

F.I.A.F.

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE
DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING IN BUCHAREST
May 28th - 29th , 1972

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL.

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

BUCHAREST, May 28th - 30th 1972.

PRESENT : MEMBERS

Messrs. J. Toeplitz, President
J. Kuiper, Vice-President
V. Pogacic, Vice-President
J. Ledoux, Secretary-General
W. Klauc, Deputy Secretary-General
P. Konlechner, Treasurer
J. Stenklev, Deputy Treasurer
R. Borde
D. Fernoaga

DEPUTY MEMBER

Mrs E. Bowser

HONORARY MEMBER

Mr E. Lauritzen

In attendance :

Mr Jan de Vaal, observer
Mrs B. van der Elst, Secretary.

1ST SESSION.Sunday 28th May, 10 am.

The President greeted all the attending members. He confirmed that the quorum was obtained and declared the meeting valid. Apologies for absence had been received from Vice-President Mr Privato, Mrs Jaubert, Mr Lindgren, Mr Monty and from the Honorary Members Mr Volkmann and Mr Svoboda.

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.

The following agenda was adopted :

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Approval of the summary and decisions of the preceding meeting.
3. Report on the organization and program of the General Meeting.
4. Examination of the items on the agenda of the General Meeting which require preliminary discussion.
5. Proposals for the new Executive Committee and the definite tasks of its members.
6. Any other business.

[Handwritten signature]

2. APPROVAL OF THE SUMMARY AND DECISIONS OF THE PRECEDING MEETINGS.

The minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting held in Oslo in February 1972 were unanimously approved, with the addition on page 1 of the name of Mr Klaue, Deputy General, amongst the present members.

[Handwritten signature]

3. REPORT ON THE ORGANIZATION AND PROGRAM OF THE GENERAL MEETING.

Mr Fernoaga had distributed the program and timetable of the General Meeting and social events organized around it, program which he commented briefly.

Mr Ledoux pointed out that almost all documents concerning the items to be discussed at the General Meeting had been sent to the members well in advance. It was decided to stick to the decision not to discuss

projects or reports which had not been submitted to the members of the Executive Committee in advance in a written form. But Mr Klaue asked that an exception be made for the reports of the Commissions whose last meetings had been held in April or even in May, so that it had been impossible to prepare a report on time for all the members. This was agreed and President Toeplitz expressed the wish that from now on, Commission Meetings be organized earlier during the year, if possible.

Rotation of the Chairmanship for the different sessions of the Congress was then organized as follows :

First Session	Prof. Toeplitz
Second Session	Mr Pogacic
Third Session	Mr Kuiper
Fourth Session	Mr Pogacic
Fifth Session	Mr Kuiper
Sixth Session	Mr Fernoaga
Seventh Session	- (Symposium)
Eighth Session	Prof. Toeplitz

IV. CONSIDERATION OF THE AGENDA FOR THE GENERAL MEETING.

Prof. Toeplitz reminded the members that it was decided in Oslo to examine at this meeting only the points of the agenda which really required preliminary discussion by the Executive Committee.

The following points were then considered :

- Agenda item 1.: Confirmation of the Status and voting right of the members, present or represented.

The Secretary-General informed the members of the Executive Committee about the delegates expected for the General Meeting. He read out a letter of Mr Lindgren explaining his absence because of illness, and asking Mr Ledoux to present, on his behalf, a new proposal to modify the rule on the election of the President. Mr Klaue agreed to mention this proposal in his report on the future policy of FIAF.

As concerned the observers, Mr Card had been invited to attend the Congress on the suggestion of Mrs Bowser. He was unfortunately unable to come because his presence was needed in New York at the moment, but

Mrs Bowser said he should certainly be invited to the next Congress.

P. Adams Sitney (Anthology Film Archives) had announced his arrival in replacement of Jonas Mekas. Although this procedure was not very orthodox, the members agreed on his attendance as observer to the Congress.

Mr Itamar Martinez, a Venezuelan student in Bucharest, supposedly representing the Cinemateca Nacional de Venezuela, had also asked the Rumanian Archive to be accepted as observer. The President and the Secretary-General decided to meet him and ask for his credentials before admitting him.

- Agenda item 5. : Report of the Secretary-General.

Secretariat : The Secretary-General said it was the duty of the Executive Committee to appoint the Executive Secretary.

Mrs van der Elst had been hired on trial one and a half year before. It was time now to decide whether or not she could be appointed as Executive Secretary and act in this capacity.

Mrs van der Elst was then asked to leave the room, and on her return, Prof. Toepfritz announced her that, by unanimous agreement, she had now become the Executive Secretary of FIAF. Mrs van der Elst thanked the Executive Committee.

- Agenda item 6. : Reports from the Archives.

This item on the agenda of the General Meeting was something quite new : it had two aspects :

- a) Questions on the book of Reports.
- b) An oral report from the new archives in FIAF, or from the archives attending a General Meeting for the first time.

It was decided to ask the delegates from the archives of Madrid, Poona and Ryong-Yang to make such a report, if possible.

- Agenda item 7. : Report of the Preservation Commission.

Due to the absence of Mr Volkmann, there would be no report at the General Meeting of this Commission's work, but Mr Klaue said that Mr Volkmann would send to the Secretariat a written report to be included in the minutes.

Mr Tudorica, the Rumanian member of the Commission, nevertheless agreed to note the questions of the members at the General Meeting, and pass them on to Mr Volkmann, if necessary, and to give a short report

on its work since last General Meeting. He would prepare this in cooperation with Mr Nils-Hugo Geber.

About the document on preservation of magnetic tapes which Mr Volkmann had recently sent out in German to all the members, Mr Ledoux made the remark that although he understood very well the reasons why the Chairman of the Commission had circulated this paper only in German, he thought it would have been better to have it translated first, if not in Berlin, than in Brussels by an appointed translator. It was a very important document and the members should have all facilities to understand it.

Mr Ledoux also repeated his request that the Secretariat be better informed about the activities of all the Commissions in general. It was a necessity to have at the Secretariat, records of FIAF's work in every field and it should not be difficult for the Commissions Presidents to send it copies of all correspondence related to the setting up of their meetings or items that were subincident to their work. It was agreed that the Secretary would write them a letter in this sense.

- Agenda item B. : Report of the Documentation Commission.

All the members had in their files the report of the Documentation Commission.

Mrs Bowser asked to correct the first paragraph in which were mentioned the four archives which had not yet paid the promised subscription to the index. In fact, Toulouse and Helsinki had now paid.

The Secretary-General then asked the Executive Committee to discuss the following problems which, he said, had to be solved before the report was submitted to the General Meeting.

- 1) Should the Commission be authorized to sell a limited number of subscriptions to the cards, to institutions outside FIAF ?

This was agreed because it was thought essential to the financing of the project.

- 2) To decide that those FIAF members who neither pay the subscription, nor participate in the indexing should no longer receive the cards after June 1972.

This was agreed.

- 3) The budget for 1973 of the Indexing Project.

The financial future of this project seemed rather difficult. On one hand, it appeared now that Karen Jones urgently needed some editorial help and, on the other hand, several expenses necessary to the project (stencils, cards, postage, etc...), were expected to be much higher in 1973 than was calculated in the first budget for 1972.

Should the subscribing members of FIAF be asked to pay a higher subscription next year ? Should FIAF pay the difference ?

It was anyway evident that the members had to be asked to pay at least the same SF. 1.000 for another year.

After the Secretary General and Mrs Bowser had prepared a new clear project for the 1973 Budget, which read :

Income	FIAF Subscribers	5.000 \$
	Bowker (minimum garanti)	7.000 \$
	Bowker (royalties)	7.000 \$?
		<hr/>
		19.000 \$
Expenses	Supplies	5.000 \$
	Postage	2.000 \$
	Wages	12.000 \$?
		<hr/>
		19.000 \$

the discussion started on the two items with question marks.

a) The Bowker Royalties : Mrs Bowser and Mr Ledoux doubted that these royalties could be paid in 1973. But maybe FIAF could loan this sum until the payment by Bowker ?

b) The wages : For more staff to help Karen Jones. Mrs Bowser agreed to telephone Karen Jones to ask her if she could possibly manage for another year with \$ 10.000 instead of the 12.000 she requested for an editor and a typist .

The members of the Executive Committee thought it would be very difficult to ask for a raise of the subscription, but one could reasonably ask all the present subscribers to pay the same amount as in 1972, for another year.

Considering that some subscribers to the cards would perhaps be found also outside FIAF, it was unanimously agreed that the missing 2.000 to 5.000 \$ could be loaned by FIAF to the Documentation Commission.

In consequence, the budget which would be submitted to the General Meeting read as follows :

Income :	20 FIAF Subscribers at 1.000 FS (11.250 FB)	225.000 FB - \$ 5.000
	Bowker (minimum guarantee)	315.000 FB - \$ 7.000
	Bowker (royalties)	225.000 FB - \$ 5.000
		<hr/>
		765.000 FB
Expenses :	Supplies	225.000 FB - \$ 5.000
	Postage	90.000 FB - \$ 2.000
	Wages (1/2 editor + 1 typist)	450.000 FB - \$10.000
		<hr/>
		765.000 FB

- Agenda item 9. : Report of the Cataloguing Commission.

Mr Klaus distributed to the Executive Committee the written report which he intended to distribute also to all the members at the General Meeting. A minor change was made in the time schedule for the manual's completion : two months rather than one, were thought necessary to receive the reactions and proposals of the members upon reading the draft manual.

- Agenda item 10. : Report of the Copyright Commission.

A draft report, prepared after the Commission's meeting in Oslo, had been sent to all the members and Mr Kuiper, in the absence of Mr Lindgren, Chairman of the Commission, asked for the Executive Committee's comments on it, particularly on the validity of the suggestion given in its conclusion, that individual FIAF members should try to prepare national reports on their respective copyright laws for co-ordination by this Copyright Commission.

He also asked for some guidance on the sum of activities which were expected from the Commission in the next few months.

Mr Stenklev said that the Commission should not hope to get quick reactions from the members on the suggestions put before them in the report. These were very hard and time-consuming researches and, from his own experience in Norway, it would not be possible to get any answer before at least six months.

Mr Kuiper agreed to that but said he did not see any necessity for the Commission to meet more than once during next year. He nevertheless stressed the importance for FIAF to get quickly some results, if only to be able to oppose the disciplin and good organisation of FIAPF by the cohesion of the FIAF members on this particular matter.

Mr Ledoux, while he disagreed with Mr Kuiper about the disciplin reigning in FIAPF, proposed another approach of the problem. Why not write down all the rights and advantages which we wanted to obtain, and collect from our members information on all the facts, laws, common practices in this field which already existed in our favour in some countries? These facts were questionable but not more than the official reports on film copyright laws which, following the wishes of the Commission, should be prepared by legal experts in each country. What we wanted were exceptions to the laws. Wouldn't it save time to go directly to the point?

Mr Kuiper agreed and said that Mr Lindgren and also Mr Hunnings had stressed the importance for the Commission to be run by archive people and not turned over to lawyers.

Mr Toeplitz suggested to Mr Kuiper to take this proposal of Mr Ledoux as a short term program for the Commission, the long term program being the survey on film copyright laws in general, as drafted in the questionnaire sent to all the members.

Mr Pogacic saw a third problem in this field: the laws concerning the legal deposit of films. In certain countries, this legal deposit existed and worked quite satisfactorily. In other countries, not. The Copyright Commission could perhaps, as a very concrete and not too ambitious task, collect all the information about the existing legal deposit laws, compare them, and handle the results of this study to the archives without legal deposit which would be greatly helped by this in their negotiations with the producers.

Mr Ledoux then suggested a fourth possible approach of the question: that one of the archives, if it had the right type of staff for this work, should prepare a careful report on the existing copyright laws in his country. This report would be circulated as an example amongst all the other archives which could then easily report on the differences existing in their national copyright laws.

Professor Toeplitz concluded by saying that the Deputy Chairman of the Commission should put all these proposals before the General Meeting as very definite short term and long term programs for the years to come, but not enter into a detailed discussion of the distributed report. Of course, if there were questions, they should be answered. Mr Kuiper agreed to this.

SECOND SESSION

Sunday 28th May, 3 p.m.

Agenda item 11 : Projects and Publications under way.

There was nothing to discuss by the Executive Committee on this item before the General Meeting. Everybody had received the list of ten projects which would be reported on. However, in the group of projects "Miscellaneous", Mr Pogacic said he would like to add "The Pool" and "Charter of the fundamental principles of FIAF" on which he had a short report to make. (See p.18)

Agenda item 12 : Future Policy of FIAF

It had been decided not to reopen here the discussion on the various aspects of FIAF's future policy as presented by Mr Klaue. He had prepared a report which he would submit to all the members at the General Meeting

But Mr Ledoux wanted to share with the Executive Committee some pessimistic thoughts which had occurred to him about the near future of the Federation. These ideas, he said, arose from the analysis of various facts :

First, the fact that some old and important directors of archives were absent here or would perhaps retire in a near future. The possibility existed that they would be, in some cases, replaced by people with a tendency towards the preminence of film institute on film archive.

There was also a tendency amongst new or future archivists to see in the creation of new archives only a way to get films for their showings. Everyone of us in FIAF wanted of course the collections to be widely shown and circulated ; we wanted to live up to our task of promoting the development of cinema art and culture, and if we did not carry this out entirely, it was because of the copyright and producers' problems. It was a policy which we had not chosen but which was imposed to us by external factors. We were now more or less submitted to enduring this situation but our position was being more and more criticized.

The question for Mr Ledoux was : Are we right or wrong in acting this way ? Shouldn't we fight for more freedom to make our films circulate also outside the premises of the archives ? When asked for films by potential users, didn't we react as rich conservative people towards poor people? This appeared especially in our position towards Latin American archives for whom everything we accomplish appears as a luxury (our manuals, our projects, etc...). They do not want to be as reasonable as we are and prefer to give priority to the diffusion of the film culture.

In principle, Mr Ledoux said he agreed with them. But on the other hand, he felt he had responsibilities towards his archive. He asked the members of the Executive Committee to give him their opinions on this problem.

Mr Kuiper, supported by Mrs Bowser, said he was more optimistic concerning the priority which young archives give or should give to the preservation on the showing of films. He thought it was a matter of education and he cited the example of Anthology Film Archives which had started as a non-profit screening society and was now slowly turning towards real archival activities. It seemed that many such archives were now in an intermediary state. The problem was more one of time : how long could we afford to wait before these preservation factors assumed their true weight. ?

Mr de Vaal and Mr Stenklev also thought it was not a great problem to convince new archive heads that the backbone of showings was a good archive. Maybe the film societies and people who claimed for a better circulation of the films had been given until now too many facilities so that they did not understand fully the necessity of building up a collection and preserving it before showing the films.

Mr Klaue said that criticism was normal. It was not a reason for pessimism. He thought there were only two possibilities, in the broader sense, when facing the future policy of FIAF : either to remain as we had lived and grown for 30 years, a museums' organisation in the traditional way, or to try to include in our tasks new aspects of the archival work in the widest sense as seemed to be nowadays the general evolution of museums which ceased to be only mere art galleries to become more and more the centers of dissemination of culture. But even in this second alternative, we should always fight for our principles which were, in this order : 1° Preservation, 2° acquisition, 3° cataloguing, 4° use of the collection.

Mr Borde, in a letter to Dr di Giammatteo which he read here, also stressed the priority of the preservation task , the saving of a maximum number of films in a maximum of countries.

Mr Pogacic said he did not see why the archives' policy was so much criticized. Were we really obsessed by the only task of preserving films ? In fact, there was a great difference between theory and practice and all the archives had many cultural activities besides building up a collection and preserving it.

As concerned the problem of the Kommunales Kino, raised by Mr de Vaal and Mr Konlechner who feared this organisation might become a danger for the film archives, the President replied that we did not have the monopoly of showing films. We should be happy the Kommunales Kino existed. But should they approach FIAF to become a member, then it would be time to discuss the matter.

Agenda item 13 : Relations between FIAF and other international organisations

ICOM (International Council of Museums)

The Secretary-General reported on his visit in Paris to Mr de Varina, President of ICOM. From their conversation, it appeared that an affiliation of FIAF to ICOM was not the best solution but that a good cooperation was nevertheless desirable. Therefore, the following approach was considered : The Executive Committee should prepare an article on FIAF which would be published in one of the next issues of ICOM News. This article would set out the possible relations and the common interests between members of FIAF and ICOM. The activities of FIAF would be related in detail and the ICOM members who are interested in FIAF (namely those having film collections) would be asked to let themselves know. On the other hand, FIAF will ask its members if they are interested in museological problems.

Having received this information, FIAF and ICOM together will then consider common action.

It was agreed that Mr Ledoux would submit this proposal as a recommendation to the General Meeting.

I.C.A. (International Council of Archives)

The Secretary-General reported on his visit in Paris to Mr Duboscq, member of I.C.A., on the purpose of discussing with him some ways of cooperation between FIAF and I.C.A. Mr Duboscq had explained all the wheels of I.C.A. and said that nothing opposed to an affiliation of FIAF. Personally, Mr Ledoux did not see many advantages in this affiliation and suggested that, before taking such a step, FIAF should send a delegate or observer to I.C.A.'s next congress which would be held in Moscow in August 1972.

This was agreed and Mr Klaue accepted to act as representative of FIAF at this congress.

A.I.A.M.A. (Association Internationale pour l'Art et les Moyens Audio-visuels)

This organisation had written to the Secretary-General asking FIAF to affiliate to their organisation. Professor Toeplitz, one of the Vice-Presidents of AIAMA, said that in fact this organisation did not yet fully exist and that it was absolutely too soon to consider any affiliation at all.

F.I.A.P.F.

The Secretary-General reminded the members of the decision taken in Toulouse, that Mr Lindgren and himself would prepare a FIAF draft agreement with our own desiderata to circulate amongst the archives and the national producers' associations if necessary.

Unfortunately, because of various circumstances and mainly because of Mr Lindgren's illness, this statement could not be prepared. Mr Lindgren and Mr Ledoux together made a good team but Mr Ledoux alone could not logically oppose the producers since, as curator of the Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique, he has signed the first FIAPF draft agreement. The President said that, since the members expected some decisions from the Executive Committee on this particularly important point, and since Mr Ledoux' report would be only a negative one, we had to propose to the General Meeting another representation of FIAF to conduct the negotiations with FIAPF.

Mr Kuiper declared himself unavailable for this delicate task, mainly for the reason that he was not in Europe. He suggested to turn this problem over to the Copyright Commission of which Mr Lindgren, Mr Ledoux and himself were members. This was agreed.

Mr Ledoux proposed that FIAF, as such, should make a careful statement saying that it stands against the "agreement" as it is written now, and send this protest to its members as a document to help them in their dealings with the producers.

The Executive Committee agreed to this as a first positive step and asked the Copyright Commission to prepare this document as soon as possible. These proposals would of course first be submitted to the General Meeting for agreement.

THIRD SESSION

Monday 29th May, 10 a.m.

Agenda item 14 : Planned projects

The Secretary-General had two new projects to submit to the Executive Committee :

1°) A project from the Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique to prepare and publish a second revised edition of the Catalogue of Silent Films held in the FIAF archives. This new edition might perhaps also include the language of the titles. FIAF would be asked to pay only for the cost of printing the catalogue, cost which would be almost totally recovered by selling approximately 30 copies to the archives. The catalogue would be confidential and not to be put in the archive's library.

This project was unanimously adopted and Mr Konlechner suggested to widen it by cataloguing also the early sound films.

To this, Mr Ledoux retorted that such a catalogue had already been started many years ago but several archives refused to contribute to it for very understandable reasons. He himself was against it too.

Mr Konlechner having remarked that even with the participation of only some of the archives, such a catalogue of early sound films would be very interesting, the President concluded by saying that this idea could be considered perhaps later on, but that the first part of this project was already a very heavy task which should be fulfilled first.

2°) A project from the Finnish film archive who suggested that one of the FIAF member archives should collect a copyright register. This register would be collected with the assistance of other archives and it should inform about the copyrights of the important films and about up-to-date addresses of the copyright owners.

The members generally thought that this project would be very useful but offered many and great difficulties in practice. Therefore, it was agreed to submit it for discussion to the next Executive Committee, if the General Meeting accepted the proposal.

Agenda item 15 : Treasurer's report

The Treasurer had distributed to all members his financial report for the year 1971. As he explained, the financial situation of FIAF was very sound. One could only regret that, due to the general money crisis in the world, the Swiss banks gave only 1/2% interest and also that only half of the members had until now paid their 1972 subscription.

On the suggestion of several members, Mr Konlechner agreed that, from now on, invoices for these subscriptions would be sent to all the members in the very beginning of the year.

Agenda item 19 : Proposals of modifications of Statutes and Rules

There was nothing more to discuss on the proposals presented by the Executive Committee since these had already carefully been prepared in the Toulouse and Oslo meetings.

The Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique however wanted to submit to the General Meeting the following modification of the Rules :

(Addition to art. 73)

"As much as possible, at least one of the three posts of reserve member will be given to a delegate who has never served on the Executive Committee".

Although in agreement with the spirit of this Rule, the majority of the members thought that the formulation : "as much as possible", could have no legal value and bereft the rule from all its strength. Therefore, they chose to reject it.

Mr Ledoux coming back into the the room only at this moment, after a TV interview, first protested against the fact that his proposal had been discussed in his absence. His intention was to submit this new rule to the General Meeting and not to the Executive Committee. After the President had explained why the Executive Committee had rejected it, Mr Ledoux said that he had phrased it in this way because the situation could occur when there was no eligible members who had never served on the Executive Committee. If necessary, he could formulate it in another way for the General Meeting.

It was decided that the proposal of the Jugoslovanska Kinoteka on the creation of a FIAF medal would be discussed under item N° 6 of the Executive Committee's agenda : Miscellaneous.

Agenda item 20. : Status of Members, Admission of new members.

Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek.

The Secretary-General reminded the members about the admittance, in Wiesbaden, of the Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek as provisional member and of the intention Dr Rathsack had expressed then of applying next year as full member.

This, he had done, but much too late, following the rules, leaving the Executive Committee no time to send them a delegate to inspect their means of preservation.

On the other hand, there were still some doubts about the real existence of the Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek as an archive. Therefore the Secretary-General recommended the prolongation of their provisional membership for one more year.

Prof. Toeplitz fully agreed to this, especially since at the time of the admittance of the former Deutsch Kinemathek e.v. as full member, (in 1968), their means of preservation had also not been inspected.

Turk Film Arsivi.

The Secretary-General reminded the members that Turk Film Arsivi had also applied for full membership, very much on time, but due to a misunderstanding, Mr Pogacic who had been designated to visit their means of preservation, had omitted to contact them and to go to Istanbul.

This was a very embarrassing situation for the Executive Committee.

The only solution, if the delegates of the Turk Film Arsivi attended the General Meeting, (there was still no news from them), was to admit them as full member on the condition that Mr Pogacic would, as soon as possible, visit their archive, report about it to the Executive Committee and that they approved this report. This was agreed.

Mr Pogacic also suggested that, in the future, it should be clearly asked to the archive applying for full membership to give its agreement to the visit of the Executive Committee's delegate and to make the necessary arrangements.

Cinémathèque Suisse (Lausanne)

Every member had in its file a letter from Mr Buache applying, on behalf of the Cinémathèque Suisse, for provisional membership of FIAF. All the conditions required by the Statutes having been fulfilled, the Secretary-General thought there would be no problem at the General Meeting for the re-integration of this old member.

American Film Institute Archives (Washington)

After the last Executive Committee meeting in Oslo, Mr Ledoux had written to Mr Kula to inform him about the opinions of the Executive Committee's members on his application as full member of FIAF, but he had received no answer.

Mrs Bowser said that from the Museum of Modern Art's point of view, there had recently been no change at all in the situation of the AFI Archives. So, her archive intended to vote for the withdrawal of the AFI's provisional membership and to give them instead the status of Correspondent.

Mr Kuiper, on the contrary, said that after having talked it over recently with Mr Kula, he thought now that the AFI Archives deserved the biggest membership we could give them. He thought there were two factors in Mr Kula's application as full member :

1^o) Although the AFI Archives have done a great deal in film archive work in the USA, they did not get the type of funds they deserved. It would be very helpful to them if they could demonstrate to Mr Stevens that they have international recognition for this program.

Also internally, it would probably assure them the continuance of funds of which, said Mr Kuiper, you realise the Library of Congress has benefitted perhaps more than any other archive.

2^o) A personal factor : there is a desire of personal satisfaction in Mr Kula's application, which is very understandable. He would be very disappointed if the AFI Archives were not admitted as full member.

Mr Kuiper also wanted the Executive Committee to realize what the AFI had done in terms of documentation and in terms of raising money for the preservation of films in America. Of course, it was still true that they did not own physical property of the films. One could say, if there were about 8.500 AFI films in the Library's collection, that Mr Kula controlled the use outside the Library of about 2.000 of those films. Still, Mr Kuiper supported their application as full member.

Professor Toeplitz and Mr Ledoux, as in Oslo, proposed to keep the AFI Archives as provisional member. Mr Ledoux said that logically their status should be that of Correspondent but that we would make fools of ourselves if we took away from them what had been voted in Lyon, since nothing new had happened since then.

In order to submit the general opinion of the Executive Committee to the General Meeting, an indicative vote was taken :

For the extension of provisional membership	7
For the status of correspondent	2
Abstention	1

V. PROPOSALS FOR THE NEW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE DEFINITE TASKS OF ITS MEMBERS.

At the last Executive Committee meeting in Oslo, it had been decided that each one of its members should be responsible for a definite task and that a list of these tasks would be prepared here at the Bucharest meeting.

Mr Ledoux said that some tasks being already clearly assigned to certain members (Secretary-General, Treasurer, Heads of the Commissions) there were not many remaining vacancies. Professor Toeplitz suggested the following list of tasks :

- Relations with other international organisations.
- Creation of new archives in countries where film archives not yet exist.
- Education of the archives' personel (by summer schools or any other means).
- Cultural manifestations under the auspices of FIAF. (To this, Mr Pogaci wanted to add the organisation and circulation of film retrospectives such as the American Silent Films Retrospective which had been a great success. This kind of film circulation was very helpful to young archives which did not yet have a rich collection of their own.)

Mr Klaue proposed two other tasks for the Executive Committee :

- Responsibility for the projects. The responsible member would keep in touch with the archive which had undertaken certain projects, would somehow encourage them and report to the Executive Committee and General Meeting.

- The task of "liaison officer" between the specialized Commissions and the Executive Committee, if the head of the Commission was not a member of the E.C.

It was decided that this indicative list would be submitted for agreement to the General Meeting.

Concerning the new Executive Committee, it was unanimously agreed that the names of Mr Privato and Mr Lindgren should be proposed to the General Meeting for election. After a long discussion in Mr Toeplitz' absence, it was also decided, by a vote of 6 against 2, that he should be proposed for election as member of the Executive Committee in order to enable him to keep in close contact with the FIAF during the time of his stay in Australia. The suggestions to submit to the General Meeting his candidature as honorary member, honorary President or to keep him as President, were rejected.

The question was then raised of suggesting to the General Meeting the election of members who had never served on the Executive Committee. Everyone agreed on the necessity of having such members in the Executive Committee but finally it was thought preferable not to add more names to the three already proposed in order not to influence too much the freedom of the elections.

FOURTH SESSION

Monday 29th May, 3 p.m.

CONTINUATION OF THE DISCUSSION ON THE ELECTIONS

The Presidential election

It was unanimously agreed that the Executive Committee as such had no right to propose a candidate for the post of President. The members of the General Meeting would rightly consider this again as too much ruling and intriguing on the part of the Executive Committee. On the other hand, it was also necessary to have more than one candidate.

In trying to make a "portrait-robot" of the qualities needed from the new President, it was agreed that :

- It was not essential but important that the President and the Secretary-General should come from countries in different political spheres (Eastern - Western).
- One should not change the President and the Secretary-General in the same year, for reasons of continuity.
- It should be a person deeply interested in archival work.
- The President should have travelling possibilities.
- It would be better if he was bilingual, but not essential.

When asked if they could possibly accept the post of President, Mr Kuiper, Mr Klaue, Mrs Bowser on behalf of Mr Van Dyke, Mr Ledoux said they could not. The only remaining candidatures known from the Executive Committee were those of Mr Privato and Mr Pogacic.

VI. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Project : Charter of the fundamental principles of FIAF

Mr Pogacic had distributed at the meeting a draft prepared by Mr Acimovic on the Statement of FIAF Principles, project which had already been accepted at the General Meeting in Lyon. This Statement or Charter was supposed to serve as introduction to the FIAF Statutes and also perhaps as the first chapter of the Basic Manual for film archives prepared by the Jugoslavian archive.

Mr Pogacic admitted that this text, written in a hurry just before coming to Bucharest, needed to be shortened and corrected but he wanted the Executive Committee to read it and to make their comments.

Finally it was decided not to submit this text to the General Meeting in Bucharest and Professor Toeplitz agreed, with the help of this draft and the one prepared for the Wiesbaden General Meeting by Mr Lindgren, to prepare a new text during his stay in Australia.

Having thanked all the participants, the President declared the Executive Committee meeting closed.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Bucharest, 3d June 1972, 3 p.m.

A short meeting of the newly elected Executive Committee was held just before the last session of the General Meeting. Mr Privato, Mr Lindgren and Mr Konlechner were excused.

The following additional officers were elected :

Vice-Presidents : Mr Victor Privato (U.S.S.R.)
 Mr John Kuiper (U.S.A.)
 Mr Raymond Borde (France)
Deputy Secretary-General : Mr Wolfgang Klaue (D.D.R.)
Deputy Treasurer : Mr Dumitru Fernoaga (Rumania)

Mr Stenklev having raised the problem of classifying the three reserve members as first, second and third, since they had been elected on two separate lists, (the first round being for those members who had never served on the Executive Committee), it was decided that, although this was not absolutely correct, for this time Mrs Suomela, Mr Molnar and Mr Stenklev would be classified in the strict order of votes received . It was also agreed that, for next General Meeting, the system of electing reserve members had to be perfected.

Concerning the elections, the Secretary-General also said he had been dissatisfied with the fact that it had not been possible to abstain when electing the President and the Secretary-General. He suggested that, when there was only one candidate for a post, one should at least type YES and NO next to the candidate's name on the voting paper.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee would probably be held in Milan since the Secretary-General had received a letter from CINETECA ITALIANA inviting the Executive Committee to meet in their town on the occasion of the MIFED, at the end of October 1972. If this meeting could not be organized in Milan, it was agreed that it would be held in Paris at each member's cost.

Thanking all the present members, President Pogacic then closed the meeting.