1998

Rare clips

Arel Lucas
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Lucas, Arel, "Rare clips" (1998). *Master's Theses*. 1650.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.bvd8-264t>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/1650

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

RARE CLIPS

A Project Report Presented to
the Faculty of
the School of Library and Information Science
San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Library and Information Science

by
Arel Lucas
May 1998

UMI Number: 1389661

**Copyright 1998 by
Lucas, Arel**

All rights reserved.

**UMI Microform 1389661
Copyright 1998, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

© 1998

Arel Lucas

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE SCHOOL OF
LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Debra Hansen

Dr. Debra Hansen, Chair

Linda Main

Dr. Linda Main

Blanche Woolls

Dr. Blanche Woolls

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

William Fish

ABSTRACT

RARE CLIPS

by

Arel Lucas

Beginning in September 1997, the Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection at the San Francisco State University Archives was cataloged. To make this archive of approximately 1,200 items of 16-mm film (motion pictures, television) and 101 posters accessible a database was created in FileMaker Pro.

Fields for the film material were based on the Library of Congress Archival Moving Image Materials manual and the particular needs of the archives, and allowed notation of the condition and description of each film item. A separate file with descriptive fields for the posters was related to the main file. Lists were generated for general access, a preservation survey, removal log, and shelf location. Recommendations were made for preservation and maintenance.

The project report also contains a general history of film, television, and moving-image archives, as well as information about the Bentley collection and the San Francisco State University Archives.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Some films are saved because one individual sticks to one project and gets it done. This is not to say that he did it alone . . .

Tom McGreevey, Joanne L. Yeck, *Our Movie Heritage* (p. 104)

If any films or television programs, or even parts of them, are saved because I stuck to this project, it will also be due to the support, help, and efforts of many others. I hope I am not forgetting someone in the list below:

Helene Whitson, archivist at San Francisco State University, made the project possible, and proposed it to me in the first place. Meredith Eliassen, library assistant working half time in the archives, did countless tasks and provided help and encouragement at every opportunity. Christine Doan, intern in the archives, appeared with a camera and conscientiously took and retook the photographs that illustrate this report. Judy Ganson, chair of Systems/Collection Management Department Services, lent her support. In the office, Barbara Chin was there with a key when I needed it; and Pam Kullberg lent me her mirror to read the titles on the "soundies" that were made for rear-projection. All the library staff was helpful, supportive and friendly, and insisted I join their staff-only events.

Dr. Debra Hansen and Dr. Linda Main, my committee members at San Jose State University, were invaluable stalwarts in the whole process of proposing and carrying the project through. I am also grateful for the support of Dr. Blanche Woolls (the director of the School of Library and Information Science), Dr. William Fisher (who oversaw my practicum on this same archive), and the rest of the faculty of the school.

Jane Johnson at the UCLA Film and Television Archives responded not only to my email but also to my request to visit their facilities, and gave me a personal tour as well as invaluable information and help.

Thanks to my supervisors at Stanford University Archives and Special Collections--Peter Whidden and then Polly Armstrong--for allowing me leeway in my schedule and for being supportive.

Willie Walker at the Gay and Lesbian Historical Society of Northern California was patient, hospitable, and helpful, imparting valuable information about the original owner of the film collection I cataloged, including the photograph of him at the end of this paper.

My family, although they were all coping with their own problems while I was engrossed in film, never reproached me for my absenteeism (from home), my expenses, or my

frequently overloaded nerves, but calmly and lovingly sustained me.

Likewise my friends, especially Johnna Beiser, who consistently saved my sanity, and Bob and Arlen, who are waiting for me at the finish line.

Arel Lucas
April, 1998
Palo Alto, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
1 INTRODUCTION: NO EASY BUSINESS	1
Sleuth Encounters	3
A Division of Labor	4
2 TWENTY-FOUR FRAMES PER SECOND: A BRIEF HISTORY OF FILM	7
3 THIRTY FRAMES PER SECOND: TELEVISION	16
4 FILM AND TELEVISION ARCHIVES	22
Preserving the Frame	22
Television Archives	31
San Francisco State University Archives	34
Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection	35
5 METHODOLOGY OF THE PROJECT	47
Inventory	47
Identification and Documentation	49
Bentley Collection Database	55
Listing of the Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection	56
Evaluation and Preservation Survey	57
6 CONCLUSION: FILMS HELD HOSTAGE	59
Preservation of the Paul Bentley Moving Image Collection	59
Keeping Cool and Dry: a New Emphasis in Film Preservation	60
Archival Storage	62
Preservation Copying	72

Contribution of the Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection Project	74
Preservation Accomplishments	74
The Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection Database	76
What Remains to Be Done	77
Proper Storage As Funding Permits	77
Preservation Duplication As Resources Permit	77
Completion of Cataloging Research	77
Collection Maintenance, Damage Repair and Cleaning	77
Restoring Continuity of Film Items	78
Concatenation of Small, Similar Items	80
Consideration of Repatriation and Other Disposition	80
National Film Preservation Foundation Grants	82
Orphan Films in the Paul Bentley Moving Image Collection	84
(a) newsreels	84
(b) films that have fallen into the public domain	84
(c) independently produced avant-garde and experimental films	84
(d) socially significant home movies, particularly those documenting ethnic and minority communities	84
(e) political commercials, and advertising, educational and industrial films of historical and cultural interest	85

(f) independent fiction and documentary films made and distributed outside the commercial mainstream	85
(g) commercially produced works whose owners are unwilling or unable to provide long-term preservation	85
A Public-Domain Film Festival	86
Conclusion	87
REFERENCES	88
BIBLIOGRAPHY	92
APPENDICES	
A. ANNOTATED LIST OF FIELDS	
B. SAMPLE PRINTOUTS	
C. PHOTOGRAPHS	

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: NO EASY BUSINESS

It takes a cynical archivist to argue, as some actually do, that fires and disasters make good publicity for their profession. But they are a reminder that . . . preserving a film heritage is no easy business. . . . Some archivists, even in the 1990s, have such inadequate resources that they have to leave their collections unexplored and hope for the best. --Penelope Houston, Keepers of the Frame (1994, pp. 2, 40)

In March 1992, Henri Leleu, a friend of the recently deceased Paul Bentley, a San Francisco film collector, made a phone call to San Francisco State University archivist Helene Whitson. Bentley's entire collection of 16-mm film (around 1,300 cans), his movie posters, books, and equipment was being kept in Leleu's basement after years of storage in an air-conditioned building. The fire inspector had ordered Leleu to remove these things from his basement. Leleu wanted to give the collection to an educational institution rather than sell it to a commercial enterprise such as a stock-footage house, but he had run out of room and time to comply with the inspector's constraints.

Reluctant to accept a hefty, disorganized conglomeration, but yet more reluctant to reject it, even though it would strain her already overcommitted resources, Whitson said yes. Space (though neither climate-controlled nor suited for film storage) was found, and the collection retrieved from the basement over many months as resources permitted.

Although she was skeptical of Leleu's claim that the collection was "worth millions," Whitson had talked the matter over with Assistant University Librarian Linda Dobb, and the decision was made to accept the collection on the basis that it would be useful to Broadcasting and Cinema Department students as curricular support. They sampled a small portion of the collection, along with interns, not knowing what it contained. Samples turned out to be misleadingly labelled. A film can labelled "Some Like It Hot" was not the well-known movie but what turned out to be--on inquiry--a pilot from a failed television series by the same name. A can with the mysterious message "Famous Songwriters" proved on a quick viewing to be a "Toast of the Town" show in which Ed Sullivan introduced 11 of the most famous songwriters alive in 1952. After this Whitson began to have a glimmering of belief that, even if it was not worth millions, the collection was valuable.

But no one could spare the time to inventory the collection beyond numbering the cans, making a preliminary list of contents based on the donor's labels, and listing the equipment, books, and posters. The books were split off from the collection since they did not represent unique or rare items, nor were they linked in any meaningful way. The equipment was stored, the posters placed in the archives for further evaluation. The daunting piles of film cans were

stowed away in two storerooms in the J. Paul Leonard Library where the archives and special collections have their home. But they were not forgotten.

Sleuth Encounters

I saw Whitson's presentation at the Society of California Archivists annual meeting in Sacramento in May 1997. She mentioned that, due to budget constraints and a collection that bulged out of the San Francisco State University Archives storage space and spilled over into niches on other library floors, she was always looking for interns and other volunteers.

I remembered Whitson's statement when my other plans for a practicum fell by the wayside, and I contacted her in the summer of 1997. She asked me if I would be interested in continuing an inventory of the Bentley collection. After a tour of the facilities and a look at the collection and its preliminary list, I assented, and began a day-by-day viewing of the film.

I toured the facilities and learned about the history of the archives by guide and video, found out how to use the viewing equipment, splice and handle film, and spent a half day in the reference room looking up resources.

Whitson told me that, in addition to the original MARC-based form, she would need documentation for the items, especially whether there were holdings of prints in other

collections. I set about researching the excerpts, television shows, trailers, and films I was inventorying, and discovered that tracking them down was taking longer than viewing the original items.

It was at that point that my encounters with 16-mm film became a mystery story with me as the sleuth. With every day I became more engaged in the project, especially since it was slowly dawning on me that these films need preservation and should be accessible, but an inventory based on viewing must be done first. By the end of the second week I realized that I was hooked, and would have great difficulty letting go of the project without seeing it through.

A Division of Labor

Previous work on the collection represented more-or-less random sampling to determine content, and some 68 of the items had been viewed, and notes taken, when I began work.

In the first ten days I viewed 21 items of varying lengths from beginning to end, and spent as much time as possible at home and at Stanford University Libraries researching the items I had viewed. The task was clearly larger than I thought. I began to see that the inventory that I was continuing was a separate piece of work from the research, and that these two parts--viewing with taking

notes, and doing the research to document the items--could be done by two separate people. I would, in fact, be researching items previously inventoried.

With each day that I passed potentially rare film through my fingers, I became more anxious that the value of the Bentley collection be properly documented. I started thinking about how I could devote more time to it, and again considered applying to do a project. After several attempts at putting together projects had failed--because somebody else was already covering the territory or because my resources dried up when my husband became unemployed--I was quite reluctant to try again.

As the last straw, I learned that there was also a time pressure on the collection inventory. An earthquake retrofit of the library was to begin in the summer of 1998, and this collection, as well as hundreds of other items, would have had to be moved at that time. If there were inventory by moving time, not only would it have to wait until after the retrofit is over and the archives has set up again, but it might not be suitably housed unless its value can be proven. (The retrofit has since been postponed, but it is still scheduled to happen within a short time frame.)

It occurred to me to temporarily divide the work on the collection. Therefore, my practicum consisted of learning about handling and preserving film as well as the operation

of a film archives, and viewing and making notes on as many Bentley items as the length of the practicum would permit. The project consisted of researching documentation and holdings of the film items, completion of viewing, and creation of a database, with recommendations for the future of the collection.

Therefore, the rest of this paper will:

1. Briefly outline the history of film and television and the relation of the Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection to that history, thus making its significance clear.
2. Provide a short history and discussion of film and television archives, with a description of the San Francisco State University Archives and the Bentley collection in this context.
3. Review the methodology of cataloging and archiving film, especially as it applies to this collection.
4. Describe how I prepared this collection for public access and the reasoning behind the methodology.
5. Delineate the products of my project and their intended use.
6. Describe methods of preservation and maintenance of the collection, and suggest further work.

Appendices, a reference list, and bibliography augment the above.

CHAPTER 2

TWENTY-FOUR FRAMES PER SECOND: A BRIEF HISTORY OF FILM

In 1878 an itinerant photographer who was beginning to make a name for himself was hired by former California Governor Leland Stanford to take some pictures on his stock farm near Menlo Park. Some say it was to win a bet, but there is no documentation of that. Perhaps Stanford just wanted to know he was right in thinking that at some point during the performance of trotting a horse has all four feet off the ground.

The farm was the site of what is now Stanford University; the photographer was Eadweard Muybridge; and the elaborate series of photographs he took that year and two years later at the Stanford stock farms near Sacramento provided one of the more colorful pieces of the history of motion pictures.

Muybridge proved Stanford's point, but he realized that he also had proved much more than that. He built devices over the next 10 years that demonstrated a theory of how people see called "the persistence of vision." This theory not only explains why people cannot see fast-moving wheels in all positions as they rotate, but also why people perceive movies and television--both stationary media--as moving. Our vision system (eyes and brain) holds images for

just enough fractions of a second for still photographs projected at 24 frames per second to seem like continuous motion. Muybridge's zoopraxiscope was similar to other devices of the time that rotated still figures across a magic-lantern beam, but his figures were more believable since they were based on his extensive motion studies of people and animals.

On February 25, 1888, Muybridge gave a lecture on his zoopraxiscope in Orange, New Jersey, not far from Thomas Edison's Menlo Park laboratory and nearby home. Although it is not known whether Edison went out in the bad weather to attend the lecture, it is known, according to film historian Charles Musser, that two days later Muybridge visited Edison. At that meeting, Musser wrote, Muybridge

suggested that they combine Edison's phonograph with his 'zoopraxiscope.' Together, they might be able to photograph and 'phonograph' the famous Shakespearean actor Edwin Booth play Hamlet. Edison approved of the idea but first turned to a more immediate task--the improvement of his phonograph.

. . . Several months later, [Edison] mentioned their conversation to the press and suggested that he would pursue the idea 'at his leisure'" (Musser, 1995, pp. 5, 7).

But apparently, once Edison started thinking about it, he was put off by Muybridge's cumbersome method of using 24 cameras to photograph motion, then hand-painting each image onto a glass disk. Muybridge had a well-functioning projector (the zoopraxiscope) that looked for all the world

like a modern projector except for the medium through which light was projected, but he did not have a motion-picture camera. Edison set out to make such a camera, but wedded it to a type of individual viewing device he called a "kinetoscope," opening parlors with such boxes and films he and his technicians made. His camera was the size of a steamer trunk and was built into a studio called the Black Maria on the lawn of his laboratory. The roof opened to let in the sunlight, and the whole studio was rotated to follow the sun, since no electric light known could supply the necessary lumens to expose the film properly. (It was not until 1899 that studio lights were installed for a public prize fight, and even then the strain on the system was so great that the lights blew out before the fight was over.)

Edison had patents on all his equipment, profiting from the manufacture of the camera and the viewing box, though few people bought his expensive and cumbersome camera. Since he did not bother with patents in other countries, and international agreements did not yet exist, engineers in France and England bought his machines and reproduced the mechanisms, but in France the Lumiere brothers improved on cameras by making them portable. They then began a series of "actualities" or slices of life that they marketed in

France and in the United States in competition with Edison.¹ A French magician by the name of Georges Melies bought a Lumiere camera and proceeded to invent nearly every special effects trick discovered before the advent of computers. His success in selling his films all over the world was matched by the influence on every subsequent generation of filmmaker of his style and story-telling ability. Robert W. Paul, an engineer in England, proceeded to become a major founder of the English motion-picture industry, focusing on everyday life, thus beginning the British tradition of documentaries for which they are justly famous.

Again in France, the Pathes, father and son, began to photograph news, and started the French newsreel industry that spread to the United States. The Pathe organization

¹A vaudeville program from 1897 survives in the Roger Imhof Scrapbook Collection at Stanford University. Amid the musical and comedy acts at Atlantic City, New Jersey, are two "turns" given over to "Lumiere's Cinematograph showing the following pictures," the first:

1. Political Discussion
2. Elevated Rail Road, N. Y.
3. Snow Ball Fight
4. East River, N. Y.
5. Garden of Tuliers, France
6. Spanish Artillery.

The second featured:

1. Children's Quarrel
2. Broadway, Union Square, N. Y.
3. Card Player and Garden Hose
4. Bath in Milan, Italy
5. Nurse and French Cuirassier
6. March of Portuguese Life Guards (Imhof, n.d.)

It can be seen from these descriptions that a plot element was not yet necessary in motion pictures.

also invented safety film for the purpose of mailing daily newsreels that succeeded their weekly service and lasted until the start of the First World War.

After numerous experiments with speeds, materials, and film gauge, a speed of 24 frames per second, 35-mm gauge, and cellulose nitrate base became standard except for safety film, which Kodak reinvented and reintroduced in 1923 in 16-mm form. Cellulose nitrate, despite its flammability, remained standard for motion-picture film until about 1950 because, with its high silver content, it furnishes great beauty and a shimmering quality to the screen. Around 1950 a series of safety regulations made it financially impractical for motion-picture theaters and studios to continue to produce, circulate, and project nitrate-based film. So, although the beauty of nitrate film is unsurpassed, 35-mm acetate or polyester film became the new standard.

Although Edison experimented with projectors he did not succeed in making one work satisfactorily. Also, synchronization problems destroyed his plan to marry photographs to the phonograph (1895), and his chief technician moved on to the competition. The Vitascope projector that bore his name was actually invented by other engineers who sought his endorsement, and for a time Edison

tried his hand at the home-movie business, which did not succeed. Nitrate-film-induced fires did not help matters.

Given Edison's failure to produce sound films, it was another 30 years before Vitaphone succeeded. The first sound movies were made using a "track and disk" with record platters (like more modern vinyl disks) and silent film. Synchronization was accomplished by cumbersome projection units isolating the disk from the motion of the projector. Movies were distributed with cue sheets that the projectionist had to follow religiously, and in the beginning there was only music for sound. Only a few of these units had been sold around the country before the system became outmoded by the perfection of optical sound--sound recorded onto the film as it was being shot, and "read" by means of a separate projector bulb (the "exciter" bulb). By about 1931 sound pictures were firmly entrenched, and the motion-picture industry was being revolutionized by this change.

Directors, producers, actors, and actresses found that the difference between silent and sound pictures was not just sound. It was style, and many Hollywood filmmakers could not adjust to the new styles of movies being invented as the sound picture evolved. Since the first use of sound was for music, the musical revue and evolving "musical" became popular. Although there was still a place for

comedy, Buster Keaton and Mack Sennett, comedy geniuses of the 1920s who had their own companies, could not adapt, and Keaton's career degenerated into second-rate movies until his revival in the 1950s. Sennett worked diligently at the new medium, but retired in 1935.² Chaplin managed some success, but never regained the enormous popularity of the "Little Chap" character that worked its magic only in the silent film.

As a result of the sound revolution, millions of feet of film were discarded or recycled for the silver content, since movie producers believed silent film would never make money again, and nitrate film was unstable, dangerous, and expensive to store and project safely. Theatrical fires became common enough that regulations were passed that sealed off projection rooms from the rest of the theaters.

Although color was used sporadically starting around 1927 with the first use of Technicolor cameras (except for much earlier tinted film), it did not become general until the 1950s. During the 1940s, the need for dyes by the

²A short subject in the Bentley demonstrates Sennett's appreciation of sound. Made in 1932, "Playground of the Mammals" is rare among narrated films of the 1930s and 1940s in that it showcases ambient noise. Most narration is done in a studio and suppresses other sounds; but Sennett himself was on the spot, commenting on action and encouraging the viewer's involvement in listening. The film has a modern feel to it, partially owing to the contrast between Sennett's personal involvement and his deferral to natural sound.

military in the Second World War threw movies back into black-and-white. Just as the first use of sound was musical, color was often used during the post-war recovery period in "musicals," or the movie version of light opera; but color soon became standard. Color, surrounding sound, wider gauge, and increasingly panoramic screens--all these innovations made earlier films look less and less marketable.

A few studios, along with a few collectors and libraries, saved films. As we shall see, some of those studios were able to raid their vaults and reissue films to fill otherwise dead time on another medium from the late 1940s into the early 1950s--television.

Early fire regulations were expanded in the 1950s in France and England to apply to nitrate-film storage, and once again film was destroyed--this time to avoid the expense of storing it safely, since its further marketability was in question. In the United States, fire regulations and inspections achieved much the same effect.

The fast burning that damaged many a theater and archives was not the only kind, though. What have been called "slow fires" (which also devour books) or chemical reactions turn nitrate films to dust. "Safety" or acetate film was exchanged for nitrate film starting in the 1940s to remedy both the public safety issues and the problem of

deterioration. Acetate was still not stable, so later diacetate and triacetate were used.

Michael Friend, whose article "Film/digital/film" appears on the World Wide Web site of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, describes the next set of issues. Not only was nitrocellulose unstable as a medium for film, but

in 1955, approximately five years after the introduction of triacetate "safety" film, the "vinegar syndrome" (acetate decomposition) was discovered. In less than a decade after the introduction of Eastman Color negative, problems in color shifting were documented, and the deterioration of magnetic soundtracks was noted within two decades of the widespread acceptance of this medium (1994).

Nothing yet known can stop either nitrocellulose or acetate deterioration. Cold can slow the process. Periodic reformatting can preserve the content. But many films have been lost that were not copied before they had moldered away or burned up.

CHAPTER 3

THIRTY FRAMES PER SECOND: TELEVISION

Television has changed the way we think, spend our leisure time, see reality. Clearly, it is the most important invention since the printing press. The claims made for it are enormous; its effects are far-reaching and still unmeasured. But what we can know about TV is much more than what we do know.

--Judy Fireman, TV Book (1977, Introduction)

The history of television is less direct and more complex than that of film. Not only theoretical problems but political and economic ones had to be solved before it could spread far, and although early experiments (1875-1928) proved telecasts possible it was more than 70 years between the first prototypes and network television. Two world wars once again had their impact on the development of technology, and delayed the advent of television as a wide public medium considerably.

But in 1948 all the elements were in place: television cameras and broadcasting equipment, a government branch that issued licenses to broadcasting stations, television "sets"³ or receivers commercially available as furniture, scattered local stations that had experimented with broadcasting, and

³The very word "set" reveals the origins of television in laboratory and hobbyist occupations. Before television receivers were widely available, one purchased a set of components which were then assembled into a receiver, much as the Apple I computer was sold as a kit for hobbyists to use to build their own machines. Of course these early television "sets" only worked if one happened to be near an experimental transmitter.

a medium that was both a model and a supplier of talent for the newcomer--radio (Abbot & Rider, 1957, pp. 59-60).

Using the commercial model of radio, what had been local and rare television stations were soon multiplied and knit together into the same fabric of nationwide competing networks that broadcast radio programs.⁴ The Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) and the National Broadcasting Company (NBC) often just moved their successful radio programs directly onto television, stars and all. A few flimsy stage sets allowed stations to broadcast the same voices, augmented by pictures, over the coaxial cable and microwave systems to affiliated stations that widened the networks' range.

In the earliest days the networks did not attempt to fill the broadcasting day, and even local stations did not stay "on the air" for more than a few hours. The networks typically broadcast during what is now called "prime time," when most Americans are assumed to be spending the evening relaxing after dinner. The two hours between 8 and 10 p.m. were the most important to advertisers, who wanted the

⁴The only exception to this network pattern was the Dumont Television Network, which had begun broadcasting in 1939, and was the only network to continue through the second world war. Judy Fireman's TV book is the source of this and many other facts of television history, most of which are documented with the photographs which appear on each page.

widest audience, and networks competed fiercely for stars, programs, and "sponsors" (advertisers paying for the production and broadcast of shows) to fill that time.

Since they were not producers of film, these basically radio-oriented broadcasters had to figure out how to syndicate their own programs to stations outside their range. In the beginning they did this by using a process usually called "kinescope" or "kine" (pronounced "kinney").

The name for this method of producing motion-picture film for shipment came from the television monitor (or kinescope). Kinescope recording units consisted partly of a very bright television monitor with a switch determining a positive or negative image, and a motion-picture camera focused on the monitor. These were mounted on a flat surface covering an elaborate mechanism that synchronized the film (at 24 frames per second) with the television tube (at 30 frames per second), and recorded the sound by a devious process onto the film (Abbot & Rider, 1957, pp. 382-385). Because television pictures are made up of dots of light racing across an electronic screen, film produced in this way was inevitably grainy, and its quality depended largely on the adjustments a skilled kinescope operator might make.

The syndicated product was of such poor quality that the former radio star Milton Berle ("the father of

television"), one of NBC's most popular entertainers, nearly quit over the network's refusal to film his show (Sackett, 1993, pp. 4-5). However, kinescope remained a rapid method of syndicating network programs, even news broadcasts, to affiliates before coaxial cable had reached many cities, as well as to unaffiliated stations. This was especially true when the kinescope switch was flipped, and the camera shot a negative of the program, instantly producing a positive image that could be duplicated and shipped without having to be developed. In fact, it was many years before any network set up a film studio.

Local stations faced increasing competition for licensing. As greater lengths of time on the air became available through the federal government's licensing arm, station owners gobbled up the contracts, and then needed to fill those hours with actual broadcasting, not just test patterns. They also had to fulfill "public service" requirements by broadcasting educational or local informational programs. They were starved for content.

Into this breach stepped the independent producers. Since the major motion-picture studios such as Paramount, Twentieth Century-Fox, and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer regarded the television industry as a competent rival for the time and money of their own audience, they refused to release their products for use on television, and were even known to

threaten employees who owned television sets. Local stations resorted as much as they could to local programming, finding local sponsors, local talent. But the movie-going, television-viewing public was used to more sophisticated programming.

There were small groups like the surviving Hal Roach Studios, Inc. (producer of Laurel and Hardy films during the 1920s and 1930s), that slowly began to furnish films to the fledgling industry. Taking advantage of the poor quality of kinescopes, independent producers like the Roach studios began to feed the new medium a constant diet of documentaries, proprietary silent and early sound films, short (up to 15-minute) musical pieces, and filmed commercials to local stations and even networks. Finally, the major motion-picture studios gave in and slowly began to release their movies for television showing, first the oldest, then gradually newer and newer films until now "cable" or subscription television producers show major studio films released the same year.

By the 1970s most television viewers were familiar with much of the surviving popular stock of silent and sound films made through the 1950s. But since 1956 there had existed an alternate method of recording, syndicating, and storing television images--videotape. Although the medium did not become commercially viable for the ordinary consumer

until almost ten years later, in that year videotape (in a larger format than the current consumer size) made its debut at network stations. The fidelity was better than kinescope recordings; it was instantly available for showing or shipment; storage and shipping were more convenient; and it could be erased and rerecorded. Videotape quickly supplanted film as the preferred medium of television recording, although some producers such as the Academy of Motion Pictures Arts and Sciences (who award the "Oscar") continued to kinescope their proceedings until 1965.

As available storeroom shelves filled with videotape, station managers began to look critically at what was filling the rest of their storage space--16-mm film. In the mid-1970s another holocaust hit the film medium. First sound, then safety film, then videotape caused commercial film producers and broadcasters to decimate film archives in favor of a new medium. During the mid-1970s more millions of feet of film were discarded, and that may have included historical newsfilm. The storage squeeze continues, and the dumping is still going on, sometimes into archives that have neither space nor funds to preserve these cultural materials.

CHAPTER 4

FILM AND TELEVISION ARCHIVES

Preserving the Frame

Harold Brown, still a novice, . . . was dealing with a diagonal tear and trying not very effectively to stick it together without losing any film. Ernest Lindgren . . . was critical but kindly. "I see," he said, "you were trying to preserve the frame."

--Penelope Houston, Keepers of the Frame (1994, p. 36)

In most countries, the history of film archives is one of conflicted politics and funding difficulties, with the rise at last of one or two national archives. In Scandinavia a cooperative alliance seems to have circumvented the usual problems, while in the United States competing archives have both added to and alleviated problems of film preservation, and no one archives dominates the scene. The National Archives began building its collection in the 1930s. Film societies such as the Essex Film Club (Nutley, New Jersey) had been established by 1939 and were still showing films when Anthony Slide published his history of U. S. film archives in 1992. Private collectors such as George Kleine, a film importer and promoter, began early to amass their collections. But apparently the oldest archives dedicated to photographic materials in the United States is the George Eastman House, founded in 1947 according to their World Wide Web site (n.d./1997).

Although the idea of saving historical film surfaced around the turn of the century, few people took the entertainment industry's film seriously. The earliest pleas for archiving film were for newsfilm, but ironically the earliest film actually archived was sent for copyright purposes to the Library of Congress by turn-of-the-century U.S. motion-picture company Biograph, and this included artistic content.

Unfortunately, little pre-1942 film beyond these first Biograph productions was saved by the Library of Congress, since public funding was denied them to build proper vaults to store nitrate-based film. Although collections donated since have augmented the library's holdings, it did not accept motion-picture film from 1912 to 1942 for reasons of safety. (In fact, its nitrate film is now stored in Kansas.)

For 30 years the Library of Congress accepted only paper prints, still photographs with descriptions of motion pictures, or cans of film that they returned after cataloging. During this time the concept of film archiving at first gained ground, then became a reality in England and France, and soon spread to the other countries that produced film: the U.S.S.R., Australia, Mexico, and so on.

Archival capabilities everywhere have been subject to the vagaries of public financing, but in France, England,

and the United States the personalities involved in film archiving have had at least as much influence as the availability of funding. As historian Anthony Slide points out,

James Card in the United States and Henri Langlois in France were collectors institutionalized along with their collections. Henry Langlois (1914-1977) of the Cinematheque Francaise personified the independent-minded, highly autocratic film archivist, in love with films and the power which their ownership bestowed (Slide, 1992, p. 6).

Although Slide's picture of Langlois and the history of film archives in general is, as he himself admits, highly opinionated, it seems to have taken strong, "independent-minded" people to push their programs, get funding, and preserve films. Langlois was, by all accounts, highly secretive about his collection and loans of films (uncopied) to other archives, so that when he died no accurate catalog existed of archival holdings. A devastating fire in 1980 further complicated the inventory, but the Cinematheque is still a force in world cinema.

It was not until the 1930s that most countries had paper or film archives, and even then the subject of what to save was controversial. In 1938, four film archives founded the Federation Internationale des Archives du Film (FIAF), the only international organization to promote film preservation. By 1980, this group had grown to 65 members, and is still a puissant force in film archiving and a major

source of information on that subject. Their published policy, according to their 1980 A Handbook for Film Archives, is "Collect now--collect as much as possible," adding that "the purpose of most film archives is not to engage in evaluation or selection of motion pictures to be collected. Their task is to keep everything. The only selection shall be made by time" (Bowser & Kuiper, 1980, p. 3).

Some archivists, notably Ernest Lindgren of what is now the National Film and Television Archive, advocated and practiced a carefully articulated selection process--in his case, by a committee. Others, like Langlois, took everything they could get.

These two men also represented opposite poles of the preservation-versus-access dilemma that confronts every archivist every day. Whereas Lindgren meticulously documented and stored every item his archives requested and received, Langlois vigorously promoted his cause by means of a somewhat moveable movie salon that attracted young filmmakers as well as publicity. As Penelope Houston writes,

For much of his career . . . Langlois was out in front, the man who gave currency to the word *cinematheque*, not just in France but throughout the world, who made the profession of archivist fashionable--not . . . by preserving films but by showing them (Houston, 1994, p. 49).

Langlois, like Paul Bentley, was a collector. Both liked to show their films under controlled circumstances, with in-group audiences. Although he was not selective about acquisition, Langlois was apparently careful about exhibition. The same appears to be true of Bentley, to judge both from the size of his collection and occasional comments about films that he probably did not choose to show: One film, for instance, has a comment written on the opaque leader, "Worthless story Junk." The film, however, an early television drama, is preserved no less carefully than others in the collection.

Although he did not emphasize showing films, Lindgren was not opposed to it, and in fact his dream facility included a "500-seat repertory cinema 'representing the last word in comfort,'" according to Houston's quotation of his 1948 article on the subject for the Penguin Film Review (1994, p. 38). Lindgren's difference with Langlois over showing films was not principle, but practice, representing his refusal to project archival films that had not first been copied--now the standard rule.

While for many years archivists conjectured about the necessity and timing of copying film, chemical tests to check on the state of decomposition of both nitrate- and acetate-based films are now standard where funds can be found for them. Some archivists prefer not to punch the

holes in the film necessary for nitrate testing, and continue checking manually, but the desirability of copying archival film is not in question. Typically, where possible, a "reference" print and at least one access print are made, and the original stored in a climate-controlled setting. The reference print is then used for further copying as long as possible.

In the United States, no one personality dominated the scene, resulting in scattered and competing archives that maintain film collections. These institutions range from the U. S. Government at the Library of Congress and the National Archives and Records Administration to private foundations like the George Eastman House, to academic institutions like the University of California at Los Angeles and San Diego, the University of Georgia, and the University of Maryland. This makes determining holdings of films difficult, so a national database is in the offing, but not yet accessible except by permission of the controllers (the National Archival Moving Image Database).

This situation, in which a national database is only now emerging, and only with strictly controlled access, is due to the peculiar and constantly changing copyright laws in the United States. Slide's book is full of hair-raising accounts of lawsuits and forcible replevin of materials involving not so much motion-picture studios as other

claimants to the physical copies of films in archives. Many films in archives have been acquired from collectors and such odd places as garbage cans outside closed cinemas and a buried swimming pool uncovered during construction work.

Because motion-picture studios regard all copies of films they produce as being their property (often in the past physically destroying all but one or two copies to prevent others from profiting from a film), virtually all prints of motion pictures are suspected by producers, heirs, and claimants of copyright of having been stolen unless an archives can prove otherwise. For most of the history of archives, motion-picture studios have regarded archives with suspicion. The only reason this has not been true in France is that Henri Langlois cultivated filmmakers and allied with them in preservation efforts. But in the United States and England particularly, there has always been a suspicion that archives might take away from producers' profits by lending out or permitting access to films.

This situation has, of course, produced much distrust on the part of archivists, who are often secretive about their holdings. While many archives have recently made their collections accessible by posting their holdings to electronic databases such as RLIN, OCLC WorldCat or the World Wide Web, there are still those for which catalogs are only available in print for a fee (such as the George

Eastman House). This is particularly understandable given the relatively recent exacerbation of hostilities between copyright claimants and archives in the Raymond Rohauer case--or I should say cases. Rohauer is reputed to have bought up copyrights and then pursued copies into archives, threatening force and bringing lawsuits. Other infamous cases such as the years-long dispute over the rights to "Birth of a Nation" did not make archivists more comfortable.

Given that most disputes regarding silent films have been settled, this may be one reason--if a minor one--that many archives and databases focus on them. But the motto "nitrate won't wait," Slide's title for his history and comments on film archives, evolved out of quotations from speeches and slogans for preservation campaigns, and reflects both the urgency and frustration felt by archivists and lovers of film over the sluggish progress of film preservation. It is true that many nitrate-based films are lost, and that many remaining are in danger of deterioration, even though at first no one missed them. By the mid-1970s, however, after television stations had spent the last 25 years filling dead time with old movies,

the discovery of value in old film libraries through television rebroadcast of the films of Hollywood's "Golden Age" helped to put an end to the malign neglect of so called "media assets." Up until relatively recently, archives and studios would frequently destroy

serviceable nitrate original negatives after duplication (Friend, 1994).

The experience of the 1930s was repeated in the 1970s in television, as Friend puts it, "around 1975, as many television stations transferred parts of their newsfilm to videotape and then deaccessioned the original film" (Friend, 1994). Although at this time film archives existed, the collection of television newsfilm was still a novel idea, and local television newsfilm is not known to have been collected until around 1980.⁵

What happened to the film that television stations discarded in order to make room for videotapes for the intervening five years? Apparently at least some of it--mostly and most likely old movies and television programs--fell into the hands of collectors.

⁵This information is an estimate by archivist Helene Whitson. According to a handout from Laurie Baty of the National Historical Publication & Records Commission, the first award to an institution for a newsfilm description project was in 1984.

Television Archives

Why preserve television? . . . It's not "just television." With all its presumed faults, limitations, and biases, the TV image is above all, an invaluable and irreplaceable history of our life and times.--Steven Davidson, Gregory Lukow, The Administration of Television . . . Collections (p. 2).

Television archives are not as common as film archives, and Davidson and Lukow attribute this to biases stemming partly from belief that film preceded television. As they point out, and as outlined above, the history of "TV development was coterminous with film and radio" (Davidson & Lukow, 1997, p. 5). Nevertheless, while film was always its own record, television as a broadcasting medium had no record except still photographs until the network days when kinescope recording was invented. This led to the establishment of film archives in most countries before television archives, and may have been responsible for what Penelope Houston calls a "deep-rooted emotional loyalty to film" (Houston, 1994, p. 141). In this case, television might be seen as a rival to film for resources of both funds (for preservation and restoration) and space.

Some of this rivalry can be seen in the motto mentioned above, "nitrate won't wait," that can be (and has been) interpreted as meaning that nitrate films have first priority over all other preservation efforts because the old films in the old medium are believed to be deteriorating

most rapidly. Thus those who advocate and promote archiving of television may be the target of opprobrium from other archivists, since many people regard "TV" as inartistic and not worth preserving, and television materials are on 16-mm safety film and younger than nitrate-based films. (This is particularly ironic since studies by Agfa-Gevaert and Eastman Kodak suggest that "it seems likely that safety film may have a life of 50 years or less," and "that nitrate film may have a longer life than safety" [Slide, 1992, p. 160].)

It was not until the mid-1960s that television archives began to spring up:

The first major attempt to create a television archives came in 1965 when what was then the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences (and is now simply the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences) created the NATAS-UCLA Collection on the campus of the University of California at Los Angeles. Similar collections were also to be developed at New York University and American University in Washington, D.C., but did not materialize (Slide, 1992, p. 117).

Following this, Vanderbilt University began its collection of news broadcasts in 1968, the Museum of Broadcasting opened in 1976, NBC donated its 1948-1977 archives to the Library of Congress, and the Museum of Broadcast Communications opened in Chicago in 1987. Further, Slide points out, "Television material is also archived at many institutions, known primarily for their film holdings." These include "The Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research," that "has 35 mm negatives and

prints, as well as original scripts, for 2,000 television programs produced by Ziv Television Programs, Inc." (Slide, 1992, p. 120). Unlike these archives, the San Francisco State University Archives specializes in television newsfilm, and the Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection is its first major excursion into motion-picture film.

Television archives present more varied problems than film, although fire and explosion are not among them. Television productions have existed in so many formats that the acquisition, maintenance, and access to equipment to play them all is more complicated than for film equipment, even considering odd film formats. Before the current common videotape size became standard, a 2-inch tape size was the rule for television stations--the first users of videotape for recording and syndication. The change in size led to a loss of much of this early videotape, just as changes from silent to sound film and from film to videotape caused holocausts in proprietary archives. Kinescopes and other film made for television require film as well as videotape equipment, and new video formats are constantly evolving.

Television is also too contemporary for everyone to realize its historical value, although, as Tyler O. Walters points out in his review article on archival preservation,

Film and video have been around long enough now for the public and the archives and library professions to recognize their significance to our intellectual heritage, as well as the potentially overwhelming preservation task they pose (Walters, 1995, p. 488).

On the other hand, it is also true that, due to what Houston calls "technical crossovers," distinguishing between film and television can sometimes be hard. Would a film series like "Screen Souvenirs," apparently rereleased for television distribution but having silent film as its content, be counted as film or as television? Are 16-mm releases of 35-mm films for television release (that often included commercials, and in the early days introductions, trailers, and behind-the-scenes data) only to be counted as films, or are they also important in the history of television programming? Kinescopes are on film stock; does that make them film?

The Bentley collection, spanning as it does television and film--all on 16-mm stock--is a hybrid of both film and television archives. Therefore it supports San Francisco State University's curriculum in both broadcasting and film.

The San Francisco State University Archives

San Francisco State University's Archives and Special Collections, housed on the top floor of the J. Paul Leonard Library, has little space and only two staff members (in terms of hours, only one and a half). But their newsfilm

archives is extensive and a much-appreciated resource for historians and broadcasters.

The news archives consists of all widths of videotape (both types of commercial television and the consumer variety), and two types of sound film (magnetic--once used almost exclusively for news recording--and optical). The newsfilm collection is from San Francisco television stations, including KPIX, KQED, and KTVU, with several hundred cassettes of documentary and other programs from the local Public Television affiliate (again KQED). The archives staff is augmented by work-study students, interns, and students performing community service to pay for parking tickets, but these are mostly educational experiences requiring continual retraining and attention from staff. It was the lack of space and personnel that led Whitson to hesitate to take the Bentley collection, but she now has no doubt that it has the potential to be an invaluable teaching tool, even possibly a major collection from the standpoint of the history of television and film.

The Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection

In 1973 Twentieth-Century Fox released a movie titled "The Laughing Policeman" made on location in San Francisco. One sequence featured a real gay bar, "The Ramrod" that, for the two years it existed, advertised an activity that would

have been highly atypical for a heterosexual bar: the owner showed old movies and carefully edited television programs.

Members of the homosexual minority had no other public forum, so social and political life revolved around gay bars and bathhouses, and bars competed partly by providing social occasions. Some bars featured theater, others sing-alongs; many showed movies on a weekly basis.

The Ramrod belonged to Paul Bentley, a gay man who owned two or three gay bars during his career as a San Francisco entrepreneur. When he died around ten years ago, he gave his movie, poster, book, and equipment collection to camera-store owner and fellow amateur filmmaker Henri Leleu.

Leleu found the films an unwieldy lot to store. They were in a basement when a fire marshall ordered their clearance, as I mentioned in my introduction. Leleu's call to the San Francisco State University Archives and the subsequent storage of the film are covered in the introduction as well. At every opportunity the collection was sampled, but by September 1997 these samples included only some 68 items. The labels on the cans--where there were any--did not always match the contents. Was the collection worth preserving? And if it was, what was its value?

In my opinion, the collection is valuable from many viewpoints:

1. as documentation of gay life and culture of this period;
2. as representing motion pictures from around 1895 to 1970;
3. as including kinescopes or duplicates of kinescopes from the early 1950s;
4. as a study collection for film and television students as well as students of cultural history;
5. as containing possibly rare or unique film items.

The social and political phenomenon (1) is briefly suggested above. Further research into Bentley and his milieu is a topic for historical, political, and social analysis.

Since the collection is all 16-mm safety film, there are no originals earlier than 1923. However, even reissues and rereleases (2) can be valuable when the original has been lost, is rare or incomplete, or parts of it are damaged. The bulk of the collection is from 1930 to 1965, including the period (1912 to 1942) when the Library of Congress did not accept motion-picture film for copyright due to the flammability of the nitrate base of film used for movie distribution.

The original broadcast medium of kinescopes (3) was 16-mm film, and, because the major networks discarded most of their kinescopes, early television programs contained in

this collection include unique or rare copies. In 1997 the Library of Congress published Television and Video Preservation 1997: a Report on the Current State of American Television and Video Preservation. A segment of this report was entitled "Losses from Early Television History," and listed programs that had not been found in known collections. One of these "lost" shows was found in this collection: "Twelve Angry Men," a "Studio One" production written by Reginald Rose, reworked by him as a movie two years later by popular demand. Incomplete versions were available, but it is believed that the Bentley program is complete. There has been no opportunity until now for students of film and/or television to compare the two productions in their entirety.

Whitson and I have also been in touch with the stepson of deceased television star Jackie Gleason, who is aiding the Museum of Broadcasting in restoring Gleason's television shows from the 1950s. They are doing this by comparing existing copies of different segments and determining the best of these before restoring the original composition of programs. We construe their interest in the Bentley copy of a Gleason skit entitled "Can You Do This?" (a game-show spoof) as confirmation that this excerpt constitutes a rare item that is in demand.

Topics for film and television students (4) are myriad, but include historical studies, horror films, comparisons of original stories with rewrites or remakes, differences between the silent and sound films of Al Christie, Mack Sennett, and Hal Roach, and scrutiny of television commercials for social or technical issues. Another obvious use of the collection is to follow the careers of performers, and the Bentley has already received its first citation by a scholar, Emily Wortis Leider, in her Becoming Mae West (Leider 1997, p. viii).⁶

Leider's citation indicates the rarity (5) of at least one item of the Bentley collection that she saw, an undated silent sequence of Mae West obviously filmed during the years of her nightclub act (1954-1959) and bearing the name of her agent (possibly a publicity film sent to television stations for promotion). Because comparison with the holdings of other archives is time-consuming and often difficult or impossible due to lack of an accessible and complete national database, it is not currently known for certain whether other films or television programs or excerpts in this collection are rare or unique.

⁶The note in Leider's acknowledgments, p. viii, reads: "Helen[e] Whitson of Special Collections at San Francisco State University Library, and Archive Film, for showing me rare clips . . . , " and thus the title of this paper. Leider autographed a copy to Whitson in gratitude for her help.

Although there is little true silent film in the collection (seven items), 26 are rereleases of silent films. A few other early silents have been altered by the addition of narration, but Bentley also acquired a number of a series of short subjects entitled "Screen Souvenirs." Rereleased most likely in the 1950s, probably for television, this was a sequence of pastiches of silent film repackaged in the 1930s by adding a voice-over and music. These remarkable films extend Bentley's reach to the late 19th century with both news footage and old, short, silent movies.

There are 32 films from 1903 to 1929, including early films of Stan Laurel (without Hardy), and other films produced by Al Christie, Mack Sennett, Hal Roach, Georges Melies and William Randolph Hearst. A single German film, "Uberfall" ("Assault") is often shown to film students as an example of the silent film output in German in 1929 (but is not in the San Francisco State University Library). It was banned by the Third Reich.

Coverage of the early sound era is quite extensive, with 75 comedy short subjects from 1929-1939. Also from the 1930s are newsreels and documentaries of newsreel production, as well as feature films, sports, and other documentaries, and dozens of cartoons. Travelogues from this era include one about Soviet Russia. Among the more fascinating of the films from the 1930s are early nature

films that, along with the continuing Bentley items extending into the 1940s and 1950s, would make for an interesting study of the evolution of environmental concerns.

The 1940s are represented by musical programs and feature films, with a few comedy shorts and a lot of wartime footage--short musical productions (10-15 minutes), household hints for women living alone or couples without domestic help, sing-alongs, patriotic cartoons, and newsreels. There are many sports and other documentaries, including numbers of series that covered what were considered to be unusual people (a woman working in a railroad roundhouse, brothers who hand-manufactured muzzle-loading rifles), travelogues--and many Warner Brothers and early Hanna-Barbera (Tom and Jerry) cartoons.

From the 1950s through 1970s the collection includes many feature films and 156 television programs and excerpts (not including commercials and television trailers). Some cartoons from the major producers Warner Brothers and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer are television rereleases. A few comedy shorts date from this era, as do some of the short documentaries for television and short subjects rereleased for television.

The collection represents the 1960s and 1970s mainly by feature films and television shows and excerpts, as well as

movies apparently made by Bentley and other local filmmakers, including Kenneth Anger. Bentley's films are mainly of sporting events, exhibits, and his bars and the immediate vicinity, but there is also a creative adaptation of the Cinderella legend called "Sinderella." The print of the film and outtakes in this collection link to outtakes in the Henri Leleu Collection of the Gay and Lesbian Historical Society of Northern California.

Television programs begin with duplications of kinescopes from the early years of network television (e.g., "Studio One," a dramatic series; "Toast of the Town," later "The Ed Sullivan Show;" "The Jack Benny Program"). Excerpts and shows representing the later 1950s include "The Garry Moore Show," the 1960s ("Gunsmoke," "Slattery's People"), and a few from the 1970s. Almost every genre of television programming of that era is represented except quiz shows (and these are mocked in the Gleason excerpt discussed above).

One highly interesting phenomenon is suggested in this collection by two reels of network programming not made for public presentation: shows for television personnel only. These reels are addressed to network stations and include material that could not be shown on television at that time (because it was considered offensive). Bentley labeled one a "gag reel," and they do include gags carried out by studio

personnel on television-show sets. On these two reels the stars and sets are those of "Gunsmoke" (James Arness) and "Have Gun Will Travel" (Richard Boone). They focus on outtakes, crude physical humor, more sophisticated sight gags, and phoney commercials for alcoholic beverages showing these substances in their very worst light.

The documentary footage is invaluable for history students: the New York World's Fair, newsreel annuals such as the one featuring the first people in space, historical travelogues, undersea exploration, war-time newsreels, public-service featurettes (including one about mail fraud in the 1930s), and an enlightening short documentary about the firing of General MacArthur.

Sports are well represented with "The Sport Parade," short subjects and various news documentaries and programs about nearly every sporting undertaking: skiing, water-skiing, ski-joring, polo, football, baseball, tobogganing, off-road vehicles, wrestling, boxing, soccer, surfing, tennis, golf, basketball, diving, swimming, climbing, and so on.

Historical and film personalities include the royalty of at least six countries and political figures from at least another three. "Milestones of the Century," a series of Pathe News summaries from 1960, focused on historical events covered by that organization, and include newsreel

film from early in the century through the 1950s. There are 16 items from this series in the Bentley, and 8 of a feature called "News Parade," a year-end news summary, as well as a few Universal-International newsreels.

The Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection Project

During my practicum, I viewed and made notes on perhaps one quarter of the film collection and only a few of the commercial posters. Since the contents of the film collection were unverified without viewing; since their value had to be determined to the extent possible to justify preservation; and since part of the value of the collection would be its accessibility, a plan was evolved in collaboration with Whitson and my project committee. I would continue to view and inspect the film, create a database for access, and research the collection as much as possible given the limited amount of time available for my project.

For the most part, film catalogers do not feel the need to view a whole film or videotape. Often collections or items are purchased new; often they come with their own documentation. Viewing past the opening titles is only done when contents are in question, which they are in this case.

The Bentley collection came completely undocumented, although there is a poster collection consisting of printed movie posters and handmade posters for private showings.

Even though the film is all on 16-mm stock, it consists of negatives, trims, clips, outtakes, trailers, commercials, television programs, and feature films, excerpts of film and television programs, short subjects comprising both fiction and nonfiction, titles alone or with some credits (for producing television trailers, musical productions, promotional and unedited footage, and independent and home movies (sometimes with outtakes). There are copies, workprints, commercial prints, television rereleases, and projection prints. Only in rare cases did written material accompany the film, and in no case is the origin of any item given, although information on the cans, reels and leaders may indicate origin.

The example of misleading labelling given in the "Introduction" is only the beginning. As I cataloged the collection, I continued to find unlabeled and mislabelled film cans. (One can labeled "Brats" was the famous Laurel and Hardy film; the other was an excerpt from the movie "Marry Me Again.") Many times a long excerpt would begin or end a reel of clips, or a clip or commercial would precede a film. For these reasons it was undeniably necessary to actually view the film just in order to identify it. What I have viewed, however, is a rather breathtaking expanse of motion-picture and television film spanning almost the

entire history of movies, and the history of network television until the mid-1970s.

The Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection is a broad, eclectic, and valuable archive of film materials that was, in the main, inaccessible due to lack of knowledge about its content at the time I began work on it in September 1997.

CHAPTER 5
METHODOLOGY OF THE PROJECT
Inventory

Viewing and inspection

Using a Cinescan vertical viewing table that controls tension and uses a low-intensity light, I viewed each item except negatives. To reduce the expenditure of time, I "fast-forwarded" through film items without extensive historical or unknown content. Viewing was necessary in order to note cataloging information (including end titles) and determine completeness and condition; and it also accomplished preservation rewinding and gained access to the "trailer" (end length of unprinted film or cellulose with sprocket holes) that often contains information such as broadcast dates. (This was an important step for verifying several television programs.) At the same time, I inspected each item for deterioration and made note of the type and condition of containers, reels, any splices, easily noticeable scratches, adhesives, and tapes, as well as any metadata found on the leader or trailer, or in or on the container. I retrieved, inspected, viewed, and made notes on each film item before replacing it in storage. In some cases I cleaned film; in all cases I removed as much adhesive and extraneous paper materials as feasible.

Annotation

The Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection was stored by its original owner under reportedly archival environmental conditions, but in nonarchival containers, and mostly without archival plastic cores. Storage beyond Bentley's death was somewhat haphazard, and some deterioration was evident. Many items were filmed in black-and-white, but it was important to identify color film for preservation reasons. As pointed out by David Roberts in "Managing Records in Special Formats," compared to black-and-white film:

Colour film presents more difficult problems. The dyes used in colour films fade more quickly and the different pigments disintegrate at different rates. Thus, the colour balance can be lost relatively quickly. Inevitably, colour film cannot survive as long as black and white film, even in the most favourable storage conditions (Roberts, 1993, p. 396).

Another important distinction must be made between movies and television. All the Bentley items look alike as far as the type of film and containers, but about one sixth of the collection is television programming. Since television programs and movies represent different categories and often different interest groups among moving image archivists and preservationists, this distinction is important.

Notes must also distinguish among: excerpts, clips, trailers, commercials; television shows with and without

commercials; television series versus individual program titles; shorts versus feature films; documentation read from the projected material versus documentation from the film can and leader; and speculation on the part of the viewer about the nature of items lacking metadata. Summaries are desirable where possible.

For preservation purposes, I identified both the type of reel and the type of can in which the film is stored, the type of image (negative or positive), whether vinegar syndrome was detectible (by odor only, since there were no funds for chemical testing), and whether there were irregularities in the film, leader, reels, or cans such as tears, splices, distortion, warping, and so on.

Identification and Documentation

The next step in the process of readying the Bentley collection for public access was research. Some film items are easily identifiable by the metadata available on the cans, film, and occasional notes in the film cans. Many are not. Simple identification of the item viewed is the first goal, but aside from that my research supported the following purposes:

1. Cataloging each reel or group of reels as a discrete item for entry into the database described below;

2. Evaluation of the collection insofar as possible to help assess its importance to cultural heritage as well as its probable monetary value;
3. A preservation survey;
4. Further research into the collection by scholars;
5. Knowledge about the collection for fundraising purposes.

There are two ways to catalog film: treating it as discrete items like books; and dealing with film collections as traditional archives, using the rules of provenance and original order where possible (Roberts, 1993, p. 395). Information about the Bentley collection is being entered into a database so that it will be accessible both to the staff and, by permission of the archivist, to the public as a collection. If a decision is made in the future to catalog the collection in MARC or another format, the database can be utilized for this purpose.

The cataloging manual used by the Library of Congress and San Francisco State University Archives is Archival Moving Image Materials. As its author Wendy White-Hensen points out, cataloging film is significantly different from cataloging books, pamphlets, serials, and other paper media. In a book the cataloger has the data needed for catalog entry in the book itself. In some instances it may be necessary to determine authority, alternate titles, or the

existence of different editions, but for the most part cataloging a book does not require much research except into subject headings.

White-Hensen writes:

This difference is due primarily to the archival need for a conflation in one record of data covering several physical pieces, perhaps bearing different identifying indicia but belonging to the same moving image title. These separate physical pieces may be either copies (in whole or in part) of the original or they may be other manifestations; there is little of the "normal" concept for a single, ideally complete physical unit. (White-Hensen, 1984, p. 2)

Therefore, research is necessary for all film items to determine if the version held has not only the authoritative title but whether it is the standard version. The manual continues:

Thus a single record may include an original title and original release details followed by the physical descriptions for the original and later versions with minor changes all grouped together in a listing, one physical description after the other. . . . A moving image archive considers that these sets of multiple details need to be given in one catalog record: a complete "item" may be the sum of these parts. (White-Hensen, 1984, p. 3).

Not only must an item be researched from the standpoint of version, but, because film and television items are the result of collaboration, it is not enough to identify the film items by title. Also to be documented are series title if applicable, actors, directors, producers, copyright holders, distributors, composers, musicians, and other crew, no matter where this information may be found. These

details are considered to be part of the record, to again quote the manual,

whether or not the pieces of film or video material being cataloged actually bear them. This introduces another major departure from traditional library cataloging: the recording of data from reference sources without the contradistinction normally made between such data (off a "chief source" or outside the item) and data transcribed from formal statements on the material. In some cases then, there will be no bracketing of any data except possibly a word or phrase made up by the cataloger (White-Hensen, 1984, p. 3).

As can be seen in records of the Library of Congress and online catalogs such as Melvyl, WorldCat, and RLIN, technical details must also be recorded. These include specifics about the film medium itself (caliber in millimeters, color versus black-and-white, type of color where specified, type of sound, number of reels, if television whether a kinescope), year first released, whether reissued and by whom, and other relevant information. The amount of this information present on or in a film can and on the film itself varies from none to most, and in this collection is often none. Excerpts and clips take a significant amount of research to determine their origin, and in most instances I was not able to complete this research due to time constraints.

After viewing and making notes on the film, I performed the following research as time permitted:

1. Looked up all easily identified film items in the Library of Congress experimental online system, printing out many entries including the MARC record where available;
3. Looked up these same items in MELVYL, RLIN, and WorldCat online, printing out some records;
4. Used actor/actress/director indexes in print to help identify excerpts or films without titles;
5. Looked up film items in the Internet Movie Database, printing out all relevant records;
6. Used other printed indexes, encyclopedias, guides, and resource books as necessary to find all the items that must be included in a catalog entry;
7. Read and made notes on background material, e.g. kinescopes, that aided me in determining cataloging information and understanding what I saw and read elsewhere.

All the relevant notes, printouts, and the final FileMaker Pro database are being turned over to the San Francisco State University Archives.

Since the San Francisco State University Archives is not set up for film research, and because not all the sources I found it necessary to use were located within any one library, my itinerary for research included libraries at San Jose State University, Stanford University, Palo Alto Public Library, San Francisco State University, San Jose Public Library, San Francisco Public Library, the Pacific

Film Archives in Berkeley, and the Margaret Herrick Memorial Library (the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences) in Los Angeles. I was in email contact with researchers and archivists at various institutions with whom I initiated contact via the listserv for the Association of Moving Image Archivists, and Archive-L (an unaffiliated listserv). My task of determining basic data for many of the films became easier in January, when Whitson obtained permission for me to temporarily re-locate the Film Superlist cumulative copyright catalog (two volumes--Hurst, 1973 and 1989) from the reference room of the J. Paul Leonard Library to the archives for the duration of my project.

Cataloger Jane Johnson of the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) Film and Television Archives gave me a tour of their facilities in late December 1997, and showed me the sources used by UCLA film catalogers for research. When checking sources such as the Library of Congress experimental online database, RLIN, and OCLC WorldCat, I noticed their references. I found that for this collection, the American Film Institute Catalog, widely used by catalogers as a primary source, is not often useful, since it includes only feature films, and this type of item makes up less than one sixth of the collection. Most of the Bentley collection consists of short documentaries, cartoons, newsreels, news documentaries, short comedies,

short musical productions, television programs, commercials, and excerpts. This combination of items makes a cumulative copyright listing the most valuable tool available, and the Film Superlist has the added benefit of providing information about copyright renewal. It was issued in three volumes (1895-1939, 1940-1949, and 1950-1959), of which the San Francisco State University Library has the first and last.

Bentley Collection Database

The San Francisco State University Archives and Department of Special Collections uses FileMaker Pro 2.1 on an Apple Macintosh as a reference tool for its collections, and using this software appeared to be the best way to make the Bentley collection accessible.

Although the choice of software was not up to me, the choice I made to purchase FileMaker Pro 4.0 (FMP) and work on the database at home on a Windows-based personal computer was based on many factors: The archives is due to update its version of this database creation software to 4.0 this Spring; no other versions than that current one were being sold at the time it was necessary to decide how to create the database; I could not access FMP in the 2.1 version or higher anywhere but the archives; the only available computer in the archives is not available much of the time; the amount of time I could spend at the archives was limited

by my part-time job; the number of items I had to view was very large in proportion to the amount of time available to view them, which was the same amount of time available to use the archives's computer. FMP appears to be powerful enough to meet access needs, but simple enough that data entry is not difficult, and switching from a Windows-based computer to an Apple is possible. My database uses fields from AMIM, mentioned above, augmented by fields for a removal log, a research log, and a preservation survey. The annotated list of fields based on AMIM and local needs is in Appendix A. Sample data entry, removal log, preservation survey, and research log forms are included as Appendix B.

Since posters, both commercial and handmade, are also part of the Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection, I made a second file of posters meant to act as a relational database with the film file, with posters feeding into the "Related Materials" field. The poster file is briefly listed in Appendix C, along with copies of photographs illustrating the posters and containers, and photographs of Paul Bentley.

Listing of the Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection

Two different list layouts have been provided, one with 14 items to the page, listing only basic information about each item, and the other four items to the page, affording a summary as well as basic information. Given the size of the

collection, only samples of these layouts are provided in Appendix B.

It is anticipated that scholars or technicians doing further work in this collection would want to create a layout which could act as a catalog. This would be useful after the restoration of continuity and concatenation recommended in Chapter 6 (5) have been completed.

Evaluation and Preservation Survey

Part of the purpose of my work on the Bentley collection was to attempt to discover its value. The monetary value of the collection is dependent on two factors--the rarity and the condition of the items. The cultural value decreases as the items deteriorate and are therefore less accessible and hard to view.

A unique or rare film or portion of a film is valuable to the extent it is rare, but much more valuable if it is also in good condition. Therefore, my initial notes include the results of an inspection of the film, its container, and reel, an impression of the condition of the film item as viewed and heard, and whether vinegar syndrome is present.

Preservation is a major issue for this collection.

Roberts might as well have had it in mind when he wrote:

Film often comes into the archivist's care in steel canisters and on reels which may be rusty and will certainly be prone to rust over long periods of time. Equally, film may appear in flimsy plastic canisters which will deteriorate and break with time. Before

receipt into the archives, or as soon as possible thereafter, film should be transferred into containers and onto cores which promote its long-term preservation (Roberts, 1993, pp. 397-398).

The Bentley collection came to the archives in just such containers on sometimes rusty reels. A few archival plastic cores only are in evidence. The winding of the films is uneven and loose from use of uncontrolled speeds of projection and rewinding. The leader is deteriorating. Tape used to secure the reels of film is most often nonarchival, and has usually left sticky residues. Often I had to splice the film in order to view it.

The condition of these films is not due to neglect or lack of expertise on the part of the archives. A lack of funds is to blame. There are funds and certainly expertise for placing the news and documentary collections on cores, for replacing their containers and properly preserving them, although a controlled environment is not available even for the regular collections.

The Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection was an orphan left on the doorstep of the archives, and shelter is about all the budget permits. In the final part of this paper, I will lay out what I know about the preservation needs of this collection according to the conditions noted and my knowledge of current preservation practice, along with an evaluation of the methodology and the database.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION: FILMS HELD HOSTAGE

Film preservation is not worthwhile without complete public accessibility.

--The Silents Majority

Resources are diminished not only by rising duplication costs, but also by greater demands that films be accessible. Some collections have no funds at all for preservation copying.

--Film Storage White Paper

Preservation of the Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection

First the dream, then the reality are presented in the opposing epigraphs.

Members of "The Silents Majority" publish an online journal (1998) with useful information and also militant advocacy of "video-transfer liberation." Their opinion of film preservation as stated, and they publish lists of silent film holdings to "help film preservation activists to direct their letters to the proper film archives."

While it is true that preservation without access may appear nearly as devastating as loss, the ability to provide that access is a function not only of legal factors--copyright problems already discussed in this paper--but also of funding. As stated in the National Film Preservation Board's Film Storage White Paper on the World Wide Web, "The goal of film preservation is to extend the useful life of

collection materials so that they remain accessible to future generations. The problem is to maximize each preservation dollar" (1994, August).

If copying must be done before the Bentley Moving Image Study Collection can be accessed, then it can, in the terms of *The Silents Majority*, be considered to be held hostage-- certainly not by the archives itself, but by lack of funding. However, a number of disposition and preservation issues may be worth consideration, some of which might help to provide resources for preservation. First, let us look at what the collection needs.

"Keeping Cool and Dry: a New Emphasis in Film Preservation"

This subtitle of the White Paper represents the new direction of archival attitudes since 1994, when the paper was first published. The analogy given for the difference between new and old emphases in film preservation work is the tension between preventive and curative medicine. Curative medicine has been found to be far more expensive than preventive, and there is increasing advocacy of the prevention of disease and its early detection and treatment as opposed to trying to treat or cure full-fledged illness.

At first, the White Paper states, the emphasis was on copying nitrate films to safety film, and this was for years what was meant by "preservation."

Attitudes toward preservation were shaped by the conviction that acetate stock was permanent, while nitrate was not. We now know that acetate and nitrate both share a tendency to degrade; in fact, in some collections, the losses from acetate decomposition are greater than from nitrate. Nature does not distinguish much between cellulose nitrate and cellulose acetate when it comes to deterioration (Film Storage White Paper, 1994).

The deterioration of color has also become a problem since "the introduction of chromogenic color motion picture stocks, to replace the cumbersome Technicolor process," a process that nonetheless produces dyes that outlast the film base. The old focus on preservation duplication "that has dominated film preservation efforts does not confront the current realities of unstable safety stock and color dyes." For that reason, prevention was proposed as the new focus-- "regular checkups" and a proper "collection storage environment." "The key to access in the future," the White Paper emphasizes, "is to preserve the original long enough to be converted, restored, and distributed in . . . new ways" (Film Storage White Paper, 1994).

There are, therefore, two prime objectives in a preservation project involving the Bentley collection:

1. Storage in a proper archival environment and
2. Preservation copying (and/or reformatting).

The third objective, "regular checkups," has just been completed for the time being.

Archival Storage

Conditions of storage of the Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection were surveyed during the same time period in which films were viewed. Posters, a small part of the collection kept in specially made boxes and a map case drawer, appear to be adequately stored--if a little warm. (See photographs in Appendix C.) Light Impressions temperature and relative humidity paper gauges were used to evaluate temperature and humidity on top of and in one of the three poster boxes and inside the map drawer. On top of the box the temperature was 22 degrees Celsius, and the relative humidity was around 40%. The same conditions were found inside the box. In the map drawer, temperature was 22 degrees Celsius, and relative humidity 50%. The posters, handmade, theater originals, lobby cards, and commercial, appear to be in good condition except that the large posters exhibit some tears, tack holes, and creases from handling before they reached the archives.

Film storage, known to be inadequate but all there is available, was checked in three different areas: the archivist's office, where film has been stored in small amounts while being viewed; in a large storage closet where about half the collection is currently kept; in a machine room where approximately the other half of the collection awaits the repair of an assigned storage room. In the

office, on top of a film can the temperature was 20 degrees Celsius, the relatively humidity around 40%. Inside the same can, the temperature climbed to 22 degrees, and the relatively humidity to around 45%. In the closet, the temperature was 22 degrees, the relatively humidity around 40%. In the machine room, the temperature was 22 degrees, the relative humidity around 45%. These are approximately room-temperature conditions, with a reasonably dry humidity for archival purposes.

In the office, films are most usually packed in boxes with the cans standing on end. In the storage areas, the film cans are stacked one on top of the other. Containers vary from shipping containers (reinforced cardboard) and cardboard boxes to non-archival plastic and metal (steel, aluminum, baked enamel). None of the cans is sealed, but many covers are tight. How do these conditions compare with recommended storage?

Craig Jones of Utah State University produced a manual for an active educational-film library, 16 mm Motion Picture Film Maintenance Manual (1983). Although this manual does not discuss archival storage as such, it does succinctly lay out the minimal storage conditions and the reasons for them. He wrote,

The condition under which films are stored has a direct effect on the length of time that the film will remain acceptable for projection. Temperature, humidity,

light, dust and air quality chemical fumes (pollution) are major causes of film deterioration during storage. Some of the major damages that can directly result from improper storage conditions are:

1. Color fading (color shift, dye fading)
2. Brittleness
3. Shrinkage
4. Weakened splices
5. Emulsion deterioration
6. Curl

Temperature

An acceptable storage temperature for motion picture film is 70 degrees +/- 5 degrees Fahrenheit. [See below.] Higher temperatures may cause shrinkage, brittleness and color fading. Lower temperatures have no adverse effect on the films and are desirable unless the films are subject to rapid temperature increases which may cause water condensation on the films [emphasis mine]. . . .

Relative Humidity

Films should be stored within an environment that remains between 30% and 50% relative humidity. However, the film is not drastically affected between the range of 15% to 60% relative humidity. Relative humidity higher than 60% causes greater damages than relative humidity lower than 15%. High relative humidity causes color shift, shrinkage, fungus growth, and curl. Low relative humidity causes shrinkage, brittleness, and curl (Jones, 1983, p. 5).

The kind of color shift that occurs when color film is stored in the dark is called "dark fading," as opposed to fading in the light, which occurs when film is subjected to light over long periods of time. (See Wilhelm's discussion of fading, 1993, p. 61.) The dyes shift in the spectrum over time whether they are exposed to light or not, until the entire film looks red or magenta. Seven items in this collection have already reached this stage. This does not mean that these films are valueless; restoration is still

possible, and future techniques might be even more effective in interpreting traces of original dyes and restoring proper color to a copy.

Cold also greatly slows the progress of vinegar syndrome in acetate film products, but the control of humidity is very important in arresting this process. Vinegar syndrome, according to a World Wide Web document by Lars Gaustad of the National Library of Norway, is a process of hydrolysis:

Hydrolysis is a chemical reaction caused by water, in our case more correctly water in the form of moisture, high humidity. When this occurs in triacetate films, the film releases an acetic acid, hence the name, The Vinegar Syndrome This acid in turn, acts as a catalyst to the hydrolytic de-esterification, and together with metal-ion [sic] catalyse a chain-scission process in the cellulose. This causes [in addition to] the nasty smell, loss in viscosity, fading of black-and-white images, discolouring of colour stock, shrinkage and plasticiser deposit on the surface of the film. The emulsion eventually turns soft and sticky, and the film is useless and beyond saving (Gaustad, 1998).

There is no argument that the best archival storage of motion-picture film of any kind is a vault specially built for this purpose. However, the nearest such vault in which space can be rented is in Hollywood--Hollywood Vaults. According to their price list, if this facility were used, the rental of one vault to accommodate the entire collection would amount to about \$400 per month, not including

transportation to and from the vaults (Wexler, n.d./1998).

This ignores FIAF's recommendation that

A model storage compound ideally should have two vaults of each of the above types [storage and conditioning chambers for removal of film]--one for original or near-original material (original negatives, duplicate positives), and one for positive copies. At this point it is instructive to recall the conflagration in Canada, where negatives and positives of the same film were stored in the same area. Both were destroyed simultaneously, and thus all films not represented in other archives were irretrievably lost (Bowser & Kuiper, 1980, p. 41).

Less acceptable but also less expensive would be the use of local climate-controlled storage facilities. The only one I have been able to find in the San Francisco Bay Area (with the exception of a full wine vault in San Jose) is Will-Store Super Storage at 4959 S. Front in Livermore. They offer storage at 50-65 degrees Fahrenheit, which is high for archival storage⁷, but better than the present uncontrolled conditions. Humidity control was unknown to the contact, but could be ascertained by testing. A five-foot by five-foot space would cost \$42 a month, with a \$25 deposit. No furniture is provided, but can be custom made by a firm that displays its wares in the lobby of the facility.

⁷Bowser and Kuiper advise 6 degrees centigrade, but recommended temperatures have been growing colder over the years as experience and experimentation progress. Still colder temperatures are recommended by the Smithsonian Institution, on which more later.

The alternative of building a film vault or retrofitting part of an existing building as a vault to house all the collections of news and other film at San Francisco State is being investigated by Whitson.

The recommendation of film preservationist Henry Wilhelm, as published in 1993, was to use frost-free refrigerators as an alternative to special film vaults when the latter are not available. However, a request to Wilhelm to confirm or update his recommendations elicited a reply that he no longer endorsed this alternative as the best available (personal communication, February 21, 1998). Wilhelm referred me to the work of Smithsonian Institution preservationist Mark McClintock-Goodhart, who aided Metal Edge (a company devoted to the manufacture of conservation materials) in preparing a kit for freezing photographic materials. In responding to my inquiry, McClintock-Goodhart stated that no kit yet exists for freezing motion-picture film (personal communication, February 23, 1998), but that his recommendations for packaging such film for freezing in ordinary home or commercial freezers are in an unpublished paper, a copy of which he sent to me. His rationale for these recommendations was published in the Journal of the Society of American Archivists in late 1996 (McClintock-Goodhart, 1996), and consists of meticulous experimentation

and strain analysis of archival materials including motion-picture film.

Physical and chemical stability are the issues in the storage of cultural materials, and of particular importance with photographic materials is the chemical stability of the gelatin layer (photographic emulsion). It is the chemical breakdown of this layer that causes deterioration of the image. McClintock-Goodhart uses several figures (1996, pp. 12, 13, 14, and 16) to map the region of stability of photographic materials within certain temperature and relative humidity parameters. "As long as the photographic materials remain in equilibrium anywhere within the region," he wrote, "an inherent degree of physical and chemical safety is ensured" (1996, p. 12). This region describes a somewhat irregular parallelogram (wider at the top) between about 20% and 40% relative humidity (at low temperatures) and 30% and 65% relative humidity (at higher temperatures), and between -25 and +25 degrees Celsius.

McClintock-Goodhart found that humidity is the most potent factor in determining whether materials can stand the strain of temperature fluctuation, which is the greatest enemy of archival materials. Responding to a question of mine about ice-crystal formation (in regard to a rumor in the archival community), McClintock-Goodhart wrote that such formation could only occur at 90% humidity (personal

communication, March 15, 1998), thus emphasizing the role of humidity in damage.

Therefore, his recommendations concerning film packaging are mainly concerned with humidity control and the prevention of the formation of condensation. These recommendations are set forth so far only in an unpublished draft (McClintock-Goodhart, 1998), but are quite specific, and resemble the Metal Edge product for freezing other photographic materials. Although no kit yet exists, film archivists can put together their own packaging materials using a silica gel or similar molecular sieve, archival-quality film-storage boxes made of acid-free paperboard, locking low-density polyethylene bags and a cobaltous-chloride type of humidity indicator (like that used in the Light Impressions paper gauges). (One type of molecular sieve is Zeolite.) A double wrap is prescribed, with an inner bag holding film on a core. The archival-quality paperboard storage box acts as a moisture trap, but the molecular sieve placed in the box with the bagged film further depletes humidity. An outer bag is placed around the humidity indicator that has been affixed to the box, and the box itself. This double wrap helps prevent condensation, damage from any leaks in the freezer or nearby film containers, and any handling problems arising from a

transition between freezing and room temperatures for access.

It is noteworthy that in a table Wilhelm published in his 1993 book on film preservation (p. 662) the difference in viable life (stated in years of storage) for two different kinds of Eastman Color motion-picture film was 65 years between storage at 75 degrees Fahrenheit (approximately 23 degrees C, or room temperature) and 40 degrees Fahrenheit (refrigerator temperature). Clearly temperature is a huge factor in preserving motion-picture film, and the difference between keeping film even in a refrigerator versus room temperature is staggering.

The method advocated by McClintock-Goodhart (called the "CMI method" from the use of the "critical moisture indicator" or cobaltous chloride) also makes a difference in the economics of film storage. In his unpublished paper, McClintock-Goodhart wrote that

The CMI method was originally developed with smaller collections in mind. Conventional freezers are widely available in smaller sizes, and far less costly than custom dehumidified walk-in cold vaults. . . . Larger vaults have not been evaluated by the author to date, but the CMI method is very competitive with the custom cold vaults most commonly built by museums and archives. The underlying reason is energy costs (1998, p. 10).

Ideally, any reference (or other copies) and the original films would be kept in separate vaults or storage areas. Hygrometers (or the CMI method) and thermometers

would be used to monitor the storage areas. Wilhelm also specifies "warm-up times" before packages of film stored at 35 degrees Fahrenheit (just over 0 degrees Celsius) should be opened in order to prevent condensation from forming on the film (1993, p. 667). The issue of "microclimate" formation inside the film package and the consequent rise in humidity during transition from lower to higher temperatures is addressed by McClintock-Goodhart in his 1996 article. The problem can be controlled by handling and staging of the transition. It is my own thought that a frost-free refrigerator could be used as a transition facility as well as for keeping unfrozen materials cold. A package frozen to -18 degrees Celsius, for instance, could be warmed up first in the refrigerator freezer (approximately 0 degrees), and then placed on a rack in the refrigerator to continue to warm up before being brought to room temperature. The refrigerator could also be used for storage, and specifications for purchase and use of frost-free refrigerators are given by Wilhelm (1993, pp. 666-668).

Most of the film is currently stored in metal cans, with some in cardboard boxes and some in cardboard shipping containers. Some are in plastic containers. Decisions on final packaging will have to await decisions on the physical environment of film storage. Freezing requires special packaging, as McClintock prescribes. Frost-free

refrigerators require similar precautions. Gaustad (1998) points out that there may be advantages and disadvantages to each type of packaging (even stabilized polyethylene and polypropylene), and decisions about the various alternatives will have to be weighed when the storage method is known. However, it is clear that most of the current packaging is damaging, either because cans are corroded, cardboard is acidic, or the tight cans around already deteriorating film are speeding up hydrolysis by not allowing acetic acid fumes to escape. No molecular sieves are currently used in any containers, but if they were, tight cans would not be a problem (Gaustad, 1998). Jones recommends that film be stored vertically in racks, but such ideal storage may not be possible at present with this large collection.

Preservation Copying

A videotape copy of a film in the collection can make that film accessible to students and scholars for their personal information; projection of the film for public viewing is quite another matter, involving legal issues, and will not be discussed here at any length. However, videotape will not preserve all the content of the film, and is not an acceptable master print for further copies. Therefore, a "reference" or master copy of each film to be preserved should also be made so that the original need not

be handled to make future copies until the reference copy has worn out.

In the past, once copies were made, the original was discarded as "surplus," but this practice has been discontinued unless the original film has deteriorated beyond salvage. Future imaging and data management technologies might be able to offer both more stability and better access than we can find today.⁸ It might also be possible to rejuvenate or restore the original film with future funding and/or future technology. Therefore, film is currently being preserved as carefully as possible, its lifetime extended with archival storage conditions.

There is currently no budget for preservation copying. However, if administrative fees can be charged for viewing, perhaps careful viewing by film scholars can actually contribute to the eventual preservation of a prioritized list of films. This should not pose a copyright problem, as Hoos Blotkamp asserts in his World Wide Web site on "The symposium on archival rights in Jerusalem":

Generally, "one-on-one" consultation in the context of research access is not considered infringement in terms of copyright law. Affording individual access to film material is not equivalent to making the material

⁸See, for example, Jurgen Heitmann's article in the February 1998 SMPTE journal, "User requirements and technologies for automatic storage and retrieval," in which the problems faced by archives today are contrasted with future possibilities both in management and machinery.

public under copyright law, and copyright poses no particular problem to this form of access, even without permission of the copyright owner (1996).

Administrative fees for viewing are charged by many archives, including San Francisco State University, and are discussed to some extent in "Some Thoughts on Accessing Film Collections" by Sabine Lenk (1996).

Contribution of the Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection Project

Preservation Accomplishments

Not only did the condition of the Bentley collection need to be assessed for the purposes of a preservation survey, but it was also desirable to perform other tasks important to the condition of the film:

1. Inspection:

As the FIAF Handbook notes,

Because of the low stability of the materials, holdings of an audio-visual archive have to be inspected constantly. . . . [Acetate types of] material should be inspected every two to five years, depending on their age and provided they are stored under optimal conditions (Bowser & Kuiper, 1980, p. 42).

I used a viewing table instead of the recommended rewind table, and do not know whether this machine exceeds the specified limit of 800 meters per hour. However, the film was inspected as far as my expertise and time permitted for the following Handbook list:

Stickiness and other indications of decay
The stability of the splicing
Discoloration of black-and-white film

Color balance in color films
 Mechanical damages (scratches and perforations)
 Shrinkage
 Growth of fungi and bacteria (Bowser & Kuiper, 1980, p. 42).

Although I did repair film that broke and splices that parted, I seldom cleaned film, and other inspection tasks were beyond my expertise and time commitment, and/or the equipment available.

2. Preservation rewinding:

It has been recommended that all film be rewound periodically, and the inspection process above accomplishes that. This process alone was beneficial in this collection since many films had been wound unevenly (probably for lack of a viewing table with proper tension), and several items had been rewound in such a way that there were large "S" bends (kinks in the film layers). As Jones points out,

Proper rewinding should be at a steady rate with a moderate amount of tension being applied to a supply reel. This should result in a tight, smoothly wrapped reel of film. The smoothness of the wrap refers to the ability of one convolution to lie exactly on top of the next convolution. When the film wrap is not smooth, the edges of the film are susceptible to damage during . . . handling. Improperly wrapped film may also result in horizontal image abrasions when the uneven film wrap is forced to become smooth due to weight and handling (Jones, 1983, p. 9).

3. Removal of Extraneous Items and Other Tasks

In some cans there were notes and other paper items, including newspaper, that were contributing to the acidity of the atmosphere inside the can, and these were removed in

many cases--either discarded or placed elsewhere in the collection. In every case, the tape that secured the head end of the film was deteriorating, and this was removed wherever possible. Some film spliced upside-down to the rest of the reel was rectified--in one case being removed to another can since the content differed greatly--and in some few cases cores were supplied where reels were warped beyond sufferance, or the film arrived without core or reel.

The Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection Database

Access is now available to the collection through very detailed descriptions in a FileMaker Pro 4.0 database I created for the San Francisco State University Archives.

Two files contain:

1. AMIM-based descriptions of all film items.
2. Descriptions of all posters, handmade and printed.

Fields for this database are listed in Appendix A, and correspond to information required for AMIM descriptions. In some cases, descriptive areas and notes have been broken down to produce more searchable fields--such as dividing "crew" into two fields so that "music" can be searchable separately. Printouts have been made of the preservation survey, the removal log, the shelf list and a short list of films (sorted alphabetically and numerically by Bentley number) for the interim use of the archives until work on the collection can be completed.

What Remains to Be Done

Proper Storage As Funding Permits

This issue is discussed above.

Preservation Duplication As Resources Permit

This also has been discussed above.

Completion of Cataloging Research

The seven and a half months during which I worked on this project were not sufficient to complete cataloging research on each item. Some items have been fully researched, others not at all, and many have been only partially verified. The database should be looked into to identify items that need further research, and sources should be found if at all possible to verify the production company versus the releaser, copyright, and other information; and to discover descriptive information where it is currently lacking. The earliest viewers of the collection were not using AMIM standards, and my own forms and methods evolved during the project such that there is inconsistency in the information in the database from one item to the next as I learned descriptive methods and how to discriminate important from unimportant information.

Collection Maintenance, Damage Repair and Cleaning

Maintenance performed during this initial viewing of the collection was minimal, mainly designed to make viewing possible--repair of splices that broke, removal of tape,

cleaning to make adhesive-damaged optical tracks audible, and so on. Basically, the collection has not had thorough examination, repair, and cleaning. Given the size of this collection, the archivist will probably want to prioritize the attention given to items, and now that the contents of the collection are known, this will be possible.

Restoring Continuity of Film Items

When the collection was retrieved by the archives, it was in a chaotic state. In many cases, the archives had to supply containers, and film was placed (possibly also during earlier shipments) in cans for the purposes of packaging without knowledge of the completeness of items. There are dozens of cases in which the multiple reels of a single film have been separated into two or more containers, discovered only during the viewing process. Second or third copies of items are scattered across two or three Bentley numbers.

It was also discovered that the collector (or owners from whom he received the material) cut up items for various purposes. Occasionally, the apparent reason for which the cuts were made is interesting in itself, and restoration is either impossible, undesirable or both.

For instance, two reels of film (one labeled "Mandatory Edits") are the putative result of censorship exercised by local stations or network affiliates, and will be of interest as items quite apart from identification and

restoration to original films. Aside from the probability that most of the films with clips on these reels are not in the Bentley collection, it seems undesirable to separate them, since they would make for an interesting historical study of exactly what kinds of material were considered necessary to excise for home viewing and why.

Many reels also consist of "teasers" or short (one- to two-minute) segments of film considered representative or salient for purposes of offering a preview of television releases to be shown on a particular station or network. These were not like ordinary trailers, with titles, credits, and voice-over such as "coming soon," but merely clips (presumably copies) from the film to be shown with real-time local announcements of title and broadcast times. There may be advantages to leaving these reels intact as well.

However, there are many television shows, such as "Toast of the Town" and "The Jack Benny Show," which were cut probably to show particular segments, but for historical reasons would be best restored. Pieces of these shows (sometimes apparently early kinescopes) are often separated over several reels, spliced with other contents, and constitute an interesting jigsaw-puzzle-like project for a future worker in this fertile collection. A field called "Links" in the database was made to facilitate identifying

separated reels, pieces of cut-up programs, and candidates for concatenation (below).

Concatenation of Small, Similar Items

There are literally scores of tiny reels of film with subject matter of commercials, trailers, and promotional items that would probably be best served if they were concatenated on reels of similar subject matter.

For instance, there are around a dozen "Benson & Hedges" cigarette commercials scattered over many Bentley numbers that--for purposes of research, access, and storage--would be better placed on one reel. Trailers, when not already on a single reel, as is the case with around 40 or 50, might also be best concatenated.

Consideration of Repatriation and Other Disposition

An international program of repatriation of films is now restoring motion pictures to the United States, and in turn archivists in this country are repatriating films to other countries of origin. This is in line with the "Recommendation for the safeguarding and preservation of moving images" adopted by the General Conference of the United National Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) on October 27, 1980 (Slide, 1992, pp. 181-183). There are apparently few films of international origin in this collection that were not released through

regular channels, but this may be an issue worth the archivist's consideration.

One of the fields in the database is "Country of Production," and films from other countries may be searched in this manner for consideration of repatriation. The few I noticed during viewing and database entry were from Australia (on the Great Barrier Reef) and Canada (a television program and some from the National Film Board, early short subjects, one series with the entry "archival copy" in the Canadian archives, and one with a can label identifying it as a workprint). I have been assured by the archivist at the Filmmuseum in Munich that the print of the one German silent film ("Uberfall") is "one of several circulating in the United States," and that the original is preserved in Germany (Chris Horak, personal communication, March 21, 1998). Presumably the films originating in England and Italy were released in the United States through international distributors and the Bentley holdings are U.S. release copies, although some have European titles that differed from American ones, and this might be looked into.

There are some "soundies" in this collection, seven on one reel, and these are rare. Only made for a few years in the 1940s, they were coupled with rear-projection jukebox-like players that soon faded from the scene. A few archives have such players, including the University of California at

Los Angeles, although theirs was not in working order as of the end of the year 1997. Since these soundies cannot be properly viewed using the equipment available at San Francisco State, one possible disposition of these might be to vend them to a facility with a player. If a buyer could be found, the proceeds might help support preservation of the rest of the collection. On the other hand, the only irregularity on the San Francisco State University Archives viewing table is that the titles are mirror-image, and they make for an interesting study of that era of American musical production.

National Film Preservation Foundation Grants

Beginning later this year, grants will be available from the federally funded National Film Preservation Foundation, "created by Congress to raise money to preserve . . . orphan films so they may be studied and enjoyed by present and future generations of Americans" (Library of Congress, National Film Preservation Board, 1998, February 13).

As the foundation defines orphan films, they

are films that do not have commercial owners able to pay the costs necessary to assure their survival. These endangered films include newsreels, silent films, avant-garde and experimental works, films no longer under copyright protection, socially significant home movies, and documentaries and features made outside the commercial mainstream.

Many of the films in the Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection fall into these categories, and it is my recommendation that application be made for funds to preserve those eligible. To that end, I have attempted to identify films that fall into the categories specified by the Foundation.

A more detailed description of what orphans are can be found in Redefining film preservation: a national plan: recommendations of the Librarian of Congress in consultation with the National Film Preservation Board (1994), and these are listed below.

- (a) newsreel and actuality footage of social importance held in nonprofit and government organizations
- (b) films that have fallen into the public domain
- (c) independently produced avant-garde and experimental films
- (d) socially significant home movies, particularly those documenting ethnic and minority communities
- (e) political commercials, and advertising, educational and industrial films of historical and cultural interest
- (f) independent fiction and documentary films made and distributed outside the commercial mainstream (Although copyrighted and privately owned, many of these films will not survive without public archive intervention.)
- (g) commercially produced works whose owners are unwilling or unable to provide long-term preservation. Public archives preserving these films should expect financial compensation from the copyright owners to cover preservation costs, should these films later generate revenue.

Tentative numbers and descriptions of films identified in the Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection are briefly discussed under these designations by letter as above.

Orphan Films in the Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection

(a) Newsreels: According to a search in the database, there are 16 newsreels and 178 documentaries with actuality footage in the collection. Their social importance may have to be determined. These include commercial newsreels (Universal, Castle Films, and Pathe), documentaries showing newsreel making, and a number of "Milestones of the Century" with actuality footage.

(b) Films that have fallen into the public domain.

Copyright sources were used wherever possible to try to determine copyright, and renewal information is in the database wherever possible. The words "in public domain?" are a signal that no renewal information was found on an item. That signal appears in 39 records in this collection.

(c) Independently produced avant-garde and experimental films. The only films that are believed to fall into this category are Kenneth Anger's "Scorpio Rising" and the German "Uberfall" (also considered avant-garde--in 1929--and banned by the Third Reich).

(d) Socially significant home movies, particularly those documenting ethnic and minority communities. Several movies or parts of them document places or events significant in the lives of the gay community of which Bentley was a part. I have identified eight of these in the collection.

(e) Political commercials, and advertising, educational and industrial films of historical and cultural interest. There are two political commercials ("Rockefeller for President" for one) in this collection, and a number of films in the latter category, including films made by Pan American Airways and Chevrolet, and a famous Virginia Slims commercial ("You've Come a Long Way, Baby"). There are also commercials for companies no longer extant, such as TWA (Trans-World Airlines).

(f) Independent fiction and documentary films made and distributed outside the commercial mainstream. Among Bentley's homemade films is one called "Sinderella." There are also outtakes of this film on another reel. "Sinderella" is an updated story of the old legend, in which all the participants are gay men. The script, if such there was, was filmed without professional actors or crew, and its colorful centerpiece is a genuine gay ball with costumed couples contributing to the background against which the Prince discovers Sinderella. This film has obvious cultural importance, and badly needs preservation.

(g) Commercially produced works whose owners are unwilling or unable to provide long-term preservation. Determining if there are any films in this category in the Bentley collection is a project for a future researcher.

Given that the San Francisco State University Archives fits the description of eligible recipients as defined by the foundation, I recommend and hope that the archives will use the data amassed to apply for funds to preserve at least some of the Bentley collection.

A Public-Domain Film Festival

If it can be determined that films suspected of being in the public domain really are not protected by copyright, perhaps they could be celebrated by a festival to raise money for preservation purposes. This was a suggestion by the archivist that needs further investigation. Most of the films that appear to be in the public domain will not have been seen for anywhere from 40 (if released to early television) to 70 years. They vary from silent comedies to early nature films from the 1930s. Short films all, they could be combined with knowledgeable commentary to make for a fascinating set of showings both entertaining and educational.

The only remaining question is whether these films should be subjected to the strain of projection before copying. Perhaps loans could be sought to copy the films in advance, to be paid back from the (non-profit) proceeds of the festival; or perhaps they could be preserved and copied with funds from the National Film Preservation Foundation, then shown for the benefit of the rest of the collection.

Conclusion

The Paul Bentley Moving Image Study Collection is only part of a wealth of visual, auditory, and paper-based information available in the San Francisco State University Archives. However, it is an important part, and I believe that it can be properly appreciated and possibly preserved now that its contents are known.

There is a great deal of room for future scholarship and demonstration of technical competence in relation to this collection, and I hope that it will be the subject of many more projects and papers.

REFERENCES

- Abbot, Waldo, & Rider, Richard L. (1957). Handbook of broadcasting: the fundamentals of radio and television. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Blotkamp, Hoos. (1996, April). Symposium on archival rights. Film preservation, 25 (52) [Online serial]. URL <http://www.cinema.ucla.edu/fiaf/enfiaf.html>
- Bowser, Eileen, and Kuiper, John. (Eds.). (1980). A handbook for film archives. Brussels: The FIAF Secretariat.
- Davidson, Steven, and Lukow, Gregory. (1997). The administration of television, newsfilm and videotape collections: a curatorial manual. Los Angeles: National Center for Film and Video Preservation.
- Film storage white paper: keeping cool and dry: a new emphasis in film preservation. (Redefining preservation task force supporting document A.) (1994, August). [WWW document]. URL <http://www.lcweb.loc.gov/film/storage.html>
- Fireman, Judy. (Ed.) (1977). TV book: the ultimate television book. New York: Workman Publishing Company.
- Friend, Michael. (1994, October). Film/digital/film. [WWW document]. URL <http://www.ampas.org>
- Gaustad, Lars. (n.d./1998). The vinegar syndrome--a brief encounter. [WWW document]. URL <http://www.nbr.no/fiat/Bogensee/2-173gaustad.html>
- The George Eastman House. (n.d./1997). The George Eastman House [WWW document]. URL <http://www.eastman.org>
- Heitmann, Jurgen. (1998, February). User requirements and technologies for automated storage and retrieval. SPMTE journal, 100-105.
- Houston, Penelope. (1994). Keepers of the frame: the film archives. London: British Film Institute.
- Hurst, Walter E. (1973). Film superlist: 20,000 motion pictures in the public domain. Hollywood: 7 Arts

- Press, Inc. (Sometimes listed under pseudonyms Minus, Johnny, & Hale, William Storm.)
- Hurst, Walter E. (1979). Film superlist for 1940-1949 motion pictures in the U.S. public domain. Holllywood: 7 Arts Press, Inc.
- Hurst, Walter E. (1989). Film superlist: motion pictures in the U.S. public domain 1950-1959. Holllywood: 7 Arts Press, Inc.
- Imhof, Roger. (n.d.) Roger Imhof scrapbook collection. Stanford University Department of Special Collections (Manuscripts Collection). Stanford, California.
- Jones, Craig. (1983). 16mm motion picture film maintenance manual. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Leider, Emily W. (1997). Becoming Mae West. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux.
- Lenk, Sabine. (1996). Some thoughts on accessing film collections. Journal of film preservation, 25 (52). [WWW document]. URL <http://www.cinema.ucla.edu/FIAF/Journal/html52/some.html>
- Library of Congress, National Film Preservation Board. (1998, February 13). National Film Preservation Foundation. [WWW document]. URL <http://lcweb.loc.gov/film/nfpf.html>
- McCormick-Goodhart, Mark H. (1996). The allowable temperature and relative humidity range for the safe use and storage of photographic materials. Journal of the Society of Archivists, 17 (1), 7-21,
- McCormick-Goodhart, Mark H. (1998). On the cold storage of photographic materials in a conventional freezer using the critical moisture indicator (CMI) method. Unpublished manuscript, Smithsonian Institution.
- McGreevey, Tom, & Yeck, Joanne L. (1997). Our movie heritage. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Musser, Charles. (1995). Thomas A. Edison and his kinetographic motion pictures. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Redefining film preservation: a national plan: recommendations of the Librarian of Congress in consultation with the National Film Preservation Board (1994). [WWW document]. URL <http://lcweb.loc.gov/film/plan.html>

Roberts, David. (1993). Managing records in special formats. In Judith Ellis (Ed.), Keeping Archives (pp. 385-427). (2nd ed.) Port Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: D. W. Thorpe/The Australian Society of Archivists Inc.

Sackett, Susan. (1993). Prime-time hits: television's most popular network programs 1950 to the present. New York: Billboard Books.

Silents Majority. Silents Majority On-Line Journal of Silent Film, The. (n.d.) [WWW document]. URL <http://www.mdle.com/ClassicFilms>

Slide, Anthony. (1992). Nitrate won't wait: a history of film preservation in the United States. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc.

Television and video preservation 1997: a report on the current state of American television and video preservation: report of the Librarian of Congress. (1997). [WWW document]. URL <http://lcweb.loc.gov/film/tvstudy.htm>

Walters, Tyler O. (1995, Fall). Thinking about archival preservation in the '90s and beyond: some recent publications and their implications for archivists. American archivist, 58 (4), 476-492.

Wexler, David. (n.d./1998). Hollywood Vaults. [WWW document]. URL [http://www.hollywood vaults.com](http://www.hollywoodvaults.com)

White-Hensen, Wendy. (1984). Archival moving image materials: a cataloging manual. Washington, D.C.: Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division, Library of Congress.

Wilhelm, Henry. (1993). The permanence and care of color photographs, traditional and digital, color prints, color negatives, slides and motion pictures. Grinnell, Iowa: Preservation Publishing Company.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: Although these sources were not cited in the text of this report, many of them were consulted in documenting the Bentley collection. The rest were used to understand the background and history of film and television, as well as for information about studios, performers, and organizations.

- All-Movie Guide. (n.d./1997). All-movie guide [WWW document]. URL http://205.186.189.2/amg/movie_Root.html
- American Film Institute, and Louis Wolfson II Media History Center. (1997). The administration of television newsfilm and videotape collections: a curatorial manual. Los Angeles: American Film Institute.
- American Film Institute. (n.d./1997). American Film Institute. [WWW document]. URL <http://www.afionline.org>
- Armour, Robert A. (1980). Film: a reference guide. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- The Association of Moving Image Archivists. (1997, September 25). The Association of Moving Image Archivists [WWW document]. URL <http://www.amianet.org>
- Atkins, Thomas R. (1976). Science fiction films. New York: Monarch Press.
- Baer, Richard. (Ed.). (1979). Film buff's checklist of motion pictures (1912-1979). 1st ed. Hollywood: Hollywood Film Archive.
- Ballantyne, James. (Ed.). (1993). Researcher's guide to British film and TV collections. 4th rev. ed. London: British Universities Film and Video Council.
- Baskin, Ellen, and Hicken, Mandy. (Comp.). (1993). Enser's filmed books and plays: a list of books and plays from which films have been made, 1928-1991. Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Berg, A. Scott. (1989). Goldwyn: a biography. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Brooks, Tim, and Marsh, Earle. (1995). The complete directory of prime time, network and cable TV shows 1946-present. 6th ed. New York: Ballantine Books.

- Brown, Les. (1992). Encyclopedia of television. 3rd ed. Detroit: Gale Research Inc.
- Buscombe, Edward. (1988). The BFI companion to the western. New York: Atheneum.
- Bushnell, Brooks. (1993). Directors and their films: a comprehensive reference, 1895-1990. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland and Company, Inc., Publishers.
- Carey, Gary. (1970). Lost films. New York: The Museum of Modern Art.
- Case, Christopher. (1996). The ultimate movie thesaurus. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Castleman, Harry, and Podrazik, Walter J. (1984). The TV schedule book: four decades of network programming from sign-on to sign-off. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Catalog of copyright entries. (1980). 4th series, part 8. Renewals. Washington, D.C.: Copyright Office, the Library of Congress.
- Catalog of copyright entries: Motion pictures and filmstrips. (1970-1973). 3rd series, Vol. 24, parts 12-13, No. 12; Vol. 25, No. 1-2. Washington, D.C.: Copyright Office, the Library of Congress.
- Chester, Giraud, Garrison, Garnet R., and Edgar E. Willis. (1963). Television and radio. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.
- Coursodon, Jean-Pierre. With Sauvage, Pierre). 1983). American directors (Vol. 1). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Daily Variety television reviews. Vols. 1-10 (1946-1973 and 1989). New York: Garland Publishing Inc.
- The Damfinos. (n.d./1997). Buster Keaton's Fan Club [WWW document]. URL <http://www.picpal.com/damfino.html>
- Deivert, Bert. (1995). Shots in cyberspace: film research on the internet. Cinema journal, 35, 1, 103-124.
- Department of Theater Arts, University of California, Los Angeles, California. (1981). ATAS/UCLA Television

Archives catalog: holdings in the study collection of the Academy of Television Arts & Sciences/University of California, Los Angeles Television Archives.
Pleasantville, New York: Redgrave Publishing Company.

Dimmitt, Richard B. (1965). A title guide to the talkies: a comprehensive listing of 16,000 feature-length films from October, 1927, until December, 1963. New York: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Eames, John D. (1985). The Paramount story. New York: Crown Publishers.

Eells, George and Musgrove, Stanley. (1982). Mae West: a biography. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Eisner, Joel, and Krinsky, David. (1984). Television comedy series: an episode guide to 153 TV sitcoms in syndication. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland and Company, Inc., Publishers.

Ellis, Jack C. (1989). The documentary idea: a critical history of English-language documentary film and video. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Ellis, Jack C. (1979). A history of film. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Ensign, Lynne N., and Knapton, Robyn E. (1985). The complete dictionary of television and film. New York: Stein and Day.

Fielding, Raymond. (1972). The American newsreel 1911-1967. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.

Fielding, Raymond. (1967). A technological history of motion pictures and television: an anthology from the pages of the Journal of the Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Film daily (1934, May 19). P. 3.

The Film Daily yearbook of motion pictures and television. (1929-1959). New York: Film Daily.

The Film TV Daily yearbook of motion pictures and television. (1959-1970). New York: Film TV Daily.

- Fisher, Kim N. (1986). On the screen: a film, television and video research guide. Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, Inc.
- Fitzgerald, Michael G. (1977). Universal Pictures: a panoramic history in words, pictures and filmographies. New Rochelle, New York: Arlington House Publishers.
- Forrester, Tom, with Forrester, Jeff. (1988). The Three Stooges' lost episodes. Chicago: Contemporary Books.
- Fry, Ron, and Fourzon, Pamela. (1977). The saga of special effects. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gianakos, Larry James. (1980). Television drama series programming: a comprehensive chronicle 1947-1959. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Gifford, Denis. (1973) The British film catalogue 1895-1970: a reference guide. London: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Goble, Alan, ed. (1991). The international film index 1895-1990. London: Bowker-Saur.
- Halliwell, Leslie. (1988). Halliwell's filmgoer's and video viewer's companion. 9th ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Halliwell, Leslie. (1976). Mountain of dreams: the golden years of Paramount Pictures. New York: Stondrill Publishing Company.
- Halliwell, Leslie, with Purser, Philip. (1986). Halliwell's television companion. 3rd ed. London: Grafton Books.
- Hanson, Patricia K., and Hanson, Stephen L. (1986). Film Review index. Vol. I. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Harries, Dan M. (n.d./1997). CineMedia [WWW document]. URL <http://ptd15.afionline.org/CineMedia>
- Harris, Jay S. (Ed.). (1978). TV Guide: the first 25 years. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Heldelfels, R. D. (1994). Television's greatest year: 1954. New York: Continuum.

- International Federation of Film Archives. (n.d./1997). International Federation of Film Archives [WWW document]. URL <http://www.cinema.ucla.edu/fiaf/enfiaf.html>
- International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF). (1986). Preservation and restoration of moving images and sound. Brussels: Van Muysewinkel.
- The Internet Movie Database. (n.d./1997). The Internet movie database [WWW document]. URL <http://us.imdb.com>
- Katz, Ephraim. (1979). The film encyclopedia. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, Publishers.
- Kloepfel, Don V. (Ed.). (1969). Motion-picture projection and theatre presentation manual. New York: Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers, Inc.
- Konigsberg, Ira. (1987). The complete film dictionary. New York: New American Library.
- Lasky, Betty. (1984). RKO: the biggest little major of them all. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Lenburg, Jeff. (1981). The encyclopedia of animated cartoon series. Westport, Connecticut: Arlington House Publishers.
- Lentz, Harris M. (1983). Science fiction, horror and fantasy film and television credits. Jefferson, North Carolina: Mc-Farland and Company, Inc., Publishers.
- Leonard, William. (1981). Theatre--stage to screen to TV. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press.
- Library of Congress. (1997, August 20). The Library of Congress experimental search system [WWW document]. URL <http://lcweb2.loc.gov/catalog>
- Library of Congress, Copyright Office. (1912-1996). Motion pictures. Washington, D. C.: Copyright Office, Library of Congress.
- Library of Congress, Copyright Office. (1978). Motion pictures and filmstrips. Washington, D. C.: Copyright Office, Library of Congress.

- Library of Congress, National Film Preservation Board.
(1997, September 19). National Film Preservation Board of the Library of Congress. URL
<http://lcweb.loc.gov/film>
- Linbacher, James L. (Ed.). (1985) Feature films: a directory of feature films on 16 mm and videotape available for rental, sale and lease. 8th ed. New York: RR Bowker Company.
- McCreadie, Marsha. (1994). The women who write the movies: from Frances Marion to Nora Ephron. New York: Carol Publishing Group.
- Magill, Frank N. (Ed.). (1981) Magill's Survey of Cinema. 2nd series. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Salem Press.
- Maltin, Leonard. (1972). The great movie shorts. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.
- Maltin, Leonard. (1972). Selected short subjects from Spanky to the Three Stooges. New York: Da Capo Press, Inc.
- Mast, Gerald. (1973). The comic mind: comedy and the movies. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
- Mazliziozzi, Ronald S. (Ed.). (1988). Treasures from the film archives: a catalog of the silent fiction films held by FIAF archives. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- McCaffrey, Donald W. (1973). The golden age of sound comedy: comic films and comedians of the thirties. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company.
- Michael, Paul. (Ed.). (1969). The American movies reference book: the sound era. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Miller, Don. (1973). "B" movies: an informal survey of the American low-budget film 1933-1945. New York: Curtis Books.
- Montgomery, John. (1954). Comedy films. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

- Mordden, Ethan. (1988). The Hollywood studios: house style in the golden age of the movies. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Moser, James D. (Ed.). (1997). International Motion Picture Almanac. 68th ed. New York: Quigley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Museum of Modern Art (New York, New York). (1985). The film catalog: a list of holdings in the Museum of Modern Art. Boston: G. K. Hall.
- National Archives and Records Administration. (1997, May 23). NARA archival information locator (NAIL) [WWW document]. URL www.nara.gov/nara/nail.html
- The National Film Board of Canada. (1991). The NFB film guide: the production of the National Film Board of Canada from 1939-1989. Montreal, Quebec: National Film Board of Canada.
- New York Times film reviews, The (1913-1968). (1970). (6 vols.) New York: The New York Times and Arvo Press.
- Nixon, Diane S. (Comp.). (1996). Directory of archival and manuscript repositories in California. 4th ed. Berkeley: Society of California Archivists.
- O'Donnell, Monica M. (Ed.). (1986). Contemporary theatre, film, and television: a biographical guide Vol. 3. Detroit: Gale Research Company.
- Okuda, Ted, with Watz, Edward. (1986). The Columbia comedy shorts: two-reel Hollywood film comedies, 1933-1958. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc.
- Parish, James R. (1973). Actors' Television Credits 1950-1972. Metuchen, N. J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Parish, James R. (1971). The great movie series. New York: A. S. Barnes and Company.
- Parish, James R. and Terrace, Vincent. (1990). The complete actors' television credits, 1948-1988. (2nd ed.). Metuchen, N. J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Passi, Federico. (1997, August 9). The cinema connection [WWW document]. URL <http://www.socialchange.net.au/TCC>

- Pickard, Roy. (1979). Who played who in the movies: an A-Z. London: Frederick Muller Limited.
- Ragan, David. (1992). Who's who in Hollywood: the largest cast of international film personalities ever assembled. New York: Facts On File, Inc.
- Reed, Robert M., and Reed, Maxine K. (1994). The facts on file dictionary of television, cable and video. New York: Facts on File Inc.
- Rouse, Sarah, and Loughney, Katharine. (Comps.). (1989). 3 decades of television: a catalog of television programs acquired by the Library of Congress 1949-1979. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress.
- Scanlon, Christopher P. (Ed.). (1997). Video source book. 19th ed. Detroit: Gale Research.
- Sennett, Ted. (1989). The art of Hanna-Barbera: fifty years of creativity. New York: Viking Studio Books.
- Settel, Irving. (1983). A pictorial history of television. (2nd ed.). New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.
- Sprecher, Daniel. (1969). Guide to films (16mm) about famous people. Alexandria, Virginia: Serina Press.
- Stasheff, Edward, and Bretz, Rudy. (1951). The television program: its writing, direction and production. New York: A. A. Wyn, Inc.
- Sullivan, Kaye. (1980). Films for, by, and about women. Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1980.
- Terrace, Vincent. (1986). Encyclopedia of television series, pilots and specials 1937-1973. New York: Zoetrope.
- Thorpe, Frances. (Ed.) (1988). International directory of film and TV documentation centres. Chicago: St. James Press.
- Tuska, Jon. (1973). The films of Mae West. Secaucus, New Jersey: The Citadel Press.
- TV feature film source book. (1967). Vol. 8 (1), 7. New York: Broadcast Information Bureau, Inc.

- University of California. (n.d./1997). Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive [WWW document]. URL <http://www.uampfa.berkeley.edu>
- University of California. (1997, October 11). Melvyl homepage [WWW document]. URL <http://www.melvyl.ucop.edu>
- University of California. (n.d./1997). UCLA Film/TV Archive--collections [WWW document]. URL <http://www.cinema.ucla.edu/lowband/arsc/collects/collects.htm>
- University of Georgia Libraries. (1997, April 15). UGA Libraries Peabody Award Archive [WWW document]. URL <http://www.libs.uga.edu/peabody/archive.html>
- Variety film reviews 1907-1980. (1983). (16 vols.). New York: Garland Publishers Inc.
- Vinson, James. (Ed.). (1986). The international dictionary of films and filmmakers. (5 vols.). Chicago: St. James Press.
- Walker, John. (Ed.). (1996). Halliwel's film and video guide. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Walls, Howard Lamarr. (1953). Motion pictures 1894-1912 identified from the records of the U.S. Copyright Office. Washington, D.C.: Copyright Office, Library of Congress.
- Winship, Michael. (1988). Television. New York: Random House.
- Wolf, Leonard. (1997). Dracula: the connoisseur's guide. New York: Broadway Books.

APPENDIX A

ANNOTATED LIST OF FIELDS

Fields from Archival Moving Image Materials: a Cataloging Manual, in order

<u>Field Name</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Main Title	This corresponds to the "main entry" field in the manual. This is the title issued in the country of production. If the item is a television program, the series and episode name or number are given here.
Parallel Title	The parallel title is the main title in a country of release. There might be several parallel titles, but in this collection only one is given, usually if it is the title held.
Production Company	This is the original production company.
Director	The director might have a different title, particularly in a different language, but the function is the same.
Producer	This is the producer rather than an executive producer, unless no other producer is given.
Writers	In this field are placed all the writers involved with an item, with their responsibilities (e.g., story, screenplay).
Version	The edition or version statement goes here. This field is only used if the title held represents a major change from the original released version.
Country Prod.	The country of production is the country of origin of the film. Reasonable assumptions are usually placed in brackets, since this information is seldom given on a film.

APPENDIX A, continued

Fields from Archival Moving Image Materials: a Cataloging Manual, in order, continued

<u>Field Name</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Country Rel.	This field may be skipped if the country of origin and the country of release are the same.
Releaser	This field also may be skipped if the production company is the same as the distributing company.
Released	The year of release must correspond to the date the holding was released. Otherwise "n.d." must be used, and the original date placed in the notes, below.
Holdings	The number of reels at each entry with the number of total reels (e.g., 1 reel of 1).
Feet	The footage of this reel or set of reels at this Bentley number.
Sound	Whether the item is printed on silent or sound film.
Color	Choices include sepia, black-and-white, and color. Films might have both black-and-white and color segments.
Description	All films in this collection so far are archival prints. Some are negatives, some positives. Other possibilities, according to the manual, are "dupe" (duplicate), "reference print," etc.
Series	If the series is not part of the title, it goes here, with any relevant number.

APPENDIX A, continued

Fields from Archival Moving Image Materials: a Cataloging Manual, in order, continued

<u>Field Name</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Copyright	This part of the notes on a film should indicate where the copyright information came from if there is conflicting information or confirmation cannot be found. It should indicate if the copyright owner has changed, if this is known.
Nature	The nature or form of the material might, for example, be a television pilot, a documentary, or amateur footage. This differs from "Genre," below.
Language	Although the manual specifies that this note should be made only if not apparent from the foregoing description, since this is a database, the note has been made a permanent searchable field.
Source of Title	If the main title did not come from the film, the source must be given here.
Variations in Title	There may be a working title, an inventory list title, or a title on the can that should go here.
Parallel & Other Title Info.	Sources of parallel titles; lengthy other title or subtitle information.
Statements Responsibility	Further information about the first seven fields, especially conflicting data.
Crew	This corresponds to the "credits" note area in the manual. "Crew" is used to discriminate between this and the later "Cast" field.

APPENDIX A, continued

Fields from Archival Moving Image Materials: a Cataloging Manual, in order, continued

<u>Field Name</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Cast	Although the manual directs the placement of narrators and voices in a separate note, they are here placed with other cast members so they can be searched together in one field.
History	The history of the film, such as the addition of a sound track or its adaptation from a novel, goes here.
Distribution	Additional information about release or history of distribution, including dates of television series telecasts.
Trade Name	Trade names, logos or trademarks go here.
Television Sponsors	The "product, service, or message being promoted," according to the manual.
Distr. Change	This corresponds to the "version with major changes distribution information" note in the manual. This would include data such as "Original work released in 1935 by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer."
Distribution w/o Change	Same as "version with minor changes distribution information." This might include the addition of subtitles or music.
Description Note	This applies to the whole description, such as, "Not viewed since negative."
Incomplete	The manual calls for noting "the nature and extent of incompleteness" (e.g., "end titles missing").
Length	This might include information about the lack or presence of commercials, which would change the length, or whether footage has been estimated.

APPENDIX A, continued

Fields from Archival Moving Image Materials: a Cataloging Manual, in order, continued

<u>Field Name</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Sound Characteristics	A sound track might be lacking, or music only. Given for this collection are also responsible parties for sound (e.g., Western Electric).
Color Information	Whether the print is Technicolor, faded, etc. There might be a color sequence in a black-and-white film.
Form of Copy	Further information about "the designation of a film" (e.g., kinescope).
Other Physical Details	These are details "important for use or storage," such as brittleness of film or the presence of splices.
Description Res. the Notes	The "source of information if not from item itself."
Accompanying Material	The "existence and type of accompanying material." In the case of this collection, these notes are mainly about writing on reels, leader, and cans, and the presence of notes inside the cans.
Accompanying Material2	A related file for placement of information from the poster file.
Series Notes	Overflow from "Series" field or sources for information in that field.
References	Reviews or descriptions of the film.
Summary	This field combines two note areas in the manual, "summary" and "contents," the only difference between the two types of notes being that one is for works of fiction, the other for nonfiction.

APPENDIX A, continued

Fields from Archival Moving Image Materials: a Cataloging Manual, in order, continued

<u>Field Name</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Numbers	Accession numbers, etc. For this collection numbers that might identify the episode or release have also been included.
With	"When two or more separate works are contained in a single item" (i.e., reel), the other titles are given here.
Genre	This uses a standard list of genre terms to "broadly categorize the content."
Censorship	"Whether the work has been viewed by a censorship board"
Awards	Where known, this field includes nominations for awards.
Rating	Designations by content rating systems such as "PG," "R," etc.
Related Materials	This field was meant for stills, posters, etc.; but also gives, where possible, the existence and location of other copies of the item. This is useful when a patron wants to view the item merely for content, since these are archival copies with limited access.

Fields for This Archives

Bentley #	The inventory number of an item in the collection.
Vinegar Syndrome?	A "yes" or "no" answer.
Needs leader?	This includes the need for trailer.
Needs core?	A "yes" or "no" answer.

APPENDIX A, continued
Fields for This Archives, continued

<u>Field Name</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Needs can?	Whether the item needs archival packaging.
Rm	The current storage room.
Shelf	Shelf location.
Col	The column in which the item is stacked.
Date Viewed	Date of viewing, if it can be determined.
Subjects	This field is carried over from the old MARC-based form, since it may be helpful in describing subject matter not covered under other fields.
Links	This field is used if the item is one of a set of pieces, or if it might reasonably be concatenated with other similar items.
Minutes	The length of the item in minutes and seconds. This information is usually from outside sources or from the leader, reel, or can, since items were not timed when viewed.
Relevance	Given the use of the collection and its cultural significance, this field is used to speculate on the reason for the presence of the item in this archive.
Out to	A field for the removal log, to specify whence an item was removed.
Out for	The reason for removal.
Out date	To log the date an item was removed.
In	To log the date an item was returned.

APPENDIX A, continued

Fields for This Archives, continued

<u>Field Name</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
Researched In	For the research log, to prevent repetition of effort.
Finished research?	To help with database searches for items that have not been completely documented.
Preservation Notes	Notes on the current condition of the item such as the type of reel and container, the presence of other reels in the container, etc.

Other Fields are duplicate fields for information about a second copy of the same item.

APPENDIX B
PAUL BENTLEY MOVING IMAGE COLLECTION DATABASE
SAMPLE PRINTOUTS

PRESERVATION SURVEY

Bentley # 45 Main title Seven Faces of Dr. Lao, The
 Room Color ☒ col. ☐ b&w ☐ sepia Released 1963
 Footage 3913 Sound ☒ sd. ☐ si. Date Viewed 11/21/97
 Feet copy 2 Holdings 3 reels of 3 Copy 2
 Description 16 mm. archival Description2

Form of Copy

Sound Characteristics Westrex Recording System. Sound good.
 Color Information Originally filmed in Metrocolor. This copy has some

Preservation Notes

Vinegar syndrome? ☐ copy 1 ☐ copy 2 Needs leader? ☐ copy 1 ☐ copy 2
 Needs core? ☐ copy 1 ☐ copy 2 Needs can? ☐ copy 1 ☐ copy 2
 Other Physical Details Metal reels in cardboard box.

Links

Bentley # 330 Main title Alcoa Premiere. The Jail.
 Room Mask Color ☐ col. ☒ b&w ☐ sepia Released [1962-02-06]
 Footage 1858 Sound ☒ sd. ☐ si. Date Viewed 1997-11-04
 Feet copy 2 Holdings 1 reel of 1 Copy 2
 Description 16 mm. archival Description2

Form of Copy

Sound Characteristics

Color Information

Preservation Notes Metal reel in metal can.

Vinegar syndrome? ☐ copy 1 ☐ copy 2 Needs leader? ☐ copy 1 ☐ copy 2
 Needs core? ☐ copy 1 ☐ copy 2 Needs can? ☐ copy 1 ☐ copy 2

Other Physical Details

Links Commercials & intros later reel?

SHELF LIST

Bentley # 45	Holdings 3 reels of	Bentley # 313	Holdings 1 reel of
Room	Shelf Col.	Room Mask	Shelf 13 Col. 2
Title Seven Faces of Dr. Lao, The		Title Hollywood Palace	
Description 16 mm. archival positive		Description 16 mm. archival positive	

Bentley # 330	Holdings 1 reel of	Bentley # 326	Holdings 1 reel of
Room Mask	Shelf 13 Col. 2	Room Mask	Shelf 14 Col. 1
Title Alcoa Premiere. The Jail.		Title Judy Garland Show, The	
Description 16 mm. archival positive		Description 16 mm. archival positive	

Bentley # 315	Holdings 2 reels of	Bentley # 528	Holdings 1 reel of
Room Mask	Shelf 13 Col. 2	Room Mask	Shelf 18 Col. 1
Title Alfred Hitchcock Hour, The. An		Title Judy Garland Show, The	
Description 16 mm. archival positive		Description 16 mm. archival positive	

Bentley # 518	Holdings 1 reel of	Bentley # 322	Holdings 1 reel of
Room	Shelf Col.	Room Mask	Shelf 14 Col. 1
Title Bugs Bunny Show, The.		Title Laramie. The Dark Trail.	
Description 16 mm. archival positive		Description 16 mm. archival positive	

Bentley # 331	Holdings 1 reel of	Bentley # 511	Holdings 1 reel of
Room Mask	Shelf 14 Col. 2	Room Mask	Shelf 18 Col. 1
Title Bell System Family Theatre.		Title Mister Ed. [Episode with Mae	
Description 16 mm. archival positive		Description 16 mm. archival negative	

REMOVAL LOG

Bentley # 45

Room Shelf Col

Main title Seven Faces of Dr. Lao,

Out to

Out for

Out date

In

Bentley # 331

Room Mask Shelf 14 Col 2

Main title Bell System Family

Out to

Out for

Out date

In

Bentley # 330

Room Mask Shelf 13 Col 2

Main title Alcoa Premiere. The Jail.

Out to

Out for

Out date

In

Bentley # 313

Room Mask Shelf 13 Col 2

Main title Hollywood Palace

Out to

Out for

Out date

In

Bentley # 315

Room Mask Shelf 13 Col 2

Main title Alfred Hitchcock Hour,

Out to

Out for

Out date

In

Bentley # 326

Room Mask Shelf 14 Col 1

Main title Judy Garland Show, The

Out to

Out for

Out date

In

Bentley # 518

Room Shelf Col

Main title Bugs Bunny Show, The.

Out to

Out for

Out date

In

Bentley # 528

Room Mask Shelf 18 Col 1

Main title Judy Garland Show, The

Out to

Out for

Out date

In

LIST

PB# 322 Nature Television
Main title Laramie. The Dark Trail.
Feet 1683
Variations in Title
Released 1960-1 Country Prod US
Production Co. Revue Studios in
Director Francis D. Lyon
Cast John Smith, Robert Fuller, Robert
Summary

One of the partners rides to a far ranch to garner some horseflesh to sell at good prices. Various fist - and gunfights ensue.

PB# 142 Nature Television
Main title Mister Ed. [Top Secret].
Feet 354
Variations in Title
Released Country Prod US
Production Co. [ZIV-UA?]
Director
Cast Alan Young (Wilbur Post), Allan
Summary

Alan Young dresses as a woman in order to recover Mister Ed, who is being held in the basement of a sorority house.

PB# 511 Nature TV program
Main title Mister Ed. [Episode with
Feet 630 Mae West?]
Variations in Title
Released Country Prod US
Production Co.
Director
Cast [Mae West, Alan Young?]
Summary

This film was not viewed since it appears to be a negative.

PB# 342 Nature Television
Main title Now You See It, Now You
Feet 3479 Don't
Variations in Title Working title:
Released 1968-1 Country Prod US
Production Co. Universal Television
Director Don Weis
Cast Jonathan Winters (Jeremiah
Summary

Winters conceives a plan to steal a painting, copy it, sell the copy, then return the painting. To do it, he springs a convict from jail, but the buyers discover the hoax, the painting is returned, and Winters gets no money, but he does get the girl.

RESEARCH LOG

PB# 317 **Nature** **Television**
Main title Studio One. Twelve Angry
 Men.

Title Varies?

Date 1954-

Production Co. CBS Television

Director Franklin Schaffner

Other date? **Country** US

Cast Robert Cummings, Franchot
 Tone, Edward Arnold, Paul

Summary

A jury deliberates the fate of a young man accused of murder. Starting from 11 to one for conviction, they gradually argue their way--guided by the calm skepticism of Robert

References

Descriptive material in Parish and Terrace, Vol. 1, p. 129.

Researched in

not in RLIN, OCLC, LC. Listed as "lost" in AMIA's 1997 report.

PB# 382 **Nature** **Television**
Main title This Is Your Music.

Title Varies?

Date 1955

Production Co. a Jan Production

Director Robert Stevenson

Other date? **Country**

Cast Byron Palmer, Joan Weldon,
 Nelson Riddle and his

Summary

With Coney Island as the setting, this episode features music for the 10 years beginning in 1914.

References

Researched in

not in OCLC, RLIN, AMG, Cinemedia, LC or UCLA cat, printed IMD. Superlist has list p. 341 of 50-59 but can't identify show.

APPENDIX C

PHOTOGRAPHS

The Bentley poster collection is housed in three conservation boxes and, where necessary due to size, a drawer in a map case. All the handmade posters (generally 9 x 12) are in the boxes, leaving only the large commercial posters in the drawer. Some lobby cards are also in the boxes. All except the last two photographs were taken by history intern Christine Doan during this project.

The three conservation boxes housing the small posters.

Handmade posters betray different styles, suggesting different artists.

These elaborate posters were apparently placed in Bentley's bars to advertise coming attractions.

Some posters, such as that for "The Disembodied," suggest that the artist did not know the content of the film.

Some films advertised on the posters are not in the collection, suggesting, along with rental shipping containers, that Bentley may have rented some films to show.

Students of gender studies will find the role of women in these films to be interesting.

Elaborate posters
like this one may
contain implications
about the
predilections of
Bentley's clientele.

The handmade posters may be contrasted with commercial
posters in the same collection.

This movie is one of several in the collection produced abroad, even though it is English-language.

Lobby cards like these were originally displayed in glass cases either in the lobby or outside the cinema.

The fact that more than one poster exists for the same film may indicate multiple showings.

(To Right and Below)
A few notes from the
film cans were
removed and placed in
the poster boxes,
such as the one on
the right, "Thanks
Paul."

The Cinescan viewing table with the author and one of her favorites.

Paul Bentley
(Courtesy,
Gay and
Lesbian
Historical
Society of Northern California)

IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (QA-3)

APPLIED IMAGE, Inc.
1653 East Main Street
Rochester, NY 14609 USA
Phone: 716/482-0300
Fax: 716/288-5989

© 1993, Applied Image, Inc., All Rights Reserved