

**FIAF XXXIII Varna  
Minutes**



FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE  
DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION  
OF FILM ARCHIVES

m i n u t e s

XXXIIIId CONGRESS

27 - 28 May 1977

VARNA

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Adoption of the agenda	3
Brighton Congress in 1978 (organization of the)	27
Budget proposal for 1978	5
Cataloguing Commission (report)	12
Central register of members' holdings in foreign nitrate f.	24
Commissions : report of the Cataloguing Commission	12
report of the Documentation Commission	11
report of the Preservation Commission	10
report of the Commission on archives in developing countries	13
report of the legal and copyright Commission	14
Confirmation of the status and voting rights of the members	1
Congresses in 1979 and 1980	29
Discharge of the administration of the outgoing Executive C.	10
Documentation Commission (report)	11
Executive Committee (election of the )	26
F.I.A.P.F. (relations with )	5
Film history (Does film history research belong in the film archives ? )	23
Future Congresses (topics for )	19
I.F.T.C. / C.I.C.T. (relations with )	6
Legal and Copyright Commission (report)	14
Membership questions - Admission of new members	7a
Minutes of the preceding General Meeting (approval of)	4
Nitrate films (problems raised by their handling)	18
Open Forum : Television archives	15
Problems raised by handling of nitrate films	18
Topics for future congresses	19
Necessity and ways to publicise FIAF	21
Summer School	22
Film historical research	23
Central register of members' holdings	24
Annual list of important films...	25
Preservation commission (report)	10
Publicity for FIAF (necessity and ways for more)	21
Relations with FIAPF	5
Relations with I.F.T.C. / C.I.C.T.	6
Summer School	22
Television archives	15



TABLE OF ANNEXES

1. OPENING

1. List of participants
2. Report of the President
3. Hommage à 2 personnalités disparues: Henri Langlois et Saul Yelin
4. FIAF accounts and balance sheet for the year 1976
5. Budget proposal for the year 1978
6. Report of the Preservation Commission
7. Proposal for the preservation of colour films in a nitrogen saturated atmosphere
8. Report of the Documentation Commission
9. Report of the Cataloguing Commission
10. Report of the Commission on archives in developing countries
11. Report from U.C.A.L.
12. Proposals to publicize FIAF on the occasion of its 40th anniversary
13. Does film history research belong in the film archive ?

2. DETERMINATION OF THE STATUS AND SETTING RIGHTS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

The Secretary-General read out the list of those persons who had been elected to the delegation on the basis of the voting which took place...

Members and their delegates

Country	Secretary	Delegates
Belgium	Henri Langlois	Henri Langlois
France	Saul Yelin	Saul Yelin
Germany	...	...
Italy	...	...
Spain	...	...
Sweden	...	...
Switzerland	...	...
U.S.A.	...	...

FIRST SESSION

May 27, 1977, 10.00 a.m.

1. OPENING

As host of the Congress, Mr Todor Andreykov, director of Bulgarska Nacionalna Filmoteka, briefly introduced Mr Pavel Pisarev, director-general of the Bulgarian Cinematography, who welcomed all the attending delegates in name of the Bulgarian Government and said he was very happy that FIAF had chosen his country to hold its XXXIIIrd Congress. He underlined the role and activities of the Bulgarian archive not only in preserving the cinematographic heritage of Bulgaria and of other valuable films but also in showing them to an always increasing audience. He then depicted in broad lines the present situation of the cinema in Bulgaria and ended by wishing FIAF a most fruitful and agreeable meeting.

The President of FIAF, Mr Pogacic, thanked Mr Pisarev for his kind words and also for the warm hospitality extended by his country and by the Bulgarian archive to the congressists. Having once more reminded the delegates of the aims of the Federation and of the tasks it had to fulfil, he then declared open the XXXIIIrd Congress of FIAF.

After a short break during which the Bulgarian authorities departed, the President gave the word to the Secretary-General for the continuation of the agenda.

Mr Ledoux first said a few words (annex 3) in memory of two great personalities related to FIAF, Henri Langlois and Saul Yelin, who had died recently. The delegates rose for a few moments in silence to pay tribute to their memory.

2. CONFIRMATION OF THE STATUS AND VOTING RIGHTS OF THE MEMBERS PRESENT OR REPRESENTED

The Secretary-General read out the list of those present, also indicating in each delegation the name of the voting delegate (underlined).

Members and their delegates

Amsterdam	Nederlands Filmmuseum	<u>J. de Vaal</u>
Beograd	Jugoslovenska Kinoteka	<u>V. Pogacic</u>
Berlin (DDR)	Staatliches Filmarchiv der DDR	<u>W. Klau</u> <u>K. Lippert</u>
Berlin (DBR)	Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek	<u>E. Orbanz</u>



Bruxelles	Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique	<u>J. Ledoux</u>
Bucarest	Arhiva Nationala de Filme	<u>M. Paraiianu</u>
Budapest	Filmarchivum/Magyar Filmtudományi Intézet	<u>I. Molnar</u>
Habana	Cinemateca de Cuba	<u>H. Garcia-Mesa</u> Pastor Vega
Helsinki	Suomen Elokuva-Arkisto	<u>S. Huhtala</u> P. von Bagh
København	Det Danske Filmmuseum	<u>J. Stenklev</u> (proxy)
London	National Film Archive	<u>D. Francis</u>
Madrid	Filmoteca Nacional de España	<u>F. Soria</u> <u>V. Gomez-Olivé</u>
Milano	Cineteca Italiana	<u>G. Comencini</u>
Montréal	Cinémathèque Québécoise	<u>R. Daudelin</u>
Moskva	Gosfilmofond	<u>V. Dimitriev</u>
New York	Department of Film/Museum of Modern Art	<u>T. Perry</u> <u>E. Bowser</u>
Oslo	Norsk Filminstitutt	<u>J. Stenklev</u>
Praha	Československý Filmový Ústav/Filmový Archiv	<u>E. Struškova</u>
Pyong Yang	Choson Minchutui Inminkongwhakug Kugkha Ingwha Munhongo	<u>Ri-Ha-Giu</u> Kim San Hon So Hen Nam
Sofia	Bulgarska Nacionalna Filmoteka	<u>T. Andreykov</u> <u>C. Borov</u> <u>A. Velchevska</u> <u>M. Staykova</u>
Stockholm	Cinemateket/Svenska Filminstitutet	<u>A.-L. Wibom</u> <u>A. Kwiatkowski</u>
Toulouse	Cinémathèque de Toulouse	<u>R. Borde</u>
Warszawa	Filmoteka Polska	<u>R. Witek</u> <u>L. Armatys</u>
Washington	Motion Picture Section/Library of Congress	<u>P. Spehr</u>
Washington	Archives/American Film Institute	<u>L. Karr</u>
Wien	Oesterreichisches Filmarchiv	<u>L. Gesek</u> <u>A. Lehr</u> <u>W. Fritz</u>
Wien	Oesterreichisches Filmmuseum	<u>P. Kubelka</u>
Wiesbaden	Filmarchiv/Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde	<u>U. Pöschke</u>

Apologies for absence had been received from Mr Victor Privato, director of Gosfilmofond and Vice-President of FIAF whose bad health prevented him from attending, and from the members of Canberra, Jerusalem, København, Lausanne, Poona and Torino. Mr Ledoux received unfortunately too late for the meeting the proxy from our member in Torino. The archives of Canberra and Poona were represented respectively by Mr Ivan Page (from the National Library of Australia) and by Mr B.E. King (from the Indian Embassy in Sofia) who did not have the right of vote according to art. 25 of the FIAF Rules. No news had come from the member archives in Istanbul, Lisboa and Tirana.

Members still to be ratified by the General Meeting.

Mexico	Cineteca Nacional	A. Balmori
Mexico	Filmoteca de la U.N.A.M.	M. Gonzalez-Casanova

Associates

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

Observers

Brazzaville	Cinémathèque Nationale Populaire	D. Mbaloula
Buenos Aires	Cinemateca Argentina	P. Fernandez-Jurado
Ottawa	National Film Archives	S. Kula
Rio de Janeiro	Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna	C. Alves-Netto J.C. Avellar
Sydney	Association for a National Film and Television Archive	B.E. King

Among the Observers, apologies for absence had been received from Mr F. Schmitt (Bois d'Arcy), Mr Misbach Biran (new Observer in Jakarta), Roh Young Suh (Seoul) and F. Gaffary (Tehran).

Honorary Members

Mr Einar Lauritzen, Stockholm, Sweden

H. Volkmann, Berlin, Deutsche Demokratische Republik

Prof. Jerzy Toeplitz was expected to arrive on the second day of the General Meeting.

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND OF THE VOTING PROCEDURES

The President underlined that a new agenda, different from the one which had been sent out in advance, had now been drafted by the Executive Committee and been distributed to all delegates. It read as follows :

FIRST SESSION27 May, 9 a.m. - 1 p.m.

1. Opening by Mr Pavel Pisarev, General Director of the Bulgarian Cinematography
2. Confirmation of the status and voting rights of the members present or represented
3. Adoption of the agenda and of the voting procedure
4. Approval of the minutes of the preceding General Meeting
5. Adoption of the FIAF budget for 1978
6. Relations with other international organizations
7. Status of Members - Admission of new members (ratification by the General Meeting)
8. Discharge of the administration of the outgoing Executive Committee

SECOND SESSION27 May, 3 p.m. - 6 p.m.

9. Commissions' report
10. Open Forum

THIRD SESSION28 May, 10 a.m. - 1 p.m.

11. Open Forum (second part)

FOURTH SESSION28 May, 3 p.m. - 6 p.m.

12. Election of the new Executive Committee
13. Organization of the FIAF Congress in 1978  
Next Congresses
14. Points on the agenda of which the discussion is not closed and any other business

This agenda was unanimously accepted.

Mr Ledoux then asked the members whether they agreed to follow during this General Meeting the voting procedures which had already been used for the Meetings in Torino and in Mexico. This was agreed.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING GENERAL MEETING

The Minutes of the XXXI<sup>st</sup> General Meeting in Mexico, which had been sent to all affiliates, were approved unanimously.



## 5. ADOPTION OF THE FIAF BUDGET FOR 1978

The Treasurer, Mr Stenklev, first briefly commented on the accounts and balance for the year 1976 (annex 4) which had been sent to all FIAF members, associate and observers. He said he was ready to answer any questions from the delegates on those accounts.

As there were no questions, he then passed onto the draft budget for 1978 (annex 5) which all the delegates had in their files.

He noted that the total expenses foreseen for 1978 (2.834.000 Belgian francs) showed a small raise of  $\pm 4\%$  on the budgeted amount for 1977, which was reasonable and was due to the present inflation rate in Western European countries where most of FIAF's expenses were made.

As regarded the Periodical Indexing Project, if one compared its foreseen expenses (1.335.000 B.F.) with its foreseen income (825.000 B.F.) which had both been calculated as closely as possible, it appeared that FIAF would have to subsidize the project by  $\pm 500.000$  B.F. The Treasurer underlined that if he had proposed this subsidy (which, he reminded, would also have to be granted for 1977) and if the Executive Committee had agreed with his proposal, it was because of FIAF's good economic situation and because it would not hamper any other activity of the Federation. This support from FIAF should also give the project a better chance to establish on firmer economic grounds. The Executive Committee however now urged the Documentation Commission to prepare for the P.I.P. a balanced budget for 1979 onwards because it would be impossible for FIAF to continue to subsidize it at this rate.

Mr Stenklev then ended his report and asked for the comments of the members. There being no questions from the floor, the President asked for a vote of approval on the proposed budget. It was unanimously approved.

## 6. RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

### F.I.A.P.F. (Fédération Internationale des Associations de Producteurs de Films)

Mr Ledoux reminded the members that, in Mexico, it had unanimously been decided to submit to FIAPF a Resolution which recommended the drafting between both organizations of a "General Declaration of Principles" on the preservation of films.

In December 1976, Mr Brisson, Secretary-General of FIAPF, had answered the following (translation) :

Mr Secretary-General,

A few weeks ago, we have received from President Pogacic a Resolution adopted by your General Meeting in Mexico which recommended the drafting between our organization and yours of a "General Declaration of Principles" on the preservation of moving images.

We find this proposal nothing less than surprising in so far as UNESCO is already conducting such a study, which would lead to parallel works on the same topic.

But it is true that UNESCO limits itself to a restricted aspect of the problems which film archives and producers may encounter in the field of film preservation. The deposit of prints, ruled by copyright, quickly raises problems of preservation which entail problems of copying. But it raises also, and even more rapidly, problems of projection and of circulation complicated by the composite character of film which is made of a physical basis and of a work registered on that basis.

It goes without saying that for our organization a "General Declaration of Principles" should go beyond the field of preservation only and include the entirety of the problems raised by the preservation of the prints.

I would therefore ask you kindly to confirm your agreement on this interpretation of the thinking which we shall have to do together in a spirit of cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Mr Kubelka having asked for some clarification of Mr Brisson's request, Mr Ledoux said he believed that FIAPF was somewhat irritated by the fact that we wanted to remain (and possibly sign an agreement) with them on a basis which must be broad enough to be accepted by all our members. He recalled that, at previous meetings, our discussions had sufficiently demonstrated the diversity of the members' views on this question. The Executive Committee wanted to avoid that FIAF be divided on this possible agreement with FIAPF and had therefore replied to Mr Brisson that "it could not at present go beyond the mission which it had got from the General Meeting in Mexico, but that it was ready to submit to the next General Meeting due to be held in Varna any suggestion which FIAPF might want to put forward".

Until now there had been no reply from FIAPF to this letter.

I.F.T.C. (International Film and Television Council)

The Secretary-General reported that, during this last year, the Executive Committee had to face a problem caused by our belonging to this organization which now seemed to form an obstacle to the establishment of closer relations between UNESCO and FIAF. He explained that, after the adoption by Unesco of the resolution on the preservation of the moving images, FIAF's Executive Committee had felt the necessity to establish direct links with Unesco, especially since the I.F.T.C. (until now our only contact with this organization) appeared to fall more and more into decay and had no program to speak of but only survived artificially with its debts.



The Executive Committee, at its Moscow meeting, had therefore decided to apply to UNESCO for category B membership, i.e. an information and consultative category of relationship. But this had proved almost impossible because of our belonging to IFTC which was supposed to represent us in Unesco. The question now was whether we should not resign immediately from IFTC.

On the other hand, there existed now also a possibility that IFTC be dissolved, which had been proposed by some members of its Bureau (among which Mr Pogacic) but which had to be decided by its General Meeting due to be held in next October.

FIAF's Executive Committee had therefore, after a long discussion, voted on the following alternative : 1) FIAF stays in IFTC at least until their next General Meeting in October, and comes to a decision after that date ; 2) We resign immediately with a letter clearly expressing our reasons. Results had been as follows : 5 votes for the first proposal

4 votes for the second proposal,

but this was of course only an indicative vote because such decision to leave (or to join) an international organisation was part of the functions of the General Meeting.

Mr Ledoux then gave the word to Mr Klaue, who had voted for the first proposal, to explain his reasons. Mr Klaue said he felt we should not leave IFTC too soon. He feared that FIAF did not have much chance of obtaining B status in this period of uncertainty for UNESCO as regarded all the new TV and cinema organizations, and if we left IFTC, we would then remain without any formal link at all with UNESCO. There was also a possibility, he said, that UNESCO would interfere in the IFTC and force them to change their policy. But he proposed that we do nothing to keep IFTC alive and that, in the meantime, we use every possibility we could find to work directly with UNESCO. He gave some examples of this collaboration.

Mrs Wibom having asked for more precise information on the IFTC (who were the members, what were their goals, what did it cost us to be a member, etc...?), Mr Pogacic, Vice-President of IFTC as delegate of FIAF, explained that, although several international organizations like FIAF, FIAPF, CILECT, FIPRESCI, etc... concerned with cinema and television, were among its members together with several individuals, the IFTC had almost no activity and had never helped us in any way. Its position within UNESCO was also rather weak, which could be deduced from the very meager subsidy it received annually from this organization. That is why, at IFTC's last meeting, he had voted for its dissolution.

The annual membership fee which we paid was around 75 dollars.

Mr Ledoux then proposed to adopt a compromise on the question of leaving or not leaving the IFTC : that we do not resign immediately but that the General Meeting of FIAF give to the Executive Committee the power to decide at its next meeting (i.e. after IFTC's General Meeting) whether or not to stay in this organization. We would then have more time to see how the situation developed and also to establish better contacts with UNESCO regarding our candidature in category B.

Mr Daudelin said he felt surprised at Mr Ledoux' sudden change of speech regarding the urgency for FIAF to leave IFTC. For him anyway, IFTC was a dead body which made us lose time and energy and, the sooner we left it, the better. If we stayed, it was as if we approved their General Meeting which, as he understood it, was only a desperate move from some of its individual members to defend their personal interests.

Mr Gonzalez Casanova asked if there was really no way of transforming IFTC into an active and useful association, but Mr Ledoux' reply was : "No, we have tried many times."

Finally, the vote on Mr Ledoux' proposal gave the following results :

Yes	22
No	3
Abst.	4

#### 7. STATUS OF MEMBERS - ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS / RATIFICATION BY THE GENERAL MEETING

---

##### a) Mexico

The Secretary-General reported that, at its meeting held just after the General Meeting in Mexico, the Executive Committee had examined and accepted the candidature of Membership of two Mexican Observers : 1) Cineteca Nacional and 2) Filmoteca de la Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico.

These two archives, although in the same town and both working on a national level, were in fact very different because one, Cineteca Nacional, was, as most of the members could see during last year's Congress, a powerful governmental archive, but the other, Filmoteca de la UNAM, was the film archive of the immense and famous Mexican University which, one could almost say, was "a state within the state".

The Executive Committee had visited the premises and preservation facilities of both archives and had found them satisfactory. Both organizations had also signed a declaration of mutual collaboration, as requested by FIAF's Statutes.

The General Meeting was now asked to ratify the decision made by the Executive Committee in Mexico.

However, Mr Ledoux added that he felt somewhat embarrassed as regarded Cineteca Nacional because the Executive Committee had received no news at all from this archive during the whole year although we knew that it had undergone some important changes after the Presidential elections in Mexico (and namely the departure of its director, Mr Garcia-Borja). It was only very recently, in reply to a telegram from the Secretary-General asking for some information that Mr Balmori, assistant-director of Cineteca Nacional and present here in Varna, had cabled : "New Director General of Cineteca Nacional is José-Maria Sbert. We shall see you in Varna. Letter follows."



But the promised letter had not yet come and Mr Sbert was not in Varna. Mr. Ledoux thought this behaviour toward FIAF rather strange from a candidate-member and asked if other members had any comments to make.

Mr Andreykov reported that he had visited Cineteca Nacional in Mexico a few months ago, that he had met Mr Sbert and that the archive seemed very active and very cooperative. Bulgarska Filmoteka anyway had excellent contacts with them.

Mr Antonio Balmori was then called into the meeting room and Mr Ledoux, having repeated what he just reported to the General Meeting, asked him if he could somewhat explain this lack of communication and give the meeting some information on the new Director of Cineteca Nacional.

Mr Balmori explained that Mr Sbert had taken over all the functions formerly held by Mr Garcia-Broja (also as Director-General of Mexican Cinematography), but that some minor administrative changes in the organization of the archive had postponed Mr Sbert's official nomination and that was why FIAF had not yet been informed. For the rest, the archive had gone on with its work as before and could report good progress.

There being no other questions, Mr Balmori left the room again for the continuation of the discussion and Mr Gonzalez Casanova, director of Filmoteca de la UNAM, was asked to come in. To a question from Mr. Ledoux, he replied that the changes which occurred in Mexico after the election had not affected his archive, and that they were progressing slowly. There being no other questions, Mr Casanova also left the room, and Mr Pogacic proposed to go on with the voting.

As this was a secret ballot vote, a committee of 3 scrutineers was appointed, namely Mr Armatys, Mr Gomez-Olivé, and Mr Razlogov. Results of the vote were as follows :

For the admittance as member of

Cineteca Nacional :

yes	19
no	6
abst.	2

Mr Balmori was then asked to come in, he was congratulated and given the right of vote for the next votings.

For the admittance as Member of

Filmoteca de la UNAM:

yes	22
no	4
abst.	2

Mr Gonzales Casanova was also called in, congratulated and given the right to vote.

The Secretary-General then informed the General Meeting that the Executive Committee, at its meeting held the day before in Varna, had unanimously admitted the candidature as Member of another FIAF Observer : The National Film Archives / Archives Nationales du Film, in Ottawa, Canada.

In fact, Mr Kula had already submitted the candidature of his archive last year in Mexico but, as he had not been able at the time to provide the Executive Committee with a letter of collaboration with Cinémathèque Québécoise, as requested by art.11 of our Rules, the examination of this candidature had been postponed. In February of this year the Executive Committee had received a declaration of mutual collaboration from the 2 Canadian archives. Everything was now in order, except for one formality : the inspection by a member of the Executive Committee of the archive's preservation facilities; but it was already arranged that Mrs Pawser would go to visit the archive in Ottawa very soon after the Congress.

Mr. Kula was asked to join the meeting to answer any possible question from the members but there were none.

The President therefore proposed to pass to votes and to admit the National Film Archives (Ottawa) as a Member, with the proviso that a favourable report be sent by the Executive Member in charge of visiting the Archive's preservation facilities.

Results were as follows :

yes	24
no	3
abst.	2

As an information, the Secretary-General then reported that the Executive Committee had accepted the candidature of a new Observer in FIAF : The Department of Film / George Eastman House in Rochester (USA).

Most of the Members knew this important archive which had been a member of FIAF for several years in the fifties but which had left it at the time of our crisis with the Cinémathèque Française. It had even, at that time, and under the direction of Mr James Card, instituted legal proceedings against FIAF. This suit had prevented us for years, (and in practice still prevented us although FIAF had won the cause) from recovering the Federation's archives which were sequestered in the old offices of Cinémathèque Française. However, Mr. Card was now retiring from the archive and was to be replaced by FIAF's Vice-President Mr. John Kuiper. Mr. Doherty, director of G.E.H. had therefore immediately submitted a candidature as Observer for the Department of Film. As this candidature fulfilled all the conditions of FIAF, the Executive Committee had unanimously accepted it, with the proviso that G.E.H. takes back the complaint lodged against FIAF in Paris in 1966 or make any other action which would have the same result.



Regarding this action, Mr. Ledoux said there were good hopes it could be accomplished soon since he had, this very morning, received a letter from Mr Doherty who said this litigation between FIAF and G.E.H. was a mystery to him but that, whatever it may have been, it was today a dead issue and that all G.E.H. now wanted was to wipe the slate clean for a new beginning.

Mr. Ledoux said he would forward this letter to our lawyers in Paris and try to settle the matter as quickly as possible.

#### 8. DISCHARGE OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE OUTGOING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The President asked the General Meeting to give its discharge to the retiring Executive Committee. This was agreed unanimously.

#### SECOND SESSION

May 27, 3 p.m.

Vice-President Klaue presided over this session.

#### 9. REPORT OF THE SPECIALIZED COMMISSIONS.

##### a) Report of the Preservation Commission.

A written report from Mr Volkmann, chairmann of the Commission, (annex 6) had been distributed to all members. Mr Volkmann having said he had nothing to add to this report, Mr Klaue called for comments or questions from the members.

Mr Ledoux said he had a few questions to put to the commission :

1) Referring to a proposal (annex 7) made by a Belgian engineer to preserve colour films in a nitrogen saturated atmosphere instead of normal air, proposal which Mr. Ledoux had submitted in writing to Mr. Volkmann a few months ago, he asked Mr. Volkmann whether the Preservation Commission thought this idea should be considered worth studying more thoroughly. Mr. Volkmann said he could not answer definitely yet, but he was doubtful because the results obtained by Nikfi laboratories in USSR for some similar experiments were rather negative. However, he said he would ask the Commission to organize some special tests on this Belgian proposal.

2) When rewinding a film before storage, is it better to rewind it with the emulsion on the inside or on the outside when storing a film? There were no proofs that it was better to do it one way or the other. Mr. de Vaal however said that, at his archive, the personnel had strict instructions to rewind the films with the emulsion on the inside, in order to protect it. While Mr Karr also said that, in the U.S.A., a recommendation made by one of the organizations for motion picture theaters, and concerning projection prints in 35 mm, was to keep the emulsion in at all times, and so to prevent focus drift.

3) Mr. Ledoux then asked if the action of matting the base of a film in order to suppress the scratches in it, could if repeated too often, harm the film ?

Mr. Volkmann said he did not think so but that no experiments had yet, to his knowledge, been made to evaluate the number of times that a film could undergo this process without harm. He promised to organize an inquiry in this direction.

4) Mr. Ledoux also asked if repeated passage of a film through a wetgate for printing (in French : tirage humide ou tirage anti-scratch) could in the long run damage this film ? Mr. Volkmann's answer was the same as to the preceding question.

There being no other questions, Mr. Klaue concluded the report of the Preservation Commission by inviting the members whose archives were able to throw some light on Mr. Ledoux's questions and to supply better information, or who worked under some internal rules on these points, to send this information to the Secretariat which would forward it to the Preservation Commission.

b) Report of the Documentation Commission.

A written report from the Documentation Commission had been distributed to all members (annex 8.).

Mrs Bowser, Chairman of the Commission asked for questions or comments on this report.

Mr. Ledoux suggested a new project : the extension of the International Index to Film Periodicals to books currently published on the cinema. He believed this addition would be a tremendous help both in time and finances to many archives, and said he was ready to pay an increased subscription to obtain these supplementary cards.

Mrs. Bowser asked if other archives represented here would also be interested in this extension of the P.I.P. and would be willing to pay more, because it would certainly take substantial financing to do this supplementary work.

Mr. Spehr wondered if one should not investigate first the already existing indexes and contact those libraries in all countries (for ex. the Library of Congress) that were already indexing those books on an international scale and examine the possibility to use their cards.

Mr. Ledoux said his archive had already done this inquiry and was subscribing to the Library of Congress cards and also to a British National Bibliography cards but this was not sufficient.

One could not expect any general library to cover satisfactorily such a specialized field as cinema. Mr. Klaue wondered whether one could not come back to the "International Bibliography on the cinema" which used to be published annually by the Rumanian archive. It was of course published with some delay, but was it necessary to have the information on books as quickly as on the periodicals ? It would anyway be much less expensive than the envisaged extension of the P.I.P. Mrs Wibom however said it was important to have a quick and accurate information on the new books published on the cinema because otherwise, after a few months, it became impossible to find them.

Mr de Vaal and Mr Kula said they would also be interested in such extension of the P.I.P. and would be ready to pay an increased subscription for it.

Mrs Bowser agreed to submit the matter to the Documentation Commission and to report on it at the next General Meeting.

Mr. Kula then reported that his archive had just published a new issue 64-76 of the Bibliography of FIAF, Member' publications. He also urged the Members to send in their information for the next issue as soon as it was available.

c) Report of the Cataloguing Commission.

All the Members had in their files a written report from the Cataloguing Commission. (annex 9).

Mr. Klaue, Chairman of the Commission, said he had only two informations to add to this report;

cf. Pt. 2 : The American Film Institute had now sent in their contribution to this project.

cf. Pt. 4 : Burt Franklin Press had announced publication of the Cataloguing Manual for late fall of 1977.

Mr. Klaue then called for questions or comments from the Members.

Mr. Ledoux said he could only repeat his plea to the Cataloguing Commission for a concrete recommendation on the computer cataloguing system to be used by a small archive like the Belgian archive, a system which would be economical but at the same time expansible for the future. He found the system used by the Imperial War Museum too elaborate and that of the Swedish archive perhaps too simple : (for instance, the technical information given about their films was very poor).

Mr. Klaue replied that it was impossible for his Commission to make a precise recommendation for big - medium or small archives as to which computer cataloguing system they should use. It depended on too many local factors, different for each archive : budget, staff available, aims of the catalogue, needs of the archive, number of datas to be put in, rapidity of growth of the collection, ect...etc... The important thing however was to start collecting datas on the films as soon as possible and even before the definite system was chosen. In reply to Mr. Ledoux' reservation about the computer system used in Stockholm, Mrs. Wibom said she was very aware of the lack of technical information given in their cards but that they were continuously working on the preparation of these new datas to put in and were hoping to have it all added by 1980. Luckily, their system was very adaptable.

Mr. Francis also underlined the necessity for an archive to start its catalogue as early as possible. In London, they had now discovered that the costs of inputting the necessary information about their existing collection were already so great that they could not afford it anymore.



Finally, Mr. Klaue concluded by repeating that the Commission would compile all the information it would receive from the members who had some practical experience in the usage of computers for cataloguing and make it available to all FIAF Members, but that each archive nevertheless had to develop its own system depending on its own national conditions.

d) Report of the Commission on Film Archives in Developing Countries.

Mr. Klaue reminded that this Commission had been created last year at the General Meeting in Mexico and he gave the floor to Mr. Perry to give a verbal report on its activities.

Mr. Perry then read out a detailed report (annex 10) in which the main point was a proposal that FIAF create a permanent Commission to deal with the problems of archives in developing countries.

Mr. Klaue having asked to open the discussion on this report, and, in general, on the problems of small and developing archives, Mr. Garcia-Mesa, director of the Cuban archive, asked to read out a report on behalf of the Secretary - General of U.C.A.L. (annex 11).

Mr. Dimitriev, while underlining that the first contacts which FIAF had established last year in Mexico with quite a number of Latin-American cinemathèques was an important step, said however that it was time now to expand our help and to make it more concrete. We should not limit ourselves to recommendations but support the small archives' efforts to develop by sending them films. He gave the example of what Gosfilmofond had done in this sense and urged the other big archives of FIAF to do the same.

Mr. Klaue thanked Mr. Perry for his excellent report which summarized in a concrete way most of the recommendations already made at previous FIAF meetings. FIAF, he said, is certainly willing to fulfil its obligations towards young and developing archives but he was afraid that some of the projects enumerated by Mr. Perry would be too heavy for FIAF's limited means and he therefore understood this report more as an appeal to individual archives who were able to work in this direction, for instance in inviting students from these archives free of charge to FIAF's Summer School or, for a longer period, as trainee in the archive itself.

Mr. Casanova agreed that this kind of help : training of the archive's personnel, was extremely useful. He also insisted on the necessity to inform and instruct the young archives by written documents or manuals and he offered the help of his archive to translate into Spanish any FIAF document such as the Basic Manual or the other manuals prepared by FIAF's specialized commissions. Mr. Garcia Mesa strongly supported Mr. Casanova and proposed his archive's collaboration in this work.

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 inform 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. Klaue 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. Klaue 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.

e) Report of the Legal and Copyright Commission.

In the absence of Mr. Kuiper, Mr. Klaue 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 12 th 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 we know as classic cinema where actually the images did not "move" but where we had a succession of still frames projected in a rapid rythm 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.



Mr. Kubelka added that every human creation belonged to a specific period and should be kept as such and in its original form. He readily admitted that, in a not too distant future, the "moving image" might abandon the support of the classical film strip and continued on other media but there would have been this specific period of film as we know it now. He personally found nothing wrong for FIAF to become, at a certain stage, an association of archives or museums preserving only the classical type film. We were now at this important point where we had to choose. If however, FIAF decided to incorporate archives collecting all types of "moving images", then we must create separate sections for each of the different media involved.

Mr. Ledoux said he entirely supported Mr. Kubelka's intervention.

Mr. Spehr said that, because of the revised copyright law in the United States, the Library of Congress was suddenly confronted with an immediate duty to collect TV material on a large scale, which caused them enormous problems on how to separate the two media, how to catalogue them etc... He asked for the advice of his colleagues on these questions.

Ms. Orbanz asked how it was possible to make a clear distinction between film and TV material when there were many examples of films (on film stock) made for and produced by the television.

Mr. Francis said that, in Britain, it was a present very difficult to separate film and television in the career of some directors or other people in this profession because they went continually from one field to the other. He felt that if FIAF archives allowed another organization to start collecting TV images, they would be cut off from part of the creative history of people in whom they were interested from the point of view of film. There was also a great danger that, because of the very nature of television organization and their present lack of interest for preservation, much of their production would be destroyed. If we waited too long, we would never be able to recover all that had been lost. The National Film Archive in London had therefore decided to collect both film and television material.

Mr. Pöschke said he did not know how the television production was at present preserved in West-Germany but he would inquire.

Ms. Struskova said she agreed with her colleagues that this was a fundamental problem. She believed FIAF should not embody the two types of archives.

Mr. Borde explained that, in France, the government had created a very powerful organization, the Institut National Audiovisuel (INA), which preserved on videotapes all the programs of the French television. They also had a large quantity of films and were one of the founders of the new TV archive's association. Mr. Borde thought we should not be afraid of this new development but we should certainly establish links with the association and, at the same time, make an inquiry among our members.

Mr. Dimitriev explained the situation in Soviet Union regarding the preservation of TV material. Gosfilmofond, until now at least, collected only film. Mr. Andreykov also explained the situation of his country in this field. His archive did not collect television material which was preserved only partially and on a temporary basis, in view of later retransmission, by the television organization itself. The Bulgarian government however was aware of this problem and wanted to solve it by creating a special organization to this aim.

Mr Perry felt there was a confusion of issues in this discussion and that two very different problems must be distinguished :

- 1°) Should FIAF archives collect also TV material ?
- 2°) the point raised by Mr Kubelka, to distinguish between the material phenomenon of the image whether it is on film or on tape.

One could therefore possibly say that FIAF archives must collect TV material and at the same time hold on to Mr Kubelka's position that these are two distinct phenomena which ought to be treated as such.

Coming back to the new federation of TV archives Mr Spehr said he was very suspicious of their archival intentions as a long term project, but Mrs. Wibon said that, in Sweden at least, the aims of the television archive were certainly in line with the FIAF principles on film archivism. Mr. Francis however said that, even if the television archives did look after their collections very well technically, they did not provide public access to it and, to him, public access to the collection was equally important as preservation.

Mr. Comencini agreed with Mr. Francis. He said we should be careful in our dealings and contacts with the new organization because the aims of the television archives were, he believed, totally different from the aims of FIAF archives, as commercial archives could be from cultural archives.

The delegate of the Korean archive, explained that they collected the whole television production of their country, for which they received special funds from the government.

Mr. Klaue felt it was time now to conclude this discussion. He summarized it and proposed to raise as a subject for one of our future congresses, the philosophical problem raised by Mr. Kubelka.

As for the inquiry to make among the members about the situation of television preservations, the Executive Committee would appoint one of its member to prepare it.

THIRD SESSION

May 28, 9.30 a.m.

This session was presided over by Mr. Jon Stenklev.

He started by announcing the arrival at the meeting of Professor Jerzy Toeplitz, former President of FIAF and at present Honorary Member, who was warmly greeted by the delegates.

## 11. OPEN FORUM (second part).

### 2. Problems raised by the handling of nitrate films (J. Ledoux).

#### a) Transportation.

Mr. Ledoux said he had heard that, in several countries, the transportation of nitrate films was now severely limited. He asked if it would not be possible here to take stock of the situation in the members countries, regarding this problem.

From the explanations given by some of the delegates, it appeared that there were

- 1) no limitations in Belgium and France.
- 2) Transportation allowed either by air, train or truck but under strict regulations in U.S.A. and England.
- 3) Transportation by air forbidden but allowed in special trucks or special train wagons in U.S.S.R., D.D.R., Sweden, Hungary.
- 4) No transportation nor projection allowed in Bulgaria.

Mr. Ledoux having asked whether anyone knew of some accidents caused by nitrate films during their transportation, Mr. Volkmann said he remembered one very grave accident which had killed 10 people near Berlin, but Mr. Spehr who had been involved with the transportation of nitrate film for almost 20 years said he had never had any trouble. He thought that as long as the films were carefully inspected and the more deteriorated reels removed before shipment and if those shipments were as direct as possible, then the air transportation was probably the safest because it was the quickest.

Mr. Stenklev thanked the members for the information given and Mrs. Bowser said she would add it in the "Basic Manual".

#### b) Voluntary destruction of nitrate film.

Mr. Ledoux explained that, in Belgium, because of regulations on air-pollution, he found it almost impossible to destroy nitrate films which he wanted to get rid of (because they were in a state of near decomposition) and he wanted to know from the members if they experienced the same problems.

Most of the members said they were allowed to use a special place to burn the nitrate films which they wanted to get rid of but several members among which Mr. Borde and Mr. Casanova, said they were against the destruction of nitrate films unless the acetate copy made of those films was



absolutely perfect and true to the original. Mr. Spehr said it seemed that, as concerned both transportation and destruction of nitrate films the members encountered most of their difficulties when they had to deal with bureaucrats who had to interpret regulations and were afraid to deviate from these just a little bit. He therefore suggested that FIAF should write out some realistic statements about shipment and destruction of nitrate films, which could be shown to those people who only believed in the written word.

To end up, Mr. Casanova reported that his archive had had a fire in one of the nitrate vaults two months before and that some experts were at present trying to establish the causes and circumstances of it. Luckily, most of these films had already been copied.

### c) Viewing tables for nitrate films.

Mr. Ledoux reminded the members that, in Mexico, he had promised to make an inquiry about the possibility to adapt some protection devices on the flatbed viewers used for nitrate-films (cf Mexico Minutes p.19) for reasons of security. In answer to his letter, a manufacturer in Milano (Prevost) had written that he did not see the possibility to adapt to an existing table the casings used on projectors for nitrate films but that a special table including those security casings could possibly be built for approximately \$ 5000 (rough estimate). Mr. Ledoux said he would hand over Mr. Prevost's letter to anyone who was interested.

Mr. Stenklev suggested also to include this information in the FIAF bulletin.

### 3. Suggested topics for Future Congresses.

Mr. Klaue recalled that, in Mexico, the General Meeting had agreed that FIAF should continue to organize the kind of Congresses which we had here, i.e. part administrative, part specialized. This of course needed a long term planning and he therefore proposed to establish a list of topics which the members would like to see discussed at these symposia.

Mr. Klaue's own proposals were :

- Discussion on all the aspects of legal deposit.
- Problems of film selection.
- Relations between film archives and television archives, and problems of preservation of TV material.
- Day-to-day problems of an archive, training of archive staff, new methods of cataloguing, cultural activities of the archive, etc...

Mr. Page, on behalf of the National Film Collection in Canberra, proposed :

- Development of a stronger, internationally recognised qualification / accreditation for film archivists, administered and awarded by FIAF.
- Colour film preservation : the tri-separation vs cold storage argument.

Mr Page also supported Mr Klaue's proposal on problems and principles of film selection.

Mr. Ledoux recalled a proposal already made in previous years to compare different methods of colour film preservation, for instance the duping of films made on a certain brand of film stock onto another brand of stock, and to compare the results in a side-by-side projection. The difficulty consisted in organizing such a projection because it required some very special technical installations.

Mr Spehr suggested to discuss problems of editorial restoration.

Mr. Pastor Vega, on behalf of Cinemateca de Cuba, proposed as topic for a near Congress :

- Films considered as cultural heritage of mankind : film preservation as the main responsibility of FIAF. Proposed subthemes for the same Congress :

- 1) How to guarantee conservation of the films produced in developing countries.
- 2) Help due to film archives in developing countries.
- 3) Promotion towards the creation of new archives in countries where they do not exist.
- 4) Preservation of theatrical films, the so called marginal films and TV films. Technical problems.
- 5) Legal problems attached to film preservation. Assistance from UNESCO.
- 6) FIAF's list of films considered as of outstanding cultural interest intended specially for new and young film archives, film societies, film schools, universities, etc... in the preparation of their exhibition programme and documentation work.
- 7) Priorities and selective criteria regarding film collections.

Mr. Casanova supported Mr Pastor Vega's proposal and wanted to add a point about the responsibilities of FIAF to preserve the film production of countries where a film archive did not yet exist and to promote the creation of film archives in those countries.

Mr Francis suggested a symposium where the various projects that individual archives are undertaking could be set forth and discussed. He felt that we often tended to work in too much isolation and would sometimes benefit from a confrontation with other members.

Mr. Comencini proposed a symposium on the problems of copyright.

Ms. Eva Struskova reminded the members of the invitation made by the Czechoslovak Film Archive to hold the 1980 FIAF Congress in Czechoslovakia and proposed as topic for this Congress the theme of "Film Archives and Society" which could cover many of the basic problems of film archivism such as : what film should we preserve for the future generations ? what are the social aims of a film archive ? etc... and should analyze these problems from a general point of view with the help of historians, scientists, philosophers, etc...

Mr. Stenklev thanked Ms. Struskova and the other members for all their suggestions. He said the Executive Committee would examine them carefully and try to establish a long-term planning of our Congresses taking into account the necessary balance between technical and material themes on one side and more philosophical or historical themes on the other side.

4. Discussion on the necessity and ways to publicize FIAF (W.Klaue).

Having explained that FIAF and its activities were very little known outside the restricted circle of its affiliates, Mr. Klaue said that both the Federation and its members individually would certainly benefit from some publicity on our achievement and the long tradition which FIAF has as the oldest international organization in the field of film. He therefore proposed some examples of what could be done in this respect, proposals which he had already submitted in writing to the Executive Committee (annex 12) as ideas for FIAF's 40th anniversary in 1978.

Mr. Stenklev added that, on this occasion, the Executive Committee had also entrusted Mr. Bruache with the task of drafting a pamphlet or brochure on FIAF, which was meant to be widely distributed.

Mr. Kula recalled the idea of a FIAF award to promote film research. He felt this was a good way of reaching out to the universities and scholars to make them aware of our existence.

Mr. Pogacic having suggested to make a television program (which could be shown in several countries) on the importance of film archives and on the necessity to preserve films, Mr. Ledoux replied by a more general question: "what kind of public did we want to reach with our publicity? This had to be defined before we could accept either Mr. Pogacic's proposal which was intended for a very broad public, or Mr. Kula's which, on the contrary, was meant for very limited circles.

Mr. Klaue said that the recommendations he had made were mainly aimed at film interested people or institutions, with whom we possibly had to deal in our work. On the other hand, we should not neglect to look for wider public support. Mr. Kubeška strongly supported him on this second point.

Mrs Bowser thought that the best publicity we could have come through making the results of our work known, especially through our publications and manuals. She also said we should try to reach film distributors and producers to give them a better understanding of what we did.

Ms. Andreykov explained how the fact that his archive was actually organizing the present congress and symposium in Bulgaria, had helped to make its work better known and had raised great interest in this country. He proposed to maintain it as much as possible, among other things through their publications.



Mr. Ri-Ha-Gyu, delegate from Pyong-Yang, explained that it certainly was necessary to make FIAF better known. He had recently visited film archives in Peking, Hanoi, Saigon, Vientian, Malaysia and Japan, which all were very interested to hear about FIAF and its activities and were now eager to establish contacts with the Federation. Mr. Ri-Ha-Gyu promised to send more details on all these archives to the Secretary-General and hoped that we would contact them as soon as possible. This was agreed.

Mr. Casanova proposed the idea of an itinerant FIAF film festival, made of one selected film from each member archive, which could be shown not only in the members' countries but also in those countries where a film archive did not yet exist to make them realize concretely the use and the results of film archivism.

Mr. Alves Netto reported that, each year in Brazil, his archive organized a FIAF film week with films coming from various FIAF archives and with comments on the efforts made for their preservation and restoration by the respective archives. This film week usually met with great success.

Mr. Lippert suggested to publish rather widely the results of FIAF Congresses and Symposia.

Mr. Pastor Vega proposed to publish these results also in the Cuban Magazine : "Cuban Film" which was distributed all over Latin-America.

Mr. Balmori said it might be useful if all members should include in their programs, publications, newspapers, posters, etc... a reference to their membership in FIAF.

Mr. Stenklev concluded by thanking all the members for their suggestions which would now be submitted to the Executive Committee for further consideration.

#### 5. Plans for the next FIAF Summer School.

Mr. Klaue announced that Staatliches Filmarchiv der D.D.R. would be willing to organize a third basic Summer School in Berlin for two weeks in the Summer of 1978, at the approximate cost of 250/300 dollars per participant, and the possibility to invite 2-3 participants from developing archives free of charge (except for their travel). He only wanted to know if the members were interested in such a basic course.

Mr. Ledoux thanked Mr. Klaue for his generous offer and said it would certainly interest several affiliates of FIAF but he wondered whether it would not be wiser to organize this course rather in 1979 and to open it in priority to students from developing countries. He also suggested, if his first proposal was accepted, to immediately approach Unesco and ask them somehow to patronize this course, in the frame of their Resolution on the preservation of moving images.

Everyone agreed on this proposal which would be submitted to the Executive Committee for further examination and careful preparation. Mr. Gonzales-Casanova having asked whether it would not be possible to have both a Summer School in Berlin with, as program, the continuation of the preceding course, and a more general and basic Summer School supported by Unesco, which should not necessarily be held in Berlin, Mr. Klaue and Mr. Ledoux replied that this was impossible, not only because of the limited financial resources of Unesco but also because of the very heavy work involved in the organization of such a course.

Mrs. Orbanz finally suggested to have one day a Summer School organized in a small and developing archive in order to examine more concretely how an archive with very limited resources could cope with its preservation problems.

#### 6. Does Film History Research Belong in the Film Archives ?

Mrs. Bowser had, following a discussion held during a recent Executive Committee meeting, drafted a paper on this question and all the members had it in their files (annex.13).

Mr. Stenklev asked the Assembly to express its opinion on this problem. For him, the answer was "yes".

Mr. Klaue said he agreed with Mrs. Bowser that film history research did belong in the film archive but he did not agree that all our Congresses should have historical themes.

Mr. Ledoux also agreed with Mrs. Bowser. He thought that her paper touched a very important question for FIAF : "What amount and what kind of research should we encourage in our archives ? What help should we give to film historians ? etc... And he cited some examples of what could be done or what was already being done in this field in some archives : Regular showings for restricted audiences of historians, scholars or journalists, special conditions to view the films on a table (but how to determine these special conditions ?), etc... He wondered whether FIAF should not try to establish a kind of deontological code or a list of recommendations regarding our contacts with film historians.

Further to the examples given by Mrs. Bowser, Mr. Spehr reported on two different experiences at the Library of Congress / Motion Picture Section which gave very positive results in this field. One was to encourage the people on their staff who had some knowledge of film history or on the importance of the films that were being copied or catalogued to extend their information to the more technical staff involved with those films.

The second was the presence in the archive of a known film scholar working there part-time. This also had a very stimulating influence on the rest of the staff.

Ms. Struskova and Mr. Dimitriev both supported entirely Mrs. Bowser's argumentation. They also described the methods used at their respective archives to collaborate with film historians. Mr. Dimitriev added that there was at present a great deal of exchanges between Gosfilmofond and the Soviet Institute of Cinema in view of the writing of an history of world cinema. He said they would soon ask also for the help of their colleague archives and invite some foreign historians for the completion of this enormous work.

Mr. Pöschke reported that, in Wiesbaden, they had appointed a committee of film historians to research all the German films from the period 1933 to 45 to show at universities, seminars, historical symposia etc...

Mr. Pogacic underlined that the films in our collections were not only important from the aesthetic point of view but that more and more the value, even of the feature films, became evident as sociological, historical or political documents. His archive had therefore developed a new type of thematic programs which was described in its annual report.

Mr. Kubelka also totally agreed with Mrs. Bowser, especially on the problem of establishing priority lists and on the necessity to be guided by film historians when doing this but he added, in agreement with Mr. Pogacic's statement, that we should allow to be guided by other specialists also when establishing these lists.

Mr. Francis having explained that in London they showed to scholars, journalists or students just as much films as record as films as art which brought them to showing a very wide range of material and to receiving an enormous amount of requests for viewing, a short discussion ensued between Mr. Francis, Mrs. Bowser, Mrs. Wibon and Mr. Ledoux on the best ways to take care of all the demands and the charges involved. Unfortunately no solution could be found but perhaps could this problem be raised again at the next Open Forum.

To conclude, Mr. Stenklev said it seemed that everyone agreed with Mrs. Bowser that film history research did belong in the film archive but he asked what the members felt about the last phrase in her paper, that : "FIAF itself should give over at least part of its time at annual congresses for consideration of film historical problems, as we have began to do".

Except for Mr. Ledoux who also thought it was an important priority, there was no answer to this question.

#### 7. Central register of member's holdings in foreign nitrate films.

This project was, in fact, the continuation of the proposal made last year in Mexico by Mr. Francis, in view of saving as many as possible of the disintegrating nitrate films. One of the conclusions in Mexico had been that individual archives should send to a central place (FIAF Secretariat), a list of their foreign nitrate films which they not interested in saving those films. Three archives (those of London, Stockholm and Prague) had already distributed such lists, either through the Secretariat or directly to the individual archives from which country the films originated. In this case, a complete list had also been deposited with the Secretariat in view of the possible compilation for a Central Register.



Mr. Francis explained that his list had been established in very simple terms, giving only the title of the films, year of production and sometimes the name of the producer, and this for reasons of rapidity. He thought this was sufficient information for a start and said we should not interfere with the project by making it too difficult.

Mr. de Vaal, Mrs. Bowser and Mr. Klaue all said they found this project extremely useful and promised to participate in it. Mrs. Wibom also fully supported it and, although the list from her archive had already been delivered to the Secretariat and was in a somewhat different form (by chronological order) than that of Mr. Francis, she felt that FIAF should establish or at least encourage some standards of the minimal data or of the form that those lists should adopt.

Mr. Ledoux said that to impose certain standards might stop some archives from participating, if it <sup>entailed</sup> is too much research work, but that the more information one could give about the films, the better.

Mr. Klaue said that the Cataloguing Commission might eventually take care of all the lists assembled at the Secretariat and make of them a central register ready for practical use.

To conclude, Mr. Stenklev also underlined the importance of this project and strongly urged all the attending members to participate in it, even in the very simple form of an exchange of lists such as stated by Mr. Francis.

B. Annual list of important films produced during the preceding year.  
(J. Ledoux).

This topic was discussed during the intervals of the election.

Mr. Ledoux first explained his proposal : that FIAF should compile and publish every year, from the member's suggestions, a list of important films made during the past year in their country. This list, he felt, could serve several purposes : 1°) to attract the attention on a certain number of unknown films; 2°) to guide the archives for their theater programming; 3°) as a filmographic tool, etc...

Of course, many details of this project still had to be discussed : definition of what is an important films; should the archives be limited to citing films from their national production only ? And limited to a certain number of films ? Having also suggested to try this project at first internally, among the FIAF members, Mr. Ledoux asked for the comments of the Assembly.

Mr. Borde, Mr. Perry and Mr. Toeplitz strongly expressed their opposition to the project. They said that, whether we chose it or not, such list would be considered by many as a kind of prize-list and as a guide for what must be collected and preserved from the other countries' production and would, in the long run, work against the preservation of more important films. This list would anyway be without a real value because made too soon after the films first came out.

They felt that if film history was so exciting, it was because it lead to constant reconsideration. Official history, said Mr. Toeplitz, is damnation of the history. And now Mr. Ledoux suggested to create, already at the break of the day, the official history of the cinema ! This was absolutely contrary to the work of FIAF. The only possible list which they could accept would be something quite confidential and internal, for members only, not no official list from FIAF.

Mr. Pogacic and Mr. de Vaal however supported Mr. Ledoux' suggestion, whether for a public or an internal list, because they also would find it extremely useful to get better information on the production of the small or faraway countries for their film programming. They said one could very well present the list in such a way that it was not considered as the official selection. made by FIAF.

Ms. Fernandez-Jurado said that, for Argentina for instance this list would be useful to inform people in Europe or in the USA, through the archives, about their national production which was very little known abroad. Mr. Dimitriev also supported the project, especially because he felt there was, in the field of recent film production, a great lack of information between countries from the East and from the West, mainly about the smaller countries.

After a long discussion in which Mr. Toeplitz and Mr. Perry said they were all for the exchange of information between members, but against any kind of official list from FIAF (even in the Bulletin, as suggested by Mr. Karr), and in which also Mr. Casanova and Mr. Kubelka strongly opposed the idea of any list (Mr Kubelka said it would be 'immoral' for FIAF to show such partiality in making a kind of preselection), Mr. Ledoux remembered the meeting that his suggestion was to try first the projet between FIAF affiliates only and withdrew his proposal.

This ended the Open Forum.

#### FOURTH SESSION

28 May, 3 p.m.

This session was presided by President Pogacic.

#### 12. ELECTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The same committee of scrutineers as for the first session was asked to act for the elections. The total number of voting members amounted to 31. Nominations were then invited, and votes taken with results as follows :

<u>President</u>	V. Pogacic	27 yes 1 no 1 abstention.
<u>Secretary-General</u>	J. Ledoux	26 yes 3 no 2 abstention.

Nominated for the post of Treasurer, Mr. Stenklev explained that, for reasons of overwork at his archive, he could not accept to be re-elected as Treasurer. He proposed the name of Mr. de Vaal, former Deputy-Treasurer. No other names were proposed.

<u>Treasurer</u>	J. de Vaal	29 yes
------------------	------------	--------

		1 no
--	--	------

		1 abstention.
--	--	---------------

The voting for 8 ordinary members of the Executive Committee then continued as follows :

R. Borde	24 votes	elected.
R. Daudelin	22	elected.
V. Privato	21	elected.
D. Francis	21	elected.
E. Bowser	21	elected.
W. Klaue	20	elected.
J. Kuiper	19	elected.
I. Molnar	19	elected.
T. Andreykov	16	
J. Stenklev	15	
P. Vega	11	
G. Comencini	9	
M. Casanova	7	

The President then asked for votes on the election of 3 reserve members with results as follows :

F. Buache	19
J. Stenklev	18
T. Andreykov	17

Mr. Garcia-Mesa, Mr. Kubelka, Mrs Wibom who had been nominated for election, had refused this nomination.

### 13. ORGANIZATION OF THE FIAF CONGRESS IN 1978.

Mr. David Francis announced that the National Film Archive invited FIAF to hold its XXXIV th Congress in Brighton, a seaside resort 54 miles from London. The dates foreseen were 28th May - 2 June. Besides the General Meeting which would take two days, there would be a Symposium with two distinct parts :

- 1°) the cinema between 1896-1906.
- 2°) film to videotape and videotape to film : the present and the future.

About the first symposium, he explained that this period had been chosen not only because these were the dates of the main activity of the "Brighton School" but also because it seemed to be the most poorly researched period in film history. The idea was to have a few designated experts look in advance at all the existing films from that period before preparing their papers for the Symposium.



Therefore, Mr. Francis needed the cooperation from all the members of FIAF to send him as soon as possible copies of all the films they had from that period so that he could lay on a screening for the experts. At the Symposium itself, there would be approximately 16 hours of showings and talks. Mr. Francis now asked for the member's comments regarding the practical details and problems for the preparation of this Symposium.

While very enthusiastic about the new approach to film history research chosen by Mr. Francis, several members (Mr. Perry, Mr. Ledoux, Mr. Spehr) wondered if the number of films which existed from that period, especially in the U.S.A., would not make it impossible to view them all. The only solution would then be either to restrict very much the period or to accept an element of selection in certain countries.

Mr. Klauze having asked whether the Symposium would include only films as an art or also as historical documents for that period, Mr. Francis replied that his idea was to consider only films as an art and not as a record. But Mr. Kubelka, Mr. Perry, Mr. Kula and Mrs Orbanz all insisted to include also the factual films in the Symposium and to study this particular period in depth, even if it had to be restricted, rather than to make an arbitrary distinction between what was fiction and what was factual, because there were many connections between the two fields at that time.

Mrs. Bowser also agreed and she proposed then to restrict the Symposium to the period 1900-1906 which she thought would produce the most interesting and less known section of film history.

Mr. Francis having replied that this approach might still involve some kind of selection, Mr. Razlogov said there could be three different approaches to such symposium : 1°) very scientific and specialized where all the films from one period were studied in detail; 2°) more general, with the intention of writing the history of that period in cinema, and then to have a few reference marks both in fiction and factual films was sufficient to draw the main lines of this history; 3°) the most realistic approach, for this Symposium at least, to study basically all the fiction films from that period but to include in the program some selected factual films related to the development of feature films or which one could not determine exactly as belonging to one or the other field.

Finally, the period 1900-1906 was agreed upon and also the third approach proposed by Mr. Razlogov. Nevertheless, and considering that everything depended from the films which Mr. Francis would receive from the members, for the Symposium, it was decided that he should have the last word in its organization and that he would have to appoint himself a small committee of other members to help him if necessary.

Regarding the second part of the Symposium : "From Videotape to Film..." Mr. Francis explained that this would not be a discussion on the preservation qualities of videotape but principally a demonstration of how and for what purposes videotape could be used in the archive work, and to compare the relative merits, costs, etc... of the different types of equipment in video. This was for many members also a fascinating and instructive topic.

#### NEXT CONGRESSES.

---

The Secretary-General reported that the Executive Committee had received a proposal from the Swiss Cinémathèque to hold the Congress of FIAF in 1979, in Lausanne, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Congress of La Sarraz.

He also recalled the invitation made this morning by Mrs. Struskova from the Czech Archive to hold the FIAF Congress of 1980 in Czechoslovakia. The themes for the specialized part of the Congresses had not yet been decided upon.

#### 14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS AND CLOSE OF THE GENERAL MEETING.

---

There being no other points to discuss, President Pogacic thanked Mr. Andreykov and his staff from the Bulgarian film archive for the generous assistance they had given to the General Meeting as well as all those - particularly the interpreters - who had contributed to the successful outcome of the Meeting's deliberations.

He then declared the XXXIII d General Meeting of FIAF closed and announced the opening, the following morning of FIAF's Symposium :  
" The influence of silent Soviet cinema on world cinema".

---