

# MEETING OF THE F I A F EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Rome, 12 - 14 November 1984

<b>Members</b>	Wolfgang KLAUE	President	
	Robert DAUDELIN	Secretary General	
	Jan DE VAAL	Treasurer	
	Raymond BORDE	Vice President	
	Eileen BOWSER	Vice President	
	David FRANCIS	Vice President	
	Cosme ALVES-NETTO		ABSENT
	Guido CINCOTTI	Deputy Sec Gen	
	Hector GARCIA-MESA		ABSENT
	Eva ORBANZ		
Anna-Lena WIBOM *			
<b>Reserve Members</b>	Sam KULA	Deputy Treasurer	
	P K NAIR		
	Paul SPEHR		
<b>Honorary Members</b>	Einar LAURITZEN		
	Vladimir POGACIC		
	M SVOBODA		ABSENT
	Jerzy TOEPLITZ		
<b>Commission Members</b>	Harriet HARRISON	Cataloguing	ABSENT
	Henning SCHOU	Preservation	
	Milka STAYKOVA	Documentation	ABSENT
<b>Executive Secretary Interpreter</b>		Brigitte VAN DER ELST	
		Jill JOHNSON	

\* Mrs WIBOM was absent on Day 1 and much of Day 3 owing to sickness.

# FINAL AGENDA

Item	Page
1 Adoption of the Agenda	1
2 Approval of the Minutes of the Vienna Meetings	1
3 Membership Questions	
3.1 New Candidates for Membership	2
3.1a Seoul	3.1b Wellington
3.2 New Candidates for Observership	3
3.2a Bogota	Cinemateca Distrital de Bogota
3.2b Manila	Film Archives of the Philippines
3.2c Manila	Film Center Archive University of the Philippines
3.2d Wisconsin	Wisconsin Center for Film & Theater Research
3.2e Quito	Cinemateca Nacional del Ecuador
3.3 Reconfirmation of Members	10
Beograd, Moskva, Stockholm, Amsterdam, Warsawa, Praha, Milano, Roma Reconfirmation procedure	
3.4 Reconfirmation of Observers	17
Caracas, Bogota, Lima, Brazzaville, Hanoi	
3.5 Membership Status of Istanbul	19
3.6 Other Questions of Membership	22
Nicaragua, Angola, Rochester, Francophone archives, Miscellaneous Enquiries, Budapest, Canberra	
4 Amendment of FIAF Rules regarding "Non-Confirmation"	25
5 Report on the Preparations for the 1985 New York Congress	25
6 Elections	29
7 Future Congresses: 1986 - 1989 (Canberra, Berlin, Paris & after)	29
8 Reports of the Specialised Commissions	34
9 Projects and Publications Underway	38
10 Relations with Unesco	45
10.1 FIAF - Unesco Co-operation	
10.2 Report on Latin American Seminar	
10.3 Report on visit to Asian Archives (David FRANCIS)	
11 Relations with Other International Organisations	49
12 Budget	49
13 Next EC Meetings	49
14 Any Other Business	50

## MINUTES

Mr KLAUE opened the meeting with a welcome to all present, especially the three Honorary Members, MM LAURITZEN, POGACIC AND TOEPLITZ, and noted for the Minutes that it was Mr DE VAAL's "25th" birthday.

Mr CINCOTTI, as host of the Meeting, welcomed everyone to Rome and confirmed that the Committee was invited to a brief reception at the Quirinal Palace as the guests of the President of the Italian Republic, Signor Pertini. Because of time limitations, the proposed visit to the Centro Sperimentale and the Cineteca Nazionale had been cancelled although members would be welcome to visit after the EC meetings. Hospitality was provided for the three evening dinners and the meeting rooms had been made available through the courtesy of AGIS (the Italian Association of Proprietors of Cultural Establishments).

Mr KLAUE reported that apologies had been received from Mr ALVES-NETTO, who could not attend as he was Vice-Director of the First International Film Festival in Rio being held at the same time, and Mr GARCIA-MESA, who had had unexpected last-minute visa and flight difficulties. With the late arrival of Mrs WIBOM, he confirmed that all 3 Reserve Members, MM KULA, NAIR and SPEHR were entitled to vote.

### 1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Agenda was adopted as presented, subject to additions requested by Mr DAUDELIN: Quito (item 3.2e) and Elections (new item 6). Two items were added to Projects & Publications Underway (new item 9). During the discussions further items were added: 3.3i, 3.6 c-g, 14.

### 2 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE VIENNA MEETINGS

The Minutes were approved subject to the following corrections:

i Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that Mrs STAYKOVA had asked for the 6.1 Decision, page 9 of Meeting 2, to be amended to read as follows:

"The Treasurer confirmed that the £650 requested for reprinting PIP Subject Headings and Guidelines would be available. Further financial support would be considered at Rome (ie £730 for producing an accompanying brochure for the 10-year microfiche accumulation)"

Mr DE VAAL accepted the amendment.

ii Mr KLAUE asked for correction to item 5.4, page 22 line 5, noting that it was Mr FRANCIS and not himself who had visited Istanbul after Varna.

### 3 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

#### 3.1 New Candidates for Membership

##### 3.1a **Seoul: Korean Film Archive Incorporated Foundation**

(This item was discussed out of sequence to allow for the participation of Mrs WIBOM)

Mr DAUDELIN reported on the correspondence since the Vienna meeting and their satisfactory response to our requests for written confirmation of the points raised (name of individual responsible for the archive, description of jobs and organisation chart showing working structure, confirmation of autonomy within the Motion Picture Promotion Corporation).

Mrs WIBOM was glad that Mr DAUDELIN could now support the recommendation she had made in Vienna that they should be accepted as members. She felt they had made considerable efforts to demonstrate their compliance with the FIAF Statutes and Rules and they would benefit considerably from FIAF guidance through becoming Members.

Mr KLAUE was rather surprised that the links between the archive and the umbrella organisation, the Motion Picture Promotion Corporation, seemed now to have been completely severed. Mrs BOWSER felt it was still not clear which individuals were responsible for which functions in the Archive but Mrs WIBOM pointed out that their culture was quite different: they were used to vertical rather than horizontal responsibility and, as long as their chosen structure worked as she had seen it obviously did, then it was impertinent of FIAF to attempt to interfere.

Mr NAIR pointed out that the emphasis seemed to be on management; there was little mention of preservation and no list of holdings. Mr DAUDELIN explained that the list of holdings had been supplied previously and was quite impressive: 423 negatives of national production from 1955-81; 182 positives from 1946-81; 43 amateur films. Mr NAIR understood these films to be held by the Korean Film Foundation, not the Archive; Mr DAUDELIN said the document referred to the Korean Film Archive Incorporated Foundation, but it had been supplied before the recent submission of documents to clarify their autonomy. Mr KULA felt it was reasonable to assume the films were in the custody of the archive.

**Decision by Secret Vote:** 8 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention and 1 spoilt paper.

After the voting, Mr KLAUE asked Mrs WIBOM to ask the Archive not to use the FIAF membership for political circulars (eg re actors kidnapped in Hong Kong and the Rangoon Massacre) but she had already done so.

### **3.1b Wellington: New Zealand Film Archive**

Mr DAUDELIN began by mentioning that everyone was aware of the quality of their work as Observers over the years, they had been active in Congresses and Jonathan Dennis had visited several member archives; he was pleased at the dynamism of this archive which had developed in a very short time. The dossier was very complete, the subscription had been paid and, in his view, there remained only the question of the visit. For geographical reasons, he suggested Mr SCHOU or Mr NAIR would be the most appropriate. He hoped the visit could be completed in time for the Visit Report to be reviewed by the EC in New York before the next GA.

Mr SCHOU mentioned that their Interim Director had visited recently and they were very well informed about the Archive. Both he and Mr NAIR asked if a special visit was mandatory as this might present problems for small archives; Mr DAUDELIN confirmed that the expenses for such Visits were met by FIAF and not the archives concerned.

Mr CINCOTTI pointed out that the French wording of Article 2 of the Rules did not make it clear that a Visit was obligatory, even though it had been consecrated by tradition; after some discussion between him, Mr TOEPLITZ and Mr DAUDELIN, Mr KLAUE suggested the Article in question should be added to the list of items which might need re-wording.

Mrs ORBANZ asked if the "financial problems" mentioned in Wellington's last Newsletter had changed; no-one knew but Mr SCHOU suggested the problems had been exaggerated in order to attract more support.

#### **Decisions:**

- i Mr SCHOU given mandate to visit Wellington on behalf of the EC
- ii Unanimously in favour by secret ballot, subject to Visit Report
- iii Wording re Visit in Rules to be reviewed to avoid ambiguity.

### **3.2 New Candidates for Observership**

#### **3.2a Cinemateca Distrital de BOGOTA**

Mr DAUDELIN mentioned that his baggage had been lost in transit so he was working without his files and personal notes. He would be asking Mr KLAUE and Mrs VAN DER ELST who had recently been to Brazil and met many of the Latin American archives to contribute their personal impressions.

Mr DAUDELIN recalled that the original application discussed in Vienna had lacked detail but, in response to his letter of July, they had now submitted



a very comprehensive dossier which might serve as a model application. In addition, a letter from the existing Observer in Bogota, Fundacion Cinemateca Colombiana, dated 18 October, was extremely positive about the work of the candidate and their friendly co-operative relations.

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported she had had several talks with the Director, Claudia Triana de Vargas; originally the archive had been concentrating on screenings and cultural activities but they were now well aware of the importance of preservation. Ms Triana had spent most of her time at the preservation workshops and was also planning to send technicians to Sao Paulo for training.

Mr CINCOTTI confirmed that, from their numerous contacts with them, they regarded them as a serious archive: the Director of the Centro Sperimentale had been impressed with their conservation and preservation work when he visited them last year and he himself had met several visiting archive staff in Rome. He suggested their development had been similar to that of the Greek archive which had started with extensive screenings via cineclub activities but had become increasingly aware of the importance of preservation.

Mr BORDE had reservations about the emphasis on projection work (150,000 spectators per year in one theatre alone) and the small size of the collection (23 features and 250 shorts including newsreels). He wondered why it was necessary to consider them when there was already one Observer in the country.

Mr DAUDELIN acknowledged that the collection was small but pointed out that it had developed considerably since 1981 when they only had 33 titles. It was known that the other archive had nitrate film but no budget to transfer it to safety stock whereas the Cinemateca Distrital had access to finance and the two archives would collaborate to safeguard their heritage. As mentioned at Vienna, there was a possibility that the two archives might join together although nothing had been officially arranged yet.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that many archives in Latin America were in a similar position: with limited collections and very little official recognition or support, they were not yet able to establish a proper balance between preservation, acquisition, cataloguing and cultural activities. Their natural emphasis was on the cultural activities to enable them to obtain public awareness and support. Through education and training, FIAF could help them achieve a better balance as had already been achieved with several other Latin American archives. In his own discussions with Ms Triana, he had satisfied himself they qualified as

Observers: they had excellent relations with the other archive and they wanted to be active within FIAF.

Mr DAUDELIN confirmed his support of their candidature, especially taking into account the views of Mr ALVES-NETTO, an old friend of the Director of the other archive, who had been sceptical about them in Oaxtepec but in Vienna had been much more positive.

Mr KULA made two procedural points. First, he pointed out that it was not clear from the Statutes whether a formal visit was required before admitting new Observers. Secondly, with reference to Mr BORDE's comments on the collection, he noted there were no guidelines in the Rules regarding the size and composition of collection required before one could qualify to join FIAF: he personally felt it would be an extremely difficult and delicate matter to attempt to draw up such guidelines.

Mr NAIR saw no reason to reject the candidature if it had the support of the existing Observer.

Mr DAUDELIN said he would stress in his formal letter to the Archive the importance of giving priority to preservation of their national production.

**Decision:**

- i Voting by show of hands: 12 in favour, 1 abstention.
- ii Add to Statutes Amendment List: no Visit required for new Observers.

**3.2b Manila: Film Archives of the Philippines (FAP)**

**3.2c Manila: Film Centre Archive of the University of the Philippines (FCAUP)**

Mr DAUDELIN asked that these two Archives should be considered together in view of the situation between them: relations were strained and the FCAUP had strongly criticised Mr De Pedro on several occasions.

Following discussion of the FAP dossier at the EC meeting in Toulouse, his letter to Mr de Pedro of 27 February 1984, and their discussions with him in Vienna, Mr DAUDELIN was pleased to report that, in spite of his previous reservations, Mr de Pedro had provided a satisfactory written answer (dated 4 October 1984) to all the points outstanding. It included an 11-page list of 800 titles (2 pages of foreign films). He therefore felt able to recommend them to the EC as Observers.

He was less happy about FCAUP who had first submitted a dossier in spring 1983 but provided more complete information on 19 October 1984. The previous list of films had been primarily student material in 8 mm but

there had been some additions since although the collection was small and it was obvious that the archive was not the main activity of the Film Centre. The University took responsibility for some of the overheads but the archive budget itself only amounted to \$10,000. He felt it was not appropriate to admit them as Observers but would like the advice of those who had visited Manila (MM KLAUE, KULA and NAIR).

Mr KLAUE said the main doubt on FAP had been concerning the film holdings. The list had now been supplied and it was clear that they were responsible for the new state legal deposit system. They were making preparations for preservation work, especially in training. Mr KLAUE stressed that Mr de Pedro made no claims to be an archivist but he was an energetic manager and widely recognised in the political and film community. He felt they were certainly going in the right direction.

He had not visited FCAUP but had met the principals. His impression was that it was not an archive: collection and preservation had no priority. This was demonstrated by a document listing the activities of the centre which showed preservation last of a list of 30 items.

Mr NAIR referred to his visits 2 years previously. He recognised Mr de Pedro's energy, influence and interest in preparing to set up an archive: he felt something more ought to have been achieved by now and he was uncertain whether he actually had custody of the films. He acknowledged that the FCAUP was part of an educational institution but at least it was staffed by people with a passionate interest in film who had put considerable effort already into documentation on the Philippines national production in spite of their limited funds. They were supported by a large number of film-makers. He felt FIAF should be very careful in making its decision to ensure it was in the best long term interests of that nation. He had been particularly distressed to learn that when the FCAUP was unable to obtain duplicate negative stock to copy nitrate films, Mr de Pedro had access to stock but did not care sufficiently to help save the nitrate films: he felt this was not the behaviour of an archivist.

Mr KULA felt one should remember that archives came from many diverse origins. He was not personally happy with the individuals in charge of either archive but felt it was essential to eliminate the personality factor. From the documentation, he judged that progress in the past 3 years was much more positive in the FAP than at the FCAUP. If the film industry had provided 800 negatives of the national heritage and it could be demonstrated that the FAP actually had custody of these films, he thought that was confirmation enough that FAP was a genuine archive officially endorsed by the government. At the FCAUP, he felt there was no significant archive activity and they did not qualify to join FIAF.



Further to Mr NAIR's comments, Ms ORBANZ agreed that it might be inadvisable to support FAP, given the fact that Mr de Pedro seemed more interested in politics than film; if the political situation changed, perhaps the archive would disappear. Mr KULA felt however that archives all over the world were at the mercy of political changes.

Mr FRANCIS felt FIAF were looking for both enthusiasm and the managerial ability to set up an archive: neither archive had both but he felt nevertheless FIAF should accept both and encourage them to develop in the areas where they were weak. Mrs BOWSER felt the archive activity in the FCAUP was virtually non-existent and did not justify admission; she felt there must be at least 50 universities in the United States with greater activity. If they were both admitted, she felt it would increase the rivalry between them to become Members two years hence. Mr KULA said that, when he first met the ladies in charge of the collections at the two archives, neither had any relevant training or background for the work. Since then he had met the FAP representative at the Poona workshop and realised she had made considerably progress but he did not know to what extent the FCAUP representative had benefited from study trips abroad.

Mr TOEPLITZ felt on the evidence of the documents that the FAP was the only one worth considering and FIAF should take on trust that they do indeed have custody of the films they claim they have. He felt there would just as likely be difficulties whether one or both were accepted.

Mr FRANCIS referred to page 1 of the FCAUP documents which indicated they had been seeking assistance and training over a period of 8 years. He felt FCAUP had the enthusiasm and the wish to develop and thought it was likely they were being thwarted in their development by the rivalry between the two institutions which was preventing them from obtaining the funding they needed. He would therefore like to welcome them both as Observers.

Mr NAIR said one should take into account the Philippine film community: some of the Philippine film-makers had told him personally that they would never hand over their films to Mr De Pedro's organisation. Statutes were not enough if they had not won the confidence of the industry. However, Mr KLAUE had met film-makers who were supportive of FAP and critical of the FCAUP, especially its training.

He supported the admission of FAP and the continuing encouragement of FCAUP to work towards qualifying for Observership in the future.

**Decisions:** Voting by show of hands:

FAP	7 for, 4 abstentions	- admitted as Observers
FCAUP	2 for, 6 against, 3 abstentions	- not admitted.

### 3.2d Wisconsin Center for Film & Theater Research, Madison, Wisconsin

Mr DAUDELIN reported that their policy statement of April 29, 1983 and letters of April 9 and May 18, 1984, contained all the information necessary in response to Article 2. They had a very large collection of some 12,000 titles including major deposits from United Artists and extensive television material. Supporting letters had been received from representatives of the 4 existing members (Mrs BOWSER, MM SPEHR, ROSEN & KUIPER) and the subscription had been paid.

Mrs BOWSER said she envisaged that, once admitted to FIAF, they would remain as perpetual Observers as their primary function was research. She had never visited them but had worked with them over the years and found them cooperative, serious and understanding of FIAF's aims. They were represented on the National Archives Committee and received certain funding from the NEA (National Endowment for the Arts) for preservation.

Mr SPEHR also supported them praising their professionalism and dedication. They had no nitrate, only safety stock copies of film held by the Library of Congress and there was considerable cooperation between the two archives. They had a major film and paper collection of political material, primarily left wing and liberal, that was unique in the United States. He agreed they would probably not want to become full Members.

Mr FRANCIS was interested in their reasons for wanting to join FIAF, either as Observers or eventually as full Members. He asked if their collection consisted of reference copies only; if they had unique material, then they should surely consider eventually becoming full Members, although at the moment preservation, at item g, seemed rather low on their list of priorities.

Mr SPEHR replied that they only had two full-time staff plus student helpers. All their United Artists, RKO and Warner Bros material was duplicates of Library of Congress holdings but in addition they had a large collection of original TV material and items like Emile de Antonio's negatives, so they were involved with cold storage and making preservation copies.

Mr KULA felt that as Observers they would obtain real benefits for their research activities through symposia at Congresses and access to member publications. Mr SPEHR felt the FIAF professional emphasis on preservation would assist them within the University where their role was currently seen as one of "cultural enrichment" for the students and the local community.

Mr FRANCIS asked as a matter of interest how many other Universities there were in the United States who had major collections and might therefore wish to join FIAF as well. Mrs BOWSER agreed there were numerous University collections but very few had any preservation activity like Wisconsin; in addition, Wisconsin was not simply providing a campus service and saw the role of its Research Center as extending worldwide.

**Decision:** By show of hand, unanimously in favour.

### **3.2e Cinemateca Nacional del Ecuador, Quito, Ecuador**

Mr DAUDELIN summarised the very impressive dossier which had been presented to Mr KLAUE and Mrs VAN DER ELST at the recent Latin American Seminar. The archive was formally established with official state recognition in 1982 although it had grown out of organisations which went back to the early 1960's. Their collection was small but growing fast, from 51 titles two years ago to 202 positives in 16 and 35 mm in early 1984. They had a 400 seat cinema and some smaller rooms for 16mm; were active in documentation and cataloguing of books and periodicals and in research and had plans to publish the results of their research on the history of the Ecuador cinema. They were keenly aware of the importance of preservation, and of both preserving and diffusing their national heritage.

Mr KLAUE reported on his meetings with Mr Estrella, the Director, at the Latin American Seminar where they had been among the most active participants. They had a staff of 10, young, energetic and very keen on preservation. There was no official legal deposit system but they had established such good relations with the producers that they now received preservation copies of almost all the national production. They had excellent relations with other FIAF members, mainly in Latin America.

Mrs VAN DER ELST was equally positive and pointed out that they were the only organisation in the country concerned with preservation of the national heritage.

**Decision:** By show of hands, unanimously in favour.

### 3.3 Reconfirmation of Members

Opening on a general point, Mr DAUDELIN was concerned that several of the dossiers, in particular from Moscow, Prague and Warsaw, were in fact simply brief letters with very little information. All these archives were well-known to FIAF and known to be working in accordance with the aims and spirit of the Federation but it was important in his view that the EC should be seen to be fair and make the same demands of all its Members. He asked the EC to consider whether these letters were a sufficient response to the requirements of Article 47, whether one should insist on having all the information specified and, if so, how one could ask for it without giving offence and causing the sort of misunderstanding that had occurred with Istanbul; alternatively, was the Reconfirmation procedure a mere formality?

The meeting adjourned at this point for the meeting with President Pertini and lunch.

Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that the dossiers from Amsterdam, Rome and Stockholm on the other hand were fully in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the FIAF requirements regarding Reconfirmation. He mentioned that Mrs VAN DER ELST had brought along copies of previous Minutes recording the very extensive discussions that had been held in the past regarding Reconfirmation especially when there had been structural changes (eg in the case of Prague). He added that he had only received 2 of the 8 dossiers before leaving for the EC meeting and suggested in future that last minute submissions should not be considered, as neither the Secretariat nor the EC Members had time to make a fair appraisal.

Mr TOEPLITZ suggested that the new EC should be asked to consider preparing a detailed questionnaire to clarify exactly what was wanted for Reconfirmation but in the meantime they should vote on the dossiers submitted.

#### 3.3a Beograd: Jugoslovenska Kineteka

Mr DAUDELIN reported that this dossier was much more complete than the 3 mentioned above, containing both a budget and an organisation chart, and as far as he could see presented no problems.

**Decision:** By show of hands, unanimously in favour.

#### 3.3b Moskva: Gosfilmofond

Mr DAUDELIN referred to their one-page submission and restated his view that the Federation had a right to expect more detail, though he was at a loss to know how to respond to them without running the risk of being



misunderstood. In private discussion, Mr BORDE had suggested to him that the Reconfirmation procedure was useful primarily for exceptions where there had been changes and could otherwise be seen as a formality in which case the present response was adequate.

Mr TOEPLITZ felt it would certainly aggravate relations between Moskva and FIAF if reconfirmation were refused.

Mr FRANCIS felt the situation would be much easier to handle if it was known that the Rules were to be rigidly adhered to: they could simply point out that the contents of the dossier did not comply with the requirements and could not therefore be discussed. In his own case, it was difficult enough to obtain the letter defining the Archive's autonomy and it was essential for him to be able to say that all Members applying for Reconfirmation had to observe the same procedures. In his view, he felt FIAF should be rigorous in demanding that the dossier be complete but could be flexible in its interpretation of the contents.

Mr TOEPLITZ again raised the possibility of a questionnaire for the future but Mr DAUDELIN read out the letter he had sent in February 1984 to all members due for Reconfirmation from which it was evident that the requirements were very clearly spelt out. Mr CINCOTTI agreed that all the information was in the FIAF Articles so no questionnaire was necessary but Mr KULA felt that the diversity of response indicated that there was certainly a need for FIAF to clarify its requirements.

In the particular case of Moskva, it was noted that Mr Strotchkov had offered to supply any additional information required and it was proposed that they be reconfirmed subject to their submission of the information requested:

- organisation chart, showing relationship to larger body,
- more detailed budget showing at least proportionate distribution between various activities, and
- information regarding any relevant new legislation.

Regarding possible uneasy relations between Moskva and FIAF, Mr SCHOU said the Preservation Commission had excellent cooperation from them: they would be attending the East European SubCommission meeting in Karlovy Vary and he himself had been invited to visit Gosfilmofond next week. Mr KLAUE agreed with Mr TOEPLITZ however that any non-confirmation, even on technical grounds, would be misunderstood; he agreed with both Mr TOEPLITZ and Mr KULA that a questionnaire should be prepared so that there was no doubt about what was required.

**Decision:** By show of hands, unanimously in favour, subject to supply of information outstanding.

### 3.3c Stockholm: Cinemateket/Svenska Filminstitutet

This discussion was begun in the absence of Mrs WIBOM but it was found that the information in the text was at variance with the accompanying Organisation Chart so the discussion was postponed until the arrival of Mrs WIBOM on Day 2.

Mrs WIBOM reminded the EC of the recent history of the Cinemateket and the peculiar way by which it satisfies the FIAF Statutes and Rules on the question of autonomy.

She had been fighting for more independence for the archive for some 16 years but neither the management of the Institute nor the staff of the Archive saw any reason for the Archive to leave the framework of the Institute. They had control of their own operations and their own budget but there was no realistic possibility of hiving off the Archive into a separate organisation simply to comply with the FIAF requirements. In addition, with all government institutions taking a 3% cut in resources, an independent Archive would most certainly be much worse off.

She had made a final attempt for independence when the new national Film & Video Agreement was being discussed in 1981 but as she could persuade no-one of the advantages of independence, had finally given up the struggle. Over the years, she had repeatedly refused a seat on the Board of the Institute in order to keep the Archive as separate as possible but, with the arrival of the new Managing Director who wanted closer links with the Directors of each Division within the Institute, she had decided it would in fact be more harmful to the Archive if she refused.

In response to Mr DAUDELIN, who asked for clarification of the Organisation Chart and the job titles of herself and Mr Lindfors on the formal declaration, she regretted that the Organisation Chart submitted was incorrect: it should show that she still has a direct responsibility for the Archive, although Rolf Lindfors was in charge of day-to-day operations. She herself was one of the 3 Main Board Directors and in addition to responsibility for the Archive had special responsibility for International Relations, both for the Institute as a whole and the Archive.

In response to Mr KULA and Mr KLAUE, she confirmed that Mr Lindfors had the authority to make decisions regarding exchanges but she would remain as the official FIAF representative. Mr FRANCIS felt the situation was similar to that which could occur in many organisations, like for instance the BFI/NFA and the Imperial War Museum. In the latter case, the Curator, Clive Coultass, had been promoted to take on additional responsibilities, like computerisation and sound, and had therefore had to appoint Divisional Heads for each area. He retained however the financial responsibility for all areas and in fact, by virtue of his promotion, was in a better position to support the Archive than he had been previously.

Mrs WIBOM agreed that this was indeed similar to the situation in her case: to take but one example, as soon as she was promoted, she had been in a position to secure 3 more staff for the Archive whereas previously they had had no increases for 6 or 7 years.

Mr LAURITZEN supported Mrs WIBOM as he too, as her predecessor, had tried and failed to get more autonomy. In response to his question about the Documentation Division, she explained that Margarete Nödstrom was Head of Documentation and Information (Library, Clippings, Stills & Posters) and Rolf Lindfors, Head of the Archive (Film storage, Cinceclubs, Screenings and Restoration); both had full responsibility for day-to-day operations and both reported to her financially. In addition, in her International Relations role, she was engaged in diverse projects and sometimes represented the whole of Scandinavia.

Mr TOEPLITZ referred to Article 23 of the Rules regarding participation at FIAF Congresses which had been introduced to discourage participation by administrators from parent institutions who had little knowledge or indeed interest in film. He therefore asked whether it would be herself or Mr Lindfors who would be the official representatives of the Archive at FIAF Congresses: perhaps her present position disqualified her?

The discussion continued after the morning coffee break.

Following Mrs WIBOM's confirmation once again that she was the Board Member responsible both for International Relations and with advisory responsibility for all Archive matters, Mr KLAUE asked that the Organisation Chart and accompanying text be revised to make this absolutely clear so that the documents in the file were correct.

Mr CINCOTTI felt the discussion should not be about Mrs WIBOM's personal position but about whether the Archive had sufficient autonomy to qualify for reconfirmation.

Mr DE VAAL asked why Mrs WIBOM had accepted the post of Head of International Relations instead of simply remaining Head of the Archive. She replied that her official designation is "Cultural Director" but she signs documents with a number of different designations depending on the requirements of the situation. He asked if she could have accepted the set-up of the BFI/NFA.

Mrs WIBOM replied that the Institute was understandably reluctant to model itself on other institutions rather than choosing an internal organisation that suited it; the organisation had changed several times over the years but the independence of the Archive activities had always



been preserved and the work of the Archive highly valued. Unlike London, the archives of the Swedish Film Institute were not officially recognised as national archives; in other words, the National Archives in Sweden had no responsibility for film and there was no one national body responsible for preserving the "national heritage", which was what she had been fighting for unsuccessfully over the years. They had to rely on secondary agreements. For instance, people could not obtain a licence to show films unless they deposited a print in the Archive, but the main object was simply to have a record of what had been licensed, not to ensure that the film was preserved as part of the national heritage.

She appreciated it was a tricky question for FIAF and regretted that FIAF had to spend so much time on this case and, indeed, on membership questions in general.

Mr KLAUE felt it was important to recognise and respect national situations and FIAF could not insist on ideal but unrealistic structures. He felt that everyone had been impressed by the progress of the Archive within the structure of the Swedish Film Institute and he was not at all sure such progress could have been achieved under a different set-up. He felt it was important to seek a compromise between the national realities and FIAF requirements. He proposed that Mrs WIBOM:

- withdrew the first two pages of the document,
- explain the functions of the Cultural Director with respect to the Archive, and
- sign with a more appropriate job title.

Mrs WIBOM summarised by stressing that, in a situation of conflict, she had to look after the best interests of the Archive within her own country, even if it meant expulsion from FIAF.

**Decision:** Unanimously in favour, by show of hands, subject to provisos above.

Following the Reconfirmation, Mrs WIBOM again expressed her regret that so much of FIAF's time had to be taken up with membership matters. Mr KLAUE agreed and hoped that the proposed questionnaire would make it easier.

### **3.3d Amsterdam: Nederlands Filmmuseum**

Before leaving the room, Mr DE VAAL apologised for the omission of the organisation chart which would be supplied on his return. Mr DAUDELIN reported that the dossier was otherwise complete and contained extra



information about their budgetary matters, news of the film theatre and information in Dutch about a new technical facility.

**Decision:** By show of hands, unanimously in favour, subject to supply of organisation chart.

### 3.3e Warszawa: Filмотека Polska

Mr DAUDELIN felt that as in the case of Moskva they could be confirmed subject to provision of an organisation chart, including the relation to the parent body, and information on the budget allocations between the different departments.

Mr KLAUE drew attention to the fact that there was no mention of the fact that Mr TOEPLITZ had recently been appointed Chairman of the new Scientific Council at the Filмотека Polska (with effect from December 1984).

In response to a question from Mr FRANCIS about the relatively high "own income", Mr TOEPLITZ reported that it was derived from showing pre-1939 films on television.

**Decision:** By show of hands, unanimously, subject to provision of organisation chart and budget information.

### 3.3f Praha: Ceskoslovensky Filmovy Ustav - Filmovy archiv

Mr DAUDELIN noted that the Organisation Chart had been supplied only in Czech and budget information was missing. He reminded the EC that there had been considerable debate about the reconfirmation of this archive in 1977 at Varna, primarily because of disagreements over varying translations of the name of the new organisations, Mr Ledoux for instance remaining unconvinced that the organisation was in fact a film archive. The dossier had arrived late so he had only read it that morning and not referred back to the 1977 discussion.

Mr KLAUE agreed there were 3 points to raise: the source and allocation of the budget and information on where the Documentation section fitted in.

Mr CINCOTTI was interested in the comment on page 2 that the "official title" was only used for international contacts, which suggested that the name of archive was simply a facade for international use; however, he and Mr DAUDELIN both felt this might be simply a question of poor translation.

While not wishing to delay their reconfirmation, Mr KULA felt it was important that the records should include a declaration of their autonomy on film archive matters, even though they were, like his own and many other archives, part of a larger organisation. (This should be signed both by the head of the larger organisation and the individual who is head of the archive.) Mr DAUDELIN felt that as one had accepted the position on the previous occasion, then there was no reason to reject it now. However, Mr KLAUE pointed out that the organisation chart suggests that only the film archive section is the FIAF representative (excluding, for instance, documentation); the organisation chart should show the whole organisation, not just the archive.

**Decision:** By show of hands, unanimously, subject to provision of correct organisation chart and budget information.

### **3.3g Milano: Cineteca Italiana**

Reconfirmation dossier to be submitted for discussion in New York.

### **3.3h Roma: Cineteca Nazionale**

Mr DAUDELIN noted the various parts of the dossier which provided full documentation on how it met each of the Reconfirmation requirements, including copy of the Statutes, in Italian, and the Internal Rules which had been updated in July 1984. It could be described as a "perfect dossier" as it was complete with all the details required and provided up to date and new information about the archive and its activities.

**Decision:** By show of hands, unanimously.

### **3.3 x Reconfirmation procedure**

Mr POGACIC referred to the Helsinki meeting when the Reconfirmation procedure had been formulated and based on two key issues (autonomy and sources of finance) in order to discourage organisations primarily concerned with "commercialisation". It was acknowledged that autonomy was difficult to define and the EC was free to make its judgment on each case.

However, they were now encountering cases like Czechoslovakia and Sweden, which had excellent archives but were clearly not autonomous. Before drafting a questionnaire therefore he thought it was important to

clarify the basic issue of the rationale behind the reconfirmation procedure.

Mr KLAUE replied that Sweden's position would be discussed in Mrs WIBOM'S presence but he did not share Mr POGACIC's view of Czechoslovakia: he felt the institution was legally autonomous and independent. There were limitations within each country and each archive but he felt the procedure should continue for the same reasons as before: to check that there was no change which would endanger the autonomy, or even the existence, of an archive.

Mr KULA agreed with Mr POGACIC that it was important to be clear on the rationale of the procedure before designing the questionnaire. He was strongly in favour of the reconfirmation procedure if only because it obliged members to reconfirm their formal undertaking to pursue the objectives of FIAF and uphold its Rules and Statutes. If the concept of autonomy was changing, we should attempt to define what we meant by it and design the questionnaire accordingly, especially regarding the information and the signatures required.

**Decision:** Mr DAUDELIN to prepare draft questionnaire for discussion at New York.

### 3.4 Reconfirmation of Observers

Mr DAUDELIN recalled that reconfirmation of a number of Observers had been held over from Vienna because Reports and Subscriptions had not been submitted and contact appeared to have been lost. Reports had now been received which, though sometimes lacking in detail, had at least re-established contact but there were still problems with subscriptions.

#### 3.4a Caracas: Cinemateca Nacional de Venezuela

A brief Report had been received (17 September 1984) and one year's subscription paid personally to Mrs VAN DER ELST in Brazil. They were making arrangements to pay the remaining subscriptions outstanding.

**Decision:** Unanimous by show of hands, following approval by the Treasurer.

### 3.4b Bogota: Fundacion Cinemateca Colombiana

Mr Hernando Salcedo Silva had written a letter to the Secretary General and the Treasurer explaining their financial difficulties but including the 1983 Report with information on acquisitions and preservation work. They owe 3 years' subscriptions. They had not attended the seminar in Brazil but Ms Triana from the other archive in Bogota had asked that they be retained as Observers, pending the anticipated merger.

Mr DE VAAL recognised that it was a moving letter but pointed out there was no precedent for retaining non-paying Observers. Mr DAUDELIN quoted from their letter in which they had offered to sell short films from Columbia to FIAF members in return for paying the subscription on their behalf. He had replied however that, although FIAF was sympathetic to their situation, the Federation itself could not take the initiative as an intermediary to help with individual financial problems; he had hoped they would discuss their situation with the two EC members from Latin America.

Mr KLAUE referred to Article 77 (the EC may extend period allowed for payment) and Rule 3 (procedure leading to Deletion).

**Decision:** Reconfirmation conditional on payment of outstanding dues before the New York Congress.

### 3.4c Lima: Cinemateca Universitaria del Peru

Mr DAUDELIN indicated that the situation was similar to that of Bogota: a Report had been received very late (with strong emphasis on screenings and no details of preservation work) and they were two years behind with the subscription (a cheque dated 1981 had been refused by the Bank).

They had not attended the Brazil seminar but Mrs ORBANZ had visited them and been shown some of their films.

**Decision:** Reconfirmation conditional on payment of outstanding dues before the New York Congress.

**For information:** Mr KLAUE reported that a small group of young and energetic film-makers, who had made a good impression at the Brazil seminar, planned to establish themselves as the **Cinemateca de Lima**.



### 3.4d Brazzaville: Cinémathèque Nationale Populaire

Mr DAUDELIN referred to their letter of August 82 which reported they were losing all government support. He had replied but there had been no response: they were now two years behind with their Reports and their Subscription and there was still no response (last FIAF communication from Mrs VAN DER ELST, September 1984).

Mr KLAUE suggested a second copy of the final letter should be routed via the Congo Embassy in Brussels but withdrew following Mr FRANCIS' warning that this might create additional difficulties for the archive if they still existed.

**Decision:** Mr DAUDELIN to send final warning that if no news received within 60 days they would have to be removed from the FIAF list of Observers.

### 3.4e Hanoi: Vietnam Film Archives

Mr DAUDELIN reported that both the Report and the Subscription had now been received so they could now be automatically reconfirmed.

**For information:** Mr KLAUE mentioned there might be some possibility of visiting the archive in Hanoi under the auspices of Unesco.

## 3.5 Membership status of Istanbul

Following the decisions in Vienna, Mr DAUDELIN accepted their invitation to visit the archive before coming to Rome and reported on his 2-day visit when he had been very cordially received by Mr Sekeroglu and his principal archive assistant who were both outstanding technicians:

### staff

- there were only 4 full time staff: himself, his assistant (a former student), one archive and one financial specialist
- these were supplemented by 3 groups of helpers:
  - voluntary helpers who came in several times a week;
  - students on three-year courses who had acquired considerable competence in restoration and preservation work;
  - civil servants imposed from above (when the archive was taken over by the state in 1970 he had been "given" 40 people, many of little use; he had tried to take them more selectively since)

### **the archive and its facilities**

- the archive was very well equipped, both for training & preservation
- it held most of the Turkish national production and was receiving considerable foreign production, especially from Americans who had filmed in Turkey.
- they had two screening theatres (one small, one with 500 seats) and some interesting programmes with day-time workshops for the students by the film-makers whose work was shown in the evenings. Prices were low both here and in the commercial cinemas in Turkey (say, about 20 cents and 1 Canadian dollar respectively). Screenings were always fully booked, because the Institute operated free of all censorship whereas there was very heavy censorship elsewhere in the country,

### **autonomy**

- Mr Sekeroglu had 3 separate government appointments and it had therefore been difficult to assess the archive's autonomy under the new structure. Others had told him privately that the Archive only really existed thanks to the personality of Mr Sekeroglu himself and they were concerned about whether it would survive if he departed.
- The Institute itself belongs partly to the Fine Arts Faculty of the new University in Istanbul and partly to the State. However, it was clear that the Institute enjoys very real autonomy, thanks to the personality of Mr Sekeroglu himself and his close relations with the Turkish film industry. (He had made some films himself with his students as crew, including an excellent short film on a Turkish painter which had recently been shown in 4 US Festivals)

### **relations with FIAF**

- Mr Sekeroglu was quite bitter at the way FIAF had treated him, especially with its "tribunal" in Vienna. He constantly referred to the difficulties he had within his country to maintain the existence of the archive at all and felt FIAF should be more concerned with helping the archive survive instead of making life complicated for him.
- he considered he had received no benefits from being a Member of FIAF and didn't even receive the FIAF publications (once his suspension is over, Mrs VAN DER ELST will send the backlog)
- he felt FIAF was "rigid and conservative" and unaware of the needs of many of its members, especially those outside Europe and would put his complaints in writing before New York
- the only advice he had had from FIAF was the recommendation in 1970 to seek state support which turned out to be the worst advice he had ever had !
  - the archive which had been independent until 1970 was virtually nationalised but with a contract clause which gave him independence during the first 5 years during which he was solely in charge. Subsequently, however, the state began to take over and it was then much less dynamic and had major budget cuts: as an example, he cited over 200 publications produced before 1975 and only 1 in the period 1975 - 1984.

- he made the following practical suggestions:
  - FIAF should have telex to simplify communications
  - FIAF should provide a better technical advice service (he had written several times to Mr KLAUE among others for technical advice on nitrate transfer but received no reply)
  - FIAF should assist with film supplier problems (they used to have to pay very high prices and only recently had been able to negotiate with Agfa-Gevaert to buy at more reasonable prices)

### Summary

In spite of the criticisms of FIAF, it was a very positive visit and all the elements are there to re-establish good relations. Mr DAUDELIN repeatedly encouraged Mr Sekeroglu to come to New York, especially for the opportunity it gave to make contacts, plan exchanges and joint projects both worldwide and with his immediate neighbours (in Bulgaria for example), and had finally obtained a promise that he would try to come.

Mr DAUDELIN reported that his visit had convinced him it was a very real archive doing serious work and protecting a substantial collection; in view of the complexities of the situation, he appreciated the difficulties in preparing a written statement defining autonomy. The outstanding subscriptions had all been paid, the 1983 Report had been brought to Vienna and the 1984 one would follow the new FIAF model. He closed with the strong recommendation that FIAF should normalise the situation as soon as possible.

In response to Mr FRANCIS, Mr DAUDELIN acknowledged that, because of their shortage of funds for restoration, the laboratory was probably still used 75% of the time for commercial purposes, but for high technology jobs for which the facilities and skills were not available in the commercial sector. During his visit, he only saw work in progress on archive material.

In response to Mr KLAUE and Mr TOEPLITZ on the structure, he said it was impossible to separate the Archive itself from the Institute as so many of the services were provided by the students: the Documentation Center was manned by one enthusiastic student working two hours a day; the programming and projection of the films was also done by students.

**Decision:** Unanimous Reconfirmation as Member.

### 3.6 Other Questions of Membership

#### 3.6a **Nicaragua: Cinemateca de Nicaragua, Observer candidate**

#### 3.6b **Angola: Cinemateca Nacional de Angola, Observer**

Mr KLAUE said that the Reports on Mr GARCIA-MESA's visits to Nicaragua and Angola would be distributed.

- Nicaragua hoped to apply to become an Observer in time for the decision to be taken in New York.
- Angola had applied to Unesco for funding to pay for the printing of films about Angola from the Portuguese Archive and were asking FIAF to support their application. Mr KLAUE added that on 1 January 1985 Luisa de Almeida would be giving up her job as Director in order to do film history research.

**Action:** Angola to be asked to send FIAF a copy of their application to Unesco so that suitable support may be considered.

#### 3.6c **Rochester: Dept of Film, International Museum of Photography**

Mrs BOWSER circulated a dossier describing the developments since the decision of the George Eastman trustees to give the collection to the Smithsonian so that the house could be simply a Museum to commemorate the founder, with temporary exhibitions but without responsibility for the collections.

The staff were told only the day before the story appeared in the New York Times in the summer and there had been considerable publicity ever since in Rochester and elsewhere. A consortium of local educational institutions were trying to find ways of retaining the archive in Rochester but they were in fact just as inexperienced in film archives as the Smithsonian.

At the request of Mr Kuiper, the Curator, she had suggested a cable that Mr KLAUE might send on behalf of FIAF to stress the concern of the international archive movement about the future of the collection. In addition, the American Film Archives Advisory Committee had discussed the situation at their meeting in Rochester and prepared a document for the Trustees stressing the importance of professional care of film collections: however, the Director, Robert Meyer, had been "too busy" to join them and the Trustees had simply acknowledged their submission. Another cause for concern was the fact that if the collection were to leave New York State, it would lose the funding currently provided by the



State and by the Federal agency NEA (National Endowment for the Arts) which could not fund the Smithsonian as it was itself a Federal institution. Neither the local consortium nor the Smithsonian represented therefore a satisfactory solution. Until a final decision was made, FIAF could make no move on the question of Rochester's FIAF membership.

Mr SPEHR added that the Smithsonian Board met in September but refused to take a positive stand in view of the turmoil at Rochester. It was clear that they would not want to operate a satellite institution in Rochester.

In response to a question from Mr SCHOU about the need to get the film depositors' consent before moving the collection, Mrs BOWSER added that they would also need the permission of the Attorney General of New York State.

Mr FRANCIS reported that this move seemed to be part of Kodak's new policy internationally as they did not want to bear the increasing burden of responsibility for preservation. In the UK, the Kodak collection had been passed to the Bradford Museum of Photography, Film and Television, part of the Science Museum. The films were already deposited in the National Film Archive but the change meant that important items, like cinema apparatus, was no longer as accessible as they were in the London area. Some depositors had withdrawn their material and the Curator, Brian Coe, had resigned.

Mr DE VAAL suggested the EC might send an official cable from its meeting in Rome expressing concern and Mr FRANCIS drew attention to the status of films exchanged with FIAF Members but Mrs BOWSER felt all the relevant points had already been expressed in their detailed initial letter and the cable already sent in FIAF's name. Unfortunately, the Trustees didn't care about these aspects.

**Decision:** No further official FIAF action.

*End of Day 1*

### **3.6d Working Group of Francophone Archives**

Mr BORDE reported on the progress made by the 8 Francophone Archives (Bois d'Arcy, Cinémathèque Française, Toulouse, Cinémathèque Universitaire, Brussels, Lausanne, Luxemburg, Montreal) in working together. All except Brussels had attended a first informal meeting at the Institut Lumière's Summer Festival in Lyons and agreed to collaborate in taking a census of their holdings of French films or films in French as a first step in identifying which films appeared to be "lost".

The filmography already existed in the following volumes :

1919-29	Prepared/published by Toulouse, 1984
1929-39	Prepared/published by Brussels, 1975
1940-50	Prepared/published by Luxembourg, 198 ?

They had started with the period 1929-39 where there would be no identification problems and half the group had already completed the task of recording what type of material they had, if any, on each film.

Mr BORDE suggested FIAF should report to Unesco on this example of regional co-operation (initiated by the participants, without seeking outside funding).

### **3.6e Miscellaneous Enquiries**

Mr DAUDELIN reported for the record that the Secretariat had received enquiries from the following :

Colombia	Subterraneo Cinemateca/Medellin
Taiwan	Film Library, Motion Picture Development Foundation
Washington	National Gallery of Art
Utah	Brigham Young University, Arts & Communications Archive
New York	American Museum of Natural History (750 films)

### **3.6f Budapest: Filmarchiv/Magyar Filmtudományi Intézet**

Mr KLAUE reported that Dr Papp had been replaced on July 1, 1984 by Professor Doktor Istvan Nemeskurti, who had been in Vienna. He did not know who if anyone had been appointed to replace Mr Molnar as the Head of the Archive.

### **3.6g Canberra: National Film & Sound Archive (formerly National Film Archive/National Library of Australia)**

Mr SCHOU reported on the change of name and statutes of the archive in Canberra dating from April 5, 1984. Mr KLAUE asked that the Archive should put the changes in writing and make a formal request for membership to be continued for the newly structured organisation.

#### 4 AMENDMENT OF FIAF RULES REGARDING "NON-CONFIRMATION"

Mr KLAUE and Mr DAUDELIN reminded the EC that the Istanbul case had revealed certain problems in the FIAF Rules, particularly Articles 12 - 22. As the present EC was near the end of its term, it was felt that they should simply present a report on the problems to the EC to be elected in New York.

The Istanbul situation had been resolved so there was no urgency, but both Mr KULA and Mr TOEPLITZ stressed the need to make provision in the Statutes as well as the Rules for situations that were not covered.

As Mr CINCOTTI had been so helpful on these topics during the discussions, Mr DAUDELIN asked if he would be willing to prepare a preliminary draft for New York.

Mr KLAUE urged all EC members to review the Statutes and Rules so that the discussion in New York would be more fruitful.

**Action:** Mr CINCOTTI to prepare draft for New York.

#### 5 REPORT ON THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE 1985 NEW YORK CONGRESS

Mrs BOWSER commented her progress report for the New York Congress, noting in particular:

##### **Budget**

Mrs BOWSER commented first on the draft budget and confirmed that they expected no financial problems. Two major grants were expected:

- \$50,000 from the NEA (National Endowment for the Arts) which was a breakthrough as NEA did not normally fund congresses;
- unspecified amount from the USIA to assist representation of 3 people from developing countries.

She recommended to the EC a Visitor's Fee of \$125. In addition to outsiders, this would apply to Members if they brought more than 3 people and Observers if more than 1.

##### **Visitors**

She asked the EC to approve the Host's List of proposed Visitors, mainly from the United States.

It was agreed that FIAF's List of Visitors should include Unesco and all members of the Round Table (ICA, FIAT, IASA, IFLA). They would not be asked to pay a fee.

**Action:** Mr KLAUE to invite Unesco, Mrs VAN DER ELST the remainder.

### **Schedule**

Mrs BOWSER reviewed the Schedule of Events and regretted that as they did not have a large enough meeting room at the Museum they had to use the University Club where access was limited. Practical arrangements for the Symposia/Workshops were still under discussion. The Technicolor Symposium would be recorded but not the Cataloguing one.

### **Voting procedures**

To speed up the voting procedures, Mrs BOWSER suggested there should be a nominating committee who would prepare and circulate a list of candidates in advance, making it quite clear that members were of course free to submit additional names at the Congress itself.

She felt such a system would ensure that all members had in advance the names of candidates who had confirmed they were willing to serve, it would encourage them to give more careful thought to its choice of officers and ensure a better balance of officers and EC members than the present haphazard system.

The following points were raised in general discussion:

#### **i Additional meetings**

##### **- 1987 Berlin Congress Working Group**

Mrs ORBANZ felt there should be a meeting of the Working Group planning the Technical Symposium for the 1987 conference in Berlin. Mr KLAUE suggested it should be on the Agenda of the newly elected EC who would decide who should belong to that Working Group.

##### **- Preservation Committee**

Mrs BOWSER added that the Preservation Committee would meet after the New York Congress.

**Decision (after Rome):** Meeting to be held May 2 - 5 inclusive.

##### **- PIP Supporters Group**

Mr KLAUE mentioned time should be allocated for their meeting.

#### **ii Time allocations**

Mr SCHOU pointed to the small amount of time allotted to the important Technicolor symposium (3 hours compared with 16 hours on Slapstick), suggesting it might have been better to postpone it if insufficient time can be given to it.

Mrs BOWSER felt the time allocations should reflect the interests of the host archive: hers was more interested in film history. The situation had been reversed at Stockholm where all the time had been devoted to technical matters. Mr KULA supported this view and felt FIAF was concerned for balance between research and technical matters over a period of years rather than within each Congress. At Stockholm there had been no historical symposium; on another occasion, or indeed in New York, it might seem appropriate to have no technical symposium at all.

On the Cataloguing Workshops, Mr KLAUE asked if there were sufficient delegates from developing countries to make it necessary to cover basic principles; would it not be better to spend more time on the computer side? Mrs BOWSER reported that the Cataloguing Commission felt that the Heads of Archives should be made familiar with the basic principles of cataloguing; in addition, only small groups could use the computer at a time. All sessions were of course optional.

#### **iii Information on planned attendance at Symposia & Workshops**

#### **iv Excursions & Visits**

Mr KULA suggested it would be interesting to visit the **Astoria** Studios and their Museum of the Cinema but Mrs BOWSER was not sure if there would be anything to see at that stage. Some people might like to visit the **Broadcasting Museum** in the next block.



- **American Film Archives Advisory Committee:** before the Congress  
Mr SPEHR mentioned that this Committee happened to be meeting in New York the week before and a number of archivists were therefore hoping to stay over as Visitors. If any FIAF members were interested to attend the Committee's meeting, they should contact Mr Rosen.

- **Washington & Los Angeles:** after the Congress  
Mrs BOWSER and Mr SPEHR mentioned that the **National Archives** and the **Smithsonian** would both welcome FIAF visitors after the Congress and some hospitality funding might be available. Mr SPEHR would welcome visitors to the **Library of Congress** and he said the West Coast people would welcome visitors too.

**Action:** Members to be given information in advance to assist with travel planning.

Mr KLAUE then turned to the General Assembly and the EC re-opened the discussion of the meeting after Vienna when ways were sought to encourage more active participation in the proceedings from the floor, especially in the sessions devoted to the formal Reports.

### Reports

All agreed that the written reports should be supplied well in advance. Mr DAUDELIN suggested the Chairman should then speak for 10 minutes maximum and Mrs DRBANZ repeated the suggestions that the Chairman should use "planted questions" to get the discussion going.

Mr SCHOU thought the Reports should be read aloud for the sake of the simultaneous translation but others felt this was boring, difficult to assimilate at reading-aloud speed, and no-one listened anyway. Mr TOEPLITZ felt the Reports should certainly not be read but the Chairman could make a brief oral summary and then invite views on specific topics that interested him. Mr KULA cited the example of learned societies where a "Discussant" who had read the Report in advance would comment on it; he felt this would provoke more reaction from the floor.

Mr KLAUE reminded the EC that the Reports could not be circulated in advance of the Congress itself as they first had to be approved by the EC meeting immediately before. Mrs VAN DER ELST mentioned that 2 Commissions would not be meeting before New York so their Reports could in fact be mailed in advance.

### Open Forum

Mr FRANCIS suggested that, in addition to questions from the floor, the Open Forum should have a particular theme, perhaps related to the interests of the host. Mr KULA felt an interesting and appropriate theme for New York would be **video** (the collection of video as an art form and the relationship between video and experimental independent film), as MOMA already have an important collection. Mr FRANCIS suggested it would be useful to take topics that had already been issues in the past, as for instance **archive distribution**, an area in which MOMA was particularly active.

Mrs WIBOM said young archives often asked what were "**the 100 classics**" which should be in every archive; others asked for video-tapes for the use of students. One always had to explain the problems of copyright, etc, but she felt nevertheless it was a topic worth pursuing. In France, for instance, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has already prepared a small suitcase containing works by modern French film-makers.

Mr KULA said he and Mr SPEHR had spent considerable time trying to compile a list of what might be called the "basic core collection of classics" which should be available for study in any serious University film department but had had trouble as soon as they started investigating the copyright problems. Nevertheless, he felt it would be interesting to at least discuss the preparation of a list for young archives. Mr KLAUE felt it should be added to the List of Future Projects so a list could be prepared before attempting discussion in Open Forum. Mr TOEPLITZ reported that such a list already existed in the Australian archive.

Mr CINCOTTI doubted the value of a list of classics for all archives as the idea of a classic would vary from country to country. An attempt had been made in 1958 in Brussels but in his view each country should make its own decisions.

Mrs WIBOM said that in making the suggestion she had not spoken of the content of the list and was not suggesting there should be one, universal list. She had thought it might be a starting point for archives, on their own or in groups, to draw up their own list and work towards obtaining the rights to make videotape copies of films which they themselves felt should be available in their archives. Even in her own fairly well-equipped archive, she had no resources to acquire films from young film-makers from Africa, Asia or Latin America. However, even if she could not obtain them, she would find it very informative to see the lists prepared by archives in those regions.

Mrs BOWSER thought it might be interesting to introduce in Open Forum the subject to be discussed at the **next Congress** to get people thinking about it in advance.

Mr TOEPLITZ proposed that for New York it would be preferable to have 3 or 4 speakers prepared to introduce these topics and see which if any generated interest from the floor. Someone could also introduce the idea of having a theme for future Open Forum sessions and see what response the idea generated.

### **Decisions**

Mr KLAUE reviewed the discussion and suggested the following:

- Reports of Documentation & Preservation Commissions to be sent out in advance in English (before the end of March)
- No reports to be read at the GA
- Time limit of 10-15 minutes for verbal report.
- Chairmen of the Commissions responsible to find individuals to raise questions or comment on the reports.
- For the Open Forum, raise several interesting topics rather than trying to pursue a single topic in detail.
- Invite members to be prepared for discussion in Open Forum and submit subjects in advance.
- The idea of a Nominating Committee for elections to be added to list of amendments to Statutes & Rules (perhaps referring to previous written proposal submitted to Secretariat in the 1970's)

### **Relations with Film Producers**

Mr SPEHR suggested it would be useful to invite to the Congress a representative from the Motion Picture Association of America. One of the objectives of the foundation of the new National Center for Film & Video Preservation, strongly supported by Mr Hodsell of NEA, was to bridge the gap between archival activities and the commercial motion picture industry in Hollywood.

Mr KLAUE and Mrs BOWSER both felt the Congress was not the occasion to attempt to initiate contact. An unfruitful meeting had been held in 1969 with FIAPF and the people concerned were still in office so it was best to leave the bridging to Mr Hodsell. Other members reported that the producers were still suspicious of archives over copyright matters.

### **Mrs BOWSER's Sabbatical**

Mrs BOWSER reported that immediately after the Congress she would be starting a one-year sabbatical. She would be able to attend EC meetings if elected but would not stand for office or take on any new projects.

## **6 ELECTIONS**

A brief discussion was held off the record to establish who would be willing to stand for office at the next elections. In the past, there had been an attempt to try and ensure good balance within the EC between East and West; now there were additional dimensions to consider: North and South, North America and Latin America, established archives and young archives. In addition, it was of course necessary for members to have competence in one of the two official languages, English and French.

In addition to Mrs BOWSER, Mr FRANCIS said he was unable to take on any additional commitments (in London he had already taken on the additional task of getting the new Museum of the Moving Image off the ground).

## **7 FUTURE CONGRESSES 1986 - 89**

### **7.1 Canberra 1986**

Mr SCHOU made available to the EC copies of recent documents and press releases covering the changes in its status since April 1984 and demonstrating the considerable government support they now enjoyed. In particular, he pointed out that the staff numbers were scheduled to grow from 10 to 50 within the financial year and would stand at 70 at the time of the Congress. Overall funding was \$2.6million. An 11-man Advisory Committee, drawn from the film, television and sound industry, was meeting regularly to help get the archive off the ground quickly. He brought a film with him to show the EC the new building, the festivities at the opening and the widespread media coverage and took the opportunity to express formal appreciation from all at the archive for the substantial help provided by FIAF and its individual members which had been a significant factor in their success.

He had only 2 points to add to his Vienna report on the preparations for the Congress:

i They had sought Unesco help for a 5 day seminar for developing



archives, primarily concerned with legal matters, drafting of Charters, etc. Unesco had suggested this could be covered in 2 days, leaving 3 days for technical matters and practical film handling.

- ii They confirmed they had \$20,000 to support travel for members with financial difficulties.

**Action:** Mr KLAUE asked that Mr SCHOU should bring to the EC meeting before the New York Congress a fully updated plan and budget. Requests for Unesco support should also be submitted to the national authorities by early 1985, with copies to FIAF so that they may be supported.

## 7.2 Berlin 1987

Mrs ORBANZ said they had so far only had two replies from the other international organisations about their interest in participating in the 1987 Congress in Berlin :

- ICA suggested a symposium similar to that in Stockholm;
- IASA suggested emphasis on archive work (restoration and re-recording on other media, video and video disk, etc)

She proposed a 3-day Symposium and put forward two possible themes :

- miniaturisation of film, paper and stills holdings
- archiving on film itself (emphasis on copy and restoration techniques)

Dr Rathsack, with his interest in CILECT, had also suggested something to do with film schools.

In connection with the "new technologies" theme, she mentioned that the major manufacturers' exhibition, the Funkausstellung, was held every two years and was scheduled for September 1987. If FIAF wanted the very latest information, then the Congress should be held in September too.

She asked that a Working Group should be set up as soon as possible, both within FIAF and with the international organisations, so that they could start seeking the cooperation of the industry.

In the discussion, Mr FRANCIS and Mr KULA both confirmed that FIAT were very keen to participate and would be responding after their own meeting in Madrid. They were ready to participate in a planning meeting in New York.

Mr SCHOU confirmed that the Preservation Commission would be keen to participate in sessions relating to preservation of film as film. On the question of the new technologies, he thought it would be interesting and



important to raise the issue of the long term problems of changing to high technology when:

- the rate of development meant that the equipment itself was likely to be superseded very quickly
- devices were so dependent on high technology that there was no possibility for archives to make or modify their own, as had been the case with film projectors
- there were as yet no long term chemical ageing tests on the actual storage media as suitable for retention 50 or 100 years or longer, even supposing today's new equipment was still usable (and supported by the manufacturers) over such extended time periods.

Mr KULA agreed that these were important and interesting issues for discussion.

On the question of dates, Mr KLAUE noted that the FIAF Congress had previously been scheduled to fit in with but not clash with the major Film Festivals in Europe and to avoid the high-fare travel periods. In view of the growth and diversity of FIAF, he felt the European Festivals could no longer be considered a relevant factor. September was after the high season but the membership should be asked at the GA if it was acceptable.

**Action:** Mrs DRBANZ to:

- prepare for New York specific proposals for dates and theme;
- make direct personal contact with whoever she wanted to join her Working Group, preferably in advance so they could meet in New York.

## 7c Paris 1988

Mr BORDE made a verbal report as follows:

- **Role of CNC:** CNC had confirmed that they would take responsibility for the physical organisation and provide financial support
- **Invitation:** the 4 French archives (CF, CU, SAF, Toulouse) had agreed that they would issue the invitation jointly and on an equal basis; they would invite Lyon to join them if appropriate when the time came.
- **Budget:** CNC had asked for information on the amount of help FIAF would be able to provide.
- **Location:** They were currently considering the Musée des Arts et Traditions Populaires, near the Bois de Boulogne. They suggested however that FIAF might ask Unesco to house the conference to celebrate the 50th Anniversary of one of its members, which would help to increase the prestige and impact of the occasion.
- **Exhibition:** They thought the main Exhibition (which would include the history of FIAF and a display area at the disposal of each individual archive) might be held in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Musée des Arts et

Traditions Populaires or the Musée d'Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris.

- **Screenings:** The Cinémathèque Française would use the Palais de Chaillot and Bois d'Arcy hoped to run programmes before, during and after the Congress. At the moment, they envisaged two compilation films: one of the treasures of FIAF archives, and one of trailers of French films.

- **Symposium:** To be decided

- **Livre d'Or:** The Cinémathèque Française had been asked to search its archives for FIAF material for the Langlois period, 1938-45.

In the discussion, Mr POGACIC expressed the view that the history of FIAF would not be of great interest to the outside world. He remembered that in Paris in 1955 there had been a major exhibition of world cinema at the Palais de Chaillot and he would like to see a really major event planned for a popular cultural centre like the Beaubourg.

Mr TOEPLITZ felt it was an important task for the new EC to set up a working group to prepare for this Congress and agreed with Mr POGACIC that they should think big and make it a major cultural event.

Mr FRANCIS felt it was important to get the cooperation of the distribution circuits worldwide so that the films prepared should be shown in cinemas, with the "cinema experience", rather than simply on TV. Mr KULA agreed but felt it was important to acknowledge the power of TV and get the cooperation of the international TV networks as well to reach an even wider audience. Kevin Brownlow had already expressed interest in making a TV film to demonstrate the work of the archives worldwide. It was not so much the Federation itself but the achievements of the individual members that would interest the public.

Mrs WIBOM supported Mr FRANCIS' view but thought it was important to harness the power of TV for marketing. She felt it was French TV more than anything which had kept the cinema alive in France. She mentioned that only a few days previously Chris Marker had told her he would like to make a film for the occasion; she had no authority to encourage him but she thought it would be an excellent idea for FIAF to consider.

Mrs ORBANZ felt the Paris cinemas could be asked to cooperate as well.

Mr KLAUE asked the Treasurer to prepare for New York a statement of how much FIAF could afford to add to the normal Congress budget for this special anniversary. He agreed with Mr TOEPLITZ that a Working Group should be appointed in New York; in particular, it was important to make decisions on who should coordinate the archive contributions to the Exhibition and the compilation film, at the practical level but more importantly at the aesthetic level.

EC Rome, No

Mr DE VA  
to be a p

**Action:**  
so that

After a  
two wor  
with the  
itself w  
Annivers  
major e  
world's

Mr DAUD  
a FIAF V  
suggest

## 7.4

Mr DAUD  
(who ha  
Cinéma  
Havana  
Cinetec  
1994 to  
their re

They w  
concern  
alterna

Mr DE VAAL mentioned that the official exhibition organisers would need to be a proper legal body for insurance purposes.

**Action:** Mr BORDE to arrange a working meeting of all the French archives so that they can bring more detailed proposals to New York.

After a short break, Mr POGACIC stressed that it was important to have two working groups, one of the French archives who would be concerned with the detailed organisation of the events in Paris, but one of FIAF itself which would be concerned with the overall planning of the Anniversary on a world-wide basis. He reiterated his point that it was a major event, the archives had made major contributions to saving the world's heritage, and FIAF should be thinking big.

Mr DAUDELIN agreed and pointed out that at Toulouse the EC had appointed a FIAF Working Group (Mrs BOWSER, MM BORDE, DAUDELIN and KLAUE) and suggested they should try to meet in New York before the first EC meeting.

#### 7.4 Subsequent Congresses

Mr DAUDELIN confirmed that there were 3 invitations for 1989: Lisbon (who had wanted 1988), Poona and Montreal (25th anniversary of the Cinémathèque Québécoise; offer of government to finance FIAF Congress). Havana had issued an invitation for 1990 (30th Anniversary) and the Cineteca Nacional in Mexico had already issued a formal invitation for 1994 to celebrate their 20th Anniversary and the 10th Anniversary of their reconstruction.

They would decide on 1989 in New York and he would ask the 3 archives concerned to indicate if they were able or interested to take an alternative year if not chosen for 1989.

## 8 REPORTS OF THE SPECIALISED COMMISSIONS

### 8.1 Cataloguing Commission

The EC reviewed the written report submitted by Mrs HARRISON. Mr KLAUE mentioned that there was a possibility of Unesco support for some publications which would be discussed under item 10 of the Agenda.

#### - **Union List of Nitrate Sound Feature Films**

Mrs VAN DER ELST referred the EC to a supplementary document prepared by Roger Holman on the project for The Union List of Nitrate Sound Feature Films (1927-55). He asked if the EC approved the proposals and asked for clarification on the following:

- should it be sent to Observers as well as Members ?
- should Country refer to country of production or release ?

All agreed that Observers should be included as they now were for the Silent Feature Film Catalogue.

Mr FRANCIS pointed out that the Observations section had been included in case it was felt additional information or clarification was needed.

Mrs BOWSER felt the project should follow the conventions used by the Cataloguing and Documentation Commissions on previous projects; for example, the Date should refer to year of first showing anywhere to press or public, not the year of production.

Mr TOEPLITZ felt it could be misleading to give the country of original release instead of the country of origin. He cited the example of Austrian films (like Masquerade and many other films) which for commercial reasons were first released in Germany. Mr CINCOTTI mentioned that in some cases, where for instance a film was released many years after production, two dates would be necessary.

Mrs BOWSER felt it was not appropriate to discuss such details in the EC: it was an internal catalogue for identification purposes only and it was important to keep it simple and as far as possible be consistent with precedents already set.

**Decision:** Issue to Members & Observers. The Secretariat to go ahead with printing standardised card and distributing them for completion.



## 8.2 Preservation Commission

Mr SCHOU opened by thanking Mr CINCOTTI for his hospitality and for organising the visit to the impressive new colour vaults; they would be interested to have reports on experiences once they become operational as they might well be a model for other archives.

Referring to his written Report, he raised the following points:

### - Status of the Video Section of the Volkmann Manual

At their November meeting they had thought this section should be dropped as the revisions to be coordinated by Mr KULA as Chairman of the FIAT Technical Committee were not available. However, Mr KULA now felt they could meet the deadline.

Mr FRANCIS who had attended the recent FIAT meeting in Madrid reported on the latest FIAT view: broadcast engineers from two organisations had approved the historical section and the questions raised but felt the solutions were not sufficiently up-to-date. He said however, that FIAF should bear in mind that these engineers were primarily concerned with transmission rather than preservation. In addition, FIAT saw itself as the organisation which should be writing about video. However, their proposed Technical Manual seemed now to be taking the form of a collection of existing articles without editorial control so was not really suitable as an alternative. If the video section was to be retained in the Volkmann document, there was an alternative suggestion that it might be based on the article by Jim Wheeler on video tape handling and preservation.

Mr KULA acknowledged that the video section was unsatisfactory for those in the forefront of technology but it did contain a lot of useful information for practising television archivists. He proposed to edit the valuable historical section but cut down on the technical information in the television section where it was not reliably up-to-date and where in fact there was no consensus on television handling procedures. Mr SCHOU asked that the revisions should be with him in time for the video section to be included in the Index.

### - Terms of Reference

Mr SCHOU raised again the question of terms of reference for the Preservation Commission. If FIAF members needed help on video preservation, then they might have to consider setting up a separate working group as the problems were so different. He would prefer however to have collaboration with FIAT.

Mr SPEHR felt there should also be exchange of information about magnetic recording tape with other organisations, like IASA who had done a lot of work on the preservation of sound recording tape. Were there for instance significant differences between sound and video recording materials ?

Mr SCHOU and Mr FRANCIS noted that the FIAF Statutes & Rules defined film as including video tape and disc and audio-visual materials generally and this also appeared in the new brochure on FIAF publications. Mr FRANCIS felt the mention in the brochure had been somewhat disturbing to FIAT and perhaps it was time to clarify the boundaries between FIAF and FIAT's areas of responsibility.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that the reality was that film archives had to take care of video material in their collections so the definition should remain in the Statutes but the FIAF Preservation Commission should concern itself with film. He hoped that it would be possible to come to agreement with FIAT to define individual areas of research to avoid overlap and duplication of effort. Mr KULA felt it was reasonable that members of each Federation should expect their own Federation to provide support for whatever was in their own archive: FIAT archives for instance would look to FIAT for preservation information on their film holding as well as television. He agreed however that the main function of the Round Table was to cooperate to avoid duplication of effort.

Mr KLAUE felt that to avoid any misunderstandings MM KULA and FRANCIS should make it clear to FIAT that FIAF and its present Preservation Commission had no intention of doing research on video; it was simply a question of completing editing on the Volkmann project which had after all been started before FIAT existed.

**Decision:** Mr KULA agreed that the revised text should be in Mr SCHOU's hands for inclusion in the index but if not received it would be dropped (deadline during discussion "end of January" later amended to "end of December"). Mr KLAUE asked that the Foreword contain a mention that the video section had been changed.

– **FIAF Preservation Commission Technical Manual (loose-leaf)**

Mr SCHOU presented again the arguments for having a loose-leaf manual so that documents could be distributed cheaply and rapidly. They would be taking the advice of the Cataloguing Commission on organisation of the contents. Mr KLAUE felt the manual could be useful inside and outside FIAF but reminded Mr SCHOU that they would need to consider problems of copyright, pricing, etc. if the manual was to be available on subscription outside FIAF. Mr KULA pointed out the copyright problems would be considerably reduced if there were no public sale. In addition, if it was

restricted to FIAF archives, the documents could more readily be considered as tentative rather than definitive reports.

- **Other matters**

Mr SCHOU then commented other activities in his report, including tests at the Royal Danish Laboratory for Stability Testing of Explosives to collect data on temperatures at which film is affected; projects discussed with Unesco, in particular alternative storage proposals for survival of moving images in hot and humid countries.

**Decision:** The Report was formally approved and Mr SCHOU was asked to summarise all Reports into one Report covering the whole year for the New York Congress.

### 8.3 Documentation Commission

In the absence of Mrs STAYKOVA, Mr KLAUE commented her Report.

In response to Mrs ORBANZ, Mrs BOWSER said the Commission was seeking replacements for herself and the other member who had left.

Referring to point 2, Mr KLAUE reported the publisher was obviously pleased with sales of the International Directory of Set Designers although he was not revealing the figures. Volume 4 was available for viewing in Rome, Volume 5 covering Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Austria and Switzerland was due out in June 85 and Volume 6 in the autumn. The working party had been very well received by the Greek archive in Athens.

**Decision:** There being no further comments or questions, the Report was formally approved.

## 9 PROJECTS & PUBLICATIONS UNDERWAY

### 9.1 Embryo 3 (New York)

Mrs BOWSER had nothing to add to her Vienna Report and confirmed that camera-ready copy would be ready by mid-1985 for publication by FIAF in 1985 or 1986. She had already written a Preface with special reference to access problems and asked for comments. Mr FRANCIS and Mr KULA agreed to look at it and bring their comments to New York.

### 9.2 Silent Feature Film Catalogue (Brussels)

Mr DAUDELIN reported that Mr Ledoux accepted the April 85 deadline but had suggested 3 further technical questions should be asked (whether the nitrate was already protected by copying, whether it had been converted to sound with part loss of the image, whether it was tinted or toned). Mr Ledoux acknowledged that not all would be able to reply but thought these questions were worth asking, if only for the basis of a future edition.

Mr BORDE felt the first and third questions were very relevant and Mrs ORBANZ mentioned that Mr Ledoux had told her he hoped to get answers to these questions for the present edition and still meet the deadline.

**Action:** Mrs ORBANZ to give Mr Ledoux the EC's go-ahead.

### 9.3 Rapallo Symposium papers (Rome)

Mr CINCOTTI confirmed that the transcription was nearly complete and he would edit some sections where the recording had been faulty. He expected it to total some 100 pages which should be ready for the Secretariat by the end of November.

Mr DAUDELIN volunteered to re-read the text and make any necessary editorial changes so that Mrs VAN DER ELST could give it straight to the printers without first having to find time to check it.

### 9.4 Stockholm Symposium papers (Mr KULA)

Mr KULA confirmed that the manuscript was now ready to be sent to Rio for publication by FIAT. It should be available by Feb/March 1985

### 9.5 Annual Bibliography of FIAF members' publications (Ottawa)

Mr KULA reported that the National Film, Television and Sound Archives had agreed to compile and publish as in the past. Work was underway.

### 9.6 International Bibliography on the Cinema (Bucharest)

Mr KLAUE had no news since Vienna.



**Action:** Mrs ORBANZ to contact them for information and to ask for a report for New York.

### 9.7 Bibliography of catalogues of ancient cinematographic equipment (Montréal)

Mr DAUDELIN confirmed that Mr Verronneau was cataloguing material as it arrived. New material would be available in New York.

### 9.8 Revised edition of the Handbook for Film Archives (Mrs BOWSER/Mr Kuiper)

Mrs BOWSER confirmed some useful photos had been received from Mr Frantz Schmitt and Mr SPEHR but the deadline for the Commissions was the end of 1984. She thought there might be some problem if Mr Kuiper lost his job through the closure of the Rochester archive.

Mr KULA mentioned that Unesco had commissioned a basic text on film archives from Christopher Roads and several members of the EC who had read it were unhappy with it. He felt that if FIAF wrote to Unesco saying the combination of the Technical Manual and the revision of the Handbook (scheduled for say mid-1986) and the new loose-leaf Technical Manual covered the same areas, then they might be pleased to use this as an excuse to abandon the idea of publishing the Roads manuscript. In his view, the Roads manuscript would need substantial rewriting to make it acceptable to the FIAF community. It seemed that the contract had not yet been issued but Manila (FAP) were prepared to publish it. The IFTC wanted to publish it in Europe but he believed Unesco would be quite pleased to drop it altogether if they had a formal letter from FIAF saying it was unnecessary. Mrs WIBOM pointed out that Unesco had already paid for the manuscript so it was now their property and they had discharged their obligation to Mr Roads.

**Action:** A telex from the EC to be sent to Unesco (Mr Arnaldo).

### 9.9 Glossary of laboratory terms (Mr SPEHR)

Mr SPEHR reported that work is progressing and a deadline for issue of the English language text would be given in New York.

### 9.10 Survey: Use of films in the collection (New York)

Mrs BOWSER had nothing to add to her written report dated August 84, except that she had since received two more replies.

**Decision:** Report to be published in the Bulletin.

### 9.11 FIAF Summer School 1984 (Mr KLAUE)

Mr KLAUE had nothing to add to his written Report except to say he thought the Summer School would not be repeated in its present form. In future

it might be best to consider holding training on a more regional basis rather than in Central Europe. Interest remained and people were enthusiastic. It was a good group and there was useful exchange between the participants.

MM SPEHR, Mr FRANCIS and Mr SCHOU all reported that their delegates were extremely positive about all aspects of the Summer School.

**Action:** Mr KLAUE to advise Mr DE VAAL which portions of the Report should appear in the next Bulletin.

### 9.12 50th FIAF Anniversary (Mr KLAUE)

Mr KLAUE reported that Mrs VAN DER ELST was compiling all the proposals put forward so far. He agreed with Mr POGACIC's previous point that the Anniversary should be celebrated worldwide: FIAF should cooperate with all the archives to encourage local activities, in addition to those planned by FIAF as a Federation and those planned with the French archives for the Paris Congress. He stressed the need for concrete decisions to be taken in New York.

Mrs DRBANZ suggested the list of ideas should be put in the Bulletin inviting members for positive response before New York and Mr DAUDELIN reminded the EC that it had already been agreed there would be a permanent column in the Bulletin devoted to the Anniversary.

#### **Decision:**

- Appeal for contributions to be put in next Bulletin for reply before end of March.
- Working Group to meet for some 4-5 hours in New York before the first EC meeting so that more concrete proposals can go before the EC and GA.

The EC broke early for lunch in order to receive Italian journalists for a joint Press Conference for FIAF and the Cineteca Nazionale

### 9.13 Statistics on Film Archives' Activities (MM KLAUE/KULA)

Mr KLAUE presented two draft documents as a basis for discussion, one covering current holdings of the archives, the other an Annual Return to be used to update the basic information.

Mr KULA stressed that if the statistics were to be meaningful it was essential to agree on definitions and for FIAF to decide what kind of information would be most useful. For instance, if an archive acquired a lot of material relating to a single title, should it count as one title, or a number corresponding to the number of separate items. He mentioned that other kinds of archives simply indicated volume of new acquisitions in "meters of shelving": this was much easier but not very meaningful.

FIAF had to decide questions like whether it wanted to compare the volume of acquisition in different archives or the percentage of national production passing into each national archive each year.

Mr CINCOTTI raised other problems of definition where he himself would have difficulty in knowing what was required:

- on point 1.1: within an archive, films might be classified by type (feature, documentation, animation, etc) or by length (long, short) but there was a confusing tendency to imply that 'non-features' were 'shorts'. He felt it was important therefore to clarify what was meant (perhaps with a sub-division Length within Type).
- on point 1.3, Acquisitions, he felt it would be more useful to indicate total length in metres rather than number of reels as the 300 and 600 mm referred to the box sizes rather than the actual contents.
- on point 2.5, Restoration treatment could usefully be extended to include for instance treatments relevant to the sound rather than the image alone.
- on point 2.6, he didn't understand what was meant by "editorial restoration" so would be unable to reply.
- on point 3.1, he asked which catalogue was referred to : internal reference or catalogue of films available for external distribution
- on point 4.2, he asked for clarification of "number of requests"

Mr SPEHR had some similar editorial comments he would pass on outside the meeting but in principle he thought it was an important exercise for FIAF to attempt to collect statistics covering the whole film archive world. As the statistics became available, archives would soon identify practical uses for them; in his own case, he would find it very useful to have some external measure to assess the "performance" of his own archive and in talking with their own administration. He would find it difficult to compile the statistics as they don't know how large their own collections are but he thought it was important to make a start and find out what statistics the archives found it possible to collect.

Mr FRANCIS would prefer to see a reduction in the amount of information required, perhaps by combining some questions. He would like to introduce however some categorisation by time period (perhaps by decades or even simply silent and sound) to give some indication of which material was being saved. In addition, he would like space for some qualitative information, for instance, a space for not more than 100 words on "your most important acquisitions".

Mrs BOWSER felt many archives would be like their archive in not keeping these statistics even though they acknowledged their value. She suggested they would not have the staff to cope with all these questions



at once and it might be more successful to introduce in stages to give archives the chance to set up appropriate systems.

Note from transcriber :

Archives should have the summary of long term requirements however so they can design systems with future expansion in mind.

Mr SCHOU agreed that many archives did not collect statistics although their archive kept monthly records. He suggested it might be useful to collect information from archives that did already keep statistics so that their experiences might be used in the design of the questionnaire. In their nitrate copy programme, they kept a record not only of the number of feet copied but the number of feet of preservation copy, of dupe copy and of viewing copies.

Mrs BOWSER mentioned that many archives had years of backlog when they took on new bulk deposits: they had rough estimates only and some provision would be needed to record the correct figures when they became available, for the year of acquisition rather than the year of accurate inventory.

Mr KULA reiterated the importance of clarifying why the statistics were wanted. He felt the report on total holdings would be extremely difficult, especially for the larger archives. For IIAF's efforts in seeking help from Unesco and other international organisations, and interventions with national governments, he felt the first priority was to have good standardised information on archives' activities from year to year, especially in those parts of the world outside Europe and North America where the cultural heritage was most at risk. In these areas, it was important to have good simple statistics, both on annual acquisitions and on what they represented in terms of percentage of national production.

Mr NAIR thought the original intention had been to publicise past and present achievements of archives and to take stock of what needed to be done in terms of national production. The most important information therefore was the % of national production held and the nitrate holdings which remained to be copied for protection. In his view the questionnaire needed redesigning to reflect that emphasis.

Mrs ORBANZ recalled that standardised Statistics were also needed for the annual President's Report, which currently relied on non-standard information from the Annual Reports. She agreed with Mrs BOWSER's recommendation for a gradual introduction.

Mr KULA referred to the RAMP study in 1983 by Frank Evans and Eric Ketelaar which suggested that the simplest approach to standardisation was to count the metres of shelving. Although he



acknowledged this was too simple, he felt the present proposals were too complex, and a compromise was needed. Mr KLAUE agreed but felt that Mr KULA's own notes had been useful in identifying problem areas but lacked concrete proposals; the draft before the EC was provided in order to provide a starting point for discussion and decision on what was practicable. He agreed it was too long and it was essential to have clear definitions.

Mr FRANCIS suggested they should aim to have a reasonably comprehensive picture by 1988 in time for the 50th Anniversary. He, MM SPEHR, KLAUE and TDEPLITZ all agreed implementation would have to be gradual. There would be time to improve the questions after an initial trial.

Mr KLAUE and Mr SPEHR felt there was no advantage in Mr SCHOU's suggestion that archives that already had experience of keeping statistics should be consulted: the problem was that they all kept them differently.

**Action:** Mr KULA to draft a simplified version. No change in circular letter from Secretariat re new Annual Reports.

#### **9.14 Collection of national copyright & archive legislation**

Mr CINCOTTI understood that in Vienna it had been decided that EC members would send documents to him in time for the Rome meeting but he had received nothing. He was still willing to work on it as he thought it was an important project.

**Action:** Mr CINCOTTI to draft letter to members asking for documents so that a Working Group could be set up in New York.

#### **9.15 Unesco Courier**

Mrs VAN DER ELST reported that following the appearance of the film archive issue, IFTC had written an angry letter to Mr Glissant, the Editor, with copy to the Director General of Unesco, saying they were offended at not being asked to participate in the publication; they found some articles "silly and offensive". This was apparently the only response to the issue so Mr Arnaldo had suggested that FIAF organise for some more positive comments, especially from outside the archive movement, to redress the balance. Mr FRANCIS pointed out that IFTC were made aware of the proposed issue in Vienna so could have intervened then if interested.

Mr FRANCIS regretted the emphasis on Napoleon in the article by the English Editor but it was acknowledged that FIAF had no power to intervene. Mr KULA said at least they had not put Napoleon on the cover though he regretted their final choice of a radiation technique from 1974 which was used by no-one. Overall, he felt the issue was considerably better than they feared.

**Action:**

- Mr KLAUE to write formally to Mr Glissant with FIAF thanks.
- EC members to encourage response via own local channels.
- Mrs VAN DER ELST to obtain a complete set in all languages to be held at the Secretariat.
- Mr DAUDELIN to ask for return of photos.

**9.16 Filmography 1895 - 1908**

Mr DAUDELIN reported that Mr André Gaudréault had been so fired by the Brighton Congress that since working on the Proceedings, he had now obtained academic funding to work on a complete Filmography of extant films covering the whole period 1895 - 1908, with a complete description of each and an analysis of editing techniques. Mr Gaudréault would like FIAF to be associated with the project but neither he nor Mrs BOWSER saw how this would be possible, apart from putting information in the Bulletin Historical Column.

Mr BORDE pointed out that perhaps 80% of the films produced in the period 1900-1913 had already been lost; those that remained represented a sample based on pure chance rather than statistical sampling methods but he felt that 20% was nevertheless a large enough sample to provide interesting results. He felt FIAF should help to give the project publicity.

Mr FRANCIS felt the project needed more careful planning. In particular, there would be problems if the synopses were to be the length of the sample as this would require extensive cooperation from FIAF member archives, simply in the provision of viewing facilities for the extensive analyses envisaged. He felt FIAF had to think seriously whether it was prepared to give such a level of support; if archives could not provide facilities, then the survey would be incomplete and less useful.

Mr SPEHR agreed that a better project description was needed. At Perpignan, there had been talk of viewing in archives but also of borrowing films which raised further issues.

**Action:**

- Mention of project in the Bulletin for information only.
- Discussion in Open Forum at New York for members to decide on official FIAF stance.

**9.17 Telex at Secretariat**

Mr KLAUE confirmed that the Secretariat would have a subscription to a telex service by Christmas.

## 10 RELATIONS WITH UNESCO

### 10.1 FIAF - Unesco Co-operation

Mr KLAUE referred the EC to the report on his meeting with Mr Arnaldo in June following the Experts' Consultation in Vienna, which showed the list of suggested projects under Programme III.3.6 for the years, 1984, 1985 and 1986-7.

Contracts had been signed for a total of nearly \$25,000 including:

- advisers for the Latin American seminar in Brazil
- editing, production and printing of the Volkmann document
- printing of the polyglot glossary of filmographic terms
- preparations for the African seminar.

There was a possibility of help with the following:

- help with the Canberra seminar
- help with some Preservation Commission projects
- survey on the implementation of the Unesco Recommendation, including provision of a minicomputer/word processor which could then be used in the Secretariat for other information work.

#### **Unesco Fellowships**

Mr KLAUE confirmed that the two Fellowship visits (Tanzania to Pyong Yang and Sri Lanka to Ottawa) had both been a success.

#### **Unesco-sponsored Visit**

In addition to Mr FRANCIS' visit to Malaysia, Unesco were sponsoring a visit by Mrs WIBOM to Thailand and Vietnam to identify what help they needed.

#### **Survey on the use of computers in film archives**

Mr FRANCIS reported that Roger Smithers had taken account of two criticisms of the previous survey: the delay between collection of data and publication; and the need for analysis of the data. The work was nearly complete and he hoped it could be published within 6 months of the last return which was in August 84. Mr FRANCIS mentioned that because of personal travel delays he had asked Mrs WIBOM to raise the matter with Mr Arnaldo; Mr KULA who had been present reported that the response was positive but there was no firm commitment. The changes within Unesco and particularly the scheduled withdrawal of the US in January 1985, meant that future budget situations were uncertain.

Mr FRANCIS reported that Mr Arnaldo had been impressed to note the report on the Minisys system from India in addition to those from Europe and North America. He thought Mr Arnaldo was prepared to support

production of a working document on a word processor. He seemed to think the other document presented by Mrs WIBOM, the **FIAT Survey on Computer implementation for retrieval from TV archives**, could be treated in the same way. Mr KULA said Mr Arnaldo had mentioned a sum of \$2000 and had been exploring locations where it might be done. Mr FRANCIS understood there had been a request to Unesco from Mr NAIR and from someone in New Delhi that Roger Smithers should go and advise them.

**Action:**

- Mr FRANCIS to urge Mr Smithers to complete the script soon and assure him that the document will be published, either by FIAF or with Unesco help.
- Mr KLAUE to write to Mrs Harrison to encourage progress on this and on the glossary.

**Documentation Centre**

Mr KULA had raised again the idea of a Documentation Centre as focus for other projects which could be done on a continuing basis, including the existing PIP service. On this also, Mr Arnaldo had been interested but could give no budget commitment.

**Survey on Unesco Recommendation**

Mr KLAUE asked for their views on whether FIAF should be the initiator for this project: it would require a Working Group and extensive work over a two-year period. He provided a draft questionnaire which would need to be discussed, perhaps in New York.

Mr KULA understood Mr Arnaldo expected the draft to be discussed at the Round Table in Rotterdam in April and before that, for Mr BORDE and perhaps Mr KLAUE, to meet with statistical experts in Unesco to review the draft.

Mr KLAUE thought Mr Arnaldo was much more ambitious as to timescale than he was.

Mr TOEPLITZ felt it would be easier for FIAF to take full responsibility rather than attempting to coordinate with other organisations. Mr NAIR felt it would be very much in FIAF's interests to be active in it.

**Action:**

- EC Members to send their comments on the questionnaire in writing to Mr KLAUE or Mrs VAN DER ELST, so that at least they could demonstrate to Mr Arnaldo that work was being done.
- Mr KLAUE to stress to Unesco that the work could not be done without a word processor



## 10.2 Report on Latin American Seminar

Mr KLAUE confirmed that a written report would be distributed to all members and mentioned in the Bulletin.

## 10.3 Report on visit to Asian Archives

Mr FRANCIS reported he was scheduled to make his report to Unesco by December 15 but he would make a separate version with additional comments for FIAF. He made a quick verbal report as follows:

### Malaysia

He had attended the last 3 days of the ABID workshop (Asian Institute for Broadcasting Development) and found there was a certain amount of unrest as it was too theoretical. Fortunately, he was able to distribute the papers from the FIAT conference in Madrid which were of high quality and gave the latest views.

For the future, he thought it was important:

- to check the qualifications of the participants (10 out of 15 had MA's in Library Science which was much more advanced than anticipated in Paris)
- the course needed more careful preparation, with perhaps the experts meeting one week in advance to design a course that matched the needs of the registered participants.

Because of the Workshop, he had less time to visit the organisations planned. There was a legal deposit statute which was not yet operative but he had been impressed with a sponsorship event and the general competence of Mrs Nor, Director of the Malayan National Archives, who had expressed willingness to host Unesco Workshops under Sarbica (South East Asian Regional Branch of ICA).

Mr FRANCIS pointed out that the national production in the 1960's had been using nitrate stock so FIAF should be wary of assuming the nitrate era finished worldwide at the same time as in Europe and North America.

### Indonesia

Mr FRANCIS had only 2 working days in Indonesia where he found new copyright legislation did not even cover film and the government staff themselves did not know the official policy.

There seemed to be a political problem with the archive which had been set up in 1971 by the Jakarta municipality rather than the state and was

run by a writer/actor who was unwilling to become a government employee as a condition of state support. Mr FRANCIS suggested FIAF might be able to support this individual by calling on his expertise and experience of archiving in unfavourable environments at the Canberra congress.

Both the government films studios and the national archives reported directly to the President rather than the Ministry of Information. At the archive they had some 7,000 reels in cold storage which had all been hand-cleaned and put into new cans with the aid of only one viewing machine and one rewinder.

Their need for help from Unesco was for an expert to visit and train their staff and for Unesco to intervene to help them import German equipment rather than the less suitable Japanese. Apparently, the Unesco coupon system which already exists can help them. They expressed willingness to host a Technical Symposium, provided sufficient basic equipment could be made available for it.

Mr FRANCIS mentioned that the State-run TV training centre was extremely impressive, with BBC-trained staff and excellent equipment; it served the needs of the country's 9 production centres and 21 mobile units.

### **Pakistan**

At the Ministry of Information in Islamabad, it was obvious that archives had a low priority: a building had been abandoned half-finished 2 years ago. However, a recently appointed head of the National Film Development Corporation where they had an archive of national production was beginning to make an impact.

In Karachi, the best hope seemed to come from the Director of the Advertising Association, himself a feature film maker, who had persuaded the International Association of Advertising to hold its conference there in 1988. He had already obtained funds for a new building which he envisaged would house an archive for both advertising and feature films. Mr FRANCIS pointed out that this was an unexpected origin for a film archive but stressed that it was important that FIAF should encourage local initiatives, however unorthodox, if they led to preservation of the cultural heritage.

He thought Pakistan was behind the other two countries in its attitude towards archives but at least the films were held and processed within the country. This had been demonstrated in the preparations for the 1st Pakistan Film Festival with its 30 years retrospective. The other two had to have their films processed outside the country in Hong Kong, Singapore

or Tokyo. In Hong Kong, where the laboratory had gone bankrupt, there were serious dangers that the films would be destroyed by the Receiver and a similar danger existed in Tokyo.

## 11 RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

### **ICA Congress**

There was no time for Mrs ORBANZ to report on the ICA Congress but she mentioned that the Minutes and planned activities of the Audio-Visual Working Group would be available in the Secretariat.

### **Round Table Meeting in Rotterdam, April 1985**

Mr KLAUE expressed his willingness to represent FIAF. Mr KULA will represent ICA.

### **ICA - FIAF Protocol of Understanding**

Mr KULA and Mr KLAUE reported that there were plans to define a bilateral protocol of understanding to avoid duplication of effort. It was hoped that this could be defined and agreed in New York and to this end, the Secretary General, Mr Keckskemeti and the President Professor Booms would be invited to the Congress.

## 12 BUDGET

Mr DE VAAL reported that FIAF was doing well. Unfortunately, the subscription from Rio had still not been paid and was now 3 years' outstanding. He suggested that the 40,000 Belg francs in the 1984 budget under Miscellaneous should be transferred in the new Budget to the new heading, "FIAF 50th Anniversary".

**Action:** Mrs VAN DER ELST to send a registered letter to Rio re the subscription.

## 13 NEXT EC MEETINGS

Mr KLAUE recalled that the schedules for the EC meetings in New York were complete. The NFA had issued an invitation to the EC to meet in London in October 1985, the year of their 50th Anniversary, but this was a matter for the new EC to decide.

## 14 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

### **Nitrate films in Brazil**

Mrs VAN DER ELST distributed some lists from the Cinemateca Brasileira of nitrate films from other countries which they had no funds to copy. They would however be willing to copy them if paid.

*At the close of the meeting, those who were able to stay went to meet the President of AGIS and viewed a publicity film designed to attract Italians back to the cinema, followed by the films of the Canberra Archive opening brought by Mr Schou.*