

F.I.A.F.
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE
DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
IN LAUSANNE
October 25-27, 1973

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

LAUSANNE, October 25-27, 1973

Present : MEMBERS

Messrs. V. Pogacic, President
W. Klaue, Vice-President
V. Privato, Vice-President
J. Ledoux, Secretary-General
R. Borde, Deputy
Secretary-General
J. Stenklev, Treasurer
P. Morris
K. Michalewicz
S. Yelin

DEPUTY MEMBERS

Messrs. F. Buache
K. Gough-Yates
J. de Vaal

HONORARY MEMBERS

Messrs. E. Lauritzen
H. Volkmann

In attendance :

Messrs. Razlogov, interpreter
G.C. Rochemont, interpreter

Apologies for absence had been received from Mr John Kuiper and Mrs Eileen Bowser.

FIRST SESSION

President Pogacic, after having welcomed the attending members, acknowledged the absence of Mrs Bowser, Mr Kuiper, Mr Morris, Mr Yelin and Mr Gough-Yates. The last three were due to arrive later during the meeting.

He started the meeting by reminding the members of the death of FIAF's founder and former Vice-President Ernest Lindgren and he asked all to rise a few moments in silence to pay tribute to his memory.

He then gave the word to the Secretary-general for a practical question. Should this meeting of the Executive Committee be held in English or French? It was decided to adopt the English language for this meeting since Mr Rochemont was there to act as interpreter to the French-speaking delegates. But for future meetings and considering that there were more and more French-speaking members in the E.C., Mr Ledoux asked whether FIAF could not envisage buying a portable system for simultaneous translation which would cost approximately 20.000 to 25.000 BF. One should add to that price the cost of two interpreters for each meeting which would mean \pm 40.000 BF per year.

Everyone was very much in favor of this purchase, but the Treasurer asked to postpone the decision until the discussion on his financial report. This was agreed.

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The following draft agenda had been distributed to the members :

1. Approval of present agenda
2. Approval of the minutes from previous meeting
3. Report of the Secretary-general : a) Secretariat
b) Membership questions.
4. Report of the Treasurer
5. Help to archives in Latin-America and in developing countries
6. Report of the specialized Commissions
7. Report on the first FIAF Summer School. Other projects.
8. Relations with other international organizations
9. Next Executive Committee and General Meeting
10. Any other business.

Mr Ledoux asked that some time during the meeting be devoted to a general discussion on modifications of Statutes and Rules because, due to the absence of John Kuiper, the meeting which was foreseen for the Statutory Commission could not be held.

It was decided to place this discussion under item 10 : "Any other business".

The agenda was then unanimously adopted.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Minutes of both Executive Committee meetings in Moscow had been sent to all members. They were unanimously approved.

3. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

a) Work of the Secretariat

The Secretary-general reported that FIAF's legal case in Paris is still going on, although the last news received from Maitre Boitard was that our opponent, Japan Film Library, had been nonsuited. We were now expecting the execution of the judgement.

A new Xerox machine had been hired for the Secretariat office.

Mr Ledoux reminded the members that, in Moscow, it had been decided to send to all FIAF members a letter informing them about the infringement to the copyright rules by the leaders of the 1973 Oberhausen Festival. This had been done, but Mr Gough-Yates had written to the Secretary-general saying he thought this circular letter was not strong enough and that FIAF should take a firmer stand on this matter. Mr de Vaal agreed with this. The other members of the Executive Committee however considered that the matter was now settled but that each archive was of course free to deal as they wished with the organizers of this Festival in the future.

The Secretary-general then reported about a letter which had been written by the Czechoslovak archive in answer to Peter Morris' questionnaire for the Unesco survey and in which they explained their discarding principles for film material.

Mr Morris had sent this letter to the Secretary-general just for information but Mr Ledoux thought it could be of interest to all to discuss this difficult problem. Should FIAF draft a resolution on this matter or should we leave to every archive the responsibility of dealing with it as they judge best ?

Mr Pogacic thought it was a question which, although very interesting, was too complex to be discussed without preparation at this Executive Committee meeting.

Mr Ledoux and Mr Klaue then suggested to draft together a questionnaire about this problem which would be sent to all FIAF members. This was agreed.

b) Membership questions

The Secretary-general then reported on all the changes which had occurred in FIAF archives since the Moscow Congress and of which he had been informed.

New leaders had been appointed in the archives of Bucharest, London, Prague, Rome, Tirana, Warsaw and Washington (A.F.I.).

Mr Klaue also reported on a visit he had made to the archive in Pyongyang which had very favorably impressed him. He said they were housed in new buildings with very modern technical equipment. They had a fine collection of Korean films and were very anxious to acquire foreign film. They were therefore very interested in FIAF and intended to apply for full membership at the next Congress in Ottawa (if, however, their coming to Canada was possible. This was a problem which would be raised with Mr Morris).

To a question from Mr Ledoux, Mr Klaue replied that for the moment, they organized no showings. They wanted the films exclusively for preservation and study. They were interested mainly in receiving some films from the production of the past 25 years and to build a good classical collection. They had no nitrate vaults. He suggested that FIAF archives should offer the North-Korean archive any films that they could give and ask if it was interested.

Mr Pogacic proposed that, in case Pyonguag submitted its application for full membership, and considering the distance, the Executive Committee agree that Mr Klaue's visit to their archive should serve as the "inspection visit" foreseen by the Statutes. This was unanimously agreed.

Cinemateca Mexicana had expressed the intention to apply for provisional membership at the next Congress. However, it seemed that a strong governmental archive, directed by Mr Garcia Borja, had recently been created in Mexico. They too had more or less expressed their desire to become a member of FIAF and of course, they were much more important than Cinemateca Mexicana, our present correspondent.

It was decided that the Secretary-general should write to Mr Garcia Borja to clarify the situation.

Cinemateca Universitaria del Peru and Cinemateca Uruguay had been informed after the Moscow Congress that their status of correspondent had been prolonged for another year on the condition that they should, within 3 months, at least send to the Secretariat a short report on their activities or a letter expressing their wish to remain in FIAF, but neither of these archives had answered.

They were also two years in arrears with their subscriptions. It was therefore decided that, following the vote taken in Moscow, both these archives should be deleted from FIAF. The Secretary-general would write them accordingly.

Mr Ledoux then read out a letter which he had received from Mr Parent, directeur général adjoint of the Centre National de la Cinématographie in Paris, in answer to a letter which he had himself written to the CNC (at the request of Mr Schmidt) renewing FIAF's wish that the French "Service des Archives du Film" should join the Federation. In his letter, Mr Parent agreed formally to this idea but without taking any definite step.

The Secretariat had sent him the usual information on how to apply for membership.

No news had been received from George Eastman House since the Moscow Congress.

Another (incomplete) application had been received from Mrs Myriam Novitch, curator of the "Ghetto Fighter's House filmarchive" in Israël who wanted to apply for the status of correspondent.

4. REPORT OF THE TREASURER

The Treasurer, Mr Stenklev, had distributed a written report (annex 1) on the financial situation of FIAF which he commented point by point. He suggested to divide the discussion in two parts because, although the general budget of FIAF now included the budget of the Periodical Indexing project, this project continued to create very specific problems which should be treated separately.

As concerned the main account in Brussels (not incl. the P.I.P. which had its own account) the situation was very satisfactory.

The Treasurer therefore agreed to the proposal made earlier to buy a portable installation of microphones for the simultaneous translation of the E.C. meetings.

In order to rationalize FIAF's accounting system, which presently worked on four different accounts, he also suggested to transfer to the Brussels bank the money remaining in our interest account in Switzerland and to put it at a fixed time deposit account where we would have a better interest.

The Secretary-general added that one could perhaps bring the Reserve Fund to a round sum of 100.000 Swiss Francs, either in Switzerland if it proved possible with the Swiss regulations, or otherwise in Belgium (leaving however the present 80.000 SF in Zürich). The Treasurer agreed to inquire in Switzerland whether one could add 20.000 SF to our present Reserve Fund and, if not, to put the available funds in an interest account in Brussels.

As concerned the economic situation of the Periodical Indexing, the Treasurer explained that it was far from good. The budget for 1973, corrected in Moscow, had proved unrealistic. FIAF had had, at this date, to advance \pm 76.000 BF to the project and the expenses foreseen for the rest of the year for the P.I.P. amounted to \pm 400.000 BF including January and February 1974 when cards for 1973 periodicals were still being dispatched.

Unfortunately, since no delegate of the Documentation Commission, which had met in London just before this Executive Committee meeting, was present in Lausanne, it was impossible to know what they had decided to palliate this bad financial situation.

President Pogacic thought that the Executive Committee should nevertheless discuss now the basic question : Should FIAF continue the P.I.P. in 1974, considering the difficulties it had to face ? Could FIAF afford it financially ? Shouldn't we also envisage the very positive aspects of this project : for the first time, an efficient collaboration between many archives which led to a very useful service ?

Mr Ledoux underlined that FIAF had signed a contract with Michael Moulds until 31 March 1974 and that he should be informed at least a month in advance if that contract was not renewed.

He also said that one should make an inquiry amongst the subscribing members to see how they evaluated the project and the cards.

Commenting on the P.I.P. budget for 1974 which had been presented in Moscow, he said we should foresee a loss for 1974 but perhaps not as much as the Treasurer feared.

Several members having agreed that the project was a great help to their archive, the general wish was that it should go on in 1974 but Mr Klaue, supported by the Treasurer, said one could not take a decision before the Documentation Commission had submitted a more realistic report and budget. There were presently too many "perhaps" involved in the Executive Committee's understanding of the situation to be able to take a decision immediately. This report, said Mr Klaue, should be submitted to the E.C. some time before its next meeting so that we should have the possibility to study it and stop this procedure of being confronted at every meeting with a new budget which we had to approve on the spot.

Mr Ledoux however, regretting again that no-one from the Commission was here to defend its standpoint, explained that it was difficult for the Commission to submit its report long in advance because their meetings were always just before the E.C. meetings. Eileen Bowser and Karen Jones had put into this project an enormous amount of time, work and enthusiasm and one should also

not forget the important financial contribution which the Danske Filmmuseum had offered the project in 1972. Mr Stenklev underlined that it was only since the beginning of 1973, when the project had to stand on its own feet, that the difficulties had begun. It was therefore understandable that some lack of experience had forced the Commission to act sometimes in a hurry.

It was decided, to conclude, that Mr Stenklev would try to reach Michael Moulds on the telephone this same evening to have some information on the decisions taken by the Commission during its meeting in London.

The discussion on the Periodical Indexing would then be resumed on the next day.

SECOND SESSION

Kevin Gough-Yates and Saul Yelin having announced their arrivals for later in the day, it was decided to postpone the discussion on the National Film Archive and on Latin-American archives until next day.

The Secretary-general also read out a letter of Eileen Bowser he just received, explaining the reasons for her absence.

6. REPORT OF THE SPECIALIZED COMMISSIONS

a) Cataloguing Commission

Mr Klaue had distributed a written report which said that, after the Moscow Congress where the draft manual on film cataloguing had been distributed to the members, he had invited the archives to express their views on this draft before the end of October 73. He had until now received 6 replies.

The Commission was going to discuss the suggestions received at its next meeting which would probably be held in Jugoslavia in November.

Mr Klaue also said that he was going to attend a Conference of the IFTC in London at the end of October, conference to which he would contribute a report on cataloguing in film archives.

He ended by saying that Mr Montesanti, having retired from Cineteca Nazionale, would no longer be a member of the FIAF Cataloguing Commission.

Mr Ledoux suggested that, before its publication, the cataloguing manual should be submitted to an English-speaking expert on

cataloguing matters (not only in film) to be sure that it was up to the standards of professional cataloguers. This expert should be paid to study it and make remarks, not on the subject, but on the form.

Mr Klaue agreed to that suggestion but he reminded the members that there is no universal system of cataloguing in the world but three or four big trends and the Commission had adopted more or less the German-English system.

Mr Ledoux suggested as an alternative to ask a known expert on cataloguing to write a foreword to the manual.

b) Preservation Commission

Mr Volkmann said that there had been no meeting of the Commission since Moscow but that a meeting was foreseen in Bucharest in December. The members would then work at the English version of the manual on preservation of colour films. Mr Volkmann hoped to be able to distribute this manual at the Ottawa Congress.

c) Copyright Commission

No report could be made since Mr Kuiper was absent.

d) Documentation Commission

It was decided to postpone this discussion until the arrival of Kevin Gough-Yates this afternoon since he would bring with him the report of the Commission's meeting in London.

7. REPORT ON THE FIRST FIAF SUMMER SCHOOL

Mr Klaue had distributed a detailed written report on this Summer School held in Berlin by Staatliches Filmarchiv (annex 2). In short, the first FIAF Summer School had been very successful, and one of its very positive aspects had been that it was the first time a category of archive personnel other than the archive heads was able to meet in the frame of FIAF. The participants had appreciated this very much.

The only problem encountered was that some participants had difficulties to understand all the lectures in spite of the English translation which was done by collaborators of the SFA. This language problem should be underlined to future applicants.

Mr Klaue raised, to conclude, the question of future Summer Schools. "Who is willing to organize the next course and should it be next year or every second year?"

The general feeling was that a Summer School every year was too much because :

1. We would soon run out of pupils ;
2. It was a heavy financial burden for the organizing archive and for the archive who sent a member of its staff ;
3. It took some time to prepare such a Summer School properly.

Answering to a question of Mr Ledoux, Mr Klaue also said that SFA did not know, before starting the courses, what kind of background the pupils had as concerned archival work, what experience they had. Therefore the organizers decided to start their lessons at the very basis, more or less specializing in basic preservation and cataloguing matters, and this decision proved to be right. For future Summer Schools however, Mr Klaue said it was essential to know beforehand the level of archival education of the participants.

A long discussion ensued on the question of knowing whether future Summer Schools should be on specialized (e.g. documentation) or on general and basic archive matters, and the conclusion was that FIAF should try to organize a Summer School every 2nd year alternating specialized and general courses.

It was decided to ask the Danske Filmmuseum whether they would be willing to organize the next Summer School, specializing on documentation.

Mr Klaue said that Staatliches Filmarchiv could, if necessary, repeat later this general Summer School but then of course with other participants, the category of all-round workers which existed in every archive.

It was decided that FIAF should, at the end of the course, deliver a certificate of attendance. It was also suggested to tape-record the lectures in the future, but not the ensuing discussions.

The main remaining problem was the language question. It limited very much the number of possible pupils and of organizing archives except if one could pay for translators.

OTHER PROJECTS ON THE WAY

Embryo 2

Mr Klaue had distributed a report (annex 3) which gave the results of an inquiry he had made amongst participating archives about

the possibility to sell "Embryo 2" outside FIAF. The result was negative.

Annual bibliography of books on the cinema (Bucharest)

Some criticism had been expressed by several archives on this publication. It was decided to leave it to the Documentation Commission to arrange this matter with the Rumanian archive.

Basic Manual

Mr Pogacic reported that this project was now very well on its way and he hoped to be able to submit the complete draft to the Executive Committee at its next meeting.

2nd Catalogue of silent films (Brussels)

Mr Ledoux reported that the project was well on the way but that a certain number of archives still had not sent back their cards, amongst which Gosfilmofond and the Library of Congress. It was agreed that, at the next E.C. meeting, it would be decided whether one should publish this catalogue incomplete or wait for the last cards to come in.

In connection with this catalogue, Mr Ledoux suggested to add to it, as much as possible, the original running speed of the films. Very often this speed was unknown of the archives but perhaps that an inquiry amongst the members would give some interesting results.

It was agreed that the Secretariat would write a circular letter to the members about this problem.

This ended the 2nd session.

THIRD SESSION

Documentation Commission

Mr Gough-Yates having arrived and having brought with him the Documentation Commission's report on its last meeting in London, together with a new budget proposal for 1974 for the Periodical Indexing project, it was decided to resume the discussion on that project.

Mr Ledoux started by summarizing for Mr Gough-Yates the discussion which had been held yesterday and asked for his comments.

Mr Gough-Yates reported that he had discussed the situation at length with the members of the Commission just after their meeting. It seemed that the present situation with the editor working in London and the secretarial office in Brussels was a grave drawback to the efficient operation of the project. They gave several reasons for this. To remedy these drawbacks, the Documentation Commission recommended that the project be moved to London. In order to make such a move possible, the editor had offered to house the project in two rooms of his house until more permanent quarters could be arranged, possibly at the National Film Archive. The "International Index to Film Periodicals" had now produced its first annual volume. This was for the year 1972 and was published in September.

Mr Gough-Yates added that, from the information he had gathered, we should certainly continue with the project. Although there was clearly a deficit in 1973, he thought the new budget for '74 was sound. He handed this new budget proposal over to the Treasurer who said he needed a few hours to study it and asked therefore to postpone the discussion on this point and its approval until the next day. This was agreed but it was nevertheless decided to discuss now the question of whether the Secretarial part of the project should be moved to London, as requested by the Commission.

Several members were very reluctant at first to what seemed to be a new arbitrary decision of the Commission. They said it was necessary to have more control on behalf of FIAF on the decisions taken. They said that, after all, FIAF archives were doing an important part of the project in indexing the periodicals, many of them also paid subscriptions for the cards and nevertheless the project seemed to be getting totally out of FIAF's hands. Why couldn't the project be done totally in Brussels, if it was necessary to have it all in one place? Was FIAF tied to Michael Moulds as editor?

The Secretary-general reminded the members that the project really needed an English-speaking editor and that such an editor would be very difficult to find in Brussels. On the other hand, we could not put aside without consideration the choice and requirements of Eileen Bowser and Karen Jones without whom, he repeated, this project would never have come to life or survived, even with sufficient funds. Mr Stenklev agreed entirely with this and Mr Gough-Yates added that we could not continue using Karen Jones and the Danske Filmmuseum's typist as cheap labor!

It was then decided to postpone the decisions on this matter until Mr Stenklev had studied the new budget, i.e. the next day.

Mr Ledoux then read out the rest of the Commission's report on the meeting held in London.

It said :

"The Commission discussed the "FIAF Directory of Film and Television Resources". Nineteen replies have now been received to the questionnaire sent out to FIAF Archives by the Commission. These have been organized into a standard format. It was agreed that a proof copy of its own entry should be sent to each archive for approval or amendment before publication. The Directory is to be sent free to all FIAF archives but the guidance of the Executive is sought on the question of selling copies to organizations outside FIAF.

"The sub-committee on classification submitted its report and the Commission now has to study the two schemes which have been evolved as a result of its work.

"The draft of the Documentation Chapter for the FIAF Basic Manual was discussed in detail and a number of amendments were suggested which the Commission hopes will be included in the final document.

"Discussion on an International filmography was postponed until the next meeting when it is hoped that Mr Spiess will be present.

"After some discussion it was decided to postpone the more detailed work on the Guidelines for describing unpublished script materials until members were able to produce examples of how the guidelines might apply to scripts in their own collections.

"A new project for the publication of an International Directory of Set Designers was put forward by Dr. Krautz and approved by the Commission. A sub-committee consisting of Messrs Krautz, Vimr, Ripeanu and Luyckx was appointed to study the matter.

Due to Mrs Bowser's absence, it was decided not to discuss this report.

8. RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

F.I.A.P.F.

All the members had in their files

1. A copy of the "agreement" drafted by FIAF (Mr Lindgren-Mr Ledoux) in 1968 as a first proposal to the FIAPF ;
2. A copy of the general regulations set up unilaterally by the International Federation of Film Producers Associations, concerning trust deposit of motion picture prints with film archives, regulations which they had submitted to several FIAF archives together with an agreement which these archives had to sign.

It was decided in Moscow to send these documents to all FIAF members asking for their comments but the Secretary-general explained that he had not sent them because, meanwhile, he had been informed of the creation of a new Federation of producers' associations, called Fédération Internationale des Producteurs de Film Indépendants (FIPFI). This new Federation had approached him saying they were ready to discuss with FIAF a new "agreement" which would be much more favourable to film archives.

Mr Ledoux added that FIPFI still was a small organization but that it might be of the interest of FIAF to sign an agreement with them. It would perhaps re-enforce our position towards the public opinion (Unesco, etc...) showing that we have good relations at least with some producers. He asked the other members for their opinion on that matter.

Mr Borde agreed with him that it would be useful for FIAF to sign an agreement with FIPFI as it could not make our relations with FIAPF worse than they were presently, but on the contrary we should take advantage of the dissidence which more and more appeared amongst producers for the moment. He suggested we ask FIPFI to present us with their draft-agreement and submit it to the members.

Mr Pogacic thought that this new organization could not influence our relations with FIAPF. Those relations were still the most important for the archives and therefore we should try again to negotiate with their representatives. We should anyway start by sending the two "agreements" as decided in Moscow. He also said that if we negotiated with FIPFI, we should do it on Federation level and not let them deal with individual archives, as FIAPF had done.

This was agreed. Mr Ledoux also accepted to write to FIPFI on behalf of the Executive Committee to continue negotiations on a possible agreement with their Federation.

I.C.A.

It was decided to send to the members all the documents which the Secretariat had received from the International Council of Archives after the Moscow Congress. Mr Klaue said he would also send two other documents on ICA which could be joined in order that the members should have the most complete information on that international organization before the next Congress when our affiliation would be re-discussed.

I.F.T.C.

Mr Pogacic, Vice-President of IFTC, said he had nothing to report since there had been no meeting recently.

I.C.O.M.

Mr Pogacic promised he would write the article on FIAF which he had accepted to write for ICOM News, before the end of this year.

The F.I.A.F. Bulletin

Mr de Vaal had enquired about the possibilities to make the Bulletin in Holland in a cheaper way. The cost price of one copy per member which was until now \$ 10.- could be reduced to \$ 5.- If the typing could be done in Belgium, the price would come down to \$ 4.-

It was decided that the Secretariat would enquire about the prices in Belgium, taking into account that if we used the Din A4 format, there would be approximately 16 pages which should be reproduced in 100 copies. It was also agreed that Mr de Vaal should have a nice lay-out designed for the front page of the Bulletin.

9. NEXT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND GENERAL MEETING

Mrs Suomela had informed the Secretary-general that she was willing to invite the Executive Committee for its next meeting in February. The proposed date was the week-end of February 23. This was agreed unanimously.

About the next General Meeting, Mr Morris confirmed that the dates would be 20-26 May, with the Executive Committee meeting on the 18th and 19th May. He proposed to have 5 or 6 administrative sessions and 2 or 2 1/2 days for various symposia mainly on preservation matters. He also proposed to have 1/2 day for a 2nd symposium on methodology of film history. The Canadian Film Archives were ready to invite a certain number of experts on these matters.

Mr Morris finally suggested to organize, in the evenings, a retrospective of films of 1924 from all countries.

Everyone agreed that this program was very attractive but Mr Ledoux wondered whether one could fit all the administrative matters in 5 or 6 sessions. Mr Morris said that if necessary, there would be a possibility to work in the evening.

FOURTH SESSIONMembership questions : The National Film Archive

The Secretary-general reminded the members of the circular letter which he had sent them all after his visit to London to attend Ernest Lindgren's funerals, informing them of the plan of the BFI's board of governors which could lead to an alienation of an important part of the National Film Archive's independence. One of the main points of this plan was that the posts of director of the BFI and curator of the archive would be combined.

Twice, Mr Ledoux had explained to Mr Keith Lucas, director of the BFI, that this move was not acceptable for FIAF as it was in total contradiction with the Zagreb Resolution.

Mr Lucas had now written him a letter expressing again the intentions of the BFI, and which the Secretary-general read out.

It was underlined that, in this letter, Mr Lucas always referred to the "integrity of the NFA" but never to its independence, and the independence of an archive was one of the main topics of the Zagreb Resolution and the reason why it was adopted by the General Meeting. In fact, when Mr Toeplitz and Mr Lindgren had drafted this text, they foresaw exactly the situation which had now arisen.

Of course, FIAF could not interfere in an archive's domestic affairs but the policy taken by an archive could affect its membership in FIAF and this was clearly stated in the Zagreb Resolution's last paragraph : "FIAF is strongly opposed in principle to the absorption by another body of any film archive member which was independent when it first became a member. In the event of such member losing its independent status, its membership of FIAF will lapse automatically and it can be obliged to return all films received from all other FIAF members on limited or indefinite loan. A new application for membership will then be necessary".

Mr Ledoux thought that this should be stated by the Executive Committee to Mr Lucas, Mr Pogacic, Mr Borde, Mr Klaue, Mr de Vaal, all supported his opinion. Mr Morris added that the situation of the Canadian Film Archives was exactly that of the NFA and that the Zagreb Resolution strengthened his own position towards the Canadian Film Institute, so he strongly advocated its enforcement.

Mr Stenklev made a comparison with the Swedish Film Institute and the Cinemateket but, in their case, the Cinemateket was formally independant while in London even this formal independance would be lost if the new structures were adopted.

A vote was then taken on the confirmation of the Zagreb Resolution and specially of its last paragraph. It was unanimously confirmed, with the abstention of Mr Gough-Yates.

The Secretary-general was asked to write to Mr Lucas to inform him of the Executive Committee's position.

Documentation Commission (continued)

Each member had received a copy of the accounts of the Periodical Indexing projects for 1973 and of its budget for 1974. The latter read as follows :

<u>INCOME</u>		
Subscriptions		BF
1. 27 FIAF subscriptions at BF 12.000		324.000
2. 10 subscriptions at \$ 300.-		108.000
3. 8 subscriptions at \$ 325.-		93.600
4. 7 subscriptions to back sets		46.000
		571.600
Bowker editorial payment (400 p.at \$ 15=\$ 6.000)		216.000
Royalties (3.600 sales at \$ 2.56=\$ 9.200)		<u>330.000</u>
		1.117.600
<u>EXPENSES</u>		
Supplies		170.000
Postage		110.000
Editorial fee		280.000
Wages (1 1/2 persons)		300.000
Rent (\$ 50 per month)		52.800
Travel		38.000
Sundry expenses		<u>80.000</u>
		1.030.800
<u>BALANCE</u>		
Income		1.117.600
Expenses		1.030.800
		=====
Surplus		<u>86.800</u>

Commenting on this budget, point by point, the Treasurer and the Secretary-general said that the amounts indicated for the INCOME seemed too optimistic, specially as concerned outside subscriptions and royalties, therefore the total Income was reduced to 978.000 BF.

The expenses' evaluation was supposed to be correct and so, instead of having a surplus at the end of the year, the Treasurer reckoned that we would have a deficit for 73 and 74 together of about 100.000 BF but this was still very much a guess.

Mr Ledoux thought that FIAF could, if necessary, afford this loss and anyway we could still consider this sum as a loan from FIAF to the P.I.P.

The last problem to decide was to know whether

- a. The whole project should be executed in London or
- b. If the "printing" of the cards should remain in Brussels and a typist hired in London.

The first solution was considered as best if there could be some kind of supervision by a FIAF officer (in this case, the head of the NFA) and an office was rented in or near the National Film Archive. In the second alternative, a problem arose about the rent which Michael Moulds asked for using his house as an office. Most of the members did not agree with this request or anyway they did not agree with what appeared to be yet another unexpected expense for the project which had to be approved on the spot by the Executive Committee.

Mr Gough-Yates said that, if a rent had to be paid anyway, he saw no objection to finding an office near the NFA and having the whole project in London. He also said that we must prepare for a situation when the editor had to be replaced. The contract with Michael Moulds was until 31st March 1974. In principle, it would be renewed, but M. Moulds could also decide to leave by himself. He therefore suggested that FIAF should appoint a 1/2 time assistant-editor who could also serve as typist. Such a person was not impossible to find.

Everyone agreed that if Mr Gough-Yates said it was possible for the head of the NFA to exert some kind of supervision on the execution of the project in London, the best solution would be to move it there. But as the situation in London was still unclear and as the costs involved in the moving to London and the appointment of new personnel had not yet been evaluated correctly, it was decided to continue the project in the same way as before (half in London, half in Brussels) until next Executive Committee meeting in Mid-February and Mr Gough-Yates agreed to study in detail the financial aspects of the move to London.

To conclude, the President said one should nevertheless acknowledge the very fine work accomplished by the Documentation Commission, symbolised here by the Bowker Catalogue for the 1972 cards which all FIAF members would have in hands very soon.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS - MODIFICATION OF STATUTES AND RULES

Mr Stenklev, head of the newly created Commission for the revision of the FIAF statutes and rules, reminded the members of the facts which had led to the decision of revising the statutes. The main problem, he said, is that our present statutes are not enough clear on the definition of a FIAF Member. They were, in his opinion, too liberal in the acceptance of full members. There was also the problem of the multiplication of film archives in one same country. This question was so complex and so vast that he thought it would be useful for his Commission's work if the Executive Committee had, here in Lausanne, a general discussion on the principles which should preside over the proposed changes of statutes and rules.

Mr Ledoux agreed with Mr Stenklev. He saw two basic questions which should be discussed :

1. Definition of FIAF membership ;
2. The rules on Exclusive Rights.

1. Membership

He thought FIAF really needed only two categories of participants: members and correspondents. The archives which were presently accepted in the categories of provisional and associate members could very well be "correspondents" even if only temporarily.

But who should be a member ? The trend in the world, he said, is to create more and more organizations who are not film archives but mostly devoted to the showing of films. The fundamental difference between archives and them is that real archives give pre-eminence to preservation. Film preservation is very costly and therefore it is impossible in most countries to create a good film archive without governmental support. That is why the multiplication of archives in one same country should be avoided, and why FIAF should admit as full members only "national" archives.

A FIAF archive should also be interested in the art of cinema. He repeated that the Federation would lose its identity if it became an organization admitting all types of film archives.

Mr Ledoux also proposed that all membership be reconsidered after a certain time, at some fixed intervals.

2. Exclusive rights

More and more often, problems arose around this rule because it was not clear enough. Mr Ledoux cited several examples which

led him to say that this article 137 should be re-written, specially as concerned lending of films in foreign countries. Concerning the acquisition of films, he was strongly for the application of the exclusive rights but said that the article should perhaps be more explicit. (e.g. what is a collection of publications, documents, etc...?)

The president then asked for the other members' opinion on these questions.

Mr Stenklev wanted to make clear that it was not his intention that full members who were already in the Federation should be rejected out of it. He was only thinking of future applications when drafting the new rules.

Mr Morris was against the automatic review of the members' status every 5 years. He was more for making use of the Executive Committee's power to recommend the expulsion of a member, if necessary. The rules could be re-written in a sense which would make this procedure more widely usable.

Mr Borde said one should be very cautious when redefining the qualifications of FIAF members. He understood the trend which led to ask for FIAF only national members but he explained that, in some countries, that was impossible (e.g. the USA). He asked that one should preserve within FIAF the rights of filmarchives which, although not national or official, were nevertheless very lively and important organizations.

Mr Ledoux answered that, when talking of national archives, he did not imply that there should be only one national archive-member of FIAF, in each country. There could be more. The word "national" was perhaps not the right word to use. He meant important archives, in opposition to local or specialized archives.

Mr Klaue said that these principles had been discussed so many times in the Executive Committee that he did not see the necessity to do it again, but Mr Ledoux answered him that it was now time to take a decision and that the Commission wanted to make a last survey before drafting the new Statutes.

It being lunch-time, it was decided to postpone the discussion until the afternoon.

FIFTH SESSION

MODIFICATION OF STATUTES AND RULES (Continued)

The Secretary-general reported that during lunch-time, the Commission had arrived to some satisfactory conclusions as

concerned membership problems and it did not seem necessary to discuss that point any further.

The discussion was therefore resumed on the

2. Right of Exclusivity

Mr Ledoux read out article 137 :

"Each full or provisional member shall enjoy an exclusive right within its own national territory :

"a) to receive and to act as an intermediary for all films sent by other members to its country ;

"b) to acquire any film or any collection of publications, documents, or objects relevant to its work.

"Where several members exist within a given country, they shall share this exclusive rights.

"Any approaches however, which a member may make to the representatives in his own country of foreign producers in order to obtain copies of their films shall not constitute a violation of the exclusive right of any other member.

He underlined that several aspects of this rule were unclear and others were, in his opinion, too strong :

- "several members within a given country share the exclusive right". This should be precized.
- When loaning films to an organization (which is not the archive) in a foreign country, or asking for a loan to a producer abroad, was it always compulsory to use the national archive as intermediary ? Was it not putting a great burden on the local archive if many films were involved ? Or, on the contrary, a restriction sometimes too strong to the archives' dealings with foreign organizations such as TV companies, or festivals ...?

He cited several examples.

There should also be exceptions to the rule, for instance when the producer asked the archive to make a copy of his film and send it to some organization abroad. The archive could not refuse and say that he must refer to the local archive abroad.

The same went for Socialist countries and their official distribution agencies. The archives could not refuse to send the films, even if the local archive did not give its agreement. To this, Mr Klaue answered that it was not an infringement of the Exclusivity Rule since it was not the archive which sent the film abroad but the Embassy or the official distribution agency (Sovexport, Hungarofilm, etc...)

Mr Pogacic cited the case of a French official cultural organization in Belgrade which had offered some French films to his archive for permanent deposit. Could he accept them without referring to the Cinémathèque de Toulouse ? The answer was YES.

Mr Morris also cited the case of production companies providing film material for foreign companies. Did the archive which provided this material to the production company have to refer first to the local archive abroad ? One usually did not, but this was again a break-away from the Rule.

Mr Pogacic thought that in drafting the Rule on exclusive rights, one should consider the interests of the archive which loaned the film. He cited again the case of the National Film Archive vs. Cineteca Nazionale in its dealings with the Italian Television in 1970, case which had led Mr Lindgren to draft a proposal for modifying art. 137 (see E.C. meeting in London 71).

But Mr Ledoux answered that art. 137 was intended to benefit to the members on a basis of reciprocity. If one time archive A made profits on the back of archive B, the next time it might be the contrary, and anyway the rule was not intended to procure financial profits to the archives.

Mr Klaue underlined that, to interpret the exclusivity rule rightly, one should never forget that priority must be given to the interests of the copyright owner (art. 155). Therefore the demands of the producer should be given full precedence over all other considerations when he asked for a film in the archive to be sent to some organization abroad.

Mr Ledoux thought that this was a dangerous way of interpreting the rule. It meant that anybody wishing a film from an archive could go to the producer and ask him to give instructions to that archive to send the film to this person or organization. Sometimes it was an archive copy and such demand could be opposed, but sometimes it was a viewing copy and then the archive could not deny having it and had to hand it over.

Mr Ledoux also remarked that nothing had yet been said about the exclusive right of acquiring collections of publications, documents, etc... Could an archive participate in an auction sale of such material in a foreign country where a national archive existed ? Was the rule of exclusivity not too strong in this case ?

Mr Morris thought that, even though every one seemed to agree on the basic principles laid down in art. 137, it would be necessary to draft a more detailed document, in the line of the Zagreb Resolution perhaps, which would clarify this rule and spell out all the exceptions which might exist.

He said one could draft a resolution which would break down this statement in 4 or 5 areas where exclusive rights are involved :

- acquisition for preservation purposes ;
- loan of material for projections ;
- sale of material to TV or production companies ;
- going to another country to borrow films, etc...

But Mr Stenklev did not fully agree. He said we could then draft resolutions to explain many of the FIAF Rules in detail. He asked, to conclude, that all the present members should send him a written resume of their views on this very complex problem.

5. HELP TO ARCHIVES IN LATIN-AMERICA AND IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The President first reminded the members of the decisions taken in Moscow and which entrusted the Executive Committee to set up, within six months, a scheme or concrete project to help the Latin-American archives. The Executive Committee had therefore asked Mr Yelin and the Secretary-general to collect more detailed information about UCAL, its members, etc...

Mr Yelin reported that he had done so, together with Mr Pedro Chaskel, Secretary-general of UCAL, but meanwhile the "coup d'état" broke out in Chile and the situation in Latin-America had worsened very much, also in the field of cinema and film archives. The head of the Chilean Film Institute had been killed. The building of Chilefilm was occupied by governmental troupes. Pedro Chaskel's life was very much in danger and also of course the film collection of the Chilean archive.

As concerned other Latin-American archives, the archive in Venezuela was closed down. Also the Cinemateca del Tercer Mundo in Uruguay. Cinemateca Uruguay was barely existing. In Peru, a film institute had been created, and in Panama, the archive was slowly developing. In Brasil, Argentina and Columbia, the situation remained as before.

Coming back to Chile, Mr Yelin explained the situation in detail. Considering its seriousness, he asked FIAF to intervene by sending its Secretary-general, Mr Ledoux, to Santiago de Chile.

He thought Mr Ledoux' intervention on behalf of FIAF could help to protect the person of Pedro Chaskel and also to prevent the destruction of the film collection of the Chilean archive. This collection contained, amongst others, some unique Chilean films.

Having learnt also that the new Chilean government was trying, through its embassies, to get hold of the Chilean films abroad,

Mr Yelin suggested that FIAF should warn its members of this menace which existed on the Chilean films in their collections. He also offered to put a program of Chilean films at the disposal of the film archives which were willing to organize showings as a token of solidarity with Chile. Mr Pogacic said he was very interested in this program.

But about the Secretary-general's trip to Santiago, several members doubted whether this would be useful and whether Mr Ledoux would have any possibility of acting positively. Mr Ledoux himself doubted whether he could get a visa.

Mr Yelin answered that the situation of Mr Chaskel was so serious that anything should be tried to protect him. He said a letter of protest was, in the present situation, not sufficient and might even be harmful. He said that the opinion of FIAF as an international organization representing many countries would probably have some importance in the eyes of the present Chilean government. Practically he proposed that Mr Ledoux should go there and just ask to be informed about the fate of Pedro Chaskel and about the situation of the Chilean film collection of which he should have a list.

A vote was then taken to know whether the Secretary-general should go, as soon as possible, to Santiago de Chile, and results were as follows : YES 7
NO 4

Mr Ledoux said he would write to the Chilean ambassador in Belgium to ask for a visa, already informing the embassy of the reasons for his trip.

On this occasion, he underlined how precarious was the preservation of the national production of films in many Latin-American countries, and proposed that something should be done to remedy this situation. Mr Yelin agreed that the loss of the Chilean films should serve as a lesson.

Mr de Vaal and Mr Morris added that this idea was so important that it deserved a special study.

Mr Klaue who had distributed a document (annex 4) on the help to be given by FIAF to Latin-American, Asian and African archives and who had proposed to create a special committee for that purpose, said that this could be one of the tasks of this committee. The creation of this new committee was approved. It was called "3 Continental Committee" and Mr Klaue, Mr Morris, Mr Gough-Yates, Mr Privato and Mr Yelin accepted to be members. Mr Klaue was appointed as Chairman.

This ended the discussion on item 5 of the agenda.

To conclude, Mr Morris informed the Executive Committee of some experience which his archive had lately with the American Film Institute Archives and which suggests that this Institute does not have control over its films.

Mr Ledoux proposed that we should take this occasion to write to AFI's new curator and ask him how the situation stands now. On the other hand, it was difficult to question again their membership in FIAF since they had been accepted twice already.

There being no other business to discuss, the President declared the meeting closed.

Annexe 1

FINANCIAL REPORT 1/1 - 30/9 1973

TOTAL FUNDS OF FIAF
per September 30. 1973

Current account in Bruxelles	BF	578.811
Interest account in Zürich (UBS - SF 7.783.59, rate of exchange per 30.9.1973 SF 100 = 1.231)	BF	95.815
Reserve Fund (UBS - SF 80.000,- rate of exchange per 30.9. 1973)	BF	984.800
Cash at the secretariate	BF	5.004

BF 1.664.430

=====

Subscriptions to be received:

for 1971	SF	750	BF	9.232
1972	SF	3.310	BF	40.746
1973	SF	11.291.95	BF	139.004
	SF	15.351.95	BF	188.982

Budget 1973 Expenses
1/1-30/9

CURRENT EXPENSES:

A. Cost of staff

Staff salaries

BF BF
140.000 80.060

Social security expenses

15.000 6.701

Auditors expenditures

5.500 2.565

External work fees

34.000 33.029

194.500 122.355

.....

B. Secretariate Costs

Office rent and charges

115.000 83.107

Transport of material

3.000 3.112

Representation, local travelling

7.000 2.053

Office supplies, printing, publication

60.000 39.004

Telephone, telex, telegrammes

39.000 23.859

Mail

56.500 27.701

Bank charges

2.000 128

Miscellaneous

1.500 8.083

284.000 187.047

.....

SPECIAL OPERATIONS:

Congress

60.000 31.850

Congress Minutes

38.500 11.526

Executive Committee

55.000 1.185

Executive Committee Minutes

11.000 2.002

Commissions:

Copyright commissions

4.535

Cataloging "

0

Documentation "

80.000 40.560

Preservation "

27.395

Special missions

22.500 18.841

Book of Archive Reports

16.500 6.784

Organigrammes

5.500 7.446

Special publications

55.000 15.860

F.I.A.F. Bulletin

30.000 38.892

Office equipment

40.000 78.038

Reserve Fund

18.110 0

432.110 284.914

.....

TOTAL

910.610 594.316

.....

Main Account
Societe Generale de Banque, Brussels
1/1 - 30/9 1973

RECEIPTS:

	BF	
Subscriptions (1970-1971-1972-1973)	893.604	
Receipts of sale of FIAF publications	1.345	
Balance forward of current account 1/1-1973	523.898	
Bank interests 1/1-31/12 1972	1.372	
Balance forward of cash at the Secretariate 1/1-73	3.302	
Reimbursement of personal telephone calls	907	
Unesco: First payment as per contract-P.Morris	15.000	
Periodical Indexing Project: Subscriptions, advance Bowker, trans.Copen- hagen up to May 28. 1973.	296.589	
	1.736.017	: : : : : : : : : :

EXPENSES:

Current expenses	309.402	
Special operations	284.914	
Unesco: Transf.of first payment ^{1/2} - P. Morris	15.059	
Reimbursement subscriptions: Münchner Stadts Museum and Anthology Film Archive	5.636	
Guarantee for bank loan - 24 months	40.000	
Guarantee for bank loan - 12 months	40.000	
Expenses Periodical Indexing Project up to May 28. 1973	260.381	
Loan to Periodical Indexing Project	79.636	
Transfers from FIAF account to new Periodical Indexing Project account	117.174	
Cash at the Secretariate	5.004	
	1.157.206	
Current account per September 30. 1973	578.811	

1.736.017
: : : : : : : : : :

PERIODICAL INDEXING PROJECT

Receipts:

Opening of new account-transfer from FIAF account -----	BF 42.282
Transfer from FIAF account- Doc. Comm.	" 40.560
Transfer from Copenhagen account -----	" 51.259
Subsc. Metropol. Library Toronto -----	" 12.413
Subscr. Filmothèque de Espana-----	" 11.220
Subscr. Türk Film Arsivi -----	" 9.316
Subscr. Swiss Film Archive -----	" 16.816

	BF 183.866

Expenses:

Editorial fee -----	BF 77.670
Salary and taxes office clerk in Bruxelles	" 72.676
Office supplies -----	" 4.369
Mail -----	" 18.500
Travel -----	" 3.494
Advertisement Monthly Film Bulletin -----	" 3.651
Sundry expences -----	" 500

	BF 180.860
Current account in Bruxelles -----	" 3.006

	BF 183.866

Annex 3



Annex 3

108 Berlin
Hausvogteiplatz 3-4

Comité DIA
Lausanne, le 20.01.1974

Informal use for public sale of
Embryo of ...

institution listed for distribution	informal use only	public sale
Modernaans Filmarchief		+
Staatliches Filmarchiv der DDR		+
Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek		+
Cinéma-théâtre Royal de Belgique		+
Arhiva Nacionala de Filme		
Bibliotheque Nationale		
Arhiv Filmovega Zavoda		
National Library of Australia		+
Archiv Cinematografico		+
Danske Filmarsiv		+
National Film Archive	+	
Gosfilmofond	+	
Department of Film, Museum of Modern Art		+
Norsk Filminstitutt		+
Canadian Film Archives		+
Czechoslovak Archive		+
Cinecena Nazionale		+
Svenska Filminstitutet		+
Filmoteka Polska	+	
Österreichisches Filmmuseum	+	
Deutsches Institut für Filmbau	+	

No replies on the inquiry from :

CINEMTECA DE CUBA
CINE ARTE DEL SODRE
BULGARSKA FILMOTEKA
OESTERREICHISCHES FILMARCHIV

Result : Because it is not unanimously accepted, public sale is impossible.

Klaue



108 Berlin
Hausvogteiplatz 3-4

Annex 4

Comité Directeur
Lausanne, October 1973

The problems of supporting or establishing film archives in Asian, African and Latin-American countries have occupied more attention with the passing years at the congresses of this organisation. There have been quite a number of suitable ideas and suggestions in this regard. In order to achieve some practical results within a definite period, I recommend

- the formation of a current working group consisting of 3 to 5 persons who will study all feasible suggestions and possibilities for promoting archives in Asian, African and Latin-American countries;
- that the working group be commissioned to prepare a first draft of concrete measures, divided into short-term, medium-term and long-term projects;
- that this working group continue working on the compilation and realisation of the proposed programme until the 1974 Congress, if this is thought necessary, or else their suggestions be taken up and work continued by the Comité Directeur.

K l a u s e

Fernruf:
Telegrammadresse: Filmarchiv Berlin
Bankkonto: BSK 6651-26-130012