

Secrétariat Exécutif



Report on the Session held on
September 13, 1948, in Copenhagen.

The session was attended by:

Mr. Henri Langlois, France,
Mr. Oliver Bell, England,
Mr. Ernest Lindgren, England,
Mr. Jindrich Brichta, Czechoslovakia,
Mr. Toeplitz, Poland,
Mr. Emery, Switzerland,
Mr. Einar Lauritzen, Sweden,
Mr. Sales - Gomes, Brazil,
Miss Iris Barry, U.S.A.,
Mr. Marcel Franziskus, Luxemburg,
Mr. Ove Brusendorff, Denmark,
Mr. Comencini, Italy,
Mrs. de Malewski-Malevitch, France.

It was agreed that English was to be the official language of the conference. Sweden and Uruguay applied for membership and were admitted as members of the F.I.A.F.

Miss Barry: declared the meeting opened and expressed her gratitude to The Danish Film Museum and to Mr. Brusendorff for having been able to arrange the meeting in Denmark at such short notice. She was pleased at having come to a country which already seemed to have recovered from the German occupation. She went on to mention the early existence of Documentary Film and then called upon Mr. Langlois to give a report.

3

with Belgium very difficult. It is a very great problem as far as the budget is concerned.

In Holland conditions are different: Films are imported through the embassy, but on the authority of the Government in The Hague. In America the situation is more difficult, because it is a private museum, and no agreement has been reached with the government.

Miss Barry: thanked Mr. Langlois for his report, which was of great interest to all of us.

Brusendorff: The Danish Film Museum is not a public institution, but a private one. In spite hereof, an agreement has been reached with the Customs Authorities to the effect that films to and from F.I.A.F.-members may be sent into and out of the country free of duty, subject, of course, to the non-commercial character of our archives.

Miss Barry: In the United States the Department of Finance is in charge of this matter. It is very difficult to obtain exemption from the regulations. In Sao Paulo the matter is handled by the diplomatic service. The matter is of great importance, and in the U.S. I have had to pay up to Dollars 75.- to get a film into the country.

Toeplitz: This Congress is of very great importance. Each member should give a brief report, not with data, but the individual problems. Each of the film museums have plans for the future, and we should not miss this opportunity. We do not want technical reports, but the general outline of developments and exchanges with other countries.

Brusendorff: In order to elucidate the problems we might compare the reports later. It will be very difficult to find time for the reports now.

Toeplitz: We must find a compromise. I suggest that each member prepares a report on the following points:

3

with Belgium very difficult. It is a very great problem as far as the budget is concerned.

In Holland conditions are different: Films are imported through the embassy, but on the authority of the Government in The Hague. In America the situation is more difficult, because it is a private museum, and no agreement has been reached with the government.

Miss Barry: thanked Mr. Langlois for his report, which was of great interest to all of us.

Brusendorff: The Danish Film Museum is not a public institution, but a private one. In spite hereof, an agreement has been reached with the Customs Authorities to the effect that films to and from F.I.A.F.-members may be sent into and out of the country free of duty, subject, of course, to the non-commercial character of our archives.

Miss Barry: In the United States the Department of Finance is in charge of this matter. It is very difficult to obtain exemption from the regulations. In Sao Paulo the matter is handled by the diplomatic service. The matter is of great importance, and in the U.S. I have had to pay up to Dollars 75.- to get a film into the country.

Toeplitz: This Congress is of very great importance. Each member should give a brief report, not with data, but the individual problems. Each of the film museums have plans for the future, and we should not miss this opportunity. We do not want technical reports, but the general outline of developments and exchanges with other countries.

Brusendorff: In order to elucidate the problems we might compare the reports later. It will be very difficult to find time for the reports now.

Toeplitz: We must find a compromise. I suggest that each member prepares a report on the following points:

1. Short summary of the foundation and history of the museum.
2. The legal position of the museum.
3. Present activities of the museum.
4. Its relations with F.I.A.F. and other museums.
5. Its plans for the future and its development.

Langlois: The vital thing at this conference is to throw light upon the spirit in which the work should be carried on, and that cannot be expressed in points.

Lindgren: I do not think there will be time for long and detailed accounts.

Miss Barry: It will be practical to divide it in 2 points; that makes it easier to write. Each country has its own difficulties to overcome, and we are no free from fault any of us, and therefore each country should be allowed to express its view freely. The members must be given a free choice.

Bell: There are many problems to deal with, and if each of us is going to speak for 10 minutes, it will take too much time, about two hours. In my opinion we should not waste all that time, because the congress will only last a very short time.

Toeplitz: I have no experience from other international congresses, but I consider it very important to learn the exact position of other countries. If we reached a point where changes had to be made, and we did not know the exact position, our organization would not be serving its purpose and would thereby defeat its own ends. It is therefore necessary that we become acquainted with each other. I know myself and a few other members, but it is not the same to read a report, which may be forgotten. If we have only got 3 days, we must spend one of them on discussing these things to reach a solution, but I cannot speak if I have no well-established foundation, and I can only obtain that by listening to the other members.

Miss Barry: This is important. There must be contact between the members of an organization. Each country should be absolutely free to speak. They have certain problems in France; Belgium has other difficulties to overcome, etc.; it is unavoidable that it should be so, but I would like to know all the problems. It is simply necessary to know each others' problems.

Lauritzen: We have also certain problems in Sweden.

Miss Barry: would like to hear Sweden's problems.

Lauritzen: Our greatest problem in Sweden is that of exchanging films with other archives. Our funds are so scarce that we have to make a negative when we want to exchange films. We have only means for one or two negatives each year. We have been approached by other archives about exchange of Swedish films, but at the moment we can do no more than send two films to France this year, two to England next year, and by order of the requests: Czechoslovakia in 1950. I would ask if it is possible to obtain help from the F.I.A.F. If the organization could help us by paying for a negative, we could make four exchanges each year insted of two, but perhaps there are no liquid funds available for this purpose. We have great difficulties in regard to Customs Duties. They must be the same as those of the U.S. No understanding is being shown in this matter. I have tried to contact the American Embassy.

Miss Barry: Those problems are the same in all countries, and it will be difficult to comply with such a request.

Brichta: It is impossible to pay other countries for copies. An exchange might be effected in the way that a film is forwarded to a party who wants it, he copies it and returns it.

Langlois: The members should try to persuade their respective governments to approach other countries as France did Italy.

Comencini: In Italy things are improving all the time. This year we have got a million Lira from the state, and next year we hope to get 9 million. In addition, the producing companies deliver their

films to the museum, which has received a number of the best films including LA DERNIERE CHANCE. It is hoped that all the companies will be made to supply their films. I am going to ask the F.I.A.F. to establish a control with the films which are being exchanged so that double exchanges can be avoided. I think that a solution can be found to the problems in connection with the customs duties.

Brusendorff: My only difficulty seems to be with regard to the future. I must have many films this year. Mr. Langlois has promised me many films, and I feel certain that the other museums are going to lend me many. That is Denmark's only problem.

Gomes: We have three possible courses to follow in our film library. We can co-operate with

- 1) The Museum of Modern art in Sao Paulo,
- 2) The National Government,
- 3) The Provisional Government.

Our arrangements are to some extent similar to those of New York. We have no particular ideas of the interest taken in the Film Library by the members of The National and The Provisional Governments. We have got an Institute, and the film industry is making progress. We produce 12 full-length films a year. The documentary films are also making headway: New production companies are being established, and a cooperation between Brazil and France as well as Brazil and England has been started. In Brazil the museum has received financial support from private persons, but they have stipulated that a large part of the money be used for film performances. Unfortunately, the museum was engaged in a law-suit with the greatest of the supporters, but now it appears that a solution will be found also for this problem.

Toeplitz: We have only one thing to worry us: We are a country without a tradition. After the devastations wrought by the Germans, we had to start from scratch. We have nothing to offer in return, and we are very anxious to obtain good films, especially instructive films. I would ask the organization what ways can be found to let us have the best films. We have only got German and Russian war

films. I presume that Bulgaria and Jugoslavia have the same problems. We have great ambitions in regard to creating a film tradition and founding a film industry. We are looking to the organization for real help to establish a film library.

Miss Barry: We are anxious to help, but funds are scarce. We shall revert to this question as soon as more funds are available.

Brichta: Czechoslovakia is in a position to give help to Poland.

Brusendorff: Denmark will undoubtedly also be able to find ways and means to give her assistance quickly.

Franziskus: The Luxemburg museum has been established after the war. We had only just made a start when the war broke out and destroyed everything. After the war we have obtained a great many German films. Luxemburg is exchanging films with several other museums, especially in Paris and Chicago. At the present time, the museum has some 350 films, the majority of which are instructional films, including many historical documentary films. I suggest that an international office be established to look after distribution of films.

Emery: In Switzerland conditions are also very difficult, because the museum receives no support from the Federal Government, but from one Canton, Bâle, which at the present time gives an annual grant of Frs. 10,000.-. This canton will not, however, go on being the sole contributor. We try to establish contact with the other cantons, and by moving the museum from Bâle to Lausanne we shall acquire better premises and improve our financial position. That is a problem upon which all the efforts of the museum are being concentrated, but even so we have seen our way to exchange a good many films.

Toeplitz: Why have you not applied to the Federal Government for support?

Emery: We have tried, but it has proved impossible to obtain a government grant; we have, however, been permitted to show films without payment of entertainment taxes.

Langlois: The last year has been the most difficult one in the history of the museum, because it had become a general opinion that the museum was rich enough to achieve anything. The museum depends on government grants for 100 % of its funds, and is therefore at the mercy of the whims of an official. The museum cannot, however, afford to make copies, and it is not allowed to sell copies either, nor can it offer free copies to other countries. The French Museum has no cinema and cannot give performances in clubs either.

(Langlois was in keen opposition to the idea that the museum should be an organization to preserve films. It should devote just as much of its work to the spreading of knowledge of good films.)

Mrs. Malewski-Malevitch: called upon the members to advance proposals for amendments by 11 o'clock the following day. She expected that all the members would want to move amendments.

(Session suspended)

Session resumed at 15.35:

Lindgren: The National Film Library in London is the oldest and best organized. It is not a government department, but receives state support. The British Film Institute has received financial aid, but not enough. Next year we hope for more money.

There are two main sections:

- 1) Preservation Section, which is extremely important. Its first duty is to preserve films. We receive films from distributors and studios, both English and foreign. We do not show the films in our own buildings, but we hope that will be possible later.
- 2) We lend films to film clubs, schools, etc., and thus endeavour to spread the knowledge of them. Public recognition is of great value. We cannot make or produce films, but hope to obtain films by barter. For this purpose it is necessary to make copies. We have good connections among the English film companies. British Film Institute is still in its organizing stage, and we must have money from the Treasurer.

The film library is a very important institution, and increas-

ing understanding for that is being shown by the government, and we hope that substantial funds will be made available for the film library.

Brichta: In Czechoslovakia we started with nothing - without traditions. Everything in connection with film has been nationalized, and working conditions have never been so good as they are now. We have had connection with England, U.S.A., Switzerland and Denmark. We cannot pay for negatives and copies, but we are able to give copies, books and apparatus in return. A special department has been instituted to produce a film about the history of film over 50 years. For this purpose we want films, posters, photos, etc. The film can show the country and its industry at a given time, which will make it of great value. In return for gifts to the Czechoslovakian work we can give pictures, books etc.

Thirifays: The Belgian film industry is mediocre, because it has only existed for three years, but the last year has seen great progress. We are a private organization with no help from either government or municipal authorities in spite of the fact that many of those who work in our institution are officials. We hope to receive financial support in the course of some weeks or months. We have established the National Scientific Association, a company for the production of documentary films and films from the United Nations. Our section for distribution of instructional films is very active: last year over 600 copies were made. Our funds come from the film companies, and our connection with the biggest film company in Brussels accounted for more than half our funds, viz. 150,000 Belgian Francs. We hope for assistance from other libraries. Formerly we were helped especially by France, Switzerland and other countries understanding our language.

Miss Barry: My problems are the same as those of all other countries. My library was established in 1935. We received money from the Rockefeller Foundation, which was of great importance for us when we started collecting film negatives. The problem is how to get these negatives. The copies disappear or are destroyed and

nothing is left. We cannot all get negatives, because there are not sufficient funds for that. I try to make negatives every year if there is money enough. We show the films to the universities, colleges, museums etc. The Y.M.C.A. Museum has not sent out much. I was pleased to see Mr. Brichta's literature. We conduct research work, and whenever possible we send out publications to increase the film library. No one has mentioned books. We promised each other to exchange books. Let us try that in spite of the difficulties in reading them and without any regard to the prices of the books. American film companies have difficulties in obtaining new copies. I have been fortunate in obtaining other films by pure accidents, both in Switzerland and Italy, and I am sometimes called up on the telephone by private persons who have got films. There are many of my films that you all want, but I cannot let you have them because the American film companies are very suspicious. It is my experience that masterpieces should not be placed outside the organization and I would call upon you to bear this in mind, too. I have made a list of films for this purpose. To this I can add a group which I can lend you. No one has got enough money to do everything they ought to do, but we must try to manage somehow. We try to place the films owned by the companies within your reach. The basic principle of the exchange must be 1000 feet against 1000 feet. We should all have made lists of all the films we have, and no one, except England, has done his duty in this respect. Mr. Lindgren is the only one among us who has published a catalog. We have also failed to give each other technical information. Many old films were hand-painted. Is it possible to reproduce these films?

Bell: Hand-painted films are more durable than films in technicolor.

Miss Barry: Massproduction is a handicap. We have had excellent films 50 years old, which are quite clear, whereas films produced during the war are blurred.

State what you have got in negatives so that we can ask one another and save our money.

We have no funds to repair the damage that has been done. I suggest

a pool within the F.I.A.F. It would constitute a protective framework for all countries because an international organization would be much better protected.

Lindgren: Both England and Czechoslovakia have made contributions to film history but the film history was first and foremost within the United States.

Miss Barry: The American film industry is not interested in the work; we have to help each other. In America a great decline has been experienced; the laboratory work, for instance, is considerably inferior to what it was 10 years ago.

Langlois: (summed up the problems)

- 1) Payment of the expenses in making negatives.
- 2) Customs duty problems.
- 3) Coordination of acquisitions by the museums with knowledge of the films held by other museums.
- 4) Support to nations where conditions are difficult.
- 5) Establishment of an international pool of Films.

Bell: Of course it must be possible to obtain small contributions from all countries, but the nucleus of an international film pool must come from the United States.

Tuesday, September 14, 1948.

Session opened at 11.35 a.m.

Miss Barry: I have received a telegram from my principal, addressed to this meeting:

BEST WISHES FOR YOUR IMPORTANT WORK

ROCKEFELLER.

We are now going to discuss amendments to the statutes, and I believe that Mr. Langlois is more familiar with this question than I am. Mr. Langlois can explain the various points and about the necessity and possibilities of having good relations with other international organizations. Miss Barry moved a resolution in this respect and proposed that the International Federation of Film archives set up a special section for documentary films.

Langlois: The statutes are different for each country. In France, for instance, the archive is connected with both Louvre and Bibliothèque Nationale. - We must discuss the relations of other international organizations with the F.I.A.F. Mr. Toeplitz is director of "The International Association for Documentary Film".

Toeplitz: We have asked the International Federation of Film archives to establish a separate section for documentary films in the film archives of each country, and I expect that this will be of interest to the members of this organization. We instructed our Section within the World Union of Documentary Film and each department to contact the film archive and bring about the closest possible cooperation. We are working to achieve the same ultimate ends from identical viewpoints. The aim is to achieve good, honest films of high artistic value.

Miss Barry: Would it not lead to a duplication of activities if that organization were to become a member of the F.I.A.F., involving superfluous work and twice as much, too?

Toeplitz: An archive that does not collect documentary films is not performing its duty. If a film library does not wish to collect documentary films, it is our duty to point this out to them. I only wish to add one more thing of great importance, namely that in order to exchange documentary films we must avail ourselves of the F.I.A.F. to avoid customs duties, and we therefore instructed each section to work in close collaboration with the film archive.

Mrs. Malewsky: In regard to the World Union of Documentary Film, it appears to have the following object: Each of the national sections of this union should form archives in their individual countries and work in close collaboration with the other film archives because their objects are identical, and the film archives must necessarily go in for collecting documentary films; but the World Union of Documentary Film does not wish to restrict its activities to the collection of such films; it wants to show them to the public as well.

Toeplitz: For commercial exchanges it is quite unnecessary to cooperate with the World Union. I wish to point out that there are two kinds of exchanges: commercial and non-commercial. We must produce and show good documentary films, and in addition to that we have to do something to sell the public on documentary films. It is for this reason that we must adopt a modern programme with documentary films. Each section will send one or two documentary films, and this programme must be circularized to the whole world. It is only for non-commercial purposes that we have to avail ourselves of the F.I.A.F. as an intermediary.

Brichta: We import films free of duty, but that applies to non-commercial films only. In my opinion all documentary films are produced for commercial ends.

Toeplitz: That is only correct to a certain extent. There are commercial documentary films, but some are not, and the latter are produced on account of their educational or artistic value. Our aim is to achieve a popularization of documentary films. I think that each archive should accept one or two commercial films, and in order to obtain exemption from duty for these films it will be necessary to

have the support of the F.I.A.F.

Miss Barry: Why couldn't that Union simply become a member of the F.A.I.F. ?

Bell: The union has no archive, and consequently it cannot be a member according to the statutes.

Miss Barry: It might become so.

Lindgren: It might be enough, if it got individual assistance from the archives ?

Toeplitz: We must endeavour to make the World Union let its films circulate for educational purposes.

Langlois: In that case the documentary film organizations of the individual countries should accept our statutes. An international organization has been formed for art films (painting, sculpture etc) to study the works of art, and that organization would like to obtain permanent relations with us. It also wants a direct cooperation with the archives and wants them to form a special art division. It would then help us to obtain the art films and to distribute them over the whole world, but would leave it to us to popularize the art films.

Miss Barry: What about international scientific films ?

Langlois: The third of the international film institutions that have been formed, is the International Institute for Scientific Films. These films are quite a genre of their own, and it is feared that they will be lost because they are generally being stored by private persons, and many of them are destroyed. At the present time great values are being lost. In order to prevent this waste, the said institute has decided to form its own archive. This decision is one of many that were made at their last congress. Their statutes however, have not yet been agreed upon, and it might be useful for us to have a conference with them about this subject. It is beyond doubt that a new film archive will have been created if they form

an archive for scientific films.

Lindgren: We can agree about the general principles. As a film archive we look upon film as a whole. We are not concerned with just one kind of films, and it is also our task to preserve these special films. In order, however, to store our films we must have sufficient accommodation to store them properly. The national film archive cannot cope with this requirement, and we are therefore not in a position to offer the International Institute for Scientific Films to store their films for them, and if a smaller group try it on their own, I shall take that as an expression of criticism.

Mrs. Malewski: The film archives make no distinction between the different film genres, and they can therefore offer all interested organizations to preserve their films, if the latter are interested in that. Hence it seems unnecessary to form separate bodies for the purpose of preserving these films.

Langlois: There is one point that ought to be made quite clear: At the time when we formed our organization we made a definition of the film archives eligible as members of the F.I.A.F. - We are not the first to form film archives. Archives for the preservation of educational films were in existence already before the last Great War 1914 - 1918. When we formed the F.I.A.F. we excluded these archives because our first consideration was cultural expansion. We cannot go beyond the terms of this object, which so far has given us scope for effective achievements. If we were to extend the scope of our activities we would be facing the question of giving admittance to these archives. The question does not arise as far as documentary films are concerned, because the organization in charge of these films has the same aims as we have. That also holds good of the art films.

Lindgren: This may be so, but I do not think such difficulties exist in London, because our films are not exclusively documentary, but films of all kinds. We are also ready to preserve the scientific films, which we consider as documentary films.

Miss Barry: My budget does not permit me to be interested in documentary films, but I am aware of the necessity of helping these other film genres because of their great importance to the community as a whole. Certain films with medical motifs could be of great usefulness if they could circulate fast, and I hope that some way can be found to preserve scientific films. I cannot afford either to preserve or stow these films; I could not get audiences for them and I have not got the necessary personnel for it. Maybe the F.I.A.F. would be able to deal with scientific films. I have no money to spend on that kind of work.

Langlois: That brings us to the end of our plans for scientific films: An archive must be formed for these films. Such a central archive should not have its domicile in the country where the F.I.A.F. is domiciled, but instead it should be given the task of circulating the films.

Emery: For a small country like ours it would be convenient if this task were placed in the hands of the members of the F.I.A.F. Switzerland can only afford one archive, and an international special archive should not come in the way of our national archive.

Langlois: The task of preserving these films would be given to the existing film archive. It should not be necessary to remind you of the most important object of our organization, namely to act as "archives". We must also give consideration to our cultural obligations. In this connection I would inform you that a congress for educational films will be convened within the United Nations and we have been asked to send an observer. In my opinion we would be greatly interested in having good relations with the educational film archives, because in their archives they hold films to which the negatives no longer exist. (Turning to Miss Barry): Will you appoint an observer?

Miss Barry: Let it be someone from the French film archive.

Langlois: Our activities are primarily concerned with the dissemination of film culture. In this connection I must tell you about the relations between the film archives and the film clubs. Incidentally, it is my view that these relations must be arranged within in each country, and in this connection I must remind you that all these various questions were discussed, together with some items of our statutes that had been adopted in July, 1946, during the Congress of the International Scientific Film Organization, to which all the members present here had been invited, except Mr. Lindgren. In addition, we discussed possible relations between the Film Club Organization and the F.I.A.F. to head off any difficulties that might arise between these two organizations. In the end it was agreed that exchange of films would come under the scope of the International Film Organization. A short time after the congress, we were informed, however, that our definition of "non-commercial" did not conform to that of M. Sadoul. The film club organization protested sharply against certain items of our statutes. I do not know if this can be considered quite correct in regard to its form, but I must admit the correctness of another international organization making reservations as to the wording of our statutes. Personally I must allow such a discussion. M. Sadoul has explained his viewpoints to us. The question now is what the relations between our two organizations can be. But perhaps it would be more expedient to discuss this matter on a national basis. Is there anyone here who can elucidate the problem from a national viewpoint? After all it is indisputable that the film archives and film clubs must cooperate.

Miss Barry: But Mr. Bell is president of the International Film Club Organization. Perhaps Mr. Bell will give his viewpoints in his capacity of acting president of the International Film Club Organization.

Mr. Bell: I wish to emphasize that the film archives must take the form of non-commercial archives. The definition of "non-commercial" as laid down in the statutes must be considered. Primarily, it is

a question of collecting or not collecting entrance money. In Holland it is laid down by law that a tax shall be collected at the entrance. Everybody must pay to be admitted. In the exact words of the law: Money must be collected at the entrance. This applies to film clubs and national libraries. In England we do not allow the film libraries to collect entrance money. In some countries money must be collected at the entrance, in others not, and the international organization of film clubs request that the amendment give guarantees in the non-commercial direction. If a film archive has reason to believe that a film club is actually becoming a commercial undertaking, the national as well as the international Film Club Organization may expel from the organization a club that has been found to be of a commercial character. The question is whether the international organization of film archives is prepared to accept that its integrity be guaranteed by the International Film Club Organization.

This is a very complicated point. We have had discussions in England about the payment of the global contribution. We have experienced difficulties with some film clubs wanting to admit students or other young people with insufficient means for a subscription, and it was discussed in the film club whether a student could be permitted to pay his subscription in 3 or 4 instalments, and whether an allowance could be granted. In England we have decided to deal with each case on its own merits, and in some cases permission was given, and in other cases it was refused.

8
Tuesday, September 14, 1948.

Session opened at 15.45.

Langlois: opened the session by reading the letter from M. Sadoul, Secretary General to the International Film Club Organization, to the F.I.A.F. about his viewpoint in regard to the definition of non-commercial shows.

Comencini: In Italy relations are good between the archive and the film clubs which were formed in 1946 at the instance of the archive, and which only give shows in conformity with the statutes of the F.I.A.F. In 1946 the position was favorable, and many good foreign films were shown. In 1947, however, the situation changed when the film club federation was formed, which in Italy was considered superfluous. The archive has contracts with the production companies. In 1947 the understanding with the film clubs was discontinued. The film clubs gave performances in conformity with F.I.C.C.'s definitions, and they were also to receive films from this organization, but they did not get any. The only thing they had gained by joining the F.I.C.C. was that the production companies refused to permit the archive to send out films to the clubs. When the clubs realized what a bad deal they had made, they withdrew from the F.I.C.C. and are now in contact with the archive^{again}. Hence, Italy does not want any modification of the rules because of the F.I.C.C.

Thirifays: In Belgium the archive receives big contributions from the film clubs, and facilities for the clubs are therefore felt to be desirable because the club members cannot very well afford the expensive subscriptions in a single payment. The situation is different in each country, and the countries should therefore make individual arrangements with the clubs. It would, however, be desirable if an exchange of films with the clubs could be brought about.

Emery: Our situation is different again. We have the best relations with the film clubs, but our archive has only a very limited number of films available, and consequently the film clubs have to hire films directly from the producers. We are doing our best to increase our stock of films. There are many difficulties impeding

the natural development of the film clubs. For one thing it is a rule that the leader of a film club must be a member of the cinema owners' organization. On the other hand, that means better opportunities of obtaining premises for showing films through the archive.

Lauritzen: In this matter our position is a special one. As you may know, my archive is supported to a large extent by the film industry, and the film industry represents the American film companies. They are against the film club movement. They maintain that Sweden is so small that the population is not big enough to support the film clubs. These clubs are a menace to the cinemas. In my opinion this is a fallacious view. There is no proof that people who have joined the clubs, cut down their visits to the cinemas. The film archive in Sweden must comply with the directions given by the film companies and consequently we cannot help any other clubs than the existing 4 clubs which have been recognized by the film industry. The clubs have contacts with high schools and universities. They want all the films to be shown in each of the clubs in order that they may know them and accept them, and many more people than the students should be enabled to see the films. Besides, we can only show them to people who live in Stockholm. The 4 film clubs do not belong to the International Film Club Organization.

Brusendorff: In Denmark we have only one film club with about 2,000 members. The cooperation between the museum and the film is close and frictionless.

Lindgren: In England we have a very strong film club movement which began in 1925. The organization of English and Scottish film clubs numbers 200 clubs. Relations between the clubs and the National Film Library are very good. I have got instructions because this request, which comes from the film club organization, was discussed at the meeting of the National Film Library. In his capacity of president Mr. Oliver Bell was able to present the views held by the film clubs. The libraries have an opportunity to examine these questions. They agreed upon two decisions which are the same as the

instructions for this Congress to-day. In the first place they agreed to be prepared to guarantee a private and a non-commercial development; they would not recommend any amendments to the statutes under which the films were to be obtained. We shall be able to obtain films for clubs which abide by the rules of the organization. The committee recommended that no exchanges be made. This would not prevent other countries from exercising their right to make their own decisions. In our country we shall continue to observe this, but we do not insist on other countries doing so. The Film Club Organization must have a non-commercial character.

The Film Club Organization has passed two resolutions, which I have been asked to communicate to you:

- 1) On a national basis, the English film clubs are opposed to amendments to the statutes of the F.I.A.F.
- 2) On an international basis, the clubs can agree to modifications, although they are in agreement with the present regulations.

Langlois: The results of our latest committee meeting were that we found that we could not make any decisions ourselves on the following points:

the question of copyright, and
regulations for commerciality.

There is no French legislation for the film clubs. The only act we have is from 1901, and there are not any special regulations either, concerning the clubs. We have requested our government to convene a conference between trade unions, the authors' association, the producers' organization and the film archive, in order to investigate the possibilities of finding a practicable solution. M. Sadoul has frustrated our efforts to bring about this conference. After the committee meeting we received a letter from the producers' organization protesting vigorously against certain decisions concerning the arrangement with the film clubs, and we were requested not to amend the F.I.A.F.'s statutes. Our attitude in this matter is the opposite of that of the Englishmen. France is the country where the first film clubs were formed, in 1918. In our country

there have been no problems with the film clubs up to 1939. There was a great movement in support of such clubs, but it was paralyzed by the Avant-garde cinemas. In 1932, the film clubs ceased to operate regularly in France. The congress in Switzerland became the swan song of the clubs. When a club wanted to give a show with old films, its management committee telephoned to Paramount which lent the club the films Paramount possessed, free of charge. After the war, the film archive was induced to further a large-scale formation of film clubs, but so many were formed that the American film distribution companies were overwhelmed by inquiries, and they found this somewhat exaggerated. I have therefore tried to check this development until our film archive had sufficient films and until legislation has been passed for the film clubs. My work did not succeed, and clubs were still being formed in very large numbers. As an example, 150 were formed in a year in the whole of France. The film clubs have approached the film distributors and maintained that they were the best propaganda agents for the distributors' films. - Lending films to the clubs has become a source of income for the distributing companies. We have therefore been prohibited from lending our American films to the film clubs. The activity of these clubs has henceforth become a kind of introduction to understanding of films, and I have therefore tried to introduce some "secondary" film clubs. My viewpoint is that there is nothing to prevent an understanding between the clubs and the archive when people take a real interest in film. The problems do not arise until the managers begin to think of profits, even if they have no advantage of it themselves. And there are some clubs where the cash receipts land right in the pocket of the management, in spite of the provisions of the law. I think that the proposal made by Mr. Toeplitz is the best one. In my opinion the producers can have no objections to our exercising a certain control over the clubs, but I think, on the other hand, that such a control over private organizations is not practicable. I therefore suggest that we must amalgamate the two organizations, and that a committee be set up, consisting of 4 or 5 representatives of each of the two organizations. This committee might negotiate a result.

Toeplitz: I find the proposal excellent, especially in view of the fact that this important problem takes different forms in the different countries. Moreover, a collaboration between the two organizations is of the greatest importance. Even if we agree to amend our regulations, the result will not be quite satisfactory. It would only mean a solution on paper. I therefore second the proposal to form a commission with four members.

Thirifays: But there is the risk that it will delay a solution. I suggest a time limit.

Langlois: That is just what I was going to say.

Toeplitz: I propose Langlois and Miss Barry as members.

Langlois: We must have a neutral man as well.

Thirifays: Why not Denmark, which seems to have no problems.

Langlois: My proposal is to appoint 4 members in addition to the Secretary General, who must take part in the negotiations in any case. We must also have a country that has particularly close cooperation with the film clubs.

Toeplitz: England, Belgium, Italy and Brazil, plus the Secretary and the President General, if they are willing. What about the time limit?

Langlois: The formation of the International Film Club Organization was postponed for the very reason that we should try to find a solution first. We must try to complete the work before the end of the year.

Miss Barry: It will take at least 3 months.

Toeplitz: The work can be started in a fortnight.

- General discussion about the time limit and the appointments. -

Toeplitz: As soon as possible, then. Do we all agree?

Langlois: From a report on the Film Club Conference at Cannes I see that the film archives have violated the regulations of the statutes in certain cases.

I made inquiries in the different countries and was told that it was not so.

Toeplitz: Then we have only "Any Other Business" left in the agenda. I suggest that Langlois reads a summary of the decisions made yesterday.

Here Miss Barry interrupted and told about Paul Wegener's death in Berlin and suggested that a telegram of condolence be sent to Asta Nielsen. When that had been discussed, the negotiations were continued.

Langlois: The problems of yesterday are listed as items, and I suggest that they be read now:

1. Lack of necessary funds to make copies.
2. Difficulties in connection with customs duties.
3. Coordination of acquisitions of the various archives.
4. Unlimited loans to be allowed, and formation of an international loan organization under the F.I.A.F.
5. Exchange of films.

I suggest that each member, backed by F.I.A.F., applies to his government to bring about an inclusion in the existing trade agreements a clause granting exemption from customs duties for our films. I shall arrange for a resolution to be adopted to that effect. But there is another and more important problem. Among our members there is a country which is very rich, viz. Sweden, but the Swedish film archive has only limited funds at its command. We have also countries like Poland, Czechoslovakia and others with no foreign exchange. All they have are the films kindly lent to them by the archives of other countries. That question is easy to solve. Let us assume that I have a film: Napoleon. It is impossible for me to spare the money to have it copied. But if each of us undertakes to have a copy made of one or two of the reels, we can have a copy made of this film. I take it for granted that we will all be willing to do so. As long as France has not paid for the copying, the film remains as a pledge with the F.I.A.F. If we had two copies of this film, it could be shown all over the world. But if we had 80 films made in

this manner that would undoubtedly satisfy the whole demand. This is a good solution for countries with a strong currency, but not quite so good for countries with weak currencies.

Brichta: A barter could be made: You send us a film, and we will make a copy which we pass on to the country of origin. We keep the original ourselves, from which we make copies for other countries after permission from the country of origin. This latter country retains full and complete control of the original. In return for the copies we send to other countries we receive copies of other films on a barter basis, meter for meter.

Langlois: Your proposal is somewhat startling. The producer is not likely to tolerate that the negative remains in your care. It would amount to a kind of sale. And with your system I would have no control over the negative.

Brichta: You have not understood a word of what I said. You send us the negative which, I admit, remains with us, but even so, you retain the control over it. You receive a copy and all other countries are also given an opportunity to obtain a copy against giving us another film copy on the basis of the meter for meter system. Thereby we can render great services to the "poor" film archives.

Langlois: If the negative be entrusted to the F.I.A.F. it may be sent to Poland, which has promised to make copies of it for those who can pay for it.

Brichta: We can't pay that.

Langlois: That proposal was made already two years ago. I cannot agree to it. I prefer to wait until we have enough money for me to pay for having a copy made, rather than your making a number of copies of Napoleon, which were to be available for all countries.

Brichta: The important thing for us to obtain is a film that we have not got already.

Comencini: It is not fair that the negative should remain with Brichta.

Toeplitz: I suggest another solution, namely that the negative be given over to the care of F.I.A.F. in such a way that the negative may be sent to the countries which are interested in it, and they could then make a copy of it for their own use. But we could add Brichta's proposal to a resolution of this tenor. The purports of this proposal are that the country of origin retains control of the negative, but it has the unfortunate disadvantage that the producer of the film will not tolerate that his film is sent abroad. Only Poland and Brichta have the raw materials necessary to make copies. But I expect that we can include Brichta's proposal in the final text of our resolution.

Gomes: If it should be found later that it would be more advantageous to have the copy made in another country, would Brichta then be ready and willing to send the film to that country?

Toeplitz: That's evident. You retain the right to dispose of the film. I suppose we can leave this problem now, and we have arrived at the general outline of our resolution, namely the participation of all countries in the making of copies, the copies are to remain with the F.I.A.F., the country of origin shall be entitled to buy the negative back, the necessity of obtaining permission of this country to make negatives, and, finally, a possibility to circulate the films.

Emery: Could we not get a list of the copies?

Langlois: I have tried to draw a text up for an agreement under which it would be possible for us to say: "May I lend this film to Miss Barry, for instance?"

Miss Barry: It is difficult to obtain permission to "Assign", and if the word "loan" is used, legal problems will arise. Finally, I suppose we shall also have to mention the authors' copyrights in the copies.

Lindgren: That question varies from one country to the next. In England we examine copyrights. We have two kinds: 50 years after publication, and 50 years after the author's death.

Toeplitz: I think it is possible to have it arranged legally.

Miss Barry: It is stupid to argue a question of which we have no knowledge. We shall have to ask UNESCO, although that institution is not popular everywhere. It is accused of being a purely Anglo-American bloc.

Lindgren: In England loans are permitted in up to 50 years, I believe, but that is different for each country.

Miss Barry: Could UNESCO not be asked to prepare a survey of the legal aspects of this matter in the different countries?

Lindgren: Isn't it difficult to cooperate with UNESCO?

Langlois: UNESCO works very slowly. For instance they could not arrange the exemption from duty that I obtained later by my own efforts.

Toeplitz: All film archives are interested in possibilities to borrow, and we should therefore endeavour to find the right possibilities in the different countries. And our organization should contact UNESCO for the solution of these problems. If we adopt the proposal, I shall invite a UNESCO representative.

Lindgren: The procedure adopted by the F.I.A.F. is not acceptable to English customs authorities; they want to make a proper examination of the films even if the parcel has been marked with title, address and contents.

Langlois: If an archive received a negative and made a copy, but were unable to give other negatives as a loan, the archive could take an extra copy and give it to F.I.A.F. as a kind of payment.

Miss Barry: That is very unbusinesslike. In Brazil and Uruguay there are a few rare films which I hope will not be destroyed. Large American companies have been reluctant to let their films go out, but I hope that I can obtain permission to get good films into the European market.

Langlois: There are not enough copies in circulation. This problem is all the more serious because the South American Countries, which have practically no copies, or none at all, have become members of the F.I.A.F. It will probably be far more difficult when the Far East also joins our organization. I therefore suggest that the party who receives a film, must give a copy in return, which will be entrusted to Mrs. Malewski for circulation, and after one year in Europe and one in South America, this copy is returned to the archive by which it was lent. This copy is to be considered a consideration for an unlimited loan.

Toeplitz: The legal aspect of this solution will have to be investigated.

Langlois: There was a time when The British Institute was the richest archive. It was restricted in its activities by a regulation which prohibited it from lending its archive films. We are entitled to send out three films a year, and without that permission the small archives would have had no chance to work at all.

Miss Barry: I propose that we establish a new, small, international archive, through which we can get an opportunity to make our films circulate.

Langlois: The fact that I have been able to use the F.I.A.F. as protector during the war enabled me to save several films. I think it would be a good thing if we had a place where we could deposit our films, and from which they could not be removed without an international outcry of dismay.

Toeplitz: I agree to that, but it will be a very complicated matter. I suggest that the "Bureau" follow up this matter. If each film archive made a contribution by giving a selection of its films to such a bureau, we could establish a very valuable archive.

Comencini: How can we bring about a better coordination of the copying work in the different countries?

Langlois: That is very simple. We have only to send each other a monthly report on our copying plans for the next period.

Toeplitz: We must ask the bureau to start this work.

Langlois: F.I.A.F. could send out a duplicated statement. Mr. Wegener is dead, and I am very sorry that I have not been able to ask him for all the information about film that he possessed. The same thing happened when and also when Méliès passed away. Griffith died. We must do everything we can to gather all possible information about film history. We must pass a resolution to the effect that each archive is to conduct historical research work, and that the results are to be sent to the F.I.A.F. which must arrange the publication of such material.

Toeplitz: Here is the text of a resolution that was passed during the Wroslaw Congress. A great number of film people were present and our object was to further film culture and film knowledge, if circumstances required it. One of the conditions for such work is peace. This is the resolution, and I ask you to support it, if you are in agreement with it:

(Read in English, later in French
translation by Toeplitz.)

The resolution was signed by representatives of Austria, Brazil, France, Great Britain, Italy, Poland, Sovjet Russia and the United States of America.

I ask you to give the resolution your moral support, assuming that it expresses your thoughts and hopes, too.

Miss Barry: We agree to it, but is it not addressed to the film producers, more than to us?

Toeplitz: It is addressed to everybody because it furthers peace.

Miss Barry: We find the wording of it right enough, but who is it directed against?

Lindgren: The great cultural work with which this congress is concerned is done in the spirit of this resolution, and I suppose it would be sufficient to state that the resolution was received with sympathy.

Toeplitz: Actually it would be enough with such a statement, but it would be desirable to adopt a resolution in support of it.

Langlois: It is necessary to express actual concord. I was asked to support the dissemination of war films both in 1939 by Frenchmen, in 1941 by the Germans, and again in 1946 by Frenchmen, but I have always refused. Incidentally, war films are always bad, and not worth preserving.

Miss Barry: Maybe from a moral point of view, but there are many artistically valuable war films. (Langlois: No!) In order to give one's assent to this resolution one must know its real aim, in other words: is it anti-American or anti-Russian?

Langlois: It is no use listening with sympathy; we must refuse to show war films. My point of view is that ever since its start, the F.I.A.F. has done everything in its power to advance the cause of peace. Even when we shook hands with certain disagreeable persons, we did so in the interest of peace. ^{We should pass a resolution that} says that we have always worked and always will work, in the interests of peace.

Toeplitz: It is superfluous to mention that the federation is working for peace; I don't want to create an unpleasant situation. I found that it was my duty to read the resolution. We can say, that we have received and accepted this resolution and add that we always work to further peace.

Langlois: F.I.A.F.'s work has always been a work of peace. I have always opposed propaganda for war by the archives, and I hold the view that war films are always objectionable.

Toeplitz, Miss Barry and Thirifays: One must be allowed to study war films.

Langlois: Apparently we agree about the wording of the text, but not about the tendency; it appears that some of us have misgivings that there is an implied meaning entirely different from that conveyed by the words when taken on their face value.

31
Toeplitz: In my opinion there are certain war propaganda films which are necessary, and it is necessary to allow them.

Lindgren: I propose that it be entered into the Minute Book that the resolution was read and received with sympathy.

Miss Barry: I agree.

Session adjourned at 17.30

Wednesday, September 15, 1948.

Session opened at 11.30.

Toeplitz: The Secretary General M. Langlois is now going to read some resolutions which were agreed upon by us in principle yesterday and the day before yesterday. These resolutions have now been drafted, and we have only to adopt them formally.

Langlois: (reading)

R E S O L U T I O N.

At the F.I.A.F. Conference held in Copenhagen in September 1948, the following countries were represented:

Brazil, Belgium, Italy, Great Britain, Poland, France, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, United States of America and Sweden.

After an examination by the members of their activities in the different countries and their difficulties, and after a discussion of the relations and connections with other international organizations such as Institute of Scientific Cinema, World Union of Documentary Film, International Film Society, ^{UNESCO} Film of Art, etc., and after a discussion of developments and future prospects of the co-operation, the following points were agreed upon:

- A. It should be remembered that the members of the federation are not only institutions for the preservation of films, but also, and primarily, are centres for film culture and film development.
- B. To send a delegate to London to attend the Congress of International Federation of Scientific Film and to study, in cooperation with the members of that organization, the possibilities of establishing archives for scientific films.

To send an observer to participate in International Federation of Educational Film and to accept and thank for the proposal and offer to cooperate made by the World Union of Documentary Film.

To add a new category of members to the federation's constitution in order to strengthen the collaboration of the international organizations working for the same cultural ends.

2

C. To request all the members of the federation to take the necessary steps in their respective countries to apply to their governments for exemption from customs duties in all international agreements whether commercial or cultural. Unrestricted import of films bearing "F.I.A.F." as trade mark.

D. To extend the principles for unlimited loans and request the UNESCO to cooperate in the matter of authors' copyrights.

To work for the formation of an international film pool, to instruct the executive committee to prepare a legal statute for this pool, and temporarily to entrust the management of the first pool to the Secretariat of the F.I.A.F.

E. The pool shall arrange the participation of the members by printing new copies in the way that all film archives shall participate in this work and pay for printing and negatives. These copies shall be joint property and shall temporarily be entrusted to the F.I.A.F. and placed at the disposal of the members by the Secretary of the F.I.A.F.; provided that the film archives, to which the new copies belong, shall be entitled to make repurchases, and no film archive shall be entitled to make new copies except with the permission of the film archive which owns it.

F. In addition, to accept the resolutions proposed by Mr. Brichta, i.e. to give the film archive a copy in order that new copies can be made, and the Czechoslovakia film archive will be responsible for the expenses and work involved. Furthermore, the Czechoslovakian Film Archive shall return the original copy to the film archive which owns it. The next copy can only be made by order of the country which owns the original film. The Czechoslovakian Film Archive will make new negatives and duplicates in return for other films on a meter for meter basis.

G. For the same purpose to recommend the making of two copies of the same film. One of these will be considered as payment for the permanent loan in favour of the archive which owns the films.

Toeplitz: The idea is that if the film archive cannot offer any film in return, the following system for permanent loans is to be recommended: The film archive which receives a copy shall make two copies instead of one. One of these shall be the property of the lending film archive, and the other shall be returned to the film archive which is the owner of the film.

H. To inform all the federation's members that they must send to the Secretary, each month if possible, or in any case every three months, a list of all the planned copies and new negatives to be used by other archives, in order to coordinate the work and avoid duplication.

Lauritzen: One copy may be better than another, and if one country's copies are especially perfect, the report must say so.

I: To print a bulletin from the F.I.A.F. every three months, or, if possible, every month.

J: To extend the historical research work to all film archives and report of the F.I.A.F.'s Secretary about the results of this work, in order to render the publication of the results possible and circulate them.

K. We thank Miss Barry for having sent films that will constitute the beginning of the pool, and appeal to all other members to follow her example.

L. After having investigated the connection between the film clubs and the film archives in all the countries represented here, and having investigated the intercourse with the International Film Society, the members of this Congress have decided to appoint a commission consisting of: Great Britain, Italy, Belgium and Brazil, which commission shall be joined by the President and Secretary of the F.I.A.F. in the capacity of advisory members, and to propose that the International Film Society appoint a similar commission to settle all disputes that may arise between the two organizations. The International Federation of Film Archives express a unanimous desire for a world federation.

Miss Barry: It is not everybody who wants an amalgamation.

Bell: The resolution should only express a desire for an investigation. I call upon the joint commission to examine the possibilities of amalgamating the two organizations. F.I.A.F. hopes to derive many advantages from it.

Langlois: We cannot exercise any control over the film clubs so long as we are not in the same organization. It is legally impossible.

Toeplitz: It must be expressed that we wish it to be so, not merely that we want to explore the possibilities. Of course the question must be examined first, but it should be expressed that we want it to be so.

Bell: We can say that it would be the ideal solution, and at the same time we ask the organization to look into the possibilities.

Sales-Gomes: We agreed to try to settle the disputes, but not about an amalgamation.

Toeplitz: In my opinion an amalgamation is not only desirable, it is necessary. If we leave it to the commission to decide whether the amalgamation is good or bad, we show, that we do not feel certain about it. It is another matter if it is possible at all to arrange it in that way. If not, we must abandon it. In theory I want the two federations to become one because they have identical although we deal with two different aspects of the cause. aims. It is my impression that everybody here agree in theory, and if they don't, I will point to the text of the resolution: It should read: "It appears to be desirable that".

Lindgren: Could we not put in in the following terms: "This Congress agree that such a union would be ideal and desirable," and leave it to the commission to examine the practical possibilities?

Langlois: That would only lead to a new organization. We must have the Amalgamation. Conditions in England are peculiar to that country.

Lindgren: No, it is more complicated than that.

57
Bell: National Film Library is a department under the British film industry.

Lindgren: Yes, we are under the same umbrella, but these two organizations aren't. Couldn't we ask our executive committee to examine the matter.

Toeplitz: We could drop this question altogether.

Gomes and Langlois: No, we must find a way.

Toeplitz: About the first half of this resolution, there is agreement. For the second half I propose: "and call upon the commission to examine the practical possibilities of forming a joint organization".

(adopted)

The congress took note of the report from the Congress for Modern Art at Vroclau and a declaration from the intellectual film workers issued during the Vroclau Congress. This declaration was received with sympathy.

Langlois: Canada has asked for admission to the F.I.A.F. because the National Film Society are about to establish an archive, but I have pointed out that it must be an independent archive with its own statutes.

Toeplitz: We have now finished the resolutions. There are two items left:

1. Financial Reports.
2. Proposals for Amendments and Modifications of the Constitution.

Lindgren: Before I read the financial report I wish to emphasize that I cannot come back to London without a report about amendments, and I therefore suggest that the session be continued until the detailed proposals for amendments are available.

Toeplitz: No member should make private plans for this evening. When the session is resumed this afternoon, we must stay till

everything has been completed.

Lindgren: The financial report has been audited by Mr. Toeplitz, Mr. Thirifay and Mr. Brichta. I propose to deal with income first: Full subscriptions have been received from Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, U.S.A., France and Switzerland. Partial subscription have been received from Belgium, and the balance will be forthcoming later. We received a small subscription from Belgium, but the amount due is set off by the fact that Mrs. Malewski-Malevitch is working for U.S.A. That gives a total annual income of 393,520 Francs.

Thirifays: I wish to explain why Belgium has not yet paid the subscription. The Belgium Ministry for Foreign Affairs had promised to pay, but hasn't done so yet, and when we learned that the federation was in need of money we advanced 15,000 Francs ourselves.

Comencini: I shall bring Italy's subscription to Paris myself.

Toeplitz: Poland has not been able to pay on account of holidays in the national bank.

Lindgren: The expenditures include the following items:

Executive Secretary	Fracs.	240,000.-
Administration	"	33,500.-
Typing	"	10,500.-
Printing	"	5,687.-
Paper (Stationary)	"	4,524.-
Mimeograph & Stenotype	"	28,880.-
Travel Expenses	"	41,167.-
Sundry Expenses	"	2,300.-
Postages	"	7,262.-
Telephone	"	3,535.-
Bank charges	"	230.-

Total Fracs. 377,085.-

Cash in bank	Fracs.	3,875.-
" " hand	"	12,560.-

Total funds held Fracs. 16,435.- equal to
about £ 20. 0. 0.

Lauritzen: Must I pay full subscription, or can I pay a partil
subscription as a new member?

Lindgren: We have only got Frs. 16,000.- left to cover expenses for the next three months, and our monthly expenditure is Frs. 40,000.-. Belgium, Poland, Brazil and Italy have not paid yet, and as we must have money, we ask you to do your utmost. The subscription money falls due by December. New members must pay by the New Year. For Sweden, the subscription must be paid for the following year (1949).

Session adjourned until 16, 15.

Wednesday, September 15, 1948.

Afternoon Session at 15.00.

Toeplitz: Gentlemen ! We have a lot of work on hand, and I wish that it may proceed rapidly. You have all received the British proposals which have been distributed to us. Proposals have also been received from Belgium, Sweden, France and Poland. I suggest that we limit our endeavours to agreeing about the general outline of our new statutes. We have neither the time, nor the possibilities to couch the provisions in legal terms. That is my reason for suggesting that we only try to agree about the main principles, upon which the precise legal phrasing may be left to the bureau, which may obtain assistance from a lawyer.

Let me begin with an introduction. The federation was formed in 1938, and the statutes adopted then are therefore out of date. Consequently it is necessary for us to draw up a text to cover the needs of the present day. We shall proceed in the following manner: I shall read the original text which it is intended to amend, and next I shall read the proposals received, and I think that this procedure can also be the introduction to the draft of our resolution.

Article 1. is read. No amendments received.

Article 2. is read followed by the British amendment.

I must say that personally I prefer the French wording: "intéressé par l'histoire et le technique du film"; on the other hand the English words: "supported by public or private funds" are better, but I must admit that I do not fully realize what makes the difference.

Bell: There is very great difference.

Langlois: It is a difference in ideas.

Toeplitz: The old statute is better in regard to the expression "intéressé par l'histoire et l'esthétique du film".

Lindgren: What we want changed is the expression "private collection".

A private collection belongs to one person only.

Miss Barry: One cannot say that an archive shall be "public".

Toeplitz: An archive ought to be an institution with legal statutes. If, for instance, the French archive has no legalized statutes, it is a private one.

Langlois: It is easy to imagine a situation where an archive has no legalized statutes. In 1936, we in France nearly came outside the province of the law.

Toeplitz: I do not think the problem is a big one. I suppose the whole question turns upon getting hold of a good, legal adviser.

Miss Barry: The F.I.A.F. have no legal statutes, and I think we can hardly require that of the members.

Toeplitz: "Public institution" does not imply the same thing in English as in French. I think that the best solution would be to leave it to a French lawyer with a knowledge of English language to find a suitable formula for this expression. What we must have is a formula under which we can exclude from our organization such film museums as have no "legal existence".

Miss Barry: Honestly, I did not know that we had a "legal existence" in our federation.

Toeplitz: No, we haven't; there is no rule in international law dealing with international "legal persons".

Miss Barry: Why can't we get along by ourselves, then?

Toeplitz: In international work it is necessary that an organization should inspire general confidence, and for this end we must have statutes. We cannot work with UNESCO and other organizations if we have no legal basis ourselves. It is immaterial whether an archive be supported by public or private funds.

Langlois: The English text has the word "supported". An archive need not be supported at all.

Toeplitz: No film archive can be imagined, which is not supported by some foundation or other.

Lindgren: But a state archive must also be called state-supported. One can say "public institutions supported by private funds". Let me say that the purpose of the statutes in 1946 was to exclude private film collectors from becoming members.

Miss Barry: Why should they be excluded? We can get a lot of films from private persons collecting films as a hobby. Many of them have got rare films, and why shouldn't we accept them?

Toeplitz: I suggest that we retain the French text from 1938 and leave out the 1946-text which was not written for our organization. We must also cooperate with private film people; it would be inexpedient to exclude them, because they have many valuable films. Does everyone agree that private persons should not be excluded? We delete the 1946-amendment: In no case can a private collection be regarded as a film library.

Bell: The English proposal is an attempt to merge the 1939 statutes into the 1946-amendments. I think we ought to state that it is not a good thing to have, say 2,000 films locked up in one building. Then our organization will assume a resemblance to a bloc organization. I propose the following addition to section 2: "...and available to the public".

Toeplitz: We must establish the fact that the film archives must be available to the public.

Langlois: May I just mention that there was no admittance to the French archive during the occupation; but of course that was an extraordinary situation, and otherwise I am in agreement with Mr. Bell's proposal.

Bell: It must be a stipulation that they are collections available to the public. We cannot have any amateur as a member. I suggest that we add: "private collections available to the public".

Toeplitz: Mr. Bell's addition to section 2 of the 1938-text is adopted. (To be added after the first sentence.)

We now proceed to section 3. "The purpose of the federation shall be to help the archives to preserve films. The purpose of this international federation shall be to develop a close collaboration and facilitate international exchanges of historical, educational and artistic films".

Langlois: Couldn't we add: "with a view to the dissemination of film culture" ?

Miss Barry: The phrase "Entre les différentes cinemathèques nationales" should be amended to "Entre les cinemathèques des pays respectives". My archive is not national, and I certainly would not like to be expelled on that score.

Bell: "Entre ses membres" would probably be better; it would render any misunderstanding impossible.

Toeplitz: So we have two amendments to section 3 from the original text.

(Both adopted.)

Toeplitz: (Reads section 4.) Here is the British amendment (which is read). As far as I can see there is a certain inconsistency in the British amendment, inasmuch as s.9 is retained, and yet the same text is inserted in s.4. I propose that the French wording about membership be retained and the British amendment be left out, as follows: "Every film archive wishing to become a member of the International Federation etc. ...". I would like to compare the British amendment with the old French text (see s.9 of the British amendment). Another important addition must be a report on the activities of the archive. When we speak of membership we must mention the way in which the members belong to the federation.

Lindgren: The non-commercial character of the federation should be defined.

Langlois: There must be a misunderstanding here. s.4 was drawn up under conditions which still exist; it does not deal with conditions for joining the federation, but aims at defining the character of the institutions which are eligible as members. Instead of the said institutions, s.4 should state: "les membres fondateurs". To s.3 could be added that other film archives (for instance for scientific films, or instructional films) cannot become members.

Toeplitz: It appears to me that we can omit the beginning of s.4 because we have already elsewhere a provision excluding archives with commercial purposes. The final sentence of s.4 is the most important and should be retained.

Lindgren: That is expressed in s.2.

Toeplitz: Yes, Mr. Lindgren is right. I propose that the first sentence of s.4 be deleted, and that we retain the last sentence which, however, will have to be placed elsewhere, but the Secretariat will see to that.

(Vote - agreement)

Toeplitz: (reads s.5) We have not received any amendments to this section. The British proposal wants it moved to another place, but it is not our task to discuss places.

Bell: I suggest the following addition: "...shall be entitled to attend the meetings, but not to vote". That all comes under the heading of "membership".

Toeplitz: Do we agree about this proposal?

(adopted)

It will be placed later.

Toeplitz: (reads s.6) The British proposal aims at merging s.6 and 9 and amend the whole text. I would like to advance a proposal for an amendment in connection with s.6. There is a certain lack of lucidity here. What is meant by congress, general meeting, and by conseil d'administration as the original French text has it, and the

English board? My suggestion is: We only want two bodies within the federation: The general meeting and the board of directors. My reasons for making this proposal are that we are not many members, and in future we shall probably only number between 20 and 30. I do not see the necessity of having three official governing bodies: The general meeting, governing body and president bureau. Two governing bodies will suffice: 1) the general meeting, convened once a year, to which each country shall send a delegate, and 2) governing body or board of directors or executive committee, which must be a little bigger than hitherto, consisting of 7 members instead of 4 and replacing conceil d'administration. The general meeting elect 7 persons to become members of the Board of Directors. Why elect 11 persons who again elect 4, when we are only 20 in all?

Langlois: In principle I agree with Mr. Toeplitz, but I have a remark to make. I think that the F.I.A.F. should only have two bodies, so that we call conceil d'administration general meeting and extend the Bureau so that it will correspond to a meeting of the board of directors. There is, however, a point which we must define in our administrative regulations, namely the persons admitted to the F.I.A.F. as observers. They should not be able to exercise any control over the affairs of the federation, and in future provision must therefore be made for the institution of one congress where members only are admitted, and another to which all are admitted.

Toeplitz: Do we all fall in with that? To make it easier, it is suggested that the statutes only mention general meeting and that the congress be dealt with by the "book of rules". There are two points in the French text which are not included in the British amendment. We suggest that each country shall organize the Congress.

Bell: No fixed rules should be given for the place where the congress should be held. For instance it would be quite impossible to hold a congress in America.

Toeplitz: So we retain s.6. but transfer it to the book of rules.

Toeplitz: (reads s.7). It is suggested to place s.7 together with 6 a and 6 b of the British amendment.

(adopted)

(reads s.8). The English edition says: "The General Meeting shall examine the report of the Governing Body and the accounts. It shall receive a report from each member of the federation. It shall elect members and officers of the Governing Body, the officers consisting of a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Honorary Secretary and Treasurer. The General Meeting alone shall be competent to make any exchanges in the constitution."

It is my view that we should prefer the British amendment, because it mentions the budget and report from the Governing Body. We thus replace the French s.8 by the British amendment 6 c to and including the word federation.

(Vote - adopted)

(reads s.9). To this has been received a Polish amendment, and the British amendment no.9. I propose that the Polish amendment be discussed rather than the English proposal because the Polish text is more comprehensive. My reason for making this suggestion is that I prefer that every film museum wanting to become a member of the Federation shall apply to the Committee in writing accompanied by following information:

1. Statutes of the archive.
2. Its relations with the government.
3. Report on its activities.

All applications are to be addressed to the Governing Body which is the first instance and shall pass it on. It is not the institution which will submit the application to the General Meeting. The stipulation that it must be sent in 3 months prior to the date of the General meeting is unnecessary. Do you agree to replace the French s.9 by the Polish text ?

(adopted).

(reads s.10). I propose that it be replaced by the British amendment s.4, s.s.2 and that ss.4 a and 4 b be added. I propose that we expel members on account of various violations, but they must be serious ones, and the expulsion must be passed by a majority of 2/3.

Moreover, I propose that the British amendment 6 d be added under the French s.10. The final result will thus be that we replace the French s.10 by the British amendments 4a and 4b, and with the Polish addition of a majority of 2/3, and that we add the British amendment 6d.

(Vote - adopted).

(reads s.11). This is a very important section. We have decided to change the composition of the board of directors and we must therefore amend this section. We must have a name for this conseil d'administration. In French it may be called "Comité directeur" and in English "Executive Committee", but I think we can have that decided by our legal adviser. A very important point is the number of members in this committee. I should say that it would be best with a larger number than that of the hitherto corresponding committee: 7 instead of 4.

Langlois: I propose that the number of members in the committee be agreed upon by each general meeting according to requirements and circumstances to be taken into consideration. In Paris, for instance, the board of the institute has a varying number of members each year. Would it not be the best plan to write: The business is conducted by a comité directeur, the number of which shall be fixed by each meeting.

Bell: No, the statutes should state the numbers of members of the committee.

Miss Barry: Why fix the number?

Toeplitz: To know how many to appoint. Langlois's proposal is dangerous because we might easily get ourselves into a situation where two men could decide everything.

Toeplitz: Shouldn't we fix the number at 7 in the statutes and then decide in our internal regulations how the tasks should be divided?

Bell: With us the correct thing would be to fix such things in the regulations.

Langlois: I think we should agree on 7, but it should be included in the regulations because then it could be changed later.

Lauritzen: Why not fix a minimum and maximum number?

Toeplitz: Excellent.

Bell: That's what we do at home.

Toeplitz: Shall we say between 4 and 8?

Bell: Can't we say: The Congress appoints a president, a vice-president, a secretary general and a treasurer and not more than 6 committee members?

Toeplitz: Let us say from 4 to 10.

Langlois: We must necessarily have a vice secretary general and a vice treasurer. If one of the two appointed officers falls ill there must be a deputy, and if the secretary general does not live in Paris there must be someone who can deputize for him. Besides we may easily, for diplomatic reasons, be compelled to have 3 vice presidents and then the committee will become too big. In my opinion the committee should be composed of a minimum and a maximum. Let us say: The Congress shall appoint a comité directeur consisting of a president, a vice president, a secretary general and a treasurer, and the general meeting may increase the number up to 10.

Bell: They are appointed for one year and may be re-elected for a new term.

Toeplitz: Instead of s.11, the final text will read as follows: The general meeting appoints for one year a comité directeur consisting of

1. president,
2. vice president,
3. secretary general,
4. treasurer.

All members are eligible for re-election. The general meeting may increase the number of members to 10 and appoint others such as

vice presidents, vice secretaries general, etc.

Emery: I suggest that we say up to 9 on account of the voting.

(adopted)

Lauritzen: A president should not be eligible for re-election more than two or three times. Should a president be allowed to go on and on and on ?

Bell: In England we prefer the system of retirement by rotation.

Brusendorff: No, there should be a limit to the number of times re-elections may take place. Twice ought to be maximum.

Toeplitz: Well, if you like, we can add "not more than twice".

Brichta: Yes, twice.

Langlois: I suppose we are sufficiently in control of our own affairs to unseat a president, even if he wants to stick to his saddle ?

Toeplitz: There will be no addition, then. The last sentence of s.11 is retained. s.12 and 13 are transferred to the book of rules. s.14 likewise to the book of rules, s.15 is omitted. We have now reached the additions. The British amendment s.10b.

Langlois: I do not agree to the wording, because the proposal was prepared at a time when a bureau existed. Members of the committee must be allowed to make decisions themselves, even if they have to submit them later to the general meeting for confirmation.

Toeplitz: "The committee shall be entitled to make decisions in the following instances", which we can enumerate, then.

Bell: The committee should not be allowed to become stronger than the general meeting. I suggest: "The committee shall conduct the business of the F.I.A.F. between the general meetings."

Toeplitz: We have then agreed to adopt s.10b with the said amendment, and we can proceed to 10c of the British amendment. It concerns financial matters (s.10c is read). One of the proposals of

the amendment allows support to be received also from the government. I do not like that. Instead of "government" we should write "members". Personally, I think that the amount should be fixed in Swiss Francs and not in Pound Sterling. Incidentally, Mr. Langlois has pointed out that the last sentence of s.10 should be omitted. I quite agree and the wording of section 10 as finally adopted therefore reads: "The federation shall be financed by annual contributions in Swiss Francs from members. The federation may also receive grants-in-aid from members and other interested organizations". We thus leave out the last sentence of the amendment.

(Vote - adopted).

We can then proceed to s.10d (read); this is a standing, ordinary adoption in all statutes of all institutions.

Miss Barry: The Danish legal adviser points out that the consequence of requiring the presence of $2/3$ of the members at a meeting where a proposal for the dissolution of the federation has been advanced, - and if only $2/3$ of those present vote for the dissolution - may be that a dissolution may be passed by a combination of members which does not represent 50 % of the total number of members. This awkward consequence may be eliminated by fixing the figures at respectively $3/4$ and $3/4$.

Toeplitz: Do we agree? Incidentally, the same thing applies to 10e. And 10e and 10f are merged into one. We have thus passed 10 d.e. and f.

(adopted)

Langlois: I am afraid we have overlooked a very important question, namely about the temporary membership.

Toeplitz: Something about that must be included in the statutes, for instance: "The Federation may admit archives as temporary members for a period of two years". The statutes should also mention "provisional membership". The general meeting should be able to grant that, if there is a small archive which will not be able to pay a contribution for some years. I propose that we adopt the following: "The general meeting may give provisional membership, but

only for two years".

Bell: The statutes should also allow for "associated members" for institutions with the same cultural ideas. They should be allowed to speak in meeting, but have no right to vote.

Toeplitz: I think we shall have to agree upon that in each individual case, but we can vote at once about the organizations to be invited.

Langlois: UNESCO, World Union of Documentary Films, Les Cinema Scientifique. I propose the following wording: The committee is temporarily authorized to admit these organizations as correspondent members, if it finds it expedient. Incidentally, it goes without saying that we should also invite the International Federation of Film Societies.

Toeplitz: We can now go on. The Swedish proposal about subscription will be dealt with by the Committee. 10g is not good. I should prefer that the general meeting decide which language are to be the official ones.

Langlois: No, it shall be expressly stated that it shall not be German.

Bell: Let me suggest: "The official languages of the federation shall be French and English or such others as shall be decided by the general meeting.

(session suspended for 5 minutes.)

13

Wednesday, September 15, 1948.

(Evening session).

Toeplitz: Our Agenda comprises:

- 1) Discussion of statutes.
- 2) Decision on the amount of the 1949-subscriptions.
- 3) Time and place for next general meeting.
- 4) Appointment of executive committee.
- 5) Any other business.

If you all agree, we can start right now. Book of Rules will deal with a large number of miscellaneous items, and I therefore propose that we discuss now the question of non-commercial film shows, because it is important that this question should be decided already now. The reason is that we must establish a firm basis for the commission formed to negotiate with the Documentary Film Organization. So I suggest that we confine our discussion to that question. The other items in connection with the statutes are to be referred to the executive committee. Incidentally, I have only received two proposals in regard to that. Do we all agree to postpone other discussions?

Lindgren: There is one point I would like to bring up. We have to travel long distances to attend the meetings, and I therefore consider it of great importance that the agenda is very exhaustive. All members must be given a chance to prepare proposals in advance.

1. The agenda must be sent out in good time before a meeting.
2. The agenda must be sent out before the general meeting to enable us to be fully conversant with its items.
3. The agenda should be very detailed.
4. It should be accompanied by all papers and documents.

We have only received the agenda, but no documents. We want to be absolutely precise in all matters. This congress was not so well prepared as it could have been. If we had received all the relevant documents, we could have got through the meeting in a much

14
shorter time, and had time for much more work.

My firm have put a lot of questions to me in connection with the agenda, but I have been unable to answer them because the agenda was incomplete.

I am instructed by the Library to bring up this matter. We are all responsible for the best possible results of the meetings. The long journeys and heavy expenses involved by the meetings make it imperative that all necessary preparations have been made in the best possible manner.

This is not intended as a criticism of anybody in particular, but I am saying it because the committee in London were somewhat disappointed when they saw the agenda for this meeting, and future meetings will give more results if the problems coming up for discussion are known in advance.

Langlois: I second that.

Miss Barry: Mr. Lindgren is right. I feel responsible for the hasty manner in which this congress was planned. I had no money for the journey until after July 1, 1948, and consequently I could not know if and when the meeting could be held, and we are grateful to Denmark for undertaking to hold the meeting at such short notice. I regret that the meeting and the plans for its work have not been properly planned, but we hope that it will not happen again.

Langlois: There is another important question in this connection: It is necessary that we should attend the congresses all of us. That should be our first consideration, and the arrangements should enable us all, as far as possible, to attend at the most convenient time.

Lindgren: I agree with Miss Barry and I, too, wish to thank Mr. Brusendorff. I am not thinking of this meeting in particular. Complaints have been made over poor arrangement of the meetings after every meeting since the war.

15
Toeplitz: Similar organizing difficulties have been experienced by all international conferences. We are all in concord with Mr. Lindgren's criticism, and we will do our best to avoid such criticism in future. We must not forget that Mrs. Malewski-Malevitch did not take up her duties here until January 1, 1948. We will finish this little discussion by promising each other that things shall be better next time.

I propose that we proceed by discussing the question of non-commerciality. First I will read s.3 of the French statutes of 1946. No amendment of this section is intended, but Mr. Langlois has proposed an addition of a s.3B to the effect that the number of payments be increased to 10 instead of 4, on condition that at least 12 shows are given each year.

Thirifays: That will facilitate matters greatly for the film clubs. This is the question we discussed yesterday or the day before yesterday. Some of the film clubs demand that we delete s.3 altogether, but I assume that you want this section kept because it covers us against the film producers. If that section were to be deleted, my proposal for an amendment would be cancelled.

Toeplitz: We must keep s.3.

Thirifays: The question is of vital importance to the Belgian Film Archive. The whole problem in connection with the film clubs would be solved if s.3 be deleted.

Langlois: I can't see that your view point is right. The French film industry proposed that we should arrange a show in the Chaillot Palace in such a way that payment should be made at the entrance, and the income was to be ours. We did not think that we could do so, and we did not want to establish a precedence. In any case I think that shows, where payments are made at the entrance, should be avoided.

Bell: Perhaps the words "in general" might be introduced in s.3B and afterwards it could be said that if local circumstances warranted it, the archive could modify the regulations.

16
Langlois: No, we must know exactly when we can and when we can't, and with the words "in general" we would be asked time and again, if exemptions could be granted. In that way a precedence would be established.

Bell: One of the things we hope for is a cinema in connection with the Film Library, where non-stop shows could be given. For these shows money will be collected at the entrance. Such shows are not commercial.

Thirifays: Could an element of uncertainty not be introduced in the proposal?

Toeplitz: May I ask a question, please? Can archives be allowed to give shows against payment at all?

Langlois: It is permitted by law with us, but the industry only allow such shows to be given when they are shown in the archive itself. The principle can not be extended to cover the clubs, too.

Toeplitz: We seem to agree about the principle, but not about the words. Can't we agree that the archives are entitled to give shows against payment?

Langlois: In the French Film Archive we made an exhibition with payment at the entrance and combined it with a show of film to which the admittance was free. The fiscal authorities, however, considered the whole arrangement as a cinema show and claimed an enormous tax. The result was that we were obliged to place a collection box at the entrance, and thus complied with the statutes of the F.I.A.F.

Toeplitz: I suggest that we adopt Mr. Bell's proposal to the effect that s.3 can be amended to suit local requirements. Incidentally, your procedure was a violation of the F.I.A.F. rules.

Langlois: The money in the box was used to pay the taxes.

Thirifays: The background of my proposal was that such a thing should be allowable, but s.3 should still be retained for the producers to go by.

12
Langlois: It is always possible to reach an understanding with the fiscal authorities. If s.3 were to be abandoned it would mean for us that we had to abandon the possibility of giving film performances. Besides, I can't see why we should give up the non-commercial principle merely to suit our own convenience.

Toeplitz: Then let us keep s.3B and, as a concession to the film clubs, allow up to ten payments.

Miss Barry: I can agree to that.

Brichta: And it is necessary when the films belong to the archive.

Toeplitz: No, the films are merely deposited in the archives. Can we all vote for that rule?

(adopted)

3c can remain unaltered.

Langlois: We have already discussed 3D. It is unlawful, and must remain in force.

(Vigorous protests)

Toeplitz: I must admit that we can hardly demand to be shown the accounts of another institution, and we had better insert than when lending a film, the individual film archive must reserve the right to examine the accounts and is responsible to the F.I.A.F. for their non-commercial character.

(all agree)

There is full agreement about s.4, and that brings us to the end of the regulations.

Langlois: May I read aloud what Mr. Brichta has written on a little slip of paper to me, and make certain alterations during the reading, necessitated by a minor misunderstanding on the part of Mr. Brichta. Lumiere died this year. On that occasion the City of Prague has decided to give his name to one of its streets. Mr. Brichta has therefore proposed that we in our federation should send one or more negatives of the films that Lumiere gave to the French Film Archive to Denmark which should be the only country in a posi-

tion to make copies of these special films. Mr. Brichta's mistake is that we in France dispose of the necessary apparatus to make such copies, because Monsieur Lumiere's heirs have given France their films together with apparatus which enable us to copy and send out these films, and I hereby offer such copies to the individual member states in conformity with the rules proposed by Mr. Brichta himself.

Toeplitz: I shall now proceed to the subscriptions. Mr. Langlois has proposed that the subscription be fixed at an amount of 50,000 French Francs converted at the rate of exchange of French Francs against Swiss Francs at the time when the vote was taken. That means one year ago. We must fix a date for the payment. Couldn't we fix an amount already now, payable in Swiss Francs, and then leave it to each country to calculate the countervalue in its own currency?

Bell: Let us fix the date of the payment of the contribution now. It must be during the first three months. I prefer the official rate of exchange on September 12, 1948. In what currency shall it be paid? The Pound may fall at any time and is very sensitive. The Executive Secretary can work out this problem. The amount has been fixed at 50,000 French Francs at the rate of exchange quoted on September 12, 1948, equal to 700 Swiss Francs if that amount is sufficient.

Toeplitz: It must be very difficult to estimate the budget for the expenditure of the federation in advance, but couldn't we use the previous budget as a basis for the estimate? I have a solution to offer: The members shall pay a minimum subscription of 700 Swiss Francs, and any contributions beyond that will be gratefully accepted.

Miss Barry: You are deceiving yourselves. That amount is too small. Last year I paid 450 Dollars, and this year I have only got to pay 166 Dollars.

Toeplitz: I suggest that the subscription shall be payable during the first three months, January, February and March.

19

Comencini: Is it possible to include a provision to the effect that the subscription may be paid in two or three instalments?

Toeplitz: That question has been referred to the Executive Committee. In regard to Mrs. Malewski-Malevitch's misgivings about rises in the cost of living in France, it may be off-set by an increase in the number of members. Let us say 700 or 800 Swiss Francs, then.

(protests)

All right then, we fix a minimum subscription of 700 Swiss Francs and hope that the rich archives will pay more.

Lauritzen: In regard to the subscription I propose that instead of everybody paying the same amount, the contributions should be fixed according to the size of the country or to the size of its film industry. I have been asked to bring up this question, but I understand that all seem to be satisfied with the present system, and I shall therefore refrain from expatiating on it, and I withdraw my proposal.

Toeplitz: Mr. Lauritzen's proposal is right in principle, but it is impossible to work it out to-night. In that way countries with a small film industry come to pay a very small contribution, and on the other hand some countries will have to pay more to make up for the small contributions from the small countries. In Uruguay, for instance, there is a small film library receiving large financial support from rich people, and that film library would probably come to pay more than Sweden. It would be better to discuss the size of the film archives and the nature of their financial support. That must be worked out very carefully for each archive.

Lauritzen: What am I going to tell my company, then?

Toeplitz: We promise to revert to the question next year. The committee will consider the question and submit its deliberations to the next general meeting. At the present time we can't change this. We shall now proceed to elect the Executive Committee. Mr. Langlois has proposed secret ballot. First we shall elect the President, next the Vice President, then the Secretary and finally the Treasurer.

20

After that we shall decide how many shall be elected to the executive committee. Another question is whether we shall vote for countries or persons. Each archive can send a person of their own choice. Another question again is how to vote for the candidates.

Bell: We must nominate and have "scrutinizers".

(Madame Malewski-Malevitch and Mr. Bell were appointed).

Langlois: Let us agree about secret ballot and elect officers first and then decide how many to appoint in addition to them.

Toeplitz: Shall we vote according to persons or archives?

Bell: Archives.

Toeplitz: Shall we vote for the candidates according as they are proposed and make a list of them. We can take one candidate at a time, and if nobody else is proposed, the candidate is considered elected. Only if we receive other proposals than those first nominated will it be necessary to have secret ballot.

Langlois: I propose that we elect new officers all the way round. It would not be a good thing if the general impression should prevail that we have the same persons always.

Lindgren: I second Mr. Langlois's proposal but certain of the officers must remain to ensure continuity in the activities.

Thirifays: The present officers have done excellent work, and I am afraid it would make a bad impression if all the old members retired at the same time. It would mean a loss to the F.I.A.F. on account of their reputation and good external connections.

Langlois: I withdraw my proposal.

Bell: I propose Poland for the presidential post. If no other proposals are made, Poland will be elected.

Thirifays: I propose U.S.A.

Brichta: We are electing persons, not countries.

Toeplitz: Yes we do not vote for countries, but persons.

Bell: I suggest that a letter be sent out from the Secretary General to the archives of the different countries, requesting them to send as their representatives the persons we already know.

Emery: Now let us get on with the election.

Toeplitz: I feel a little anxious about accepting the post as president. You know that I come from a country where the archive is still in its embryo stage, but otherwise I think that it might be a good thing for our ideals if the election came to affect a young and strong film archive. I am therefore prepared to accept the post if Miss Barry will give her assurance that she cannot remain in office, because she has performed great and fine work. Otherwise I shall propose her for the presidential post.

Miss Barry: Is it necessary to give such an assurance ? I wish the federation every possible success, and the young people should be given a chance.

Thirifays: Personally I want Miss Barry as president, but on the other hand I must admit that the excellent way in which Mr. Toeplitz has conducted our negotiations qualifies him for the post.

Langlois: I have mentioned my desire to resign from my post for the benefit of younger organizations, but apart from the desirability of continuity, it is absolutely necessary that the President in any case be a new person. But could we not somehow keep Miss Barry in a leading post ? To appoint her as Honorary President would mean to put her out of active work, but we could appoint her as Vice President with an extra title, which would also make it possible to pay some attention to continuity.

Thirifays: We have two important posts in our organization: the President and the Secretary General. Mr. Toeplitz could become president, Miss Barry secretary general, and Mr. Langlois vice president.

Langlois: I could agree to become vice secretary general if Miss Barry became secretary general.

Toeplitz: For the presidential post we have only one proposal, namely Toeplitz. - Any other proposals? - No - (Toeplitz elected.)
Proposals for the post as vice president, please?

Lindgren: Denmark.

Brusendorff: Miss Barry.

Toeplitz: Denmark.

Langlois: Mr. Comencini.

Miss Barry: I do not wish to be elected for this post. I propose Mr. Lindgren.

Lindgren: I am much obliged, but I don't think I can accept. I have been treasurer for such a long time. I want to be helpful, but I cannot accept it.

Thirifays: I think we cannot accept your refusal.

Toeplitz: Could you not reconsider it?

Lindgren: I don't like the idea of re-electing all the old members.

Brusendorff: We ask you to accept the post, as Miss Barry cannot accept election.

(Lindgren elected)

Langlois: For the post as Secretary General I propose Miss Barry.

Toeplitz: So do I.

Miss Barry: I must admit that I would like to remain on the committee, but I feel that I ought to propose somebody else.

Everybody: You must accept.

Miss Barry: O.K.

Toeplitz: As treasurer I propose Denmark.

23
Everybody: So do I.

Brusendorff: May I propose Belgium.

(Denmark elected)

Brusendorff: I shall do my best.

Lindgren: Now that we have elected four and only got one new member I ask permission to retire. I cannot see that I am indispensable, but I am ready to lend a hand if I should be wanted as a reserve.

Langlois: Yes, but you represent the British Film Library. Impossible. The election is over.

Toeplitz: We need a vice secretary general, another vice president and a vice treasure.

Lindgren: I propose Belgium, Brazil and Italy.

Lauritzen: Could the managers of the archives not decide for themselves whom to send out, so that we only elect a country.

Toeplitz: I think we should elect three members to the committee. I propose Mr. Langlois as vice secretary general.

Lindgren: And Italy as second vice president, Brazil as vice treasurer.

Gomes: I would like to have Brazil replaced by Uruguay. I think we ought to show a kindness to our friends from that country.

Toeplitz: It is impossible, because Uruguay cannot say if they are ready to accept their election.

Langlois: If Brazil refuses to accept the election I think Mr. Thirifays should be elected. The kindness Mr. Gomes mentioned towards Uruguay can be shown by accepting the member from that country as representative from Rio della Plata; I think that will please him very much.

Toeplitz: Then we have: second secretary general Mr. Langlois; vice president Mr. Comencini; vice treasurer Mr. Gomes.

74

Miss Barry: We must send a telegram to Monsieur Tchekoff of the Film Ministry in the U.S.S.R. saying that we are interested in ^{a cooperation with} them, and achieve, if possible, that they become interested in us.

Toeplitz: We must agree about the place and date of our next general meeting.

Comencini: My committee have authorized me to propose Italy as the place of the next meeting. The Congress will then be held in Rome, and we have good reasons to hope for support from our government.

Toeplitz: We thank you Mr. Comencini, and shall be happy to go to Italy. What date do you suggest?

Comencini: Couldn't we name the month only? If so, I would prefer September or October.

Langlois: Couldn't we make it coincide with the biennale at Venice?

Miss Barry: No.

Toeplitz: No, I am against that, too; then we would rather have October. In Rome in October, then.

That brings us to: Any Other Business.

Emery: We have experienced great difficulties with our film archive, and it is possible that we shall move it to Lausanne. So do not be surprised if you hear that our office has moved from Bâle to Lausanne. It will still be the same office.

Lindgren: Before we end the meeting I propose that we all pass a vote of thanks to Mr. Brusendorff and his staff for the cordial hospitality we have received here. I have enjoyed my stay in this country. We must also thank the President for his great work.

(applause)

Miss Barry: I would also like to express my appreciation of the great work performed and also to thank Mr. Toeplitz for his work yesterday and today.

Session terminated at 22.00