

F.I.A.F.

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE

DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

CSLO, 13 - 15 November 1979

CONFIDENTIAL

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OSLO, 13-15 NOVEMBER 1979

Present: Members : W. Klaue, President
E. Bowser, Vice-President
D. Francis, Vice-President
R. Daudelin, Secretary-General
J. de Vaal, Treasurer
R. Borde, Deputy Secretary-General
J. Stenklev, Deputy Treasurer
T. Andreykov
Honorary Member : E. Lauritzen
Executive Secretary : B. van der Elst
Interpreter : J. Johnson

Mr Levy of the Ceskoslovensky Filmovy Archiv attended the second day of the meeting to discuss arrangements for the Karlovy Vary Congress.

Apologies for absence had been received from Messrs Pogacic, Kuiper, Buache, Alves-Netto and Comencini. The meeting had had no news from Mr Tikhonov, the first reserve member.

Mr Klaue opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and by thanking Mr Stenklev and his archive for staging the meeting.

1. Adoption of the agenda

A draft agenda had been sent to members in advance. Mr Daudelin suggested that discussion of the Karlovy Vary symposium be brought forward to point (5) to allow more time for consultations with Mr Levy. It was also agreed that more candidatures and more projects would be discussed than those mentioned under points (3) and (11) respectively. A report on the Legal and Copyright Commission was added under point (8). The agenda was then adopted in the following amended form:

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Approval of the minutes of the preceding meetings in Lausanne

3. Membership questions:
 - Reconfirmation of observers: Lima, Montevideo C.U., Sydney
 - Reconfirmation of 8 members: Helsinki, Habana, Jerusalem, Montreal, Poona, Toulouse, Tirana, Washington L.C.
 - New candidatures: Imperial War - London
Bundesarchiv, Koblenz
 - Miscellaneous: Jakarta, Japan, Venice, etc...
4. Report by Mr Francis on his trip to Latin America
5. Organisation of the Karlovy Vary and Rapallo Congresses
6. Modification of Statutes and Rules: status of observers
7. Report of the Treasurer on the period January-October 1979
8. Reports of the specialised Commissions:
 - Preservation
 - Cataloguing
 - Documentation
 - Archives in developing countries
 - Legal and Copyright
9. Relations with UNESCO:
 - Preparation of the recommendation for the safeguarding of moving images
 - Feasibility study on the creation of an international documentation and training centre for moving images (contract with UNESCO)
10. Relations with other international organisations (FIAT, etc...)
11. Projects and publications underway:
 - Summer School
 - Embryo
 - Handbook for film archives
 - FIAF brochure
 - T. Andreykov's project on the circulation of small cinematographies
 - Publication of the Brighton and Lausanne papers
 - Annual bibliography of FIAF members' publications
12. Miscellaneous

2. Adoption of the minutes of the meetings of the Executive Committee in Lausanne

Second meeting: 4 June 1979

The minutes should contain a list of the members present, including Mr Lauritzen.

Paragraph 2 on page 1 should stress that several suggestions were put forward before Mr Stenklev's solution was accepted.

The minutes of the two Lausanne E.C. meetings were then approved.

3. Membership questions

Mr Daudelin reminded the meeting that a 2/3 majority was needed for reconfirmation.

3a Observers

Cinematoca Universitaria del Peru: Lima

The Executive Committee had been unhappy in Lausanne about Lima's report, especially in respect of its preservation activities. No reply had been received to the Secretariat's request for further details. It was decided to write to Lima once more, by registered delivery, asking them to submit the information in time for the New York meeting at the latest. A copy of the letter would be sent to Mr Alves-Netto.

Cinematoca Uruguay: Montevideo

Mr Daudelin reminded the meeting of the discussion in Lausanne about Montevideo. FIAF had in fact received a reply from Mr Martinez-Carrill, which went some way to clarifying the points raised with Mr Ferrari. At the same time, however, the case of Montevideo raised other questions, for the Cinematoca Uruguay was buying the rights to films on the same basis as commercial distributors. Mr Daudelin recalled the precedent of the Oesterreichisches Film-museum, which FIAF had obliged to create a special separate division to deal with such activities. The question was whether FIAF wished to remain a "pure" organisation, or whether it was ready to accept within its ranks several kinds of archives varying according to the conditions obtaining on the different continents.

It was suggested that members be reminded of the need to draft their reports according to a certain pattern, and that some archives be discouraged from laying undue emphasis on the development of certain aspects of their activities.

The meeting agreed to a request from Mr Francis to postpone a decision on the C.U.'s reconfirmation until after point (4) of the agenda.

Association for a National Film And Television Archive: Sydney

The report from Sydney had finally arrived. The meeting voted unanimously to reconfirm Sydney's observer status whilst reminding it that it was late with its subscription.

Filmkhanah Melli Iran: Tehran

There had been no contacts with Tehran, all the mail being returned to the Secretariat. It was decided to put the question of this archive on ice in view of the circumstances.

3b Reconfirmation of membersSuomen Elokuva-Arkisto: Helsinki

Mr Daudelin informed the meeting that Mr Olli Alho had been appointed as the new director of the Helsinki archive, with Mr Huhtala becoming head of the research and information department.

The letter from the SEA, although perhaps laconic, met FIAF requirements. It nevertheless raised the more important question of autonomy. The meeting discussed the system at the SEA whereby staff members are appointed not by the director but by the administrative council. It was felt that this arrangement was symptomatic of present trends: the state was playing an increasingly important role in the affairs of semi-private film archives, a development which could have a bad influence on the work and the whole spirit of the archives concerned.

All in all, however, the change at the SEA was for the better, especially as far as its finances were concerned.

Mr Klaué noted that Helsinki's budget submission was not quite in order, with details about its income missing. It was decided to ask for further information both about this and about the SEA's relations with film organisations in Finland.

Mr Francis and Mr Stenklev felt that it was perhaps a little premature to reconfirm the SEA after such sweeping changes in its organisation. This being the case, the meeting agreed to draft a letter in careful terms to the SEA informing it of the Executive's reasons for delaying reconfirmation.

Cinemateca de Cuba: Habana

Habana's dossier was very brief. No budget had been submitted, and the meeting also noted that the archive's new statutes were supposedly not ready, even though they had been brought in in 1976. It was agreed to postpone reconfirmation until the Spring in order to obtain the supplementary information required, including clarification of how Habana's screening programmes stood in relation to Cuban copyright laws.

Archion Israéli Leserativ: Jerusalem

The Executive Committee noted that Jerusalem was a very autonomous archive with real independence even on the economic level. The meeting was worried, however, that the archive might be attaching too much importance to projection to the detriment of preservation. It was seen, for instance, that the AIL had spent \$24,000 on film rentals alone, whereas many FIAF archives have a principle never to pay for the films they show.

Mr Stenklev thought in fact that Jerusalem's activities made it better suited to observer status. Mr Francis, who had visited the AIL, confirmed that their

preservation work was limited in scope, and Ms Bowser pointed out that according to the archive's organigramme nobody was actually active in that field. Mr Klaué said that he had received an assurance from Ms van Leer at Lausanne that Jerusalem would be concentrating more on preservation work in future, but it was agreed that more details must be sought before reconfirmation. The E.C. also wanted to know with which body the AIL's statutes were registered and what its relations were to film organisations in Israel.

The Executive judged the reference to "public screenings" under point 5c) of the AIL's statutes to be very dangerous. It was felt that FIAF should constantly educate its members about the pitfalls and general implications of such policy.

There was some peripheral discussion about the activities of the AIL in obtaining films on Jewish matters directly from producers in America and Britain. Ms Bowser said that Jerusalem had always obtained her permission first, and it was further pointed out that the rule of exclusivity operated by FIAF was perfectly clear on this matter.

In conclusion, it was decided to postpone reconfirmation pending receipt of the additional information required.

National Film Archive of India: Poona

After discussion, it was similarly decided to delay examination of Poona's reconfirmation until the following information had been received:

- a more detailed financial report, including particularly the proportion of the budget devoted to preservation;
- clarification of the NFAI's relations with the Film Institute of India;
- an indication of the NFAI's degree of autonomy.

Tirana Film Archive

It was decided to grant Tirana's request for its reconfirmation to be postponed while its statutes were being revised, but they should be informed that it must be discussed at New York.

Very little was known about the Tirana archive (they never answer letters), and the Executive agreed that a letter should be sent urging them to attend the Karlovy Vary Congress so that more could be learned about the archive.

Dinémathèque Québécoise: Montréal

Mr Borde gave details about the CQ, saying that it was a small archive, employing only 10 people and constituted as a private corporation, but that it had achieved a good balance between preservation and projection. He saw no reason for not reconfirming the CQ as a member.

After various questions on the archive's budget and organigramme had been

answered with Mr Daudelin leaving the meeting, he returned to explain that the persons shown under the heading "acquisition" in the organigramme were there to establish formal contacts with depositors. he stressed that Montréal's main aim was preservation and that as for the public screenings, which did not involve too much expenditure, the QC specialised in Canadian cinema and animation.

In a formal vote, the Executive Committee agreed unanimously to reconfirm the membership of the Cinémathèque Québécoise.

Cinémathèque de Toulouse

Having examined the dossier submitted by Mr Borde for the reconfirmation of the Cinémathèque de Toulouse, the Executive, which was well familiar with the CT's position and spirit of independence, heard that budgetary restrictions were holding back the archive's expansion. Mr Borde then explained that, in the context of the CT's statutes, "active members" were those people who lent effective help to the archive in one way or another. They were presently 17 in number, including the President, whose position was more or less honorific. He also informed the meeting that the CT had just acquired the services from the CNC of a permanent technician who would now be working at Toulouse.

There being no other questions, the Executive Committee unanimously voted to reconfirm the membership of the Cinémathèque de Toulouse.

Library of Congress: Washington

The Motion Picture Division had submitted a complex dossier, but had omitted to send an internal organigramme (with the numbers of staff employed in each department) and a copy of the "Library of Congress's procedures and rules for recommending officers". There was also some discussion about the MPD's autonomy in the wake of reorganisation: was not "film" being lost among other media in the same division? Was there not a danger that one day the person responsible for relations with FIAF would no longer be the chief film officer?

Ms Bowser thought that the MPD had benefitted from reorganisation because they now had direct access to the Librarian of Congress. She was more concerned with the preservation activities of the MPD, but for the time being she had no concrete reason to be actually alarmed.

Mr Stanklev and Mr Francis both thought that more information was required, especially about the budget and about the person responsible for relations with FIAF. In the light of these considerations, it was decided to postpone the Motion Picture Division's reconfirmation until the information was at hand.

3c New candidatures

(i) for membership

Imperial War Museum: London

In discussing the candidature of the Imperial War Museum, the question was raised whether it could be guaranteed that the keeper of the film department would always be the person responsible for relations with FIAF and its members.

Mr Francis was unable to cast much light on the issue except to say that Mr Coultass ranked second in the IWM to the overall director. He added that, although there was a potential conflict of interests between the NFA and the IWM, this had never happened and the two institutions enjoyed very good relations on the basis of a gentlemen's agreement. He noted that the IWM's preservation work was excellent and supported their candidature.

Mr Bowser asked why, by analogy with the Museum of Modern Art, the Department of Film should not be the member instead of the IWM as a whole. Mr Coultass had offered the explanation that the IWM's administration and cataloguing system required that the IWM be the member (although its letterheads indicated that there was a distinct department of film), but this reason was unsatisfactory. Mr de Vaal noted that the document of collaboration with the NFA, required under article 11) of FIAF Rules, was missing, and that the budgetary details were incomplete.

It was decided to postpone consideration of the application until the matters raised had been resolved and the missing information supplied. It was agreed that the list of members' addresses should not be published until the status of the Imperial War Museum had been clarified.

(ii) for observer statusBundesarchiv: Koblenz

This candidature had already been discussed in Lausanne. The basic question was that it was the "Bundesarchiv" which had asked to join, and not the film department. Although in Ottawa, for example, it was the National Film Archive which was the member and not the Public Archives as a whole, the specific point about the Bundesarchiv was that it was they who had decided to create the federation of archives in West Germany.

Mr Stanklev argued that Koblenz fulfilled the conditions to become an observer. Mr de Vaal disagreed, saying that it was not the film department which was applying and, as such, questions of autonomy were raised. It was pointed out, however, that the autonomy rule (Article 3) related solely to members. Mr Francis agreed with the interpretation that Koblenz qualified for observer status, but suggested that they should be informed of the autonomy conditions that they would have to fulfil if they were later to apply to become full members. He also proposed that Wiesbaden and West Berlin be informed of any Executive Committee decision.

Mr Klaue raised the problem posed by the terms of the contract regulating

the Kinemathekverbund: what would happen in future if FIAF members wanted to exchange German films with Wiesbaden and West Berlin, because the contract specified that preservation was to be a responsibility of the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz, with West Berlin and Wiesbaden merely receiving a copy of the film? Who would control the German films already deposited on a loan or exchange basis by FIAF members?

A vote was then taken on whether to admit the Bundesarchiv as an observer. The result was:

7 for
1 against

The Bundesarchiv Koblenz was therefore admitted as an observer.

Another vote was then taken on whether to write to Wiesbaden and West Berlin to ask for their comments on article 6) of the Kinemathekverbund contract:

7 in favour of writing
0 against
1 abstention

It was therefore decided to ask the Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde and the Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek for their comments.

La Cinémathèque de Grèce: Athens

Mrs Mitropoulos had submitted the extra information requested of her at Lausanne. It showed that, although her archive's list of Greek films was good, the preservation facilities left a great deal to be desired.

Mr Bords referred to the films in the archive's collection, which clearly showed that it was basically a federation of film clubs. He said that he would be in favour of Athens becoming an observer, but would not support an eventual application for membership. Mr Francis pointed out, however, that such an application must be reckoned with. He thought that she should be reminded of some of the problems connected with her archive, and that a suggestion be made to her to separate the film clubs from the other activities of the archive. He stressed that FIAF would be in a better position to educate and influence the Athens archive if it were actually inside FIAF. Furthermore, they had a good collection of 35 mm Greek films which simply had to be preserved.

A vote was taken on whether to accept Athens as an observer. The result:

7 for
1 against

Athens was therefore admitted as an observer. It was agreed to pass on to Mrs Mitropoulos the Executive Committee's comments on the suitability of her archive for full membership at a future date.

Mr Andreykov raised the matter of a series of Soviet films which the Sofia archive had loaned to Athens and which he did not think had ever been returned. Mr Andreykov would check on this point. Mr Francis said that with Athens an

observer, FIAF would have greater powers of intervention in its affairs and could complain officially to it on behalf of the BNF in Sofia.

It was agreed to postpone consideration of the Fundacion Cinemateca Argentina's application to become a Member until after point 4) of the agenda.

3d) Miscellaneous

Jakarta

It was agreed to send an official letter to the Jakarta archive to assist them in their representations to the Indonesian authorities.

Tokyo

The information from Tokyo about the establishment of the Nippon Audio-Visual Library was felt to be most interesting. It gave the impression of being a very serious organisation. It was decided to wait until more was heard from them about a possible request for observer status.

Various

Enquiries had been received from the United Nations in New York, the Biennale in Venice, Mozambique (I.W.C.), the State Film Archives of Western Australia and the Basque Film Archive. The Astoria Foundation in the USA was not in a hurry to apply for observer status, thus allowing time for their position to be clarified in relation to FIAF Rules.

New directors

The meeting heard that in addition to Mr Alho taking over at the Suomen Elokuva-Arkisto in Helsinki, Mr Strotchkov and Mr Galnares had been appointed directors of the Gosfilmofond in Moscow and the Cineteca Nacional in Mexico respectively. There had also been a change at the top of the Filmovy Ustav in Prague.

12. Miscellaneous : Next meetings of the Executive Committee

It was decided that the next meeting of the Executive Committee would be held in New York from 16-18 April 1980. The AFI was planning a meeting of those interested in cold vaults, and this would take place after the E.C. meeting.

The Osterreichisches Filmerchiv in Vienna had extended an invitation to the Executive Committee to hold its October 1980 meeting in Vienna at the expense of the OFA to mark its 25th anniversary. The exact dates still needed to be discussed, and Mr Klaue would take the matter up in his reply to the OFA.

The Cinémathèque Québécoise proposed Montréal as the venue for the Spring 1981 meeting of the Executive Committee.

Wednesday, 14 November
(Mr Levy present)

4. Report by Mr Francis on his trip to Latin America

The meeting next heard a very thorough report from Mr Francis about his trip to South America; he had been nominated by the Executive Committee to take up an invitation from the Cinemateca Argentina to participate in the celebrations marking their 25th anniversary, and profited from the occasion to visit other film archives in Brazil and Uruguay.

Mr Francis was in general very enthusiastic about his visit, repeatedly stressing that the particular problems of South American archives can only be understood properly by visiting them in person.

He had been very impressed by the achievements of the archives in the countries visited, despite the tremendous difficulties they encounter in their work. He was full of praise for the dedication and enthusiasm of their staff. He then went on to describe the archives he had visited.

Fundacion Cinemateca Argentina: Buenos Aires

Mr Francis reported that the Fundacion Cinemateca Argentina was totally independent from the government; its films are purchased from distributors. Although the FCA was organised along different lines from European archives, it was doing good work in collecting Argentinian films and supporting documentation. It was felt that FIAF should try to recommend a simple printing machine for the FCA to improve its facilities, but all in all Mr Francis supported their application for membership.

In reply to a question from Mr Klaue, Mr Francis explained that the FCA's relations with the Argentinian Film Institute were normal, but that on account of the censorship board they had difficulties in obtaining foreign films from other archives. They were also hampered in their activities by a lack of funds.

As far as the technicalities of the FCA's application were concerned, Mr Klaue noted that one or two documents were missing but that they were not vital. It was agreed to come back to the question of their membership after Mr Francis's report.

Cinemateca Uruguay: Montivideo

Mr Francis went on to give a detailed description of the Cinemateca Uruguay, drawing particular attention to the fact that it was a private organisation which operated more or less like a cinéma d'art et d'essai, buying the rights to films from distributors. As far as preservation work was concerned, there was no satisfactory laboratory in Uruguay, which meant that nitrate did not survive there. It was also very difficult to get hold of film stocks, the cost of which was very high.

Mr Francis likened the CU to a small version of the British Film Institute. He stressed that the archive was very important in Uruguay as the only source at all of cultural activity. Its understanding with the Cine Arte del Sodre was excellent, and the two archives cooperated effectively.

Cine Arte del Sodre: Montevideo

The Sodre had a very interesting collection, which had unfortunately been reduced in size following two fires. Good results had been achieved in the field of preservation, the vaults were air-conditioned, and in general, from what Mr Francis was able to learn, their prospects were improving.

Fundacao Cinematoca Brasileira: Sao Paulo

The FCB, which was a private organisation with some governmental support, was doing excellent preservation work. Mr Francis thought that their laboratory should serve as a model to other small archives. With the limited financial resources at its disposal, Mr Francis believed that they were doing a marvellous job.

Cinematoca do Museu do Arte Moderna: Rio de Janeiro

The Executive heard that since the fire the CMAM had seen their income reduced considerably and had been forced to lay off a lot of staff, but they hoped to be able to reopen their cinema in January. The relations of the Rio Cinematoca with Sao Paulo were excellent.

In reply to a question from Mr Stanklev about the problem of censorship in Brazil, Mr Francis said that the situation was rather free for the time being.

Membership questions

Returning to the application of the Fundacion Cinematoca Argentina for full membership, Mr Daudelin recommended that the application be accepted on condition that the missing documents were sent. This was unanimously agreed to.

On the recommendation of Mr Daudelin, the E.C. voted unanimously to reconfirm the Cinematoca Uruguaya as an observer.

It was agreed to write to the federation's observers to remind them how they may use the title FIAF on their letterheads.

5. Organisation of the Karlovy Vary and Rapallo Congresses

Mr Levy had brought three documents with him relating to the Karlovy Vary Congress:

- 1) a letter to FIAF members concerning the symposium;

- 2) information on the state of the preparations for the Congress. Everything was progressing well, Mr Levy reported, with support being lent by the Czech ministries concerned and the Czech cinematography;
- 3) a letter to the 5 experts invited to compile the animation programmes.

It was clarified that FIAF would of course be paying the travel and accommodation expenses of the experts from its own funds.

It was agreed that the Executive would begin by discussing Mr Levy's "Information Sheet No. 2" in systematic detail.

Symposium Part I/1st day

The following had expressed interest in preparing the topic of selection criteria employed by various archives: Messrs Borde, Buache and Francis. Mr Daudelin thought that if a basic documentation kit could be prepared in advance, the day could be profitably given over to the projection of film clips and the discussion of archival selection criteria.

Ms Bowser suggested that the circular letter to members should ask for a statement of their respective selection principles. As far as her proposed participation in the symposium panel was concerned, she thought that in fact Mr Larry Kerr would be better able to present US archival selection policy.

Mr Francis said that the best person to outline Britain's policy was Mr Clyde Jeavons, the chairman of his archive's selection committee, and they would like to concentrate on demonstrating the effects of what was now 30 years of selection. This, however, would require the projection of at least one hour of film.

Mr Borde said that he hoped to prepare a contribution together with Mr Buache on the subject of the preservation of popular films as a potentially rich documentary source for future sociological study. This would also be illustrated by old popular film clips. Mr Borde also wanted to deal in the symposium with the question of whether dubbed copies ought to be destroyed or not, and with the selection of publicity material published by the distributors.

Mr Andreykov thought that the idea of showing film clips was a good one, and he suggested that members be invited to submit extracts both of films that they would preserve and of those that they would not. These could then be projected and serve as a basis for discussion.

Mr Stanklev mentioned another interesting aspect that could be discussed: why do some archives ignore the collection of documentary material and concentrate exclusively on the preservation of fictional films?

Mr Klaue said that a GDR specialist, Dr Schultz, should be added to the list

of names. He also suggested that FIAT be invited to the symposium to make a statement on "selection and television". IAHHIST, or alternatively a historian, could also be invited to explain what the historical approach to selection is. Mr Klaus raised the possibility of using time in the evening(s) to show film clips and supported the idea of preparing as much material in advance in order to save time on the day.

Mr Francis suggested that an existing article by Mr Nicholas Pronay, a member of IAHHIST with very strong ideas on selection, could be circulated in advance, as could the minutes of the discussion on selection held at FIAT's Santander seminar. Mr Daudelin asked Mr Francis to go ahead with this idea by contacting FIAT and ensuring the presence of one of their representatives at Karlovy Vary.

It was agreed that an appendix be added to the members' circular letter inviting them to nominate speakers for the symposium; to send any papers and published articles to Brussels by the end of March; and to submit details of film clips that they would like to show, similarly by the end of March. This information would then be sent to Mr Levy in Prague in time for him to prepare a documentation kit for the symposium. The detailed schedule for the day could then be finalised in New York.

Mr Francis raised the point that IAHHIST had no funds of their own to send a delegate to Karlovy Vary. Mr Andreykov proposed as an alternative solution that, as the 2nd general assembly of historians working on the general history of the cinema project would be finishing immediately prior to the Congress, two or three of them could be invited to the symposium.

On the initiative of Mr Borde, it was decided to draft a simple questionnaire on selection principles to be sent to members and observers in order to have a statistical overview of the issue in advance of the actual symposium.

Mr Klaus said that any decision about paying IAHHIST's expenses would depend on how much was left in the budget for the Congress. In the meantime, it was agreed that the Secretariat should extend an invitation to them.

Symposium Part II

Mr Daudelin thought that Mr Levy's information sheet for this part of the symposium was not clear enough either for the members or for the experts. More detailed terms of reference were called for. Mr Andreykov agreed with Mr Daudelin. The theme of the symposium needed to be defined precisely.

Mr Daudelin suggested that each archive could submit an hour-long selection of the most interesting animated films from its national production and that the task of the experts concerned would be to compile a small number of programmes of the best material, perhaps broken down according to decades.

Mr Andreykov was in favour of limiting the symposium to the beginnings of animated-film production in each country. He felt this was in itself a sufficiently wide-ranging topic; if it were any wider, the symposium would become a mere film festival.

Mr Stenklev supported this argument and stressed the need for a specific time period to be defined. Mr Klaue agreed but pointed out that, although the original intention had been to focus on silent films, this would exclude some countries whose animated-film production did not start until later.

Mr Francis suggested spreading the subject out over two or more Congresses.

Ms Bowser proposed that the period after World War II be chosen, say 1945-1959. Mr Stenklev backed this idea.

Mr Levy, as the organiser of the symposium, finally opted for Ms Bowser's suggestion. The title of "Post-war animation (1945-1959)" was chosen for the symposium.

Turning to the instructions to the members, Mr Daudelin proposed that under point 2) of Mr Levy's circular each country should be restricted to a programme of one hour. Under point 4), each archive should prepare some sort of programme notes to accompany its selection, and they would be sent via the Brussels Secretariat to Prague. On a practical point, Mr Daudelin said that the circular should be sent both to members and to observers.

Mr Francis noted that there was a problem of print availability (in Britain at least) for films in the 1945-1959 period. A solution would be to show extracts. He suggested a letter be sent to other members to ask them whether they possessed copies of the films it was proposed to screen.

Mr Stenklev was afraid that the selection committee would tend to eliminate the production of small countries.

It was recognised that the task of the experts needed to be redefined in the light of the decisions taken.

There was a proposal to ask the members to send their comments on the films that they submit.

Mr Klaue reiterated his opinion that a selection committee was necessary if each country were to submit an hour-long programme. The alternative was to screen in full a shorter selection from each country, but as this was no guarantee of a good programme Mr Klaue preferred the original idea of a selection committee.

Mr. de Vaal returned to Mr. Francis's points about the difficulty of obtaining prints and releasing them for such a long period before the symposium for selection purposes .

Mr. Klaue said that members should send their lists of titles to the secretariat by January 15, indicating which ones they either do not possess or are unable to send in advance. The Secretariat would then try to track down the copies required.

It was pointed out that no nitrate copies should be sent. There would be projection facilities in Karlovy Vary for 16 mm., 35 mm. and cinemascope films.

Having agreed to retain the idea of a selection committee, the meeting went on to discuss the experts' terms of reference.

Mr. Klaue felt that the selection committee should be asked to keep a certain geographic balance among the members submitting programmes of films.

Mr. Stanklev agreed, adding that the experts should not necessarily look for the best quality film, but ought to concentrate on pointing out innovations and national features.

Mr. Francis thought that members should be urged to submit less well-known films. He then returned to the difficulties of preparing extracts. Mr. Daudelin said that the archives themselves should see to this.

On the subject of the exhibition of animated film material, it was decided that it should cover the same time period as the symposium itself.

Organisation of the General Meeting and of the Symposium

All relevant information had been given at Lausanne.

Mr. Levy said that the Czechoslovak authorities needed to have the names of those attending the General Meeting six weeks in advance. Mention should be made of this in the letter to members about the Congress.

The budgetary provisions for the General Meeting were such as to allow one expert to be invited to the first symposium.

The Executive went on to draw up a draft agenda for the General Meeting. It was decided notably that there would be five sessions, including two Open Forums held on different days. Members should be invited to submit suggested topics in writing.

The E.C. stressed the need for the reports of the commissions to be presented in a more lively manner.

it was decided to invite Mr. Levy to the next meeting of the Executive Committee in New-York.

FIAF Congress in Rapallo - 1981

Mr. Daudelin read out a letter from Mr. Cincotti in which he made various suggestions about the arrangements for the Congress. His main proposal was that the General Meeting be held in a municipal theatre. Having examined the brochure of the theatre, the Executive Committee concluded that, although the premises were admirable in most respects, they were not suitable for the General Meeting. The Executive Committee instead opted for Mr. Cincotti's alternative proposal, namely that the meeting should be held in the Hotel Bristol. The Executive Committee agreed that the theatre would be a suitable venue for the symposium and accepted Mr. Cincotti's suggested topic for it (Cinematographic comedy in Europe on the eve of the Second World War : a case of socio-cultural schizophrenia or a conscious escape from reality)

It was suggested that Mr. Borde, in his capacity as Deputy Secretary-General, should go to Rapallo to discuss arrangements with Mr. Cincotti. In this way plans could be finalised in New-York and Mr. Cincotti could be told in person of the Executive Committee's preferences as far as the premises for the General Meeting are concerned.

As to the title of the Rapallo symposium, Mr. Klaue said that it should be restricted to : " Comedy in Europe in the 1930 s." Mr. Klaue said no reason either on geographic or artistic grounds, why the USSR should be excluded from the concept of "European Comedy". He suggested that Mr. Dorde raise the matter with Mr. Cincotti when he visited Rapallo.

Mr. Andreykov wanted the symposium to last four days, whereas Mr. Borde suggested three. In any case it was agreed that there should be a second one-day symposium given over to an aspect of FIAF's professional archival work. A notice should appear in the Bulletin asking members to submit suggestions.

6. Modification of the Statutes and Rules

Status of Observers

In a preliminary examination of this problem, referred to the Executive Committee from the Lausanne General Meeting, Mr. Stanklev and Mr. Klaue had concluded that in practical terms observers enjoy 95% of the rights that members have. The two main exceptions were the right to exchange films and to vote at the General Meeting. The rules should not be made too precise; it should be left instead to the common sense of the Executive Committee when examining candidatures. The Executive Committee should be very strict when admitting members and should be liberal with observers. In short, it

meant that FIAF could have perpetual observers.

Mrs. Bowsor asked whether film museums could become observers under these conditions. Mr. Klaus and Mr. Stenklev said they interpreted FIAF's statutes in such a way that film museums could be admitted as observers, but would never be allowed to progress to full membership unless they expanded their activities to become a genuine archive.

Mr. Francis thought a more difficult problem connected with an open-door policy for observers was whether screening organisations should be eligible for observership. Mr. Stenklev thought that it should be up to the Executive Committee not to accept potentially harmful organisations as observers. He stressed again that this ad-hoc, common sense approach was preferable to a set of precise rules that could eventually prove to be too limitative.

Mr. Klaus summed up the feeling of the meeting by saying that it was not necessary to modify the Statutes and Rules on this point. It would nevertheless be useful to explain the Executive Committee's reasons at Karlovy Vary by clarifying, among other things, the rights and privileges of observers. It was also decided to discuss the matter again at New-York with John Kuiper present.

7. Report of the Treasurer on the period Jan-Oct. 1979

All the members had received a copy of the " Budget Comparison " covering the first ten months of the year. It showed that the budget had not been disproportionately exceeded on any item except that of " Miscellaneous " in special expenses : 56.682,- BFr. for a budget of only 20.000,- BFr, but this was due to the exceptional fee which FIAF had agreed to pay to its legal advisor ; for the Unesco study on the preservation of moving images.

Mr. de Vaal then drew the members' attention to the item " External work-fees "- This amount had until now represented the fees paid to occasional helpers (typists mostly) who had sometimes worked at the secretariat, and it also covered the Auditor's annual fee. But Mrs. van der Elst now wished to have a more permanent and more able assistant, because of the increase of work and responsibilities created by her comparative isolation in Brussels and also because it was not healthy for the secretariat of an international federation such as FIAF, to depend on only one person's availability. It appeared that the budget established for 1980 allowed a part-time assistant to be hired and the only problem would be to find the suitable person. Mrs. van der Elst however said that she had somebody in mind for the job, and the Executive Committee immediately agreed to her proposal.

Mr. de Vaal then informed the Committee that the secretariat of FIAF might

eventually be forced to move from Galerie Ravenstein because the Belgian Film Archive, which had made this office available to FIAF, might need it back in the near future. However, Mr. Ladoux had promised that, in such an eventuality, he would help the secretariat to find a new office nearby.

Regarding the P.I.P., Mr. de Vaal reminded the members that the office in London had now increased its surface area by renting the rooms next door. That of course also meant a rent increase which had not been foreseen for this year but only for 1980.

Mr. Francis had agreed to supervise the lease of this new office with the help of a lawyer.

Finally, Mr. de Vaal reminded the members that any costs entailed by the work of a commission should be officially invoiced to FIAF through one of the member archives, and not directly by the head of the Commission to the Treasurer or the secretariat.

In answer to a question from Mr. Stanklev, the treasurer reported that most of the subscriptions were paid regularly by the members and observers. Only two observers (Paris and Sydney) were at present in arrears, but it was hoped that they would pay their dues in the next few weeks.

Regarding the small income which FIAF got from its publications, Mr. de Vaal proposed that a general increase of 25% be applied to their selling price. This was agreed.

D. Report of the specialized Commissions

A written report from Mr. Volkmann had been distributed to all members. The financial part of it had been discussed and dealt with under the item : " Treasurer's report ".

Mr. Klaus agreed with Mr. Volkmann's suggestion that FIAF should officially thank the non-FIAF experts of the Commission without whom the Preservation Manuals could never have been written. He offered to write them a letter of thanks himself.

Regarding the last paragraph of Mr. Volkmann's report, which read as follows :
 " The Commission and its authors are now occupied with the popular version
 " of the whole book, destined especially for young archives who have not a
 " great well trained technical staff. We discussed the matter at a Meeting
 " in Bruges (Belgium). In September 1980 the Commission will meet in Bois
 " d'Arcy. Then the manuscripts will be ready for correction and in 1981 it
 " should be possible to distribute it. We will discuss with UNESCO whether
 " they are willing to publish it " ; Mr. Klaus made the following suggestion :

that we do not wait for the popular version of the Preservation Manual to be ready to approach UNESCO, but that we start negotiating with this organisation immediately upon completion of the 3rd. part of the scientific version : " the preservation and restoration of magnetic recordings ". The need for an expert publication on the preservation of moving images is evident and there is a great chance that UNESCO would support it either morally or, hopefully, financially. The Executive Committee agreed to this proposal. Mr. Klaus will discuss it in more detail with Mr. Volkmann.

b). Cataloguing Commission

The following report of the Cataloguing Commission had been distributed to all members :

" The Commission held its last meeting in April of this year. On the activities of the Commission since that time the following may be reported :

" 1.- Finally, after 3 years of waiting, " Film Cataloguing " has been published. Special thanks go to Eileen Bowser who had contact with the publisher and Harriet Harrison, Motion Pictures, Broadcasting and Recorder Sound Division, Library of Congress, who was in charge of editing and correcting the manuscript.

" Last June we had cancelled the contract, but soon afterwards the publication took place.

" 2.- The manuscript of the Study on the Usage of Computers for Film Cataloguing has been completed. A present a clean copy is being made which will, as soon as possible, be duplicated and sent to all members and observers.

" All the 7 participating archives have given their consent to make this Study available to all those outside the Organization who are interested in it.

" Therefore the Cataloguing Commission recommends to duplicate this publication in 200 copies and to sell it to those outside FIAF who are interested in it.

" Recommended price : 5.00 US-Dollars, number of pages between 50 and 60,

" 3.- Work is going ahead on the other projects of the Commission, above all a dictionary of filmographic terms required for the cataloguing of films, as well as a bibliography of filmographic sources.

" 4.- The Cataloguing Commission was faced with a few personal problems :

- " - We grieve over the death of Leszek Armatys. He will have to be replaced.
 " The Commission should, at its next meeting in the first 6 months of 1980
 " discuss a suitable candidate and propose him for confirmation to the
 " Comité Directeur.
- " On account of my election as President of FIAF I regard it as appropriate
 " to resign the function of chairman of the Cataloguing Commission. After
 " careful reflexion and consultation with a few members of the Cataloguing
 " Commission I asked Harriet Harrison to take over the chairmanship for
 " which she possesses all qualifications. Harriet Harrison consented and
 " has obtained the consent by the Library of Congress. I request the Comité
 " Directeur to agree to my resignation as chairman of the Cataloguing Com-
 " mission and that Harriet Harrison takes over that function. I am prepared
 " to continue working in that Commission.
- (s) Wolfgang Klauke

The following decisions were then made by the Executive Committee :

- 1) To buy 25 copies of the " Cataloguing Manual " from the publisher Burt Franklin at a special discount price for free distribution to Observers and to the members of the Commission.
- 2) To accept Mr. Klauke's resignation as chairman of the Commission and to nominate Mrs. Harriet Harrison to take over this position.
- 3) To invite Mrs. Harrison to attend the next meeting of the Executive Committee in New York and, thereafter, as often as practical.

On behalf of the whole Executive Committee, Mr. Daudelin warmly thanked Mr. Klauke for the excellent work he had done for FIAF at the head of the Commission.

c) Documentation Commission

Mrs. Bowser made the following report :

- " The Commission met in Sofia June 6-8, 1979 through the hospitality of the
 " Bulgarska Nacionalna Filmoteka, and held a joint meeting with the Initia-
 " ting Committee of the General History of the Cinema. A proposal was made
 " by the commission and accepted by the general assembly of historians as a
 " recommendation to each national team to add as an observer a documentation
 " expert from the national archive, whether or not he was a member of FIAF.
 " The working group for the INTERNATIONAL DIRECTORY OF CINEMATOGRAPHERS, SET-
 " & COSTUME DESIGNERS met in Berlin 29-31 August and working group for the
 " INTERNATIONAL INDEX TO FILM & TELEVISION PERIODICALS met in Amsterdam
 " 8 - 11 November.

" 1. THE INTERNATIONAL DIRECTORY OF SET & COSTUME DESIGNERS
 " VOLUME 2 : FINLAND - FRANCE has been completed and will shortly be sent
 " to FIAF archives. However, this edition is incomplete and is sent only
 " as an interim working tool. Unfortunately, some pages and the index were
 " lost in the mail and will have to be reconstructed. However, the complete
 " edition which will also contain the French cinematographers will be published
 " by Saur K.G. Munich - London - Paris - New York in the future. The contract
 " with this publisher was signed on behalf of FIAF by Wolfgang Klaus, provi-
 " ding free copies for FIAF but no other payment for the first edition. Should
 " the publication prove successful, future volumes may be published under a
 " contract to be negotiated at better terms. On October 2, Alfred Krautz
 " turned over to the publisher in Munich the manuscript for the first volume,
 " which will be CINEMATOGRAPHERS, SET & COSTUME DESIGNERS OF THE GDR (1946-
 " 1970) AND POLAND (1900-1970) Publication is expected in 1980.

" 2. The CLASSIFICATION OF FILM LITERATURE by Michael Houlds is now in its
 " final stages of preparation and is expected to be published by ASLID in
 " 1980.

" 3. Fulfilling FIAF's contract to UNESCO, the commission produced a FEASI-
 " BILITY STUDY FOR AN INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTATION CENTER. At extremely short
 " notice, the commission took on the project at its meeting in Sofia, and
 " after discussion there. Karen Jones and Frances Thorpe accepted to write it.
 " They met several times over the summer months to complete the study, it was
 " approved by FIAF's chief officers, and turned over to UNESCO by the October
 " deadline. The commission wishes to express its thanks to the two members
 " who were responsible for this difficult task and commend them for finishing
 " it with such a speed and to such a high standard.

" 4. The INTERNATIONAL DIRECTORY TO FILM & TELEVISION DOCUMENTATION SOURCES
 " has been nearly completed and will be published by the FIAF Secretariat
 " in 1980. This new edition has been enlarged to include documentation sour-
 " ces outside of FIAF, and will be available for sale to institutions which
 " are not members. It is the work of Brenda DAVIES. The commission is parti-
 " cularly grateful to Brenda for the completion of this task, the final one
 " of the many she has performed for the commission. We have regretfully
 " accepted the retirement of Brenda Davies from the Documentation Commission.
 " She has served since the commission's beginnings in London in 1960, was its
 " first President, and its guiding spirit. We thank her for her work, and hope
 " we may still call on her for advice from time to time.

" 5. The commission has undertaken a new project, an INTERNATIONAL DIRECTOY
 " TO DISSERTATIONS AND THESES ON CINEMA as suggested by the General Assembly
 " in Mexico.
 " However, this will not be a FIAF publication, but a matter of cooperation
 " with another project. The largest existing directory is one compiled by
 " Raymond Fielding for the United States and published by the University Film

" Association Journal (UFA Journal). The current volume, just published
 " and containing about 420 entries, is on deposit with the FIAF secretariat
 " in Brussels where it may be seen by interested members. The commission
 " offered its help to give future editions of this work on international
 " basis.

6. The international index to film & television periodicals

The 1977 volume was published by Macmillan in September 1979 and is available
 " for a price of £ 35.- The volume for 1978 is expected to be published by
 " FIAF itself by February 1980 and we hope to be able to sell it at a lower
 price as well as providing it at cost price (± £ 7) to FIAF members.

Mrs. Bowser then asked for the opinion of the Executive Committee regarding
 the publication of the volume for 1979.

The Executive Committee decided that it would also be published by FIAF it-
 self and distributed in North-America with the generous help of the American
 Film Institute who has offered to do this for handling costs only (3-4 dollars
 per volume)

The possibility for FIAF to publish the cumulative volume of the television
 cards will be studied by the sub-commission and a draft budget will be sub-
 mitted to the Executive Committee at its next meeting.

d) Commission for archives in the developing countries

The main point of Mr. Andreykov's report was the difficulty of financing
 the training scheme project for candidates from archives in developing coun-
 tries . Positive offers to take a trainee had, so far, been received from
 Canberra, Copenhagen, London (I.M.M.), New York, Oslo, Ottawa, Prague, Sofia
 and Warsaw. Similar arrangements were being made on a direct basis by London
 (NFA), Bois d'Arcy and the PDRK Film Archive, whereas the Staatliches
 Archiv der DDR, la Cinémathèque de Belgique and the Oesterreichisches Filmar-
 chiv had asked to postpone their schemes until a later date.

Mr. Andreykov said that the links between the Commission's members were
 regrettably rather weak.

Mr. Klaue asked the Commission to arrange a meeting immediately before the
 E.C.'s New York meeting to agree upon steps that could be taken to give the
 Commission's work some impetus.

Mr. Klaue stressed the need for detailed information about the trainees,
 linguistic and technical qualifications before recommending them to a par-
 ticular archive, otherwise the venture risked being a waste of time and
 money.

Mr. Andreykov would be visiting Senegal and Nigeria in the near future and would discuss the issue directly with the organisations concerned.

Using the example of his own experiences when sounding out the authorities in Zambia and Tanzania, Mr. Stenklev reiterated the difficulty of ensuring that the proper people are in fact nominated as trainees by the developing countries concerned.

Mr. Klaue underlined that the project would not work unless funds could be raised for the trainees' travelling expenses. He suggested that an approach be made to UNESCO for a subsidy and that the ideas contained in the final report of UNESCO's Buenos Aires meeting should also be considered. The U.N.D.P. Fund was another (slight) possibility.

e) Legal and Copyright Commission

No report was available but Mr. Klaue suggested that John Kuiper be invited to the New York meeting to help the Executive Committee to draw up possible terms of reference for the Commission.

9. Relations with UNESCO

a) "D" Status

It was agreed that, as soon as the official confirmation came from UNESCO that FIAF had been granted "D" Status, the membership should be informed through the Bulletin.

FIAF had been invited by UNESCO's NGO Council to participate in a conference on disarmament to be held in 1980 in Geneva. It was decided to decline this invitation as it did not fall within FIAF's field of work.

It was agreed to investigate exactly what the rights and obligations of UNESCO's "E" Status were and to discuss them at the New York meeting.

b) Feasibility study on the creation of an international documentation and training centre for moving images

A very late start had been made on this project, but thanks to the excellent work of Karen Jones and Frances Thorpe, the contract with UNESCO had been fulfilled. Mr. Klaue thought that the successful completion of this assignment may have positively influenced UNESCO's decision to grant "D" Status to FIAF.

The Executive Committee agreed that the general policy of the feasibility study was very good and once again extended their thanks to the authors.

c) UNESCO's draft recommendation for the preservation of moving images

Mr. Klaus explained that Mrs. Klaver had refused to prepare FIAF's legal study of the UNESCO draft because of her close links with UNESCO's Copyright Department. A gentlemen's agreement was reached instead with a very experienced Swiss legal adviser who, fortunately, was able to grasp FIAF's problems very quickly and thoroughly. Mr. Klaus explained that as Dr. Straschnov had insisted on his name remaining confidential, FIAF was free to use his commentary as it wished.

Beginning discussion of the document, Mr. Stenklev felt that the formulation was so clear and forceful that the committee should alter it as little as possible. Having said this, the meeting went on to scrutinise the legal commentary point by point as follows :

- point 4 : after hearing Mr. Andreykov's arguments, it was decided to delete this point.
- point 5 : Mr. Klaus explained, as Mr. Borda had done earlier, that the literary references in the submission were an indirect way of exerting pressure on the producers to accept the system of statutory deposit for foreign films as well as for the national production. There was no chance of this being accepted, but the presentation of good, strong arguments such as the artistic value of translated works was at least a step in the right direction.

Mr. Francis stressed how important he thought it was to press for the deposit of foreign films produced in the same language as that of the country of deposit - for instance, American films ought to be subject to statutory deposit in England. He had already expressed this view to his national UNESCO Commission and asked whether the fact that it diverged from FIAF's commentary would cause any problems. In reply, Mr. Stenklev said that on the contrary it was an argument that was bound to help FIAF in its negotiating tactics, as it represented a reasonable compromise between the " all or nothing " extremes.

Mr. Klaus reaffirmed that members were not bound to use this document word for word, in their individual representations to UNESCO. He said however, that the membership should be informed of any fundamental changes to the text that the Executive Committee might decide to make.

After Mr. Francis had once again insisted on the importance of foreign production, Mr. Lauritzen said that he had sympathy for this point of view because the commercial success and cultural influence of American films in Sweden was generally greater than domestic films. He doubted, however, whether the producers would

agree to this, quoting the example of a new Swedish archive with the statutory right to make videocassettes of all foreign film and television production. The producers were so resentful of this obligation that in many cases they preferred to deposit used copies of films with the Swedish Film Institute.

In the light of the discussion, the meeting agreed to a proposal by Mrs. Bowsar to add the phrase " which is not the national language " (" qui n'est pas la langue du pays ") in the 2nd sentence of paragraph 2 as follows :

" If it can be granted that a foreign film, shown to the public
" in cinemas or on television in its original language, which
" is not the national language, does not form "

Still on point 5, it was agreed to retain the references to literary translation and to couple each reference to " dubbing " with the notion of " subtitling " as follows :

In the 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence, the underlined words should be added as follows : " If it can be granted that a foreign film, shown to the public in cinemas or on television in its original language, does not form specific part of the national heritage, the same certainly cannot be said of those moving images which have been dubbed or subtitled in the language of the country whose audio-visual heritage is to be preserved. In fact, the dubbing and subtitling requires "

Add also the word " subtitling " to the sentence which starts : Just as these translations, so should the dubbing and subtitling of "

The wording of the recommendation should consequently read : "b" "national production" shall be taken to mean moving images made, dubbed or subtitled by a maker having

On account of the subsequent decision to delete the whole of point 12, the sentence should be deleted in point 5 which reads :

" mention will be made to the dubbing ".

- point 6 : Add "or the subtitling" in the definition of 1 (B)

- point 7 : The meeting agreed to redefine the term copy as follows :

"(c) " copy " shall be taken to mean the best pre-point material "

and in French :

"(c) " copie " signifie ici les éléments de tirage de la meilleure qualité."

- point 11 : It was agreed to refer throughout the text to " statutory deposit" and " dépôt légal " in the French.

- point 12 : it was decided to delete this point on the grounds that its demands were unreasonable.

- point 15 : Add at the end of the paragraph : "one copy as defined " In the French : " une copie, comme définie plus haut "

- point 18 : It was agreed that this point should be less detailed in its references to television production. It was therefore shortened to read as follows :

" Passing now to the timing of the deposit, and starting out
" from the idea expressed both in the UNESCO commentary and
" in point 6.(d) of the first draft of the recommendation that
" it should be made " as soon as possible", there is a reason
" for asking why there is a difference between a cinematogra-
" phic film and a television production in this respect. FIAF
" proposes that no distinction be made between cinematographic
" films and television production. "
Delete the rest of the paragraph.

To clarify the wording of point 6 (d) of the UNESCO draft document, the meeting agreed to propose, under point 18, the following formulation :

" (d) in the case of a cinematographic film, the copy
" should be deposited immediately after completion of the
" production ... "

- point 19 : It was decided to change the final three lines of the paragraph to read as follows :

" 6 (e) the depositor should have controlled access to the
" deposit recordings on condition that such access should not
" cause the slightest deterioration to the materials "

In French : " dans la mesure où cet accès ne causera
" aucune détérioration aux enregistrements utilisés "

point 20 : It was agreed to strike out the following references to the limited length of inter-archival loans:

" provided that the length of the loan is limited ..."
and later
(III)" on a temporary basis "

point 26 : Delete in the wording for the recommendation :

.... " be invited to "

point 29 Replace the French phrase " une copie " by " des copies "

The rest of the document was approved by the Executive Committee. It was clarified that the document, as amended, would be sent in due course to UNESCO as FIAF's official position paper. Individual members could adapt it to suit their own purposes.

With regard to the next meeting of experts, FIAF had been invited to participate in the CICT delegation but, with the granting of "B" status to FIAF, this was no longer necessary. UNESCO would be asked whether FIAF's new status entitled it to be represented on its own account at the meeting, and if this proved not to be the case the Executive would look for other ways to ensure its participation in the meeting.

There was a consensus that FIAF would not like to form part of the CICT delegation. After Mr. Borde had read out extracts of a letter from CICT urging FIAF to reconsider its decision to disaffiliate from CICT, Mr. Klaus said that he would reply to the effect that the Executive Committee was bound by the resolution of the General Meeting to withdraw from CICT.

Mr. Stenklev informed the meeting that CICT was on the offensive, as indicated by their attempt to get the Nordic-Finland Television Union to join them. This particular offer was likely to be refused.

Mr. Borde was nominated to represent FIAF at the March meeting of experts in Paris. It was also decided to ask FIAF members if any of them were due to represent their respective countries at the meeting; if that was the case, it would be helpful to arrange a joint meeting in Paris beforehand.

II. Projects and publications underway

a) General history of the Cinema

Mr. Andreykov would be submitting a written progress report on this project to the Karlovy Vary General Meeting.

The first general assembly of the countries engaged in this task was held in Sofia just after the Lausanne Congress. 40 representatives had attended and the most important result was agreement, after lengthy discussions, on the methodological approach to be followed.

Initial contractual negotiations had been held with the Bulgarian publishers of the work. Proposals for the contract, which will be signed in 1980, will be submitted beforehand to the second general assembly to be held in June '80.

Mr. Andreykov then outlined the three main tasks being tackled at present :

- (i) to ensure that all countries with a national film production have a project team. There were between 55 and 60 teams, already, but difficulties were still being encountered, especially with Third World countries. In this light, UNESCO had made a grant of \$ 6,000,- to the international secretariat of the project, and this had enabled Mr. Andreykov to visit Damascus on the occasion of the film festival there and to meet the project leaders of 13 Arab countries. This led to the formation of an Arab coordinating committee.

Mr. Andreykov was travelling next to West Africa to arrange for project leaders for the francophone countries (on the occasion of a film festival in Senegal) and for the anglophone countries (with the assistance of the Nigerian film archive)

Contacts would also be established with certain Latin American countries via FIAF's Mexican or Spanish members.

- (ii) To allocate a certain number of pages to each national team. The allocation would be finalised by the organising committee on the basis of working plans drawn up by each national team.
- (iii) To negotiate a contract with the publishers. The contract would have to be signed by the head of each national team on behalf of all the members of the team.

Mr. Andreykov also announced that the publication would be included in the UNESCO programme as from 1981 and this would ensure greater financial assistance until the end of the project.

In view of the fact that the project was not an official FIAF venture (although it had its support) and that FIAF had unexpectedly not been represented at the Sofia meeting, Mr. Deudelin asked whether FIAF's role was becoming purely symbolic and to what extent it should be made more effective.

Mr. Stanklev then explained why Norway (and Sweden) had not been represented at the Sofia meeting. Apart from the fact that it was proving extremely difficult to find suitable qualified people to actually write the history in those countries, there was also uneasiness and scepticism about the practicability of writing a universal history of the cinema by committee.

Mr. de Vaal echoed these remarks but said, like Mr. Stanklev, that despite this general reluctance, he was doing his best to arrange for a Dutch team of researchers to work on the project.

Mr. Stankev expressed respect and understanding for the project, but asked Mr. Andreykov to understand Norway's position and difficulties.

b) The circulation of programmes from small film-making countries

Mr. Andreykov had nothing to report since the Lausanne Congress, but said he would try to submit a model circulation programme to the next Executive Committee meeting

10. Relations with other international organisations

a) FIAT : Mr. Francis had attended a meeting of FIAT archivists in Santander which had been designed as a pre-summer school seminar. It had been a well-organized, very interesting meeting which had provided an opportunity for wide-ranging discussions and had left Mr. Francis with the impression that former fears about FIAT were not founded.

b) IAPHIST : Mr. Francis had also attended a conference of IAPHIST in Amersfoort. The interesting point that had come out of another very useful meeting was how the historians involved, who use film materials, had invariably failed to make optimum use of film archives.

It was decided that the following organisations would be invited to Karlovy Vary : UNESCO, FIAT, IAPHIST (for the 1st. symposium), ASIFA (for the 2nd. symposium) and ICA.

- The Executive Committee approved the circular letters for Karlovy Vary to be sent to members.

II. Projects and Publications underway (continued)

c) Handbook for Filmarchives

The final chapters have now been received and a final selection of 12-15 photographs will be made as soon as possible.

It was decided that FIAF would publish the Handbook itself and that the price would be calculated strictly on the basis of the costs incurred.

d) FIAF Brochure

Mr. Francis said that the Brochure was almost ready and that a sample would be sent to each member asking them to estimate the number of copies they would require. He added that the list of FIAF publications contained in the Brochure would be representative, but not exhaustive. An inflation supplement of 25% was payable on the unpaid part of the costs. Details of distribution would be finalised in New York.

e) Summer School in Berlin

Mr. Klaus gave details of the problems that had beset the summer school, especially on account of the scandalous behaviour of one of the participants. The episode raised questions of policy for future summer schools. Should they continue to deal with all-round aspects of archival work, or should the content be more specific and specialised? The participants in Berlin had been split on the issue, as had the instructors.

Mr. Klaus reiterated the need for more careful selection of candidates from countries without a film archive to ensure they had appropriate qualifications. There was also a need to check language comprehension, because the summer school was a waste of money in some cases because of this problem.

Mr. Klaus also pointed out that, although the training had been useful for several representatives, it was very doubtful whether this would lead to the foundation of archives in their countries. The best chance of getting film archives established in more Asian and African countries would be by persuading the governments of those countries.

In reply to a question from Mrs. Bowser, Mr. Klaus explained that, despite persistent efforts, it had been difficult to obtain sufficient information about the candidates. Mrs. Bowser also suggested that the participation of instructors from archives other than the Staatliches Filmarchiv would be useful for the summer school trainees. Mr. Klaus agreed, but pointed out that the necessary funds would have to come from other sources.

Mr. de Vaal suggested, that specific training programmes should be devised for future summer schools, as a way of ensuring that suitable candidates are nominated. Mr. Francis suggested that it might even be necessary to visit the countries concerned before the summer schools in order to make it plain what was expected of the trainees and what they in turn could expect to get from the school.

It was agreed to put the issue on the agenda for New York as a separate item.

f) Embryo

A letter from Mr. Ladoux was read out in which he opposed the suggestion that the Embryo catalogue should be made available to observers and serious researchers outside the Federation.

Mr. Klaus said that the plan was consequently no longer practicable unless a new catalogue were printed which omitted the holdings of archives which objected to their being made public.

Mrs. Bowser said that her archive was interested in re-publishing Embryo, but to do so she would want to bring it up to date and undertake the project

quite openly, even putting the catalogue on sale. In response to a comment by Mr. de Vaal, Mrs. Bowser acknowledged that publication would create a greater demand for access to the films in question. She suggested that it could be made clear in the introduction to the catalogue, that access was not guaranteed.

It was agreed that Mr. Daudelin should write to those observers who had enquired about Embryo to the effect that they could not have access to it, but that a new, abridged edition was being considered which would be freely available.

It was also agreed that Mr. Daudelin should inform Mr. Ledoux of the Executive Committee's decision that an investigation into the leaking of the Embryo catalogue to the Italian historian concerned was not necessary. Mr. Borde added that, in his opinion, although the archive which had done this was technically at fault, it was morally justified in aiding genuine scientific research in this way.

Mr. Klaus summed up by saying that the issue of Embryo would be a suitable topic for the Kerlovy Vary open forum discussion.

g) Publication of the Brighton Papers

Mr. Francis reported that progress was slow because of the need for certain symposium contributions to be checked and because an attempt was being made to compile lists of credits for all of the films shown.

- Mr. Francis reported that the " Cinema 1900-1906 " retrospective was at present touring in South America. He hoped that it would eventually be circulated in Europe too.

- The Secretariat was still waiting to hear from European archives whether they were interested in the proposed Australian retrospective.

- Mr. Daudelin announced that a request had been made for permission to print a Turkish translation of the Preservation and Restoration of Color Film and Sound. It was agreed to check with Mr. Volkmann first.

12. MISCELLANEOUS

- As far as the touring programme of CILECT was concerned, Mr. Klaus hoped to meet Mr. Casanova shortly and would pass on any new information via the Secretariat.

Mr. Klaus brought the meeting to a close by thanking Mr. Stenklev and his colleagues for their hospitality and excellent organisational work during the meeting.