronic presence, and on the other by a politicized and commodified spirituality… it behooves us to think seriously about what theatre and performance have to teach us about the possibilities and perils of summoning the incorporeal. To what end are we seeking an escape from bodies? What are we mourning when we flee the catastrophe and exhilaration of embodiment? (2)

Phalen positions performance as a necessary and separate counter to disembodying digital practices, but I would like to propose a new matrix. Could a performance-based model for archive interaction help us re-imagine the digital archive experience as embodied?

To explore this question, I turn to a pair of digital archives designed to preserve and transmit knowledge of a major political performance, the Free Speech Movement (FSM) launched in the fall of 1964 by students at the University of California at Berkeley. I will be working with both an institutional FSM digital archive, constructed and maintained by the Bancroft Library at UC Berkeley, and a grass-roots FSM digital archive, created and sustained by friends and veterans of the original campus movement. Using performance theory to analyze the Bancroft Library FSM Digital Archive, I hope to reveal a redundancy of loss in digital archive practice. Then, using the grass-roots FSM digital archive practice to explore theories and modes of performance, I aim to fuse organic and digital systems of memory to allow for an embodied, organic paradigm that focuses not on loss, but rather active experience and generational transmission.

A Generation of Loss

In her introduction to *The End of Performance*, Peggy Phelan wonders: ""How does performance studies illuminate the project of historiography, the effort to rehearse the event that is gone but still radiating meaning to someone (if only the laboring historian) who is removed in time from its 'first' unfolding?" (9) I believe one productive insight performance studies has to offer historians and archivists is the view that all archived documents are a fragmentary representation of previously live (and lived) historical events. In this paradigm, the past is like a performance — it disappears, but leaves provocative traces open to multiple interpretations. This is, in fact, the theoretical model proposed by Pearson and Shanks in *Theatre/Archaeology*. The work of archaeologists, after all, is quite similar to that of archivists; as Shanks puts it, "Archaeologists work with material traces, with evidence, in order to create something… which stands for the past in the present" (11). This is equally true of the archivist. Shanks also notes the unstoppable force of loss in the work of the archaeologist. "The archaeological refers to social and cultural entropy, loss and ruin," he writes, explaining this claim with

a reference to the "processes of decay, ruin, putrefaction and of ageing, erosion, wearing" that is evident in all archaeological objects. Organic loss, as in the archival practice, is a constant issue for archaeologists. Yet the real object of archaeology, Shanks argues, is "social experience," which is "ineffable" through material documentation or preservation (10). He writes: "The past is not somehow 'discovered' in its remains, for what would it be? Gone is the notion of a singular material record bequeathed to us from the past and from which meaning can be 'read off'. Instead archaeology is… an active agent of interpretation" (11). He concludes: "Archaeology is then the relationship we maintain with the past: it consists of a work of mediation with the past" (11). Shanks credits his own engagement with performance studies for the evolution of this theoretical framework. His model of "interpretive archaeology" posits historical investigation as a "creative act" and "social practice"; it is a second-generation performance, in this sense, of live (and lived) events past (xvii, 69).

This performance-inflected paradigm seems like it could be incredibly useful in the domain of archive practice. If taken up seriously, it would reveal that the true objects of the archive are the social practices of the past only hinted at and reconfigured by media, and *not* the paper, tape, film or bytes through which content is stored. There is already from the outset, then, a fundamental set of losses incurred in the collection of fragmentary traces of the past for the archive. Digitalization does not introduce loss to the archive; rather, it is only participating in a process of diminishing aura, authenticity, wholeness and sensory richness that always and necessarily occurs in archive formation, that is, in the attempted materialization of performance past. Indeed, it is the first generation of loss that is most profound; the second, through digital reproduction, is minimal by comparison.

To consider this argument further, I would like to examine a document from the Bancroft Library FSM Digital Archive, one that clearly represents at least two generations of archival loss. The "Executive Committee Meeting, Nov. 23,1964" document is a searchable-text file linked from the "Meetings and Minutes" page of the digital

archive. It has been manually typed into a computer (as opposed to being visually scanned), and it appears as a World Wide Web page that instantly reformats its margins and spacing to fit individual computer settings, screen size and user-initiated adjustment of window size. Unlike scanned documents, then, the format is unstable; only basic HTML such as paragraph breaks and indentations remains constant each time the document is accessed. Here, there is a loss of basic aesthetic fixity.

A hard copy of these meeting minutes can be found in Box 3, Folder 6 of the Bancroft Library's Free Speech Movement holdings. The copy on file at Bancroft Library has numerous handwritten and white-out corrections, indicating that it represents a primary draft of the document. A careful line-by-line scrutiny of the two documents, digital and hard-copy, reveals that not only have no new errors (such as spelling or word choice changes, or missing content) been introduced to the digital version, but also typographical errors in the hard-copy version have been preserved. For example, in section 7, paragraph 5, the phrase "what't the point," where "what's" is presumably incorrectly typed, is left intact as "what't" in the digital minutes. This is evidence of the great care taken by the archivists to achieve a degree of textual fidelity. However, there is nothing in the digital version to indicate that this typo appears in the original, such as a [sic], which one could argue would interject too much editorial mediation in the archived document. How, then, is the digital researcher to know that this is not, in fact, an error of transcription? These small questions of origin could potentially undermine a reader's general faith in the digital document and therefore result in its loss of authority.

The "disembodied" digital version also lacks some material information that is available in hard-copy form. For instance: the original minutes are typed on a manual typewriter on one side only of five pages of barely opaque typewriter paper that have yellowed a bit from age; there is no unusual smell or tactility; there are eight places where incomplete words are XXXed over, while in 6 other places corrections are made with whiteout or handwritten. The XXXs and other forms of revision are quite jarring to observe in the age of the "delete key," and it is their absence

in the digital translation that is most strongly felt.

Should the digital archive be condemned for these losses, for this diminishment of wholeness, aura and certainty? Here it is helpful to consider the function of meeting minutes. They are, by definition, the record of one person's observations about a live, fleeting event (a political planning meeting) experienced by many. In this sense, it is its own mini performance archive, already wrought with erasures, mistakes and disappearance of the original moment. The work of the Bancroft Library to preserve the hard-copy document, then, is already a second-generation of archiving, and far more has been "lost" in the first step than will ever be lost through third-generation digital conversion. Consider the following important absences: Nowhere in the hard-copy version does it tell us who wrote the minutes — what might the particular biases of the author have been in representing the proceedings? Neither does it tell us when they were written — later that day, or later that week? How much time passed to allow for mis-remembering? These questions underscore the fundamental lack of objectivity and objecthood of the so-called "original" hard-copy version. The real "original," of course is the live event of the meeting, although if Schechner is right that "all behavior is restored behavior," then perhaps must add another layer of loss to the chronology of recording and digitalization (*Performance Studies* 8). At any rate, the "failures" of both the hard copy and the digital archive document remind us of the inevitable impossibility of any historic documents to be faithful or complete, or to provide that longed-for direct experience of the ephemeral moment.

Another holding of the Bancroft Library FSM Digital Archive worth analyzing for its relationship to loss is Ken Sanderson's "Notes to *Multiversity Lost,*" which is linked to from the "Pamphlets and Short Works" page of the archive. Sanderson created this explanatory document specifically for the digital archive, more than three decades after he published the original 1965 pro-FSM pamphlet "Multiversity Lost," which reworked John Milton's epic poem *Paradise Lost* to describe the events of the FSM. He explains: "Of all literary genres, topical satire has the shortest shelf-life, so some explanatory notes are a sad necessity" ([1]). His use of the term "shelf-life"

suggests, of course, a natural tendency to decay, rather than to endure, over time. It also recalls a comment by historian and archivist Stewart Brand in his seminal essay "Written on the Wind" that "digital media have the working lifespan of a pack of Twinkies" ([6]). It is important to note, however, the distinction between Sanderson's observation of loss and the more typical loss-centered rhetoric of archive debates. Sanderson is not worried about the paper his words are printed on. Instead, he is concerned that the meaning, context and subtext of his original work will decay over time, no matter how well-preserved the *physical document* itself is. Sanderson attributes this potential loss of meaning to the site and temporal specific nature of his writing: "The poem's language and allusions draw from popular culture of its time, contemporary journalistic accounts of FSM, Leftist history, Leftist jargon, Clark Kerr's *The Uses of the University*" ([4]) His recognition of the inevitable limits of accessibility and legibility of specific moments past underscores the fact that the computer interface is not the real obstacle to complete, embodied experience of the past.

If the digital archive is useful for understanding loss not as a digital-specific problem, it is also a valuable resource for creating new modes of engagement with the always already fragmented traces of history. I would like to turn now to the grass-roots version of the FSM Digital Archive to explore the possibilities for re-performance and active experience of the past.

A Living Document

In a 2001 memo to "Friends and Veterans of the Free Speech Movement," Michael Rossman, former FSM activist and head of the Free Speech Movement Archive project, writes:

> Much of the Free Speech Movement's history and interpretation has been recorded, in a complex welter of documents -- but even more has not, and remains live in the memories and present lives of those who made this movement and moved on. As much as paper or more, you are the document of the FSM… a vital, collective document still developing, which our mailings and reunions, our symposia and memorials extend. We intend to gather and tend this

larger document as an organic extension of the document of 1964. The Web site may facilitate this; we invite you to help us explore ([4]).

This invitation to explore the role that digital technology might play in passing on an embodied knowledge poses a direct challenge to critics of digital archives who mourn the possible loss of embodied, sensory-rich archive documents. The veteran-run FSM online archive sees itself as directly tied to organic memory, rather than textual or photographic memory. It is quite supportive of the Bancroft Library's preservation efforts, but it prioritizes its own work differently, hoping to pass on its past not through hard-copy documents but rather through the bodies, stories and experiences of both those involved with the original FSM and those who encounter the veteran's archive.

This mission sounds very much like the "repertoire" Diana Taylor delineates in "Acts of Transfer". Taylor conceives of the repertoire as a process-oriented transmission of past knowledge through ephemeral and embodied acts, such as dance, ritual, group storytelling, and other kinds of performance. Taylor argues that this model of the repertoire is directly opposed to the archive, which is "always already mediated," in the sense that the archivists mediate what information a future user has access to, and which disembodies the past through its privileging of texts and virtualizations. In the face of a wave of digital archives, she argues, it becomes even more urgent to learn to transmit history through repertoire, through embodied performance. And lest we think to simply expand our definition and practice of archiving to include the repertoire, Taylor rejects this idea explicitly. "On the contrary," she writes, "there is an advantage to thinking about a 'repertoire' performed … as something that cannot be housed or contained in the archive (12).

It seems to me, however, that Taylor's description of the repertoire does not require multiple bodies in a single physical space. She writes: "The repertoire requires presence — people participate in the production and reproduction of knowledge by 'being there,' being a part of the transmission. As opposed to the supposedly stable objects in the archive, the

actions that are the repertoire do not remain the same. The repertoire both keeps and transforms choreographies of meaning" (6). Could we create a repertoire experience online if we understood live presence not as a physical requirement, but rather as a temporal one?

Here, a different strain of performance theory becomes useful, specifically the kind proposed by Philip Auslander to deal with performance in an age of electronic mediation. For Auslander, mediation does not *ipso facto* rule out "liveness." According to Auslander, "liveness is historically conditioned and … a cultural construct, not an ontological condition" (*Liveness* [2]). He notes that "as historical and technological conditions have changed, so has the definition of liveness," calling "physically co-present bodies… a sufficient cause for liveness, but not a necessary one" ([3]). Citing radio, television and Internet broadcasts, Auslander concludes: "The category of live events is an ever-expanding one whose primary common element is simultaneity. What all three categories of live events have in common is that the audience perceives the performance as it takes place, whether or not audience and performers are co-present" ([3]). And in "Live from Cyberspace," Auslander argues it is *especially* through digital technology that "we can see that liveness is first and foremost a temporal relationship, a relationship of simultaneity" ([6]). This conception of liveness suggests the possibility for a live experience of archived documents that does not depend on a physical co-mingling of archive user and documents, let alone of archive user and archived experience (the always already impossible promise of the archive).

My concept for how a digital archive might perform as a repertoire further takes shape by thinking of a digital archive as a kind of "prosthetic memory," a term coined by film theorist Alison Landsberg to describe the technologically-enabled transmission of someone else's past, as in *Blade Runner* and *Total Recall*. Landsberg compares these science-fiction fantasies of implanted (false) memory chips to "experiential, historical events" like southern civil war re-enactments and Colonial Williamsburg-style "living past" museums (192). For Landsberg, both of these represent "strategies for making an other's history into personal memories" (192).

Landsberg is thinking of future cyborgs, not today's Internet user, of course. But her observation that both digital memories and historical performances "provide individuals with the collective opportunity of having an experiential relationship to a cultural or collective past they either did or did not experience," suggests to me the potential power of merging digital history with live performance (193). Especially since, as Landsberg notes, "then these particular histories or pasts might be available for consumption across existing stratifications of race, class and gender… [and therefore] might become the grounds for political alliances" (193). This is why the digital is so useful for the repertoire, I believe; it invites a much larger and potentially diverse, non-site-specific community to receive and generate embodied knowledge. (It also leaves more of a trace for those not present at the performance to access, which I will discuss later). The political potential of prosthetic memories recalls performance theorist Philip Auslander's work in *Presence and Resistance*, in which the author tackles the problem of creating politically effective and affecting art in an age of decreasing presence and increasing mediation.

I would like to propose, then, a kind of digital archive practice that would both offset the disembodying, text-centric practices of history, as articulated by Taylor, and reveal digital archives as a potential site for embodied engagement. Specifically, I would like to experiment with adopting the combined organic-digital framework of the veteran's FSM archive for working with the more robust and extensive Bancroft Library's FSM digital archive. There is still, after all, something to be said for the depth and breadth of a collection, which is why abandoning the archive model entirely is simply implausible. (Imagine the performance that would transmit all of the past knowledge stored by the Bancroft Library's FSM archive; it would have to be some kind of around-the-clock, three-week endurance test, hardly a practical or effective model for keeping the past alive.)

To this end, I would like to conclude my paper by presenting the a proposal for a digital archive performance projected entitled "Multiversity Regained!" The goal of "Multiversity Regained!" is to create a collective, live experience of the

Bancroft Library's FSM digital archive through the mode of online performance. Attached is a proposed script and supporting documents created for an online site called Free Speech Removement (http://groups.yahoo.com/group/freespeechremovement/), which had already been designed and published to generate a contemporary political context and a sense of community for the performance. The Free Speech Removement home page invites visitors to join the "fight for non-site-specific free speech," proclaiming: "We support the free dissemination and fair use of speech 'at a remove'; that is, from anywhere in the world." It explains itself:

> What does "Free Speech Removement" mean? It is not, of course, an effort to "remove free speech," i.e. to destroy, limit or repress it. It is, instead:
> - a re-movement, that is, a movement again, a renewed effort. This is a free speech movement for the 21st century: digitally-grounded and digitally-motivated.
> - a remove-ment, as in, an instrument or agent of the action or process of *removing*. Here, removing means the creation of physical distance between the audience and the free speech act or text, as in "at a remove" yet still interacting with the information and ideas expressed.
> The root "remove" also means "to be removable, to be able to be dissolved or eliminated," as in "This stain is removable with water." We are interested in the removability of digital archives, that is their relative impermanence and instability in comparison with the fixity and durability of more traditional hard-copy archives.

Taking its cue from Auslander's performance theory, "Multiversity Regained!" and the Free Speech Removement aims to create a "live" experience of the Bancroft archive through simultaneous embodied usage, rather than physical co-presence with the hard-copy artifacts. As noted in the script, each participant is self-cast in a historical FSM role, using the *dramatis personae* of

Sanderson's "Notes to Multiversity Lost." Sanderson's theatrical document helps participants both conceive of the past as performance and reorient their thinking about the fixity or wholeness of archival records. Participants will be asked, through simultaneous archive usage, to rebuild the lost context of Sanderson's original satire. They will also be encouraged to create, as Landsberg suggested, a kind of politically-charged prosthetic memory of the FSM through collective engagement with its digital remembrance.

The specifics of the participants' engagement with the archive are inspired by the observation by Shanks that "Performance-about-performance, second-order performance, has presented potential for the reintegration of surviving fragments. These may take the form of re-enactment, revival, lecture, demonstration, audio-visual presentation, story-telling" (65). These specifics include three mini-missions, in which participants perform their historical roles, such as finding a revelatory document or file about their "characters" in the Bancroft archive and making a statement, in character, about how they feel they have been historicized by the archive. This latter mission is inspired by the veteran FSM digital archive's self-stated goal of "showing how the FSM has been treated as history" ("Home Page" [3]). The three tasks would ultimately generate a database of links from the archive and user comments about those links that could be used by future researchers as a unique path, with creative thematic connections across archived documents, through the Bancroft FSM digital archive. This database would be preserved and made publicly available on the Free Speech Removement group site as a trace of the digital archive performance. I believe this proposed performance would accomplish three things. First, the multiplicity of readings of archive documents this performance would generate would help prevent an archive from operating as a fixed and stable authority on the past. Second, the participants in this performance would walk away with a sense of collective engagement with the past, with memories of a live transmission of knowledge that are stored, cared for and passed on through their organic bodies. Finally, a performance such a "Multiversity Regained!" would help put in perspective, I believe, the current fixation on loss in the digital archive debates and open up new opportunities for imagining creative, generative interfaces and infrastructures for historical content digitally preserved and made publicly available online.

WORKS CITED

Auslander, Philip. "Live from Cyberspace." A *Location One* Essay. http://www.location1.org/ ossa/auslander_live_cyber1.html. First published 31 May 2001. Accessed 10 December 2002.

--. Presence and Resistance: Postmodernism and Cultural Politics in Contemporary American Performance. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

--. "Response to Roundtable on *Liveness*." Originally presented August 4, 2000 at the ATHE Conference in Washington D.C. http://athe. drama.uga.edu/AuslanderResponse.html. Accessed 10 December 2002

Baker, Nicholson. Double Fold: Libraries and the Assault on Paper. New York: Vintage Books, 2001.

Blau, Herbert. Blooded Thought: Occasions of Theatre. Baltimore: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1982.

Brand, Stewart. "Written on the Wind." Originally published in *Civilization Magazine*, November 1998. http://www.longnow.org/ 10klibrary/library.htm. Accessed 21 November 2002.

Brody, Florian. "The Medium Is the Memory." The Digital Dialectic. Ed. Peter Lunenfeld. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001.

Crawford, Walt and Michael Gorman. Future Libraries: Dreams, Madness, Reality. Chicago: American Libraries Association, 1995.

Critical Art Ensemble. Digital Resistance: Explorations in Tactical Media. New York: Autonomedia 2001.

"Free Speech Movement Executive Committee Meeting, Nov. 23, 1964. " *Bancroft Library Free Speech Movement Digital Archive.* http://sunsite. berkeley.edu:2020/dynaweb/teiproj/fsm

/places/extra/brk00038898a/@Generic__BookV iew. Accessed 21 November 20002 at:

Landsberg, Alison. "Prosthetic Memory." *Cybercultures Reader.* Ed. David Bell. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Lunenfeld, Peter. "Introduction." The Digital Dialectic. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001.

McKenzie, Jon. Perform or Else: From Discipline to Performance. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Pearson, Mike and Michael Shanks. Theatre/ Archaeology. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Phalen, Peggy. "Introduction." The Ends of Performance. New York: New York University Press, 1998.

--. Mourning Sex: Performing Public Memories. New York: Routledge, 1997.

"Preserving Digital Information: Report of the Task Force on Archiving of Digital Information." Commissioned by the Committee on Preservation and Access and The Research Libraries Group, Inc. First published 1 May 1996. http://www.rlg. org/ArchTF/tfadi.index.htm. Accessed 10 November 2002.

Sanderson, Ken. "Notes to 'Multiversity Lost'." *Bancroft Library Free Speech Movement Archive.* First published December 1998. http://sunsite .berkeley.edu:2020/dynaweb/ teiproj/fsm/pams/ brk00040434a/@Generic__BookView. Accessed November 30 2002.

Schechner, Richard. Performance Studies: An Introduction. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Taylor, Diana. "Acts of Transfer." The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003. Accessed 18 October 2002 http://hemi.ps.tsoa.nyu.edu/course-nyu/advanced/ materials/text/taylor.html.

Appendix 1: Proposed Script for a Digital Archive Performance
"Multiversity Regained!"
To be performed in a chat room at the online Free Speech Removement Group or some other public forum, depending on the computers used by participants.

OPENING MESSAGES:
(10 minutes before)
Welcome to "Multiversity Regained," the first digital archive performance of the Free Speech Removement! Special thanks to "Multiversity Lost" (1964) author Ken Sanderson for inspiring our collaboration today. We're here to help explore new ways to engage with digital archives. We will be starting in less than 10 minutes. Please feel free to check out our polls, links, and messages while you wait, or ask me any questions.

(5 minutes before)
Welcome to "Multiversity Regained," the first digital archive performance of the Free Speech Removement! Special thanks to "Multiversity Lost" (1964) author Ken Sanderson for inspiring our collaboration today. We're here to help explore new ways to engage with digital archives. We will be starting in less than 5 minutes. Please feel free to check out our polls, links, and messages while you wait, or ask me any questions.

(3 minutes before)
Welcome to "Multiversity Regained," the first digital archive performance of the Free Speech Removement! Special thanks to "Multiversity Lost" (1964) author Ken Sanderson for inspiring our collaboration today. We're here to help explore new ways to engage with digital archives. We will be starting in less than 3 minutes. Please stay here with us in the chat room and feel free to ask me any questions.

(2 minutes before)
Welcome to "Multiversity Regained," the first digital archive performance of the Free Speech Removement! Special thanks to "Multiversity Lost" (1964) author Ken Sanderson for inspiring our collaboration today. We're here to help explore new ways to engage with digital archives. We will be starting in less than 2 minutes. Please stay here with us in the chat room and feel free to ask me any questions.

(1 minute before)
Welcome to "Multiversity Regained," the first digital archive performance of the Free Speech Removement! Special thanks to "Multiversity Lost" (1964) author Ken Sanderson for inspiring our collaboration today. We're here to help explore new ways to engage with digital archives. We will be starting in 1 minute. Please stay here with us in the chat room and feel free to ask me any questions.

(STRAGGLERS)
We are still waiting for 1 or more of our esteemed participants to arrive. Please stay here with us in the chat room, and we apologize for the delay.

OPENING
Welcome to "Multiversity Regained," the first digital archive performance of the Free Speech Removement! It's time to start. Today's performance should take approximately 25 minutes. Please speak up immediately if you have any problems or questions at any point, or if this text is moving too quickly. Please stay in this chat room at all times unless you see the phrase "GO!", which is your cue to carry out a mission.

BACKGROUND
To begin: I would like to direct your attention to the archived document: "Notes to Multiversity Lost," which is the first digital work we will be engaging with today. The author's notes to "Multiversity Lost", a 1965 FSM-based satirical reworking of John Milton's epic poem *Paradise Lost*, can be accessed at: http://sunsite.berkeley.edu:2020/dynaweb/teiproj/fsm/pams/brk00040434a/@Generic__BookView .

The above link should open in another window so that you can work with the archive and here in the FSR group at the same time. If anyone has trouble opening this link and document, please let me know. I'll wait a few seconds while you open the page. GO!

Everyone should now have the FSM Digital Archive document "Notes to Multiversity Lost" open. (Please stop me if you are having problems.) We begin with the author's observation: "Of all literary genres, topical satire has the shortest shelf-life, so some explanatory notes are a sad necessity."

I like this observation because it helps reorient our thinking about archive documents. Sanderson is obviously worried that the meaning, context and subtext of his original work will decay over time, no matter how well-preserved the *physical document* itself is. We're here to see how a group of simultaneous archive users can help rebuild the lost context.

Our methods today are inspired by performance theorist Diana Taylor's forthcoming book _Acts of Transfer_ , in which she argues that historical knowledge is best transmitted not through archives, but rather through "the repertoire," which requires liveness, co-presence and bodies.

She writes of the repertoire: "People participate in the production and reproduction of knowledge by 'being there,' being a part of the transmission. As opposed to the supposedly stable objects in the archive, the actions that are the repertoire do not remain the same. The repertoire both keeps and transforms choreographies of meaning."

We are here to resist Taylor's neat opposition of archive and performance. We are trying, instead, to create a repertoire experience *of* an archive. You all will help choreograph new meanings and connections among FSM digital documents.

CASTING
So: First up on our agenda: Casting all of you, our esteemed participants, in this production.

In his notes, written more than 30 years after the original work, Sanderson includes a *dramatis personae* to make the satire legible to future audiences of his epic ode to the Free Speech Movement. (Isn't it fabulous how Sanderson sees history as performance?)

If you scroll down the digital archive screen, you'll see 16 people and organizations listed in the *dramatis personae*. Please take a minute now to look quickly through them and select one person or organization who you wish to represent in our performance today. Parts are first come, first served. Type the name of the part you want here in the chat room. GO!

(CONFIRMING PARTS)

+
Okay, , you'll be playing the part of

-
Sorry, , that part is already taken. Please choose another!

(STRAGGLERS)
We're still waiting for 1 or more participants to select a part. Thank you for your patience, and feel free to ask questions or say anything on your mind as we wait.

FIRST TASK: DIGITAL ARCHIVE RESEARCH
Okay! Now that our performance is cast, it's time for you each to tackle the first of two tasks. The Bancroft

Library's FSM Digital Archive is full of documents pertaining to the *dramatis personae* of Multiversity Lost. FIRST: In the
window that is currently open to "Notes to Multiversity Lost, " please open the home page of FSM digital archive and return here for further instructions. Here's the link: http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/FSM/

NEXT: Using the Bancroft Library's FSM Digital Archive, please find one document or file (text, photo, audio, video, etc.) that you believe suggests or reveals something particularly interesting about your character. Please feel free to interpret this directive as broadly, creatively or controversially as you wish. You have up to 8 minutes to choose a document or file. FINALLY: When you have completed this task, please copy and paste a link to it in this chat room, along with a one-sentence description.

I'll be here to answer any questions that come up. As soon as you have finished the first task (you don't need to take the full 8 minutes), I will personally assign you your next one. Unless you have a question, please start your search now! GO!

SECOND TASK: GOOGLE SEARCH
(ASSIGN INDIVIDUALLY)
, great work. Your submission has been recorded. Now, for your next assignment. Again, I'll be here to answer any questions that come up. Please follow these instructions:

FIRST: Take another 5 minutes to find a second web page or digital file that complements or complicates the information about your character that you just submitted. IMPORTANT: You can look anywhere on the World Wide Web for this second document EXCEPT the Bancroft Library's FSM Digital Archive. Google.com might be a good place to start. THEN: Copy and paste the link here in the chat room, along with a one-sentence description.
FINALLY: When you complete this mission, I'll confirm your final instructions for this performance. GO!

PERSONAL STATEMENT
(PERSONALIZE)
, thanks for this excellent link. Finally, I would like to you make a brief statement to our group, in character, about your experience today. Please let us know, in character, how you feel about how either the FSM in general or your character in particular has been archived by the Bancroft Library or represented on the WWW. Take a moment to think about this, and enter your statement here in the chat room. GO!

FINAL INSTRUCTIONS
(PERSONALIZE)
, great statement. Right now, I'm adding it to the "Multiversity Regained!" data base, along with all of the other links and information we've collected today. This data base serves a record and trace of our collective engagement with the FSM digital archive today. You can view the data base creation in progress right now at: http://groups.yahoo.com/group/freespeechremovement/database?method=reportRows&tbl=1 .
This data base will stay online and provide other interested users with a uniquely constructed walk through of the FSM digital archive, one that makes new, creative and provocative historical and thematic links based on YOUR readings and ideas.

(PERSONALIZE)
, thank you for your participation in this experiment today, and please feel free to stick around a little longer to see the rest of your fellow participants' character statements. Also, I encourage you to read later Ken Sanderson's "Multiversity Lost" with the new context that today's performance has created. Thank you!

Appendix 2: "Multiversity Regained!" Supporting Document #1: The Manifesto of The Free Speech Removement

From: "quantum_jane" <quantum_jane@yahoo.com>
Date: Sat Nov 9, 2002 3:25 pm
Subject: A MANIFESTO

Free Speech Removement: A Manifesto

Principle #1: Free speech requires the freedom to speak AND the freedom to access others' speech.

The right to think and speak freely requires two very different kinds of freedom. The first and most commonly defended requirement for free speech is freedom from official censorship and censure. The second and less frequently invoked requirement for free speech is free access to others' speech. The late '60s Free Speech Movement at the University of California, Berkeley was primarily concerned with the former; the new Free Speech Removement is primarily concerned with the latter.

Free access to speech is vital for two reasons. First: What use is the right to speak freely if legal, academic and cultural practices eschew available technologies and thereby severely limit the speaker's ability to reach a wide audience? Second: Access to as wide a range of information and opinions as possible is absolutely necessary to enable and to encourage future diversity of opinion and expression.

Principle #2: Publicly available Internet archives are the most important tool in the effort to create a worldwide context of free speech.

Who should have the right to access archived information and texts? Site-specific archives allow access to only privileged individuals -- those who can afford to live in or travel to a particular place.

Digital archives allow access to a much more inclusive group--anyone in the world who can find and use a computer.

Our current project is to use the Bancroft Library's Free Speech Movement Digital Archive as a vehicle for exploring the benefits of free speech access. While all public Internet archives embody the spirit of Free Speech Removement, the FSM Digital Archive is especially implicated in the struggle to achieve free speech and therefore our choice for the inaugural Free Speech Removement digital performance.

Principle #3: Digital archives can perform, and these performances further the cause of free speech.

Many media specialists, historians, artists and lawyers (just to name a few of its many opponents) are highly critical of digital archives. They focus on what is lost in the translation of physical objects to digital documents, such as sensory engagement (a phenomenological problem); control of how the object is modified or distributed (a legal and economic problem); authenticity, presence, originality and reliability (an ontological problem); or completeness and accuracy (an epistemological problem). By concentrating on these losses, critics undermine and block the creation and maintenance of
Internet archives, and thereby thwart the efforts of others to provide free access to free speech.

The Free Speech Removement aims instead to highlight the digital archive's unique potential for the discussion, debate, dissemination, creative manipulation and strategic employment of the information and texts archived. By allowing digital archives to perform, however, it calls attention to itself as a viable and valuable format for information storage and access. A live digital archive performance highlights its unique potential for the discussion, debate, dissemination, and strategic employment of the information and texts archived.

Appendix 3: "Multiversity Regained!" Supporting Document #2: An excerpt from "A Short Treatise on Digital Archive Performance"

From: "quantum_jane" <quantum_jane@yahoo.com>
Date: Sun Nov 10, 2002 7:53 pm
Subject: A Short Treatise on Digital Archive Performance

In Practice (a short description of digital archive performance)

The Free Speech Removement aims to produce a new kind of digital archive performance. We not only recognize the preservation goals of a hard-copy archive, but also strive for a new set of goals that we believe can be accomplished through the interactivity, productivity and creativity of live online performance. These goals are:

-to enable more active and critical engagement with an archive's holdings;
-to build an audience of simultaneous users;
-to allow for lively and raucous, real-time debate;
-to widely disseminate archive materials to people not in attendance;
-to help users create new thematic links and historical narratives across multiple archival holdings;
-to build a larger social, cultural, historic and personal context for the archive;
-to allow traces of these live performances to become a part of the digital archive itself.

These goals will be met through organized online performances, during which logged in users will be asked to engage each other and a digital archive in a variety of collaborative and creative tasks.

Appendix 4: "Multiversity Regained!" Supporting Document #3: On Mediation of the Free Speech Movement

From: "quantum_jane" <quantum_jane@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri Nov 22, 2002 1:32 pm
Subject: What the heck is up with that creepy patriotic uptight retro-macho photo?

You may be asking yourself: "What the heck is up with that creepy patriotic uptight retro-macho photo on the home page of the Free Speech Removment?" Is THAT really the image of a 21st century digital free speech movement?

Actually, this home page photo is of the UC Berkeley student body president who spoke in *opposition* to the original free speech movement. I like it for a couple of reasons.

First, notice that pesky little "Copyright" in the lower left hand margin? I think that fits nicely with the student body president's anti-free speech sentiments. Technically, it's not legal to use this copyrighted photograph on the Free Speech Removement home page. In the spirit of FSR, however, I have "removed" the copyrighted photo from its original legally sanctioned home to help make a point about current creepy, uptight retro-macho nostalgia for economic ownership of information.

Second, notice all of those microphones and recording instruments pointed almost like weapons at the speaker in the photograph? I love it-- the original Free Speech Movement was always already electronically mediated. In this way, digital mediation of the Free Speech Movement archive is nothing new-- it is absolutely in keeping with the original modes of the FSM's live performance and transmission.

Appendix 5: "Multiversity Regained!" Supporting Document #4: Excerpts from "Notes to Multiversity Lost"

Notes and original work by Ken Sanderson
(Notes: Dec. 1998, Original Work: May 1965)
Complete Notes and Original Work can be found at the Free Speech Movement Digital Archive, Searchable Text Documents, "Pamphlets and Other Short Works"

Of all literary genres, topical satire has the shortest shelf-life, so some explanatory notes are a sad necessity. *Multiversity Lost* (a.k.a. "Mariopagitica") was published in three installments in *Spider* magazine, arguably the first "underground" publication of the Sixties:
   • Vol. 1, no. 3 (15 April 1965)
   • Vol. 1, no. 4 (3 May 1965)
   • Vol. 1, no. 5 (24 May 1965)
Esquire magazine, in its September 1965 "Back to College" issue, ran several articles on FSM, including a profile of *Spider* (and an excerpt of *Multiversity Lost*). Also, a severely abridged version of *Multiversity Lost* was printed in *Revolution at Berkeley: The Crisis in American Education*, ed. Michael V. Miller and Susan Gilmore (New York: Dial, 1965), pp. 305-312. (This book also appeared as a Dell paperback in 1965.)
The poem's language and allusions draw from popular culture of its time, contemporary journalistic accounts of FSM, Leftist history, Leftist jargon, Clark Kerr's *The Uses of the University*, and various works of high canonical literature, most obviously *Paradise Lost* and other works by John Milton. During the "FSM semester" (Fall 1964), I was a student in Stanley Fish's Milton Seminar (English 151)—this was before Fish went on to become an academic superstar—and, for me, FSM gave life to those great Miltonic topics (individual conscience, freedom of speech, rebellion...).

DRAMATIS PERSONAE
   {For more information, see Appendix III in David Lance Goines, *The Free Speech Movement: Coming of Age in the 1960s.* Berkeley: Ten Speed Press, 1993. 653-65}
Baez, Joan: Folk-singer who led the march on the Regents' meeting and the Sit-in.
Beebe, Lucius: Columnist for *San Francisco Chronicle*; called Sproul plaza "Red Square," called students "screaming, verminous, bearded beatniks."
Brown, Edmund G. ("Pat"): Governor of California during FSM era.
Feuer, Lewis: Berkeley Professor, author of three polemical articles in *The New Leader*; coined such phrases as "lumpen intellectual," "limpnik," "generational animus"; viewed FSM as an infantile revolt against authority; an ex-radical turned Establishment Liberal, he opposed Kerr's Multiversity idea.
Goldberg, Art: Steering Committee member, caricatured by his critics as impulsive and vulgar; expelled from U.C. during "filthy speech" controversy.
Kerr, Clark: U.C. President, known as a Liberal, ex-labor mediator; delivered Godkin Lectures enunciating his idea of the Multiversity; once said that the president's job is to provide "Parking for the faculty, athletes for the alumni, and sex for the students." Defending his ostensible non-censorship policy, he said that the University tries to make "students safe for ideas, not ideas safe for students."
Powell, Charlie: Student Body President of the ASUC (Associated Students of the University of California), pronounced "A-suck."
Rossman, Michael: Member of Steering Committee of the FSM, Berkeley Renaissance-man; noted for "intuitive mathematics," recorder playing, Spanish poetry translations; interviewed in *Look* magazine, he remarked "The intellect demands raw meat"; had been called a "specialist in alienation," a member of the "cult of existential self-pity."
Savio, Mario: By far the best known of all FSM members, Savio was a member of the FSM Steering Committee; he was generally recognized as "the" leader of the movement and has since become the symbol of the entire FSM affair. A philosophy major, he quoted Kierkegaard in a *Life* magazine interview; favorite

expressions are "you know," "clearly," and "immoral." Famous speech: "There's a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part, you can't even passively take part, and you've got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus and you've got to make it stop. And you've got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, that unless you're free, the machine will be prevented from working at all."

Scalapino, Robert: Political scientist, "Liberal," ran a nationwide broadcast of talks on the theme "Free World vs. Communism"; he moderated the Greek Theater Meeting.

Searle, John: Professor of Philosophy, faculty ally of FSM.

Sherriffs, Alex: Vice-chancellor, had a long history of attempts to destroy student politics.

Strong, Edward: Berkeley Chancellor, professor of Philosophy

Students for Law and Order: Noted for their support of law and order by hurling eggs, stink-bombs, and lighted cigarettes at demonstrators; believed to have been partly financed by the *Oakland Tribune*, right-wing newspaper owned by William Knowland (once known as the "Senator from Formosa") who, according to one theory, was responsible for the original order banning the recruitment of students on campus for off-campus political activity. The *Tribune* was being picketed for alleged racial discrimination in hiring policy.

Towle, Katherine: Dean of students

Weinberg, Jack: FSM Steering Committee member, former grad student, CORE-worker; held for 32 hours in the captured police car. His offhand ironic quip, "Don't trust anyone over thirty," was picked up by the media and treated as a solemn pronouncement of the "Sixties generation."

TYPOLOGY

Inasmuch as the characters in this mock-epic correspond to figures in *Paradise Lost*—just as figures in the New Testament fulfill their prefigurations in the Old Testament—a word is in order on the way these correspondences line up. In the beginning of the poem, Savio corresponds to Milton's Satan, Kerr is God, and the "seduced" students are both Adam and the angels who take part in the heavenly war against God. By the end of the poem, Kerr is the chastised Adam, expelled from the Garden for his prideful revolt (his creation of the Multiversity) against Reason and History, while Savio becomes the Son of *Paradise Regained*, who has learned his mission, found his strength, and will now "save Mankind."