

MEETING OF THE F I A F EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Canberra, 18 April, 1986

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

FINAL AGENDA

Item	Page	
1	Adoption of the Agenda	1
2	Membership Questions	
2.1	Next Reconfirmation of Members	1
2.2	Buenos Aires: Museo del Cinema	1
3	New Election System for Berlin	2
4	New Project: International Catalogue of Newsreels	4
5	Future Congresses	
5.1	1988: Paris	5
5.2	1989: Lisbon	6
5.3 *	Suggestions for Future Symposia	8
6	Unesco: Survey on 1980 Recommendation	9
7	Evaluation of the Canberra Congress	
7.1	Organisation	9
7.2 *	Absence of EC Members	10
8	Next EC Meetings	11
9	Any Other Business	
9.1 *	Invitations to Congresses	11
9.2	Council of Europe	12
9.3	IASA Congress	12
9.4	FIAT Congress	12
9.5 *	Statutes & Rules	12
9.6 *	Adoption of the Budget	13

MINUTES

1 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The draft Agenda was approved, subject to the addition of items requested by Mrs WIBOM (asterisked on Final Agenda).

2 MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

2.1 Next Reconfirmation of Members

Mr CINCOTTI explained that there would be 13 Members to consider at the next EC meeting: first, the three Members they had been unable to reconfirm in Canberra:

Rio de Janeiro	Cinematca do Museu de Arte Moderna
Bucuresti	Arhiva Nationala de Filme
Frankfurt	Deitsches Institut für Filmkunde

and then, 10 more Members, all of whom were already overdue, having been last reconfirmed 6 years ago:

Buenos Aires	Fundacion Cinematca Argentina
London	Imperial War Museum
Beijing	Zhongguo Dianyíng Ziliaoguan
Habana	Cinematca de Cuba
Jerusalem	Archion Israeli Leseratim
Toulouse	Cinémathèque de Toulouse
Poona	National Film Archive of India
Tirana	Arkivi Shtetëror i Filmit i Republikës Popullore Socialiste të Shqipërisë
Washington	Library of Congress
Lausanne	La Cinémathèque Suisse

Action: Letters to be sent to the archives concerned.

2.2 Buenos Aires: Museo del Cinema

Mr FRANCIS reported that he and Mr KULA had had a long meeting with Mr & Mrs Fernandez Jurado when they described the ways the two organisations were funded and their separate responsibilities.

The Museum, founded 1971, has a huge collection of newsreels (12,000 reels) covering the whole history of the newsreel in Argentina as well as

16mm prints of Argentinian films. Almost the entire Argentinian production was destroyed in a major fire in 1968, so in many cases these 16mm represent the only surviving prints in existence. In some cases, there are similar titles in the two collections but for the most part they are different.

The Museum is funded by the municipality rather than the country; the Archive is a private Foundation. The municipality had been willing to purchase the newsreels for the Museum for the asking price of \$1million, a sum which the Foundation could not have afforded. This is an example of how, with two different kinds of organisation, they are able to maximise potential resources from different sources. Preservation is undertaken by both. They obviously work closely together, as a husband and wife team, and with Mr Fernandez-Jurado being Head of the Museum but also a Vice-President of the Archive.

However, seeing them as unrelated archives, the situation is similar to that in Montevideo where there is both a public and a private organisation. He and Mr KULA both felt that, if there were no personal connections, it would be reasonable for the Museum to be considered as a suitable candidate for Observership, given the importance of their collections and their preservation role; and there seemed no reason to disqualify them because of the personal connections.

Mr CINCOTTI welcomed their comments but pointed out that the case could not be further considered until the formal dossier was submitted.

3 NEW ELECTION SYSTEM FOR BERLIN

Mr CINCOTTI referred to the proposals presented to the GA by Mrs BOWSER and the ensuing discussion. He understood almost everyone would be willing to accept the idea of a general list of candidates which could be presented at the beginning of the GA, but very few seemed to support the idea of an election committee.

He suggested that, without any change in the Statutes, it would be possible to prepare a list of candidates, omitting only those who had formally stated they could not stand. However, there was a problem to know how to identify the eligible individuals in each archive.

Mr TOEPLITZ suggested the following procedure:

- two or three months before the Congress (six months was too far ahead), the Secretariat would write to each archive asking for the names of eligible candidates, whether or not they were able to attend the next Congress. Inevitably some archives would not reply.

- at the beginning of the Congress, complete the list with the names of any additional delegates to the Congress, unless of course they specifically withdrew.
- before the actual elections, there could be a call for any further candidates.

Mrs ORBANZ understood this to be similar to Mrs BOWSER's proposal. Mr FRANCIS felt it missed one important factor, namely that the list sent to the archives should be one from which they had to withdraw rather than one which they agreed to be added to. Archives which might not trouble to reply when asked to put forward a candidate, would be far more likely to respond if they knew that an individual from their archive would automatically become a candidate unless they took some action. Such a procedure had the additional advantage that it would provide useful feedback on the attitudes of individual archives towards serving the Federation through membership of the EC.

Mrs VAN DER ELST asked how one could identify the names of individual candidates and it emerged that Mr FRANCIS was referring only to candidate archives. Mr CINCOTTI suggested that this changed the whole concept that individuals were elected as individuals, not as representatives of their archive.

Mrs BOWSER thought it would be suitable to send the request to the Head of the Archive, who would remove the Archive's name from the list if they did not want to submit any candidate, or give the name of any individual they were willing to put forward. It was the Head of the Archive who would be responsible for authorising the funding of the time and expenses involved so he should get the letter and decide on the nomination. There would thus be not more than one candidate per archive.

Mr TOEPLITZ suggested it might be better to ask the Head of the Archive, not whether he was willing to be a candidate himself or, if not, to nominate one of his staff, but whether the Archive wished to nominate a candidate and, if so, whom.

Mrs WIBOM felt there should be more specific information about the costs involved eg travel, hotels, meals; absences from work twice or three times a year, with up to 10 days at the time of the GA; time spent on EC work between meetings.

Mr CINCOTTI felt too much stress on the costs, which should be self-evident, would discourage participation. He felt the emphasis should be on ensuring they are able to attend the EC meetings.

Action: Secretariat to prepare draft.

16mm prints of Argentinian films. Almost the entire Argentinian production was destroyed in a major fire in 1968, so in many cases these 16mm represent the only surviving prints in existence. In some cases, there are similar titles in the two collections but for the most part they are different.

The Museum is funded by the municipality rather than the country; the Archive is a private Foundation. The municipality had been willing to purchase the newsreels for the Museum for the asking price of \$1million, a sum which the Foundation could not have afforded. This is an example of how, with two different kinds of organisation, they are able to maximise potential resources from different sources. Preservation is undertaken by both. They obviously work closely together, as a husband and wife team, and with Mr Fernandez-Jurado being Head of the Museum but also a Vice-President of the Archive.

However, seeing them as unrelated archives, the situation is similar to that in Montevideo where there is both a public and a private organisation. He and Mr KULA both felt that, if there were no personal connections, it would be reasonable for the Museum to be considered as a suitable candidate for Observership, given the importance of their collections and their preservation role; and there seemed no reason to disqualify them because of the personal connections.

Mr CINCOTTI welcomed their comments but pointed out that the case could not be further considered until the formal dossier was submitted.

3 NEW ELECTION SYSTEM FOR BERLIN

Mr CINCOTTI referred to the proposals presented to the GA by Mrs BOWSER and the ensuing discussion. He understood almost everyone would be willing to accept the idea of a general list of candidates which could be presented at the beginning of the GA, but very few seemed to support the idea of an election committee.

He suggested that, without any change in the Statutes, it would be possible to prepare a list of candidates, omitting only those who had formally stated they could not stand. However, there was a problem to know how to identify the eligible individuals in each archive.

Mr TOEPLITZ suggested the following procedure:

- two or three months before the Congress (six months was too far ahead), the Secretariat would write to each archive asking for the names of eligible candidates, whether or not they were able to attend the next Congress. Inevitably some archives would not reply.

- at the beginning of the Congress, complete the list with the names of any additional delegates to the Congress, unless of course they specifically withdrew.
- before the actual elections, there could be a call for any further candidates.

Mrs ORBANZ understood this to be similar to Mrs BOWSER's proposal. Mr FRANCIS felt it missed one important factor, namely that the list sent to the archives should be one from which they had to withdraw rather than one which they agreed to be added to. Archives which might not trouble to reply when asked to put forward a candidate, would be far more likely to respond if they knew that an individual from their archive would automatically become a candidate unless they took some action. Such a procedure had the additional advantage that it would provide useful feedback on the attitudes of individual archives towards serving the Federation through membership of the EC.

Mrs VAN DER ELST asked how one could identify the names of individual candidates and it emerged that Mr FRANCIS was referring only to candidate archives. Mr CINCOTTI suggested that this changed the whole concept that individuals were elected as individuals, not as representatives of their archive.

Mrs BOWSER thought it would be suitable to send the request to the Head of the Archive, who would remove the Archive's name from the list if they did not want to submit any candidate, or give the name of any individual they were willing to put forward. It was the Head of the Archive who would be responsible for authorising the funding of the time and expenses involved so he should get the letter and decide on the nomination. There would thus be not more than one candidate per archive.

Mr TOEPLITZ suggested it might be better to ask the Head of the Archive, not whether he was willing to be a candidate himself or, if not, to nominate one of his staff, but whether the Archive wished to nominate a candidate and, if so, whom.

Mrs WIBOM felt there should be more specific information about the costs involved eg travel, hotels, meals; absences from work twice or three times a year, with up to 10 days at the time of the GA; time spent on EC work between meetings.

Mr CINCOTTI felt too much stress on the costs, which should be self-evident, would discourage participation. He felt the emphasis should be on ensuring they are able to attend the EC meetings.

Action: Secretariat to prepare draft.

5.2 1989: Lisbon

Mr CINCOTTI recalled that the Portuguese archive had brought a report on their Congress plans but there had been no time to present it to the GA.

They proposed to hold it, in April, at the Gulbenkian Foundation which was housed in a marvellous, modern building, with large well-equipped meeting rooms and 3 viewing theatres.

They were willing to accept the Gaudreault/Gunning project ("Evolution du montage cinématographique, 1899-1907: analyse du corpus") for the Symposium but would also like to propose a second historical Symposium on cinema and colonialism, or "The cinema of Europe and its former colonies". Mr CINCOTTI commented that archives in a number of countries had holdings of films made about their former colonies and it was a subject with vast possibilities.

Mr CINCOTTI asked the EC if it would be appropriate to have two historical symposia and initially the idea was rejected but Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that in Canberra there had been two technical symposia and he saw no reason why the position should not be reversed.

He suggested there might be a negative reaction to the word "colonialism" but this could be avoided by choosing the title more carefully: either "The Colonial Cinema" or "The Cinema of the Colonies", the latter covering the colony's own production. He pointed out that the theme was particularly interesting for the Portuguese and when representatives from Angola and Mozambique had first attended a FIAF Congress, their prime interest had been to establish contact with the Portuguese Archive to negotiate access to films made in and about their respective countries. The Portuguese were very serious and he thought it was a very valid project.

Mrs HARRISON pointed out that the outline of the Gaudreault/Gunning project seemed to indicate that they were primarily interested in discussing problems of methodology in the classification and description of films, and meeting with people working on standards in this area. She understood it to be a Technical Symposium and suggested it should rightfully be organised by the Cataloguing Commission.

Mr DAUDELIN pointed out that the Group were already two years into a 10-year project. They could presumably share it with FIAF at a Symposium some other year but establish contact with the Cataloguing Commission in the meantime. He understood they were developing their methodological approach in parallel with their historical research.

Mr FRANCIS understood they were interested in the year 1989 as they expected by then to have amassed substantial data and be ready to discuss

in open forum how it could be best utilised. He had the feeling that they were seeking help from FIAF in how to handle the data. Mrs BOWSER agreed it was part of Cataloguing but of a more specialised kind than what they normally handled.

Mr TOEPLITZ was confused and uncertain how one could hold a symposium on a subject that was so specialised and with such a narrow time-band. He suggested a very interesting symposium could be held about editing but covering a much wider time scale. He agreed that, in any case, this did not seem to be a historical subject. He felt the idea of a symposium covering the colonies could be a vast subject, if one included India and the French and Italian colonies as well as the Portuguese. He had always thought it would be satisfactory to have a balance between technical and historical subjects but perhaps it was not necessary to maintain that balance within each congress. There had been no technical symposium in Vienna either.

In the discussion of 5.3 below, the following points were made about the two Symposia proposals:

Mr KLAUE felt the Gaudreault/Gunning topic would only attract the few archives which were also centres of historical research; most of the specialists worked outside the archives.

Mr DAUDELIN disagreed: the group of young historians would by then have worked on the project for some 6 years and had simply suggested that one day should be devoted to 4 or 5 presentations and some 50 1- or 2-minute films to illustrate their views. From their work so far, they were finding that editing techniques which were considered "novel" later, were in fact already in use during this early period. He did not feel members would be put off by such a proposal and there would be plenty of time for other topics as well.

Mr CINCOTTI suggested that, as it was rather a presentation on a specific research project rather than a real symposium, then they should certainly seriously consider including the second topic. Rather than using the word "colonialism" in the title, it could be called "Cinema of, in or about the colonies" and concentrate on showing and discussing films, rather than concepts of colonialism. Mr BORDE felt it might be called "Les constantes du cinéma de l'époque coloniale". There would probably be the same stereotypes and themes appearing in films in the colonies of the different European nations. In parallel, they should consider ways and means to provide copies of these films for the new archives in the colonies themselves, as a record of their own heritage.

Action: Mrs HARRISON to contact Gaudreault/Gunning to explore how Cataloguing Commission might help and, hopefully, report with more information for discussion at next EC.

5.3 Suggestions for future Symposia

Mr FRANCIS addressed the problem that most of the delegates attending a Congress were Heads of the Archive whereas, when it came to the specialist and technical symposia, it would generally have been more useful if their specialist technical staff had been able to attend and/or contribute.

Now that elections were held every two years, he suggested it was possible to consider a radical change in approach. In the Election Year, when Heads of Archives would be attending, one of the symposia could be about an aspect of archive management, the other about a more "interesting" topic to make sure that people actually turned up. In the alternate years, they could address the more specialist subjects. The idea would be that the relevant specialists could come from the archives to participate in the symposia, or rather Workshops, which concerned them and the Head of the Archive need not feel obliged to attend. This would assist many archives who had financial problems: at present the Head of the Archive felt bound to attend and found it very difficult to fund the presence of a second person. This meant that the Head of the Archive might come to the GA but decide not to attend the Symposium or attended the Symposium but lacked the knowledge to benefit from it, both of which were unsatisfactory. He mentioned that FIAT had already experimented with this approach.

Mr CINCOTTI and Mr KLAUE both welcomed the idea and recalled it had been part of the intention behind the decision to hold elections every two years. However, they would need to amend the Statutes & Rules as there were still numerous administrative decisions (Reports, Membership questions, etc) that at present had to be taken annually. Mr KLAUE mentioned that the ICA had elections only every 4 years. He stressed that it would be important to choose the topics for symposia/workshops very carefully. Mr CINCOTTI felt it might be difficult to handle budgets on a two-year rather than an annual cycle.

Mr BORDE acknowledged that over the years there had been a trend from management by the GA towards that of the EC. However, as the Federation increased in size, it was important that members should continue to feel they had a voice and there should be a general meeting every year, even if only for one day, as was planned for example for Paris.

Mr SCHOU asked that in discussing future changes they should also consider alternative ways of handling Commission Reports. For the Preservation Commission, in addition to the formal general Report, he would welcome the opportunity to have perhaps a 1-hour Workshop to present with more technical detail the results of their on-going projects to an informed audience.

Decision : Further discussion at the next EC meeting.

6 UNESCO: SURVEY ON 1980 RECOMMENDATION

Mr KLAUE reported that the text of the questionnaire had been agreed with FIAT; they had hoped for Unesco's comments before the GA but they had not been received.

He was concerned about the execution of the 8 Appendices inserted by Unesco as part of the contract and, while willing to do some preliminary planning and seek members' cooperation, he was in need of some guidelines from the EC. Mrs WIBOM and Mr FRANCIS felt it required a lot of work, perhaps disproportionate to the value of the contract : \$13,500 with \$5000 committed to FIAT and word processing equipment to be paid for from the \$8,500 for FIAF. Mr KLAUE felt it would not be too much of a load if the tasks were distributed. Unesco would be paying for the final publication costs although it didn't at the moment figure in their future budgets. The approach could be further discussed at the next EC but they should really not lose more time as the project should be completed by the end of 1987 to form the basis of the 1988 Round Table.

Mrs ORBANZ, Mrs BOWSER and Mr KULA supported Mr KLAUE's proposed approach to the work and suggested he should be authorised to seek whatever help was needed from the Commissions and individual archives. Mr KLAUE agreed to continue on the lines proposed, provided it could be further discussed at the next EC meeting.

Decision : Put on Agenda for next EC meeting.

7 EVALUATION OF THE CANBERRA CONGRESS

7.1 Organisation

Mrs WIBOM made 3 comments:

- first, she felt the arrangements for all aspects of the Congress had been excellent.
- referring to the discussion under 5.3 above, she felt the Symposia had been a bit too specialised for the Heads of Archives: in this case, it would have been necessary to bring along both Preservation and Cataloguing specialists but they could not have afforded it. She was not yet in a position to evaluate the content of the Symposia, whether in fact they had met the needs of the actual participants.
- she felt the programme had perhaps been a bit too ambitious as they had been on the go for very long hours throughout.

Mr KLAUE pointed out that, without the generous contribution of the Australian archive, 15 archives would not have been able to attend. This situation worried him if FIAF was to arrange further "long-distance" congresses where the host was not able to offer such support.

Mr KULA recognised this was a problem but it was important that the