

F.I.A.F.

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE
DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS
IN TURIN (May 30-31 and June 5, 1975)

CONFIDENTIAL

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

TURIN, May 30 - 31, 1975

Present : MEMBERS

V. Pogacic, President
W. Klaue, Vice-President
J. Kuiper, Vice-President
J. Ledoux, Secretary-General
J. de Vaal, Deputy Secretary-General
J. Stenklev, Treasurer
R. Borde, Deputy Treasurer
Eileen Bowser
R. Daudelin
S. Yelin

RESERVE MEMBERS

I. Molnar

HONORARY MEMBERS

E. Lauritzen
H. Volkmann

In attendance:

B. van der Elst, Executive Secretary

Apologies for absence had been received from Mr Privato, Vice-President, and from Mr Toeplitz, honorary member.

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. Reconfirmation of Observers. Examination of new candidatures
4. Examination of the items on the agenda of the General Meeting
5. Report on the organization and program of the General Meeting
6. Any other business.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

The Executive Committee decided to postpone this item until the next day because the members had received the Minutes of their Amsterdam meeting too late to be able to read them in time for this session.

3. RECONFIRMATION OF THE STATUS OF OBSERVERS. NEW CANDIDATURES

The Secretary-General started the discussion of this item by reading the list of delegates who had announced their participation in the General Meeting, and of the visitors (previously called observers) to the Congress.

The latter were: Mr Pedro Chaskel, Secretary-General of UCAL
 Mrs Isadora de Norden, Cinemateca Distrital de Bogotá
 Mr Sam Kula, National Film Archives of Canada
 Mr Valerio Marino, Istituto Luce, Roma
 Mr Enno Patalas, Münchner Stadtmuseum/Film Abteilung.

Mr Kula would be there to represent the National Film Archives, a department of the Public Archives of Canada, which had submitted its candidature as Observer. In connection with this candidature, Mr Ledoux proposed to discuss first the situation of the Canadian Film Archives which the National Film Archives had taken over. Formally, they were still member of FIAF but, in fact, they had transferred all their collections -partly to the N.F.A. in Ottawa and partly to the Cinémathèque Québécoise - and they had ceased all archival activity since the end of April. FIAF however had not officially been informed of this.

Mr Pogacic and Mr Stenklev thought that the Canadian Film Institute should at least write FIAF a formal letter notifying us of the archive's dissolution before we ceased to consider it as a member. If necessary, the Secretary-General should write Mr Clavel to request such a letter. This was agreed. It was also decided that if there was no answer from Mr Clavel, the C.F.A. would automatically be suspended until the next Executive Meeting.

Coming back to the application of the National Film Archives as Observer, Mr Ledoux said he saw no objection to their admission. All the other members and, in particular, Mr Daudelin, having given their agreement, they were formally accepted as Observer.

The second application as Observer was that of the Cinémathèque Universitaire in Paris. Mr Ledoux reminded the Executive Committee that their case had already been discussed twice. The archive certainly fulfilled all the conditions now required to become an Observer. He therefore strongly recommended their acceptance by the Executive Committee. There being no objections, the Cinémathèque Universitaire was unanimously admitted as Observer in FIAF.

The third candidature was that of the Filmoteca de la Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, directed by Mr Gonzalvez Casanova. Mr Yelin explained that, although this was a small archive, it had an interesting collection of films especially as concerned the history of Mexican cinema. There was no obstacle to their admittance as Observer. The only reservation made was that FIAF now had three Observers in Mexico and that difficulties could eventually arise when one or several of them would ask for the status of Member. At present however, the Executive Committee decided to admit the Filmoteca de la U.N.A.M. as Observer.

Reconfirmation of Observers

The Secretary-General then read out the list of all the archives which had been admitted as Observers in previous years and which, following art. 20 of the Statutes, had to be reconfirmed.

One by one, he briefly commented the situation of the archives in Bois d'Arcy, Buenos Aires, Cairo, Lima, Los Angeles, Lyon, Mexico (I.N.A.H.), Montevideo, Rio de Janeiro and Tehran.

They were all unanimously reconfirmed as Observers.

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

Only a few points on the agenda of the General Meeting gave rise to some discussion. They were:

- Report of the President
- Report of the Documentation Commission
- Report of the Copyright Commission
- Report of the Preservation Commission
- Report of the Treasurer
- Status of Members
- Modification of Rules
- Next General Meeting

a) Report of the President

Mr Pogacic read out the report which he intended to make for the General Meeting. It consisted mainly of a review of the Executive Committee's work during the past year and informed, or brought the attention of the members on the Resolution passed by UNESCO's General Assembly regarding the preservation of moving images. Mr Pogacic thought this Resolution was of such importance for FIAF that the General Meeting should devote a special point of its agenda to its discussion. All the members having agreed, the Secretary-General proposed to modify the agenda accordingly. He also proposed to suppress points 5 and 6 of the agenda (report of the Secretary-General and report of the Treasurer) and to link these reports respectively with "Membership questions" and with "Budget proposal". This was accepted.

Mr Pogacic then explained why he found the UNESCO Resolution important for FIAF and why FIAF should try to play a part in its outcome. There was a good possibility for FIAF to participate in the meeting of experts convened by UNESCO to take place in September 1975 in Berlin (DDR) in order "to draw up a program for the purpose of salvaging and conserving moving images, which might include in particular the following :

- (i) the conduct of studies, in cooperation with the non-governmental organizations concerned and, as necessary, with the competent intergovernmental organizations, on the problem of the destruction of moving images;

- (ii) a study of the desirability of establishing an instrument to protect moving images from being destroyed."

Mr Pogacic, as head of the new IFTC Committee for the Cultural Audio-Visual Heritage, had been asked to propose names for the designation of those experts.

Mr Klaue added that FIAF should, even before the Berlin meeting, inform UNESCO of its official standpoint regarding the Resolution and that the Executive Committee should prepare such a statement already here in Turin.

It was decided to distribute the text of the UNESCO Resolution to all members at the beginning of the General Meeting.

b) Report of the Documentation Commission

Mrs Bowser unofficially informed the Executive Committee that she had obtained a grant of \$15,000 from the National Endowment for the Arts, in favour of the Periodical Indexing Project. She still had to receive a formal confirmation from the N.E.A. but it was 99% certain that we would get this grant in the form of matching funds, which meant that the P.I.P. must have incomes of its own at least equivalent to the amount of money awarded by the N.E.A. The official notification of the grant was expected to arrive in a few weeks.

After this excellent news, Mrs Bowser reported that Frances Thorpe, new editor of the P.I.P. in London, had asked permission to investigate the possibility to move the P.I.P. office in London with St James Press who were moving into new premises in September and apparently had some office space to offer us. The advantages of such a move would be that St James Press might be able to help the editor in the administrative matters or difficulties linked with the day-to-day running of an office. It seemed that the rent of this new office might not be higher than the rent which we would have to pay at the expiry of our present lease (i.e. in September 1976).

However, many uncertainties remained regarding this move : How high would the new rent be ? Would we be able to sub-let our present office for the one year which remained in our lease ? How far would we be linked with SJP in this new location (sub-tenants of SJP or co-tenants in the same building?) What price would SJP ask for administrative help ? How much would the move cost ? All these questions remained unanswered.

The Treasurer, considering that a decision would have to be made before the next Executive Meeting, proposed to appoint a small committee made of the Secretary-General, the Chairman of the Documentation Commission and himself

to investigate the matter thoroughly and inform the Executive Committee of its conclusions by correspondence, or to take a postal vote on the matter. Mr Ledoux however refused to be part of this committee because he said he was already suspected of being against the project and he did not want to be put in a position where he might perhaps have to vote against the other delegates' decision.

Mr Stenklev proposed that some responsible member of the Executive Committee should go to London to investigate the matter but Mr Ledoux feared that, even so, we would still be unsufficiently informed of all the implications of such a move because, as we had learned at great costs when we first moved the P.I.P. to London, the British laws and habits were too different from ours and Frances Thorpe was no more an expert in these matters than any member of the Executive Committee.

Finally, it was decided that the President, the Treasurer, Mrs Bowser and Mrs van der Elst would, after as much inquiry as possible on the conditions of the move, make a decision on the matter and inform the other members of the Executive Committee.

As for the other problems of the Documentation Commission, Mrs Bowser said she had prepared a written report which would be distributed at the General Meeting.

c) Report of the Legal and Copyright Commission

Mr Kuiper reported that there had been no meeting of the Commission this year but that, as regarded contacts with the producers' associations (FIAPF) Mr Ledoux and himself were preparing to have another meeting, just after this Congress, with Mr Gronich and Mr Brisson at their insistent request. Since the delegation of FIAPF would include also their lawyer, Mr Ferrara, it was hoped that Mr Pogacic could participate in this meeting to equilibrate FIAF's side.

Mr Ledoux suggested to have a thorough discussion among the Executive Committee to prepare this meeting because he felt very unsure about the arguments that could or should be used. He said that he personally had always been opposed to renewing the contacts with FIAPF because it would inevitably lead to detailed discussions and perhaps endanger the advantages already acquired by some archives, but they were now forced to hold this meeting. He thought one should, if possible, avoid to discuss the FIAPF "agreement" point by point but rather propose to establish a general declaration of principles. On the other hand, if FIAPF had asked its legal adviser to participate in this meeting, it was most probably with the intention of raising some specific points!

Mr Pogacic agreed not to discuss the "agreement" point by point but he felt that some principal points - which he knew to be of great interest to the producers - should be evoked here. For instance :

- 1) the physical property of the films
- 2) the premises of an archive (number and size of projection halls)
- 3) the diffusion of the archive's holdings outside its premises
- 4) the responsibility of FIAF for its members, in the frame of its Statutes and Rules. Could FIAF control its members in that respect ?

The answer to this last point was 'Yes' in principle, although Mr Ledoux said it was not FIAF's role to play policeman for the producers.

Following Mr Pogacic, the third point was of greater importance for the producers and he wanted to know the members' opinion on this question. He thought that FIAF could accept, on behalf of its members, to prevent the diffusion of the archives' collections outside their premises without the copyright holders' prior consent. Mr Ledoux also said that, with certain limitations, he could accept this point, but Mr Yelin and Mr Daudelin were against it mainly because they were against signing any agreement with FIAPF and also because this clause would be resented by several archives who had already made other arrangements with producers not belonging to FIAPF. Mr Daudelin added that, in his opinion, FIAPF had lost much of its representativity and authority among filmmakers and he did not see why we should take so much precautions with them.

Mr de Vaal thought much preferable that each archive made its own arrangements with its national producers' association rather than have an agreement between FIAF and FIAPF.

Mr Klaue also was against the signature by FIAF of any agreement with FIAPF. He said we could anyway never reach more than a common declaration of principles and, as regarded FIAF, these principles were clearly defined in art. 155 of our Rules, (new art. 116). He added that every archive must also take into account the national laws of its country, that not two archives in FIAF worked under the same conditions, they all had different ways of acquiring their films, different arrangements or contracts with their local distributors or producers and therefore, it would be impossible to come to a detailed agreement.

Mr Stenklev supported this argument and proposed rather to ask the delegates of FIAPF for a declaration on what they expected from the film archives, how they saw their role, their duties and their rights.

Mr Borde reported that, in France, the Centre National de la Cinématographie was precisely preparing a kind of agreement to present to the producers or distributors: a set of rules for the showings made in the cinémathèques (mainly Cinémathèque de Toulouse and Cinémathèque Française) in order to try to fill in the judicial gap until now so much resented by the French producers.

Mr Ledoux and Mr Pogacic, although agreeing that a statement of principles was all that FIAF could accept to undersign, said that probably FIAPF would not be content with that. We had to look at the problem from the point of view of the producers who, until now, were more powerful than us since they could threaten to stop giving us films. FIAF had to be careful in its discussions with their delegates.

Mr Kuiper then summarized the arguments which had been raised until now :

- the great diversity of FIAF members which made it impossible to find a common solution to all their problems and, consequently, the danger to see the Federation split if an "agreement" with FIAPF was forced upon its members;
- the fact that FIAF was more international than FIAPF;
- the fact that socialist countries were not interested in signing a contract with FIAPF (although this argument was more or less questioned by Mr Pogacic and Mr Klaue).

Mr Pogacic repeated that the key problem for the producers was that some archives allowed their films to be shown outside their premises without the copyright holders' prior authorization and he suggested to discuss, at the General Meeting, whether FIAF could or not, undertake to limit the diffusion of their collections, on behalf of its members.

Mr Daudelin was against even discussing this point with the General Meeting. He feared it would create a panic because such an undertaking was clearly an intervention in the internal affairs of some archives for whom FIAPF producers represented only a small percentage of the companies with whom they usually dealt.

Mr Ledoux underlined that this undertaking was already implied in FIAF's Rules since, in Lyon, paragr. c) of art. 141 had been suppressed. The article read as follows :

"Membership of the Federation shall imply willingness on the part of the member to supply on request a copy of any film in its collection, in its best and most complete form, to any other member unless it is specifically prohibited from doing so by undertakings given to the copyright owners, and provided always that he receives satisfactory assurance from the requesting member that the use to be made of the film will not be contrary to the interests of the copyright owners, it being understood that any film so supplied may be used for one or more of the following purposes :

- a) preservation within the member archive
- b) showing on the member's own premises;
- c) showing privately and non commercially to non paying audiences."

On the other hand, if FIAPF really insisted on this specific point, Mr Ledoux thought we might accept it but with certain limitations, e.g. that it be

- only for the producers members of FIAPF
- only for the future and not for the past
- only for the producers who have asked to sign this agreement
- with some facilities for film schools, etc....

After Mr Klaue had repeated that the archives could not go beyond what was foreseen in their national laws as regarded the protection of rights (and he explained that in D.D.R. only public showings were protected and that showings in film schools or film clubs were not considered as public showings), and after Mr Yelin had insisted that FIAF should not sign any agreement whatsoever with FIAPF because their interests and ours could never meet, the President concluded as follows : the three FIAF delegates at their Paris meeting with FIAPF would try to keep the discussion on very general lines. If FIAPF asked very specific questions, the delegates would say they could only answer in a personal capacity and offer to refer the question to the next FIAF General Meeting. This was unanimously agreed.

d) Report of the Preservation Commission

Mr Volkmann reported briefly on the current work of the Preservation Commission which was proceeding with the manual on the preservation of colour films and magnetic records. He also asked for the approval of the Executive Committee on the appointment of two new members in the Commission: Mr Polishko (Gosfilmofond) and Mr Schmitt (Service des Archives du Film / Bois d'Arcy). This was agreed.

e) Relations with other international organizations

It was decided to suppress this item from the agenda of the General Meeting since the relations with FIAPF would be dealt with under "Report of the Copyright Commission", and there was nothing new to report about FIAF's relations with I.C.A. and ICOM.

On this occasion, the agenda of the General Meeting was somewhat modified and it was decided to retype it and redistribute it at the start of the General Meeting.

f) Report of the Treasurer

Mr Stenklev first commented on the accounts of the Federation for 1974, accounts which had already been discussed at the Amsterdam E.C. meeting but which were now presented under the form of a "Balance" and a "Profit & Loss Account". This made it easier to understand the true financial situation of the Federation and showed that the expenses for 1974 had exceeded the income by 294.309,- Belgian francs. This excess of expenses had been covered easily because of the excess of income carried forward from previous years but it was clear that such a situation could not be repeated every year. Mr Stenklev explained that the excess of expenses was mainly due to an unforeseen increase in the cost of the Periodical Indexing Project and the move of the P.I.P. office to London. However, it was now almost certain that the grant from the National Endowment for the Arts would restore the P.I.P.'s fortunes for at least one or two years.

The Treasurer then presented the financial report of FIAF from January 1st to May 22, 1975. There were no special remarks made on these accounts, if only that it already appeared from the "Budget comparison" that the budget made for 1975 would certainly be overdrawn on several items. Therefore, in drafting the budget of the Federation for 1976, Mr Stenklev had been forced to count on a substantial raise of subscriptions from all Members, Associates and Observers, raise which had already been announced last year at the General Meeting. Even so, the proposed amounts for Expenses in 1976 had all been calculated very tightly. There was some discussion about the costs foreseen for "Commission meetings" and "Special Publications" but if one took into account that, in case of necessity, the Treasurer was authorized to transfer sums within the limits of each Chapter, the Executive Committee approved the proposed figures for expenses.

Concerning the budgeted income and, in particular, the amount foreseen for "Editorial fee St James Press - Selling of 2.500 copies of the P.I.P. volume", Mr Ledoux thought the estimation was too high. It would, he said, be more realistic to count on the same quantity of volumes sold as by Bowker in 1974, i.e. 1.000 volumes. If St James Press happened to sell more, so much the better, but we should not base our budget on hopes.

Mr Stenklev answered that he had foreseen this amount following the indication given him by Mr Gough-Yates that the volume was selling very well and that he expected at least 3000 copies to be sold. Mr Stenklev also added that he had wanted to present a balanced budget and that we knew - but without being able to reveal it yet - that we would receive the NEA grant. For all these reasons, he had put down this amount of 27500 copies sold. But Mr Ledoux still thought it was not a realistic way of drafting a budget.

The President then asked the Executive members whether they agreed to submit to the General Meeting the budget prepared by the Treasurer as endorsed by the Executive Committee. It was unanimously agreed except by the Secretary-General who voted against.

g) Modification of the Rules

Mr Ledoux proposed to discuss first the "Voting procedures" drafted by Mr Kuiper and Mr Stenklev. The French translation made in Brussels by Mr Ledoux and Mrs van der Elst was found unsatisfactory and would be corrected, before the start of the General Meeting, by Mr Borde and Mr Daudelin.

The English text however was approved on the condition that the phrase : "Wherever negative votes equal affirmative votes, the motion is lost" be deleted because it was contradictory to article 37 of the new Rules.

As regarded the Rules as such, the Secretary-General proposed to examine only the small modifications which he had brought in after the last Executive meeting, since all the other articles had already been discussed and approved in Amsterdam. These modifications were minor things which had been forgotten in the first draft or not decided upon but which derived from the new Statutes. They were :

Art. 3 : In judging the degree of autonomy Consideration will be given to the following Distinctiveness of its own Board, officers and personnel and of its own Rules;

Art. 16: The Executive Committee shall decide how to settle the commitments of the deleted member towards the Federation and its Affiliates.

Art. 29: The preparations of a General Meetingcomprise : a)....
b) the request for an annual report from all the Affiliates;

Art. 36:

Votes shall be cast by a show of hands except in such cases provided for in the Statutes and Rules, namely: a)... b).... c)election of the Honorary Members;

Art. 49: Before confirming every 5 years the status of Members and Associates, the Executive Committee shall ask the concerned Member or Associate to send, in writing, the informations described in art. 2, paragr. b, e and g of these Rules, together with a declaration concerning the matters evoked in art. 3. Before confirming every year the status of Observers, the Executive Committee shall take into consideration the informations contained in their annual report.

Art. 79:

The financial year will be determined by the Executive Committee

These modifications were all unanimously accepted.

h) Status of Members

All the members had in their files a copy of the letter (annex 1) which the Secretary-General had written to Mr Keith Lucas, director of the British Film Institute, as the Executive Committee had instructed him to do at their Amsterdam meeting. He summarized the sense of this letter as an appeal to the Board of Governors of the B.F.I. and as an opening to further discussion.

He also explained that what he hoped to obtain by these negotiations was a written document clearly defining the relations between the B.F.I. and the National Film Archive. He wondered whether the Executive Committee shared this view. Nobody had any objections.

Mr Ledoux then asked how he should proceed when Mr Lucas answered the letter or if he was approached by some representative of the B.F.I. to discuss this matter. He said he would not seek to meet them but, as he was quite frequently going to London for C.R.B. affairs, it was probable that the question would be evoked. He therefore wondered whether we should not now nominate a small committee to deal with this problem (because he did not want to be alone on this matter) or give him some definite instructions.

Mr Pogacic and Mr Klaue thought it was not urgent to decide now what the Executive Committee would do after they received Mr Lucas's answer, if he answered. That was the task of the next Executive Committee. Mr Borde supported this argument.

Mr Stenklev added that it was the Secretary-General's task to clarify the matter, pick up whatever information he could obtain and transmit them to the Executive Committee which might then appoint a special committee, if necessary, to make the final decision. Mr Ledoux agreed on this.

i) Next General Meeting

There was, as yet, no proposal from any archive to organize FIAF's next General Meeting, although Mr Klaue had some indication that the Bulgarian archive might be ready to organize it. Therefore, Mr Ledoux asked the members whether they thought necessary to hold a General Meeting (or a specialized Congress) next year. With the new Statutes, it was no more an obligation to hold a General Meeting every year and if we had no inviting archive, it would cost FIAF a lot of money.

Mr Stenklev said it was very important that the members should have an opportunity to meet at least once a year. Mr Klaue said that, if we had a candidate to organize the Congress next year, we should accept it. Otherwise, we should cancel it for 1976 but already start to prepare the Congress for the year after. He underlined it was the duty of the Executive Committee to formulate the program of future Congresses well in advance so that they could be prepared carefully. It took more than one year to organize properly a specialized Congress. Mr Daudelin supported this argument and added that it was not enough to entrust the archive, willing to act as host to the Congress, with the task of organizing it completely, even if the E.C. proposed a specialized theme. He thought the E.C. should participate actively in the re-organization of our Congresses, should redefine the frame of our work at the General Meeting and try to arrange meetings where there is more question of cinema and less of administration.

Mr Ledoux suggested that this problem be submitted to the General Meeting but asked that a vote be taken on the question: "Shall we organize a Congress in 1976 or not?" The answer was 'Yes' unanimously, save for Mr Ledoux who abstained.

the last item to discuss was :

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PRECEDING MEETING

The Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting in Amsterdam were unanimously approved.

After Professora Prolo had given some information on the organization of the General Meeting and of the Symposium on PASTRONE AND GRIFFITH which she said would be chaired by Professor Aristarco, the President, Mr Pogacic, thanked the attending members and closed the meeting.

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

TURIN, June 5, 1975

All members of the newly elected Executive Committee were present, except Mr Stenklev and Mr Privato.

Election of new officers

It was unanimously decided to renew the mandates of Mr Klaue, Mr Kuiper and Mr Privato as Vice-Presidents of FIAF, of Mr de Vaal as Deputy Secretary-General and of Mr Borde as Deputy Treasurer. There was some discussion to decide whether Mr de Vaal, who was only a reserve member of the Executive Committee, could still be Deputy Secretary-General but, since nothing in FIAF Rules foresaw such eventuality and since Mr Ledoux explained it was more convenient for him to have the Deputy S.G. in a nearby country, it was agreed to maintain Mr de Vaal in this post.

Relations with FIAPF

Mr Kuiper reported that he had received, this very morning, a phone call from Mr Gronich which very much clarified the motives of FIAPF to come rapidly to an agreement with FIAF. It seemed that the producers' associations were very worried about the implications of the UNESCO Resolution on the preservation of moving images, resolutions which might lead to the extension of statutory deposit, the creation of film archives in every country, etc.... They were also concerned about the new Commission of I.F.T.C. for the Audio-visual Cultural Heritage, presided by Mr Pogacic.

In view of all this, the position of FIAF vs FIAPF now appeared much stronger and it was important to know it when Messrs Pogacic, Kuiper and Ledoux were going to meet the FIAPF representatives in Paris the next day.

Mr Kuiper then proposed to discuss FIAF's position towards legal deposit. He thought that several archives were not interested in such a law but, on the other hand, we agreed that the preservation of the national production was our first duty. Mr Klaue said the archives should not be afraid of a development which they could not foresee. It was true that the spirit of the UNESCO Resolution was, ultimately, to establish the statutory deposit of films but such development would not be reached before long. Therefore, we should not, in our negotiations with FIAPF, declare that we were against it.

Mr Ledoux declared that he, personally, had no interest in perserving national production, often bad. He would much prefer good foreign production. He thought it would be useful to take advantage of our strong position now to discuss better terms with FIAPF which feels there is a menace and is seeking an ally in FIAF. Mr Daudelin however was against our becoming

allies with FIAPF when other producers were becoming friendly to the archives. They might change their minds if we allied with FIAPF.

As regarded the meeting of experts which was going to be held in Berlin to discuss the UNESCO Resolution, Mr Pogacic who had been asked by I.F.T.C. to recommend some names for those experts, asked the Executive Committee to discuss who they thought would be the most suitable persons in the twelve countries which were going to be represented. The E.C. suggested the following:

U.S.A.	John Kuiper	Japan	?
DDR	Wofgang Klaue	Senegal	?
France	Frantz Schmitt	Egypt	Mr Al-Hadary
Canada	Sam Kula	India	Mr Nair
URSS	official delegate of the archival organization	Mexico	Mr Garcia-Borja
FIAF	Jacques Ledoux	Sweden	official delegate of archival organization
I.F.T.C.	Vladimir Pogacic		

Of course, these were only suggestion which UNESCO might accept or not.

Mr Klaue then asked who would prepare the official answer from FIAF to UNESCO concerning the Resolution. It was decided that Mr Klaue, Mr Ledoux and Mr Pogacic would draft it together.

Next General Meeting

Mr Ledoux reported that Mr Garcia-Borja had offered him, only to-day, to organize FIAF's next Congress in Mexico. Because general elections due to be held at the end of 1976 in Mexico might change his position at the archive, Mr Garcia-Borja thought that the spring of 1976 was the only possibility for him to organize a FIAF Congress.

It was therefore decided that, provided Mr Stoyanov-Bigor agreed to postpone the FIAF Congress in Bulgaria until 1977, we should accept Mr Garcia-Borja's invitation. Mr Pogacic agreed to discuss this with Mr Stoyanov-Bigor immediately and to ask both archives to write an official invitation within one month, so that all FIAF members could be informed as soon as possible.

The question now was to decide whether we should organize next year a traditional General Meeting or a specialized Congress. Mr Ledoux thought that we should "take the plunge" and organize something completely new. If the Congress was going to be held in Varna, he proposed a topic for an open Congress, with film showings: 'The influence of Soviet Cinema on the other cinemas'. One would have perhaps 2 half-day symposia and for the rest, projections. He suggested to invite film historians and have about 40 outsiders to whom a fee of \$50 would be asked. A special committee could be appointed to organize the symposia well in advance, publish it in the press, etc.... All the members seemed very interested by this idea.

Mr Pogacic proposed an alternative idea: to invite film specialists from countries where no film archive existed as yet and ask them to explain their situation, but Mr Ledoux feared that such a topic would be as administrative as our usual meetings.

If the Congress was going to be held in Mexico, the situation was of course different. It was therefore decided that the Executive Committee should meet some time in the fall to prepare the next General Meeting. Mr Pogacic proposed to hold this meeting in Belgrade at the end of October. This was unanimously agreed.
