

# fiat

Symposium Karlovy-Vary. 21|6|1980.

Problems of selection in film archives.

Problèmes de sélection dans les archives du film.

© fiaf 1981  
tous droits réservés

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES ARCHIVES DU FILM.  
Coudenberg 70 B 1000 Bruxelles

## PREFACE

Au lendemain du Congrès de Lausanne, en juin 1979, le Comité directeur de la FIAF lançait l'idée d'un symposium technique annuel qui clôturerait désormais l'Assemblée générale de la Fédération. Déjà un symposium historique, responsabilité de la cinémathèque hôte du congrès, s'intégrait à notre rencontre annuelle. Ce nouveau symposium, plus court (une seule journée) et plus modeste (aucun spécialiste invité), serait la responsabilité directe de la Fédération et traiterait d'un sujet directement lié à notre travail professionnel d'archivistes du cinéma. Ce nouveau symposium, un peu dans l'esprit de l'Open Forum de nos assemblées générales, serait enfin l'occasion d'évaluer des expériences, de confronter des pratiques, de trouver aussi des modes nouveaux de collaboration entre nous.

En novembre 1979 les membres de la Fédération étaient donc informés que le premier symposium technique de la FIAF serait consacré à la question de la sélection : critères et principes de sélection, expériences pratiques, chutes et versions doublées, etc. En un mot : sélectionner ou ne pas sélectionner ? !

Afin d'ajuster le symposium aux besoins réels des archives, un questionnaire en 20 points fut posté à tous les membres et observateurs de la FIAF : 37 archives ont bien voulu y répondre. Enfin, quelques archivistes furent invités à préparer une communication, histoire de mettre le feu aux poudres !

Nous nous sommes retrouvés entre nous - en famille ! - au matin du 20 juin, pour parler de sélection. Le texte qui suit témoigne le plus fidèlement possible du travail de cette journée, une journée qui, vu l'intérêt du sujet, sembla à plusieurs beaucoup trop courte, même si son horaire en fut fort chargé. Les interventions de chaque participant ont été conservées le plus intégralement possible. Signalons au passage, peut-être un peu comme une mise en garde, que le mot sélection, pourtant bien quotidien dans notre vocabulaire, ne semble pas avoir tout-à-fait le même sens en langue française

qu'en langue anglaise : certaines interventions traduisent ce glissement de sens - elles n'en sont pas moins intéressantes !

Nous avons cru bon d'ajouter en annexe quelques documents qui complètent les interventions de certains participants, ou encore qui accompagnaient le questionnaire de certains autres.

Cette publication se présente donc comme un prolongement de nos échanges de juin 80. Puisse-t-elle être utile aux nombreux archivistes qui, quotidiennement, doivent faire face à la cruelle question de la sélection !

Robert Daudelin  
Secrétaire général FIAF  
Co-ordinateur du Symposium

## INTRODUCTION

Jiri Levy - Czechoslovakia

When the topic of this symposium was discussed in the Czechoslovak Archive and at the meetings of the Executive Committee, three factors were considered : the first one selected the need to deal with general archives activities, the second required a subject matter allowing all archives to contribute their opinions and experience, and the third factor was to find a topical theme, so far little theoretically formulated. We realize that selection in film archives is a topic - or rather a problem - which all of us have to face. On the other hand, the selection criteria vary, ranging from strictly established ones to subjective standards.

There is no doubt that the major goal of every archive is to collect and scientifically preserve national productions. The contrary would be illogical and nonsensical. There are however indisputable differences between semantic, aesthetic, historical and technical criteria. It usually turns out during discussions on selection, that it is a problem unknown to young film archives, which at their stage try first of all to gain the reputation of a rich archive by attempting to accumulate the largest possible number of prints. The more experienced archives, which may have already reached the degree of saturation, have to make a decision : which films should be preserved and used as study material, and which should be discarded. This undoubtedly presents a highly complex question, and in view of the volume of film production and the limited possibilities of film depositories, it is an indispensable question.

This symposium is not expected to solve the problem, but we believe it will be beneficial to share our problems and experience. It is obvious that selection cannot be considered separately, without the broader context of conditions in film archives, their traditions, experience and possibilities. Selection is also closely related to the economic, financial situation of archives. That is why we expect to hear ideas that go beyond the subject of selection and introduce new and stimulating aspects.

Robert Daudelin

En novembre dernier nous vous avons soumis un questionnaire (voir Annexes 1 et 2), qui schématiquement bien sûr, et avec une marge d'erreur et d'approximation inévitable, essayait de produire un diagnostic de ce que sont les pratiques de sélection dans nos archives.

37 archives membres de la Fédération ont répondu à ce questionnaire ; leurs réponses devraient donc constituer la base même de nos discussions d'aujourd'hui. En voici le résultat.

Parmi les 37 répondants, 13 archives ont un comité de sélection et 14 un règlement intérieur définissant des méthodes de sélection. Ces résultats commandent cependant quelques précisions :

- dans le cas des archives qui ont un règlement intérieur, ce règlement varie évidemment d'une archive à l'autre : il peut être plus ou moins explicite, se limiter à des principes généraux ou inclure même des précisions techniques ;
- les archives qui ont un comité de sélection ne sont pas nécessairement, comme on serait porté à le croire, des archives d'Etat : sur 13 archives ayant un comité de sélection, 6 sont des organismes d'Etat et 7 sont (plus ou moins) privées ;
- ces 13 archives ayant un comité de sélection ne sont pas non plus uniquement de "grandes" archives ; il y en a de toutes les tailles, comme à la FIAF ;
- on y retrouve, dans une proportion à peu près égale, des archives déjà anciennes (20-25 ans) et des archives relativement jeunes, voire même très jeunes ;
- dans quelques archives - au National Archive de Londres, notamment - la responsabilité de la sélection est confiée à un comité spécialement chargé de cette tâche. Dans plusieurs autres cas, on pratique une sélection, mais sans règles fixes, chaque cas étant considéré en quelque sorte comme un cas d'espèce ;

- dans certaines autres archives, il existe des critères de sélection pour certaines parties de la collection seulement : documentaires de court métrage, "out takes", etc. ;
- dans certains cas, la sélection est à la base même de la collection : c'est la sélection, le choix de tel titre plutôt que tel autre, qui donne son sens (sa valeur) à la collection, un peu comme dans un musée de peinture - n'est-ce pas le cas du Museum of Modern Art de New York ?
- enfin, comme certains l'ont fait remarquer, il y a plus ou moins sélection, selon qu'on fait la distinction entre recueillir des films ou des documents et les entreposer, et conserver au sens strict du terme - c'est-à-dire, assurer des conditions réelles de conservation, faire des travaux de restauration, etc.

A signaler : seulement 4 archives sur 37 font état d'un parti-pris très rigide vis-à-vis de la sélection : pas de comité, pas de règlement et pas de sélection en ce qui concerne les 15 premiers points du questionnaire :

- 2 de ces archives sont privées, et 2 sont des archives d'Etat. Enfin, un cas très particulier : une archive possède un comité de sélection et un règlement pour en guider le travail, mais ceci ne s'applique qu'à la production nationale... et c'est une archive d'Etat.

Si maintenant nous examinons les pratiques de sélection des 37 répondants, on trouve ceci :

- 9 archives exercent une sélection en ce qui concerne les films de long métrage de leur production nationale : 7 de ces 9 archives sont des archives d'Etat et la moitié d'entre elles peuvent être considérées comme de grandes archives -i.e. des archives possédant de volumineuses collections ;
- 16 archives sur 37 exercent une sélection en ce qui concerne les films de long métrage d'origine étrangère (que les films soient en version originale ou doublés) ; une de ces 16 archives précise que les longs métrages d'origine étrangère en version doublée ne sont pas conservés ;

- 17 archives sur 37 sélectionnent en ce qui concerne les courts métrages et les actualités ;
- 22 archives sélectionnent dans le cas des films publicitaires ;
- 20 archives sur 37 sélectionnent en ce qui concerne les films-annonces et les copies incomplètes (dans le cas de films censurés) ;
- dans le cas de rushes, des chutes ("out-takes"), 24 archives sélectionnent. Ce sont majoritairement les archives d'Etat qui sont ici les plus libérales : elles n'exercent pratiquement pas de sélection dans le cas des rushes et des chutes (plusieurs des archives en question ont pour mandat de conserver la production nationale ; les "out-takes" leur sont déposés en même temps que tous les autres éléments liés à la production d'un film) ;
- enfin, dernière question au chapitre des films : 50 % des archives exercent une sélection en ce qui concerne les copies sur support nitrate de films qui ne font pas partie de leur collection.

La seconde partie du questionnaire portait sur les documents et se limitait à 6 types d'acquisitions : affiches, feuillets et dépliants, "press-books", photos, périodiques populaires et curiosités.

- 13 archives sur 37 pratiquent une sélection dans le cas des affiches, feuillets et dépliants et press-books ;
- 10 archives sur 37 pratiquent une sélection dans le cas des photos ;
- 18 archives sélectionnent dans le cas des périodiques populaires ("fan magazines") et des curiosités de toutes sortes.

#### En conclusion...

Notre débat d'aujourd'hui n'est donc pas un débat théorique : la sélection est un aspect très concret de notre travail d'archiviste ; c'est aussi un aspect de notre responsabilité vis-à-vis le cinéma et son histoire. Notre petite enquête nous a appris que, d'une manière ou d'une autre, environ 40 % des documents qui nous sont remis font l'objet d'une sélection.



De quelle façon procédons-nous à cette sélection ? A la lumière de quels critères ? Arbitrairement ? Selon des principes directeurs ? Ou, plus prosaïquement, selon nos moyens, nos budgets, nos équipements ?

Afin de ne pas perdre de vue cet aspect très concret de la question, nous partirons donc des expériences d'archives qui ont des politiques de sélection assez clairement définies, structurées, pour élargir progressivement nos échanges en direction de positions plus générales - ou même de positions de principe que certains voudraient faire valoir, ou reconnaître, à l'occasion de ce symposium...



Problems of selection of film materials and the archival system in  
Czechoslovakia (appendice 4)

---

Vladimír Opela

In Czechoslovakia, the problem of selection has been tackled by several working groups attached to the highest archive bodies, which are the Archive Administration and the Central State Archive.

Before informing you about the system of selection which we have been applying in full since 1969, I would like to mention briefly some starting points of our approach to the question of selection, to define some notions, and to say something about the pre-requisites of a good selection. In this respect, we apply the long-standing experience of Czechoslovak and foreign archives, the theory of the selection of written documents as defined in the works of Czechoslovak theorists of archives, especially those of Jaroslav Vrbata and Tomas Fiala - taking into account the specificity of film/audio-visual/records - and the results achieved by working group attached to the Archive Administration, which does research on the project entitled "The Definition of the Scientific Principles of the Selection of Film/Audio-Visual/Records"/ thereafter only "records".

Selection is a cognitive, assessing and decision-taking process in the course of which archival materials are being constituted, i.e. the records which are of permanent value because of their historical, political, economical or cultural importance. This process is preceded, accompanied and followed by a number of operations which constitute the complexe called the procedure of discarding.

Selection has to be based on the competency of the archive. A condition for good selection is the setting of ideal, as well as real, aims :

- what we should archive,
- what we are archiving in reality,

and the ensuing analysis showing

- what we are now taking needlessly into the archive, and, on the other hand, which important things we are omitting.

In this process, the aim of the archive is to preserve all records of permanent documentary value while leaving out less valuable documents.

The pre-requisite of selection is the cognizance and assessment/evaluation/ of the records. This cognizance depends on the quality of information available in the archive about the records in question, as well as on the quality of information on the archival materials kept there.

The assessment requires a standard-setting base, i.e. :

- general regulations for the discarding procedure,
- a regulation obligatory for the originator of the records, and
- type lists of archival materials.

The assessment, i.e. the ascertainment of the permanent documentary value, is very difficult. It is based on the following general criteria :

- a/ the importance of the content of a record, and
- b/ the form in which this content is expressed.

However, the assessment must also take into account the specific features of film/audio-visual/records. These features consists in

- the way in which these records are made, using various information carriers which are changing in accordance with technological progress ;
- the fact that the cases in which the author is the sole originator of a record are extremely rare whereas, in most cases, a number of highly qualified professionals/film director, director of photography, art director, etc./ also take part in making the record ;
- the fact that these film/audio-visual/records, whole or in part, may become a source of new records and
- the fact that these records may have a documentary and historical value as well as a cultural value of their own.

When assessing film/audio-visual/records, we have to take into account their value of primary sources, especially in the following fields :

- cinema and television ;
- fine arts, music and drama, mostly in the spheres of performance, director's conception, stage-scenery and choreography as well as in the sphere of aesthetics ;
- social and political events ;
- nature, natural science and technology ;
- everyday life and atmosphere of a given period ;
- sociology, mainly research into psychology of the crowd.

The analysis of the content of a record has to focus on the definition of the importance of the object captured, on the importance, range and concentration of the pieces of information contained in it, on the definition of the degree of authenticity of the record and on whether it has the properties of a primary source. In all cases, we have to assess whether the record really is what it pretends to be, which is almost always hampered by the seeming objectivity of the records. Such a criticism requires a thorough knowledge of socio-political and economical developments, of the development of cinematic art and of the state of technology, conditioned by a given period.

An analysis of film/audio-visual/records as works of art takes note of the artistic treatment/including originality, compactness of composition and action, application of new artistic means of expression and new techniques, etc./ expressing the personality of makers and performers, who, through artistic records and their performances, themselves become the objects in respect of which the permanent documentary value of a record is to be assessed.

There is also a need to analyze the records as to their completeness, physical, chemical and technical conditions. For such an assessment, papers/such as shooting scripts, continuity sheets, production sheets, etc./ are of great importance, documenting how the work originated and how it was carried out, the way in which the record was made and reproduced and any interference into its originality.

Lastly, the records have also to be assessed from the following viewpoints : their future practical utilization, the period in which they were made and, in the case of foreign-made records, the copyright and the possibility of acquiring the record from its originator.

At the same time, the problem of duplication/multiplication/ of identical records and of similar records is to be dealt with.

The common work of qualified archivists and, in some cases, of experts, too, is the condition for assessing whether a record is of permanent documentary value.

The procedure of internal discarding of records is envisaged i.e. a subsequent selection after their transfer to the archive where records are kept permanently.

The matters I mentioned in the first part of my paper do not cover all the problems of selection, nevertheless, that enable us to apply general criteria as well as specific viewpoints to the accomplishment of practical tasks, to eliminate random, spontaneous, subjective selection, improvisation and superficiality from our decision-making, and thus to take the first steps to solve the problem of scientific selection.

## II

Constitutionally the administration and organization of the system of archives fall within the scope of activities of the Czech Socialist Republic and of the Slovak Socialist Republic. A global legal regulation of the Czech system of archives was effectuated through an Archivism Act, adopted by Czech National Council and published under No 97/1974 in the Law Gazette and through eleven binding decrees implementing the Act. In the Slovak Socialist Republic, a similar Act was adopted in 1975.

#### The legal regulation

- explains basic terms in the field of archivism,
- pays attention to measures to be taken before the records are transferred to the archives, and to the preservation of archival materials,
- defines the status and the main tasks of each kind of archive, as well as the relations between and to other bodies and organizations, and
- provides for the uniform control, organization and checking of the archival system, including the unification of the working process and working methods used in the performance of basic tasks in archives.

According to the § 24 of the Archivism Act, adopted by the Czech National Council and published under No. 97/1974 in the Law Gazette, the Film Archive of the Czechoslovak Film Institute is an archive of special importance. It is not, however, the sole archive keeping film archival materials. In addition, there are the Czechoslovak Television Archive, which keeps audio-visual archival materials made or produced for this institution, or acquired through an exchange of materials, as a gift, from left estates or as a result of contracts, and the Slovak Film-Archive, keeping the Slovak film-production.

The goal of the Film Archive of the Czechoslovak Film Institute is to collect, preserve, scientifically process and utilize the film archival materials documenting the Czech film-production, the origin and development of cinematic art, the life of the Czech nation and important world events.

The film Archive obtains film archival materials from :

- a/ the Czechoslovak Film organizations in the course of the discarding procedure, and
- b/ elsewhere.

In the discarding procedure, the whole Czechoslovak film production is assessed as well as those films produced abroad which have been distributed in Czechoslovakia. The main directive for the assessment of film records is the Czechoslovak Film Regulations for Discarding of Film Materials.

I would like to point out the main feature of these Regulations reflecting the wish of the Czechoslovak society to preserve the wealth of archival materials for future generations : the direct designation of some film records as archival materials. This category includes the original negatives, nationally produced fiction and non-fiction films/animated and documentary films and newsreels/, with the exception of commissioned films.

The existence of the Czechoslovak Film Commission for the Discarding of Film Materials is another important fact, enabling a collective approach towards, and the application of general criteria and of specific viewpoints in the assessment of records in terms of their permanent documentary value. This fact also makes possible a continuous selection of film records in a planned manner. The Commission is composed of qualified staff workers of the following Czechoslovak Film enterprises :

- the Central Film Distribution Agency/ to assess the possibilities of future practical utilization of Czech films and of films having unlimited monopoly rights ,
- the Czechoslovak Filmexport/ to assess the possibilities of exportation of Czechoslovak films and to present the claims of foreign owners of monopoly rights when foreign films are assessed ,
- the Barrandov Film Studio, the Gottwaldov Film Studio and the Prague Short Films/ to assess whether the film record in question could be used for making new films, and to present the originator's claims ,
- the Barrandov Film Laboratories/ to assess the technical condition of films ,
- the Slovak Film Distribution Agency/ to co-ordinate the matters in question in the Czech Socialist Republic with those in the Slovak Socialist Republic , and
- the Film Archive of the Czechoslovak Film Institute, whose representative is the Chairman of the Commission.

I would like to mention that the Commission members are contributing through their work to prevent the destruction of any film record of permanent documentary value. However, they do not decide whether such a record will be



taken over by the archive - this decision can only be made by the Film Archive and the Archive Administration. The attitudes of the members of the Discarding Commission are very important, however, for the preservation of records existing in two or more identical copies and for the establishment of the degree of reduction to which film records are to be subjected.

As regards the film records acquired by the Film Archive from elsewhere/ i.e. outside the discarding procedure/, these possibilities include

- purchase of film records, their donation by individuals and organizations, and, sometimes, their bequest or discovery, and
- exchange of film records between archives.

The assessment of film records as to their permanent documentary value is made by the most experienced, qualified staff workers after viewing these records and with the help of commissions of experts. The assessment is based on the importance of the record as to its content, on the final artistic impact of the record, on the value of each of its components and on all the other criteria mentioned in the first part of this paper. The following aspects are also taken into account : the information contained in the lists of sought films, the presence of foreign films in the collection and their variety as to the genres, and the need to show the work of important film-makers and their evolution.

The most difficult thing is the correct assessment of the value of newsreels and documentaries, where the ideal aim is to cover all human activities, the life of the country, and the transformations in the society as well as in nature.

When assessing any discipline, we always try to do it with the help of a group of experts invited from research institutes, universities or the respective fields.

The Film Archive usually knows best the gaps in its documentary holdings, and consequently, it must do everything - and that is where the paradox of selection lies - to fill in at least some of these gaps. It is helped in

doing this by other institutions dealing with historical documentation : the State Office for the Preservation of National Monuments and Nature, museums, but also the Czechoslovak Film production enterprises, film schools and film amateurs. In this, the Film Archive sometimes proves to be successful.

This task is a difficult one, but, just as it is true of the work in many other professions, it is true of the film archivists' work that we always have to strive for the impossible in order to achieve the possible.

## System of Archival Selection of Moving Images in the Prague Film Archive

Blažena Urgošikova

There are two working commissions in our film archive : the identification commission and the archivation (acquisition) commission. The former has been working for a number of years - since the end of the fifties (it was founded by the film historian Myrtil Frida). Its original task was and still is to identify unknown films, complete the missing data and evaluate their artistic and documentary value. For these reasons the commission centres its interest mainly on films from the silent period as well as on the sound films of the thirties. These materials are either deposited in collections, or continue to be acquired from private persons by purchase or donation. The second commission - the archivation (acquisition) one - was founded at the beginning of the seventies with main objective to evaluate and select films completing the collection.

Although the two commissions have different tasks, they work along the same principles and follow the same system determined on the basis of the existing experience and main guidelines. The system includes the work procedure, accurate definition of archivation criteria and the evaluation method ; the evaluation method could be regarded as an auxiliary component, since it is not binding in the decision-making process.

The films are selected according to the following criteria :

- films of good to outstanding quality;
- films reflecting the political and social character of a period and environment (or assisting the spectator to know it) ;
- films of famous personalities (screenwriters, directors, directors of photography, musical composers or musicians, editors, architects) ;
- films with famous actors ;
- films shot with new and original techniques ;
- film adaptations of famous works of literature ;
- films characterizing certain genres and their development ;

- films typical of different national "schools" ;
- films important in terms of development of the film language ;
- films awarded at important film festivals ;
- films with exceptional commercial success ;
- film remakes of successful films from the past.

The commission views the film and after the projection discusses the pros and cons on its archivation. The decision must be put in written form indicating all the relevant reasons. It is based on the above criteria, but is also influenced by the possibilities of borrowing films from other archives and by the present state of the collection. In practice it means that the reasons for archivation can be represented also by other factors .

For example : we know, that our collection of the Italian silent films is not large enough to provide a representative image of this cinematography. That is why, when we acquire a film from that period, we add it to our collection even though the collection would need another film, more important and more characteristic for the given period. Similar procedure is applied to archiving films according to directors, performers and other items.

Apart from the basic task - i.e. the decision about deposit, the commission notes further data that can often be acquired only after seeing the film : time of the action, genre rareness of the material, whether the film is meant for research purposes only or whether it can be presented in a cinema, technical quality of the material.

In conclusion, every member personally evaluates the film he or she has seen. Compared to the original discussion, the result of which is the decision about archival deposit, this evaluation does not assess the historical or documentary quality, but studies the film as to the current aesthetic requirements. (For a historian it is often difficult to make distinction between the film and its historical value).

For evaluation, we use grades from zero to six ; zero being the lowest. It can be roughly said that zero to two grades are used for artistically sub-standard films, three to four for average films and five to six for films

better than average. We had several reasons for this type of evaluation. In the criteria given for deposit, with exception of item 1, the artistic value of a film is not explicitly included. We felt it was a shortcoming since we got used to consider a certain part of a film production to be an art. Apart from that the evaluation has a practical aspect as well : E.g. we wish to have a film with a certain actor in our collection and the acquired film gets low grades, but we do not have another film. We therefore accept the film with a note saying that after acquiring a more characteristic film, the original one will be excluded from the collection. Or, when we can select a film with a certain actor (and we are not interested in the whole production with the said actor) and there are no other reasons for deposit, the decisive factor for selection is a higher artistic quality.

In the film, So endete eine Liebe (1934, Karl Hartl), the reasons for deposit are : the film Ein Leben lang (1940, directed by Gustav Ucicky), also with Paula Wessely, was found uninteresting for lack of quality, and undeserving permanent deposit.

This assessment has no principal influence (except point Nr. 1) on the decision concerning the archival deposit, and on the contrary, it is often in conflict with the criteria of deposit and the final decision, as demonstrated by the following cases. Films Sing You, Sinners (1938, dir. Wesley Ruggles), Der gestiefelte Kater (1936, Alf Zengerling), Robinson Crusoe (1944, Alexander Andriyevski), Robert und Bertram (1925, Rudolf Walther-Feinz), Son of India (1931, Jacques Feyder) were evaluated by zero (we obtain the average evaluation figure from the assessments of all members of the commission), but were included into the holdings. The film Sing You, Sinners, to complement Bing Crosby's profile, Der gestiefelte Kater as a sample of inexperienced early Czech dubbing, Robinson Crusoe as an adaptation of a well-known book, Robert und Bertram as an illustration of the stupid commercial production of the twenties, Son of India as a typical example of unexperienced work in early sound films.

The above-mentioned system and procedures were elaborated for the deposit (acquisition) commission. As I have already mentioned, the identification

commission works in a similar manner. Members of the acquisition commission are specialized workers of the Film Archive and of other departments of the Film Institute and other film enterprises - Central Film Distribution, Czechoslovak Filmexport. The so-called "old timers" are an important component of the identification commission. They are people who for years have worked in various film spheres as actors, film directors, cameramen, film editors, distribution workers, etc., some of them already during the silent film period. Their participation in the work of the commission is most valuable and irreplaceable because they are eye-witnesses of the film-making in the past. We work in this manner because we should critically assess our entire collection to make sure that it will be based on the same principles.

The film Institute also prepares documentation as an aid to its work in the selection of films.

First of all, a card index of desired films. Every specialized worker of the archive, who sees a film which does not exist in our collection, and should, in his opinion, be included, makes a written proposal. The proposal should include basic data on the film, i.e. the original title, year of production, country of origin, director - the place where he has seen the film, film magazines which published articles about it - possibly indications about the possibility of acquiring the film. Another aid is the Basic Funds of World Cinema, which the Czechoslovak Film Institute started publishing in the middle of the seventies. These Basic Funds were prepared by specialists of the Film Archive and other departments of the Film Institute and by outside specialists for individual national cinemas. Outstanding works of national productions are included.

These principles and procedures are intended for feature films. General principles are also applied to animated films, taking into account their specificity. At present we are preparing a similar system of selection and assessment for documentary films and newsreels.

QUESTIONSWolfgang Klaue

I have some questions about the practical work of this commission. How many members belong to this commission? Are these persons from the Archive and Institute only, or do they also come from institutions outside the Archive? What authority does the commission have? Are the decisions taken by the commission final? Or must they be approved by any superior person or body? And is the commission composed of advisers or are these persons engaged for this task only and are they doing something else in the Archive? How many are advisers, how many are employees dealing with selection?

V. Opěla

Which commission do you have on mind? We have the supreme discarding commission dealing with the Czechoslovak production, and two commissions active within the Archive.

W. Klaue

The acquisition commission.

V. Opěla

The acquisition commission has 15 members, out of which 7 are members of the Film Archive. The chief historian of the Archive assumes the chairmanship of this commission, and the decisions are approved by the Director of this commission, and the decisions are approved by the Director of the Archive. In addition to the employees of the Archive, the commission includes experts from the Film Institute, from the Study and Information departments, and other persons, such as a university professor, who teaches at FAMU/Film and Television School, and invited specialists from other branches, e.g. from the Museum of Applied Arts, etc.

W. Klaue

How often does the commission meet?

V. Opěla

The commission holds weekly sessions during which 2-3 feature films are viewed.

Raymond Borde

*Il y a une chose que je n'ai pas très bien comprise. Vous avez parlé d'une commission d'acquisition, certes. Vous avez parlé également d'une commission d'élimination. Je voudrais savoir très précisément s'il s'agit de deux commissions différentes et quelle est, à ce moment-là, le travail de la commission d'élimination.*

V. Opěla

The discarding commission of the Czechoslovak production has the task of assessing the Czechoslovak film production and foreign production released in Czechoslovakia. The work of this commission is based on individual assessments of its members, representing the various institutions of the Czechoslovak Film. It proposes which film materials should be preserved in terms of their permanent documentary value. Naturally, it does not evaluate all the film materials. A case in point : when a Czech feature film is made, the original negative is transferred after two years to the Film Archive. The same applies to negatives of animated and documentary films. In newsreels, the period is longer. This commission, when evaluating films, tries to reach a decision which other duplicating materials, lavender prints or dupe-negatives, or other materials, such as pilot prints or prints with foreign language subtitles should be deposited in the Film Archive. The commission submits the proposal and the Archive decides jointly with the Film Administration. This decision is consequently the result of the work done by the acquisition commission, which discusses all the materials. The chairman of the discarding commission is the member of the Archive acquisition commission and decides - or presents the decision of the Archive - and this decision is final following the approval by the Film Administration.

Robert Daudelin

*Est-ce que votre commission, dite d'élimination, a strictement une valeur*



*consultative ? Est-ce juste de comprendre que finalement c'est la commission de sélection qui prend les décisions réelles ?*

V. Opèla

The discarding commission is a consultative and coordination body for the selection of film archival materials. The decisions are made by the chairman of the commission who also puts forth the final proposal about film materials, and the final decision is then carried out by the Film Administration.



## Selection in the National Film Archive of Great Britain

Clyde Jeavons

When I was being interviewed for the job I now have in the National Film Archive in London, I remember being asked the question : "What are your views on selection ?". My reply was : "I am a reluctant believer in selection".

Six years have passed since then, but that would still be my answer today, and I believe it is one that would be shared by all of my colleagues in the National Film Archive who are concerned with the selection and acquisition of film and television. We carry out the task of selection both reluctantly and with a certain amount of apprehension, conscious of the fundamental fallibility of what we are doing and somewhat painfully aware that we are setting ourselves up as the arbiters of what future generations of students and researchers of the cinema and television will be able to see from the past. We are, in short, behaving in a godlike fashion. I hope therefore, that this paper, while describing and implicitly supporting the notion of a selection policy for film archiving, will reflect also throughout, the reservations and doubt and reluctance which I am certain we all share when to choose or reject a moving image for preservation.

It is self-evident that any method of selection must by its nature be imperfect, and that the only way to be sure of preserving everything which anyone in the future might need is, quite simply, to preserve everything.

Why, then, do we select ? Or to turn the question round : Why don't we select everything .

This is the dilemma which Ernest Lindgren, the first curator of the National Film Archive, recognized straight away when, in 1935, he was invited by the British Film Institute to establish a National Film Library (as the Archive was then called) with a brief to rescue and preserve films of artistic and

historic interest. He realized that film was the underprivileged, and that film archiving was unlikely ever to win sufficient resources to achieve the ultimate ideal of wholesale preservation. In other words, he saw the obvious : that the cost of preserving, storing and cataloguing films were such that any organization attempting a policy of total archiving soon be overwhelmed by the sheer volume of material.

He considered careful selection as the first vital step in any preservation programme ; it would, he believed, keep the preservation problem within reasonable bounds, and give some guarantee that the money required for it (in our case, public money) was being spent on films which would justify it and continue to justify it. At the same time, he was aware that any selection procedure adopted must be flexible and that in operating it the constant aim must be to reduce its unavoidable imperfections to a minimum.

Being a man of some logic and pragmatism, Ernest Lindgren devised for the National Film Archive a selection policy that would be both systematic and based upon precepts which, in the first instance, would exclude nothing from consideration but which, upon the application of reasoned criteria would ensure that realistic selection decisions were finally arrived.

His first criterion was in itself a selection decision. It was not the role of any national archive, he reasoned, to take upon itself the archiving burdens of the whole world. He had already envisaged, along with other then existing archives, a global network of no-operating film archives doing complementary work, and he proposed that the National Film Archive's area of consideration should be confined to any film shown in the United Kingdom, whether it was shown just once or many times. (Later, as I shall explain, this was extended to include any television programme transmitted on British television). At the same time, he recognized that film was an international art and that to have a British National Film Archive containing only British films would be as absurd as having a National Art Gallery full of only British paintings, so he was careful to add that the films being considered, albeit on British screens only, could be of any source or nationality. The philosophy behind this, of course, was that any motion picture which might

have a cultural impact on British minds, however transitory or small, should be eligible for consideration. Lindgren cited in particular American Hollywood cinema, which, he rightly pointed out, had undoubtedly had far more social and cultural effect on British audiences than their own national cinema, which was, in any case, for the most part little more than an imitation of Hollywood.

Another factor which helped to shape the National Film Archive collection was Lindgren's insistence that film was also important as an historical and sociological document, and he established from the beginning that the National Film Archive should select and acquire films not only as art and entertainment and as examples of cinema history, but also as historical records. That is to say, as records of events, places and people, and as a portrait of contemporary life and behaviour in general. Thus, for some years at least, The National Film Archive became perhaps unique in its scope and in its terms of reference, but by the same token fashioned for itself a selection policy which was both complex in its criteria and elaborate in its procedures.

Much of what I have described - and which we still call in the Archive the "Lindgren philosophy" - I am aware is well known to many of you. I am aware also that it has its opponents as well as its apologists. I think it is important for me to stress, however, that in its very basics, at least, the Lindgren concept of selection is still the one which underpins much of the work of the National Film Archive, although 45 years of archiving have, of course, seen a considerable evolution of those first principles in terms of attitudes, criteria and procedures.

I should like now to try to trace this evolution to the present day ; to explain our procedures as they are now, and how, if at all, our attitudes have changed over the years ; and, along the way, to imply some of the many questions which the problematic of selection inevitably poses.

The National Film Archive formalized its selection procedures some forty years ago with the setting-up of what was called the Selection Sub-Committee. This move in itself reflected another facet of Ernest Lindgren's attitude to selection : the need to seek and glean advice from "experts" (and I very deliberately put the word "experts" in inverted commas). This was by no means an original idea. As early as 1898, only three years after the historic date which we call the birth of cinema, a visionary called Bolesles Matuszewski wrote an article (see Appendix 3) in a Paris journal which called for "the creation of a depository for historical cinematography", and among his many ideas as to how this could be brought about, he wrote the following : "A competent committee will accept or reject the proposed documents according to their historic value".

Like Matuszewski, Lindgren could not conceive of one person, like a Keeper in a museum, no matter how knowledgeable, being regarded as the expert on film, the sole arbiter of what should be kept. Unlike a Keeper in a museum, who might well be the recognized expert on a specialized subject and justifiably make unilateral decisions based on his or her unique knowledge, no one person, he felt, could possibly embrace all cinema knowledge, and as he was himself at that time the only member of the staff employed to acquire the Archive's films, he gathered around him a panel of voluntary advisers who would meet periodically to make recommendations from all spheres of film production : classic films, entertainment films, documentaries, newsreels and so on. Those advisers were a combination of British Film Institute staff, filmmakers, film historians and a smattering of the more respected film critics. Film selection in this form continued for about ten years until a separate History Committee was formed to consider mainly non-fiction films and newsreels as historical records, and the original Selection Sub-Committee changed its name to the Art and Entertainment Committee, its brief being to consider mostly feature and fiction films - or, as the new name implied, films as art and entertainment.

An earlier division had occurred in 1943 with the setting up of a Science Committee, to consider films as scientific records, and in 1953, the Art and Entertainment Committee, which had now become the General Committee, first began to consider seriously television material, although this was restricted

initially to actual films made for television (mostly American), TV series (also American) and newsreels. This had a far-reaching effect on the Archive and the British Film Institute as a whole, for as a result, the BFI, in 1961, formally adopted television as a part of its cultural brief. The Archive engaged a Television Officer (whose name, by the way, was David Francis) and, in the late sixties, a separate Television Committee was established to consider all television material transmitted in the United Kingdom. One further change in the committee structure occurred in the mid-seventies, when television news and current affairs programmes were made the remit of the History Committee, which consequently became known as the History and Current Affairs Committee.

This quite elaborate structure - four committees meeting regularly to consider the entire gamut of film and television exhibition in the UK - is still the basis of the Archive's selection procedures, and a few words about the composition and criteria of each of these committees as they are now might be instructive.

The General Committee, as I have explained, developed from the Archive's first and only film committee. At first, its consideration of feature films was fairly rigid, seeing the cinema more or less exclusively in art terms and confining itself to a selection of what it collectively regarded as the classic films. Very rapidly its members recognized that film was also a populist medium and began to consider films in terms of stars, box-office success, and so on. (It is revealing, and a little embarrassing to note, for example, that even so it took this committee three attempts to recommend Gone With the Wind for preservation, having rejected it twice !). Later on, the importance of individual directors became a criterion, the films of certain "approved" (again, I put the word in inverted commas) directors being automatically selected without question. And further on still, themes and genres and nationality and many other facets of a film - including sometimes negative ones - were brought into consideration. Today, greater attention is now paid, for example, to areas of critical debate like auteurism, structuralism, experimentalism, film noir, women in film, and so forth - not necessarily because the Archive supports or adopts or approves of these debates

or themes, but because their very emergence and existence implies that future students and researchers of the cinema will wish to see and study the films which represent them.

As the criteria and the cinematic areas of this committee's consideration have developed and broadened over the years, so has its membership changed. From a preponderance of internal staff and film-makers has emerged a committee composed mainly today of national film critics, cinema historians and trade-reviewers - chosen not necessarily because they are considered as greater "experts" (in inverted commas, remember) than, say, film-makers themselves, but for the very practical reason that (unlike most film-makers), they are likely to have actually seen a majority of the films being considered. These members are carefully chosen also to represent between them a wide spectrum of attitudes and views, ranging from those concerned mainly with mainstream, commercial distribution to those who support left-wing cinema and the avant-garde.

This committee considers all feature and short fiction films shown to the press or public, and regularly reconsiders films not selected in the past, often through retrospective seasons arranged at the National Film Theatre. National Film Theatre screenings also provide an opportunity to consider new or recent films from other countries.

One major change in recent years has been the attitude to British cinema. Once, this was considered, without discrimination, as being subject to the same criteria of selection as all other cinema, but the general view taken now is that most, if not all, British cinema should be automatically selected for preservation, on the simple and obvious grounds that the British National Film Archive has a special responsibility towards the cinema of its own country, and if the National Film Archive does not preserve it, no one else will.

Other developments over the years include an increasing tendency to leave some areas of selection entirely in the hands of Archive staff : collections of past films offered to the Archive, for example, no longer (as they used to)



go through the committee selection procedure ; nor is the committee asked to make decisions about the duping of unstable nitrate films already kept in the Archive, as it once used to do.

The History and Current Affairs Committee considers, broadly speaking, non-fiction films and television programmes as records of twentieth-century history, life and current events, and here, of course, recommendations are based on somewhat different criteria from those for film as art and entertainment whose selection is largely a question of critical, and often subjective judgment. This committee is composed of subject specialists - historians, sociologists, educationalists, television journalists, and so forth - who use film or television in their daily work and who, in making their judgments, consider more the content and ideology of a film rather than its skill or technique - although they, too, may be factors.

Again, attitudes to such film and television material have changed over the years. There was a time when reconstructions of historical events were frowned upon and normally rejected by the Archive ; now they are often valued for the modern attitudes they reveal of past events. It is true also that the soundtrack was sometimes considered as less important than the action in a film recording an event perhaps even dispensable altogether : in newsreels, for example. Now we take the view that what is heard on the soundtrack, whether it be commentary or even music, is often equally significant and worthy of study for the attitudes it strikes or the viewpoint it promotes. Newsreels, we have come to learn (and for the same reasons) are important not for the individual items within them, but as entities, and now we strive to acquire whole runs of newsreels from all the companies which made them, in the proven belief that historians will want to study them in their entirety and not piecemeal. In this connection, I can report that we made a decision at the beginning of 1980 to record off-air, on videotape cassettes, both of the main news bulletins on British television each day, and this we are now doing.

At the same time, we still hold to the Lindgren view that films which record subject-matter which can as easily be recorded in other forms, such as books

and still photographs, probably need not be preserved, unless again they propose an ideological viewpoint which itself is worth keeping. And subject-matter which can, and probably will be filmed again, and possibly better, will receive less sympathetic consideration than that which the camera can only capture once. I would mention also, at this point, that in the case of non fiction war film material, we will usually defer to our colleagues in the Imperial War Museum and leave the selection to them - unless, of course, we believe such films to be equally important in the context of the National Film Archive collection.

Similar criteria to those of the History and Current Affairs Committee are applied to the advice and recommendations of the Archive's Science Committee, which is also composed of subject specialists, but here the final act of selection is more clear-cut, the opinion of one member (who may have been the only one to have seen a particular film or television programme, since it falls exclusively into his or her area of expertise) often being sufficient to arrive at a decision.

Finally, there, is the Archive's youngest committee, the Television Committee whose members - a mixture of television producers and writers and television critics - consider television as a medium, or for its technique, or (dare I say) as an art. The whole output of television is considered by this committee - drama, light entertainment, soap operas, arts programmes - everything except those programmes which fall specifically into the remit of the other three committees, though such programmes might nevertheless be doubly considered as examples of television technique as well as for their content or subject-matter.

Certain guidelines and disciplines are common to all the National Film Archive's selection committees. It is normally expected that no selection decision can be made unless at least one person on the committee in question (or, at the very least, a known consultant) has actually viewed the film or television programme being considered ; nothing, or almost nothing, is selected unseen. Majority voting is not a factor, and indeed voting rarely occurs : the opinion of one member may be enough to reach a decision, or in the case

of an argument (as will often happen on the committee considering feature films or television) the strength of opinion of one person, or a minority of people in favour of a film or television programme will usually indicate that the material should be selected. And in all cases, whatever is chosen, we ask that the selection is accompanied by a cogent reason. The reasons which emerge - and they may range from the straightforward (e.g. that it is a film by a particular director, or an excellent record of an event) to the more elaborate (e.g. to show that the film reflects a complex theme or ideology) - are not intended to be instructive to future historians or for their amusement (thought that may well turn out to be the case). The exercise is meant solely as a simple discipline imposed on our advisers, its function being to encourage them to justify their choices and to provide a basis for discussion if opinions differ, or a basis of agreement which others, less convinced, might nevertheless feel able to support. Above all, we constantly ask ourselves and our advisers alike to bear one thought in mind when making our judgments : will any future historian or user of our archive in fifty or 500 years' time regret that we did not keep this film or television programme ?

I realise that the elaborate procedures I have described beg many burning questions. Questions like : Who chooses the selectors ? What are their qualifications ? How many of their decisions are totally subjective or personal ? How often do they get it wrong ? How do we know if they're getting it wrong ? One question in particular has been asked frequently within the National Film Archive itself, and it is this : Why do we have this elaborate selection procedure ? Would we not reach more or less the same decisions, or even better ones, without it and spend less time and work doing so ? The answer is, we don't know. Ernest Lindgren himself, in his later years, actually proposed that some, if not all, of the advisory committees he had himself conceived and set up had probably outlasted their usefulness and could safely be disbanded. But at the same time he envisaged a much larger staff of specialists and consultants within the Archive to replace them.

For myself and my present colleagues, I can probably safely say that yes, in the case of films and television material where the judgment is purely subjective or based on the art and history of the cinema and television, we could

make equally valid decisions among ourselves, maybe even better and more liberal ones ; we should certainly, I think, select more. In the case of film and television as records of history and science, we are less sure - short of becoming all-round experts ourselves, we would certainly still need the advices of many consultants, if not committees.

At the same time, we are very conscious of the value of our committees and the advice they give us. We are aware also that our committee procedures provide a demonstration to our sponsors, the public, that the work we do is being done responsibly and in a manner open to their scrutiny and criticism. And above all, perhaps, we value the interchange of idea, and the continuous contributions to the growth of our own expertise and knowledge, which come from the bringing together of these many and varied people who are as seriously involved as we are in the promotion of film and television as art and culture. Perhaps, we do need them, after all.

There are many more questions and issues of debate about selection which I know are in your heads and mine, and which we consider daily in the National Film Archive : What is the point of selection if we cannot acquire what we select ? Are we selecting too little ? Are we selecting too much ? Are we genuinely meeting the needs of posterity or are we just selecting for ourselves ? How far are we wastefully duplicating the efforts of other Archives ? How will the new technologies of video and disc and laser and other technologies yet to come affect our notions of selection and acquisitions ? Is selection simply out of date ? ...

Alas, I have no time to attempt an answer to those questions in this brief paper, although I hope that they will provide some raw material for this symposium.

QUESTIONS

Larry Karr

Can you tell me approximately how many of the films selected, say in one year, actually enter the Archive in any form within the next 5, 10 or 20 years? Also, approximately how much time is spent collectively by all these committees roughly in a given year, for the selection work?

Clyde Jeavons

Well, the ratio of acquisition to selection: because we have no legal deposit system in the United Kingdom, I'm afraid they are miles apart. What we are doing, very largely, is a work of theory. It's a theoretical exercise. But it does have two major functions: one, it does concentrate our minds on priorities, it does sort out for us what we should be trying to acquire. And there is also a difference between commercial feature films and non-fiction films. We find it very difficult indeed to acquire commercial feature films we have selected because of the system we are forced to have, which is voluntary deposit, the begging system. And I would say that over the space of 5-10 years, under this system, we are lucky if we get 10 or 20 percent of the films we ask for.

We are more successful with British productions than we are with American or European productions.

In the case of non-fiction films, it is a little easier. I would say that over a relatively short period, say 2-5 years, we are successful in getting about 70-75 percent of what we select, simply because of the non-commercial nature of these films, and the fact that the film-maker often feels privileged to put his little film in the National Film Archive. And a lot of the films are sponsored films, made by rich companies who feel no pain in giving us copies of their films. It's also true that in case of non-fiction films, we often get much better material. We often succeed in getting pre-print material almost straight away.

Your second question, the amount of time and effort and work put into the committee's system: it is quite big! We have to service these committees, we have to act as secretaries to them, we have to chair them, we have to put

up papers for them, we have to arrange screenings for the committee members, particularly again in the area of non-fiction films where they are unlikely to have seen the films in the normal course of events. And I would say that a good 50 percent of the working hours put in by our acquisition staff is spent on the act of selection and servicing the selection committees.

Vladimir Opěla

I would like to ask if your reluctance is justified. Wasn't it a certain Englishman in the 19th century who said that "selection is the only healthy human activity - the basis of healthy human activity"? I believe this can be applied to films as well, but what I want to ask is how do you select documentary materials?

Clyde Jeavons

Well, I regard selection as both healthy - because it concentrates the mind - and as I said, it helps one to establish priorities and not waste time over a mishmash of material which needs to be sorted out and so on. I consider it unhealthy in the sense that I still regard the ideal as being to find some way of preserving everything. We cannot possibly set ourselves as judges of what the future will need. And the only way to get around that is to give them everything. But realism plays a part in that...

How do we select documentary material? I tried, I think, to explain in my paper our criteria and procedures for doing this. I think they are probably no different from anyone else's. A documentary can reveal many, many things - it can be simply a direct record of events, current affairs, arts and crafts, lifestyles, etc., and what we tend to do is to take a more negative approach. We tend to reject rather than select by applying the criteria that I mentioned, which is first of all whether the film record is useful in any way as a film record, as a moving image. If it can be duplicated in some other form, such as a book or a photograph, or a drawing or whatever. This would be a reason, very often, for rejecting it, unless the film itself is constructed in such a way that it is interesting as a film. I hesitate to be more specific in that because I could go on for half an hour on specifics as to why or why not we take a non-fiction film, but maybe that answers your question adequately.

Anna Lena Wibom

*I am interested in a question related to these committees. When, and how do you pay them? Are they salaried to work on your committees? And how often do you have to pay to get preservation material?*

C. Jeavons

*We don't pay our committee members, they are entirely voluntary. They are advisers who are invited to - if we want them - to come on our committees. These committees meet every two months and we give them a good lunch and we do our work over this good lunch and as long as we keep our catering standards high, we find we keep our committee members. That is their payment. It's called the hedonism principle...*

*As for paying for preservation material, well, as an archive we are not badly off these days. We have a relatively high State funding, but most of this money goes into the act of technical preservation, mainly the duplication of nitrate films. We still have very, very small budgets for acquiring preservation material and we still rely, for the most part, on voluntary deposit. Again, there are certain differences in different areas. This certainly applies to feature films, and frankly, our budget - our total budget for one year for acquisition - could be spent on one colour film if we so chose: it's so small and the cost of film is so high. So we tend not to blow it all on one feature film as we might be tempted to do. We tend to use our acquisition money on more difficult material, like independent films where the film-maker can't possibly afford to give us what may be his or her only copy of the film. So we will tend to use our acquisition money to subsidize that kind of area, or maybe to buy a politically vulnerable film from a country wherefrom the film has been imported for a screening, and rather than let the film go back and disappear, we will maybe buy that film and keep it in the Archive.*

*The main area of difference is television where we have succeeded, where commercial television is concerned, in persuading the television companies that we are or should be their archivists. They have acknowledged this by now giving us an annual grant of some substance, which enables us to purchase something in the region of 50 percent of all our commercial television selec-*

tions for one year by buying back preservation copies from the companies themselves. This does not, alas, apply to the BBC ; we have no such fund to buy copies from the BBC. What we do have with the BBC is a very generous deal, whereby they give us very cheap access to their recording equipment, and we can achieve a small percentage of the BBC material by that method.

Mark Strotchkov

What film material of British productions do you preserve, i.e. negatives, dupe-positives, dupe-negatives, etc. ?

C. Jeavons

Another complicated question because we accept basically what we can get. Again, by having this awful voluntary deposit system, where commercial feature films are concerned, we are lucky if we can get one or two used distribution prints. We want pre-print material, we want preservation material, and in the case of British material, we can normally expect, after a period of time, when the film is well out of commercial viability, to be presented with some form of negative, of fine-grain positive material. But we have to wait a long time usually. As I've explained, in the case of non-fiction material, we are usually more successful in getting pre-print material. We try to get the earliest generation material possible, I mean the nearest to the original negative if not the original negative. The same applies to television : although we use videocassette for access purposes, we try to preserve as near to the original material as possible, whether its original source is film or broadcast standard tape. That's what we try to get for preservation.



Extracts chosen and commented by Clyde Jeavons

1. SUSPENSE

An American film made in, I believe, 1912. If I am wrong, Larry Karr will correct me ! I think the reasons for its significance are self-evident. It is clearly a formative film of great originality for its time, containing innovations of astonishing sophistication, such as its complex editing, its use of dramatic close-ups, its introduction of split-screen effects, its imaginative camera angles, its use of mirror shots and reverse angles, and so on. It is, in short, a film of amazing virtuosity for its time, containing the kind of film drama which only becomes commonplace at a much later date. And there is no doubt, I think, that any archive looking for an early film to demonstrate the birth of dramatic technique in the cinema could do worse than to choose this as a supreme example.

2. PICCADILLY

It's rather an interesting film. One of the selection reasons might be as a silent musical, because there is a tremendous number of musical numbers in it which you can't hear. But I chose to show this really as an example of a British film, which is supremely British in theme and setting, and with some very interesting shots of London among other things, and yet it has a photographic style of a quality and panache quite rare in the British cinema of the time. It's called Piccadilly as you saw - it could be chosen for its credit sequence alone. It was directed and produced by E.A. Dupont, a name virtually unknown outside Britain, at the end of the silent era. It starred Anna May Wong, contained one of the first appearances by Charles Laughton ; its screenplay was by the novelist Arnold Bennett, and it was designed by Alfred Junge - many of whose original set designs we also have preserved in the National Film Archive. So all these reasons, plus the fact that it is a British film of considerable quality pretty well unknown outside British shores, makes it a selection of some importance for the NFA.

### 3. HOLLYWOOD REVUE OF 1929

Gene Kelly eats your heart out ! That was an extract from Hollywood Revue of 1929, made by MGM as one of the first all-singing, all-talking, all-dancing films of which there was a spate at the beginning of the sound era. I'm sure you recognized the numbers, I won't comment on that. I chose this really for two reasons : one is the kind of popular Hollywood product which would have made a big impact on British audiences, as well as influencing the British musicals of the thirties, and also as a non-British film which is uniquely preserved in the British NFA, or was at the time we restored it. It has an extremely interesting restoration history which I am prepared to explain to anyone afterwards who is interested. It also contains other elements which make it a film of some importance, including some early two-colour Technicolor sequences, and the fact that it features just about every star who was on MGM's books at the time, from Buster Keaton to Joan Crawford, all doing hearty numbers on the screen.

#### Bob Rosen

*These are really wonderful extracts and they are in a quality and spectrum. They would really be selected because they exemplify some area of film history, or for other reasons. But it seemed to me that the problem of selection, at least for most of us, is really at the completely opposite end. It's the problem of de-selection. I think we would - you would - hardly turn down a film from 1912 of inferior quality. You would select that one as well. And the question is, when you have limited resources, and limited space, when finally do you reluctantly and hesitantly say "no, enough, we can't take it" ? And it seemed to me, that perhaps much of the discussion should be at the other end of our consideration, at the level of those films that we wouldn't want, and ultimately feel regretfully we had to reject.*

#### C. Jeavons

*I am acutely aware of that thinking. When I was asked to present this paper and show some film, I was also asked if I would like to show some rejections. I thought about this for a while. First of all, there is a problem about*

showing rejections, and not only in the NFA. And they would probably be difficult to come by, particularly if I had to explain the context in which I was showing them. But we are certainly aware of this of the notion that maybe we should be showing rejections and not selections, apart from doing something mildly entertaining. But also I felt that to try and give examples of films rejected by the NFA is automatically an invidious exercise. The moment you put something on the screen, somebody will find a reason for wanting to keep it, because, as I keep saying, in the end, ideally you want to keep everything. So I can't, really, give you a satisfactory answer to that question, but I note it.

#### 4. JOUR DE FETE

I offered this simply as an example of the kind of European feature distributed in the United Kingdom, which we would undoubtedly want to select and keep in the Archive, as well as representing the beginnings of Tati's unique style of comic film-making. Our version is rather horribly dubbed into English, but as the comedy is mostly visual, we are relatively happy with it, and it has become a film very rarely shown even in retrospectives of Tati's work, and for that reason alone we value it quite highly.

#### Jan de Vaal

I would like to ask, and it's a point of special interest for smaller countries, why did you choose a rather well-known, still existing, and I presume in good quality print of the French film? I mean still existing in France. Talking about the troubles of space, and certainly now the economic troubles we all have, wouldn't it be much better to see this wonderful film of Jacques Tati, which undoubtedly was a great success in Great Britain, preserved by the French colleagues in order to get space and money to preserve other films in your own country?

#### C. Jeavons

Yes, again in theory I accept that entirely and I think that we all would...

it's one of the questions I asked in my paper : are we duplicating the efforts of other archives ? I think there are one or two possible answers to that. One is that certainly film historians in Great Britain want and do study Jacques Tati. I've had a great number of demands to show this film to individual researchers in England, and it had virtually disappeared from view for many years - this particular film, I mean. Tati's other films of course are shown relatively often. And at the very least we would want to have a copy of the film in the Archive in some form - if only an access copy - if only we could be sure that an adequate job of preservation was being done in the past ; we have all had this problem of wondering whether or not a film which is coming to our hands is being adequately preserved elsewhere, whether or not it is from our own production, and whether we shouldn't just to make sure preserve it ourselves at least for the time being. Maybe the time will come when we are all adequately preserving our own product and we can simply accept access copies of the films of other nations.

#### de Vaal

I am pleased to hear that you are of the same opinion. I want to give you an example : we have, in our archive, a very old French film with a very young Fernandel, and also Françoise Rosay. It's a wonderful French comedy. We, the members of the selection committee of the Nederlands Film Museum, we were very enthusiastic about this and we thought it should be preserved. But first we inquired and we got news from Raymond Borde that the film was not a unique copy, it still exists in France so we left it, we didn't preserve the print. And I think that maybe this is something that we have to think about in the near future ; that we should have a kind of warning office or whatever you want to call it, that we can call upon in order to have more means to preserve other materials.

#### C. Jeavons

Yes, I accept this entirely and it takes us back to our old chestnut of when are we going to have a central register of all the films in the archives, so that we can check this out ? Otherwise we just don't have the time to go into that kind of investigation very often.

Robert Daudelin

*Was there actually any preservation done with that title ?*

C. Jeavons

*Yes, we have what we call a master copy of this. I don't think we acquired original pre-print material. What we have done here is work from a distribution print ; we have made a dupe-negative print and this access copy.*

#### 5. SONG OF CEYLON

I needn't say too much about that extract, except that it was from Song of Ceylon, one of the key documentaries from the British documentary movement of the thirties. Perhaps the most lyrical and beautiful of the whole cycle of those films. The independent productions of that day... and of course the NFA is now the prime source for the supply and study of examples of the British documentary movement, and I don't need to justify its selection beyond that. My offer is simply as an example of one of the high points in the British film production, and the kind of thing if anything justifies our existence.

Audrey Kupferberg

*You mentioned before that your selection committee had considered two or three times Gone with the Wind before accepting it for preservation. How would you be preserving a colour film like Gone with the Wind ?*

C. Jeavons

*We are talking about earlier days when you grabbed anything what you could get and what we should have tried to get in those days would have been at most two distribution copies of the film. We didn't get it at the time although we finally selected it. We do have a copy now which, I think, we regard as an access copy rather than a preservation copy, there being no point now in Britain for the preservation of Gone with the Wind. I hope that's being done elsewhere. And of course the cost of trying to preserve a distri-*

bution of Warner distribution prime - would both be astronomical and ridiculous. There are many other horror stories like Gone with the Wind from the NFA, if you want to hear them.

Robert Daudelin

What's the situation with Song of Ceylon? Do you have the original negative?

C. Jeavons

In the case of most of the Britain documentary movement films, we do have something near the original material. There are cases even among that group of films where original materials have become lost or damaged, and we've had, in a number of cases, to work from simply original prints. Even in that area of film, we cannot guarantee to have achieved acquisition of the original materials.

#### 6. THE BATTLE OF THE PLANTS

That was called The Battle of the Plants; perhaps it really belongs to the Imperial War Museum; an example of a science documentary of which we have numerous examples in the NFA. It's from the "Secrets of Nature" series, and it was made in the 20s by Mary Field and the photographer Smith, who were really the pioneers of this kind of nature film, at which the British always seemed to have excelled. It contains of course many innovative techniques, including stop-motion, special lighting, and an artificial studio set-up, which would have been the only way to capture the shots we saw. I think the reasons for preserving it are more or less self-evident, and it's another example of the wide variety of the British material for which we are always searching.

Sam Kula

This kind of film is possibly safer to discuss in terms of deselection than some of the others. It brings up a problem that occurs when your selection criterion incorporates a wide range of materials. This kind of film of

course can be made today ; the record it incorporates can be done with greater fidelity to reality, and with more sophisticated techniques. So as a document, - you know, the way flowers grow - I suspect that over the last forty years there haven't been too many changes in the way it's done. One example of the film in terms of the technique of the day that was available to the cinematographers of the time would be interesting. That thirty, forty, sixty, eighty or hundred of them could be duplicated by anybody going out with the equipment available today into the back yard - is another question. And maybe the example Bob Rosen is looking for - of deselection - would be if you had 150 or 200-300 films like this, you'd only want one copy, and the others could go. It's simply indicative of the techniques available to film-makers of the time.

I've got a practical case at home of a thousand films produced over a 20-25 year period by Bell-Canada, one of our more substantial private monopoly in telecommunications, primarily for instructional purposes. They provide information about telecommunication systems of the day - the telephone and its uses - and they have a lot of information in them, but the question is : does any archive need a thousand copies ? A thousand titles in this kind of series ? And this kind of material, it seems to me, you could deselect. You'd take an example of a film like that and you 'd let the others go. The problem is that even there, you'll find someone to tell you that every film, and every sequence of the film, has some value, and it shouldn't be destroyed. At least, though, the static factor does not come into play, shall we say, as much. And you can apply your criteria with a little more safety than you could if you showed us a feature film and argued that this is something we don't want in our archive. Because if you didn't want them, there is surely someone around this table who would.

### C. Jeavons

Again I accept that and indeed, there were many poor imitations of this kind of film made at that time which we do reject on the grounds you've mentioned. And the reason for keeping this particular series is - because these people were the pioneers of this kind of technique. It's as simple as that. And I would certainly not reject a Mary Field film, but I would reject many of the imitations that were made at the time, and very poor ones too.

## 7. NEWSREELS

Voilà ! That was of course Maurice Chevalier and Josephine Baker entertaining French troops during the Second War. I chose it to demonstrate the selection of newsreel material in the NFA, but it's not an obvious example, because first of all it isn't a British newsreel, it's French, it's part of a series called "Journal de guerre", which was brought out in France during the early years of the war, and the question might well be asked why we're preserving it in the NFA. The answer is, first of all, because it came into our hands (we believe examples of the newsreel were brought over to Britain by the Free French later in the war). And secondly, because it is a valuable and relatively rare study document, of the kind being increasingly used in historical research in Great Britain, and one which adds another element to the more conventional British newsreels used in those studies.

### Raymond Borde

*Tous les documents que nous avons vu ce matin sont absolument remarquables, et vous avez montré, Clyde, les côtés positifs du comité de sélection. Mais je voudrais en savoir davantage sur les côtés négatifs, car j'ai tendance à penser qu'un comité de sélection, quand il élimine des films, joue, objectivement, comme une commission de censure. Et c'est pourquoi je voudrais vous poser une question, question peut-être un peu perfide - un piège ! - mais une question extrêmement précise, sur un moment de la production nationale anglaise. Vous avez eu, il y a à peu près quinze ou vingt ans, une production de films d'épouvante, à Hammer Film, avec des gens comme Terence Fisher. Cette production a été considérée, à ce moment-là, comme populaire, comme méprisable. Maintenant, la critique européenne la considère comme très importante. Ma question est simplement la suivante : avez-vous, à l'époque, sélectionné ou avez-vous, à l'époque, éliminé les films de Hammer Film ?*

### C. Jeavons

*Yes, you're right. When the cycle of British horror films began to be made, at the time you said, I think they were regarded contemporaneously as populist, not very important. And of course one or two examples were selected*



*at the time. Subsequently, and this is part of the committee's system, we do have a very strict system of re-considering past material. Now there is a danger in that : it disappears. But by our system we do go back over previous weeks, previous genres, to see, to re-assess their importance and so on. To use your example of Terence Fisher - he is now what I would have referred to in my paper as an approved film director - he is now a film director where we would now try to acquire everything we can find. Perhaps it's a shame we didn't have that prescience at the time. And that, as you imply, is part of the fallability of our system of film selection.*

#### 8. CORONATION STREET

It looked pretty dull and mundane that piece of film, but it is in fact an extremely significant piece of TV history, because it is the very first episode of Coronation Street, which has been the most popular and longest running soap opera on British television, which has been going on now for well over a decade. This is the kind of TV programme where we would normally select exemplary episodes from time to time rather than attempt the impossible task of taking every daily episode, to show the way it changes and develops over the years, to signify its longevity and endurance. And broadly speaking also, for its sociological interest both as an example of extraordinarily popular television output and for the social background it purports to portray.

#### 9. ADVERTISING FILMS

As you have recognized it was a commercial for a soap powder, made for the cinema in 1946. We select a relatively large number of advertising films for again, fairly obvious reasons : they are part of cinema history, they have immense sociological interest, they show social attitudes and movie techniques in a very short space of film in a very revealing way, and not least, they are often the kind of film on which well-known film directors cut their teeth, or make to raise quick cash for their more serious produc-

tions. This particular example was made by one of the cleverest and most eccentric of Britain's short film-makers, called Richard Massingham, a kind of maverick documentarist, and the film is of course a valuable addition to our collection of this particular director's work.

#### 10. T.V. COMMERCIALS

The significance of this one is that it was the very first commercial to be transmitted on British Independent Television in 1955. It shows also that very little has changed in television advertising. We also regard the T.V. commercial as an important motion picture document for many of the same reasons I've previously described. Some people say they're the best things on British television, and there is some truth in that in so far as again they're often made by directors who go on to achieve success with feature films, and they frequently display cinematographic techniques of astonishing innovation and virtuosity. And some of the best animation work in Britain today, for example, can be seen in T.V. commercials.

#### Daudelin

*You mentioned you were given quoted reason for a film being dismissed by the television committee. Does that apply to all four committees ?*

#### Jeavons

*All committees are subject to this discipline of giving a reason for everything they select. I don't mean to elaborate on that because I've said in my paper why. But it does apply to all the committees and all selection decisions.*

#### 11. FOX HUNT

The last piece I'll introduce in advance because I'll show it in its entirety. It's been recently restored in the Archive in splendid Technicolor, and it is, I consider, one of the genuine treasures of the NFA, and I wanted it to be the

climax of this presentation. Appropriately enough it is animation, which anticipates our next symposium ; it is British animation of the 30s, it's called Fox Hunt and it was made by Anthony Gross who was delighted when he saw this restored version some weeks ago. Its style is at the same time unique and yet entirely redolent of its period. It is quite simply a delightful film and I offer no greater justification for its selection in the NFA than that it very happily exists. And I hope you'll enjoy it as much as I have on the many times I've now seen it.

Eileen Bowser

*Is the acceptance of a film for the collection ever used by any producer for prestige purposes ? I ask the question because we encountered the problem at the Museum with producers who wanted to donate films to us in order to be able to mention that their film was in the collection of the Museum of Modern Art...*

Jeavons

*We try to discourage that kind of thinking - for example - just to digress slightly from your point - we resist, the wish of committees to select films because they'd won awards. We take the rather purist view that just because a film has won an award it shouldn't automatically then receive an accolade and be automatically selected. In the same way, we try to discourage the kind of publicity which gives a film an accolade because it's been selected by one of our film committees. That's not what they are there for - to give accolades. They are there to try and make a rational judgment about the films they are considering. Nevertheless, occasionally, film companies, particularly this happens with television, do pick up our selections and publicize them as being accolades of their work. But on the whole, we don't encourage it.*

Sam Kula

*One has to recognize the fact that in the field of advertising films, to develop a selection machinery whereby enough people at any one time have seen enough of the films to select for the archive, is an enormous administrative machinery, and a fairly simple solution may very well be to select the award winner*

as picked by the industry itself, as being a significant example of innovations in the field. Although you don't want to rely on someone else's awards, when the awards are given by the people who have been exposed to practically everything that has been made in the given field in a way in which you can't do it, and the same applies to industrial films for instance, or sponsored films. The associations in that field do make awards because it's administratively impossible to get staff exposed to that quantity of films, and we rely on the industry itself in fact to select for us. It seems to be a sensible approach in that way.

#### Jeavons

In practice, we end up selecting award-winning films because they're award-winning films, which in itself is significant, but we try to be a little more objective on the whole, if we can.

#### Eva Orbanz

I think Clyde mentioned at one point that in the Archive they select their own kind of film. I was wondering whether they only select films which are recommended by the committees or whether they, the Archive people, make their own selection.

#### Jeavons

The committees, as I've explained, are purely advisory, and they work to a specific agenda which we present to them, which, on the whole is composed of all the latest product available. Nevertheless, the Archive staff does indulge in selection of its own: e.g. if we receive a collection of past material, we won't normally put that through the committee procedure, because selection has already been made in past meetings, and all we have to do is process - apply that list to the selection decisions that were made in the past. That doesn't mean that we don't look at a collection we are offered with more latitude, we certainly do. We're not so strict as to only select what has been selected in the past. We will take a much more generous view of the material we're actually offered. And, in the same way, there are simply areas of which don't go through the committee procedure because they don't go on to the agenda of the committee procedure - this is the area of

obscure films, early collections, etc. These will normally be handled only by the Archive staff who will apply their own expertise such as it is to make the selection decisions. And in the end, we're not bound by committee decisions, they are voluntary committees who simply make recommendations to give us a set of priorities. We don't have to accept their advice, and there are occasions when we may choose to override their advice, and make a selection where they have made a rejection.

#### Kupferberg

You mentioned earlier that you'd take a Mary Field documentary but you wouldn't take an imitator, and we often acquire imitations because they are significant for being imitations, such as the Billy West films. Do you have a policy that you don't take imitators.

#### Jeavons

I hope I didn't say that we categorically rejected all imitations of Mary Field films. I didn't mean to imply that. Obviously, imitations are interesting as examples of imitations. We would simply assess them a little more strictly, and make the comparison with the original material, but we certainly wouldn't reject them out of hand. They would be assessed for what they are worth. And the example you quoted about Billy West is a good one. That's an obvious example where one should want to make some examples.



## The American situation

Larry Karr - American Film Institute

In the United States there is a wide diversification of institutions interested and involved in gathering, collecting and using moving image materials. The first key distinction needed to be made is between preservation and reference collections, that is, between a collection of preservation materials and a collection of reference prints. This is a major problem in the United States, with an enormous number of film collections, held by bodies ranging from private collectors who may or may not be vaguely institutionalized, to university libraries, film departments at colleges and universities, journalism departments, historical societies, public and private archives. A recent development is the "media art center", which generally is a regional institution, concentrating on new film and video work, particularly independent productions, on regional distribution, on exhibition of film and video productions that would otherwise not be available in their area, and on building their own film and video collections. Over 80 of these institutions met in the Spring of 1980 to form a National Organization of Media Art Centers (NAMAC), a harbinger of developments to come.

A preservation collection could be defined in accordance with the principles of preservation (See Appendix 5). These were drafted by Eileen Bowser, and, after considerable discussion, approved by the United States Film Archives Advisory Committee. In summary, these principles in the American system state that preservation is having the best surviving copy, stored under the best possible conditions, used only a limited number of times, and used only for generating additional copies. Preservation materials are not used for any other demands nor for any other needs, whether they are internal (within the archive), or external. The materials themselves and their continued existence are important, rather than the short-range immediate use of them, and that forms the *raison d'être* of a preservation collection. Of course, an archive with preservation materials naturally has reference materials as well.

A reference collection could be described as having the following characteristics : the best obtainable copy (not the best surviving one), stored under whatever conditions are available, and used as often as requested for reference purposes. Curators of reference collections face the unpleasant knowledge that current access and use of their materials inevitably wear them out, but are making an optimistic assumption that replacement copies of equivalent quality will be readily and cheaply obtainable in the future.

Historically, many archives have been formed as reference collections, and only later have evolved into an archive with preservation materials. This change can occur after having bitter experiences finding that a worn out or deteriorated film was once the best or the only known surviving copy. For example, the Library of Congress began acquiring films in the 1890's, for legal purposes of copyright, not for archival purposes. It wasn't until long after the companies that had produced these early films disappeared, together with virtually all of their production, that the "paper print" collection assembled at the Library was perceived as an archival resource. It wasn't until the 1950's that these films were preserved and made available for use in duplicate reference copies.

As for television collections, there is the experience of the University of Georgia as an example. Its School of Journalism has been administering the Peabody awards program for distinguished radio and television broadcasting for the past 40 years. They have gradually assembled a collection of over 7000 film and videotape programs of all types which were submitted to them for awards consideration. With foresight, they retained copies of all submitted programs, to be used as part of a reference collection for teaching purposes in the School. It wasn't until about four years ago that the University found that over 10 % of the collection had either disappeared or been damaged beyond repair, and what was left turned out to be, in many cases, the only surviving copies of those programs. Even if the programs had not been individually unique, the collection has an organic whole that makes it an invaluable resource for study and research, particularly for productions of single, local television stations.

The University of Georgia example illustrates the principal risk of a reference



collection, since it is very difficult to recognize the point in use-time when the materials cease to be just reference copies, and become the best available copies, or the only surviving copies -- that is, preservation copies. And when this point is recognized, the materials may be worn out or damaged, or lost. The time of recognition of archival qualities of a collection may be too late, and what remains can be second or third rate in quality, if salvagable at all.

#### THE NITRATE PERIOD

Between 1912 and 1942 the Library of Congress had a very consistent and simple selection policy for nitrate films. It took none -- simply because it did not have appropriate storage facilities. This had led to a large part of the task of the present American archival system : to gather the missing pieces from this period into archival collections.

The Museum of Modern Art Department of Film was established in the early 1930's, dedicated to the art of the film, which entailed cinematography and artistic achievement as well as the history of the cinema. The work of the Museum was absolutely essential in generating awareness of the need for film preservation, and it also did what it could within its areas of specialization to keep selected films alive. Newer United States archives lacking the history and tradition of the Museum's collecting program might argue, however, that they operate under a handicap, since the richness and depth of the Museum's core collection of "important" films make a broader, more complete collection of American films seem like dull dross in comparison. Perhaps this is a fitting reward for the Museum, since its pioneering efforts in distribution and study of the films they selected, have, in part, led to the canonization of many of these selfsame films. Of course, the growing recognition of film-as-art set the stage for new archives to come into existence and share the burden that the Museum bore alone for so many years.

The collection at the International Museum of Photography at George Eastman House was begun in 1948 with the acquisition of its first curator, James Card,

together with his private collection of over 800 films. His subsequent policies of selection and acquisition were designed to complement those of the Museum of Modern Art. Besides acquiring films that were passed over by the Museum, Card also exercised his own taste and judgement to acquire films that he either liked or thought important, or, more often, were simply available to him for acquisition.

The UCLA Film Archives was established in 1967 as a reference collection, principally of nitrate films, to be used by the students of the University. UCLA in its turn found that the collections they had assembled turned out to contain much archival material, including large quantities of original negatives and other preprint materials. This collection is becoming more and more important, not only in terms of the intrinsic value of the films it holds, but also because of its complementary relationship to the other United States archival collections.

The film collections of the National Archives will be discussed later, in more detail, in context with the principal types of materials it holds, which are documentary and non-theatrical productions of the United States Government, together with related productions from the private sector, especially newsreels.

When the AFI Archives program was established in 1968, its mandate was (and still is) to work with the existing film archives, to help them do the things they want to do. The relationship was to be cooperative and supportive of existing work, and most important, not to be duplicative of ongoing efforts. So instead of AFI building its own vaults and developing a laboratory and curatorial staff, a collaborative arrangement was worked out with the Library of Congress, one part of which provided that all of the films acquired by the AFI would be given to the Library which would assume the laboratory and curatorial care of the AFI Collection.

For American films made after 1950, in the triacetate period, there is not yet a systematic program of selection for preservation. Current preservation work, the real work as defined by the principles of preservation, relates almost entirely to nitrate film. The numerical estimates given below are

rather discouraging in terms of the size of the task. While I cannot vouch for the complete accuracy of any of the individual numbers in this paper, I have been conservative in my calculations, and these are probably the smallest estimates of the actual number of titles made.

In the nitrate period, there were approximately 21,000 feature films made in the United States, perhaps 120,000 short films and 30,000 newsreel issues (1). This is a total of at least 170,000 titles, not counting items such as trailers. The preliminary selection has already been accomplished by default, because over half of these films don't exist -- anywhere. So for whatever reasons that these films are lost, mostly random (decay, fire, deliberate destruction, etc. due to ignorance, apathy, negative profit/loss evaluations of continued commercial value, demise of the original film producers and rights owners, etc.), the total production does not exist from which American archivists can make intelligent and informed selections. As a result, the initial preservation approach was to acquire all available films to fill in the gaps of the entire American film heritage.

In the period from 1968 to 1979, the United States nitrate-preserving archives began to coordinate their work and significant funding for preservation became available from the National Endowment for the Arts, administered by the American Film Institute, resulting in the preservation of about 12,500 individual films. This number is misleading since it includes unedited footage totals from the National Archives, which have been reduced arbitrarily to titles for comparison purposes (2). There are about 30,000 additional titles still on nitrate base only, collectively held by the United States archives. Depending upon the collective progress in the next twenty years that it will take to complete the preservation work at present rates, there may be an additional 20,000 titles that will be acquired by these archives for preservation.

Even if preservation funding keeps pace with deterioration and loss, no more than one-third of the United States theatrical production made before 1950 will be preserved in archives. Hopefully, film producers and distributors will retain copies of the other surviving films. In this context, selection

is very easy. Any film made prior to 1920 is always acquired for preservation, and the earlier a film was produced, the higher is the priority, since the losses are greatest for the earliest films.

However, once we reach the mid 1920's, selection factors do come into play, since proportionately more films survive. The American Film Institute has inadvertently cornered the market for the "B" films of Kenneth McDonald. He began work in 1923, reached his peak in 1925, made his last film in 1928, and was never heard from again. After acquiring more than half of his 22 films, we found it difficult to tell one of these routine programmers from another. As a result, we began to pass up any further Kenneth McDonald films. Fortunately, the UCLA Film Archives didn't have any of his productions and they were willing to acquire several of his films which we passed up.

An informal, ad-hoc understanding such as this may be satisfactory for formula "B" films of the 1920's ; however, preserving the output of the major Hollywood studios requires a different approach : an informal system of studio adoption. Under this arrangement, the individual United States archive which has been able to develop the best working relationship with a given producer will gradually take over its collections for archival preservation, without interference or competition from the other archives. The George Eastman House has a long-standing relationship with MGM and considerable holdings of their original nitrate materials. The Museum of Modern Art has substantial holdings from Fox. UCLA Film Archives has a major collection from National Telefilm Associates, which includes the output of a number of now-defunct producers of the thirties and forties, such as Republic Studios. The Library of Congress, with the largest potential resources for preservation, holds the lion's share of production from Columbia, Paramount, RKO, Universal, and Warner Brothers, as well as a number of other, smaller producers. This division of holdings began by accident, but we have been careful to observe these divisions and concentrate a given producer's holdings in a single archive, rather than spread them among several different and geographically separated repositories.

There have been occasional breakdowns, mostly back to the late 1960's when these divisions of labor were being formed. AFI, for example, copied seven

important Fox films. While these are now in the AFI Collection at the Library of Congress, hundreds of equivalent Fox titles are being preserved either at UCLA or the Museum of Modern Art. From the point of view of the researcher, it doesn't make sense to have Fox's output split in these three ways. This situation should be corrected in the future, and prints of our seven Fox orphans will probably be turned over to the most appropriate archive.

The odd split in Fox's production between the Museum of Modern Art and UCLA is a tangled story. The Museum's long-standing, gradual, selective relationship with Fox was interrupted one day by the discovery of an overlooked cache of early sound Fox productions, found somewhere on their back lot. These were offered to the Museum for preservation, with Fox agreeing to retain any of the films that the Museum did not want. The Museum, not able to take the entire collection of over 100 titles, elected to select from the group by analyzing the list of film titles and credits, picking those which were thought to be of importance : features with familiar titles, well-known directors, actors or technicians whose subsequent work was well-known, etc. Thus the Museum selected the "best" or the most "important" or the most "well-known" pictures, leaving a collection that temporarily was in limbo until the UCLA Film Archives took over the remaining films a few years later when Fox threatened to junk them. Today, the Museum and UCLA are jointly preserving these remaining films, which include some very "obscure" motion pictures that appear in retrospect to be as interesting and worthy of preservation as the group which the Museum first selected.

This example illustrates the changes we have had in our nitrate preservation system, due to the increasing selectivity of the archives as they grow older and acquire experience. The Museum of Modern Art has always been very selective, compared with the newer archives, because of the fundamental mission of the Museum as a whole and its emphasis on the art of the cinema and related areas. When the American Film Institute was formed, there was a considerable amount of nitrate material still outside the archives, in the hands of film producers and distributors and an incredible number of private collectors. We very rapidly gathered over 8000 nitrate films in the first four years of the acquisition program (the present total is over 16,000). This wasn't very

difficult to do, because we were taking anything we could find. There was so little selection involved that we were willing to take in any nitrate as long as there was still some recognizable image left on the film. At the beginning of the program in 1968, the gaps in the collective holdings of the United States archives were so great that we did not need to be selective, since almost any new acquisition was going to be otherwise "lost". With the growing acquisitions of all of the United States archives, the gaps have been filling up and as we have grown older and more experienced, we have become more selective at AFI. Fortunately, the UCLA Film Archives began to broaden its acquisition policies and efforts at about the same time we began to be more selective. UCLA began to acquire types of films that were inadequately represented in their collections, but very well represented in ours. This situation resulted in a productive working relationship ; but lately, even UCLA has become more selective, realizing the magnitudes of the preservation burden that they have assumed through major acquisitions of nitrate collections. The preservation of the nitrate films remaining outside the archives, especially the more marginal material, may require that yet another major institution be formed, hopefully with its own separate, previously-untapped sources of funding. If such an institution would suddenly spring into existence, eager to build a large collection of its own, it would be of great service to the current archives since it would help carry the remaining burden of nitrate preservation work.

We have recently taken the first steps to formalize the selection policies and practices of The American Film Institute and the Library of Congress into a formal document (see Appendix 6). While this is still in draft form and is written with the AFI Collection at the Library of Congress in mind, it has a broader applicability in the United States since all of the major archives are collaboratively working to preserve the same film heritage. The paper itself was produced at the impetus of the management of the Library of Congress who wished to see a better policy statement of what and why films were being acquired, consistent with the selection policies of the Library in other areas. Even in draft form, it provides some interesting observations. The guidelines for the acceptance of materials include the obvious criteria, written in a general manner. What is of more interest is the kind of reasoning that could be applied to a specific film, for example, a two reel short

called FARM FOLLIES, made by Universal in the mid-twenties. This film stars Queenie, the horse, playing herself, and is an indescribably bad slapstick comedy, clearly made very cheaply, with no obvious values. We acquired it for preservation. If we had to formally justify this action, we could argue that if this film had been made in the teens, it should be preserved since so few films survive from that period. If (as this film did) it came from the twenties, we could argue that it should be preserved because few of Universal's films from this period survive, so that this film would add significantly to the body of surviving films available for research. If, however, the film had been made in the thirties, we might argue (but with lessening conviction) that it demonstrated the attitude of Hollywood production as it reflected stereotypes of life in rural communities in America. Finally, if this film had been made in the forties, when the quality of short film production was dropping, we might argue (by a great stretch of the imagination) that this was an unusual film because Queenie the horse had billing above all the other actors, giving it a uniqueness with respect to other short films from that period. In fact, it was by this latter reasoning that FARM FOLLIES actually was selected for showing at the Museum of Modern Art as part of an extended series of films produced by Universal several years ago. It was shown on the same program with FRANCIS THE TALKING MULE...

In terms of the guidelines for the rejection of materials, the first statement is that if a film fails to meet the general acceptance criteria, then it probably should not be acquired. Another key is that material generally is rejected if equivalent holdings exist in other United States archives, and that the film has been preserved in copies of verified high quality. There are exceptions to this rule, because there are a few films which are of such importance that they should be held in as many archives as possible, with duplicate preservation materials.

Another category of materials that are generally rejected is stock footage lacking documentation aids. Out-takes are another example, simply because there is far too much material available for the asking, which could easily flood any archive. Pre-production and by-products of distribution elements

are generally avoided as well, especially those relating to foreign versions of American films, including subtitle bands, inserts, trims, overlays, etc. Amateur films are generally rejected, including home movies, student films, etc. This decision is partly a reaction to the average quality of this genre, but it also recognizes its quantity and non-theatrical nature which will be discussed later on. Finally, foreign films are generally not acquired as nitrate for preservation. While films made in the United States have been the highest preservation priorities, the broad impact and influence of foreign productions has made them a part of this country's film heritage, making it necessary to acquire and preserve selected samples. There are additional considerations such as comparing the costs of copying a film in hand with the costs of importing the original version from a FIAF archive and then producing a subtitled version that would be accessible to United States audiences. This perhaps is a discussion for another time, but it is a general problem that bears directly on the work of FIAF. Finally, since in most cases foreign films are preserved in their country of origin, the copying of these films in the United States would be done principally for reference purposes, rather than for preservation purposes.

To select a film for preservation in the United States' system usually takes just one vote of one individual within any one of the archives. These individuals are idiosyncratic in many ways, and have different tastes, interests, and judgements. This can be very helpful, for example, when considering the silent slapstick comedies, especially those which continued to proliferate in the twenties. Setting aside those featuring the handful of top comedians, there remains a large group of interesting, but marginal productions. At present, the AFI Collection is heavily represented in this area, with scores of films made by obscure comics. The depth is so great that we are beginning to be more selective with new acquisitions. Fortunately, the Museum of Modern Art has developed an interest in this area, and will begin expanding their holdings as we slow down our acquisitions. Given the geographic scope of the United States, spreading the preserved films of this genre among several archives will actually result in easier access for researchers seeking to view a sampling of 1920's slapstick comedy.

A remaining problem relates to the quality of the preservation materials in



United States archives. It wasn't until the late 1960's that the major film producers began to turn wholesale quantities of original negatives and other preprint materials over to the archives for preservation. Prior to this time, the archives were able to obtain release prints, but almost never high-quality preprint materials. As a result, as was the case at the Museum of Modern Art, early preservation copies were nitrate duplicate negatives made from prints. By today's standards, these are not adequate quality preservation, but it was the only approach available to the Museum in the thirties and forties. As it turns out, in most cases with films from the silent period, the original materials in the hands of the producers never survived into the sixties, and the holdings at the Museum have become the only surviving materials, therefore the best surviving materials, thereby justifying the Museum's previous actions. A parallel problem exists for films made in the triacetate period after 1950, which will be discussed later.

The newsreels from the nitrate period are a more complicated problem. We are fortunate that the National Archives has been able to expand its mandate beyond only preserving materials produced by the United States Government, to preserving materials made in the private sector, the content of which reflects upon the Government, its operations, and its impact upon United States society. By this extension, they have been preserving a considerable amount of the surviving United States newsreels. A recent study done by a staff member of the National Archives indicates that there is about 120 million feet of nitrate left in private hands which is worth copying. This amount of material is so large that none of the other archives, particularly the non-governmental archives, could possibly handle it.

The selection problems for newsreels fall into two areas. Since the complete, edited release issues generally do not exist prior to 1940, any surviving copies are selected for preservation. The second area is the remaining 90 % of the iceberg, which is the unused out-take material. After the National Archives nitrate fire in 1978, a high-level management decision was made to convert all of the surviving nitrate as quickly as possible and to accept no film in the future on nitrate, but only acetate preservation copies made from nitrate. The implementation of this decision required the development

of selection and deselection criteria for handling the surviving nitrate out-take footage (see Appendix 7). What is of immediate interest is that the categories of material to be junked consisted of such things as human interest stories, cute kids, scooter races, disasters aside from the great "dust bowl" of the thirties, local, regional, and Canadian interest stories, fashion shows, ship launchings, foreign language versions, staged and dramatized materials, etc. As for the newsreel staple of sports coverage, all amateur and college sports were discarded along with anything else not of championship or Olympic stature. For sports, this would mean the retention of only 1 % of the existing material. These criteria were not theoretical, and actually were applied by the curatorial staff at the National Archives. Despite the apparent ruthlessness of the deselection guidelines, the result was the retention of about 60 % of all surviving out-take materials. On reflection, this might be a reasonable figure for this type of footage. In many cases, there did exist an edited story which was preserved, so that there exists some footage on most subjects.

The most encouraging development for saving newsreels is the establishment of a new archive at the University of South Carolina. Twentieth-Century Fox will be donating its entire newsreel collection to the University, and will finance the conversion of more than 50 million feet of nitrate to acetate. The University will acquire the collection as acetate and will have approximately 90 million feet of newsreel footage stored and handled to archival standards in a new facility. This new archive, once it is established and becomes operational, will be responsible for 50 million feet of nitrate out of the estimated 120 million worth copying. We hope that this will permit the National Archives to turn its attention to the other major newsreel collections which are as yet uncopied.

THE POST NITRATE PERIOD

The preceeding sketch of the nitrate period was basically the good news, the manageable part of the preservation task. The bad news is the current nightmare : everything that comes after 1950 on acetate film or videotape. The first problem is that, generally speaking, the archives cannot obtain preprint materials for films made in this period ; this is parallel to the problems faced by the Museum of Modern Art in the thirties when they began to collect film prints. With the exception of some black and white television productions, it is unlikely that producers are going to be in a position or be willing to turn over wholesale amounts of original negatives or finegrains, whether black and white or color, to the archives for preservation. The risk and danger of storing nitrate films are not present, and the tax incentives are not the same as in the late 1960's. Furthermore, the archives cannot afford to preserve color or tape, at least with present technology, even if they had the original materials available to copy. The bulk of post-1950 films acquired by the archives have been release prints. In some cases, these are good, new prints, but most are simply used release prints. In either case, these prints are used for reference purposes within the archive. Thus, the preservation/reference collection dichotomy has come back to haunt the curators of the preservation collections. There really isn't that much which can be done to remedy this situation, certainly when the total amount of United States production is considered.

For the triacetate period, about 10,000 theatrical features were made in the United States, and about 16,000 short films, giving a total of about 26,000 theatrical titles. This compares with about 240,000 theatrical titles made in the rest of the world (3). But numerically, however, the theatrical area is only part of our concern. In the non-theatrical field, which is non-television and non-commercial production, the United States output is on the order of 450,000 titles, compared with perhaps 120,000 foreign. And as for network television, approximately (4) 250,000 titles have been produced in the United States, compared with about 220,000 foreign telecasts. These do not include television commercials, but the United States lead the world with approximately 775,000 compared with 100,000 foreign commercials.

Thus the total number of titles produced in the United States in this period is in excess of 1.5 million, an enormous, enormous number. Just how this backlog can be handled will be the archival challenge for the next 25 years, and it may even turn out to be the challenge for the next generation or two of archivists.

In the theatrical area, the Library of Congress has a good representative sample of feature films, but these are prints which are viewed on a demand basis by researchers. Current annual acquisitions are between 175 and 200 features via copyright deposit. In addition, about 100 made-for-television features are being acquired each year. The other archives which are not blessed with a statutory deposit system do not have the funds to purchase theatrical films, but instead must rely upon traditional methods of begging, borrowing, etc. Hence, the Library of Congress will continue to maintain the core collection of feature films in the foreseeable future.

One large portion of the United States feature production is the sex-exploitation film. Until the mid 1970's, there are relatively few of this genre in the collections of the Library of Congress. This was due to the reluctance of the producers to turn a copy of such a film over to the Government for fear that the print subsequently would be used as evidence against them in court proceedings. We have, however, been able to circumvent this by having certain cooperative producers turn representative samples of this genre over to the other, non-governmental archives, where they will be quietly stored for the future, when the social acceptance of "pornographic" films may make them more accessible to scholars and researchers. Due to a number of complicated factors, the number of sex-exploitation films being deposited each year has recently been steadily increasing at the Library of Congress. After a careful study of a number of these films by the Library's staff, they are retaining only about 10 % of those submitted for copyright deposit, since the staff found the bulk of this genre to be duplicative, boring, and repetitious.

The non-theatrical area consists generally of films made on 8mm and 16mm and also videotape productions for non-broadcast purposes. The subjects include educational films, training films, certain documentaries, U.S. Government production, independent productions, experimental films and student films.

Aside from the National Archives' holdings of government production, only the Library of Congress has substantial holdings in this area, acquired through copyright deposit. This selection process strives for a broad sampling of the variety of current productions which document United States life and culture.

A new archive is presently developing at the University of Iowa, called the American Archives of Factual Film, which will specialize on the informational, industrial, and factual film production. This archive is being established within the context of an institution heavily involved in technology and its applications, and is an appropriate place for such a concentration. It is hoped that the American Archives of Factual Film will grow to assume the chief responsibility for its area and assemble a broad crosssection of archival material. As with the University of South Carolina newsreel collection, this will help the existing archives by freeing them to concentrate on their own areas of specialization.

The National Archives' selection policy is titled "General Records Schedule # 21", which governs the selection criteria for government productions. This document was put together by a committee and applies to all audiovisual materials considered for permanent retention by the National Archives. In general, the National Archives selects for review all of the output of the Government, but what is kept for final retention amounts to about 1 % overall of available material. For audiovisual materials, however, the retention rate is about 20 %. This figure might serve as a reasonable guide for a retention rate for non-theatrical materials in general.

The Anthology Film Archives has been grappling for years with the problems of the independent filmmaker, both present and past, and is gradually making inroads into the handling of this specialized area of production, in cooperation with the Museum of Modern Art.

TELEVISION

Like nitrate film, television productions have suffered severe losses. This misfortune is due in part to the nature of early live broadcasting ; if any permanent copies were made of a broadcast, they were most likely single kinescope copies of inferior quality. Videotape is not permanent, since it can be erased, and it suffers from instability problems that may turn out to be as great as those for nitrate film and color emulsions. Furthermore, much of television's programming was considered by its creators to be too ephemeral to warrant any retention since there was no profitable re-use potential. Since the United States' networks no longer have ownership of the programs they broadcast outside of news and certain documentaries, the bulk of past television programming is scattered in the hands of a myriad of original producers and their successors, many of who are difficult to locate. While there are no accurate estimates of either the total number of productions or the rates of survival, we can guess that pre-1970 programs will have losses well over 50 %. One symptom of the general problem is the status of the nightly news broadcasts, which were not retained on an "as broadcast" format by anyone until 1968 when two individuals at Vanderbilt University unilaterally decided to begin recording them off the air. It wasn't until eight years later that the National Archives began to do the same thing. As a result, virtually no news broadcasts survive before 1968, and much of what does exist is captured in copies-for-the-record on videotape of less than broadcast quality.

Television commercials have been discussed briefly in terms of their being the single largest component of current United States production of all moving images. There are many who would argue that the commercials are often more important and interesting than the programs they support. And then there are some elaborate commercials whose production costs are in excess of \$ 50,000 per minute. In fact, it is possible that the total production costs of the commercials within a given program may exceed the actual costs of the program itself. Certainly, their impact has been enormous and some preservation is required, but the overwhelming quantity calls for stringent selection and the development of different, more economical ways of handling and cataloging them. Hopefully, as archival off-the-air

recording of television becomes more prevalent, the capture of television commercials within the context of normal broadcasts will improve the overall retention rate. The Library of Congress currently receives 100 to 200 per year through copyright deposit as well as many others inadvertently incorporated within regular programs, but the total is insignificant compared with an estimated annual production of over 40,000.

There is a private organization which gives "Clio" awards for quality commercials, and consequently has built a retrospective collection numbering over 100,000. This non-archival collection is highly selective, since, as with the University of Georgia collection, they were selected for submission by the sponsors or producers. Hence, the collection can be presumed to consist of the "best", the most "elaborate", the most "creative", or the most "expensive" commercials, whereas an archive would be interested in a much broader cross selection, also including commercials which were shown most often, and which were the most effective in influencing their intended audiences. Sometimes, it is dangerous to limit selection to award-winners, especially when the selection criteria are unrelated to archival considerations.

The area of political commercials is perhaps more interesting, but they are quite difficult to obtain, since political candidates generally prefer not to be reminded of their previous campaign promises. One private collection of over 5000 items spanning 25 years exists and will hopefully find its way into an archive.

If we examine the regional nature of broadcasting in the United States, there are almost 1000 individual television stations, much of whose programming is tailored to meet community needs, including local production. What is seen in one city may be somewhat different, and in some cases, entirely different from one station to another, depending upon network affiliations, syndication of prepackaged programming, etc. The quantities of programs simply build up too quickly for a national institution to even attempt to deal with the differences in broadcast programming. For instance, if only half of these television stations were to originate three locally produced shows each day, the total annual production of all these stations would be

547,000 individual shows ! The best archiving that can be accomplished in this area is to encourage the development of regional archives, operating on and supported at the state level, which would specialize in gathering audiovisual relating to their state or region. This has been a slow development, and at present, there are only twelve institutions engaged in this type of work.

If we look ahead and examine the new technological development, the problem only becomes worse. There are, for instance, over 4,300 cable television systems operating in the United States, serving over 16 million homes. While much of the material distributed on these systems has been used before, or consists of theatrical feature films, these systems have provisions for the transmission of local community-originated programming. In addition, there are networking programming services developing that serve many of these cable systems and operate on an around-the-clock basis. There already is a network with continuous news, another for sports, and three networks whose programming is religious in nature. Overall, there are perhaps 11,000 programs annually being distributed through these systems with a reach going beyond that of a single, local station. Further developments in programs produced for direct sale to consumers on videotape or videodisc will only complicate the problem of acquiring and preserving even random samples of this material.

The archives which deal with television materials are considerably more diverse and a bit less coordinated than the nitrate-preserving institutions. This is in part an institutional age factor but also reflects the fact that it is considerably easier to acquire television materials for immediate reference use than it is to acquire nitrate originals. For this reason, most of the television collections in the United States are used for reference purposes.

The Museum of Broadcasting was established several years ago with funding from William Paley of CBS. The Museum has selected and acquired over 4400 programs spanning the entire history of broadcast television and is currently acquiring material at the rate of 1000 hours per year (5). These programs are all converted to a common 3/4" format for master videotape copies, and



duplicate copies on 1/2" format are used for reference. While this is not preservation in the original gauge, it does create a manageable simplicity in handling the materials. Since all copies are on magnetic tape, there are no preservation copies. However, it may well develop that this type of system will be the only economical way to handle any sizeable quantity of television material. We may have to abandon the idea of retaining the moving image in the best possible quality, in the original gauge, in a permanent format, in exchange for the ability to keep quantities of it readily available for reference purposes. The Library of Congress has built a collection of 15-20,000 television programs over the years, and continues to acquire material through copyright deposit. The selection is made by two reference librarians, based on their own knowledge and experience and general selection criteria (see Appendix 8). They select all news and documentaries, and virtually all specials that are broadcast, but do use some selectivity for other non-fiction materials, and sample fiction series, retaining about 50 % of the latter category. The selection process is based on paper materials generated by the Copyright Office from information submitted by the copyright claimants, rather than by viewing the individual programs themselves.

Of interest for the future is the change in the copyright law which gives the Library the power to enforce compliance, to demand the deposit of a program whenever it is first published with copyright notice in the United States. The problem here is that the reference librarians who select from 8000 copyright deposits annually estimate that there are at least double or triple this number of programs created each year that could be subject to this selection process, calling for a larger staff and considerably more time and effort to expand the acquisition and selection process.

Looking at the United States production on a prospective basis, the current total annual production is difficult to estimate. It can be figured (6) to contain a minimum of 400 theatrical films, 15,000 private video productions for non-broadcast use, 4,500 films and 29,200 videotapes made by or for the United States Government, about 15,000 16mm films made for non-theatrical purposes, 11,000 programs for cable television network systems shown in more than one city, and roughly 10,000 programs broadcast on network television. Excluding approximately 40,000 television commercials

and an uncountable number of local television productions, this produces a minimum yearly production total of at least 85,000.

These figures raise even more questions, beginning with the fundamental one : what should we do ? The answer lies in some sort of selection scheme, perhaps in stages, with one generation of curators reviewing the selection of their predecessors in order to deselect materials judged unimportant after the passage of 50 or more years. The next question is how can the archives preserve even a portion of this mass of material ? For the United States, I cannot foresee anything but a continuation and expansion of the existing system, which attempts to spread the work out to as many institutions that are willing to carry a share of the national burden. We will need to continue to develop a wide diversification of specialized archives, working in concert with the existing institutions through a coordinated network. We will also have to encourage the development of archives within the producing organizations themselves, and ask them to take some responsibility for the continued existence of their own work. Finally, we will seriously have to consider the tradeoffs between preservation according to high quality standards (expensive) of a small amount of rigidly selected material, versus a system of conservation for the record, sacrificing quality for the ability to retain a maximal portion of the exploding moving image heritage of the twentieth century.

(1) This estimate is based on a number of sources. There were about 110,000 motion pictures registered for copyright through 1949, including, of course, a number of non-theatrical titles. Lauritzen's AMERICAN FILM INDEX 1908-1915 lists 23,000 films during this eight year period, an average of 3,000 per year. Data extracted from Fielding's THE AMERICAN NEWSREEL indicates that eight major newsreel producers made two releases a week for a collective 295 years, yielding 30,000 individual issues. Combining this information with the counts from the AFI CATALOG yields :

<u>period</u>	<u>#features</u>	<u>survival</u>	<u>#shorts</u>
pre 1910	-	-	30,000
teens	4,000	15 %	30,000
20's	6,606	25 %	25,000
30's	5,500	75 %	20,000
40's	5,000	90 %	15,000
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	21,106	52 %	120,000

## (2) ESTIMATES OF NITRATE FILMS PRESERVED 1968-1979

YEAR	AFI ARCHIVES		LIBRARY OF CONGRESS		MUSEUM MODERN ART		IMP/GEH		UCLA FILM ARCHIVES		NATIONAL ARCHIVES		GRAND TOTAL	
	Titles	Footage	Titles	Footage	Titles	Footage	Titles	Footage	Titles	Footage	Titles	Footage	Titles	Footage
1968	1	3,000**									100**	500,000**	101	503,000
1969	83	249,000**	130**	520,000							100**	500,000**	313	1,269,000
1970	47	141,000**	200**	800,000							100**	500,000**	347	1,441,000
1971	39	117,000**	125**	500,000							100**	500,000**	264	1,117,000
1972	53	159,000**	255**	1,097,000	317	865,000**	51	204,000**			100**	1,000,000**	776	3,325,000
1973	97	291,000**	651**	2,573,000	214	584,000**	128	512,000**			100**	950,000**	1,190	4,910,000
1974	99	297,000**	767**	3,457,000	100	273,000**	61	244,000**			100**	900,000**	1,127	5,171,000
1975	76	228,000**	1,036**	3,816,000	89	243,000**					100**	850,000**	1,301	5,137,000
1976	64	192,000**	1,511**	4,642,000	102	278,000**	74	296,000**			100**	800,000**	1,851	6,208,000
1977	27	81,000**	2,359**	6,040,000	79	215,000**	121	484,000**			100**	750,000**	2,686	7,570,000
1978	22	66,000**	1,201**	3,743,000	81	221,000**	56	224,000**	37	80,000	100**	1,000,000**	1,497	5,334,000
1979	49	145,000**	500**	1,500,000	122	400,000**	54	282,000**	46	219,500	200**	3,600,000**	1,066	6,221,000
GRAND TOTAL	657	1,969,000**	8,735**	28,688,000	1,104	3,085,000**	545	2,246,000**	83	299,500	1,300**	11,850,000**	12,519	48,206,500

\*\* ESTIMATED

- (3) These estimates are based on the following figures :

period	#features	#shorts & newsreels
50's	4,000	10,000
60's	3,184	5,000
70's	3,000	1,000
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>10,184</u>	<u>16,000</u>

Some very interesting estimates of film production totals worldwide appear in THE HOPE REPORTS PERSPECTIVE, November 1977, covering the period from 1915 to 1977. These figures have been extrapolated and partially compensated for to include videotape productions.

- (4) This estimate of television production is undoubtedly low. It includes network programs broadcast to more than one city. The assumptions made for this estimate are that, over 33 years from 1948 to 1980 inclusive, there were three commercial networks broadcasting an average of 8 hours per day. The total hours broadcast are then reduced by 50 % to compensate for repeats of individual programs and for movies originally made for theatrical release. Assuming an average length of 45 minutes per title, this yields an estimated 192,192 individual, unique programs broadcast. The PBS/WNET system has generated an estimated 35,500 programs during this period (Private Communication, Alan Lewis, Director of Public Television Archives). The remaining 6 hours of broadcasting per day on a typical station would include syndicated programs that were sold across the country to individual stations without having first been broadcast on a network, as well as local programming. Counting only 25 % of this time as having been broadcast on more than one station yields an additional 24,024 programs. The total of these three figures is 251,724 programs. This total is consistent with, although somewhat lower than the estimates of Hope, or those which can be extracted from the tabulated data presented in Lichty & Topping's 1977 AMERICAN BROADCASTING, A SOURCE BOOK ON THE HISTORY OF RADIO AND TELEVISION.

- (5) According to Mary V. Ahern, Curator of the Museum of Broadcasting (Private Communication), the selection of programs for the Museum is a complex procedure based on professional judgement and primarily aimed at representing broadcasting of the United States from the 1920's on. The Museum is selecting milestone specials, performing arts, documentaries, interviews, sports, and children's programs as well as top-rated series and full days from around the country. The Museum also has special collections in the International, Presidential and World War II sections. The Museum opened in 1976 and the selection procedures were established in 1975 and 1976.
- (6) These figures are drawn from a variety of sources. PRIVATE TELEVISION COMMUNICATIONS by J.M. and D.P. Brush (1977) provides an estimate based on surveys of users and producers in this area. The National Audiovisual Center's annual report for 1979 on Federal Audiovisual Activity provides detailed figures for production within the Executive Branch of the Government. Interestingly, over 75 % of these productions were for the Department of Defense. The HOPE REPORT PERSPECTIVES provides data on 16mm production for non-theatrical purposes. Finally, the recent ACCESS II : INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS HANDBOOK OF SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (1980), surveys the cable network systems with considerable detail on hours of operation, type of programming, etc.

QUESTIONSEileen Bowser

*I would like to know what is the percentage of current American films submitted for copyright that's now retained by the Library of Congress ?*

Karr

*That's about 70 percent of all materials that can be selected - those are retained.*

Jon Stenklev

*I'm asking for a figure that I know is impossible to give, but an estimate anyhow : to what extent have European archives and other archives been able to fill the gaps in your national production you talked about in the beginning of your exposé here ?*

Karr

*For the nitrate period ? The main interchanges of nitrate film have been done by the MOMA - that's been part of developing their own collection. There hasn't been that much of American nitrate coming from the other FIAF archives into the U.S.A. In part, wherever possible, we try to avoid this, if there is a preserved copy or only an acetate copy in a FIAF member, we would rather spend our money now copying on protected nitrate and leave the task for twenty, fifty years from now to actually physically bring back to the U.S. the materials that are held by FIAF members. There are of course exceptions and films of unusual, immediate need or immediate merit. But what is important for us is to know of unprotected nitrate films in FIAF archives that have not been copied and which will not be copied. And this is one task we've been working and the MOMA has been making major investigation in these collections. But we're simply in our holding pattern... most of the archives are. It is important for us to know of the existence of materials, so the Embryo Project is vital for American archives as was the new edition of the silent feature films catalogue.*

Robert Daudelin

*Your paper dealt mostly with your national production. What about foreign films, which are so massively distributed in your country?*

Karr

*Most theatrical foreign films were not registered for copyright prior to 1978, and it's a little unclear what's going to happen in the future. Generally speaking, foreign films are only being protected at the moment at the MOMA.*

Eileen Bowser

*I just wanted to point out that we have a situation in reverse. I know that many European archives are acquiring the American product from their distributors. It's much easier for us to acquire foreign films from these distributors than from the American distributors. At the end of their distribution rights, many of them are happy to turn them over to us. I can't give you any figures, we don't have all of them, but in quite large quantities.*



## On the Structure of an Evaluating System for Audiovisual Materials in the GDR

Günter Schulz - German Democratic Republic

Today there is no doubt, that a high practical, historic and artistic-aesthetic value must be attributed to audiovisual materials as document and work of art and has led to an increased demand for their preservation. This finds expression in corresponding statements on "filmed and transmitted information" in the Final Act of the Helsinki-Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe of August 1, 1975 as well as in efforts made by UNESCO and various international organizations, not lastly by FIAF.

In the beginning this trend was accompanied by the exclusive endeavour to collect everything, to close the gaps and to establish optimal conditions : in the GDR too. In 1967 the central store in Berlin-Wilhelmshagen was inaugurated on the occasion of the FIAF-Conference which took place there. The available holding capacity gave rise to optimism for a longer-lasting storage capacity in the field of acetate films.

Yet already in 1975 there had emerged signs of a total utilization. The construction of a new vault, this time for coloured material, has to be started, but also new considerations had to be taken in order to prevent its early fullness. An investigation in the GDR showed, that an annual quantity of between 90 and 100 tons result from the total field of production, including studios of film and TV-production, of industry and the sphere of education, the organized activities of amateur filmers and the taking over of materials from other countries by distribution (in consideration of the classic kind of storing : 1 positive, 1 negative, 1 dupe-positive). This amounts to the construction of such a colour-film vault for 800 tons, as it is now completed, every ten years at present costing around 10 million marks.

This clearly increasing quantity of materials has in general led to three major problems :

- The utilization of the present storage capacity, regarding television, the

- central laboratory of GDR, the studios, etc.,
- the lack of separation between useful und useless materials and
  - a defective depth of recording contents and subject components.

Changes toward the practised method of complete preservation of all materials become, side-by-side with the construction of new vaults, a cogent need. The realisation of introducing the reduction of materials by means of evaluation is therefore in the GDR not a spontaneous brainwave but a social requirement in order to achieve, by way of a positive selection according to value, a separation between valuable materials and those which are not worth being scored up under optimal conditions, and to prevent uncontrolled cassation.

The evaluation of audiovisual materials as documents and works of art should not - of course - amount to an uncontrolled reduction, but must take place, as far as it is possible, on the basis of objective standards. It is essentially determined by the prevailing ideological position, that means the ideological point of view finds direct expression in the historic approach and evaluation. An international system of evaluation can therefore be achieved only with difficulty, but joint analyses of the basic problems and the solving of general methodological questions can be aspired and positive results can be expected.

In each case we orient at ourselves on the analysis of the contents by assessing the importance of the presented object and/or action, the degree of completeness and the objective by including the origin, the time and place of production, the purpose of its utilization and time of first screening.

In this connexion we also have to identify, control the authenticity of the facts and to look into the manual dependence on sources in different forms (sound, printed, etc.).

Over and beyond the value of the presented informations - as far as it is relevant - the artistic-aesthetic value is assessed, that means how the communicative, the social, the pedagogic and the creative functions have been

reached between the ideological-emotional content and the form of the work, of the significance and symbols (including the quality of the means of artistic expression).

Likewise included are the quantity of material per title, the kind of originality and the physical condition, the photographic, electro-mechanic and mechanical quality. Also legal issues, such as regulations concerning licence and copyright issues are taken into consideration just as specialized or new technical processes, trend and schools of art, etc.

The evaluation must, proceeding from these criteria, aim at three decisions for audiovisual materials in the GDR :

1. complete permanent storing, that means one positive and one negative per title ;
2. temporary complete storing for 5 to 10 years, followed by reducing to a negative or a positive or total cassation after a new decision ;
3. total cassation in the archive's preliminary work.

In order to reach that, the evaluation must be based on the knowledge of the historic conditions, which form the individual work. In such a way the evaluating person must possess a large treasure of specific datas, etc., because the more knowledge, the more precise will be the evaluator's idea about the object and his ability for correct understanding.

For realizing such evaluating processes in the GDR the emphasis is placed on the transformation of the Staatliches Filmarchiv, which had been in the first place an administrative and final archive of the film industry, into a central final archive of the GDR (including television, industrial studios and organized amateur filming). Such a method of systematic complementing makes precise legal safeguardings necessary. In 1979, a regulation on legal deposit for audiovisual materials and documents for the field of the film industry was put into force. In order to cover all producers and distributors of such materials in the GDR, a central legal deposit regulation at government level will become important.

To achieve this aim of evaluation forms of organization and technological processes must be applied which will be introduced step by step :

- extension of the scope of responsibilities of the group, set up at the Staatliches Filmarchiv of the GDR, for the field of film-institutions and as coordinating organ for television ;
- transformation of the existing production archives to intermediate archives ;
- setting up of an internal and a central commission as decision-making bodies at the central final archive ;
- extension of the legal-deposit regulation and adoption of cassations regulations for the territory of the GDR ;
- a regular exchange of information between the partners;
- setting up of storage systems for temporary materials and final materials in the archive ;
- technologies for evaluation and admission ;
- and last but not least : close international cooperation in order to safeguard the exchange of informations and materials.

Of course it needs a lengthy period to manage such a system for the GDR, we have to start now, because the problems around us make it necessary, and that means to "create" gaps, not uncontrolled, but consciously.

## QUESTIONS

### Bob Rosen

Ten years after a technology is finished, it's outmoded, but 30 years later, it's part of the history of technology. How do you decide to reject a film at one point when its value to the researcher would change at a later point in history?

### G. Schulz

I know this is a problem but we have many films of that kind, as I mentioned. I think it is enough to store one film of the same kind, and the other film we decide to store up e.g. 5-10 years, and we have many documentation materials/contents, etc., and after 5-10 years, we submit the film to the internal commission, and the commission has to make a decision. And sometimes it's necessary to see the film again. But for the Staatliches Film Archiv, it would be impossible to select all the material from television. And we fight for such a commission in the TV, too. We get a later selected material from TV. It is not easy, but we must try it in order not to fill up our vaults within ten years, and have no space left. This is also a criterion for us : a social, economic one.

### Kahlenberg

Thank you very much for bringing up a negative example of the selection work. I think this has to be appreciated. There is one remaining question : I think you have brought us an example which has been distributed quite often within the GDR in 59 and 60 following years. What strikes me is that if you give this foreign film for destruction, of course you don't have the chance to get to the pictures afterwards by asking Czech colleagues to lend you a copy if there is a need for it. But of course you lose the synchronized German version, and there might be differences among those as they have been prepared originally which had been thought to be applicable for the distribution in the GDR. Would you be prepared to store a simple tape with the German sound or have you additional written material within the Staatliches Film Archiv relating to this film, which you give for destruction?

Schulz

We get the documentation materials' list for dubbing from the sound synchronisation (i.e. from the dubbing or synchronisation department), and we get the list from the feature films and from these films too. Therefore it would be possible to make a remake of the sound, if you need it, but I don't think it would be necessary. Another case : we would decide - we will decide - to store up the copy with the German language, when the film is important, with important components, etc. And we must have material for television, for the production, etc., and there we very often need the German language. This is difficult, we know it. This is the beginning, and we try to begin with negative examples, we must destroy something, we have no chance. I think for the countries with a big production, you must do it.

Vladimir Opěla

What other written materials go with a film print deposited in your film archive ?

Schulz

What documentation ? For feature film, we get documentation of the distribution, pictures, posters, and lists from the studios (i.e. dialogue lists) because every film is dubbed in the GDR and we get the lists, too. Now, since 1979, we have such a regulation, a legal regulation, that we must get these materials.

Blazenka Uργοšiková

I'm not sure I understood correctly, but you mentioned permanent deposit, temporary deposit and elimination/destruction. Is this really decided by one person as I understood ?

Schulz

No, we have a commission. Not only one person. We have an internal commission and an external commission, and these commissions decide, not one person alone.

Sam Kuia

I found it very valuable that you mentioned two different functions, as you put it : a "final selection", that is for permanent storage, and selection for intermediate activity, for limited time. My question is : do you have a possibility to select film material for a limited period of storage only for TV productions or for documentaries of official origin, or do you even decide about feature films of DEFA production, for instance, and for limited storage, too, or do you have a group of material which per se is destined to be stored permanently.

Schulz

We store permanently feature films and animation films, and temporarily more scientific popular films, for instance, commercials, documentaries, and a big group of colour film from TV, these are stored in our vaults too, and we must wait for their decision, therefore we have a temporary system of cataloguing and storing up.

Kahlenberg

An additional question : how is the internal committee formed ? Is it a hierarchical body or are your colleagues with the same rights ? How does it work ?

Schulz

The head of this commission is Mr. Lichtenstein, in the function of deputy director, and then we have scientific members with historic knowledge, and we have members from the technical department, too, in order to know what we can do with the material on technical basis.





## The selection of non-fiction film

Clive Coultass - Great Britain

I will try here to give the views of those historians who are interested in audio-visual materials about the kind of film or television productions they would like preserved for posterity. In fact there is not a total consensus about this and indeed most of them would probably say that one should preserve as much as possible and avoid the whole process of selection. Decisions about what to preserve and what to reject are so arbitrary and suspect that it is better in principle to keep everything. Any kind of film in time becomes interesting to someone. However, as archivists we recognize in practice the virtual impossibility of doing this, or at least of guaranteeing that it can be done, though one must keep constantly in mind the fact that new technology may change this situation in the most radical fashion in the near future.

I have chosen to deal in the main with non-fiction film. This does not mean of course that historians are disinterested in feature films. The contrary is true because feature films offer important historical and sociological evidence about the periods in which they were produced. In general though selection of feature films may be less controversial than that of non-fiction film.

It is possible to divide the period of production of visual images into two areas, one that of nitrate film and the second which succeeds it and which also roughly corresponds with the age of television. We all understand the nitrate problem and the struggle to preserve the heritage of film as an art form during that epoch, perhaps the Golden Age of film history, but preservation of the non-fiction film may have been a lower priority in the first instance. Naturally it is to this area which the historians now turn to seek assurances that everything possible may be done to re-print materials, before the inevitable progress of nitrate deterioration leads to the loss of much valuable historical evidence in visual terms about the first half of the present century.

The first concern must be with the various series of cinema newsreels which were the main medium of visual communication until the decade after the Second World War. Since these were produced commercially they have only usually fallen into the domain of public archives in different countries at a time when the problems of preservation and storage have proved to be uneconomic for the original companies. In most cases this has only happened at a time when great quantities of the nitrate film itself have been approaching a critical stage. The problem of American newsreels has been written about comprehensively by William T. Murphy of the National Archives and will be referred to in this symposium by Larry Karr of the American Film Institute. In Britain to date only one large collection, that of the important Visnews group, has passed into the hands of the public archives.

It is the view of historians that earnest endeavours should be made to preserve all of these series of newsreels, even where the actual coverage of events is duplicated. As far as possible, a newsreel needs to be seen as a whole, as an instrument of communication. Varying treatment of events by different newsreels also offers important kinds of evidence. In any case, a process of selection is likely to be time-consuming and indeed it may in cost terms equal the amount of expenditure required for preservation. As far as possible, the out-takes also should be preserved, representing as they do the pre-edited reality, and providing sources of information for the historian on what was selected for production and what left out, so promoting research on the reasons for these choices. Out-takes form a significant proportion of the collection at the National Archives in Washington DC, as indeed they do also at the Imperial War Museum which holds for instance the original mute camera rolls shot by the British units in the Second World War. In practice, the effort of selection from such material demands employment of so many staff and so many hours of viewing that it is usually more feasible to use funds on printing of it on a non-selective basis.

Historians would also recommend to archives that they should try to preserve as far as possible all other non-fiction films from this area if they already hold them or have the possibility of acquiring them. For those looking for selection criteria this may sound unhelpful but we are thinking now of a

period which ended nearly thirty years ago and already that amount of historical perspective makes almost any film on any subject interesting to someone or other in some way. Moreover, in fact the majority of archives are likely to print from nitrate by using different types of criteria, the first being the physical condition of the film itself, as assessed by routine testing methods. The next priority may be that of demand, the extent to which particular films are actually needed for research or production purposes, and an archive may arrange its printing programme to correspond with these. In fact, combining these two criteria seems to be as sound a method as any. There is always the risk that the full programme may never be completed and some material lost but in the developed countries at least the only solution can be provision of public funds, granted in response to pressure on governments from all those individuals and authorities concerned about our visual heritage. Obviously the impending UNESCO resolution will assist this cause.

If this programme of preservation appears to be needlessly non selective in terms of content, the point has to be emphasised again that even the most mundane film may give us information about the past. The value of a film in this respect must be judged differently from its value as a work of art. Naturally those documentaries which have a high artistic content will go to the top of anyone's selection list but the historian looks at film production from another angle. Incidentally, this also applies to feature films. If one preserved only the best films made by Hollywood to-morrow's student would see the achievements of that industry in a totally false light !

With the post-nitrate era we are concerned with the more recent past and with the future and in the case of non-fiction material with the deluge of television images which have taken over from the newsreels as the primary agent of visual communication. Again one might wish to preserve the whole of this output and indeed there is a powerful school of thought which argues that it should be attempted. Future researchers in history or mass communications will not be able to study in totality the presentation of contemporary events put forward by the media unless it is all preserved, just as national libraries keep the entire run of daily newspapers.

One member of the IAMHIST Council has been the strongest advocate of this view and indeed his own university in Britain has videotaped off the air full coverage of the last General Election. Archivists may argue that the domestic video format used in this case is inadequate but a university library thinking in the first place of an immediate study project rather than the aim of keeping material for the next generation may be able to seize the initiative on the grounds that something kept in some form is better than nothing. It is the kind of development which will be repeated elsewhere and it should be considered by FIAF in the light of the discussions which have taken place on the subject of the proliferation of film archives or of institutions with archival pretensions. The electronic age enormously increases the potential for recording, legally or illegally, and it is inevitable that more and different kinds of bodies will begin to hold audio-visual materials. If archivists feel, rightly, that the quality of many of these tapes is sub-standard, the reason may be that in the first place, the historian is looking for visual evidence and not necessarily for artistic or image quality. It must be the duty then of FIAF to educate the historian and to take part in a mutual exchange of information. If there has to be a declaration of principle from FIAF it should be that officially recognised archives are those which seek to preserve the image in the finest form possible, irrespective of content, whether fiction or non-fiction. Nevertheless, the fact that video enables other organisations to record outside the established archives is bound in time to pressurise them and may lead in some quarters to a body of opinion which suggests that archives are not doing their job properly unless they aim to keep the whole of television output.

In fact the archival situation is already more complicated than it was during the early years of FIAF. Some national archives are able to take television materials on deposit. In other countries television companies maintain their own libraries but usually with the intention only of keeping their material for re-transmission. It is an unusual situation for a company to allow access to researchers. Decisions on selection may be made by producers or supervising librarians but there is rarely a consistent or informed policy. In the background is the suspicion that the video age creates the constant temptation to economise by wiping tapes and re-using them rather than keeping them for posterity.

Whatever the circumstances, if in the end it is necessary to make selections, the first aim ought to be to monitor both the distribution of non-fiction film and the production of broadcast materials. The archive must take active steps to record information about this huge output. It is not possible to do this on a haphazard basis, for instance simply on the recommendations from time to time of some interesting programme which someone happens to see on television. Having recorded the information, the process of selection should be undertaken by an informed group, which may include representatives from the archive, those perhaps concerned with the productions themselves, and independent experts in various intellectual fields.

I would like to take the examples of the selection committees of the National Film Archive in Britain as a model for these procedures. Clyde Jeavons is talking about these at greater length but some important points of principle might be isolated. One is the representation of divergent interests which add up to substantially more than the views of the producers of the films themselves, even though they also may be represented. For a television company, for instance, to select its own material without reference to historians or to experts in similar fields is rather like print journalists having the option of choosing for conservation or destroying what they have written in the past. I think one can quite easily see what might happen in those circumstances. There is also the situation in many countries where government departments select their own records for preservation and fortunately in Britain at least in the case of film this is now done in consultation with the staff of the archives.

Another principle operated by the National Film Archive's committees is that a film should be preserved even if only one member feels that there is a valid reason for doing so. This extremely democratic idea is in fact the only sensible way of ensuring that worthy material is not passed by, in so far as one can be certain of this in any selection process. It recognises the fact that one should actually view the film, rather than select the material on the basis of paper documentation, and clearly not everyone on a committee can do this. The National Film Archive in fact arranges viewings, sharing out the film under consideration between individuals on its committees.

In sum, the method is preferable to that of relying on decisions being made by the chairman of the committee, which appears to be the principle used in some other archives. I have to say also that historians would in the final resort be in favour of selection committees, once they agree that selection is essential, but they are unlikely to favour the idea of discarding committees, which also seem to be part of the administration of some archives.

The National Film Archive is only able to acquire immediately a proportion of the material it selects. It may never obtain all of it. It is essential therefore, in countries which do not have a statutory deposit scheme, to maintain a back-log acquisitions list. A national archive cannot wait to identify material which is of historical value until it has the means, financial or otherwise, to take it into its collection. The back-log list itself may become an instrument of pressure on governments to provide adequate funds.

Establishing criteria in terms of content is of course very difficult and individual historians and archivists have different ideas on this question. Conservation of items relating to the national history and culture of a particular state is an obvious priority, particularly where those films are not duplicated elsewhere. However, the world is now a global village and one must endeavour to keep also a visual record of contemporary events on an international scale. Particular incidents are recorded, broadcast and commented on in different ways in different countries. If selection is adopted one should choose that item which adds to the print or sound report. Images of real events are of primary value. Studio discussions and interviews can be more carefully sifted since there are those in which the main personalities add little to what they may have said already to the press or radio. On the other hand, some discussions do produce new ideas or may in themselves have interest as purely visual records of the participants. Again it is the duty of an informed group to balance the usefulness of keeping these different forms of communication. A selection committee must be knowledgeable about the overall coverage of a specific event or topic and to be in a position to propose or veto additions to the record. None of these decisions can be perfect and the only ultimate test is time itself.

Some archivists have expressed concern about the selection of amateur film.

An archive rarely goes out to canvass for this type of material and it often turns up merely by chance, as for instance after an appeal by a television company in search of original film on a subject about which it happens to be making a documentary. On the other hand one also finds enthusiastic makers of home movies who are only too eager to offer their film to archives. Since these individuals often like to receive some payment, or at least a new print of their film in return, selection again can be a problem for an archive. Amateurs often shot film of incidents or localities which had no interest for the newsreel cameraman, so the archive again has to look for an informed historical opinion. The results may be very valuable. The National Film Archive has a unique series of amateur films which give a visual impression of the British Raj in India and the Imperial War Museum's collection includes an amateur film shot in China in 1937 which gives comprehensive cover of a fascinating incident involving a British cruiser at the beginning of the war with Japan and also, most surprising of all, an amateur film which has the only known colour footage of the Blitz on London. To have rejected these items would have been no less than tragic and archives are advised to take seriously this kind of material, even if in the end ninety per cent of it proves to be disappointing.

In sum, the opinion of most historians would be in favour of preserving as much of the media output as possible, by whatever means are most appropriate. The traditional archives ought to open their minds to the inevitability of other institutions beginning to participate in this programme. Rather than raising conflicts about these issues, it should be our aim to co-ordinate these various activities in such a way that historically valuable material is preserved as a part of a coherent national policy. The new technology may revolutionise this process in the very near future and hopefully in a way which will make immediate selection procedures redundant.

Anna Chodnikiewicz - Poland

I'm from Filmoteka Polska and I would like to share with you several thoughts on both saving the national heritage and selecting and discarding material. We have been talking about it for a long time and when I listened to this discussion, which is very interesting indeed, I thought we were right to discuss those problems in the archive. We believe that the demand of the times is to think about the problem of exchange of information on much closer cooperation and division both within the country in question and outside. We have given, in our archive, many thoughts to the fact that the film is a document of an era ; that's why we're trying to gather everything that's possible, within reason, of course. The nitrate film comes first, and national production comes first. Like everybody else, we collect mainly the national production, and we keep all that's possible, even nitrate, of prewar production. I just wanted to say that we don't believe in instant history. Our archive is 25 years old, and we believe that the time has come to re-evaluate the collection. Sometimes there is such a need : we should stop and think about our national collections and try to evaluate it. I'm not sure that what we decided to enter 5 years ago is right. I think we should start once again.



LATIN AMERICA

Cosme Alves-Netto - Brazil

I just want to speak from the point of view of the Latin American archives, which show a basic difference from the archives mentioned today. Most of us are private organisations without economical help from the State. So we do have another kind of problems. Most of us are new archives in the sense that the preoccupation of conservation research is more or less recent. We are working in countries, most of us at least, where there are no official laws regarding film preservation. In fact, in some countries, there are laws against film preservation. Recently, there was a law in Venezuela determining that all nitrate films should be located and destroyed. This was an official law that was discarded a few years ago. But it gives the general idea of the kind of problems we have to deal with in our countries. Most of the regulations deal with monuments and paper archives. The importance of film as historical document is a very recent idea in our continent. In fact, we could say that it's only ten years now that something started to be done. I'll project only one film that we kept in the archive, but I'll keep talking during the projections. It's a silent film.

It's an old film from 1908, made in São Paulo during an exhibition of animals. We kept this film because it's an old one ; in fact it's the oldest Brazilian film that we found up to now. Brazilian films started to be made one year after Melies's presentation in Paris. But this was the oldest one we have found up to now. I want to stress that in our case, and that of most of our colleagues from Latin America, it's very difficult to have any selection except the one which is based on economical limitations. We want to keep everything as a general idea - I suppose this is the general idea of all archives, but we have some economical limitations in consequence of the problems I explained before. Most of us receive very little or no help from the government. We must keep our preservation program within internal sources and this leads us to discard any commission of selection and to restrict preservation as a whole. We think that the fact our archives have decided

not to have any selection commission, except the one for economical reason, is very important to us. It is the only way to start getting some help from the government : to show them that we have the capacity to preserve a very important quantity of visual documents of the history of the country. And this should impress them more than to say that we could preserve fiction films for instance. In fact, we are obliged to stress our interest in documentary films and newsreels, because this is the way we can keep a good relation with all the government organizations that could help us to do preservation work. This film, for instance ; if it were a more recent film, probably it would have no interest to keep. The original was already in bad shape ; it was not restored in Brazil but with the help of our colleagues from the GDR, who prepared this print. The original was quite shrunk. But we think that in the case of small archives, the work of a selection commission deals mostly with a certain priority regarding the national material. We kept everything which is from our national cinema because nobody kept it before us. So even if we have a long history of film industry, just a very few examples of this industry have survived. In the past, government authorities have tried their own selection, and this was quite a bad example for us, because they only selected what they thought was important, and film was not important at all. So all the museums who have made some kind of archival work in our countries were dedicated to collect papers and similar things, but not films. That's why we think, in general, the selection is just something that we don't even consider now. This film has more or less 80 years, and we just keep wondering that those people are looking at us and we are looking at them, 80 years later...

Paulina Fernandez-Jurado - Buenos Aires

We're in the same position as Cosme and the Cinemateca Museo del Arte Moderno de Rio de Janeiro, and we're now looking for many films which are on their way to disappear, e.g. we're now trying to buy every film which appeared in Argentina or abroad, e.g. in Uruguay. We are now buying perhaps hundred films. We know that they are in very bad conditions, but they are films of the 40s and there are no negatives in Argentina because of the fires we had in our laboratories ; not in ours at the Cinemateca, but in the commercial

laboratories. So we're buying and paying a lot of money for unique copies, but not in good conditions. We have a National Institute of Cinematography, and there is a law providing that our Cinemateca National exists in Argentina. There is legal deposit in Argentina, which has been working from the middle of the 60s, so every Argentinian film must be delivered to the National Institute of Cinematography. But they are using this unique copy for festivals or in some exhibitions, so those films will be destroyed in a few years. So these are our conditions of work ; we're a private institution and have more sense than they have, at least for the time being.

Our production of silent films was about 350 films in the silent period. And we received, in 23 years of research, thirteen films. During the last year, we discovered seven more. We have catalogued, more or less, all the 350 films. We now want to restore and get all the films from the forties to the fifties, because after the 50s films are on acetate base. We're still buying Argentinian films, but our intentions and goals are to find all the films from the 40s, because they are going to be destroyed.

Hector Garcia-Mesa - Cuba

Of course there is a slight difference with the Cuban archive being a state institution. We have the complete backing of government, and that's why, for the first time in our country, the Cuban film archive was established in 1960. We're now celebrating our twentieth anniversary. But concerning the preservation of our own production, the situation is exactly the same as in the rest of the Latin American countries. We have made a rather exhaustive research during the last ten years or so, and we have come to the conclusion that more than 80 percent of the silent production has been lost. We even circulated a letter among our colleagues, a very optimistic letter, trying to find out whether any material could be found in any archive. Of course, the answer was no. What regards the sound production, we have been able to locate and we keep in our vaults about 50-55 percent of the production. The rest was lost, because there were no institutions interested in preserving films.

Manuel Gonzales-Casanova - Mexico

At the Filmoteca de la UNAM, the situation is also different from the situation of my colleagues, because it's part of the National University, which is part of the State. But we're also young, we're of the same age as our colleagues from Cuba : we're having our twentieth anniversary. We have not yet a selection committee, because we haven't needed it really. We have a programme of acquisition of films for our archive. This programme has these characteristics : first of all, we try to have all the Mexican material without any exception, also the fragments that can be found from the period 1896 till 1940s. Why 40s and not after 40s ? Because the industry began as an organized industry in Mexico around the end of the 30s, and all this material has been more or less well preserved and the Cineteca Nazionale has more possibilities because it is more linked to the official industry. They have a more direct relation in this material. Our second point of priority is for the Latin American film, and the Mexican film that has been produced out of the industry. The third is the silent material from foreign countries that we find on the Mexican territory. We have found some material that does not exist in the country of origin, and it is material that was shown in our country and we consider it important and we try to save it. Then the fourth point in the order is the material that is necessary for us for teaching and for research. And then there are other materials. We have two specialized areas : one, that is all material that was produced or that is related to the National University, without exception, because it is our own production, and we have created recently the section of scientific cinema so that in the order of acquisition for this section, we have more or less the same order as I said before.

Pas de sélection !

Raymond Borde - France

Je voudrais donner ici le point de vue de deux archives francophones qui sont hostiles à toute sélection, c'est-à-dire à toute élimination de films au nom de jugements de valeur : la Cinémathèque de Toulouse et la Cinémathèque Suisse. J'ai débattu de ce problème avec Freddy Buache et je suis autorisé à vous parler en son nom comme au mien.

Je rappelle qu'il s'agit de deux archives assez comparables, de dimensions relativement restreintes et qui ont le même problème concret à résoudre : que doivent-elles faire quand on leur dépose, ou quand on leur propose à l'achat des films de valeur artistique apparemment faible ?

Nous avons décidé de prendre tous les films, quels qu'ils soient, bons ou mauvais, nobles ou ridicules, la seule restriction étant d'ordre financier. Nous ne faisons un choix que lorsque nos crédits sont insuffisants et ce choix, nous le ressentons comme une faute et comme un regret.

Bien sûr, à l'origine, nous faisons la chasse aux chefs-d'oeuvre, comme toutes les cinémathèques, issues de ciné-clubs et créées par des cinéphiles. Nous avons renoncé à tout jugement de type esthétique ou intellectuel, quand nous avons mesuré la relativité des goûts et la fragilité des valeurs.

Nous avons sous les yeux l'exemple malheureux des musées de peinture qui, au début du siècle, refusaient l'impressionnisme pour ne sélectionner que la peinture académique, dite de salons - puis qui, au milieu du siècle, ont rejeté toute peinture académique au nom de critères inverses, et qui, maintenant, le regrettent.

Mais nous avons surtout réalisé que, s'il y avait eu sélection en 1925, on aurait rejeté Louis Feuillade, parce qu'il faisait des films populaires, considérés à leur époque comme un divertissement de basse qualité, pour ne

garder que Marcel L'Herbier qui était un "artiste".

Pour nous, tout film, bon ou mauvais, est un reflet de société et ce reflet est dialectique :

- tout film constitue un témoignage volontaire ou involontaire sur les façons de vivre et les mentalités ;
- à l'inverse, les films influencent la sensibilité et l'idéologie d'une époque.

Une expérience nous a renforcé dans cette conviction : c'est celle du C.I.C.I. Vous savez que le C.I.C.I. (Congrès Indépendant du Cinéma International) est l'héritier lointain du Congrès de la Sarraz en 1929. Il se tient chaque année dans une Cinémathèque (Bruxelles, Lausanne, Toulouse, Munich et, cette année, Luxembourg). Il est organisé autour d'un thème : "Les plus beaux mélés du monde", "La fin du muet", "Le cinéma du samedi soir", "Les monstres sacrés", etc. A côté de quelques grands titres, la règle est de montrer des films méprisés, oubliés, inconnus, et le résultat est toujours surprenant sur le plan de la découverte.

Enfin, les besoins des chercheurs qui rendent visite aux cinémathèques ont évolué. De plus en plus, on nous demande des films secondaires, mineurs, que nous avons tendance à mépriser, et c'est un besoin qui se développe de façon irréversible. Les historiens de type traditionnel qui ne s'intéressent qu'aux oeuvres marquantes font place aux historiens des mentalités et aux sociologues qui veulent tout voir dans la période qu'ils étudient. La valeur artistique leur est indifférente parce qu'à travers le film, ils étudient une société. Si nous sélectionnons les seuls films qui nous semblent valables, nous leur fournirions un échantillon qui, du point de vue statistique, ne serait pas représentatif.

Bref :

- nous ne pratiquons, à Toulouse ou à Lausanne, aucune sélection ;
- il n'y a pour nous aucun film maudit ; même la production pornographique est, à la limite, un reflet de société ;
- nous pensons qu'une commission de sélection équivaut à une commission de censure.

Je voudrais enfin évoquer un problème dont personne n'a parlé jusqu'ici, celui des copies doublées. Il ne concerne que certains pays, dont la France où 9 spectateurs sur 10 voient les films étrangers en version doublée.

La pratique générale, dans les cinémathèques, est de refuser les copies doublées parce qu'elles sont une trahison de l'oeuvre originale. Je pense que c'est une erreur :

- a) le film doublé est consommé massivement. Il devient à la fois un produit différent et un fait social, et c'est lui qui s'insère - beaucoup plus que les versions originales - dans la sensibilité collective. Il y a donc intérêt sociologique à le conserver, pour connaître les rapports du cinéma et du public à un moment donné ;
- b) un film doublé est une copie dont l'image est intacte. On oublie trop souvent que les sous-titres portent atteinte à l'oeuvre originale, en introduisant sur le plan visuel un élément parasite et ineffaçable. Il y a donc intérêt, pour des utilisations techniques ultérieures de l'image, à conserver les copies doublées.

En conclusion, nous avons été extrêmement surpris des résultats de l'enquête sur la sélection, menée auprès des membres de la FIAF. La sélection continue à s'exercer dans plus d'un tiers des cas, elle continue à obéir à des critères artistiques qui sont devenus très vulnérables et c'est pourquoi elle apparaît aujourd'hui comme une survivance du passé et un anachronisme.





## Setting priorities

Eileen Bowser - U.S.A.

*There was not enough time left in the symposium to reply to the intervention of Raymond Borde. This brief note is written after the discussion because his declaration cannot be left unanswered.*

Further, throughout the symposium the Museum of Modern Art has been given as an example of the most selective of film archives. It is true that our selection policy is first and foremost to collect and preserve films of all kinds which represent the art of cinema, the best films which have been made throughout the history of the medium. It doesn't exactly follow that we have therefore rejected other films. I cannot speak with certitude about the policies of my predecessors, but I believe that Iris Barry and after her Richard Griffith could say as I do that I have never condemned a film to die. The question is not that of selection after all, but priority. When Raymond Borde tells us that it is as necessary to save mediocre films as well as the masterpieces, we all must agree with him. But I don't believe that he would insist on saving a mediocre film at the expense of a masterpiece.

As an exemple, Iris Barry thought it right to keep all of the surviving negatives of the Biograph and Edison production that were available to us. When it came to the difficult and costly task of preserving them, which fell to me, I followed a system of priority, not knowing how much work could be done with the available funds and time before nitrate deterioration overcame them. The first choice was to copy the films directed by D.W. Griffith which did not exist elsewhere in any form, even in the paper print collection of the Library of Congress. That task completed, the same principle was applied to the films of Edwin S. Porter for Edison and those of Mack Sennett for Biograph. The third step was to concentrate on copying the more important films by these directors which did exist elsewhere but without the excellent quality to be obtained from the original negatives. Finally, all surviving Biograph and Edison negatives of whatever kind were copied and preserved for future

generations, thanks to the miraculous intervention of enough funds to do it all. During this time period, a handful of nitrate negatives disintegrated before they could be copied. They were not rejected, they disappeared because they were not the highest priority.

When scarcely anyone else was collecting films, Iris Barry began by collecting masterpieces, to as great an extent as she could scrape together the funds to do it from an uncomprehending public. Since that time, the growth of our still-small collection has been slow but steady and its spread across the whole range of film production has increased. One more example, since it has been mentioned during the symposium : when we had the opportunity to preserve the nitrate films of 20th Century-Fox, we made priorities. We could not know how long and how far we could go in this happy relationship with the production company and how much of their production we would be able to preserve. In the event, they decided to turn over the remaining nitrate to UCLA and mostly ceased sending films to us. We are glad they are being preserved in a qualified film archive. But we never had the opportunity to reject those films and would not have rejected them had the studio continued to make them available to us.

The proper word for the process we must all go through is not selection, which implies rejection, but priority. Setting priorities means making judgements. All human judgements are fallible. It is worth repeating here a viewpoint that I have expressed in FIAF meetings in the past : it is absolutely necessary that those who have the responsibility of setting priorities have as much knowledge as they can get of film history, cultural history, and history in general. We cannot escape our responsibility and our choices will be judged.

Final remarks

Mark Strotchkov - USSR

I believe that no archive can exist without a systematic selection of film materials. What is the selection system in our archive? We select both films (moving images) and film materials (on paper). As regards our national production, the Gosfilmofond works according to a principle of depositing all fiction or popular science films made for theatrical distribution; this concerns feature, mediumlength and short films. There is a law in the USSR which assures legal deposit of all films made in our country and released in theatres. We are going to work along the lines of this principle in the future.

The Gosfilmofond was founded in 1948, so that many silent films, made before its establishment, have alas not been preserved. But we keep searching for them, and we have succeeded in finding some of them in our country or with the assistance of our colleagues in other archives. I would be very grateful, if other archives, upon discovering the silent films made in our country, could advise us before destroying them, so that we could obtain them. This could take place within the film exchange among archives. And in the same way, if we find films made in other countries, we will always inform other archives and ask them if they wish to acquire them.

We keep only original negatives of nitrate films in special storage. All the other materials, such as intermediate-positive, optical soundtrack, have been in most part transferred to acetate stock. This work will soon be finished, although it is very complicated, as you know, and the materials transferred on acetate support are subsequently destroyed (i.e. nitrate materials). Commercials, advertising films, films made on demand by ministries and other organisations, are not deposited in the Gosfilmofond. We keep the so-called "actors out-takes", sequences which were omitted out of the final version of a film. They are scenes from important films, such as War and Peace, made by famous directors and starring well-known performers. National productions

are selected by the department of film science. The Soviet documentaries (full-length, medium-length and short) are kept separately, in the Central State Archive of Film, Photographs and Documentation in the town of Krasnogorsk near Moscow. The Gosfilmofond is not obliged to keep them, but since our FIAF colleagues are often interested in documentaries, we have included in our collection many films made by important film-makers. We have also restored many films on the demand of colleagues from other archives. We preserve only those TV films, which are subsequently released in theatres. All television films, made exclusively for the TV are kept in the TV archive.

As for films of other countries, the Gosfilmofond collects fiction films, animation, documentaries, science fiction films, and newsreels ; feature, medium-length and short films. Part of the films come from distribution, and part from mutual exchange with FIAF members. Like in other film libraries, we put in the first place important films of the world cinema, films made by famous directors, cinematographers, etc. ; films interesting by their subjects, genre, techniques. We try to collect various documentation materials, concerning both the Soviet and foreign cinematic productions. We accept publicity materials, posters, bulletins, photographs, film revues and magazines, various rare documents, montage lists, dialogue scripts, minutes of film discussions, cinema programmes, etc. We are interested in any documentation concerning Soviet or foreign films deposited in our archive. We are convinced that the principles of our deposit system are right, because they help us to carry out the task of preserving for future generations the works of the Soviet cinema culture and the culture of other countries.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that the adopted principles bring about many difficulties, because the fund is increasingly growing, and I agree with those of our colleagues who profess caution towards selection. We also believe we have to be careful. It may happen, that a film which we now, in 1980, regard as worthless and uninteresting from the artistic or other point of view, may years later, after its destruction, be remembered with regret. That is why we keep all the films produced by our country, and we collect foreign films with the help of our colleagues ; this sometimes proves to be very expensive, but we want to keep those films for the future. We're now

building new storehouses with up-to-date technical equipment for our collections.

Also, in terms of selection, there have been many examples of rare films destroyed for reasons of space shortage, differing tastes, or commercial reasons, and I agree with Mr. Borde that we have to be extremely careful. We must not permit such cases to happen again.

When speaking about selection, we must not forget the selection of film materials, documentation. Films differ in their importance, in their makers, screenplays, etc. It is their most important features that have to be preserved : in some film, we decided to keep only negatives and soundtrack, in others negatives, soundtrack and intermediate-positives, and in films which are frequently used in our country and which you often demand, we keep all the materials necessary for striking a copy any time.

We have another problem. I discussed it with other colleagues : we have problems with positive film stock. In order not to waste stock to make dupe-negatives, we decided, in case of quality films made in the USSR, to keep not only the negative, dupe-positive, magnetic and optical soundtrack, but also the dupe-negative and optical soundtrack. This allows us not to waste film stock on or for the use of archives which desire to have it.

I think that the problems we are discussing today can be solved in many ways, and we cannot reach a common conclusion, regarding selection and preservation of film materials. Every archive has its history and tries to enrich its holdings, every archive tries to have a most interesting collection of films. But I am sure that the results of today's meeting can be worked out and exploited by us, and will help us to improve our work. I, for my part, have listened with greatest attention to what my colleagues from other archives said in their papers, and I have learned many valuable things.

Sam Kula - Canada

I was struck by the fact that there is such a wide range of approaches to this question, depending on where one stands, in time and in terms of organization, in terms of control over one's national production. I think the point was very well made here by our colleagues from Latin America, that for them the question of selection doesn't exist, the question is of acquiring resources they can acquire, and begin the conservation of those resources that have survived, and are in very poor conditions.

The question of selection enters into archives when the volume begins to outstrip one's space, one's manpower and one's money. And in the beginning stages of the world archive movement, there was very little talk about selection, because the question simply was one of acquisition and conservation. What I think is frightening us all, is the vast, the exponential increase in moving images - the kind of statistics that Larry Karr was delivering to us earlier, which are beginning to appear in every country in terms of the sheer numbers of the films that are being produced now that the means of production have been reproduced so widely, they are so available to so many people for so many purposes. And of course, television, which consumes and produces vast quantities of moving images. But I think that a lot of the talk about selection stems from our inability to cope with the volume at the present time, and my concern is, to some extent, that one comes up with means of dealing with this volume which are unacceptable in the long-term objectives of any archive in any country. What we seem to need is the system which most national archives have attempted to produce, some with more success than others, which in English comes out as a phrase called "records management". The idea that the moving images are a form of documentation that need to be managed, when they are produced in volume, like the records of any government department, there has to be some method of identifying those materials and scheduling them, another English term which presumably translates with some difficulty into other languages. Scheduling means simply a list of the docu-

ments that have been produced and some decision being arrived at in consultation with the producers about the eventual sort of disposition. What it really means for film archives, operating in any territory, it seems to me, is a way of buying time, delaying the decision, until some historical perspective has been achieved. It's a way of placing large quantities of documentation, the moving images produced, the theatrical motion pictures for non-theatrical, scientific, educational purposes, and for television, in some kind of suspension, relatively inexpensively, in volume, while a reviewed period is passed, while there is time to reconsider the documentation for long-term archival conservation. It's a fairly recent phenomenon in archives, but it's become a very important one. And I think it offers us a possibility of dealing with the kind of volume we're facing, at the same time avoiding the kind of error that, as Raymond Borde pointed out, was repeated so often in the past. While I've been sitting here, listening with considerable education for myself, I've been developing a set of laws on the selection of audio-visual materials. And modestly I call them Kula's laws on the selection of audio-visual materials and for what they are worth, which is not much, I offer them to you in closing :

#### KULA'S LAWS ON THE ARCHIVAL SELECTION OF MOVING IMAGES

1. All statements on selection criteria are exercises in creative writing. The words are relatively meaningless until interpreted in practice. In practice all archives should take what they can get, and pass on to other archives what they cannot store or conserve.
2. All selection criteria are rooted in time ; therefore all selection criteria are rooted in the current prejudice on cultural value ; therefore all selection criteria are suspect. Archivists must find a way to delay selection (if selection is necessary) until some semblance of historical perspective can be achieved.
3. A valid case, either historical, sociological or cultural, can be made for the conservation of every moving image by someone for some purpose.
4. Every selection at any moment in time is conditioned by the volume of

material available. A single surviving example of any film of any type of any period will be selected by any archive. A thousand surviving examples may appear to require selection, but what is really in question is space, personnel and money.

5. When the full weight of the new technology is applied to the long term storage of moving images, selection will no longer be necessary.



F. Kahlenberg

I think most of what I wanted to contribute has already been said, and I think the contribution of our Canadian colleague could be considered as winding the discussion. I think that it is very important indeed if an archive, an institution, has to consider selection criteria, to remember its aims, its functions, and there is one other point, which I want to emphasise, that selection is not at all a question which has to be kept in mind in evaluating the material of our early film production, of our early years. It's simply a question of our present-day mass production, not only in film production, but also in TV production. And so far, I think, selection is the field which we have to keep in mind in order to fight our future periode. There is no doubt that we will never get all the money which we would need to keep all film material of the present-day TV production on film, professionnally, for permanent use. We have to select, otherwise we will not overcome the next decade. Selection also is a pre-condition to take priorities in doing our preservation work. We have to differentiate between film material which we have in a proper condition already, and that which should be handled immediately, and it's very important to do it for those film examples which are not yet represented in our collection. Another point is very important, particularly for national archival institutions, in the context of FIAF : a lot depends on international co-operation. No national film archives should waste money in saving a foreign production which already has been preserved permanently by the relevant country. That means that we definitely rely on the willingness to a cooperation in lending copies, in delivering prints, from the national production to other countries, if they are wanted.



## EN CONCLUSION...

Robert Daudelin

Sam Kula et le Dr. Kahlenberg m'ont facilité la tâche en tirant déjà la "morale" de nos échanges !

Je me limiterai donc à quelques remarques supplémentaires :

- je suis très heureux, rassuré aussi, de voir que dans les archives où il y a des critères de sélection bien définis, il y a également beaucoup de souplesse dans leur application ;
- je constate aussi que les mécanismes de re-évaluation sont très importants dans ce contexte et que la loi de la deuxième chance devrait même être une règle de base dès qu'il est question de sélection ;
- comme l'ont souligné notamment nos collègues d'Amérique latine, la sélection, comme également d'autres aspects de notre travail, est directement tributaire, entre autres choses, du contexte économique dans lequel nous travaillons ;
- et dans ce sens-là, comme l'a déjà souligné Dr. Kahlenberg, il y a sûrement intérêt à trouver des mécanismes de collaboration : circulation des informations (un fichier central, comme celui dont rêvent Clyde Jeavons et David Francis ?), services techniques communs bâtis selon nos exigences et nos besoins (un laboratoire noir et blanc ?), et plusieurs autres bonnes idées qui sont contenues en germe dans nos échanges d'aujourd'hui...



ANNEXES / APPENDICES



## ANNEXE 1

## Questionnaire FIAF sur les pratiques de sélection (11/79)

Un des deux symposiums du Congrès de Karlovy-Vary sera consacré à la sélection des films et documents dans les cinémathèques. Avant d'aborder cette question sur le plan théorique, il serait extrêmement utile de savoir, dans la pratique, sur quel type de matériel s'opère cette sélection.

Nous vous demandons de répondre au questionnaire suivant, en précisant que votre réponse ne sera utilisée que sous la forme d'une statistique globale concernant toutes les archives de la FIAF.

1. Avez-vous un comité de sélection pour l'acquisition des films et des documents ? oui - non
  
2. Avez-vous un règlement intérieur définissant des méthodes de sélection ? oui - non
  
3. Exercez-vous une sélection avant d'accepter, dans vos collections le matériel suivant :
  - a) en ce qui concerne les films :
    - les films de long métrage de votre production nationale oui - non
    - les films de long-métrage d'origine étrangère en version originale oui - non
    - les films de long-métrage d'origine étrangère en version doublée oui - non
    - les courts-métrages documentaires oui - non
    - les films d'actualité oui - non
    - les films publicitaires oui - non
    - les films annonces oui - non
    - les copies incomplètes, dans le cas de films censurés oui - non
    - les rushes et les chutes oui - non
    - les copies sur support nitrate de films que vous ne possédez pas oui - non
  
  - b) en ce qui concerne les documents :
    - le matériel publicitaire édité par les distributeurs :
      - affiches oui - non
      - feuillets et dépliants oui - non
      - press-books oui - non
      - photographies oui - non
    - les périodiques de cinéma ayant le caractère de magazines populaires oui - non
    - documents divers ayant un caractère de "curiosités" oui - non





APPENDIX 2FIAF Questionnaire on film and document selection policy (11/79)

One of the two Symposiums of the Congress in Karlovy-Vary will be dedicated to the selection of films and documents in the film archives. In order to address this question theoretically, it would be extremely useful to know in practice what type of materials this selection concerns. We ask you to reply to the following questionnaire, understanding that your reply will be used only in the form of a total statistical study of all the archives' replies.

1. Does your archive have a selection committee in charge of films and documents acquisition ? yes - no
2. Are there written guidelines or principles used by your archive for such selection ? yes - no
3. Do you make a selection before accepting in your archive the following material :
  - A) Films :
    - feature films of your national production yes - no
    - feature films of foreign origin in original version yes - no
    - feature films of foreign origin in dubbed version yes - no
    - short documentary films yes - no
    - news films yes - no
    - publicity films yes - no
    - film trailers yes - no
    - incomplete copies in the case of censored films yes - no
    - rushes and outtakes yes - no
    - film on nitrate base that you do not possess yes - no
  - B) Documents
    - Publicity material published by distributors :
      - posters yes - no
      - leaflets and brochures yes - no
      - press books yes - no
      - stills yes - no
    - Film periodicals of a popular nature (fan magazines) yes - no
    - Ephemera (trivia) yes - no



## APPENDIX 3

A New Source of History : The Creation of a Depository for Historical  
Cinematography (Paris 1898) by Boleslas Matuszewski

---

It would be a mistake to believe that all the categories of *representational documents*\*\* which come to the aid of History have a place in Museums and Libraries. Unlike medallions, illuminated pottery, sculpture, etc., which are collected and classified, photography, for example, has no special department. To speak the truth, the documents it provides are rarely of a clearly historical nature, and above all, *there are too many of them!* Still, one day or another, someone will classify all the portraits of men who have had a marked influence on the life of their times. However, by then that will only be backtracking, and from now on the issue is to go forward in this direction ; and official circles have already welcomed the idea of creating in Paris a *Cinematographic Museum or Depository*.

This collection, of necessity limited to begin with, would grow as the interest of cinematographic photographers moves from purely recreational or fantastic subjects toward actions and events of documentary interest ; from the *Slice of life* as human interest to the *slice of life* as the cross-section of a nation and a people. Animated photography will then have changed from a simple pastime to an agreeable method of studying the past ; or rather, since it permits seeing the past directly, it will eliminate, at least at certain important points, the need for investigation and study.

In addition it could become a singularly effective teaching method. How many vague descriptions we will abandon the day a class can watch, projected in precise and moving images, the calm or troubled faces of a deliberating assembly, the meeting of chiefs of state ready to sign an alliance, the departure of troops and squadrons, or even the mobile and changing physiognomy of cities ! But it may be a long time before we can draw upon this auxiliary source of teaching history. First we must accumulate these exterior manifestations of history so later they can be unfolded before the eyes of those who did not witness them.

---

\*\* Words in italics appear thus in the original.

One problem may trouble our thinking an instant - for the historic event does not always take place where it is expected. History is far from being composed uniquely of planned ceremonies, organized in advance and ready to pose for the cameras. There are the beginnings of action, initial movements, unexpected events which elude the camera exactly as they escape the news agencies.

No doubt the effects of history are always easier to seize than the causes. But one thing makes another clearer ; these effects, fully brought to light by the cinema, will provide clear insights into causes which heretofore have remained in semi-obscurity. And to lay hands not on everything that exists but on everything that can be grasped is already an excellent achievement for any source of information, scientific or historic. Even oral accounts and written documents do not give us the complete course of the events they describe, but nevertheless History exists, true after all, in the larger spectrum even if its details are often distorted. And then the cinematographic photographer is indiscreet by profession ; on the lookout for any opening, his instinct will often make him guess where things are going to happen that later become historic causes. He is more likely to be criticized for his excess of zeal than lamented for his timidity ! Natural curiosity or the lure of profit, and often a combination of the two make him inventive and bold. Authorized to appear at somewhat ceremonious functions, he will rack his brains to insinuate himself without authority into others, and most of the time he will know how to find the occasions and places where tomorrow's history is about to develop. He is not the sort to be frightened by a movement of the people or the beginnings of a riot, and even in a war it isn't hard to imagine him bracing his camera against the same epaulements as the first-line guns, and catching at least part of the action. He'll slip in wherever the sun touches... If only for the First Empire and the Revolution, to choose examples, we could reproduce the scenes which animated photography easily brings back to life, we could have resolved some perhaps accessory but nonetheless perplexing questions, and saved floods of useless ink !

Thus this cinematographic print in which a scene is made up of a thousand images, and which, unreelied between a focused light source and a white sheet makes the dead and the absent stand up and walk, this simple band of printed celluloid constitutes not only a proof of history but a fragment of history itself, and a history which has not grown faint, which does not need a genius

to resuscitate it. It is there, barely asleep, and like those elementary organisms which after years of dormancy are revitalized by a bit of warmth and humidity, in order to reawaken and relive the hours of the past, it only needs a little light projected through a lens into the heart of darkness !

The cinematographer does not record the whole of history perhaps at least that part he gives us is uncontestable and of absolute truth. Ordinary photography can be retouched, even to the point of transformation. But just try to make identical changes on a thousand or twelve-hundred microscopic images ! It can be said that intrinsic to animated photography has an authenticity, exactitude and precision which belong to it alone. It is the epitome of the truthful and infallible eye-witness. It can verify verbal testimony, and if human witnesses contradict each other about an event, it can resolve the disagreement by silencing the one it belies.

Imagine a military or naval manoeuvre whose phases have been collected on film by a cinematographer : any debate can be rapidly brought to a close, ... he can establish with mathematical precision the distances separating places in the scenes he has photographed. Generally he has clear indications to back up his attestation of the time of day, season and climatic conditions surrounding the event. Even what escapes the naked eye, the imperceptible progress of things in motion, is seized by the lens at the distant horizon and followed up to the foreground. Ideally, other historic documents should possess the same degree of certainty and clarity.

The issue now is to give this perhaps privileged source of historical evidence the same authority, official existence and accessibility as other already well-established archives. It is being arranged as the highest echelons of the government, and in addition the ways and means do not seem so difficult to find. It will be sufficient to give the cinematographic proofs of historical nature a section in a museum, a shelf in a library or a cupboard in the archives. Their official depository will be at the Bibliothèque Nationale, the library of the Institut de France, under the care of one of the Académies concerned with History, in the Archives Nationales, or even in the Musée de Versailles. It's merely a question of choosing and deciding. Once it is established, there will be no lack of endowments as gifts or even motivated by financial interest. The price of cinematographic projection equipment, like reels of film themselves, very high at the outset, is diminishing rapidly and falling within the reach of

mere amateurs of photography. Many of them, not even including the professionals, are beginning to be interested in the cinematographic applications of this art, and ask nothing better than to contribute to the constitution of History. Those who do not bring their collections themselves will leave them freely as a legacy. A competent committee will accept or reject the proposed documents according to their historic value. The *negative* reels it accepts will be sealed into marked, catalogued cases. They will be the prototypes which will not be touched. The same committee will decide the conditions under which *positive* copies may be lent out, and will put on reserve those which for special reasons of propriety can only be released to the public after a certain number of years. The same is done for certain public records. A curator of the chosen establishment will care for the originally limited new collection, and an institution of the future will be founded. Paris will have its *Depository of Historical Cinematography*.

The creation of this foundation is indispensable and will sooner or later come to pass in some great European city. I should like to contribute to its establishment here in Paris where I have been welcomed with such easy good grace. And at this point I modestly request to enter the picture.

As the photographer of the Emperor of Russia, and on his express orders, I have been able to catch a cinematographer's-eye view of, among other curious tableaux, the important scenes and intimate incidents of the visit made by the President of the French Republic to St. Petersburg in September 1897.\*

These shots, which the initiative of such a high authority permitted me to take, were projected before his very eyes, after which I was able, for some sixty consecutive showings, to offer the same spectacle to the soldiers in Parisian military bases. I was surprised and charmed by the effect they produced on these simple souls to whom I had the opportunity to show the physiognomy of a foreign land and its people, the concept of ceremonies so foreign to them, in short, the manifestations of a great nation.

---

\* It was discovered during a projection that one of these shots indisputably refuted a false statement coming from abroad which allged that an impropriety of conduct had been committed during these meetings. Certainly the affair was of small importance, but it is nonetheless only one example of animated photography in the service of truth, verifying the testimony of men. A whole anecdotic side of history will hereafter escape the fantasy of narrators.

I offer this not uninteresting series of cinematographic exposures as the basis for the establishment of the new Museum. I have had the good fortune to take films of persons of considerable importance, and with their support perhaps I will be able to see these archives of a new genre founded in Paris.

I have described why I augure a rapid and easy development for this depository. I shall contribute to it myself. In addition to the scenes I have mentioned, I already have a great many others to my credit : the coronation of His Majesty Nicolas II, the Russian visits of the two other emperors, and the Jubilee of Queen Victoria of England. Most recently I was able to photograph in Paris parts of completely unexpected and compelling events. I propose to collect throughout Europe reproductions of all scenes which would seem to me to be of historic interest, and to send them to the future Depository.

My example will be imitated... if you are only so good as to encourage this simple but new idea, making suggestions of your own to improve it, and above all giving it the wide publicity it needs to thrive and be fruitful.

*(Translated from French by Julia Bloch Frey.)*





APPENDIX 4Ceskoslovensky Filmovy Ustav-Filmovy Archiv : Regulations for depositing, giving away and archiving film materials (1979)\*\*

---

1. Original negatives

Because of their unique value, original negatives of fiction and non-fiction films/with the exception of commissioned films/ must be deposited and archived with particular care. After being conveyed to the Film Archive of the Czechoslovak Film Institute these original negatives are checked in ten-year periods as to their permanent documentary value, and a proposition may be made to give them away.

2. Original negatives, lavender prints and duplicated negatives of commissioned films - including their accessories - are delivered to the customer immediately after the making of prints unless another agreement has been concluded. If the Czechoslovak Film produces a picture commissioned by the Czechoslovak Television and is allowed by it to make a print of this film for its own documentation, this print is checked after five years, and a proposals may be submitted to give it away.

3. Lavender prints of films made domestically

Lavender prints and duplicated negatives of films made domestically must be retained for five years. After this period, they are checked, and a proposition is submitted to give them away provided that original negatives exist and are in good repair. The proposal to give away magnetic recordings of mixing and international mixing-tapes is submitted after three years, and the same, proposal regarding children's films and animated films is made after ten years. If these films do not have a commentary, magnetic recordings of mixing are retained.

---

\*\* This is an extract from Branch Directive No. I-397 of the Managerial Board of the Czechoslovak Film (September 12, 1979).

4. Sound negatives of foreign-language versions - or foreign-language accessories of films produced domestically

These materials are checked after ten years, and a proposal is made to give them away.

5. Lavender prints and duplicated negatives of foreign films

These materials are retained for two years. After this period, they are checked, and a proposition to give them away is submitted. As a rule, lavender prints and duplicated negatives of films produced in socialist countries need not be archived. If required and in virtue of mutual agreements, these films can be ordered in the country where they were produced.

6. Prints of films produced domestically

All prints of fiction and non-fiction films made domestically - with the exception of commissioned films - must be archived. Prints subtitled in a foreign language - or made in foreign-language versions -, if such have been produced, are retained for ten years. After this period, they are checked, and a proposition is made to discard them.

7. Prints of foreign films

Prints of foreign films are being archived selectively. Prints of films made in socialist countries are not archived at all or only exceptionally. If required and in virtue of mutual agreements, these films may be ordered in the country where they were produced.

8. Distribution prints of films of all kinds

When giving away distribution prints, the criterion employed is their actual, or presumed future, exploitation. After the checking, the distribution prints whose continued exploitation may be probable are kept in relief depositories. When the licence of a film has expired, distribution prints of this picture are given away. This is done on the base of a Technical Report given by the Central Film-Lending Office. The rule is that, in the course of a year, as many distribution prints should be given away as were acquired over the same period.

9. Viewing prints of films made domestically

Viewing prints of domestically-made films of all kinds are stored for five years and, in the case of important pictures, for ten years. After this period, a proposal is submitted to give these prints away. Before doing it, they must be offered to the Film Archive of the Czechoslovak Film Institute and to the Central Film-Lending Office.



APPENDIX 5Principles of Film Preservation in American Archives (1977)\*\*

1. Archives acquiring films have an obligation to insure their preservation by :
  - a) storage under the best climatic and secure conditions ;
  - b) the manufacture of reprint materials (negatives, fine grain masters, etc.) of the highest possible quality and the most long-lasting materials, in order that new projection copies can be generated when required which will be as near as possible to the quality of the originals.
2. The needs of film preservation must have precedence over other important archival tasks and external demands.
3. All films should be preserved. As most archives have limited resources for copying films, the following elements should determine the priority of films to be copied :
  - a) The degree to which the film is endangered. All nitrate films, color films, and video recordings are to be considered as endangered for reasons of instability. In the case of nitrate, priority must go to those films which show signs of beginning deterioration. Films which are being projected in master copies, as in the case of some independent filmmakers, are to be considered as endangered even when they are on acetate stock.
  - b) The degree of rarity of materials held, i.e., unique copies.
  - c) The anticipation of needs of present and future generations of viewers.
  - d) The judgment of the archivist as to the importance of the film.
  - e) The obligation to preserve the national production, or the specialized purpose of the individual archive.

---

\*\* These rules have been agreed to as working principles of film preservation in archives by the following American archives : The American Film Institute, Anthology Film Archives, International Museum of Photography at George Eastman House, Library of Congress, Museum of Modern Art, National Archives and Records Service, UCLA Film Archive. The rules are currently under revision to extend the emphasis to pertain to archives holding all types of moving images, including videotape.

4. No copy should be used for projection purposes until preprint or master materials of that film exist in an archive, or unless it is determined that better materials for preservation exist in another archive.
5. Efforts should be made to determine the best surviving materials before copying the materials held by the archive.
6. To avoid duplication of efforts, attempts should be made to determine if any other archive has already made preprint materials and whether these are the best to be achieved. However, in some cases where the film is considered to be of special importance, it may be desirable to have additional preprint materials in more than one archive.
7. No preprint materials made for preservation should be used for projection. An archive should make an informed decision as to the number of times the preservation materials may be used for making release prints, after which additional preprint materials must be made for this purpose. Preservation materials should not be used for cording off sections to print excerpts ; whole reels should be printed, even though only a part may be used.
8. Commercial users of an archive's films should be expected to pay not only all laboratory and handling costs but in addition should contribute toward the preservation work of the archive which has made the commercial use possible.
9. Once copied, film originals should be stored by the archive as long as possible : that is, in the case of nitrate films, until they have deteriorated to the point at which it is dangerous to store them, in the hopes that future technology will find a way to preserve the original image or to make better copies. However, once nitrate is protected by the best possible acetate preprint materials and is still in a condition to be used, access should be encouraged, because of the unique quality of nitrate and the fact that its life is limited.
10. Archivists have an obligation to be informed of the latest developments in the field of film preservation and to encourage research in the field.

APPENDIX 6American Film Institute - Library of Congress : Principles of Selection (1979)I. General Principles

1. All films should be considered for preservation. For practical, financial and logistical considerations, it is understood that criteria must be developed for a prioritized selection and that any method of selection of films must be intrinsically imperfect.
2. Preservation should be in the original gauge. However, the nature of some materials and anticipated uses together with economic factors may dictate the transfer to a subgauge (i.e. 35mm to 16mm for locally originated actuality footage, 3/4" tape from quad, etc.).
3. Unless the new medium is considerably longer lived than the original, "preservation" is not accomplished, but only a temporary delaying, "safeguarding" action, which will require the next generation of archivists to make a further transfer of the same materials with accompanying copying losses.

II. Guidelines for Acceptance of Materials

1. General guidelines :
  - A. The degree of rarity of the materials ; i.e., unique copies.
  - B. The anticipation of the needs of present and future generations of viewers. Is there any conceivable reason why the loss of the film in question would, in the near or distant future, be regretted ? If the answer is yes, than the decision should almost certainly be in favor of preservation.
  - C. The obligation to preserve significant American production.
2. Operational Guidelines :
  - A. Survival rates must be taken into account. For the nitrate period, roughly 175,000 titles were produced in the U.S.. U.S. archives hold 11,000 of these in a preserved state, and have about 25,000 still on nitrate only. In addition, an estimated 25,000 titles survive outside archives on nitrate. If all remaining nitrate as preserved, roughly 61,000 titles or 35 % of U.S. output will be preserved. Based on

What survives, the following may be used as guidelines by period :

- a) 1894-1920 : Perhaps 15 % of the features survive and possibly 10-20% of the shorts. Therefore all film from this period, regardless of country of origin should be preserved.
- b) 1921-1930 : The survival rate for features has grown from 12 % to 20 % over the past twelve years. Using the AFI Catalog as a base, some selection should be made when encountering routine B features of obscure companies whose output is adequately represented, and no socially redeeming elements can be discerned.
- c) 1930-1935 : With a number of notable exceptions, the bulk of the studio output still exists and is more or less under control, and virtually all of the b/w films will end up being preserved from these companies. Some selection is needed for the B product and small company productions, however. Shorts require selection.

B. American social, cultural and economic history :

These are films which reflect the dynamic interaction between filmmakers and their audiences, and which will provide sociologists and psychologists for generations with basic material to study this most pervasive and influential aspect of twentieth century culture.

This may include :

1. Films that throw light on American manners and customs, socio-economic relationships, the relative status of groups, etc.
2. Films that document the appearance of the American scene, urban or rural, at a particular time in a particular area.
3. Films that provide documentation on specific news events or developments.
4. Films that document the activities of personalities of historic significance or American individuals (or groups) in foreign locales.
5. Films which had exceptional box-office success and wide-spread mass appeal.

C. The development of the motion picture as an art form.

This may include :

1. Films that reflect the technological development of the film medium, or significant film production techniques.
2. Films that reflect the influence of other media on the film medium.



3. Films which complete holdings on specific, recognizably important individuals in the film medium : Hence, all of the films of major directors, actors, cinematographers, screenwriters, etc.
  4. Films which received wide and lasting critical approval or which are recognized for aesthetic quality.
- D. Representation of significant film genres : this may include films which may not meet other criteria, but are necessary in order to provide adequate coverage of a film genre.
- E. Completion or improvement of existing holdings : This may include films which duplicate titles in the collection but which may be of better technical quality or enable the archive to preserve a more complete version of a title. Such films may also be of importance for restoration.

### III. Guidelines for Rejection of Materials

#### 1. General guidelines :

If a given film fails to qualify under any of the criteria above for selection, it probably should not be acquired. This is the most difficult archival decision, since in a large percentage of cases, the probability of the total loss of a given film is quite high because of the unique nature of much of the film materials available to the archives. In addition, rejection of a given title presupposes accurate information as to what the title is and whether the physical copy in question is really what it is supposed to be, both of which are complicated again by the nature of the materials.

#### 2. Operational Guidelines :

- A. Material which qualifies only marginally under acceptance criteria may be rejected if it is incomplete, in poor physical condition, or if adequate representation of that particular type of film already exists in archives. Criteria for adequate representation must take into account the year the film was made, the company producing it and the creative talent involved in the production. As an example, 400' from a sound feature film made after 1935 might be rejected if the feature involved was a routine programmer.

- B. Material may be rejected which duplicate holdings in other U.S. archives, provided that : the film is covered by preservation materials of verified high quality, that the film is complete there, and that it needs no further restoration. There may be limited cases, however, such as a film which is considered of social importance, in which it may be desirable to have preprint materials in more than one archive.
- C. Stock shot material : Random footage that has no finding aids or documentation indicating what the material is. Animal footage is a typical example.
- D. Outtakes : Except in limited cases, unused footage from productions is not to be considered an archival responsibility.
- E. Production elements : Materials of use only for commercialization of films. This would include such items as foreign language subtitle bands, inserts, main and end titles, etc.
- F. Amateur compilations : Footage made up of excerpts of other films, usually assembled by private collectors, losing the provenance of the original materials. Only in a few cases, such as censor cuts which might shed light on social attitudes, would this type of material be of interest.
- G. Material which can be acquired only at a cost which unreasonably outweighs its apparent importance and value, or with restrictions on subsequent use which are too limiting.
- H. Amateur films. Generally speaking, home movies, amateur productions, especially those on sub-standard gauges, should be only sparsely represented in an archive. While individual films may be selected for their specific content, sampling may be required to retain a base large enough to represent the genre for subsequent study.
- I. Foreign films : If a foreign film is otherwise available in the U.S., and is adequately preserved in the FIAF archive of the country of origin, it should not be necessary for an American archive to preserve it. It may be important in limited cases, however, to consider the preservation of an American release of a foreign film in which there are English titles, subtitles, or a dubbed English track, or which has been re-edited for an American audience.

APPENDIX 7

National Archives and Records Service (USA) for Evaluating Newsreel Outtakes (1929-1951) and the March of Time Stock Film Library (1935-1951)

---

General Categories to be converted :

1. Significant activities of the U.S. Government and its officials, including all Presidential and Vice-Presidential activities whether official, partisan, or personal ; Senators and Representatives ; Supreme Court ; cabinet-level officials and or department heads ; and other high-ranking officers.
2. Events and topics or other phenomena with national implications, e.g., labor strikes and union activity or topics relating to or illustrative of the effects of the Great Depression. Scenes showing living and working conditions in all aspects of American society.
3. International news events and topics, especially those involving U.S. foreign relations ; also wars, conferences, foreign heads of state (royalty, presidents, prime ministers, etc.) and conditions in foreign countries.
4. Prominent, well known, famous or infamous personalities in all fields of endeavor, e.g., arts, culture, entertainment, politics, sports, technology, etc. Especially desirable is sound film with synchronized speech. Early sound interviews are also important.
5. Technological change and advancement, e.g., in architecture, conveyances, medicine, transportation, etc.
6. Scientific achievement, including discoveries, announcements, experiments, and demonstrations.
7. Footage relating to ethnic and racial minorities, such as Polish-American, Italian-American, Afro-Americans, and Hispanics ; footage relating to immigrant groups ; footage relating to women and to the changing perception of women in social and vocational roles.
8. Sports footage should be limited to Olympic and professional championship games or matches and professional all-star games.
9. Cultural activities, including the performing arts and communication arts (radio, television, and motion pictures).

Some specific categories to be converted :

1. Outtakes relating to "landmark" newsreel stories as mentioned in Fielding's book The American Newsreel 1911-67. (Required reading).
2. Outtakes relating to MOT issues of particular editorial significance as mentioned in Fielding's other book The March of Time, 1935-1951. (Required reading).
3. Significant recreated events involving the participants.
4. Experimental reels (MOT).
5. Camera footage by Richard de Rochement, Julien Bryan, and Eric Salomon.
6. Completed productions identified as "cut negative". (This is not the same as "negative cuts", which are in fact unedited outtakes).
7. Controversial or censored films.

Categories to be avoided

1. Sports--amateur and college sports and non-championship professional games or matches.
2. Human interest stories such as "cute kids" and scooter races, unless they have unusual anthropological, sociological, or cultural value.
3. Disasters, exclusive of the "Dust Bowl" during the 1930's and earthquakes.
4. Local, regional, or Canadian "local" stories unless there are broader implications.
5. Weather stories such as hurricanes and snow storms.
6. Beauty and fashion shows.
7. Ship launchings and other ceremonies.
8. Obvious stunts and "oddities".
9. World War II official film, provided there is adequate coverage in other record groups.
10. Foreign language version.
11. Staged, dramatized events with actors.
12. Animation outtakes.

APPENDIX 8Library of Congress : Acquisitions Policy Statement (1969)1. Motion Pictures

The Library of Congress will endeavor to acquire for its permanent collections all motion pictures (however recorded) of recognized merit, a representative sampling of other motion pictures typical of commercial productions for entertainment purposes, and a comprehensive collection of motion pictures which contribute to the knowledge and understanding of all countries.

Motion pictures will be acquired on the basis of their value as sources for reference and research in all subject fields within the scope of the Library \* .

2. Definition

The term motion picture is intended to include all types of works consisting of a series of images which, when shown in succession, impart an impression of motion, together with any accompanying sounds, whether recorded on film, tape, paper, or any other media that may be devised.

3. Means of Acquisition

Motion pictures are acquired through copyright, gift, exchange, transfer, and purchase. Copies are also obtained in exchange for the use of Library films for copying purposes. The Library will not permit copying of any film that is protected by copyright or other restriction, without the permission of the copyright owner or the restrictor.

---

\* Particular emphasis will be given to fields such as the following : sociology, customs, history, institutions, human resources, art, education, entertainment, sport and recreation, economic activities, industrial processes, scientific and technological progress (with special attention to that of the motion picture industry), geographical features, natural resources, political affairs, governmental operations, the technique of communicating ideas, and the use of the motion picture medium as a fine, or applied, or dramatic art.

#### 4. Selection

Selection of motion picture for addition to the collections may be delegated by the Selection Officer to the Head, Motion Picture Section, Prints and Photographs Division, in consultation with other appropriate Library officers and, whenever necessary, with outside experts.

#### 5. Form of copies

When a motion picture is available in more than one edition, the Library will seek to acquire the most complete, uncut, and authentic edition available. As to the form of the copies, the Library generally prefers, and will select or try to acquire the following :

- Copies reproduced on either 35mm or 16mm film, if available, the preference depending on which gauge represents the form in which copies of the work are most widely distributed for public exhibition. The Library's general preference as to size is not affected by the existence of copies in any larger or smaller size or of copies that have been reproduced by a process requiring special or unconventional forms of projection. Where copies have been issued in the form of video tape, the Library still prefers to receive a film transfer if available.
- Copies reproduced in color, if readily available in the size preferred by the Library, rather than in monochrome.
- Copies accompanied by sound, where both sound and silent versions are available ; where versions exist in different languages, the Library prefers the original language version, but will also attempt to acquire, when needed, the English version.
- Where copies exist only in the form of video tape, copies reproduced on 2-inch tape, if available.

Exceptions to the above policies will be made under the following conditions :

- 1) If the motion picture has been produced by a new process or a unique combination of processes, if it exists in a new or unique format, or if the copies require a new or unique method for their showing, the Library prefers to acquire copies reflecting the new or unique process, format,

or method. Where the copies in such a case are copyright deposits, the Head of the Motion Picture Section of the Prints and Photographs Division will notify the Head of the Arts Section in the Examining Division, Copyright Office, that an exception should be made.

- 2) Where the person depositing for copyright registration proposes to submit copies that do not satisfy the general acquisitions policies outlined above, the Copyright Office will consult the Head of the Motion Picture Section who may, after weighing the factors, recommend that an exception be made for one or more works.
- 3) Where the person depositing for copyright registration proposes to submit copies that, although satisfying the general acquisitions policies outlined above, are different in form from the copy of the particular work that the Library wishes to retain for its collections, the Copyright Office will consult the Head of the Motion Picture Section. The latter may, after weighing the factors, recommend that the deposit copies be accepted for copyright registration only on condition that the claimant bind himself under a Supplemental Motion Picture Agreement to deliver on demand a copy of a different description.

#### 6. Sources - Copyright

- 1) American newsfilm. The Library will make a comprehensive selection of American newsfilm.
- 2) American citations. All motion pictures receiving public or critical acclaim of one kind or another (industry, critics, and festival awards, objective critical approval in various publications and other media, box-office approval, etc.) are generally selected.
- 3) American miscellaneous. This group represents a cross-section of the industry's output including television programs. It is intended to convey a picture of the motion picture production and consumption pattern over a wide area of interest.
- 4) American non-theatricals. This group consists principally of factual expository material used for teaching, training, and documenting purposes. It includes films and television programs on industry, science, non-clinical medicine, education, religion, travel, etc. A large portion

of this group is selected for its reference and research value. Because of the large output of this type of material, a sampling technique will of necessity be employed in selection.

- 5) Foreign miscellaneous. A well-balanced representation of foreign production, selected for the most part on the basis of professional critical opinion or the reference and research needs of the Library, is chosen from this group.
- 6) Television commercials. Outstanding commercials will be selected yearly on the basis of the ratings of winners of national polls or festivals of commercial films.
- 7) U.S. Government Agencies Motion Pictures. (See also : Sources - Other than Copyright, sect. 3.).  
Documentary and scientific motion pictures produced by private concerns in cooperation with U.S. Government agencies such as NASA, USOE, the Department of Agriculture, USIA, etc., will be selected, when copyrighted, according to the criteria set down for non-government motion pictures. However, no comprehensive coverage of this type of motion picture will be attempted.
- 8) Unpublished motion pictures registered by means of a deposit of still shots will be requested as gifts when desired for the collection.

#### 7. Sources - Other than Copyright

Titles available through sources other than copyright will be selected, where applicable, by applying the criteria listed above.

- 1) Gift. The gifts of a selection of uncopyrighted motion pictures produced by commercial and educational producers will be requested each year. The criteria for this selection are those listed above.
- 2) Exchange. The Exchange and Gift Division arranges, in consultation with and on the recommendation of the Motion Picture Section, exchange of motion picture copies with reputable and reliable film archives, educational organizations, and motion picture collections, as follows :



- a) Motion picture films which are still protected by copyright in the United States are not exchanged without the permission of the copyright owner.
  - b) Public Law 87-846 gives the Library the right to exchange divested copyrighted motion pictures.
  - c) The Library also exchanges duplicate copies from its collections of films which are in the public domain.
- 3) Transfer. Certain motion picture films are produced by or for agencies of the United States Government in pursuance of their functions, and copies of them become, in consequence of such production, part of the records of those agencies as defined by law (44 USC 366). An agreement between the National Archives and the Library of Congress relative to motion picture films designates the former as the repository of Government film. Under this agreement the Library acquires a limited amount of this type of film for possible exchange and similar purposes and for its own collections, as needed, in accordance with the criteria stated above.
- 4) Purchase. Motion pictures suitable for the Library collections, but not otherwise available, may be purchased as funds permit.



## TABLE DES MATIERES - TABLE OF CONTENTS

Préface (Robert Daudelin)	1
Introduction (Jiri Levy)	3
Problems of selection of film materials and the archival system in Czechoslovakia (Vladimir Opela)	9
System of Archival Selection of Moving Images in the Prague Film Archive (Blažena Urgošikova)	17
Selection of the National Film Archive of Great Britain (Clyde Jeavons)	25
The American Situation (Larry Karr)	53
On the Structure of an Evaluating System for Audiovisual Materials in the GDR (Günter Schulz)	79
The Selection of Non-fiction Film (Clive Coultass)	87
The situation in Latin America (C. Alves-Netto, P. Fernandez-Jurado, H. Garcia-Mesa, M. Gonzales- Casanova)	95
Pas de sélection ! (Raymond Borde)	99
Setting priorities (Eileen Bowser)	103
Final remarks : Mark Strotchkov	105
Sam Kula	108
Friedrich Kahlenberg	111
En conclusion ... (Robert Daudelin)	113

### ANNEXES/APPENDICES

- Questionnaire FIAF sur les pratiques de sélection	117
- FIAF questionnaire on film and document selection policy	119
- A New Source of History : The Creation of a Depository for Historical Cinematography (Paris 1898) by Boleslas Matuszewski	121
- C.F.U./F.A. : Regulations for depositing giving away and archiving film materials (1979)	127
- Principles of Film Preservation in American Archives (1977)	131
- American Film Institute - Library of Congress : Principles of Selection (1979)	133
- National Archives and Records Service (USA) for Evaluating Newsreel Out- takes (1929-1951) and the March of Time Stock Film Library (1935-1951)	137
- Library of Congress : Acquisitions Policy Statement (1969)	139

