Concerning the complete manual on film preservation to be published by the Commission, Mr. Ledoux asked whether the already published part on the preservation of black and white films would be revised. He said he had heard some criticism on this chapter because it did not describe enough of the experiments and tests which had been made and which had led to the recommendations of this manual. In England, the N.F.A. was at present making some new experiments on nitrate films with the help of governmental experts on fires and explosives and it seemed that their conclusions were somewhat different than those described in the FIAF manual. Mr. Ledoux thought that if a new brochure was to be published, the conclusions of those English tests should perhaps be included. He also described what he knew of those tests made at the N.F.A. (see 1975 annual report of the N.F.A.).

Mr. Volkmann, saying that similar tests had also been made in the D.D.R., agreed that it certainly would be interesting for the archives to know the results of such experiments but he doubted whether it would help changing anything because of the costs involved.

Mr. Ledoux replied that it certainly would, after some time, and if many such reports were published, and he therefore suggested that every archive which had undergone fires (whether accidentally or provoked) should send to the Preservation Commission a scientific report on all the circumstances of the fire and the conclusions which could be drawn from it.

c) Report of the Cataloguing Commission

Mr. Klaus reported that his commission had had no meeting since the last Congress but planned to hold one for Spring 1976 in Belgium.

A search was being made, both in the USA and in England, for a publisher for the Cataloguing Manual. It was decided to give a deadline to the end of 1975 to decide whether a commercial publisher could be found. If not, FIAF would publish the Manual at its own cost and under its own responsibility.

d) Copyright Commission - Relations with FIAF

Mr. Ledoux and after him Mr. Pogacic both reported on the meeting which, together with Mr. Kuiper and immediately following the Turin Congress, they had had with the representatives of FIAF, Messrs. Brison, Gronich and Ferrara. It appeared that FIAF was now very eager to reach some form of agreement with FIAF in face of the new UNESCO Resolution, especially as concerns the legal deposit of films, and had asked for some proposals from FIAF. The FIAF representatives however explained that there was very little chance to arrive to a consensus on that matter among the members of FIAF, giving FIAF all the reasons which had been developed at length at the Turin Congress. But it seemed that FIAF would not be contented with those arguments and we were now faced with the alternative either to break off our conversations with FIAF or to make them some other concrete proposals.
Mr Ledoux had distributed some written suggestions to the Executive members which he would like to discuss here as he himself had doubts about some of them. They read as follows:

1) To provide FIAPF with the articles in our Statutes and Rules which concern more particularly the producers (art. 4 of the Statutes, art. 116-117-118 of the Rules).

2) To ask for a general authorization to use the films for showings on the archives’ premises.

3) To ask for a general authorization of showing:
   a) silent films
   b) film fragments of maximum 10 minutes, as long as those (free) showings are held in a school or university, and in the frame of a lesson given by a teacher appointed by the school or university (therefore excluding extra-curricular showings or just held on the campus).

4) Exchange of films among members?

Mr Ledoux added that his reservations about sending the whole of the FIAPF Rules to FIAPF was mainly because of Chapter IX (Relations between members) rather than for Chapter X (Use of collections) although in this chapter also were some articles which FIAPF could have reasons to suspect.

Mr Yelin recalled what he had already underlined several times: for him, it appeared impossible that FIAPF and FIAPF could come to a detailed agreement which would be satisfactory to all members on an international level.

Mr Pogacic agreed, but he said that we began to make ourselves ridiculous by saying neither Yes or No to FIAPF and declaring we could find no common standpoint among the FIAPF members. We had the Statutes on which the majority of the members at least agreed and, as this was an official document, we might as well send it to FIAPF as a basis for discussion.

Mr Klaue said we should not forget the UNESCO Resolution and the new possibilities which it would probably offer to the archives. If we signed with FIAPF a contract with precise definitions, it would limit those possibilities. FIAPF knew this very well and therefore insisted to make such a contract. Mr Klaue thought we could only ask FIAPF to prepare with FIAPF a general agreement on basic principles. He added that we should not only submit them the FIAPF Statutes which mentioned only one aspect of the archives activities, i.e. preservation, but also send them our Rules which gave a more complete picture of the activities of FIAPF members.

Mr Stenkliev fully agreed with Mr Klaue. He said we should try to reach a general agreement, strongly linked with the UNESCO Resolution, agreement which could then be used as basis for a more specific agreement with archives on a national level if FIAPF so desired.
Mrs Bowser agreed that we should send the whole Statutes and Rules and not ask for the specific permissions proposed by Mr Ledoux. But the Secretary-General thought that FIAF would not accept this vague answer to their very pressing and concrete demands. He said they wanted two things:

1) a general declaration which they could use vis-à-vis UNESCO to show that they participated in the task of preservation;

2) a precise contract to protect their rights. And in this wish, they were supported by the authors of films.

If we only proposed them to sign a general agreement, it would either bring us to a rupture with FIAF or, at best, postpone once more the settlement of the problem.

Mrs Puran and Mr Pogacic said that time worked for us and that FIAF also was changing.

Mr Stenklav then proposed that the Secretary-General should write to FIAF, sending them the newly revised Statutes (it was finally decided not to send the Rules) and asking whether some common principles could be found based on those Statutes since FIAF would be unable to ask the entire membership to accept narrower limitations. He should also underline that FIAF was free to submit to each individual archive a more specific agreement if it so wished.

Mr Stenklav said he was aware that by acting this way, we were only stalling the problem but that was, in his opinion, already a solution. His proposal was finally accepted and Mr Ledoux was asked to write in this sense to Mr Brisson.

7. ORGANIZATION OF THE NEXT GENERAL MEETING

XXXII Congress in Mexico - 1976

It was agreed that if Mr Ledoux was unable to go to Mexico for a few days before the end of this year on the occasion of a trip which he was planning to make to the United States, Mr Yelin would contact Mr Garcia Borja as representative of the Executive Committee and discuss with him the plans for the Congress.

XXXIII Congress in Varna - 1977

Mr Ledoux reminded the members that, at the General Meeting’s demand, it had been decided to change the style of FIAF’s Congresses at least every second year, and that the Executive Committee had agreed to organize a specialized Congress in Varna (Bulgaria) in 1977, with a program which could attract a limited (± 50) number of non-FIAF participants, on the theme: The influence of silent Soviet cinema on the other national cinemas.