Formats and Standards: A Film Archive Perspective on Exchanging Computerized Data

ROGER SMITHER

Abstract: Film archives—despite the "published" nature of many collections—share conventional archivists' problems in processing information on their holdings. Also common to both is the feeling that the introduction of computers should make easier the sharing of processed information and the realization that such data exchange is dependent on the acceptance of common standards and formats. Information given to the Cataloguing Commission of the Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film (FIAF), which is developing such standards, indicates that progress at the national level in some countries may come to hinder, not help, international developments and illustrates some of the problems in planning international cooperation.

About the author: Roger Smither is Keeper of the Department of Information Retrieval at the Imperial War Museum, London, England. He is a graduate of Cambridge University, where he read history, before joining the staff of the museum as a film cataloger in 1970. He has been in his present post since 1977, and a member of the Cataloguing Commission of the Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film since 1979. This article derives from a paper given as the keynote address at the Symposium on Computer Applications in Film Archives during the 42nd Annual Congress of FIAF held at the National Film and Sound Archive in Canberra, Australia 14–19 April 1986. The help and encouragement during the preparation of this paper of the Chairman of the FIAF Cataloguing Commission, Harriet Harrison of the Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division of the Library of Congress, is gratefully acknowledged.

THE POSITION OF ONE who rides two horses or falls between two stools is proverbially uncomfortable: sympathize, then, with the position of film archivists. Relegated by librarians to the outer world of "non-books" because of the medium in which they deal, they find they drop to a still lower level of consideration because their concerns are archival. For example, the library community's first published ISBD(NBM) "may require elaboration . . . to meet the requirements of sound, film and other archives";[1] however, should they turn for solidarity to other archivists, they are likely to find their collections dismissed as "library" material (the overtone of professional disdain apparent in "library" almost equals that of the phrase "non-book") on the grounds that their material is commonly extant in multiple copies around the world.

This labeling of film as library materials may be justifiably quibbled with. Some film preserved in archives (and not only in film archives) is as unequivocally archival material as a diary, an author's notebooks and manuscript, a file of official records, or a collection of personal papers. "Home movies," collections of rushes, offcuts and unused footage from finished or unfinished feature films, extensive collections of unedited record footage such as the Imperial War Museum's holdings of film from the British Army Film and Photographic Unit, and personalized collections such as the Library of Congress's *Theodore Roosevelt Association Film Collection*[2] all meet this definition. It is, however, true that much of the film preserved in film and other archives is barely within or clearly outside this category. Many film archives are dedicated to the art of film, and their collections consist primarily of released (one

might then indeed almost say published) feature films. The description of such collections as archival remains valid, but is justified in terms of the preservation-centered (rather than distribution-centered) priorities of the institutions that house them and especially in terms of the problems inherent in the materials housed.

In spite of the origins in "publication" of much of the material held, a film archive is likely to find after all that a significant proportion of its collection may be unique. Film, or moving image material generally, is international and indeed intercultural in a way that few other media are. The proportion of screen time in the majority of the world's countries that is devoted to material originating outside those countries is ample testimony to this. At the same time, the form in which a piece of moving image material is presented in different countries—or on different occasions in the same country—is liable to almost infinite change. Its total length, continuity, artistic effect, and indeed its very comprehensibility may be affected by the requirements of local censorship or the decisions of a local distributor about the appetites or the staying power of a cinema audience or the needs of television advertisers. Its physical form can be affected by technical requirements (such as the different shapes of a widescreen film format and the domestic television screen) and technical manipulations (including the addition of sound to a silent film or the currently controversial process of colorization). Its content can be affected by translation and other forms of adaptation to different audiences, whether those take the form of dialogue bearing no relation to the lip movements of the dubbed actors or the intrusion into the visual image of textual

---

[1] *ISBD (NBM): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Non-Book Materials* (London: International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, 1977).

[2] Wendy White-Hensen and Veronica M. Gillespie, *The Theodore Roosevelt Association Film Collection: A Catalog* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1986).

subtitles. Over and above these intentional differences, the film archivist must confront the frailty and vulnerability of the medium, and accept that copies of older films are susceptible to a range of damage and deterioration, making it almost inevitable that there will still exist differences between even theoretically identical copies.

A natural consequence of this is that film archivists find the cataloging of their collections more akin to archival processing than library cataloging. Although a film is likely to be kept in a labelled container and carry titles and credits, these cannot—whatever the superficial resemblance—be considered equivalent to a title page. Much has already been made of the mutability of film, and few details are easier to change than a title. Everyone has their favorite story of a distributor's title-change: typical is the film released on different sides of the Atlantic as *Tomorrow We Live* (UK) and *At Dawn We Die* (USA). Titles are also lost, inadvertently added to the wrong film, or deliberately misused to conceal an act of copyright piracy or the like. In any case, for reasons already indicated, even the correct identification of a film by title does not provide sufficient information about that film, and the additional data is only available through extensive investigation and research. Further similarities between film cataloging and archival processing may be found in the need to document an item in many physical components, since even an archive's "single copy" may exist in multiple forms (negative, positive, 16mm, 35mm, etc., each occupying several reels), and in the need to furnish some account of the content of the items held, as film is not an easily browsed medium.

This background gives film archivists a special interest in the sharing of information, which has characteristics in common with the interests of both the library and conventional archival worlds. Beyond the attractions of library-like shared cataloging effort, film archivists and the users of their collections will appreciate, like the archivists and users of paper archives, any research tool that makes it easier to discover the whereabouts of material that complements or completes the contents of those collections. In addition to these benefits of information sharing, film archivists will also welcome assistance in establishing the relationship of footage held in their archives to the original work created by the film maker, a need that transcends the apparently equivalent function of the edition statement in bibliography, because the differences between film versions are rarely stated in accessible form on the films themselves or even in widely available sources. Because of this range of special characteristics, and because of the international element in moving image distribution, exchange of data among film archives has an important international dimension which accentuates some problems—and introduces others—that will not yet have caused much difficulty to sharers of data in a predominantly national context.

Information exchange features prominently among the stated goals of the Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film (FIAF).[3] Currently approaching its fiftieth anniversary, FIAF now has over seventy-five members, observers, and subscribers, representing major specialist film archives or the film archive division of major general archives or national libraries from over fifty countries around the world. Among its principal aims are: to facilitate the collection and international exchange of films and documents

---

[3]The Secretariat of the Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film, from whom additional information may be obtained and copies of publications ordered, is located at Coudenberg 70, 1000 Brussels, Belgium.

relating to cinematographic history and art; to develop cooperation between its members; and to promote the development of cinema art and culture. FIAF carries out some of its work through specialist commissions composed of experts from the staff of member archives. A Documentation and Cataloguing Commission was set up in 1968, and divided into two separate commissions the following year. The Cataloguing Commission produces publications that will help FIAF member archives with the cataloging of their collections, a conspicuous recent example being the five-language *Glossary of Filmographic Terms*.[4] Among its other tasks, the commission has sought to monitor and report to the general membership on the usage of computers for cataloging in film archives. This has resulted in the preparation of two studies, the first in 1979 and the second in 1985, which have demonstrated a marked increase in the number of archives already using or planning to introduce computers for this purpose.[5]

The expansion of computer usage among film archivists has led naturally to exploration of the extent to which these new archival tools can promote the traditional archival goals, and especially to consideration of the possibility of FIAF archives sharing their information through the new information technology. The topic has been raised in specialist symposia or general congress sessions at most recent annual congresses, frequently in terms of some impatience to know why progress towards such an obviously desirable goal is so slow. Some encouragement is derived from two concurrent trends at the national level in various countries.

The first is the continuing progress being made in several countries in the preparation of comprehensive retrospective or current national filmographies, noted in another Cataloguing Commission publication, the *Bibliography of National Filmographies*.[6] As a national bibliography aims to do with books, a national filmography aspires to list in a comprehensive and consistent form the complete film output of a particular country. Since film production has a shorter history and is on a considerably smaller scale than book production, even in countries that produce large volumes of film, the generation of retrospective filmographies is a realizable project, although never an easy one. Definitive description of a film as provided in a national filmography typically extends the normal bibliographic standard by requiring, for example, the listing of organizational and personal "credits" far more extensive than a book's author and publisher, and by the provision of a synopsis or summary of the argument or story line of a film to help in its identification in any one of the many circumstances leading to retitling or to assist the reader when—as is sadly probable for older films—there is no surviving copy of the film to speak for itself. Such works more than adequately provide those benefits of information sharing listed earlier, notably in the provision of an original yardstick against which to measure archival holdings.

Currently, major projects of retrospective filmography are derived from material assembled and held on computer. Classic examples are the elegant *Svensk filmografi*, now nearing completion, and the *Catalogue de la Production Ciné-*

---

[4]Jon Gartenberg, *Glossary of Filmographic Terms = Lexique de termes filmographiques = Lexikalisches Handbuch für Film [etc.]* (Brussels: Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film, 1985).

[5]FIAF Cataloguing Commission, *Study on the usage of computers for filmcataloguing* [sic] (Brussels: Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film, 1979); Roger Smither, ed., *Second FIAF Study on the Usage of Computers for Film Cataloguing* (Brussels: Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film, 1985).

[6]Dorothea Gebauer, comp., and Harriet Harrison, ed., *Bibliography of National Filmographies* (Brussels: Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film, 1985).

matographique Française, of which the first volumes appeared in 1983.[7] Current filmographies may be exemplified by *Film Canadiana*,[8] of particular interest because it is assembled from information collected by the archives representing Canada's two major linguistic traditions (the Moving Image and Sound Archive, formerly National Film, Television and Sound Archives, in Ottawa and the Cinémathèque Québécoise in Montreal) and derived from a computer file serviced by UTLAS, the major Canadian bibliographic utility;[9] it thus provides a modest but encouraging prototype for computer-based data sharing between archives that do not have an identical background and with the added achievement of the finished product emerging into a potentially wider framework.

The second trend at the national level is the development of national data bases. In several cases reported in the FIAF Cataloguing Commission's *Second Study*, archives propose participation in computer networks that will encompass more than one aspect of a country's film activity—production, distribution, censorship/registration and, indeed, national filmography, as well as archival requirements—and in the specific case of India, the development of the network INDO FILM NET is well advanced.[10] Closest of all to providing a valid precedent for a large-scale international or global data base is progress towards the development within

the United States of NAMID—the National Moving Image Database—under the auspices of the National Center for Film and Video Preservation in the American Film Institute.

Supporting NAMID is also a tradition of retrospective filmography compilation,[11] but the project's current goals are much more extensive. "The National Moving Image Database will provide information on the film, television and video holdings of the nation's archives, producers, networks, studios and libraries, as well as access to filmographic and cataloging data on American film and television production."[12] Progress to date includes the selection of hardware and software and the creation of a data base for development work. Meanwhile a NAMID standards committee is holding a series of meetings to discuss further stages in the project's evolution, such as the publication of an agreed list of genre terms, the development of a section of the standard data base record to describe the holdings of different contributors, and investigation of procedures for collating different cataloging terms used in contributing archives.[13] The committee has already agreed to the use of the MARC Visual Materials (VM) format as the communication format for the network. Given the volume of moving image material generated in the United States, and the potential number of participants in NAMID even at the archive level, the

[7]*Svensk filmografi 6: 1960–1969* (Stockholm: Svenska Filminstitutet, 1977), and subsequent volumes; *Catalogue de la production cinématographique française 1975* (Bois d'Arcy: Service des Archives du Film du Centre Nationale de la Cinématographie, 1983).

[8]*Film Canadiana 1983–1984* (Montreal: National Film Board of Canada, 1985), and previous volumes.

[9]Donald Bidd with Louise de Chevigny and Margo Letourneau, "Computerized information system operates for A-V materials," *Canadian Library Journal* 41 (December 1984): 323–30.

[10]P. K. Nair, Foreword to *Indian Films 1983* (Pune: National Film Archive of India, 1985); see also the contribution by P. K. Nair and Atul Asthana to Smither, *Second FIAF Study*.

[11]*The American Film Institute Catalog: Volume F2: Feature Films 1921-30* (New York and London: Bowker, 1971).

[12]*National Moving Image Database Factsheet* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Film and Video Preservation, American Film Institute, 1986); distributed at the FIAF Congress, Canberra.

[13]Reports and information from the National Center for Film and Video Preservation, The American Film Institute, Kennedy Center, Washington, D.C., 20566.

rest of the film archive world may be justified in thinking that if NAMID succeeds then everything is possible after all, and will watch progress with interest.

Individual institutions as well as national effort have contributed to the potential development of international computerized data exchange. Various front-rank film archives have published catalogs of their own holdings based on computerized files: examples include the National Film Archive in London and the Department of Film of the Museum of Modern Art in New York.[14] Given the strength of their collections, and the respect already accorded to those institutions because of knowledge of their published cataloging rules,[15] their catalogs carry a reputation not far short of national filmographies, although the information they contain is not so comprehensive. Still more significant is the news that the Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division of the Library of Congress has begun the on-line cataloging of moving image material using the library's systems and a cataloging manual for *Archival Moving Image Materials*[16] and so providing, with the full international prestige of the library in support, both an important precedent and (through library released tapes) a growing body of extant cataloging data on archival film in the MARC Visual Materials format.[17]

Given these encouraging moves towards the buildup of authoritative computerized files of filmographic data, and the concurrent development of national channels for the sharing of that information through formal networks and through the availability of information on library utility tapes, it may be tempting to conclude that all is well and to sit back and wait for things to get even better. In fact, however, an optimistic attitude is not entirely justified, and the reasons for this caution have already been hinted at, as in the absence of any international examples in the foregoing list of advances and, more subtly, in the noting of the need for meetings within the NAMID framework of a standards committee. The cause for concern in the film archival world is precisely the fact that common standards for data exchange are being developed not only well after the perception of the usefulness of shared data, but also after the development of the first potential contributions to a global data base.

The importance of a common format and of formal standards in the context of computerized data exchange will not be news to readers of the *American Archivist*, who have had the benefit of excellent articles by Nancy Sahli and Steven Hensen in the Winter 1986 issue to prepare them. These have pointed out "the need for standardized formats and procedures"[18] and more than one "immediate and compelling reason for archivists to

---

[14]*National Film Archive Catalogue Volume 1: Non-Fiction Films* (London: British Film Institute, 1980); Jon Gartenberg, et al., eds., *The Film Catalog: A List of Holdings in the Museum of Modern Art* (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1985).

[15]*Rules for Use in the Cataloguing Department of the National Film Archive, 5th Revised Edition* (London: British Film Institute, 1960); Jon Gartenberg, *Film Cataloguing Manual: A Computer System* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1979).

[16]Wendy White-Hensen, comp., *Archival Moving Image Materials: A Cataloging Manual* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1984).

[17]"Visual Materials Online System is Announced," *Library of Congress Information Bulletin* 45 (16 June 1986): 238–39; "Online Users Group Presents Program on Visual Materials," *Library of Congress Information Bulletin* 46 (13 April 1987): 153–54; "Catalog Records for Archival Moving Image Materials," *Cataloging Service Bulletin* 36 (Spring 1987): 64–66.

[18]Nancy A. Sahli, "Interpretation and Application of the AMC Format," *American Archivist* 49 (Winter 1986): 9–20.

abandon some of their more individualistic ways."[19] They have also noted the need for education and outreach in explaining the advantages of using the AMC format while examining some of the more or less palatable implications, for example in coming to terms with the librarians' approach to access points, name authorities, or subject headings.

The FIAF Cataloguing Commission has been making similar efforts on behalf of the film archive community for several years, with the evolution of cataloging rules supporting an ISBD-like format for data exchange being the principal concern of the full commission since 1981 (due for completion in 1988) and with working parties from the commission simultaneously examining topics related to standards such as the question of designations for film genres, a particular concern for many film archives. The commission, however, necessarily works slowly and, meanwhile, major projects are underway in FIAF archives before the standards have even been finalized, let alone accepted by the membership at large. Part of the reason for slow progress will be familiar to participants in any similar working party. As it is dependent on the willingness of the members' institutions to continue sanctioning the diversion of time and resources to commission projects, it is difficult to maintain momentum between meetings. Its international character then means it is not normally possible for the commission, with members from seven or more countries, to meet for proper working sessions more than once a year. Beyond these administrative difficulties, the problems that confront the commission in the preparation of standards also have their own special characteristics.

The particular dimension in the FIAF deliberations that is quite naturally not present in the consideration given in the Sahli and Hensen articles is again the international dimension. Whatever the difficulties in the way of cooperation in data exchange between the eponymous readers of the *American Archivist*, they may at least be expected to have in common a single national and cultural context and a finite set of organizational structures and goals. FIAF member archives, by contrast, operate in a very wide range of national and institutional contexts. Their ability to subscribe to common ideals cannot overcome the fact that among the effects of those differing contexts are significant policy constraints on the types of computer systems to which access is easy or even possible. Some types of data sharing may simply not be available options to certain archives, and it is necessary to consider how their professed eagerness to take part in any data-sharing exercise is to be accommodated.

Beyond the question of the ability to participate in data sharing, the international dimension greatly increases the difficulty of maintaining standards across the whole range of potential participants. At the most obvious level, in a context of international data exchange (rather than national exchange of data which itself possibly includes an international element) the whole topic of language and script availability and usage must be settled, together with provision for translation. The creation of a filmographic record for a work may be considered the responsibility of an agency in the country where that work originated, but it is less clear who should carry responsibility for translating that record for use in another country, or how editorial responsibility should be allocated between these agencies. In any case, to refer simply to the country where a work originated overlooks the large and growing number of

---

[19]Steven L. Hensen, "The Use of Standards in the Application of the AMC Format," *American Archivist* 49 (Winter 1986): 31–40.

TABLE 1

Transliteration Variations in FIAF Archives	
BRONENOSEC POTEMKIN	(*International Index to Film Periodicals*, FIAF) (Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin) (Det Danske Filmmuseum, København) (Norsk Filminstitutt, Oslo)
BRONENOSEC "POTEMKIN"	(Filmoteka Polska, Warszawa)
BRONENOSETS POTEMKIN	(Nederlands Filmmuseum, Amsterdam) (National Film and Sound Archive, Canberra) (UCLA Film, Television and Radio Archives, Los Angeles) (La Cinémathèque Québécoise, Montréal) (Film-khane-ye Melli-e Iran, Tehran)
BRONENOSETS POTIOMKIN	(National Film, Television and Sound Archives, Ottawa)
BRONENOSETS POTYOMKIN	(Archion Israeli Leseratim, Jerusalem) (*Catalogue of Viewing Copies*, National Film Archive, London)
BRONENOSETZ POTEMKIN	(Tainothiki tis Ellados, Athinai)
BRONENOSETZ POTYOMKIN	(Cinemateca Brasileira, São Paulo)
BRONENOSEZ "POTJOMKIN"	(Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde, Wiesbaden)
BRONENOSEZ POTEMKINE	(Cinémathèque Municipale, Luxembourg)
BRONINOSETS POTEMKIN	(*Film Catalog*, Museum of Modern Art, New York)

films produced in one way or another internationally—whether as formal international co-productions, or less formally international, either in the sense that films are made in a country other than that of the production company to gain the benefits of particular locations, wage-rates, and facilities, or where a "foreign" director makes a film in another country. The compilers of national filmographies are likely to define "national" with sufficient elasticity to lay claim to such films as well as the more clearcut cases—*Svensk filmografi*, for example, contains an entry for Jean-Luc Godard's film *Masculin-Feminin*—and questions of responsibility may be difficult to resolve.

These problems are exacerbated by the fact that a filmographic record commonly contains an important proportion of content analysis, and thus differs appreciably from the neutral transcription of a bibliographic record. Procedures must be evolved to accommodate the desire of one agency to expand, correct, or challenge the analysis provided by the original data creator. It is possible to imagine very different views on Richard Attenborough's film *Gandhi*, for example, coming from Great Britain and India, or indeed from sources in Pakistan, Bangladesh, or southern Africa. As an immediate example of this problem, the working party on genres has been obliged to conclude that international agreement on usage of a term to describe film plots involving the more gung ho types of espionage or resistance may be impossible because, while

TABLE 2

Name Format Variations	
Eisenstein, Sergei	(National Film and Sound Archive, Canberra)
	(Archion Israeli Leseratim, Jerusalem)
	(Gosfilmofond, Moskva)
	(*Film Catalog*, Museum of Modern Art, New York)
	(National Film, Television and Sound Archives, Ottawa)
	(Filmoteka Polska, Warszawa)
Eisenstein, S. M.	(Nederlands Filmmuseum, Amsterdam)
	(Tainothiki tis Ellados, Athinai)
	(Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin)
	(Det Danske Filmmuseum, København)
	(La Cinémathèque Québécoise, Montréal)
	(Norsk Filminstitutt, Oslo)
	(Cinemateca Brasileira, São Paulo)
Eisenstein, Sergei M.	(*International Index to Film Periodicals*, FIAF)
	(*Catalogue of Viewing Copies*, National Film Archive, London)
	(Cinémathèque Municipale, Luxembourg)
	(Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde, Wiesbaden)
Eisenstein, Sergei Mikhailovich	(Film-khane-ye Melli-e Iran, Tehran)

Note: For the purposes of this table, variations in transliteration, such as Serge/Sergei/Sergej have not been recorded.

"our" films will safely qualify as harmless entertainment, "theirs" will always be wicked propaganda.

Such problems are not confined to the levels of theoretical responsibility and different perspectives; the basic issues of standards are also present, but exaggerated by internationalism. Table 1 provides an elementary illustration of this problem: a "straw poll" of eighteen FIAF member archives revealed nine variations in the transliteration conventions used to render the title of Eisenstein's classic film *Bronenosec Potemkin* in Latin rather than Cyrillic script. Table 2 reflects the same sample's range of possible variations in house-style for the rendition of Eisenstein's own name as an added entry. These issues are not trivial. The viability of data exchange depends on the consistency of the data shared. The economic

investment in cataloging effort, however, and the more subtle investment of institutional or even national pride and status represented by a publication that is intended to be definitive, all make the willing acceptance of retrospective change to new standards a somewhat utopian aspiration. This problem is not limited to those with prestigious publications at stake; the increasing rate of computer usage itself comes close to looking like bad news rather than good. The introduction of computers offers many archives their best opportunity in a generation or more to look critically at their cataloging procedures. If their response to that opportunity has been a conscious or inadvertent move in a direction that will not be endorsed by the approved standards, however, it will be asking a lot of such archives to reopen the whole topic and

revise their procedures once more.

Another dimension to the question of standards omitted from detailed consideration in Hensen's article relates specifically to the question of data exchange between computerized systems. This again is a problem that is more likely to arise in an international context than in a national setting where a substantial body of agreement may be anticipated. Such exchange takes place at the level of the lowest common denominator between the systems involved. Computers can readily remove the less essential accessories of human expression from a body of text, but cannot be relied on to introduce them with 100 percent accuracy when they are missing. The effective quality of information in a data base, in other words, will be that of the least ambitious of its contributors. For example, if two computerized catalogs are to exchange data, and the first records that data in a normal mixture of upper and lower case with diacritics and accents while the second uses upper case only with no diacritics, the only available common language is that of the second system. Questions of standardization are not, of course, restricted to those of upper and lower case and accents, although as it happens there is precisely this problem between *Film Canadiana*, which has a full character set, and the Bois d'Arcy *Catalogue*, which does not (see Figure 1). A moment's study of the two examples will reveal other divergences; the two publications differ in their treatment of an opening article in the title, in the presence or absence of addresses for production companies or distributors or of role names for cast credits, in the location of original source information, and so on. These are, however, major national publications. One may well question how far either or both will change to reflect each other's standard or a third standard subscribed to by neither of them. (Figure 2 illustrates that entries in published film archive catalogs, though less comprehensive than those in national filmographies, also offer scope for variations in format.)

It is a peculiar irony of this "Age of Information" that the introduction of new technology can actually reduce the amount of information available to those who really need it. An archive that sends its catalog data for batch processing by an outside agency can find that data so tied up in complicated or expensive input and correction cycles that it never seems to get to its users. An archive that has acquired a single-user microcomputer will find that the machine can be available at any one time for input, for update or for retrieval, but not for all simultaneously, so that someone may always be frustrated. Even in a larger system, an array of conventional index card cabinets to which many users could have simultaneous access with little supervision might be replaced by one or two terminals giving access to an on-line system conditional on the presence of archive staff to supervise and assist the enquirer. In any of these cases one could question the benefits of the new system to the archive or its users. Such problems should not arise, of course, and given proper system planning and preparation they will be avoided. There is, however, a tendency to assume that the introduction of new technology in some way automatically results in an improvement in services and circumstances. This is simply not confirmed by experience; the improvement must be worked for.

The same is as true for cooperative ventures between computer users as it is for users within a single institution. The fact that two organizations are using computers does not automatically make it easy for them to exchange information, and it is not the obvious differences (of hardware and software) that make the exchange difficult so much as the form of the information itself. These difficulties

Figure 1: Record Format Variations in National Filmographics

FILM CANADIANA 1983-1984

A guide to Canadian films produced in 1983 and 1984

Un répertoire des films canadiens produits en 1983 et 1984

The Blood of Others
(Le Sang des autres)

Production: International Cinema
Corporation; Filmax : Antenne
2/Films A2, 1984.

Distributor: International Film Finance
Corporation, Orion Pictures
International Inc.

127 min. : sd., col. ; 35 mm

Credits: director, Claude Chabrol; producer,
John Kemeny; Denis Héroux; executive
producer, Gabriel Boustani; screenplay, Brian
Moore; camera, Richard Ciupka; sound,
Patrick Rousseau; editing, Yves Langlois;
music, François Dompierre.

Cast: Jodie Foster, Michael Ontkean, Sam
Neill, Stéphane Audran, Lambert Wilson,
Kate Reid, Jean-Pierre Aumont, Alexandra
Stewart, Marie Bunel, Roger Mirmont

Summary: Paris, 1938. Another European war
looms ominously. *The Blood of Others* is about
beautiful Hélène who is prepared to risk her
life for the man she loves. It is also about Jean,
for whom heroism has less to do with love than
with political idealism. Throughout the war,
Hélène has one narrow escape after another as
she travels to the front in search of her lover.
In the name of love, she gets involved with the
invader to get Jean out of prison camp, helps
the Resistance which Jean has joined, and en-
.. gers her own life as well. Based on a novel
: Simone de Beauvoir. Also available in a ver-
sion of two episodes (90 minutes each) and in
another of six episodes (45 minutes each).

*Co-produced by International Cinema Corpo-
ration, Films and Antenne 2/Films A2 with
the financial assistance of Telefilm Canada.*

Le Sang des autres
(The Blood of Others)

Production: International Cinema
Corporation; Filmax : Antenne
2/Films A2, 1984.

Distributeur: Intercontinental Film Finance
Corporation, Orion Pictures
International Inc.

127 mn : son, coul. ; 35 mm

Générique: réalisateur, Claude Chabrol;
producteur, John Kemeny; Denis Héroux;
producteur délégué, Gabriel Boustani;
scénario, Brian Moore; images, Richard
Ciupka; son, Patrick Rousseau; montage, Yves
Langlois; musique, François Dompierre.

Interprétation: Jodie Foster, Michael
Ontkean, Sam Neill, Stéphane Audran,
Lambert Wilson, Kate Reid, Jean-Pierre
Aumont, Alexandra Stewart, Marie Bunel,
Roger Mirmont

Résumé: Nous sommes en 1938, à Paris, où la
guerre menace. Hélène, styliste dans une mai-
son de couture, vit une relation amoureuse
perturbée par les préoccupations politiques de
son ami, Paul. Un jour, par curiosité et par
dépit, elle devance Paul à un rendez-vous qu'il
a avec un syndicaliste. Et elle rencontre Jean.
L'amour naît, fulgurant, impossible. Hélène va
tout faire pour garder Jean, quitte à l'arracher
à son idéal. Mais c'est l'univers de Jean qui se
referme sur elle. Par amour, elle se compro-
mettra avec l'occupant pour protéger Jean. Par
amour encore, elle aidera la Résistance où
Jean s'engage. Par amour, elle risquera sa vie.
Et autour d'elle, le sang coule, le sang des au-
tres, le sien aussi peut-être... D'après le roman
de Simone de Beauvoir. Il existe aussi une ver-
sion de deux épisodes de 90 minutes chacun et
une autre de six épisodes de 45 minutes cha-
cun.

*Coproduit par International Cinema Corpora-
tion (Ciné-Simone), Filmax et Antenne 2/
Films A2 avec le concours financier de
Téléfilm Canada.*

Production originale en anglais.

Figure 1 (continued)

CATALOGUE DE LA PRODUCTION CINEMATOGRAPHIQUE FRANCAISE

$$\boxed{1975}$$

19750130-INNOCENTS AUX MAINS SALES (LES)

NO CODE C. N. C. 75095147. Im. 43407 DU 7/10/74. FICT.

Prod. LES FILMS LA BOETIE, TERRA FILM, JUPPITER GENERALE CINE-MATOGRAFICA; **lab.** ECLAIR; **lieux** SAINT TROPEZ, ENVIRONS DE SAINT TROPEZ.

35 MM, 3433 M, 24 I/S, 126 MN, COUL. , PANAVISION, EASTMANCOLOR, COMOPT.

Réal. CLAUDE CHABROL; **d'après** LE ROMAN DE RICHARD NEELY 'THE DAMNED INNOCENTS'; **adapt.** CLAUDE CHABROL; **dial.** CLAUDE CHABROL; **mus.** PIERRE JANSEN; **dir. orch.** ANDRE JOUVE; **ass. réal.** MICHEL DUPUY; **scripte** AURORE PAQUISS; **dir. prod.** PIERRE GAU-CHET; **rég.** PATRICK DELANNEUX; **dir. photogr.** JEAN RABIER; **cadr.** YVES AGOSTINI; **photogr.** ROGER CORBEAU; **mont.** JACQUES GAIL-LARD; **son.** GUY CHICHIGNOUD; **décor.** GUY LATTAYE; **maq.** DIDIER LAVERGNE, LOUIS BONNEMAISON.

Interp. ROMY SCHNEIDER: JULIE WORMSER, ROD STEIGER: LOUIS WORMSER, PAOLO GIUSTI: JEFF MARIE, FRANCOIS MAISTRE: COMMIS-SAIRE LAMY, PIERRE SANTINI: COMMISSAIRE VILLON, JEAN ROCHE-FORT: MAITRE LEGAL, FRANCOIS PERROT: GEORGES THORENT, HANS CHRISTIAN BLECH: L'EMPLOYE AUX COFFRES, RENE PIGET: LE MECA-NICIEN, DOMINIQUE ZARDI: AGENT 1, HENRI ATTAL: AGENT 2, JEAN CHERLIAN: POLICIER DU BATEAU, GEORGES BAIN: JOUEUR DE BOU-LES, GILBERT SERVIEN: L'HUISSIER, RENE HAVARD, SERGE BENTO.

T. P. ; 1ère sort. 26/3/75.
No visa 43407 DU 19/3/75.
FRANCE (60%) , ALLEMAGNE (20%) , ITALIE (20%) .

Rés. MARIEE A LOUIS, UN AMERICAIN PLUS AGE QU'ELLE, TRES RI-CHE MAIS MALADE, JULIA, FRUSTREE DES JOIES DE LA SENSUALITE, S'ENNUIE DANS LA SUPERBE MAISON QU'HABITE ACTUELLEMENT LE COUPLE A SAINT-TROPEZ. ELLE DEVIENT VITE LA MAITRESSE DE JEF QUI SE DIT ECRIVAIN ET LOGE DANS UNE VILLA VOISINE. LORSQUE LOUIS DISPARAIT, LA POLICE SOUPCONNE FORTEMENT JULIA ET JEF. LOUIS REPARAIT ET LUI APPREND QU'IL A TUE JEF. MAIS L'AMANT REAPPARAIT LUI AUSSI. . . L'IMBROGLIO DEVIENT INEXTRICABLE POUR JULIA, ECARTELEE ENTRE SON MARI QU'ELLE AIME MAINTE-NANT SINCEREMENT ET UN JEF DONT ELLE DOUTE ET QUI VEUT LA REPRENDRE, AVEC L'ARGENT DU MARI. JEF LAISSE LOUIS MOURIR D'UNE CRISE CARDIAQUE, FAUTE DE SOINS, MAIS LA POLICE L'ARRE-TE ALORS QU'IL EST SUR LE POINT DE TUER JULIA.

Figure 2: Record Format Variations in Catalogues Published by Major Film Archives

The British Film Institute

National Film Archive
CATALOGUE

Volume 1.   Non-Fiction Films

Great Britain: 1943

the SILENT VILLAGE   [3791]
 sp. MOI *p.c.* Crown *d.* Humphrey Jennings
 A reconstruction, filmed in the village of Cwmgiedd in
 South Wales, of the way in which the Czechoslovakian
 mining village of Lidice was taken over by German
 troops, resistance to the occupation, and the final
 execution of the male inhabitants. 3262ft. 35mm.

become more acute when variations of national and cultural practice come to bear as well as divergent practices between institutions. The fact that the nature of their collections obliges film archives to confront the international problems of data exchange rather sooner than other archivists will have to, gives those other archivists the opportunity to learn some lessons—and make some preparations— that may help their own cooperative ventures move in this direction. For the film archivists themselves, however regretta-

bly, it is clear that time is running out for the opportunity to make the most of international data exchange. Many institutions are devoting a great deal of effort, investment, and prestige to major projects that are not anticipating the need for cooperation and agreement as the basis for data exchange. The longer such projects continue, the more they grow, and the more they are joined by others of a similar character, the more difficult it will be to reverse the trend.

Figure 2 (continued)

THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART,
NEW YORK

The Film Catalog:
a List of Holdings in
The Museum of Modern Art

The Silent Village
1943
Great Britain
Nonfiction short
p British Crown Film Unit
d Jennings, Humphrey
002669