

F.I.A.F.

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE
DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
IN OTTAWA (May 17-18, 1974)
and IN MONTREAL (May 24, 1974)

CONFIDENTIAL

3

CONFIDENTIAL

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

OTTAWA, May 17 - 18, 1974

Present : MEMBERS

V. Pogacic, President
 W. Klaue, Vice-President
 J. Kuiper, Vice-President
 V. Privato, Vice-President
 J. Ledoux, Secretary-General
 J. Stenklev, Treasurer
 P. Morris, Deputy-Treasurer
 E. Bowser
 S. Yelin

DEPUTY MEMBERS

K. Gough-Yates
 J. de Vaal

HONORARY MEMBERS

E. Lauritzen
 H. Volkmann

In attendance:

K. Razlogov, interpreter
 B. van der Elst, Executive Secretary

Apologies for absence had been received from Messrs. R. Borde, K. Michalewicz and F. Buache.

OPENING

The President, Mr Pogacic, greeted all the attending members. Considering the absence of Mr Borde and Mr Michalewicz, he gave the right of vote to the two reserve members present, Mr de Vaal and Mr Gough-Yates. Vice-President Privato was expected to arrive only on the next day.

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The following agenda was adopted :

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Approval of the minutes of the preceding meeting
3. Examination of the items on the agenda of the General Meeting
4. Modification of Statutes and Rules
5. Proposals for the new Executive Committee
6. Report on the organization and program of the General Meeting
7. Any other business.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

The Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting in Helsinki had been sent to all the members. They were unanimously approved.

3. EXAMINATION OF THE ITEMS ON THE AGENDA OF THE GENERAL MEETING

Item 1. Confirmation of the status and voting rights of the members present or represented.

Mr Ledoux asked whether he should, under this point, ask each delegation (comprising several delegates) who among them had the right to vote. He feared that this procedure, which had until now always been used at the General Meeting, might lead to some difficulties and he cited the examples of London and Ottawa where the archives were represented by both the director of the archive and the director of the Institute, and also the case of Stockholm where some doubts remained as to who was the real head of the archive: Mr Donner or Mrs Wibom, both attending the meeting.

Concerning the last case, Mr Stenklev explained that Mr Donner was the head of the Cinemateket which included the archive and all connected activities. If some doubts remained on who should have the right to vote, it would be better to settle the matter privately with them before the meeting. This was agreed.

In the case of the British Film Institute and the Canadian Film Institute, it was clear that, the head of the archive being present, the right of vote must be given to him, but the question remained as to whether the directors of the Institutes were part of the archive's delegation or whether they should be considered as observers and were therefore not allowed to attend the sessions reserved to full members. They might however be invited to attend only that part of the session which concerned their organization. A long discussion ensued. Some members feared that if the director of the Institute was accepted as part of the archive's delegation, he might in the future decide to represent it alone at FIAF's General Meetings and nothing in our present Rules could prevent that. In fact, such archives as Prague and Habana were actually represented in Ottawa by the director of the "Institute" alone. This was no problem when the archive was not in conflict with the Institute or any other large institution which embodied it, but experience had shown that it was not always so.

In this connection, Mr Ledoux also raised the problem of archives (e.g. Poona) represented at a General Meeting by the diplomatic representative of their country. Was it normal that such delegates, totally unfamiliar with archival work, should have the right to vote? Under the present Rules, we could do nothing but accept it, but it was decided that this Rule (art. 40) should be reconsidered in future. Mr Yelin however underlined that the Executive Committee should not interfere with the internal matters of an archive and decide to whom they could or not delegate their vote.

The question of the voting rights being settled for this General Meeting, the decision on the attendance or non-attendance of Mr Lucas and Mr Noble at the sessions reserved to full members only was postponed until the contents of these two sessions had been examined more in detail.

Mr Ledoux then proposed to continue the discussion by examining items 17 and 14 on the General Meeting agenda because of their importance and the time it would need to discuss them thoroughly. This was agreed.

Item 17. Statuts of members. Admission of new members. Renewal of the membership of provisional members and correspondents.

The Secretary-General reported that there was no problem involved in the renewal of the status of provisional members and correspondents.

The film archive of Pyong Yang had applied for full membership and there too, he foresaw no difficulty.

Several new applications had been sent in:

a) Cineteca Nacional, in Mexico

Because of a change of address, communications with this archive had been interrupted for some months and the documents which they should have sent us in support of their application had arrived too late and were anyway very uncomplete. Following the Rules, it was therefore impossible to accept their application at this General Meeting but, since Mr Garcia Borja, supposedly the head of the new archive, was going to attend the General Meeting as an observer and there would be an opportunity to talk to him, Mr Ledoux asked Mr Yelin to make a short report on the Cineteca Nacional which he had recently visited. From the documents which the Secretary-General had received, it seemed that the archive was housed in very luxurious buildings but that the emphasis was laid much more on public activities than on preservation. Was the new Cineteca a real archive or was it a film institute, and what was the role of Mr Garcia-Borja who signed : Director General de la Cinematografia ?

Mr Yelin reported that he had visited the Cineteca. They did not only have very impressive buildings but also vaults and preservation facilities, a cataloguing department and 3 projection rooms. They were just starting their collections which were still very modest but a new legal deposit law would soon bring in more films. He thought that Mr Garcia-Borja worked there in a double capacity, as director of the cinematography and as head of the archive but he was positive that this title of director of cinematography had nothing to do with commercial cinemas. He added that the new Mexican archive received full support of the Mexican government and that FIAF should encourage the creation of a real archive in Mexico. He suggested to take the opportunity of Mr Garcia-Borja's presence here in Ottawa to establish better links with him and to help him prepare the archive's application to FIAF for next year.

This was agreed.

b) Service des Archives du Film of the Centre National de la Cinématographie, in Paris (Bois d'Arcy).

Most of the members of the Executive Committee knew this archive which they had visited on the occasion of an E.C. meeting in Paris. They had now applied as provisional member and their application was formally fully in accordance with the Rules. Mr Borde had written that he agreed to their adhesion. The only reservation which Mr Ledoux made was about the archive's autonomy within the C.N.C. On the other hand, since in their application letter they formally accepted to respect FIAF's Statutes and Rules, it could be taken as a guarantee of their autonomy.

Mr Pogacic underlined that it would ^{be} of great interest to FIAF to have this archive as member.

It was finally agreed to propose to the General Meeting to admit them as provisional member. After the Congress, the Secretary-General would contact them and see in what way they could implement the required autonomy. These measures would then be examined by the Executive Committee when the archive applied for full membership.

c) Cinemateca do Museu de Arte Moderna, in Rio de Janeiro.

Everyone knew Mr Cosme Alves Netto, director of the Brazilian archive, which had sent in an application as Correspondent of FIAF. Mr Ledoux supported their candidature.

The Executive Committee unanimously agreed to submit it to the General Meeting.

d) Cinémathèque Universitaire, in Paris

Mr Ledoux reported that he had received the official application, as Correspondent, of this new organization created in Paris and directed by Mr Claude Beylie. Their case had already been examined in Helsinki and the Executive Committee had then come to the conclusion that they did not appear to have any archival activities. On the other hand, Mr Borde had sent a telegram saying he was favourable to their candidature on account of their constant efforts for locating and acquiring old films in France. He underlined that France still did not have a "legal deposit" law.

Mr Ledoux therefore proposed to postpone the decision concerning the admission of the Cinémathèque Universitaire until the Executive Committee had the opportunity to discuss it with Mr Borde. This was agreed.

The Secretary-General then asked to come back to problems concerning the status of present members.

Concerning the situation of the National Film Archive and the British Film Institute, Mr Ledoux reminded the members of what he had explained in Helsinki and that, at the time and following conversations which he had with Mr Lucas, he had felt confident that the matter would be settled in a satisfactory way.

ut he had recently learned that, on Mr Lucas's own advice and against the advice of the Director's working party (see Helsinki minutes), the BFI Board of Governors had decided to remove that area known as the Information Department/Book Library, its collection and the British Film Catalogue from the N.F.A. and to establish it as separate department within the B.F.I. Mr Ledoux considered this move as a structural change within the N.F.A. and a clear sign of Mr Lucas's attempt to defy FIAF and to test its strength. He thought that any sign of weakness on our part would therefore play against N.F.A.'s future and consequently against the future of FIAF. Mr Gough-Yates confirmed what Mr Ledoux had said.

Some members thought that if FIAF accepted this change of structure without reconsidering N.F.A.'s membership, the B.F.I. would not stop at this and would gradually annihilate N.F.A.'s autonomy and turn it into a service to its own purposes. Mr Ledoux then gave a recent example of Mr Lucas's disastrous intrusion in the N.F.A.'s affairs : there had been a very clear breach of the FIAF Rule on exclusivity rights by the Swedish archive, and Mr Lucas had settled the matter with Mr Schein above the head of Mr Gough-Yates and very much to the disadvantage of the National Film Archive.

Mr Ledoux underlined that this was a very good example of what we wanted to avoid in the future or it could mean the end of FIAF. He suggested to explain this very openly to Mr Lucas here in Ottawa, to tell him that, because of the changes of structure within the NFA, FIAF had to reconsider its membership but that the Executive Committee would first like to receive from him a written statement explaining how, in his opinion, the Zagreb Resolution applied to the relations between the N.F.A. and the B.F.I.

Mr Ledoux added that, by adopting this policy, FIAF took the risk of losing the N.F.A. and perhaps also the Swedish archive, but he thought it was unavoidable and he, personally, was ready to take that risk. But was the Executive Committee unanimous on taking such a strong line ?

Mr Kuiper first asked to state clearly the principle which made us take this risk : the priority, by FIAF standards, of archival work. "There is often, he said, a legitimate difference of interest between the priorities of film archives and those who wish and need to study and utilize films and these priorities quite often get confounded. FIAF must help to safeguard the archivist's authority and see that he is not overruled."

All the members of the E.C. agreed to that principle.

Mr Gough-Yates then said he had informed Mr Lucas that, consequently to the fact that N.F.A.'s Information Department/Library had been established as a separate department outside the archive, none of its staff could be member of FIAF's Documentation Commission any longer. Mrs Bowser considered this move as very regrettable for the Commission she chaired, as it deprived it of one of its most active members, Brenda Davies. She added that if the E.C. made a rule of this policy, three other members of the Commission would also have to leave since they were not actually working within member archives. She meant Mr Vimr, Mr Krautz and Mrs Schlosser. She suggested rather to make a rule saying that members of the specialized Commissions must be proposed by the archives.

Volkmann suggested that she include those people she wanted to have in the Commission as experts but Mrs Bowser said it was difficult to get the participation of experts outside the FIAF archives because, if they did not come from the archives, they could not get the funds for travelling. Mr Gough-Yates also added that Mr Lucas would not see any difference if Brenda Davies was considered an expert or a member of the Commission and that such a move would look like an accommodation on our part and an implicit acceptance of N.F.A.'s change of structure.

Mrs Bowser insisted that there must be a general rule on the conditions for admission in the Commissions and that it was not possible to consider Brenda Davies' case alone. She therefore proposed that "people who are not part of a FIAF archive shall be member of the Commissions only if the Commissions ask them. It would then be possible for Brenda Davies to stay a member of the Documentation Commission. Mr Klaue suggested, as an alternative, to suspend Brenda Davies's participation in the Commission until the situation of the N.F.A. in the frame of the B.F.I. was judged satisfying by the Executive Committee which would then reconsider her participation.

But Mr Gough-Yates did not agree with both these proposals. He said that they could clearly be seen by the director of the B.F.I. as a compromise. He thought FIAF had to be very strong on that point because, even if it gave us very little political leverage on the B.F.I., it was a way of indicating them that we were serious.

Mrs Bowser then asked for a vote on that question : Could Brenda Davies continue to participate in the Documentation Commission ?
Results were as follows : yes : 2 - no : 8.

The discussion then continued to decide whether or not Mr Lucas should be invited to discuss the situation with the Executive Committee before the start of the General Meeting. Mr Klaue and Mr Stenklev were in favour of it because they thought that it could shorten the discussions at the General Meeting if the Executive Committee heard him first and made him aware of their strong and unanimous standpoint. Finally it was decided that Mr Gough-Yates would ask Mr Lucas whether he wanted to meet the Executive Committee and, in that case, to invite him to come.

Canadian Film Archives

The Secretary-General having first reminded the members of the situation between the Canadian Film Archives, the Canadian Film Institute and the Public Archives as it stood at the time of the Helsinki meeting, gave the word to Mr Morris.

Mr Morris reported that, although the resolution adopted by the E.C. in Helsinki had not been completely useless, it seemed that, in the long run, the case was almost lost for the C.F.A. The concerned authorities which had met to discuss that problem all agreed that the proposition for an autonomous film archive was the best solution but that the Public Archives were already far enough advanced in their own planning so that the situation was unchangeable. Therefore, and providing that the Public Archives came up with an adequate and total film preservation program, the Canadian Film Archives were prepared to transfer progressively their resources to them. Mr Morris said they were now waiting for the Public Archives' proposals.

To a question of Mr Ledoux asking if FIAF could help the C.F.A. in any way and what he should report to the General Meeting, Mr Morris answered that since, for the moment, nothing was really settled, there was not much to report to the General Meeting except that there was a problem about the independency of the C.F.A. and that a new film archive was in formation at the Public Archives. The Secretary-General should also take this opportunity to insist with the Public Archives that, in creating their film department, they must consider the FIAF Rules on autonomy.

The Secretary-General then read out a letter of Prof. M.A. Prolo, of Torino, in which she asked the Executive Committee to submit to the General Meeting the following proposal : "To invite Mr Langlois, founder member of FIAF....., to rejoin FIAF and to make all possible efforts to achieve this aim."

Mr Pogacic, Mr Klaue, Mr Volkmann and Mr Stenklev all spoke against writing to Mr Langlois to invite him to come back. If he really wished to rejoin FIAF, he should make a written application and the E.C. would examine it as it did with all other candidatures.

Mr Ledoux however asked to seriously discuss the possibility of Mr Langlois's return to FIAF ; he thought that this question deserved consideration because the Cinémathèque Française was no doubt a powerful archive and he saw some political advantages for FIAF in their being member, but there were also many drawbacks.

The majority of the members finally decided that it was ill-timed to discuss this question at the present General Meeting, that we should first have a clear indication from Mr Langlois himself that he was interested in rejoining FIAF and that the legal case which was still pending with Mrs Kawakita should also be completely cleared first. Mr Ledoux agreed to answer in this sense to Miss Prolo asking her eventually to sound Mr Langlois's intentions.

Item 14. Modifications of Statutes and Rules

The Secretary-General explained that the draft Statutes which had been sent to all FIAF members three weeks ago (just in time to be considered by this General Meeting, following the Rules), were slightly different in wording with the text which had been prepared by the Statutes Committee in Helsinki because this text had been drafted under great pressure of time and certain necessary modifications obviously had been overlooked. He apologized to Mr Stenklev, head of the Committee, for not having consulted him in making these modifications but this was also due to lack of time. He now proposed to have first a general discussion on the revised Statutes as a whole, and to re-read them afterwards article by article for approval.

Mr Klaue having asked whether the General Meeting would be requested to vote already this year on the new Statutes, Mr Ledoux said it was up to the E.C. to decide. He personally was for adopting them as soon as possible, with the proviso that the Executive Committee could bring in some minor changes when preparing the Rules.

A general discussion then started on the proposed draft.

Mr Ledoux underlined that great differences existed among the FIAF members, not only in their size, their degree of autonomy, their organisation, but also in their activities. The only activity which they all shared was film preservation and that is why the new article 4, giving the definition of the FIAF members, had been drafted in this form : "Members shall be autonomous, non-profit, national film archives whether governmental or non-governmental, devoted to the history and aesthetics of the cinema, and accessible to the public. The members of the Federation shall have as main object of their activity, to collect and preserve films and all documentation related to the film medium. Members may and should have as second object of their activity to organize the projection and the viewing of films, to provide facilities for consulting documentation, to collect and present film museum exhibits, to publish film literature and, in general, to develop all non-commercial activities related to the promotion and dissemination of film culture, in an historic, educational and artistic perspective."

Mr Pogacic said he would prefer, in the third paragraph, to suppress the word "may" and make it an obligation for the members to have several activities other than preservation, to stress their action in the development of cinematographic culture. But this motion was rejected almost unanimously because, they said, absolute priority had to be given to preservation and sometimes archives did not have the material possibility to exert more activities. "May and should have as second object of their activity" was replaced by "may and should additionally".

The Secretary-General then expressed his doubts about the term "correspondent" in article 3. He thought it was necessary to find another term for this category of affiliates to the Federation, a term that indicated clearly that they were not in the Federation, in order to avoid confusion with "members". If the term "correspondent" was kept, the Executive Committee would have to be very restrictive when admitting such candidates, and this was certainly not the sense of FIAF's new policy. On the contrary, we wanted to be open to many other kinds of organizations.

Mr Ledoux also proposed to enlarge the category of "Associates", to include perhaps organizations such as film institutes, or archives which did not have enough autonomy to be admitted as members.

A long discussion followed about the term which should be adopted instead of "correspondent", since most of the members agreed that it should be changed. Mr Morris proposed to keep a category of "correspondents" for those young, developing archives which would eventually become members, and to add a fourth category of "observers" for the other applicants who could never hope to become members, a category which could then be very open. He thought that a distinction had to be made between those two types of adherents in order to avoid complications when they applied for full membership. This proposal however was rejected because it seemed to be unnecessary.

Although it was not found very satisfactory, the term "observer" was finally adopted for the third category of affiliates to the Federation, by a majority of 7 votes out of 10. It was also agreed that another term should be found for those people invited to the General Meeting which were at present called observers.

Mr Klaue then asked to discuss the true meaning of the words "historic heritage of the cinema" in article 1. Did that mean that FIAF would also accept as full members those archives preserving films as historical documents ?

Mr Ledoux first said that he thought preferable for the Statutes to remain vague on this notion, but later on (during the third session) the discussion was resumed on that problem and Mr Volkmann insisted on adding in article 1 precisely the words "films ... as historical documents". He explained that in many countries, especially the Third World, only documentary films were produced and that, in those countries, it was easier for the beginning archives to get governmental subsidies for the preservation of documentary films rather than for feature films. Why exclude those archives from FIAF's full members' category ?

Mr Pogacic replied that 1°) documentary films could very often be considered artistic and so they fell within FIAF's aims as defined in article 1, and the archives which had such films in their collections could be accepted as members, but that 2°) we wanted to make a distinction between archives which pursued FIAF's traditional aims and the specialized archives for which the category of "Associates" had been created.

Mr Stenklev said that one could very well interpret the text "to promote the preservation of the artistic and historic heritage of the cinema" as covering also the field of historical documents, but Mr Klaue and Mr Volkmann said it should be stated more clearly in the Statutes. They drew the attention of the members to the fact that the true aims of FIAF were anyway defined a second time in article 4 : "archives ... devoted to the history and aesthetics of the cinema".

Finally it was agreed to draft article 1 (par. 2) as follows :

a) to promote the preservation of film as art and historical document and to bring together all organizations devoted to this end.

In article 4, Mr Klaue also asked to add the word "catalogue" as part of FIAF members' main activity. This was unanimously accepted.

Mr Yelin then proposed to add in the same article the following (underlined) words : "The members of the Federation shall have as main object of their activity to collect, preserve and catalogue films, especially their national production ...", because he thought this was a priority that should be stressed, since it was often not respected. Mr Pogacic agreed with him. He added that it would make a point better understood by the producers who often reproached to the archives to want to have the film classics preserved in all the archives around the world.

Mr Ledoux, supported by Mr Stenklev, said that, although this priority certainly existed, it should better not be mentioned in the Statutes because it could be interpreted in a restrictive way by the authorities which financed the archives. He thought in particular of countries without any significant film production where the beginning film archives could then be forced to spend all their funds on the preservation of films of very little importance.

Mrs Bowser proposed that, when defining in the Rules what is implied by the words : "national archives", one should add that their primary aim is to preserve the national production. This was agreed.

Concerning the Rules, Mr Ledoux underlined that we would have to be extremely careful in their drafting since many terms included in the Statutes would only become significant when accompanied by the Rules which would explicit them (e.g. the words : autonomous, national, etc...) and that the Executive Committee would need to have at its disposal a great power of appreciation on these matters.

Mr Stenklev proposed to submit the revised Statutes to the vote of the General Meeting but, if they were adopted, to make them valid only from the next G.M. onwards when the new Rules would be ready. Mr Morris supported this suggestion because he found that the present Rules were totally unadapted to the new Statutes and that the Federation could not work one whole year without Rules. The decision on that matter was postponed until the next day.

Mr Morris and Mr Kuiper also suggested to the "Statutes Committee" to add some chapter heads above the main articles : a simple short statement on what it was about. It would facilitate their reading. This was agreed.

THIRD SESSION

May 19th, 1974

Mr Gough-Yates informed the Executive Committee that Mr Lucas had expressed the wish to meet them some time during the day. It was decided to ask him to come and join the meeting at the end of the afternoon. It was also decided that Mr Kuiper would expose FIAF's point of view and introduce the debate.

Finally, it was agreed that no final decision on the status of the National Film Archive in FIAF would be taken at that moment but that this task would be entrusted to the next Executive Committee, although Mr Gough-Yates said that any postponement in this matter would be unfavourable to the N.F.A. because it gave Mr Lucas more time to achieve some more definite changes within the N.F.A. and the B.F.I. If we gave the task of deciding on this question to the next Executive Committee, we had to be very clear on the kind of assurances we wanted to receive from the B.F.I. and make Mr Lucas understand that N.F.A.'s membership was endangered until the Executive Committee had received a satisfactory reply to a series of questions on the archive's future autonomy.

Mr Stenklev added that, after the Congress, the Secretary-General should perhaps confirm also in writing to Mr Lucas, and on behalf of the Executive Committee, the requests which have been made here to him and the possible consequences of their non-fulfilment.

Modifications of the Statutes (cont'd)

The discussion was then resumed on the revision of the Statutes which were now re-read article by article. Here-under the articles which gave rise to some discussion.

Article 5 : Definition of the Associates.

Mr Ledoux wondered whether this definition had to be so precise. He would have liked to enlarge it to some organizations dealing with film preservation but which did not comply with all the conditions mentioned in article 4, for instance on the point of view of autonomy. But some members having underlined that this category included film institutes and that, if such institutes joined FIAF, it might lead to a confusing situation, it was decided not to change the article.

Article 6 : Definition of Observers.

The draft of this article read as follows : "Organizations whose interest is in supporting the preservation of films or the aims of the Federation and which are not eligible for membership or associateship may apply for admission as observers". This text was considered too broad in its meaning. Mr Morris therefore proposed the following text which was adopted : "Organizations whose activities in whole or in part fall within the aims of the Federation as defined in art. 1, and which are not eligible for membership or associateship, may apply for admission as observers". (x)

Article 9 : Admission of members, associates and observers.

"The E.C. accepts or rejects candidatures bearing in mind the interests of the Federation". Mr Stenklev wanted to suppress this part of the article because he thought it meant an evaluation on the part of the Executive Committee. But Mr Ledoux said that this phrase had been added because one could not always be bound by strict rules and there were often cases when the E.C. would have to exert its judgment in accepting or rejecting candidatures. Mr Pogacic added that it was precisely the Executive Committee's "raison d'être" to lead a policy.

Mr Morris also agreed that this sentence defined very clearly the frame of reference in which the E.C. had to operate.

(x) This modification of art. 6 was forgotten in the transcription which was made for the members at the General Meeting and was therefore not voted. It is the first draft which was adopted. The E.C. should decide what to do on this matter at its next meeting.

"The status of member or associate must be confirmed by the General Meeting". If the General Meetings were held only every two years, new members could always be accepted by the Executive Committee, subject to confirmation by the G.M. at its next meeting. Or one could decide, even if there was only a specialized Congress organized, to have half a day dedicated to membership questions. This matter will have to be settled in the Rules.

Article 17 : Voting rights.

Mr Yelin asked whether a member could delegate his vote to any other person. He took as example the case of the Indian delegate at this Congress, a member of the Indian embassy totally unfamiliar with archival matters. It was decided that the Rules would also have to define clearly to whom an archive could delegate its voting rights.

Article 27 : Modifications of Statutes and Rules.

This article was transformed in such a way that modification of the Statutes could not be introduced too lightly. In the corresponding Rule, one shall have to add the obligation to send the proposals for modifying the Statutes and Rules, by registered mail, to the Secretariat.

In all the other articles, only modifications in wording were decided. The modified draft would now be retyped in order to be redistributed to the members before the General Meeting.

It was finally agreed that the same Committee, chaired by Mr Stenklev, would prepare the draft for the revision of the Rules and that this must be done in time for the next General Meeting. For this year, the present Rules could still remain in usage in so far as they were not contradictory to the Statutes.

Agenda item 6 : Report of the Treasurer

Mr Stenklev had distributed to the members the accounts of the Federation for the year 1973. This document was not discussed because the Executive Committee had already studied it at its Helsinki meeting.

Mr Stenklev also presented a budget proposal for 1975 which was accepted, but Mr Ledoux protested because it did not include the 1975 budget proposal for the Periodical Indexing Project, omission for which he had already strongly protested last year.

The Treasurer replied that he had only received this budget from Karen Jones the day before (he distributed it around), that Karen Jones herself could not have prepared it earlier because she had only just started her work in London at the beginning of May and that he, in Oslo, had no indications whatsoever to make out this budget. Mr Gough-Yates added that even for Karen Jones, it was still impossible to make a serious budget for P.I.P. in 1975, either for revenues or for expenses, because there were still too many unknown factors. She had anyway tried to give some reasonable figures which the Executive Committee now discussed one by one, in order to be able to include it in FIAF's total budget.

Mrs Jones had foreseen a deficit of \pm 62 000 Belgian Francs, but Mr Stenklev and Mr LeDoux reckoned that one should more reasonably expect a deficit of about 200 000 B.F. Could FIAF possibly afford to clear that sum off?

Mr Klaue and Mr Privato however said that they did not see the necessity to offer more subsidies to the project than Karen Jones asked for. She was the specialist in that matter, not the Executive Committee. This latter point was accepted and Mr Stenklev accepted to prepare a new budget including the P.I.P. as a special chapter, in time to be submitted to the General Meeting.

He ended his report by saying that the subscriptions of the members to FIAF could remain at their present level for 1975 but that they would have to be raised in 1976.

Agenda item 10 : Report of the Documentation Commission

Mrs Bowser reported that the Documentation Commission, which had lost several of its active members this year, had made a request to the Bulgarian archive to delegate Miss Staykova as new member of the Commission. Did the E.C. approve of this choice? The Executive Committee agreed unanimously, as long as Miss Staykova was part of the Bulgarian archive's staff. Mrs Bowser said she was.

6. PROPOSALS FOR THE NEW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The present Executive Committee had no proposals to make to the General Meeting for the election of the new Executive Committee.

Mr Keith Lucas, at that moment, joined the meeting.

Mr Pogacic introduced to him all the members of the Executive Committee then gave the word to Mr Kuiper to start the discussion on the changes of structure at the National Film Archive.

Mr Kuiper, saying that he spoke on behalf of the unanimous Executive Committee, expressed the members' deep concern after the report that the Information and Documentation Department of the N.F.A. had been removed from the archive's jurisdiction and had become a separate department within the B.F.I. This appeared to be a major structural change in the N.F.A., contrary to the principles laid down in FIAF's Zagreb Resolution about the members' autonomy.

Mr Lucas replied that he wanted to clarify certain points in order to allay the Executive Committee's concern. The aims and obligations of FIAF and of the B.F.I. as stated in their Statutes were very close. He said that it was the B.F.I. which had been one of the co-founders of FIAF in 1938 and not the National Film Library (former name of the N.F.A.).

He explained that if the Information/Documentation/Book Library had been made a separate department within the B.F.I., it was to improve the quality of their work and that this change would certainly not lead to a reduction of cooperation with the other departments or the archive. He added that this was only one of the many administrative adjustments and efforts of rationalization which had been operated within the B.F.I., hopefully to result in a better service, and that it was not a constitutional change of the N.F.A. He ended by saying that the N.F.A. was the heart of the Institute and that he and the Board of Governors of the B.F.I. had every intention of continuing to develop it and to maintain and develop its international links which they considered essential.

The President then gave the word to the Secretary-General.

Mr Ledoux first said to Mr Lucas that he believed all what he had declared about the B.F.I. but that, with regard to the N.F.A., all the answers which the Executive Committee wanted to give him, were already laid down in the Zagreb Resolution. This Resolution had not been adopted by FIAF only for the purpose of the N.F.A. It was a considerate position which FIAF had taken in general towards the existence of film archives within film institutes. We did not believe that archives belonging to institutes were our enemies, but there was a certain minimum degree of autonomy which had to be maintained absolutely and the N.F.A., at the time when the Zagreb Resolution was drafted, was already felt to be very near this minimum.

Mr Ledoux then reminded Mr Lucas that, when they met in Brussels in January 1974, he (Mr Lucas) had told him that the project of combining the two posts of director of the B.F.I. with that of curator of the archive had been abandoned, but also that a working-party had been appointed to discuss the possible re-organization of the archive and that, since this working-party comprised three members of N.F.A.'s staff, he did not think that any structural changes would result from it. Now we learn that the working-party has indeed recommended that no structural changes be made but that Mr Lucas himself had advised the Board of Governors to detach the Information/Documentation Department from the N.F.A. !

Mr Ledoux also expressed to Mr Lucas the concern of the Executive Committee's members when they had heard about the infringement of the exclusivity rights in England by the Swedish Film Archive and the step which had been taken then by Mr Lucas. This confirmed their opinion about the loss of autonomy of the N.F.A. The Executive Committee therefore doubted whether the N.F.A. could remain a member of FIAF but, before taking any final decision, its intention was to ask Mr Lucas to take a written stand concerning the future of N.F.A. as regarded the Zagreb Resolution.

The new Executive Committee would then act according to the assurances given in this document.

Mr Lucas then replied point by point to Mr Ledoux.

1. About their conversation in Brussels : his recollection of the matter was that he never said he thought there would be no change in the archive's structure. He merely said that he would take his colleagues' advice on this, which he did. Then having discussed the working-party's report with the Executive Committee of the Institute, he had expressed his own view about the need to substantially improve the representation on that Executive Committee of the Documentation/Information Department. The Committee had confirmed his views and told him to go ahead.

2. With regard to the Swedish Film Archives, Mr Lucas had received from his colleague in Sweden, Mr Schein, a letter which drew his attention to the letter written by Mr Gough-Yates to Mrs Wibom and which required, in Mr Lucas's opinion, an immediate reply. Since Mr Gough-Yates was absent at the time, Mr Lucas consulted the deputy-curator's senior colleague who assured him that no situation as described in Mr Gough-Yates's letter existed, and Mr Lucas wrote to that effect to Mr Schein sending a copy to Mr Gough-Yates to await his return. There was therefore, said he, no inhibition of the freedom of action of the archive in this matter.

3. About the Executive Committee's request to Mr Lucas to take a written position on the Zagreb Resolution : Mr Lucas said this was an unfortunate and unhelpful movement. "You are well aware, he said to Mr Ledoux, because of your long knowledge of the Institute and its constitution, that we are not in a position to accept the Zagreb Resolution. You knew that at the time that it was written". After he had explained that after the resignation of Mr Lindgren, Mr Gough-Yates and himself had found themselves in a very difficult situation and how he had come finally to form a different opinion from Mr Gough-Yates's about certain matters, he insisted several times on the point that it would prove constitutionally impossible for the B.F.I.'s Board of Governors to accept the Zagreb Resolution and added that "what is important is not that we abide by certain Rules but that we act in the spirit of doing our job constructively and that we do not fail in our national and international obligations".

Mr Kuiper then explained to Mr Lucas that the root of the matter was a problem of priorities, that for FIAF priority had to be given to preservation and that it was the "raison d'être" of the Zagreb Resolution to safeguard the archivist's authority and see that it was not overruled.

Mr Lucas having replied that it was impossible that the N.F.A. could ever become completely independent and be funded otherwise than through the B.F.I. or another official organization, Mr Morris said that was not the key question. Every archive had an ultimate authority who administered funds, but FIAF, in its Statutes and in the Zagreb Resolution, was more concerned with practical day to day responsibilities. FIAF's archivists had to know that the people with whom dealt in other organizations were responsible as they were themselves, and that they could not be overruled by some higher authority because of a conflict of needs with other departments of this organization.

Mr Klaue, saying that he appreciated the role of the D.F.I. as funding member of FIAF, underlined that now however it was the N.F.A. which was our member and that, after the changes made in its structure taking away one of its departments, this member was not the same as it was when the Zagreb Resolution was signed. Therefore, although the Executive Committee was well aware that it could not interfere in the B.F.I.'s internal affairs, it considered this change of structure a membership matter and had decided unanimously that it was necessary, both for FIAF and the N.F.A., that Mr Lucas, as director of the B.F.I., should give them a written statement on the Zagreb Resolution in relation with the autonomy of the N.F.A. Mr Klaue also said that it was not possible to split the spirit and the constitution of an organization and that, if a member of FIAF declared itself unable to accept part of its constitution and rules, then there was no common spirit.

After some more sharp exchanges between Mr Lucas, Mr Klaue and Mr de Vaal had been smoothed away by Mr Pogacic, Mr Lucas concluded the discussion by saying : "My only comment is : There is no change whatsoever in the intention, the spirit, the way in which the Institute is treating the archive. Our intentions are aimed at improving both the archive and the Institute since they are one body. It is regrettable and dangerous if we allow ourselves to be so pre-occupied with the minutiae of the situation to fail to observe the broader issues involved".

The President then decided to make a short break in the meeting.

Agenda item 22 : Date and place of the next General Meeting

The Secretary-General reported that Mr Gesek had informed him that it proved impossible for both the Austrian film archives to organize the next General Meeting in Vienna because of financial difficulties. For the same reasons, Mr Monty had also replied that he could not organize it next year in Denmark. The only remaining solution would then be to have a General Meeting organized by FIAF itself, without the invitation of an archive, in a not too expensive country, e.g. Yugoslavia. Mr Pogacic accepted to make preliminary enquiries.

7. ANY OTHER SUBJECT

FIAF Bulletin

Mr de Vaal asked for the Executive Committee's opinion on the last issue of the FIAF Bulletin which had been published in a much cheaper way than the preceding issues. Mr Ledoux said that the price was now acceptable but he thought that the lay-out of the articles might perhaps be improved.

The Executive Committee was unanimous in asking Mr de Vaal to continue his task as editor of the Bulletin.

Infringement of exclusive rights of the N.F.A. by the Swedish film archive

This problem had already been exposed during the discussion on the autonomy of the N.F.A. within the B.F.I. but Mr Gough-Yates now asked how this matter would be settled. He demanded some reparation from the Swedish archive or at least the guarantee that this situation would not occur again.

Mr Ledoux having read out the Rules which concerned the intervention of the Arbitration Jury, the Executive Committee decided one should first try an amicable arrangement before getting involved in this very complicated procedure. A small party composed of Mr Klaue, Mr Kuiper and Mr de Vaal was asked to meet Mr Donner and Mrs Wibom here in Ottawa and try to obtain from them, in writing, the recognition of the N.F.A.'s exclusive rights in England and the assurance that such cases of infringement (because of which the N.F.A. had suffered difficulties with the producers) would not happen again. This party would then report to the next Executive Committee and Mr Gough-Yates could either withdraw his complaint if he received satisfaction, or he could go ahead and make a formal charge.

There being no other questions to discuss, the President thanked all participants and closed the meeting.

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING IN MONTREAL

May 24th, 1974

1. Designation of the officers among the new Executive Committee.

Mr Klaue, Mr Kuiper and Mr Privato were reinstated in their position of Vice-Presidents of FIAF.

Mr de Vaal agreed to become Deputy Secretary-General.

Mr Borde (absent) was designated as Deputy Treasurer.

2. Next meeting of the Executive Committee.

The members discussed whether it was necessary to hold a meeting of the E.C. in the fall or whether it would not be better to have one longer meeting at the beginning of 1975. The Secretary-General said it was most uncertain that he would be able to attend a meeting in the fall because of the very busy months he was going to have at the Belgian archive until the end of the year. On the other hand, many tasks had been entrusted to the Executive Committee by the General Meeting, e.g. the preparation of the new Rules. It was therefore finally agreed to fix a date and a place for a possible meeting in October, and to decide later whether to hold this meeting or not. Paris was chosen as meeting place for the 26th, 27th and perhaps the 28th October, 1974.

3. Revision of the FIAF Rules.

Mr Stenklev proposed to send his suggestions on the modification of the Rules to the members of the "Statutes and Rules Committee" as soon as possible and then to hold a meeting with them to discuss this draft in the same way as they had done for the revision of the Statutes. He urged all the members of the E.C. to send him their written suggestions on the Rules.

4. Admission of new members.

The archives of Tehran and Bois d'Arcy had announced that they would apply for membership at the next General Meeting. Which member of the E.C. should then be sent to inspect their premises, as foreseen in the Rules ?
The decision on this matter was postponed until the next E.C. meeting.

The Secretary-General underlined that, as regarded the French archive, there was still a problem of autonomy which should be examined and solved before they were accepted as member.

The Cineteca Nacional in Mexico which had also announced its proximate application was very similar to the Service des Archives du Film as regarded autonomy. But, since they were still in the process of getting constituted and organized, FIAF could perhaps help them in establishing their autonomy.

5. Publication of the Symposium on new preservation techniques.

It was decided that this Symposium would be published as a document separate from the General Meeting Minutes. The Secretariat will first try to make a transcript of it and the E.C. will decide afterwards in what form it should be published.

6. Members of the specialized Commissions.

It was felt necessary to establish a new rule on the election of the members of the FIAF Commissions, but also on revising their membership periodically. Mrs Bowser and Mr Klaue were very much in favour of such a rule but they did not feel prepared to decide on the status of their present members right now. It was decided to discuss this matter at the next E.C. meeting.

Concerning Mrs Brenda Davies and the suspension of her membership in the Documentation Commission, Mrs Bowser was asked to inform her that, because of the separation of the Information/Documentation Department from the N.F.A., she was regretfully no longer able to represent the N.F.A. on the FIAF Documentation Commission.

Mr Morris having asked whether FIAF members should then also suspend their exchanges of publications with this Department since it no longer belonged to a FIAF member, Mr Gough-Yates replied that all publications should now be addressed to the curator of the N.F.A. All FIAF members would be informed of this change.

7. Infringement of exclusive rights by the Swedish film archive.

Mr Kuiper reported that, together with Mr Klaue and Mr de Vaal, he had met with Mr Donner and Mrs Wibom to inform them of Mr Gough-Yates's complaint, ask what they had to say for their defense and what guarantees they could give that it would not happen again.

Mr Donner and Mrs Wibom had declared that they had not realized the implications of presenting the FIAPF agreement in those countries where the archive had refused to sign it. They had anyway presented it to a distributor and not to a producer. They said they would be careful in the future to inform the local member when such situation was about to occur again.

Mr Gough-Yates however was not satisfied with this answer. He underlined that this was not the only complaint he had to make about the Swedes' attitude towards the N.F.A. They always wanted, for instance, to deal with the National Film Theatre directly, which weakened N.F.A.'s position.

But Mr Klaue said that FIAF's rule of exclusivity was unprecise and, as long as it was not made more explicit, one could not base the intervention of the Arbitration Jury on it.

Mr Stenklev, having explained that Mr Donner was new in his position as curator and therefore did not always understand the necessity of some FIAF rules, asked Mr Gough-Yates whether he would accept to give him a few months delay before making a formal charge. He (Mr Stenklev) would meanwhile have the opportunity to meet with Mr Donner in some reunion of the Nordic Group and would again try to settle the matter amicably. Mr Gough-Yates agreed to that proposal.

This ended the meeting of the Executive Committee in Montreal.

5. Publication of the Symposium on new preservation techniques.

It was decided that this Symposium would be published as a document separate from the General Meeting Minutes. The Secretariat will first try to make a transcript of it and the E.C. will decide afterwards in what form it should be published.

6. Members of the specialized Commissions.

It was felt necessary to establish a new rule on the election of the members of the FIAF Commissions, but also on revising their membership periodically. Mrs Bowser and Mr Klaue were very much in favour of such a rule but they did not feel prepared to decide on the status of their present members right now. It was decided to discuss this matter at the next E.C. meeting.

Concerning Mrs Brenda Davies and the suspension of her membership in the Documentation Commission, Mrs Bowser was asked to inform her that, because of the separation of the Information/Documentation Department from the N.F.A., she was regrettably no longer able to represent the N.F.A. on the FIAF Documentation Commission.

Mr Morris having asked whether FIAF members should then also suspend their exchanges of publications with this Department since it no longer belonged to a FIAF member, Mr Gough-Yates replied that all publications should now be addressed to the curator of the N.F.A. All FIAF members would be informed of this change.

7. Infringement of exclusive rights by the Swedish film archive.

Mr Kuiper reported that, together with Mr Klaue and Mr de Vaal, he had met with Mr Donner and Mrs Wibom to inform them of Mr Gough-Yates's complaint, ask what they had to say for their defense and what guarantees they could give that it would not happen again.

Mr Donner and Mrs Wibom had declared that they had not realized the implications of presenting the FIAPF agreement in those countries where the archive had refused to sign it. They had anyway presented it to a distributor and not to a producer. They said they would be careful in the future to inform the local member when such situation was about to occur again.

Mr Gough-Yates however was not satisfied with this answer. He underlined that this was not the only complaint he had to make about the Swedes' attitude towards the N.F.A. They always wanted, for instance, to deal with the National Film Theatre directly, which weakened N.F.A.'s position.

But Mr Klaue said that FIAF's rule of exclusivity was unprecise and, as long as it was not made more explicit, one could not base the intervention of the Arbitration Jury on it.

Mr Stenklev, having explained that Mr Donner was new in his position as curator and therefore did not always understand the necessity of some FIAF rules, asked Mr Gough-Yates whether he would accept to give him a few months delay before making a formal charge. He (Mr Stenklev) would meanwhile have the opportunity to meet with Mr Donner in some reunion of the Nordic Group and would again try to settle the matter amicably. Mr Gough-Yates agreed to that proposal.

This ended the meeting of the Executive Committee in Montreal.