

F.I.A.F.

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE

DES ARCHIVES DU FILM

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

MEXICO (May 21 - 23 and May 27, 1976)

CONFIDENTIAL

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

MEXICO, May 21 - 23, 1976

Present : MEMBERS

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

RESERVE MEMBERS

J. de Vaal
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, from Mrs Puran, from Mr Buache and from Mr Toeplitz.

The President having proposed to invite Mr Garcia-Borja, our Mexican host, to attend the meeting, this was agreed unanimously.

I. 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 - New candidatures of Members and Observers
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 minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting in Belgrade were unanimously approved.

3. RECONFIRMATION OF OBSERVERS. EXAMINATION OF NEW CANDIDATURES

The Secretary-General asked to postpone this item until the next day because, having received certain documents relating to this point only the night before, he was not ready yet to discuss them now.

This was agreed. (See p 7)

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

Pt. I Confirmation of the Status and voting rights of the members present or represented.

Mr Ledoux informed the Executive Committee about the delegates who would attend the Congress and the archives which would not be represented. The latter were the archives of Bucharest, Istanbul, Lisboa, Poona, Pyong Yang, Roma, Tirana, Bois d'Arcy, Cairo, Lyon, Mexico (I.N.A.H.), Montevideo, Paris and Tehran.

The Secretary General also read out the list of Visitors who would attend the meeting.

Pt. 2. Adoption of the agenda of the General Meeting

The Executive Committee examined the draft agenda of the General Meeting and, at the request of the Treasurer who thought that the financial report (Pt 15) should be delivered before the report of the specialized Commissions, decided that Pt 15 would remain in the Seventh Session but that the Treasurer would participate, budget in hand, in the discussions about the specialized Commissions since their activities very often depended on the financial possibilities of the federation.

Pt 4 "Opening speech by Mexican authority" was put at the beginning of the first session, and Pt 6 "Relations with UCAL" was postponed until the third session (Open Forum) in order to give more time to the Latin-American delegates attending for the first time a General Meeting to get acquainted with FIAF before this discussion took place.

Mr Yelin then gave a short survey of the plans for the Symposium on Latin-American cinema to be held at the sixth session and about the speakers who would participate in it.

Pt.7. Report of the specialized Commissions

a) Preservation Commission

Mr Volkmann had distributed a written report on the activities of the Preservation Commission.

Asked to comment on it, he repeated that the main and most urgent problem which the Commission met at present, was the extreme slowness with which the National Film Archive in London was revising the English translation of the chapters on colour-preservation which had now been in their hands for 16 months with the result that only one chapter out of six had been checked, in spite of the repeated reminders of Mr Volkmann to Mr Harold Brown. Considering that "the conduct of the N.F.A. had met with strong criticism on the part of the scientists who had, without any obligation to FIAF, completed their work for this manual, and considering that such an attitude within international cooperation could not be tolerated, that the N.F.A. alone deserved to be blamed for the fact that the urgently required publication on colour-preservation could not, as planned, be sent to the archives in 1975 but not before 1977," Mr Volkmann strongly requested the Executive Committee to replace Mr Harold Brown by Mr Karnstädt (DDR) as member of the Commission.

Mr Ledoux thought that this proposal was too severe a blame on Mr Brown, especially since his personal responsibility in this matter was not clearly proved. Mr Pogacic, Mr de Vaal and Mr Stenklev, while saying that they could understand Mr Volkmann's angry attitude, also agreed with Mr Ledoux and said that the other members of the Preservation Commission should support the proposal to expel Mr Brown from the Commission before the Executive Committee could come to a decision.

Mr Volkmann having agreed to consult these members by letter as soon as possible and to report to the Executive Committee, it was also decided that Mr David Francis would be asked to explain his point of view on the matter here in Mexico, before the General Meeting, since the N.F.A. was clearly implicated in the Preservation Commission's written report due to be distributed to all members.

Concerning the publication of the Preservation Manual, Mr Klaue recommended to look for a commercial publisher (e.g. Burt Franklin in New York) since this Manual certainly offered some commercial interest.

Mr Ledoux agreed but said we should first publish it in form of a draft, as for the Cataloguing Manual, and Mr Volkmann explained that the Commission had planned to make first a very limited edition (\pm 200 copies) of the original text of the experts who would then possibly revise it in order to make it more accessible to the various preservation technicians in the archives.

After that, it could be published more widely on a commercial basis, bound together with the already published Manual on the preservation of black and white films.

Mr Kuiper concluded by saying that this discussion should lead the Executive Committee to think further, in a more general sense, on the type of help which the Federation could or should offer to the specialized Commissions and various experts working for FIAF when such problems as the final publication of their studies arose. These problems (choice of experts having or not the means to travel, cost of preparatory meetings, translations, choice of publisher, etc...) were, at the bottom, mainly financial and it seemed that at present we were not quite prepared to meet the challenge.

That situation should not go on and Mr Kuiper urged the Executive Committee to take it into consideration if FIAF wanted to develop its action and its help to the archives.

b) Documentation Commission

Mrs Bowser at first briefly commented on the written report which she had prepared for the General Meeting.

Regarding the FIAF summer school on film documentation due to be held in Copenhagen in 1977, she asked for some financial help of FIAF to organize it and especially to pay part of the staying cost of some members of the Documentation Commission as teaching staff for the school. This amounted to \pm 35.000 BF. The Executive Committee agreed.

The Treasurer also agreed to finance the meeting of the Documentation Commission in Copenhagen just before the Summer School.

Mrs Bowser then raised the question of the Periodical Indexing Project and the new problem created by the fact that St James Press had now declared its unwillingness to continue publishing the volume unless (1) the sales for the 1974 volume substantially increased in the next few months and/or (2) we agreed to add the nonfilm periodicals to those now being indexed, which the publisher felt would greatly increase the sales potential of volume to general libraries. The commission however felt that to do this would add \pm 100.00 BF to the cost of the project and St James Press said that FIAF should assume those supplementary costs.

To explain the background of the present situation, apparently in a dead-lock, Mrs Bowser had distributed to all members of the Executive Committee copies of the correspondence exchanged between her, the Treasurer and Kevin Gough-Yates as representative of S.J.P.

St James Press' only alternative solution was to pay us only £ 1500 as editorial fee instead of £ 2000 as agreed in the contract.

Mrs Bowser also said that she had contacted another publisher in New-York and that they would possibly agree to publish the P.I.P. volume and pay us royalties of 15% of net sales, with an advance of \approx 1500.

To summarize her report, Mrs Bowser said we now had before us three choices:

- 1°) to add the indexing of the non-film periodicals at a supplementary cost for FIAF of \pm £ 1200
- 2°) not to add the non-film periodicals and get a reduced fee from S.J.P.
- 3°) go to another publisher

Mr Stenklev confirmed the informations given by Mrs Bowser. He added that until now, all the contacts and negotiations with S.J.P. had been done through Kevin Gough-Yates and not directly with the director George Walsh. Therefore, it might be that Mr Walsh was not of the same opinion as Mr Gough-Yates and we should negotiate with him before taking any decision. As for the immediate future, he saw no other solution than to accept the reduced fee of £ 1500 proposed by St J. Press for the publication of the 1975 volume and at the same time start negotiations with the other publisher in New-York.

He also said that, as regarded financial support from FIAF to the project, there would be no great difficulties for the year 1976 but certainly for 1977 and FIAF could not afford to subsidize the P.I.P. more than it had done until now. The other commissions also needed FIAF's support.

Mr Klaue having asked if the offer made by the New-York editor would cover the costs of the project, Mrs Bowser said she reckoned that we would get approximately the same payment as from St J. Press but later, since it was based on royalties.

Mr Ledoux thought that we had until now considered the problem from a wrong angle. What really was important for the archives in this project was the cards and not so much the volume. He reminded that, in the beginning, the volume had been presented as having a double advantage : financing of the project and prestige for FIAF. In his opinion, this double aim was far from being reached. He even felt that it was, because of the volume, that FIAF had been driven into all these expenses and, as regarded prestige, the selling of 1000 volumes could not be considered as very significant. Mr Ledoux therefore wondered if one could not abandon the printing of the annual volume and make only the cards (which, he insisted, were extremely precious for the archives), but perhaps in some cheaper way.

On the other hand, if the Executive Committee decided to have the volume published, he insisted that we should send now an ultimatum to St James Press saying : "either you print the 1975 volume and pay us £ 2000 or you return immediately the material which has already been handed over to you."

Mr Borde agreed with Mr Ledoux that, for his archive, the P.I.P. cards were essential and not so much the volume. Mr Stenklev however said that the volume also was useful for his archive and he did not think that to abandon its publication would very much reduce the costs of the project. That could only be calculated with the help of Ms Thorpe and with the P.I.P. accounts in hands but he reckoned, and so did Mrs Bowser, that the difference could not be more than the editor's salary for one month. But Mr Ledoux thought we should re-think the system entirely and perhaps imagine another form of indexing, less precise, less demanding on the part of the editor and therefore cheaper. For instance, he reminded the members about the system of indexing on sheets of paper as was done until 1972. And each archive could retype in its own way the information received. Or, another possible solution could be a cooperative system, which meant : at the cost of the interested archives only.

Mrs Bowser replied that :

- 1° the only archive where cards are at present retyped is Brussels. All the other archives use the cards received from London.
- 2° cards take a lot of space and, when the annual volume arrives, they can, if necessary, be thrown away.
- 3° it is more economical to pay for one typist in London than for a supplementary typist in each of the archives to retype the information received.

Mr Yelin supported the arguments of Mrs Bowser. He added that, for the archives in developing countries, the volume was very important.

To conclude, it was decided that a registered letter signed by the President would be sent as an ultimatum to Mr George Walsh requesting him either to respect the contract which he had signed only one year ago or to return to our London office the material already delivered to them, and give them a delay of two weeks. In case they decided to return the material, Mrs Bowser was authorized to continue her negotiations with the New-York publisher and have the new contract signed by the President and the Treasurer of FIAF.

Mr Stenklev also said he would, in the very next days, examine as carefully as possible what would be the financial consequences for FIAF of the possible abandon of the volume.

Mrs Bowser having said she expected a telegram from Frances Thorpe about a meeting she was going to have in London with George Walsh on the next day, it was also decided to rediscuss the matter, if necessary, at the next Executive Meeting immediately after the Congress.

c) Cataloguing Commission

Mr Klaue said he had no comments to make at present on his written report. He only asked for the authorization to organize a meeting of the Cataloguing Commission in the fall in Belgium, in order to complete the almost finished work on the Dictionary of Filmographic Terms. This was agreed.

d) Copyright Commission

Mr Kuiper reported that the Copyright Commission had not met this year but that all its members had attended the UNESCO experts' meeting in Berlin. But he also said that he had some doubts as to the necessity for this Commission to continue. In a sense the Commission only duplicated the work that the full Executive Committee was really taking care of.

Secondly, the Commission was sometimes divided because it tended to be forced into taking positions on points where again the whole Executive Committee should express its opinion.

Thirdly, when it met vis-à-vis FIAPF, it handled matters in which there were no clear resolutions and Mr Kuiper found this situation very frustrating.

As Mr Pogacic insisted that the talk of the Copyright Commission, which at present had only 3 members (Mr Kuiper, Mr Klaue and Mr Ledoux), was to present the Executive Committee with some ideas and concrete proposals as a basis for discussion, and at least with its programme for the next year as did the other Commissions, Mr Ledoux explained why the Commission which, at the start, had very sincerely tried to understand and look how the archives could make use of the extremely complex copyright law, had little by little been entrusted only with the relations FIAF-FIAPF and, more recently, been concerned with the questions raised by the UNESCO Resolution.

These problems were now so important and essential for FIAF that the Copyright Commission, as it first was formed, had not much sense anymore.

However, Mr Ledoux felt that it should not be dissolved but continue on another basis, e.g. only if an urgent problem arose, or on certain occasions such as the UNESCO meeting.

Mr Klaue also said why he would not want to liquidate the Commission. There were still several problems which it needed to examine and which the Executive Committee did not have the time to handle.

I° Based on its Resolution, UNESCO will continue to examine the necessity to establish an international instrument on film preservation. In view of this, FIAF must be prepared to explain its own problems and its position, e.g. on legal deposit which will raise a lot of legal problems.

2° Negotiations with FIAPF. We must be prepared to possibly offer them our contract, if they ask for it.

3° The legal situations of film archives in different countries. We should request our members to explain the position of their archive on legal deposit, film showings, etc... We will need this for our future discussions with UNESCO.

Of course, these were all long term problems, but the Copyright Commission should start examining them.

Mr Pogacic having reminded that the UNESCO Resolution raised also many other important problems, it was decided to postpone the discussion on the survival of the Copyright Commission until after the discussion, at the General Meeting, of this Resolution and also of the relations with FIAPF.

THIRD SESSION

May 22

As decided the day before, the President opened the discussion on Pt 3 of the E.C. agenda.

3. RECONFIRMATION OF OBSERVERS. NEW CANDIDATURES OF MEMBERS AND OBSERVERS.

The Secretary-General made a short report on the present situation of each of the FIAF Observers.

Bois d'Arcy

Mr Ledoux read out a letter of Mr Schmitt dated 4 February 1976, in which he said that the Service des Archives du Film was considering applying to FIAF as Member and asking what was the procedure to follow. Although the Secretariat had immediately answered this letter, it had as yet received no further news from Bois d'Arcy. Mr Schmitt was not going to attend the Congress of Mexico. Meanwhile, the Executive Committee agreed to reconfirm the Service des Archives du Film as Observer.

Buenos-Aires

Cinemateca Argentina was in arrears of payment of its subscription to FIAF for more than 2 years. It was decided that, unless Mr Fernandez Jurado could pay at least part of his debts here in Mexico, the Treasurer would send him a registered letter giving the archive 3 months' delay for payment, after which it would have to be deleted from the Federation.

Cairo

Al-Archive Al-Kawmy Lil-film was unanimously reconfirmed as Observer.

Lima

The problem here was the same as for the Cinemateca Argentina, and therefore Cinemateca Universitaria del Peru was reconfirmed pending the payment, within the next 3 months, of its subscriptions in arrears.

Los Angeles

The UCLA Film Archive seemed to be developing quite satisfactorily. It was unanimously reconfirmed in its status of Observer.

Lyon

Mr Borde reported that, very recently, the town of Lyon and the State Secretariat for Cultural Affairs had bought the Château-lumière and had given it to the Comité de Fondation du Musée du Cinéma de Lyon (for 2/3) and to the Fondation Nationale de la Photographie (for 1/3). The situation was therefore much better for the Musée du Cinéma and the Executive Committee unanimously decided to reconfirm it as Observer.

Mexico

Cinemateca del I.N.A.H. would not be represented at the Congress but, as its situation as regarded FIAF remained unchanged, it was decided to reconfirm it as Observer.

Montevideo

Cine Arte del Sodre was also reconfirmed as Observer.

Paris

The Secretary General deplored having had no contact whatsoever with the Cinemathèque Universitaire since their admission in FIAF, in spite of the proximity between Paris and Brussels.

They had not sent an annual report.

Mr Borde also regretted this lack of information but said that his archive however had many contacts with the Cinemathèque Universitaire and that it seemed to be developing quite normally. He said he would talk to Mr Beylie about their cooperation with FIAF.

Meanwhile, the Cinemathèque Universitaire was reconfirmed in its status of Observer.

So were the archives in Rio de Janeiro and Tehran.

New candidatures

There were three applications for the status of Observer.

1° Association for a National Film and Television Archive (Sydney)

Mr Ledoux reminded the members that this organization had been created somehow to bring pressure to bear on the Australian Government to establish a strong central film archive.

Both Mr Vellacott (National Library of Australia) and Mr Toeplitz, whom the S.G. had consulted, were favourable to their admittance in FIAF as Observers.

Although they were not themselves an archive, Mr Ledoux supported their candidature. So did Mr de Vaal. After Mr Klaue and Mr Kuiper had asked and received some supplementary information about the cooperation existing between the candidate and the National Library of Australia, the Association for a National Film and Television Archive was unanimously accepted.

2° Korean Film Archive Incorporated Foundation (Seoul)

All the members had received some weeks ago a file containing all the necessary documents for the candidature as Observer of this film archive in South Korea.

Mr Ledoux reported that the first contacts he had with the organization dated from 1971 and that since then, he had sporadically been advised that they would apply to FIAF but only now had this intention materialized. Having found it quite correct and in order with our Rules, and also because they had quite a big production which ought to be preserved, Mr Ledoux recommended to the Executive Committee to accept this archive as Observer.

Mr Klaue said that we already had a Korean member (Pyong Yang) in the Federation. The intention of the Pyong Yang Government being to unite the country and to have only one film archive, Mr Klaue knew from his conversations with our member there that they felt it to be against their interests to have the archive of Seoul in FIAF, and he thought that we should at least ask Pyong Yang for their opinion about this case. Meanwhile, he was not in favour of the acceptance of the South-Korean archive.

Mrs Bowser replied that she did not understand how the admission of Seoul was against the interests of the Pyong Yang archive. Whatever might happen in the future, we were at present dealing with two countries. She also said that she could not see such political principles entering the decisions of the Executive Committee. Who knew in what country next this might come up and she thought it could be the end of FIAF if we began to make this kind of decisions.

In Belgrade, in the case of the negative vote on South-Africa, she did see a practical reason because if we accepted the archive of Pretoria, we would have lost much more on the other side. But was it really true that we would lose Pyong-Yang if we accepted Seoul? That was not clear to her.

Mr Pogacic, who had had in Belgrade just before the Congress the visit of the North-Korean ambassador, said that of course they opposed Seoul's candidature for the same reasons as given by Mr Klaue, but personally the President felt that we could not enter here into political discussions. It would be the end of FIAF which until now had very wisely avoided such kind of discussions even in the worst period of cold war.

Mr Borde said he agreed with the President. Political sympathies were one thing and the interest of FIAF was another thing, more important. In the history of FIAF, we could see that it had been able to unite and make to cooperate Israël and Egypt, D.D.R. and B.R.D., both Berlins, etc..., for the better interest of film preservation.

Therefore, he thought we should accept the candidature of Seoul.

Mr de Vaal strongly supported these arguments.

Mr Kuiper said he had heard that South-Korea was interested in joining FIAF but he wanted to underline that his archive had not in any way sponsored this application. However, politics being put aside, he was pleased to see the dossier which accompanied this candidature and which showed they were sincere in trying to save their film production and had gone a long way in getting the technical equipment to do this and develop their expertise. Their films, as national production, were interesting.

Mr. Kuiper thought that, in the same way as the interest of the Federation had developed film archives in many other developing countries, it had also sponsored this application. These were the principles we stood for : the development of film culture, of film art, across political boundaries. To refuse those would therefore be a very serious matter. FIAF was until now basically a non-political organization and we could not afford to turn back from that position.

Mr. Yelin however felt that there were times when a political discussion could not be avoided. It was life which dictated this, beyond our intentions. There were strong political positions which separated, even the members of FIAF in two parties following different ideologies and options of life and this could not be put aside completely. Even to say: "We don't want political discussions in FIAF" was a political position. Mr Yelin did not want to insist on this but said he would vote against the admission of the archive of Seoul.

Of course, replied Mr Pogacic, we do lead here a policy, but it is the policy of FIAF : political neutrality; collaboration among our members. That is the only platform which can keep us alive.

Mr Ledoux then reported about his visit to Moscow a few days before. He had met there with Mr Privato and some representatives of Goskino who had also told him that Seoul's candidature did not have their agreement.

They feared it would bring some difficulties with North-Korea. The Secretary General had then reminded them about their own vote in favour of the Albanian candidature some years ago, about the co-existence in FIAF of Israël and Egypt, of both Berlins, etc..., about the admission of Cuba with the help of U.S. votes in a moment of great tension between those two countries, and he had mainly underlined the great danger for the Federation to introduce this kind of political criterias in the admission of new archives, criterias which could possibly some day round on their own interests.

It was true that all the decisions which we took were political but we should try to keep FIAF apart from the ideological, political movements which may confront us.

Mr Yelin having said that we should not, at the Executive Committee where we knew each other so well, hide our opinions and avoid to have from time to time political discussions when there was a problem which, beyond strict matters of preservation, concerned the culture in a broader sense. Mr Ledoux said he felt this to be extremely dangerous for FIAF whose aims were above all to encourage the preservation of films, of any films, even if their ideology was sometimes totally opposed to that of all our members (e.g. nazi films).

Here is now an archive (Seoul) which simply asks to become Observer, which seeks to preserve its national production completely unknown to us. Our duty is to say : "Go ahead. We shall help you." And Mr Ledoux concluded by saying he thought it was also in the interest of North-Korea.

Mr Yelin answered that he agreed all films should be preserved but that South-Korea was for him an extreme case which had nothing to do with the other examples cited before.

Mr Stenklev said that most opinions had now been brought forward, and it was time to come to a vote. To him, the case was very simple. Korea was once one country but it was now divided in two countries since 1952, which was quite a long time, and we could only take the present situation into consideration.

Seoul's application is, according FIAF's Statutes and Rules, perfectly in order and we must therefore come to a decision and vote on it.

Mr Pogacic then asked to vote by a show of hands, on the admission as Observer of the Korean Film Archive Incorporated Foundation, with the following results :

For :	6
Against :	2
Abstentions :	3

3° Cinémathèque Nationale Populaire et Musée du Cinéma (Brazzaville)

All the members had in their files a dossier provided by the applicant, as requested by our Rules.

The Secretary-General explained that he had, some months ago, had the visit of a delegation from this new organization which appeared to be, as yet, only very small and having as main object the creation of a film-projection network throughout the Congo, due to the fact that their national production was practically inexistent and that the foreign films could never remain in the country. Therefore, their main wish in joining FIAF was probably to obtain films for showings.

However, Mr Ledoux strongly supported their application as Observer 1°) because it was our first candidature in black Africa, and 2°) because several of the present FIAF members, actively committed in film preservation, had started in almost the same way as Brazzaville. Mr Pogacic and Mr Kuiper both supported Mr Ledoux' arguments. A vote was then taken on the admittance as Observer of the Cinémathèque Nationale Populaire and it was unanimously accepted.

Membership questions in general

Mr Ledoux then said he would like the Executive Committee to discuss a more general problem about membership.

He felt that there was, for the moment, a certain movement to transform film archives into film institutes, perhaps only by name, but perhaps sometimes more profoundly, and he cited the examples of Lisbon, Istanbul, Prague whose last organigram was not in agreement with FIAF Rules. The case of Stockholm also had never really been solved.

He reminded the members that, from its next meeting onwards, the Executive Committee would have to re-examine the status of all the members and therefore, he thought we should discuss now the problems raised here above, the procedure to follow (chronological order ?), and the degree of severity which should be adopted when applying this new Article of the Statutes (art. 9)

We should also have in mind possible new candidatures for membership (e.g. Bois d'Arcy which had been asked to provide a detailed report regarding its autonomy vs. the C.N.C.); we could not be very strict with those and on the other hand accept that some old members did not respect the same rules. We must be consistent.

Mr Ledoux also said he did not want to start a series of wars between the Executive Committee and some FIAF members but nevertheless, he strongly believed in the wisdom of art. 3 (autonomy) and felt that the re-examination of the members' status could lead us to obtain certain changes for the better interest of those same members, as had happened in London.

Mr Klaue thought that the cases cited by the S.G. (Istanbul, Prague, Stockholm) presented no serious problems. Not all "institutes" were bad for FIAF.

He also agreed that the Executive Committee should use the chronological order in dealing with its re-examination.

Mr Kuiper thought it was difficult to continue this discussion without any concrete questions. We should first write to our 8 oldest members: New-York, London, Brussels, Copenhagen, Milano, Prague, Stockholm and Warsaw, asking them for the information described in art. 49 and leave it then to the new Executive Committee to decide.

This was agreed.

New candidatures

Mexico : Cineteca Nacional and Filmoteca de la UNAM

The Secretary-General proposed to link the discussion on both those candidatures he felt that the Mexican problem should be seen as a whole and because the two candidates, although very different, had many interfering points. All the members of the Executive had received the candidates' application dossier. Formally, they were both quite correct. The Secretary-General however felt embarrassed because he found the situation very unclear.

Cineteca Nacional, whose director was Mr Garcia Borja and was supported by the Mexican government, seemed a very wealthy archive and their film collection, although very recent, was already quite impressive.

But the fact that Mr Garcia Borja was at the same time head of the archive and Director-General de la Cinematografia (which gave him the power to decide on film production, distribution and even censorship in Mexico) made Mr Ledoux rather doubtful on the autonomy of the archive. He also wondered whether, after the general elections due to be held in June in Mexico, Mr Garcia Borja would remain at the head of the archive and, if not, whether the archive itself would not be suppressed.

As for the Filmoteca de la Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, it was a much smaller but more ancient archive than the Cineteca. Its director, Mr Gonzalez Casanova, also directed a Center of Cinematographic Studies, which had published some interesting works, and a film school.

Mr Ledoux asked then Mr Yelin to explain his views on the problem of those joint candidatures.

Mr Yelin first underlined that Mexico City had 11 million inhabitants which gave room for different types of filmarchives. The government changed every 6 years and the last sextenial had seen a big development of the cinema industry in Mexico. The government had given strong structures to the national film production and distribution and had, in this frame, also created the Cineteca Nacional. It was only for those reasons that the head of the archive was at the same time Director-General de la Cinematografia.

Mr Yalin felt that those strong structures allowed to have faith in the future of Mexican film production and led him to believe that a change of government would not endanger the life of the Cineteca.

The Filmoteca de la UNAM had, on the other hand, a quite different role to play since it emanated from the University.

Unlike many other countries, universities in Latin-America were very powerful, autonomous bodies which also led a quite autonomous cultural life and, although the Filmoteca's film collection and its financial means could not be compared to those of the Cineteca, it had done some excellent work in the field of preservation and study of the old Mexican cinema and in the education of new Mexican filmmakers. Therefore, Mr Yelin strongly supported the candidatures of both archives.

Mr Borde having asked if the two candidates did collaborate in their work, Mr Yelin replied that it was difficult to answer but, as far as he knew, there was some collaboration and anyway a good relationship between the two directors.

Mr Klaue then asked if the Filmoteca de la UNAM worked on a national level and Mr Yelin replied that it clearly did so. They were related to several other universities all over the country.

Mr Kuiper said he was very much in favour of the part taken by universities in the development of film preservation. National archives being very busy in their day to day work of acquiring and preserving films, showing them, dealing with producers, etc ..., they could not do as much work as they should in the field of film history, aesthetics, theory, etc... but universities could help them in that task and FIAF should encourage this. Therefore, Mr Kuiper felt that, in the real sense, a university involved in film archive work and especially film study was a body that should join FIAF in the Associate category, its specialized subject being somehow the cinematographic education of people.

The fact for our only present Associate to be alone in his category was a source of great discontent and brought discredit on the Associate status in general among possible candidates, whereas this category could be a source of great strength for the Federation, and we should re-evaluate it.

In his view, Filmoteca de la UNAM fitted very well in the Associate category, and we should propose this as an alternative to Mr Gonzalez-Casanova.

Mr Pogacic did not agree with this proposal because he found that the Filmoteca did not correspond to the definition of Associates given in art. 5 of the Statutes. He rather supported the idea of accepting both archives as Members, because of the Mexican context which allowed the co-existence of two very different bodies with different aims and different financial resources.

Mr Ledoux said he still found the situation unclear and reminded that one of the formalities required by the Rules still had to be accomplished, i.e. a visit to the preservation facilities of the candidates. He also insisted that both Mr Garcia-Borja and Mr Casanova be requested to give more information on the autonomy of their archive.

Since it was impossible for lack of time, to make those visits before the Congress, the decision about the admittance of the Mexican candidates to full membership must be deferred to the next Executive Committee which would meet just after the Congress.
This was unanimously agreed.

Ottawa : National Film Archives

All the members had in their files a copy of the letter which, following the decision taken in Belgrade, Mr Ledoux had written to Mr Kula asking him to join to his application for membership a new declaration of collaboration with the Cinémathèque Québécoise.

They also had copies of the correspondence which had followed, and especially a letter from the President of the Cinémathèque Québécoise (dated April 22, 1976) in which he said that the Board of the Cinémathèque had found premature the signing of a letter of collaboration between the two archives and had asked Mr Daudelin to recommend to the Executive Committee to reconfirm the National Film Archives in their status of Observer, at least for another year.

The President then gave the word to Mr Daudelin who explained in detail how his Board had been led to write such a letter although he himself, after several a meeting with Mr Kula in order to draft a declaration of collaboration which would be acceptable to his Executive Committee, had assured Mr Kula only two weeks before that final approval by the full committee was only a formality. In fact, the Board had decided to momentarily refuse its approval because the heads of the Canadian Institute (Ottawa) had strongly advised them to do so. The reason for this was that they were very dissatisfied with the way in which the N.F.A. respected the contract signed with them in October 1974 and also because it appeared that the N.F.A. still had not been granted an autonomous budget and was at present financed by special funds of the Public Archives.

The Secretary-General felt that the problem was very clear. Art. II of our Rules said that "an applicant to membership was required to present a declaration of collaboration countersigned by the existing Member in his country. Only the Executive Committee is authorized to relieve the applicant of this obligation". The question was now to decide whether we should trust the Cinémathèque Québécoise's opinion and therefore follow their advice, or if we should not and then continue to discuss N.F.A.'s candidature.

Mr. Kuiper, supported by Mr Pogacic, said that we could not interfere in the internal affairs of the Canadian archives and that it was even dangerous for us to impose our solution without the agreement of our Member. We should first encourage the two archives to settle their difference and then to come back to us. This was unanimously agreed. Mr Kula would be informed that the Executive Committee had not examined the candidature of his archive because he had not submitted all the required documents and that it was therefore postponed. Mr Daudelin added that he thought this situation was very temporary as there was no major obstacle to its clarification.

Membership : other problems.

Mr Fioravanti (Cinteca Nazionale in Rome) had written two letters successively to the Secretariat (who had forwarded it to the Treasurer) and to the Executive Committee asking permission for the C.N. to pay 2000 Swiss francs instead of 2500 SF as subscription for 1976 because of financial difficulties due mainly to the fall of the lira in Italy. As the Treasurer had answered negatively to his request, he was now addressing himself directly to the E.C.

All the members agreed that it was impossible to grant a reduction of fee to the Cineteca Nazionale while all the members, and especially the other Italian members, suffered more or less the same difficulties, but it was decided that the Secretary-General would explain to Mr Fioravanti that he could pay the additional 500 SF with a certain delay which could even reach two years if necessary.

Coming back to the examination of the items on the agenda of the General Meeting, the President proposed to discuss :

Pt 8. Organisation of the Congress in Varna

Mr Ledoux reported on the visit which he had made in March in Sofia and Varna, together with Mrs Bowser, to start organizing with Mr Stoyanov-Bigor FIAF's next Congress in Varna. He had been very disappointed by the projection facilities in Varna and wondered, in spite of Mr Stoyanov-Bigor's assurances that all the problems could be settled, if it would be possible to hold a Congress open to a broader public than usual, as it had been our intention. Considering that this Congress would be the first of its kind, we could not afford to let it be a failure. Mr Ledoux therefore proposed to limit the attendance at the Congress to FIAF's affiliates and to some experts and historians whose travel and stay would be paid for either by the Bulgarian archive, by the Soviet authorities or by FIAF.

Mrs Bowser had reached the same conclusion as Mr Ledoux after her visit to Varna. She felt it would not be wise for FIAF to organize a large congress in such conditions.

Anyway, it was decided to wait for the arrival of Mr Stoyanov-Bigor in Mexico before taking any firm decision since he had announced he would come with some concrete proposals. As for the program of the Symposium, it would be discussed at a special meeting of the Varna Program Committee and the Executive Committee on the following day.

Pt 9. Projects and publications

a) FIAF Summer School in Berlin

Mr Klauw had distributed a written report on the organization of the next Summer School for archive personnel to be held in Berlin next August.

He also had 4 requests to make to the Executive about this Summer School.

1°) Could he accept participants from outside FIAF? He had two applications and proposed to ask for the approval of the member archive in the applicant's country. This was unanimously agreed, as long as priority was given to FIAF applicants.

2°) Could FIAF pay £ 50,- for the travel costs of one interpreter from England? This was agreed.

3°) Could the Secretariat prepare some certificates to deliver to the participants at the end of the School? The answer was yes.

4°) Could this certificate be presented to the participants either by the President or the Secretary-General? Mr Pogacic agreed to go to Berlin for the close of the Summer School.

b) Catalogue of silent feature films in the members' collections

Mr Ledoux reported that the Cinémathèque in Brussels had almost finished its work on this project which would be ready for publication before the end of this year. The cheapest way of publication for the very small quantity of copies which was needed was to have it typewritten and then xeroxed and bound (estimated price : 60.000,- Belgian francs) This was agreed.

It was also decided that no more than one copy per participating archive would be printed.

c) Bibliography of FIAF members' publications

The National Film Archive of Canada proposed to take over the annual publication of this bibliography which, until 1974, had been done by the Canadian Film Archives. It was unanimously agreed to accept this proposal.

Pt 10. Open Forum

The members agreed that the only point under this heading which should be discussed beforehand by the Executive Committee was :

Relations with FIAPF

All the members had in their files copies of the letters written by the Secretary-General to Mr Brisson following the decision taken in Belgrade and of Mr Brisson's answer (annexes I & 2). There was also copy of a letter from Mr Brisson to Mr Pogacic in which he seemed to assume that Mr Ledoux' letter only reflected his personal opinion and that he was alone responsible for the deadlock in which the negotiations now were. Mr Ledoux vigorously protested to Mr Pogacic because he had not rectified Mr Brisson's assertion and had not even informed Mr Ledoux about this letter.

Mr Pogacic said he had not answered Mr Brisson's letter because he had no mandate from the E.C. to negotiate with him. Mr Ledoux repeated that he would resign from the FIAF-FIAPF committee if such things should happen again.

Coming back to the heart of the matter, everyone agreed that the letter written by the Secretary-General to Mr Brisson (annex I) clearly expressed the Executive Committee's opinion and that there was no possibility whatsoever to come to terms with FIAPF in the way they wanted it. A letter in this sense, signed by the President of FIAF, should again be written to Mr Brisson after discussion at the General Meeting in order to express the unanimous feeling of FIAF members that FIAF cannot come to a detailed agreement with FIAPF but would be ready to sign a joint statement of fundamentals.

If it so wishes, FIAPF is free to submit to each individual archive a more specific agreement. But Mr Klaue made reservations about this last point and it was agreed not to mention it as FIAPF could take advantage of this permission to impose it on some weaker archive.

Mr Klaue also suggested that the Executive Committee prepare a draft "general declaration of principles" in case FIAPF accepted our proposal. This should be one of the first tasks of the next Executive Committee.

Pt 15. Financial report and budget proposal

The accounts and balance sheet for 1975 had been sent out beforehand to all members, together with the budget proposal for 1977 and the accounts for the first term of 1976.

The Treasurer, Mr Stenklev, first commented on the Profit and Loss Accounts for 1975. The picture was much brighter this year than last year because we had been favoured by a much better rate of exchange, the subscriptions had been raised and, most of all, the P.I.P. had momentarily been put on its feet again by the N.E.A. grant of \$ 15.000,-. Therefore, the excess of income for 1975 added to the excess of income carried forward from previous years came up to 982.356,- Belgian francs.

Coming back to the problems of the P.I.P., Mr Stenklev said he had tried to figure out the sums which could be saved by not publishing the cumulative volumes anymore, and he had come to the conclusion that there was very little if anything to gain by doing so. On the other hand, Mrs Bowser had received the day before a cable from Ms Thorpe who reported on her meeting with Mr Walsh, Director of St James Press. The latter had informed her that Mr Gough-Yates had been fired and that St James Press wished to continue publishing the Periodical Indexing volume under the same contract terms as before.

Therefore, both Mrs Bowser and Mr Stenklev thought it advisable for us to stay with St James Press.

However, if the project was safe for 1976, due to the remnants of the N.E.A. grant, it was not so for 1977 and if we did not have a better sale, the subsidy from FIAF to the project would then amount to half a million Belgian Francs.

This was too high. Mr Stenklev proposed that at least 200.000 BF be supplied by a raise of subscription fee to the cards for those most interested, i.e. the FIAF subscribers. FIAF could then possibly pay the remaining 300.000 BF under the condition that it did not harm the normal functioning of its other working bodies. No decision was taken on this proposal.

This ended his report on the accounts for 1975. After having read aloud the letter of approval of the Belgian auditor who had controlled them, he asked for the comments and approval of the Executive Committee.

Mr Ledoux congratulated the Treasurer for the excellent presentation of those accounts. He thought that, for the first time, the financial situation of FIAF was clearly laid out. As concerned the Periodical Indexing Project, he would be very happy if the project could continue in its present form but, considering the pessimistic future prospects of income and expenses of the P.I.P. explained by Mr Stenklev (and which he entirely shared), he suggested that the Documentation Commission start studying, as soon as possible, a change of formule for its financing (cooperative or other) or a way to reduce the cost of the project, so that it could be applied at the latest in 1978.

The President then asked for a vote of approval of the 1975 accounts and balance. They were unanimously approved.

To follow, the Treasurer quickly commented on the accounts made by the Secretariat for the period January-April 1976. As this was simply a survey of the sums received and paid during this period and a budget-comparison, Mr Ledoux thought that there was not much sense in discussing this at Executive meetings and he proposed to suppress this formality in the future, leaving only the "budget comparison" to be distributed. This was agreed.

Budget proposal for 1977

Mr Stenklev explained that it was very difficult to prepare this budget, especially as regarded 'special expenses' because these expenses were often unforeseeable. He had therefore simply raised the sums used for those items in 1975 by a certain percentage, with implicit permission to exceed those amounts if necessary since last year's excess of profit allowed it. He reckoned for instance that 130,000 BF for the Varna Congress would not be sufficient but he had until now no information whatsoever to calculate how much this Congress actually would cost FIAF.

The item "Executive Committee" however had been lowered, compared to 1976, from 60,000 BF to 30,000 BF because the experience had shown that this amount was sufficient and also because it was now more or less decided that the Executive Committee would hold only one meeting between General Meetings.

But Mr Ledoux thought that 30,000 BF was not enough and that, considering the financial difficulties of all film archives, FIAF should foresee some fixed sum to help the archive organizing the meeting of the Executive Committee.

Finally, it was decided not to change the budgeted sum for 1977 but to take Mr Ledoux' proposal into consideration for next budget.

As regarded the number of E.C. meetings to be held between Congresses, Mr Ledoux strongly advocated the idea of having only one meeting, for reasons of lack of time and of money, but of course not as an intangible rule.

He was supported by Mr Borde. Mr Volkmann was against this idea. He said that FIAF used to be a very active Federation and one of the reasons for this was the frequent meeting of its Executive Committee. To have only one meeting between Congresses would very much slow this activity down. The President then asked for a vote to be taken on Mr Ledoux' proposal. It was unanimously accepted.

Mr Stenklev then resumed his report by announcing that he wished not to stand for Treasurer anymore at the next elections of the E.C. He explained that he did not have enough time for this task because of too much work in his own archive and that he also felt to be too far away from the FIAF secretariat and from the FIAF office in London to keep enough in contact and be able to follow up FIAF affairs as he thought a Treasurer should. Mr Ledoux and Mr Pogacic both said they very much regretted Mr Stenklev's decision and hoped that it was not irrevocable. This ended the Treasurer's report.

5. ORGANIZATION AND PROGRAM OF THE GENERAL MEETING

The last item to decide was the chairmanship of the various sessions of the General Meeting due to begin on the next day. It was agreed that Mr Pogacic would preside over sessions 1, 4 and 7, Mr Klaue over sessions 3 and 5 (Open Forum) and Mr Kuiper over session 2. Session 6 (Symposium: Latin-American cinema) would be chaired by a Mexican moderator, Mr Jose Estrada.

Mr Pogacic then declared closed the meeting of the Executive Committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

MEXICO - May 27, 1976

M I N U T E S

All members of the newly elected Executive Committee were present, except Mr Buache. The President had also invited Mr Stoyanov-Bigor to attend the first part of the meeting which concerned the organization of the next Congress in Varna.

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. Mr Borde was appointed Deputy-Secretary-general and Mr de Vaal, Deputy-Treasurer

Organization of the Symposium of Varna

The Executive Committee was asked to reconfirm the Program Committee of the Varna Symposium and possibly to enlarge it, and also to designate the experts which would be responsible each for one day of the Symposium.

Mr Daudelin reminded that each of the 5 days of the Symposium would be dedicated to a sub-theme or particular aspect of the main theme

These sub-themes and the experts responsible for their planning were :

1. Silent Soviet Cinema, source of revolutionary films (W. Klaue)
2. Silent Soviet Cinema and its influence on sound-cinema of the thirties and forties (P. von Bagh)
3. Silent Soviet Cinema and "les cinémas de libération" (translation unknown) (a delegate of UCAL)
4. The influence of the style of Silent Soviet Cinema (Ted Perry)
5. The influence of Silent Soviet Cinema on world-cinema : tentative synthesis (J. Toeplitz).

It was also decided to ask Professor Toeplitz to preside over the Program Committee which would now also include, besides its former members, the experts responsible for each sub-theme.

Mr Molnar then suggested to organize, on the occasion of the Symposium, a small exhibition of books and articles on the same theme. As it appeared that there did not exist enough literature on this theme to make an exhibition, Mrs Bowser proposed to expose also some other material or documents collected by archives or historians and which would testify to direct influence of Silent Soviet Cinema on other cinemas.

Mr Yelin added that some posters of that period would also be appropriate to exhibit as testimony of the aesthetic influence which prevailed around that time. Mr Stoyanov-Bigor said he would inquire on the possibility to find a small exhibition hall for that purpose, perhaps in the town of Varna itself.

The Secretary-General then reminded the members that the General Meeting had left it to the Executive Committee to decide whether this E.C. had been elected for one or two years and consequently whether there should be elections during the Varna Congress. A vote was taken on this matter and the Executive Committee unanimously decided that there should be elections in Varna.

New Members

The Secretary-General then started the discussion on the two candidatures for membership which he preferred to link, as they were both from Mexico City.

The two applying archives were :

- Cineteca Nacional, directed by our host for the Congress, Mr Garcia-Borja,
- Filmoteca de la U.N.A.M., directed by Mr Gonzalez-Casanova.

To complete the requirements of the FIAF Rules, both archives had now submitted to the Executive Committee a detailed statement regarding their autonomy in the frame respectively of the Direccion General de la Cinematografia and of the University of Mexico. The Executive Committee also had had the opportunity to visit the premises and preservation facilities of both these archives.

The problem was that, in both cases, their admittance as Members would create a precedent : Cineteca Nacional was a governmental whose structure could be compared to that of another possible Member: Bois d'Arcy (within the frame of the Centre National de la Cinematographie), and Filmoteca de la UNAM was the first university archive which applied as Member.

Mr Ledoux also mentioned art. 12 of the FIAF Rules : "When two or more institutions from a given country apply at the same time, the E.C. may take its decision of admission dependent on the signing by the applicants of a declaration of mutual collaboration", but as it was by an oversight of the Executive Committee if this article had not been applied here, he proposed to ask for such a declaration later. Mr Ledoux then asked for the other members' comments.

Mr Borde said that the candidature of the two Mexican archives should lead us to a broader reflexion on FIAF's policy as regarded membership. At present, the tendency in FIAF seemed to prevail that Member archives should be governmental archives. But was it of the interest of FIAF to exclude from effective membership the other type of archives, the small archives which, in his opinion, were the true cultural centres ? He did not think so. FIAF had been made of such small archives which little by little had become important bodies and often governmental archives. Therefore he proposed to accept both Mexican archives as Members.

Mrs Bowser agreed with Mr Borde. She could see some relationship between the situation here and the situation of her archive towards the Motion Picture Section of the Library of Congress. Both organizations happily co-existed, performing different functions. It was necessary to have those different functions performed by different bodies as a way of being sure that all films could be preserved.

Mr Kuiper was also worried about the future of FIAF but in another sense than Mr Borde. He was thinking of the many future specialized archives, TV archives (especially in the USA but also in other countries) which would most probably want to enter FIAF and deserved to be in but which, in his opinion, could never be full members; they should be Associates. He also thought that an archive such as Filmoteca de la UNAM which worked on a university campus was essentially a sophisticated study center and therefore a specialized case which deserved Associate membership. At present, the status of Associate was considered as second class membership and therefore disdained by those who should normally apply for it. Mr Kuiper proposed that, at its next meeting, the Executive Committee start redefining the status of Associate with its privileges and obligations, that we explain this eventuality to Mr Casanova and ask him to voluntarily suspend his application until he could see what the status of Associate would offer him.

Mr Klaue agreed that we should re-examine the character of Associateship to make it more attractive but we should not forget that, in Latin-America, film archives often existed only in the frame of universities and they were not like the archives of U.S. universities. They often worked on a national level. The Mexican situation being also a very specific case, he proposed to admit both archives as Members of FIAF.

Mr Pogacic agreed with Mr Klaue. We could not ask that all FIAF archives be built on the same model.

Mr Ledoux said he felt rather uneasy to have to admit two FIAF members in the same town, but he also thought that there was no other solution.

Coming back to the problem of cooperation between the two applicants, Mr Daudelin felt worried because of the position of Mr Garcia-Borja as Director General de la Cinematografia, which gave him an enormous power not only on film production in Mexico but also on the censorship, film distribution, etc... As on the other hand, Mr Gonzalez Casanova's Centro de Estudios Cinematograficas produced films, this could lead to a very difficult situation between the two men. Mr Pogacic therefore insisted that we ask for a letter of mutual collaboration between the two archives, as foreseen in art. 12 of our Rules.

Mr Yelin repeated what he had already explained at the first E.C. meeting, before the Congress: that he saw no other solution than to admit both archives as Members of FIAF.

Mr Stenklev explained that he was also very embarrassed because he thought that basically, there were bad aspects in both archives. He compared the situation of the Mexican applications and the strictness with which the Executive Committee had treated some European archives such as London and Stockholm and he wondered whether FIAF should have "one law for the rich and another for the poor" (avoir 2 poids et 2 mesures). He also agreed with John Kuiper and the re-evaluation of the status of Associate. But finally, he thought it was time to pass to votes.

Mr Ledoux asked for a secret vote and at the same time he said he wanted to establish as a principle that voting at the E.C. always be secret when it concerned membership. This was agreed.

He then asked that the voting for both Mexican archives be linked, which meant that if one archive was admitted, the other would too and vice-versa. Voting by a show of hands was taken on this matter but Mr Ledoux's proposal was rejected by 6 votes against 5.

A secret ballot vote was then taken for the admittance of the two candidates separately, with the following results :

<u>Cineteca Nacional</u> :	Yes	9
	No	1
	Abstention	1
<u>Filmoteca de la UNAM</u> :	Yes	9
	No	1
	Abstention	1

Specialized Commission for archives in developing countries

The creation of this new Commission had been proposed by Mr Pogacic during the Open Forum (Themes for Future Congresses) and had been supported by Mr Perry. Mr Pogacic therefore proposed that the Commission which should be small and could work mainly by correspondence, be composed of Mr Perry, Mr Yelin and himself. This was agreed.

Plans for the 40th anniversary of FIAF

This item was postponed until the next E.C. meeting. Mr Klaue said he would prepare a paper on this matter.

Reconfirmation of the Presidents of FIAF's specialized Commissions

Mrs Bowser (Documentation Commission), Mr Klaue (Cataloguing Commission), Mr Kuiper (Copyright Commission) and Mr Volkmann (Preservation Commission) were all reconfirmed in their posts as Chairman of a FIAF Commission. Concerning the Copyright Commission, Mr Kuiper wondered whether it should continue since, for the last 2 years, it had more or less ceased to function. But Mr Pogacic and Mr Ledoux both said that this Commission, even if it did not work in the same manner as the other specialized Commissions, should be maintained because it could be very useful in our dealings with FIAPF and

UNESCO. Its present members were Mr Kuiper (President), Mr Klaue and Mr Ledoux. Mr Pogacic asked to be informed of its activities as he was the delegate of FIAF in IFTC which was our present link with UNESCO.

UNESCO

Mr Pogacic having asked to examine what FIAF could prepare for UNESCO's 19th General Assembly due to be held this year in Nairobi, Mr Klaue said it was too late to do anything. After the Executive meeting in Belgrade, he had drafted a letter from FIAF's President to the Director-General of UNESCO, letter which offered FIAF's help in many precise items regarding film preservation but which, due to a misunderstanding, was finally not sent.

All we could do now was to offer our participation in two projects which were included in the plans of UNESCO resulting from the experts' meeting in Berlin: the creation of a pilot archive for the preservation of moving images in developing countries, and the training of film archivists. We could also add that our intentions were wider than what is foreseen in this plan and refer to the final recommendations of the Berlin meeting.

Mr Pogacic then said he had incidentally learnt that UNESCO had made up a project (n° 4.121.4; Studies on the preservation and presentation of the cultural heritage and on the development of museums) which said: "furthermore, the development of cinematographic museums will be promoted as part of these studies. Specialists will be trained to enable them to effect the transfer of images from old nitrate to acetate or plastic film in order to ensure their preservation for the general public's appreciation and the historian, and the proposed creation of a pilot museum for these recordings will be assisted. In addition, a publication will be prepared on the techniques and equipment required for the establishment of specialized museums and archives. The pilot project will be carried out in cooperation with the International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF), the International Council of Archives (ICA), the International Film and Television Council (IFTC) and the International Council of Museums (ICOM)."

Underlining that FIAF was omitted from the organizations cited here above, Mr Ledoux said we should write a strong letter to the Director-General of UNESCO saying that we could not accept this exclusion and that we would refuse further cooperation to the realization of the UNESCO Resolution if FIAF was not added to the organizations participating in this project. A copy of this letter should be sent to a certain number of national commissions of UNESCO. This was agreed.

Next Executive Committee meeting

Mr Borde said there might be a possibility for him to organize a meeting of the Executive Committee in Perpignan, with the help of the local Palais des Congrès. The E.C. agreed that Mr Borde should further investigate the matter and that the meeting should be held on 11- 12 - 13 December 1976. Mr Borde said he would inform the Secretariat as soon as possible.

Mr Ledoux also said that there was a vague proposal from the delegates of Gosfilmofond to hold this meeting in Moscow. They thought it might be possible to organize it but could promise nothing. At the request of Mr Yelin, it was agreed that the Secretary-General would contact Gosfilmofond later on to see if there was a more precise offer, and that he should make the decision as to the place of meeting when he would have all elements in hand.

There being no other items to discuss, Mr Pogacic then closed the meeting of the Executive Committee.
