

**FIAF XXXV Lausanne  
Minutes**

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE  
DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION  
OF FILM ARCHIVES

m i n u t e s

XXXVth GENERAL MEETING

---

30 May - 1 June 1979

LAUSANNE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Adoption of the agenda	7
Archives in developing countries (report of the Commission)	4
Cataloguing Commission (report)	6
Commissions : report of the Preservation Commission	6
report of the Cataloguing Commission	6
report of the Documentation Commission	6
report of the Commission for archives in developing countries	7
report of the Copyright Commission	21
Confirmation of the status and voting rights of the members	1
Discharge of the administration of the outgoing Executive C.	7
Documentation Commission (report)	6
Election of the new Executive Committee	34
Financial report and approval of the budget for 1980	5
Membership questions : Admission of new Observers	9
Reconfirmation of members	8
Varia	10
Minutes of the preceding General Meeting	5
Next FIAF Congresses	37
Open Forum : Report of delegates from invited archives	29
Preservation of avant-garde and experimental films	30
Seminar for Latin-American archives in Mexico	30
Circulation of film programmes from smaller countries	30
25th anniversary of F. Cinemateca Argentina	32
Embryo Catalogué	32
Proliferation of archives within certain countries	33
Preservation Commission (report)	6
Projects and publications underway	28
Relations with other international organisations	25
Report of the President on behalf of the Executive Committee	5
Statutes and Rules of FIAF (modification of the )	11
UNESCO : recommendation on the preservation of moving images	21
Unfinished and any other business	37

## TABLE OF ANNEXES

1. List of participants
2. Hommage to Viktor S. Privato
3. Report of the President on behalf of the Executive Committee
4. Accounts for 1978
5. Budget for 1980
6. Report of the Cataloguing Commission
7. Report of the Documentation Commission
8. Report of the Commission for Archives in Developing Countries
9. Proposal to modify the Statutes and Internal Rules of FIAF
10. Report of the Copyright Commission
11. Proposal for a better circulation of film programmes from smaller countries (T. Andreykov)
12. Archives cinématographiques nationales officielles et archives cinématographiques régionales, spécialisées ou privées (F. Schmitt)
13. Retrospective Fernando de Fuentes, presented by cinateca Nacional (Mexico)
14. Programme of the Symposium : "Le cinéma indépendant et d'avant-garde à la fin du muet".

FORMAL OPENINGMay 30, 1979, 3 p.m.

Mr Albert Mermoz, President of La Cinémathèque Suisse, welcomed all the delegates and visitors present at the first session of the General Meeting of FIAF. He regretted not to be able to receive the Congress in the new premises where the Cinémathèque Suisse hoped to move very soon and paid tribute to the enthusiasm and knowledge of its curator Freddy Buache who somehow managed to palliate the difficult conditions in which the Cinémathèque had to work until now.

He wished FIAF every success in its work in Lausanne and declared the 35th General Meeting open.

The President of FIAF, Mr Vladimir Pogacic, thanked Mr Mermoz for his speech of welcome and said how pleased FIAF was to meet in Lausanne, like it had done exactly 25 years ago.

He then paid homage (annex 2) to the late Vice President of FIAF, Victor Privato, who died a few weeks before the Congress; also to Mr Frida and Mr Ondroucek, and asked all to rise for a few moments in silence to pay tribute to their memory.

Mr Tikhonov, on behalf of Gosfilmofond, thanked the many delegates who had shown their sympathy on the occasion of Mr Privato's death and he briefly evoked his life and his career at the head of the Soviet filmarchive. He ended by saying that Gosfilmofond would try to remain true to its tradition of development of the archive and of strengthening its links with FIAF and its members.

Mr Pogacic, who presided over the first session of the General Meeting, then asked the Secretary-General Raymond Borde to start with the first point on the agenda.

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

---

Mr Borde read out the list of those present (annex 1), also indicating in each delegation the name of the voting delegate (undelined).

Members and their delegates

Amsterdam	Nederlands Filmmuseum	<u>J. de Vaal</u>
Beograd	Jugoslovenska Kinoteka	<u>V. Pogacic</u>
Berlin (DDR)	Staatliches Filmarchiv	<u>W. Klaue</u>
Berlin (BRD)	Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek	<u>E. Orbanz</u>
Bruxelles	Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique	<u>F. Buache</u> (proxy)

Bucuresti	Arhiva Nationala de Filme	<u>M. Paraiianu</u> <u>M. Olteanu</u>
Budapest	Magyar Filmtudományi Intézet es Film- archivum	<u>I. Molnar</u>
Canberra	National Film Archive of Australia	<u>D. Francis (proxy)</u>
Habana	Cinematca de Cuba	<u>P. Vega</u>
Helsinki	Suomen Elokuva-Arkisto	<u>S. Huhtala</u>
Jerusalem	Archion Israeli Leseratim	<u>L. van Leer</u>
København	Det Danske Filmmuseum	<u>I. Monty</u>
Lausanne	Cinémathèque Suisse	<u>F. Buache</u>
London	National Film Archive	<u>D. Francis</u> C. Jeavons H. Brown
Madrid	Filmoteca Nacional de España	<u>F. Soria</u> C. Gauthier
Mexico	Cineteca Nacional	<u>A. Balmori-Cinta</u> A. Pelayo
Mexico	Filmoteca de la U.N.A.M.	<u>M. Gonzalez-Casanova</u>
Milano	Cineteca Italiana	<u>G. Comencini</u>
Montréal	Cinémathèque Québécoise	<u>R. Daudelin</u> P. Veronneau
Moskva	Gosfilmofond	<u>V. Tikhonov</u> S. Khomutov
New York	Department of Film/Museum of Modern Art	<u>E. Bowser</u> A. Mancia
Oslo	Norsk Filminstitutt	<u>J. Stenklev</u> E.B. Fonn
Ottawa	National Film Archives	<u>S. Kula</u>
Praha	Ceskoslovensky Filmovy Ustav/Filmovy Archiv	<u>J. Levy</u> V. Opela
Pyong Yang	National Film Archives of the D.P.R.K.	<u>Pak Sun Tae</u> Kim Sam Hong Kim Yong Sok
Rio de Janeiro	Cinematca do Museu de Arte Moderna	<u>C. Alves-Netto</u>
Rochester	Department of Film / I.M.P.-G.E.H.	<u>J.B. Kuiper</u>
Roma	Cineteca Nazionale	<u>G. Cincotti</u>
Sofia	Bulgarska Nacionalna Filmoteka	<u>T. Andreykov</u>
Stockholm	Cinematket/Svenska Filminstitutet	<u>A.L. Wibom</u> R. Lindfors
Torino	Museo Nazionale del Cinema	<u>G. Comencini (proxy)</u>
Toulouse	Cinémathèque de Toulouse	<u>R. Borde</u>
Warszawa	Filmoteka Polska	<u>R. Witek</u> A. Chodnikiewicz
Washington	Motion Picture Division / Library of Congress	<u>P. Spehr</u>
Washington	Archives / American Film Institute	<u>L. Karr</u>

Wien	Oesterreichisches Filmarchiv	A. Bleyer-Brody L. Gesek <u>W. Fritz</u> A. Lehr
Wien	Oesterreichisches Filmmuseum	P. Konlechner <u>P. Kubelke</u>
Wiesbaden	Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde	<u>U. Pöschke</u> D. Gebauer

Apologies for absences had been received from Mr J. Ledoux ( Brussels), R. Edmondson (Canberra), F. Ribeiro (Lisbon), P.K. Nair (Poona) and M.A. Prolo (Torino)

The quorum having been obtained, according to art. 14 of the Statutes, the Secretary-General declared the XXXVth General Meeting valid.

Associates

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

Observers and their delegates

Bois d'Arcy	Service des Archives du Film	F. Schmitt N. Schmitt
Brazzaville	Cinémathèque Nationale Populaire	D. Mbaloule
Buenos Aires	Fundacion Cinemateca Argentina	G. Fernandez Jurado P. Fernandez Jurado
Cairo	Al-Archiv Al-Kawmy Lil-Film	A. Al-Hadary
Los Angeles	U.C.L.A. Film Archive	R. Rosen
Montevideo	Cinemateca Uruguay	C. Ferrari
Paris	Cinémathèque Universitaire	C. Beylie
São Paulo	Fundação Cinemateca Brasileira	M.R. Galvão
Deoul	Korean Film Archive Inc. Foundation	Roh Young Suh Yoo Ki In

Apologies for absence had been received from Mr. Misbach Y. Biran (Jakarta).

Honorary Member

Mr Einar Lauritzen, Stockholm

Visitors

Mr Borde also welcomed to the Meeting a number of other guests among whom :

the delegates of the Film Archive of China (Beijing)	Mrs Kong Lian
	Hsu Hou Li
	Ho Tseng Kan

Mr Enno Patalas, Münchner Stastmuseum, Fikmmuseum, München  
The admission of these two archives as Observers of FIAF was to be announced later.

Mr. Jacques Dumont, Fédération Internationale des Archives de Télévision

Mr Fred Junck, Cinémathèque Municipale de Luxembourg

Mr Boudjema Karèche, Cinémathèque d'Alger

Mrs Aglaya Mitropoulos, Tainiotheke tes Hellados, Athens

Mr Clive Sowry, National Film Unit of New Zealand.

The arrival of a delegate for UNESCO, Mrs M. van Vliet, and of a delegate for the International Council of Archives, Mr. O. Gauye, was announced for the next day.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The following agenda was unanimously adopted :

FIRST SESSION

1. Confirmation of the status and voting rights of the members present or represented.
2. Adoption of the agenda.
3. Approval of the minutes of the Brighton General Meeting.
4. Report of the President.
5. Financial report and adoption of the budget for 1980.
6. Report of the specialized Commissions : Preservation - Cataloguing -  
Documentation - Archives in developing countries.
7. Discharge of the administration of the outgoing Executive Committee

SECOND SESSION ( Members only )

8. Membership questions - Admission of new members and observers.
9. Modification of the FIAF Statutes and Rules.



THIRD SESSION

10. Report of the Copyright Commission and discussion of the UNESCO document on the preservation of moving images.
11. Relations with UNESCO
12. Relations with other international organisations : FIAPF, FIAT, etc...

FOURTH SESSION

13. Open Forum

FIFTH SESSION

14. Projects and publications underway
15. Election of the new Executive Committee
16. Organisation of the next FIAF Congresses
17. Points on the agenda of which the discussion is not closed and any other business

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PRECEEDING GENERAL MEETING

The Minutes of the XXXIVth General Meeting in Brighton, which had been sent to all affiliates, were unanimously approved.

4. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

The President, Mr Pogacic, read out a report on the activities of FIAF's Executive Committee during the past year (annex 3)

Mr Cincotti asked why FIAF had decided to leave the CICT (International Council of Cinema and Television), a decision of which he approved.

The reasons for FIAF's action are given in detail in the minutes of the 34th Congress at Brighton. Mr Pogacic nevertheless reiterated that CICT had ceased to be an effective organisation on account of the withdrawal of several large federations and the lack of working plans and ideas, and was furthermore preventing FIAF from developing closer contacts with UNESCO. Mr Cincotti was happy with this explanation

5. FINANCIAL REPORT

All the members had received a copy of the accounts for 1978 (annex 4) and no questions on them were put to the Treasurer, Mr de Vaal. He underlined, as every year, that FIAF's financial position was healthy.

Mr. de Vaal then asked for comments on the draft budget for 1980 (annex 5), which had already been sent out to the members.

Ms E. Orbanz asked why there had been an increase of the PIP budget. The treasurer explained that the publisher had given up publishing the next issues of the annual volume and that after careful study FIAF had decided that the PIP office could take over the publishing itself, at least for one year, because the project so far was working well. Mr. Cincotti stressed that in his opinion the PIP was an invaluable project and welcomed all efforts to maintain it.

The budget was then unanimously approved.

The president asked the meeting to submit proposals for the Open Forum scheduled for the Fourth Session of the General Meeting

## 6. REPORT OF THE SPECIALISED COMMISSIONS

### a) Report of the Preservation Commission

In the absence of Mr. Volkmann, Mr. Klaue gave a short oral report on the work of the commission. There had been no meeting so far this year, but one was planned for October. The commission had two projects in hand. Firstly, the work on the draft of the preservation of magnetic tapes was almost finished, and the document would be sent out to members once it was ready. Secondly, the commission intended to discuss at its next meeting a popular version of the publication devoted to the preservation of black-and-white films, colour films and magnetic tapes.

Mr. Volkmann would present a full report in the next FIAF bulletin.

### b) Report of the cataloguing commission

As for the written report on the work of the Cataloguing Commission (annex 6), Mr. Klaue added that after successive ultimatums the US publishing house had still not fulfilled its contract to publish the "Film Cataloguing" book. Consequently, the commission had asked the Executive Committee to take steps to cancel the contract, and a new publisher will be sought.

Mr. Pogojic thanked Mr. Klaue on behalf of the General Meeting for the excellent work of the Cataloguing Commission.

### c) Report of the Documentation Commission

Speaking on the report from the Documentation Commission (annex 7), Ms Bowser said that it had been decided that FIAF should publish the annual volume of the International Index to Film Periodicals itself. She again called on the help of all archives to sell the volume as the best way of ensuring its future publication.

She still had no details at the present of publication arrangements for the 1977 volume.

Ms. Bowser then told the meeting that FIAF had accepted a contract from UNESCO to carry out a feasibility study with a view to adapting an existing national documentation centre for moving images to serve as an international centre. The Documentation Commission had undertaken this task with support from Mr. Klaus, as it was likely that training would be involved in the proposal.

Mr. Kula added that the National Film Archive in Ottawa had again compiled a list of member publications and that a copy would be mailed to all members. He asked the members for their continued cooperation in the compilation of this publication.

Mr. Kula went on to inform the meeting about a proposed scheme to publish an annual International Catalogue of Educational and Documentary Films. The sponsoring body would be MIFED, the Milan Trade Fair and a recent meeting in Milan decided that the project would be feasible as long as financial and computer support were forthcoming. If the project were approved, it was likely that the Documentation Commission, or members of it, would be approached for their assistance.

The president thanked Ms. Bowser for her work.

d) Report of the Commission for archives in developing countries.

Mr. Pogacic had no fresh documents to add to his written report (annex 8) but said that there had been a meeting of the Commission in the morning and that a list of developing countries, which would like to send trainees, would be sent in a few days time to those archives which had informed the Secretariat that they would be prepared to take them. The matching of trainees to archive would depend largely on cultural agreements and finance, but Mr. Pogacic hoped that the project would be working soon.

The National Film Archives of the DPRK had inadvertently been omitted from the list of archives willing to accept trainees. Mr. Pogacic apologised for this omission.

7. DISCHARGE OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE OUTGOING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The meeting unanimously agreed to give its discharge to the retiring Executive Committee.

This brought the business of the first session to a close.

## SECOND SESSION

Mrs. Eileen Bowser took the chair for this session.

Mrs. Bowser asked the assembly to adhere to the statutory meeting and voting procedure. This was unanimously agreed to.

The Secretary-General, Mr. Borde, spoke first about the functioning of the Secretariat. The Secretary-General was no longer based in the same place as the Secretariat, but he declared himself to be very happy with this new arrangement, for it had increased the importance of the role of the Executive Secretary. Mr. Borde thought that Mrs. Van der Elst had made successful use of this larger degree of initiative which had devolved upon her.

Mr. Borde then spoke about the role of the assistant Secretary-General. For years this had been an honorary position, but Mr. Borde thought it would be better if the assistant actually actively assisted the Secretary-General. He urged the members to bear this point in mind when electing the new Secretary-General. From his own experience, he thought that if the Executive Secretary, the Secretary-General and/or his assistant were based in Europe, this would have the making of an efficient organisational set-up.

Mr. Borde then informed the meeting about certain of FIAF's archives which had been recovered from the former headquarters of the Executive Secretariat in Paris. They had remained there, under seal, since 1960, and comprised two types of documents. Firstly, there were comprehensive files on the congresses held between 1939 and 1959, and these were now kept in Brussels. Secondly, there were correspondence folders for each country. These were less comprehensive, but nevertheless would enable members to trace the relations of individual cinematheques with FIAF. There was, however, a gap between 1939 and 1945, and Mr. Borde appealed to older members for any material they might have to fill that gap. He was making this request on behalf of Mr. Ledoux who hoped to deal with the early history of FIAF.

## 8. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

Mr. Borde reminded the meeting that the Executive Committee had reconfirmed the membership of the following eight archives :

- Filмотека Nacional de España (Madrid)
- Magyar Filmarchivum ( Budapest )
- Norsk Filminstitutt ( Oslo )

- Bulgarska Nacionalna Filmoteka ( Sofia )
- Archiva Nationala de Filme ( Bucaresti )
- National Film Archive of Australia ( Canberra )
- Österreichisches Filmarchiv ( Wien )
- Österreichisches Filmmuseum ( Wien )

The criteria employed by the Executive Committee in reconfirming membership were the progress made by each archive, especially in the field of preservation, their budget and most importantly at a time of growing governmental interference in the work of film archives, the degree of autonomy enjoyed by the archive.

The meeting would not be called upon to vote on the admission of full members this year, but the Secretary-General announced that the Executive Committee had approved the application of 4 observers :

1) Fundação Cinemateca Brasileira ( São Paulo )

This was an old member which had left in the 1960. It had experienced severe financial difficulties but had made a remarkable recovery and was now very well equipped, especially for preservation and restoration work.

2) Kvikmyndasafn Islands ( Reykjavik )

This was an archive in the process of being established under the aegis of the Icelandic government

3) Münchener Filmmuseum ( München )

This archive, which formed part of the Münchener Stadtmuseum and was financed by the city, had developed a remarkable collection of German films and had performed excellent work in reconstituting certain classics.

4) Film Archive of China ( Beijing )

Mr. Borde outlined the history of the Film Archive of China's relations with FIAF. In addition to possessing all Chinese films made since 1949, it also had a lot of old Chinese and foreign films which should prove to be a rich source of material for historians.

Mr. Borde next announced that four more applications for observer status were pending. They were :

- 1) Bundesarchiv, Koblenz
- 2) Greek Film Archive, Athens
- 3) Municipal Film Archive, Luxembourg
- 4) Astoria Motion Picture Foundation, New York

Mr. Duache then took the opportunity to announce the presence of Mr. Karèche, who had been invited to the Meeting as the representative of the Cinémathèque d'Alger.

Mr. Borde then spoke about the association which had recently been created in the Federal Republic of Germany grouping the archives of Wiesbaden, Koblenz and Berlin (West). In his opinion this was a very interesting, indeed important development, and he thought that France and Italy, which also have several archives, might consider adopting a similar solution.

Mrs Orbanz clarified that all the three archives in question were state-subsidized, with the Berlin archive receiving its support from the Berlin Government

The association had only been founded last December and had not yet started work, but it was clear that the archives' limited resources would be more efficiently used if they could henceforth avoid duplicating work. To this end, Wiesbaden, Koblenz and Berlin (West) planned to cooperate on the following projects :

- central cataloguing of films
- training of archivists in the FRG
- consideration of electronic data systems
- a biographical catalogue of German filmmakers

The three archives planned to divide their work, with Koblenz (which has laboratory facilities) storing negatives and making copies for Berlin (West) and Wiesbaden, although these two archives would remain the owners of the films. This arrangement would permit Berlin (West) to devote more resources to the preservation and restoration of foreign films and to the collection of film documents. Wiesbaden and Berlin (West) would be responsible for the distribution of films on a non-commercial basis to film clubs, schools, universities and the like.

Mrs. Orbanz said that the West German association would welcome advice and assistance from countries with similar groupings, such as the United States.

Mr. Pöschke pointed out that 20.000 negatives are stored in Wiesbaden but that only 200 would be delivered to Koblenz.

Mr. Casanova informed the meeting that the Mexican archives were working on arrangements for a similar association and hoped to be able to present full details to next year's meeting.

Mr. Casanova took the opportunity to mention the recent exclusion from FIAF of CINEMATICA MEXICANA DEL INAH. He was sure that the Executive Committee had its reasons for acting as it did, but nevertheless felt that the other Mexican archives should have been consulted first. He said that the INAH had benefitted from a new administration and thought that FIAF should have encouraged the new officials by being less hasty in excluding them.

Mr. Pogagic returned to the question of the new association of archives in the FRG. He stressed his enthusiasm for a practical and logical solution, but pointed out that if Wiesbaden and Berlin (West) wanted to preserve their member status there might be problems because of Article 4 of the Statutes. This stated that one of the main aims of member archives must be to preserve films, but as a result of the distribution of tasks Wiesbaden and Berlin (West) would no longer fulfil this condition. It might prove necessary to amend Article 4, but Mr. Pogagic said that discussions were to be held to decide whether two or three (if Koblenz were to join) places should be allocated to the West German archives or only one seat for the association as a whole.

Mr. Borde explained with regard to INAH that the Executive Committee was expecting INAH to make a new application.

Mrs. Bowser thanked Mr. Borde for his excellent work.

#### 9. MODIFICATION OF THE FIAF STATUTES AND RULES

It was verified that with 38 voting members present, any modification to the Statutes would require 26 votes in favour for the statutory 2/3 majority.

Mr. Stenklev in his capacity as the Chairman of the small committee which had been established to examine modifications to the Statutes, explained the philosophy behind the changes which were being recommended ( see Annex 9 ). The two main recommendations were :

- 1) Abolition of the " associate " status
- 2) The introduction of a system of rotation for the " head officers " of the Executive Committee i.e. the President, Secretary-General and Treasurer would be allowed to serve a maximum of three terms of office.

Another minor change which the committee was recommending was that Honorary Members should have the right to speak and make proposals at General Meetings.

Furthermore, a new point should be added to the introductory article of the Statutes stressing that FIAF also aimed b) .. " to encourage the formation and development of film archives in all countries ".

Mr. Kuiper pointed out an omission under Article 14 of the circular of the proposed modifications, which should read : "... 10,11,15 d, e,g,g,h " etc. The letter "d" had been left out.

Mrs. Orbanz asked why the Committee had recommended that the probationary period before an observer may be considered for membership should be increased from one to two years. Mr. Stenklev replied that the suppression of associate status would lead to an increase in the number of observers, and the extra waiting period would give FIAF the chance to take a closer look at the application of these observers for membership.

Mr. Kubelka raised the case of the application for observer status submitted by Astoria Motion Picture Foundation, New York, which, he said, would not be eligible for full membership under the present statutes. The associate member category was meant for archives such as the AMPF, and if it were not to be lost to FIAF, the statutes would have to be modified radically.

Speaking on behalf of Mr. Ledoux, Mr. Buache said that the latter was strongly opposed to the abolition of associate member status because it would either close the door on some archives with which FIAF would like to have contact or, inversely, it would open the door to archives which we would not like to have as observers or full members.

Mrs. Bowser clarified from the chair that the AMPF would not qualify for membership under the present statutes, but that it was intended to discuss at the Open Forum what kind of archives FIAF wished to see become eligible for observer status.

Mr. Klaue pointed out that, at the time the Committee was reviewing the issue, the AMPF had not yet made its application. He stressed that FIAF had only had one associate member over the past 8 or 10 years and that the only difference between observer and associate member status was to be found in the substantially higher fees that the latter had to pay. He repeated the need for a general discussion to consider the case of archives such as AMPF which were in effect film museums with no films.



Mr. Kuiper underlined that observers were in no way obliged to become full members. Observer status was a legitimate form of affiliation in its own right which suited many organisations.

Mr. Stenklev said that FIAF had been trying in vain for a long time to find a reasonable and profitable definition of associate membership in between full membership and observer status. He also pointed out the possible danger of the status of associate being abused to create the impression that the links of an associate member with FIAF were much closer than they actually were.

Mr. Francis pointed out that Mr. Coultass of the Imperial War Museum would not be averse to the proposed change, but would wish in that case to apply for full membership. The National Film Archive would not oppose such an application.

Mr. Kula expressed his disappointment at the move to suppress associate member status without opening up what he saw as the larger, related issue of the qualifications for full membership of FIAF.

Mrs. Wibom asked whether the crux of the problem was not in fact simply that the expression "associate member" was semantically inappropriate.

Mr. Stenklev thought the phrase was very good, but that it had proved impossible to flesh it out in such a way that a distinction could be made between the various categories of affiliation.

Mr. Kuiper said that the feeling of the Committee was that the associate category had to be eliminated before other changes could be made which would widen FIAF's membership capability and boost the attraction and importance of observer status.

Mr. Cincotti agreed that confusion had been sown in some people's mind regarding the distinction between full and associate members. He acknowledged that only one archive had thus far been admitted as an associate, but felt nonetheless that there were organisations which wanted links with FIAF but which could never become full members. He therefore proposed to retain the associateship category but to change the name to, say, "corresponding member" or "observer" with a concomitant renaming of the present observers as "candidate members" whose applications for full membership would be either accepted or rejected after two years.

Mr. Kubelka expressed his personal view that FIAF should surround itself with other kinds of organisations working in related fields. Until now these had been repelled. He also thought that observer status was a catch-all category grouping diverse small organisations

as well as future full members and this could indeed be confusing. He therefore proposed a return to the former system of three categories : full member, provisional member ( for archives which will later become full members, eg Munich ) and associate member ( for archives which do not want to become full members or which work in allied areas such as poster and equipment collections, children's films etc.)

Mrs. Bowser explained from the chair that the term " affiliate " had been coined to embrace all the categories. Observers, however, were not bound to FIAF rules. The Chairman saw a danger in " overdefining " the categories, a supple definition would enable a wider range of organisations to be admitted.

Mr. Klauz supported the view that FIAF's doors should be open to organisations which are not film archives but which support FIAF's objectives. He felt that the Statutes in fact already explicitly allowed for this in the definition of the status of " observer "

Consequently, he reiterated the Committee's view that the two categories of member and observer were sufficient and saw no problem if the observer category were to embrace a wide range of organisations.

Mr. Comencini favoured the retention of associate member status because he valued its clear definition in the Statutes as a category for archives specialising in particular types of films. The distinction thus made between associate and full members avoided confusion. Referring next to the recently established association of archives in the FRG, Mr. Comencini advocated an addition to article 3(a) of the Statutes to take account of this development, namely

" Article 3

The Federation shall be composed of :

- a) members and national associations of film archives "

Mrs. Dowser ruled that consideration of this proposed modification would have to be postponed to a later date. She then invited Mr. Coultass to express his opinion as the representative of FIAF's sole associate member. Mr. Coultass first of all explained that the Film Department of the Imperial War Museum did indeed specialise in particular non-fictional historical areas, but emphasised strongly that its primary aim was the preservation of films and not their collection. Indeed the IWM was recognised by the British Government as an archive and even had the statutory right of deposit for certain material. He felt sure that if the category of associate were abolished, the IWM would apply for full membership. It would not accept the status of observer, for that would not only imply demotion but would deprive the IWM of its

right to exchange material with other archives. IMA in fact had never been happy with its status as an associate. It was an anomalous, almost embarrassing position, Mr. Coultass said; for instance, he had to remind the Chair once again that associate members did in fact have voting rights at the Meeting. In conclusion, he supported the proposal to abolish associate member status and saw no reason why full membership should not be extended to all archives whose primary aim was preservation, irrespective of any specialisation.

Mr. Balmori said that if the status of associate were abolished, the category of observers should be extended to cover those institutions which did not have significant film collections but which nonetheless supported the preservation of films.

Mr. Pogagic said that as a result of the debate he felt that only the two categories of full member and observer should be retained, but that the Executive Committee should try to define them better.

Mr. de Vaal disagreed with Mr. Pogagic. He felt instead that the meeting was puzzled by how to describe the third category of affiliate.

Mr. Stenklev sided with Mr. Pogagic. He felt that the membership should recommend the abolition of associate status but that the Executive Committee should try to come up with clearer definitions of the member and observer categories which would leave FIAF open to other institutions but would avoid the impression of first, second and third class affiliates.

From the chair, Mrs. Dowser said that the meeting should move to a vote on the various recommendations.

## STATUTES

### Article 1

Proposal : " To encourage the formation and development of film archives in all countries " .

Vote : 39 for  
0 against  
0 abstentions.

The proposal was adopted .

### Article 5

Proposal : " Delete the whole article "; and all other provisions in the statutes and rules which speak of " associate member " and, linked with that, " affiliate "

Vote : 27 for  
 11 against  
 1 abstention

The proposal was adopted

Mrs. Dowser referred to the Executive Committee the task of suggesting better, clearer definitions of member and observer status.

Mr. Kubelka proposed a general discussion at the Open Forum on the whole question of FIAF's membership policy. This had already been agreed to

#### Article 7

Proposal : " Film archives intending to apply for membership must first be observers for at least two years "

Vote : 34 for  
 5 against  
 0 abstentions

The proposal was adopted

#### Article 14

Proposal : " Add at the end of the article the following words (underlined) : '... shall be valid in all matters save those provided for in articles 10, 11, 15 d,e,g,h and 27 of the Statutes ' . "

Mr. Kuiper explained that this amendment was intended to prevent a hastily re-arranged General Meeting from considering certain important questions at short notice and from making changes that the full membership might not approve of.

The proposal was unanimously adopted.

#### Article 15, paragraph k)

Proposal : " to approve the proposal from the Executive Committee for three members of an election committee "

Mr. Stenklev explained that an election committee, which is a common feature of most large international organisations, would make for more efficient and lively elections. For instance, a member who in any event would be unable to accept a nomination for a particular post would be able to inform the committee in advance that he would not like to be considered. Conversely, by avoiding the embarrassment of calling for candidates in the actual Meeting ( although the proposed election

committee would never omit any suggestion for any post from members present), Mr. Stenklev hoped that there would be more than one candidate for each post and that a genuine election could be held. He explained that if this proposal and the amendment to Article 18 (rotation of "head officers") were accepted, the election committee would be the only one elected at the 1980 Meeting and would prepare the elections for the "head officers" in 1981. A rotation system of elections would then have been inaugurated.

Mrs. Bowser explained that in practical terms the election committee would work at least a year in advance of an election; a list of candidates would be sent to members who, if they did not wish to support any of the committee's nominations, would be asked to put forward their own proposals. Mrs. Bowser thought that such a system would extend democratic participation in FIAF, not diminish it.

In reply to a query from Mr. Kubelka, the chairman said that it would be up to the election committee to devise the best way of selecting candidates: say, by approaching directly members whom they considered to be suitable candidates, or by seeking suggestions from the membership.

Mr. Buache said on behalf of Mr. Ledoux and in his own name that he was opposed to this type of committee. Even if the proposal was well intentioned, it removed power from the General Meeting, the spontaneous, unprepared democracy of which should be preserved.

Mrs. Wibom spoke next, saying that FIAF was growing all the time in size and the scope of its functions and had the ambition to represent film archives in UNESCO and other international bodies. She felt it was important for the Executive Committee to represent a wide range of opinions and for the head officers to be elected on a rotating system. The proposed election committee would ensure this diversity much better than the present random, unprepared system. She had always felt very uneasy at the elections, and although stressing that she was not levelling criticism at any individual committee member past or present, it was always a surprise for her to see the composition of new committees. Young and specialist archives were under-represented, and an election committee would ensure that these and similar considerations were better met. She disagreed with Mr. Buache's view that it would undermine the General Meeting's democratic rights. On the contrary, the Meeting had a right to be better informed; Mrs. Wibom, for instance, had been attending FIAF meetings since 1965 but still did not know some of the members and their ability and willingness to serve in an executive capacity.

Mr. Buache reiterated his opposition to the creation of an election

committee. The sovereignty and spontaneity of the General Meeting must remain intact. He was, on the other hand, in favour of establishing a committee to examine the whole future general policy of FIAF.

Mr. Casanova agreed with Mrs. Wibom that the Executive Committee should represent different interests, but declared his opposition to an election committee which, he said, would take power away from the General Meeting. He acknowledged the danger of spontaneous ballots at the General Meeting but thought that FIAF members were responsible and aware enough to elect the Executive Committee with careful judgement.

Mr. Kubelka said he had found Mrs. Wibom's explanation very convincing. But while supporting the creation of an election committee he wished to see its duties and powers clearly defined.

Mr. Kula stressed that the election committee would never operate a "closed shop". Any list of candidates they might put forward could always be added to at the General Meeting.

Mr. Spehr spoke of the tendency of election committees in general to be conservative bodies interested in maintaining the status quo of the administrative leadership. He would be happier if the proposal obliged the committee to propose at least two candidates for each post, otherwise their nominee would take on the appearance of an official candidate. He was in two minds : the General Meeting certainly needed to be better informed about potential candidates, but if the committee were to become a body to maintain certain figures of leadership within the organisation, it was a dangerous proposal and he was against it.

Mrs. Bowser pointed out from the chair that if the election committee were set up, the Meeting would have to define its remit when it came to revising the Rules.

Mr. Borde was against the proposal for two reasons. Firstly, FIAF was not yet such a large organisation that it really needed an election committee. Secondly, although the Executive Committee had lightened the General Meeting's burden of administrative tasks over the years, thereby happily leaving it more time for debate, he felt that this move was going too far by depriving the Meeting of its spontaneous power of decision making.

Mrs. Wibom proposed the following amendment :

" The members of the election committee shall not at the same time be members of the Executive Committee "

Mr. Casanova reiterated his opposition to what he considered a dangerous proposal. He went on to suggest a public register of candidates

whereby anyone who had a candidate in mind would be able to advertise the nomination, thus leaving time for information to be gathered about the candidate.

Mr. Pöschke proposed to defer the decision to allow time for further study of an election committee's eventual powers.

The meeting then voted on the amendment proposed by Mrs. Wibom.

Vote : 13 for  
19 against  
6 abstentions

The amendment was therefore rejected.

A vote was then taken on the main proposal to set up an election committee :

Vote : 22 for  
12 against  
4 abstentions

The proposal was therefore rejected.

#### Article 18

Proposal : The General Meeting shall elect a new Executive Committee every two years, and the head officers may only be elected for three consecutive terms.

Mr. Karr asked why no change had been proposed to the length of time ordinary members may sit on the Executive Committee. Mr. Stenklev explained that the reason was to be found in the practical question of numbers : with 11 executive members and FIAF being a small organisation, the pool of potential executive members would soon have been exhausted. Hence it had been decided to propose the rotation system only for the head officers.

Mrs. van Leer raised the point that the composition of the Executive Committee had remained unchanged for a long time; furthermore, with more and more decisions being made outside the General Meeting, members had fewer opportunities to judge the merits and performance of potential and actual Executive members.

Mr. Pogagic proposed an amendment : " to limit the period in office to two consecutive terms."

Mrs. Bowser spoke from the chair in support of this proposal, saying

that members would be more willing to consider being nominated for an important post if they knew that the responsibility would be for a maximum of four years instead of six.

Mr. Kubelka also spoke in favour of the amendment, which he considered would be more practical and would make for more genuine rotation.

The meeting then voted on Mr. Pogacic's amendment :

Vote : 20 for  
11 against  
7 abstentions

The amendment was therefore rejected.

The meeting then voted on the entire original proposal to Article 18 :

Vote : 32 for  
1 against  
5 abstentions

The proposal was therefore adopted.

#### Article 20 h)

Proposal : " to submit to the General Meeting (in writing) an annual report of the activities of the Federation."

The proposal was unanimously adopted.

The remaining proposed changes to the Statutes had already been encompassed by previous votes and so were not voted upon separately.

#### INTERNATIONAL RULES

Mr. Stenklev explained that most of the proposed changes to the Internal Rules were minor amendments designed to clarify the text. The modification to Article 76 was a purely practical measure and the only really substantial revision was in Article 44, which recommended giving honorary members the right to make proposals.

Mr. Cincotti put forward an amendment to the proposal for Article 7 :

" ... Decisions at the General Meeting shall be by absolute majority of the Members present or represented".



After clarification, this amendment was unanimously adopted.

The meeting then voted unanimously to accept the entire set of recommended revisions to the Internal Rules.

This brought the business of the Second Session to a close.

THIRD SESSION

May 31st, 3 - 6.30 p.m.

( Mr. Klaue in the chair )

Mr. Klaue welcomed Mrs. van Vliet from UNESCO to the Meeting.

Mr. Borde informed the full meeting that the Executive Committee had accepted as observers, the following four applicants :

- SÃO PAULO : FUNDAÇÃO CINEMATECA BRASILEIRA
- REYKJAVIK : KVIKMYNDASAFH ISLANDS
- MÜNCHEN : FILHMUSEUM / MÜNCHNER STADTMUSEUM
- BEIJING : CHINESE FILM ARCHIVE

10. REPORT OF THE COPYRIGHT COMMISSION AND DISCUSSION OF THE  
UNESCO DOCUMENT ON THE PRESERVATION OF MOVING IMAGES.

Mr. Kuiper introduced the Report of the Copyright Commission  
( Annex 10 )

Mr. Klaue then reported on the UNESCO meeting which he and Mr. Borde had attended in Paris from 2-4 May 1979 to consider the first draft of an international recommendation to safeguard and preserve moving images. After giving a short historical outline of the development of this instrument, Mr. Klaue explained that FIAF's basic position had been determined by the responses received from 16 FIAF members to the document originating from the 1978 UNESCO General Assembly. In accordance with the views expressed by these members, Mr. Klaue and Mr. Borde had suggested amendments to the working document being used by the Paris meeting.

- In the preable to the document FIAF had first of all suggested an addition to acknowledge the results already obtained in the field of the preservation of moving images by film and television archives. This had been accepted. Secondly, they had sought to insert a statement to the effect that moving images represented a new form of artis-

tic expression which needed to be preserved just like books or paintings. This had also been agreed to.

- FIAF had tried to extend the scope of the proposed legal deposit to include foreign production, but had failed in the face of strong opposition from the production side. The revised text now recommends voluntary deposit for films by foreign producers.
- FIAF had also asked for preprint material to be included in the legal deposit, and after long discussion this had been agreed to.
- As far as the rights of archives were concerned, FIAF had pressed for rights to preservation, access and inter-archival loans. The producers had at first rejected all of these calls, but at length a compromise was reached, stating that :
  - " the official archives should be entitled, subject to the relevant provisions of international conventions and of national legislation, to :
    - a) undertake at their own expense all necessary measures for the safeguard of the moving image heritage.
    - b) project the copy for educational or research purposes within its legal premises to a limited number of viewers on a strictly non-profit-making basis. "

FIAF's representatives had been unable to obtain more substantial successions.

- FIAF had succeeded in gaining acceptance of the rights of already existing archives.

The proposal to establish a central agency in each country to execute the legal deposit was rejected.

- The proposal to make the legal deposit retrospective for films produced before the implementation of legislation was accepted.

Mr. Klaue then gave some information about the participants at the meeting. In addition to members of the UNESCO Secretariat there had been experts representing film archives and related spheres, the producers' representatives and, keeping the balance between the two, legal experts on international copyright.

The steps that will have to be taken in future were outlined in the Report of the Copyright Commission, but Mr. Klaue underlined the need for FIAF to find a legal expert since the formulation of the new draft was becoming increasingly a legal problem of devising a text which was in accordance with international copyright conventions and laws.

In general, Mr. Klaue thought that the work on a system of legal deposit had so far been very successful.

Mr. Rosen appreciated the energetic work which had gone into representing FIAF's views, but expressed a doubt as to the definition of an officially recognized archive, in view of the fact that in some countries there was more than one archive.

Mr. Klaue explained that the main problem had been to recommend solutions which would not harm the rights of existing archives and which would take account of the fact that in some countries there were several archives. There was indeed no mention of this point in the revised draft; a flexible wording had been preferred in order to leave it up to respective national legislation to decide the matter. Mr. Klaue thought that in most countries the officially recognized archive would be a member or observer of FIAF.

Mr. Kuiper explained further that the principal change which had been made in Paris was to delete previous references or allusions to a central archive. There had been a greater recognition of existing archives, which should open the door to an acknowledgement that there need not be just one archive in each country. In view of the fact that this was an issue on which there was a lot of controversy, Mr. Kuiper thought the compromise satisfactory and urged representations to UNESCO national commissions, where appropriate, to strengthen the case for recognition of a "plurality" of archives..

Mr. Klaue reiterated the importance of individual members lobbying their respective UNESCO national commissions. As soon as the revised draft was available, a working group would be established to give advice as to the points that should be raised during future discussions on the recommendations.

Mrs. Bowser stressed the need at this stage for a common stance.

Mr. Pöschke, as a member of the FRG's UNESCO commission, said that he would like to receive FIAF's comments on the revised draft as soon as possible.

Mr. Konlechner congratulated the negotiators on the concessions they had won at the Paris meeting. He then sought clarification of Article 14: was the present position that archives would not be allowed to receive prints which had not been publicly distributed, or that they would not be permitted at all to receive other films? At best it was an unhappy formulation, he thought, and at worst a very dangerous point. Mr. Konlechner had failed to get his government to show interest in the proposed instrument and he recommended that FIAF should issue a

circular (which FIAF representatives could then use in representations to their governments ) stressing that it was in fact of the utmost importance for their work.

Mr. Klaue read out the new text of Article 14 :

" In accordance with the spirit of this recommendation, official archives should be encouraged to seek the voluntary deposit, subject to all the rights therein, of copies of moving images made by foreign producers and publicly distributed in the country concerned "

Mr. Klaue said that he shared Mr. Konlechner's doubts and that it was something that FIAF would have to work on in the future. He also supported the proposal to send out a circular letter.

Mr. Kula stressed that archives' rights would, in the final analysis, be dictated by national legislation and not by the revised document under discussion. Thus there was no need for archives to feel that they could not press on a national level for wider rights than those already conceded in the UNESCO draft.

Mr. Kuiper returned to the reference in the revised document to " officially designated archives " in the plural. FIAF members from countries with several archives now believed that this was a clear indication that there could be more than one official archive in a country. He asked, however, whether a commentary would be published with the final instrument to aid its ultimate interpretation.

Mrs. van Vliet first thanked the Meeting for its invitation and passed on the best wishes of the Secretary-General of UNESCO. Then, turning to Mr. Kuiper's question, she said that there would be no explanatory report; it would be up to the General Conference and member States to interpret the document. She pointed out, however, that a commentary would accompany the revised draft and that it would contain the official points of view of the archives and of the producers.

Mr. Konlechner felt that there should be no specific mention of video discs, as this might lead later to a restrictive interpretation. Mr. Klaue explained that in fact FIAF's proposal to delete the specific reference to video discs in Article 5 of the document had been accepted, and the text now read :

" Research should be directed specifically towards the development of more stable supports for moving images "

Mr. Klaue went on to say that the producers had expressed their admiration for FIAF's preservation work and research and had even offered to help with the financial side of the matter. Furthermore,

a consensus had been reached with them on the section on technical measures : the series of recommendations under Article 16 of the working document had been rejected as not being worthwhile and the following statement substituted for it :

" The preservation of moving images calls for special conditions of storage and handling because of the physical properties of the different material supports. Member States should therefore take all the necessary measures so that moving images are preserved in accordance with the archival standards recommended by the international organisations competent in this field."

Mrs. van Vliet, in a reply to a question from Mr. Borde, said that the revised draft plus accompanying commentary should be ready by July.

Mr. Beylie made two points with reference to Article 10 (f) (iii) of the Paris working document:

- 1) he felt there was no need to specify education or research. The two were intimately linked and he proposed a change in the text to " education and research ".
- 2) the producers' fears would be calmed if it were stressed that most private showings of films by archives were 'viewing and working' sessions, often for the benefit of individual researchers. In this context, he felt the phrase in the text " to a limited number of viewers " was unduly restrictive, and asked whether there had been debate on this point.

Mr. Klauw agreed with Mr. Beylie's first suggestion. As for the second point, he said that it would be left to national legislation to lay down the conditions, but the present wording, he felt, was to be welcomed for its flexibility.

Referring to point 5 of the working document, Mr. Kula felt that FIAF's proposal to replace the phrase " stabilisation of nitrate film " by " transfer of the film to acetate support " was tantamount to casually conceding that research into the stabilisation of nitrate film had failed. This was a disappointing admission of defeat and he spoke in favour of continued research in the field.

## 11. RELATIONS WITH UNESCO AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

Mr. Pogacic explained that following the decision to withdraw from CICT, FIAF had immediately applied for admission to category B) of UNESCO. The application would probably be discussed in October.

Mrs. van Vliet said that it was too early to say what the Director-General's recommendation would be to the UNESCO's Executive Board on FIAF's application. In the event of its being rejected, Mrs. van Vliet said that the Cultural Heritage Division which she represented would certainly like to maintain its fruitful links with FIAF.

Mr. Klaue said that it would be up to the Executive Committee to review the situation if UNESCO said no; the possibility of returning to CICT in that eventuality would depend on changes within that organisation. He stressed that FIAF was so far very encouraged by the contacts established with UNESCO and was grateful for the help it had received.

Mr. Klaue repeated that there had been no direct contacts in the past year with FIAPF ( International Federation of Film Producers Associations) Mr. Pogacic had already outlined FIAF's relations with FIAT ( Fédération Internationale des Archives de Télévision ), and there had been a report in the last FIAF Bulletin of the FIAF/FIAT meeting in Brussels last November.

Mr. Klaue welcomed the presence at the Meeting of representatives of four international organisations :

- the International Council of Archives
- the International Association for Audio-Visual Media in Historical Research and Education ( IAMHIST)
- The International Federation of Television Archives
- the International Federation of Film High Schools ( Cilect )

The Executive Committee had decided that David Francis would be the person responsible for relations with FIAT. The floor was then given to Mr. Dumont, the Vice-President of this organisation, who began by thanking the Chairman for having been invited and given the opportunity of addressing the meeting. He hoped that the friendly relations between FIAF and FIAT would prove to be lasting and effective and stressed the need to find the best means of mutual cooperation. Mr. Dumont then summarised the recent work of FIAT, drawing particular attention to the fact that the question of the criteria for admission to FIAT was still unresolved and to a study and research seminar to be held in Spain, to which Mr. Francis had been invited as FIAF's representative.

Mr. Rosen asked whether FIAF genuinely expected FIAT, which he saw basically as a producers' organisation, to commit itself to the preservation of television material and to ensuring scholarly access to it.

Mr. Dumont replied that FIAT's role was in fact to preserve original television material, certainly in Europe, although he acknowledged that in some countries, for instance the United States, the producers were not the ideal archivists and that in such cases preservation was an extremely crucial issue.

Mr. Rosen recognised that FIAT had succeeded very quickly in resolving certain aspects of preservation, but asked again whether the producers could be expected to give a genuine commitment to public access to their material.

Mr. Dumont could not speak for other television organisations in the world, but the position in France as regards access to television material was certainly as good as for any other audiovisual form. He stressed that FIAT, like FIAF, in respect of films, was striving to get television material accepted as part of our cultural heritage and consequently more accessible to the public. This was a process which inevitably would take some time.

Mr. Kula said that he expected television material to be deposited with archives eventually and in the meantime welcomed FIAT's contribution towards the preservation of these film resources.

Mr. Klaus expressed the hope that the incoming Executive Committee would maintain and promote what he saw as the very fruitful contacts between FIAF and FIAT.

Mr. Coultass spoke next as the representative of IAHIST. They were due to hold a conference in Holland in September and a report would appear in the FIAF bulletin.

Mr. Casanova spoke next on behalf of Cilect.

He first informed the meeting about a programme of 11 Student films (16 mm.) which CILECT was willing to make available to archives free of charge.

Secondly, he outlined the main points of a letter sent by CILECT to FIAF in April :

- asking for FIAF's cooperation to urge UNESCO to improve access to educational film materials;
- supporting FIAF's attempts to secure the legal deposit of moving images and the right for archives to project them for the purposes of research and education;
- inviting FIAF to help CILECT with the financing of copies of films and their distribution.

Mr. Klaus regretted that the letter had never reached the FIAF Secretariat. If the proposals could be copied out in time, the matter could be discussed at the Open Forum; if not, it would be referred to the Executive Committee.

With time in hand, it was decided to move on to point 14 of the agenda.

#### 14. PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS UNDERWAY

##### - Basic Manual ( now called Handbook for Filmarchives )

Mr. Kuiper reported that comments on the draft had been incorporated into the final text and said that the manual would appear in the New Year.

Mr. Kula provisionally offered the services of the National Film Archive of Canada to undertake the French translation of the manual.

##### - FIAF brochure

The intention of this publication was to provide an updated version of the small FIAF brochure " Why preserve films ? " Mr. Francis hoped that it would be ready by the end of the year and thanked Mr. Casanova for his offer to translate the brochure into Spanish.

##### - Bibliography of FIAF Member Publications

Mr. Kula had already reported that the 1978 issue had been published. It was agreed to extend the scope of this work to include the publications of observers.

##### - FIAF Summer School

Mr. Klaue reported that the programme for this year's school, to be held in Berlin and Frankfurt/Oder, had already been published and that 29 applications had been received for 20 places. 7 had already been confirmed and 13 were still on the waiting list. Thanks to UNESCO subsidy and the money available within the FIAF budget, the Commission for Archives in Developing Countries had been able to offer to pay the travelling expenses of summer school trainees from Indonesia, Guatemala, Malaysia and Tanzania and half the expenses of the Kenyan delegate.

##### - Brighton Papers

Referring to the 1900-1906 Symposium held in Brighton, Mr. Francis said that the participants' comments were in the process of being checked and would be combined with the papers actually published and a list of films screened in a publication which would hopefully appear before next Congress.



As far as the video symposium was concerned, Mr. Francis suggested that a synopsis of the proceedings should appear in the FIAF Bulletin.

A selected programme of the films screened at Brighton was available to interested archives.

Mr. Klaus concluded the session by thanking Mrs. Van der Elst and Mr. Andreykov for their work in producing the papers of the Varna symposium.

FOURTH SESSION ( Mr. Buache in the chair ) 1 June 1979

14. PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS UNDERWAY ( continued )

Mr. Borde asked Mr. Andreykov to make a progress report on the " General History of the Cinema " project. Mr. Andreykov informed the meeting that contact had been established with archives from 104 countries, who had been informed about the outline and methodology of the project. 60 countries would be represented at a 6-day meeting to be held in Sofia to discuss the project further. It was hoped to start writing the history in 1981, and the first four volumes were scheduled for publication in 1983.

13. OPEN FORUM

a) Delegates from invited archives

- Mr. Buache first gave the floor to Mrs. Mitropoulos of the Greek Film Archive, who explained that her archive had been functioning as such since 1963 and was involved with the preservation of films and research into Greek cinema. The work of the archive included a book on the discovery of Greek cinema and a catalogue, due to appear in October, of Greek films between 1906 and 1979; emphasis was also placed on the distribution of domestic and foreign films to regional cine-clubs.

Mr. Karèche of the Algerian State Film Archive ( 1964 ) spoke next. His institution had archives, a documentation centre, a library and a photo library. The archive attached great importance to the widespread screening of films as a political priority designed to establish Algeria as the centre of Arab and African cinema. In reply to a question from Mr. Buache, Mr. Karèche said that he thought the Algerian archives' difficulties with the producers had now been resolved. The latter then asked for the cooperation of FIAF members in helping the Algerian archive to get back all the films dating back to its colonial period.

Mr. Junck gave details next of the Luxembourg Municipal Film Archive, founded three years ago and with a relatively substantial budget. Although Luxembourg had no distribution system of its own and the archive was having to obtain its films from a variety of sources, Mr. Junck believed that it was legitimate for Luxembourg to have its own archive.

b) Preservation of avant-garde and experimental films

- Mr. Buache passed the floor to Mr. Rosen, who asked what would remain in fifty years' time of contemporary independent and avant-garde films ( 16 mm. or even 8 mm. ) He asked whether archives were concerned with the preservation of these films.

Mr. Kula replied that although the collection of experimental and avant-garde films required a lot of time and money, his archive was doing as much as it could in this rewarding and worthwhile field.

Mrs. Bowser said that the Museum of Modern Art in New York also devoted time and money to the preservation of endangered (independent) films and went on to give details of its work.

Mr. Daudelin explained that there were a lot of independent filmmakers in Quebec and that the collection and preservation of their films was one of the main preoccupations of his archive.

c) Filmoteca de la UNAM

- Mr. Casanova next informed the meeting that the Filmoteca de la UNAM was organizing a seminar in Mexico in October for Latin American archives. Mr. Casanova hoped that FIAF would lend its financial support to the seminar. The matter was referred to the Executive Committee.

Mr. Casanova then announced that his archive wanted to organise some special events to mark its 20th anniversary and asked for support and ideas from other members. Mr. Andreykov said his archive would be prepared to screen a retrospective of Mexican cinema in Sofia.

d) The Andreykov Proposal ( Annex 11 )

After Mr. Andreykov had briefly introduced his proposal, Mr. Borde recommended that it be studied closely by the Executive Committee. He termed it an important and necessary idea.

Mr. Stanklev commented that filmmakers from small countries would also like to have their films shown in big countries. He thought, however, that with the money available from bilateral cultural

agreements, it should be possible to arrange more programmes. Account must also be taken of problems such as the costs involved in subtitling copies.

Mr. de Vaal thought that not enough films were shown within the context of cultural agreements and that those which were chosen by the archives of small countries were of a poor standard often being national prestige productions. He suggested shorter, alternative programmes, but raised the problems of cost, subtitles and the quality of 16 mm. prints in the Socialist countries.

Mr. Alberti set the problem within the context of the crisis in the cinema, and suggested as a solution, that special foreign programmes might not only be screened within film archives but could reach new audiences by touring regional chains of experimental cinemas.

Mr. Klaué doubted whether the Executive Committee could make much progress discussing this problem. He thought that it was basically the task of archives to initiate bilateral or multilateral film exchanges.

Mr. Stenklev saw a need for more cooperation between the donor and screening archives to obtain a programme of films which will appeal not to the donor in the first instance, but to the public of the archive actually projecting the films.

Mrs. Bleyer-Brody spoke in favour of the project and believed it and small cinematographic nations would benefit from the general history of the cinema project now underway.

Mrs. Mitropoulos said that her archive had been successfully organising foreign film weeks in Greece for a long time. She thought such programmes were invaluable and fully supported the project.

Mr. Casanova believed the project would be of great benefit to students.

Mr. Pogagic thought that if an archive prepared a programme of films and offered to circulate it, it would never be refused.

Mrs. Wibom mentioned the problem of producers determining access to films; the high costs involved, in producing subtitled copies, the lack of public interest. She asked whether FIAF archives would accept 16 mm. films, which would make matters much easier.

Mr. Al-Hadary reiterated the need to make certain at the outset that the proposed programme of films will interest the foreign countries

in which they are destined to be shown.

Mr. Beylie supported the idea of minimum programmes for smaller archives.

Mr. Junck suggested the compilation of an international programme of films, selected by FIAF with UNESCO support, as a means of publicising films from several small countries at once.

Mr. Tikhonov lent his support to Mr. Andreykov's proposal and at the same time asked for cooperation with the screening of Soviet retrospectives.

Mr. Buache summed up the discussion and recommended that the question be taken up at a latter stage by the Executive Committee.

e) Fundacion Cinemateca Argentina

Mrs. Jurado extended an invitation to a member of the Executive Committee to visit the Buenos Aires archive in October to mark its 30th anniversary. She also announced her archive's intention of applying for full membership of FIAF.

Mr. Buache thanked her for this invitation.

f) " Embryo " catalogue

Articles that had appeared in France and Italy revealed that the " Embryo " silent film catalogues, which had been intended for internal usage, had been made public. Mr. Borde thought the time had now come to make these catalogues openly available to serious film historians.

Mrs. Bowser agreed, but thought that the members who had contributed to the catalogues should first consent to their publication.

Mr. Klaus underlined the need for this.

Mr. Konlechner welcomed the suggestion to make the catalogue public and called for the veil of secrecy to be dropped completely and for more catalogues to be published in the interest of serious research.

Mrs. Bowser suggested a new edition of Embryo which would exclude those holdings which archives asked not to publicise.

Mrs. van Leer called for the revival of the project, mooted several years ago, to compile a catalogue of archives' negative holdings.

Mr. Konlechner said that he was not in favour of such a catalogue because of all the problems involved, especially the difficulty of describing the physical condition of the materials held.

Mr. Francis supported Mr. Konlechner and called for a wider exchange of information between archives about their respective holdings, especially of nitrate films, in order to facilitate decisions about their eventual copying.

Mr. Spehr spoke in favour of Embryo being made publicly available. On the other hand, he thought that information about pre-print material should remain confidential among archives. FIAF should compile a register of nitrate holdings as a matter of urgency.

Mr. Alberti, speaking about the Embryo catalogues, suggested two editions; a public version would simply state which films still existed, and the internal version would contain details of where the films were held.

Closing the discussion, Mr. Borde recommended that the Executive Secretariat write to all members who contributed to "Embryo" and that FIAF proceed on the basis of the replies received.

9) Proliferation of archives within certain countries.

Mr. Cincotti outlined the increasingly serious situation in Italy, where new regional archives, often functioning more as distribution centres, were complicating relations with the national archives by seeking to establish their own collections to obviate the need of turning all the time to the national archives. The growth of private collections would also soon create problems, Mr. Cincotti said.

Mr. Schmitt read out a prepared statement on this subject (Annex 12)

Mr. Alberti said that he agreed fully with Mr. Cincotti and he thought it were important for FIAF members that the principles contained in Mr. Schmitt's paper be asserted in order to regularise the spread of new "cineclub-archives". Mr. Alberti went on to explain what steps were being taken in Italy to tackle this complicated problem, and concluded by warning FIAF of the legal dangers of becoming entangled in cases of pirating by dishonest institutions.

Mr. Borde emphasised how serious the proliferation of "false" archives in France and Italy was becoming, but did not see how Mr. Schmitt's proposals could be implemented in view of the fact that they were not FIAF members. Any action would have to be taken

by national governments; all FIAF could do was to be very strict should any of these bodies apply for membership. He then explained that of the fifty or so "archives" in France, only five could be termed "serious". The others had sprung up in a variety of circumstances: some had been established with good, though somewhat utopian intentions, whereas others were simply private collections.

Mr. Alberti supported the recommendation contained in the last paragraph of Mr. Schmitt's proposal, whereas Mr. Daudelin thought it contradicted FIAF's usual insistence that national legislation should settle such matters whenever possible.

Mr. Beylie thought that if properly constituted, specialised regional archives had a role to play on condition that the national archive's rights were not infringed. He was against the uncontrolled dispersion of films, but stressed that this should not be confused with the legitimate distribution of films for educational purposes.

Mr. Kubelka was not in favour of a general FIAF statement expressing support for the unification of archives. This might play into the hands of governments of certain countries whose archives did not want to be centralised. Any declaration must be adapted to particular countries.

Seeking to sum up, Mr. Buache suggested that it would be best for archives in the countries concerned to compile dossiers outlining their position which could serve as a basis for the Executive Committee when dealing with the matter in future.

Mr. Schmitt closed the discussion by stressing his desire to see cinematheques everywhere giving priority to the preservation of films and urged FIAF to make a statement to this effect.

Mr. Francis announced that the new director of the British Film Institute was to be Mr. Anthony Smith, a former BDC producer and a member of one of the BFI's selection committees. He added that the NFA would be collaborating in the project of taking trainees from developing countries.

This brought the business for the Session to a close

FIFTH SESSION ( Mr. Pogacic in the chair )

15. ELECTION OF THE NEW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

A roll-call confirmed that there were 38 voters.

Ms. Gautier, Ms. Gebauer and Mr. Veronneau were designed as scrutineers.

a) Election of the President

Mr. Cincotti restated his proposal to nominate the leading officers as a team, whilst still voting for the posts separately.

Mr. Pogacic ruled that each post would be voted upon individually in turn.

Mr. Balmori then proposed Mr. Klaue for President because of his balanced stance and extensive knowledge of the Federation's technical and other work. There being no other candidates, the meeting moved to the vote

Vote : 31 for  
5 against  
2 abstentions

Mr. Klaue was therefore duly elected as President.

b) Election of the Secretary-General

Mr. Stenklev proposed Mrs. Bowser as the head of an archive which had helped other archives all over the world. She was also Chairman of the Documentation Commission, had served for several terms as Vice-President of FIAF, and it was largely due to her that the indexing project had got off the ground.

Mr. Borde proposed Mr. Daudelin because of his wide knowledge of FIAF's work, the ability he had shown to solve delicate international problems for the Federation, the fact that he was bilingual and, most importantly, because he represented a smaller new archive.

Mr. Cincotti raised the possibility of communication difficulties if the Secretary-General were from North America. He therefore proposed Mr. Buache for the post, but the latter declined the nomination because of pressure of work.

A vote was the taken as follows :

- Mrs. Bowser : 17 votes  
- Mr. Daudelin : 20 votes

Mr. Daudelin was therefore duly elected as Secretary-General

c) Treasurer

Mr. Pogagic proposed the reelection of Mr. de Vaal as treasurer on account of his excellent work already in this post.

There being no other candidates, the meeting moved to a vote.

Vote : 36 for  
1 against  
1 abstention

Mr. de Vaal was therefore duly elected as Treasurer

d) Ordinary Members of the Executive Committee

The results of the voting were as follows :

Mr. Borde	31 votes	Elected
Mrs. Bowser	29 votes	Elected
Mr. Andreykov	28 votes	Elected
Mr. Francis	27 votes	Elected
Mr. Buache	25 votes	Elected
Mr. Pogagic	25 votes	Elected
Mr. Stenklev	23 votes	Elected
Mr. Alves Netto	22 votes	Elected

---

Mr. Kuiper	21 votes	
Mrs. Orbanz	20 votes	
Mr. Tikhonov	17 votes	
Mr. Comencini	12 votes	

e) Reserve Members of the Executive Committee

The results of the voting for the three reserve members were as follows :

Mr. Kuiper	19 votes	Elected
Mr. Tikhonov	19 votes	Elected
Mr. Comencini	18 votes	Elected

---



: Mr. Casanova	17 votes
Mr. Molnar	17 votes
Mrs. Orbanz	16 votes

#### 16. ORGANISATION OF THE NEXT FIAF CONGRESSES

Mr. Levy and Mr. Daudelin gave an initial outline of the symposium on animation production to be held during the 1980 Congress in Karlovy Vary. The emphasis would be placed on the beginnings of this film form in each country. Members were free to submit films of their choice. Mr. Levy repeated that the delegates would be able to attend the Karlovy Vary Film Festival immediately after the Congress.

Mr. Cincotti confirmed the offer of the Cineteca Nazionale to organise the 1981 Congress at Rapallo. A draft plan would be presented to the forthcoming Executive Committee.

Mr. Pogagic announced that New York was already earmarked for the 1985 Congress to coincide with the 50th anniversary of the Museum of Modern Art.

Mrs. Mitropoulos had offered to organise the 1982 Congress in Athens.

#### 15. UNFINISHED AND ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Mrs. Bowser raised the question again of whether film museums should be admitted to FIAF. She asked whether there were any other international organisations to which such museums could turn.

Mr. Kubelka reiterated his point of view that FIAF should try to draw as many interested and related bodies as possible towards it, including even private collectors. He thought however, that the statutes would need to be amended to create a special category for these bodies.

Mr. Stenklev considered the discussion rather premature. He thought the Executive Committee should first define who can become an observer and foresaid no difficulties should the scope of observer category eventually be extended. The important point was to be careful in admitting new members after the probationary period as observer.

Mr. Francis made a strong plea for the inclusion of film museums in FIAF's observership category. He felt they were a missing element in the Federation's work.

Mr. Stenklev stressed that he was not opposed to the admission of film museums as observers, and Mr. Pogagic, setting the problem in the context of FIAF's general policy, added that he thought the observer category should be a wide one.

Mr. Kubelka explained why he thought the category of provisional ( or candidate ) members was inappropriate for organisations which were already well-established but which would never become full members of FIAF because of the Statutes.

#### CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

Mr. Klaue thanked Mr. Pogacic for his long years of service with FIAF. His dedication, energy and skill had seen FIAF through many difficult problems.

Mr. Klaue then thanked Mr. Buache and the Cinémathèque Suisse for their hospitality and thus brought the 35th General Assembly to a close.