

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

Secrétariat  
Galerie Ravenstein, 74  
1000 BRUXELLES  
Téléphone 13.41.53

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING.  
18th, 19th and 20th November 1970.

m i n u t e s

KLEINMACHNOW near Potsdam

CONFIDENTIAL

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Kleinmachnow, 18th, 19th and 20th November 1970

SUMMARY AND DECISIONS

Present	Members	Messrs.	E. Lindgren, Vice-President V. Privato, Vice-Président V. Pogacic, Vice-President J. Ledoux, Secretary General P. Konlechner, Treasurer W. Klaue, Deputy Secretary General M. Frida J.B. Kuiper
	Deputy Members	Mr.	J. de Vaal J. Stenklev D. Fernoaga
	Honorary Members	Messrs.	E. Lauritzen H. Volkmann M. Svoboda

Apologies for absence

	Members	Mr.	J. Toeplitz, President
		Mrs.	E. Bowser
		Mrs.	Jaubert
		Mr.	E. Spiess, President of the FIAF Documentation Commission
<u>In attendance</u>		Mrs.	D. Schirmer, Secretary Interpreter

1st SESSION

Wednesday, 18th November : Afternoon Session

---

President Toeplitz being absent, Mr. Klaue agreed to act as chairman of the first meeting. He welcomed the Executive Committee Members, noted that a quorum was attained and declared the meeting valid.

He read out a letter from the President of F.I.A.F., Prof. Toeplitz, in which Prof. Toeplitz apologised for his absence to all colleagues taking part in the meeting and told them that he had to fly to Australia in a very important mission. He apologised especially to the vice-presidents for the additional burden that his absence would put on their shoulders.

Further apologies for absence had been received from Mrs. Bowser, Mrs. Jaubert and Mr. Spiess, in his capacity of President of the Documentation Commission.

The Secretary General suggested to write a formal letter to Mr. Papp in Budapest explaining to him why the meeting of the Executive Committee had to be called off in October and to express to him the members' and his own regrets. At the same time, Mr. Ledoux suggested to propose to Mr. Papp that one of the future meetings of the Executive Committee be held in Budapest.

This was agreed.

Mr. Klaue then wanted the question of the chair settled. Mr. Lindgren wanted to be excused to preside the meeting for the afternoon session since he arrived last and late for the first meeting. Mr. Pogacic felt it would be rather difficult for him to chair the meeting because of language problems and because the minutes would be in English. Mr. Privato also felt that the language difficulties would delay the work if he accepted the chair.

Thus it was agreed that Mr. Lindgren would preside all meetings after the first one.

1. ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT AGENDA

The following agenda was adopted :

1. ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT AGENDA
2. MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING
3. PRESIDENT'S REPORT
4. SECRETARY GENERAL'S REPORT
  - a) Secretariat
  - b) Membership problems
5. TREASURER'S REPORT
6. PROSPECTS AND POLICIES
  - a) Zagreb Resolution
  - b) Circular letter from Cineteca Nazionale
  - c) Buying films by archives
  - d) Exclusive privilege of FIAF versus the instructions of copyright holders
7. RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS, INCLUDING FIAPF
8. REPORTS FROM THE PRESERVATION, CATALOGUING AND DOCUMENTATION COMMISSIONS
  - Rules for commissions
9. PROJECTS
10. DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT EXECUTIVE AND GENERAL MEETINGS
11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS
  - Méliès Letter

2. MINUTES

Mr. Ledoux regretted that the minutes of the Executive Committee and the General Meeting of Lyon were not available. He reminded members that the FIAF Secretary, Miss Moffat, had had a nervous breakdown before the Lyon Congress and the new girl that Mr. Lindgren was able to find among the BFI staff to substitute her, proved also not to be a success.

Mr. Lindgren said that Miss Murrell had taken the notes very conscientiously at the meetings and had expected that within a month or two after the Congress she would supply the minutes.

Miss Murrell left the BFI at her own desire and only after writing her a rather strong letter and talking to her on the telephone she had come to see Mr. Lindgren and had given him the material at which she had been working. Mr. Lindgren told members that it had been evident that Miss Murrell had had a serious nervous breakdown, but that she had appeared profoundly apologetic and Mr. Lindgren said that he would undertake with the help of his own secretary to produce an adequate report of both the Executive Committee sessions and the Congress sessions in Lyon.

Mr. Ledoux pointed out that a decision should be taken concerning the payment for Miss Murrell.

It was suggested that Miss Murrell should be paid half the money that was promised to her, £ 25/-/-, under the condition that she should be available and help Mr. Lindgren's secretary finish the reports.

This was agreed.

3. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

None of the Vice-Presidents were in a position to give the President's report.

Mr. Pogacic expressed his concern about the absence of the President, the same could happen with the Secretary General. He thought that it would perhaps be necessary to reorganise the Executive Committee work and divide and precise the functions of the FIAF officers.

4. SECRETARY GENERAL'S REPORTa) Secretariat

Mr. Ledoux reported that he had found a temporary Executive Secretary, Madame Roth, who works 2-3 hours a day for the Federation. He told members that she had agreed to leave as soon as he would find some other candidate for the Secretariat. Of three candidates, Mr. Ledoux had picked Madame Brigitte van der Elst, who speaks excellent French, good English and who had studied at Bruxelles and at some university in the United States. Mr. Ledoux said that Madame van der Elst would start work in the FIAF Secretariat from 1st December, 1970, 2 hours a day at a fixed time and 2 hours at request to choose.

A small committee was formed by the Secretary General, the Treasurer, Mr. Klaue and Mr. Frida to discuss her salary

Mr. Volkmann thought that 4 working hours per day would not be sufficient to run the FIAF Secretariat.

Mr. Lindgren appreciated Mr. Volkmann's concern but he said that first of all a programme of work had to be worked out to occupy a full-time secretary; he agreed with Mr. Ledoux that the work of FIAF for the moment does not require more than a half time secretary.

The Secretary General suggested that Mrs. Roth should stay only for one month to assist Mrs. van der Elst or else afterwards only on the condition that Mrs. van der Elst herself asked for somebody to help with the filing.

Filmography of Film Librarianship, published by Mr. Sam Kula, AFI 40 copies of the Filmography were sent to the General Secretary with the request to distribute them among FIAF member archives. But since it was stated that there were 46 members altogether, Mr. Lindgren suggested that the Secretary General should write to Mr. Kula thanking him for the 40 copies and asking him at the same time for 6 more copies to complete the circulation of the publication.

This was agreed.

In the connection the Secretary General raised the question again - they didn't have the time to discuss this in Lyon - whether it could be established as a rule for FIAF members that they should be obliged to send a free copy of their own publications to other members. Mr. Ledoux pointed out that some archives were already doing this. He felt that it would cost nearly nothing to ask the publisher to print 50 more copies for free distribution, because he thought that a certain number of member archives were unable to buy these publications due to money and currency restrictions.

The Secretary General proposed to formulate this as a written rule for FIAF members.

The members present liked the idea in theory but Mr. Stenklev and Mr. Lindgren pointed out that the conditions differ from country to country and that the proposal would be not very practical to be carried out

Mr. Klaue preferred to have this item added to FIAF rules as a recommendation. A vote was taken on this.

6 members favoured to have the proposal as a rule

5 members favoured to have the proposal as a recommendation.

It was agreed that the Secretary General would draft a proposal for a rule and that it then be subject for discussion at the next Executive Committee Meeting.

Letter of Mrs. Richter-Levin, Tel Aviv,  
to FIAF Secretariat

Mrs. Richter-Levin wrote to the Secretariat that they wanted to buy two projectors and one editing-table and she wondered whether FIAF could advise her on what equipment would be best to buy.

The Secretary General told the Executive Committee Members that he had already replied that it was impossible to answer such a question because there were too many considerations involved.

Most members present felt that FIAF ought to give that kind of advice in this field only in terms of general principles. The members then entered into a discussion on the subject. Mr. Volkmann pointed out that there had been a FIAF project in 1965 when he had sent out circular letters to member archives asking them to send prospectus and any other technical documentation about the used types of equipment in the field of film technique. The project had failed since less than 10 % of the archives had cooperated.

Mr. Volkmann offered to resume the task in the Preservation Commission but that would still mean that they could only elaborate a list of equipment produced in different countries with the description of the functions from which the archives would have to make their choice.

Mr. Konlechner felt that the archives who wanted to buy technical archive equipment should visit international exhibitions and draw their knowledge from that source.

Mr. Klaue admitted that so far there had been only one request for advice on technical archive equipment but that new members joining FIAF, especially from the underdeveloped countries would expect such advice. He therefore suggested that the Secretariat should collect information from companies, producers, etc. about machinery produced for film archives, without any judgement of the best machinery.

This was agreed.

2nd SESSION

Thursday, 19th November : Morning Session

Chair : Mr. Lindgren, Vice-President

The case of sequestration in Paris

Mr. Ledoux reported a letter of 4th September, which he had received from Me. Boitard, the lawyer who is pursuing the sequestration case for FIAF in Paris, and it appeared from it that George Eastman House is still opposing to the return of the papers to FIAF.

Mr. Lindgren explained for the benefit of Dr. Kuiper the matter of the sequestration and that even though Mr. Langlois had no objections now that it be lifted and FIAF possessions be returned to FIAF, George Eastman House who were a party of the sequestration maintains that FIAF should not have its files back unless all their letters, which they regard as their property have been extracted and turned over to them.

Mr. Lindgren wondered whether Dr. Kuiper felt that he could do anything for FIAF and whether his relations with the successor of Mr. Beaumont-Newhall of James Card were such that he would be able to make any useful presentation.

Dr. Kuiper said that he might be able to find something out in this matter.

NAPOLEON by Abel Gance

Mr. Ledoux reported that he had been asked by the Deputy Curator of the National Film Archive, Mr. Colin Ford, and by Kelvin Bronlow for the National Film Theatre, to help provide a complete copy of NAPOLEON to be shown at the British Film Institute exhibition "Cinema City" in London with an introduction by Abel Gance. On request of Mr. Ledoux the film archives of Belgrade, Rome, and Prague had sent their incomplete prints of NAPOLEON to London where Kelvin Bronlow had also the NFA's incomplete but rather long copy of the film at his disposal. He was able to make a fuller version of NAPOLEON out of all these copies than had ever been seen. Mr. Ledoux said that he did not know when the negative would be ready. Abel Gance had asked to see the results. Mr. Ledoux reported that he had been unable before coming to this meeting to reach Mr. Bronlow to talk to him as to what material he would hand over to Paris.

Mr. Frida reported that he had read in the papers that Abel Gance is preparing a second synchronisation of NAPOLEON. And he felt that if he should use the material that FIAF members had sent to London, FIAF should get a credit for the newly reconstructed version.

Mr. Lindgren told members that this reconstruction of NAPOLEON was being done on private initiative of Kelvin Bronlow who had tackled this job of reconstruction with great enthusiasm but to a large extent as a private person. Mr. Lindgren added that he was concerned about what would happen to the reconstructed version. He said that the credit for the film goes first to Abel Gance who created the film and only secondly to Kelvin Bronlow. To Mr. Lindgren it was of much more importance that the reconstructed version would be preserved in the archives of FIAF members. He said that he would try to use his influence on Kelvin Bronlow to see that the reconstructed copy would be preserved. If this was not the case he would make a serious complaint against Kelvin B.



Mr. de Vaal added that a copy of NAPOLEON had recently been found in the Dutch archive.

#### 4. b) Membership problems

##### Pacific Film Archive

Upon the request of Mr. Kubelka, Mr. Ledoux had written a letter to that archive, attention of Mr. Sheldon-Renan in Berkeley, but had not received any answer so far.

##### UCLA

The new organigram of the UCLA had been received, Mr. Hugh Gray is the new director for one year. Curator of UCLA is Professor Epstein, but since the UCLA archive seems to be in a process of re-arrangement after Colin Young's departure. Mr. Lindgren suggested that FIAF should leave them time for another year to get settled.

##### Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique

Mr. Ledoux reported that the financial situation in the Belgian archive had been bad for the last years. Since 1965 they had a fixed subvention, but since that time the money had lost its value constantly. The Ministry had been warned by them that unless the subvention for the archive would be increased the archive had to stop certain of its activities. The board of the Belgian archive had thus decided to reduce its staff by one third from 1st October, 1970 and to close the documentation department.

##### Canada

Mr. Ledoux informed members that Mrs. Jaubert, member of the Executive Committee, had become president of the International Federation of Animation Films.

##### Latin America

No change to report.

##### Japan

Mr. Ledoux expressed his concern that FIAF had no member in Japan. The MMA in Tokio which had left FIAF when the dispute with Mr. Langlois had begun, exists still as an archive. But Mr. Ledoux had read in the latest Japan report of Unesco that it has been considered to create an independent organisation instead of letting the archive be at the charge of the Museum where it is only a department.

And Mr. Klaue pointed out that he had received a letter from a new organisation, the Japan Film Council, saying that Mrs. Kawakita had handed over to them all files and that they are responsible for film archive problems now. It was said in that letter also that they were interested to have contacts with the Staatliches Filmarchiv. Mr. Klaue told members that he had replied to this letter and had drawn their attention to FIAF. But their answer was that they are young and would want to establish their archive first and then would look for contacts with FIAF.

Mr. Kuiper reported that his institution, the AFI, had developed an exchange programme with the MMA in Tokio and that perhaps it would be useful to explore the matters of the Federation through that open channel of the MMA.

Mr. Lindgren suggested to leave the matter to the Secretary General to keep in touch with Mr. Klaue and Dr. Kuiper and try to find an opportunity to strengthen the interest of FIAF in Japan.

Mr. Ledoux also suggested to write a letter to Mr. Richie to find out from him what the situation is in Japan now.

This was agreed.

#### Reykjavik/Iceland

Mr. Ledoux had received a visitor from the Reykjavik film archive which seems for the time being to exist only on paper. Mr. Ledoux had advised the gentleman to establish some contacts with one of the Scandinavian archives and he had also given him the statutes and rules of FIAF. The gentleman from Reykjavik had contacted Mr. Monty at Copenhagen but he had written to Mr. Ledoux that the Reykjavik archive would not yet apply for being admitted to FIAF for the moment.

#### Poland

It was reported that the Centralne Archiwum Filmowe had changed its name to FILMOTEKA POLSKA, but that there was no change involved in the structure of the archive.

#### Switzerland

The Film Museum of Zürich is no longer a member of FIAF.

#### Tirana/Albania

At Lyon the Albanian archive had been represented by somebody from the Albanian Embassy in Paris. And it had been decided in Lyon to accept Tirana as a full member at the condition that they would authorise somebody of the Executive Committee to inspect their preservation facilities before 31st December 1970, as is foreseen in the FIAF rules.

A letter and a cable to Mr. Aristidi had remained unreplied. Mr. Ledoux then emphasised that Tirana would not be accepted as a full member if the FIAF stipulation would not be met and they would not be included in the members' list to be published early 1971.

It was suggested by Mr. Lindgren that the Secretary General should write once more to Mr. Aristidi explaining that the matter had been considered at the Executive Committee Meeting and that they should clearly understand that if the condition were not observed, not only could they not become a full member but they would also lose their status of provisional membership.

All agreed that the matter should be examined again at the next Executive Meeting.

#### Sweden

Mr. Ledoux pointed out that the letter by Mr. Harry Schein, dated 8 July 1970 (in the file of the members) seemed insufficient considering what was agreed in Lyon.

It seemed evident to Mr. Lindgren that the name of the Swedish archive given in the letter - Svenska Filminstitutet - Cinemateket - did not give preference to the name of the archive as it was stipulated in the Zagreb Resolution.

Mr. Ledoux was also concerned about the division of the Cinemateket into three branches, and that the distribution department is not part of the Cinemateket but a department of the Swedish Filminstitutet. He pointed out that one clause of the Zagreb Resolution is that the archive should be responsible for all their films and of course of their distribution.

Mr. Ledoux told the members that Mr. Bo Jonsson had planned to visit him in Brussels but had not come to see him yet.

Mr. Volkmann and Mr. Lindgren said that they had a short conversation with Mr. Jonsson. They judged him a capable administrator and thought it wise to give him time and support him since he had inherited a situation which he did not create.

Mr. Privato pointed out that the Executive Committee should not try to interfere with internal affairs in Sweden too much, especially concerning the various functions in the various departments.

But Mr. Ledoux insisted that the letter of Mr. Schein be answered, otherwise it would mean that the Executive Committee was satisfied with it, which was not at all so.

Mr. Lindgren suggested to authorise the Secretary General to write a friendly letter to Mr. Bo Jonsson saying that the question of the Swedish Film Institute had been considered at the Executive Committee Meeting at Kleinmachnow and that the members were not entirely satisfied with certain features of the letter of Mr. Schein. It should furthermore be included that they hope to see Mr. Jonsson at the next Congress to consult him and to discuss things with him. And it should be added that the Executive Committee members wished him every success in his new post.

This was agreed

#### American Film Institute

Mr. Ledoux reminded members that the AFI had been accepted at the Lyon Congress as a provisional member by 20 votes for, six votes against and three abstentions. He had received a letter giving the reassurance about the autonomy of the Archive.

But Mr. Klaue and Mr. Volkmann - who were prevented from participating in the discussion because of visa difficulties - expressed their concern about an institute being a member of FIAF that does not fulfill the obligations of an archive which are laid down in the statutes under article 5.

Mr. Lindgren pointed out to them that even though he understood the position of both Mr. Klaue and Mr. Volkmann, a vote had been taken on the question at the General Meeting and that the vote could not be reversed at the Executive Committee.

Mr. Lindgren advised them to use the opportunity to state their objections at a future Congress when AFI would ask for its provisional membership to be made full membership.

Mr. Volkmann still felt that it would be necessary in such cases to discuss any proposal which is against the rules and it is against the rules to accept a member who has rights but no physical ownership of the films.

Mr. Lindgren had a vote taken about the letter from the AFI, 8 members were in favour of accepting the letter as meeting the conditions of the Zagreb Resolution.

There were no votes against.

#### National Film Archive of the United Arab Republic

The Secretary General had informed the UAR Archive that it was accepted as a member of FIAF by 28 votes in favour, and one abstention. He had furthermore asked them to let him have the name of their archive for registration in the language of their country with an English translation in brackets.

Mr. Klaue informed members that Mr. Gohar and Mr. Hadari had visited the archives in Yugoslavia, Hungary and the GDR. He told members that the Egyptian Archive has a very small budget only, due to the political and economic situation in the country. Mr. Klaue said that they concentrate for the time being on the collection of films and documentation and that they would appreciate help from FIAF members, but that they had no experience on how to contact them.

Mr. Klaue also told members that the two gentlemen of the UAR Archive had asked him to inform the Executive Committee about their desire to send out a circular letter asking archives to exchange films, documentation material and films, preferably of Egyptian origin, with them and whether this could be done by the Secretariat or through the members directly.

It was Mr. Pogacic's impression, too, that Mr. Gohar and Mr. Hadari were serious people with a desire to create a serious archive.

Mr. Lindgren suggested that FIAF should not wait for the UAR archive to write to FIAF but he recommended to authorise the Secretary General to write to them telling them that Mr. Klaue and Mr. Pogacic had reported their case and would they please let the Secretariat know what kind of assistance they would like.

It was agreed to write the letter in this sense.

#### Montevideo/Uruguay

Mr. Konlechner informed members that the two archives of Uruguay had paid the subscription fees for 1970 and thus had become correspondents.

#### Complaint of Mr. David Stone

The Secretary General informed members that he had been visited by the American producer, Mr. David Stone, who had wanted to make a complaint against the Cinemateca Argentina. Mr. Stone had told the Secretary General that he had sent films to the Cinemateca Argentina which they had sold to the television.

Mr. Lindgren felt that FIAF is obliged to investigate such matter and find out the truth about it but only under the condition that a written complaint had been presented. As this was not the case the Secretary General agreed to write a letter to Mr. Stone asking him to formulate precisely what the complaint is about.

This was agreed.

#### Mexico

Mr. Ledoux reminded members that the Mexican Archive had asked for provisional membership, but they had been given only status of correspondent

by 19 votes for, 9 against and 1 abstention, due to the late application to the Lyon Congress.

Mr. Ledoux said he had received a letter from Mexico saying that they are happy about their admittance to FIAF and are working on the localisation of the material of the Mexican cinema of the thirties which they hope to be able to present in a retrospective on the Mexican cinema.

The Secretary General read out a letter from Eileen Bowser in which she reported about the experience of the MMA of New York with the Mexican Archive in spring 1970. It was stated that the MMA had lent at the request of Gosfilmofond a large group of Soviet films to the Mexican Archive but that Mr. Gomes Gomez had returned the films only after they had asked the Soviet Embassy for help, one reel had been very badly damaged. Mrs. Bowser concluded that they were extremely reluctant to lend any more films to the Mexican Archive in the future.

3d Session

Thursday, 19th November : Afternoon.

Mr. Lindgren opened the discussion on the financial report.

Mr. Volkmann had not spent the sum which he had received for the Stockholm meeting of the Preservation Commission and he did not see the necessity for returning it to the central account if it would be needed for the 1971 Preservation Commission. He had offered Mr. Konlechner a receipt over this sum.

Mr. Ledoux and Mr. Lindgren disagreed with Mr. Volkmann on this procedure and re-explained what the normal procedure was : i.e. to ask every year to the Executive Committee the money which would be needed for the meetings of the commission. If the money had not been used for the purpose for which it was given, it should be returned to the treasurer. There was no necessity to give the presidents of the commissions an advance on the budget to spend. Mr. Volkmann pointed out that there were more than 7 persons in his commission, also that he would like to have 2 meetings of the commission year in order to achieve results and that he would need in most cases 2 experts. Mr. Lindgren said he was not questioning the necessity for FIAF to finance the work of the commissions but the question was whether this work should be financed by requests made each time for special purposes and the unspent money then being returned to the central account - or whether the presidents of the commissions should have a sum of money permanently held at their disposal. This second alternative was not foreseen in the rules. Other members supported Mr. Lindgren in his view that each application to the budget should be considered on its own merits.

Mr. Volkmann then agreed to return the money to the central account and make a new application in March.

The Executive Committee authorized Mr. Konlechner to provide 5.000 SF ~~to~~ buy office equipment for the FIAF Secretariat in Brussels.

5. b) Bank problems

Mr. Konlechner first explained a certain number of daily difficulties, encountered in operating the Zürich account and pointed out that there was no more reason to keep the bulk of FIAF capital in this bank.

Members then entered into discussion as to what other banking arrangements FIAF should make.

Mr. Lindgren was very much in favour with Mr. Kuiper's proposal to try variation II of Mr. Konlechner's report (annex I) to leave the FIAF Swiss Francs savings account with the Swiss bank and try a Belgian Francs budget account in Belgium.

This was agreed and also that FIAF subscription fees should from 1971 on be paid to Belgium and accounted in Belgian Francs, since 95 % of the fees were used for the Secretariat.

A vote was taken, all members (except the Secretary General, who abstained) agreed to try variation II to be subject to be reviewed in one or two years' time.

## 6. PROSPECTS AND POLICIES

### a) The Zagreb Resolution

The Secretary General reminded members that the Zagreb Resolution had been accepted at the General Assembly in Lyon without any change, but that it had been stated then that at the next Executive Meeting it would be reconsidered. Any forthcoming changes, improvements, etc. would then be presented to the next General Assembly.

Mr. Lindgren undertook to read out the Zagreb Resolution paragraph by paragraph and members agreed to his suggestion that in the 1. paragraph "only" and "completely" should be dropped. (... "It is the considered opinion of FIAF that film archives can discharge their responsibilities most effectively (only) if they are (completely) independent"...)

Members entered into discussion on the Zagreb Resolution.

Mr. Lindgren expressed his concern about paragraph 4 and volunteered to try to reword it. No agreement was reached on it.

Dr. Kuiper suggested to form the requirements into questions to soften them and Mr. Privato felt that the Zagreb Resolution sounded as if FIAF would want to prevent younger archives from joining them or even to interfere to some extent in their internal affairs.

Mr. Ledoux pointed out that rules could not be made and applied without a certain interference.

Mr. Klaue stated that it had been accepted in Lyon that the Zagreb Resolution would be included in the rules of FIAF and he thought that the original formulation of the Resolution was quite correct and it should be adhered to.

Mr. Lindgren still favoured Mr. Kuiper's suggestion to put the statements into questions, whereas Mr. Privato preferred to replace 'should' by 'it is advisable'.

Mr. Ledoux reminded that a certain number of archives could defend themselves with this document against being swallowed by bigger institutions and that if these statements were made too soft they would not serve their purpose.

Mr. Lindgren in his capacity of representative of the National Film Archive had a vote taken on his suggestion to formulate the statements into questions, there were 4 members in favour and the majority against it, one abstention (Dr. Kuiper).

Another vote was taken on Mr. Privato's suggestion to substitute 'should' for 'it is advisable', one member (Mr. Privato) was in favour and the majority against it.

It was thus agreed to leave the Zagreb Resolution as it is except the above stated changes in paragraph 1.

Mr. Ledoux then read out Mr. Schein's letter on the Zagreb Resolution and also his version of the Resolution. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 had been kept unchanged, paragraph 3 had been dropped altogether and from then on the text differed completely.

Mr. Lindgren closed the subject on the Zagreb Resolution by stating that it seemed that Mr. Schein accepted in principle the Resolution and all agreed that Mr. Schein had not produced anything sufficiently different. This was agreed.

6. b) Circular letter from Cineteca Nazionale

All members had this letter in their files.

Two archives had already replied directly to Mr. Giammatteo, Mr. Lindgren and Mr. Borde (copies of their letters were in the files of the members).

Mr. Lindgren expressed his astonishment that some one who knows nothing about work in FIAF, and who has never taken part in any discussion, can really make any useful contribution to FIAF policy.

Mr. Lindgren felt that they should send Mr. Giammatteo a polite letter but that his proposals should not be discussed in detail since they were not based upon work in FIAF, and that his only experience with FIAF work is his experience in Rome.

Mr. Ledoux said that a new conception of the activities of film archives should be elaborated since the Cineteca would want to open a discussion on that. Mr. Ledoux and Dr. Kuiper felt that the subject should be discussed anyway to see whether the Executive Committee is still satisfied with the structure and the aims of FIAF.

But Mr. Lindgren strongly opposed to this, he felt that this was a subject to be discussed at the next Congress and in this he was supported by Mr. Pogacic.

Mr. Lindgren thought that in order that the General Assembly could discuss this, the Executive Committee Meeting should discuss how they could present the question to the General Assembly and what sort of principles should be laid down for an Executive Committee to discuss this.

Mr. Ledoux disagreed with Mr. Lindgren, he pointed out that the Executive Committee was the proper place to discuss this subject, even more so, because it was foreseen in the agenda and because it arose from Mr. Giammatteo's letter.

Mr. Lindgren proposed to postpone the discussion of FIAF prospects and the future structure of FIAF and that all Executive Committee members should come prepared for this discussion to the next Committee meeting.

Mr. Klaue strongly supported the President in this and promised to present a paper about the problems, prospects and the future structure of FIAF to the next Executive Committee Meeting.

He said that he had three main problems in mind which he would want to raise at the next Executive Committee Meeting.

1. Relationship between film and television archives
2. Private collections as the cassette television recording develops.
3. New definition of the tasks of FIAF

Mr. Lindgren also agreed to prepare a paper on that subject and he suggested that the Secretary General should invite all members of the Executive Committee to send him their written statements on the future policy of FIAF.

The statements should circulate before the next Executive Committee Meeting and serve as a basis for discussion.

All agreed to this.

It was agreed that Mr. Ledoux would send a reply to Mr. Giammatteo to thank him for his contribution and that it would be discussed along with other



proposals of the Executive Committee members at the next General Assembly in Wiesbaden.

#### 6. c) Buying of films

Mr. Ledoux pointed out to members two important problems, first, the payment by archives for film rights, and second, paying rent for films for the showings in the archive theatres.

Mr. Ledoux reported that Mr. Konlechner had bought some films from an independent young film maker in Holland, Mr. Zwartjes, for which he had paid a considerable sum of money. And Mr. Lindgren had received a letter from Mr. Nair of India in which he had been asked to buy films for the Indian Archive.

Mr. Konlechner explained members that the film producer in question, Mr. Zwartjes, is an independent film-maker who makes his living on making films and that he sees a difference between an independent film-maker and a big production company. He commented that the Austrian Archive had paid Mr. Zwartjes a fixed sum, not for the rights of the films, but to support him, and that this was not against the rules of FIAF.

Mr. Ledoux, Mr. Lindgren and Mr. de Vaal disagreed with Mr. Konlechner's view, they felt that the big production companies would never agree with the distinction between an independent film-maker and a big production company.

Mr. Ledoux suggested that there were many other ways to help independent film-makers, but an archive should not pay more for a copy to be preserved in the archive than the laboratory costs.

Mr. Lindgren added that Mr. Konlechner paid more than laboratory costs to the owner of the films in order to have the opportunity to show them. Thus, he had paid a kind of rights.

At this point Mr. Lindgren introduced his own correspondence with Mr. Nair. Mr. Nair had written to Mr. Lindgren that he had been offered a number of films by British producers and distributors for sale for restricted archive use.

Mr. Lindgren said that he could not buy films for Mr. Nair in Britain through the NFA because it would damage their own position. Mr. Lindgren stated that it is wrong in principle for archives to get into the commercial business of buying films, they would thus build up a market against themselves.

Mr. Ledoux added that by buying films certain members were endangering very seriously the way of functioning of other members.

Mr. Lindgren and Mr. Privato also felt that in acquiring films for preservation an archive should never pay more than laboratory costs for a film.

Mr. Konlechner expressed his concern that one day young independent film-makers would not be interested any more in depositing with the archives and the archives would not get any American underground films any more, which he personally considered as films.

Mr. Ledoux told him that there were a considerable number of films that were not available at present and archives would still not buy them.

Mr. Lindgren stressed that there are other ways of helping young film-makers, as for instance the production fund of the BFI in London.

Mr. Lindgren brought a rule to the attention of the members which he had drafted : "No member of FIAF is permitted to pay more than laboratory costs and servicing charges for any film which is required only for preservation and for showing in its own premises, except with the authorisation of the Executive Committee".

A vote was taken on the question whether it was wrong in principle for archives to pay for films for preservation and use in archive premises more than lab costs : the majority, including Mr. Konlechner, who said that there were two kinds of films, voted in favour of this.

The majority (except Mr. Konlechner) agreed to have a rule to control this.

The General Secretary was asked to formulate the rule for the next Executive Committee when it would be decided how it should be presented to the General Assembly.

This was agreed.

4th SESSIONFriday, 20th November : Morning Session

(Mr. Volkmann absent)

Mr. Lindgren informed members that due to this decision he would inform Mr. Nair that the NFA would act for him in London and buy films for him under the condition that they would purchase films against the payment of the laboratory costs plus a minimum servicing charge, for the Indian Archive.

6. d) Exclusive privilege of FIAF versus the instructions of copyright-holders

Mr. Lindgren suggested to withdraw this item from the agenda, he said he would undertake to write a short paper on this subject and present it to the next Executive Committee Meeting for discussion.

This was agreed.

Mr. Pogacic referred again to the absence of the President, Prof. Toeplitz, and that it had been proved that none of the members could effectively take his place.

Mr. Pogacic also commented on that fact that the Secretary General had too much work to do. He said that members would appreciate to have the material and the working files at least a fortnight in advance for preparation and thus keep the discussions in the Executive Committee Meetings always on a certain high level.

He suggested that there should be a subdivision of the work among the Executive Committee members, that certain people should specialise in certain fields. The second point, that was raised by Mr. Pogacic, was that people who take part in the meetings of the Executive Committee are always better informed than other members and of course, the President and the Secretary General are better informed than the Executive Committee members.

Mr. Lindgren was grateful to Mr. Pogacic that he had raised this problem and he agreed that the Secretary General had too much work to do with no real assistance from the Secretariat for the time being. But Mr. Lindgren also felt that Mr. Pogacic had a kind of platonic ideal in his mind on meetings where everybody would be well informed. And Mr. Lindgren thought that it was an essential part of the process of communication in the Federation to go over the same grounds several times, from the President and the officers at the top down to the ordinary members at the bottom. Mr. Lindgren expressed his hope that Mr. Pogacic would include his ideas on these matters in a paper and present this to the next Executive Committee Meeting .

Mr. Pogacic agreed to this.

7. RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS INCLUDING FIAPF

National Technical Museum, Prague

No news about the meeting of experts working in the field of photographic technique to be held in 1971 in France. Mr. Frida had been unable to contact the Director of the National Technical Museum in Prague for information.

Journée Internationale du Film de Court Métrage

Mr. Ledoux had received a letter from this organisation, who organizes Annecy and Tours Film Festivals, in which they ask FIAF to do something to normalize standard information on short films.

Mr. Lindgren felt that FIAF itself could do very little about that but he suggested that the Secretary General should write to them and tell them that FIAF would encourage to give this their special consideration, and that at the same time they themselves, as a specialised organisation on short films should help FIAF to encourage in every country the collection and publication of information about short films.

Copyright

Mr. Ledoux reported that Mr. Lindgren and himself had met Mr. Hunnings, and asked him as decided in Lyon to Geesme the adviser for FIAF in copyright matters. He should be paid a nominal fee of £ 50 per year (which was confirmed by the Treasurer) and Mr. Hunnings would get paid additionally if he did some special work for FIAF.

Mr. Ledoux announced that there would be a kind of a seminar with Mr. Hunnings early in 1971.

The members felt that it would be very convenient if this seminar on copyright questions could be combined with the next Executive Committee Meeting.

Mr. Lindgren said that he would explore the possibility of having the next Executive Committee Meeting in London and he would let members know in due course.

International Film and TV Council (IFTC)

Mr. Ledoux drew the attention of Mr. Klaue to the International Film and TV Council in Paris organised by IFTC in the beginning of December. He said that some of the meetings would be of special interest to FIAF, namely electronic methods of cataloguing films, but Mr. Klaue felt he could not represent FIAF there due to visa difficulties at such short notice. Mr. Klaue said he would ask Dr. Roads of the Imperial War Museum, London who is a member of the IFTC and also of the cataloguing commission, to represent FIAF and to report to the cataloguing commission.

This was agreed.

IFTC and FIAF

Mr. Ledoux informed members of another IFTC meeting to be held on 1st December about the future of new techniques of recording cassettes, etc. but he suggested to postpone the matter in the absence of Prof. Toeplitz.

Mr. Klaue wondered whether FIAF could get some financial help from Unesco through IFTC for certain FIAF projects (manual on cataloguing, preservation brochure, etc.) which are of wide interest to archives and other institutions. And he also wondered whether FIAF could appeal to IFTC or Unesco to support a declaration on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of cinematography especially for the developing countries, to establish film archives in those countries. And third, he wondered whether FIAF could get help from Unesco to invite young archives and government officials of the developing countries to participate in one of the FIAF Congresses.

Referring to his own experience, Mr. Ledoux objected to accept any financial help from Unesco or IPTC for FIAF publications, any help for the underdeveloped countries from Unesco or IPTC could be considered.

Mr. Lindgren added that Unesco would take the credit and control for any publication that they finance and it would thus no longer be a FIAF publication. The idea was not discussed any further.

International Federation of Film Producers Association (FIAPF) (FIAPF letter in the file of the members)

Mr. Ledoux reminded members that FIAF had held contacts with FIAPF for a number of years. Mr. Lindgren and he himself had participated in about 3-4 meetings of FIAPF about the deposit of films in the archives. But both felt that there had not been any possibility to arrive at an understanding with FIAPF in the name of FIAF and that it would be wise not to make any more move but to wait.

Mr. Ledoux informed the members that in Cannes in 1970 FIAPF had made a unilateral draft of regulations of the relations between FIAPF and FIAF. This draft had been sent individually to Mr. Langlois, Mr. Schein, Mr. Monty and also Mr. Ledoux had been presented with a copy - and all had signed it. Mr. Ledoux said that Mr. Monty had told him that he had not the power to oppose the document and Mr. Ledoux admitted that this also applied to Belgium, because it had been felt that they might find themselves without films. Mr. Ledoux thought that it was an irregular draft document and that he and Mr. Monty had a number of reservations against it, but that they nevertheless had signed it.

Mr. Lindgren said that it seemed evident that the Producers' Agreement had not been drawn up with any legal aid and that it contained a lot of rubbish, and as for the Danish case, there were even some elements in it which were against the Danish law.

Mr. Lindgren further criticised the method of FIAPF as an international organisation to take unilateral action and to approach members of FIAF individually. He felt strongly that there was no need for the members to sign the document.

Mr. Stenklev said that most archives of FIAF are government bodies and that it would be a proper way for an archive to hand this document over to the ministry concerned to deal with it.

Then the members entered into discussion as to how to deal with the letter of FIAPF which had not been sent officially to FIAF and what to advise FIAF members to do when they would be presented with such a letter.

Mr. Lindgren felt that a letter should be written to the Producers Association. He expressed his hope that FIAF and FIAPF would come to an agreement on workable principles. He felt that the producers had to learn to understand that archives should be able to look permanently after their films. And he thought that the film archives had the task to persuade the producers that when they entrust their films to the archives they run no risk of endangering their commercial interests.

Mr. Ledoux opposed the idea of writing a letter to the Producers Association.

Mr. Lindgren had a vote taken on his suggestion to write a letter to the Producers Associations.

In favour : 8; 3 abstentions.

Mr. Lindgren and Mr. Ledoux drafted a letter which was read out by the President, Mr. Lindgren, to the members, in which FIAPF is asked to send a copy of the draft agreement to FIAF. The letter expresses furthermore that FIAF would consider the draft agreement and would then communicate with FIAPF again. The last and important paragraph of the letter was drafted as follows : ...In the mean time it will be appreciated that if any of our members asks us for advice on your draft document we shall not be in a position, of course, to advise them to sign the agreement on which we have not been officially consulted.

Members agreed to that draft letter to be sent out in this sense to FIAPF.

Item 8 was postponed due to Mr. Volkmann's absence in this meeting.

## 9. PROJECTS

(2 papers in each member's file)

Mr. Ledoux asked members to drop such projects from the lists as had been left untouched for many years.

### A. PRESERVATION AND ACQUISITION

#### 1. Classical silent films (Toulouse, Belgrad)

Mr. Pogacic said that this project should be deleted on the request of Mr. Borde. This was agreed.

#### 2. Inquiry about technical devices for films of sizes no longer in common use (SFA, Berlin)

Mr. Klaue told members that it continues, inquiries would be sent out before the end of the year.

### B. BIBLIOGRAPHY

#### 3. Annual bibliography of books on cinema (Bucarest)

Mr. Fernoaga confirmed that it continues.

#### 4. Information centre of research projects

Mr. Ledoux reported that this project had been initiated by Mr. Colin Young and that Brussels archive would be willing to continue.

#### 5. Bibliography of publications by members of the FIAF (Ottawa)

Mr. Ledoux assumed that it continues even though Mr. Morris had left the Canadian archive.

6. Bibliography of publications dealing with the work of film archives (Bruxelles)

Mr. Ledoux agreed that due to the difficult situation in the Belgian archive they had been prevented from doing it, but they would want to continue the project. This was agreed.

Mr. Ledoux announced that in the "Journal of Motion Pictures Engineers" a draft standard of terms in motion picture films had been published, and he offered to have it photocopied and distributed among the members. This was approved.

C. FILMOGRAPHY

7. Seminar on film identification - atlas for the identification of slapstick actors (Prague)

Mr. Frida told members that the work on the atlas continues. He informed them that the next identification seminar would be held in spring 1972 but that visitors who wanted to do some practical work on this topic would be welcome in Prague at any time.

Mr. Frida reported that there would have been only 12 participants to the 1970 film identification seminar if it had been held. He expressed his disappointment about the lack of interest that the big archives showed in that subject.

Mr. Lindgren explained that it was not through lack of good will that the NFA would not send anybody to the identification seminar anymore. He pointed out that Mr. Harold Brown, the technical officer of the NFA had participated in the first identification seminar which was held in Czechoslovakia and that Mr. Brown had made a written contribution to the seminar in which he had explained his particular interest in identification, which was, reading something of the history of films from looking at the film strip.

Mr. Lindgren told members that Mr. Brown feels that he cannot make any more effective contribution because he can perform no function in looking at films and trying to identify them from the screen, as is Mr. Frida's expertise. And Mr. Lindgren promised Mr. Frida to send him the memorandum in which Mr. Brown had expressed his views and some doubts about the identification seminar. Mr. Lindgren said that Mr. Brown had also expressed his concern about the fact that quite a number of films which were in a rather bad physical condition had been brought along to the identification seminar and put onto screen. Mr. Lindgren expressed his view that he had expected some publication on the work and experiences of the identification seminar since this would be of some assistance and use to all archives for their work.

Mr. Frida fully agreed and told Mr. Lindgren that on the next identification seminar in spring 1972 they would try to find some rules which would be presented in a publication.

Mr. Lindgren asked Mr. Frida whether he could possibly produce some kind of provisional report on the whole identification problem and present this to the 1971 General Assembly to clarify his own view and to get stimulation from the members for this work.

Mr. Frida agreed to do this.

5th SESSION

Friday, 20th November : Afternoon Session

(Projects ctd.)

8. Films and TV programs on cinema (Budapest and Copenhagen)

Mr. Lindgren was concerned about the fact that this project would involve archives in laborious research, but Mr. Ledoux thought that a rather valuable filmography would result from this work, advising film archives what material they should try to preserve on films and TV programs.

It was agreed that the project would be continued the Secretary General was to remind Budapest and Copenhagen archives to send out their requests so that members could cooperate.

9. List of filmographical sources (Pragues)

Mr. Ledoux reported that Mr. Frida had published a list of filmographical sources for the identification of silent films and that it had been agreed that the Prague archive should be supported in this by Prof. Toeplitz. But Mr. Frida said that he did not yet have any consultation with Prof. Toeplitz. But the final list of filmographic sources would be published with the cooperation of the Polish archive or Prof. Toeplitz, respectively. It was understood that there were two parallel activities in elaborating film sources, the Roumanian archive compiling the national filmographies only, with the member archives contributing, whereas Mr. Frida explained, his publication would contain valuable filmographical sources and information on various film personalities (bio-filmography) with a list in the appendix of general publications.

Mr. Ledoux noted that Mr. Frida's publication would not include filmographies of genres. He will raise the function at the next General Meeting.

This was approved.

## D. MISCELLANEOUS

10. Handbook for film archives (Beograd)

Mr. Pogacic told the members that they would try to present a few chapters of the manual to the Executive Committee Meeting which would be held after the 1971 General Assembly.

Mr. Ledoux offered Mr. Pogacic to send him a photocopy of the draft of the project which had been presented to the Executive Committee several years ago and which would perhaps be of some use to the Yougoslav archive in elaborating the Handbook.

This was approved.

11. The Pool (Amsterdam)

Mr. Ledoux reminded members that in Lyon they had arrived at the conclusion to disperse the Pool.

The members entered into discussion as to how to distribute the films of the Pool.

Mr. Ledoux, Mr. de Vaal and Mr. Privato expressed their views to have regional film pools, one in Latin-America, one in Africa and one in Asia.



Most members were in favour of the idea to make the films accessible to young archives.

Mr. Konlechner thought that the Pool had never been really practical with not too many valuable films of second-rate quality. But Mr. Lindgren objected to this by telling Mr. Konlechner that most of the copies had been presented as new prints to the Pool and that NFT, for instance, had used the films of the Pool.

Mr. Lindgren reported that he had never been an enthusiast supporter to the Pool, but that now that the Pool existed he would be rather reluctant to dissipate the films. He felt that in the future they might want to draw upon such a collection of 106 films.

Mr. Lindgren had a vote taken as to whether the Pool should be kept or dispersed, 2 members wanted to keep the Pool,

6 members were in favour of dispersing it.

Mr. Lindgren suggested that Mr. de Vaal should write to all archives who had contributed prints to the Pool, telling them that it had been decided to disperse the Pool and that the Executive Committee members felt that these films should be used to help young archives, and asking the original donors whether they would agree to allow the Executive Committee to distribute the films.

Mr. Lindgren said that the replies to the letter would be considered in the following Executive Meeting.

This was approved.

Mr. Ledoux told the members that the projects 12.-15. were projects by the Secretariat which had been in waiting because of the difficult situation in the Secretariat, but they would be continued.

#### NEW PROJECTS

##### 1. EMBRYO 2 (SFA, Berlin)

The project continues.

##### 2. Film-maker's bibliography (Ottawa)

This project was accepted at Lyon as a project of the Canadian archive. Mr. Lindgren asked the Secretary General to write to Peter Morris in London and ask him whether his successor in the Canadian archive is aware of the responsibilities that Peter Morris undertook.

##### 3. Study seminars for archive personnel (SEA, Helsinki)

Mr. Lindgren felt that the only practical possibility to realise such an idea was to make a plan for each year to arrange a seminar for 2 weeks in some convenient capital city, where the senior members of FIAF and specialists of the archive staff would give lectures and demonstrations. Students from outside organisations should be admitted as paying students and also the archives who would send their students should be expected to contribute to the costs.

Mr. Konlechner felt that such kind of training for archive staff was very important and he agreed to support the project as much as he could.

Mr. Pogacic reminded members that Prof. Toeplitz had agreed to study the problem of a summer school with the Polish archive, but that there had been no news yet.

Members agreed that the project deserved to be considered and that it should be entrusted to Prof. Toeplitz.

Mr. Lindgren suggested that a syllabus of lectures be drafted for such a course, whether there should be technical lectures, or lectures on cataloguing and there should be a second draft from an administrative point of view concerning the estimated costs, etc.

4. International translation bureau for articles and documents on cinema (AFI, Washington)

It was agreed to delete the project for being too ambitious. The Secretary General promised to write to Mr. Kula to let him know their decision.

5. A publication for internal circulation about the legal and administrative aspects of the functioning of archives : documents on legal deposit, advantages and exemptions conceded to archives, ways of financing, etc. (Beograd)
6. Charter of fundamental principles of the archives. This charter would serve as a preamble to the statutes of FIAF which deal only with the legal and administrative functions of the Federation and its members. (Beograd)

Mr. Ledoux explained that Nos. 5. and 6. were handed in to him by Mr. Acimovic as one project and that he had divided the project into two.  
It was agreed that the Secretariat would explore project 5.

And on Mr. Ledoux's suggestion Mr. Lindgren agreed to do project No.6.  
Mr. Lindgren agreed to contact Prof. Toeplitz and ask him to cooperate.

Mr. Pogacic added that they had proposed a third project in their paper, namely

To make an inquiry about the films that were considered lost in the national production

Mr. Pogacic pointed out that it would be an ideal situation if each archive possessed its own national production completely and he therefore suggested that archives should be invited to make up a list of the most important national productions that they considered lost.

Mr. Frida said that he had received a long list of film titles from the Museum of Modern Art Film Department of New York that they consider lost and he had found one of those American films in the Prague archive.

Mr. Ledoux asked Mr. Frida to report the title to him to have it included in the silent film catalogue.

Mr. de Vaal agreed to send out invitations to the archives to cooperate, to collect the lists from the archives and to combine them.

7. Study on the copying of variable density sound tracks (SFA, Berlin)

Mr. Klaue reported that SFA had spent a lot of money and time on certain methods of printing such material. He said that he would welcome an exchange of experiences with other archives who would also cooperate to write a document for all FIAF members about the best method of printing variable density sound tracks.

Mr. Konlechner volunteered to act as the reporteur to FIAF for this project. It was agreed that he should invite all FIAF archives to report their experiences to him and that a report should be elaborated with the assistance of Messrs. Klaue, Brown and de Smidt.

8. A project for an ideal archive building (NFM, Amsterdam)

Mr. de Vaal reported that he had made an inquiry about a building for an archive to be built in Amsterdam. He had given the task to a number of students and a number of drawings had been sent in to him, which he kindly permitted to be published as a FIAF publication to give inspirations to other FIAF archives.

It was agreed that FIAF would pay for the printing costs, about 5-600 Guilders (about US \$ 150).

9. A collection of dupe negatives of 300 film classics (AFI, Washington)

(Members had a paper in their file).

It was agreed that 2 lists should be established, one list of 300 feature films and a second one comprising short films.

Mr. Lauritzen volunteered to select the films and to present the lists to the next Executive Committee Meeting.

This was agreed.

10. Internal list of continuities and dialogue lists in possession of film archives (CRB, Bruxelles)

It was stated that only such continuities and dialogue lists should be considered as are faithful to the released versions of the films concerned.

Since Dr. Kuiper reported that AFI has as many as 50,000 continuities and descriptions and also Mr. Privato said that they have a great number of continuities, Mr. Lindgren suggested that the internal list of the continuities and dialogue lists in the possession of archives should include only such archives with a comparatively small collection. But it should be indicated in the lists that large collections, such as Washington and Moscow collections are accessible, too.

Mr. Lindgren asked Mr. Ledoux to invite archives to contribute to the project. The lists would be published for internal circulation among the members. All agreed to cooperate.

11. Anthology of film critics published before 1914 (CRB, Bruxelles)

Mr. Ledoux told members that he would write to all FIAF archives asking them to give information about film criticism (no reviews published in trade papers) that had been published before 1914.

All agreed that the project would be desirable and useful.

## 8. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONS

Summary of Mr. Volkmann's report :

The Preservation Commission had met for 3 days at the end of October 1970 in Stockholm. The expenses of the meeting had been met by the Swedish Film Institute. The following archive representative had been present :

Messrs. Micheew (Soviet Union)  
 Tudorica (Roumania)  
 Krog (Denmark)  
 Brown (England)  
 Henk de Smidt (Holland)  
 Geber (Sweden)  
 Volkmann (GDR)  
 Philipp (GDR)

Technical experts from outside institutions :

Messrs. Vivie (France)  
 Enequist (Sweden)  
 Kohlbeck (Sweden)  
 Söderlund (Sweden)  
 Norlander (Sweden)  
 Tamm (GDR)  
 Dewals (Belgium)  
 Dr. Levenson (England)  
 Orring (Sweden)  
 Moroza (Roumania)

Mr. Volkmann had presented a document comprising 12 pages on the preservation of colour films and the results of the Leipzig meeting, and members had reached agreement in all items. The most important conclusion which had been reached at in Stockholm was, that due to the result of actual tests in the Soviet Union the Kodak and Soviet experts had agreed that - 5°C is a sufficiently low enough temperature for the storage of colour films. The original suggestion of Kodak to store colour films at - 18°C had been based on purely theoretical considerations.

Mr. Volkmann told members that the Preservation Commission would hold its next meeting in March 1971 in Copenhagen, where one item of their agenda would be the acceptance of the formulations on the preservation of colour films.

Mr. Volkmann said that the recommendations of the commission on colour preservation would be distributed at the 1971 General Assembly.

Mr. Volkmann announced to members that he would want to have a second Preservation Meeting in October 1971 devoted to the preservation of magnetic tapes and he expressed his hope that the October meeting would be financed by some archive. But he emphasised that he would ask for 3300 SF to finance the Copenhagen Preservation Commission Meeting.

Mr. Konlechner reminded members that since Mr. Volkmann had not needed any money for his Commission in 1970 he should have 3300 SF for the March Meeting.

Mr. Ledoux pointed out that they had agreed in Vienna to hold only 3 days' meetings with an allowance of 250 SFA = 20 US \$ per day per person, an amount which was being based upon other international organisations regulations.

Mr. Lindgren recommended for future action that if a president of a commission presented a request for money it should be based on the budget. The president should ask the country where the meetings were going to be held for the approximate cost and prepare a little budget on the basis of which he could apply for the money.

#### Report on the Cataloguing Commission

Summary of Mr. Klaue's report :

The Cataloguing Commission met from 13-15 October 1970 in Budapest, at the expenses of the Hungarian archive. There were 8 members of the Cataloguing Commission (Mr. Ledoux and Dr. Roads had been unable to attend) plus 5 observers.

12 documents had been sent out to the members of the Cataloguing Commission before the meeting, and in Budapest 4 more documents had been distributed.

The agenda being too big some of the items had not been exhausted.

The Commission had agreed to present a draft manual of film cataloguing to the next General Assembly. But to accomplish this the members had felt that another meeting in spring 1971 (31 March to 2 April) was necessary to discuss the draft version, or a few chapters of it.

The cataloguing members had one common meeting in Budapest with the Documentation Commission. Both commissions had agreed on a project to translate the maximum data version of filmographic data into 19 languages.

Mr. Klaue presented a number of problems to the Executive Committee, a) He told the Executive Committee members that Mr. Frida had asked to be released as a member of the Cataloguing Commission and he had suggested that Mr. Opela should take his place (he had been an observer at Budapest). b) Mr. Klaue informed the Executive Committee Meeting that the members of the Cataloguing Commission had recommended to organise a kind of a seminar for film cataloguers or an exchange of cataloguers between the archives, as a possibility to study the cataloguing methods in various archives.

c) Mr. Klaue presented his and the commission's view that they thought useful for their work to establish close contacts with ASLIB, the Association for Special Libraries and Information Bureau. ASLIB offers a special training programme for cataloguers. The Commission had agreed to delegate Roger Holman, senior cataloguer of the NFA, as an observer to a training seminar of ASLIB (held in London in November 1970). Mr. Holman is expected to report on this to the next Cataloguing Commission Meeting.

d) The problem of selection had been raised at the Cataloguing Meeting, although members were aware that this does not really touch their field of work. Nevertheless, they felt that a commission should be established to elaborate certain recommendations for the selection of films to be preserved by archives.

Mr. Klaue said that he was unable to give a report on the Documentation Commission but that Mr. Spiess had agreed to hand in a written report to the Secretary General soon.

Mr. Klaue felt that it was necessary for his work to have 10 members working in the Cataloguing Commission, and he reminded the Executive Committee that it had been approved that the president of a commission was permitted to form a commission of up to 10 members.

Mr. Lindgren feared that since there would be more meetings in the future than there were countries to meet the expenses of the commission, not to forget the other expenses FIAF has to meet, they might reach a point where a rise of subscription fees would become unavoidable. Mr. Lindgren said that he did not object to the commission, because they played an important role in FIAF, but he wanted members to be aware of where FIAF was going and to understand the implications of their decisions.

Mr. Ledoux said that the budget for 1970 was made out to finance three commissions at 7 persons each.

Mr. Volkmann thought that FIAF is not an organisation which was founded to save up money.

Mr. Konlechner said that he was not against giving money to the commissions but he wanted the authorization of the Executive Committee.

It was agreed to put 2050 SF at the disposal of Mr. Volkmann for the Preservation Commission Meeting and 2050 SF at the disposal of Mr. Klaue for the Cataloguing Commission Meeting to be held in March 1971 in Copenhagen.

#### Mr. Ledoux on the Documentation Commission

Mr. Ledoux informed members about a letter that he had received from Mrs. Karen Jones, librarian at the Danish Film Museum, and member of the Documentation Commission (she was elected vice-president of the Documentation Commission at Budapest). Mrs. Jones is in charge of handling the exchange of the lists of contents of film magazines between the 14 participating archives.

It had been agreed in Budapest to slightly change the procedure of the exchange, due to a new duplicating machine for stencils of 3 x 5 inches size to which Mrs. Jones had access. The stencils should be sent to Copenhagen to make the number of cards required and these cards would then be sent to the participating archives, directly by the Danish Archive or ~~brought~~ <sup>by</sup> the Secretariat in Brussels.

It was agreed that FIAF would pay for the stencils, an estimated sum of US \$ 300 over a trial period of 3 months to be reconsidered.

This was agreed.

Mr. Ledoux announced the names of the members of the Documentation Commission that had been present at Budapest :

Mr. Spiess (Fed. German Rep.), Mrs. Bowser (USA),  
Mr. Vimr (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Luyckx (Holland),  
Mr. Moulds (Canada), one representative of the Hungarian archive  
Mrs. Karen Jones (Denmark)

plus 2 observers : Dr. Krauz (GDR), Mr. Dimmer (Holland).

The items of their agenda were brought to the attention of the Executive Committee members.

1. Publication of a FIAF directory
2. Exchange of lists of periodicals
3. Report about the preservation of posters by Mr. Luyckx

Mr. Ledoux asked Mr. Konlechner to consider for the 1972 budget that there would be at least 6 commission meetings.

He also felt that it was a necessary procedure for the president of a commission to ask the national archive's advice before extending an invitation to an expert of that country.

Mr. Lindgren suggested that the Secretary General should examine the question in this sense and present his proposals to the next Executive Committee Meeting where they would be discussed and perhaps be considered for presentation to the General Assembly.

Mr. Ledoux agreed to do this.

#### 10. NEXT GENERAL MEETING

##### NEXT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. Ledoux said that Mr. Hector Garcia Mesa of Habana had cabled him that they were very sorry to have to renounce the honour and pleasure of being host to the 1971 FIAF Congress.

Mr. Lindgren suggested to send him a nice and cordial reply.  
This was agreed.

Besides, it was agreed, to send 2 letters to Budapest and Stockholm, to thank the archives for having been the hosts to the FIAF commission meetings.

Mr. Ledoux informed members of a letter of invitation from Mr. Pöschke, Wiesbaden, in which is expressed that the Deutsches Institut für Filmkunde would be happy to be host to the 1971 FIAF Congress, to be held from 1-6 June, 1971 in Wiesbaden.

This was agreed.

Mr. Lindgren suggested that the Secretary General should send a letter of particular thanks to Mr. Pöschke and invite him at the same time to the next Executive Committee Meeting, to arrange all the necessary details with him.  
This was agreed.

##### Executive Committee Meeting

It was agreed that the next Executive Committee Meeting should be held from 27th February to 2nd March, 1971.

Mr. Konlechner warned members that he might not have the time to present the accounts properly due to some other important work in Austria at that time.

Members felt that it would be advisable for the next Executive Committee Meeting to have a consultation with Mr. Hunnings and that London would therefore be a good place for the meeting.

Mr. Lindgren agreed to investigate this immediately on his return to London and he would let the Secretary General know his decision within a short time.

Mr. Lindgren suggested to have one day with Mr. Hunnings and devote one half day to the future policy and structure of FIAF at the next Executive Committee Meeting.

This was agreed.

He also felt that they could save time on other parts of the agenda if everybody came well prepared to the Meeting.

#### 11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Frida had received a letter from Madame Méliès in which she asks the Prague archive for dupe negatives of colour Méliès sound films against payment.

But Mr. Frida told members that the Prague archives does not possess the original material.

Mr. Lindgren understood that there were two problems involved, first, he agreed as Mr. Frida had suggested - to tell Mrs. Méliès to apply to the archives who keep the original material. The second problem is a question of ownership. Mr. Lindgren felt that the Méliès family could be considered the rightful owners and that if an archive has the technical facilities it has the obligation to provide the material.

Mr. Frida wondered whether an archive was entitled to charge a copyright owner a certain fee towards the costs of preservation of the material, especially in a case where the archive had done some special work on restoring the film.

Mr. Lindgren thought that this was a question of judgement.

Mr. Pogacic asked FIAF to patronize a manifestation of the Yugoslav archive to be held in January 1971 within the frame of a festival dedicated to the Lumière Brothers and early silent productions.

Mr. Ledoux and Mr. Lindgren agreed, but Mr. Ledoux reminded Mr. Pogacic that the Yugoslav archive should have approached the Secretariat in writing.

In closing the meeting Mr. Lindgren expressed his thanks on behalf of all the members to Mr. Klaue and Mr. Volkmann and all colleagues of the Staatliches Filmarchiv who had worked for the Executive Committee Meeting at Kleinmachnow near Potsdam and specially to Mrs Schirmer who kindly acted as Secretary