Mr. Andreykov proposed to expand to other archives in developing countries in Asia and Africa, the help already given by his archive in the form of Bulgarian film prints which were deposited with the local archive after some festivals or Bulgarian film weeks organized in those countries.

To a proposal from Mr. de Vaal to contribute with the FIAF Bulletin, Mr. Casanova said he would be very willing to send him extracts from the UCAL bulletin (CIDUCAL) which could serve to better information of the FIAF members on the various problems encountered by film archives in Latin-America and asked also to be allowed to publish FIAF news. This exchange of information was, in his mind, extremely valuable for both organizations. Mr. Dimitriev suggested to have a special issue of the Bulletin dedicated to the problems of developing archives.

Mr. Pogacic said he was surprised at the direction taken by the discussion on Mr. Perry's report. To him, the problem was far greater than the sending of a few films to small but already existing archives in Latin-America. For him it concerned in priority the creation of film archives in countries where they did not yet exist. Most of those countries had started producing films but no one thought of preserving them or knew how to do this, and these fundamental documents would soon be lost for ever. Mr. Pogacic felt that this was the primordial task of FIAF and he believed that the report of the commission proposed some very concrete action from FIAF in this direction.

Mr. Daudelin having protested that, without a written text, it was impossible for the members to analyze or even react to this very condensed report, Mr. Perry apologized for not having had the time to have it duplicated, but he underlined that the main item in it was a specific proposal for the establishment of a permanent commission and that all the other projects were only examples of what this commission might accomplish. He agreed with Mr. Dimitriev and Mr. Klaus that individual archives should help the young and developing archives as much as they could, but that we should also have some long-term projects done in the name of FIAF.

To conclude, Mr. Klaus put to the vote Mr. Perry's proposal to ask the new Executive Committee to study the Commission's report and to determine whether or not a permanent commission should be established to deal with the problems of archives in developing countries.

It was unanimously accepted.


In the absence of Mr. Kuiper, Mr. Klaus reported that although this Commission had not really functioned this year, the Executive Committee had decided that it should stand and concentrate on one project: the draft of a general declaration of principles on which all FIAF members can agree, in view of a possible agreement with FIAPF (International Federation of Film Producers' Associations).
Mr. Ledoux added that, at the Moscow meeting of the Executive Committee in January, Mr. Kuiper had also made a very interesting report about the revised copyright law in the United States, of which a résumé could be found in FIAF's 12th issue of the Bulletin.

10. OPEN FORUM.

All members had been asked beforehand to give in writing the topics or ideas which they wanted to be discussed under this heading. This resulted in a list of 8 subjects which would be dealt with during two sessions.

1) Television archives.

Mr. Ledoux reported that the Executive Committee had recently been informed about some plans for the creation of an International association of television archives. Five important European television or audio-visual Institutes seemed to be ready to create this association - They were: BBC (England), RAI (Italy), SRT (Sweden), ARD-NDR (West-Germany) and INA (France).

The question which the Executive Committee had discussed at length was now whether FIAF should react to the creation of this new Association. Should we encourage it or should we try to include television archives in our Federation, which brought us back to the definition of "film" given in article 1 of our Statutes?

The Executive Committee, while underlining that this was a fundamental problem for FIAF, had come to the following conclusion:
1°) that FIAF is, following our Statutes, open to any interested archive ready to abide by our rules and principles.
2°) that we should establish links with the new association, get better knowledge on their aims and activities and find possible ways of cooperation.
3°) That we should make an inquiry among our members about the state of television archiving in their respective countries.
4°) that FIAF should more actively publicize its aims, activities and principles.

Mr. Ledoux then asked for the comments of the General Meeting on this question.

Mr. Kubelka said he wanted to raise a principle question and related it to its intervention at last year's Congress about the way to preserve film either on the classic support of film stock or by any other electronic means.

He felt that the FIAF definition of "film" as given in the Statutes was too broad and should not encompass the whole field of moving images which included so many different media. There should be a specific definition for what was known as classic cinema where actually the images did not "move" but where we had a succession of still frames projected in a rapid rhythm one after the other to give the illusion of movement. Quite a number of films made depended on this kind of projection and could not be seen properly through an electronic machine.