

**FIAF XXXII Mexico  
Minutes**



FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE  
DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION  
OF FILM ARCHIVES

m i n u t e s

XXXIInd CONGRESS

---

24th to 27th May, 1976

MEXICO

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Adoption of the agenda	4
Budget proposal for 1977	33
Cataloguing Commission (report)	9
Commissions : report of the Cataloguing Commission	9
report of the Documentation Commission	9
report of the Legal and Copyright Commission	11
report of the Preservation Commission	6
Confirmation of the status and voting rights of the members	2
Documentation Commission (report)	9
Executive Committee (election of the)	34
FIAPF (Relations with)	25
Financial report	33
Legal and copyright Commission (report)	11
Membership questions - Admission of new members	23
Minutes of the preceding General Meeting (Approval of)	6
Miscellaneous	35
Modification of the FIAF Statutes and Rules	24
Next Congress in Varna	31
Open Forum	15-27-37
Preservation Commission (report)	6
Projects and publications under way	40
Relations with FIAPF	25
Relations with UNESCO	35
Report of the President	5
Symposium : Latin-American cinema	33
UCAL (Relations with)	27
UNESCO Resolution on the preservation of films	12
Varna (organisation of the next Congress in)	31

## TABLE OF ANNEXES

1. List of participants
2. Report of the President
3. Report of the Preservation Commission
4. Report of the Documentation Commission
5. Film Effects System for the archival preservation of colour motion picture (Linwood Dunn)
6. FIAF Prize for the best dissertation in the field of film history
7. Proposal to modify the FIAF Statutes  
Proposition de modification des Statuts de la FIAF
8. Relations with FIAPF - Correspondence
9. Résolution unanime des membres de la FIAF à soumettre à la FIAPF
10. Financial report
11. Budget for 1977
12. Report on the 2d Summer School in Berlin
13. Proposal for the organization of the 3d Summer School in Copenhagen, August 1977.



FIRST SESSION

May 24, 1976, 10.00 a.m.

I. OPENING

As host of the General Meeting, Mr Hiram Garcia Borja, director of the Cineteca Nacional of Mexico, briefly introduced Lic. Mario Moya Palencia, Secretario de Gobernacion, who welcomed all the attending delegates in the name of President Echevarria and of the Mexican Government and said he was very happy that FIAF had chosen his country to hold its XXXIId Congress. It meant that the Federation understood the efforts which had been made and still were made by the Mexican authorities to develop a valuable national film archive. He underlined the role and activities of Cineteca Nacional not only in preserving the cinematographic heritage of Mexico but also in showing it even in the most remote places of Mexico by means of "cinemoviles" and also through special television programs.

He then thanked FIAF for having chosen Mexico City to organize its Symposium on Latin-American cinema which would help to identify and explain even more its very specific culture in its artistic, historical, political and socio-economical expression to the many delegates coming from all other parts of the world.

He ended by wishing FIAF a most fruitful and at the same time agreeable meeting and declared open the XXXIId Congress of the Federation.

The President of FIAF, Mr Pogacic, thanked Mr Moya Palencia for his kind words. He expressed the Federation's gratefulness for the most efficient and generous way in which Cineteca Nacional had organized the Congress and hoped that the quality of the meeting would prove equal to the beautiful premises in which they took place. Having summarized the aims of the Federation in general and the purpose of this Congress in particular, he reminded that although many excellent and rich film archives already existed in the world, there were still none in black Africa, very few in Asia and those existing in Latin-America often met with great difficulties in their development.

FIAF was here to try to solve these problems and attenuate this injustice.

The meeting was then adjourned for a short break.

2. CONFIRMATION OF THE STATUS AND VOTING RIGHTS OF THE MEMBERS PRESENT OR REPRESENTED

---

The Secretary-General, Mr Ledoux, read out the list of those present (annex I) also indicating in each delegation the name of the voting delegate.

Members and their delegates (the names of the voting delegates are underlined)

Amsterdam	Nederlands Filmmuseum	<u>J. de Vaal</u>
Beograd	Jugoslovenska Kinoteka	<u>V. Pogacic</u>
Berlin (DDR)	Staatliches Filmarchiv der DDR	<u>W. Klaue</u>
Berlin (DBR)	Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek	<u>E. Orbanz</u>
Bruxelles	Cinemathèque Royale de Belgique	<u>J. Ledoux</u>
Budapest	Filmarchivum / Magyar Filmtudományi Intezet	<u>I. Molnar</u>
Habana	Cinematca de Cuba	<u>S. Yelin</u> H. Garcia Mesa
Helsinki	Suomen Elokuva-Arkisto	<u>P. von Pagh</u>
Jerusalem	Archion Israëli Leserativ	<u>L. van Leer</u>
København	Det Danske Filmmuseum	<u>I. Monty</u>
Lausanne	La Cinemathèque Suisse	<u>F. Buache</u>
London	The National Film Archive	<u>D. Francis</u>
Madrid	Filmoteca Nacional de España	<u>F. Soria</u> V. Gomez-Olivé
Milano	Cineteca Italiana	<u>G. Comencini</u>
Montréal	Cinémathèque Québécoise	<u>R. Daudelin</u>
Moskva	Gosfilmofond	<u>V. Dimitriev</u> K. Razlogov
New York	Department of Film / Museum of Modern Art	T. Perry <u>E. Bowser</u>
Oslo	Norsk Filminstitutt	<u>J. Stenklev</u>
Praha	Filmoteka/ Ceskoslovensky Filmovy Ustav	<u>S. Ondroucek</u>
Pyong Yang	Choson Minchutui InminKongwhakug Kugkha Ingwha Munhongo	<u>V. Pogacic</u> (proxy)
Sofia	Bulgarska Nacionalna Filmoteka	<u>G. Stoyanov-Biqor</u> Z. Jandov
Stockholm	Cinematket/Svenska Filminstitutet	<u>A.-L. Wibom</u>



Torino	Museo Nazionale del Cinema	<u>M.-A. Prolo</u>
Toulouse	Cinemathèque de Toulouse	<u>R. Borde</u> C. Borde
Warszawa	Filmoteka Polska	<u>R. Witek</u> L. Armatys
Washington	Motion Picture Section/Library of Congress	<u>J. Kuiper</u>
Washington	American Film Institute Archives	W. Sharples <u>L. Karr</u>
Wien	Oesterreichisches Filmarchiv	<u>A. Lehr</u>
Wien	Oesterreichisches Filmmuseum	<u>P. Kubelka</u>
Wiesbaden	Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde	<u>U. Pöschke</u>

Apologies for absence had been received from the members of Bucharest, Canberra and Poona who had asked for some "Visitors" to attend the meeting for them. No news had come from the member archives in Istanbul, Lisbon, Rome and Tirana.

The Secretary-General then proceeded with the calling of Associates and Observers.

#### Associate

London	Imperial War Museum	C. Coultass
--------	---------------------	-------------

#### Observers

Buenos Aires	Cinemateca Argentina	G. Fernandez Jurado
Lima	Cinemateca Universitaria del Peru	M. Reynel Santillana
Los Angeles	U.C.L.A. Film Archive	R. Rosen
Mexico	Cineteca Nacional	H. Garcia Borja
Mexico	Filmoteca de la U.N.A.M.	M. Gonzalez Casanova
Ottawa	National Film Archives	S. Kula
Rio de Janeiro	Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna	C. Alves Netto

Among the Observers, apologies for absence had been received from :

F. Schmitt (Bois d'Arcy), M. El Dessouki (Cairo), G. Gomez-Gomez (Mexico), E. Hintz (Montevideo) and F. Gaffary (Tehran).

#### Honorary Members

Mr Einar Lauritzen, Stockholm, Sweden

Mr Herbert Volkmann, Berlin, DDR.

Prof. Toeplitz and Mr Svoboda were unfortunately not able to attend the meeting.

Visitors

J. Chang Liang, Cinemateca Universitaria de Guatemala  
 P. Chaskel, Cinemateca Chilena de la Resistencia / Secretary-General of UCAL  
 W. Dassori, Cinemateca Uruguaya, Montevideo  
 M. Martinez-Carril, " "  
 L.G. Dunn, Film Effects of Hollywood, Inc. California  
 A. Edwards, National Library of Australia, Australian Embassy, Washington  
 R. Izaguirre & R. Restifo, Cinemateca Nacional de Venezuela, Caracas  
 G. Liciu, Rumanian Embassy, Mexico  
 T. Luddy, Pacific Film Archive, Berkeley, California  
 D. Mbaloula, Cinémathèque de la R.P. du Congo, Brazzaville  
 I. de Norden, Cinemateca de Bogota, Colombia  
 S.B. Singh, Indian Embassy, Mexico  
 C. Wong, Cinemateca Universitaria de Panama  
 Dr. Taenyun Yoon, Embassy of the Republic of Korea, Mexico  
 Zarin Kim, " " "

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Secretary-General underlined that a new agenda, different from the one which had been sent out in advance, had now been drafted by the Executive Committee and been distributed to all delegates. It read as follows :

MEXICO / XXXII GENERAL MEETINGDRAFT AGENDAFIRST SESSIONMonday May 24, 10 a.m.

1. Opening speech by Mexican authority
2. Confirmation of the status and voting rights of the members present or represented.
3. Adoption of the agenda and voting procedures
4. Approval of the minutes of the preceding General Meeting
5. Report of the President



Visitors

J. Chang Liang, Cinemateca Universitaria de Guatemala  
 P. Chaskel, Cinemateca Chilena de la Resistencia / Secretary-General of UCAL  
 W. Dassori, Cinemateca Uruguay, Montevideo  
 M. Martinez-Carril, " "  
 L.G. Dunn, Film Effects of Hollywood, Inc. California  
 A. Edwards, National Library of Australia, Australian Embassy, Washington  
 R. Izaguirre & R. Restifo, Cinemateca Nacional de Venezuela, Caracas  
 G. Liciu, Rumanian Embassy, Mexico  
 T. Luddy, Pacific Film Archive, Berkeley, California  
 D. Mbaloula, Cinémathèque de la R.P. du Congo, Brazzaville  
 I. de Norden, Cinemateca de Bogota, Colombia  
 S.B. Singh, Indian Embassy, Mexico  
 C. Wong, Cinemateca Universitaria de Panama  
 Dr. Taenyun Yoon, Embassy of the Republic of Korea, Mexico  
 Zarin Kim, " " "

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Secretary-General underlined that a new agenda, different from the one which had been sent out in advance, had now been drafted by the Executive Committee and been distributed to all delegates. It read as follows :

MEXICO / XXXII GENERAL MEETINGDRAFT AGENDAFIRST SESSIONMonday May 24, 10 a.m.

1. Opening speech by Mexican authority
2. Confirmation of the status and voting rights of the members present or represented.
3. Adoption of the agenda and voting procedures
4. Approval of the minutes of the preceding General Meeting
5. Report of the President

SECOND SESSIONMonday May 24, 3 p.m. - 6 p.m.

6. Report of the specialized commissions
7. UNESCO Resolution on the preservation of films
8. Report on the main FIAF projects and publications

THIRD SESSIONTuesday May 25, 10 a.m. - 1 p.m.

9. Open Forum (part I) :  
See special list

FOURTH SESSION (reserved to Members only)Tuesday May 25, 3 p.m. - 6 p.m.

10. Status of members. Admission of new members.
11. Proposal for the modification of FIAF Statutes
12. Relations with FIAPF

FIFTH SESSIONWednesday May 26, 10 a.m.-1 p.m.

13. Open Forum (Part II)

SIXTH SESSIONWednesday May 26, 9 p.m.

14. Symposium : Latin American cinema

SEVENTH SESSIONThursday May 27, 10 a.m. - 1 p.m.

15. Financial report and budget proposal for 1977
16. Discharge of the administration of the outgoing Executive Committee
17. Election of the new Executive Committee
18. New FIAF projects
19. Relations with other international organizations
20. Points on the agenda of which the discussion is not closed and any other business.

This agenda was unanimously accepted.

Mr Ledoux then asked the members whether they agreed to follow during this General Meeting the voting procedures which had been distributed to all delegates and were the same as those used for the General Meeting in Turin. This was agreed.



#### 4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING GENERAL MEETING

The Minutes of the XXXIst General Meeting of FIAF in Turin, which had been sent to all members, associate and observers, were approved unanimously.

#### 5. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr Pogacic read out his report (annex 2) in which he underlined that although no internal difficulties had recently arisen for the Federation, the two main questions which FIAF now had to examine seriously were : 1°) its relations with the International Federation of Film Producers Associations in so far as this organization requested us to sign with them an agreement which our Executive Committee felt unacceptable, and 2°) the UNESCO Resolution on the preservation of moving images which, to become really fruitful, would require from the already existing archives and of course from FIAF many initiatives and efforts.

Mr Pogacic also mentioned a third problem which he considered of prime importance : the small number of affiliates to FIAF and their unbalanced geographical distribution; among the 53 FIAF affiliates, 32 were European, 6 North-American, 8 Latin-American (but only 1 member), 3 Asian, 1 African and 1 Australian, and FIAF had affiliates in only 38 countries while the United Nations alone already counted more than 125 countries.

The President urged the General Meeting to reflect on all these problems which of course would be discussed more in detail later during the sessions.

#### SECOND SESSION

Vice-President Kuiper presided over this session.

#### 6. REPORT OF THE SPECIALIZED COMMISSIONS

##### a) Report of the Preservation Commission

A written report (annex 3) had been distributed to all members. The Chairman of the Preservation Commission, Mr Volkmann, said he was happy to report that the difficulties with the National Film Archive concerning the correction of the Preservation Manual which were mentioned in this report were now settled, and that Mr Francis had agreed to relieve Mr Brown from all his other duties until the completion of these corrections. Mr Volkmann therefore believed that the publication of the second part of the Preservation Manual (dealing with colour films and other audiovisual media) could be foreseen before next Congress.

Mr Ledoux asked if some members in the Assembly already preserved magnetic tapes and if so, in what way.

Mr Daudelin said that, in Montreal, they preserved some half-inch tapes in the same conditions as black and white film, but they had not yet made any tests to see how these tapes evolved.

Mr Francis reported that the N.F.A. preserves television programs produced originally on tapes since 1959. They tend to preserve any program which started on black & white videotape in the form of film. Any tape which was produced in colour, they preserve in the form of original 2 inch videotape or copy videotape. These tapes are held in the same conditions as acetate film. The N.F.A. has recently acquired a reproducer which will play 405, 625, high and low bend, but no colour, to start testing operations to see how these tapes are surviving, because they have already had the case of some disintegrating magnetic coat.

Mr Kula said that, in Ottawa, they tended to keep the videotapes in their original format and did not transfer them except for projection purposes. Regarding the preservation of these tapes, he only knew that there were some precautions to take such as making a magnetic field stand survey of the storage area. They also kept the tapes in the same environment as black & white films.

Mr Kula then said that his archive was quite involved with videotape in relation to manufacturing reference copies on 3/4 inch tapes (Sony cassettes). They had an in-house facility for doing so and made a great deal of material where the optical quality was secondary to its documentary value for researchers, for instance newsreels which they would not hold in 35mm nitrate and where the probability of making either 16 or 35mm acetate prints was low in the archive's scale of priorities.

Mr Comencini said that, in Milano, they transferred some black & white films on 3/4 inch videotape cassettes for purposes of study. He suggested that the archives which envisaged to do the same would adopt one single standard of tape in order to facilitate exchanges.

Mr Kubelka, speaking as a filmmaker and not as an archivist said he felt anguished when hearing the present discussion because of the danger that any transfer represented for a film. Almost all of the new generation of independent filmmakers refused to have their films transferred on tapes even for study purposes because they felt it to be a mutilation of their original work. The danger which Mr Kubelka saw coming was the day when the whole heritage of cinema would be on tape and then "cinema will never have been". It was already bad to see a film in its second or third generation reproduced on film stock, but that could not be helped. Mr Kubelka however said one should be well aware that a copy never equalled the original and therefore he urged the archives 1°) to preserve every positive they had, even if it had been transferred. 2°) to foster research that would make it possible to better preserve the original and not so much hope in some research that would find the ideal means of transfer.

In this precarious situation, what we should introduce in our decisions when we transfer and throw away, is a classification into works of high intensity and low intensity.



What should be analyzed in a film is where lies its intensive part: in the photography, the format, its documentary value, etc... and then take our decision of transfer accordingly.

Filmmaking and videomaking are two different things, concluded Mr Kubelka. There is a totally different philosophy behind those two media, and when we switch over from one to the other, we don't have the same work anymore.

Mr Comencini said he agreed with Mr Kubelka but he nevertheless wanted to encourage the preservation of films by transfer into videotape cassettes because he thought it was the only way to preserve them for a long period. He said that in Italy one could at present transfer a film to videotape, via a telecinema equipment, for less than 100 dollars.

Mr Perry said he also entirely agreed with Mr Kubelka but he suggested to use tapes as "aide-mémoire" to make reference prints and by the same taken keep the original materials from being printed too often and leave them in much more ideal storage conditions. One should point out to the students and scholars that these tapes were only "aide-mémoire" and after they had studied those over and over again, we would require that they look at the original material.

Mr Kula supported Mr Perry's suggestion. Students will prefer to see tapes that nothing, even if they are aware that what they see is a travesti of the original. But what further depressed him in the whole problem raised by Mr Kubelka was that, in any kind of colour printing, there was always an element of subjectivity. The members had all witnessed the tribulations and pains which directors suffer when trying to get from a laboratory a print that approximates their conception in relation to the colour. Mr Kula therefore thought that, whatever method of transfer involved, this element of subjectivity would still be there unless we invented a system which encodes values as the director has agreed they should be and so enables laboratories objectively to reproduce these colours according to those values, even some decades later.

Mr Kuiper asked whether any members had any evidence that fading colours could be restored and Mr Volkmann replied that it was impossible except at the very early stage of disintegration.

Mr Dunn said the problem was that the film did not fade evenly, but in waves.

Mr Francis reported that there were some ways to combat fading by going through an electronic process which puts a specific instruction to each frame as it goes through and it is possible to correct and enhance certain areas of the colour. But one ends up with a videotape and, in order to get it back onto film, one must go through another process (called Vitronics in Britain). The expense of all this however is colossal.

Mr Ledoux said he had been very impressed by what Mr Kubelka had said. Mr Kubelka, he underlined, was the only regular colour filmmaker among us and filmmakers should be given the word for this important problem.

Mr de Vaal added that we were all talking of tapes, but nobody even knew how long tapes could be preserved.

Mr Kula agreed that the storage properties of tapes were totally unpredictable. Some were very good, some bad and it seemed to depend on the quality of the original stock, or the way tapes were processed, or the kind of machinery that was used, etc... The variations appeared to be just as numerous as they were with nitrate films.

Mr Dunn agreed with Mr Kula and he added that he did not see any future for the permanency of the moving image on tape as compared to film in its black and white 3 separation form.

This ended the discussion on the report of the Preservation Commission.

b) Report of the Documentation Commission

Mrs Bowser said she had little to add to her written report (annex 4) which had been distributed beforehand, except for pt 7: the International Index to Film Periodicals.

Under the heading she had stated a problem which the commission had with St James Press, the publisher of the P.I.P. annual volume. This problem now seemed to come to a resolution and it was likely that FIAF would continue with this publisher at least for the near future.

Mrs Bowser also made a plea that the only way to get this project on firm ground and guarantee that it would continue, was to get some help from the members by promoting in their country either the subscription to the cards or the sale of the volume.

c) Report of the Cataloguing Commission

Mr Klaue had distributed the following written report:

" Thanks to an intervention by Mrs Eileen Bowser, Museum of Modern Art - Film Department, an editor for "Filmcataloguing" has been found in the USA. FIAF has signed a contract with Lenox Hill, Publishing and Distributing Corp. in New York. Presumably the book is due to be published in the course of 1976.

The Cataloguing Commission met in spring 1976 for a consultation centered around two projects:



### 1. Dictionary of Filmographic Terms

Approximately 250 terms used in cataloguing of films and TV-material are defined and translated into 24 languages. The Commission, at its recent meeting, dealt with the completion of the list of terms and with the working out of definitions. A working translation of the major part of the terms has already been completed in 18 languages.

The intention is to put up for discussion the definitions of filmographic terms among the FIAF-members in 1977. The project is scheduled to be finalized in 1978.

### 2. Questionnaire on the Use of Computers in Film Cataloguing

The Cataloguing Commission has sent questionnaires to members of FIAF who are known to already operate with computers or are making preparations in this regard, to find out about the experiences made. Answers have so far been submitted by the Imperial War Museum, the American Film Institute, the Library of Congress and the Staatliches Filmarchiv der DDR. It would be desirable if all archives, that have made experience in this field, could make them available to the members of the Federation.

The materials sent in are scheduled to be published in 1977.

The Commission dealt with a number of other projects, such as the compilation of a list of restored classical films, a new version of a bibliography of filmographic sources, the cataloguing of TV-materials, but finally reached a decision to concentrate on the above-mentioned two projects and to finalize them within a foreseeable period."

Mr Klaue asked whether the members had any comments to make on this report.

Mr Ledoux said that although he was very interested by computerized catalogues, small archives such as the Belgian Archive could not afford one and he asked the Commission not to forget the other cataloguing systems, for instance a mechanical system with punched cards which interested him to catalogue at least the technical datas of the films. He asked whether any of the delegates had any experience of this system.

Mrs Wibom explained that, in Stockholm, they had computerized their catalogue which, she said, was extremely practical and made them spare money on personnel. She reported that the entire cost for developing their computer system including the first run had amounted to approximately 35.000 Swedish Crowns (± 8000 Dollars). She invited any member of FIAF who was interested to come to Stockholm and see it working.

Mr Coultass said it was too soon for him to comment definitively on the computer system used at the Imperial War Museum. He was sure that the computerization would assist the film department in the assessment of technical data regarding the condition of nitrate films but with regard to subject data, he needed at least 8-9 months more to see how this system could help.

Mr Klaue concluded his report by saying that the Commission was far from recommending to small archives to start computerizing their catalogue but that it wished to correct and disseminate all the available information on what already existed in various archives in order to warn the other members not to go in the wrong direction and also to give them some optimistic views on the possibilities of computers.

d) Report of the Legal and Copyright Commission

Mr Kuiper said he had no proper report to make regarding the work of his Commission this year because it had not met but it had worked a lot to prepare the UNESCO meeting of experts held in Berlin in September 1976, which would be reported on under the next item.

Mr Ledoux however wanted to raise a question regarding copyright. Did film archives have the right to record off-air on video-cassettes films projected on television which interested them as internal reference prints?

Mr Kuiper said there was certainly no international law on this matter, and that the laws of the home territory prevailed. But they varied quite much from country to country.

Mr Kula said that in Canada they did it and had permission to do it as long as it was solely for internal use. Copyright law was inexistence on that point. But one ought to act with care and remember that most TV broadcasters had acquired the material they broadcast sometimes for a very limited license. So even with their agreement, one might run into problems with the owners of the international copyright, for instance.

Mr Klaue explained that in D.D.R., as in most socialist countries, copyright belonged to the state and there would therefore be no problem to possibly make those recordings which Mr Ledoux had mentioned.

Mr Razlogov agreed. Although each socialist country had its own copyright laws, in USSR also, the state owned the copyright on everything produced within its territory, and as Gosfilmofond and the Soviet Television were both state organizations, there should be no problem.



Mr Francis said that in Britain nothing, apart from certain programs of an educational purpose, could be recorded off-air for whatever purpose. But practically, it was possible to come to an agreement with the TV or the producing companies in the limited terms expressed earlier by Mr Ledoux. Mr de Vaal said that in Holland, this practice was legally forbidden.

Mr Pogacic then read out a letter of Mr Privato, Vice-President of FIAF, which he had just received. Mr Privato regretted very much not to be able to attend the General Meeting because he held FIAF's matters very much at heart, and he wished all the delegates and other visitors a very successful meeting.

#### 7. UNESCO RESOLUTION ON THE PRESERVATION OF MOVING IMAGES

Mr Kuiper reported that this Resolution, of which the members had already been informed last year in Turin, first resulted in a meeting of experts which was held in September 1975 in East Berlin, which was chaired by Mr Klaue and was attended by several members of FIAF amongst delegates of various other international organizations dealing with the moving images. The final report of that meeting had been published in the FIAF Bulletin. Mr Kuiper underlined that, for him, one of the important outcomes of this conference was the examination of statutory deposit, although the participants could not even begin to approach a solution to this problem.

Mr Klaue added that a small working group of FIAF had also prepared for this meeting two important papers which served as basis for most of the discussions. Although almost every aspects of archival work were touched, it became necessary to concentrate on some items among which the most interesting subject was the problem of legal or statutory deposit. As representative of the producers, Mr Brisson's attempt was of course to limit this legal deposit as much as possible, that is: to limit it for each country to its national production. The majority of experts however did not agree on this limitation, but no decision was reached at this meeting.

What came out of this meeting and passed into the program of UNESCO for 1977-1978 is much more limited than the recommendations expressed in the Final Report. There are two points:

- 1°) to work on a preliminary study on legal and technical aspects of preservation (\$ 16.000 are foreseen for this aim).
- 2°) the training of specialists for the transfer of nitrate films onto acetate stock, and the proposed creation of a pilot film archive or museum.

Mr Klaue therefore recommended that FIAF establish a permanent contact with those departments of UNESCO responsible for the realization of those two points and/or other steps which UNESCO might make in this direction, and also that FIAF prepare its contribution for further meetings with UNESCO, to express our point of view on legal deposit, on the structure and financial problems of film archives, etc ...

Mr Pogacic felt that we should have a general view of the question and present UNESCO with a detailed but complete plan of actions to take. FIAF's action should aim towards: 1°) the creation of a film archive in all countries where no archive already exists; 2°) the establishment of legal deposit in every country; 3°) the creation of a very simple pilot archive which could be established even in the poorest countries.

Mr Ledoux who had attended the Berlin meeting as delegate of FIAF said that he also thought the most important point which had been raised and which must be discussed by the General Meeting here was the problem of legal deposit, because he found that FIAF should have a unanimous standpoint to present at further UNESCO meetings regarding the kind of legal deposit we should demand: the legal deposit either of the national production or of all the films shown in the archive's country. He therefore asked the members to express their opinion on this important problem.

Mr Alves Netto first wanted to answer Mr Pogacic's proposal. He said no-one of course was opposed to the creation of one archive per country but, in so far as this Resolution emanated from UNESCO who always worked through the governmental structures, it could mean a problem for those countries such as Brazil where the existing film archives were far from being governmental.

It could lead to the creation of a parallel organization with all the difficulties this situation implied. One should therefore recommend UNESCO to look for and to support whenever possible the existing film archive, even private, rather than to create new ones.

Coming back to legal deposit, Mr Kula underlined that this was a very broad question which, beyond the two alternatives put forward by Mr Ledoux, raised many other questions: should the producer or the distributor be compelled to provide the archive with a print or with master material (the printing elements), including documentation, scripts etc.? Should he provide this material free or at print cost? and what about countries where there are more than one archive?

One could always dream of an ideal situation where the archive received everything but how far from this ideal should we set our goal in order to obtain statutory deposit was not an easy decision for FIAF and would bring out important precedents for the archives. Mr Kula found it impossible to answer Mr Ledoux' question immediately.

Mr Stenklev also found it premature to answer Mr Ledoux but, as a principle of negotiation, he thought one should always ask the most in order to obtain what one really intended to receive.

Mr Perry then raised the problem of independant filmmakers for whom it would be financially impossible to deposit one copy of their films free in all the countries where they were shown. Mr Kubelka strongly supported Mr Perry's statement.



Mr Rosen said what was important was to get the major (to be defined) producers end up repaying the people of the country in which they had made money, but people marginal of these large producers (independent filmmakers, film students who turn films that have world wide audience but will never pay back the costs involved) should not be penalized. Because of the difficulty of formulating such a proposal, Mr Rosen thought it was premature to come to a vote here at the General Meeting.

Mr Pöschke said that, even without statutory deposit in his country, he had contracts with many foreign producers and distributors, who deposited their films in Wiesbaden.

Mr Klaue explained that the ideal situation described by Mr Kula here above was not far from reality in most of the socialist countries. Therefore he did not feel it impossible for FIAF to ask for a legal deposit as wide as possible. But that would bring us to another important problem: the selection of films to preserve.

Mr Garcia-Borja thought that FIAF should fight for both forms of legal deposit as defined by Mr Ledoux, because we all knew how difficult it was to acquire films from the producers or distributors without any payment, and he agreed with Mr Rosen's arguments. He was pessimistic however about the real influence of a UNESCO resolution in this field vis-à-vis producers, for whom only the commercial interests prevailed, but suggested that FIAF should try to obtain a statutory deposit law in each member's country. He also raised the problem of the retrospective effect of such a law.

But Mr Pogacic, supported by Mr Klaue and Mr Stenklev, said one should not underestimate the influence and weight of UNESCO on the governmental authorities if not on the producers and he was certain that this Resolution, however vague, could already serve as a tool for the archives to ask for support to their legal authorities.

Mr Perry having repeated that he saw immense difficulties in the total form of legal deposit because of the number of archives that already existed and would exist in the future and the financial imposition which they would put upon the producers (especially the independent filmmakers), Mr Sharples said he understood this but still felt it would be a mistake to weaken our original request. We might rather limitate it from the start 1°) to the theatrically distributed films, and 2°) settle on one archive per country.

If we proceeded in the other direction (legal deposit of the national production only), we would violate the fact that Mr Kubelka had stated before, i.e. that film is an international entity. We would be strenghtening the archives of Japan, India, the USA, Italy and a few others to the enormous detriment of the other countries. It would be immoral and wrong for FIAF to endorse such a proposal.

There being time to close the session and considering that no motion could be put to votes, Mr Kuiper said the Executive Committee would study this matter further.

Pt 8 of the agenda: "Report on the main FIAF projects and publications" was postponed until the 7th session.

THIRD SESSION

May 25th, 10 a.m.

Vice-President Klaue presided over this session.

9. OPEN FORUM

All members had been asked to send beforehand, in writing, the topics or ideas which they wanted to be discussed under this heading. This resulted in a list of 12 subjects which would be dealt with during two sessions.

1°) Presentation by Mr Linwood Dunn of a new method for colour preservation on black and white 16mm stock.

Mr Dunn (President: Film Effects of Hollywood) presented this system which he called the "FAMP" System (Film Effects System for the archival preservation of colour motion picture) by reading a paper (annex 5) and illustrating it with various appropriate slides and short film extracts.

2°) Creation of a central register of member holdings, in view of saving as many as possible of the disintegrating nitrate films (D. Francis)

This item was linked, during the discussion, with the following subject proposed by Mr L. Karr:

3°) Discussion on the preservation priorities of FIAF members.

What obligation, for example, does an individual member have to preserve important films produced outside his country, if it can be determined that they are not presently being preserved by another FIAF member.

To introduce the subject, Mr Francis explained that he had raised this question because the N.F.A., and probably other archives as well, stood before the following problem: the instability rate among recent nitrate acquisition is alarming and, for financial reasons, the curators have to choose which film they copy and which one they let go. It is vital that decisions of this sort are made with full knowledge of what exists elsewhere backed up with technical information about these holdings. In that frame the FIAF Catalogue of documentation on Silent Films in member's holdings is helpful but it is uncomplete. And also it contains no technical description of the condition of the films, which is important in order to know where is the best copy. Thirdly it says nothing of originals which might exist outside FIAF, e.g. with producers.

Mr Francis asked for a general discussion on this problem to see how we could possibly start this project of Central Register, to know if certain archives would be ready to contribute their lists of holdings to this Register, etc...

Mr Ledoux agreed on the importance and the complexity of this proposal, but he saw many difficulties in its realization. For instance he did not see the possibility to compare the physical quality of various copies by correspondence. Even if there were appropriate codes, this evaluation would still be very subjective. Many films also needed great filmological competence to be compared. Which was the original version, the official version, etc...

Mrs Wibom replied that however the difficulties, there were many advantages to Mr Francis' proposal. The Swedish Archive had in its collections 1800 foreign nitrate films, all in very bad state, which they could not copy for lack of funds but which they also did not want to destroy because in this collection might be some only existing prints or prints which another archive might want to copy. Therefore she said the Cinemateket would be very willing to cooperate in establishing such a list as Mr Francis wished to have in FIAF.

Mr Kula suggested to initiate this project by dealing with clear areas where the information could easily be determined. To start with basics such as: which archive knows the existence of or holds the original negative (as the film was originally released) in those cases most frequent where there were not multiversions of the film. And the members would have access to that negative for further copies as required for study in the various countries.

Mr Sharples thought that a Central Register should start as a cumulation of individual registers from the different countries, but that we should first establish a uniform approach to the problem, a sort of standardized list of minimum data to record in our inventory. Mr Rosen supported Mr Sharples' suggestion.

Mr de Vaal raised the problem of unidentified films.

Mr Klaue said he had no doubts about the usefulness of such register but experience has shown that the establishment of a central catalogue in FIAF was extremely difficult. Some members will not participate. The information received is uncomplete, etc... However, if we decided to launch the project, we must do it quickly and simply: use the instruments which we already had, such as the Bulletin. Members could so communicate to other members their preservation program and, if they had doubts on the completeness or the state of their prints, ask if no better print existed.

Mr Kuiper agreed with Mr Klaue. He felt that if we wanted too much, we would loose precious time. We should certainly share more information but waiting for minute descriptions of the technical condition of somebody else's print should never cause our films to disintegrate.



Mrs Wibom having asked how many of the present archives had a program for restoring foreign nitrate films besides their national production, several delegates replied by raising their hands.

Mr Kubelka said he had always been against the idea that an archive sees its prime duty in restoring its national production. Especially in the case of Austria.

Mr Garcia-Mesa said they preserved foreign nitrate film because there were very few Cuban films left from that period, and also because no one could guarantee them that the foreign films which they had existed elsewhere in a better condition.

Mr Karr underlined that there was also the problem of the varying version in the language. If the foreign films in Stockholm's collection had Swedish subtitles, perhaps they should be kept only for that reason.

Mrs Bowser reported that the MOMA preserved a certain number of foreign films chiefly for the reason that they had English titles.

About the Central Register, she thought that even if some archives would not participate, one could start with those who are ready to do it and who are interested.

The minimum information required would be, she felt, to know that the archive is holding a nitrate print or negative, the conditions of the titles, and the approximate length. That would give enough information for a curator to decide if it was useful to ask for lending the material for comparison in his own archive.

Mr Pogacic added that one should also know whether one could obtain a copy from its holder.

Mr Gonzalez-Casanova explained that the point of view of his archive towards the preservation of foreign nitrate films was the same as Mr Garcia-Mesa's in Cuba. However he agreed that one should always give pre-eminence to the preservation of one's national production. He supported Mrs Wibom's suggestion to communicate to other members the list of one's foreign nitrate holdings to see if they were interested. He also asked whether the "rich" archives could not offer to copy some of those films for the benefit of those archives who did not have the necessary resources to copy their own national holdings. Of course, there was always the very serious problem of transporting these nitrate films from one country or continent to another. Severe laws very much restricted this transport in some countries.

In other countries, like Argentine, even to hold nitrate films was forbidden by law. Mr Casanova thought that this should be known in order to try to save those films in other countries.

Mr Alves Netto explained that in Brazil the resources of the archive were so limited that they could not cope even with the preservation of the national production. Their foreign nitrate holdings were therefore condemned to disintegration because one could neither copy them for lack of funds nor transport these abroad because of transport limitations on nitrate.

Mr Ledoux summarized the discussion by reminding that 2 interesting proposals had already been made: 1°) that archives should send to a central place (FIAF Secretariat) a list of their nitrate films which they could not or did not want to copy to see if some other members were interested to save those films. There was of course always the problem of rights that should be solved. 2°) Mr Kula's suggestion to make a central list of the original negatives that archives hold or know the existence of, and which could be copied.

Mr Ledoux asked Mr Francis what he thought of these proposals. Mr Francis replied that he would be extremely happy with any movement that was made towards the aim of a central register. He proposed a third solution, i.e. that members should send to a central place the part of their catalogue that contained only their nitrate holdings, (in the form of which it existed at present) and that some simple form of correlation was made, perhaps by original title by alphabetical order, even if in the first instant there was no technical description. That would at least point the direction to where an archivist should look when he was at the point of having to copy nitrate originals.

He therefore asked whether FIAF could possibly pay a person to investigate the matter, receive existing lists and analyse the problems involved.

The Treasurer answered that this was again a question of priority. He could not say yes or no right now. But he thought that the whole problem raised by Mr Francis was a basic problem which could not be solved by individual archives and should be studied in detail by the next Executive Committee. Meanwhile he strongly supported the first proposal mentioned by Mr Ledoux, as a modest approach to the ideal solution. Mr Kuiper also agreed with this proposal.

Mr Ledoux further suggested that archives which faced the same problem as the N.F.A. in London: the obligation to be selective in their program of copying nitrate films, and would like to know if other archives have already copied the films which they plan to save, should communicate their program of copying to the other members either via the Secretariat or through the Bulletin. But he did not think it was possible for FIAF to create a Central Register such as Mr Francis had envisaged.

Mr Francis said he would be happy with any solution, as a start.

Mr Garcia Mesa then said that Cinemateca de Cuba had almost come to the end of its program of copying its own nitrate holdings and therefore offered to the other Latin-American archives which could not do it, to copy some of their nitrate films for them. He asked the interested Latin-American colleagues to send him some lists of titles with, of course, an order of priority.

Mr Ledoux then asked to discuss the problem of transport of nitrate films which seemed to vary from country to country. There being no time left, it was decided to postpone this discussion until later.

4°) Precautions to take with nitrate films on viewing tables such as Steinbeck or Prevost tables, or for the verification of nitrate films.  
(J. Ledoux)

Mr Ledoux said that everyone here knew what were the precautions to take with nitrate films in the vaults or in the projection booths but it seemed that the problem of security on the viewing tables or during the printing process had never been solved or even discussed clearly among the members, as resulted from the answer received to a circular letter which he had sent to his colleagues regarding this matter.

Mr Ledoux' question was: "what are the precautions to take to prevent a nitrate film to catch fire on a viewing table or on a printer, or what should be done if it starts burning? what kind of extinguishers should be used? what kind of fire-blankets, if any? etc...

Mr Ledoux agreed with Mr Volkmann that the FIAF Preservation Manual explained what to do in case of a big nitrate fire, but these explanations were too vague for the specific case of viewing tables where it should be possible to limit the fire to one reel at the most.

The answers which he had received from the members to his letter regarding this question were also often vague and sometimes contradictory.

Mr Klaue knew that a certain number of archives had internal rules for the precautions to take in these cases - perhaps FIAF could collect these rules, translate them and distribute them to those interested.

Mrs Wibom explained that in Stockholm, the archive's building had been specially designed to include all necessary protective devices both in the protection booths and in the rooms where nitrate films could be seen on moviolas or other viewing tables. These tables were standing on ± 4m<sup>2</sup> of steel; the walls of the room were covered with asbest (dangerous however for other reasons) and a fire blanket was supposed to fall down automatically in case of fire on the table. The personel however was instructed to run away if a nitrate film caught fire. All these precautions had been tested by the fire brigade and were found satisfactorily.

Mrs Bowser thought one could not go too far. She had seen many times how the protection devices installed on the projector had stopped a starting fire on a nitrate film and there was never more than one frame burned. She wondered whether such devices could not be used also on the viewing tables.



Mr Rosen agreed and suggested that FIAF, which was certainly a great consumer of flatbed viewers, should make a collective recommendation to the manufacturers of those tables to study the matter and perhaps construct automatically those devices which Mrs Bowser had mentioned.

Mr Ledoux said that any manufacturer would build this device on demand if we were ready to pay for it. He proposed to ask for prices to Steinbeck or Prevost or Moviola and inform the interested members.

Mr Klaue however supported Mr Rosen's proposal to draft a collective FIAF recommendation to the manufacturers which would be useful also to those archives which used other types of tables. And he suggested again that FIAF collect all the available information among its members in order possibly to come to a better prepared discussion on this problem at one of our next congresses.

5°) FIAF Prize for the best dissertation in the field of film history research. (J. Ledoux)

Mr Ledoux had sent a circular letter to all members before the Congress to expose his idea of a FIAF Prize (annex 6). He now asked for their comments.

Mr Pogacic supported this proposal but made reservations for the limit of age (40 years) put in the regulations. He felt it should be open to all researchers.

Mr Borde also agreed with the idea of a Prize, especially to encourage dissertations on original topics.

Mr Perry said he supported the proposals very much but he saw one practical difficulty: the great number of dissertations which the Jury would have to read. He also underlined that one should foresee in which way the dissertations would be submitted: through the archives who would make a pre-selection?

Mrs Wibom made a remark about the language problem and the costs of translation. She also said she did not understand the use of Prizes given afterwards since all the costs incurred for writing a dissertation came before its writing. If we felt that a particular study should be undertaken, a much more practical way to encourage this would be for an archive to offer service to researchers by making its collections, screenings, documentation, etc... available to them.

Mr Perry agreed with her.

Mr Coultass agreed with Mrs Wibom. He also suggested to take this proposal to certain selected universities or film departments and offer a Prize in association with those universities, in the normal context of academic studies.

Mr Klaue felt that we should have a certain guarantee of continuity, be certain that FIAF would be able to finance it for a certain number of years.

Mr Stenklev said that one possible way of financing this Prize would be to dedicate the interests of the Reserve Fund to this aim. He asked who would be member of the Jury for this Prize and thought it was too big a job for the Executive Committee who already had many other tasks to perform for the Federation. He also underlined that this Prize might serve somehow to publicize FIAF and make it better known.

Mr Kuiper said he also supported the idea of a Prize sponsored by FIAF and agreed with Mr Coultass that we do this in liaison with universities.

Mr Yelin agreed with Mr Ledoux' proposal but not with the idea of a preselection. He wondered whether it would not be possible to associate it with a film publisher who would be willing to publish the chosen dissertation and also finance it partly.

One should also think how to advertize the Prize outside FIAF and perhaps link this with Mr Stenklev's idea of printing a pamphlet on FIAF for wide distribution.

Mr Gonzalez-Casanova was all for a FIAF Prize but he asked the Executive Committee to consider particularly Mrs Wibom's proposal or that of Mr Yelin. Mr Alves Netto proposed that FIAF, instead of a Prize, should create a Fund for the help to small and developing archives.

Mr Klaue said the Assembly should now come to a vote either to accept the proposal, or to ask the Executive Committee to study it more in details, or to refuse it.

Mr Kuiper made a motion that the idea of a FIAF Prize be handed over to the next E.C. for consideration and representation at the next General Meeting.

After Mr Ledoux had said he might agree on this proposal on the condition that he himself would not have to work on it, Mr Kuiper's motion was passed by 18 votes for, 1 against and 2 abstentions.

#### 6° Themes for Future Congresses (W. Klaue)

Mr Klaue introduced this topic as a general problem. After the discussions held the day before and this morning, it appeared that most of the questions which were raised needed more preparation and the help of specialists to be solved, and that they could even become the subject of specialized congresses. We should therefore think of themes for future congresses which are on the line either of specific tasks of the archives (preservation, cataloguing, administration of the collections, etc...) or of film historical studies.

Mr Yelin said it appeared clearly that the gap in technologies and financial resources kept widening between the archives in the economically rich countries and in the developing countries and therefore it seemed that in a few years one would only be able to preserve well the North-American films and a few others. In consequence, he proposed as theme for a future congress to discuss what films should we preserve for the future generations? How to make a selection?

Mr Kubelka, coming back to the discussion which had been held the day before during the report of the Preservation Commission, suggested to hold a congress where specialists could be invited to discuss and demonstrate alternative systems of preservation such as 3-separation or the electronic systems recommended, following Mr Kubelka, by the Preservation Commission.

Mr Volkmann agreed, but he said one should then be able to compare the original with the other systems on the same screen.

Mr Dunn said he did not understand why one should wait at least 2 more years to discuss the 3-separation system of colour film preservation. He had been involved with it for ± 40 years with the best U.S. technicians in this field and although he might perhaps show better tests than the ones shown this morning, he assured the members there was no need to make more surveys in this matter which would only delay the solution to the urgent problems of the archives.

Mr Ledoux wondered whether the General Meeting would be the ideal place to discuss such technical matters since most of the members, including himself, were no specialists and would perhaps not follow a technically very elaborate discussion. But Mr Kubelka insisted that the difference between the two trends of preservation systems (electronical or on film stock) should be demonstrated to all the members so that they could make a decision with full knowledge of the facts.

Mr Kubelka was then asked to propose a motion, which he said he would prepare for the next day. (see page 35).

Mr Pogacic then asked to come back to the proposal made by Mr Yelin, and to devote one of our very next congresses to the specific problem of archives in developing countries which he found most urgent and which raised a moral problem to FIAF: did we have the right to use the financial resources of international organizations such as UNESCO or FIAF for the subsidy of researches which would benefit only to the rich archives? He thought one should not reject Mr Alves Netto's suggestion to create a fund for the help of those developing archives. The structure of FIAF, which was until now composed of a majority of comparatively rich archives, was already changing and would continue in this sense with the admittance of more and more film archives from Africa, Asia or other young nations.



He therefore moved that FIAF should create a small commission to study the specific problems of those archives, that this commission make a short report already at the next FIAF Congress who would then decide whether the next congress could be dedicated to this theme.

Mr Perry supported this motion, which was approved by 18 votes for and 2 abstentions.

It being time to close the session, it was decided that the following topics on the list for the Open Forum would be dealt with at the 5th session.

#### FOURTH SESSION (reserved to members)

President Pogacic presided over this session.

#### 10. STATUS OF MEMBERS. ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

The Secretary-General reported that there were no problems regarding the status of Members.

The Executive Committee had received the candidature for membership of three present Observers.

1°) The National Film Archives (of Canada) whose director is Mr Kula, had submitted its candidature well on time but, as they had not been able to provide the Executive Committee with a letter of collaboration with the already existing member in its country (art. II of the Rules) and since the Cinemathèque Québécoise had asked the Executive Committee to postpone for a year the examination of the N.F.A's candidature, the Executive Committee had decided to agree not to examine this candidature at this meeting.

2°) Two Observers from Mexico City: C.N. and Filmoteca de la Unam, had also submitted their candidature for membership. But considering the documents required for the candidature of Cineteca Nacional had been handed over to the Executive Committee only two days before and since the Executive Committee still needed to receive some precisions from both archives, it had decided to postpone the examination of those two candidatures until its meeting to be held just after the General Meeting.

Mr Ledoux also reported that the Executive Committee had accepted the candidature of three new Observers:

a) The Association for a National Film and Television Archive in Australia (Sydney - Australia).

This organization had been created somehow to bring pressure to bear on the Australian Government to establish a strong central film archive.

Both Mr Vellacott (National Library of Australia) and Prof. Toeplitz, whom the Executive Committee had consulted, were favourable to their admittance as Observer.

b) Korean Film Archive Incorporated Foundation (Seoul - South-Korea), a new archive with which we were in contact already for several years and which had now asked its admittance as Observer of FIAF.

c) Cinemathèque Nationale Populaire de la R.P. du Congo (Brazzaville) whose delegate we were happy to see among the attendants to the Congress.

## II. MODIFICATION OF THE FIAF STATUTES AND RULES

All the members had in their files a proposal to modify a few articles of the FIAF Statutes (annex 7) following the decision taken at the Ottawa General Meeting to establish the FIAF headquarters in Brussels.

The Secretary-General explained that, while taking the necessary steps to incorporate FIAF in Belgium, he encountered some difficulties in the conditions laid down by the Belgian law and principally the fact that an International Association must have at least one Belgian member in its Executive Committee if it wanted to be incorporated in Belgium.

The Executive Committee found this obligation unacceptable and therefore proposes to keep the official Headquarters of FIAF in Paris as before and to obtain for the Secretariat the official authorization to function in Belgium. This would give us practically the same rights and could be obtained after a few minor changes were made in the Statutes. These are only formal changes required by the Belgian law and their main aim is to underline the non-profit-making character of the Federation.

Mr Ledoux then read out the proposed modifications.

As there were no questions from the members, the President asked for a vote to be taken by a raise of hands on those modifications. They were approved by 29 votes for and 1 abstention.

Mr Ledoux then raised the problem of a possible modification of art. 104 of the Rules on the Exclusivity Right. He said he had received only one answer, from Cineteca Italiana, to his circular letter regarding this matter, written after the General Meeting in Torino where Chapter IX (which includes this article) was only accepted on the condition that the Executive Committee would examine new proposals made by those members who were not satisfied with it.

Mr Comencini proposed to suppress the two following lines in the article: "Where several Members exist within a given country, they shall share this exclusive right".

His reasons were that these 2 lines were in contradiction with the beginning of the article: "Each Member shall enjoy an exclusive right within its own national territory", and that even if there were several members in one country, they were all fully members in their own right and should all benefit entirely from the exclusivity right. Practically this would mean that in cases where an archive should lend films to another non-FIAF institution abroad (television, film festival, film clubs etc...) with the cooperation of another archive in that country, he should also inform the other members of FIAF in that same country who might have the right to possibly veto that transaction. But this information would not be necessary for exchanges between the archives.

Mrs Bowser supported Mr Comencini's proposal.

Asked for their comments, Mr Kubelka and Mrs Orbanz both said they had already explained in Torino that they were against the Exclusivity Right in general and therefore had nothing to say for or against this particular aspect of art. 104.

Mr Karr was against Mr Comencini's amendment. With the experience he had of art. 104, he thought it worked reasonably well in its present wording. He feared that if all the FIAF members in the U.S. had to approve or at least wave objections whenever a film was sent into their country by another archive, this would add more burden and would create problems in the time involved in completing such transactions.

Finally, the President brought to the votes the proposal made by Mr Comencini to suppress in art. 104 of the Rules the words: "Where several Members exist within a given country, they shall share this exclusive right". It was approved by 29 votes for and I vote against.

## 12. RELATIONS WITH FIAPF

The Secretary-General reported on the meeting which, together with Mr Pogacic and Mr Kuiper, he had had immediately after the Torino Congress with three delegates of the International Federation of Film Producers' Associations (FIAPF) : Messrs. Brisson, Gronich and Ferrara.

It appeared that FIAPF was now very eager to reach some form of agreement with FIAF, considering the new Unesco Resolution on the preservation of films and especially as regarded, the threat of legal deposit. The FIAF delegates however, explained them that there was very little chance to arrive to a concensus on a detailed agreement among the members of our Federation and gave them all the reasons which had been developed at length at the Torino Congress. As it seemed that FIAPF would not be contented with those arguments, the whole Executive Committee rediscussed the problem at its October 1975 meeting and decided again to send a very clear letter to Mr Brisson re-explaining him why FIAF could only sign a very general agreement with FIAPF.



All the members had in their files a copy of this letter signed by Mr Ledoux as well as Mr Brisson's reply (annex 8) in which he again asked for FIAF's detailed comments on the contract already proposed by their Federation to some of FIAF members, comments which would tantamount to a detailed counter-proposal on our part. Feeling that we were in a deadlock, Mr Ledoux asked for the opinion of the other members on this matter and possibly for the vote of a motion.

Mr Stenklev said there was no doubt that we, as a Federation, would never come to a detailed agreement with the Federation of Producers. He therefore proposed to stick to the terms of the letter written to FIAPF by Mr Ledoux on behalf of the Executive Committee.

Mr Pöschke explaining that his archive had very good personal relations with the producer's association in Germany, supported the proposal that each archive make its own negotiations with its national producers because he also felt that a detailed agreement between our two Federations was impossible to reach.

Mr Soria agreed with him. He also said that FIAPF always tried to divide us but, that, as a Federation, we had a certain strength which we should not neglect.

Mr Kubelka, speaking in the name of the authors of films, said he felt that the whole position of the producers was immoral. The authors, contrary to the producers, wanted their films to be preserved and were therefore totally on the side of FIAF. He also said that all the producers did not have the same position as FIAPF. They were not unified and the situation was slowly changing in our favour. Therefore our policy should be to temporize and try to survive this difficult period without too much harm. Mr Buache totally agreed with him. He also suggested we approach Unesco on this problem and try to obtain that Unesco should inform the governmental authorities who might exert some pressure on the Producers.

Mr Razlogov also agreed with Mr Kubelka on the moral right of authors which was a right legally recognized in the socialist countries, different from the producer's rights and which brought them nearer to FIAF. But practically, we had to deal with the producers and we could not, in this respect, go further than a declaration of principles.

Mr Ledoux called for a break during which, together with Mr Pogacic, Mr Kuiper, Mr Klaue and Mr Stenklev, he drafted a motion which read as follows:

" Unanimous resolution of the Members of the International Federation of Film Archives, passed in the General Meeting held in Mexico City on May 26, 1976.

Considering:

- a) The desire of FIAF and its members to preserve for posterity films of an artistic, historic or sociological interest, and to make them accessible for research and study purposes, without interfering with the commercial interests of those who own or control the rights of these films.
- b) The common interest of FIAF and the International Federation of Film Producers Association.
- c) The close and good relations which already exist between a number of archives and a number of film producers.
- d) The help many film archives are providing to film producers in storing and preserving films which might have otherwise deteriorate or be lost.
- e) The willingness of member film archives of FIAF to respect in all circumstances the legitimate interests of the copyright holders.

The members of the FIAF gathered in a General Meeting in Mexico City on May 26, 1976, do hereby urge FIAPF to join the FIAF in drafting a General Declaration of Principles for the preservation of the moving images in the spirit of the Resolution 3.422 adopted unanimously by the 18th General Conference of the UNESCO."

(For French translation, see annex 9.)

FIFTH SESSION

Wednesday May 26, 10 a.m.

13. OPEN FORUM II

7° Relations with UCAL (Union de Cinematecas de America Latina)

Mr Chaskel, Secretary-General of UCAL and Director of Cinematica Chilena de la Resistencia, started by thanking FIAF and especially the Cineteca Nacional of Mexico for this opportunity given to the Latin American film Archives and filmmakers to meet with their colleagues and to make their works better known.

He reminded the members that 4 years ago, UCAL had published a Manifesto on the General lines of its action, declaring that the cultural act in Latin America must be the Liberation of the people and that also the cinema must serve this cause.

During the last years, the filmarchives of UCAL had therefore followed this line of conduct within the possibilities of their resources and the political context of each of their countries. Mr Chaskel acknowledged with pleasure the good relations which were slowly growing between FIAF and UCAL archives and expressed the wish that this collaboration may continue even better in the future.

Mr Yelin then urged his colleagues of Latin-America to seize this opportunity to explain to all the other FIAF members their problems and the situation in which they had to work, a situation which was not only specific to all developing countries, but even more specific to this continent.

In name of Cinemateca Uruguaya, Mr Martinez-Carrill informed the Assembly of the creation, in November 1974, of a new organization, the "Regional de Cinematecas del Cono Sur" whose members the Cinemateca Argentina, Cinemateca Uruguaya, Cine Arte del Sodre, Cinemateca Universitaria de Paraguay and, very soon, the Cinemateca Universitaria del Peru. This association had been created to solve very concrete problems of work by a better integration of these archives in view of complementing each other's action (e.g. in the field of programming, teaching, preserving, etc... and the solution of problems of transport, customs, etc...). All together, the archives of the Regional had a collection of  $\pm$  7000 titles. The problems they encountered were mainly economical and were increased by the fact that most of these archives were non-governmental and therefore heavily taxed instead of being subsidized. Mr Martinez-Carrill added that some of these archives had preferred to leave UCAL but it did not mean in any way that a conflict existed between UCAL and the Regional del Cono Sur.

In name of Gosfilmofond, Mr Razlogov repeated what Mr Privato had already written in his letter to the President, that they were extremely happy to meet here in Mexico so many visitors of Latin-American archives. He underlined the interest which the Soviet Union and particularly Gosfilmofond had for the developing countries and the help which it had already extended to the archives of UCAL and which it hoped to extend in the future, e.g. by the sending of classic Soviet films. Another field in which FIAF might also cooperate with those developing archives would be the techniques of preservation, cataloguing, documentation, etc... in which some of our archives were already very knowledgeable. Mr Razlogov also mentioned the possibility for more collaboration in the field of film restoration, and he cited the exemple of Eisenstein's film "Que viva Mexico" which Gosfilmofond was presently trying to restore after having received the raw material from the MOMA / Department of Film and for which the film archives of Mexico could probably supply very valuable documents and information.

Mr Gonzalez-Casanova thanked Gosfilmofond for the great help which it had already given to UCAL and offered to reciprocate this help in any possible way. He also very readily accepted Mr Razlogov's demand for help on the restoration of "Que viva Mexico!" .



Mr Garcia-Borja fully agreed with Mr Gonzalez Casanova and added that Cineteca Nacional owned a precious collection of Eisenstein's drawings made in Mexico, which they would try to reproduce and offer to all members of FIAF.

Mr Alves Netto then informed the members of another form of help to Latin-American archives which Staatliches Filmarchiv der DDR had undertaken by recuperating in Berlin the oldest Brazilian feature film whose physical condition did not allow it to be preserved in Brasil.

Mr Soria offered the help of Filmoteca Nacional de España for the exchange of films with Latin-American archives, especially since the films he could provide were either Spanish spoken or with Spanish sub-titles.

Coming back to the intervention of Mr Alves Netto, Mr Ledoux asked why this possibility offered already several times by FIAF to preserve in Europe or in the USA some films of the developing archives which they could not preserve themselves, and to do this on their behalf, was not more exploited. But Mr Chaskel explained that, while they appreciated the offer made by FIAF, the Latin-American archives had found more practical to have in this field a direct relation from archive to archive, and not from Federation to Federation.

Mr Rosen, as representative of a South-Californian and more-over State-school archive, expressed his interest both in programming and in holding films of Latin-America in order to bring them to the Spanish speaking people of California.

Mr Klaue reminded the members that he still held at their disposal in Berlin a big retrospective program of Latin-American documentaries, put together on the occasion of 1974's Leipzig Festival. He also said that S.F.A. offered a free of charge participation at the next Summer School for archive personnel to be held in Berlin to two delegates of Latin-America. He then reminded those interested Latin-American archives the offer which he had already made last year to give them old documentary films made in Latin America in the twenties by German filmmakers and which he believed to have a great historical and sociological value. He agreed with Mr Chaskel that a direct bilateral collaboration between the members of UCAL and the members of FIAF was more practical than to go via their respective Federations.

Mr Armatys informed the members that Filmoteca Polska was preparing a program of Polish films to circulate in Latin America.

Mr Perry said he did not want to give the impression by his silence that the Department of Film / Museum of Modern Art was not interested in the problems of the Third World. The archive had and still was distributing several programs among Latin American archives. They were also ready to help in any other possible way whenever it was requested, but they were rather reluctant to impose their assistance if not asked for it before.



Mr Fernandez-Jurado asked if FIAF was also ready to help those archives in Latin-America who were not in UCAL? Mr Ledoux said he could not answer this question because again, FIAF had not been informed of what Mr Martinez-Carrill had reported earlier about the Regional del Congo Sur. He regretted very much that lack of communication which existed between Latin-American archives and FIAF.

Mr de Vaal agreed with him and suggested once more to all delegates to make better use of the FIAF Bulletin to disseminate more news on their work and accomplishments.

Mr Fernandez-Jurado and Mr Martinez-Carrill also agreed on the need for better coordination and communication of the information and Mr Martinez-Carrill added that he thought it was in this field (communication of its experience and knowledges) rather than in some financial or material help that FIAF could best help the Latin-American archives whose very specific problems nobody could solve but themselves. Therefore, he believed in the necessity for Latin-American archives to join FIAF even if only as observers.

Mr Yelin, addressing then the representative of FIAF's new observer : the Cinémathèque Nationale Populaire de la R.P. du Congo, said he was happy to see for the first time in this Assembly, a delegate of black Africa and asked him if he would care to speak about his organization. Mr Donatien Mbaloula, while explaining that his archive was only beginning, said that the first aim of its organizers and of the Congo Government who supported it, was the search for film material of good quality, primarily African, or made in Africa, but also other classic films. They wanted to teach the people in Congo to go and see a film rather than to go to the cinema (until now, the only films they could see was the worst kind of commercial cinema). This was a long and exacting labour, especially as the gap between rich and poor countries was increasingly widening and the efforts needed to fill it in, almost unbearable. Mr Mbaloula mentioned for example the demonstration made yesterday by Mr Dunn, which had been its first contact with FIAF. Considering the situation of his Cinémathèque, he could only call this "science-fiction", something which was bound to discourage any young film-archive. He therefore urged FIAF to take an interest in the problems of African archives in the same way as it now did for Latin-American archives.

Mr Ledoux said he very well understood Mr Mbaloula's reaction when he spoke of science-fiction (more-over, he was not the only one to speak this way), but the Secretary-General wanted to answer this objection. It would be dangerous for FIAF to obey the criticism which was implied in such declarations : even if one could not now directly take part in the progress of the technique, this progress might one day prove very useful also to small and poor archives.

On the other hand, Mr Ledoux reminded that FIAF also fought on its other front : the developing archives, for instance with the publication of the Basic Manual and the organization of Summer Schools for archive personnel.

Mrs van Leer then underlined that there were also poor and small archives in Europe. But she added for the benefit of the attending Latin-American and African archivists that, from her experience, it was possible to start from scratch and to succeed.

Mr Fernandez-Jurado explained that Cinemateca Argentina had participated in the creation of several archives in Latin-America but he also underlined the help they had received from both Mexican Archives : Cineteca Nacional and Filmoteca de la UNAM. He therefore urged the Executive Committee of FIAF to accept them both as full members, because this would have a great importance for the other Latin-American archives. Mr Alves-Netto strongly supported this request, and so did Mr Martinez-Carrill who added that one should nevertheless not forget the responsibility of the strongest and oldest archives in Latin-America in helping their colleagues. He firmly believed in the collaboration of the Third World with the Third World.

Mr Klaue then closed the discussion on this point. He felt that since the Congress of New York in 1969, encouraging progress had been made in the relations between FIAF and the Latin-American archives. Even if we did not reach definite conclusions, the discussion had also showed the importance of the motion adopted at the third session to create a specialized commission to study the problems of developing archives.

8°) Organization of FIAF's next Congress in VARNA.

Mr Stoyanov-Bigor, in name of Bulgarska Nacionalna Filmoteka, declared that they were very happy to organize FIAF's next Congress and Symposium and that with the help of the Bulgarian Government and especially the Ministry of Culture and the Filmmakers' union, they wanted to make it a very special event. He also reported that a special commission had been appointed for the program and the organization of the 5-day Symposium which would constitute the greater part of the Congress and which would be devoted to "The influence of silent Soviet cinema on world cinema".

The Congress would be held at Varna, at the Black Sea, at the end of May. He then asked Mr Daudelin, as Secretary of this special Commission, to give further details on its organization.

Mr Daudelin explained that each of the 5 days of the Symposium would be dedicated to one major aspect of the main theme.

1. Silent Soviet cinema as source of revolutionary films
2. Silent Soviet cinema and its influence on the sound film of the thirties and forties
3. Silent Soviet cinema and the films of liberation
4. The stylistic influence of silent Soviet cinema
5. The influence of silent Soviet cinema on world cinema : summation .



One delegate of FIAF would be responsible for each of these sub-themes to appoint the speakers for that day and decide what films would be shown. It was also decided that the proportion of films shown would be ± 50% from the socialist countries and 50% from the other countries.

As regarded experts and speakers, the same proportion was chosen. This term of expert should be taken in a very broad sense, including not only film historians and theoreticians but also filmmakers who could testify of the possible influence of silent Soviet cinema on their films.

The program committee was at present composed of Mr Stoyanov-Bigor as President, Mr Daudelin (Secretary), Mrs Bowser, Mr Buache and Mr Dimitriev. Mr Daudelin felt that it should now be enlarged to include at least the organizers of each day.

The Bulgarian Archive was going to acquire the necessary equipment for the showing of films either in 16 or 35 mm, for various speeds and image formats. There would be simultaneous translation in English, French and Russian.

The dates suggested by Mr Stoyanov-Bigor for both Congress and Symposium were from May 22nd to 30th, but were not yet quite fixed. Mr Daudelin gave some practical details and ended by urging the members to send him as soon as possible, their suggestions regarding the film historians or experts from their country whom it would be interesting to invite, and the films to be shown. He now asked for the members' comments on the proposals of the commission for the symposium.

Mr Borde made a motion that, considering the importance of the influence of the silent Soviet cinema on the militant cinema of Latin-America, the chairmanship of the third day of the Symposium (S. Silent cinema and the films of Liberation) be entrusted to a delegate of UCAL. Mr Yelin seconded this motion which was approved unanimously.

Mr Ledoux first thanked Mr Stoyanov-Bigor for his generous invitation to hold the Congress in Varna. He then raised the question of the time which should be devoted during the Congress to FIAF's administrative matters or "General Meeting". Would two sessions of half a day be enough? Should there be elections? He reminded that the new Statutes now allowed us to have elections every two years if we wanted.

Mr Klaue and Mr Daudelin both said that two half days would be enough for FIAF's administrative matters, if carefully prepared by the Executive Committee. Mr Kubelka having insisted on keeping the Open Forum, it was also decided to dedicate one whole day to this point on the agenda. Finally, Mr Buache made a request that the dates of the FIAF Congress did not coincide with the Festival of Cannes, not only for his sake but mainly because of the experts, critics and historians which we would like to invite for the Symposium and which most probably would also want to attend Cannes' Festival.

After Mr Ledoux had explained that this was very difficult to foresee, since we never knew the dates of Cannes before the end of the year, Mr Stoyanov-Bigor said he would see what he could do.

SIXTH SESSION.

Wednesday May 26, 15 p.m.

I4. SYMPOSIUM / LATIN-AMERICAN CINEMA : REALITY OR FICTION?

In this symposium, which was chaired by Mr Jose Estrada, papers were presented by the following experts, representing each the Cinema of their respective country :

Héctor Olivera (Argentina), Cosme Alves Neto (Brasil), Carlos Alvarez (Colombia), Julio Garcia Espinosa (Cuba), Pedro Chaskel (Chile), Gonzalo Martinez (Mexico), Pedro Rivera (Panama), Nora Izcue (Peru), Carlos Rebolledo (Venezuela).

To illustrate the Symposium, the following Latin-American films were shown during the evenings of the Congress :

Cantata de Chile (Cuba), Ligar el Alfabeto a la Tierra (Panama), El Coraje del Pueblo (Bolivia), Vidas Secas (Brasil), La Patagonia rebelde (Argentina), Runan Caycu (Peru), Los puños frente al cañon (Chile), Que es la democracia (Colombia), Venezuela tres tiempos (Venezuela), Actas de Marusia (Mexico), Canoa (Mexico).

SEVENTH SESSION

Thursday May 27th, 10 a.m.

This session was chaired by President Pogacic.

I5. FINANCIAL REPORT AND BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR 1977.

The Treasurer, Mr Stenklev, first briefly commented on the financial report for the year 1975 which every archive had received beforehand (annex IO). This report which had been approved both by a professional auditor and by the Executive Committee showed that the financial position of FIAF was now sound thanks mainly to the raise of subscriptions and, as regarded the Periodical Indexing Project, thanks to the grant of \$ 15.000 from the National Endowment to the Arts. This grant however was not renewable and would cover only part of the P.I.P.'s deficit for 1976. Mr Stenklev then commented on the draft Budget for 1977 which every delegate had also received (annex II).

He noted that the total expenses foreseen for 1977 (2.661.000 Belgian francs) showed a raise of ± 10% on the budgeted amount for 1976, which was reasonable.

As for the foreseen income, made principally by the affiliates' subscriptions and the income brought in by the P.I.P., it was slightly inferior to the expenses (by 243.500 BF), but this difference could be compensated by the excess of income brought forward from previous years.

However, Mr Stenklev and Mrs Bowser again underlined the necessity to put the Periodical's Index Project on firmer feet and therefore urged the members to try to promote it as much as possible each in their own country. Mrs Bowser had therefore distributed in all the boxes some publicity material for the project. This ended the Treasurer's Report.

Approval of the draft budget on the accounts was then submitted to the vote of the Meeting and carried unanimously.

#### 16. DISCHARGE OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE OUTGOING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The President asked the General Meeting to give its discharge to the retiring Executive Committee, and this was agreed unanimously.

#### 17. ELECTION OF THE NEW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Mr Pogacic then asked Mrs Colette Borde, Mr Leszek Armatys and Mr Valentin Gomez to act as scrutineers for the counting of votes during the elections. This was agreed.

Owing to the temporary absence of Mr Molnar, the total number of valid votes for these elections should amount to 29.

Nominations were then invited, and votes taken with results as follow :

President :	Mr Pogacic	24 Yes 2 No 3 Abstentions
Secretary-General :	Mr Ledoux	25 Yes 3 No 1 Abstention
Treasurer :	Mr Stenklev	26 Yes 2 No 2 Abstentions

The voting for 8 ordinary members of the Executive Committee then continued as follows:

Mr Privato	26	<u>Elected</u>
Mrs Bowser	23	<u>Elected</u>
Mr Daudelin	21	<u>Elected</u>
Mr Molnar	20	<u>Elected</u>



Mr Borde	17	<u>Elected</u>
Mr Klaue	16	<u>Elected</u>
Mr Kuiper	15	
Mr Stoyanov-Bigor	15	
Mr von Bagh	15	
Mr Yelin	15	
Mr Buache	13	
Mr de Vaal	13	
Mr Francis	13	
Mrs Puran	13	

Since four of the candidates had equal votes for the 8th place, a second vote was taken, with the following result :

Mr Kuiper	16	<u>Elected</u>
Mr Yelin	15	<u>Elected</u>

The voting then continued normally for 3 reserve members :

Mr de Vaal	17
Mr Buache	16
Mr von Bagh	14

#### 19. RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

##### UNESCO

Mr Ledoux having underlined once more that our relations with Unesco through the International Film and Television Council were very unsatisfactory, he reported that enquiries had been made to enable FIAF to have direct relations with Unesco, for instance by applying to this organization as a Category B member. Until now, and because of our links with IFTC, this kind of membership seemed very difficult to obtain.

Mr Pogacic proposed that the Executive Committee be asked to deal with this problem. This was agreed.

#### 20. POINTS ON THE AGENDA OF WHICH THE DISCUSSION IS NOT CLOSED.

Several of these points were raised during the intervals of the voting for the Executive Committee.

##### a) Motion proposed by Mr Kubelka on the method to be adopted for the preservation of colour films.

Mr Kubelka introduced the motion on which he had requested a formal vote from the General Meeting (see p. 22) by saying he was very concerned by the direction which the research of the Preservation Committee had taken.



He feared that this Committee should see the transfer on some electronic system as the ultimate way to preserve colour films and should abandon the system of preservation on film stock. This problem however was of such principle importance that Mr Kubelka felt it should not be left to solve to technicians alone.

His motion therefore read as follows :

"In view of the fact that an image transfer from transparent film to an electronic system constitutes the loss of essential characteristics of the medium, the General Assembly recommends that FIAF continues research for possibilities to preserve the cinematographic image in its original form.

The essential problem in which direction our longterm preservation will go, should be discussed by the General Assembly.

As a first step, it is recommended that the new Executive Committee gathers information on the present technical and financial possibilities of colour preservation through colour separation on black and white stock.

It is recommended that we should invite experts and have demonstrations of colour image through colour separation in comparison with results of transfer to electronic systems, at or after the Congress of Varna."

Mr Pogacic then asked for a vote by show of hands on the adoption of this motion. Results were as follows :

For	10
Against	8
Abst.	11.

Mr Kubelka's motion having passed, it was decided that this problem would be submitted again to the General Meeting as soon as possible after the Varna Congress.

b) Visnews.

Mr Francis started to explain a letter which most members had received from a London Company called VISNEWS, inviting them to buy material from their newsreels collection, some of which referred to events that happened in their own country. Actually the N.F.A. had, in dead storage, all this material of the nitrate era (up to 1951) and they had not been consulted by Visnews when this letter was sent out. It seemed however, that Visnews' aim was to raise money for the copying of this nitrate material (+ 13 Million feet) which the N.F.A. could not possibly include in its plans of copying before many years. Mr Francis therefore said, that, if the interested members were prepared to pay for the costs of making an intermediate copy and a print and to leave this intermediate copy with the N.F.A., he was ready to handle this matter with Visnews.



Several members said they were interested in this material and would agree to this kind of approach by Mr Francis, but Mr Ledoux was in principle opposed to such way of doing (to pay for the intermediate copy to remain with the N.F.A.) because he felt this to be against FIAF Rules, art. 110.

Such practice could lead to a misuse of their power by strong archives holding rare material in which other archives were very much interested. Mr Francis replied that his proposal was the only practical solution he saw to this problem as Visnews would not allow the N.F.A. to pass over master material to other archives, but he was not pressing anything and he would also be ready to go back to Visnews saying that nobody was interested and that the N.F.A. would try to cope themselves with this material in their longterm program, which might take 20 years, with the risk that some of these very unstable films get lost in the meantime. Mr Francis also supported Mr de Vaal who had said he was anxious not to set a precedent by buying films to a commercial company.

Mr Stenklev and Mr Pogacic, saying that they were very interested in acquiring this material, agreed with Mr Francis.

Mr Kula however, although very interested also, suggested that perhaps Visnews and the N.F.A. would accept a compromise solution, i.e. that each of the interested archive negotiate its own terms with Visnews but with the knowledge and consent of the N.F.A.

Mr Fernandez Jurado said that, aside from the question of whether or not Mr Francis' proposals violated FIAF Rules, the problem was that one did not know exactly the importance of this material, either in its content nor its quantity.

Mr Francis explained that, as it was in dead storage, the access to this material was very difficult. The only access one could have was to complete reels and he had hoped, with partial financing of Visnews, to be able to copy complete reels from which might be extracted what interested other members.

As it was impossible, far from reaching a decision, even to come to an indicative vote on this matter, Mr Pogacic decided to stop the discussion on this point.

c) Open Forum (Continued).

8°) Discussion of the role of Universities in the development of Film-archives through courses of study, model programs of preservation, research programs, publications, etc ... (J. Kuiper).



Discussion of the archival responsibility towards scholars in providing access and use of the collections under the care of the members.

(W. Sharples)

Those two subjects being evidently linked, it was suggested to discuss them together and the President first asked Mr Kuiper and Mr Sharples, who had submitted them for discussion, to present the problems.

Mr Kuiper, having underlined that both Mr Sharples and himself came from a background of teaching film in universities, they had experienced the extreme difficulty for the students and teachers to obtain the basic material (i.e. films) to study. Mr Sharples therefore thought there was a responsibility of the film archives towards scholars in providing access to their collections, not only to foster film study, but also to make those scholars and students aware of the importance of preserving films, which they were at present far too little.

In putting all our energy and funds into film preservation, we are certainly performing our responsibility toward the scholar 500 years from now, but that scholar cannot help us in gaining the funds that we need today. Mr Sharples felt that, no matter how desperate was the need for preservation, we must find some means to turn our energy and funds towards other tasks such as cataloguing, the expending of study facilities and obviously the printing of more reference prints for the use of filmscholars and students.

Mr Kuiper, on his side, wanted to emphasize the role of film departments in the universities to complement the tasks performed by film archives, i.e. in the field of study and interpretation of the cinema.

We need the universities to help us, he said, but it is FIAF's problem to see in what way and under what form of association with FIAF they should work with us.

As only delegate of a university archive at the meeting, Mr Rosen strongly supported Mr Kuiper's and Mr Sharples' request. He said that in the coming years, a plurality of archives would be developing in all countries and people would have a plurality of interests in those archives ranging from presentation to a public, education, scholarship etc.. besides preservation. He therefore thought that there should be, in FIAF, a place where this kind of activity would not be marginal, but integrated with its activities.

Because of the importance of all these problems and the lack of time to discuss them properly during this Congress, Mr Ledoux proposed to postpone the discussion until the "Open Forum" at next year's Congress. He also suggested that Mr Kuiper and Mr Sharples put their ideas under writing as a proposal for a new FIAF project which could circulate among the members, to be thought over before the Varna Congress. This was agreed.

9°) Plan for publicity on the occasion of FIAF's 40th anniversary. (W. Klaue)

Mr Klaue made a motion to recommend that FIAF's 40th anniversary in 1978 be used to disseminate publicity on a wide scale the activities of FIAF; and to ask the Executive Committee to prepare, in close collaboration with the members, a plan for this occasion and to report on it at the next General Meeting.

This was agreed unanimously.

10°) Discussion on the status of the preservation of film sound and particularly film music, with emphasis upon the location and preservation of the original manuscript scores to films and original recording session tracks (W. Sharples).

Mr Sharples reported that the AFI, with the cooperation of the Library of Congress, had begun a specific program dedicated to the preservation of film music. Having explained the many difficulties and obstacles one encountered in this field, he asked for the cooperation of his FIAF colleagues in this project. He also explained that there had been created the last few years, internationally, a number of organizations devoted to the subject of film music which did some very interesting work in this field. Mr Sharples offered to distribute to the members the information which these organizations published.

He added that, if some archives were interested, the AFI would be ready to exchange tapes or records of film music with them.

Mr Pogacic said that this project seemed extremely interesting but he suggested Mr Sharples rather to write a circular letter to all members about it because one was not prepared to discuss it here.

Mr Ledoux having asked whether there was a separate copyright on filmmusic in the U.S.A.; Mr Kuiper replied that the music of a film could be registered separately and often was. The Library of Congress already had a large collection of film scores but it was by no means complete.

11°) Proposal that FIAF, through its Documentation Commission, seek to prepare an annual list of dissertations : 1) those previously finished 2) an annual list. (T. Perry)

Mr Perry further suggested that a critical annotation of those dissertations would add to the interest of such lists.

Mr Ledoux having asked him what he exactly meant by "dissertations", Mr Perry replied that in the U.S.A., a dissertation was a work prepared for a doctoral degree and did not cover master's theses. He agreed that the definition of this word varied from country to country and he proposed that the Documentation Commission, if they agreed to undertake this project, should also define it more clearly.

Mrs Bowser, in name of the Documentation Commission, said she welcomed this proposal and would submit it to the members at their next meeting. Mrs Orbanz reported that the Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek had started preparing such a list for Western Germany and that they would be willing to cooperate to the project.

This ended the Open Forum.

d) Date and place of future Congresses

The Secretary-General having asked whether there were proposals for some place to hold the FIAF General Meetings in 1978, 1979 or later, Mr Ondroucek said that the Czechoslovak Film Institute - Film Archive might be able to organize the 1979 General Meeting either in Prague or in Bratislava.

8. REPORT ON THE MAIN FIAF PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS

Basic Manual on film archives

Mr Kuiper and Mrs Bowser who had agreed in Torino to undertake the final preparations for this FIAF Manual, had distributed the following outline of the proposed (tentative) chapters :

- I. Introduction : What is a Film Archive? FIAF (5 pages)
- II. Practical Work of Film Archives (30-40 pages)
- III. Preservation (30-40 pages)
- IV. Documentation (30-40 pages)
- V. Cataloguing (30-50 pages)
- VI. Legal and Administrative (5-10 pages)
  - Bibliography
  - Appendixes
  - Index

They asked whether the delegates had any other suggestions to make, for instance should there be a special chapter on "Screenings" and one on "Collecting apparatus" ?

Mr Pogacic thought that a chapter on screenings and programming in the archives was very important and should be included. Mr Kula said he would even like to see this concept of "screenings" enlarged to "diffusion", i.e. contacts with cine-clubs, universities, other cultural institutions, etc...

Regarding the preservation of film apparatus, Mr Daudelin felt that it should be dealt with in a short separate chapter, but he agreed that there was a problem in finding the appropriate person to write this chapter.



### FIAF Summer Schools

Mr Klaue had distributed a report on the Summer School to be held in Berlin (DDR) next August (annex I2). He said he had nothing to add to this report.

Mr Monty had distributed to all members a "proposal for the organization of the 3d FIAF Summer School to be held in Copenhagen in August 1977." (annex I3). This proposal had been prepared by Mrs Karen Jones and the Documentation Commission since the Summer School was to be dedicated to the documentation departments in film archives.

Mr Monty having asked for comments of the members on this proposal, Mrs Bowser added that the Documentation Commission would like, in so far as it was possible, that the archives should send to this Summer School the person in charge of the indexing for the International Index to Film Periodicals. It would be extremely useful for the day-to-day workings of the Index if the indexers could once get together with the editor.

Mr de Vaal said he found the charges to be paid for the Summer School very high, but Mr Monty replied that Copenhagen in summer was very expensive and that they had already tried to reduce the costs to a minimum.

### List of important films considered as lost

It was decided that the Executive Committee would deal with this problem. Mr de Vaal was asked to calculate the approximate cost of this publication before the next meeting.

### Annual bibliography of FIAF members' publications

Mr Kula's proposal that the National Film Archives (Canada) should take over this bibliography, previously assumed by the Canadian Film Archives, was accepted with thanks.

There being no other question to discuss, President Pogacic thanked Mr Garcia-Borja and his staff for the generous assistance they had given to the General Meeting, as well as all those - particularly the interpreters - who had contributed to the successful outcome of the Meeting's deliberations.

He then declared the XXXIId General Meeting of FIAF closed.

-----