

F.I.A.F.

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE

DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

PARIS (October 26 - 27, 1974)

---

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

## MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

PARIS, October 26 - 27, 1974

Present : MEMBERS

V. Pogacic, President  
 V. Privato, Vice-President  
 J. Ledoux, Secretary-General (Sunday)  
 J. de Vaal, Deputy Secretary-General  
 J. Stenklev, Treasurer  
 R. Borde, Deputy-Treasurer  
 E. Bowser  
 R. Daudelin

RESERVE MEMBERS

K. Gough-Yates  
 I. Molnar

HONORARY MEMBERS

E. Lauritzen  
 H. Volkmann

## In attendance :

K. Razlogov, interpreter  
 B. van der Elst

Apologies for absence had been received from : Messrs W. Klaue, J. Kuiper, S. Yelin and J. Toeplitz.

OPENING

The President, Mr Pogacic, greeted all the attending members. Considering the absence of Messrs Klaue, Kuiper and Yelin, he gave the right of vote to the two attending reserve members.

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The following agenda was adopted :

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting
3. Financial questions
4. Report of the specialized Commissions
5. Next General Meeting
6. Relations with other international organizations
7. Membership questions
8. Modifications of the Rules in accordance with the new Statutes
9. Any other business.

## 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Minutes of the Executive Committee meetings in Ottawa and Montreal had been sent to all the E.C. members. They were approved subject to a small modification on p. 6, required by Mrs Bowser. In the second paragraph, line 4, she asked to replace the words "if the Commissions ask them" by "if the FIAF archives ask them".

## 3. FINANCIAL REPORT

A report on the FIAF accounts (January 1 - September 30, 1974) had been distributed to all the members. The Treasurer, Mr Stenklev, proceeded to comment on it, page by page.

He underlined that the current account in Brussels was presently at a very low level, far too low for this period of the year, and he explained that this was due not only to the very rapid inflation in all prices which had made our expenses grow faster than foreseen, but mainly because of the great costs involved in the move of the Periodical Indexing Project to London. Up to this date, FIAF (the Federation's current account) had already advanced the sum of 542.000 Belgian francs to the project and had furthermore blocked 130.000 BF in a time deposit account in order to guarantee the rent of the P.I.P.' office in London. One must hope that the project would, in the long run, be able to reimburse the advanced money to FIAF but meanwhile we were undergoing a very difficult time as concerned ready money.

Mr Stenklev foresaw that we would not be able to close the year, or at least the first months of 1975, without attacking the Reserve Fund. Of course, this was an important decision to make and he proposed to wait for the arrival of the Secretary-General to discuss this matter.

To conclude his report, he reminded the members of the suggestion which he had already made in Ottawa, to raise the FIAF subscriptions in 1976 of about 20%. This proved more than ever to be a necessity.

Mr Pogacic, saying that he personally thought that everything should be done to maintain the P.I.P. afloat, agreed to postpone the discussion on this matter until the next day. He thanked the Treasurer for his report.

## 4. REPORT OF THE SPECIALIZED COMMISSIONS

### a) Preservation Commission

Mr Volkmann reported that no meeting of the Preservation Commission had been held since the General Meeting. The English version of the manual on the preservation of colour films was ready to be handed over to the National Film Archive in London for a last revision of the language. Mr Volkmann hoped that it could then be published in time to be distributed at the next General Meeting.

The Commission would meet in the spring of 1975 to determine the authors of the chapters on magnetic tapes' preservation and to start the discussion on new video-electronic and video-mechanic techniques. Unfortunately, a meeting scheduled for the end of this year in Stockholm had to be cancelled because of some difficulties raised by the Swedish Film Archive.

Mr Volkmann also informed the Treasurer of the budget which he would need in the near future for the publications of the Commission.

b) Documentation Commission

Mrs Bowser said that the Documentation Commission was going to hold its first meeting since the General Meeting immediately after this E.C. meeting, at Bautzen, as guest of the Staatliches Filmarchiv der DDR. Therefore, and considering that the discussion on the P.I.P. was postponed until the next day, she did not have much to report on the other activities of the Commission. It was experiencing great difficulties because it had lost several of its important members and could not easily replace them. Mrs Bowser said that, in consequence, the fulfillment of several projects was deleted and that the commission was also considering to meet less frequently. All these questions would be debated at their Bautzen meeting.

c) Cataloguing Commission

Although absent, Mr Klaue had sent to the Executive Committee the following report :

"According to the decisions taken at the last meeting, the corrections and additions were duly incorporated into the manuscript of the Manual on Film Cataloguing.

An editorial group will meet in London in November to polish the linguistic style of the final version of the manuscript. The manuscript shall be ready for the printer by the end of this year. The next Cataloguing meeting will be convened in Spring 1975."

d) Copyright Commission

Considering the absence of Mr Kuiper and Mr Ledoux, no report could be made on the work done by this Commission, but Mr Pogacic informed the members that he had had some unofficial contacts with Mr Brisson and had spoken with him of the proposal made by Mr Morris in Helsinki, i.e. that FIAF and FIAPF prepare a compromise between the existing draft agreements, a set of minimum conditions to which both could agree and, if it proved impossible that both the Federations take the responsibility for all their members, that this compromise serve as basis to a model agreement which national producers' associations would then sign with individual archives if they wanted to.

Mr Brisson had submitted this proposal to the Executive Committee of FIAPF which had agreed to it; he had then written to Mr Pogacic and to Mr Kuiper to suggest a meeting for preliminary discussions and he had asked Mr Kuiper,

as Chairman of the Copyright Commission, if he could already inform FIAPF of any comments which he might have to make concerning the text of the FIAPF agreement. Mr Kuiper had sent to Mr Brisson a rather detailed comment which Mr Pogacic now read out. (Annex 1).

While underlining that his basic idea had been to renew contacts with FIAPF on the level of the Federations, and not to go immediately into details of wording and new agreements, Mr Pogacic thought that it would be tactically useful to hold a meeting between FIAF and FIAPF delegates and to maintain friendly relations with them, if only to prevent other agents to tarnish our reputation with them.

Mr Stenklev agreed and added that there already seemed to be some progress in the fact that FIAF was ready to rediscuss the text of its "agreement".

Mr de Vaal reported that the Nederlands Filmmuseum had also been submitted the FIAPF agreement for signature but that, until now, they had been able to temporize and had not yet signed it.

Mr Pogacic then suggested to stop this discussion and resume it the next day when Mr Ledoux would be present.

#### 5. NEXT GENERAL MEETING

The President reminded the members that, in Ottawa, there had been no proposal for a definite place to hold the next General Meeting and that he had been asked to inquire on the possibility to organize it in Yugoslavia, but without the financial intervention of the Yugoslav archive. He had therefore sent some proposals of hotels and prices to the Secretariat.

Mrs van der Elst, on behalf of Mr Ledoux, reported that since then the Secretary-General had received a semi-proposal of Miss Prolo to hold the General Meeting in Torino, but also without any financial contribution of the Museo Nazionale. Mr Ledoux also strongly objected to holding a General Meeting in Yugoslavia if it had to be in such touristic places as proposed by Mr Pogacic, for fear of a great percentage of absenteeism at the working sessions.

Mr Pogacic replied that those hotels were the only ones he could find with the necessary accommodations and also within easy reach of an airfield. However, he personally would prefer the solution of Torino.

Mr Stenklev and Mr Borde said that, since the members would in any case have to pay their own fare and hotel costs, they much preferred the setting of Dubrovnik than that of Torino, hot industrial city, and also that the members for FIAF could be trusted to have some sense of responsibility.

Finally, it was decided to postpone the decision on this matter until the next day.



7. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONSCinémathèque Universitaire (Paris)

Because of the absence of Mr Borde in Ottawa, the decision about the application of this organization as Observer had been postponed. Mr Borde now reported what he knew of the Cinémathèque Universitaire and why he supported their candidature. He explained how and for what purpose this organization had been created and said that it had recently obtained official recognition from the Centre National de la Cinématographie and also some subsidies to make 16 mm prints of the 35 mm originals which they owned. It had also obtained the legal rights to make showings (of extracts) in French universities, which was their main activity. One could also say that their collections were growing fast. Mr Borde recalled what he had already said: that their staff was made of film enthusiasts who had made great efforts (often rewarding) in locating and acquiring old films in France, that the "legal deposit" did not exist in France and that therefore, any serious organization which contributed to the salvage of the French film production should be encouraged by FIAF. He proposed to admit them as observers.

Mr Pogacic said that this was a delicate matter, closely related to FIAF's general policy and, in particular, to our policy in France. Should we, or shouldn't we encourage the creation of several small archives in one country or, on the contrary, support only national archives? What about Bois d'Arcy? Did they fulfill the conditions to be members of FIAF? In his opinion, they did not because they did not organize showings nor were they able to exchange films with other archives, and both these tasks were part of the aims of FIAF as defined in article 1 of the Statutes. But, if the conditions to be admitted as member were those defined in article 4, he considered that the Imperial War Museum, for instance, fulfilled these conditions and should be admitted as member rather than as Associate.

Mr Daudelin thought that it was not so much a question of defining the members than a clarification of the term "observer" which was needed here and that we ought to define the observers in the light of applications such as that of the Cinémathèque Universitaire. This option could be either accepted or rejected but one ought to take a decision.

Mr Stenklev reminded the members that one of the reasons behind the modifications of Statutes adopted in Ottawa was precisely a greater strictness in the admission of members but an opening to many other film organizations with which we wanted to have better contacts. He agreed that the extent of this opening had not yet been decided upon.

As regarded the Cinémathèque Universitaire, Mr Borde agreed that it was too soon to take a decision and that the question of principle should first be solved. Mr Pogacic concluded by proposing to rediscuss this matter when the Secretary-General had arrived.

## 9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Filmoteka Polska had written to the Secretariat following the circular letter which had asked all members to help Cine Arte del Sodre in Montevideo after the fire which had almost destroyed their collections for the second time. Mr Pastuzko said he had some nitrate prints to offer them but could not afford to pay their transportation to Montevideo. He asked whether FIAF would be ready to cover these costs.

The members unanimously said that this was not possible because it was too dangerous, too complicate and too costly to organize.

The Secretariat had also received a telegram from the National Organization for the Cinema of Lybia which said : "Suite lettre M Privato, nous avons l'honneur d'inviter un de vos spécialistes à Tripoli pour discuter le sujet d'archives de films. Boukhari - PDG - Khaiala".

Mr Privato explained that, following a decision taken by the FIAF Committee on developing countries, he had sent a circular letter to all kind of film organizations in Asia, Africa and Latin-America to promote the creation of new film archives. Apparently, this was an answer to his letter.

It was decided that the Secretariat should answer to the Lybian organization and ask them what kind of help they expected from the FIAF specialist and if they would be prepared to pay for his trip to Tripoli.

Mr Volkmann then explained that he had been invited to go to Tehran to give technical advice to the Iranian Film Archive for the construction of their new vaults. Considering that the Iranian archive would probably submit its application for membership at the next General Meeting and that it would therefore need to comply with article 6 of the Rules which requested an inspection of the archive's means of preservation by a member appointed by the Executive Committee, Mr Pogacic suggested to ask Mr Volkmann to act as delegate of the Executive Committee in this matter. It was unanimously agreed.

Mr Ledoux had received a letter from the A.F.I. Archives signed : Dan Rose, archivist. The President asked whether anyone knew of this change at the head of the Washington archive. Mrs Bowser explained that Larry Karr had only been appointed temporarily as acting archivist and that Dan Rose was the newly elected chief-archivist. She said that she would ask the A.F.I. Archives to notify FIAF officially about their new staff organization.

### FIAF's law suit in Paris

This long legal process had finally come to an end and the Secretariat had received a letter from its lawyer in Paris who was trying to organize the final settlement (breaking of the seals at the rue de Courcelles where the FIAF archives were still sequestered, in the presence of the various parties to the case). The President suggested to give procuration to Mrs van der Elst for that matter. This was unanimously agreed.

SECOND SESSION

The Secretary-General joined the meeting at that point.

REPORT OF THE DOCUMENTATION COMMISSION (Cont'd)International Index to Film Periodicals

Mrs Bowser first made a few general comments on the project. She announced that the 1973 catalogue was published and would be distributed soon to all members. She had visited the P.I.P.'s London office which seemed to be functioning rather well. The main problem was that of personal. Karen Jones was going to leave at the end of her contract, i.e. end of April 1975 and she had not yet been able to find a successor. Mrs Bowser then turned the floor over to Mr Stenklev to report on the financial situation of the project.

The Treasurer re-explained that the critical financial situation in which FIAF stood at present was mainly due to the great costs involved in the move of the project and the rent of an office in London. He cited some figures and concluded by asking whether it was not possible to reduce the cost of the project by diminishing, for instance, the number of periodicals indexed. He said that if we did not reduce our expenses drastically, we could not avoid "borrowing" money from our Reserve fund in Switzerland at the end of this year to cover the period until the new subscriptions for 1975 were paid. Mr Ledoux said he was against breaking into the Reserve Fund.

Mrs Bowser said that it would be difficult to restrict the project and that it would most probably not solve the financial difficulties. She suggested rather to raise the subscriptions which had remained the same since the start of the project in 1972. Mr Stenklev agreed to that and said we should envisage a raise of 20 %.

Having inquired about the number of subscribers to the cards outside of FIAF (they were only 18) and also about the number of annual volumes sold by Bowker up to this date (only 944), Mr Ledoux said that this was hard to understand and that, apart from increasing the promotion of the sales, one should perhaps also change something to the system. Evidently, the book sold better than the cards because of its much lower price. Therefore, wouldn't it be possible to suppress the distribution of cards, coming back to a system of sheets (perhaps combined with a system of adhesive labels), and publish only the annual volume ?

Mr Gough-Yates replied that the adoption of such a system would bring no significant saving because most of the spending connected with the P.I.P. went into labour costs and Mr Ledoux' system would need the same amount of work.



Mr Stanklev then suggested to try to obtain subsidies for the project from one or other international or even national foundation interested in the cinema. Mrs Bowser said she would try.

The possibility of moving the project to another country was also considered but everyone agreed that this solution could only be envisaged if it was to house the project within a FIAF archive in order to diminish the costs, and apparently no archive had enough space or the means for that.

Mr Volkmann was against continuing with the project. He said that it was too big an enterprise for an organization such as FIAF since it had brought us into a dangerous situation which would probably become even worse at the departure of Karen Jones. He was also opposed to our breaking into the Reserve Fund.

To conclude, the President proposed to ask the Documentation Commission to prepare a thorough analysis of the situation, together with a summary of the replies received from all members to the questionnaire concerning the project, in order that the Executive Committee can decide at its next meeting whether or not to recommend the continuance of the project beyond this year.

## 7. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

### a) Cineteca Italiana

The Secretary-General reminded the members that, following the decision of the General Meeting in Ottawa, he had on June 10 written to Cineteca Italiana to inform them that they had been granted a 3 months' delay to pay their subscription in arrears, after which period they would automatically be deleted.

Mr Comencini had then written to Mr Ledoux to propose another kind of settlement (reduction of the subscription, or associate membership or some further delay), letter which Mr Ledoux had answered saying that all this was impossible and re-explaining the Rules. Since, on the first of October, no other news or payment had been received from Milano, the Secretary-General sent a circular letter to all members to inform them of the deletion of Cineteca Italiana. Messrs Comencini and Alberti immediately reacted and wrote that they were ready to pay 2 years' subscription (1972 and 1973) before the end of this year and asked whether they could pay the 1974 subscription in the first half of 1975. They also asked the Executive Committee to grant them a reduction on the 1975 subscription.

The Executive Committee did not accept this request because the two other Italian members were in the same position as Cineteca Italiana as regarded governmental subsidies and they nevertheless managed to pay their fees regularly.

As for the first part of their proposal, the majority of the members agreed to it on the condition only that the subscriptions for 1972 and 1973 were effectively paid before the end of 1974 and the 1974 subscription before the next General Meeting. Until that was paid, Cineteca Italiana must remain outside of FIAF. The Treasurer agreed to inform them in writing of this decision.

b) Service des Archives du Film (Bois d'Arcy)

Mr Ledoux reported that, after Ottawa, he had informed the S.A.F. that they had been accepted as Observer and that we hoped they would, next year, submit their application for membership following their first intention. There remained however the problem of their autonomy within the Centre National de la Cinématographie. The Service des Archives had been created by an ordinance (décret ministériel) in June 1969. It had its own budget within the C.N.C. but no official constitution. It was run following a "règlement d'exploitation". Mr Ledoux thought that, although it was very desirable for FIAF to have the S.A.F. as member, we should nevertheless apply to them the same criteria of admission as to the other members and namely that of autonomy. This problem could probably be solved without too much difficulty but the Executive Committee should discuss now when and in what way the question should be put to them.

All members strongly felt that everything should be done to enable the S.A.F. to become a member and that there was no reason to be more strict with them than with all the other governmental archives which were already in FIAF. But Mr Ledoux said that, since the Service des Archives needed FIAF even more than FIAF needed it, we should negotiate their admittance in FIAF with the C.N.C. by requiring for instance some kind of statute for the S.F.A., in their own interest.

Mr Stenklev underlined that, as long as the new Rules were not drafted, the Executive Committee itself was not certain of what it meant precisely by "autonomy". He thought we should first discuss this matter among us before approaching the C.N.C. and the S.A.F. which had furthermore not yet submitted its application for membership.

Mr Ledoux said he did not insist on approaching them immediately but we could already lay the Zagreb Resolution before them and ask them, for the next E.C. meeting, how the Service des Archives complied with this rule. This was agreed.

Mr Pogacic concluded by saying that the Statutes and Rules Committee should also meanwhile carefully prepare the discussion on "autonomy", perhaps make a legal study of the word as opposed to "independence" and try to find some constitutions of governmental organizations (museums, libraries, etc...) which could serve as example when drafting our Rules. Mr Daudelin cited the Statutes of the Norsk Film Institutt.

c) Center of Film Studies / U.N.A.M. (Mexico)

This organization, directed by Mr Gonzalez Casanova, had written to the Secretary-General to formally request its admittance as member of FIAF.

The Secretariat had answered them, on June 21, explaining the procedure to follow for such candidature and since then had received no news. As Messrs Pogacic and Daudelin both reported that the contacts which they had had since the Ottawa Congress clearly indicated that the "Cineteca Nacional" of Mexico was shaping well and that they still wished to join FIAF, it was decided that, if Mr Casanova did submit an application in good order, the Executive Committee could not refuse its admittance as observer but that nothing more should be done to attract him.

d) Canadian Film Archives (Ottawa)

The Secretary-General then gave the word to Mr Daudelin to report on the present situation at the Canadian Film Archives. Speaking on behalf of Mr Morris, Mr Daudelin explained the facts which had led to the signature of an agreement between the Canadian Film Institute and the Public Archives of Canada, agreement which sets out the terms for the transfer of all the resources of the C.F.A. (films, book library, stills, posters, etc...) to the Public Archives. The date of this transfer had not yet been decided upon and was dependent on the fulfilling by the Public Archives of the conditions described in the agreement. A probable date therefore was April 1975. Mr Daudelin added that Mr Sam Kula, head of the new film department of the Public Archives, had come to visit him and seemed very active in establishing the bases of his archive but that he had not yet written any official confirmation of its creation neither to the Cinémathèque Québécoise nor to FIAF, although it seemed that he wished to join FIAF.

Mr Morris also wanted the Executive Committee to discuss the destination of the films loaned to or exchanged with the C.F.A. by FIAF members, as it was clear that those films could not automatically be transferred to the Public Archives. Nothing in the Statutes and Rules foresaw the possibility of the dissolution of an archive, but as regarded the films, everyone agreed that article 143 of the Rules could be applied in this case. The Secretary-General was therefore asked to contact Mr Morris and decide with him where the films belonging to FIAF members could be kept until the members themselves decide what should become of them.

THIRD SESSION

The National Film Archive (London)

Mr Ledoux briefly summarized what had happened and what he had done, since Ottawa, in connection with the N.F.A. case. He had been to London in July on the occasion of the re-naming of the former Kingshill House to "Ernest Lindgren House". He learned there that David Francis had been appointed curator of the archive. At the beginning of September, he learnt that Mr Gough-Yates had been dismissed from his post of acting-curator of the

National Film Archive with only two days' notice, that his Union considered this as a case of unfair dismissal and had therefore (and for some other more general issues) called out a general strike at the British Film Institute in order to force "a full inquiry into the way the B.F.I. is being run". A few days later, Mr Ledoux received a "confidential" letter from Mr Keith Lucas in which he undertook to respond to the points set out in the Zagreb Resolution in as far as they related to the National Film Archive. All the members of the Executive Committee now had a copy of this letter in their files.

Finally, Mr Ledoux learnt that, after approximately two weeks' strike at the B.F.I., the case of Mr Gough-Yates' dismissal had been submitted to an independent Arbitrator who was going to make an inquiry and would settle the matter in the following terms :

1. Whether the reasons given for the dismissal of Mr Gough-Yates were fair ?
2. Whether the procedures followed were correctly observed ?
3. In the light of his entire record of employment at the B.F.I., whether it would be reasonable to continue in this employment ?

Considering that the reasons given by Mr Lucas for sacking him more or less involved FIAF in the sense that he was reproached with an anti-management attitude in the dispute over the National Film Archive's autonomy, Mr Gough-Yates asked the FIAF Executive Committee possibly to provide some evidence for him to the Arbitrator.

Mr Gough-Yates then gave some more details on the grounds given by Mr Lucas for dismissing him. He repeated what he had written to Mr Ledoux : "Would some members of the Executive Committee be prepared to give verbal or written evidence relating to FIAF/BFI relations since Mr Lucas had been director, and perhaps produce the recording of the E.C. session in Ottawa when Mr Lucas had met the Executive Committee ?".

Mr Ledoux said that one should make a distinction between Mr Gough-Yates' personal case and that of the National Film Archive. He felt that FIAF could not, on its own initiative, intervene in favour of a person, however sympathetic this person was to FIAF. FIAF should never intervene into the internal matters of another organization except if those matters affected the structure of a member on a point which was essential to its membership, e.g. its autonomy. Secondly, we should also preserve our future relations with the National Film Archive and, providing evidence in favour of Mr Gough-Yates against the B.F.I. without formally being asked to do so, might harm us in our negotiations for the autonomy of the London archive. But, it would be different if FIAF members were asked by the Arbitrator to answer questions which were put to them in relation with the case of Mr Gough-Yates. Then one could not refuse to answer. Mr Ledoux added that, as regarded the tapes of the E.C. meeting, they had always been considered as confidential (which was a guarantee of the members' freedom to speak openly) and therefore the tapes of Ottawa could regretfully not be produced as evidence.



Mr Gough-Yates said that he agreed. He was not asking the Executive Committee to come and fight his case but he also added that, in his opinion, this matter was central to the issue relating to the autonomy of the National Film Archive.

To conclude, all the members without exception agreed that, if the Arbitrator appointed to settle the dispute between the B.F.I. and Mr Gough-Yates' Union asked for the testimony of FIAF or its members, we would give it.

Commenting on the confidential letter of Mr Lucas in which he pretended to respond to the question which was put to him in Ottawa by the Executive Committee, Mr Ledoux said that this answer was beside the point since it did not give any assurances regarding the autonomy of the N.F.A. Mr Lucas merely repeated what he had said in Ottawa, namely that there had been no recent changes in the archive's status or role and that therefore, there was no reason for FIAF to get alarmed.

However, said Mr Ledoux, it seems that there had been a great change in the administration of the N.F.A., although we did not know when that change occurred. In a brochure which was published in 1955 and described the N.F.A., it was written : "The National Film Archive is administered by a National Film Archive Committee appointed by the Governors of the British Film Institute ; under powers given by the Institute's Articles of Association the Governors delegate to the National Film Archive Committee full responsibility for the protection, maintenance and development of the Archive's collection, and for controlling its use. The principal officer of the Archive is the Curator".

In FIAF, we were living on the assumption that this structure was still in operation, but this Committee now seems to have disappeared. Also the new Curator was appointed by the Director of the B.F.I. and not by the Governors. He is therefore responsible to the Director. This makes a great difference in the present context.

Mr Ledoux thought that FIAF should try to obtain from the B.F.I. at least a come-back to the former structure (as described above) and perhaps also ask that the N.F.A. should have its own set of rules in the frame of the Constitution of the B.F.I. This condition should not prove too difficult to obtain since the N.F.A. already worked under a very well known, although unwritten, method of operation.

In conclusion, it was agreed that FIAF representatives should meet representatives of the B.F.I. in order to discuss the situation of the N.F.A. within the B.F.I. and make some proposals, but this meeting, although unofficial, should be well prepared and therefore it was decided to wait until the next Executive Committee to organize it definitely. Mr Ledoux having asked what he should answer meanwhile to Mr Lucas' letter, the members agreed that it was not necessary to answer it immediately.



Mr Gough-Yates was then asked to leave the room momentarily because the Executive Committee needed to discuss a more personal question which concerned him. Because he was no more employed at the N.F.A., Mr Gough-Yates had had to pay himself the costs of his trip to Paris for the E.C. meeting and he had asked whether it would be possible for FIAF to reimburse his fare. The discussion was long, but finally it was decided that FIAF could not pay his trip for two reasons :

1. In order not to create a precedent.
2. Because it might look to the direction of the B.F.I. and to outsiders as if FIAF was adopting a definite position in the conflict between Mr Gough-Yates and the B.F.I. and was losing its objectivity.

A vote was taken on the motion that FIAF reimburse Mr Gough-Yates' fare to Paris, with the following results :

Against	6
Abstentions	3.

Mr Gough-Yates was then called back into the room and was informed of the decision taken.

#### RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

##### F.I.A.P.F.

The Secretary-General first expressed the opinion that the present move undertaken by Mr Pogacic (as explained before) of renewing our contacts with FIAPF was unfortunate. He did not see how it could lead to anything constructive since, evidently, we would never be able to establish with the Federation of Producers a type of agreement which would be satisfactory to all parties concerned. Even if we obtained some concessions from the producers, there would always be some strong archives such as Washington, Moscow, New York or London which would refuse to sign any agreement and if FIAF had participated in the making of this agreement, it would weaken their position. Mr Ledoux much preferred to keep the present situation in which the members had more or less been able to establish a "modus vivendi" with their producers which was not unbearable.

Mr Pogacic did not agree with the latter. He explained that, in Jugoslavia, the FIAPF had recently presented the archive, via Jugoslavia Film, with their draft agreement and that they were exerting very strong pressure on Jugoslavia Film to make the archive sign it. He also explained that the contacts which he wished to renew with FIAPF and Mr Brisson were more of an informal type. He certainly did not want to rush things and enter too quickly into details of contracts which might lead us onto dangerous grounds, but he believed in personal contacts and thought one could arrange many problems in that way.

Mr Volkmann believed that it was useless to discuss with FIAPF. He said the only way to obtain better terms for the film archives was to initiate a revision of the general copyright law, to prepare an annex which would legalize the necessary principles for the archive world, and it was in that perspective that FIAF should fight.

Finally, it was decided that the whole matter would be turned over to the Copyright Commission, the Executive Committee having accomplished the task which the General Meeting had entrusted them in Moscow, to renew our contacts with FIAPF.

#### Conseil International des Archives

After the negative vote of Ottawa, some correspondence had been exchanged between the Secretary of the I.C.A., Mr Keckskemeti, and Mr Ledoux, about the necessity of establishing other links between the two organizations. It was decided that Mr Pogacic would visit him or write to him in order to further this question.

#### 8. MODIFICATION OF RULES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NEW STATUTES

It was agreed that the Committee for the Revision of the Statutes and Rules would meet two days before the next Executive Committee meeting to prepare a draft for the revision of the Rules.

#### NEXT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND GENERAL MEETING

It was decided that the next meeting of the Executive Committee would be held either in Holland or in Belgium as being a central place for all participants. Probable dates were 8-9-10 March.

The place to hold the next General Meeting was then discussed and, although there was some disagreement on this, it was decided to accept the offer of the Museo Nazionale del Cinema to arrange the next Congress in Torino at the expense of FIAF and the members, some time at the very end of May, beginning of June. The Secretary-General would arrange the details with Miss Prolo and inform all the members as soon as possible.

- - - - -

Mr. A. Brisson  
Secretary General  
International Federation  
of Film Producers Associations  
33, Champs-Elysees - 75008 Paris

Annex 1

September 6, 1974

Dear Mr. Brisson:

Thank you for the opportunity of commenting upon the IFFPA text of the deposit agreement you so kindly sent me in your letter dated July 29, 1974.

Because the Library of Congress bears a unique relationship to film producers through the copyright law and because the problems to which the IFFPA text relate appear to be intensified by the multiplicity of national boundaries in Europe, I have chosen to reply personally to your letter as Chairman of the FIAF Copyright Commission.

My first reaction to the text is that there are many fine things about it which should be retained. Among these are the recognition of an archive's role in preservation (preamble, Section 5, Section 13); the willingness of the producers of a film to pay for copies made by an archive in the course of its preservation activities when such copies are removed by the producer (Section 4); and the blanket permission given to an archive to hold showings of a producer's film on its premises for study purposes without prior written permission (Section 5).

Speaking from experience with preserving films here in North America, I must say it is difficult for me to understand why IFFPA has included Section 7. In the U.S.A. we find that in the case of nitrate film especially, once deterioration begins it can proceed very quickly and consequently the time limits specified in Section 7 seem to be very harmful to the preservation goals already recognized by the Federation in Section 1 and Section 5.

I am also puzzled by the lack of distinction in the draft document between property ownership and the more important rights of public exhibition, of distribution, and of other forms of commercial exploitation. Here in North America we are only too happy to let archives own the physical property of a film while an archive's right to exploit, to exhibit, and to distribute are severely restricted. This distinction between physical ownership and rights seems to be an extremely important one and I urge that it be seriously considered as a point worth incorporating into the IFFPA draft. If such a distinction can be made then there would be little need for the IFFPA to worry about its copyrights (Section 10), or about foreign exhibition (Section 8), or about preservation by copying - an absolute necessity for nitrate and color films (Section 7).

I sincerely trust that these comments are helpful and I am anxious to discuss them and others with you in Paris.

cc: Mr. Pogacic  
Mr. Ledoux

Sincerely yours,  
John B. Kuiper