

**FIAF XXX Ottawa  
Montréal  
Minutes**



FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE  
DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION  
OF FILM ARCHIVES

m i n u t e s

XXXth CONGRESS AND  
GENERAL MEETING

20th May to 25th May, 1974

OTTAWA & MONTREAL

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Accounts for 1973 (Approval of the)	6
Adoption of the agenda	2
Budget for 1975	27
Cataloguing Commission (Report)	7
Commissions : Report of the Cataloguing Commission	7
Report of the Documentation Commission	8
Report of the Legal and Copyright Commission	11
Report of the Preservation Commission	9
Developing countries (Relations with archives in)	13
Documentation Commission (Report)	8
Election of the new Executive Committee	35
Executive Committee (Election)	35
I.C.A. (Relations with)	14
I.F.T.C. (Relations with)	15
Legal and Copyright Commission (Report)	11
Members: Confirmation of the status and voting rights	1
Membership questions : Change of status	22
Admission of new members	24
Renewal of the status of provisional members and correspondents	25
Other membership problems	25
Minutes of the preceding General Meeting (Approval of)	3
Next General Meeting	37
Open Forum	28
Other international organizations (Relations with)	14
Preservation Commission (Report)	9
Preservation (Symposium on new preservation techniques)	15
Projects (Proposals for new)	36
Projects and publications under way	36
Reports : President's report	5
Secretary-General's report	5
Treasurer's report	5
Auditors' report	6
Statutes and Rules (Modification of)	16
Symposium on film archives and new audio-visual techniques	15
Unesco (Relations with)	15

For TABLE OF ANNEXES, see next page.

TABLE OF ANNEXES

1. List of participants
2. Agenda
3. Report of the President
4. Report of the Treasurer. Accounts for 1973
5. Report of the Cataloguing Commission
6. Report of the Documentation Commission
7. Report of the Legal and Copyright Commission
8. Proposal for the modification of FIAF Statutes
9. Budget proposal for 1975
10. Linwood Dunn : the S35M System
11. List of projects and publications under way
12. Report of two projects by the Rumanian Film Archive :  
International bibliography on the cinema  
List of filmographical sources classified by countries
13. New project: Circulating film series / Anthropological cinema
14. Dictionary of Documentary Filmmakers : a project of the SFA der DDR
15. Program of the Symposium : Methodology of Film History

-----



FIRST SESSIONMonday, May 20th - 9.30 a.m.OPENING

The President, Mr Pogacic, welcomed all the attending delegates at FIAF's XXXth Congress. He reminded the members that, since they last met at the XXIXth Congress in Moscow, FIAF had suffered a very sad loss, that of one of its founder-members and long-time Vice-President, Mr Ernest Lindgren. He therefore asked all to rise for a few moments in silence and pay tribute to his memory.

He then gave the word to the Secretary-General for the first point on the agenda.

1. CONFIRMATION OF THE STATUS AND VOTING POWERS OF THE MEMBERS PRESENT OR REPRESENTED

Mr Ledoux read the list of those present (annex 1) also indicating in each delegation the name of the voting delegate.

Full members and their delegates (the names of the voting delegates are underlined)

Amsterdam	Nederlands Filmmuseum	<u>J. de Vaal</u>
Belgrade	Jugoslovenska Kinoteka	<u>V. Pogacic</u>
Berlin (East)	Staatliches Filmarchiv der DDR	<u>W. Klaue</u>
Berlin (West)	Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek	<u>H. Rathsack</u> E. Orbanz
Bruxelles	Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique	<u>J. Ledoux</u>
Bucarest	Arhiva Nationala de Filme	<u>B. Ripeanu</u>
Budapest	Magyar Filmtudományi Intézet és Filmarchivum	<u>I. Molnar</u>
Canberra	Film Collection/National Library of Australia	<u>E. Vellacott</u>
Habana	Cinemateca de Cuba	<u>S. Yelin</u>
Haifa	Archion Israëli Lešerativim	<u>L. van Leer</u>
Helsinki	Suomen Elokuva-Arkisto	<u>P. von Bagh</u>
København	Det Danske Filmmuseum	<u>I. Monty</u>
Lausanne	Cinémathèque Suisse	<u>V. Pogacic</u> (proxy)
London	National Film Archive	<u>K. Gough-Yates</u>
Madrid	Filmoteca Nacional de España	<u>F. Soria</u>

Montreal	Cinémathèque Québécoise	<u>R. Daudelin</u> R. Boissay
Moscow	Gosfilmofond	<u>V. Privato</u> V. Dimitriev K. Razlogov
New York	Dept of Film/Museum of Modern Art	<u>E. Bowser</u> M. Akermark (expected)
Oslo	Norsk Filminstitutt	<u>J. Stenklev</u>
Ottawa	Canadian Film Archives	<u>P. Morris</u>
Poona	National Film Archive of India	<u>R. Nath</u>
Prague	Filmoteka/Ceskoslovenski Filmovy Ustav	<u>S. Ondrousek</u>
Rome	Cineteca Nazionale	<u>J. Ledoux</u> (proxy)
Sofia	Bulgarska Nacionalna Filmoteka	<u>G. Stoyanov-Biqor</u>
Stockholm	Cinemateket/Svenska Filminstitutet	<u>J. Donner</u> A.L. Wibom
Torino	Museo Nazionale del Cinema	<u>V. Pogacic</u> (proxy)
Warsaw	Filmoteka Polska	<u>J.S. Pastuszko</u>
Washington	Motion Picture Section/Library of Congress	<u>J. Kuiper</u> P. Spehr
Washington	Archives/American Film Institute	<u>L. Karr</u>
Vienna	Oesterreichisches Filmarchiv	<u>L. Gesek</u> A. Lehr
Vienna	Oesterreichisches Filmmuseum	<u>P. Kubelka</u>
Wiesbaden	Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde	<u>U. Pöschke</u>
Toulouse	Cinémathèque de Toulouse	<u>J. Ledoux</u> (proxy)

Since 33 full members out of the 37 belonging to FIAF were present or represented, the quorum required by article 15 of the Statutes was obtained and the Secretary-General declared the XXXth General Meeting valid.

Provisional members and their delegates

Pyong Yang	National Film Archives of the DPRK	<u>Kim Bong Chun</u> Li Yong Gil
Tehran	The Iranian Film Archive	<u>F. Gaffary</u>

Associate member

London	Imperial War Museum	C. Coultass
--------	---------------------	-------------

Correspondents and their delegates

Buenos Aires	Cinematca Argentina	G. Fernandez-Jurado
Los Angeles	U.C.L.A. Film Archive	H. Suber



Honorary members

Mr Einar Lauritzen, Stockholm, Sweden  
 Mr Herbert Volkmann, Berlin, DDR

Observers

Mrs Chloe Aaron, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington  
 Mr Cosme Alves Netto, Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna, Rio de Janeiro  
 Mr Hiram Garcia Borja, Cineteca Nacional, Mexico  
 Mr Sam Kula, National Film Archives, Canada  
 Mr Keith Lucas, British Film Institute, London  
 Mr James Moore, National Archives, Washington  
 Mr Enno Patalas, Film Abteilung, Münchner Stadtmuseum, München  
 Mr Tony Reiff, Pacific Film Archives, Vancouver  
 Mr Pierre Stevens, National Museum of Man, Ottawa

Several other observers were expected only for the next day to attend the Symposium on new film preservation techniques.

Apologies for absence had been received from :

Messrs. W. Alberti and G. Comencini (Cineteca Italiana)  
     R. Borde (Cinémathèque de Toulouse)  
     F. Buache ( Cinémathèque Suisse )  
     L. Fioravanti ( Cineteca Nazionale )  
     P. Génard (Cinémathèque de Lyon )  
     P. Nair ( National Film Archive of India )  
 Prof. M.A. Prolo (Museo Nazionale del Cinema )

The Secretary-General also read out a telegram from Professor Jerzy Toeplitz regretting his inability to attend and wishing the Congress every success.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The following agenda had been distributed to the members :

FIRST SESSION

Monday, May 20 - 9.30 a.m.

1. Confirmation of the status and voting rights of the members present or represented.
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Approval of the minutes of the preceding General Meeting
4. Report of the President
5. Report of the Secretary-General
6. Report of the Treasurer
7. Report of the Auditors
8. Approval of the accounts for 1973 and discharge of the administration of the outgoing Executive Committee.



SECOND SESSIONMonday, May 20 - 3 p.m.-6 p.m.

9. Report of the Cataloguing Commission.
10. Report of the Documentation Commission.
11. Report of the Preservation Commission.
12. Report of the Legal and Copyright Commission.
13. Relations with Latin-American archives.

THIRD AND FOURTH SESSIONSTuesday, May 21

Symposium on Film Archives and New Audio-Visual Techniques.

FIFTH SESSIONWednesday, May 22 - 9.30 a.m.-1 p.m.

14. Modifications of Statutes and Rules
15. Relations between FIAF and other international organizations.
16. Budget proposal for 1975.

SIXTH SESSION (Full members only)Wednesday, May 22 - 3 p.m.-6 p.m.

17. Status of members. Admission of new members. Renewal of the membership of provisional members and correspondents.

SEVENTH SESSIONThursday, May 23 - 9.30 a.m.-1 p.m.

18. Open Forum.

EIGHTH SESSIONThursday, May 23 - 3 p.m.-6 p.m.

19. Election of the new Executive Committee and Auditors.
20. Projects and publications under way.
21. New projects.
22. Date and place of the next General Meeting.
23. Points on the agenda of which the discussion is not closed and any other business.

On Friday, May 24, the Congress leaves for Montreal where a visit will be organized to the National Film Board of Canada and a Symposium in Methodology of Film History held on Saturday, May 25.

Mr Ripeanu, on behalf of Arhiva Nationale de Filme, asked to delete the point 14, Modifications of Statutes and Rules, because he considered that the proposal for what he called "almost new Statutes" had been sent too late to the members to be studied seriously and that it might therefore lead to very long discussions during the General Meeting. He proposed to postpone it until next year.

But the President replied that it was a point too important to be withdrawn from the agenda even if it must lead to lengthy discussions. He also said that the proposal for modification had been sent to all members within the time required by the Statutes for such purpose.



Mr Klaue then asked for a small modification in the wording of point 13 : "Relations with Latin-American archives" which should be enlarged to : "Relations with archives in developing countries". This was agreed.

No other remarks being made, the agenda was definitely adopted.

### 3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING GENERAL MEETING

The Minutes of the XXIXth General Meeting in Moscow which had been sent to all members were approved unanimously.

### 4. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

The President of FIAF, Mr Pogacic, delivered his report (annex 3).

### 5. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Mr Ledoux said his report would be brief because the greater part of the Secretary-General's work concerned membership questions and that these would be dealt with under point 17.

He reported that, as a whole, the Federation was in good shape. It presently comprised 47 members, 3 new applications would be submitted to the General Meeting. 3 other applications had been submitted to the Executive Committee but too late or too uncomplete to be examined by this General Meeting. They came from Mexico, Panama and Ecuador.

The Executive Committee had met 4 times during the year, in Moscow, Lausanne, Helsinki and Ottawa.

As for the Secretariat in Brussels, it had accomplished its normal tasks but it had also seen its workload increase this year because of the card printing and dispatching for the Periodical Indexing Project. This task had now been turned over to Ms. Jones in London and this question would be discussed later, under item 10 of the agenda.

### 6. REPORT OF THE TREASURER

The Treasurer, Mr Stenklev, commented the financial report for the year 1973 which had been sent in advance to all members (annex 4).

On p. 1, (Total funds of FIAF), he remarked that the funds in Zurich appeared to be very important, but this was due to the very favourable rate of exchange of the Swiss franc to the Belgian franc at the time when the accounts were made. At the beginning of 1974, the interest account in Zürich (collecting the 3 monthly interests of the Reserve fund) had been transferred to our Brussels account in order to benefit of a much higher rate of interest.

The item "Loan to the P.I.P." would be explained later on, during the report of the Documentation Commission.

Mr Stenklev made no comments on p.2.



About p. 3, (Budget comparison), he underlined that if some expenses were much lower than the budgeted amounts (e.g. for Congress and Executive Committee meetings), it was due to the fact that many archives generously contributed to the organization of such meetings when they hosted them. The same went for some meetings of the specialized Commissions. But in the future, because of the archives' increasing financial difficulties, we could not take for granted that they would be able to continue being so generous and we should foresee it in our budgets.

Commenting on p.7 (Accounts of the Periodical Indexing Project for 1973), he said the project had lived through a difficult year of transition and adaptation, and it was hoped that the installation of a small office in London for its total execution under the supervision of Karen Jones would now establish it more rationally. Details on the plans made by the Documentation Commission for this purpose would be discussed under item 10.

To conclude, Mr Stenklev said that the economical situation of FIAF was satisfying but, because of the running inflation all over the world, he foresaw that he would have to ask for a raise of the members' subscriptions for the year 1976. He reminded the members that those subscriptions had not been raised since 1970.

There being no further discussion on the accounts, the President thanked Mr Stenklev and called for the Auditor's report.

#### 7. REPORT OF THE AUDITORS

Mr Pöschke was the only auditor in charge of controlling FIAF's accounts since Mr Zumavski had left the Tchechoslovakian archive and had resigned as auditor of FIAF.

He declared that he had examined the accounts and the documents relating to them and had found everything in order. He therefore recommended the approval of these accounts by the General Meeting and the discharge of the administration of the outgoing Executive Committee.

#### 8. APPROVAL OF THE ACCOUNTS FOR 1973 AND DISCHARGE OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE OUTGOING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approval of the Treasurer's report on the accounts for 1973 was then submitted to the vote of the Assembly and carried unanimously, less the abstention of the Treasurer himself.

Mr Pogacic also asked the General Meeting to give its discharge to the retiring Executive Committee and this was agreed unanimously.



SECOND SESSION

This session, which started before the lunch-break because there was some time left, was chaired by Vice-President Privato.

9. REPORT OF THE CATALOGUING COMMISSION

Mr Privato gave the word to Mr Klaue, chairman of the Commission, to present his report.

Mr Klaue said he had nothing to add to his written report which had been distributed to all members (annex 5) but he was ready to answer questions.

Mr Ledoux asked to discuss more in detail pt. 4.4., the Commission's future work, and in particular the project for a dictionary of filmographic terms in ± 25 languages and the definition of filmographic terms. He wondered whether the Commission would find the basic list of filmographic terms necessary for both these projects.

Mr Klaue replied that the Commission intended to prepare a dictionary of filmographic terms based on the maximum data list included in the Cataloguing Manual. A translation in 14 languages was already prepared but they still wanted to add some important languages from countries with a large film production (e.g. Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, etc...). The definition of filmographic terms would also be based on the maximum data list of the Manual.

Mr Yelin having asked when and how the Cataloguing Manual would be translated into languages other than English, Mr Klaue replied that the final version, in a typewritten form, would be ready at the end of this year but it could not be printed before 1975. He offered Mr Yelin to send him the typewritten version as soon as it was ready to be translated into Spanish.

Mr Kuiper, saying that there was a great interest in his archive for the manual, objected however that there was a problem in its form. The manual was an excellent description of the various cataloguing systems in use but it did not attempt to be prescriptive and to foster one ideal way of cataloguing. Was it not the task of an international organization like FIAF to establish a unified and standard way of cataloguing and was there some hope that we would ever reach that point ?

Mr Klaue agreed with Mr Kuiper that it was very necessary to achieve an international unified rule for film cataloguing but said that it would not be easy. The form which the Commission had chosen for its manual was only a first step, chosen because there were so many systems used by the archives, depending on the very different conditions they had to work with (finances, sources, staff, necessities of the archive, etc...) but in the long term, we must see to it that FIAF comes to an agreement on standard rules in this field, together with other international organizations which had similar problems, although they sometimes had a very different approach to cataloguing.



Mr Klaue was positive that we should not try to formulate our own standards in isolation.

Mr Vellacott having asked whether Mr Klaue could give a short account of the main views expressed by the big archives on the Manual and the amendments which they proposed to bring to it, Mr Klaue replied that the main point of disagreement among the archives which had commented on the draft was about the number of datas they wanted to find in their catalogue. This was also the crucial point when one tried to come to an international agreement.

He therefore agreed with Mr Ledoux who said he believed that at least the minimum data list established by the Cataloguing Commission should be considered as prescriptive by the archives and could serve as basis for an international standard rule.

Mr Ripeanu having asked whether the Commission had plans to work in future in closer collaboration with the Documentation Commission, Mr Klaue said that both Commissions would probably have a common meeting next year.

#### 10. REPORT OF THE DOCUMENTATION COMMISSION

A written report on the Commission's work during the year had been sent beforehand to all FIAF members (annex 6).

Mrs Bowser, chairman of the Commission, added that since this report had been written, a new member had joined the Commission : Miss Milka Staikova, from the Bulgarian archive.

Mr Gough-Yates then briefly commented on the installation in London of the Index to Film Periodicals in a small office which FIAF had rented very near the National Film Archive. He believed that it should now prove a very workable situation for the project.

Mr Kuiper asked Mrs Bowser to comment on one of the projects for the future work of the Commission : television documentation . He said this problem had become very acute in recent years and he wanted to know how the Commission planned to approach it.

Mrs Bowser having replied that the Commission had, until now, only been able to establish the immensity of the problem and therefore planned to invite experts in this field who might point out to the Commission the direction to follow, Mr Kuiper proposed to have a general discussion on this question and urged the members to express their views on what should be or had been undertaken in the field of collecting and preserving TV material.

Personally, he thought it had become a very serious challenge, at least in the U.S.A., to see what experience could be brought from the film archives to the field of TV. In FIAF, he said, we consider television a branch of the same tree of artistic and human communication and expression as film. Therefore, as we see that television has become a prime distribution source for cinema,



that the news program has entirely migrated to TV, that many creative documentaries and even feature films are being shot exclusively for the television, that the gap between the technologies of film and TV is narrowing constantly, in view of all these similar aspects, we must feel uneasy at the thought that so little is being done to preserve and catalogue TV's production adequately.

Mr Morris also admitted that we had a duty in this field but, after two years' experience in cataloguing the Canadian television programs for the Yearbook of Canadian Cinema, he could only say that it was an almost insurmountable task.

Mr Ledoux, having explained how the situation stood in Belgium, asked the members whether they were convinced it was their task to preserve television. Personally he was not. He said that most of the film archives already did not have enough resources to properly preserve the heritage of cinema. There was of course a fringe of cinema and television production which intermingled but, on the whole, he believed that television was still a different medium which should have its own archives, and that FIAF should encourage the creation of such archives. In answer to Mr Yelin who asked whether, in his distinction, he also included cinema films merely produced by the television (e.g. the R.A.I.) and those films made for television but by filmmakers traditionally turned towards the cinema, Mr Ledoux said that of course it would be absurd to reject all what touched television but he refused, for the Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique, the task to deal with the whole Belgian television production plus all the relating documentation.

Mr Ripeanu reported that, in Rumania, a section had recently been created in the frame of the film archive to deal with their national TV production.

Mr Stenklev then asked to come to the financial aspects of the Periodical Indexing Project. He explained that the financial situation of the project was still insecure and that it would probably need a support from FIAF ( $\pm$  150.000 Belgian francs a year) for a few years more. He added that close contact must of course be kept between the editor of the project (presently Karen Jones), the Executive Committee and Mr Gough-Yates, its supervisor in London on behalf of FIAF, so that it did not slip economically out of our hands.

To conclude, Mr Pogacic thanked Mrs Bowser, Mrs Jones and the Documentation Commission for the work they had put into this project which was one of the best accomplishments of FIAF and a proof of the useful collaboration of its members.

#### 11. REPORT OF THE PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Mr Volkmann had distributed to all members the following written report :

"During the last year the Preservation Committee had the final discussions about the conservation and restoration of colour films.



The manuscript is ready for printing and only due to technical reasons it could not be distributed at this congress.

We planned to have a meeting with the authors of the publication in Ostende (Belgium), but since I was ill at that time, I had to cancel this session. I must therefore send the manuscript to the authors in order to get their agreement.

This manuscript of approx. 180 pages will be sent to all archives as soon as possible.

In April, we intended to have another meeting with the members of the Commission and experts of magnetic records.

Unfortunately, some experts informed me they could not come and others did not send any answer to me before the first day of the conference.

Therefore, I had to cancel this session as well, which was expected to be held in Amsterdam.

We will meet again with the same agenda in autumn."

He added that a German version of the Manual on the preservation of colour films would be ready, in a few copies, at the end of this year and that the English version would be handed over at the same moment to the National Film Archive in London which had accepted to correct its form.

Mr Donner having asked if some collaboration existed between the Commission and the European Broadcasting Union, Mr Volkmann replied that there was no collaboration with that particular organization but that the Commission comprised several experts from other bodies, scientists who worked in the same field and direction as the Commission, mainly people from companies manufacturing the raw stock (Kodak, Agfa-Gevaert, etc...). It was very difficult to invite all the experts they wished to have with them because of organizational problems of the Commission's meetings.

Mr Kuiper then asked Mr Volkmann whether he could already give some insight into the general direction which the Commission was taking, some recommendation on the best way to use in the future to preserve both colour films and magnetic records. If the Commission had real hopes of determining a satisfactory new medium for preserving films, how long would the gap be between the laboratory experiences and the realization of this into media that could help the archives? He underlined that there was a great urgency to have such information for the future planning of their work and also of their budgets.



Mr Volkmann replied that it was very difficult to know exactly how much time would be needed but he said that, in about one year, the Commission would already have some results for a very interesting system based on Laser rays. For other systems, one would probably have to wait much longer. He also explained that, if those new media were adopted, the archives would have to change their whole equipment. The main purpose of the manual which was now in preparation was therefore to give recommendations for the period of time until the new systems could be in operation.

Mr Pogacic asked Mr Volkmann whether the Commission had investigated workable solutions for the small and poor archives which could not afford the costly systems evoked until now. Mr Volkmann replied that it was possible, with limited means, to preserve colour films for about 20 years in the same state as they were now, but probably not much longer. It was therefore absolutely imperative to continue the research for other systems.

Mrs Wibom reported on the results of a conference of the Data Archive Committee which she had attended in Sweden and which had been working for 4 years on this problem. This Committee was going to recommend to the Swedish Parliament that all TV material should be taped, as well as all the films which had received a visa of exhibition in Sweden. All this material would then be kept by the National Archives of Sweden.

Mr de Vaal concluded the discussion by reporting that, in Holland, many experiments were at present being made on the use of video-discs for the preservation of films. He hoped to be able to give a more detailed report on this subject next year.

## 12. REPORT OF THE LEGAL AND COPYRIGHT COMMISSION

Mr Kuiper started by summarizing the written report (annex 7) which had been distributed to all members. He added that since the last meeting of the Commission in Helsinki, Mr Ledoux and himself had visited Mr Gronich, representative of the MPAA in Paris. It had been an informative meeting, he said, a good way to express an opening or a continuation of our contacts with the FIAPF. Mrs van Leer having asked whether Mr Gronich had appeared ready to treat with FIAF as such, in its entirety, or whether each archive would still have to deal with the producers separately as it was in the past, Mr Kuiper replied that they had made no final determination on this matter since it was merely an exploratory conversation they had had. But he did not think that Mr Gronich was ready to accept FIAF as the representative body on all questions of permissions and rights.

## 13. RELATIONS WITH ARCHIVES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Mr Klaue reported that, in October 1973, the Executive Committee set up a small working group to summarize and try to put into a concrete form the various ideas and proposals expressed on this matter by FIAF members during the last few years. Members of this group were : Messrs Privato, Morris, Gough-Yates, Yelin and himself as chairman.



The conclusions of their first meeting, held in Ottawa, was that FIAF should become more active towards the developing countries, not by promoting film archives in general but by concentrating on a few specific countries which had developed a film industry and where no film archive existed as yet. The Committee therefore suggested to work on two levels :

- 1) on an official level, with the existing film organizations or cultural bodies,
- 2) on a personal level, with the film enthusiasts.

They had also discussed some practical steps :

- 1° - to establish closer links with potential members after a careful examination of the Unesco World Survey on the Systematic Preservation of Films, and use for this purpose the good bilateral contacts which already existed between some of our members and these archives ;
- 2° - to obtain more information on the situation prevailing in this field in the Latin-American, African and Asian countries by asking our members to attend such international events as the Tashkent Festival, the Conference of the filmmakers of the Third World, the Leipzig Festival, etc... which filmmakers of those countries also attended,
- 3° - to draft a new leaflet explaining the aims and the character of FIAF. Mr Morris said he was ready to prepare a draft for such leaflet,
- 4° - to offer more practical help to possible members in A.A.A.L. by compiling a list of classical films available in FIAF archives, by distributing FIAF publications free of charge, by establishing a fund (within the FIAF budget) for our activities in the developing countries, by organizing the individual and practical education of specialists in some of our experienced archives and finally, by offering them storage room or preservation facilities in our archives,
- 5° - to establish closer relations with Unesco for the following purposes :
  - a) to initiate a Unesco resolution on the importance of film archives for the national film heritage,
  - b) to get a financial support for a training course for film archivists from countries in Asia, Africa and Latin-America,
- 6° - concerning the relations of FIAF with Latin-American archives, to circulate the report of the Secretary-General of UCAL, with our full support.

Mr Yelin then added some detailed information on the present situation of some archives in Latin-America. He said we could be happy of the improvement, in recent years, of the relations between FIAF and UCAL. UCAL's secretariat was momentarily established in Habana until their next General Meeting.



15. RELATIONS BETWEEN FIAF AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF ARCHIVES

Mr Ledoux reminded the members that, at the last General Meeting, the Executive Committee had proposed that FIAF should establish formal links with this important organization by becoming its member. This proposal had been rejected because the members felt that they were not enough informed on the implications of such an affiliation. During the year, the Secretariat had sent to all FIAF members several documents on the I.C.A., its Statutes, the list of its members and Mr Klaue had written a circular letter explaining the interest for FIAF of joining this organization. The Secretary-General therefore suggested to resume the discussion on the proposed affiliation and then to come to a vote.

Mr Pogacic, recalling that in Moscow he was one of the opponents to our joining the I.C.A., said that he still maintained the same opinion because of some difficulties he had with the public archives in Yugoslavia which had tried to get hold of a part of his archive's film collections.

Mr Ripeanu however said it would be very useful for FIAF to establish close links with I.C.A. because, through the "paper archives" which were often strong and well-subsidized organizations, we could foster the creation of new film archives and also because we had in common with them many problems specific to the archive world which they could help us to solve thanks to their longtime tradition in this field. Mr Ledoux and Mr de Vaal agreed with Mr Ripeanu.

Mr Pastuzko, describing the relations between the Central State Archive of Poland and Filmoteka Polska, said that the State Archive did not help them much but that they did not interfere with the Filmoteka's work either.

Mr Klaue replied to Mr Pogacic that he did not see any danger in our affiliation to I.C.A., on the contrary, he said, if we are in their organization, we could negotiate for our members which are in a difficult situation towards the "paper archive" of their country.

The following motion was then submitted to votes : "Should FIAF join the International Council of Archives as a member ?"

The voting was secret and gave the following results :

Yes	18
No	7
Abstention	7

As the adhesion to I.C.A. did not obtain two-thirds of the votes as requested by the Statutes, the motion was rejected. Mr Donner underlined that, in this case, the abstention was equivalent to an opposition.



Mr Vellacott asked whether it was possible to seek any other formal link with I.C.A., and Mr Kubelka asked whether the discussion and the vote on this matter could not be resumed because he felt that the point had not been clearly understood by the members, but the answer to both questions was no.

Mr Ledoux concluded by saying that, in his opinion, FIAF absolutely had to find another way of cooperating with I.C.A. and that the Executive Committee would study the matter.

#### UNESCO

Mr Morris reported that the contract which FIAF had signed with Unesco for the "Survey on the systematic preservation of films" was almost completed. He agreed to Mr Vellacott's suggestion that FIAF should submit, for inclusion in this publication, a description of its own activities which would offer a convenient opportunity to publicize ourselves.

#### INTERNATIONAL FILM AND TELEVISION COUNCIL (I.F.T.C.)

Mr Pogacic, Vice-President of I.F.T.C., reported that he had recently attended a meeting of the Bureau of this Unesco organization where its functioning had been severely criticized. A plan for its reorganization was being prepared. Mr Ledoux repeated that, in his opinion, FIAF's adhesion to this organization was useless and that we should resign from it. He underlined that our contracts with Unesco did not necessarily have to go through the I.F.T.C. By way of proof, he mentioned the above contract.

#### THIRD AND FOURTH SESSIONS

Tuesday, May 21

#### Symposium : Film Archives and New Audio-Visual Techniques

This Symposium which was chaired by Mr Morris, included a presentation by Mr Ralph Sargent of his report : "Preserving the moving image", and papers read by :

- Mr Linwood Dunn (Film Effects of Hollywood) on a "Proposed system for the preservation of the motion picture image",
- Dr Charles Ih (CBS Laboratories) on "Holographic archival color storage",
- Mr Arnold Schieman (National Film Board, Canada) on "Our shrinking heritage".

These papers were followed by a general debate. If possible, a detailed brochure will be published by FIAF on this symposium.



FIFTH SESSION (reserved for members)

Wednesday, May 22

This session was chaired by Vice-President John Kuiper.

14. MODIFICATION OF STATUTES AND RULES

Mr Kuiper reported that the sub-committee for the revision of Statutes and Rules, chaired by Mr Stenklev, had prepared a draft for the modification of the Statutes which had been sent to all members. The Executive Committee, in its last meeting held just before the General Meeting in Ottawa, had made a few minor modifications to this text, mainly to correct some errors in English and some unintentional errors and omissions, and the final draft, approved by the Executive Committee, had now been distributed to all the delegates (annex 8). He asked Mr Stenklev to present it.

Mr Stenklev, having recalled the historical background for those modifications, summarized the main trends of the proposed changes in three points :

1. to specify more accurately the quality of member, to give more rights to the associates and to enlarge the concept of correspondent,
2. to make our annual meetings less administrative, but this meant giving more power to the Executive Committee while leaving to the General Meeting its role of ultimate authority,
3. to simplify our procedures and our way of functioning.

He then suggested to start by a general discussion on the principles put forward in these new Statutes and afterwards to discuss the details.

But Mr Ripeanu first wanted to know what would happen with the Rules if the new Statutes were adopted. He also asked which document was submitted to the members for discussion : the one distributed at the General Meeting, or the one sent to the archives hardly within the time-limit set out by the Statutes for such procedure. In his opinion, the two texts were very different. And finally, he thought absolutely necessary to discuss the new Statutes article by article and not to adopt them globally.

Mr Kuiper replied that it was up to the General Meeting to decide what policy should be adopted for the application of the Rules during the interim period (1 year) before new Rules could be drafted and voted. There were several possibilities. Secondly, he assured Mr Ripeanu that there were no substantial changes between the two drafts proposed to the members. About the way of discussing and voting on the new Statutes, he repeated that it was also Mr Stenklev's and his intention to have a detailed discussion but that they had suggested to start by a general discussion on the principles involved in those changes.



Mr Ondroucek said that the Czechoslovak archive had carefully studied the proposed draft and approved it fully.

Mr Vellacott then moved that the General Meeting thank Mr Stenklev and the Committee for the work which they had done and that the proposed draft be endorsed as a working document for further discussion. This being accepted, he asked for some clarification on the following points :

Art. 1 (b) "to facilitate the collection and the international exchange of films .... for the purpose of making them as widely accessible as possible". Accessible to whom, asked Mr Vellacott, to FIAF members ? To the public ? Or both ?

Art. 4 "The members shall enjoy an exclusive right .... throughout the territories of their country". This phrase needed some definition to qualify what that right referred to.

Mr Stenklev replied that both the points raised by Mr Vellacott were already in the former Statutes and that it was not the time now to discuss those.

Mr Kuiper and Mr Pogacic however explained that "as widely accessible as possible" meant : within the limits of our duties to copyright owners.

But Mr Nath, the Indian delegate, insisted that a further clarification of this concept be written in art. 1 (b) of the Statutes otherwise, he said, this phrase could be misleading to the producers. And the fact that art. 4 stated : "No organization whatsoever which, under a cover of archive activity, make use of their collections for commercial purposes, shall be admitted to the Federation" was not convincing for producers because the terms "as widely as possible" could also mean : to a large audience, even if not commercially. Mr Kubelka fully supported Mr Nath's arguments. He added that a new age had come in the film archive movement when film producers began to realize that old films did not lose their commercial value. Therefore, we more and more needed to inspire confidence to copyright owners in order to obtain films for our collections.

Commenting on the whole article 4 which gave the definition of "members", he said he felt a restrictiveness of FIAF towards the acceptance of new members. He thought that this definition should not be so precise and that the terms "national" and "autonomous" should be withdrawn because they were too restrictive and controversial.

Mr Donner also supported this request and, together with Mr Kubelka, he asked to postpone the vote on the new Statutes until next year when they could be re-drafted after due consideration of the members' objections. Mr Ledoux saw no point in postponing the vote until next year. He thought preferable to have a thorough discussion on the whole draft here at the General Meeting when all the members were together.



Mr Pogacic explained that article 4 should be considered with reference to article 3 : "The Federation shall be composed of members, associates and observers". By stating that there were three categories of adherents to FIAF, it gave the possibility to have within the Federation all those organizations which Mr Kubelka referred to when he said that the Statutes were too restrictive in their definition of members. Because we could not at the same time inspire confidence to copyright owners and admit as members the great number of so-called archives which were mainly concerned with the showing of films, therefore taking the responsibility for them vis-à-vis the producers. FIAF being nevertheless very eager to establish some formal links with those organizations, had created a category of observers.

Mr Kubelka having asked what the Executive Committee meant by "national" film archives and how this notion could accommodate, for instance, the American situation, Mrs Bowser replied that the intention of this term was to differentiate between those major archives which had a responsibility to their national production and to their whole country as far as making films accessible, and regional archives.

Mr Rathsack asked for a more precise definition of the words "autonomous" and "non-profit" in article 4. Should this second word be taken in its absolute sense? Why could not an archive make some profits (e.g. on the renting of films to TV with the copyright owner's permission) for the benefit of the archive's work ?

Mr Monty asked why the Committee had added the word "autonomous" to the definition of members. This was, he said, not a clarification of the old Statutes but rather a limitation in the membership. Mrs Bowser however replied that the meaning of "autonomous" had quite precisely been defined in the Zagreb Resolution adopted several years ago by the General Meeting. Putting it in the Statutes was a way of confirming this decision of the General Meeting.

Mr Ripeanu said that, in Bucharest, they had carefully studied the proposed draft, comparing it with the existing Statutes and they had come to the conclusion that the new draft did not yet conform to the wishes expressed by the General Meeting all along its discussions on the future policy of FIAF and that it was not yet ready to be submitted to the votes since even the Executive Committee had found it necessary to make last minute changes to the text. He therefore suggested to ask all the members to send, within a certain time-limit, their remarks and proposals on the new Statutes to the ad-hoc Committee who would then work the draft over again and present the next General Meeting with a detailed report on the proposed changes and the reasons behind those changes.



Mr Kuiper said it was now time to close the general discussion and, in order to arrive to some final decision, he proposed the following procedure : Members make a motion which must be seconded. The motion is then discussed and possibly amended, the amendment being then brought to a vote. If the amendment looses, the main motion is brought to a vote. If the amendment passes, the main motion, as amended, must also be voted. Mr Kuiper also reminded the members that a two-thirds majority was needed to modify the Statutes. This procedure was accepted.

Mr Kubelka moved that the acceptance of the revised Statutes be postponed until next General Meeting. After Mrs van Leer had explained that a postponement would not solve the problems involved, the motion of Mr Kubelka was put to votes, with the following results :

Yes	4
No	20
Abstentions	4.

Mr Vellacott, seconded by Mr Daudelin and Mr Gough-Yates, then moved that the revised draft of the Statutes, as endorsed by the Executive Committee, be accepted.

But Mr Morris first proposed an amendment to article 4. He asked that the word "national" be deleted because the term was confusing. He was not however against the intention behind this word. Mr Klaue suggested to replace the word "national" by "working on a national level". Mr Kuiper asked for a vote on this proposal. It was accepted by a majority of 26 on 28 voting members.

Mrs van Leer brought in an amendment to art. 1 (b) "to facilitate the collection and the international exchange of films and documents relating to the cinematographic history and art, for the purpose of making them as widely accessible as possible". She proposed to add : "at all times, respecting the rights of the copyright owners". This motion was not seconded but it gave rise to a long discussion on this paragraph. Mr Ledoux, supported by Mr Pogacic, Mr Daudelin and Mr Yelin, explained that the terms "for the purpose of making them as widely accessible as possible" was not an encouragement to illegal exchange of films. There was no climate of mistrust between the producers and FIAF such as Mr Kubelka described. But the problem was that we could not preserve, exchange and project films as widely as we wanted because we had to respect the rights of the copyright owners and those rights were clearly mentioned in the Rules. It was however not reasonable to mention our limitations in the first article of our Statutes. This article had been worded in this way for 35 years and had never given rise to any difficulty with the producers. Why then should we make this concession now ?

Mr Kubelka (seconded by Mr Gesek) moved that only the words "as widely as possible" be deleted. The voting gave the following results :

Yes	1
No	27



Mr Donner, seconded by Mr Monty, proposed to delete from article 4 the word "autonomous". (Members should be ... autonomous ... film archives). He explained that if this word was kept here, very few archives could remain members of FIAF. Mr Nath, representing the Indian archive, supported this argument. Mr Rathsack also said that there was a contradiction between "autonomous" and "governmental" in the same phrase.

Mr Ledoux replied that this word was very important, even if it was ambiguous. The term "autonomous" had been chosen by preference to "independent" because it was more flexible. The Executive Committee was well aware that there is no absolute autonomy and that all the archives depend more or less from some ultimate authority, but it was impossible to foresee in the Statutes all those various situations. The notion of autonomy for an archive was not new. It was described in the Zagreb Resolution and we often referred to it in a very legitimate way. This term had not been put into the Statutes in a restrictive meaning but well in the interest of the members, to safeguard their integrity.

Mr Klaue and Mr Daudelin agreed with Mr Ledoux and Mr Klaue said we should avoid the danger of becoming a very administrative body having only big institutes as members. Mr Pogacic added that it would also endanger our relations with the producers if the archives did not stay responsible for their own work.

Mr Coultass thought that if the word "autonomous" was included in the Statutes, it should also be defined in the Statutes.

Mr Donner's motion was then put to votes, with the following results : Yes 4  
No 24.

Mr Donner, seconded by Mr Kubelka, proposed another amendment of article 4 : to delete the last paragraph "The members shall enjoy an exclusive right throughout the territories of their country".

Mr Ledoux, while underlining that this rule was already in the old Statutes, explained that it had been set up to help the small or poor archives by preventing the more powerful archives to go and acquire films all over the world sometimes against the possibilities of the national member. Mr Gough-Yates said that, in his opinion, this rule was fundamental for FIAF, and added that, without it, the films would become even less accessible because competition between archives would make their prices raise. Moreover, if foreign archives addressed themselves directly to the producers or distributing companies in another archive's country, they might interfere with agreements or upset understandings which existed between the local archive and those companies by offering them different terms or a different type of contract, when most archives were very happy to work on behalf of the foreign member and obtain the material for them.



Mr Rathsack objected that this rule was illegal in the E.E.C. countries where free competition was a rule. Mr Donner, as producer, also objected to this rule because he said that the international character of film production today made the situation very complex and made the exclusivity rule impossible to apply in many cases.

Mr Kubelka asked how this rule worked when there were several FIAF archives in one country? Mr Klaue replied that, although he was convinced that this rule was essential, he agreed that it had to be better defined in the FIAF Rules, and not in a restrictive way. Mr Ripeanu thought that this rule should not be kept in the Statutes because this problem had become purely formal and could very well be settled amiably between the members or by the Arbitration Jury, if necessary.

Mr Kuiper then asked to come to a vote on Mr Donner's amendment to delete the phrase, in art. 4, dealing with the exclusive rights. Results were as follows :

Yes	4
No	25
Abstention	1.

The amendment was therefore rejected.

Mr Donner then brought in another amendment. He asked to remove from art. 9 the following phrase : "The status of members and associates shall be subject to confirmation every 5 years by the Executive Committee". He thought that this procedure was useless since, on the one hand, the status of members was very precisely defined in art. 4 and, on the other hand, there was always the possibility to expel a member.

Mr Ledoux explained that this rule had been added by the Statutes Committee because its members considered that it was unhealthy to have life-members in FIAF and that an expulsion was more degrading than non-confirmation.

Mr Rathsack, although agreeing with the idea of regularly controlling the members' status, asked who would control the decisions of the Executive Committee on this matter. He said it was anti-democratic to have one part of the members (the Executive Committee) control themselves and the others not. Mr Kubelka and Mr Ripeanu supported this argument. They said it appeared as a kind of dictatorship of the Executive Committee. Mr Rathsack suggested to install, for the purpose of confirming the status of the members, a special committee independent from the Executive Committee and whose members would change every year.

Mr Ledoux underlined that in many international organizations, the admission and confirmation of members was treated exclusively by the Executive Committee and that, in this proposed draft of the Statutes, article 10 (d) read : "Non-confirmation of the status of a member or associate may be appealed to the General Meeting", but he suggested to change that paragraph and to write : "Non-confirmation ... must be ratified by the General Meeting".



The Chairman then brought to a vote Mr Donner's amendment on the deletion of the phrase : "The status of members and associates shall be subject to confirmation every 5 years by the Executive Committee".

Results were as follows : Yes           9  
                                   No           19  
                                   Abstention 1.

Mr Kubelka (seconded by Mr Donner and Mr Morris) then moved that art. 10 (d) be changed as proposed by Mr Ledoux. This was voted unanimously.

But Mr Ledoux also asked the General Meeting to authorize the Executive Committee to make all subsequent changes following this amendment in a few other articles of the Statutes. This was agreed.

There being no other amendment proposed to the draft Statutes, Mr Kuiper then brought to votes Mr Vellacott's motion to accept the modifications to the Statutes proposed by the Executive Committee, but with the amendments adopted here-above.

The voting was secret. It was controlled by the following non-voting scrutineers : Mr Spehr, Mrs Orbanz and Mr Dimitriev.

Results were as follows : Yes           27  
                                   No           4  
                                   Abstention 1.

As more than two-thirds of the votes were affirmative, the President declared that the revised Statutes were adopted.

#### SIXTH SESSION (reserved for members)

This session was chaired by Vice-President Wolfgang Klaue.

#### 17. STATUS OF MEMBERS. ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS. RENEWAL OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF PROVISIONAL MEMBERS AND CORRESPONDENTS

It was decided that this question would be treated following the procedure described in the Rules of FIAF as long as they did not conflict with the revised Statutes.

Mr Klaue gave the floor to the Secretary-General to introduce the first application for membership.

#### NATIONAL FILM ARCHIVE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA (PYONG YANG)

Mr Ledoux reminded the members that the film archive of Pyong Yang had been a FIAF Correspondent for many years, that it had been admitted as provisional member in 1973 and that they had now made an application for full membership.

Mr Klaue, together with a delegation of the Staatliches Filmarchiv der DDR, had visited the archive in October 1973 and had made the following report :



The Chairman then announced this result to the Korean delegation which was greeted with acclamation.

Kim Bong Chun thanked the General Meeting for their vote and declared that his archive would try, more than ever, to enforce the spirit of FIAF and to promote the development of other film archives in Asia.

#### CINEMATECA DO MUSEU DE ARTE MODERNA DO RIO DE JANEIRO

The Secretary-General explained that this archive whose director, Mr Alves Netto, was well-known in FIAF, had submitted an application as Correspondent. Considering that this category of members had been suppressed this very morning, during the revision of Statutes, the Brazilian archive should now be offered the status of Observer. Mr Ledoux said that the Executive Committee considered it a serious and good archive and unanimously agreed on its admittance.

Mr Yelin added that it was only due to financial problems if the Cinemateca did not apply for membership. Otherwise, he confirmed that it was a very important archive in Brasil which owned a very good collection of Brazilian films and others. He hoped that in the near future they could become members of FIAF.

There being no other comments, Mr Alves Netto was then asked to join the Meeting. Replying to a question of Mr Pogacic, he explained that his archive had, within the Museu de Arte Moderna de Rio de Janeiro, the same kind of status as the Department of Film within the MOMA of New York.

Mr Klaue then announced him that the Executive Committee had, following the revised Statutes, agreed to grant his archive the status of Observer.

Mr Alves Netto thanked him and left the room again.

#### SERVICE DES ARCHIVES DU FILM DU C.N.C. (Bois d'Arcy)

Mr Ledoux introduced the candidature of this important French archive which had made an application as provisional member. But again, as this category of members had now been suppressed, they could only be offered the status of Observer, at least for the first year. The Cinémathèque de Toulouse having given its consent to their affiliation, the Executive Committee had unanimously decided to admit them. As no delegate of the Service des Archives du Film was attending the General Meeting, there was no further discussion.

The Secretary-General also mentioned that the Executive Committee had received an application for membership of Cineteca Nacional, in Mexico. This application had arrived too late to be submitted to this General Meeting and was anyway incomplete but Mr Garcia Borja, its director, had announced that he would contact the Executive Committee and renew his application as Observer for next year.



## RENEWAL OF THE STATUS OF PROVISIONAL MEMBERS AND CORRESPONDENTS

There were two provisional members : Al-Archive Al-Kawmy Lil-Film, of Cairo, and Filmkhaneh Melli Iran, of Tehran, which following the revised Statutes and at least until they applied for membership, would have to join the category of Observers.

As for the Correspondents : Cinemateca Argentina (Buenos Aires), Cinemateca Universitaria del Peru (Lima), UCLA Film Archive (Los Angeles), Musée du Cinéma et Cinémathèque de Lyon, Cinemateca Mexicana del I.N.A.H. (Mexico) and Cine Arte del Sodre (Montevideo), they also had become Observers and no voting was therefore required from the General Meeting for the renewal of their status.

## OTHER MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

The Secretary-General then raised the regrettable case of CINETECA ITALIANA in Milano. For years, this archive had been in arrears with the payment of its subscription fees and recently, Messrs Alberti and Comencini had written to the Executive Committee to announce once more that they were unable to pay their 1972, 1973 and 1974 subscriptions and to ask whether it was possible for the archive to retrogress to the status of provisional member so that they would pay a lower subscription and yet remain in FIAF.

Mr Ledoux explained that, following the Statutes and Rules, this solution was impossible and that there remained only the possibility to allow the archive a maximum period of 3 months for settlement of its subscriptions in arrears or wait for a period of 2 years after which they would be considered to have ceased all connection with the Federation and could rejoin it in the capacity of a new applicant (art. 30 of the Rules).

Mr Privato proposed to allow the Cineteca Italiana a delay of 3 months after which the decision of deletion should come into force automatically if the requested payments were not made. This was unanimously agreed.

## NATIONAL FILM ARCHIVE (LONDON)

Mr Ledoux said that, during this last year, the Executive Committee had been very preoccupied by some problems which had arisen at the National Film Archive in connection with its autonomy within the British Film Institute, problems which endangered N.F.A.'s membership in FIAF, and he proceeded to explain the facts which had led to this situation.

Shortly after the death of Ernest Lindgren, it was learned that the Governors of the British Film Institute proposed to abolish the post of Curatorship of the N.F.A. in its present form and vest the title in the Director of the B.F.I. It was also proposed that areas of the Archive relating to documentation should be removed from the N.F.A. and be established as a separate department.



The Executive Committee, at its meeting in autumn, had considered that this move was directly against the Zagreb Resolution and had written to Mr Lucas, director of the B.F.I., to explain him the implications of such a move on the membership of N.F.A. in FIAF. Mr Ledoux reminded the members that when the Zagreb Resolution had been drafted, the General Meeting had agreed to accept the situation existing with some members which did not entirely comply with the demands of the Zagreb Resolution and in particular that of the National Film Archive, as long as this situation did not worsen.

In January 1974, Mr Lucas had come to Brussels to meet Mr Ledoux and explain the B.F.I.'s position again. He agreed not to pursue the idea of holding both the office of director of the Institute and that of curator of the archive and said he would try to convince the Board of Governors to reverse their position on that matter. He announced that a working-party had been set up to study the restructuration of the various departments of the B.F.I., that this party included 3 members of N.F.A.'s staff, and that therefore it was most unlikely that they would advocate any changes in the structure of the National Film Archive.

A few months later however, the Executive Committee had learned that the working-party had given its conclusions as foreseen but that Mr Lucas, as director of the B.F.I., had convinced the Board of Governors to operate the changes which he advocated and to remove from the N.F.A. that area known as the Information Department/Book Library, its collection and the British Film Catalogue and to establish it as a department of its own within the B.F.I. The Executive Committee of FIAF unanimously considered that this was a change of structure which questioned N.F.A.'s membership in FIAF. They also feared that the reduction of N.F.A.'s autonomy would not stop at this and considered for proof a recent case of infringement, by the Swedish Archive, of the FIAF Rule on "exclusive rights" in England which had been treated quite off-handedly above the head of the deputy-curator of N.F.A. by a correspondence between Mr Lucas and Mr Schein.

The Executive Committee had then met Mr Lucas here in Ottawa and, after a frank and open discussion, had asked him to state, in writing to the next Executive Committee, his position and that of the B.F.I. concerning the future of the National Film Archive and its autonomy in the light of the Zagreb Resolution. The new Executive Committee would then act according to the assurances given in this document.

After this detailed account of the facts by Mr Ledoux, the Chairman called for a short break to be taken and, after the break, he gave the word to Mr Kuiper.

Mr Kuiper first informed the meeting that, during the break, the "exclusive rights" affair between the Swedish Archive and the N.F.A. seemed to have been solved amicably. As regarded the problem of a structural change of the N.F.A., he stressed the complexity, flux and incomplete information of the situation, and called for a cooling-off period. He said, however, that together with the other members of the Executive Committee, he would be ready to support any decision of suspension or deletion of the National Film Archive if it proved that this archive could no longer serve its function as member.



Mr Klaue then gave the word to Mr Keith Lucas.

Mr Lucas vigorously defended himself against Mr Ledoux's allegation that he had felt duped and blamed this impression on the frailty of human memory.

He confirmed that it was far from his wish that the N.F.A. should secede from FIAF, that he was not trying to destroy the archive and that, in any case, according to the terms of the B.F.I., it was not in his power to do so. He proceeded to read two paragraphs from the Constitutions of the B.F.I. and of FIAF which stated their general aims, to demonstrate how similar these were. He warned FIAF against any intrusion into the internal affairs of an archive, reminded the delegates that each archive had its own very different structure and that FIAF should take these into account and not impose unrealistic Rules. Throughout, he stressed the need for moderation and constructiveness of attitude. He went on to say that he would reply in writing to the questions posed him by the Executive Committee. He reminded the delegates that he too had inabdicable obligations to the B.F.I. as well as to FIAF and that the present restructuring was held to be in the general interest of archiving. To conclude, he informed the meeting that one of the largest buildings of the Institute was to be named after the late Ernest Lindgren.

The Chairman, having asked for further comments from the delegates, informed them that the Executive Committee took a note of Mr Lucas's promise to answer their questions on the future of the National Film Archive, and that they would examine his answer at their next meeting.

#### CANADIAN FILM ARCHIVES (OTTAWA)

The Secretary-General explained that the Executive Committee had examined similar problems of status involving the Canadian Film Archives and the Canadian Film Institute in Ottawa. He did not give details as a solution seemed to be on the way, but said he was ready to answer any questions if necessary. There was no further discussion.

#### 16. BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR 1975

The budget proposal for 1975 had been distributed to all members (annex 9) and Mr Stenklev, the Treasurer, proceeded to comment on it, point by point. Comparing the expenses of 1973 with the adopted budget for 1974 and the proposed budget for 1975, he showed that both FIAF's expenses and income were constantly growing but that, due to the inflation which raged everywhere, our expenses were growing faster than our revenue. He therefore informed the members that he would have to ask for a raise of 25 % on the subscriptions, not for 1975, but for 1976. He asked those members which had to make out their budgets far ahead of time to take note of this.



Considering the changes in the categories of members which were brought by the modification of Statutes, changes which had transformed the provisional members into Observers and would therefore cause a lessening of subscription revenues in 1975, he proposed to raise the subscription of Observers from 300 to 500 Swiss francs.

Mr Yelin, speaking on behalf of the Observers which for the most part, were small and poor archives, said he was against such a raise. He was supported by Mr Ledoux, Mr Klaue and Mr Ripeanu.

Mr Stenklev, saying that he would try to find another way of balancing the budget, withdrew his proposal.

There being no further questions from the members to the Treasurer, the Chairman then put to the vote the motion that the Budget for 1975, as proposed by the Treasurer, be approved, with results as follows :

For	31
Against	0
Abstention	1.

#### SEVENTH SESSION

Thursday, May 23 - 9.30 a.m.

#### 18. OPEN FORUM

Mr Daudelin, who chaired this session, stated the general aims of this point as a less formal opportunity to discuss items not on the agenda. He proceeded to enumerate some of the suggested topics for discussion :

- a) Mr Ledoux had earlier expressed a wish to discuss the preservation of pornographic or erotic films and the related documentation,
- b) the relationship between archives and the teaching of cinema,
- c) the position of FIAF vis-à-vis film festivals,
- d) what is being done to preserve television material,
- e) Mr Linwood Dunn's address on the S35M film preservation system.

Mr Donner wondered if he might add to this list :

- f) the question of film rentals for screening on archive premises,
- g) the definition of the archive's premises (difficulties arising when an archive used branches),
- h) some copyright questions,
- i) the relations between FIAF and archives which were integrated within a large film institute.

Mr Daudelin moved that the meeting should begin with the television question (d).



Mr Larry Karr asked the delegates how they set about the acquisition of TV material in their respective countries.

Mr Gough-Yates, of the National Film Archive in London, replied that the Independent Television networks gave a grant of £ 20,000 per year to acquire as much television films of theirs as possible, and any unwanted material was offered gratis. The N.F.A., in effect, did the I.T.V. networks archiving for them. Relations were not so good with the B.B.C. who did their own archiving with rudimentary preservation of video-tape. The N.F.A. only received material of less impressive quality. There were honorary selection committees which monitored all programmes, with bi-monthly meetings, to decide what was to be saved. He also said that since the changeover from 425 to 625 lines, it had been found necessary to film 425<sup>on</sup> video-tape. All colour programmes were on 625 lines.

Mr Donner said that Sweden did only keep 25 % of the present television output. There was also a law forbidding the destruction of film material within 6 months. There was at present a state commission investigating the possibilities of 100 % preservation. He added that the television companies stored all their newsreel material.

Mr Gesek, speaking for the Austrian Film Archive, explained that as yet there was no agreement in Austria with the television companies. However, this year, it had been decided that all that was not kept by the television companies would be offered to the film archives who were at present in possession of all the newsreel information until 1964.

Mr Moore, observer from the National Archives of Washington, explained that the C.B.S. television network had granted them a non-exclusive royalty free license, at present undergoing a ninety-day trial period.

Mr Ledoux, underlining that the Belgian Film Archive could hardly afford to preserve their own cinema material, asked how all what he had heard until now was possible, particularly as television output was generally several times greater than that of the cinema.

Mr de Vaal agreed that this was a big problem. Municipal archives however were becoming increasingly aware that film must be preserved as well as paper documentary evidence. In Holland, a Central Film Deposit Archive involving TV would be set up which would be financed directly by the Government, but come under the tutelage of the Nederlands Filmmuseum. This project however was very expensive and would take time to come into operation.



Mr Klaue spoke of the necessity of a Central Film Archive in the G.D.R. Television companies had volunteered half the cost of building new premises for housing the stock but the problem of selection still existed. Each year, there was 150 tons of material offered, and the principles of selection were continually discussed. Eventually, the entire film stock would be undertaken. There was a large television production library but communication difficulties arose as all were governmental institutions, and all under the supervision of different ministries.

Mr Pogacic, although he acknowledged the absolute necessity to preserve TV material because it was the greatest source of documentation on our times, said that because of the smallness of the Yugoslavian archive, he had had to refuse demands from the Yugoslavian television companies which had asked him to preserve and catalogue their production. The archive nevertheless received a copy of the most important documents, copy of which became its propriety.

Dr Rath sack, having first stressed the difficulty of making a selection in the TV production, said that in the G.F.R. it had been decided to preserve only, but entirely, that sector of TV production which included feature films and documentaries of great artistic value. It represented, for the moment, about 7 hours of projection a day.

Mr Moore and Mr Kuiper explained the system which had, for the time being, been adopted in the U.S.A.

Mr Ledoux, although he fully agreed that it was necessary to preserve TV material, wondered whether it would not be more rational to entrust this task to specialized organizations or to separate sections within the organizations which already embodied the film archives. Mr Kuiper said there were advantages and disadvantages in both systems.

Mr Privato then explained that, in the U.S.S.R., there were two separate organizations to deal with film and television and that they even depended on separate ministries.

In Rumania, Mr Ripeanu said that the National Film Archive had, at a first stage, accepted to take care of the preservation of their national TV production but with a certain selection. Now, a splitting of the two tasks had been decided but there were plans of co-operation and mutual help between the film archive and the new TV archive.

In Hungary also, it was a separate organization which took care of the TV material to preserve, as Mr Molnar explained.

Mr Pöschke reported that the Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde was negotiating with the West-German 2d channel to undertake the keeping of a few hundred films for them.



Finally, Mr Gough-Yates explained how, in England, the film archive considered its role in the field of TV. He said that the N.F.A. somehow justified its existence by performing a public service. If they did not accept to collect also TV material, they would become somewhat like a mausoleum and there was a danger that their funds might be curtailed. This task however did imply a very serious selection and Mr Gough-Yates gave some examples of how the N.F.A. made their selection in the field of TV. He personally did not think it was advisable to separate both types of archives.

The chairman, Mr Daudelin, then asked to open the discussion on another subject proposed : the preservation of pornographic films, the interest or lack of interest in preserving such material and the difficulties encountered, e.g. with transport and customs, when dealing with such films which had now become a world phenomenon.

Mr Ledoux added that it was also very difficult to get accurate information on the erotic or porno films distributed, their credit titles, their exact title, their quality, etc.... If one wanted to preserve this kind of cinema, one ought to preserve the best and know where to find it without having employees monitor each film shown in town.

Mrs Bowser said that, in light of the legal problems involved, there was a function here for the unofficial archives. Very often, official government institutions had no pornography section because either they feared the moral opposition of their authorities or because the distributors feared ensuing litigation. Therefore, she said, the MMA Department of Film did try to collect this material.

Mrs Wibom said that the Swedish Film Archive at least received a report of each film with a public licence, but that very often such information was inaccurate, with pseudonyms, etc....

Mr Ledoux stressed the difficulties of selection. He said the problem was essentially one of evaluation as pornographic films received none of the critical appreciation lavished on the "serious" cinema.

Coming back to the problem of selection and the criterias to apply, Mr Lucas wished to lay more emphasis on the semantic arguments.

The definition was perhaps important to make here of what is erotic and what is pornographic, since the second term excluded any aesthetic or cultural value while "erotic" did not. Therefore, he thought that an archive for pornography ought to be set apart from the usual, due to its solely scientific or sociological interest, and also in order to avoid the criticism that the film archives were harbouring anti-art, or something which was deliberately of a salacious nature for exclusively commercial purpose.

Mr Pogacic explained that the Jugoslavian Archive was in possession of some very early pornographic films which they kept as historical documents. He spoke of the fact that the history of pornographic films was quite as long as the history of cinema itself and could be studied in this perspective.



Mrs Bowser then asked Mr Larry Karr to explain the difficulties he was experiencing in preparing the 1960's film catalogue for the U.S.A. and the documentation on American pornographic films of that period which this catalogue could provide. Mr Karr said that there would be approximately 6,000 titles in the catalogue, the only criteria for entry being that the films had achieved some kind of national distribution. Of these, about one third touched on erotic subjects but the ambiguity of some synopses made the definite figure difficult to determine.

Mr Kubelka argued that no one could or should set himself up as an arbiter on the subject of pornography. The criteria changed quickly and therefore we should collect as much as possible and not search for artistic pretexts to excuse the preservation of pornography but keep them as historical and sociological documents. Mr Ledoux supported this argument and said that, to be comprehensive, an archive should preserve films typical of all directions in film-making, be they films exploiting violence or, indeed, sex.

Mr Ripeanu also agreed that an archive should be representative of all tendencies in film-making but he wondered why then the Meeting had discussed at length and voted that the FIAF Statutes should advocate for its members an exclusive interest in cinema as an art. It was therefore illogical that we should discuss the question of preservation of pornography at all ; we should leave that subject to specialized archives.

To clarify what he had originally said, Mr Lucas explained that he had no wish to see all pornography discarded but he repeated that it would be better to entrust it to specialized archives.

Mr de Vaal informed the Meeting that, after an inquiry into his methods of selection in the Netherlands, a government committee had reported that all should be preserved including the pornographic films, if only for their sociological interest.

Mr Yelin, underlining that his situation was perhaps different from others, said he felt strongly that the problem was one of principle : should we, film archives, remain indifferent to this universal wave of pornography, and other similar movements which affected our culture and our life, or should we have a more critical attitude. In Cuba, they had chosen the second alternative.

To conclude, Mr Stenklev proposed that, at some further meeting, one should raise the question of Censorship.

Mr Daudelin then gave the word to Mr Linwood Dunn, President of "Film Effects of Hollywood" to deliver his paper : The "S 35 M System of preserving the moving image (annex 10). This paper was related to the Symposium on the new preservation techniques.



After Mr Dunn had read his paper, Mr Ledoux asked him if this system was in any way similar to the French system known as Roux-color, which had been experimented some 20 years ago. Mr Dunn said that it was, he knew this system very well but said it was called in the US Thomas-color and then became Colorvision. Although he agreed with Mr Ledoux that the quality of image preserved in the Colorvision system was not so good, he said that since then, the lenses and beam-splitting systems had been so improved that he could sincerely recommend the new system described in his paper.

Mr Privato however thought that the method of preserving colour films in very low temperature vaults such as the SFA der DDR was going to build, was more economical and also better for the quality of image. He agreed nevertheless that these methods had only been tested in the laboratories and would only be put into practice this year. Mr Dunn replied that, of course, if one had good ways of storing the original films, it was better for the faithful reproduction of the image. As concerned the economical aspect, he was unable to compare. Mr Ledoux said that the system of vaults at low temperature was an impossible choice for the small archives because it required a large investment in funds. He thought that Mr Dunn's solution was, in the immediate future, more within their reach.

Mr Daudelin then raised the question of FIAF archives' relationship to film festivals, and whether or not FIAF should adopt a common stand towards the organizers of the festivals who regularly asked for films to be shown in their retrospectives, or asked another archive to serve as intermediary for such demands. Mr Ledoux took up in speaking from his own experience in Brussels. There he was only able to lend films to other archives for screening in their own premises. He felt that Festivals tended to be reasonably well endowed and that FIAF members should be firm with them, asking them to pay the costs of any copies made for their use, even if this must be done through the agency of the archive originally approached.

There being no further comments on this matter, Mr Daudelin proposed to start discussing Mr Donner's topics.

Mr Donner rose the question of the definition of an archive's premises. In the larger countries, such premises were inevitably spreading to other cities. This posed many problems for the relations between archives and producers, notably those of payment. Mrs Wibom asked the delegates in general about the question of payment for screening in the archives premises. She wondered how general this practice was.



Mr Ledoux said that, in Belgium, the Cinémathèque was not paying for projection on the premises of the Archive but made itself useful to distributors in many ways. As for Mr Donner's query, the Belgian Film Archive never showed films away from its Brussels premises as there was never enough money to make the necessary prints and, in any case, the smallness of Belgium made Brussels readily available to any Belgian. He acknowledged the uniqueness of his situation.

Mr Donner called on FIAF to conduct an internal inquiry into these two problems : - the question of payment for projection on archive premises,  
- the scope of film archives premises.

Mrs Wibom then asked to expose two copyright problems which she had recently experienced with FIAF members.

Firstly, she called on the members to restrict the showing of the film "The Saga of Gösta Berlin" as another film was at present being made in Sweden on the same subject and the producers therefore did not like the old version to be shown.

Secondly, she explained a case of infringement of copyright by another FIAF archive which had caused great difficulties to the Cinemateket. Having refused the Pyong Yang archive a copy of the film "I am curious-blue" at the request of the producers, she had learned some time later that the delegation of this archive had admitted to these same producers having received a copy of "I am curious-yellow" from another FIAF archive. The producers blamed the Swedish Archive for that.

Replying to Mrs Wibom's first query, Mr Ledoux said that a circular letter from the Swedish Archive to all members would be sufficient to stop the showing of the "Saga of Gösta Berlin".

Secondly, although he was unable to speak for his North Korean colleagues, Mr Ledoux asked if this could not be due to a language misunderstanding. In general however, he recommended again that archives be careful in expressing their wishes.

Referring back to the payment of royalties, Mr Kubelka said that FIAF insisted that no payment should be made for showings in the archives. However, in the case of experimental cinema which was of little commercial value, he felt that some payment should be made to recompense the filmmakers for the potential depletion of their already small audience.

Mr Ledoux said that it was dangerous to make such a distinction between one category of films and another for boundaries were unclear and the precedent could easily slip from the experimental to the commercial. However, he felt there was a way out of this difficulty. While insisting that no payment was being made for royalties, it was possible to pay the expenses of those filmmakers, for whom he held a great deal of sympathy, in other ways such as travel costs, transport costs, etc....

It being lunch-time, Mr Daudelin then closed the Open Forum.



EIGHTH SESSIONThursday, May 23 - afternoon19. ELECTION OF THE NEW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

After Mr Pogacic had reminded the Meeting of the procedures for election, the number of voting members was counted to 33, nominations were invited and votes taken, with results as follows :

<u>Elections for the President :</u>	V. Pogacic	For	27
		Against	1
		Abstentions	5
 <u>Election of the Secretary-General :</u>	J. Ledoux	For	31
		Against	2
 <u>Election of the Treasurer :</u>	J. Stenklev	For	29
		Against	2
		Abstention	2.

The voting for membership of the Executive Committee then continued as follows :

<u>8 ordinary members :</u>	W. Klaue	31 votes
	S. Yelin	28 "
	E. Bowser	24 "
	V. Privato	24 "
	R. Borde	22 "
	R. Daudelin	21 "
	J. de Vaal	21 "
	J. Kuiper	21 " .

Messrs Gough-Yates, Molnar, Morris and Ripeanu had also been nominated for election on the Executive Committee but did not obtain sufficient votes.

<u>3 reserve members :</u>	K. Gough-Yates	25 votes
	I. Molnar	25 "
	P. Morris	25 " .

Also nominated were : Mr Gesek and Mr Ripeanu.

The Secretary-General then reminded the members of a proposal, which had already been submitted at the General Meeting in Moscow, to nominate Professor Jerzy Toeplitz as honorary member of FIAF. This proposal was now put to votes and was carried unanimously, with general applause.



Concerning the election of the Auditors which, in former General Meetings, usually took place at this stage, the Secretary-General reminded the members that this function had been suppressed in the modified Statutes. The Executive Committee had decided to replace it by the control of the accounts by a professional firm of auditing because it had proved very difficult, in recent years, for the auditors elected by FIAF to do their job effectively, mostly for want of time and the difficulty of rassembling all the documents at a suitable place before the General Meeting.

## 20. PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS UNDER WAY

All the members had in their files a list of all FIAF projects at present under way (annex 11), and also written reports on three of these projects :

1. annual bibliography of books on the cinema,
2. list of filmographical sources classified by countries, both project undertaken by the Arhiva Nationala de Filme of Bucharest (annex 12),
3. second catalogue of silent films in the members' collections, project undertaken by the Belgian archive and which was almost completed.

There was no further news concerning the Basic Manual for Film Archives. The Yugoslavian archive was still working at it.

Mr Ledoux then proceeded to discuss the question of Summer Schools for archive personnel. He asked if there was any member archive interested in holding a Summer School, for the recent one held by the Staatliches Filmarchiv der DDR was a tremendous success. The Executive Committee felt it was a good idea to alternate the theme of such courses, as well as the countries in which they were held. It was impossible to hold one in Denmark next year as it had first been proposed but Mr Monty did not reject the idea of holding a course on the theme of Documentation some year later. As there were no other immediate proposals, the Secretary-General said that the Executive Committee would decide what to do and probably write directly to the archives themselves.

## 21. NEW PROJECTS

Two written proposals for new projects had been distributed to the members.

### a) Circulating film series : Anthropological cinema

This proposal, made by the International Council of the New York Museum of Modern Art and submitted by Mrs Bowser, was described in detail in the written document (annex 13) and needed no further discussion.

Mr Ledoux thanked Mrs Bowser for her generous proposal.



b) Dictionary of Documentary Filmmakers members of the Association  
Internationale des Documentaristes (A.I.D.)

Mr Klaue had distributed a description of this project (annex 14).

Mr Ledoux felt that the A.I.D. qualification limited the book's scope beyond the range of FIAF's interest as publisher. However, he fully admitted that the FIAF members should co-operate to this project as a project of the S.F.A. if Mr Klaue required their help. Mr Klaue explained that they had chosen the A.I.D. membership as a basis guideline for their dictionary because a complete index of all documentary filmmakers would be impossible to compile. He agreed not to undertake it as a FIAF project and said that Staatliches Film Archiv would then undertake it by itself. He welcomed the help of his FIAF colleagues in this task.

Mr Vellacott then proposed another project in connection with the Symposium on new preservation techniques. He recalled that, in the foreword to his report, Mr Sargent had referred to the detailed literature search which Films Inc. undertook before they began their survey. This list of approx. 4,300 references contained much material of a direct practical interest to the FIAF members. He therefore proposed that, with Mr Sargent's consent, FIAF should copy and circulate this list among its members.

Mr Pogacic said this was a very interesting proposal and asked Mr Sargent whether he agreed to it. Mr Sargent immediately agreed and said he would hand the list over to Mr Vellacott in order to be copied.

22. NEXT GENERAL MEETING

The Secretary-General explained that, due to a very difficult financial situation, the two Austrian archives which had offered to organize the XXXIst Congress in Vienna, had recently informed him that they would unfortunately be unable to do so. Mr Ledoux had then turned to the Danske Filmmuseum who had also previously announced its willingness to organize a General Meeting in Copenhagen, but there again and for the same reasons, Mr Monty had said that it would be impossible, at least in 1975.

The only solution which remained was then that FIAF itself should organize a Congress, without the financial help of a member archive, probably in a country where hotels were not too expensive. Mr Ledoux said that the Executive Committee would examine the matter and inform the members as soon as possible.



### 23. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Mr Donner expressed his dissatisfaction that the most important item which he had proposed for discussion at the Open Forum, namely "The relations between film archives integrated in a film institute, this institute and FIAF", had not been discussed. Mr Pogacic, while agreeing that this problem was extremely important, underlined that it had been evoked at length already at previous General Meetings (e.g. Lyon) and also at this General Meeting under the heading of "membership questions". He also said that the question remained open and that it would certainly have to be solved sooner or later.

Mr Pöschke informed the members that he had received, from the International Federation of Film Producers Associations, a letter which raised copyright problems involving the Italian television (RAI) and film archives. Mr Ledoux asked Mr Pöschke to submit this letter to the FIAF Copyright Commission which would study it.

Mr de Vaal then asked the members whether they had any comments to make on the FIAF Bulletin, and whether they wished to continue receiving it. Mr Vellacott replied that, as a distant member of FIAF, he found the Bulletin extremely useful and thought that its role as link between the Executive Committee and the other members would only increase now that the revised Statutes had given more responsibilities to the Executive Committee.

There being no other item to discuss, the President concluded the meeting by expressing the gratitude of FIAF to the Canadian Film Archives and their staff for their generous hospitality in Ottawa. He also thanked the Congress secretaries, the interpreters and the recording engineers, and he declared closed the first part of the 30th General Meeting.

The second part of the Congress would now be held in Montreal, at the invitation of Cinémathèque Québécoise, and would consist mainly in visits of interesting bodies such as the National Film Board of Canada, or Videograph, and also in a Symposium in the Methodology of Film History. This Symposium will form the subject of a separate publication.

-----