

**FIAF XXVI Lyon
Minutes**

FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE
DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION
OF FILM ARCHIVES

m i n u t e s

XXVith CONGRESS AND
GENERAL MEETING

26th to 29th May, 1970

LYONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AGENDA of the General Meeting	2 - 3
Approval of the Accounts for 1969	14
Approval of the Preceding Minutes	10
BUDGET for 1971	47
COMMISSIONS : Report of Preservation Commission	23
Report of Documentation Commission	55
Report of Cataloguing Commission	55
CONGRESS : Date and place of future Congresses	54
COPYRIGHT problems	53
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE : Discharge of outgoing Ex. Committee	14
Election of Officers and Ex. Committee	50
FIAF SECRETARIAT : Work of Secretariat	49
INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS : Relations with other I. Org.	52
Introduction	1
IRIS BARRY : Homage to Iris Barry	7
MEMBERSHIP questions : Zagreb resolution	32
Admission of new members	37
Renewal of membership	45
Other membership problems	47
MODIFICATION OF STATUTES AND RULES	31
OPEN FORUM	25 - 31
Other Business	58
PROJECTS : 1. Projects and Publications under Way	15
a) Preservation	23
b) Filmography	15
c) Bibliography	17
d) Miscellaneous	18
2. New Projects	56
REPORTS : President's Report	10
Secretary-General's Report	11
Treasurer's Report	12
Auditor's Report	14
Status and Voting Powers of Members	5 - 6
For TABLE OF ANNEXES, see next page.	

TABLE OF ANNEXES

1. Documents on the Château Lumière
2. Programme du Congrès
3. List of Participants
4. Agenda
5. Financial Report / Rapport Financier
6. List of Projects and Publications under Way
Liste des Projets et Publications en cours.
7. Plan for a Manual for Film Archives (Mr. Pogacic)
Plan d'un Manuel pour les Archives du Film (Mr. Pogacic)
8. FIAF Members' Filmservice : The Pool.
9. Report of the Preservation Committee
10. Proposals to modify the Statutes and Rules of FIAF
Propositions de modification des Statuts et Règlements de la FIAF.
11. Statement on FIAF membership, Zagreb Resolution.
Résolution de Zagreb concernant la qualité de membre de la FIAF.
12. Statement made by Mrs Van Leer.
13. Budget proposal for 1971 / Projet de budget pour 1971
14. Augmentation des cotisations / A rise in the annual subscription.
15. Report of the FIAF Commission on Documentation
16. Report of the FIAF Commission on Cataloguing
17. New Project : Film maker's Bibliography (Ottawa)
18. New Project of the Jugoslovenska Kinoteka (three propositions)
19. New Project : Specialized Study Seminars (Mrs Suomela)
20. New Project : Establishment of an international translation bureau (Mr Kula)
21. New Project : Embryo 2 (Staatliches Filmarchiv der D.D.R.)
22. New Project : Inquiry into existing equipment and methods of printing
historic film sizes (Staatliches Filmarchiv der D.D.R.)
23. New Project : Study on copying variable density (Staatliches Filmarchiv)
24. New Project : Collection of dupe negatives of classic films accessible
to all member archives (Mr Kula)
25. List of other planned projects
26. Report on the annual bibliography of books on the cinema (Mr Fernoaga)
27. Joint declaration of the 3 United States Archives.
28. Presentation of primitive films by the Rumanian Archive
29. A machine to restore damaged perforations on 35mm films (J. Stenklev)
30. Les amis de Georges Méliès
31. Le Musée du Cinéma de Lyon et ses collections.

INTRODUCTION

On Tuesday morning, 26th May, M. LeFranc made a welcoming speech to the delegates. He took the place of M. Cousté, President of the Société Lumière, who unfortunately was unable to be present.

During the week, some very pleasant social events took place.

After the Press Conference on Tuesday morning, 26th May, a toast was offered to the delegates of FIAF by the Société Lumière. Everyone was able to meet and talk in the grounds of the Château Lumière during this very short, but agreeable reception.

During the afternoon the delegates were invited to a Reception at the Town Hall, by the Lord Mayor, M. Pradel. On this occasion, everyone was able to meet several local celebrities who were present.

In the evening a Gala was held at the Palais des Congrès to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the cinema. The public showing included extracts of Lumière Films and lasted for four hours. M. Jean Vivié introduced the Gala Performance and a certain number of celebrities were present.

On Wednesday evening, 27th May, a visit to the old town of Lyon was arranged. It was a guided tour given in English and French and included visiting several old houses.

On Thursday evening, 28th May, all the delegates were invited to the private house of M. Paul Génard, President of the Cinema Museum of Lyon, to see his collection, which is the foundation of the Museum now being established.

Saturday, 30th May, will be a memorable occasion. For those delegates who had not left Lyon, there was a day outing by coach into the heart of the Beaujolais country. During the day a visit was made to La Maison Ampère, and everyone stopped to do some wine tasting at two private vineyards. Lunch was arranged for the delegates at Limas, and at Salles a visit was made to an old monastery. To end the day was a very interesting visit to the French Car Museum at the Castle of Rochetaillée-sur-Soane. The whole of this trip was offered to the delegates by the Cinémathèque de Toulouse.

(DRAFT) AGENDA OF THE XXVI GENERAL MEETINGFIRST SESSION (OPEN)Tuesday, 26th May
11.00 to 13.00 h.

- 1) Confirmation of the status and voting rights of the members, present or represented.
- 2) Adoption of the agenda.
- 3) Approval of the minutes of the preceding General Meeting.
- 4) Report of the President.
- 5) Report of the Secretary General.
- 6) Report of the Treasurer.
- 7) Report of the Auditors.
- 8) Approval of the accounts for 1969 and discharge of the administration of the outgoing Executive Committee.

SECOND SESSION (OPEN)Tuesday, 26th May
15.00 to 17.00 h.

- 9) Projects and publications under way (list herewith)
- 10) Preservation of already duped films.

THIRD SESSION (OPEN)Wednesday, 27th May
10.00 to 13.00 h.

- 11) Report of the preservation commission.
- 12) Report of the documentation commission.
- 13) Report of the film cataloguing commission.

FOURTH SESSION (OPEN)Wednesday, 27th May
15.00 to 18.30 h.

- 14) Open Forum.

FIFTH SESSION (FULL MEMBERS ONLY)Thursday, 28th May
10.00 to 13.00 h.

- 15) Proposal of modification of statutes and rules.
- 16) Question relating to the status of members.
 - a) Approval of the resolution taken by the Executive Committee.
 - b) Admission of new members.
 - c) Renewal of the membership of provisional members and correspondents.

SIXTH SESSION (OPEN)Thursday, 28th May
15.00 to 18.30 h.

- 17) Planned projects (Provisional list here attached. Members should remit new propositions in writing to the secretariat on arriving).

SEVENTH SESSION (MEMBERS ONLY)Friday, 29th May
10.00 to 13.00 h.

- 18) Relations between FIAF and other international organizations.
- 19)
 - a) The 1971 budget
 - b) Rise of subscriptions
 - c) Work of the FIAF's secretariat.
- 20) Election of the new Executive Committee and Auditors.
- 21) Date and place of the next General Meeting.

EIGHTH SESSION (OPEN)Friday, 29th May
15.00 to 18.30 h.

- 22) Any other business.

FORMAL OPENING (In presence of visitors and press)

Tuesday, 26th May

As M. Pierre Cousté, President of the Société Lumière, was unable to be present, M. LeFranc welcomed all the delegates, observers and press present at the first session of the General Meeting of FIAF.

He said how honoured he was to be given the opportunity of welcoming everyone and conveyed M. Cousté's regrets at not being able to be present. It was with great pleasure that the Société Lumière offered the Château Lumière to FIAF for their 26th Congress, and it appeared a true homage to Louis Lumière that FIAF should hold its Congress in the same town and place that his work was first recognized in 1895. Lyon was very much aware of the great tribute we were paying Lumière by choosing to come to Lyon to celebrate the 75th anniversary of cinematography. The people of Lyon were very proud of Lumière and his achievements. Nevertheless, Lumière's invention, although great, was one of many at that time - printing, the telephone, trains and motor cars. Lumière was a man who lived more for his work than for money, and it is thanks to large organizations all over the world, and our own Federation, that people would remember him.

M. LeFranc then thanked the delegates for their own unestimable contribution arising out of the solidarity of so many nations, and wished FIAF every success in their work and a pleasant stay in Lyon.

The president of FIAF, Professor Jerzy Toeplitz, thanked M. LeFranc for his welcome speech and said how pleased and honoured FIAF, which now counted more than 40 members, was to meet at the Château Lumière for this great anniversary.

M. Génard then gave some information about the Château Lumière (annex 1) in which the General Meeting was taking place, and which was to be the site of a cinematographic museum, and also about the social events arranged for the delegates.

He then invited all those present to partake of a reception (vin d'honneur) in the adjoining room.

WORKING SESSIONSFIRST SESSION (OPEN)

The President, Professor Toeplitz declared the 26th Congress of the Federation open and asked Vice-President Ernest Lindgren to preside over the first session.

Ernest Lindgren explained that he was presiding only during this first session to enable Professor Toeplitz to deliver his presidential address.

Secretary-General Jacques Ledoux clarified certain practical details of the Congress programme (annex 2) and asked delegates wishing to propose new projects under item 17 of the agenda, to give them in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible so that they could be circulated in advance.

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

M. Ledoux read the list of those present (annex 3) asking those who will vote to identify themselves, with results as follows :

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

Amsterdam	Nederlands Filmmuseum	<u>Mr. J. de Vaal</u>
Belgrade	Jugoslovenska Kinoteka	<u>Mr. V. Pogacic</u>
		<u>Mr. F. Acimovic</u>
West Berlin	Deutsche Kinemathek	<u>Mr. H. Berg</u>
Brussels	Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique	<u>Mr. J. Ledoux</u>
Bucharest	Arhiva Nationala de Filme	<u>Mr. D. Fernoaga</u>
Budapest	Magyar Filmtudományi Intézet és Filmarchívum	<u>Mr. S. Papp</u>
Copenhagen	Det Danske Filmmuseum	<u>Mrs. T. Draskovic</u>
London	The National Film Archive	<u>Mr. I. Monty</u>
Milan	Cineteca Italiana	<u>Mr. E. Lindgren</u>
Montreal	La Cinémathèque Canadienne	<u>Mr. W. Alberti</u>
Moscow	Gosfilmofond	<u>Mrs. F. Jaubert</u>
		<u>Mr. V. Privato</u>
		<u>Mr. V. Dimitriev</u>
New York	Museum of Modern Art - Dept. of Film	<u>Mrs. E. Bowser</u>
Oslo	Norsk Filminstitutt	<u>Mr. J. Stenklev</u>
Ottawa	Canadian Film Archives	<u>Mr. P. Morris</u>
		<u>Mr. J. Clavel</u>
		<u>Mr. J. Turner</u>
Prague	Ceskoslovenský Filmový Ústav	<u>Mr. M. Frida</u>
Rome	Cineteca Nazionale	<u>Mr. L. Fioravanti</u>
Sofia	Bulgarska Nationalna Filmoteka	<u>Mr. Stovanov-Bigor</u>
Stockholm	Filmhistoriska Samlingarna	<u>Mr. H. Schein</u>
		<u>Mr. N.H. Geber</u>

Turin	Museo Nazionale del Cinema	Mr. R. Radicati <u>Mr. J. Ledoux</u> (proxy)
Toulouse	Cinémathèque de Toulouse	<u>Mr. R. Borde</u> Mr. G.C. de Rochemont
Warsaw	Centralne Archiwum Filmowe	<u>Mr. J. Toeplitz</u>
Wien	Osterreichisches Filmarchiv	<u>Mr. J. Mayerhofer</u> Mrs. J. Mayerhofer
Wien	Osterreichisches Filmmuseum	<u>Mr. P. Konlechner</u> Mr. P. Kubelka
Wiesbaden	Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde	<u>Mr. U. Pöschke</u> Mr. E. Spiess

The following members were still expected :

Mr W. Klaue and Mr Volkmann from Staatliches Filmarchiv der D.D.R.
Mrs L. Van Leer, from Archion Israëli Leseratim, Haïfa.
Mr. H. Garcia-Mesa, from Cinemateca de Cuba, Habana.
Mrs H. Suomela, from Suomen Elukova - Arkisto, Helsinki
Mr. P.K. Nair from the National Film Archive of India, Poona.

The quorum having been obtained, according to art. 15 of the Statutes which requires that at least one half of the full members be present or represented, The Secretary-General declared the XXVIth General Meeting valid.

Provisional members and their delegates

Istanbul	Turk Film Arsivi	Mr. S. Sekeroglu Mrs. S. Sekeroglu
Tirana	Filmarshiva Republikes Popullore te Shqiperise	Mr. G. Nos
Washington	Library of Congress	Mr. J. Kuiper

Associate members and their delegates

London	Imperial War Museum	Dr. C.H. Roads
--------	---------------------	----------------

Corresponding members and their delegates

Lyon	Comité de Fondation du Musée du Cinéma et de la Cinémathèque de Lyon	Dr. P. Génard Mr. C. Perrin
Montevideo	Cine Arte del Sodre	Mr. W. Alberti (proxy).

Observers

Washington	American Film Institute	Mr. S. Kula
------------	-------------------------	-------------

Mr. Ledoux said it was also hoped that the meeting would be joined later by M. Parent, Deputy Director-General of the French National Cinema Centre, by M. Jean Vivié, of the French National Film Service, and by Mrs Malthéte-Méliès.

Mr. Ledoux also welcomed to the Meeting, as an Honorary Member of FIAF, Mr. Einar Lauritzen of Stockholm.

Homage to Iris Barry

Vice-President Lindgren paid homage to the late Mme Iris Barry, Founder President of FIAF.

" Before we pass to our next business, I should like to say that for very many of us this 26th Congress of FIAF is in one respect a very sad occasion. There is one absent member who will never be with us again.

" I refer of course to our Founder President, Miss Iris Barry, who died, not very far from here, in Marseilles, at the end of December last year. I have been asked to accept the honour, and the privilege, of paying a brief tribute to her memory.

" Iris was born in England, in 1896, almost simultaneously with the birth of cinematography itself, and after an education in England and Belgium, and a short period of apprentice work in France, her life, like that of so many others, was interrupted in 1914 by the First World War, which she spent working in a post office in Birmingham.

" One of her oldest friends, Ivor Montagu, has contributed an article to the last issue of SIGHT AND SOUND, in which he recalls those early days, and tells us that because of them, she was known as the 'Birmingham Sparrow'.

" He describes her as he first knew her, in a striking paragraph, and it is a portrait we can easily recognise:

'She was a tiny woman, extremely slim. She was always strikingly and fittingly dressed, on no money at all. She had a clear but slightly sallow skin. Her blue eyes were searching and impressive. Her hair was black. When she was quite young, I am told, it was fair, but as does happen with some people and animals, darkened without aid as she grew up. She had an Eton crop* - so close on her shapely skull that it would almost today qualify as skinhead'

" As a young woman Iris wrote poetry. This brought her to London for a meeting with Ezra Pound, which led her to join a literary group composed of T.S. Eliot, Pound, Richard Aldington, Herbert Read and Wyndham Lewis. She had encouragement from the Sitwells, especially Edith Sitwell, which she remembered with gratitude.

" She met Sidney Bernstein, who discovered her interest in the cinema, and employed her to report on film trade-shows for the Granada cinema circuit he was then building up. Sidney Bernstein is today Lord Bernstein, and head of the giant Granada Television Company.

* i.e. a schoolboy cut.

" Iris had her first novel published and John Strachey, who later became a well-known member of Parliament, invited her to review films regularly for THE SPECTATOR, a serious political and literary weekly which he then edited. This was the first time in England that films were seriously reviewed as a new art form.

" It was in her capacity as film critic of THE SPECTATOR that she first met Ivor Montagu in 1924, and joined with him and a small group, including Adrian Brunel, the film director, Sidney Bernstein, Frank Dobson, the sculptor and a few others, to form the Film Society in 1925 - the first film society in the world.

" It met with considerable opposition, from film trade, from the censor and even the press, as Ivor Montagu describes, but he goes on to say :

' However, we pulled out every establishment stop we had. Half the snobs in London, intellectual and social, were at the opening; Iris, who had flung herself into the thick of the battle, more than held her own in a tall, black, super-poke hat, with a wide brim and wide scarlett ribbon, like a witch.'

" It was the work of the Film Society, from 1925 to 1932, which helped to create the climate for the British documentary movement of John Grierson, and which paved the way for the British Film Institute, out of which grew in turn our own National Film Archive. It was Iris who planted the first seeds.

" At this point, Iris struck one of the less happy periods which punctuated her life. Her marriage to the poet and literary critic Alan Porter broke up, and she lost her job as film critic of the LONDON DAILY MAIL, to which she had been appointed after THE SPECTATOR.

" The first half of her life, the British half, was over, and she went to the U.S.A. and survived a very difficult period.

"Eventually, however, she obtained a job with the Museum of Modern Art, and while there she conceived the idea that the Museum should embrace the cinema, as well as the more conventional art forms. And so she acquired a new crusade for which to battle.

" With the aid of a substantial five-year grant prised out of the Rockefeller Foundation, and with the help of John Abbott, a man experienced in finance, who became her second husband, she began to campaign for the support of the big film companies, of the directors and the stars.

" Ivor Montagu tells us that according to Lilian Gish, it was D.W.Griffith's trust in Iris which saved the D.W.Griffith collection, and he adds that for this success alone, all future generations of cineastes owe a debt to her.

" The Museum of Modern Art Film Department was formed in June 1935 , and shortly after Iris Barry and John Abbott embarked on a tour of Europe, as far as Moscow, searching for film masterpieces.

" It was during this tour that I first met Iris. We had started the National Film Archive in May 1935, and as a very nervous and diffident young embryo archivist of twenty-six, I went to the Savoy Hotel to interview Iris and John Abbott in their bedroom, for SIGHT AND SOUND. The curious can still find that interview printed in one of the 1936 issues. I do not think I ever quite overcame the awe I felt for Iris on that occasion.

" This period was perhaps the summit of her career and her happiest time.

" She wrote her monograph on D.W.Griffith, she translated from the French THE HISTORY OF THE CINEMA by Bardeche and Brasillach, and wrote a whole series of perceptive and illuminating programme notes for the Museum of Modern Art's film performances. In 1938, she joined with The Cinémathèque Française and our own National Film Archive to create FIAF and become its first President.

" Her work for FIAF, and with FIAF, is known to most of you, and I will not dwell on it here.

" For her services to the French cinema, and perhaps for the aid she gave to those who escaped from Occupied France during the 2d World War, she was made a Chevalier of the Legion d'Honneur in 1949.

" About this time, she fell seriously ill, and eventually was forced to give up her job as the first Director of the Museum of Modern Art's Film Department to retire to the south of France, to Fayence, where she spent the last part of her life. This was our good fortune, because it enabled her to work with FIAF more closely and attend our meetings more frequently.

" She was born a child of the English countryside, in a family of dairy farmers, and ended her days in the French countryside which she equally loved. She gave the first half of her life work to her native country, England, and the second half to her adopted country, America. The whole of her life, in a sense, belonged to the world, because it was devoted to the international art of the film, and because she initiated world-wide movements of film societies and film archives now existing in every culturally-developed country.

" I have described my first meeting with her. My most poignant meeting was on new year's eve in London in the early sixties, where she had come to lecture at the National Film Theatre. Towards midnight we were walking on the fringe of the happy crowds in Piccadilly Circus celebrating the arrival of the New Year. She wanted to escape from them, and we went into the Café Royal in Regent street for a drink. But we could not escape. In an adjoining room, a noisy New Year's Eve party was in full swing. And suddenly I saw that Iris's face was wet with streaming tears, and I was more sharply aware than at any other time of a profound sadness and loneliness in her life which she rarely allowed to be seen.

" I believe that Iris never found in her personal life the deep-lasting happiness which she must often have longed for. Yet often those who give most to the world so do out of their own inner restlessness, and out of their own deep longing and dissatisfaction. What Iris achieved in our field still has to be measured at its true worth. Those of us who are left can never afford to forget our deep indebtedness to her.

" I ask you all to rise for a few moments in silence and pay our tribute to her memory."

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

This was unanimously adopted. (annex 4)

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

Mr. Ledoux explained that the minutes which had been circulated to all members embodied two innovations; first, the Minutes and all the Meeting papers had been combined within a single volume, and secondly, it had been reproduced on the new international paper format to which only one member, the Canadian Film Archive, in Ottawa, had made any objection.

Mr. Lindgren congratulated the Secretary-General on the excellent way in which the Minutes had been reproduced.

The Minutes were approved unanimously.

4. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

The President of FIAF, Professor Toeplitz, delivered his report. Illustrating his discourse by references to the work of particular FIAF members during the year, he observed that in comparison with the first film projections 75 years earlier in Lyons, the number of projections now given throughout the world in cinemas and on television was immense, and posed great problems of collection and selection for film archives. Support for their work was needed from public authorities, from the film industry and from public opinion, each of which were growing more sympathetic, but not fast enough.

FIAF had grown in numbers and strength since its inception but it still represented only one-third of the countries of the world. The number of archive workers, only some 2000, was also still small, and more must be done for recruitment and training.

More must be done also to increase the popularity of archive film performances, especially of silent films, to promote historical research and create a research information centre, to stimulate the showing of archive films in film schools and universities, and to give help to independent film-makers, and he wished the delegates a successful and useful Congress.

The President's Report was received with applause, and Mr Lindgren thanked Professor Toeplitz.

5. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Mr. Ledoux explained his difficulties in finding an Executive Secretary to succeed Madame Recht. Two candidates had been appointed, but their engagements had been terminated after a short period. In this situation, he was grateful to the National Film Archive of London for lending the services of Miss Carol-Ann Murell who would join with Madame Coppens of the Royal Film Archive of Belgium to provide the secretariat for the Congress.

During the year, requests for information about creating film archives had been received from Iceland, Ceylon, Malaysia, and the Walt Disney Organisation in Hollywood.

The FIAF Secretariat was having difficulty in completing its membership records; only 13 members out of 43 had supplied copies of their constitution and statutes.

Four Executive Committee Meetings had been held during the year, in New York, Zagreb, Vienna and Lyons. The volume of members' annual reports, containing 41 reports, was the most complete yet issued. 34 members out of 43 had contributed to the volume of organigrams, which could have great educational value for new young archives. The number of archive members with telex had increased from 4 to 12. Many members however still did not even have telegraphic addresses. Mr. Ledoux cited the archives of Bucharest, Budapest, Milan, Sofia, Turin, Warsaw, Vienna (Austrian Film Archive), Istanbul and Lyons, and also the Imperial War Museum of London, as having neither telex nor a telegraphic address, which made communication with them difficult for FIAF. FIAF now had its own telegraphic address: FIAFILM.

The writ issued against FIAF in New York during the previous Congress for alleged infringement of copyright in The Birth of a Nation had been withdrawn, and FIAF was no longer involved in this case.

It was hoped that, as a result of assurances given by the Director of George Eastman House to Mr Lindgren in London, the legal sequestration of FIAF's documents and files in Paris could be lifted during the coming year, since George Eastman House was the only remaining objector.

Mr. Ledoux urged FIAF members to send copies not only of their publications but also their internal documents, automatically to all other members and said that the FIAF secretariat would willingly distribute them if requested to do so. The Museum of Modern Art in New York had offered to circulate an American Film retrospective to European Archives and he invited those interested to advise him so that he could arrange a private meeting during this Congress with Mrs Eileen Bowser to discuss the arrangements.

Mr Lindgren thanked Mr Ledoux for his report. The Meeting adjourned for lunch.

SECOND SESSION (OPEN)

The President of the Session, Mr Lindgren welcomed Mr. and Mrs. Suomela from Helsinki. Mrs. Suomela agreed that she formally represented the Finnish Film Archive and had the power to vote.

6. REPORT OF THE TREASURER.

Mr Lindgren said that the Treasurer Mr Geber had recently resigned for purely personal reasons, and the Treasurer's Report would therefore be presented by the Deputy Treasurer, Mr Borde. Mr Geber, however, was present to give any supplementary explanations if they were required.

Mr Borde referred to the written statement of accounts for 1969 (annex 5) which had been distributed to the delegates. Expenses for 1969 stood at 49.227 Swiss Francs, which was less than the 63.000 Swiss Francs in the budget because the latter included provision for a secretariat in Paris, namely the secretary's salary, rent of an office and purchase of furniture, none of which had been incurred. Under chapter 2 of the accounts, however, the expenditure had exceeded the budget figure, mainly because of the expenses incurred in the unsuccessful search for an executive secretary in Paris.

The assets shown on page 4, including subscriptions, publications and bank interest, amounted to 58.014 Swiss Francs. There was a credit balance for 1969 of 8.743 Francs, without taking into account the credit balance of the previous year.

The liquid position was shown on page 1 of the account; on 31st December 1969 FIAF had in its Swiss bank 78.221 Swiss Francs. This was an account of FIAF's finances in 1969 in general outline. One should also look at pages 5 and 6 concerning subscriptions paid and owing. On 31st December 1969, the total amount of subscriptions in arrears was 13.030 Francs, but since then, most of the outstanding subscriptions had been paid, and the total amount of arrears at the present moment was only 2.760 Francs.

Mr Geber would be able to add further information on any points of detail in the accounts, if necessary.

Mr Lindgren thanked Mr Borde, and opened discussion on the Treasurer's Report.

Mr Pogacic asked why certain full members had not paid their subscriptions for 1969, and he thought that they owed some explanation to the General Meeting.

Mr Alberti explained that the Cineteca Italiana had had difficulties because of the postal strike, but it was anxious to pay its subscription up to date, and he had brought the overdue balance with him to Lyons.

Mrs Bowser explained that the fiscal year of the New York Museum of Modern Art was different from that of FIAF, and the Museum's subscription for 1969 would be paid in July 1970. The Museum hoped in future to arrange matters so as to obviate this delay.

Mr Ledoux said he felt obliged, as Secretary-General, to point out that, according to FIAF's Statutes and Rules, both the Cineteca Italiana and the Museum of Modern Art being in arrears with their subscriptions, had no right to vote during the present Congress. The relevant article in the Rules was number 54 which he read out to the General Meeting.

Mrs Bowser protested that the same situation had obtained ever since the Museum of Modern Art had been a member of FIAF, and never before had it been refused the right to vote.

Mr Peter Morris, as a former Treasurer, agreed that the Museum had always previously been in arrears, but it had paid as soon as possible after 31st December, and this was the first occasion on which its subscription was still unpaid at the moment of the General Meeting.

Mr Geber said he had written to Mr Willard Van Dyke and had also spoken to him in Stockholm to ask him if he could not resolve this problem, but he had said it would be difficult.

Mme Jaubert said she recognised that the Statutes and Rules must be observed, but where a member was in arrears because of obvious difficulties, there should be a certain delay before it was deprived of its power to vote.

Mr Lindgren said he found his position as President of the Session embarrassing, because the Museum of Modern Art was an old member which had always in the past paid its subscription up-to-date, and for the first time was in arrears for what seemed purely a technical reason, whereas to speak frankly, the Cineteca Italiana had been in arrears each year as long as he could remember. It seemed he had to apply a rule which made no distinction between these two cases.

Mr Alberti said that the position of the Cineteca Italiana could be resolved immediately if the Treasurer would accept payment from him in Lyons in Italian lire. As for the Museum of Modern Art, not only the subscription but also the work of a member should be taken into account, and he thought it scandalous to penalise the Museum at a moment when it had offered to all its European colleagues a valuable American film retrospective.

Professor Toeplitz agreed that the Rules must be observed but suggested that article 114 of the Rules gave the General Meeting an escape from its dilemma since it allowed a member to address a request to the Treasurer for a six months' delay in payment, and this period could be further extended by the Executive Committee. He suggested that Mr Alberti and Mrs Bowser should apply to the Treasurer for such an extension, so that the Treasurer could refer it to the General Meeting for sympathetic consideration.

Mr Ledoux replied that article 114 could only apply to payments for the current year 1970, and not to 1969. He too was embarrassed by the problem, but he had a different solution, and he asked for a five-minute recess to enable him to discuss it privately with Mr Alberti and Mrs Bowser.

Mr Lindgren agreed and declared a five-minute interval in the discussion. After the interval, he called on Mr Borde.

Mr Borde announced that he had now received from Mrs Bowser for the Museum of Modern Art a cheque in payment of the Museum's 1969 subscription in Swiss Francs, and Mr Alberti for the Cineteca Italiana had paid its subscription in Italian lire, so that both members were now fully paid up.

Mr Ledoux agreed that all was in order and that both the members concerned now had the right to vote.

7. REPORT FROM THE AUDITORS

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

Mme Jaubert said that she regretted that her fellow-auditor, Mr Gesek, was not present, but she had examined the accounts and the documents relating to them, and she had found everything in perfect order.

8. APPROVAL OF THE ACCOUNTS FOR 1969 AND DISCHARGE OF THE OUTGOING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approval of the Treasurer's report on the accounts was then submitted to the vote of the Meeting and carried unanimously.

The President welcomed Mrs Van Leer on her arrival at the Meeting. He also read a telegram from Mr Parent of the French National Cinema Centre regretting his inability to attend the General Meeting, and a telegram from Mr Nair of India explaining that, because he had only just obtained his Government's authorisation to attend the Congress, he would be late in arriving.

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

Mr Lindgren said this finished the business of the Session over which he had been asked to preside and he had pleasure in asking Professor Toeplitz to resume his presidency of the General Meeting.

9. PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS UNDER WAY

Professor Toeplitz referred to the next item on the agenda, Projects and Publications under way, a list of which had been distributed (annex n° 6). He asked Mr Ledoux to introduce the item.

Mr Ledoux said that projects 1 and 2 concerning film preservation and storage would obviously have to be postponed until the arrival of Mr Volkmann, and his report on the preservation commission.

B. Filmography

3. Seminar on film identification/ atlas for the identification of American slapstick. (Mr Frida)

Mr Frida said that invitations for the second Seminar on Identification to be held in Czecho-Slovakia on October 4th-10th, 1970, were now being sent out. It would be devoted to early American silent comedy shorts, and he hoped archives would send both their identification experts and unidentified films.

It was expected that the Atlas on American Slapstick would be completed in time for distribution at the Seminar. He invited questions from the General Meeting.

Mr Ledoux asked if a report on the first Seminar held in Gottwaldov would be published. Mr Frida replied that in the personnel changes in the Czech Film Archive, the report had been lost sight of, but it was hoped to recover it and to publish it.

Mr Ledoux asked about the finances of the 1970 Seminar and suggested that the dates proposed might be inconvenient to some members. Mr Frida replied that the hotel charges were cheap because the Czech Film Archive was bearing half the cost, and to his regret, the dates could not now be changed.

4. Films on the cinema (Mr Papp)

Mrs Draskovic, speaking on behalf of Mr Papp, said the Hungarian Film Archive was still very willing to complete this task but was unfortunately unable to obtain from FIAF members answers to its requests for information. It had written to Mr Ledoux for assistance, but received no reply.

Professor Toeplitz asked if Mrs Draskovic could be more precise about the information collected from those archives which had responded. She replied that 11 archives had provided information of some 300 films and a few archives replied that they had no information to give.

Professor Toeplitz said that 300 films was already an encouraging beginning, and wondered if there were other difficulties preventing the Hungarian Archive from making progress on this project.

Mr Ledoux said it was true he had received a letter from Budapest on this project and he had submitted it to the Executive Committee at its March Meeting in Vienna when professor Toeplitz had undertaken to discuss it personally with Mr Papp. In view of this, Mr Ledoux had not himself answered the letter and it was unfortunate that Professor Toeplitz did not have the opportunity to meet Mr Papp which he was expecting. Mr Ledoux regarded the project as being of prime importance, and 300 films seemed to him very little, in view of the many hundreds made, especially if one included television. The task was possibly too large for a single archive to undertake.

Professor Toeplitz asked Mr Papp whether he was willing to share the project with another archive or whether he would prefer to withdraw from it altogether.

Mrs Draskowicz said that Mr Papp, given the assistance of other FIAF members, was willing to continue the project and if FIAF wished it to do so in co-operation with another archive, it would accept this.

Professor Toeplitz said he knew that the Danish Film Archive in Copenhagen was interested, and since it was time for the session to close, he suggested that the details of a co-operation between Budapest and Copenhagen might be worked out privately, in time to be announced at the next session.

The President adjourned the General Meeting until the following morning at 9.30 a.m.

THIRD SESSION

25th May 1970, 10 a.m.

The President, Professor Toeplitz welcomed as new arrivals to the General Meeting, Mr Volkmann and Mr Klaus from the Staatliches Filmarchiv of East Berlin, and Mr Schein from the Swedish Film Institute in Stockholm. He also read a telegram from Mr Hector Garcia-Mesa of the Cuban Film Archive in Havana regretting his inability to attend and delegating his representation and vote without restriction, to Mr Jacques Ledoux.

CONTINUATION OF PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS UNDER WAY

The President returned to Project n° 4 : Films on the cinema, and asked Mr Ledoux to report on the private discussions which had taken place since the close of the previous session.

Mr Ledoux said that as a result of the private discussions which had taken place between Mr Papp, Mrs Draskowicz, Mr Monty and himself, it had been agreed that the Hungarian Film Archive would make a new appeal to all members for information on films on the cinema produced throughout the world, whether in the possession of film archives or not, and had undertaken to complete a list of these films in time for the next FIAF Congress.

Mr Monty, on the other hand, had undertaken to compile a similar list of television productions on the cinema, with the help of Mr Papp as far as television films in the Socialist countries was concerned, but since this was too big a task to complete in one year, Mr Monty would present a provisional report to the next Congress.

There being no discussion on this proposal, the President declared it accepted and wished the participants success.

5. List of filmographical sources (Mr Frida)

Mr Frida said that, to his regret and owing to other preoccupations, no progress had been made on this matter, and Professor Toeplitz had suggested it should be taken over by the Documentation Commission.

Professor Toeplitz echoed what Mr Frida had said and expressed the view that the Cataloguing Commission might be even more appropriate for this task.

Mr Ledoux proposed that in that case, the project should be deleted from the list of projects, and should therefore feature henceforth in the programme of the Cataloguing Commission.

Mr Frida agreed, except that he still doubted whether the Documentation Commission was not more suitable for this purpose.

The President proposed, to terminate the discussion, that it be accepted that, the List of Filmographical Sources be assigned to a specialised commission and that the choice of the commission be decided in talks with the presidents of the commissions and the Secretariat, before the end of the Congress.

This was agreed.

6. Bibliography of National Filmographies (Rumanian Archive)

Mr Fernoaga thanked members for their help on this Bibliography which was now finished, and he hoped the members would find it useful.

The President proposed that members should have time to study the Bibliography which they might wish to discuss later. Meanwhile, he thanked Mr Fernoaga for completing this project and for its excellent presentation.

C. Bibliography

7. Annual bibliography of books on the cinema (Mr Fernoaga)

The President thanked Mr Fernoaga for having completed this publication which seemed to him extremely well done, and of great utility.

8. Information Centre of Research Projects (Mr C. Young)

Mr Colin Young, who was unable to be present, was shortly leaving UCLA to take up the Directorship of the new British National Film School in London, and the President was uncertain whether anyone else in UCLA would interest himself in this project. In the meantime, the only course open was to leave this project in suspense.

9. Bibliography of FIAF members' publications (Mr P. Morris)

Mr Morris said the Bibliography had been completed and was being printed. Copies would be sent out to members within a few weeks. Some FIAF members were still not sending copies of their publications for inclusion and he urged them to do so. In thanking Mr Morris, the President asked him if the Canadian Film Archive was willing to continue this publication in the future and Mr Morris replied in the affirmative.

D. Miscellaneous

10. Handbook for film archives (Mr Pogacic)

The President said that an outline had been distributed on this project (annex n° 7) and he only wished to ask Mr Pogacic how he envisaged the execution of this project. Mr Pogacic replied that he awaited the suggestions of the Meeting on the plan circulated. The Manual would be written by the staff of the Yugoslav Film Archive with the help of specialists from other archives. Certain paragraphs would also be submitted to the specialised FIAF commissions and eventually of course to the Executive Committee. It would be a popular document, offering a choice of various possibilities, and at the same time be as complete as possible.

The President suggested the discussion should concentrate on two problems: first, whether the list of proposed contents was complete; and secondly, whether it was to be designed for young inexperienced archives or for well-established archives.

Mr Ledoux said he wished to remind the General Meeting of the resolution agreed at the previous General Meeting in New York, as part of the proposals made by Mr Borde and modified at the request of Mr Pogacic, on aid to young film archives. This resolution was as follows :

"Basic Manual. Finally, since young and small archives feel the need of having some basic manual containing minimum information about research and conservation of films, to be used in instructing their personnel, and in their relationship with public authorities, such a manual should be prepared by some large archives with experience in improvised solutions and difficult beginnings."

From this, it seemed clear to Mr Ledoux that the original idea was to produce a manual for young and small archives and although this was not contradictory to the plan of Mr Pogacic, and matters of interest to the larger archives could be included, he hoped that the original simple intention would not be lost sight of, and that a comprehensive manual of archive practice would not be attempted.

Mr Kubelka, supported by Mrs Jaubert, said one thing he missed in the plan for the manual was any mention of film projections, which were a most important part of the work of young archives especially.

Mr Volkmann said that a comprehensive scientific manual of archives procedures would take many years to complete and would have to embrace the results of the work of the FIAF specialised commissions. In the mean time, there was need for a short, simple guide, and this ought to be produced very quickly, within one year or at the most two.

Mr Pogacic agreed that the Manual should be written for young archives and the title of the first section "Why Create a National Film Archive" implied this. There was also provision to refer to projections, but he felt that the Manual should follow a logical order, beginning with the basic work of conservation, and referring to the work of film projections later in the scheme, leaving young archives to choose those activities which most interested them.

The President suggested that the General Meeting accept the proposals of Mr Pogacic and while recognising the impossibility of fixing a date for its completion, urge upon him the importance of completing it in the quickest possible time, for the reasons already stressed by Mr Volkmann.

Mr Ledoux proposed that the title for the Manual should be that accepted at New York, namely : Basic Manual. This was agreed, and the President thanked Mr Pogacic for his contribution.

11. The Pool (Mr de Vaal)

Mr de Vaal referred to his short written report on the Pool which had been distributed to the delegates (annex n° 8). The Executive Committee had discussed the problem that the Pool in recent years had been little used, and had decided that this problem should be considered again by the new Executive Committee.

The President said that the Executive Committee had considered how best to use the films in the Pool, which was created eight or ten years previously, but was now little used by young archives perhaps because of financial and transport difficulties, perhaps because of lack of interest. The Executive Committee had arrived at no conclusions, and it was premature to expect the General Meeting to agree on conclusions, but it would be valuable to hear any opinions on this matter which delegates might wish to express.

Mr Kubelka suggested that the Pool might be more used if it circulated complete programmes rather than individual films. Mr Konlechner disagreed on the grounds that particular films in a programme series might create copyright difficulties, and the Pool should not be a substitute for direct co-operation with FIAF members and with producers which could alone ensure the building up of good retrospective programme series.

Mr Privato suggested that since the purpose of the Pool was to circulate the best film classics, he supported a proposal made in the Executive Committee that they now be distributed among young archives on indefinite loan, subject to the agreement of the archives of origin, an agreement which Gosfilmofond would willingly give. Perhaps the allocation of particular films to particular archives could be decided at this General Meeting.

Mr Lindgren reminded the General Meeting that a Pool virtually offering world-wide distribution to films could arouse profound suspicion in the film industry if world rights, or at least the formal permission of all the copyright owners, had not previously been obtained, and he quoted evidence of this suspicion which he had encountered in London, over the proposal for the Pool to circulate a programme series on the western.

Mr Ledoux said no archive had contributed films to the Pool without assuring itself that no copyright problems would arise, and the proposal for a Western series was never more than a proposal, which had been abandoned when the copyright difficulties were realised, so that no one could reproach FIAF on this account. The Pool had been hampered first by the cost of transport of 35 mm copies, and secondly by the fact that it was based in Europe, in Amsterdam, whereas its potential users were mainly outside Europe. Mr Ledoux suggested that the Pool in Amsterdam should be wound up, and instead regional pools of 16 mm films inexpensive to make and to transport, should be created outside Europe, for example first in Latin America, and then later perhaps in Asia and Africa. He felt sure the members of FIAF would make the effort to contribute films free of copyright difficulties to such regional pools.

Mr Konlechner said these regional pools would need 16 mm negatives to replace copies worn out in use, and this might increase the copyright difficulties. He thought it would help archives very much to be supplied with information of the basic copyright in films.

Mr Morris said he also had had complaints from producers, not about particular films in the Pool, but about the Pool itself. They wondered why FIAF was in the distribution business at all. He felt that Mr Ledoux' proposal would increase these fears, and he thought the idea of a pool or pools should be abandoned.

Mr de Vaal said he hoped the problem of the Pool would be resolved by the next Executive Committee. To Mr Privato he would say that even the Gosfilmofond films in the Pool created difficulties; he could not show some of them in Holland because exhibition rights had been bought by commercial distributors.

The President said that the Pool at Amsterdam could not be liquidated suddenly and without full consideration of all the interests involved. He thought it a good idea to create regional pools in Latin America,

and perhaps in India, but he recommended to the General Meeting that the new Executive Committee be instructed to study these problems, to ascertain which archives would contribute to regional pools and to present to the next General Meeting a concrete plan of action. He would like the delegates to vote on this recommendation.

Mr Ledoux, while agreeing in principle, suggested that if the General Meeting could be asked if it was in favour of a Latin-American pool, this expression of its opinion could help to advance the work of the Executive Committee by indicating immediately the direction in which it should move.

The President then asked the members to indicate by a show of hands how many of them were in favour of creating film circulation pools outside Europe.

The results were :	For:	9
	Against:	6
	Abstentions:	7

The President said that clearly opinion was divided, but Mr Ledoux declared himself satisfied by the fact that 9 members had indicated their willingness to collaborate in the formation of extra-European pools. The President said this confirmed his original proposal that the matter should be considered by the next Executive Committee as one having high priority. He asked if the General Meeting was in favour and the proposal was given unanimous assent.

12. Leaflet "Why preserve films" (Mr de Vaal)

Mr de Vaal said a few changes were necessary to bring the old leaflet up-to-date, such as adding FIAF publications, changing the FIAF address and revising the list of members. He also thought it could be made more interesting by the addition of some stills. Mr Ledoux had undertaken to explore the possibility and cost of printing it in Belgium.

Mr Kubelka wished to see under 'The Functions of an Archive' reference made to film projections. An archive which did not project films was like a library without a reading room. The President replied that art. 5(2) of the Statutes made it clear that, while conservation was made obligatory for an archive, projection was optional, and he could imagine an archive which concentrated on conservation and for the time being had no projections. Projection was the obligation of a film society.

Mr Lindgren said he did not understand the anxiety of Mr Kubelka on this point because in fact, nearly all FIAF members were engaged in projecting films and only a comparatively small number, unfortunately, gave priority to preservation.

Mr Kuiper suggested that the words "research and study" should be used instead of "projection", which was only one technical method of research and study.

Mr Kubelka said it was the question of access which was important; often the archive was the only organisation existing to provide this.

Mr Meyerhofer asked if the leaflet under discussion could not include the addresses of all the member archives, and so serve as a directory.

The President, in reply to Mr Kubelka, suggested it was wrong to insist on FIAF members as being the sole disseminators of film culture; there were many others. As to the leaflet, all the opinions which had been expressed should be considered in producing a new version, and to add the addresses of all members seemed a particularly good idea. Mr Ledoux warned that if addresses of all members were included, this information would quickly fall out of date, unless a new leaflet were printed each year, which would be expensive. He preferred a separate sheet of addresses which could be changed each year and added to the leaflet as an insert.

Mr Meyerhofer said that if the Leaflet could be extended into a booklet, it could be listed in national bibliographies, but the President advised the Meeting to wait for the basic Manual of Mr Pogacic to fulfil this function. Mr Kubelka asked whether the Manual did not replace the Leaflet in any case, and the President replied that it might eventually do so; in the meantime, a Leaflet quickly revised and printed would serve a useful purpose while waiting for the Manual to appear.

Mr Ledoux further reminded Mr Kubelka that the Leaflet was not only a useful publicity document to include in FIAF replies to letters requesting information, but copies could also be supplied in bulk for the use of members themselves, to advertise the fact that they were part of a large international movement.

The President thanked members for their contribution to the discussion, and said it was clear that the project had been adopted to proceed with the Leaflet, in a revised form.

At this point, the President read a telegram from Mr Colin Young, explaining his absence from the Meeting and wishing it all success.

This concluded the business of the second session.

THIRD SESSION

According to the plan previously agreed by the Executive Committee, Mr Vice-President Privato assumed the presidency of the third session.

11. REPORT OF THE PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Mr Privato said the first matter to be considered was agenda item 11, Report of the Preservation Commission and he called on Mr Volkmann. Mr Volkmann's written Report had already been circulated to members (annex n° 9).

Mr Volkmann said that the Preservation Commission had met in Leipzig in November last year to consider exclusively the problems of preserving colour films, and had been assisted by technical experts from the Soviet Union, Belgium, Rumania and the D.D.R. He regretted the absence of Harold Brown of the National Film Archive in London and of two Kodak experts invited through the Museum of Modern Art in New York and the National Film Archive in London. The Commission was mainly concerned with the stability of the colour, which was less stable than black-and-white. Provisional conclusions suggested that the additive process (e.g. Technicolor) was more stable than the subtractive process (the basis of all other systems). Loss and change of colour was a chemical process. In old films, blue was the colour first destroyed, whereas in modern films it was yellow. Temperatures over 0° C. were injurious to colour, and humidities over 50% could encourage harmful biological action. Exposure to light in printing and projection had little effect, compared with heat. Protection from ultra-violet during re-winding was desirable.

There were two methods of preserving colour film: storage at low temperatures and reduced humidity, and the making of black-and-white separations. For the former, ideal conditions were -5°C and relative humidity of 30-40%. Dryers were not recommended. Storage of the reels in plastic bags helped to maintain their condition in case of break-down in the air-conditioning apparatus. There was no difference between the conditions required for nitrate and acetate films. The second method of black-and-white separations required three times the storage space and problems arose from shrinkage differences between those separations.

Because of the complex problems involved, the Commission would recommend a common research plan to avoid duplication of effort. The Commission would meet again in the following autumn to continue its work, and would present its final conclusions to the next FIAF Congress in 1971.

Mr Volkmann said he also had to refer to the Report on Vaults by the Dutch Technicians. He could only give a personal opinion at this stage but he thought it an excellent Report, for which the Meeting should be grateful to Mr de Vaal. By an entirely different route, the Dutch technicians had reached the same conclusions as the Preservation Commission had reached six years earlier, and the Commission would consider their Report at its next meeting.

Mr Privato thanked Mr Volkmann for his report and asked if there were any questions.

Mr Kubelka asked if there were not differences between the various film stocks in use, but Mr Volkmann replied that while this was true, they all required the same storage conditions.

Mr Schein asked how many archives had low temperature stores. Mr Volkmann said that there were none in operation. One had been constructed in the National Film Archive in London, but it was not yet in use. The experiments carried out in Moscow on various storage temperatures from 20°C to -80°C were laboratory experiments only.

Mr Lindgren added that the cold store of the National Film Archive was experimental and was designed to give temperatures down to the -18°C mentioned in Kodak literature to provide flexibility of operation, but in practice it was more likely to be run nearer to the -5°C mentioned in Mr Volkmann's Report. It was not yet being used solely for technical reasons and delays in equipping the conditioning chamber through which films had to pass on entering or leaving the store.

Mr Privato said he was sure all members would want to study Mr Volkmann's valuable report on these complicated technical problems, and he proposed that when they had read it, they should communicate any suggestions or comments to Mr Volkmann within a period not exceeding three months. He would also ask Mr Volkmann to complete his work during the year and report to the Executive Committee, so that the Committee could present the final conclusions to the next Congress.

Mr Ledoux said that, during the Executive Committee in Vienna, he had suggested to Mr Volkmann that the committee which had been working on the colour film was to be considered as specialised sub-commission concerned with a specialised subject. The Preservation Commission as originally conceived was concerned with more general problems, many of which were being held in suspense; its Preservation Manual was published some years earlier and needed bringing up-to-date to incorporate new information and suggestions. He hoped that within the period of the present Congress, Mr Volkmann would be able to present a list of members of a reconstituted Preservation Commission which would be able to deal with the ordinary, technical preservation problems of FIAF members, less specialised than that of colour.

Mr Ledoux also said that he was exploring the possibility that Gevaert might act as host for the next meeting of the sub-commission on colour film.

Mr Volkmann thanked Mr Ledoux for his efforts with Gevaert. He could not, however, agree that colour film was the task of a sub-commission since there was no more important task than the preservation of colour. He also urged that FIAF must provide finance for the work of all its commissions, and for the Preservation Commission especially, because it needed the help of outside technical experts, many of whom could not come unless their living costs could be met.

Mr Schein said that in Stockholm the Swedish Film Institute needed the Report of Mr Volkmann's Commission as quickly as possible, and would be prepared to meet the small costs of facilitating its work by providing hospitality.

Mr Ledoux said he did not want to dispute what Mr Volkmann had said about the importance of the colour film problem; it might even be the most important. But beside important problems, there were smaller everyday problems which should not be abandoned because of a preoccupation with colour. They did not require outside experts but could be considered by technicians within archives and he would like Mr Volkmann to name the members of a commission which could consider these more ordinary problems.

Mr Privato suggested that the discussion on this matter might now be closed because a General Meeting could not reach final conclusions on technical questions so complex. He would like to thank Mr Schein for his offer and to remind members to give Mr Volkmann within two or three months their observations and those of their specialists, on his report. The Meeting asked Mr Volkmann and his commission to continue with a task which they had begun so promisingly.

Finally, Mr Volkmann remarked that the Preservation Commission at present consisted of six persons, namely Mr Misheeff (USSR), Mr Tudorica (Rumania); Mr Philipp (DDR), Mr De Smidt (Amsterdam), Mr Harold Brown (London) and himself, and he thought this was enough to deal with all technical problems, including others besides the colour film.

It being lunch-time, Mr Privato declared the session closed.

FOURTH SESSION

OPEN FORUM (item 14 on the agenda)

The presidency of the session was taken by Mr Vice-President Pogacic.

Mr Pogacic said that in this open forum, which was the idea of certain young FIAF members, delegates were free to choose their subject and to talk on anything they wished. There was no fixed agenda.

Mr Borde said he wished to raise the problem of young and small archives. The previous year, at New York, the General Meeting adopted a recommendation that practical effect should be given to the following propositions :

- a) That big archives should pass to small young archives good nitrate prints which they had copied, instead of destroying them.
- b) The big archives should influence big international distributors to deposit films with small archives.
- c) That big archives should give to young archives in developing countries copies of films formerly made in those countries.
- d) That a basic manual should be published.

Members knew that (d) would soon be completed. But members should also examine their consciences and ask whether on the first three propositions any big archive had done anything, or any small archive had asked for anything to be done.

Mr. Fioravanti drew attention to the present generation of young students who rejected film history, who had a contempt for the commercial cinema past and present, who deserted the ordinary cinemas for their own private showings of underground films, and who rebelled against conventional film-making and film-makers. The Cineteca Nazionale enjoyed legal deposit for Italian films, but these underground films, some highly praised by the cities, they could never acquire. He felt FIAF members should try to understand these new movements, and should ask whether they did not require some modifications within their own archives.

Mme. Jaubert said she was impressed by what Mr Fioravanti had said. His contention that young people were not interested in film history, however, was true and yet not true. In Montreal, after numerous experiments, they had succeeded in finding a formula of combining performances of films made by the younger generation with old films and classic films, in which their young audiences were greatly interested. It was important for the European archives which had created FIAF to evolve, for example in avoiding duplication by some degree of specialisation, as the Cinémathèque Canadienne had done by concentrating on early Canadian films. Knowing that the great classics had already been saved. It was easy to get the young people to take a fresh interest in film history if one remembered that they were pre-occupied with what went on in the world, with the social rather than with the aesthetic.

Mr Ledoux said he regretted that no reply had been made to the important questions asked by Mr Borde. However, since Mr Fioravanti had raised another point, he would like to say that he did not understand Mr Fioravanti's concern. It was not the purpose of film archives to force spectators to see films in which they were not interested, but to meet their wishes like any other kind of library. Many present could testify to a vivid interest by young people in the history of the cinema, but if in certain cases they were not interested, it was not the function of archives to act as dictators of taste and to decide what their audiences must be interested in.

Mr Alberti said he disagreed with the suggestion that film archives were like book libraries, because it was the film archives who chose what programmes to project, not their audiences. The only films which really existed were those which were shown, and by the selection of their programmes, film archives helped to make film culture; they played an active, not a passive role. If independent and underground films were outside the reach of legal deposit, this was a problem to which a solution had to be found. He also thought that to meet the problem of copyright, a bureau could be set up to buy films and film rights, for non-commercial distribution, and in this way separate the film society interest from the archive interest. These were problems which should be studied.

Mr Privato said that the needs of young archives, and archives not yet created required a change in the structure of FIAF. They had to be encouraged even at some risk, even possibly at the risk of losses. He had the feeling that FIAF examined too closely and too scrupulously the applications it received for membership. It should admit new members readily, especially from the developing countries, and even assist them financially, by reducing their admission subscriptions to a minimum. Existing members might send to new members in the first year four or five films to form the basis of their collections.

Referring to Mr Borde's remarks, Mr Kubelka said he was strongly against the destruction of any nitrate film, because its original photographic quality was lost in the copies which were now being made, whereas if the original could be kept, even at the risk of its blowing up, it was possible that better copying methods might be discovered later.

Mr Morris suggested that the discussion, although interesting, was degenerating into a philosophical exchange more suitable to the dinner table. He wanted to revert to the points made by Mr Borde. Mr Borde merited an answer. What should be done about an archive with limited resources making copies of films already preserved? What use could FIAF members make of EVR in their work?

Mr Klaue, in reply to Mr Kubelka, reminded the Meeting that in New York the year before he had opposed the keeping of nitrate films. It was dangerous to go on keeping them after they had been copied and to give them to young archives which had no possibility of being able to keep them under suitable conditions: dangerous not only for the films, but for the young archives themselves. Secondly, archives must be selective; there was no point in preserving a film devoid of aesthetic or historical value simply because it was old; the resources of all film archives were limited, and if they were burdened with keeping films of small value, the preservation of films of greater value would be endangered. Finally, he agreed with Mr Privato that big archives should help smaller ones, and the Staatliches Filmarchiv had done this, but it was not always the best thing to send a lot of films; in some cases it was more useful to give them technical help or copying facilities or advice on their organisation.

Mr Konlechner thought that Mr Klaue's approach was too authoritarian. Most FIAF members had no airconditioned stores until some few years ago, and it should not be a policy of FIAF to withhold nitrate films from archives for this reason. Also, how could one judge what films might in the future be considered important? The Austrian Filmmuseum, for example, had recently had difficulty in finding Howard Hawks' films, because many archives had not thought his work important. Archives should not judge, but take what they can get. Finally, in support of what Mr Kubelka had said about possible future improvements in making copies, he understood that EVR had an excellent quality of sharpness, which would mean that already we were in a position to have better picture quality.

Mr Pogacic appealed to members not to dispute technical matters, which were the province of the preservation Commission, but to use this opportunity to discuss matters of principle.

Mrs Suomela said what interested her were the problems of young and small archives; she wondered whether big archives understood them. One of her problems in Finland was the training of specialised staff, and she wondered whether FIAF could organise meetings not for archive directors, but for technical workers such as librarians and documentation experts. It might perhaps arrange seminars and lectures, which would be more useful than trainees to visit various archives.

Mr Volkmann said that since his Austrian friends had raised question of nitrate films, it was impossible to reply without referring to technical matters. In the DDR, the use of nitrate films was restricted by law to the archive and one or two other organisations, and the public transport of such films was forbidden. The Staatliches Filmarchiv, which had been copying its nitrate films for six years, but continued to keep those with artistic value. Furthermore, the making of nitrate copies in the early days was not nearly so consistent as had been implied, and it was possible today to print acetate copies which reproduced almost exactly the characteristics of the nitrate originals from which they were made.

Mr Schein said he regretted that the problems raised by Mr Fioravanti and Mr Alberti had not been taken up. They were not peculiar to Italy, but existed elsewhere, including Sweden. Film making today was not the same as it used to be, and this must influence the activities. Young film makers were not so interested in money as in obtaining a distribution and a showing for their films, and FIAF should consider how it could assist in this. He also supported Mrs Suomala's idea for seminars on specialised technical problems, and not only for small archives; he suspected that bigger archives could profit from them also.

Mr Borde said that at the beginning of this discussion he had asked, provocatively, whether the larger archives gave sufficient help to the smaller. For his own archive, he could answer 'yes'; the aid he had received was remarkable. Secondly, he would like to suggest that the small film archive might find it more helpful to specialise, than to try to do everything at once. By limiting itself to searching for films illustrating a particular aspect of cinema, such as films on politics, on painting, on the fantastic, etc., it would have the satisfaction of being able to build up within its area of specialisation a relatively important collection, and it would be helping to preserve films missing from the collections of big archives.

Mr Kuiper said that during the last ten years the Library of Congress had developed a machine-readable computer-controlled cataloguing system called the MARC system, to provide international exchangeability of communication about books and monographs. In the past two months the Library staff had worked on the adaptation of this MARC system to motion pictures and other projected materials. He had with him copies of their proposals to give to any FIAF member interested, and he would greatly welcome their comments.

Mr Kubelka said he would like to raise the question of the future of FIAF in general. Is FIAF really able to collect and preserve all that needs to be preserved? He thought not. For example, colour film was not being preserved by FIAF members at all, and they could not cope with the immense amount of material made every month. He suggested the solution was to get the commercial producers and television companies interested in creating archives, as Disney had just done, and to persuade them to affiliate to FIAF.

Television was important, but there was no television archive affiliated to FIAF. Those archives wishing to show film retrospectives, even, were being forced more and more to go outside FIAF to commercial producers and film-owners, because FIAF could not provide the copies required. It was better to have the commercial archives with FIAF than to leave them to work alone, with FIAF going more and more out of the picture.

Mr Kula said he felt obliged to restate the basic principle that the primary function of a film archive was to preserve. Secondly, he thought that young people did not reject film history or film classics: what they rejected was instruction about film history; the two things should not be confused. Thirdly, he supported Mr Klaue's view that film archivists had to select, and this was a responsibility they could not escape. Fourthly, as a help to young archives, he wondered if FIAF could establish a bank of negatives of, say, 500 basic film classics in their most complete form on which young archives could draw for their copies. This would help older archives, too, by saving them from needless duplication in the copying of the incomplete and inferior versions of their possession.

Mr Pogacic said he had suggested that the present discussion should avoid technical matters because these were already provided for elsewhere on the agenda of the General Meeting; for example, item 10, Copying of Nitrate Films already Copied. He therefore appealed once again to members not to use this Open Forum to discuss questions which were elsewhere on the agenda.

Mr Ledoux said that since, despite the appeals made by Mr Pogacic, there had already in this Open Forum, been considerable discussion of the subject of agenda item 10, he proposed that this item be deleted from the agenda, especially as the Meeting was falling behind its timetable.

It was generally agreed that agenda item 10 be deleted.

Dr Roads said that as the only Associate Member of FIAF he would like to make a plea for more specialised film archives in FIAF, and thought that FIAF should do more to recruit them, even if only as Associate Members. He stressed especially the importance of film archives of scientific and technological films as a field being neglected. The contacts such archives could have with schools and universities would help young people to appreciate the value of film as a historical document. Finally, he made a plea for more viewing machines in film archives, so that students could see the films of their choice, instead of having to rely on what the archive chose to project in its theatre.

Mr Acimovic complained of a lack of information within FIAF. When the Yugoslav Film Archive was recently asked to collect information from all over the world about legal deposit and the methods of financing film archives, in order to support new legislation on these matters being considered by the Yugoslav Parliament, it found a great lack of information available from FIAF members. He thought much more of this information should be collected by FIAF. Each archive had to struggle alone in its own country, but

supported by examples from other countries it could struggle more effectively. He also believed it would be valuable for FIAF to produce a declaration of principles, and of its position in relation to film culture and film preservation. This document could also show by comparative figures how little was given to film culture and preservation compared with the sums spent in other cultural and academic fields. If it was sufficiently persuasive and exciting such a document could help FIAF members in their struggle against the inertia of public opinion. In FIAF Congresses, Mr Acimoric, would like to see a diminution in the discussion of administrative things, and an increase in discussions of the things which interested members in their daily work. Finally, he suggested that FIAF members were too complacently satisfied to go on presenting programmes of the old international classics. What about the national production? Had all the films of the last 25 years been saved? He believed not, and that many important films made since the last world war had already been lost.

Mr Ledoux said that it was not strictly the case that independent and underground film makers were interested only in distribution and not in money, as Mr Schein had alleged. It was true that they did not look for immense profits like MGM and other commercial distributors, but they understandably wanted to earn money with their films, both to live and to make more films. This led on to another consideration which he had already developed at New York last year, namely the problem of the purchase and renting of films by film archives for their projections. It was extremely important that in obtaining films for preservation, archives should pay no more than the laboratory costs. If, from a desire to help independent producers, archives bought preservation copies at prices above laboratory cost, and failed to do the same for commercial productions, their position would become untenable. Furthermore, most film archives had hitherto paid no rental fees for films projected on their own premises, and here the same problem arose; one could not follow one kind of policy for one type of film producer or distributor, and another for another. He wished to add a word concerning the present discussion, the first of its kind held in FIAF. While he agreed that it had to be entirely free, nevertheless, one had to think about its results. Many ideas had been expressed, and if they were to be applied, it was important that those who had raised them should write them down and submit them to be considered as new projects on Friday.

Mr Klaué said that he regarded film as a part of the audio-visual mass media and he felt the time had come to consider whether the scope of FIAF should not be enlarged to include all the audio-visual mass media, which might mean changing its statutes and rules. He suggested that the new Executive Committee should be asked to study this problem. It had already been studied in his own country, where it had been decided to extend the work of the Staatliches Filmarchiv to television and so to create a central archive of film and television.

Mr Alberti, replying to Mr Ledoux on the question of paying for films, said it was not true that archives never paid for films shown in their own theatres; if the Cineteca Italiana demanded payment, they paid. Secondly, he urged vigorously that FIAF should set up a press bureau to give news of its activities regularly to the world's press; this would be most valuable propaganda.

Mr Kubelka said he had to disagree with Mr Ledoux about payment to independent film-makers. Unlike the commercial producer catering for a mass audience, who lost nothing by helping an archive, the independent film-maker had a very small potential audience of perhaps only hundreds, and an archive which showed his film without payment could take away this audience. This new movement was producing high art for the first time in cinema history, and FIAF must support it, not act against it. Mr Kubelka also wanted to ask Mr Lindgren whether he had any information on the copyright problem, unless this was to be discussed elsewhere on the agenda.

Mr Kula said there were other ways to assist young film-makers than giving money. His own organisation, for example, had helped independent film-makers by making and preserving intermediate material at its own expense to help them to conserve their printing facilities, and had also helped them to copyright and protect their work so that they could exploit it more profitably. There were no doubt other ways in which an archive could assist these film-makers, and at the same time ensure that their work was reflected in the national collection.

Mr Pogacic said that the time had unfortunately arrived to close the discussion. He thanked everyone who had spoken. It was impossible to draw general conclusions from such a wide-ranging debate, but he regretted particularly that no answer had been given to the questions asked by Mr Borde at the beginning, which seemed to him fundamental.

FIFTH SESSION (28.5.70 10 a.m.)

(for full members only)

The President, Professor Toeplitz, presided over the session.

MODIFICATION OF STATUTS AND RULES (agenda item 15)

Professor Toeplitz introduced item 15 of the agenda, Modification of Statuts and Rules. The only change was to delete sub-paragraph (c) in Article 141 of the Rules, and asked the Secretary General to explain this. (annex N° 10)

Mr Ledoux said a paper had been circulated quoting Article 141 of the Rules, and the sub-paragraph (c) which he proposed the General Meeting should agree to delete read as follows: "Private and non-commercial projections to non-paying audiences." When FIAF members exchanged films with each other, they sometimes sent films without the direct authority of the copyright-owners, because they did not know who they were. This involved a certain risk, because the copyright owner might at some future time make himself known and assert his rights. This was not likely to embarrass FIAF members if it was clearly understood that they exchanged films exclusively for the two purposes which had always been conceded in all FIAF discussions with FIAPF, namely, for preservation and for showing on their own premises. It was not

permissible, however, to use them without the copyright owner's direct permission for any kind of showing outside the archive, even to a non-paying audience. This was why he proposed the deletion of sub-paragraph (c); to avoid confusion and misunderstanding.

Mr Konlechner asked whether this meant that for the first two purposes, the copyright owners' permission was no longer necessary; and secondly, that provided the owners' written permission was obtained for festival retrospective showings, exchanges would not be impeded.

Mr Ledoux said he was only speaking of films of which the copyright owner was unknown; where the copyright owner was known, the question did not arise.

There being no other questions, the President put the proposal to the vote of the General Meeting, and it was carried unanimously.

MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS: ZAGREB RESOLUTION (agenda item 16)

The President next turned to item 16 of the agenda, concerning questions of Membership, and said he proposed to begin by asking the General Meeting to approve the resolution on the requirements for FIAF Membership at Zagreb in October 1969, and on which a paper had already been circulated to the members. (annex n° 11)

The President said this was not a modification of the Statutes and Rules, but a clarification of existing Statutes, and of long practice. It was meant to apply to new archives coming into existence as a guide to their constitutional formation, and to archives in danger of losing their autonomy through absorption into a larger organisation. He wished to stress that it did not apply to existing members of FIAF. The reason for the resolution was that two members, the Deutsche Kinemathek in Berlin and the Finnish Film Archive were in danger of being taken over by film schools, and had turned to FIAF for advice and support. The Executive Committee foresaw the possibility of the same problem arising elsewhere, and felt it necessary to safeguard against this by adopting the Zagreb resolution. Complete independence for a film archive was not always possible especially in the developing countries, but unless it has autonomy it can be responsible within its own field of activity, and it cannot be accepted as a member of FIAF, since FIAF was essentially an organisation of archives, and could only admit archives who were not pre-occupied with other non-archival considerations. The Executive Committee did not want to dictate in detail how autonomy should be preserved - that was an internal matter for each organisation to decide for itself - but only to state a principle. Its resolution would only have a formal value after it had been adopted by the General Meeting. He opened the discussion.

Mr Ledoux wished only to remark that the six conditions listed in the resolution were not obligatory either singly or in their entirety, but were considerations to be taken into account by any future Executive Committee when assessing the autonomy of an applicant for membership.

Mr. Fioravanti said he could not agree with the opening statement of resolution, that an archive could work most effectively only if it were totally independent ; as part of a larger organisation it might well enjoy greater technical and financial resources. He had no objection to the first two of the six requirements listed, but he thought that to ask for the last four was not possible. Furthermore, to insist on them would prevent FIAF from enlarging its range of interests and membership, which other speakers had advocated.

In reply to a question from the President, Mr. Fioravanti said he was not totally against the resolution, but he would like to see it modified, and the last four of the six conditions omitted.

Mr. Schein said he was against the resolution as it stood. If it was necessary, it should be rephrased and applied in a different way. He did not see why it was needed at all. Sweden for decades had had an independent film archive, which had no money and for that reason did not work very well. Now the archive was dependent, a department of the Swedish Film Institute, and it worked very well. It had been said that autonomy was important for the archive to be able to fulfil its responsibilities to the film industry, but the confidence of the industry was based on individual cases, not on general rules. FIAF itself, with archives from both socialist and western countries, representing two copyright systems, and two legal systems, was too varied in its membership for it to be possible to impose the same rules on all. The Polish Government, for example, could influence its autonomous archive, but the Swedish Government could not influence the Swedish archive, though it was dependent. There was no half-way state between dependence and independence. For a dependent archive to act as though it were autonomous was a form of play-acting.

The second condition in the Zagreb resolution required an archive to have its own statutes and constitution, but how many members of FIAF did so ? Ernest Lindgren had autonomy in London, and it worked, but in all essential matters his Archive could not act independently of the British Film Institute. This resolution would render a disservice to the emergent countries because it was in effect a restriction, and it could do great harm. It was also an interference in the internal affairs of the people in such countries as Finland and West Berlin, which had been cited ; why suppose that FIAF knew better what was good for these people than they did themselves ? He asked that the vote on this resolution be taken by secret ballot, and urged that it be either rejected, or referred back to the Executive Committee for re-writing, so that it spoke not of pretended autonomy but of genuine autonomy.

Mr. Berg said he was grateful to the Executive Committee for this resolution which was in the real interests of FIAF. FIAF had a duty to protect its member. If his own Deutsche Kinemathek had been absorbed by the film school, this would not have been done to help it to preserve its films, but in order to have the possibility of using those films, and of getting films from other FIAF members, for its educational work in the school, and genuine archival activities would have been brought to an end.

Furthermore he believed that all the six conditions in the resolution were important, not only those relating to formal matters, like the title and constitution; but also in its day to day work, as implied in number 5 for example ; however much archives differed from each other, they all had a responsibility to respect copyright, and must be able in their own right to do so.

Mr. Suomela explained the situation of her Archive in Finland, whose existence had been threatened, and said she was grateful to receive this resolution from Zagreb. The authorities in Finland did not understand the nature of a film archive, and she was able to inform them by using and publishing this resolution. She hoped the General Meeting would adopt it.

Mr. Lindgren stressed that the six points listed in the resolution were only desired requirements, not essential conditions, and to reject the whole document because of an objection to only one or two of the requirements was to misread its intention. He was surprised that Mr. Fioravanti objected to number 4, requiring the archive to be responsible for the uses of the films in its collection, including those received from other FIAF members, because this was surely fundamental, and the exchange of films between archives depended on it. Mr. Schein's argument was logical if one accepted his basic premise, which was that there was no intermediate position between total dependence and total independence. On 35 years' experience of such an intermediate position, he (Mr. Lindgren) had to disagree. That was why there was a special word for this position, namely autonomy, which meant something different from independence. His own National Film Archive had no legal entity of its own, and was part of the legal entity of the British Film Institute, so that in legal matters reference had to be made to the BFI. But the Statutory Deposit Bill to which Mr. Schein had referred was for the deposit of films in the National Film Archive, as its title made clear, not in the British Film Institute. He believed the Zagreb resolution to be a useful and necessary statement, clarifying what was required of a member to discharge his responsibilities to FIAF, and to enable FIAF to assist the member. He hoped the General Meeting would adopt it.

Mr. Mayerhofer expressed concern at the statement in the resolution that if an existing FIAF member lost its independence, its membership would lapse automatically. This was unique in his experience of international bodies, and it seemed to him an interference in the internal affairs of members. It was as though the international association of libraries should require all libraries to be independent, whereas many were attached to universities etc. He suggested that instead, for questions of liability and responsibility, these should be an international convention for members to sign, and that quite separately from this there should be a series of recommendations concerning the constitution of an archive, but they should not be made a condition of FIAF membership.

Mr. Alberti said that the Cineteca Italiana had no reason formally to object to the six conditions, but he was concerned with a much wider issue, namely, the policy of FIAF, which was more important than the individual interests of those archives which welcomed or objected to the resolution. FIAF did not need such a resolution to prove its good faith towards producers which had already been shown by its decision that morning to delete Article 141 (c) of the Rules, almost without discussion. His fear was the resolution would turn FIAF into an exclusive limited club, and that the admission of all the new kinds of member which were being mentioned the previous day in the Open Forum would be prevented. He therefore proposed that for this year the resolution be accepted only as a recommendation, to allow for the formulation of a better policy in the future.

Mr. Morris said that the case of the resolution was in the fourth of the six requirements, as had already been mentioned. That morning they had agreed to delete Article 141 (c) of the Rules, out of respect to the protection of copyright owners, but what was that worth if any of the members present could have their decisions overruled? He was concerned not with the intention of the resolution, but with its vagueness. How were the six requirements to be interpreted in particular cases? Would different standards be applied? If FIAF wished to act seriously according to this resolution, it should incorporate the principles in its Rules. He therefore wished to propose that the Zagreb resolution be agreed in principle, but that the Executive Committee be recommended to investigate the possibility of incorporating it in its Statutes and Rules.

Mr. Pogacic said he also wished to refer to point 4 in the resolution. If archives could not exercise responsibility for the films sent to them, FIAF exchanges would become impossible. Secondly, on point 6, requiring member archives to be represented by their own officers, this was essential for the personal contacts which were such an important aspect of FIAF meetings.

Mr. Kubelka said that the Austrian Filmmuseum, which was an independent archive, was in favour of the Zagreb resolution, and he did not understand how any independent archive could be against it. If there was any danger in a member being integrated into a larger organisation this was a recommendation useful to guide those concerned. It was not part of the Statutes, not a rigid position to be rigidly applied; compromises were possible and the new members FIAF wanted to encourage need not be excluded. As a statement of FIAF opinion, and a recommendation, he thought it was very good.

Mr. Papp did not agree with the resolution in its present form. It looked to the past instead of the future. It was impossible to foresee what different kinds of archives might want to join FIAF, or how conditions might vary from country to country. History had shown that international federations only worked if they respected national sovereignty.

He would therefore like to see the resolution modified and made less strong.

Mr. Fioravanti explained to Mr. Schein why he accepted point 2 of the resolution. To Mr. Lindgren he wished to say that he was opposed to the other points, including point 4, not because he was against the exercise of responsibility for Films, but because it did not concern FIAF who exercised that responsibility. The resolution gave FIAF a kind of legislative power, but FIAF was a federation, not a Governmental organisation which could impose such severe rules as to hinder the admission of new members. He regarded points 3,4,5 and 6 as an internal interference in the affairs of a member.

Mr. Schein, in reply to Mr. Berg, said it was interesting to hear his account of what happened in West Berlin, but one could not be sure that others there might have a different view. Ernest Lindgren enjoyed independence in London, but who could say what might happen there in the future, with different people and circumstances? Mr. Lindgren also began by calling the six points considerations, then requirements, then desiderata. This was a great change in meaning; if they were only desiderata why not say so? Mr. Morris and Mr. Pogacic said one had to be sure that films would be used responsibly. Mr. Schein agreed, but this could not be ensured by a resolution of this kind; it depended on individual relations between archives. Mr. Kubelka had described the resolution as a recommendation, but it was not so described. All these ambiguities led to only one conclusion: that this paper was not suitable for any decision according to the evaluation of those who wrote it. He believed it should be referred back to the Executive Committee for reconsideration.

The President closed the discussion and said he wished to make a few observations before putting the resolution to the vote. First, to say that the resolution was open to modification was not to express a lack of confidence in its principles; no document submitted to discussion should be treated as sacrosanct and unchangeable. Secondly, the text made it clear that it applied only to new members. Thirdly, the automatic loss of membership mentioned in the text was not of a finite character, since a new application would be immediately considered in relation to the considerations listed. Fourthly, the words "consideration will be given" clearly allowed scope for judgment, and did not imply that every requirement listed had to be met. It was natural that a large body like FIAF should feel the necessity to have its member organisations well-defined. FIAF itself could not avoid sharing the responsibility carried individually by its members, because their exchanges were based on FIAF rules and practice, and letters of complaint had in the past been addressed to FIAF. FIAF had to guide its members, and internationally to be responsible for their actions. He therefore proposed to the General Meeting that it should approve the resolution, and then ask the Executive Committee to consider ways in which it could be improved; it would not close the problem, but would provide a starting point for its further consideration.

He agreed with Mr. Schein that the voting should be secret, so that no one felt any compulsion to follow the lead of the Executive Committee.

The vote was then taken and the papers counted by three non-voting scrutineers agreed by the Meeting, Mr. Kubelka, Mr. Turner and Mr. Acimovic, with results as follows :

For the Zagreb resolution	-	20.
Against	-	7.
Abstentions	-	1.

The President declared the resolution carried by a clear majority. He then asked whether the Executive Committee was to consider any improvements to the text.

Mr. Ledoux suggested that members should submit any proposals for modifying the text in writing.

This was agreed by general assent.

ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS.

(a) Library of Congress, Washington.

The President called on the Secretary-General to introduce the application of the Library of Congress.

Mr. Ledoux said the Motion Picture Section of the Library of Congress had been accepted as a Provisional Member at the previous General Meeting in New York and was now applying for full Membership. According to a Formality provided for in Article b of the Rules, it was required in such a case that a visit should be paid by a member of the Executive Committee to the premises of the applicant archive, but by good fortune the whole General Meeting had the opportunity the previous year to go to Washington and to inspect the vaults and premises of the Library of Congress. The Executive Committee saw no objection to the application, on the contrary they welcomed it, and on behalf of the Committee he proposed that the application be approved. If the General Meeting wished, Mr. Kuiper could be invited into the room to give any supplementary information desired, although Mr. Ledoux himself saw no necessity for this.

There being no request for further information from Mr. Kuiper, the President ordered the vote to be taken, with results as follows :

Number of full members voting	-	28.
Votes for admitting the Library of Congress Motion Picture Section to full Membership	-	28.

Mr. Kuiper was called into the room, greeted with acclamation, and congratulated by the President on the election of his archive.

(b) Filmarshiva Republikës Popullore të Shqipërisë, Tirana.

Mr. Ledoux explained that the Albanian Film Archive, which was now applying for full membership, had been a provisional member of FIAF for seven years, which was the maximum period permitted by the Rules. He had informed the Director, Mr. Aristide of this in a letter of 6th June 1969, and had advised him that he would now have to apply for full membership, and that it was a necessary condition that a member of the Executive Committee should inspect his preservation facilities. The application for full membership had arrived very late, and contained no reference to the required visit of inspection. Since the status of Provisional member could not be prolonged in this case, the Executive Committee had agreed to propose to the General Meeting that full membership be granted from 1st. January 1971, provided that before that time a member of the Executive Committee had been invited to Albania to visit the storage vaults, and had reported favourably to the Committee. This recommendation had been explained to Mr. Nos, who had come from Albanian Embassy in Paris to represent the archive at this General Meeting. The Albanian Film Archive was a state organisation, which had always behaved correctly as a member, replying to requests, and sending its reports, but otherwise having no personal contact with FIAF.

The President proposed that instead of the required visit of inspection being described as a "condition", one might use such a phrase as "provided that", (sous la réserve que), and that the choice of the Executive Committee member to make the visit should be agreed with the Albanian Film Archive.

Mr Lindgren indicated that he did not mind what phrase was used, provided that the Meeting behaved honestly to Mr Nos, and made it clear to him that the visit was a condition required by the Rules without which the full membership could not be ratified.

Mr Nos was then called into the room and the President explained the situation to him. He asked whether Mr Nos had any observation to make. In reply, Mr Nos gave greetings and good wishes from the Albanian Film Archive, and described its history and activities in some detail. He gave a guarantee that the Albanian Film Archive, if elected as a full member, would willingly respect all its membership obligations.

The President asked if anyone wished to ask Mr Nos any questions.

Mr Lindgren said that Mr Nos had not answered directly the point about the visit of inspection. He wished to ask Mr Nos if he accepted it as a condition of acceptance of his Archive's application, and if he could assure the Meeting that arrangements for the visit would be made.

Mr. Nos replied that this was certainly accepted, since it was in the Rules, which his Archive had undertaken fully to respect.

Mr. Nos then retired, and a vote was taken with the following results :

For full membership	-	25
Against	-	3
Abstentions	-	1

Mr. Nos was recalled, and the President announced this result to him. He looked forward to hearing from the Director of the Archive about the details of the visit previously mentioned.

Mr. Nos thanked the General Meeting, and was welcomed with acclamation.

(c) Swedish Film Institute.

Mr. Ledoux said that for many years the Swedish member of FIAF was Film-historiska Samlingarna. In 1964 FIAF was informed that this body had been absorbed into the Swedish Film Institute, but it then been assumed that it would continue as a department within the Institute, like the National Film Archive within the British Film Institute, and that it would continue its previous status as a member. In 1967 Mr. Schein had informed the Secretary-General that this was not the case, and this was where the present problem had started. Mr. Schein wanted the Swedish Film Institute to be the member of FIAF, but had been informed that this was contrary to FIAF Statutes and Rules and could not be accepted ; FIAF could only accept an identifiable and autonomous archive department within the Swedish Film Institute. At the General Meeting in New York, the SFI representative, Mr. Lindqvist, said the archive of the SFI would be the member, and undertook to supply an organigram to show the position of this archive within the SFI, but this had never been received. Instead, Mr. Schein sent a letter to say that the archive within the SFI would comprise 4 departments, namely Film Archives, Documentation Service, Programmes and Projection, and a Technical Service. In his last letter Mr. Schein had conceded that the archive of the SFI might be the FIAF member. If this was now confirmed by him, all that remained was to ask him to send a letter assuring FIAF of the autonomy of that archive within his Institute.

The President invited Mr. Schein to present his point of view.

Mr. Schein said that there seemed to have been a double misunderstanding, since in 1964 he had assumed that the Swedish Film Institute would be accepted as the FIAF member. He believed that all FIAF members should be really autonomous. Some present members were not? but the SFI was truly autonomous and should be a member. It conformed to FIAF Statutes and Rules because it was non-commercial and more than half its activities were those proper to a film archive. It was stronger than most archives, receiving all Swedish Films free, and having the confidence also of Foreign producers. It would be ridiculous for the SFI to enjoy the confidence of the producers and not of FIAF.

He therefore urged that the SFI be accepted as a member. If, however, the General Meeting insisted, then it would have to be accepted that the archive of the SFI, although having no legal or physical entity, should be the member. As to the letter which Mr. Ledoux asked for guaranteeing its autonomy, he would only write such a letter if all the other members had to do the same ; he would not be the only one.

The President suggested the issue was basically a simple one. All that was asked for was that the Swedish Film Institute should create within its organisation an archival entity, under the control of one person who was responsible and known to all FIAF members, such as existed in London, Prague and Rome. He hoped that past misunderstandings could be forgotten, and that relations with the Swedish archive could begin again with a tabula rasa.

Mr. Lindgren supported this plea. The misunderstanding centred on Article 5 of the Statutes, which said that "The Federation shall be composed of Film Libraries, archives and museums". The problem was that the Swedish Film Institute as a whole was more than an archive.

Mr. Schein asked whether an archive, to be a member, must be solely an archive. More than half of the SFI's activities, as he had already said, were archival. He would like to know the opinion of the General Meeting. In reply, to the President, he said he did not ask for a secret vote. The resolution he wished to propose was that the Swedish Film Institute as a whole be considered a member of FIAF.

The President put this resolution to the vote, with the following result :

For - 3

Mr. Schein agreed that it was unnecessary to take the vote further, and the discussion was closed.

SIXTH SESSION

May 28th, 1970 at 3 p.m.

ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS (Continued)

(d) American Film Institute.

Mr. Ledoux said that the Archives Section of the American Film Institute was applying for Provisional Membership, and their application had been very carefully considered by the Executive Committee. These were two problems. First, the Executive Committee wanted a letter from the Director of the AFI guaranteeing the autonomy of its Archives Section, but if the Meeting so decided, membership could be granted provisionally, subject to such a letter being received within a certain time. More important was the problem of the ownership of the AFI's film collection, which was deposited with the Library of Congress.

Was this the property of the Library of Congress, or was it held in common by both organisations, and subject to AFI control. This was a question which the Meeting might want to put to Mr. Kuiper. Apart from this, the Executive Committee believed that it was most important for FIAF to have some kind of link with the American Film Institute.

The President asked for the opinion of Mr. Kuiper.

Mr. Kuiper explained that the Library of Congress held many film collections, including one from the American Film Institute. The physical material was the property of the American nation, but the AFI had to be consulted about the use of Films in its collection. In that real sense, they did own, or control the collection. The situation was an unusual one.

Mrs. Bowser said it would be useful to both the present American members if the AFI could be admitted as a member. The General Meeting, however, should fully understand the ownership question, because they might be creating a precedent which in other future cases could prove embarrassing.

In reply to a question from Mr. Morris, Mr. Kuiper said that the AFI would be able in general to enter into exchanges with other FIAF members without having to obtain the permission of the Library of Congress, provided the Library retained technical control over the choice of laboratory etc. The prints originally deposited, of course, could not leave the Library. Mr. Lindgren asked whether, if a member wanted a film in the AFI collection, it would have to apply to AFI, and if it applied to the Library of Congress, the Library would not be able to supply the film without first obtaining the permission of the AFI.

Mr. Kuiper agreed that this was so.

Mr. Volkmann referred to the AFI film lists, and he believed the Meeting was faced with an artificial construction, and that to vote for the AFI was to vote against FIAF's Statutes.

Mr. Kuiper agreed that it was unfortunate that the AFI list included RKO and Paramount Films, which were direct gifts from the distributors, but the remaining half of the list were gifts from the AFI.

Mr. Lindgren thought it desirable to find a solution, since both the present American members wanted AFI to be associated with FIAF, AFI had its Archives Section with Mr. Kula as archivist, and to insist too much on the importance of its own collection might lead it to create a separate collection which would not be in the interests of film archiving in the USA or of the two present members.

It was eventually agreed that Mr. Kula be invited in to the Meeting to answer members questions, and it was also decided on a majority, with 17 members in favour, that the President should invite Mr. Kula to comment on the alternative possibility of offering the AFI the status of Corresponding Member.

Mr. Kula then joined the Meeting.

The President told him that it was unanimously agreed that the American Film Institute should be within the FIAF family ; there was, however, a clear division of opinion as to the most suitable category of membership, some favouring Provisional Membership, and some favouring Corresponding Membership. He therefore asked Mr. Kula whether, if his present application were rejected, he would agree to apply at this General Meeting for admission as a Corresponding Member.

Mr. Kula said he believed that the AFI could work best in FIAF as a full Member. However, there was such closeness between the work of the AFI and FIAF that he would, although with some reluctance, be prepared to accept Corresponding Membership if that were the only possibility open at that time.

The President invited questions from the members.

Mr. Lindgran said he only wished to explain to Mr. Kula the difficulty of the Meeting, so that he could comment on it, and perhaps say something which would offer members the solution they were grasping for. Everyone wanted in FIAF ; of that there was no doubt. The problem was that apparently AFI did not physically have an archive of its own. FIAF did not want to encourage it to create its own archive ; the present work of AFI in supporting existing preservation work in the United States seemed absolutely right. Yet without a film collection how could it qualify as a Full Member within the Rules ? The chief concern of members was not even so much a matter of the AFI as of the precedent they could be creating for the future when they faced similar situations in other organisations whose status might be much more doubtful.

In reply to this and further questions from Mr. Morris, Mr. Klaue and Mr. Ledoux, Mr. Kula said it was clear that the resitancy of members hinged on one question, that of ownership of the AFI film collection. It was time that the AFI did not administer storage vaults, but there was emphatically an AFI film collection, so designated and so controlled. This control was ownership as far as he understood it. As the AFI's film archivist, he could exchange and lend these films, and determine their use. Because the films were stored by public funds in the Library of Congress the physical copies deposited could not be withdrawn. But what FIAF members were interested in was his ability to authorise the loan, exchange and use of copies made therefrom, and this authority he had.

It was this which could enable the Archive Section of the AFI to function as a member of FIAF, and he hoped as a Full Member. He would gladly undertake to have a letter signed by his Director and addressed to the Secretary-General of FIAF confirming the autonomous status of the Archive Section, and its ability to apply for membership according to FIAF Statutes.

Mr. Kula then withdrew.

Mr. Privato said that his personal opinion was that the American Film Institute should be accepted as a Provisional Member.

Mr. Borde said the AFI position was not very different from that now obtaining in France, where the owners of Collections of Films could have them stored by the French National Film Archive Service without losing ownership or control. He therefore favoured the application of the AFI.

Mr. Ledoux said this analogy was not correct since films could be withdrawn from the French Archive Service, but not from the Library of Congress. In his own archive he was in precisely the opposite position to that of Mr. Kula, in that he owned films physically but had no rights in them. He was now being asked to agree that things which were opposite were really the same ; this was his difficulty.

The President closed the discussion, and instructed the vote by secret ballot to be taken, with Mr. Acimovic, Mr. Turner and Mr. Clavel as scrutineers. The motion was that the American Film Institute (Film Archives Section) be admitted as a Provisional Member, on condition that within three months the Secretary-General received a letter from the Director of the AFI confirming the autonomy of the Archives Section, and its ability to be responsible for respecting the Statutes and Rules of FIAF. The results of the vote were :

For the motion	-	20
Against	-	6
Abstentions	-	3

Mr. Kula returned to the Meeting and was received with acclamation. The President announced the result of the vote to Mr. Kula, who thanked the Meeting.

(c) National Film Archive in the United Arab Republic, Cairo.

Mr. Ledoux said that the Film Archive in Cairo, which was a state organisation created by the Minister of Culture, had sent in a most excellent application, complete with all the information and documents required, including a list of 173 films in its collection, presumably all Egyptian, and a cheque in payment of its subscription. The Executive Committee unanimously recommended its admission as a Provisional Member.

The President asked for the vote to be taken on the motion that the National Film Archive of the United Arab Republic be admitted as a Provisional Member, with the result as follows :

For	-	28
Against	-	0
Abstentions	-	1

(Later in the General Meeting, Mrs. Van Leer of the Archion Israeli Lese-ratim, Haifa, issued a statement to make it clear that the abstention was not hers, and that she had voted for admission of the Cairo Film Archive. She said that she strongly believed that politics should not be introduced into FIAF if its present character was to be safeguarded) (Annexe n° 12)

(f) Uruguayan Film Archive (Cineteca Uruguaya) Montevideo.

Mr. Ledoux said the Cineteca Uruguaya, which had been a Corresponding Member for many years, had been deleted from membership about ten years ago for non-payment of its subscription. It now applied to be re-affiliated, presumably as a Corresponding Member, but unfortunately it had not complied with the Rules, by enclosing a cheque in payment of its subscription. The Executive Committee therefore recommended its admission as a Correspondent, on condition that a cheque for 300 Swiss francs was received before 1st January 1971. The formal agreement of SODRE had not been received, but since Mr. Hintz of SODRE had personally brought the application to Europe and handed it to Mr. Lindgren in London, who passed it to Mr. Ledoux, it must be assumed that SODRE gave its approval. The film Archive was a small but serious one, with an important film collection, which ought to be accepted.

The motion was then put to the vote that the Uruguayan Film Archive be admitted as a Correspondent, on condition that its subscription was received before 1st. January 1971. The result was :

For	-	27
Vote not valid	-	1

(g) Argentine Film Archive.

Mr. Ledoux said this was absolutely identical with the Uruguayan case - an archive which used to be a Corresponding Member in the time of Mr. Roland, and which now wished to rejoin. Its application, however, was accompanied neither by a list nor the payment of its subscription. The Executive Committee proposed that it be re-admitted as a Correspondent on condition that FIAF received before 1st January 1971 both a list of its films and a cheque in payment of its subscription. This was put to the vote of the Meeting, and agreed unanimously.

(h) Mexican Film Archive.

Mr. Ledoux said the Mexican Film Archive, founded by Mr. Gomez Gomez, whom members had met at the London Congress two years earlier, had applied for provisional membership, but very late, and with supporting documents in Spanish, which there had been no time to translate. The Executive Committee recommended corresponding membership this year, and Mr. Gomez Gomez could apply again for provisional membership next year.

Mr. Konlechner described some unsatisfactory experiences he had had with Mr. Gomez Gomez over a Bunuel retrospective.

Mr. Privato said his experience with the Mexican Archive had been favourable.

The President proposed first to ask the General Meeting to vote on provisional membership, and if the vote was against, then to vote on corresponding membership. The results were as follows :

On the first vote

For Provisional Membership	-	5
Against Provisional Membership	-	19
Abstentions		5

On the second vote

For Corresponding Membership	-	19
Against Corresponding Membership	-	9
Abstentions		1

The President declared the Mexican Film Archive a Correspondant.

RENEWAL OF MEMBERSHIP(a) Turk film Arsivi, Istanbul

Mr. Ledoux said this was the only Provisional Member applying for prolongation of its membership status. It still owed part of its 1969 subscription. Nevertheless he proposed the prolongation of provisional membership for a further year. This was agreed by the Meeting unanimously.

(b) Turk Sinematek Dernegi, Istanbul

Mr. Ledoux said the Sinematek Dernegi also had not paid its 1969 subscription, but had sent in reports, and applied for continuation of its status.

Mr. Fioravanti said it was a small organisation, with very few films, which worked hard, and attracted a considerable student audience to its projections.

It was proposed, and voted unanimously, that its status as Correspondent be continued for one more year.

(c) Lima Film Archive, Peru.

Mr. Ledoux said no reports had been received, and no request for prolongation of its status. Nevertheless he proposed that it remain as a Correspondent for one more year. This was agreed unanimously.

(d) UCLA, Los Angeles.

Mr. Ledoux said Colin Young was leaving to take up a post as Director of the British National Film School; and the future of UCLA in FIAF was uncertain. Nevertheless he proposed that it remain a Correspondent for one more year. Agreed unanimously.

(e) Museum Foundation Committee, Lyons.

Mr. Ledoux said this was an embryo organisation with a remarkable collection of early cinematograph apparatuses and a unique collection of Lumière negative films. The success of its efforts in organising the present Congress had been quite extraordinary. He therefore proposed that its status as Correspondent be continued for one year. Agreed unanimously.

(f) SODRE, Montevideo

Mr. Ledoux said this was one of the most solid of the Latin-American archives, and it had the status of a Correspondent owing to financial difficulties in transferring money abroad. He proposed the continuation of its status as Correspondent for a further year. Agreed unanimously.

(g) Pyong Yang, North Korea.

Mr. Ledoux said that after many years the Pyong Yang Archive, which had always paid its subscription, had sent a letter to him, hoping for permanent contact, and expressing the wish to send a delegate to Lyons, although this had not proved possible owing to difficulties of communication. He proposed a continuation of its status as Correspondent for a further year. Agreed unanimously.

(h) Film Museum of Zurich.

Mr. Ledoux said that he had had no news from Mr. Egger, and his subscription had been unpaid for two years. He proposed the deletion of the Zurich Film Museum from membership. Agreed unanimously.

OTHER MEMBERSHIP PROBLEMS(a) Latin-America.

Mr. Ledoux said that at the New York General Meeting of the previous year Mr. Hintz had declared his hopes of being able to organise a grouping of Latin American archives, UCAL , to reaffiliate in some manner with FIAF, but he had since written to say that the organisation of such a meeting had so far proved impossible.

Mr. Alberti, representing Mr. Hintz enlarged on the difficulties in Latin America, and communicated the wish of Mr. Hintz that despite all the disappointments, this subject should continue to have the attention and sympathy of FIAF.

The President said FIAF had discussed this problem at all its meetings, and would continue to do so. He hoped that Mr. Hintz would respond by paying the minimum subscription of 75 dollars required from him, not for financial reasons , but as a token of his own seriousness.

(b) Tunisia.

Mr. Ferdaga reported on Film archive developments in Tunisia. He undertook to give Mr. Ledoux the address of the Tunisian Cinemathèque.

This ended the consideration of membership questions, and the President, declared the session closed.

SEVENTH SESSION

May 29th, 1970, 10 a.m.

Mr. Lindgren presided over the Session at the request of the President.

Budget for 1971. (Agenda item 19)

He called on the Deputy Treasurer, Mr. Borde, to present the Budget for 1971.

Mr. Borde referred to the Budget which had been circulated to members on pp. 7 and 8 of the Financial Report and Budget, and reviewed the expenses which were expected, amounting to 74,500 F.S., a little more than the 71,000 F.S. of the current year, 1970. In his view this was the minimum necessary. Turning to the budgeted revenue figures on p.8, he observed that the total subscription expected amounted to 71,500 F.S. On this source of revenue alone, therefore, it would clearly be necessary to increase the members' subscriptions to balance the budget (annexe n° 14)

Mr. Ledoux emphasised that FIAF subscriptions had not been increased for 12 years. An increase was necessary now because of inflation, and would only enable FIAF to maintain its present minimal Secretariat and Services; it would not provide for their enlargement.

Mr. Stenklev, Mrs. Suomela, and Mr. Konlechner all spoke in favour of raising the subscriptions. MR. Fernoaga said an increase was beyond the possibilities of some members, and the future Executive Committee should review the position.

Mr. Borde warned that if subscriptions were not raised, FIAF would have to eat into its Reserve Fund.

Dr. Roads, although not having a vote, spoke in favour of the increase, although he also hoped more would be done to supplement income by recruiting new members.

Mr. Lindgren said FIAF was not only the largest and most effective of international Film organisations, but it was also independent, and this ensured the completeness of its international representation; independence had to be paid for.

Mr. Lindgren then asked the Meeting to vote on the motion that FIAF membership subscriptions should be increased to the following sums :

Full members	-	2000 F.S.	
Associate members	-	1000 F.S.	
Provisional members	-		
		for 1st; and 2nd year	700 F.S.
		addition for each succeeding year	- 250 F.S.
Correspondents	-	300 F.S.	

The results of the vote were as follows :

For	-	21
Against	-	4
Abstentions	-	4

Mr. Lindgren declared the motion carried.

Mr. Lindgren then put to the vote the motion that the Budget for 1971, as submitted by the Deputy Treasurer, Mr. Borde, be approved, with results as follows :

For	-	27
Against	-	0
Abstentions	-	1

Work of the FIAF Secretariat.

Mr. Alberti said that the work of FIAF must grow, which meant that each year the subscriptions must be increased unless other sources of revenue were found. He urged the Future Executive Committee to discuss two possibilities: the possibility of subventions from outside, comparable to the governmental grants member archives received for their own work, and the possibility of organising revenue-earning services.

Mrs. Suomela said that FIAF could do more for its members, for example, by creating a permanent working service centre, to provide centrally the kind of help which individual archives were at present giving bilaterally. The Finnish Archive would be willing to pay an even higher subscription for more services.

Mr. Lindgren welcomed Mr. Nair of the National Film Archive of India to the Meeting. He regretted that he had arrived late at the Meeting, but he had two days in which to develop personal contacts with other members, which was a most important benefit of FIAF. He invited Mr. Nair to contribute to the discussion.

Mr. Nair said he was happy to be at the Meeting. He regretted that his first vote had been a negative one, but he had felt obliged to vote against raising the subscriptions. One had to ask, and one's authorities asked: 'What are the benefits we receive?' He suggested that subscriptions might be graded according to the size of a member's collection. He also observed that FIAF membership was limited mainly to Europe and America, His Archive, was the only Asian member. Other archives throughout the world should be brought into FIAF.

Mr. Meyerhofer asked if FIAF could not obtain a grant from UNESCO. The Secretariat of the International Libraries Association, for example, was paid by UNESCO.

Mr. Ledoux said a member's subscription represented the cost of a single film negative; it was not much. As to the suggestion of money from UNESCO, he would ask Professor Toeplitz to speak about this. His own experience had not been encouraging. Members often spoke of enlarging the work of the Secretariat, but always in generalities. If they would submit precise proposals, he would examine them with great pleasure.

Professor Toeplitz said that in principle all applications for UNESCO money would have to be made through the International Council of Films and Television. As from next year, the Council would be financed on a contractual basis and would welcome projects from FIAF (such as the Bibliography of the Rumanian Archive) which could be completed by FIAF, but which would be of value outside FIAF. UNESCO would keep a certain part of the revenue - 20 % for example - to pay its administrative costs, and the rest would go to FIAF. FIAF in turn could keep a percentage and pass the balance to the archive which had done the work.

Mr. Lindgren thanked Professor Toeplitz for his informative intervention, but owing to shortness of time felt it necessary to introduce the next item.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(Agenda item 20)

To remind the Meeting of the ^{cedures} ~~procedures~~ for election of Officers and Executive Committee, Mr. Lindgren read out Articles 59 to 67 inclusive of the Rules.

Nominations were then invited, and votes taken in accordance with these Articles, with results as follows :

President	: Professor Toeplitz	29	<u>Elected.</u>
	Mr. Lindgren	1	
Secretary- General	: Mr. Ledoux	29	<u>Elected.</u>
	Abstentions	1	
Treasurer	: Mr. Konlecher	25	<u>Elected.</u>
	Mr. Borde	2	
	Mr. Stenklev	1	
	Abstentions	2	

Mr. Lindgren then proposed that 2 members from outside Europe be elected, and the results of the vote on this proposal were :

For : 26
 Against : 4
 Abstentions : 0

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

2 Extra-European members	:	Mr. Kuiper	23	<u>Elected.</u>
		Mr. Jaubert	19	<u>Elected.</u>
		Mr. Bowser	12	
		Mr. Nair	4	
		Abstentions	0	
6 Ordinary Members	:	Mr. Pogacic	24	<u>Elected.</u>
		Mr. Lindgren	23	<u>Elected.</u>
		Mr. Privato	22	<u>Elected.</u>
		Mr. Klaue	22	<u>Elected.</u>
		Mr. Frida	20	<u>Elected.</u>
Mrs. Bowser	7	Mr. Borde	5	
Mr. Alberti	7	Mrs Van Leer	4	
Mr. Fernoaga	7	Mr. Monty	4	
Mrs. Suomela	7	Mr. Stenklev	4	
Mr. De Vaal	6	Mr. Spiess	3	
		Mr. Turner	2	

Since four of the candidates had equal votes for the sixth place, a second vote was taken on the four, with the following result :

Mrs. Bowser	13	<u>Elected.</u>
Mrs. Suomela	7	
Mr. Fernoaga	7	
Mr. Alberti	3	

The voting then continued normally :

3 Reserve Members	:	Mr. De Vaal	22	<u>Elected.</u>	(First reserve)
		Mr. Fernoaga	19	<u>Elected</u>	(Second reserve)
		Mr. Stenklev	16	<u>Elected</u>	(Third reserve)
		Mr. Alberti	15		
		Mrs. Suomela	13		
		Mr. Kubelka	1		

2 Auditors (voted on a show of hands) : Mrs. Van Leer
Mr. Berg.

Arising out of the voting, the following suggestions were made, to be considered by the future Executive Committee :

1. That an election committee might be appointed to receive nominations (Mr. Stenklev).
2. That the separate vote for extra-European members was out-moded and should be re-considered (Mr. Pogacic, Mr. Ledoux)
3. That it was essential to find a way of bringing new and younger members on to the Executive Committee (MM. Ledoux, Kubelka, Pogacic, Lindgren)
4. That a single comprehensive list of all those eligible for election to any post should be prepared as a master voting paper for every vote (Mr. Morris)

EIGHTH SESSION

May 29th, 1970, 3 p.m.

For the first part of the session, Mr Lindgren presided.

Mr Lindgren said he was very happy to welcome Mrs Malthête-Méliès. Her presence was particularly appreciated at this time, in view of her husband's illness, and all the members wished to express their sympathy with her and their pleasure at seeing her.

Mr Lindgren announced that in the lunch interval, the new Executive Committee had met and had elected the following additional officers from amongst their number:

Vice-Presidents :	Mr. Pogacic
	Mr Privato
	Mr Lindgren
Deputy Secretary-General:	Mr Klaue
Deputy Treasurer :	Mr Frida

New Executive Committee

Thus the new Executive Committee, in full, was now as follows :

President : Professor Toeplitz
 Vice-Presidents : Mr Lindgren
 Mr Pogacic
 Mr Privato
 Secretary-General : Mr Ledoux
 Deputy Secretary-General : Mr Klaue
 Treasurer : Mr Konlechner
 Deputy Treasurer : Mr Frida
 Ordinary Members : Mrs Bowser
 Mme Jaubert
 Mr Kuiper
 Reserve Members : Mr De Vaal
 Mr Fernoaga
 Mr Stenklev

RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS (Agenda Item 18)a) International Council for Film and Television (CICT)

Mr Ledoux outlined a complaint of the Royal Belgian Film Archive against CICT which had accepted its proposal to produce a world list of production (stock-shot) libraries, and then published it without giving any credit to the Belgian Archive on the title page. Mr Ledoux was convinced that this was not due to an oversight but to the desire of CICT to justify itself to UNESCO.

Professor Toeplitz, as Vice-President of CICT, said he had had nothing to do with this matter, but he would protest officially at the next meeting of the Bureau of CICT. A written confirmation of the General Meeting's endorsement of such action would be helpful to him.

Mr Lindgren then put to the Meeting the motion that Professor Toeplitz should protest to CICT on behalf of FIAF and the Royal Belgian Film Archive, with the following result :

For :	28
Against :	0
Abstentions :	0

Mr Ledoux said that if the Belgian Archive obtained no satisfaction, he would recommend to the next General Meeting that FIAF resign from CICT.

b) International Council of Museums (ICOM)

Mr Ledoux said that ten years previously, ICOM had created a World Union of Film Museums, which had never really functioned. It had now decided to suppress it and to have relations instead. It was agreed that the Secretary General should encourage these contacts.

c) International Council of Archives.

It was agreed that contacts with this body should be encouraged also, and that FIAF members should encourage archives and museums in other fields to use films in their work and should offer its help in preserving films of interest to them.

d) International Federation of Film Producers (FIAPF)

Mr Ledoux said there had been no further contact and he had nothing to report.

Mr Lindgren said that he had been approached in London by Mr Filson, who represented the British Film Producers' Association in FIAPF, but nothing had developed from this.

Copyright Problems.

Arising out of the discussion on relations with other international organisations, Mr Ledoux reported a proposal of the Executive Committee, that FIAF should employ, at a most fee, a lawyer in London, Mr. Neville March Hunnings. Mr Hunnings, a qualified international lawyer who worked in the British Institute of Comparative Law, was also a great film enthusiast, President of the former British Society for Film History Research, and author of a definitive study on film censorship.

On his own initiative, he had attended the Stockholm Copyright Conference some years earlier, where he had presented a paper on behalf of the interest of film archives. He was willing to help FIAF and Mr Ledoux believed it would be difficult to find anyone more suitable or better qualified.

Mr Lindgren confirmed what Mr Ledoux had said, and added that he had undertaken to be Chairman of a FIAF members' ad hoc Commission on Copyright, to which Mr Hunnings would be attached as legal adviser. He believed the main task of such a Commission should be to define the concessions and privileges which film archives should enjoy in film copyright legislation, which had hitherto been dominated entirely by commercial interests.

Mr Lindgren then asked for a vote on the proposal that a Copyright Commission be set up under his presidency, with Mr Hunnings to be employed as legal adviser to FIAF and to the Commission at a modest retaining fee. This was agreed unanimously.

The following members signified their willingness to contribute to the work of this commission:

Mr Acimovic	Mr Pöschke	Mr Kuiper
Mr De Vaal	Mr Berg	Mr Konlechner
Mr Monty	Mr Alberti	Mr Ledoux

Since Mr Lindgren had to leave early, the Presidency of the Session at this point was assumed by Mr Pogacic.

Declaration by Mr Privato

Mr Privato said he wished to make a statement outside the agenda. He had been deeply concerned to learn that the house where Auguste and Louis Lumière lived was to be demolished and he urged that FIAF should appeal to the Mayor of Lyons for its preservation, and communicate this appeal to the press.

Mr Ledoux said it was not certain that this would help Mr Génard in his plans for securing the Château Lumière, as distinct from the Lumière villa, for his Museum of Cinema, but in any case he believed that Mr Privato's suggestion, which could be drafted as an official statement, should be discussed again in the presence of Mr Génard who was shortly expected to join the Meeting. This was agreed.

DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT GENERAL MEETING (Agenda item 21)

Mr Ledoux reported that Mr Hector Garcia Mesa was still hoping to be able to invite FIAF to Havana for its General Meeting in 1971, but a final decision had not yet been made. It was agreed by the General Meeting that if the invitation to Cuba was not confirmed, it should be left to the Executive Committee to find an alternative location.

Mr Ledoux said he would like to know which members might be able to entertain FIAF Congresses in future years, and the following offers were tentatively made :

- 1973 : Israël
Moscow (or Leningrad)
- 1974 : Montréal
Vienna
Copenhagen
- 1975 or
1977 : Washington

REPORT OF THE DOCUMENTATION COMMISSION (Agenda item 12)

Mr Ledoux referred to the Report of Miss Brenda Davies, which had been circulated (annex n° 15). He also read a letter from Miss Davies tendering her resignation from the Chairmanship of the Documentation Commission, but offering to remain, if required, as an ordinary member.

Mr Ledoux said that the Commission had met in Wiesbaden where the excellent hospitality offered by the Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde had greatly facilitated its work. After discussion on the choice of a new Chairman, it was finally decided to ask Mr Spiess to be Chairman, which he accepted, and to ask Mrs Bowser to act as a link between the Commission and the Executive Committee.

REPORT OF THE FILM CATALOGUING COMMISSION (Agenda item 13)

Mr Klaue said the Report had been distributed (annex n° 16) to members, and he wished to make briefly six points :

1. The meeting of the Commission had only been made possible by the generous hospitality of the Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde.
2. He would like members to comment, here or by letter, on the draft for a Manual on Film Cataloguing.
3. He would like to see the Manual on Film Cataloguing put on the list of projects for which financial support might be sought from UNESCO.
4. The next meeting of the Commission would be held in Budapest in October.
5. He hoped that at future General Meetings, there would be more time for discussion of the Reports of Commissions.

NEW PROJECTS (agenda item 17)a) Film Maker's Bibliography. (Mr Morris)

Mr Morris explained that this was a proposal for a bibliography of books and articles in major film periodicals which discussed the work of significant film-makers. It would not appear annually but would be a reference list to be used as a working tool. It would also be retrospective, extending as far back as seemed reasonable. (annex n° 17).

Mr Lindgren suggested there were two kinds of projects; one which a member completed on his own responsibility and under his own name, and for which he simply sought the help of other FIAF members ; and one which he offered to complete for FIAF, on FIAF's responsibility and under the name of FIAF, in which case it would always have to be eventually submitted to the approval of FIAF before publication. He asked whether Mr Morris's project fell into the first or the second category.

Mr Morris replied that it fell into the first, and would be a project of the Canadian National Film Archive, completed with FIAF help. On a show of hands, Mr Morris's project was approved as one to which members should give all possible aid.

b) Project of the Yugoslav Film Archive (Mr. Acimovic)

To collect information of laws and finance of film archives in all countries to make a list of lost films of national productions and to prepare a chart of the fundamental principles. (annex n° 18)

It was agreed that this be studied by the Executive Committee.

c) Specialised Study Seminars (Mrs Suomela)

It was agreed that this project (annex n° 19) be studied by the Executive Committee.

d) International Translation Bureau for Articles and Documents (Mr Kula)

It was agreed that this project (annex n° 20) be studied by the Executive Committee.

e) Embryo 2. (Mr Klaue)

Mr Kuiper said he hoped to be able to make a considerable contribution to this second edition. Mr Klaue said the Staatliches Filmarchiv would bear the whole cost of the project. The General Meeting thanked Mr Klaue and gave its unanimous approval to the project. (annex n° 21).

- f) Enquiry into Existing Equipment and Methods of Printing Historical Film Sizes. (Mr Klaue)
Mr Ledoux said this project (annex n° 22) had already been submitted to the Executive Committee and accepted. FIAF was grateful to Mr Klaue for undertaking it.
- g) Study on copying variable density (Mr Klaue)
Mr Klaue said this was really a project (annex n° 23) of the Austrian Filmmuseum who should be asked to do it in consultation with the Executive Committee. This was agreed.
- h) Customs facilities enjoyed by members. (Mr. Ledoux)
Mr Ledoux asked that this be held in abeyance until the Secretariat could complete it. It was agreed.
- i) Insurance (Mr Ledoux)
It was agreed that this also was a task for the Secretariat and should be held in abeyance.
- j) Classical Silent Films 35 mm Negatives from 9,5mm Positives. (Mr Borde & Mr Pogacic)
It was agreed that this be considered by the Executive Committee.
- k) Publications dealing with the work of film archives. (Mr Ledoux)
Mr Ledoux said the Executive Committee had appointed an Editorial Committee of Mr Ledoux, Klaue and Pogacic to supervise this project, although its publication was doubtful. He proposed to ask the Executive Committee to consider the publication of an annual volume before each Congress. This proposal was agreed.
- l) Archive Theatre Programmes
Mr Ledoux said this had originally been prepared by Mr Monty, but never published. Revision and publication were future tasks for the Secretariat.
- m) Duplication in the work of film archives. (Mr Lindgren)
It was agreed that this should be examined by the Executive Committee.
- n) German Silent Features - Supplementary List (Mr Berg)
Mr Berg requested the help of members in his project to publish a supplementary list of German Silent Feature Films.

o) Fischinger Films (Mrs Bowser)

Mrs Bowser said the Museum of Modern Art Film Department, acting on behalf of Oscar Fischinger's widow, was trying to assemble a complete collection of his films, and asked for the cooperation of all members. It was agreed that the Secretary General should circulate this request.

p) Acquisition Lists (Mr Ledoux)

Mr Ledoux said some members already published Acquisition Lists of books and reviews, and suggested that they be circulated to all members. It was agreed to refer this proposal to the Documentation Commission.

q) Ideal Film Archive (Mr De Vaal)

Mr Ledoux said Mr De Vaal had a collection of plans for an ideal film archive building prepared by architecture students in Holland. The Executive Committee had proposed that the Secretariat should publish them in book form for members and possibly for sale. This proposal was agreed by the General Meeting.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda item 22)Leipzig Film Festival

Mr Ledoux said that, as in previous years, the Staatliches Filmarchiv requested FIAF patronage for the retrospective of the Leipzig Film Festival of which this year's theme was : Documentary Film Making in the Age of Lenin. This was agreed unanimously.

Tours Film Festival

Mr Ledoux read a letter he had received from the Film Festival organisers at Tours, asking for the help of FIAF. It was agreed that this was not a FIAF matter, and that the letter should be forwarded to CICT.

Declaration of Mr Privato on Lumière Villa.

Mr Génard having joined the General Meeting, Mr Ledoux read to him the statement proposed by Mr Privato, appealing to the Mayor and City of Lyons to save from demolition the house in which Auguste and Louis Lumière had lived. It was also proposed to communicate this statement to the press. Mr Génard thanked the General Meeting and said he was greatly moved by their concern. He doubted whether the statement could be effective because the demolition work had almost started and it might be too late now to stop it. However, he agreed that the statement could be sent; he would hope for a miracle.

CLOSE OF THE CONGRESS

Mr Pogacic and Mr Ledoux expressed the profound gratitude of FIAF to Mr Génard, the Foundation Committee of the Cinema Museum and the Lumière Company for their generous hospitality to the Congress.

It would remain in the memory as the most moving of FIAF Congresses, because their hosts, to whom they came uninvited, had made extraordinary efforts with limited resources, to facilitate the work of the Congress and to make the visit of all the delegates to Lyon a happy one.

Mr Génard, who was greeted with long applause, thanked the Meeting.

Mr Ledoux also thanked the Congress secretaries, Mrs Coppens and Miss Murell; Melle Marie Chantal from the Lyons Tourist Bureau, the interpreters Mme Dargel and Mme Engelhorn; the recording engineers; and finally, the Cinémathèque de Toulouse who had generously shared in the costs of the excursion which the delegates were to take on the following day.

Vice-President Pogacic then declared the 26th General Meeting closed.
