

**FIAF XXXIV Brighton  
Minutes**

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE  
DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION  
OF FILM ARCHIVES

m i n u t e s

XXXIV CONGRESS

---

28th to 29th May, 1978

BRIGHTON

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Adoption of the agenda	3
Archives in developing countries (report of the Commission for)	8
Approval of the minutes of the preceding General Meeting	5
Budget proposal for 1979	5
Cataloguing Commission (report)	6
Closing of the General Meeting	25
Commissions : report of the Preservation Commission	6
report of the Cataloguing Commission	6
report of the Legal and Copyright	7
report of the Documentation Commission	8
report of the Commission for archives in developing countries	8
Confirmation of the status and voting right of the members present or represented	1
Congresses in 1979 and 1980	22
Discharge of the administration of the outgoing executive com- mittee	11
Documentation Commission (report)	8
Executive Committee (election)	15 s.s.
Histoire Générale du Cinéma (projet)	23
International History of the Cinema (project)	23
Legal & Copyright Commission (report)	7
Membership question - Admission of new members	7
New projects	23
Preservation Commission (report)	6
Projects under way	24
Open Forum : Relations with International Organizations	12
Discussion on Unesco document : possible inter- national instrument concerning the safeguarding and preservation of moving images	14
Circulation Seeking information about archives in countries not connected with FIAF	18
General History of the cinema	19
Loan of film matériel to non FIAF organizations	20
FIAF Summer Schools	20
Organization of the next FIAF congresses in 1979 and 1980	22
Report from Mr Ledoux on his resignation as Secretary-General	1 s.s.
Report of the President	5
UNESCO : Possible international instrument concerning the safeguarding and preservation of moving images	14

(s.s. means : separate section)

## TABLE OF ANNEXES

1. List of participants
2. Report of activities from the Executive Committee
3. FIAF accounts and balance for the year 1977
4. Draft budget for 1979
5. Report of the Cataloguing Commission
6. Report of the Documentation Commission
7. Report of the Commission for Archives in Developing Countries
8. Report from Cinemateca Nacional de Venezuela
9. Report from Cinemateca Uruguay - Montevideo
10. UNESCO Document : "Possible international instrument concerning the preservation of moving images."
11. Result of the enquiry on archives in developing countries
12. New Project : A General history of the cinema.
13. Report on the next FIAF Summer School.
14. Programme of the Symposium : "Cinema 1900 - 1906" and of the Symposium : "From Film to Videotape and from Videotape to Film".

FIRST SESSION

May 28, 1978, 9.30 a.m.

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

---

The President, Mr Pogacic, welcomed all the attending delegates in Brighton and immediately started the General-Meeting's business by the first point on the agenda. He therefore gave the word to the Deputy-Secretary-General, Mr Raymond Borde.

Mr Borde read out the list of the members 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	<u>W. Klaue</u>
Berlin (BRD)	Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek	<u>H. Rathsack</u> <u>E. Orbanz</u>
Bruxelles	Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique	<u>J. Ledoux</u>
Bucuresti	Arhiva Nationala de Filme	<u>M. Paraiianu</u> A. Puran
Budapest	Magyar Filmarchivum	<u>I. Molnar</u>
Canberra	National Film Archive/National Library of Australia	<u>R. Edmondson</u>
Habana	Cinemateca de Cuba	<u>P. Vega</u>
Helsinki	Suomen Elokuva-Arkisto	<u>S. Huhtala</u> P. von Bagh
Jerusalem	Archion Israeli Leseratim	<u>L. van Leer</u>
Kobenhavn	Det Danske Filmmuseum	<u>I. Monty</u> K. Jones
Lisboa	Cinemateca Nacional	<u>A. Seixas Santos</u>
London	National Film Archive	<u>D. Francis</u> C. Jeavons
Madrid	Filmoteca Nacional de España	<u>L. Berlanga</u> F. Soria
Mexico	Filmoteca de la U.N.A.M.	<u>M. Gonzales-Casanova</u>
Montréal	Cinémathèque Québécoise	<u>R. Daudelin</u> P. Véronneau

Moskva	Gosfilmofond	<u>V. Dmitriev</u>
New York	Department of Film/Museum of Modern Art	<u>E. Bowser</u> J. Gartenberg R. Summers
Oslo	Norsk Filminstitutt	<u>J. Stenklev</u>
Prague	Ceskoslovensky Filmovy Ustav/Filmovy Archiv	<u>S. Ondroucek</u> M. Frida
Pyong Yang	National Film Archives of the D.P.R.K.	<u>Pak Sun Tae</u> Kim Chol Yong Kim Yong Sok
Roma	Cineteca Nazionale	<u>G. Cincotti</u>
Sofia	Bulgarska Nacionalna Filмотека	<u>I. Andreykov</u>
Stockholm	Cinemateket/Svenska Filminstitutet	<u>A.-L. Wibom</u> R. Lindfors
Toulouse	Cinémathèque de Toulouse	<u>R. Borde</u> C. Borde
Warszawa	Filмотека Polska	<u>R. Witek</u> A. Chodnikiewicz
Washington	Motin Picture Section/Library of Congress	<u>P. Spehr</u>
Washington	Archives/American Film Institute	<u>L. Karr</u>
Wien	Oesterreichisches Filmarchiv	<u>W. Fritz</u> L. Gesek
Wien	Oesterreichisches Filmmuseum	<u>P. Konlechner</u> P. Kubelka
Wiesbaden	Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde	<u>U. Pöschke</u> D. Gebauer

Mr Buache from Cinémathèque Suisse, Mr Comencini from Cineteca Italiana and Mr Kula from the National Film Archives in Ottawa were expected to arrive some time later. Apologies for absence had been received from Mr V. Privato Vice-President of FIAF, and from Ms Adriana Prolo from the Museo Nazionale del Cinema in Torino who had given her vote to Mr Comencini.

#### Associates

London	Imperial War Museum	<u>C. Coultass</u> R. Smither
--------	---------------------	----------------------------------

Mr Coultass raised a question to know whether, following the new Statutes, he now had the right of vote. Mr Borde referred him to art. 17 of the statutes which said: "Each associate has the right to vote on all matters except those arising from the application of Statutes and Rules."

Observers

Brazzaville	Cinémathèque Nationale Populaire	D. Mbaloula
Caracas	Cinemateca Nacional	R. Izaguirre R. Restifo
Jakarta	Sinematek Indonesia	H. Misbach Biran H.A. Karim
Los Angeles	U.C.L.A. Film Archives	R. Rosen
Rio de Janeiro	Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna	C. Alves Netto
Rochester	Department of Film/I.M.P.	J. Kuiper
Seoul	Korean Film Archive Incorporated Foundation	J.H. Lee

Apologies for absence had been received from Mr Schmitt from Bois d'Arcy, Mr Fernandez Jurado from Buenos Aires, Mr Reynel Santillana from Lima and Mr Graham Shirley from Sydney.

Honorary Members

Mr Einar Lauritzen, Stockholm, Sweden  
Mr H. Volkmann, Berlin, Deutsche Demokratische Republik.

Visitors

Mr Borde greeted a certain number of other guests to the Congress who had already arrived, among which :

Mr J. Dumont, International Federation of Television Archives  
Ms Dalton, Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research  
Mr D. Lance, International Association of Sound Archives  
Mrs A. Mitropoulos, Cinémathèque de Grèce  
Mr Liam O'Leary  
Mr E. Patalas, Münchner Stadtmuseum  
Mr R. Shields, International Federation of Film Societies  
Mr M. Verdone, Conseil International du Cinéma et de la Télévision  
Mr. R. Waldekrantz, University of Stockholm  
Mr T. Watson, Imperial War Museum, London

## 2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND OF THE VOTING PROCEDURE

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 SESSION

28 May, 9 a.m. - 12.30 p.m.

1. Confirmation of the status and voting rights of the members present or represented.
2. Adoption of the agenda and of the voting procedure
3. Approval of the minutes of the preceding General Meeting
4. Report of the President
5. Adoption of the budget for 1979
6. Questions on the Commissions' reports

### FIRST SESSION - Part II (reserved to member)

7. Status of members - Admission of new members  
(ratification by the General Meeting)
8. Discharge of the administration of the outgoing Executive Committee

### SECOND SESSION

28 May, 2 p.m. - 4.30 p.m.

9. Open Forum

### THIRD SESSION (For members and associates only) 29 May, 9.00 a.m. - 1 p.m.

10. Report from M. Ledoux on his resignation as Secretary-General
11. Election of the new Executive Committee
12. Organisation of the next FIAF Congresses in 1979 and 1980
13. Points on the agenda on which discussion was not complete, projects, and any other business

Mr Ledoux protested because the General Meeting had been shortened to only three sessions. He thought this was much too short and deprived the General Meeting of the possibility to discuss thoroughly all the items on the agenda or to get better informed on any other FIAF matters which the members had the right to know.

Mr Pogacic said he also regretted the very short time allowed to the General Meeting but this was due to the organisational problems of the two Symposia which were to follow the General Meeting. He added that the Executive Committee had no intention whatsoever to restrain the members' possibilities for discussion and that we would hold longer sessions if necessary.



Mr Klaue asked to include in pt 13 a report on the main FIAF projects. This was agreed. The agenda, thus amended, was then unanimously adopted.

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

---

The Minutes of the XXXIIIrd General Meeting in Varna, which had been sent to all affiliates, were unanimously approved save for one abstention.

### 4. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

---

The President, Mr Pogacic, read out a report which he presented as a report of the activities of FIAF's Executive Committee during the past year (annex 2). He ended by evoking the grave problem of the Secretary-General's resignation but reminded the members that an opportunity would be given specially to discuss this problem during the 3d session on the next day. There being no questions or comments on this report, Mr Pogacic then gave the word to FIAF's Treasurer for the next item on the agenda.

### 5. ADOPTION OF THE BUDGET FOR 1979

---

All the affiliates had received the FIAF accounts and balance for the year 1977 together with the auditor's report. (annex 3). As there were no questions on these accounts, the Treasurer, Mr de Vaal, started to comment on the draft budget for 1979 which all the delegates had in their file (annex 4). He explained that, at its meeting in Perpignan, the Executive Committee had decided to raise the Executive Secretary's salary, the reasons therefore being that the resignation of Mr Ledoux had given her additional responsibilities and more work, and also because it felt that FIAF now functioned as a real international organisation and its staff salaries should therefore be adapted.

All the other items on the budget showed only some normal inflation and they gave rise to no particular comments. As for the P.I.P., Mr de Vaal announced some new information but before giving the word to Mrs Bowser on that point, he asked for the comments of the members on the first part of the budget.

Mr Ledoux said he protested with the Treasurer and the Executive Committee because he had not been consulted about the raise of salary granted to Mrs van der Elst. As national member in the country where the FIAF Secretariat is established, he felt this would have been only normal. He also thought this raise was unjustified and said the Executive Secretary did not have more work because of his resignation.

Mr Daudelin replied that the Executive Committee's decision had not been merely to raise the Secretary's salary but to readjust it after a careful examination, in the Statutes and Rules, of her responsibilities and duties which were much more than those of a simple office employee. The members had considered that she should be treated as a person working in an international bureau whose functions did not exactly coincide with the definitions existing in the Secretariat's country of establishment.

Mr Borde and Mr de Vaal both supported Mr Daudelin's argument and confirmed that the Executive Secretary did have more responsibilities, and also more work, now that Mr Ledoux had resigned as Secretary-General. The President then gave the word to Mrs Bowser to comment on the P.I.P. budget. She explained that, as it was drafted here, the P.I.P. budget showed a deficit of more than 300.000 Belgian francs but that the Executive Committee in Perpignan had agreed to finance it by 200.000 BF. The remaining sum was to be raised some way or another by the Documentation Commission or the project would, regretfully, have to be cancelled ! The Commission had then tried very hard to find a solution to this crisis and had come up with some proposals which Mrs Bowser would explain later, but, just before this General Meeting, it had received the news that the Bulgarian Ministry of Culture had decided to allow a three year grant to the P.I.P. which would save it for at least that period.

Mr Andreykov was asked to read the letter in which Mrs Jivkova, Minister of Culture of Bulgaria, explained why she had decided on this grant of \$ 4000 for 1978 and more for 1979 and 1980. Mr Pogacic, Mrs Bowser, Mr de Vaal and Mrs Thorpe all expressed their thanks to Mr Andreykov for this generous grant and Mr Klaue suggested to modify the 1979 budget proposal accordingly. This was agreed and the 1979 budget, thus modified, was put to the Assembly's vote. It was unanimously adopted, save for one abstention.

#### 6. REPORT OF THE SPECIALIZED COMMISSIONS

##### a) Preservation Commission

Mr Volkmann reminded the members that the last report of the Commission had recently been published in the FIAF Bulletin. He had hoped to be able to distribute the draft report on the "Preservation and Restoration of Colour and Sound in Films" here at the General Meeting but some mishaps in its printing had postponed its publication by a few weeks. The members would however receive it before the end of July.

In answer to a question of Mr de Vaal, Mr Volkmann explained that he would personally prepare a slightly revised version of the first part of the Preservation Manual, i.e. 'the preservation of black and white films' mainly for the benefit of film archives in developing countries. This revised version of about 80 - 100 pages should be printed in 100 copies.

Mr Gonzalez Casanova immediately proposed to have this new version translated into Spanish at his archive in Mexico for the benefit of the Latin American Archives. This proposal was gratefully accepted.

##### b) Cataloguing Commission

All the participants had before them a written report on the work of this Commission during the past year (annex 5).

Mr Klaue briefly summarized its main points and added that the publication date of the Manual had now been postponed one more month.

c) Legal and Copyright Commission

Mr Kuiper, chairman of the Commission, read out the following report :

"Because of the change in archive positions of the Chairman and the resignation of M. Ledoux, the Committee held no formal meeting during the past year. However, the executive Committee as a whole, the President of the Federation, and several individual members of the Executive Committee carried on the work of the Commission. Notably in Yugoslavia in November 1977, there was a meeting held in Belgrade on the preservation of moving images. This meeting of a group of experts was called together by UNESCO and followed an initial meeting held in Berlin in September 1976. The object of this meeting was to review the technical and legal aspects of film preservation and to examine the practical and administrative problems flowing from these two aspects. Mr Pogacic, Mrs Bowser, Mr Volkmann, Mr Kula, and Mr Roads, all members of the Federation, were present.

A final report from this meeting is being distributed at this time for discussion by the delegates in Brighton and the Chairman of the Commission believes it is important for the Federation to arrive at a firm position on the matters discussed in the UNESCO report especially on the topics of :

- legal deposit
- problems of selection
- problems of the usage of collections
- changes in international copyright laws
- technical recommendations for preservation.

Relations with FIAPF also got the attention of the commission.

In July 1977 Mr BRISSON of FIAPF wrote the Secretary General that FIAPF was prepared to discuss with our Federation an agreement on the acquisition and use of films but that such a discussion could only be based upon the type of contract that had already been established and had been sent to many of our members. Instead of merely revising the existing FIAPF contract, the Secretary General offered to prepare a paper to be called, "A declaration of General Principles On the Preservation of Moving Images" in the hope that the Federation and FIAPF could agree first on general principles and later move on to satisfactory specific agreements.

At the time of his resignation, the Secretary General had not been able to complete this statement of principles. After the discussion in Brighton, the Commission intends again to take up this work on the declaration for use vis-a-vis FIAPF.

In addition, it is recommended that considerable time be set aside at the next Congress to hold a wide-ranging discussion of the problems enumerated at the Belgrade Conference of UNESCO. This discussion should be held even if it is necessary to replace or reduce the time normally set aside for a symposium."

Mr Kuiper then added that the members would already have the opportunity during the second session of this Congress, Open Forum, to discuss a very important UNESCO document concerning the safeguarding and preservation of moving images, which again raised the main issues enumerated here-above.

Mr Klauč underlined that the Copyright Commission was at present composed of only three members, out of which one member was about to resign. He thought this was too small a group to undertake the heavy tasks which lied before the Commission and he suggested to enlarge it. Mr Kuiper agreed to make proposals for the appointment of new members at the next Executive meeting.

d) Documentation Commission

All the participants had before them a written report from the Documentation Commission (annex 6).

Concerning the International Index to Film Periodicals, Mrs Bowser added that, further to the recent information about the Bulgarian grant, the Commission had discussed various means to put the project on a better financial basis and had decided to study the possibility of expending it to the most important television periodicals, and to make this new index available either in combination or separately from the film periodical card service, at the additional cost of 300 Swiss francs. She asked for an indicative show of hands from those archives who would be interested in this new service. Eighteen archives answered positively which Mrs Bowser found quite encouraging. She said the Commission would now study the application of this project more in details.

e) Commission for archives in developing countries

Mr Pogacic, chairman of the Commission, regretted the unforeseen absence of its rapporteur, Mr Perry. However, the members all had before them his written report (annex 7), together with a summary of the answers received from 19 countries to a questionnaire, which had been mailed to 55 countries not yet connected with FIAF, to discover what were their specific needs in the field of film preservation. The results of this questionnaire would be discussed during the Open Forum.

To conclude, Mr Pogacic suggested to enlarge the Commission to 5 members, now that its three first members : Mr Mbaloula, Mr Perry and himself, had completed the preliminary tasks. The General Meeting agreed and asked the Executive Committee to appoint two new members at its next meeting.

The President then allowed the Meeting to break up for a few minutes after which the members only re-assembled for the next item on the agenda :

7. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS - ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

Mr Pogacic gave the word to the Deputy-Secretary-General to introduce the discussion on two candidatures for membership.

a) Department of Film of the International Museum of Photography at George Eastman House (Rochester)

Mr Borde reminded the members that this old and well-known film archive, formerly member of FIAF but separated from the Federation since 1960, had been admitted last year as Observer with the proviso that it should put an

end to all legal proceedings which had opposed it to FIAF in former years. Mr Kuiper had officially renounced to any claims by a letter dated December 20, 1977, and this matter was now closed.

Mr Borde added that the Executive Committee had carefully examined the documents submitted by Mr Kuiper for his archive's application for membership and especially the points concerning the Film Department's degree of autonomy within the International Museum of Photography, and that the members had found these informations quite satisfactory. The archive had a remarkable collection of films and documents and very interesting public activities.

Mrs Bowser had visited the archive on several occasions and confirmed the very good relations and the cooperation which existed between the Film Department of George Eastman House and the other American archives. She strongly recommended its admission as Member of FIAF.

Mr Kuiper was then asked to join the meeting and answer question from the delegates.

Mr Ledoux asked him for more detailed explanations on the autonomy of the film Department within the I.M.P. Mr Kuiper said that, as Director of the Department, he was totally responsible for the direction and policies of that Department and for the motion picture collection. The archive also was a separate budget and is responsible for the programming of its theatre.

There being no other questions, Mr Kuiper then withdrew and the President instructed the vote by secret ballot to be taken (with Ms Gebauer, Ms Puran and Mr Gartenberg as scrutineers) on the admission of the Film Département of I.M.P./G.E.H. as member of FIAF.

The results of the vote were :	For the motion	28
	Against	4
	Abstention	-

b) Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna (Rio de Janeiro)

Mr Borde said that the Cinemateca of Rio de Janeiro, which had been an Observer in FIAF for 4 years, was now applying for full membership.

Mr Alves Netto had submitted an application in good form from which it appeared that this archive was becoming one of the most important film archives in Latin-America. It has an interesting collection of films among which many Brazilian films and organize numerous public activities. This archive is also an active member of UCAL (Union de Cinematecas de America Latina).

Unfortunately, one of the formalities required by FIAF for the admission of members had not yet been fulfilled, i.e. a visit of the archives premises by a member of the Executive Committee. Mr Perry, director of the Department of Film of the MMA in New York, had however recently visited the archive and had made a very favourable report.

The Executive Committee therefore recommended the admission of Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna as a Member, with the proviso that a visit be paid to that archive as soon as possible and at the latest, before next General Meeting.

Mr Alves Netto then joined the meeting. To a question of Mr Borde, he answered that the relations of his archive with Cinemateca Brasileira in Sao Paulo were excellent and that they were even planning to run in common a laboratory for the restoration of films.

Mr Ledoux having asked for some details about his activities in UCAL, Mr Alves Netto explained that this association was much more a regional organization than FIAF, aimed at establishing contacts between the various Latin-American archives and helping them to exchange programs, experiences, etc ..., but that it was certainly not as structured as FIAF. He hoped to be able to talk more about the relations between FIAF and UCAL during the Open Forum.

Mr Ledoux also put some questions about the archive's autonomy within the Museu de Arte Moderna, to which Mr Netto answered that this autonomy was most satisfying : the archive has a separate budget, separate staff and the archive's director is entirely responsible for all its work.

Concerning the problem of a visit to the archive by a member of the Executive Committee, Mr Netto confirmed that he was ready to receive this member as soon as possible.

Mr Luis Berlanga reported that he had visited the archive of Rio in recent years and he thought that it had every reason to become full Member of FIAF.

Mr Alves Netto then withdrew.

There being no other questions or comments from the Assembly, the President instructed the vote by secret ballot to be taken on the following motion: that Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna be admitted as Member under the condition that a visit by a member of the Executive Committee be made to the archive's premises at the earliest possible date.

The results of the vote (33 members voting) were :

For	30
Against	1
Abstention	2

Mr Alves Netto was informed of this decision and congratulated, but he would have no right of vote at the G.M. until the last condition was fulfilled.

c) Observers

Mr. Borde informed the General Meeting that the Executive had accepted two candidatures for observership during the past year :

1) Cinemateca Nacional de Venezuela (Caracas)

That archive, directed by Mr Izaguirre, fulfilled all conditions to become affiliated to FIAF and Mr Borde briefly summarized the information which its director had given the Executive Committee to support its candidature (Annex 8).

2) Cinemateca Uruquaya

This archive had already been affiliated to FIAF for many years as "correspondent" but economic difficulties had caused its temporary withdrawal from the Federation in 1972. Its development now allowed it to come back and Mr Borde gave some examples of its present activities, (Annex 9). He added that the list of films held by the archive was also very impressive. The archive is directed by a group of Executive directors, among which Mr Martinez Carrill, whom many members have already met, and Ms Cristina Ferrari, who represented the archive here at the Brighton Congress.

3) Reconfirmation of Observers

Mr. Borde reported that following Article 9 of the Statutes the Executive Committee had proceeded to the reconfirmation of the Observers' Status but that several Observers had not sent in their annual report this year. Considering that the information contained in this report must serve as the basic document for the Observers' reconfirmation, the Executive Committee had decided to postpone these archives' reconfirmation.

Mr Ledoux having asked what had happened with the reconfirmation of the Observers which had been postponed last year in Varna for the same reasons, Mr Borde answered that only Film Kaneh Melli Iran had not sent its report in spite of the Secretary-General's letter to remind them of this duty. There was again no report from Tehran this year but Mr Borde expected to see Mr Gaffary here in Brighton and to hear some explanation for his silence.

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, and this was agreed unanimously.

This finished the business of the first session.

SECOND SESSION

This session was presided over by Mr David Francis, host of the Congress.

9. OPEN FORUM

Mr Francis first read out the list of proposed subjects for the Open Forum. They were :

1) Relations with International Organizations

The idea behind this particular item on the Open Forum was that for a long time, in addition to the International Federation of Film Societies, FIAF has been the only other international organization in this field. But recently three new associations have been founded which are directly connected with our work. They are : Fédération Internationale des Archives de Télévision (FIAT), represented at the Congress by Mr Jacques Dumont, its vice-president ; International Association for Audiovisual Media in Historical Research and Education (IAMhist), represented here by Mr Clive Coultass, and the International Association of Sound Archives (IASA), represented at the Congress by its secretary, Mr. David Lance from the Imperial War Museum.

The International Federation of Film Societies had also delegated its chairman, Mr Ronald Shields, to this meeting.

Mr. Francis thought it extremely important that some kind of collaboration be established between FIAF and these other international organizations, and he therefore asked each of the delegates to tell about the background of their associations and give their ideas about ways of cooperation.

IASA

Mr Lance explained that IASA was set up in 1969 to provide a professional forum for any kind of institutional and professional individual collector of recorded sound. It is a medium specific and not a subject specific association with a broad range of  $\pm$  200 members originating mainly in North America, Western Europe, and some other English-speaking countries. The Secretariat is at present based in London at the Imperial War Museum. Mr Lance said that he is open to any suggestion of collaboration between FIAF and IASA. As a start he proposed exchanging association publications.



IAMhist

Mr Coultass reported that this association, which was started only last year, is the formalization of a series of contacts between some historians and archivists and deals with the field of "film as history" as distinct from film as an art form. It is still in a very early stage of development, although some archives with large collections of non-fiction films have already joined it. A formal meeting at which the first Executive Committee will be elected is planned to take place next year in Holland. It is intended for IAMhist to sponsor international projects or research among historians or students.

There will be an archives' commission (which will not duplicate FIAF's work) to deal with specific problems of historical selection :e. g. the kind of criteria that an archive might look for in selecting material of historical interest, both in film and television.

Mr Kuiper asked which large archives were presently participating in IAMhist, and Mr Coultass cited the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz, the Austrian Filmarchive, the Canadian Film Archives, and N. F. A. and the Imperial War Museum in London.

FIAT

As Mr Dumont had not yet arrived, Mr Francis who had attended the first general meeting of FIAT in Paris, gave some information about this important new organization, which until the present time has been limited to large European archives of television organizations. It was not yet clear whether a film archive with a large television collection would be eligible for FIAT, but preservation did appear to be one of their main concerns. Since the work of this organization is so closely related to our work, we should find an opportunity later during the Congress to talk to Mr Dumont.

Mr Ledoux proposed that we hear him some time during the Symposium on videotape, and Mr Klaue added that even if we did not manage to open the discussion with FIAT at the General Meeting, the new Executive Committee should be authorized to negotiate a kind of agreement of cooperation with them in order to avoid duplication of our work which in several fields (cataloguing, documentation, etc ...) would cover the same areas.

Mr. Francis asked the members whether they agreed on this proposal, in which he also included contacts with IAMhist and to a lesser degree with IASA, whose scope is much wider than ours. This was agreed. Mr Rosen said that he would find it extremely useful to have some kind of cooperation between the various international organizations, so that through participation in one of these international organizations it would be possible for any archive to have ongoing knowledge of what the others are doing, and it would be practical to have some coordination in terms of conferences, publications, and utilization of resources.

Mr Francis then asked Mr Ronald Shields to speak on behalf of the International Federation of Film Societies (IFFS - FICC). Mr Shields reminded the members that already in 1962 an agreement called the "Agreement of Soho" had been signed between our two organizations to facilitate cooperation between our members, in particular by promoting the preservation and the wider study of those films in which we had a common interest. However, in spite of much good will on both sides there were difficulties in implementing the Agreement, and in the course of years it was more or less abandoned. The IFFS has now therefore established a "Commission for International Non-Commercial Film Exchange", whose chairman is Mr Ondroucek, director of Ceskoslovenska Filmovy Ustar-Filmovy Archiv, also present at this Congress.

Mr Shields now asked FIAF to renew contacts with his Federation and possibly to nominate one or two of its members to discuss with their Commission for International Exchange the ways and means to re-examine the Soho Agreement and to make better use of it.

Mr Frida, on behalf of Dr. Ondroucek, supported Mr Shield's appeal and asked the new Executive Committee to consider this problem.

Mr Klaue, underlining that the promotion of film culture is a part of FIAF's duties, also supported this request, even though there are limitations in what the archives could do to help film societies.

Mr Ledoux recalled briefly what the difficulties with the Soho Agreement had been : film rights were the main problem. However, he was not against the appointment of a small committee to examine these problems again, even though he did not feel optimistic about the results. Mr Francis closed the discussion by asking the new Executive Committee to study the concrete application of this decision.

## 2) Discussion on UNESCO document : Possible International Instrument Concerning the Safeguarding and Preservation of Moving Images

Mr Francis explained that this document (annex 10) which all members now had before them was based on a meeting held last November in Belgrade. This meeting was attended by several FIAF members, including Mr Pogacic, Mrs Bowser, Mr Kula, and Mr Volkmann. It was to be submitted to UNESCO's General Assembly in October-November of this year for discussion. If accepted, the proposed instrument (recommendation) could not be adopted before autumn 1980 ; however it is vitally urgent for FIAF to introduce any changes in this document before this year's General Assembly.

Mr Francis therefore proposed to study one by one the different areas covered in this paper. However Mr Ledoux suggested dispensing with a discussion of Part I "The Technical Aspects of Preserving Moving Images", due to lack of time. The members agreed that they were all very much aware of this information, and they agreed to proceed immediately to Part II, "Legal and Administrative Aspects of Preserving Moving Images", which presents greater problems.

Mrs Wibom reported that her archive had received this document with a request for comments from her Ministry of Education three months ago, and she had replied in great detail. She wondered whether other members had been approached in the same manner, and two delegates answered affirmatively.

Mr Ledoux then opened the discussion. He felt that three recommendations in this document were most important but also very dangerous for the film archives :

a) Paragraph 49 which foresees that moving images should be deposited with one central agency designated officially in each country for that purpose. Several of FIAF's existing members were not government archives or co-existed with an official archive and nevertheless did some excellent work ; what would become of them ?

b) Paragraph 43 : legal deposit limited to films made by national producers. Although one can understand why this restriction was introduced, the recommendation would be a disastrous backwards step for many of our members, who have already achieved a more advantageous position with regard to the deposit of foreign films production in their archives.

c) Paragraph 59 which strictly limits the way in which the archives can use the films in their collections, even in some cases restricting the interpretation which is given by the national legislation on the subject of production (see paragraph 57).

Mr Ledoux thought that if such a recommendation was adopted, the archives would be totally defenceless vis a vis the producers, and this would take us several steps backwards in what we have already obtained from them. For this reason he asked to discuss again at this time the question of our relations with FIAPF.

Mr Pogacic, as one of the participants in the Belgrade meeting of UNESCO which was the origin of this document (although the text had been drafted solely by UNESCO's administration), explained why FIAF had not been able to obtain better terms for these proposed recommendations. It had been impossible to convey to UNESCO's experts the idea that moving images should be considered as cultural material rather than as merchandise to which producers held all the rights.

However at this time FIAF members had the chance and even the duty to try to introduce modifications into the most contested paragraphs of this document, either through their national UNESCO commissions or by sending a joint FIAF statement to the UNESCO secretariat before their General Assembly took place.

In answer to Mr Ledoux, Mrs Bowser said that she did not feel quite as pessimistic as he did about the three points which he had raised. Concerning the central agency officially designated to receive the deposited films, it was not exactly what Mr Ledoux envisioned. The wording of paragraph 49 suggests that there should be a national entity which will then select properly equipped archives, and there may be more than one to be found suitable in a given country.

Concerning the matter of legal deposit, she said that it was impossible to persuade UNESCO experts that producers should be obliged to deposit 50 or 100 copies of their films in all countries where they choose to distribute them, in the face of the producers' opposition to this plan. She knew that this "recommendation" was behind the practice in some of our countries where the national legislation demands the deposit for preservation of all films or television programs which have been publicly shown in the country. She only hoped that this paragraph could be improved.

As for the communication of deposited material, Mrs Bowser thought that the terms which the FIAF representative at Belgrade obtained to be mentioned here in paragraph 59 were an accomplishment, since the FIAPF (producers') delegates tried hard to put a fixed number on the size of the audience, and it is now called a "limited audience", to be interpreted in each country by the national legislation.

Mr Klaus said that he agreed with Mr Ledoux concerning paragraph 43 (legal deposit limited to national production). He thought that the scope of the legal deposit should be settled by each country's national legislation, with priority given to the deposit of national production. In paragraph 44, one should underline the importance of negative material for preservation purposes: What UNESCO proposes here is also behind the practice in some of our archives. He did not agree with paragraph 47, which advocates separate institutions for the permanent preservation of film and television. In the DDR, experts had come to the conclusion that it was most practical and economical to preserve these two media together. The argument of "immediate access" for television was, according to him, an excuse against permanent preservation.

Paragraph 43: he had no change to propose for this point, but he suggested that the question of "selection" should be included as a theme for one of our next Congresses, as it had become a very important theoretical and practical problem in archival work.

To conclude, he also suggested that the General Meeting should authorize the next Executive Committee to summarize in a common statement the results of the discussion held here and send it as soon as possible to UNESCO's Secretariat, with a copy to each member, so that each of us may give motivated instructions to his own national commission of UNESCO. FIAF should also know precisely what the legal situation of each of our members is in the field of copyright, legal deposit, etc., and the Copyright Commission should send out a questionnaire for this purpose.

Finally, we should all carefully study these recommendations and be prepared to discuss again their precise wording when it is time to make a final resolution.

Mr. Huhtala said that he agreed with Mr Ledoux and Mr Klaue's comments concerning paragraph 43. He raised the argument of sub-titled prints which were useless in countries other than the one for which they had been sub-titled. Why couldn't a producer deposit them with the archive once their theatrical exploitation had ended? He also asked why UNESCO advocated the form of a "recommendation" instead of a "convention", which is much stronger, for the instrument regulating the preservation of moving images.

Mrs Bowser explained that it was decided to make the proposal in the form of a recommendation rather than a convention because the latter applied only to the states which chose to ratify it, and as well, it was usual for a proposal to become a recommendation before it became a convention.

Mr Rosen offered vigorous support to the members who had expressed their fears concerning the idea of one central agency to administer archival programs.

The reason for this attitude in the document was perhaps that it gave so little attention to the question of access and the problem of different types of users in different geographical areas. He therefore suggested that if changes could be introduced into this document we should stress not the question of one or several archives in one country but rather the responsibility of archives in the coordination of film preservation and also the range of different functions that those archives might have in providing access to different users.

Mr Dorde wanted to come back to paragraphs 59 and 60 (on the use of collections) which he also felt was disastrous. He said that they looked very much like the type of "Agreement" which FIAPF had been trying to impose on film archives for several years and which we were trying to resist.

Mr Ledoux supported Mr Klaue's suggestion about paragraph 43 (scope of legal deposit to be decided in each country by national laws), but he proposed extending it to the field of communication (paragraph 59) also. If we could not obtain this change in UNESCO's recommendation, it would be better not to have any recommendation at all.

Mr Spehr insisted on the point raised by Mr Klaue about the preservation of pre-print material.

Mr Casanova and Mr Stenklev insisted on the urgency of a FIAF action in sending our comments to UNESCO in order to try to amend certain points of this document. Mr Casanova suggested that each member also be asked for written comments. He was supported by Mr Berlanga in his feeling that the document was too important to be read and commented upon by the members in the short time which was given them at the General Meeting. He therefore suggested that all delegates should study it carefully after the Meeting and send their comments to the FIAF Executive Committee as soon as possible. The Executive Committee would then summarize these comments and communicate a common FIAF statement to UNESCO via all possible channels, including the members' national commissions of UNESCO.

Mr Kuiper, on behalf of the Copyright Commission, said that he would try to establish this common declaration on FIAF's position, but that this might be difficult to do, due to the very different structures and therefore different positions of individual members. Mr Stenklev having also insisted on the urgency of this action, Mr Francis asked for the General Meeting's agreement on Mr Casanova's proposal. This was accepted.

Coming back to our relations with the producers' association (FIAPF), Mr Ledoux proposed postponing any action in this field until after the General Assembly of UNESCO, when we would know what decision had been taken regarding the proposals contained in this document. This was agreed.

### 3) Circulation Seeking Information about Archives in Countries not Connected with FIAF

All the delegates had in their file the results of a questionnaire which had been sent out by the Commission on archives in developing countries (Annex 11), the purpose of which was to make a first elementary survey of the situation of film preservation in countries not yet connected with FIAF.

Mr Francis gave the word to Mr Pogacic, chairman of the Commission, to comment on this questionnaire.

Mr Pogacic explained that this was only a provisional report on the results of the enquiry, since more answers were still coming in almost every day. Nevertheless he thought that these first answers were already quite significant of the needs prevailing in developing countries regarding film preservation.

The Commission now planned to study these results quite carefully and to maintain contact with the organization which had responded. Members of FIAF would also be approached to see which of them could help in providing internship for some of the staff members of these archives or in sending an expert to some of the interested African countries. Mr Pogacic repeated that the Commission on Archives in Developing Countries would be enlarged to five members in view of the more intensive tasks which this action required.

#### 4) General History of the Cinema

All the members had before them the written description of a project called "A General History of the Cinema" by Guido Aristarco and Todor Andreykov (Annex 12).

Mr Andreykov explained that the idea for this vast project had come from some discussion among film historians and archivists at the Varna Symposium last year. Although not a FIAF project, its initiators nevertheless did not imagine its implementation could be successfully completed without the assistance and support of the Federation and its members.

The Executive Committee both in Perpignan and in Brighton had approved the principle of such assistance, but now it needed to submit this proposal for The General Meeting's approval.

Mr Borde agreed that he himself found this project extremely interesting because for the first time :

- 1) the history of cinema would be treated in a scientific way ; and
- 2) the film production of each nation would be studied.

He therefore strongly supported Mr Andreykov's request to FIAF :

- a) to appoint two official representatives of the Federation to the International Management Committee of the project (cf. Paragraph 3.3)
- b) to recommend that its individual member archives give practical assistance to the participating historians, i. e. to put at the disposal of the national teams both films and photographs to illustrate the general history of the cinema, and to help in the area of filmography and documentation in as detailed a way as possible.

Mr Daudelin was also very enthused about this project and advocated that FIAF give it its wholehearted support. He recalled that this type of work was already being applied in other disciplines such as the history of science, and that it had already brought some interesting results. He was surprised at the lack of reaction from the Meeting and supposed that it was due to the short time that the members had to become acquainted with the project.

Mr Ledoux agreed that this was the main reason, and Mr. Francis proposed that the discussion on this item be postponed until the next day during the intervals between the elections. This was agreed.

#### 5) Loan of Film Material to Non-FIAF Organizations (U. Pöschke)

Mr Pöschke said that he wanted to remind the members of the FIAF rule of exclusivity (article 104) which some archives tended to forget or overlook. He cited in particular the loan of film or other archive material which some FIAF members had made to the Münchner Filmmuseum without informing the Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde.

#### 6) FIAF Summer Schools

Mr Klaus had distributed some written information (Annex 13) on the next FIAF Summer School which he intended to organize in Berlin (DDR) next year. He added that Staatliches Filmarchiv would offer a grant for the living expenses and inscription fees of three participants from developing countries. FIAF would pay for the travel expenses of one of these participants, and help would be asked from the relevant national commissions on UNESCO to cover the travel expenses of other possible participants from developing countries.

Mr Pöschke informed the meeting that he was contemplating the organization of a FIAF summer school in Wiesbaden, possibly in 1980 or 1981.

Since it was time to end the meeting due to the impending official welcoming reception given by the mayor of Brighton for FIAF, Mr Francis proposed that at the next session any item on the Open Forum which the members wanted to discuss further could be continued at that time.



THIRD SESSION  
-----

May 29, 9.30 am

This session being reserved to members only, the minutes of points 10 and 11 of the agenda are being printed and bound in a separate section and are sent to the members only.

Hereafter follow the minutes of points 12 and 13 which concern all FIAF affiliates.

SEPARATE SECTION

1.-

THIRD SESSION (Reserved to Members only)

May 29, 9.30 a.m.

Vice-President Bowser presided over this session.

10. REPORT FROM Mr LEDOUX ON HIS RESIGNATION AS SECRETARY-GENERAL

Mrs Bowser introduced Mr Ledoux' report by explaining, in the following words, how the Executive Committee had been informed of the Secretary-General's resignation and what were its first reactions.

"On 28 July 1977, Jacques Ledoux sent his letter of resignation to the President with copies to the Executive Committee. It was rather strange to us to have our Secretary-General resign so soon after having accepted the position. The time between 28 July and the next Executive meeting was spent in trying to persuade him to change his position or to clarify his reasons for this unexpected resignation. It was unexpected by all of us. But, perhaps we had not been listening carefully enough to what he was trying to tell us.

There were personal visits to Brussels, there was an exchange of correspondence. Because it was not foreseen by the Statutes, we thought it was necessary to wait until the next Executive Committee meeting to formally accept the resignation. We asked Jacques Ledoux to come to Perpignan but he refused. We discussed the matter at length in Perpignan including everything we had learned from Jacques Ledoux about the reasons for his resignation, but it still did not seem sufficiently clear to us in spite of all that effort.

The letter that you received from the President informing you of the Secretary-General's resignation was written not by him but by the entire Executive Committee at the meeting in Perpignan. If we did not explain the reason why our Secretary-General had resigned, it was because we felt we could not explain them sufficiently well.

You then received the letter of Jacques Ledoux dated April 13, 1978 (marked confidential).

This letter referred to certain events in such a way that we thought it was necessary that it be explained as well as possible what has gone on, so that you can make your own judgment. There has been no personal quarrel with Jacques Ledoux or any other member of the Executive Committee. There is some completely different interpretation of some events.

Certainly, the great majority of the members of this Federation are interested, as far as we can, to keep political considerations out of our work. It's very difficult to do so in a truly international organisation like ours. The Executive Committee as a whole feels that this is what we are trying to do and most of the time we are succeeding. But what we need now is to have a statement from Jacques Ledoux to try to clarify the letter he sent you and the reasons for his resignation."

Mrs Bowser then gave the word to Mr Ledoux who spoke as follows :

"Je voudrais d'abord rectifier deux choses qu'a dites Mme Bowser :

1°) Je n'ai pas été invité officiellement à Perpignan, mais c'est vrai que si je l'avais été, je ne serais pas venu, cependant j'aurais écrit pour expliquer pourquoi je ne venais pas.

2°) Je voudrais souligner que le Comité Directeur à Perpignan n'a pas jugé nécessaire de prévoir à l'ordre du jour de cette Assemblée, une discussion sur les raisons de ma démission et que c'est à la suite de mes demandes que cette séance a lieu.

J'ai insisté pour qu'elle soit réservée aux membres.

Je vais essayer de parler sans passion, et si possible, sans citer des noms, mais ce n'est pas facile de ne pas parler des personnes si je dois expliquer les motifs de ma démission.

Il m'a semblé en tous cas indispensable que l'on m'offre la possibilité de m'expliquer devant vous tous à l'Assemblée Générale. Vous m'avez élu à Varna et il était en effet un peu surprenant pour vous de recevoir l'annonce de ma démission par la lettre du Président.

Cette annonce a été formulée de façon que je trouve offensante pour moi. J'ai pensé que ce n'était pas tout à fait ce que je méritais, mais enfin c'est à vous de juger de ma conduite.

Donc, passons aux événements qui se sont déroulés et aux réflexions que ces événements m'ont inspirées.

Je dois remonter à plus haut que Varna pour vous expliquer mon état d'esprit. J'ai toujours pensé que le secrétaire général avait un rôle important à jouer au sein de la Fédération et j'ai toujours essayé non pas de faire disparaître la politique de nos débats, c'est absolument impossible, je le sais, mais j'ai toujours cru que ces considérations politiques, lorsque l'intérêt de la FIAF était en jeu, occupaient finalement un plan secondaire, que les gens, même engagés politiquement, comprenaient que l'intérêt de la Fédération commandait parfois des décisions qui dépassaient le plan politique ; et j'ai été très fier et très heureux de voir la FIAF être ce qu'elle était, par exemple quand Israël a voté pour l'Egypte, ou quand les Etats-Unis ont voté pour l'admission de Cuba en pleine guerre froide, ou quand l'U.R.S.S. a voté pour l'admission de l'Albanie, etc ...

Récemment cependant, quelques incidents se sont produits :

Le premier, que je cite uniquement pour mémoire et où, j'en suis sûr, vous me donnerez tous tort : il y a 2 1/2 ans, lors d'une réunion du Comité Directeur à Belgrade, nous avons reçu la candidature de la Cinémathèque d'Afrique du Sud. Vous me connaissez suffisamment pour savoir que je n'ai pas beaucoup de sympathie pour la politique menée par ce pays. J'ai cependant défendu l'admission de l'Afrique du Sud à la F.I.A.F. parce que je considère que l'intérêt de la Fédération est d'avoir le plus grand nombre d'archives possible et personnellement je trouve que les films d'Afrique du Sud ont une importance capitale, même pour les ennemis de la politique d'Afrique du Sud. J'ai été seul de mon opinion et je me suis incliné précisément par réalisme politique, parce que je voyais très bien qu'il s'agissait d'une position idéaliste de ma part, faisant abstraction de tous les problèmes et que mes collègues avaient de très solides raisons d'être contre cette candidature, parce que le fait d'accepter l'Afrique du Sud parmi nous, nous aurait en effet posé énormément d'ennuis à l'UNESCO et ailleurs.

A Mexico, les choses sont devenues beaucoup plus sérieuses, avec l'admission de l'Archive de Corée du Sud comme Observateur. Je ne veux pas rouvrir ici la discussion, mais grosso modo ma position a été identique à celle que j'avais prise à propos de l'Afrique du Sud et ici je n'ai plus été seul à défendre ce point de vue.

J'ai beaucoup regretté d'avoir à me battre pour défendre ce point de vue, parce que c'était la première fois dans l'histoire de la Fédération qu'un tel problème d'admission divise le Comité Directeur de cette façon là.

Je pense que la FIAF a reçu un grand choc à Mexico, un tel choc que j'ai espéré que cela servirait en quelque sorte d'avertissement et que nous allions revenir vers des discussions moins empreintes de considérations politiques qui devraient à mon avis, céder le pas devant d'autres considérations, c'est-à-dire la préservation de films de tous les horizons quels qu'il soient.

Alors, est arrivée l'Assemblée Générale de Varna et les Comités Directeurs qui ont précédé et suivi l'Assemblée Générale (Mme Bowser a parlé de la surprise provoquée par ma démission si peu de temps après mon élection. Cela provient simplement du fait qu'il y a eu une réunion du Comité Directeur après l'Assemblée Générale, où les choses ont, d'après moi, mal tourné).

Parlons de ce qui s'est passé au cours des Comités Directeurs de Varna.

Il y a eu trois événements essentiels. Vous savez combien je suis attaché au problème de l'autonomie des cinémathèques. Je vous rappelle que l'Assemblée Générale à Varna, a voté l'inclusion dans nos statuts de cette considération de l'autonomie à une majorité tout à fait écrasante. De la même façon, la même majorité a inclus et dans nos statuts et dans le règlement le problème de la reconfirmation des membres ; ce qui a nos yeux justifiait cette procédure, c'est que nous admettions des membres mais nous ne savions pas ce qu'ils étaient devenus et nous avons senti l'obligation de réexaminer tous les 5 ans la position de ces membres. Là il faut faire évidemment une distinction.

Nous savons bien qu'il y a parmi nous des membres de longue date qui ne sont pas tout à fait en ordre avec les vues actuelles sur l'autonomie exprimée par les statuts. Mais je pense que nous ne pouvons pas demander, par exemple au D.I.F. à Wiesbaden, ou à la Cinémathèque Hongroise, membres de très vieille date, de changer leur structure après tant d'années. Par contre, lorsqu'un membre très ancien veut modifier sa structure dans un sens qui ne nous semble pas correspondre avec ce qui est mis dans nos statuts, je crois que le devoir de la FIAF est d'intervenir aussi vigoureusement qu'elle le peut.

Je ne crois pas qu'il s'agit d'une intrusion dans les affaires intérieures d'un membre.

Ce problème s'est déjà posé avec Stockholm et avec Londres, et dans ces deux cas, le Comité Directeur a pris une position très ferme.

Je ne dis pas que nous avons gagné sur toute la ligne, mais je pense que nous avons pu sauver l'essentiel et, lorsque précisément à Varna, s'est posé le problème de la reconfirmation de la N.F.A. à Londres et de la Cinémathèque à Stockholm, il n'y a pas eu de dissension ni de ma part, ni d'aucun autre membre du Comité Directeur. On a dit : ce n'est pas tout à fait satisfaisant, mais il faut reconfirmer ces membres.

Mais, il y a eu le problème de Prague. Je m'excuse auprès de Mr Ondroucek. Je ne voudrais pas que l'on croit qu'il s'agit d'une question personnelle, il s'agit vraiment d'une question de principe.

Prague est une très vieille cinémathèque, pour laquelle nous avons tous une énorme admiration. Je n'exagère pas en disant cela, c'est vraiment une cinémathèque qui doit faire partie de la FIAF, mais pas plus qu'on n'imagine la FIAF sans la N.F.A. de Londres, membre fondateur et également cinémathèque d'une très grande importance en notre sein.

Or, il y a 2 ou 3 ans, Prague nous a envoyé un nouvel organigramme de sa structure et j'en ai fait part au Comité Directeur en disant que ce n'était pas possible d'accepter cette nouvelle structure parce qu'elle s'opposait à ce que nous considérons comme l'autonomie souhaitée.

Je n'ai pas voulu, moi personnellement, intervenir directement auprès de Prague et j'ai préféré demander à un membre de notre Comité Directeur, notre Vice-Président Mr Klaue, d'intervenir diplomatiquement auprès de Mr Ondroucek pour lui demander de modifier cette structure, d'arranger les choses de telle façon qu'il n'y ait pas de problèmes.

Cela a duré deux ans. C'est-à-dire que successivement à deux Assemblées Générales, Mr Klaue a accepté d'intervenir auprès de Mr Ondroucek, me donnant aussi raison dans mon interprétation des choses, mais sans obtenir de résultat.

J'imagine que les autorités tchécoslovaques n'étaient pas d'accord et que Mr Ondroucek a essayé de faire quelque chose mais qu'il n'y est pas arrivé.

Mais le cas me semblait particulièrement important parce que nous avons déjà un pays socialiste (la Hongrie) avec une structure qui ne nous satisfait pas entièrement.

Je ne souhaitais pas qu'un autre exemple existe dans les pays socialistes ou la plupart des cinémathèques sont au contraire, bien autonomes (Varsovie, Sofia, Bucarest, ... ont des organismes tout à fait en règle avec nos statuts). Il me semblait dangereux que Prague puisse être un exemple d'une transformation qui va dans un sens dangereux.

Nous savons tous que cette tendance se manifeste dans le monde entier. Prague m'a donc semblé un exemple dangereux et je ne voyais pas la différence que l'on pouvait faire entre Prague et, par exemple, le cas de Londres où il s'agissait également d'une inclusion de la Cinémathèque dans un organisme plus grand dont le Directeur deviendrait le conservateur de la cinémathèque.

Le Comité Directeur a absolument refusé cela à l'époque, et m'a laissé me battre pendant plus d'un an. Je me suis personnellement beaucoup exposé dans cette affaire et je ne voyais pas comment je pouvais défendre le point de vue à propos de Prague, qui me semblait en opposition totale avec celui que le Comité Directeur et l'Assemblée Générale avaient adopté pour Londres.

A la première réunion du Comité Directeur de Varna, tout ce que je vous dis là a été exposé et j'ai eu l'approbation explicite du Comité Directeur et notamment de notre président, qui est intervenu dans le même sens, et nous avons remis l'examen de la reconfirmation de Prague au deuxième Comité Directeur qui allait se réunir après l'Assemblée Générale. Il était entendu que Mr Klaue et moi-même rencontrerions Mr Ondroucek entretiens.

C'est ce que nous avons fait. Mr Ondroucek nous a expliqué qu'il s'agissait en réalité d'un malentendu linguistique et qu'"Institut" en tchèque ne voulait pas dire la même chose qu'"Institut" en français, que cela avait été traduit comme cela, à défaut du mot adéquat, mais que ce n'était tout de même pas un Institut.

J'ai un peu hésité là-dessus. Je me suis dit que c'était peut-être quand même une explication et une solution.

Contrairement à ce que l'on peut croire, je n'aime pas tellement me battre et créer des problèmes, mais à la réflexion il m'est apparu que dans un titre où il y avait à la fois le mot "Ustav" et le mot "Filmarchiv" derrière, cela ne pouvait que cacher un Institut ou quelque chose de similaire, qui avait une cinémathèque.

Après avoir rencontré Mr Ondroucek et Mr Klaue, j'ai lu la brochure que Mr Ondroucek avait distribuée à Varna même : "Filmarchiv & Archivism", et j'ai lu dans cette brochure la confirmation de ce que je pensais, c'est-à-dire que la cinémathèque n'était pas l'Institut, mais qu'elle était une partie de l'Institut.

Au surplus, la brochure cite les accords de Helsinki qui font clairement la distinction entre Instituts et Cinémathèques.

Alors, au Comité Directeur suivant, j'ai expliqué les choses que je viens de vous dire, peut-être en d'autres mots, et on pouvait alors adopter plusieurs solutions.

La plus raisonnable était de dire à la Cinémathèque de Prague : "Le Comité Directeur n'a pas estimé possible de vous reconformer cette année-ci, continuons la négociation et voyons comment les choses pourraient s'arranger".

Le Comité Directeur n'a pas voulu de cela.

J'ai protesté avec violence. J'ai dit que si on ne pouvait en aucun cas envisager la non-reconfirmation des membres (ce qui me semblait inclus dans la notion de reconfirmation), je ne voyais pas alors à quoi servait cette "cérémonie".

J'ai été à nouveau seul de mon avis.

Brusquement, tous ceux qui dans le passé m'avaient donné raison sur ces problèmes, avaient changé d'avis, y compris notre Président, et à l'unanimité moins ma voix, la Cinémathèque de Prague a été reconfirmée.

Je vous raconte cela avec beaucoup de détails, mais puisque cette reconfirmation a été votée, je ne veux pas rouvrir cette discussion. C'est une chose terminée, mais il faut bien vous expliquer dans quel état d'esprit j'étais après ce que je considérais un peu comme une trahison.

Au même Comité Directeur, une autre chose m'a beaucoup affecté.

L'Assemblée Générale avait confié au nouveau Comité Directeur le soin de composer une commission pour l'aide aux cinémathèques dans les pays en voie de développement.

Il y a eu aussi une longue discussion à ce sujet et la proposition (avec laquelle j'étais tout à fait d'accord) était de créer une commission avec 5 membres représentant si possible les 5 continents.

Il y a des pays en voie de développement à peu près dans tous les continents et cela me semblait en tous cas une voie harmonieuse.

Etant donné aussi la discussion qui avait eu lieu à l'Assemblée Générale où étaient intervenus plusieurs membres de l'Amérique Latine et compte tenu aussi de notre politique constante vis-à-vis de l'Amérique Latine, il me semblait en tous cas indispensable qu'un représentant de l'Amérique Latine soit inclus dans cette commission.

On a discuté de cela.

Il y avait deux clans ; l'un dirigé par notre Président qui voulait une commission de trois personnes seulement et l'autre qui voulait une commission de cinq personnes.

On a voté, avec comme résultat : 6 voix contre 5 pour une commission de 3 membres : (1 délégué américain - T. Perry, 1 européen - M. Pogacic et 1 délégué africain - M. Mbaloula).

Voyant le résultat du vote, Mr Borde est intervenu pour essayer tout de même de sauver la situation qui lui semblait comme à moi, assez scandaleuse et a proposé une solution de compromis, c'est-à-dire d'ajouter un représentant de l'Amérique Latine.

Le Président s'est opposé à rouvrir le vote, bien qu'un vote de 6 voix contre 5, peut sembler un peu tangent.

Moi, j'ai trouvé que c'était une erreur politique et une erreur tactique de créer une commission pour les pays en voie de développement en excluant des représentants de continents aussi importants que l'Asie et l'Amérique Latine.

J'y ai vu également comme dans le cas précédent, un vote politique que j'ai déploré.

La troisième affaire c'est quelque chose qui s'est déroulé après Varna et qui concerne une mission qui avait été confiée par le Comité Directeur à Mr Klaue. Sans vouloir faire de personnalité, je suis bien obligé de dire quelques mots à ce propos, à propos de Mr Klaue particulièrement.

Mr Klaue est un homme pour qui j'ai une vive estime et une très grande admiration, notamment sur le plan de la Fédération. C'est un de ceux qui a le plus fait et qui continue à faire des choses extraordinaires pour la FIAF. Je sais ce que c'est que de diriger une cinémathèque. Je sais que c'est un homme extrêmement occupé et je trouve admirable qu'en dépit de cela il réalise un grand nombre de choses importantes pour la FIAF.



Quand j'ai proposé au Comité Directeur, que Mr Klaue, qui avait organisé précédemment deux Summers School à Berlin Est et qui se préparait à en organiser un troisième, que nous demandions donc à Mr Klaue qu'il aille à Copenhague pour voir et s'inspirer de ce qui se passait là à ce nouveau Summer School, (et qui était fatalement différent de ce qui s'y était fait à Berlin), tout le monde au Comité Directeur a bien sûr accepté cette proposition comme allant de soi.

La seule chose qui m'a étonné, c'est que Mr Klaue accepte, parce que je sais ce que c'est que de prendre du temps pour ce genre de voyage.

Ainsi, quand Mr Klaue m'a invité à deux reprises à la Summer School de Berlin pour que je vienne voir, je ne suis pas allé (non par manque d'intérêt, au contraire) simplement parce que je n'en avais pas le temps.

Il y a eu, je le précise tout de suite, une erreur de la secrétaire exécutive qui, après le Congrès de Varna ne m'a pas rappelé que cette décision avait été prise et qu'il fallait en aviser immédiatement M. Monty. C'est vrai que nous avons commis là une faute mais qui me semble minime, d'autant plus qu'il y avait à la table du Comité Directeur le représentant de la Cinémathèque Danoise, Mr Stenklev qui avait reçu procuration de Mr Monty et qu'il y avait à cette même table, Mme Bowser, qui sans être l'organisatrice de la Summer School de Copenhague, était quand même une des responsables et en liaison constante avec Copenhague à ce sujet.

Alors, ma stupeur a été immense de recevoir soudainement de Mr Monty une lettre rédigée en des termes que j'ai trouvé extrêmement désagréables, parce que cette lettre comportait trois critiques :

- 1°) pourquoi fallait-il envoyer Mr Klaue, alors qu'il y avait déjà Mme Bowser pour représenter la FIAF à ce Summer School ?
- 2°) pourquoi fallait-il que la FIAF dépense son argent à payer des voyages absolument inutiles ?
- 3°) est-ce qu'il était vraiment nécessaire d'envoyer un troisième citoyen de la D.D.R. à Copenhague, alors qu'il y avait déjà un boursier D.D.R. de la FIAF à ce cours et un des professeurs à ce cours était également Est-Allemand ?

Alors là, j'ai trouvé que Mr Monty exagérait et qu'il évoquait des problèmes politiques là où il ne fallait pas.

Evidemment, j'ai très bien imaginé l'attitude de Mr Klaue.

Quand on vous donne une gifle en plein visage, il est normal que vous ne veuillez plus accomplir la mission qui vous a été confiée, surtout quand les critiques sont formulées de façon que j'ai trouvée extrêmement terre à terre, pour ne pas dire mesquines, comme si Mr Klaue attendait que la FIAF lui paie son voyage pour profiter de cela et aller passer deux jours très agréables à Copenhague.

Le fait que Mr Monty a envoyé copie de cette lettre à Mr Klaue fermait à mes yeux toute négociation possible, et j'ai répondu de façon un peu violente, je le reconnais, à Mr Monty, parce que j'étais très indigné de l'insulte qui était faite à un membre de la Fédération qui se dépensait sans compter pour elle. J'ai même tendu une perche à Mr Monty en lui disant "sans doute n'est-ce pas vous qui avez écrit cette lettre", mais il a insisté en disant que c'était bien lui.

Voilà les trois éléments qui m'ont fait penser que la FIAF ne connaissait plus la paix, l'unité, l'amitié, qu'elle avait connues dans le passé.

Je dois dire aussi que j'ai été extrêmement choqué dans cette dernière affaire de voir le silence total observé par le Président de la Fédération qui avec les autres membres du Comité Directeur, avait reçu copie de l'échange de correspondance entre Mr Monty et Mr Klaue ; et je pensais que si le Président a un rôle à jouer à la FIAF, c'était une affaire dans laquelle il avait à manifester son autorité.

Sinon, on ne voit pas très bien ce que fait le Président de la Fédération. Et bien, il s'est tu complètement.

Il n'a ni écrit, ni téléphoné à personne, de même d'ailleurs que Mme Bowser qui a joué quand même un certain rôle dans cette Summer School, qui est Vice-Présidente de la FIAF et qui était présidente de la Commission de Documentation, initiatrice de cette Summer School.

Je dois dire que j'ai été très choqué par ce silence.

J'ai toujours au cours de mes 17 ans en tant que Secrétaire Général, assumé mes responsabilités, même quand elles étaient désagréables. Je crois que quand on accepte un poste, il faut en accepter les avantages et les désagréments, même si ce sont presque toujours des désavantages qui en résultent.

Je ne reproche pas au Président et à Mme Bowser de ne pas avoir pris parti pour moi : j'aurais été extrêmement satisfait qu'ils prennent parti contre moi, qu'ils me disent que j'avais tort ou que j'avais été trop violent, comme me l'a écrit Mr Stenklev en termes très diplomatiques. Cela au moins me semble correspondre aux devoirs d'une charge librement acceptée.

À la fin de juillet, j'ai passé en<sup>revue</sup> ces différents événements, et je me suis senti un peu écoeuré, un peu découragé, et je me suis dit que je ne voyais plus très bien ce que je pouvais faire au Secrétariat Général de la Fédération. Si je n'avais pas le soutien du Président, si une telle crise de confiance entre lui et moi se produisait, je n'avais plus du tout envie de continuer.

J'ai donc envoyé ma lettre de démission au Président.

La réaction a été que j'ai reçu de lui une lettre personnelle en réponse à ma lettre officielle et que dans cette lettre, Mr Pogacic disait à peu près "que voulez-vous, mon cher ami ? La situation est ce qu'elle est dans le monde et la FIAF c'est un peu le reflet du monde tel que nous le connaissons".

Je lui ai répondu très rapidement que je n'étais absolument pas d'accord avec lui, ni que cette affaire soit traitée sur un plan personnel, ni que l'on soit résigné à ce que la FIAF devienne ce qu'elle n'a jamais été.

C'est vrai aussi que Mr Borde et Mr de Vaal sont venus me voir spécialement à Bruxelles pour essayer de me faire changer d'avis. Je leur ai dit à peu près ce que je vous dis ici.

Je les ai remerciés de leur démarche, mais cela ne changeait évidemment rien au fait que pour moi il n'y avait plus moyen de travailler, en tous cas pas avec Mr Pogacic en tant que Président.

Après cela, il y a eu un silence total. Je m'attendais à ce que le Président fasse quelque chose.

Mme Bowser a dit : "ce n'était pas prévu dans les statuts et nous ne savions pas quoi faire". Mais, Madame, il y a des centaines de choses qui ne sont pas prévues dans les statuts, mais il appartient précisément au Président d'agir dans ce cas. Le Président n'a pas consulté le Comité Directeur. Il ne leur a même pas écrit. On a attendu le mois de janvier à Perpignan pour examiner la chose et pour vous envoyer cette lettre que je trouve un peu décevante en ce qui concerne ma démission.

J'ai reçu après cela, un certain nombre de coups de téléphone et de lettres de membres disant : "qu'est-ce qui se passe ? Nous ne savons rien et nous devrions tout de même être informés de ce qui se passe à la Fédération".

J'ai mis longtemps à me décider à écrire la lettre aux membres, parce que finalement tout cela ne me semble pas d'une telle importance, mais Mr Comencini ayant insisté, j'ai finalement écrit une lettre d'explication qui ne pouvait être que sommaire, en espérant que le Comité Directeur allait mettre le problème à l'ordre du jour de cette Assemblée Générale, ou plutôt les problèmes que cette démission posait.

Quand j'ai reçu l'ordre du jour, j'ai vu que cela n'y était pas. Je trouvais que les problèmes qui avaient motivé ma démission devaient tout de même être évoqués et que l'une des choses que cette démission pouvait apporter était justement que l'on parle enfin à cette table de choses que d'habitude on passe sous silence.

Voilà ce que j'avais à vous dire. C'est évidemment à vous à juger si j'ai eu tort ou raison d'agir de façon aussi intempestive.

Mais, je voudrais profiter de la parole qui m'est donnée pour dire quelques mots de l'avenir de la Fédération, c'est-à-dire comment je vois, moi, cet avenir.

Je crois qu'il faut dorénavant discuter plus ouvertement des problèmes politiques. Ces problèmes existent. Il n'y a pas de raison de se servir ici de fleurets mouchetés.

Je crois aussi que la FIAF a besoin d'un Président qui s'occupe très activement des affaires de la Fédération et qui assume ses responsabilités, qui manifeste son autorité.

Il n'est pas sain pour la Fédération, d'avoir un Secrétaire Général qui fasse tout, et un Président qui fasse beaucoup moins. J'en ai déjà parlé au Comité Directeur. J'ai dit là à Mr Pogacic que je ne soutiendrais plus sa candidature.

A ce propos, je voudrais aussi vous rappeler que chaque année pratiquement, au moment des élections, j'ai demandé qu'il n'y ait pas une seule candidature pour les postes de Président, Secrétaire Général et Trésorier.

C'est une mauvaise méthode et peu démocratique.

Il faut laisser le choix à l'Assemblée Générale entre au moins deux candidats. Je crois qu'on ne peut pas trop compter sur les membres lorsqu'il y a une seule candidature pour qu'ils votent "non". Or, il serait très intéressant de voter "non", de pouvoir apprécier l'opposition.

Je voudrais donc renouveler l'appel que j'ai souvent fait avant les élections pour qu'il y ait plus qu'un candidat, et s'il n'y en a qu'un, que les membres expriment leur sympathie véritable pour le candidat unique, et que le candidat en question, même élu, sache exactement où il en est.

Voilà, je suis prêt à répondre à vos questions et je soumets mon comportement de l'année dernière à votre jugement.

Merci.

Mrs Bowser thanked Mr Ledoux for his explanation and asked for the comments of the members.

Mrs van Leer made a plea to the FIAF members to return to the old days when politics were completely kept out of the Federation. She also suggested a return to FIAF's former habits, when all the problems were openly discussed at the General Meeting and not left entirely in the hands of the Executive Committee.

Mr Comencini said that he approved of Mr Ledoux's action, and reiterated his trust in him. He blamed the Executive Committee for having informed the members too late of the Secretary-General's resignation. He also conveyed Mrs Prolo's feelings as being the same as his.

Mr Pogacic said that he wanted to answer Mr Ledoux, and his response follows.

"The resignation of the Secretary-General not being foreseen in the Statutes, all that could be done was to wait for the meeting of the Executive Committee, which alone was entitled to accept or refuse the resignation, and meanwhile to replace the Secretary-General by the Deputy Secretary-General, which was done. The Executive Committee was as surprised as the members by Mr Ledoux's letter, and a lot of time was spent trying to persuade him to change his mind. I wrote to ask Mr Ledoux to come and discuss the problem with me or with the Executive Committee, but he refused, saying that he had no time. That is how we came to the meeting of Perpignan.

"I did not think it was in the interest of FIAF to make an "affair" out of the resignation. Of course, the Executive Committee discussed this problem at length in Perpignan, and drafted a letter to the members. If we did not give any reasons for Mr Ledoux's resignation, it is because they were not at all clear to us. In his letter of resignation to me, he said that it was because of certain decisions taken at the second Executive Committee meeting in Varna, in which he had felt completely isolated in his position, especially the way in which the Executive Committee considered the reconfirmation of certain members of the Federation. These are for me moral reasons : the fact of being left in a minority. In this letter, Mr Ledoux did not speak of FIAF's politization ; however in his letter of April 13th to the members he speaks exclusively of this as the cause for his resignation.

"I completely agree with Mr Ledoux (and probably with most of you) that politics must be kept out of the FIAF. But I do not see how the reconfirmation of Prague's film archive can be linked with politics. On what political grounds did the vast majority of the Executive Committee reconfirm the Czechoslovak Filmovy-Ustav/Filmovy Archiv ? Perhaps we did wrong in making that decision, but it was certainly not made on political grounds. The second point cited by Mr Ledoux as proof of FIAF's politization is the number of members appointed for the Commission for Archives in Developing Countries".

There are no politics whatsoever in this decision. The point was to give a start to this new commission founded in Varna on my initiative and that of Mr Perry. It was therefore normal that we should participate in it. For the first time, we had among us a delegate from black Africa, a continent in which everything was still to be done and where we particularly wanted to concentrate our action. Why not elect him? For Asia, we had consulted our Korean member to see what new contacts could be made on that continent. But the idea was mainly to have in the beginning a small commission, which was easier for the preliminary studies we wanted to make, and possibly to enlarge it afterwards.

"I thought that the situation of film archives in Latin America was already fairly well known. Furthermore, I must admit that after Mexico's Congress, I also had become afraid of a certain politization of FIAF and to me there was a certain danger of such politization coming precisely from some Latin American delegates.

"Anyway, this Commission was there to realize concrete points in accordance with UNESCO's Resolution on the preservation of moving images, and we wanted first to contact those countries in Africa and Asia of which we knew almost nothing.

"The last point in which Mr Ledoux accuses me personally is, I believe, a case of misunderstanding between Mr Monty and the Executive Committee, in which Mr Klaue is the victim. Unfortunately, Mr Ledoux had not informed Mr Monty on time of the Executive Committee's decision. If I did not intervene, it is because I received (together with the other members of the Executive Committee) copy of the whole correspondence between Mr Monty, Mr Klaue and Mr Ledoux when everything was over, and nobody asked for my intervention. Furthermore, I thought preferable not to add anything since I thought the whole affair had been caused by some fault of the Secretariat.

"Finally, if it has to be asked what one has done for FIAF, I also can say I have been in the Federation for almost 25 years, and have worked a lot for it. But I do not want to prolong this speech. It remains to you to judge my actions and that of the Executive Committee and to decide whether we did give a political aspect to FIAF or not".

The chairperson, Mrs Bowser, then proposed a short break for private discussion before proceeding with the election. After this break, she still called for some general comments of the members, asking them preferably to leave aside the particular examples cited by Mr Ledoux.

Mr Casanova, later supported by Mr Berlanga, said that he regretted the more personal turn which this crisis of FIAF seemed to have taken. He felt that the time had now come to clearly define which problems should be discussed and decided by the General Meeting. The policy of the FIAF in all its aspects must be decided by the General Meeting, which would then mandate the Executive Committee to apply it. But for the moment, it seemed that the Executive Committee had taken more power than could be accepted in a normal democracy.

Mr Cincotti felt that the crisis in FIAF was graver than some members wanted to admit. There was a danger of the Federation being split into two groups, and the only way to eliminate the danger was to tackle the problems quite openly and directly and not to try to avoid them by remaining silent. He strongly supported Mr Ledoux's recommendation about the elections : to vote as responsible, conscious and autonomous members.

Mr Kubelka having asked Mr Ledoux whether he was ready to be elected again to one or the other office of the Executive Committee, Mr Ledoux said that it depended on who would be the President.

Mr Pogacic protested against what he called an ultimatum from Mr Ledoux.

Mr Ledoux replied that he did not want to issue an ultimatum, but it was clear that, considering the "confidence-crisis" (crise de confiance) between Mr Pogacic and himself, it would not be wise to re-elect a team which could not work together as heads of the Federation.

Mr Pastor Vega strongly protested against Mr Pogacic's allegation that Latin Americans were trying to play politics in FIAF. This was of course an accusation directed against Cuba, which he denied, saying "It's only that FIAF means something for Latin-America and Latin-America means something for FIAF. What Saul Yelin did was only to try to create links between FIAF and our continent. The Mexican Congress was organized because of that. But of course each country has its specific problems. And political problems come from reality and not from our action. We see FIAF not as a political instrument but as an instrument that can help the development of Latin America's film movement. That is very important for us and it is the only responsibility we assert."

Mrs Wibom suggested that, like many other international organizations, FIAF should have an election committee to prepare the elections. She also remarked that it would be helpful to the ordinary members if they knew more about individual members of the executive committee : their work, their specialties, etc . In this way they would be able to vote more intelligently. She suggested an election board consisting of three or four members to be appointed for next year.

Mrs Bowser replied that the outgoing Executive Committee had already discussed a new procedure which would perhaps eliminate some of these difficulties, and which included limiting the terms of office of the executive officers. A proposal will be put forward at the next Congress.

## ELECTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

She then proposed moving on to the elections, and called for nominations for President. After a long silence, Mr Pöschke nominated Mr Pogacic. Mr Kuiper seconded the nomination and, Mr Pogacic having expressed his great uneasiness at accepting this nomination after all the accusation which Mr Ledoux had made about him, some discussion followed.

Mr Kuiper observed that the structure of the organization has been changing and that this is a sign that it is becoming more international. It is only natural that there are some problems and "growing pains" as a result of this transformation. However, at this time we should focus upon the problem of the identification of the future leadership of FIAF. In the past FIAF has depended almost exclusively on the talents of individuals, but now the structure of the organization must be such that we have a truly representative body. Mr Kuiper suggested that for the present FIAF keep a nucleus of the current leadership, and that these persons look carefully at the structure, duties, and length of terms of the offices of FIAF. If the offices revolve terms on a yearly basis and many people have a chance to serve, it will be easier to identify our future leadership.

Mr Cincotti said that he felt it would be best for Executive Committee members to be elected for two years and the Secretary-General for four years, for the sake of continuity. He proposed linking the election of the President and the Secretary-General, suggesting J. Ledoux as President and W. Klaue as Secretary-General, as a team.

Mr Kubelka stated that he found <sup>Mr</sup> Cincotti's suggestion very interesting.

Mrs Bowser said that it was impossible to accept such a suggestion with our present Statutes and Rules, and that if there were no other nominations she would call for a vote for Mr Pogacic as the sole nominee.

Mr Ledoux said once more that he regretted the fact that there was only one candidate for the office.

Ballots were then distributed and the voting started.

Meanwhile, Mr Comencini said he was astonished that Mr Pogacic's name was the only one on the ballot, since Mr Cincotti had nominated Mr Ledoux.

Mrs Bowser said that she had not understood that to be the case.



Mr Cincotti said that he had nominated a couple (knowing, however, that as such it could not be accepted ; but that his intention was to nominate J. Ledoux as President and at the same time make clear his suggestion for Secretary-General. However, since Mrs Bowser had misunderstood what he had tried to convey, there was only one name on the ballot, which he regretted.

Mrs Bowser apologized for having misunderstood, but said that the vote had been taken and it was too late to change it.

The results of the voting for President were then announced :

V. Pogacic	20 yes
	15 no
	1 abstention

Mrs Bowser then called for the nominations for Secretary-General.

Mr Stenklev nominated Raymond Borde.

Mr Borde wanted to clarify several points : one, that the Secretary-General of FIAF should, in his opinion, represent an important archive ; secondly, that he would be willing to fill this position for only one year ; and thirdly, he wanted to announce that he would propose Mr Ledoux for election to the Executive Committee, and that if elected, Mr Ledoux be appointed as Deputy Secretary-General.

Mr Bowser then asked for any other nominations and Mr Pöschke nominated Jan de Vaal. There being no other candidates, votes for Secretary-General were taken with the following results :

Mr Borde	25 votes	Elected
Mr de Vaal	9 votes	
Invalid ballots	2	

Voting for eight ordinary members of the Executive Committee then continued, with the following results :

W. Klaue	33 votes	Elected
E. Bowser	25 votes	Elected
R. Deudelin	23 votes	Elected
D. Francis	23 votes	Elected
J. Ledoux	23 votes	Elected
V. Privato	21 votes	Elected
F. Buache	19 votes	Elected

---

T. Andreykov	17 votes	
J. Stenklev	17 votes	- Tied vote

---

J. Kuiper	15 votes
I. Molnar	15 votes
P. Vega	13 votes
M. Casanova	9 votes
G. Cincotti	9 votes
M. Paraianu	7 votes
P. Konlechner	6 votes
S. Huhtala	3 votes
S. Kula	3 votes

---

In the first re-vote to choose between Mr Andreykov and Mr Stenklev, a second tie was the result :

T. Andreykov	18 votes
J. Stenklev	18 votes

The result of the second re-vote was as follows :

T. Andreykov	19 votes	Elected
J. Stenklev	16 votes	
Invalid ballot	1	

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

J. Stenklev	20 votes	Elected
J. Kuiper	17 votes	Elected
I. Molnar	17 votes	Elected

---

M. Casanova	16 votes
P. Vega	14 votes
G. Cincotti	13 votes
P. Konlechner	8 votes

## 12. ORGANIZATION OF THE NEXT FIAF CONGRESSES IN 1979 AND 1980.

---

In the absence of Mr Buache, Mr Borde explained that the 1979 Congress will be held in Lausanne from May 31st to June 4th. Two and one-half days will be allotted for General Assembly, and three to four days for Symposium. The theme of the Symposium this year will be "The Independent and Avant-Garde Cinema at the End of the Silent Period." Using this theme, FIAF will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Congress of Independent Cinema which was held at the Chateau of La Sarraz in 1929.

Speaking for Mr Ondrousek, Mr Frida said that the 1980 Congress will be held at Karlovy Vary. The dates first proposed for the Congress were June 19-28, 1980. This would enable the delegates to attend the Karlovy Vary International Film Festival immediately afterwards. However, if there is an objection to these dates it could be held earlier at Gotvaldov or Bratislava if necessary.

Mr Ledoux explained the reasons for which the Congress has traditionally been held at the end of May ; first, to avoid conflicts with the Cannes Film Festival, and second, to avoid the higher air fares and full hotels which mark June as the beginning of the tourist season.

Mrs Bowser, Mr Edmondson and Mr Netto expressed their preference for the Congress to be held at the end of May.

Mrs Wibom, Mr Kula and Mr Kubelka said that they would choose the latter part of June. Mr Kula asked why the Congress should always be fixed at the same time, and suggested that if the Czechoslovakian archive can accommodate the delegates at the end of June, the Congress should be scheduled then.

A vote was taken to ask which members preferred June 19-28, with the following results :

29	yes
5	abstentions
2	no

Mr Edmondson said that transportation costs are a matter of concern to him. By travelling in February or March, travel costs can be cut in half. He wanted the members to keep this in mind when establishing the dates of future congresses.

Mr Kubelka brought up the subject of the theme of the symposiums. He felt that it was good that the theme be discussed at the General Meeting and not just by members of the Executive Committee. He asked Mr Frida which themes had first been suggested, and Mr Frida read the titles : 1. The Social Importance of Film Archives, and 2. Films as Documents of an Era.

Mr Borde explained that he would clarify the Executive Committee's decision to change the theme. What they proposed was "Feature Films as Reflections of society and of an Epoch"; the suggestion read by Mr Frida was a much broader subject. The Executive Committee had thought it necessary to choose a narrower, more manageable theme.

Mr Casanova agreed with Mr Kubelka that it is important for all members to have an opportunity to discuss the subjects for symposium themes. He proposed a theme for a future symposium: the problem of primitive cinema in the countries which are far from the principal centers of production.

Mr Casanova had another proposition for the Executive Committee. When arriving at the meetings, members are given a great quantity of information which is difficult to study thoroughly before the General Meeting. This makes responsible participation at the General Assembly difficult. Therefore, why can't the General Assembly be held later in the Congress, giving the members time to study all the information?

Mr Cincotti said that the Cineteca Nazionale would be glad to organize the 1981 Congress somewhere in Italy, though not necessarily in Rome, and not necessarily at the traditional time of year, which obviously creates problems for some members. He said that the Cineteca Nazionale would undertake a large part of the expenses: that is, they would underwrite the expenses of one delegate from each archive. He is thinking of suggesting Rapallo, a small resort near Genoa, as the site for the Congress.

### 13. NEW PROJECTS AND PROJECTS UNDER WAY

#### Project for an International History of the Cinema

Mrs Bowser asked for comments on Mr Andreykov's paper, which had been distributed to all the delegates. (Annex 12)

Mr Cincotti felt that the project was rather impractical. He questioned the feasibility of making such a history objective. His feeling was that individual archives could make contributions, but that FIAF itself should not get involved in the project.

Mr Andreykov reread point 6, paragraph 5 as a response to Mr Cincotti, and said that no material aid was being requested of FIAF.

Mr Casanova said that although Mr Andreykov's project is ambitious, it is worthwhile and has the full support of his archive.

Mr Cincotti said that he is not against the project, and that his archive is also willing to help ; but he still thought that it would be difficult for all the countries to agree on which method and which point of view to use.

Mr Borde said that it would not be possible to accomplish anything by concentrating only on the difficulties of this project. He proposed that the General Meeting authorize the Executive Committee to appoint one or two colleagues from among those who have experience in historical work to be on the international committee.

Mr Klaus also offered his support for the project, saying that in Varna it had been decided that there should be more emphasis on historical research.

#### Projects Under Way

Mrs Bowser announced that an old project, an Atlas for Slapstick Actors, was being done jointly by the Prague and New York archives. They hope to have it finished in three years.

Mr Frida said that in addition, the Prague archive will begin work on an International Catalogue of Films for Children. Each archive will be sent a questionnaire on this topic.

He also brought up the issue of the Identification Commission, which held its first session in Czechoslovakia ten years ago. He expressed hope that the project would be continued, as the issue is an important one.

He then asked about the Central Register of Nitrate Films which individual members cannot or do not wish to copy. Since last year's decision there has been some response, but not enough. He asked whether there was further news on this subject.

Mrs van der Elst replied that there have been no further responses since last year.

Mrs Bowser asked which archives had responded.

Mrs van der Elst named the Swedish, Czechoslovakian, and British archives, who all sent lists of the nitrate films which they could not copy. Moscow, Poona, and Budapest had replied that they had or would have copied all of their nitrate films. Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek (Berlin) and Rome had replied that so far they have not been able to compile the requested list.

Mr Francis explained that the list of nitrate films which his archive had distributed directly to some members was somewhat different : it was a list of the National Film Archive's holdings of the films of those particular countries. Pursuing the same line, he added that he also wanted to thank everyone for their fantastic cooperation on supplying prints for the symposium on "The Cinema from 1900 to 1906" due to begin that same afternoon. He said that it would be a good idea to continue this work as much as possible, and that both a preservation copy and a access print in 35 mm could be made of any nitrate films which an archive could not copy. These access prints would be guaranteed to be available for further research.

Mrs Puran brought up the Annual Bibliography of Books on Cinema a project which was abandoned in 1974, but which is drawing more and more interest now. The project will be taken up again on the condition that the members participate and take it more seriously this time.

Mr Kula said that the 1977 Bibliography of FIAF Members had been mailed the week before.

#### CLOSING OF THE GENERAL MEETING

Mr Pogacic wished to thank Mr Francis and the National Film Archive for their hospitality. He then closed the General Meeting and announced the opening of the symposium : "Cinema 1900 - 1906" for the same afternoon. The programme of this symposium and of the symposium on "Film to Videotape and Videotape to film " is to be found in annex 14.