COMMON PROBLEMS WITH ALL STUDIOS

When we created our first production code book in 2007, it had 18,000 codes and was developed completely from lists that we had acquired from several reputable sources. Since that time, we have been continually modifying and expanding the original lists because we were USING THEM as we were going through literally tens of thousands of stills.

Our 2013 Movie Still Identification Book has 45,400 production codes and the VAST majority were taken directly from the stills. And I can tell you that taking them DIRECTLY from the images has shown every kind of crazy variation imaginable. Because of this, we think it would be beneficial for YOU to see a couple of the oddities that were common to all studios and might help you understand some of the unusual marks that you might see.

When you first start using production code numbers, you will immediately recognize the huge amount of inconsistencies. We gathered these codes from a WIDE variety of sources, such as studio records, lists from dealers and collectors AND going through tens of thousands of stills. BUT, the problem isn't from the wide variety of sources: the problem is within the studio system.

Reland Susan Paole

These codes were used for control at THAT particular time for THAT particular purpose. They didn't take into consideration that maybe different people who created different stills from the Key Set would write the numbers differently, OR that when the distributor remade the stills for press releases, they would write it a different way, OR, if it was redistributed later by a different distributor, or even a distributor in a different country, that the codes would become slightly different.

You have to remember that at the time these stills were originally released, people were just doing their job and there was NEVER EVER a single thought that MAYBE... 40... 50... 60 ... or more years down the road someone might have trouble figuring out what this still was. Their only thought was to do their job and promote the film.

We've learned some very important lessons while compiling production codes. When oddities arise, you basically have to be a detective to search for clues. Sometimes it is written one way and then another. If you don't find it under one listing, try it under a slight variation, etc.

When we first started, I thought that I would just contact the studio archives and they could quickly clear up any problems. So, my first encounter was trying to identify some cast members on some early stills from the teens.

The stills had a studio stamp, the title, a recognizable star, a well-known director and a good production code number, so we "thought" this wouldn't be too much of a problem.

m Ganna Ara

After our initial search, none of the regular sources had the cast members, so we contacted the studio archivist. We sent over the title and production code and received a shocking report:

THEY HAD NO RECORD OF THAT PRODUCTION EVER BEING MADE THERE.

We said: "Wait, here's a copy of the stills with the studio stamp and you can see the production codes!" The studio archivist said:

WE HAVE NO RECORD OF THAT.

After some additional discussions, we came to the conclusion that it was fairly common for the production company to use their own system and THEN the studio would completely re-number and retitle the project.

The problem is that the documentation during production was basically eliminated and NO records kept. Sometimes, identifying pre-release stills CAN GIVE YOU NIGHTMARES!

Here are some other examples common to all studios:

Problems With NSS Number Confusion

Since we were just talking about National Screen Service, let's start off with an NSS problem.

The images on the following pages feature stills from the classic musical *The Sound of Music*, starring Julie Andrews and Christopher Plummer.

id and Susan Poole



That is until you showed them another still from the film, such as the one on the next page.



It shows the number 79/44. That's right. 79 is the production code number and NOT the NSS number.

In the 1960s, some studios started "printing" production codes with still descriptions on **some** of

the stills. It wasn't consistent. This practice gained popularity and is now the norm for a lot of newer stills distributors, such as Disney.

Mistakes on Studio Issued Stills

Here is a problem that happens often and is rarely caught except for major films. When studios send out their press materials, it would be expected that their employees would know what they are doing, or at least know when something is blatantly wrong. Collectors rely on the studio tag and rarely double check the production code number to make sure.

Check out the following still from the award winning film *Guess Who's Coming To Dinner* starring Spencer Tracy and Sidney Poitier:



Corristo 910: Columba Pittims, Balkar Reverse Providence Anticipation Participation Participation Participation Participation Participation Participation Participation Balkar Reverse Participation P Sidney Poitier doesn't quite look like himself in this shot. According to the production code, this still is for the film *Captain's Courageous*.

Here's another still from *Guess Who's Coming To Dinner*.



Correighs © 1967. Calamitia Pietarea. All Biglios Reserved. Premiosian provided for Newspaper Magazine reproduction. PEDVID 15 U.S.A. BLEWER PICTURES Presents & STRACT REMARKS REPORTED & SPENCER TRACY - DOMEY POSTER - KATHARENE HEPBORN » GUESS WHO'S COMING TO DINNER and introducing KATHARENE REQUITED + Naux by Seven Pictures by Willing RES - Product on Devents by Stract REMARK TRADECTOR

Sidney Poitier looked at lot like Mickey Rooney when he was a child. Anyway, you get the point.

When mistakes like this occur on a major title that everyone knows, it is easy to spot the wrong still. But this is not the case when it involves a lesser known title. These stills are normally just passed through because we have a tendency to think that the studio would know their own material.

The point is this. Just because it is issued by the studio doesn't automatically make it correct. The production code on this still clearly states that it is *Boy's Town*. So, it's good to always check the production code as well.

Multiple Production Code Numbers on Stills

We touched early on a problem of multiple numbers under Independent Distributors. Let's revisit this point, as it was not just an independent distributor problem, but a problem for ALL distributors that handled imports. While we are at it, with our next sample, we can also cover copyright tags.

Shown on the next page are some stills for the 1972 re-release of Charlie Chaplin's *Limelight*.

These stills were distributed by National Screen Service and all of the stills have the NSS service tag and number (72/26) on the bottom right.

All of them also have the production code "L" for *Limelight*.

id and Susan Pools



What you can't see is that three of the six have a 1956 copyright on the left with no studio (which is odd since the original release came out in 1952). The other three stills have a 1972 copyright by Columbia Pictures.

REMEMBER: ALL 6 have the 1972 NSS tag and number.

Now let's look closer at the top left still, which you can plainly see has 3 production codes in the right corner.



72/26

L-5 is the production code for *Limelight*; CC-8 is bound to be Charlie Chaplin -8, but P-116 – No clue.

We already learned in the Independent Distributor section that every time the stills were handled by a different distributor, the production codes were added and/or taken away at the discretion of that distributor. But now we can add that the copyright tags went along with it also.

Original vs. Reissued Stills

One of the biggest problems with production codes is identifying reissues from originals. When a studio reissues their own film, they just pull the material and send it out again. So, it is almost impossible to tell which release it is from. You can hope that they put different copyright tags on them, but as you saw in the last example, that's not that accurate either.

Only one major studio went out of their way to renumber their reissues. We cover that in the next chapter on individual studios. The best hope that we currently have is that the reissue was by a different distributor leaving their own mark.

I understand that there is a company in New York trying to come up with a way of dating newer stills by the chemicals that were used to develop them, but I haven't heard any real results yet.

Handwriting Mistakes

Here are a couple of clips from the film, *Hannie Caulder*.

The production code for *Hannie Caulder* is "HC." "HC" = $\underline{\mathbf{H}}$ annie $\underline{\mathbf{C}}$ aulder - that seems fairly simple. We have gone through a lot of *Hannie Caulder* stills and they were all the same with one exception.

The image below features an enlarged view of the bottom of a still from *Hannie Caulder*. It clearly shows the "HC" code.



m Productions. Ltd. All Hights Reserved. Permission granted for newspaper and mogazine reproduction. (Made in U.S.A.)
"HANNIE CAULDER"
Panavision® A Paramount Picture



Now let's look at the still clip on the next page.

The following image also shows an enlarged view of the bottom of a still from *Hannie Caulder*. But this one, for some reason, shows the code as "MC"???

r Productions Ltd. All Rights Reserved. Permission granted for newspaper and magazine reproduction. (Mode in U.S.A.)

"HANNIE CAULDER" Panavision® A P



This mistake was probably due to a studio employee copying the code from another still, mistaking the "H" for a "M.". The problem is that if you only had the one still, you would not notice the error.

Backwards Printing

Here's a clip of a still from the film *The Bride Wore Red.*



"THE BRIDE WORE RED",

The production code number is actually "997," which you would see if you hold the still up to a mirror. The code is BACKWARDS.

Eduard Susan Panic

Numbers Chopped

The next clip is taken from a still for the film The *Incredible Shrinking Man.* Fortunately, this is a popular film and should be recognizable to most. However, there is NO identification on the front of the still, and all you have is the production code (which you can see is 828)

Unfortunately, if the identification of THIS particular still was based solely on the production code, it would remain unidentified. Here's why.



The production code on the still, "828" was actually **chopped** at printing. The actual production code, as seen on the snipe that was attached to the back of the still, is "1828." Fortunately, in this particular instance, there was a studio clip on the back side.

Always beware when the production code is very close to the edge, as there is no telling how much could be **CHOPPED!**

That Little Black Box

We have been asked many times about the little black boxes found on some stills. Here is a sample of a still from the Marilyn Monroe film, *Don't Bother to Knock*. Notice the black box at the bottom right of the still, which has the production code in it.



Now here is another still from the same film, BUT NOTICE, the black box is on the top right.



Theorem of National Joseph Error (Control Workson, March 19, MONIOC) in Control Contro

So WHY the black box, and does the placement mean anything. i.e. produced in different locations or edited for different reasons, etc? Let's first address the black box.

In Chapter 4, we discussed the marking of stills by the Publicity Department in the making of the Key Set. Occasionally, the production codes would have to be revised AFTER they were etched on a still. The best way to make these changes was to create a black background and make a new one. Yes, these were initially created to make changes. Some studios picked up the process to become a regular spot instead of scratching them into the still.

Then if there was a need to make a change, there was already a space to do it.

And as for the placement, I wanted to make sure so I asked an employee who worked in the Publicity Department creating Key Sets. I was told that it was placed where they had more room. There was NO reason other than that.

Before we move on to the studios, let's look at one last area of concern that involves re-makes of films using different actors BUT the SAME codes. Warner Brothers was one of the worse to do this. Numerous times Warner Brothers would re-make a film 5 to 10 years later and then use the same production code for BOTH films.

For example, *Two Against the World* was released in 1932 starring Constance Bennett with the working title of *Higher Ups*. In 1936, Warner Brothers released *Two Against the World* starring Humphrey Bogart.

It was also released under the TV title *One Fatal Hour* and the British title *Case of Mrs. Pembroke*. BOTH the 1932 and the 1936 films used the SAME CODE.

For this reason, when possible, always try to reconfirm the identification by a second source. Once you identify a still by the production code, if there are actors in the still, try to confirm their identity.

id and Susan geom

If you are a veteran at production stills, then you know that you will run into every scenario imaginable. You basically have to be a detective looking for clues to the identity of THAT still. So any information that can be gleaned from the still, such as distributors, markings on the back, scene explanations, magazine stamps, etc., are potential clues.

 \sim \sim \sim \sim

CINEMARETRO

BRINGING CINEMA OF THE PAST INTO THE FUTURE IN A NEW MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO 60'S & 70'S http://www.cinemaretro.com

CINEMA RETRO PO Box 1570 Christchurch Dorset BH23 4XS England Tel: + 44 (0) 870 4423 007 Fax: + 44 (0) 1425 273068 solopublishing@firenet.uk.com USA OFFICE: PO Box 152 Dunellen, NJ 08812 USA Tel: + 001 732 752 7527 Fax: + 001 732 752 6959 clnemaretro@hotmail.com kinoart^{.net}

ORIGINAL MOVIE POSTERS AND LOBBY CARDS

12,000 SELECTED VINTAGE INTERNATIONAL POSTERS AVAILABLE

WOLFGANG JAHN SULZBURGSTR. 126 50937 COLOGNE GERMANY +49 221 1698728

