PROJECT MUSE®

The State of Orphan Films: Editor's Introduction

Dan Streible

The Moving Image, Volume 9, Number 1, Spring 2009, pp. vi-xix (Article)

Published by University of Minnesota Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/mov.0.0024>

➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/362422>

The State of Orphan Films

DAN STREIBLE

Editor's Introduction

A little more than a decade ago, the term *orphan film* emerged as the predominant metaphor for motion picture preservation in the United States, and elsewhere. A decade ago, in September 1999, the first Orphan Film Symposium took place at the University of South Carolina. This special theme issue of *The Moving Image* presents ten essays derived from talks given at the sixth Orphan Film Symposium, held at New York University (NYU), in March 2008. Such a full-fledged publication, aptly in the AMIA journal, brings the work of the Orphan Film Project to a new level of achievement. Much as dozens of orphan films have been preserved by or for the symposium, many of the scholarly presentations heard at "Orphans" have subsequently been published on their own, in journals (including this one) and books.

In his editor's foreword to *The Moving Image* 6.2 (Fall, 2006), Jan-Christopher Horak wrote enthusiastically about attending the fifth Orphan Film Symposium at the University of South Carolina, which focused on sponsored films. He described "a palpable sense of excitement" at the event and saw potential for "seismic changes to film and media studies," based on the rediscovered works and new ideas presented there. "More than one participant predicted the opening of a whole new field, comparable to the sea change brought about by the FIAF Brighton Conference in 1978, which gave birth to early cinema studies. Indeed, there was a sense at Orphans 5 of history in the making. . . ." Horak concluded that the symposium might even enter "into the mythology of film historiography." Such laud will be difficult to fulfill—and certainly made Orphans 5 a tough act for its sequel symposium to follow.

Independent of the Orphan Film Symposium, scholarly research into sponsored films has indeed begun to flourish. *The Field Guide to Sponsored Films* (National Film Preservation Foundation, 2006) by Rick Prelinger was a milestone. At least three anthologies are scheduled for publication by university presses in the year ahead: *Films That Work: Industrial Film and the Productivity of Media* (Amsterdam, 2009) edited by Vinzenz Hediger and Patrick Vonderau; *Useful Cinema* (Duke, forthcoming), edited by Charles Acland and Haidee Wasson; and *Learning with the Lights Off: A Reader in Educational Film* (Oxford, 2010), the brainchild of Devin Orgeron and Marsha Orgeron (incoming editors in chief for *The Moving Image*, by the way). Studies of other orphan genres are also on the rise, such as Karen L. Ishizuka and Patricia R. Zimmermann's edited volume *Mining the Home Movie* (University of California Press, 2008). The authors retrace the forces that have generated recent interest in amateur films. They note that the Orphan Film Symposium events "have functioned to generate new research and curatorial activities and have lent increased visibility to the orphan film cause. They have also provided a significant academic and curatorial context for amateur film research."

This collection of essays from Orphans 6, then, joins an emerging body of scholarship. The sixth symposium focused on works of, by, about, for, against, and under "the state," broadly conceived. Media archivists, scholars, filmmakers, preservationists, curators, lab experts, collectors, distributors, librarians, students, and other enthusiasts convened to share their passion for the preservation, study, and creative use of neglected motion pictures. For three full days and four nights, presenters addressed the role of orphan films in recording, constructing, and imagining the state.

The first Orphan Film Symposium began with screening part of this never-released newsreel story. “Leon Trotsky, of the Soviet Republic” (as John Ford introduces him in this early sound newsreel) addresses the Movietone microphone—in Russian: “Comrades, by the irony of fate I play the role of Trotsky in the new Raoul Walsh production by the Fox studio.” The faux Trotsky is Boris Charsky, an actor in Walsh’s *The Red Dance*. Bewildered Fox employees behind him include Tom Mix (top left, in cowboy hat). Recorded on the Fox lot in Hollywood, January 27, 1928. Source: MVTN 0-282: *Dedication of “Park Row”* [1928], Fox Movietone News Collection, Newsfilm Library, Moving Image Research Collections, University of South Carolina. Reproduced with permission.

Some three hundred *orphanistas* from eighteen nations experienced forty hours of screenings, talks, discussions, and performances. Far from being a parade of government-sponsored propaganda and sober instruction on citizenship (“not that there’s anything wrong with that”), the symposium drew an exciting array of film and video that added humor to the sobriety and offset the propaganda with perplexity, nuance, beauty, and truthiness.

In addition to screening material discussed in the following essays, the event presented an admixture that included:

- *Singapore Rebel* (2005) and other political protest videos by Martyn See, which the Asian Film Archive took in at a time these were banned by law
- an evening of short works by the late filmmaker Helen Hill, including *The House of Sweet Magic* (1981), a Super 8 stop-motion film she made at the

age of eleven—which was rediscovered only days before the symposium (Harvard Film Archive now houses the Hill collection)

- two artful amateur productions saved by the Center for Home Movies: *Our Day* (1938, a family portrait made in Lebanon, Kentucky, by Wallace Kelly) and *Think of Me First as a Person* (1960–75, a home movie compilation by the father of a boy with Down Syndrome)
- *Sunday* (1961), Dan Drasin's documentary about Greenwich Village protesters singing folk music in Washington Square Park (preserved by UCLA Film & Television Archive with funding from the Film Foundation)
- *Noticario de Laya Films no. 3* (1937), a Catalan newsreel from the Spanish Civil War, formerly presumed lost (preserved by NYU Libraries with the FilMOTECA Española)
- the Academy Film Archive's new preservation of Corporal Samuel Fuller's amateur footage of his U.S. Army division's liberation of Falkenau concentration camp in May 1945
- *200* (aka *Bicentennial*, 1975), a three-minute piece of psychedelica by animator Vince Collins, done for the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) [!?]
- two original 16mm camera rolls shot by cine-poet Jem Cohen at Ground Zero in 2004

As this partial list demonstrates, eclecticism is a precept of the symposium and inherent in the orphan film rubric. This translates into engaging forms of programming and expands our understanding of the history of film and other recording media. In this respect the biennial symposium has precursors that include the annual AMIA Archival Screening nights and programs within AMIA conferences, such as the Small Gauge Symposium in 2001 or the Regional Audio-Visual Archives screening in Montreal in 1999. Maryann Gomes, then director of North West Film Archive (UK), curated the latter. She entitled it "The Richness of the Regions: Projecting a Global Picture of the Twentieth Century" and screened an eclectic set of short works from around the world. The richness inspired curatorial decisions for the symposium and furthered my realization that historians are not seeing most of the films that exist to be studied.

Readers of *The Moving Image* no doubt know that an orphan film symposium is not a festival of movies about parentless children, but it is worth answering here the question often asked by both insiders and outsiders: what is an "orphan film"? There are two answers.

First, there is the legal problem of an orphaned reel as encountered in archival practice: a film whose rights holder/s (if they exist) have abandoned its care, or are unaware of the legal claim they have on it. Archives have sought the right to take proper care of such items without having to worry about legal trouble should an owner later appear. U.S. copyright law has reckoned with the phenomenon of “orphan works” in recent years, and the creative, legal, and archival communities continue to seek practical and legislative reforms that will allow these works to be preserved and used. Orphans 6 included a panel on these issues.

A second definition, however, explains the curatorial and intellectual energy associated with the phenomenon. Orphan films can be conceived as all types of neglected cinema. While a film might not be literally abandoned by its owner, if it is unseen or not part of the universe of knowledge about moving images, it is essentially orphaned. Its orphan-ness might be material, conceptual, or both. Physical deterioration obviously puts films at risk. In this sense, more moving image works are orphaned—or headed to the orphanage—than not. But even a preserved and well-stored film is orphan-like if its existence is unknown outside of the archive.

Although most material presented at the symposium over the past ten years was captured on celluloid, television and video have also been part of the project from the beginning. Likewise born-digital and digitized audiovisual content. Film prints projected on mechanical projectors continue to attract us. Such projection is increasingly a special event. So much so that we can say, ironically, mechanical reproduction on motion picture film has an “aura.”¹ However, pictures and sounds captured and carried on magnetic and digital media can also fit comfortably under the orphan rubric. [See, for example, Dylan Cave, “‘Born Digital’—Raised an Orphan?” *The Moving Image* 8.1 (2007).]

The term *orphan film* may itself morph into a post-celluloid phraseology, but the conceptual understanding of cultural productions that get neglected will remain a binding concept. Further, the conservator’s interest in the materiality of videotape, computer files, and future formats is an extension of issues earlier addressed in the science and practice of film preservation.

Of course casting too wide a net can make a concept untenable. The orphan film phenomenon maintains an affinity for neglected, lost, damaged, hidden, excised, rare, unique, odd, experimental, ephemeral, and utilitarian productions. Although they have their own compelling content and preservation issues, works such as, say, *The Wizard of Oz*, *The Lord of the Rings*, *Yojimbo*, *Schindler’s List*, or *Seinfeld* (not that there’s anything wrong with that) remain peripheral to the orphan film phenomenon. In this sense, the focus on orphaned material decenters the most popular and commercially

successful movies. Rather the center is on recordings as historical documents. Orphan films are often “not-a-movie” films, artifacts not released theatrically: unfinished newsreels, outtakes, amateur works, test reels, unidentified footage, surveillance recordings, and works from other nontheatrical genres.

The difficulties institutions encountered with not-a-movie material led to adoption of the orphan metaphor within preservation circles generally and the Orphan Film Symposium specifically. The informal term got picked up in hearings for the Library of Congress National Film Preservation Plan. The Librarian’s 1993 report on those discussions among representatives of American archives, studios, labs, and other stakeholders categorically defined the division between commercial movies and all “the other” films, “the ‘orphans’ singled out in testimony.”

If there is a single division that separates most of the preservation issues discussed in this report, it is between two categories of films: those that have evident market value and owners able to exploit that value; and the other films, often labeled “orphans,” that lack either clear copyright holders or commercial potential to pay for their continued preservation. In practice, the former are primarily features from major Hollywood studios; the latter—numerically the majority—include newsreels and documentaries, avant-garde and independent productions, silent films where copyright has expired, even certain Hollywood sound films from now defunct studios. For these films the urgency may be greatest.²

A year later the Librarian removed the scare quotes. *Redefining Film Preservation: A National Plan* urged “public investment” in orphan films. It advocated a “foundation to raise funds for the preservation of orphan films.” The National Film Preservation Foundation that emerged in 1996 has since provided grants to preserve more than 1,500 at-risk films. The foundation maintains the operational definition found in the 1994 plan, supporting a “broad range of materials of artistic and documentary value.”³

Newsreels often head the list of orphan categories, a fact relevant to the formation of the symposium. In 1998, George Terry, then dean of libraries at the University of South Carolina, asked me to organize a one-off conference on film preservation, one that would highlight his Newsfilm Library’s huge and wonderful collection of Fox Movietone newsreel outtakes (most of it nitrate). As a film historian I had not been directly involved with preservation. But when I first heard an archivist refer to newsreel outtakes as

“orphan films,” the term resonated with prevalent strains of media history and cultural studies. Much media scholarship continues to address content outside of the mainstream—censored works, independent film, the avant-garde, cable access programs, nontheatrical film traditions, and the like.

Needing to learn more about preservation, I attended the 1998 AMIA conference, promoting an interdisciplinary symposium on the subject of orphan films. I got recommendations identifying the best speakers to invite. They all said yes—as did a like number of accomplished scholars who knew the archival world well. Several media artists who work with rich collections of archival films (Carolyn Faber, Alan Berliner, Péter Forgács, and Bill Morrison) came with recent work. This 1999 event was entitled “Orphans of the Storm: Saving ‘Orphan Films’ in the Digital Age.” The designation Orphan Film Symposium came later; through word of mouth, the shorthand “Orphans” stuck as a nickname for the event.

For whatever reasons, the forum for archivists, academics, and artists to talk without disciplinary borders worked. Participants urged a sequel. Though university resources were limited, archives, laboratories, and collectors began to offer help, their generosity allowing the symposium to grow. The Library of Congress staff in particular contributed greatly as informal technical and curatorial advisors. Private-sector sponsors came on board. The Selznick School of Film Preservation began bringing its students and the NYU Moving Image Archiving and Preservation (MIAP) program followed suit. Later, master’s students from sister programs at the University of East Anglia, UCLA, and the University of Amsterdam joined in.

People from diverse professions and avocations have been symposiasts, all stirring the pot and enriching the experience. They share at least one thing, however: a passion for saving, studying, and screening neglected moving images. It was this dedication and enthusiasm that led me to hail them as *orphanistas* at the second symposium. Surprisingly the term continued to circulate. *L.A. Weekly*’s review of Orphans 2 ran under the headline “Orphanistas!” The 2003 Margaret Mead Film and Video Festival featured new work by Bill Morrison and Gregorio Rocha, who were introduced as *orphanistas*. A further type of legitimation followed when Mead festival audience member Emily Cohen published a review essay, “The Orphanista Manifesto: Orphan Films and the Politics of Reproduction” in *American Anthropologist*. (There is no actual manifesto, by the way.) Most recently, Caroline Frick’s forthcoming book *Saving Cinema* (Oxford University Press) asserts genuine influence to the preservation cause that *orphanistas* advocate, even referring to the “orphanista mantra.” (There is no actual mantra, by the way.)⁴

The symposium is also the planned culmination of year-round research and preservation work. The sample of authors, topics, and films in this issue is representative of the work of the Orphan Film Project. Essays cover historical periods ranging from the 1910s to the 1980s and forms as diverse as campaign films, state tourism promotions, agricultural and educational shorts, silent features, advertisements, home movies, artful propaganda, union films, religious broadcasting, military training films, and antiwar documentaries.

We begin with **Paolo Cherchi Usai's** 2008 keynote address on the state of state-run film and media archives around the world. He reflects on his Orphans of the Storm keynote from 1999—"What Is an Orphan Film?"—in the context of the "digital storm" of the intervening decade. The text appears here as it was delivered.

Two essays examine films of the silent era. Although the style and nature of the works they assess differ starkly, both involve the U.S. government (hero and villain). **Jennifer Zwarich's** study of Department of Agriculture films is original on two counts. She analyzes a subset of a large corpus of little-known films produced by the USDA in the teens and twenties. Second, Zwarich argues that the filmmakers were progressive reformers, who succeeded in alleviating a social ill; this counters the many media studies that have presumed that state-sponsored bureaucracies simply reinforce status quo ideology and social structures. **Juana Suárez** and **Ramiro Arbeláez**, on the other hand, bring to light quite a different treatment of Uncle Sam. The Colombian feature film *Garras de oro* (1926) is a scabrous satirical harangue against Theodore Roosevelt, with a prologue in which "Tío Samuel" literally steals the isthmus of Panama from a map of Colombia. Preserved by the Museum of Modern Art and the Fundación Patrimonio Fílmico Colombiano twenty years ago, the film has not been substantially written about until now.

Jennifer Horne's reintroduction to filmmaker James Blue's three documentaries promoting the Alliance for Progress reverses the U.S.–Colombia power relations. These U.S. Information Agency productions skillfully walk the line between American propaganda and a liberal, humanist form of artistic representation. These three preserved films exist as beautiful 35mm prints at the National Archives. Horne suggests, as a few others have, that the study of USIA films merits a long-term research project, needing many contributors. [A note of serendipity: at Orphans 6, the rare screening of *Garras de oro* and Blue's *The School at Rincon Santo* (1963) revealed that both conclude with a person singing the Colombian national anthem.]

The dynamics of filming through a national, or colonial, lens persist in the home movies about which **Julia Noordegraaf** and **Elvira Pouw** write. Their close examination of a set of amateur films shot in the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia) by a Dutch mine

owner demonstrates how complex the content of a “home movie” can be. They ask us to reconceptualize these mute 16mm documents—and many others—not as “family films,” but as “extended family films.” Defining what constitutes a family is at least as difficult as categorizing people by national and ethnic identities.

The three remaining feature essays deal with American contexts, each focusing on a state (Georgia, North Carolina) or a local battleground (the 18th congressional district of East Harlem, New York City). **Devin Orgeron** looks at a subgenre of nontheatrical films, promotional “Vacationland” productions, which were familiar (to the point of cliché) in midcentury America. However, he then takes us to the exceptional treatment filmmaker George Stoney brought to such material in *Tar Heel Family* (1951)—one of many such exceptional works Stoney made while working in the mode of sponsored film. **Craig Breaden**’s report on the campaign advertisements for former Georgia governor Carl Sanders also shows us the exceptional: renowned documentarians David and Albert Maysles shot the long-form television ads in 1969–70 as work for hire. That Maysles 16mm films and elements are to be found in the political history library of a state university is yet another reminder of how disbursed and fragmented archival film material often is.

Charles Musser’s essay on a little-known New York-based production company is conspicuously longer than a typical journal essay, and for good reason. What began as a modest project—to show an obscure short preserved at the Museum of Modern Art—led to a major rediscovery, just as *Orphans 6* was about to unfold. *People’s Congressman* (1948) was indeed interesting as part of Paul Robeson’s filmography, but it also opened up a need to know more about the sole on-screen credit, Union Films. Responsible for two dozen productions in its brief existence, the company played a significant role in the history of American documentary film. Headed by filmmaker and left-wing activist Carl Marzani, the organization’s output, Musser argues, counters the notion cultivated by past histories that leftist, American documentary was moribund between its heydays in the 1930s and 1960s.

Four short but incisive (and personal) pieces comprise this issue’s Forum section, also drawn from the *Orphans 6* program. **Eric Breitbart** writes of his experiences as someone who made films both for the U.S. Army and the radical antiwar collective Newsreel (aka Camera News, Inc.). His remarks introduced a screening of *The Army Film* (1969), newly preserved as part of a Pacific Film Archives project. (PFA’s Pamela Jean Smith supervised the preservation, using a print courtesy of Greg Pierce’s Orgone Cinema collection.) Next, writer **Paul Cullum** and archivist **Mark Quigley** offer complementary perspectives on the fascinating niche television programming created by religious organizations. They show not only how voluminous these syndicated programs

He: "It never occurred to me before, but it's those so-called 'orphan shots' which have slowed down our movie shows."

Another conception of an orphan. Eastman Kodak's *How to Make Good Home Movies* (1958) included this suggestion that amateurs edit unessential footage out of their homemade films. (Thanks to Laura Kissel.)

were but how underappreciated some of their bolder productions are, especially in the case of the long-running series *Insight*. Its episodes are now in the early stages of video preservation at the UCLA Film & Television Archive.

Finally, with much sadness, six colleagues offer tributes to a major figure in the world of film archiving, William S. O'Farrell, who passed away in 2008, at age 54. Like many in our field, I was guided into understanding moving image archiving as a profession, practice, and passion by the funny, learned, and generous Bill O'Farrell. When the Orphan Film Project was looking to get its legs, he was an early supporter. Hearing about the first symposium, he was determined to make the second. So he and his protege Charles Tepperman drove the one thousand miles from Ottawa, Ontario, to Columbia, South Carolina, straight through. When a scheduled speaker cancelled, O'Farrell stepped up and gave an impromptu presentation on 9.5mm to 35mm blowups (and sang a little improvised tune about the 9.5mm gauge!). Although unable to attend the 2008 symposium, he nevertheless contributed to it. Here's some of what he e-mailed to me:

From: woofa@canadianfilm.com

Date: November 2, 2007

I talked today with JoAnne Stober (Nat. Archives) to look at a very interesting film called *Friendly Interchange* made in 1961. She wants to present at Orphans. (Under other circumstances I'd consider doing this myself.)

The film was by Alma Duncan and Audrey McLaren, who left the NFB and made 3 animated films under the company name Dunclaren Productions.

My dad knew Alma and Audrey, and in the 1980s he righted a wrong. Crawley Films numbered their own productions with P numbers. By some quirk, the

Dunclaren films were assigned P numbers. When the 1983 donations came in, he and I noticed the problem. He called Alma and Audrey, had the films deaccessioned, and properly urged them to donate the films.

Regarding "The State" Orphans theming: You will love this. *Friendly Interchange* is about the idea of free trade between the U.S. and Canada. And no one has seen this film in almost 50 years.

Plus, it adds some Canuck-U.S. content. :-)

JoAnne Stober did indeed screen and introduce the Library and Archives of Canada's 35mm print of *Friendly Interchange*. Bill was right: this film about a decidedly unsexy topic was unexpectedly beautiful.

Symposiums aside, the orphan metaphor has got legs—and a history. In Hollywood lingo the term has long referred to undistributed movies. As early as 1979, UCLA announced an extension course called "Orphan Films." But it simply consisted of screening and discussing eight auteur films that had distribution difficulties, nothing approaching the current conception of orphanhood.⁵ In the twenty-first century, however, the copyright limbo problem has internationally become deemed an orphan issue. Even the International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF) has taken up the vocabulary, albeit cautiously. Its April 2008 "Declaration on Fair Use and Access" states that FIAF "supports efforts to clarify the legal status of 'orphan' motion pictures." Only weeks later, the European Digital Libraries Initiative announced a specific concerted effort, issuing a memorandum of understanding on orphan works. Significantly, representatives of content owners and rights holders joined with archives, libraries, and other cultural institutions to sign the document. Its aim is to make the digitization of cultural resources (including films) lawful in the European Union (EU) when copyright owners cannot be identified. In November 2008, the EU launched an Internet destination, dubbed EUROPEANA, to aggregate digitized material, orphaned and otherwise, including "photographs, films, and audiovisual works."⁶ Web portals such as this, alongside the Internet Archive, Library of Congress projects, European Film Treasures, and other digital repositories present a potential contradiction. Thousands of orphan and archival films and videos are now being made accessible and impacting research and teaching in a positive way; but mass-scale digitization alone should not undo the preservation consciousness that the orphan film metaphor was designed to mobilize.

As Paolo Cherchi Usai notes near the beginning of his keynote text, the phrase *orphan film* has itself reached popular parlance via the Internet, especially through Wikipedia, the presumed and de facto oracle of public knowledge. The English-language

Wikipedia offers a good and useful definition (“. . . any film that has suffered neglect”), he advises. Any similarities between the Wikipedia entry for “Orphan film” and the ideas and words expressed in this editor’s introduction are rather intentional.⁷

A final note about Internet resources: Audio recordings of Orphan Film Symposium presentations are available for playback and download. The Web site NYU.edu/orphans hosts the 2008 recordings; the 2006 recordings can be accessed at SC.edu/filmsymposium. Both sites link to the text of programs from Orphans 1 through 5, all held at the University of South Carolina. NYU has scheduled the seventh symposium, “Moving Pictures Around the World,” for April 7–10, 2010, at the Library of Congress National Audio-Visual Conservation Center in Culpeper, Virginia.

NOTES

This collection of essays would not have come to be without the efforts of colleagues who have helped build the Orphan Film Symposium. At the University of South Carolina, Susan Courtney, Laura Kissel, and Julie Hubbert have been there from the beginning, and Karl G. Heider was our great ally. At New York University, the Department of Cinema Studies and the Tisch School of the Arts have supported the symposium, led by Richard Allen, Howard Besser, Mona Jimenez, Jonathan Kahana, Mai Kiang, Alicia Kubes, Antonia Lant, Charles Leary, Anna McCarthy, Chris Straayer, and Zhang Zhen. The spirited students of the NYU MIAP program played an essential role in Orphans 6, as did Martin Johnson. Paul Fileri provided skilled research assistance for this publication. At NYU Libraries, Alice Moscoso and Sarah Ziebell in the Preservation Department sparked the preservation, research, and access crucial to the symposium (with the backing of Paula De Stefano); Ann Butler and Brent Phillips in the Fales Library and staff at the Tamiment Library did likewise.

Because the Orphan Film Project is such a hybrid animal, the list of partners and sponsors is too lengthy to list here (though they are acknowledged in full on the Web site). However, because their significant generosity has made the project and this publication possible, I must thank the Double R Foundation, the Film Foundation, the Maxine Greene Foundation, and the film and video professionals at Kodak, Haghefilm, Colorlab, SAMMA Systems, Ascent Media/Cinetech, Cineric, Universal Studios/BlueWave Audio, Film Technology, Technicolor, The Cinema Lab, Monaco Film + Video, Postworks, Broadway Video, and VidiPax.

For their work in the preparation of this and other issues of *The Moving Image*, thanks are due to Karen Gracy (interim editor for two years) and the anonymous peer reviewers (more than twenty for this edition) who read manuscripts and wrote reports.

1. Walter Benjamin’s influential essay “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction” (1935) notably proffered the idea that motion pictures, being mass-produced copies, lack the “aura” of a traditional, unique

work of art. At a Flaherty Film Seminar discussion in 1999, Laura U. Marks uttered the counterproposition that "film has an aura." She was addressing curator Mark McElhatten after a screening of uncanny found-footage films he had assembled. Her remark rang true, and rang truer throughout the seminar week, which experienced many projection failures—as did the first Orphan Film Symposium three months later. (Fortunately, all subsequent symposium projection has been handled by the ingenious projectionist James Bond, without whom Orphans would not have survived as an archival film screening venture.)

2. Annette Melville and Scott Simmon, *Film Preservation 1993: A Study of the Current State of American Film Preservation: Report of the Librarian of Congress*, vol. 1 (Washington, DC: National Film Preservation Board of the Library of Congress, 1993), www.loc.gov/film/study.html.
3. *Redefining Film Preservation: A National Plan* (Washington, DC: National Film Preservation Board of the Library of Congress, 1994), www.loc.gov/film/plan.html.
4. Paul Cullum, "Orphanistas! Academics and Amateurs Unite to Save the Orphan Film," *L.A. Weekly*, Apr. 26, 2001; Emily Cohen, "The Orphanista Manifesto: Orphan Films and the Politics of Reproduction," *American Anthropologist* 106, no.4 (2004): 719–31. See also Caroline Frick, "Restoration Nation: Motion Picture Archives and 'American' Film Heritage" (PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2005), 220–30, passim. Published reports on past symposiums include: Devin Orgeron, "Orphans Take Manhattan: The 6th Biannual Orphan Film Symposium," *Cinema Journal* 48, no.2 (Winter 2009): 114–18; Regina Longo, "Fifth Orphan Film Symposium: Science, Industry, and Education," *The Moving Image* 7, no.1 (Spring 2007): 92–94; Jenn Libby, "Foundling Films: Orphans 5: Science, Industry and Education," *Afterimage* 33, no.6 (May–June 2006): 11; Dorian Bowen, "Orphans 04: On Location: Place and Region in Forgotten Films," *The Moving Image* 5, no.1 (Spring 2005): 167–71; Liz Coffey, "Orphans of the Storm III: Listening to Orphan Films," *The Moving Image* 3, no.2 (Fall 2003): 128–32; Dan Streible, "Saving Orphan Films, a South Carolina Symposium," *International Documentary* (Dec. 1999): 18–22; Sarah Ziebell Mann, "A Meditation on the Orphan, via the University of South Carolina Symposium," *AMIA Newsletter* 47 (Winter 2000): 30, 33. Two issues of the journal *Film History* stemmed from collaborations at the second and fifth symposiums: the Small-Gauge and Amateur Film issue, 15, no.2 (2003), coedited with Melinda Stone; and the Nontheatrical Film issue, 19, no.4 (2007), coedited with Martina Roepke and Anke Mebold.
5. The eight films, which included Robert Altman's *Thieves Like Us*, Jonathan Demme's *Citizen's Band*, and Arthur Penn's *Night Moves*, were of course picked up for distribution, not orphaned for long. "'Orphan Films' Course to Screen Eight Neglected Works at Guild," *Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 23, 1979; "Belson, Tewkesbury, Bick, Duke to Discuss Their 'Orphan Films,'" *Los Angeles Times*, Jan. 16, 1980.
6. "Council Conclusions of 20 November 2008 on the European Digital Library EUROPEANA," *Official Journal of the European Union*, Dec. 13, 2008, C319: 18–19. See www.europeana.eu. My thanks to the Wikipedia

contributor who added information about the EU memorandum to the entry on orphan films. "Memorandum of Understanding on Diligent Search Guidelines for Orphan Works," June 4, 2008, http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/digital_libraries.

7. While a few anonymous revisions appeared prior to 2009, the orphan film entry at <http://en.wikipedia.org> consists primarily of text I contributed between May 30, 2007 (when the entry was created) and March 21, 2009. This was true of the entry at press time at least. Some ideas expressed there, and in this essay, appeared earlier in my article "The Role of Orphan Films in the 21st Century Archive," *Cinema Journal* 46, no.3 (Spring 2007): 124–28.