

F.I.A.F.  
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES  
ARCHIVES DU FILM

Secrétariat  
74 Galerie Ravenstein  
1000 BRUXELLES  
Téléphone 13.41.53

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
25TH AND 26TH OCTOBER 1960

m i n u t e s

ZAGREB

CONFIDENTIAL

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Zagreb, October 25th and 26th, 1969

SUMMARY AND DECISIONS

PRESENT

Members

Messrs. J. Toeplitz, President  
E. Lindgren, Vice President  
V. Privato, Vice President  
V. Pogacic, Vice President  
J. Ledoux, Secretary General  
N.H. Geber, Treasurer  
W. Klaue, Deputy Secretary  
General  
R. Borde, Deputy Treasurer  
M. Frida

Deputy Members

Mrs. E. Bowser  
Messrs. J. de Vaal  
P. Kubelka

Honorary Member

Mr. H. Volkmann

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Member

Mr. P. Morris

Deputy Member

Mr. I. Monty

Honorary Members

Mrs. I. Barry  
Mr. E. Lauritzen

IN ATTENDANCE

Miss E. Latour, Secretary

Mr. Acimovic, Interpreter

Saturday, 25th October : Morning Session

The President, Professor J. Toeplitz, took the chair. He welcomed the Committee Members, noted that a quorum was present and declared the meeting valid.

He proposed to observe a minute of silence to the memory of Richard Griffith, which was done, and suggested a telegram be sent to the MMA. This was agreed.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Following agenda was adopted :

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Approval of the minutes of the preceding Executive Committee
3. Membership problems
4. Possible increase of the subscriptions
5. F.I.A.F. projects
6. Date and place of the next General Meeting
7. Extension of F.I.A.F. - Educational use of archive films - Study of principles of specialization in the preservation of films in the film archives
8. Relations between F.I.A.F. and the producers - Summons about the use of Birth of a Nation
9. Organization of the relationship between UCAL and F.I.A.F.
10. Report of the Commissions of Film Cataloguing and of Documentation - Functioning of F.I.A.F.'s commissions
11. F.I.A.F. Secretariat in Brussels
12. Treasurer's report - Bank problems
13. Any other business
14. Date and place of the next Executive Committee meeting.

Mr. Ledoux then read a letter received from Mrs. Iris Barry who was in hospital. It was decided to send a telegram wishing her prompt recovery

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

The minutes of the preceding Executive Committee meeting held at New York from 19th to 20th May 1969 were unanimously approved.

3. MEMBERSHIP PROBLEMS

The Secretary General raised the important question of non-independent archives. Since the Congress of New York he had received enquiries on this subject from Rome, Prague, Stockholm, Helsinki and Berlin. Since such cases were becoming more and more frequent, F.I.A.F. should define more clearly what was required from such archives and whether for instance a merger between an archive and a school of cinema was against our statutes or not.

The President stated that now the statutes nor the internal rules provided anything on this matter. He thought that F.I.A.F. should therefore discuss the question and issue a formal statement.

Mr. Lindgren agreed. He added, however, that this problem was an archive's own concern and that F.I.A.F. could only give advice. On the other hand, it was important for F.I.A.F. that its members should avoid dealing with non-archive problems at the various meetings. F.I.A.F. should fully maintain its archive character.

Mr. Geber reminded the meeting that the rules provided that an archive could be represented by a larger organization.

Mr. Kubelka said the Executive Committee should accept the existing situations but that when a new case arose, independence should be recommended.

Mr. de Vaal said the Executive Committee was not sufficiently informed of the situation existing in each member archive. He mentioned the case of Sweden. The Executive Committee should be provided with an organigram and a budget. He was strongly against any merger with schools.

Mr. Klaue said F.I.A.F. should make allowances for young archives which could not be independent straight away. These archives should, however, maintain some independence and have their own rules.

Mr. Volkmann added that possessing one's own statutes was not sufficient. An archive should have a budget of its own and should take its own decisions.

Mr. Privato expressed the opinion that F.I.A.F. could only make recommendations but he agreed that each archive must have independent statutes.

Mr. Kubelka said that if F.I.A.F. took a strong position, organizations including an archive would have a lead. They would be forced to comply with it.

Mr. Pogacic corroborated the opinion that the Executive Committee should have as members only representatives of archives and that the statutes and rules should ensure this.

Mr. Borde thought that the two criteria which should be taken into account for membership were : 1. statutes conform to F.I.A.F. requirements  
2. the use the archives made of films.

Mr. Toeplitz said he believed it was impossible to make a general rule and that the Executive Committee could only speak on general principles. (In answer to Mr. de Vaal's remark on archives not being connected with schools).

Mrs. Bowser agreed on the point that F.I.A.F. insist that only representatives of archives attend the meetings.

The President proposed that they should first take a practical decision.

Mr. Ledoux proposed that the recommendation be formulated after the discussion of the nominal cases.

#### BERLIN

Mr. Ledoux had received a letter from Mr. Berg of the Deutsche Kinemathek about a merger with the Akademie (film school of Berlin). Mr. Ledoux had answered it drawing Mr. Berg's attention on art. 5 of the statutes and to the fact that previous experience had shown that it was a bad solution for an archive ; it reduced its importance and displaced the centre of its interests. A similar letter had been received from Dr. Stein, Senator für Wissenschaft und Kunst. The Senator had asked whether the merger was in accordance with F.I.A.F.'s rules and if the Akademie had to apply for membership of F.I.A.F. or whether it could take over the membership of Deutsche Kinemathek and if a new decision of the General Meeting was needed what it would probably be.

Mr. Volkmann explained that Mr. Berg had always fought against the merger. He also wanted to correct an error in the Senator's letter. The budget of the DK did not come entirely from the city of West Berlin. They also had funds granted by the lottery and the Volkswagen foundation, to acquire new collections. West Berlin only paid for rent and salaries. In the case of a merger, Mr. Berg would loose these funds for which a great deal of fighting was already going on. If the head of the film school also became head of the archive, the money would go to the school, not to the archive and they would loose the possibility of making new acquisitions and become a mere instrument of the school to use films for educational purposes.

Mr. Privato said that F.I.A.F. should only accept the merger if a document clearly stipulated the financial autonomy of the Deutsche Kinemathek.

Mr. Toeplitz expressed the opinion that personal questions should not be mixed with questions of principle. It was decided that if a member lost its autonomy, it automatically lost membership. F.I.A.F. could not accept automatic transfer of membership to a larger body.

Mr. Ledoux was asked to write to the Deutsche Kinemathek in this sense.



Mr. Klaue added that it was not only a question of F.I.A.F.'s statutes but also a political matter. Deutsche Kinemathek was independent but the Akademie was financed by the Government of the German Federal Republic and East Germany could not have any contacts with the Government of the Federal Republic.

This question would be examined when the new application would be sent.

#### HELSINKI

Mr. Ledoux had just received a circular letter from Mrs. Suomela, Curator of the Finnish Filmarchive saying that the State was planning a kind of institute combining the film school and the archive.

The Secretary General had then received a personal letter from Mrs. Suomela who said she was against this merger and asked which F.I.A.F. rules could prevent it. Mr. Ledoux answered that there was no such rule.

Mr. Lindgren had advised against the merger in his letter to Mrs. Suomela, saying that Finland, like any other country, should have an archive and that experience had shown that if they were attached to another organization they would be in danger not to remain an archive in the full sense of the word.

The Committee agreed that Mr. Ledoux should write that :

1. the question had been raised at the Executive Committee meeting
2. if the film archive as such ceased to exist, there would automatically be cessation of membership and a new application would then be necessary.

#### SWEDEN

Mr. Ledoux reminded members that at the London General Meeting Mr. Lindquist had declared that Filmhistoriska Samlingarna did not exist any longer. It had been explained to him that F.I.A.F. could not accept the Swedish Film Institute as a member for the reasons stated above. Mr. Lindquist had given no sign of life for one year and Mr. Geber said constantly that he was not in a position to give explanations. In New York the case had been raised again. Mr. Lindquist had given the assurance that the matter would be settled as soon as he arrived back in Sweden. The very day he left for Zagreb, Mr. Ledoux had received a letter from Mr. Lindquist saying that the Swedish Institute of Cinematography-Film Archive would be the member of F.I.A.F. and that he himself would be responsible for all archive activities. Mr. Ledoux had also received the report of the Svenska Filminstitutets.

This report was one year old - the new one not being printed yet. It mentioned a budget for the film archive. But there was an organigram describing the activities of the Institute where no mention was made of a Film Archive although the report described film archive activities.

Mr. Geber said he had been asked by Mr. Schein to establish a proposal for an organigram for future archive activities and film restoration, and to provide a budget for the next ten years.

Mr. Geber also said he could not tell if the report for 1968/69 would have changes in the organigram. The report had been written by Mr. Lindquist but some of the information had been provided by Mr. Geber who had not seen the report yet.

Mr. Lindgren wondered why letters were still received under the heading Filmhistoriska Samlingarna since this body had been officially dissolved in 1967.

The President opened the discussion but Mr. Kubelka expressed the opinion that it was impossible to discuss the Swedish case since so many facts remained obscure to him.

The Secretary General was asked to read the formal information received from the Board in 1967. Harry Schein had written to Mr. Ledoux in April 1967 in answer to Mr. Ledoux's letter to him. Mr. Ledoux had told him that Svenska Filminstitutet could not become the member of F.I.A.F. instead of Filmhistoriska Samlingarna and gave several instances where it was always the archive and not the larger body that was the member. Mr. Schein had answered that Filmhistoriska Samlingarna did not exist and therefore, how could it be a member of F.I.A.F. The name of their organization was their own concern and not F.I.A.F.'s.

Filmhistoriska Samlingarna was only a department of Svenska Filminstitutet and the obligations of membership could only be fulfilled by organizations having legal existence. This was not the case of Filmhistoriska Samlingarna. He ended his letter by saying that he did not care how F.I.A.F. solved the problem.

The Executive Committee had decided not to answer this last letter and to continue to consider Filmhistoriska Samlingarna as member. Therefore, when Mr. Lindquist informed the London General Meeting that Filmhistoriska Samlingarna did not exist, F.I.A.F. told him that its membership would have to be cancelled. He had said he would try to settle the matter but nothing had been done.

Mr. Toeplitz drew attention to the fact that in the letter of October 1969 for the first time it was clearly mentioned that the member of F.I.A.F. was the Swedish Institute of Cinematography - Film Archive. It was quite different from Mr. Schein's letter of 1967 since it said that the member was the whole body. However, what was lacking was precision: an organigram showing that Filmhistoriska Samlingarna was not a section but a specific Department; in the organigram included in the Report of the Swedish Film Institute there was no trace of such an independent department. This was unacceptable.

Mr. Toeplitz asked what Mr. Lindquist meant in his letter by 'projection activities'. Mr. Geber could not tell.

Mr. Toeplitz asked to write a letter to the Swedish Film Institute asking them to confirm officially whether a Swedish Film Archive existed or not. If it did, they should inform F.I.A.F. of its internal rules and of the person who would be in contact with F.I.A.F.

Mr. Lindgren added that when it wrote this letter, F.I.A.F. should first state its own position and go on, making an appeal to the Swedish Film Institute so they could take some dispositions and avoid any further misunderstanding.

The meeting agreed to this.

Mr. Geber's abstention was noted.

## 2ND SESSION (25th October - afternoon)

Mr. Toeplitz being delayed, Mr. Lindgren took the chair and opened the session.

Mr. Ledoux informed the meeting that during the New York Congress an observer, Mr. Moore, Chief Audio-Visual Branch of the Library of Congress in Washington, had shown delegates a film on the burning of nitrate films. Mr. Ledoux had written to him, expressing F.I.A.F.'s interest in this matter and asking for a copy of the film. He had not yet received an answer. Mrs. Bowser said she would find out what the difficulty was.

Mr. de Vaal informed the Meeting that he had sent a telegram and that he had been asked to pay and had done so. He was now waiting for the film.

Mr. Ledoux had also written to Cuba after the New York Congress expressing the hope that what had happened would not happen again but he had received no reply. In addition, he had written to correspondents and provisional members to confirm the decisions of the General Meeting.

## TIRANA

The Albanians had now been provisional member for seven years. They had always sent in reports and answered letters, be it negatively. Our statutes provided that after seven years, a provisional member should become a full member. Mr. Ledoux reminded the Committee that someone had to go to Tirana and investigate on their preservation facilities. He had written to them after New York informing them that the New York General Meeting had voted by 20 against 2 their prolongation but that it was the last one and that it was hoped they would send in their formal application, drawing their attention to art.6 of the rules. Mr. Ledoux remarked however, that it was difficult to comply with this rule since the date of the next General Meeting was not always fixed early enough. Anyhow, there had been no reply from Tirana.



Mr. Klaue said that he had some exchanges of documentary films with Tirana but no information with regard to the situation.

Mr. Lindgren suggested a reminder be sent and it was agreed that Mr. Ledoux would send it, and that the matter be considered again at next Executive Committee.

#### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The Library of Congress was accepted as a provisional member but there was no reaction on their part. Mr. Geber mentioned that they had paid their subscription. Mrs. Bowser had no news in connection with their membership but she knew that their preservation and acquisition programs were doing well. Mr. Ledoux mentioned that it was a common practice for new members to tour the other archives to see how they worked. Mrs. Bowser thought that if Mr. Kuiper of the Library of Congress had not taken any action, it was because he did not know what was expected from him.

Mr. Ledoux agreed to write him a letter.

#### PRAGUE

After New York, Mr. Zvonitcek had written a letter to the Secretary General dated 17th June 1969, giving the new organization of the Czechoslovak Archive of the Czech and Slovak Film Institute and the names of the persons habilitated to sign the letters.

Mr. Toeplitz was worried with certain consequences Mr. Zvonitcek's letter could have. Who was going to sign the mail with F.I.A.F. ? Why should Mr. Frida not sign all letters, even if internally, an authorisation was requested. One person should be responsible to F.I.A.F.

Mr. Frida explained that it was not so clear to him either and that he could only give his personal opinion that Mr. Zvonitcek wished to be responsible for all inter-archive relations and represent both Czech and Slovak archives abroad but that in practice, he, until now, signed all letters.

Mr. Ledoux asked that it be stated clearly what should be put in the list of members.

Upon the suggestion of Mr. Lindgren it was agreed that the F.I.A.F. member in Czechoslovakia be designated :

The Czechoslovak Archive of the  
Czech Film Institute (Director : S. Zvonitcek) and the  
Slovak Film Institute (Director : J. Kominar).  
correspondence : Myrtil Frida, Curator  
Malesicka ul., Praha I, telephone, telegram.

ROME

Mr. Ledoux read a letter received on 10th July 1969, from the Vice-President of the Cineteca Nazionale, Mr. Di Giammatteo saying that a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Centro sperimentale had been held recently and that it had been decided that Messrs. Di Giammatteo and Verdone would be responsible for the work of the archive. Mr. Ledoux had talked personally with Mr. Fioravanti and he had sent him a copy of the new organigram. Mr. Fioravanti had expressed the desire, as Director of the Centre, to continue to receive all F.I.A.F. communications but Messrs. Di Giammatteo and Verdone wanted all F.I.A.F. documents to be sent to them. Their intention was to represent the Cineteca Nazionale at future F.I.A.F. meetings.

This was again a delicate situation. On the organigram Mr. Fioravanti still appeared as the Head of the whole centre. What should be done in this case ?

Mr. Kubelka said that to him the real representative for the Roman archive was Montesanti. He was the only one who cared about the collection.

To Mr. Ledoux this was again a case of an archive being a part of a larger institution. In Italy the law provided a budget for the Cineteca. The relations between the Cineteca and the Centre were not clear. We did not know what Montesanti's statute was.

Mr. Toeplitz was of the opinion not to answer Mr. Di Giammatteo's letter before further clarification.

Mr. Pogacic reported that Mr. Montesanti had no decision power and that he had written to him for exchanges with the Cineteca Nazionale and Mr. Montesanti had answered to write to Mr. Fioravanti.

It was decided to leave Mr. Di Giammatteo's letter unanswered.

PARIS

Mr. Ledoux reminded members that he had received a letter from Mr. Holleaux expressing the desire to become a member of F.I.A.F. and that the decision in New York had been to wait and reply politely to Mr. Holleaux. This had been done on 7th July 1969. Mr. Ledoux had received an answer on 17th October 1969. Mr. Holleaux was no longer Director, he had been replaced by Mr. Astoux. The letter said that a decree had entrusted the Centre national de la Cinématographie française with the preservation of cinematographic films but this mission among others did not authorize this administration to apply as a provisional member of F.I.A.F. since

this mission would probably only be transitory. Furthermore they found it difficult to comply with art.2 of F.I.A.F.'s internal rules. They believed that for the time being the best solution was to establish friendly and non official relations between F.I.A.F. and their administration.

#### CAIRO

Mr. Ledoux had corresponded a great deal with Mr. Y. Gohar, Chef du Centre technique des images visuelles. The latter had asked how to become member so we had sent him the statutes and rules. As soon as he had received the book, he had sent the amount of subscription without giving further details. They did not appear to have an archive. Mr. Ledoux had not answered since he had received the last letter. He thought it would be a good idea to ask Mr. Klaue to answer, as Deputy Secretary General and as he had been in Cairo. He should explain that they had to provide all the documents mentioned in the rules.

Mr. Klaue and the Executive Committee agreed.

#### TUNIS

A company called SATPEC had expressed the wish to become member. They had written in March 1969. Mr. Ledoux had answered that F.I.A.F. could not accept commercial companies as members. They had answered on 24th July 1969 saying that their activities were not in contradiction with art.5 of the statutes since they preserved only films from the State. They had requested a copy of Mr. Volkmann's book on preservation which had been sent to them and they had asked to be accepted as observers at the next General Meeting. This letter had been answered in August with a request for more information. Mr. Fernoaga had said in New York that he had visited Tunisia; there was an archive there and he would send information. Mr. Ledoux suggested to write to Mr. Fernoaga for advice.

This was agreed upon as being the only solution for the time being.

#### MADRID

The archive had asked the Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique to send a film. From the ensuing correspondence the situation in Madrid appeared to be confused. They had a new address.

Answering the President, Mr. Geber said they had paid their subscription, confusing Swiss francs and pesetas. He had written to them about this but to the old address and had not yet received an answer.

Mr. Toeplitz suggested that the excess of money be returned to Filmoteca Nacional less the F.I.A.F. subscriptions for 1968 and 1969 and that a registered letter be sent to them asking for a clarification of the situation.



Mr. Ledoux thought a personal enquiry should be made and Mr. Borde accepted to go, on the occasion, to Madrid on condition that Madrid's agreement should be received beforehand.

#### PYONG YANG

In New York Mr. Privato had been asked to find out more about this archive. Mr. Privato had written, as promised, but had not received an answer.

#### BUCAREST

The only news was that Mr. Fernoaga had become Director again.

#### ZURICH

Mr. Ledoux had not received any news after his letter following the New York General Meeting. He had the greatest doubts on the existence of the Zurich Film Museum. He would propose that they should be deleted, at the next General Meeting.

#### CANBERRA

A letter had been received in June 1969 from the organization called the Commonwealth Archives asking to become a member of F.I.A.F. Mr. Ledoux had answered in July and had not received any further news.

In New York, Mr. Lindgren had said he would write personally to Mr. White about what seemed to be the weakness of the Australian archive. He then exposed the Austrian situation. The National Library in Canberra had become interested in F.I.A.F. activities through conversations Mr. White had had in London many years ago. There were two weaknesses in the Australian situation, firstly, Mr. White himself was remote from the film department although he signed all letters received by the British Film Institute and secondly, they did not devote enough money to it. In New York, there had been another Australian representative, the National Film Theatre in Sidney. Film enthusiasts were very dissatisfied with the situation.

Mr. Lindgren promised to write again to Mr. White, although he would be resigning two years from now.

#### WALT DISNEY PRODUCTIONS

Mr. Ledoux read a letter from this organization which wanted to set up a Walt Disney Archive and asked for help and addresses in the United States. Mr. Ledoux wanted, on this occasion, to raise the general question of archives belonging to a commercial organization such as Walt Disney.



Mrs. Bowser thought that the Walt Disney Productions should be advised to make use of existing archives.

Mr. de Vaal expressed the opinion that it would be a good thing to admit as member of F.I.A.F., specialized archives such as the ones devoted to the work of Méliès, Lumière or Disney.

Mr. Kubelka understood the position of the MMA, he thought that colour film preservation was so expensive that such initiatives as that of the Disney Productions should be encouraged since the MMA could not manage everything. Besides if they became member, we could hope to have access to their films.

Mr. Lindgren said more time should be devoted to think about this matter. If Disney's Productions' intentions were genuinely disinterested, of course, one should encourage it's initiative. They spoke of creating an archive of history of animation. But to what extent would other companies producing animated films entrust their films to Walt Disney? They should be advised to create a separate foundation. Commercial companies had short lives sometimes.

Mr. Toeplitz expressed the view that the idea of creating independent company archives was a good one. They should be helped and given advice. F.I.A.F. should express its interest.

Mr. Lindgren wanted to know if these company archives would be prepared to co-operate with F.I.A.F. members. Also it would create a precedent. Many a commercial company could see in this a device to prevent them to hand their films over to existing archives.

Mr. Volkmann thought anyone asking F.I.A.F. how to build an archive should be given advice. Any preservation was good.

Mr. Geber said that F.I.A.F. always complained that production companies were not preserving their films and now we had a company expressing the desire to preserve its films. This should be considered as a historical event.

Mrs. Bowser insisted that films should be preserved by permanent institutions.

Mr. Kubelka thought that since F.I.A.F. could not force these companies to make use of existing archives the best policy was to be friends. It might be the only solution in the United States, since the cost of preservation was so high, to convince these companies to establish their own foundations and if the company were dissolved, F.I.A.F. national members might recover the collection.

Mr. Ledoux agreed with Mr. Kubelka. F.I.A.F. could not manage everything. A company archive might be against our immediate interest but it was in the interest of preservation. We should maybe reconsider our position and invite them to join F.I.A.F. so we could exert our influence.

Mr. Toeplitz said F.I.A.F. should not overlook the fact that a film company had come to it not as an enemy as in the past but, they should not jump to conclusions and invite them to join F.I.A.F. F.I.A.F. should, however, provide technical help, documents and information.

#### MEMBERSHIP OF LARGER ORGANIZATIONS (continued)

Mr. Toeplitz asked the Executive Committee to raise again the problem of archives belonging to a larger organization. Some rules should be established and he suggested a small committee be charged with compiling such a document.

It was decided that a small committee composed of Messrs. Toeplitz, Lindgren, Ledoux and Kubelka should meet outside Executive Committee meetings to establish the document.

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN UCAL AND F.I.A.F.

As very little time was left before the end of the second session, point II of the agenda was now examined by the Executive Committee.

Mr. Ledoux read a letter received on 14th October 1969 from Mr. E. Hintz, who was very pessimistic as to future prospects of organising Latin American Archives. Mr. Ledoux reminded the meeting that in New York he had been strongly against relations with an organization of which F.I.A.F. was not sufficiently informed.

On the basis of the New York resolution, Mr. Toeplitz suggested that Mr. Ledoux answer Mr. Hintz's letter saying that F.I.A.F. did not, at the moment, see the need to send a representative to Latin America. There were two possibilities :

1. they should be informed well in advance of a meeting of more than two or three archive representatives or, if Mr. Hintz could not give the assurance that such a meeting would be held,
2. on the occasion of a film festival, UCAL should try to invite a F.I.A.F. delegate from the Executive Committee. This was accepted.

3RD SESSION : Sunday 26th October - Morning

#### 12. TREASURER'S REPORT - BANK PROBLEMS

Mr. Geber said he would like to split his report into three parts :

- 1) finances
- 2) function of the treasurer
- 3) the budget for 1970.

He then proceeded to explain certain items of the report. Some objections were made by Mr. Ledoux about the ventilation.

Mr. Geber answered that he had only been elected treasurer by the last General Meeting in New York. When he had taken over he had noticed that there was no system and had suggested to the Executive Secretary to ventilate according to a new coding system. Mr. Geber had also found out that 10 % of the documents were missing so it had been necessary for him to go to Brussels in order to make his financial report. He said there was no book keeping at the secretariat. For instance, the income for publications had been added to the sum put at the secretariat's disposal for expenditure.

The President expressed the Executive Committee's thanks to Mr. Geber and proposed to discuss the following two items :

- 1) to define the duties of the Treasurer and to specify how far they extended
- 2) to fix the work of the secretariat in this respect.

Mr. Ledoux explained the present working conditions of the Executive Secretary. He recused, as he had done in the past, all responsibility for treasury matters.

The President proposed the following resolution :

1. Mr. Geber would present to the next Executive Committee details amplifying his report.
2. He would also write to Mr. Peter Morris for clarification.
3. The duties of the Treasurer were to ensure that finances were properly taken care of and any lacks or deficiencies should be reported to the Secretary General.

Mr. Geber added that in some instances it would be impossible for him to be more precise.

Mr. Ledoux suggested that a current account be opened in Brussels. Up till now the Cinémathèque de Belgique had been advancing money to F.I.A.F. This was sometimes difficult so he asked the Treasurer to open an account of maximum SF 8.000.

This was agreed.

#### 4. INCREASE OF SUBSCRIPTIONS

This had already been discussed in New York and Mr. Ledoux introduced the discussion by pointing to a vicious circle : in order to have a more efficient secretariat they needed more money and to have more money they had to present a programme which could only be carried out by a better secretariat. And, ofcourse, the members, especially the official bodies, needed long notice to obtain more money for their subscription.

The President said that it was true that the cost of living had risen constantly for the last 10 years and also that it was of vital necessity that the budget should provide for special activities. The rise in the cost of living could be proved by some official document.



Mr. Ledoux did not think a single member would resign on this account but Mr. Kubelka said it might prevent new members from joining.

Mr. Lindgren pointed out that it was difficult to defend an increase of the subscription when the budget had a boni. The justification of the increase should not so much be the rise in the cost of living but the difficulties they encountered in carrying out their work. He had already mentioned this in a letter about the financial burden of the commissions' work.

Mr. Kubelka was against raising the subscriptions. He said F.I.A.F. ought to remain a poor organization. Rich archives should be taxed and poor ones de-taxed.

For Mr. Klaue there could be no distinction between big or small archives, rich or poor. F.I.A.F. had its statutes : each member had the same rights and the same duties. It was not true that in commissions one found only rich archives. Mr. Klaue was ready to convince his Government that the fee had to be increased. F.I.A.F. had a positive budget because it did not fulfil its obligations. A reserve should be provided (to help young archives for instance).

Mr. Privato agreed with Mr. Kubelka.

A discussion took place on the utility of the commissions ; belonging to one was an advantage as well as a burden. And they provided help to F.I.A.F. members.

Mr. Lindgren expressed the opinion that there was no such thing as poor or rich archives. Rich archives had more expenses.

Mr. Geber drew the attention on the fact that he needed information to prepare such a budget.

Mr. Ledoux said that expenses incurred for the work of the commissions should be provided for in the budget and that, in this case, the budget would be very unbalanced and that, therefore, subscriptions should be raised.

Mr. Geber said that with such a draft budget one could not go to one's financial authorities and ask for an increase of the subscription. But here they had landed back again in a vicious circle.

Mr. Kubelka wondered if the possibility of obtaining a grant from the UNESCO should not be examined.

Mr. de Vaal said that to tell the members in the next General Meeting that the subscription was going to be raised in 1971 might prove already too late for some of them.

The President stated that the majority was in favour of an increase and suggested to the Treasurer to prepare a budget for 1971 as soon as possible.



## 5. F.I.A.F. PROJECTS

### I. Preservation Commission

Mr. Volkmann reported that the new German edition of the preservation manual had been published this year. The next meeting would be held in November in Leipzig on problems of storing and preserving colour films. Moscow, Bucarest and Berlin had already accepted the invitation. But London, New-York and Brussels had not yet answered. It would be a pity that western countries would not be represented since methods differed. The Commission would finish that work in 1971 and a new preservation manual including preservation of colour film would be published.

Mr. Lindgren regretted not having been able to accept the invitation not so much for financial reasons but due to the fact the technical section of the B.F.I. was overworked.

Mr. Ledoux said he had not enough knowledge of the problems of colour preservation to attend the Leipzig Commission meeting. According to Mr. Volkmann's wish, Mr. Ledoux had contacted Gevaert but had not received an answer yet.

### 2. Reports on vaults by Dutch engineers

Mr. de Vaal had prepared a report on vaults in English. It had been translated into German by Mr. Klaue. Mr. Ledoux thought it should be examined by the Preservation Commission. The French version would be ready soon. Mr. de Vaal said this report had originally been made for the Film Museum and then he had thought it might be useful for F.I.A.F. He had had it translated into English and he was sorry it had not been sent out yet.

### 3. Metro-Kalvar Process

No news.

### 4. Completion of Films

No news.

### 5. Customs

No news.

### 6. Insurance

No news.

7. Classical Silent Films - negatives 35 mm to be made on the basis of positives 9,5 mm

Mr. Borde reported that the operation was being carried out in three phases :

- I. 9,5mm copies in good condition had been listed. Copies which were believed lost in 35mm (cartoons, slapsticks, French art films, etc.).
2. It was intended to send out this list to F.I.A.F. members and ask them if they had any copies in 35mm.
3. The list would then be reduced to those films that could really be considered as lost and, after that, the third and technical phase could begin under Mr. Pogacic's leadership.

At the moment, the list contained about 50 titles.

8. Handbook for Filmarchives

Mr. Pogacic proposed to prepare a project to be sent before the next Executive Committee meeting.

9. Films on the Cinema

No news.

10. List of Filmographical Sources

Mr. Toeplitz informed the Executive Committee that he was working on this project with Mr. Frida. He had collected elements for this project but had to get in touch with Mr. Frida in order to present a sample list for the next Executive Committee. It should be submitted to the Catalogue Commission.

Mr. Ledoux proposed that the list be submitted at the same time to the Executive Committee and to the Commission so as not to lose time.

11. Universal Filmography

Mr. Ledoux mentioned that this was a wrong title. In New York it had been said that it would be a bibliography of national filmographies. Bucarest was working on it.

12. Bibliography of F.I.A.F. members' publications

No news.

13. Bibliography of books and periodicals published before 1914, including sources in specialized libraries and collections outside F.I.A.F.

Mr. Ledoux informed the Executive Committee that this was on the way but no quick publication could be expected.

14. Annual Bibliography of books on the cinema

No news.

15. Publications dealing with the work of films

No news.

16. Information Centre of Research Projects

No news.

17. Atlas for the identification of actors of American slapstick

Mr. Frida informed the Executive Committee that this project was on the way and that it would be presented during the second Symposium on film identification in March or April in Czechoslovakia.

FOURTH SESSION - Sunday 26th October - afternoon

## II. F.I.A.F. SECRETARIAT IN BRUSSELS

The Executive Committee discussed the case of establishing the Secretariat in Brussels and engaging an executive secretary.

Mr. Ledoux raised the question of the confidential character of certain F.I.A.F. documents. He was of the opinion that, in addition to the statutes and rules that were sent to applicants, F.I.A.F. should be authorized to provide these applicants with the book of organigrams.

Several members expressed the opinion that there was no fundamental secrecy in the organigrams and it was decided to circulate organigrams giving only functions, without any names; this, provided the archives concerned agreed.

The General Meeting had decided to go on with the case F.I.A.F. had in Paris against Eastman House. The President said that if Maître Boitard was of the opinion that the case could not be won, F.I.A.F. should drop it. He would himself go to Paris and talk to Mr. Boitard about it. He would raise again the matter at the next Executive Committee.

Mr. Ledoux raised the case F.I.A.F. had in Brussels about the book of statutes and rules having been badly printed. It had been refused by F.I.A.F. but the printer had insisted on being paid and had brought action against the Federation. The case would soon come before court.



In New York, Mr. Ledoux had been contacted by a company called Faraday Press which wanted to publish directories, catalogues, etc. in collaboration with F.I.A.F. Mr. Ledoux had asked for a concrete proposal but was not sure of their seriousness. It was agreed not to go on with this matter unless they made a concrete offer.

Mr. Ledoux also raised the question of archive films exchanged and used outside the archive but this question was postponed until the next Executive Committee meeting.

## 6. DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT GENERAL MEETING

Lyon was suggested since it would be the 75th anniversary of the first public showing of the cinematograph and as they now had a correspondent in Lyon Mr. Ledoux proposed to go there and find out on the spot about practical matters. The palace of congress would be put at the disposal of F.I.A.F. for its meetings but members would have to pay for their boarding, and F.I.A.F. would also incur some expenses based on the London General Meeting budget.

It was decided that Mr. Ledoux would go to Lyon to find out how to organize this General Meeting as cheaply as possible in the month of May. If it could not be managed in Lyon, he would receive instructions to arrange the General Meeting in the South of France with Mr. Borde's help.

Mr. Klaue had received a letter from Havana confirming the invitation to hold the 1971 General Meeting there.

F.I.A.F. had also received an invitation from Stockholm for 1971 but Havana's proposal had come first. The question of transportation should be raised with the Cubans.

Mr. Ledoux then spoke about the organization of the General Meeting. It frightened new members when they had in front of them a Presidium of people who knew all the answers and it discouraged any active participation in the meetings.

Mr. Ledoux made three propositions :

- the members of the Executive Committee should not speak first and generally restrain from intervening at all
- the Presidency should not be assumed by the President alone but a rotation system should be established
- an Executive Committee should never be entirely reconducted. There should always be a new member.

Mr. Lindgren said that this question had already been discussed extensively and that it was natural that the members of the Executive Committee should lead discussions.



Mr. Kubelka not only agreed with Mr. Ledoux's suggestion but reminded the Executive Committee of another suggestion made at the General Meeting i.e. to reserve a period of time for free discussion.

Mr. Klaue said time for such an experiment should be provided at the very beginning of the General Meeting. He feared it would only be a waste of time. Mr. Klaue also had the impression that discussions at the General Meeting were only a repetition of those of the Executive Committee.

Mr. Privato proposed that half a day be devoted to such an experiment and that young archives be allowed to expose their problems.

Mr. Borde was very much in favour of a rotation of young and small archives on the Executive Committee considering the advantage he had derived himself from his own experience on the Executive Committee.

Mr. Pogacic agreed to welcome new archives on the Executive Committee but he doubted whether it would be possible for the President or the Secretary General not to open the discussion since they knew the problems well. Young archives were only interested by two problems : lack of money, lack of films. About the rotation of presidency ? Who could decide who was going to preside ? According to the statutes, only the President could invite someone else to take the presidency.

The President formulated four points raised during this discussion :

1. Presidency at the General Meeting : in fact, the number of questions was growing at the General Meetings. On the other hand, there was a tendency to reduce the time of the congresses. The President was obliged to close the discussions and move on to the next item. According to the statutes, the three Vice-Presidents and the Secretary General could also preside; in fact, all representatives of the archives could.
2. Order of Speech : If the members of the Executive Committee did not speak, nobody else would. They could wait for other interventions and speak only if these lacked. What was more important, the Executive Committee should only discuss the problems which had to be discussed by the Executive Committee according to the rules and avoid examining problems which the General Meeting could deal with two days later.

### 3. New Members on the Executive Committee

The possibility provided by the rules should be used and at least one new member should be recommended each year for election on the Executive Committee.

### 4. Open Forum

This was a tempting proposition. The agenda always provided a final item 'any other business' but there was never any time left. Room should be found for it at the beginning of the General Meeting.

The feeling of repetition was due to the fact that discussions of the Executive Committee had to be reported to the General Meeting. It was time to bring new people in.

It was decided that :

1. at the next General Meeting there would be a rotation of presidency as far as the rules permitted this ;
2. there would be an open forum during the General Meeting ;
3. the Executive Committee would recommend the election of a young representative who had never been member of the Executive Committee before.

STATEMENT ON F.I.A.F. MEMBERSHIP (continued)

(paper no.I)

The document would be circulated as a resolution of the Executive Committee to all members of F.I.A.F. The statement intended to help archives resist absorption. It was a dissuasion document as well as a warning but of course the Executive Committee and the General Meeting remained free of its judgement in individual cases. It was also intended to support members who wanted to get their films back. After minor changes in the formulation of the document, it was adopted unanimously. Mr. Geber's absence was noted.

#### 7. EXTENSION OF F.I.A.F. ACTIVITIES

The discussion was postponed until the next meeting of the Executive Committee.

#### 8. RELATION BETWEEN F.I.A.F. AND PRODUCERS - SUMMONS ABOUT THE USE OF BIRTH OF A NATION

Mr. Ledoux had received no news from F.I.A.P.F. The document referred to should be prepared for the next General Meeting. This question was postponed until next meeting.

About the summons, the Secretary General reported that he and Mr. Lindgren had been to see the lawyer of MMA after the New York General Meeting. He had asked the court judging the case to dismiss F.I.A.F. since F.I.A.F. itself did not hold or show any films.

Mrs. Bowser was asked, when back in New York, to see how the situation stood.

She said it would be a very long case.

Mr. Lindgren explained that there was a possibility that in England, BIRTH OF A NATION had never been under copyright.



10. REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONS OF FILM CATALOGUING AND OF DOCUMENTATION  
FUNCTIONING OF F.I.A.F. COMMISSIONS

Mr. Klaue reported on the Cataloguing Commission.

1. Mr. Acimovic had been elected as Vice-President.
2. It had been proposed to enlarge both commissions up to 10 members, as all members could not attend the meetings.
3. The Presidents of the commissions who were not members of the Executive Committee should receive the minutes as well as the minutes of the General Meeting if they were not attending.
4. A letter of reminder should be sent to all members on the necessity of national filmography and the collection of information about non published filmographies.
5. A letter of reminder should be sent to all archives to make their remarks on the report of the Commission for Documentation and Cataloguing presented at the New York Congress.
6. All F.I.A.F. projects should be handed over to the commissions concerned.
7. Financial help should be found for the work of the commissions since they could not expect always the kind of hospitality they encountered in Wiesbaden.

Some results of the work of the Cataloguing Commission

1. It had been decided to work on a manual on film cataloguing. A draft and a time table had been produced. It could be prepared for the 1971 General Meeting.
2. It was decided to include in the future discussions of the Commission problems of international co-operation such as international collaboration in filmographic work.
3. Discussion on the relation between F.I.A.F. and I.F.T.C. on electronic methods. It was suggested to ask for financial help to the I.F.T.C. for the preparation and publication of the Manual on Film Cataloguing. Mr. Toeplitz was asked to prepare the grounds.

A common meeting had been held of both Commissions which agreed upon exchanging minutes on a regular basis since there were links between the two.

The wish was expressed that both Commissions should hold their meetings at the same time and in one place. The Hungarian Archive was approached to organise the next meeting in Spring, next year.

Mr. Lindgren then read the report of Miss B. Davies, President of the Documentation Commission. (paper no.2)



Mr. Lindgren did not see the necessity of sending the minutes of the Executive Committee meetings to the Chairman of the Commission who was not on the Executive Committee. These minutes should be reserved for the members of the Committee ; he would see that Miss Brenda Davies would receive all the information concerning her Commission.

About the Directory proposed by Miss Davies, Mr. Ledoux advised that it should be prepared by the Commission but published by the secretariat after having been submitted to the Executive Committee.

Mr. Lindgren did not think any publication should be issued conveying the impression that F.I.A.F. was only interested in documentation problems. Mr. Ledoux precised that what Miss Davies wanted was a brief, simple and cheap document stating documentation facilities but this, of course, could involve many problems.

Mr. Toeplitz expressed the opinion that the Documentation Commission dealt with too many problems at a time but Mrs. Bowser explained that it only conveyed this impression because the members were assigned tasks to do at home and present to the next meeting. Mrs. Bowser also said that the intention of the Documentation Commission was to inform wider circles, people who did not know how to gain information, what sources existed within F.I.A.F.

Mr. de Vaal noted that not enough attention had been given to poster preservation.

It was decided that F.I.A.F. should publish such a 'Directory' but after having asked the archives if they wished to appear in it. The title decided upon was 'Sources of information within F.I.A.F.'. The President asked that some samples be produced at the next General Meeting.

It was also decided that Miss Davies and Mrs. Bowser would get together and write the future reports so that Mrs. Bowser could act as reporter, Miss Davies not being member of the Executive Committee.

Mr. Lindgren raised the question of F.I.A.F. making financial contributions to the work of the Commissions. I it could not find the means to do that, then it had to be prepared to accept a limit to the number and the work of the Commissions.

The President suggested that the Commissions make an estimate of how much money they needed to function.

Mr. Ledoux proposed to thank and congratulate the Deutsche Film Institut in Wiesbaden for the organisation of both Commission meetings and for their hospitality. This was agreed.

Miss Davies, in agreement with Mr. Ledoux, had invited Mrs. Schlosser to attend the Documentation Commission meeting but she had answered that she was no longer librarian with the AFI. This raised the question of outside specialists being invited to the Commission meetings. Could Miss Davies invite Mrs. Schlosser as an expert ?

This was accepted.

Another point presented to Mr. Ledoux was the meeting which would be held in Genoa in April 1970, a meeting of the IXth International Congress of the Museums and Libraries of the Performing Arts. Miss Davies was of the opinion that F.I.A.F. should delegate one of its members to Italy. The Executive Committee wondered if it was really interesting and worthwhile. It was finally decided to write to Miss Prolo about it and to ask her to represent the Federation.

### 13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

1. Mr. Ledoux had heard from Mr. Lindgren that the draft minutes of the New York General Meeting were full of errors. Besides they were badly printed but going through them again would mean further delay. Could it be sent as it was for approval to the members ? This was agreed and it was also decided to give members two months to send their corrections after which the incorrect English would be amended also.

Mr. Ledoux proposed the present size (Din A4) of the General Meeting minutes for all future F.I.A.F. administrative documents.

#### 2. Enquiry into Violence

A questionnaire had been received by the members from CICT about an enquiry they were making about violence in films and other media. The general opinion was that F.I.A.F. was not concerned but Mr. Kubelka thought F.I.A.F. should be opposed to it as to any form of censorship. Mr. Toeplitz stated that one could only be opposed to the results of such an enquiry but not to the enquiry itself.

3. The CICT had also asked F.I.A.F. to be represented in a meeting of experts for the study of Scandinavian culture in Copenhagen. This matter was handed over to the Danish Cinematheque.

4. The last point was that F.I.A.F. had received a letter from the 'Association internationale de Documentaristes' about a meeting to be held in Leipzig next year. F.I.A.F. had accepted in New York to send delegates to that meeting. Mr. Klaue and perhaps Mr. de Vaal would attend.

I4. DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

It was decided that the next Executive Committee meeting would take place in Vienna, at the official invitation of the Osterreichisches Filmmuseum, from 13th to 16th March 1970.

The President warmly thanked Mr. Pogacic and the Jugoslovenska Kinoteka on behalf of the Executive Committee for the excellent organization of the meeting and their kind hospitality.



STATEMENT ON F.I.A.F. MEMBERSHIP

At the meeting of the F.I.A.F. Executive Committee held in Zagreb on the 25th and 26th of October 1969, the following explanation of principles contained in the Statutes and Rules of F.I.A.F. was adopted:

It is the considered opinion of F.I.A.F. that film archives can discharge their responsibilities most effectively only if they are completely independent. Nevertheless in some countries film archives are incorporated within other organizations, such as film institutes, museums, etc. F.I.A.F. recognises that in certain circumstances no film archive would exist at all unless it had been created within the shelter of another organisation.

These arrangements however can sometimes create membership problems for F.I.A.F., because if it were to admit the parent bodies and their directors into its membership and discussions, F.I.A.F. would endanger its status and its integrity as an international body devoted exclusively to representing the film archive movement. The success of its work both internally and in relationship to other international organisations depends upon its exclusive concern with film archive matters being unquestioned. There must be no suspicion that it is in any way concerned with, or motivated by other problems or considerations.

For this reason, F.I.A.F. cannot accept into its membership film archives attached to other organisations unless these archives have such a degree of autonomy as to be able to join F.I.A.F. as members in their own right, to have the necessary authority in themselves to discharge the responsibilities of membership, and to be able to send their own staff to take a full and independent part in the discussions and management of F.I.A.F. So-called film archives which are merely service departments of other organisations are not eligible for membership.

Although F.I.A.F. is compelled to make this distinction clear in its own interest and to safeguard its own integrity, it is also in the interests of individual film archives themselves, which cannot effectively ensure the permanent preservation of the films in their collections, establish good relations with their national film industries, and serve impartially all those to whom their collections can be useful, unless they have sufficient independence or autonomy to defend their needs as an archive.

In judging the degree of autonomy within the framework of a larger organisation required to enable an archive to qualify as a responsible and self-contained member of F.I.A.F., consideration will be given to the following requirements :

1. The archive should have its own distinctive title, in which the name of the archive should be given first place.
2. The archive should have its own constitution (Statutes and Rules).

3. The archive should have its own budget and control over its own finances.
4. The archive should have complete control over and responsibility for all the uses of all the films in its collections, including those received from other members of the F.I.A.F., subject to the rights of the copyright owners.
5. The archive should be able to act in all respects within the field of its own work as though it were an independent archive.
6. The archive should be represented in all dealings with F.I.A.F. members and F.I.A.F. itself, solely by its own officers.

Finally, F.I.A.F. is strongly opposed in principle to the absorption by another body of any film archive member which was independent when it first became a member. In the event of such member losing its independent status, its membership of F.I.A.F. will lapse automatically and it can be obliged to return all films received from all other F.I.A.F. members on limited or indefinite loan. A new application for membership will then be necessary.

REPORT ON THE MEETINGS OF THE DOCUMENTATION COMMISSION OF F.I.A.F.

Wiesbaden October 20th - 23rd

The Commission began by considering the draft agenda and added to it an item on the storage and preservation of related materials.

It then studied the new rules which had been prepared by the F.I.A.F. Executive Committee and went on to the election of a Vice-Chairman. Mr. Spiess was elected and agreed to act in this capacity.

Before proceeding to the first item on the agenda there was a brief discussion on communications within F.I.A.F. and it was felt that although the principle of addressing letters and enquiries to the Head of an archive was a good one, in practice it sometimes led to delays and it was therefore suggested that in the case of enquiries directly relating to a specific department, such as a library, the letter might be addressed to the librarian with a copy for the Head of the archive.

The Commission studied the programme proposed by the F.I.A.F. Executive and decided that items relating to all the points mentioned were already included in the draft agenda.

We then proceeded to a long and complicated discussion of the problems of exchanging information on the indexing of periodicals and considered also the Rumanian publication 'Cinematografia in Presa' although of course our Rumanian delegate was unfortunately not able to be with us. It was felt that all that could be said at present about this publication had already been said in the Chairman's letter to the Secretary General at the New York Congress. The main obstacles to its more general use are 1) the language problem - the article abstracts, being in Rumanian, are inaccessible,

2) the time factor - for many archives it is necessary to have the indexing information almost as soon as a publication appears. However, for those archives where time is not of the greatest importance and/or where indexing is done only by film title or personality the publication is a most valuable tool and the Commission proposes in its next circular on indexing problems to draw the attention of all archives to 'Cinematografia in Presa' and to recommend its use in the limited sense already mentioned. Should it become possible to issue and circulate a French edition it will be necessary to consider to what extent this could replace the indexing guide sheets which are at present being exchanged on an experimental basis among the archives represented at the Brussels meeting of the former Cataloguing and Documentation Commission.

We proceeded to take a further look at the methods proposed at that meeting for exchanging indexing information and realised that our long term aim in this matter was the exploration of possibilities of standardisation and centralisation of this kind of information. As a first step in this direction it was suggested that the information at present



being circulated might be presented in the form of cards and some sample entries were worked out on this basis. The advantage of cards is of course that they would form a ready-made card-index for new archives while they are no more difficult to transfer to an existing system than sheets. They would be slightly more bulky to post. It was then agreed to send a set of such samples (on sheets of card which can be divided into 3 standard 6"x4" index cards) to all archives and ask whether they felt that this method would be acceptable as an alternative to the guide sheets. In the meantime the circulation of the guide sheets would continue. It was emphasised that whatever method is used the time factor is of the utmost importance.

During a discussion on indexing only periodicals it was agreed to attempt a co-operative project on 'Photoplay'. A list of holdings will be compiled and the appropriate archives asked to participate.

There was a short discussion on problems of bibliographic information. Most archives receive annual requests for such information from the Venice Biennale and from the Rumanian Archive. It was agreed, in the absence of the Rumanian delegate, to write to Rumania asking whether co-ordination of these two annual requests was possible.

Machinery for exchange of information within F.I.A.F. was discussed briefly and the value of the Brussels Secretariat as a clearing house was emphasised.

On the subject of book indexing Mr. Spiess offered to produce an index to Der Deutsche Film by Albus.

Realising that the Commission is already collecting information from many archives which may not be generally accessible throughout F.I.A.F. and feeling that there is a general lack of published information on the work of F.I.A.F., the Commission suggests for itself the task of compiling a F.I.A.F. Documentation Directory which it suggests might also be available for film and library organisations outside F.I.A.F. It presents for the consideration of the Executive the following table of contents :

1. Introduction explaining the aims and objects of F.I.A.F.
2. List of names and addresses of member archives, with names of principal officers and heads of departments.
3. Explanation of F.I.A.F. rules that enquiry must be initiated in the enquiries own domestic archive.
4. Information on holdings of documentation material within F.I.A.F.:
  - a) books - size of stock and whether available for loan
  - b) periodicals - whether list of holdings available
  - c) list of film periodicals available on microfilm

- d) related material holdings
- e) areas of specialisation
- f) availability of information services
- g) details of viewing facilities
- h) list of F.I.A.F. and archive publications or availability details of such as list
- i) availability of photo-copying or micro-film reading facilities in archives
- j) holdings of scripts in archives - whether lists of titles available
- k) list of Documentation Commission projects and any other research projects known to the Commission
- l) book indexes already prepared for Commission and where they can be obtained
- m) other bibliographic information (e.g. availability of book accessions lists and bibliographies from archives or any other sources).

The Commission feels that much of the information on holdings necessary for such a project will be contained in the replies to Mr. Klaue's proposed circular on related materials and it hopes to collaborate with him in sending out a joint enquiry. We visualise the Directory as being cheaply produced - perhaps duplicated or photo-printed.

The Commission discussed the preservation and storage of related materials and reports were made on the present position in London and New York on stills and the microfilming of news clippings. The Commission has now received from the Dutch Film Museum its illustrated booklet on the preservation of posters and it recommends this publication to all archives and other organisations in the field as a manual of advice on this form of material preservation. We also discussed acquisition and preservation of scripts and some questions on the security of collections.

Finally, returning to our periodical indexing problems it was felt that the Commission should be in a position to study methods of subject indexing and it was proposed to set up two projects :

- 1) a study of the use of numerical systems with particular reference to the Dewey extension in use in Copenhagen (to be undertaken by Miss Jones in collaboration with the Librarian, N.F.A.).
- 2) A study of 'Key Word' systems - advice sought in an archive who can provide expert opinion in this field (the N.F.A. is already studying a revision of its own system and would be willing to collaborate).