

F.I.A.F.

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE  
DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

KARLOVY-VARY

15-17 June 1980

CONFIDENTIAL  
-----

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HELD IN  
KARLOVY-VARY June 15-17, 1980

---

Present : Members : W. KLAUE, President  
E. BOWSER, Vice-President  
D. FRANCIS, Vice-President  
V. POGAGIC, Vice-President  
R. DAUDELIN, Secretary-General  
J. de VAAL, Treasurer  
C. ALVES-NETTO  
T. ANDREYKOV  
R. BORDE  
J. STENKLEV

Reserve member : V. TIKHONOV

Honorary members : E. LAURITZEN  
M. SVOBODA  
J. TOEPLITZ  
H. VOLKMANN

Observers : H. HARRISON  
J. LEVY  
V. OPELA

Executive secretary : B. van der ELST

Apologies for absence had been received from Messrs. BUACHE, COMENCINI and KUIPER.

Mr. KLAUE opened the meeting by welcoming the members of the Executive Committee and, in particular, all four of FIAF's honorary members.

Following a request by Mr. STROTCHKOV, the new director of Gosfilmofond, to attend the sessions, the Executive agreed to a proposal by Mr. KLAUE that he should be invited to attend the end of the meeting and be given the floor to state the policy of his archive towards FIAF.

## 1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The following agenda was adopted :

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. APPROVAL of the minutes of the preceding meeting
3. Report on the organisation of the two Symposiums in Karlovy-Vary
4. Membership questions : - New candidatures for  
membership : Beijing  
observership : Perth - Alger - Manila  
- Reconfirmation of observers  
- Varia
5. Financial report on the period January - May 1980
6. Discussion on the policy of FIAF towards film archives in developing countries.
7. Examination of the main points of the General Meeting's agenda and of the report of the President
8. Relations with UNESCO : programme for/the period 1981 - 1983
9. FIAF publications ( Handbook, FIAF Brochure, etc...) and projects
10. Miscellaneous.

## 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

Due to the fact that some members had received their copy of these minutes only the day before, that item was postponed until the next day.

## 3. REPORT ON THE ORGANISATION OF THE TWO KARLOVY-VARY SYMPOSIUMS

### a) Symposium I : on the problem of selection in Film Archives

Mr. LEVY set out the final arrangements for the first Symposium. The speakers were to be Messrs. OPELA, BORDE, ALVES-NETTO, COULTASS, JEAVONS, KARR, SCHULZ and Mrs. URGOSIKAVA from the Czech archive.

Mr. DAUDELIN then explained the running order for the Symposium, pointing out that it would be sufficiently flexible to allow for spontaneous discussion. All the proceedings were to be taped for subsequent transcription and publication.

Mr. OPELA confirmed in response to a query from Mr. FRANCIS that the layout of the Symposium room would permit simultaneous projection and discussion.

b) Symposium II : Post-War Animation ( 1945 - 1959 )

Mr. LEVY then went on to set out the final organisational details of the second Symposium, for which a total of 117 films had been received in addition to filmographies and other documents. Mr. KLAUE thanked the staff of the Ceskoslovensky Filmovy Archiv for their hard work in preparing the Symposiums.

4. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

a) New applications for membership

China Film Archive : Beijing

Mr. DAUDELIN reported that the archives in Beijing had paid their membership fee and, as their application had been discussed at previous meetings in Lausanne and New-York, he proposed that the General Meeting be recommended to approve their candidature.

It was agreed that Mr. de VAAL, who would be visiting China in the autumn, would make the formal inspection required by the Rules. Mr. POGAGIC, who would also be going to China, would undertake the task if it transpired that Mr. de VAAL were unable to do so.

Mr. DAUDELIN reminded the meeting that the Executive Committee was also due to recommend to the General Meeting, the admission of the Imperial War Museum and of Fundacion Cinemateca Argentina (Buenos Aires) as new members. It was agreed that Mr. FRANCIS would make the formal visit to the Imperial War Museum.

b) Applications for observership

State Film Archives of Western Australia : Perth

Mr. FRANCIS, unfortunately, had no knowledge of Mr. EDMONDSON's views on the possible proliferation of archives in Australia.

Mr. TOEPLITZ was able to inform the meeting that Mr. B.E. KING, the director of SWAFA, was a serious man and, although the archive was just starting up, he recommended their admission as observer.

Mr. FRANCIS felt that the question of proliferation was a general issue which needed to be discussed at greater length, perhaps in the Open Forum.

In view of the fact that the documents submitted by Perth had already been



discussed and approved in New-York, there was no further discussion.

The Executive then voted unanimously to admit the State Film Archives of Western Australia as an observer.

#### Cinémathèque d'Alger

Mr. DAUDELIN reported that a very incomplete application had been received from Alger just after the New-York meeting. In addition to the fact that no subscription fee had been received so far, the Secretary-General raised a number of points concerning the budget which Alger had submitted; it was clear from this, for example, that Alger attached greatest importance to its projection activities. Mr. DAUDELIN also recalled the problems that Alger had experienced in its dealings with the producers.

Mr. BORDE, speaking in his own name and on behalf of Mr. BUACHE, counselled prudence for two reasons. Firstly, he felt it was unhealthy for an archive to depend on public screenings for 80% of its revenue - a figure taken from Alger's budget report. Secondly, the producers were vehemently opposed to Alger's practices, and Mr. BORDE thought there was a danger of all FIAF members being tarred with the same brush if Alger joined the Federation.

Mr. BORDE made two proposals : to establish whether there were any outstanding disputes between Alger and the producers, and secondly to pay an informal preliminary visit to Alger to assess the situation. Mr. POGAGIC echoed Mr. BORDE's advice to adopt a cautious approach.

Mr. ALVES-NETTO pointed out that Arab and African archives differed from the " standard model " insofar as they were often entrusted with more extensive cultural, and even commercial, responsibilities. This did not mean, however, that preservation work was necessarily excluded, and he stressed that a different organisational structure was not in itself a reason for rejecting an application. Similar problems of principle would be encountered if other Arab or African countries submitted candidatures. He agreed that there were questions to clear up and advocated discussing them directly with Mr. KARECHE.

Mr. KLAUE said that, if a representative from Alger came to the General Meeting, he could be invited to meet either the whole Executive or a smaller group of its members. Otherwise, the dialogue would have to continue by post, but in any case Mr. KLAUE stressed the need for an objective and not an emotional approach. He felt that the nub of the problem was to discover what the legal basis was for Alger's projection activities, both in respect of

national laws and international copyright conventions, and recalled also that in the past FIAF had successfully exercised its right to educate errant archives about the need to concentrate on the preservation of films.

Mr. TOEPLITZ outlined FIAF's dilemma as he saw it, namely that we would like to recruit as many members as possible and at the same time entertain good relations with the producers. He fully supported Mr. KLAUE's idea of a small group to discuss the issues with Mr. KARECHE or his representative; he should be told frankly of FIAF's objections to Alger's set-up, but reassured that there were possibilities, perhaps by hiving off the archive's commercial and screening interests, for resolving the difficulties and submitting the application to the Rapallo General Meeting.

Mr. TOEPLITZ said that FIAF had solved similar problem cases in the past and emphasised his belief that it would be mistaken on grounds both of policy and principle to shut the door in Alger's face without further ado.

Mr. STENKLEV added his voice to the proposal for a small committee consisting perhaps of the President, the Secretary-General and another person, and said that, if the dialogue with Alger were to continue instead by post, our letter should be written in the spirit of Mr. TOEPLITZ's comments. We must stress the need for strict compliance with FIAF statutes and Rules, drawing particular attention to our disquiet over the percentage of Alger's revenue derived from commercial activities, and could suggest a possible meeting between Mr. KARECHE and a member of the Executive Committee in Alger.

Mrs. BOWSER agreed with this procedure, adding that we should enquire about the archive's responsibility towards the Algerian national film production.

Mr. DAUDELIN clarified this point by referring to Alger's submission, in which they say they hold the entire national production. He then proposed that the 3-men committee to meet Mr. KARECHE, should consist of Messrs. KLAUE, DAUDELIN and, for psychological reasons, ALVES-NETTO; if this meeting did not materialise, Mr. DAUDELIN would write to Alger, setting out the Executive's position.

#### Film Center of the University of the Philippines - Manila

Mr. DAUDELIN briefly introduced this dossier, which had arrived very late. It appeared that the Film Center had no preservation facilities as such, concentrating instead on training, projection and distribution activities. One of its strong points appeared to be the promotion of Filipino films abroad.

Mr. TOEPLITZ added that the director, Mrs. MORENO, was an energetic, well-placed figure, but, more pertinently, the establishment of an archive was an

idea for the future rather than the present. At present, the Film Centre possessed only a small collection of films and other material, along with a library and a photo lab.

Mr. DAUDELIN summarised the documents sent by Manila, stressing again that its archival work proper was effectively non-existent. He recommended writing to Mrs. MORENO to say that we are interested in the application of her Film Center but that we require more information about current preservation activities.

The meeting also learned from Mr. ANDREYKOV that there was another Filipino institution doing archival work, a representative of which had attended the recent meeting in Sofia on the World History of the Cinema project.

#### c) Miscellaneous

- Mr. DAUDELIN read out the list of archives whose membership was due to be re-examined as required by the Rules, in the coming year: Washington AFI, Istanbul, West Berlin, Lausanne and Pyongyang.
- Mrs. van der ELST reported briefly on the recent visit to the Brussels Secretariat of a representative of the Cinemateca Portuguesa in Lisbon. The main point to be noted was that the archive, which is in the throes of organisational change, had expressed a keen desire to develop along model FIAF lines.
- Mr. DAUDELIN told the Executive that it could expect an application for observership during the Karlovy-Vary Congress from the Angolan Film Archive in Luanda, whose representative, Mrs. ALMEIDA, was due to attend the Congress.
- The United Nations Film Archive in New-York had also announced its intention to apply for observer status, as had the Film Department of the National Archives of Malaysia.
- Following a visit to the Secretariat by a Senegalese delegation, Mr. DAUDELIN reported that there was every reason to believe that a national film archive would be established in Senegal in due course.

#### d) Reconfirmation of Observers

Mr. DAUDELIN reported that the vast majority of observers had submitted an activities report, and that there should be no problem to reconfirm these archives. No news had been received from Caracas, Lyon, Montevideo and Teheran, and in the case of Sydney, no subscription had been received for nearly three years.

Association for a National Film and Television Archive : Sydney

Mr. TOEPLITZ said that the ANFTA was a group of enthusiasts with no official support and little prospect of gaining any. What is more, their idea of creating a national archive was purely utopian in view of the existence of Canberra archive. He felt sure that it would be no loss for FIAF if they ceased to be an observer.

It was agreed to write to Sydney giving them three months to settle their arrears or otherwise they would be disaffiliated. The General Meeting would be informed of this decision.

Cinemateca Nacional de Venezuela : Caracas

Mr. ALVES-NETTO told the meeting that he had received an activities report from Caracas just before his departure for Karlovy-Vary, and so presumed that their official report had been delayed in the post. The Executive agreed to reconfirm the Cinemateca Nacional de Venezuela on condition that it submit a report before the next meeting of the Committee.

Comité de Fondation du Musée et de la Cinémathèque de Lyon

Mr. BORDE reported that there had been no change in Lyon's position over the past year. As far as he knew, the administrative obstacles which were hampering the archive's work should be removed in 1981.

Mr. DAUDELIN pointed out that Lyon was a very inactive observer and that there seemed to be little advantage in their membership, either for the archive or for FIAF. It was therefore decided to send a firm letter to the director, Dr. GENARD, to remind him of his obligation to submit an annual report and to invite him to play a more active part within the Federation.

Cine Arte de Sodre : Montevideo

Mr. FRANCIS felt that, from what he saw on his visit to the Sodre, Mr. HINTZ was intent on accomplishing as much preservation work as its material restrictions allowed. Mrs. BOWSER was able to add that she had received a visit from the new overall director of the SODRE.

Mr. DAUDELIN recommended that we impress upon Montevideo the importance of an annual report as a means of maintaining contact, especially with geographically distant archives, and that their observer status could only be reconfirmed once this account had been received.



Filmkhaneh Melli Iran : Tehran

In view of the political developments in Iran and the fact that all mail is returned undelivered, Mr. DAUDELIN proposed that enquiries be made at the Iranian Embassy in Brussels to try to establish which ministry the archive comes under and, indeed, whether it is still functioning.

Mr. ALVES-NETTO urged that in any case this should not be the last attempt to re-establish contact with Tehran. Mr. KLAUE suggested UNESCO in Paris as another avenue of enquiry.

c) Miscellaneous

Sigematek Indonesia : Jakarta

In its annual report, the Indonesian archive had asked FIAF a number of practical questions concerning, among other things, the acquisition of books. In this particular case, it was agreed that the request should be referred to the Documentation Commission but, on a more general level, Mr. KLAUE suggested that any similar queries contained in reports from other archives should be discussed by the Executive at its next meeting in Vienna.

Mr. ALVES-NETTO suggested that the compilation of a book <sup>list</sup> could be a task for the Commission for Developing Countries. Another idea, perhaps suitable for discussion at the Open Forum was the creation of a " book pool "

The film archives in Italy

Mr. DAUDELIN began by recalling the context for this discussion : several FIAF members had received persistent invitations to attend colloquia in Italy, and there were clear signs of increased activity from cine-clubs and peripheral archives. As this seemed to indicate a trend towards the regionalisation of film archives in Italy, Mr. COMENCINI had been asked to prepare a report on this rather confusing situation and the attitude of FIAF's Italian members.

After Mr. COMENCINI's report had been read out ( annex 1 ), Mrs. BOWSER, while regretting very much that Mr. COMENCINI was not here to discuss the whole situation, commented that the growth of regional "film centers" in Italy seemed to resemble the situation in the U.S.A. Welcoming the establishment of a coordinating committee by the FIAF members in Rome, Milan and Turin, she then came to the more particular case of her archive's relations with the Cinoteca Griffith in Italy, on which Mr. COMENCINI complained in his letter.

She stressed that the Cineteca Griffith had already been in existence for a number of years with no contacts whatsoever with MOMA and that it had certainly not been set up with the help of MOMA. She regretted that Cineteca Griffith should be seen as a rival of the FIAF member archives; it was a small specialized archive which conducted serious research and educational work and, Mrs. BOWSER was sure that its director, Mr. HOMOUDA, who purchased his films from a number of sources, had no intention of diverting any regional funds that were available away from the other archives.

As for the charge that Cineteca Griffith was merely a private collection of films, Mrs. BOWSER felt the fact that it received a small subvention from the Federal Government effectively refuted this claim.

Turning to the Exclusivity Rule, Mrs. BOWSER said that, as far as she could remember, the move to make the rule indivisible, ( and hence making it necessary to obtain permission from every FIAF member in a particular country ) had not been accepted. For this reason, she had not sought the permission of all three Italian archives, but only of one in each case.

Mr. DAUDELIN felt the issue was more serious and complicated than Mrs. BOWSER had portrayed it. He referred to a letter he had received from Mrs. Elaine MANCINI, Mr. HOMOUDA's representative in New-York, asking him to provide an article for a book on North American film archives, libraries and related institutions, sponsored by the Venice Biennale and written under the supervision of Cineteca Griffith, a book which would serve as an aid for new regional archives in Italy! Mr. DAUDELIN saw this as an attempt to undermine the official FIAF members and felt it was particularly grave in that again no distinction was made between seriously-minded archives and amateur collectors. He did not doubt Mr. HOMOUDA's seriousness but pointed out that this initiative was being launched in his name. He also agreed with Mr. COMENCINI's assertion that, although he received a small subvention, Mr. HOMOUDA was a private collector. Mr. DAUDELIN concluded by urging the Executive to take a position on this confusing problem and the principles it raised.

Mr. KLAUE proposed to divide the discussion into two parts : firstly, the proliferation of archives ( in Italy and elsewhere ) and, second, the complaint of the Cineteca Italiana against MOMA.

As for the complaint, Mr. KLAUE said that FIAF should reply formally in writing to Mr. COMENCINI and that MOMA ought to do the same.

Mrs. BOWSER, saying that of course she would reply, asked Mr. DAUDELIN to

clarify his misgivings about Mrs. MANCINI's request. Mr. DAUDELIN repeated that it would be wrong to intervene in the Italian situation and effectively further the proliferation of archives there.

Mr. KLAUE spoke of the attitude FIAF should take towards the burgeoning of archival activities in Italy. He felt we should not act counter to the interests of our existing Italian members, and should therefore be careful not to support the growth of regional archives in Italy. Consequently, as the forthcoming " colloquium on filmarchives " was being organised by the Venice Biennale out\_with the FIAF framework, we ought to advise our members not to attend it.

Mr. POGACIC, whilst appreciating the problems in Italy, felt the exclusivity rule was being taken too far if it entailed obtaining the permission of FIAF members to attend a non-FIAF meeting in their country.

Mr. BORDE explained that the situation was similar in France, with a number of so-called regional ' archives " being formed which, in reality, were nothing more than cine-clubs. Turning to the concrete measures FIAF could take, he advocated the utmost strictness in admitting new observers, perhaps stipulating even the number of films to be held by the applicant.

Mr. TOEPLITZ said that there was nothing new about proliferation and cited the example of when several American archives applied simultaneously for membership. But now he thought it was time for FIAF to make a declaration of principles to make it clear that an organisation must have sufficient means to create and maintain an archive, which, after all, was a very different proposition from establishing a small collection of films for teaching or screening purposes. He recalled the crucial importance of a similar declaration, the Zagreb Resolution, which had strengthened FIAF by reaffirming the autonomy of its member archives in relation to film institutes. The new declaration should affirm why a serious archive was absolutely essential to preserve the national production of a country ( for reasons of financial and material resources, power, etc... ) ; the importance and expense of an archive and the need to keep its activities separate from collections of films, held for educational reasons. This declaration, Mr. TOEPLITZ urged, should be conveyed to UNESCO and its national commissions.

He summed up by saying that the present situation was dangerous and that FIAF should adopt an offensive stance, not a defensive one. Referring to the Bologna/Venice meeting, Mr. TOEPLITZ disagreed with Mr. POGACIC, arguing that the presence of FIAF members, even in their personal capacities, effectively sanctioned what amounted to a slap in the face for the Federation.

Mr. STENKLEV affirmed his belief in the effectiveness of national archives and said that FIAF should use the UNESCO resolution due to be passed in Belgrade as the instrument for pursuing its policy in this matter.

Referring to the proposal to be very strict with observers, he saw the danger of the Executive coming into conflict, on this issue, with the General Meeting which, he had the impression, was in favour of extending the rights of observers and making it easier for them to join.

Mrs. BOWSER agreed with Mr. TOEPLITZ, but emphasised that FIAF's problems would not be solved simply by a statement of principles. There was going to be a proliferation of archives whether the Federation liked it or not, and so we had the choice of either dismissing them all as mere cine-clubs or of admitting the serious ones, as in the past, and educating them on the importance of preservation work. She cautioned against putting all new organisations in the same basket and spoke strongly against a return to very restrictive attitudes.

Mr. BORDE fully supported Mr. TOEPLITZ's idea for a declaration of principle in order to make FIAF's aims clear to governments, producers and prospective observers.

Mr. POGACIC also backed the proposal, but stressed that it must be a statement of FIAF's policy and could not seek to proscribe the establishment of regional archives in a country like, say, Yugoslavia, whose federal structure and regional differences made such a development imperative. He then reasserted his view that there was no harm in attending serious meetings which are not sponsored by FIAF.

Mr. TOEPLITZ made it clear that he was not advocating that there should only be centralised archives. He was not against regional archives in principle. The important thing was to stress that anyone wishing to set up a serious archive should be aware of what it costs, what equipment is needed and so on. Any declaration should therefore function as a warning to people of the preconditions for a genuine archive.

Mr. FRANCIS spoke against a formal declaration. He said that FIAF already had a set of rules for admitting observers and agreed with Mr. BOWSER that it would be a shame to revert to more restrictive policies, for it was better that new institutions should develop under FIAF's tutelage rather than outside it. He went on to describe the important role that regional archives played in Britain and how the national archive cooperated successfully with them. He felt sure that there was room for both types of archive and feared that a formal declaration would inhibit the development of potentially important regional institutions.



Mr. TIKHONOV reaffirmed Gosfilmofond's belief in the need for a centralised archive to carry out the task of preserving the national heritage. He realised this was not possible in some countries but, because a proliferation of archives led to a dissipation of energies, he nevertheless felt there had to be a leading archive in every country and that the smaller ones must be made aware of their wider, national responsibilities. He supported Mr. TOEPLITZ's call for a declaration of principles and the proposal to work through UNESCO to implement FIAF policy.

Mr. de VAAL commented that the emergence of film organisations in Italy could not properly be compared with the successful pattern of regional archives in Britain, which were much more serious in their work.

Mr. KLAUE asked how the issue should be presented at the General Meeting. Should it be discussed at the Open Forum or solely among the members? He thought that if agreement could be reached with the members, whose general experience testified to the advantages of central archives, then FIAF could work towards a declaration of principle; a declaration which, while acknowledging regional imperatives in some countries, would advise developing countries in particular of the benefit of concentrating resources in a single archive.

On a practical point, Mr. KLAUE favoured dividing the specific case of Italy from the questions of principle that proliferation raised. He thought the Executive should advise its members to distance themselves from the regional initiatives in Italy, but that the recommendation could not of course be binding upon them.

Mr. DAUDELIN said that in any case we should inform the General Meeting of the position of our Italian members towards the Venice colloquium, ie they will not get involved unless FIAF is asked to become associated with it. It was then agreed that the Italian situation should be discussed during the "closed" session and the general issues during the Open Forum.

Mr. POGACIC proposed that the Executive recommend its members not to accept invitations to attend the Venice meeting unless FIAF were to play an official role in it, but reiterated his opposition to a declaration of principles if, by being distributed through UNESCO, it were to become more than an internal document.

Mr. KLAUE tried to summarise the recommendations to be given to the membership :

- not to go to Venice unless FIAF participates officially;
- not to do anything to foster the spread of regional archives in Italy;
- not to cooperate with the MANCINI book project.

Mr. DAUDELIN, agreeing with Mr. KLAUE, returned finally to the " regional- archive - central archive " conflict; he reminded the meeting of the astute wording of the UNESCO recommendation, which spoke of " officially recognised archives ".

Mr. BORDE offered to introduce the general debate on proliferation at the Open Forum.

( 16 June, afternoon session )

## 5. FINANCIAL REPORT

### 5a Budget comparison for the period Jan-May 1980

Mr. de VAAL made a number of comments on FIAF's budget, so far this year :

- the ceiling for the year's publications budget had almost been reached already, even though other books were due to come out this year.
- FIAF had been asked to make a contribution to the Swiss magazine "Travelling", which had devoted an entire issue to the FIAF Symposium in Lausanne last year.
- FIAF had received the 2nd. instalment of \$ 6,000,- of the Bulgarian grant to the P.I.P., for which the Executive expressed its gratitude.

As for a possible contribution to the issue of "Travelling", relating to the Lausanne Symposium, the meeting agreed with Mr. KLAUE that FIAF's financial circumstances meant that it could not comply with the request.

### 5b Budget 1981

Mr. KLAUE began by saying that he anticipated resistance from the membership to the proposed increase in subscriptions, but that as yet he had received no firm counter-proposal.

Mr. de VAAL then referred to a letter from Mr. LEDOUX who had raised a number of objections to the draft budget for 1981, among them that the Secretariat would account for 66% of FIAF's income (discounting the P.I.P.); Mr. de VAAL pointed out that this was not excessive in view of the fact that personnel costs accounted for between 65% and 80% of the average archive's expenditure.

As for the proposed rise in subscriptions, Mr. de VAAL said that, if we wanted to maintain a smoothly-functioning secretariat and to continue to produce publications, reports and other tangible results, there was no alternative but to increase the fees. Otherwise FIAF would be a mere talking shop.

Mr. STENKLEV refuted another point made by Mr. LEDOUX, namely that FIAF subscriptions are automatically geared to inflation because they were paid in Swiss francs. The existence of inflation in Switzerland and Britain and the high exchange rate of the pound sterling meant that this was not true everywhere.

It was also wrong of Mr. LEDOUX to create the impression that the secretariat was about to take on a second full-time member of staff; it was more accurate to say that there would be two part-timers.

Mr. STENKLEV added that, although the discussion about the P.I.P.'s organisational methods might be resumed, there was no escaping the need for increased subscriptions. Moreover, he stressed that the proposed increase was relatively small and that the subscriptions had not gone up since 1975. He also affirmed, in passing, that the proportion of the cost of executive meetings borne by FIAF was minimal. One reason for FIAF's higher expenditure at present was the large number of publications in hand, but Mr. STENKLEV said the General Meeting should be reminded that these ventures will also generate income for FIAF.

Mr. FRANCIS added that, in his opinion, inflation in Britain would remain at or about the 20% mark for another two years at least.

Mr. KLAUE emphasised the need to prepare the budget discussion thoroughly for the General Meeting and to counter objectively the arguments raised by Mr. LEDOUX.

Referring to the year-over-year deficit of BF 620.000,- ( and not 700.000,- as put forward by Mr. LEDOUX ), Mrs. van der ELST put forward that the Brighton General Meeting had already budgeted for a deficit of 300.000 Belgian francs for 1979 and that it had had to be increased in the course of the year because of the decision to publish the P.I.P. annual volume ourselves and to double the surface of our office in London ( which doubled its cost ) without yet being in a position to earn income from this publication. This revenue was hopefully expected to start coming in the second semester of 1980.

Mr. BORDE counselled caution in the discussion about inflation, saying that the very low rate of inflation in Switzerland compensated to an extent for rising costs elsewhere. Mr. STENKLEV reiterated in reply, however, that it was the relative strength of the Swiss franc in relation to other currencies which counted, and it was a fact that sterling ( in which all our expenses were paid for the P.I.P. ) was stronger now vis-à-vis the Swiss franc than 2 years ago.

Mr. TOEPLITZ urged that the problem of our inflation-related losses be illustrated to the General Meeting by means of concrete examples. It was decided that Mr. STENKLEV present all the relevant figures to the General Meeting. It was also agreed that Mrs. BOWSER would introduce the P.I.P. budget to the General Meeting.

Discussing the moderate increase in personnel costs which will result from the appointment of a second member of staff for the secretariat, Mr. TOEPLITZ argued forcefully that it was absurd for an organisation of FIAF's size to have only one half-time employee to handle its Secretariat. Mr. KLAUE added that Mrs. van der ELST's workload was now a lot greater than a few years ago.

Mr. de VAAL turned to the question of the wage rise that the editor of the P.I.P., Mrs. THORPE, had asked for. Mr. FRANCIS reported that the standard BFI procedure for regrading applications had been followed, and that the BFI personnel manager had approved the application on the grounds that Mrs. THORPE did not enjoy any financial and administrative support services in her job.

After some discussion, including a proposal from Mr. FRANCIS to pay the rise as from April 1981, the Executive agreed with Mr. STENKLEV that FIAF, in its present straitened circumstances, could not afford to pay the regrading increase; it was felt that the cost-of-living adjustment of about 18%, due in any case to Mrs. THORPE was an adequate increase.

In response to a question from Mr. KLAUE, Mr. de VAAL stated that, in the event of the General Meeting rejecting the subscription increase, the only alternative would be to cut back the budget drastically. Mr. STENKLEV suggested this might even entail discontinuation of the P.I.P. project. It was agreed to await the decision of the General Meeting before considering what form a pruned budget would take.

Mr. VOLKMANN explained that there was a shortfall of \$ 1,000,- in the funds required for the meeting of the Preservation Commission scheduled for later this year. Mr. de VAAL said that the extra money might be available, depending on the planned activities of the other Commissions. Mrs. BOWSER and Mrs. HARRISON then reported that neither the cataloguing nor the documentation commission planned full meetings until the Spring of 1981. Furthermore, there was a possibility that the cost of the recent Documentation Commission meeting in Stockholm would be met entirely by the Svenska Filminstitutet, thus obviating the need to ask FIAF for funds.

Mr. de VAAL warned that, despite this good news, money would also be needed to publish the Preservation of Magnetic Tapes and The Directory of Film and TV



Documentary Sources; Mrs. van der ELST added that the Executive Committee's budget would have to be doubled too, to meet the cost of simultaneous interpreting.

The meeting agreed to a reluctant suggestion from Mrs. van der ELST to postpone publication of the two books until 1981, thus releasing the funds earmarked for the Cataloguing Commission to the Preservation Commission and the Executive Committee.

Mr. DAUDELIN argued that, if the General Meeting voted against higher subscriptions, the revised budget should be drafted in plenary session; Mr. TOEPLITZ however thought that, if the need arose, the task of finding ways to reduce the budget should be discharged by the Executive. Mr. KLAUE struck the compromise by saying that, if the General Meeting rejected the budget, the Executive should outline the policy implications of this decision during the 5th session of the General Meeting.

Mr. BORDE stressed the legal and moral need for the Executive Committee to execute the will of the General Meeting.

Mr. FRANCIS argued in favour of a brief rationale or explanation to accompany each item listed in the budget. The members judged this to be a good idea and agreed to implement it as from the 1981 Congress.

Ma. de VAAL said that FIAF's financial difficulties were not alleviated by the fact that many members and observers were very slow to pay their subscriptions. It was agreed that the Treasurer should impress upon the members in his report that they are obliged, under FIAF Rules, to pay their fees within the first six months of the year.

## 6. DISCUSSION ON THE POLICY OF FIAF TOWARDS FILM ARCHIVES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

---

On the assumption that the Executive Committee's decision to wind up the Commission for Developing Countries would be ratified by the General Meeting, Mr. KLAUE proposed the need for an alternative policy along the following lines :

- 1) the Secretariat should compile a list of potential member archives in developing countries as a basis for future contacts.
- 2) Information about FIAF should be disseminated more frequently, perhaps in the form of an annual newsletter, to nascent non-member archives, UNESCO, the press, etc.

- 3) FIAF should give a new impetus to the proposed exchange of staff between archives in developing and developed countries.
- 4) we would publicise the training courses organised by FIAF.
- 5) the compilation of a list of experts to whom archives in developing countries could turn for advice on both special problems and general archival policy.
- 6) the organisation of regional seminars ( eg in Africa + Asia ) on the establishment of film archives in developing countries, along the lines of the recent seminar held in Mexico for Latin American archives.

Mr. KLAUE emphasised that the execution of these tasks would be beyond FIAF's financial resources and that, if the Executive decided to go ahead with any of these proposals, UNESCO should be approached for aid.

Mr. POGACIC commented on the decision taken in New-York to dissolve the Commission of Developing Countries. He said that the Commission's work had been hampered by his prolonged illness and consequent absence from two Executive Committee meetings as well as by the difficulty of gathering commission members from three continents. Describing the work of the Commission of Developing Countries as vital, not only for the countries concerned but also for the very future of FIAF, Mr. POGACIC said he none the less accepted the Executive Committee's decision, although he was astonished that it should have been made without consulting the Commission's members.

The important thing now, he stressed, was to continue our Third World support work. There were pressing practical difficulties to be overcome : how to match prospective trainees from developing countries to host archives in developed countries ? How to convince officials in Third World countries of the need to set up national film archives. On this point, Mr. POGACIC proposed to publicise FIAF's work on the occasion of the forthcoming UNESCO General Assembly in Belgrade.

As for Mr. KLAUE's proposals, Mr. POGACIC said the idea to hold regional seminars was unrealistic, even if FIAF received financial support from UNESCO. The idea of a list of experts had also been explored, but almost all the archives approached had replied that they had no-one to propose. He concluded by urging the need for a Commission for Developing Countries as a vehicle for FIAF policy in this field.

Mr. ANDREYKOV agreed with Mr. POGACIC that the Commission should continue to exist, perhaps in another form, in order to establish close links with

archives in developing countries and to coordinate the flow to them of the concrete, practical information they need.

Mr. ALVES-NETTO said it was true the Commission had met infrequently, but saw no solution to this in view of the underlying geographical and financial imperatives. He also thought that perhaps too much had been expected of the Commission : it was not an executive body and with no practical back-up services and no money, it was possibly a mistake to have tried to become one. Nevertheless Mr. ALVES-NETTO was convinced that the Commission had a role to play in formulating FIAF policy in this sphere.

Mrs. BOWSER suggested that UNESCO could be asked to provide money for the Commission to meet.

Mr. DAUDELIN made it clear that the New-York meeting had made no decision to wind up the Commission; it had simply posed the question of whether the Commission was the best medium for executing FIAF policy towards developing countries.

Mr. TOEPLITZ, recalling that the problem of how to aid the development of archives in the Third World had a long history, set out the following proposals :

- 1) as, for practical reasons, the members of a Commission would never be able to meet, one member of the Executive Committee should be charged with the question of FIAF's relations with developing countries.
- 2) we should make use of our existing members in Latin America, Africa and Asia to act as FIAF representatives and establish contacts with neighbouring countries, with a view to setting up archives there.
- 3) approaches should be made to UNESCO's regional centres for help.

Mr. BORDE added another proposal, namely that Mr. ANDREYKOV, in his capacity as secretary of the world history of the cinema project, should compile ( with the help of the respective national committees for this project ) a list of useful names and addresses in those countries where no archive exists.

Mr. POGACIC said that UNESCO was currently focussing its efforts on the countries of Black Africa, but that results were difficult to achieve as the officials responsible for culture in those countries were always changing. In other words, FIAF must bear in mind the fundamental problem of obtaining adequate information on which to base its development policy.

Mr. FRANCIS argued in favour of the continuation of the Commission. He felt that FIAF could in fact point to a number of positive achievements for developing countries which, although perhaps realised outside the framework of the Commission, deserved to be included in the reports on its work. If it were wound up, there would be evidently no possibility of applying for UNESCO support.

Mr. ALVES-NETTO agreed with Mr. FRANCIS, drawing attention to the most concrete result of all : the presence now of FIAF in many developing countries.

Mr. TOEPLITZ said he had no special idea about the method of presenting the past achievements of the Commission but maintained that the Commission structure was no longer an adequate vehicle for policy. It would be dishonest to prolong its existence in the full knowledge that it would not be meeting.

Mr. KLAUE agreed with both Mr. TOEPLITZ and Mr. FRANCIS although, as far as UNESCO was concerned, he felt sure FIAF's chances of obtaining financial support would not be jeopardised if the Commission ceased to function. He remained convinced that small ad hoc working groups would best meet FIAF's needs.

Mr. ALVES-NETTO suggested a concrete project to propose to UNESCO : to pay for 2 persons to visit a series of countries with a view to evaluating the situation there and setting up new archives. This method had worked very well in the past when applied to Latin America.

( June 17 )

Mr. DAUDELIN read out a text setting out the reasons to be given to the General Meeting for dissolving the Commission for Developing Countries and entrusting the Executive Committee with its mandate. The Executive agreed on Mr. DAUDELIN's wording.

Mr. KLAUE then returned to the proposals for alternative action which he had outlined at the beginning of the discussion.

As for the question of arranging training for representatives from Third World archives, Mr. DAUDELIN and Mr. KLAUE undertook to write to the host archives and the developing countries to get more precise details on what the former were prepared to offer and how the latter expected to benefit. Mr. POGACIC again stressed that the most important consideration of all was to ensure that suitable candidates were put forward for the training.



As for the idea of finding specialists to act on FIAF's behalf, Mr. KLAUE undertook to sound out Mr. NAIR of the National Film Archive of India to see whether he would be prepared, with financial support from FIAF, or UNESCO to play such a role in Asia. In the case of Africa, Mr. ANDREYKOV proposed that we work through the Institute for African Culture in Dakar. Mr. POGACIC undertook to speak with the director of the Institute for African Culture at the forthcoming UNESCO conference in Belgrade.

As for the proposed list of experts, Mr. POGACIC pointed out that there was usually greater need for general film archivists rather than specialists. On a different point, he suggested that the Preservation Commission be charged with making recommendations for coping with the different atmospheric conditions that obtain throughout the world.

The possibility of further Summer Schools should also be kept in mind, although these should not be tasks for the Executive Committee. Conversely, the prospect for more regional seminars based on the Mexican model seemed to Mr. KLAUE to be dim, at least in the medium term.

Mr. DAUDELIN recalled the suggestion made by Mr. FRANCIS in New-York to prepare various blueprints and kits for developing archives. Another concrete proposal was for the Documentation Commission or an archive to compile a list of basic reference works for newly established archive libraries. Connected with this, Mr. DAUDELIN said the most practical step that FIAF could take would be to speed up publication of the French and Spanish versions of the Handbook.

## 7. EXAMINATION OF THE MAIN POINTS OF THE GENERAL MEETING'S AGENDA AND OF THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

---

### - President's report

Having discussed the presentation and the contents of the newly-inaugurated Presidential report, the Executive debated whether it should be read out to the meeting or not. It was finally decided, for practical reasons, to read out the report and distribute it at the end of the session.

### - Documentation Commission

Mrs. BOWSER, outlining the report due to be laid before the General Meeting, notified the meeting of the plan to hold a workshop in Madrid on the use of the film and TV literature classification scheme devised by Michael Moulds.

The Executive agreed that the funds earmarked in the draft 1981 budget for Summer Schools could, in principle, be used to enable more archivists with limited means to attend this workshop.

#### - Cataloguing Commission

Mrs. HARRISON then outlined her report to the General Meeting. Additionally, she said she had been unable to find out how many copies of "Film Cataloguing" had been sold by the American publishers, Burt Franklin.

The Executive approved the report of the Cataloguing Commission to raise the price of the " Study on the usage of computers for film cataloguing " to \$ 5,-

The Executive also gave the go-ahead to publicise, by making use of FIAF member publications and the P.I.P.'s own advertising list, the Cataloguing Commission's two recent publications. It was further agreed to prepare an updated list of all FIAF publications with prices so the Executive could decide at Vienna on how best to promote them.

Mrs. HARRISON reported some progress in arranging for the Russian and Spanish versions of the proposed glossary for filmographic terms.

Outlining what the cataloguing commission sees as its next major task, the compilation of a set of international standards for film cataloguing, Mrs. HARRISON said she would like to ask UNESCO to finance two extra meetings of the commission over a two-year period. It was agreed to return to this when discussing UNESCO.

Finally, the Cataloguing Commission had proposed " computerisation in film archives " as a tentative topic for a future congress symposium. Mrs. BOWSER suggested that New-York in 1985 might be a suitable occasion to deal with this theme.

#### - Preservation Commission

Mr. VOLKMANN reported that the manual on the preservation of magnetic tapes should be ready by the turn of the year. He hoped UNESCO might be interested in financing the publication of the popular version of the whole preservation manual.

The Executive Committee went on to finalise the subjects to be discussed under the remaining points of the GENERAL MEETING agenda.

## 8. RELATIONS WITH UNESCO : PROGRAMME FOR THE PERIOD 1981 - 1983

---

The meeting discussed how FIAF could contribute to UNESCO's next working programme and what requests for assistance should be submitted to UNESCO.

It was agreed that our paper to UNESCO should refer to the following FIAF projects as being suitable for UNESCO subsidies within the framework of its 1981 - 1983 programme :

- Summer Schools and workshops ( AFI + Madrid );
- Exchange of specialists ( placement of trainees from developing countries in established archives ) ;
- Scheduled publication of the combined volume on preservation ;
- The Cataloguing Commission's project to draw up international standards for film cataloguing ;

There was also the possibility of UNESCO receiving \$ 5 million from the UNDP to spend on major projects. Although Mr. VOLKMANN suggested tentatively that the request from Mozambique for help with designing an archive to withstand extreme humidity might be a suitable project to submit to UNESCO in this connection, the meeting went along with Mr. STENKLEV's view that it would be better for FIAF not to overreach itself, by taking on grandiose commitments, especially at this stage of our relations with UNESCO. It was agreed that we should stick to the projects noted above, whilst offering the advice of FIAF experts should UNESCO receive specific requests from developing countries.

Mrs. DOWSER suggested we ask UNESCO to buy some of FIAF's existing publications for use in developing countries or to finance the subscriptions of young archives to the P.I.P.

The meeting agreed to Mr. DAUDELIN's proposal to ask UNESCO for help with publishing rapidly the French and Spanish versions of the Handbook. Returning to the question of the Mozambique pilot study for vaults in tropical countries, Mr. DAUDELIN believed that this was closely related to Mr. FRANCIS' idea for basic blueprints and kits for developing countries. As such, these projects would be suitable for UNESCO aid.

Mr. KLAUE none the less felt that, at a time when we needed to consolidate our reputation in UNESCO's eyes, we must be careful not to overestimate our possibilities. It was agreed, however, to make clear to UNESCO that FIAF was willing to provide advice and that the urgent problem of tackling film preservation in tropical countries was exacerbated by the technical difficulties encountered there.

Mr. KLAUE also referred to the possibility of FIAF help with compiling historical filmographies, but stressed that this was more an idea for the future.

As for the annual activities report that FIAF, on account of its " B " status, was henceforth obliged to submit to UNESCO, it was felt that it would be appropriate to send copies of the reports of the Executive and of the Commissions and a list of our publications. It was also agreed to seek clarification of the fate of FIAF's feasibility study for an archival training centre.

#### 9. FIAF PUBLICATIONS AND PROJECTS

---

##### - A Handbook for film archives

With the Handbook now printed, it was agreed to sell the remaining copies directly ( e.g. through MOMA in New-York ), rather than advertising for such a small print-run.

Mr. FRANCIS asked for a courtesy payment of £ 20,- to be made to the person who produced the photographs for the handbook.

Mrs. BOWSER undertook to discuss details of the Spanish translation with Mr. CASANOVA.

##### - FIAF Brochure

The Brochure had eventually come out, but the quality of the reproduction of the photographs in it was very poor. Mr. FRANCIS said the printer, who was only willing to accept part of the blame, would do a reprint at cost price, but this would amount to another £ 600,- or so.

Mr. DAUDELIN agreed that the leaflet was very disappointing, especially after waiting for so long, but he felt it was impossible to allocate more money at present to a reprint. He therefore recommended that we make generous use of it for the time being and bring out a better edition in two years'time.

Mr. BORDE fully agreed with Mr. DAUDELIN.

Although Mr. CASANOVA had said he would prepare a Spanish version of the brochure, there were no concrete plans for one at this stage.

The meeting agreed to draft a letter to the designer of the brochure, setting out the reasons for our dissatisfaction and our reluctance to pay the remainder of their fees.

Despite Mr. ALVES-NETTO's doubts about the suitability of this brochure for developing countries, it was agreed that Mr. POGACIC would circulate a few copies as publicity for FIAF on the occasion of the UNESCO conference in Belgrade and as he felt appropriate.

Mr. FRANCIS concluded by offering his apologies to the Executive Committee for the poor quality of the brochure. The Executive Committee in turn thanked him for his efforts.

- World History of the cinema project

Mr. ANDREYKOV gave a progress report on this project, the initiating committee and General Assembly of which had recently met in Sofia. Seventy countries were already involved in the project, and a number of regional sub-commissions had been set up.

It was agreed to invite members and observers whose countries had not yet contributed national project teams to participate in the project; those represented at Karlovy-Vary could be asked during the General Meeting, and a formal letter would be written to the rest.

Following a complaint about poor communication from Mr. DAUDELIN, the Executive urged the Project's Secretariat to provide more regular information on its activities as they concern FIAF representatives, and also to make better use of the FIAF Bulletin.

Mr. KLAUE made it clear that FIAF could only encourage its members to participate in the project; there was no question of FIAF being empowered to sign a formal declaration on their behalf as the Initiating Committee seemed to suggest in its letter. He would reply formally to the Initiating Committee to this effect.

Mr. POGACIC was afraid that FIAF's prestige was being used to an extent to put pressure on countries which were being slow to respond. In the case of Yugoslavia, he said there was a number of issues which required clarification before its editorial team could be set up.

It was agreed to pursue the discussion during the Open Forum.



- FIAF Bulletin

Mr. DAUDELIN suggested that the news in the Bulletin should be grouped systematically under permanent headings and that an attempt be made to improve the technical presentation.

These recommendations notwithstanding, the Executive Committee thanked the editorial board of the Bulletin for their work, especially Mr. de VAAL.

- Annual FIAF Report

It was agreed that Mrs. van der ELST should look into alternative ways of publishing the annual report, which had now become very bulky and consequently costly to handle. The matter would be reviewed at the next Executive Committee meeting in Vienna.

- New edition of EMBRYO

It was decided to leave until the General Meeting any discussion on Mrs. BOWSER's proposals for the new edition of Embryo.

- Programmes of small cinematographies

Mr. ANDREYKOV announced that he would be presenting a set of concrete proposals in a paper to be distributed to the General Meeting.

9. MISCELLANEOUS

- It was confirmed that the Executive would meet immediately after the General Meeting on June 20. Mr. CINCOTTI would be invited in order to discuss details of the Rapallo symposium.
- FIAF had been invited to the forthcoming congress in London of the International Council of Archives. It was agreed that Mr. FRANCIS would represent FIAF.
- It was also decided that Mr. FRANCIS would represent FIAF at the autumn meeting of FIAT in Canada, as he was already due to attend on behalf of the BFI.
- The Executive Committee then gave the floor to Mr. STROTCHKOV, the new director of Gosfilmofond, who outlined his specific interest as an archivist and promised to lend his full support to FIAF.

## 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

---

On page 13 of the New-York minutes, under point 12 of the agenda, the documentation Summer School will, if it materialises, be organised by the American Film Institute with assistance from the Documentation Commission, and not the other way round as stated in the minutes.

With this correction, the minutes were adopted.

## 10. MISCELLANEOUS ( cont. )

---

Mr. KLAUE reminded the meeting of the need to decide upon a topic for the " archival symposium " at Rapallo.

After some discussion, it was agreed in principle to deal with a specific aspect of the preservation of colour film, perhaps the problem of fading and how it affects different types of colour film. The Executive decided to return to this point at its next meeting.

Mr. KLAUE formally closed the meeting by thanking Mr. LEVY, his staff and the interpreters for having provided such excellent support facilities.

Annex 1



ARCHIVIO STORICO DEL FILM • MUSEO DEL CINEMA

MEMBRO EFFETTIVO DELLA F.I.A.F.  
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE  
DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

20121 MILANO . VILLA COMUNALE  
VIA PALESTRO 16 . TELEFONO 799.224

Milan, le 12 mai 1980

M. Robert Daudelin  
Secrétaire Général de la FIAF  
c/o Cinémathèque Québécoise  
MONTREAL

Cher Ami et cher Secrétaire Général,

J'ai bien reçu votre lettre du 30 avril et je vous en remercie beaucoup. Tout d'abord j'ai le plaisir de vous informer que du 22 au 29 mai, en collaboration avec la Délégation du Québec à Milan, nous présenterons une "semaine du cinéma Québécois"; ci-joint la première annonce du programme.

Je vais ensuite tâcher de répondre à votre lettre qui pose bien des problèmes sur la situation italienne. Je vous informe avant tout que le 25 avril à Rapallo, à l'occasion d'une manifestation sur le cinéma français des années '20, il y a eut une rencontre de travail entre la Cineteca Nazionale (Laura, Cincotti), la Cineteca Italiana (Comencini, Alberti), le Musée du Cinema de Turin (Prolo), c'est à dire les trois membres de la FIAF pour l'Italie.

A la suite de cette rencontre (ci-joint le communiqué de presse) les trois archives ont créé un "comité" permanent pour la coordination des activités et pour examiner et résoudre en comun tous les problèmes de la conservation des films, de la diffusion, des rapports avec les organismes italiens officiels et de la FIAF. C'est un important résultat surtout en ce moment ou il y a beaucoup de confusion sur le problème des cinémathèques.

Voici qu'avant de répondre a chaque point de votre lettre je dois bien vous donner des informations sur ce problème. Pendant plus de 30 ans en Italie (1945-1975 environ) il n'y avait presque aucune attention de la part des organismes officiels (Ministère, Municipalité, ect.) sur le travail des archives de Milan, Rome et Turin.

./.

Cela a signifié l'attribution de subventions tout à fait insuffisante pour le travail de recherche et de conservation. Malgré cela les trois archives, avec beaucoup de sacrifices, ont fait un travail tout à fait remarquable.

C'est avec la création des "régions" en Italie qu'il y a eut tout à coup un intérêt pour les "cinémathèques"; en effet les régions ont fait, ou s'ont en train de faire, des "lois" sur le cinéma culturel, et comme elles ont de l'argent à dépenser, beaucoup de personnes, avec l'appui de partis politiques, ont eut l'idée de "fonder" des archives pour recevoir des contributions.

Le curieux de l'affaire est- et nous venons de l'apprendre- qu'il n'est pas nécessaire d'avoir des films pour fonder une cinémathèque: il suffit de l'avoir l'idée et... du papier en tête. Donc dans chaque grande ville italienne il semble qu'on va assister à la naissance de nouvelles archives qui seront des cinémathèques de "consommation", c'est à dire des organismes qui auront le but d'organiser surtout des projections, des manifestations, ect. Et il semble que les "régions" préfèrent ce genre d'activités (qui est plus "publicitaire") au travail de recherche et de conservation.

Pour ce motif la Région Lombardie et la Région Piémont, au lieu d'aider les archives de Milan et Turin qui existent, qui possèdent un patrimoine de films, préfèrent provoquer la naissance d'autres organismes. Il y aura donc une "prolifération sauvage" de cinémathèques en Italie d'ici quelques années et, j'ai le droit de penser, beaucoup de demandes d'adhérer à la FIAF...

Nous avons parlé de ce problème à Rapallo, problème que la FIAF un jour aura sur sa table. Il faut dire que nous ne sommes pas "contre" la création d'autres cinémathèques en Italie: chacun dans un pays libre a le droit de penser et d'agir, mais nous sommes "contre" la création de cinémathèques qui sont seulement telles sur le papier...

Il faudra faire bien attention au problème et d'autre part je crois que la FIAF prendra ses précautions et peut-être il faudra de la sévérité. Comment? C'est à notre Comité Directeur de prendre les décisions et il faudra tenir compte du rapport Schmidt de Lausanne (1979) comme base de discussion.

Maintenant, après ce long préambule, je vais essayer de donner une réponse aux problèmes de votre lettre:

1) Colloque de Bologne. Nous n'y avons pas participé mais nous connaissons les rapports et les conclusions. Il nous semble que pour le moment il a été fait un travail sérieux d'études du problème "cinémathèque". Nous savons que la Biennale désire continuer le colloque, avec la présence d'institutions étrangères, en novembre à Venise. Et bien à Rapallo nous avons décidé de demander à M. Lizzani de "reconduire" l'initiative dans le cadre de la DIAF: seulement à cette condition nous allons y participer. Nous ne sommes pas d'accord qu'il soit fait en Italie un colloque officiel avec la participation de membres de la FIAF, si cette rencontre n'est pas placée dans le cadre de la DIAF. Cette position sera exposée à Karlovy Vary par M. Cincotti et nous sommes d'accord.



2) Josè Pantieri. Nous connaissons cette personne qui possède une petite collection privée de films. Nous n'avons pas de rapport avec M. Pantieri. Il existe partout dans le monde des gens qui possèdent des films, cela ne veut pas dire qu'il s'agit de cinémathèques.

3) Cinémathèque Griffith de Gènes. Voilà un problème délicat car il touche un membre de la FIAF, c'est à dire le Musée M.A. de New York. Il y a peu de jours qui est passé par Milan l'assistant de Madame Bowser, M. Gartenberg. Et bien, M. Gartenberg nous a bien confirmé ce que nous pensions: c'est à dire que le Musée de N.Y. a vendu à Monsieur Homouda des films américains avec lesquels cette personne a fondé la cinémathèque Griffith. Nous n'avons jamais donné notre accord pour cette opération que nous considérons grave, soit par l'évidente infraction à nos statuts et règlements, soit pour le trouble que cela nous cause. En effet cette cinémathèque offre ses films pour des séances payantes dans les ville en Italie (même à Milan). Nous n'avons pas manqué d'informer M. Gartenberg de notre surprise et préoccupation pour cette "affaire" du M.M.A? de New York. Il est évident qu'il n'est pas possible d'accepter qu'un membre de la FIAF puisse vendre ses films auprès d'un collectionneur privée dans un autre pays, et à l'insu d'un membre de ce pays.

Nous avons informé la Cineteca Nazionale de notre position vis à vis de cette "affaire" et nous attendons des explications et surtout des assurances de New York que cela ne va plus se répéter. Nous n'avons évidemment aucune objection que Madame Bowser écrive des articles pour la revue de M. Homouda, mais nous n'acceptons pas que le Musée envoie des films. Je vous prie de croire que nous considérons cette histoire très grave, pénible et désagréable, car nous avons toujours eut des excellents rapports avec nos collègues de New York.

Une dernière chose: il faudrait peut être rappeler aux membres de la FIAF une correcte interprétation de l'article sur "l'exclusivité" de notre règlement. En effet il nous semble que des membres pensent qu'il suffit de l'accord d'un membre de la FIAF, dans un pays ~~xx~~ ou il existe plus d'une archive, pour que l'accord entre en fonction. Cela, comme vous savez n'est pas exact: pour l'Italie par exemple, il faut l'accord de Milan, Rome et Turin. Enfin chaque cinémathèque dispose de son droit d'exclusivité; je crois bien, si la mémoire m'aide, que c'est à Mexico que nous avons arrangé cela en modifiant nos règlements.

Je vous prie de m'excuser, cher ami, de cette longue lettre mais je voulais bien vous donner mon point de vue sur toutes ces questions. Point de vue qui pourra, j'espère, aider tous les collègues du Comité Directeur dans la discussion. En effet, malgré ma bonne volonté et pour des raisons de force majeure, avec beaucoup de regret, je ne pourrai pas venir à Karlovy Vary. Je vous prie de m'en excuser et j'espère pouvoir encore une fois participer à une réunion de la FIAF à laquelle j'ai participé pour la première fois en 1948!

Merci pour votre attention. Bien amicalement.

Gianni Gomencini  
