

Chapter Title: Memory and Trust in a Time of Un-framing Film Heritage

Chapter Author(s): NICO DE KLERK

Book Title: Exploring Past Images in a Digital Age

Book Subtitle: Reinventing the Archive

Book Editor(s): NEZIH ERDOĞAN, EBRU KAYAALP

Published by: Amsterdam University Press. (2023)

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/jj.5076337.14>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



This book is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.



Amsterdam University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Exploring Past Images in a Digital Age*

Memory and Trust in a Time of Un-framing Film Heritage

NICO DE KLERK

Erdoğan, N. and E. Kayaalp (eds.), *Exploring Past Images in a Digital Age: Reinventing the Archive*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2023

| 199

DOI 10.5117/9789463723442_CH10

ABSTRACT

Based on my experiences in a national, publicly funded film heritage institute, I'd like to reflect on the public tasks this category of institutes has been mandated with, particularly presentation, access, and visitor/user information, and the ethical issues they imply. Behind these reflections is the notion that film historians, film archivists and their expert communities must confront – and communicate – all the signifying contexts that have impacted the production, distribution, exhibition and/or archiving of films in a certain administratively defined area as a result of which the objects collected in a film heritage institute serving that area have a specific shape.

KEYWORDS

film archiving, film history, archival science, colonial cinema, film heritage institutes

Today, more than ever before, cinema heritage is available in ways different from its original manifestations, whether it concerns material aspects, projection and viewing technologies, business policies and practices, exhibition spaces and their schedules, presentation formats, purposes or target groups. Their digital semblances, on discs or online, can be watched any place at any time and in any dimension, yet often without any contextual modulation. This multiplied accessibility has removed the distinctive experiences between film heritage and newly released works – a concomitance that is repeated in many cinema museums' onsite screenings of archival materials alongside new films that have a commercial release in film theatres in the same country or city, while their visitor information further equalises its supply of programmes with entertaining and easily digestible titbits.

The heritage experience, however, is marked by a distinct frame within which archival artefacts have been repurposed and made to comment on the times and circumstances of their production, design, marketing, screening, use, effect, aesthetics, etc. Enhanced by specific spaces, such as archives and museums, this frame stimulates concentration, reflection and sensemaking. Film archives' ubiquitous access, however, threatens to erase the notion of heritage altogether (a circumstance perceived by some, perhaps, as a liberation from these institutes' not entirely unfounded, traditional reputation for restrictive access policies). Under these conditions, no one can be blamed for forgetting the film archive, except the film archives themselves. Because as long as they fail to adequately present their artefacts, onsite *and* online, and fully inform their publics about why their holdings look or sound the way they did and – in restored and/or digitised versions – do, heritage will become a defunct, meaningless term, history a foreign country without a travel guide.¹

JUMP

I take a short, silent non-fiction film shot probably in 1912, on the island of Java, titled *Koepok – Inenting in de Desa/Cowpox Vaccination in the Countryside* (J. C. Lamster, 1912; hereafter *Cowpox Vaccination*), as a little case study to illustrate the importance of preventing both archival amnesia and irrelevance. I will begin with a detailed discussion of a few of the film's shots and then

gradually widen the perspective to matters regarding archival work, access to and reuse of its materials. All the film elements of the title I discuss, from the one nitrate duplicate negative and two nitrate positives that were input for its preservation to the various projection prints and digital semblances, are kept at the archive of the Eye Filmmuseum, Amsterdam.²

In its currently available, most recently preserved 35 mm projection print, the film opens on a scene of crowds of indigenous people on their way to a vaccination site.³ Next, it shows an indigenous vaccinator arriving in a country village whose inhabitants and those of surrounding settlements are waiting to have their babies inoculated, which duly happens in the next few shots that show the vaccinator at work on an open-air platform. The film ends on a “group portrait” that crams as many people as possible in its limited field of view.⁴

Commissioned by the Koloniaal Instituut in 1911, shortly after its foundation the year before, the film is part of a collection of information and propaganda films made on location in colonial Indonesia (at the time called the Netherlands East Indies). Films – as well as lantern lectures and exhibitions – were used as instruments in the educational task the institute had assigned itself, convinced as it was that “in various circles of the Dutch population knowledge about colonial matters leaves much to be desired.”⁵ For the making of these films, J. C. Lamster, a captain in the colonial army at the Topographical Department, a division of the Engineer Corps, was hired while he was on leave in the Netherlands. After having been sent to Pathé Frères, in Paris, to inform himself of the “current developments of cinematography,”⁶ Lamster and his family returned to the Netherlands East Indies in February 1912. With them sailed a Pathé cameraman, Octave Collet, whom the Koloniaal Instituut had hired for six months, after which time Lamster was supposed to be able to finish the job by himself.⁷ Filming lasted from the spring of 1912 – the earliest reference I found to the making of these films was a report in a Bandung-based newspaper of April 1912⁸ – through the early summer of 1913.

Even this little bit of information is already relevant to come to grips with a moment in this archival projection print of *Cowpox Vaccination*. The moment in question is the jump in shot number two, showing a procession, to a camera position closer to the people passing in front of it – shot number three. This was not an unknown option at the time, no doubt for economical reasons (saving film stock – an essential consideration when filming on location). But it is rather unusual in this collection of films, in which overall scene and shot coincide – similar to the tableau style in fiction films – in order to show activities and movements uninterrupted. Whenever filming conditions allowed, closer shots showing details were made to be cut in later, but as a rule, a cut was made only when activities came to an end or moved to another locale, a



Fig.10.1



Fig. 10.2

transition commonly marked by a title panel.⁹ At the time, the early 1910s, this way of filming was the default mode of many industrials, travelogues and other non-fiction films. However, the abovementioned jump was almost certainly made in the camera; the fact that in shot number three the open-air barber by the side of the road is still cutting the hair of the client in shot number two indicates that not much time had been lost between the two camera set-ups.

During the years that this film was available for public screenings – as all of the films in this collection, less than a decade and a half¹⁰ – either or both

of these shots were shortened, possibly the result of damage caused by wear or tear which was then replaced by shortening and splicing the film. In fact, in both nitrate positives that were input for the film's preservation one can spot a *copied* splice, a white horizontal line just below the upper frame line in the first frame of shot three. Made by overlapping one image partially with the next one – after the loss of one or more frames, the two ends of the film strip were cemented together again – a splice, when copied, can be seen in a new positive print as a white horizontal line, a result of the light deflected by the overlap during the duplication process. What this means, then, is that these two elements belong to a generation of prints at one or more removes from the originals. Despite these changes, though, the retained, in-camera jump to a closer position within the profilmic space suggests a more experienced, livelier notion of the topic to be filmed. And in this one may see the hand of a professional cameraman. Hence, incidentally, the shooting of the film can arguably be dated before September 1912, when the Pathé employee's contract expired.

| 203

One may be tempted to see the mark of a professional confirmed in the transition from shot four to five. These two shots show the arrival of the vaccinator in the village, who subsequently walks towards the camera that pans along with him (another shot variation to give this film record more animation) until he exits screen right; in shot number five he is picked up again entering screen left. This filmically conceived option looks even more unusual, not just in this collection, but in contemporary non-fiction filmmaking generally: an instance of continuity editing. But it is precisely for its rarity that I seriously doubt that the copied splice between *these* two shots reflects the same “level of intentionality”¹¹ as the moment discussed above. The transition between shots four and five begs another explanation.

EPITEXTS

To find out how shots four and five came to hang together we need to know more than the print can tell us. In fact, none of the abovementioned, surviving nitrate elements that formed the input for this preservation contains the image information to enable us to arrive at a satisfactory answer; the copied splice was already in the nitrate duplicate negative. As noted, the two nitrate positives and the one nitrate duplicate negative are all that is left of what for all practical purposes may be called the original materials; no camera negative or complete first-generation projection prints have survived. As a matter of fact, during my inspection of the remaining nitrate materials of this entire collection, in 2009 and 2010, I found that almost no element could be posi-



Fig. 10.3



Fig. 10.4

tively said to have been made in 1912 or 1913. What I did find was that insofar years of stock manufacture, release or production could be identified through edge marks, most of the materials date back to between 1917 and 1924.¹² With regard to *Cowpox Vaccination*, parts of its composite duplicate negative consist of Kodak film stock made in 1923; the two positives could not be identified precisely, but as they measure almost the same length, contain the same number of shots, and copy some of the duplicate negative's physical and formal characteristics they can safely be dated around that same year.

More unequivocal information about these elements' histories comes from some of the film's epitexts: the Koloniaal Instituut's film catalogues, its annual reports and what remains of its business papers. From the latter, we learn that the institute rented its films exclusively to schools, colleges and universities, museums, colonial and trade expositions, various associations and other educational, non-theatrical venues.¹³ I surmise that it is for its endeavour to "avoid the character of a commercial cinema screening," with its proverbial cheap and garish amusements, that all its prints were initially left in black and white.¹⁴

The film catalogues bring us a step closer to the remaining prints. The institute published three editions of its film catalogue, those of 1914, 1918, and 1923. Each subsequent edition shows significant differences from the preceding edition. As the institute explained in the second edition:

The changes and corrections introduced mainly consisted of removing failed or unclear parts, shortening lengthy scenes, correcting and adding intertitles, putting parts in the right order as well as inserting, in some films, still images in order to supplement the topic as much as possible.

| 205

By transferring the topics of some films to separate ones, the original number of films [...] was raised from fifty-five to fifty-eight. Furthermore, due to their great length, fifteen films were split into two films of equal length, increasing the collection by another fifteen.¹⁵

What this announcement omitted to mention, let alone motivate, however, is that the new prints were now coloured (mostly by tinting). Indeed, the two abovementioned nitrate positive prints are both tinted, while the nitrate duplicate negative contains colour instructions for the lab scratched in black leader film plus a few inserted, orange-tinted title panels. Left unmentioned, too, was the acquisition of 1,000 m of Pathé Frères footage, parts of which were included in a number of newly made projection prints (prints containing this material could not be shown outside the Netherlands, in all probability for reasons of copyright) as well as additional footage shot in 1917 by L. Ph. de Bussy, director of the institute's Trade Museum, with Lamster's camera (which had remained in the colony). As a result of the corrections, rearrangements and additions practically no title escaped changes in length compared with the 1914 catalogue. In 1923 a similar operation was undertaken. All these invasive measures taken over the years could be quite drastic. *Cowpox Vaccination*, for instance, was cut from 150 m in the 1914 catalogue to 110 m in the 1918 edition, and finally to 45 m in the 1923 edition. In fact, the latter length is almost identical to the length of all three remaining nitrate elements mentioned – small differences between them are due to the length of title panels and leader film (see note 1).

What this strongly suggests, then, is that rather than having survived the Koloniaal Instituut's inspections, it is far more likely that this seemingly unique instance of continuity editing between shots four and five was *accidentally created* by the removal of one or more intermediate shots, now lost, that might have shown other parts of the vaccinator's walk through the village. As a matter of fact, if the missing part would only have contained this walk, then this 40-metre cut might have been made already in 1918. But that all shots were linked by continuity is, given the then accepted, predominant stylistic choices, extremely unlikely. Unfortunately, no printed brochure of this title, a so-called "illustration" (*toelichting*), the text of which was compulsory reading during the film's screening, has survived.¹⁶ One cannot, therefore, establish what an earlier, longer version might have included. Nor has any of the footage removed in both 1918 and 1923, as far as I can tell, been reinserted in another title's print. But one thing seems almost certain: the alteration in *Cowpox Vaccination* was not meant to introduce a new type of shot transition we now call continuity editing.

Parenthetically, there may have been more considerations to adapt the prints besides the ones mentioned in the 1918 catalogue. For instance, a comment in the introduction to the 1918 brochure to the film *A Car Ride through Bandung* indicates that it had outlived its use value: "Bandung is in the grip of a veritable construction frenzy that seems to transform the city daily. Therefore, the film, shot in 1913, does not at all show the city of today."¹⁷ Although information regarding revised versions has hardly come down to us, this quotation does point up the efforts made to update the institute's film collection. Nevertheless, rearrangements, elisions or additions in subsequent prints of *A Car Ride through Bandung* could not in the end camouflage the changes the city had undergone since the film's making.

SECONDARY PROVENANCE

So why all this detail? Well, because usually the elements that constitute the input for an archival projection print – analogue or digital – are inaccessible to audiences, often even to researchers, for reasons of safeguarding, copyright and other legal measures (embargoes, various Enemy Property Acts, for instance), sensitive content, fragile materials, uninventoried materials, deficient retrieval systems or sheer secrecy. They are also routinely left unmentioned in visitor information and other forms of publicity or in newly made prints. Unlike projection prints of titles preserved or restored by, for instance, the Cinémathèque française in Paris or the Cinematek in Brussels, it is still not common practice to preamble prints with information about their input

materials (their genealogy and generation, physical characteristics, production or distribution traces) and the technologies used to create the new prints. Providing longer introductory texts seems worth the trouble only in the cases of films that have a certain prestige. Customarily, though, by not pointing out why an archival projection print looks or sounds the way it does obstructs an audience's appreciation and understanding. Surely a responsible cinema-theque doesn't want its visitors to leave its premises with the idea that the Koloniaal Instituut's collection contains an early instance of continuity editing. And this particular type of knowledge, the history of film style, is just one aspect of these institutes' pivotal role in restoring the forgotten.

What is more, information about original circumstances and considerations does not suffice. Canadian archivist Lori Podolsky Nordland has written: "A document is more than its subject content and the context of its original creation. Throughout its life cycle, it continually evolves, acquiring additional meanings and layers, even after crossing the archival threshold." Nordland has termed these additional layers of context and meaning *secondary provenance*.¹⁸ The archival term *provenance* refers to the entity that creates or receives items in a collection. The relevant, multiple entities in this particular little case study are – to keep things simple – the commissioning institute, the filmmakers and the heritage institute where the film elements are now stored.¹⁹

Ideally, the role of its current repository differs from the other two. Because during its appraisal of incoming archival materials a heritage institute commonly applies the principle of provenance as a guideline for evaluation on the basis of the creator's and/or owners' mandates and functions. But creators or owners, of course, are free to do with their materials as they see fit. This, as we have seen, happened at the Koloniaal Instituut with its invasive measures and changes of policy, from black-and-white to coloured prints, for instance. And in 1918 it also permitted the Association for the Promotion of the Netherlands Abroad to commission a Dutch entrepreneur to make a compilation of these materials for a coloured, more exoticising film; Dutch intertitled prints of this film and a domestic distributor's logo are evidence that this film, titled *Onze Oost/Our Eastern Province* (Johan Gildemeijer, 1919), was released in Dutch commercial cinema theatres.²⁰ With all these decisions the Koloniaal Instituut created, and allowed the creation of, new meanings and contexts for new audiences. Such practical decisions and measures may actually make a creator overwrite, even forget, its *own* archive. Only by the time when its materials have ceased serving commercial, practical and/or ideological purposes and start to be forgotten, they may find their way to a heritage institute, to which then falls the task of halting amnesia and sorting out the layers of context, meaning, significance and/or purpose.

Once inside a film heritage institute, another element of provenance

becomes relevant: the arrangement and description of these materials directly related to their original and/or subsequent shapes, purposes, and functions. That is why, in the case of the films commissioned by the Koloniaal Instituut, 1923 is such a crucial date. Because during my inspection of the materials – the latest comprehensive inventory of these archival materials to date – I could not but conclude that there was no point in following the institute’s initial plans and earliest catalogue, for there simply was not enough footage in support of that. I could only date back with any certainty less than a handful of partial film elements to 1912–1913. Given the large number of duplicate negatives in the collection, older prints were plausibly discarded after new, revised ones had been struck. I, therefore, recommended to take the catalogue of 1923 as a reference point for new preservations and projection prints, because more – though not all – nitrate materials agreed with the lengths and titles in that year’s catalogue than with the earlier two. My proposal, then, implied not only that all new safety prints of the titles shot by or under the supervision of Lamster should be coloured, but that a number of them would be *shorter* than some titles’ longest available nitrate materials. This is always a sore spot for film archivists, who often appear to identify “originals” with prints of greater length and directorial intentions – as the restoration histories of *Metropolis* (Fritz Lang, 1927) or *Napoléon vu par Abel Gance* (Abel Gance, 1927) illustrate – even though at the time, not a soul may have seen such versions. But Lamster was a mere hired hand and as was customary for non-fiction films of the time, his name was never mentioned on the prints or in the catalogues. The choice for the 1923 catalogue as a reference recognises the central role of the Koloniaal Instituut as sponsor, distributor, editor and owner of the materials, which it emphatically imprinted onto audiences through their title panels and logo.

Above I said that the role of the heritage institute is “ideally” different from that of record creators. But the work on this collection over the years (mine was the third effort in a period of about twenty years to inspect this collection of films for preservation, presentation and research purposes) actually exemplifies how reality often disrupts ambition. As a result of these successive efforts, this group of films now exists in projection prints in black-and-white 16 mm reduction prints, in black-and-white 35 mm prints, in 35 mm colour prints and in digital formats (albeit inconsistently, as they mix coloured and black-and-white versions). Available budget, increased knowledge, ethical considerations and priorities (or occasions to create priorities – in this case, the abovementioned book on Lamster and the accompanying DVD), amongst others – determine such decisions. One can safely say that this film heritage institute, just like the Koloniaal Instituut, simply has continued creating its own additional layers of context, significance and meaning.

MEMORY

But let us assume – again according to the principle of provenance – that the arrangement and description of these materials have been satisfactorily aligned to one of the Koloniaal Instituut's purposes or policies. Then a new phase of forgetfulness sets in immediately. Because the moment films have been restored, preserved and made available for screening or streaming, filmmakers come knocking on the door for their found footage or compilation film. Or a picture researcher inquires about “content” for a TV programme. Or an advertising agency calls about “material” for a commercial. This is what actually happens on a daily basis at a sizeable film heritage institute.

Nowadays this “knocking on the door” is further encouraged by these institutes' digital channels, on their own websites, on YouTube, Vimeo or elsewhere. These “display windows” make wonderful promotional material, even though they may not always have been intended function that way (European Film Gateway 1914, for instance²¹). Nonetheless, this is where filmmakers, picture researchers, companies as well as private individuals may find the stuff they need or like without being overmuch bothered by history or any other type of relevant knowledge. This, you might say, is one way of returning to the public what the public made possible: the creation of an institute with a mandate to collect, research, preserve, present and access the film heritage of a particular administrative unit, regardless of the use made of it by visitors, users, clients, etc.

However, from an archival and film historical point of view, I observe that such channels often fail in their tasks of explanation, sensemaking or interpretation, whether it concerns archival, technical, aesthetic, business, and other (film)-historical information, or whatever else appears to be relevant in a given case.²² Of course, from the users' perspective, this very lack provides them with an unbiased service (here I leave aside – not unlike many users and digital platforms in their own ways – copyright issues regarding preserved materials²³). One client might want to use a film like *Cowpox Vaccination* to argue the beneficence of Dutch colonial rule during the era of the so-called Ethical Policy, which professed to put the welfare of the local population, their health, education, or employment, before profit. Another might use the same film to argue that, despite such enlightened notions, only the most routine types of jobs in these fields, such as vaccinator, were offered to indigenes (or Indo-Europeans for that matter). And yet another might want to demonstrate that J. C. Lamster was the inventor of continuity editing.

Secondary provenance is an open-ended process. In all this, it befits a film heritage institute, certainly a publicly funded one, to act with reserve and impartiality. Apart, perhaps, from refusing requests for materials by obvious

enemies of the public, an archive is no arbiter of taste or sentinel of sensemaking. It fulfils a gatekeeper function by virtue of its film-historical and -technical know-how, but it is paid by the public to serve the public. Despite all this, nothing absolves a film heritage institute from performing its important, mandatory task: to make sure, between subsequent instances of amnesia, that all these layers of history, all these additional meanings and signifying contexts are retrieved, preserved, researched and made fully available. And while users, whenever they are so inclined, may only cherry-pick from all this knowledge, there is no compelling reason to copy this selectiveness, let alone nonchalance. Memory is the basis of the authority on which rests the public trust that heritage institutes should strive for. Nobody else does.

FILMOGRAPHY

A Car Ride through Bandung (1913)

Koepok – Inenting in de Desa/Cowpox Vaccination in the Countryside

(J. C. Lamster, 1912)

Metropolis (Fritz Lang, 1927)

Napoléon vu par Abel Gance (Abel Gance, 1927)

Onze Oost/Our Eastern Province (Johan Gildemeijer, 1919)

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

NICO DE KLERK is a film historian and archivist, currently employed as a post-doctoral researcher in the project “Projecting Knowledge: The Magic Lantern as a Tool for Mediated Science Communication in the Netherlands, 1880–1940” at Utrecht University. Before that he worked at the Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Geschichte und Gesellschaft, Vienna, in the research project “Exploring the Interwar World: The Travelogues of Colin Ross (1885–1945).” In 2015 he completed his PhD dissertation “Showing and Telling: Film Heritage Institutes and Their Performance of Public Accountability” (a revised edition was published in 2017), which drew on his twenty years of experience working as a collections researcher, archivist and curator at the then Netherlands Filmmuseum. He is on the editorial board of *The Moving Image: Journal of the Association of Moving Image Archivists* and *Early Cinema in Review*.

NOTES

- 1 For a wider and more widely sourced account concerning the policies of film heritage institutes, see my *Showing and Telling: Film Heritage Institutes and Their Performance of Public Accountability* (Wilmington, DE, and Malaga: Vernon Press, 2017).
- 2 *Koepok – Inenting in de Desa* (The Netherlands: Koloniaal Instituut, 1912), J. C. Lamster [Octave Collet]. The details are:
 - Nitrate duplicate negative A394, 35 mm full frame, b&w, tinting, 43 m, Dutch titles, preservation element
 - Nitrate positive B2323, 35 mm full frame, b&w, tinting, 46 m, Dutch titles, preservation element
 - Nitrate positive B4728, 35 mm full frame, b&w, tinting, 48.4 m, Dutch titles, preservation element
 - Acetate duplicate negative C2317, 35 mm full frame, b&w, 51.5 m, Dutch titles, preservation element
 - Acetate positive D6648, 35 mm full frame, b&w, [51.5 m], Dutch titles, projection print
 - Acetate duplicate intermediate negative C5643, 35 mm full frame, b&w, 51 m, Dutch titles, preservation element
 - Acetate positive DK6643, 35 mm full frame, 51m, b&w, colour, Dutch titles, projection print
 - DVD 141–11, b&w, [2'40]
 - Playable rendition, .mxf, IMX 50, 25, b&w, colour, [2'40"]
- 3 This print was made in 2010. Its creation was occasioned by the publication of a book on its filmmaker, J. C. Lamster. See Janneke van Dijk, Jaap de Jonge and Nico de Klerk, *J. C. Lamster, een vroege filmmaker in Nederlands-Indië* [J. C. Lamster, an early filmmaker in the Netherlands East Indies] (Amsterdam: KIT Publishers, 2010). The film's digital version was included in a DVD of the same title that was packaged with the book.
- 4 Information about the camera's 18 mm lens's limitations comes from a letter to the board of directors of the Koloniaal Instituut, the film's sponsor, written by its secretary, Professor Wijsman, who, during his public relations tour in colonial Indonesia on behalf of the institute had visited the filmmaker that it had hired; H. P. Wijsman, "Letter, January 20, 1913," 3; Koninklijk Instituut voor de Tropen (Royal Institute for the Tropics). This was the new name given to the Koloniaal Instituut in 1950, a change necessitated by the formal independence of the Indonesian colony, in December 1949. Hereafter KIT], Amsterdam, 4314.
- 5 Koloniaal Instituut, *Eerste jaarverslag, 1910–1911* [First annual report, 1910–1911] (Amsterdam, 1912), 14. This meant that the films were screened to Dutch audiences only, although requests for loans to other European countries were routinely granted. But they were not made available for screenings in the colony.

- 6 Koloniaal Instituut, *Tweede jaarverslag, 1912* [Second annual report, 1912] (Amsterdam, 1913), 17.
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 De Preanger-Bode, "Opening Dessa-Landbouwschool" ["Agricultural Country School Opening"], 17, no. 112 (April 24, 1912), morning edn., 2. Delpher, <http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=MMKB08:000128484:mpeg21:p001>.
- 9 In modern parlance one might say that there was no decoupage, only montage.
- 10 After their premiere, in April 1915, the films were in distribution for twelve years. In 1927 the Koloniaal Instituut announced: "To avoid further deterioration of the film collection from now on it will mainly be reserved for use by the association [Koloniaal Instituut] itself"; Koloniaal Instituut, *Zeventiende jaarverslag, 1927* [Seventeenth annual report, 1927] (Amsterdam, 1928), 14.
- 11 Guy Edmonds, "Conserving the Unwieldy Body: A Material Approach to the Cinematographic Remains of Paul Julien," in *Tourists and Nomads: Amateur Images of Migration*, edited by Sonja Kmec and Viviane Thill (Marburg: Jonas Verlag, 2012), 25–32.
- 12 Edgemarks, or edge data, are (a combination of) numbers, letters or company names printed on the edge of film rolls by stock manufacturers, production companies and/or labs. Their systematicity allows the identification of the year of manufacture, production and/or release.
- 13 Apparently for a long time no film rent was charged. Only the 1923 catalogue mentions, besides restitution of overhead, "a small fee [...] of 1 cent per metre per screening, earmarked for partly covering the costs of maintenance and repair of the image collections." Koloniaal Instituut, *Catalogus van kinematografische opnamen van de Koninklijke Vereeniging "Koloniaal Instituut" te Amsterdam* (Amsterdam, 1923), 3.
- 14 Minutes of the Board of Directors of the Koloniaal Instituut, January 15, 1912, 8; KIT, 219. At the time, it was not unusual for films to be coloured by various applied processes (i.e. *after* a black-and-white positive print had been made), such as tinting, toning and/or stencilling. For more information, see Paul Read and Mark-Paul Meyer, eds., *Restoration of Motion Picture Film* (Oxford and Woburn, MA: Butterworth and Heinemann, 2000), 41–44.
- 15 Koloniaal Instituut, *Achtste jaarverslag, 1918* [Eighth annual report, 1918] (Amsterdam, 1919), 18. This annual report contained the 1918 catalogue in Appendix XII.
- 16 These "illustrations" were introduced more or less simultaneously with the 1918 catalogue; *ibid.*, 18, 86.
- 17 This "construction frenzy" erupted in the wake of the plans, in the late 1910s and early 1920s, to move the seat of the colonial government from Batavia – today's Jakarta – to Bandung and its healthier climate.
- 18 Lori Podolsky Nordland, "The Concept of 'Secondary Provenance': Re-interpreting Ac co mok ki's Map as Evolving Text," *Archivaria* 58, no. 1 (2004), 147–59.

- 19 With “simple” I mean to abstract from the local cameraman Lamster hired for a short period of time after Octave Collet’s return to France – on both there is hardly any more information than what I have stated here; from the Koloniaal Instituut’s role in renting the films and providing lecturers; from the fact that the films had been housed at this institute and its successor, the Royal Institute for the Tropics, until the latter transferred the materials to the then Nederlands Filmmuseum between the late 1960s and early 1990s; from the Dutch National Archive, The Hague, and the International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, where original elements of the film’s epitexts are kept; as well as from the erstwhile Department of Colonial Affairs, which had paid Lamster’s salary for the duration of the commission and pressured the Koloniaal Instituut into greater activity in pushing its film catalogue.
- 20 *Onze Oost/Our Eastern Province*, The Netherlands (Vereeniging tot Verbreiding van Kennis over Nederland in den Vreemde [Association for the Propagation of Knowledge about the Netherlands Abroad]), 1919, domestic distributor HAP-Film, print identification number DK1823, 35 mm full frame (safety projection print), b&w, colour, silent, 1401 m, 69,’ Dutch titles.
- 21 EFG1914 Project, <https://europeanfilmgateway.eu/content/efg1914-project>.
- 22 With this I mean, of course, *historically* relevant. Many a Communication Department’s efforts to point out an artefact’s relevance for *today* are misguided and futile, as that is precisely what their users and consumers can easily define themselves.
- 23 For more information about these issues in film archival settings, see the recent, in-depth study by Claudy Op den Kamp, *The Greatest Films Never Seen: The Film Archive and the Copyright Smokescreen* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018).

