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**FIRST SESSION**

Mr. V. Pogacic, President of FIAF, greeted all the attending members, and Messrs Alberti and Commencini from the Cineteca Italiana who had been invited as observers. He then opened the discussion.

1. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA.**

The following draft agenda had been distributed to the members:

1. Adoption of present agenda
2. Approval of the Minutes from previous meeting.
3. Membership questions, Secretariat.
4. Finances.
5. Distribution of tasks amongst the members of the E.C. and setting up of an editorial committee for the FIAF Bulletin.
6. Next General Meeting and Executive Committee.
7. Projects: Summer School
   Basic Manual for film archives.
8. Relations with other international organisations.
   Report of Mr. Klaue on ICA Congress.
9. Future Policy of FIAF. Continuation of the discussion held in Bucharest. Results of the enquiry on FIAF's relations with developing countries.
10. Work of the specialized commissions.
11. Any other business.

This agenda was unanimously adopted.

Mr. Lindgren however asked that sometime during the first day be dedicated to a short preliminary discussion on the subject of the "Meeting on Copyright problems" which had been organised by the MIFED for the following day. This was agreed.
2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS E.C. MEETING.

The Minutes of the E.C. Meetings in Bucharest had been sent to the members. There were a few remarks to make:

P.9. (middle of the page) Mr Kuiper suggested to change the phrase: "The possibility existed that they would be, in some cases, replaced by people with a tendency towards the preminence of film institute on film archive" and to replace the last words by: "film institute work over film archive work".

P.10. Mr Konlechner asked to rectify the last paragraph. He had not raised the problems of Kommunales Kino, he had only made some comments on it.

In the Minutes of the second E.C. in Bucharest, Mr Stankev asked to add that one had also discussed the problem of the voting procedures for the admission of full members. These procedures (art 8 & 9 of the Rules) should be revised in order to avoid what happened with the admission of the AFI Archives which were admitted by simple majority.

These corrections being noted, the Minutes of the E.C. Meetings in Bucharest were adopted.

3. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS, SECRETARIAT.

Mexico.
The Secretariat in Brussels had had the visit of a Mexican journalist, Mr José de la Colina, which was sent by the Mexican authorities in charge of the new official film archives presently created in Mexico. All necessary documents for an affiliation to FIAF had been given to him.

Ferrara.
The town of Ferrara in Italy had written to inform FIAF of its intention to create a communal film archive, and asked information on the procedures to join FIAF. This had been sent to them.

On this occasion, the Secretary-General wanted to raise the problem of the increasing number of archives which, in countries where other FIAF archives already existed, asked or would ask to join FIAF. He cited Arsenal and, possibly the Kommunales Kino in Germany, Anthology Film Archives in New York, a so-called archive in Tel-Aviv.... Although most of these organisations did excellent work in the field of film culture and really had a collection of films, would it not create problems for FIAF vis-à-vis the producers to admit them all as members? Or maybe there should be no limit to FIAF membership?
The President, Mr Pogacic, admitting that this was a fundamental question, suggested to discuss it under item 9 of the agenda: Future Policy of FIAP. This was agreed.

Anthology Film Archives / New York.
Jonas Mekas and P. Adams Sitney had written to FIAP, on behalf of Anthology Film Archives, to apply for provisional membership. All necessary documents had been sent them but there was no further news.
Mrs Bowser and Mr Kuiper both supported the candidature of AFA. They said they considered this organisation was a real film archive, more or less specialized in collecting & preserving films of independent filmmakers. This served a very necessary purpose. It was decided to wait until we received the required documents from AFA to discuss their candidature any further.

Iranian Film Archive / Teheran.
Mr Gaffary, director of the Iranian Film Archive which was a former member of FIAP, had written to the Secretary-General expressing his intention to rejoin the Federation. All necessary documents had been sent to him but no further news received. Mr Ledoux agreed to write him again personally.

Rio de Janeiro.
Mr Alves Nato had written Mr Ledoux to inform him of his hope to present his archives' request for application to FIAP before the Moscow Congress. He also mentioned the 100% paid by FIAP for his stay in Bucharest during last General meeting. The Secretary-General explained that, due to a misunderstanding, he had to pay Mr Alves Nato's hotel bill in Bucharest on behalf of FIAP and he now asked for the E.C.'s agreement a posteriori. This was unanimously accepted.

On this occasion, Mr Klaue gave some information on the Latin-American documentary films' retrospective to be held in Leipzig during the festival. This retrospective, although it had been very difficult to organize, now comprised about 28 hours of films. Several Latin-American filmmakers and archivists would come to Leipzig on this occasion and Mr Klaue invited also interested members of the E.C. Since it might be a good occasion to set up better relations between FIAP and the Latin-American Archives, Mr Pogacic accepted the invitation, on the condition that a special meeting be organized.
FIAP MEMBER ARCHIVES.

București.
Mr. Feneșe confirmed, as in the circular letter which had been sent to all members, that he had been appointed as director of a new production company in Rumania and that he had been replaced at the head of the archive by Mr. Nicolae Zeicu. He wanted to assure the Executive Committee that there was nothing changed in the archive's relations with FIAP.

Canberra.
The Secretary-General had had the visit of Mr. Fleming, head of the National Library of Australia, but not directly in charge of the Film Collection and apparently not very aware of film archival questions. Mr. Lindgren had met him in London.
Both Mr. Lindgren and Mr. Ledoux were quite pessimistic about the evolution of this archive but they had convinced Mr. Fleming of the necessity to have better contacts with FIAP. Therefore, he agreed to send Mr. Wallace, new head of the Film Section to our Congresses as often as possible.
Mr. Ledoux read out a passage of a letter Professor Toeplitz had written recently and which said:

"There is a growing dissatisfaction in Australia with National Library in Canberra as the representative of FIAP. There are other institutions which would like to organize film archives, amongst others - National Film Theatre (you know of them, they are very active) and perhaps the Australian Film Institute. Do you authorize me to contact these institutions unofficially, of course and to write to you in due course what are the possibilities of having another member here, really active?
I do not intend to cause a break with National Library, but supply you with a sondage of the situation to draw the conclusions at a large stage."

All the members agreed that one should accept Prof. Toeplitz' suggestion and try to obtain a first hand report on the situation. Mr. Ledoux accepted to write him in this sense.
Mr. Volkman had received a request for information on preservation matters from the Commonwealth Archives office in Sidney which were at present building a new Archives Repository, including various vaults. It was decided to send also a copy of this letter to Mr. Toeplitz.

Stockholm.
Svenska Filminstitutet (Mr. Schein) had recently informed the Secretary-General that Mr. Jonsson and Nils Hugo Geber had left the Swedish Archive, and that Jörn Donner had been appointed head of the Cinemateket.
The Secretariat of FIAF had sent a copy of this letter to all members but Mr Ledoux wanted to know if the Scandinavian members of the E.C. had more details to add to this information.

Mr Stenklav confirmed the news and said that Mr Jonason had returned to his former work as a film producer and that Mr Gober still had difficulties with the Swedish Film Institutet.

It was unanimously agreed though that FIAF could not interfere in the internal affairs of this Institute.

Cairo.
The Secretariat had learnt incidentally that Mr Gomaz had been replaced at the head of the Egyptian archive by Mr Ahmed Al Hadrany, former deputy director of the archive.

Wiesbaden.
Mr Pöschke had sent to the Secretariat copies of the correspondence he had exchanged with the Freundend der Deutschen Kinemathek concerning some supposed infringement of film rights by Arsenal. It was unanimously agreed that the FIAF did not have to interfere in a conflict between a member and external organisations but, on this occasion, Mr Klaue who had been cited in this affair, explained the position of SFA towards the Freundend der D.K. He said that the only circumstances in which Arsenal got films for projection from SFA’s collection was when the owners of the rights had expressly asked for it; as for loans from Arsenal to SFA (Mr Gregor had somehow complained that they lent films to SFA without getting anything in return), Mr Klaue said that the films in question were Latin American documentaries which the archive of Santiago de Chile had expressly authorized to be shown at the Leipzig L.A. retrospective organized by SFA.

Mr Ledoux also reported that Mr Gregor had informed him of the intention of Freundend der D.K. to apply for corresponding membership of FIAF.

Miscellaneous

Musée de l’Homme / Paris.
Mr Dudart, head of the Film Department in the Musée de l’Homme, had written to the Secretary-General to inform him of the creation of an International committee on ethnographical and sociological films, under the sponsorship of UNESCO.

They wanted therefore to draw up an inventory of cinematographical documents existing in this field and asked FIAF’s help in this research. Mr Ledoux asked the E.C. whether it was possible for FIAF to conduct such an enquiry amongst its members. He personally thought it would be difficult because many archives did not have film classification allowing them to give this kind of information.

Mr Pagacic also thought preferable to send Mr Dudart a list of FIAF members, which he could then contact himself on behalf of the Musée de l’Homme, but not on the behalf of FIAF. We could also possibly offer him to send our members a circular letter recommending this project.
Reprinting of the Book of Statutes and Rules

The Secretary-General raised the problem of the continual changes in Statutes and Rules which FIIF had faced these last years and which had caused the Book of Statutes and Rules to be almost out of date although it was only 4 years old. More changes were already foreseen for the Moscow Congress and perhaps also in Montreal, etc... Therefore, was it wise to have this rather expensive publication reprinted now, and in what form?

Mr Konlechner suggested to have the Statutes reprinted in the form of a loose-leaf publication, so that separate pages could easily be changed or added. Mr Lindgren proposed to have a small editing committee which could, whenever changes were decided, control that all the other rules affected by this change be modified in consequence; until now, this had been done too carelessly.

Mr Ledoux and Mr Steklov both suggested a committee which would rather be charged with the task of simplifying the Statutes and Rules. Our present Statutes were far too detailed, inflating almost beyond control, and because of their preciseness, sometimes a restriction to the organization's efficiency.

Although it was a very long and difficult task, Mr Steklov agreed to examine the matter and to report about it at the next Executive Committee meeting. It was also decided to reprint the Statutes and Rules in the form of a loose-leaf publication in 1973. The Treasurer said that it was possible to finance it within the limits of the 1973 budget, under the item "Special Publications".

4. FINANCIAL REPORT

The Treasurer, Mr Konlechner, had distributed his written report for the three first quarters of 1972.

This report being very clear, there was not much comment. The financial situation of FIIF was very healthy. Total funds amounted to BF 1,495,413,- and the subscriptions still to be received amounted to BF 254,083,-.

One archive was very much in arrears for its payments: Cineteca Italiana, which owed subscriptions fees for 2 1/2 years.

Mr Konlechner was thanked for this excellent report.

There being too little time left before lunch to start the discussion on points 5 and 6 of the agenda, it was decided to discuss item 7: "Projects" first.
7. PROJECTS

SUMMER SCHOOL FOR ARCHIVE PERSONNEL

Mr Klaue had distributed a draft report of the 1st FIAF Summer School which would be organized by Staatsliches Filmarchiv in the summer of 1973 (annex 1). Everyone agreed that this program was excellent and even so promising that probably more than 15 (as foreseen) pupils would apply for the course. How would SFA then select the pupils and would it not be a more economical utilization of the school to enlarge it to more applicants?

Mr Klaue replied that it was perhaps possible to accommodate up to 20 pupils but not more. As for the selection, if there were too many applicants, it should be made by the Executive Committee and preference should be given to delegates from young and small archives. This was agreed.

Mr Klaue also said that the program had been set up, neither for specialists in preservation nor for cataloguers, but for people without any specialization who did not have the possibility to learn their trade in their own country.

Mr Lindgren having asked whether this Summer Course would be run by SFA in its own right or by FIAF, Mr Volkmann replied that this was a matter of FIAF, run by SFA for FIAF.

It being lunch time, it was decided to discuss the second project: Basic Manual, at the beginning of the fourth session.

SECOND SESSION

Preparation of the MIFED/FIAF meeting on copyright problems.

Mr Alberti and Mr Comencini attended this part of the second session in order to inform the Executive Committee on all the details of the meeting on copyright foreseen for next day. It was agreed that this was a meeting organized by the MIFED and Cineteca Italiana and that the FIAF Executive Committee and the Copyright Commission had been invited to give the archives' point of view. They were no experts on copyright and their declarations could not bind the Federation.

Mr Lindgren, head of the Copyright Commission, agreed to be FIAF's spokesman but the chairman of the meeting would be Cineteca Italiana's delegate.

Simultaneous translation in English-French-Italian was assured.
The theme of the discussion would be, following the wish of Mr Alberti:

a) the problems encountered by film archives in their dealings with TV, cineclubs, etc... wishing to make use of the archives’ collections.

b) the "public domain" in copyright.

Concerning theme a), Mr Ledoux recalled Mr Alberti that there was not much to discuss; every FIAF member knew that, without the owner's permission, they had no rights at all outside the use on the archive’s own premises.

Mr Lindgren read out a report on copyright problems encountered by film archives, report which he intended to make at the MIFED meeting (annex 2) and asked for the Executive Committee’s permission to make use of this text as he thought best during the discussions. This was agreed.

Mr Konlechner suggested to make use of this opportunity given by the MIFED meeting to publicize the archives’ point of view, the value of their work and the difficulties they encountered namely in the field of copyright; he suggested also to make some concrete proposals, e.g. the creation of an European copyright office for films, such as already existed for music records.

Although he considered this as a very good idea, Mr Lindgren thought we should still use some discretion in our statements since, not only the press, but also the producers from whom so many archives were dependant, would hear about these declarations.

Mr Kuiper accepted to explain, if necessary, the American position in the field of copyright.

5. DISTRIBUTION OF TASKS AMONGST THE MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

It had been decided, at the E.C. meetings in Belo and Bucharest, that some definite tasks should be assigned to all members of the Executive Committee, and the following examples had been given:

- relations with other international organizations
- education of archival staff
- relations with archives in developing countries
- cultural activities
- responsibility for projects underway

Mr Ledoux, Mr Lindgren and Mr Stenklev were opposed to this idea because, they said, in practice several members of the Executive Committee already had very definite and absorbing tasks (Presidents of specialized commissions, Treasurer, Secretary-General, etc...) and that it was the Secretary General’s task to ask for the other members’ help whenever necessary.
Mr Lindgren added that the Executive Committee should not become a kind of unpaid secretariat. This was very much misunderstanding its functions.

Nevertheless the decision had been taken and the following tasks were assigned:
- relations with other international organizations and, in particular, IFTC: Mr Pagacic.
- education of archival staff: Mrs Suomela.
- cultural activities (anniversaries, etc...): Mr Mlonar.

Mr Kuiper proposed to take up responsibilities for following up projects underway but this was considered a specific task of the Secretariat.

**SETTING UP OF AN EDITORIAL COMMITTEE FOR THE FIAF BULLETIN**

As decided in Bucharest, a small editorial committee was appointed to assist Mr de Veal in his task as editor of the Bulletin. The two members of this committee are: Eileen Bowser and Raymond Borde.

**6. NEXT GENERAL MEETING AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Mr Privato gave the following information on the Next General Meeting which would be held in Moscow during the first half of June 1973. 3 days would be devoted to the E.C. meeting and 4 days to the General Meeting. One more day would be reserved for a visit of Gosfilmofond in Bialye Stolby.

Two delegates from each FIAF archive would be invited to the General Meeting and their stay in Moscow paid for by Gosfilmofond. Two anniversaries would be celebrated during the Congress:
- 75th anniversary of Eisenstein Birthday
- 25th anniversary of Gosfilmofond

One could therefore organize, as main subject of discussion, besides the usual items on the agenda, a Symposium on Eisenstein with the participation of external experts.

Gosfilmofond also offered to invite on this occasion a few representatives of developing countries who are interested in creating a film archive or already started one.

The E.C. would help designate these possible observers.

The President thanked Mr Privato for his generous proposals and asked for the other members' comments.

The idea of a one-day symposium on Eisenstein was unanimously approved.

Mr Privato asked the E.C. to make proposals for a few very good experts to invite to participate and said that he would enquire about Soviet experts.
He said that the financial help of FIAF would probably not be needed excepts perhaps for the publication of a booklet on this symposium after the Congress.

Concerning the next E.C. meeting, the Secretary-General said he would try to organize it in Brussels, in March 1973.

This ended the second session.

THIRD SESSION

9. FUTURE POLICY.

After the General Meeting in Bucharest, there was a general feeling amongst the members of the Executive Committee that, at the meeting, the discussion on the Future Policy of FIAF had been handled wrongly and that the interventions of some members had been unduly cut short. Therefore, the Executive Committee thought very necessary to rediscuss at least the most debated point of the Future Policy problem: the definition of FIAF full membership, and to communicate to all members the main arguments of this discussion which should then be raised again at the next General Meeting.

To start the exchange of views, Mr. Klaue had prepared a short paper on this subject (annex 1).

In the discussion, two trends of opinion rapidly appeared:

- some members wanting to enlarge the interpretation of art. 1 of the Statutes and, by way of consequence, the Federation, to all non-commercial film or "audio-visual" archives, specialized or not,
- and the other members (the majority) wanting to confirm art. 1 in its present form, i.e. to reserve full membership of FIAF to film archives devoted principally, even though not exclusively, to the preservation of the artistic and historic heritage of the cinema, adding that steps should be taken to associate other types of film archives by some other form of membership.

The following arguments were given by the first group:

- when the Statutes (art. 5) say: "archives devoted to the historic or aesthetics of the cinema", one should understand that not only films as "work of art" belong to the history of the cinema, but also films as historical, sociological, etc. . . . . documents.

- Who can define what is truly a film - work of art?
- We should enlarge the Federation in order to be more influential on
  a) the producers
  b) the governmental authorities,
or we shall remain a very small exclusive but unimportant group in the very
large world of audio-visual. We must enlarge our membership in order
to work more effectively.

- Film archives' directors are, because of various circumstances, becoming
more and more "archivists" (in the technical sense of the word) and less
"historians". The scientific and technical character of our archives is
getting every day more specific. Therefore, it is important for us that
we open the Federation to all archives and institutions which already
exist in great number outside FIAF and which, like us, collect, preserve
and spread films under different aspects but which all have as common
interest: the preservation of films.
This will mean, of course, a complete change in the style of FIAF which
would become a large organisation, possibly divided in various sections,
as for instance ICOM and ICA.

The arguments of the second group were:

- We are not excluding any archive from the Federation since we are
ready to accept, very broadly, all kind of specialized archives as
associate members. We are ready and even eager to share our knowledge
on technical matters of preservation, documentation, etc........... with all
archives and institutions concerned with this problem.

- We want to limit full membership of FIAF to archives whose main interest
is the art and history of the cinema because, although there is a growing
number of film archives, we are the only organisation having this common
platform which gives us life and vitality. The art of cinema is our field
of expertise. We are qualified in this domain and recognized as such.
If we let FIAF be overrun and overruled by a multiplicity of other
institutions whose only common interest is the technical aspect of
preservation, we shall loose our present spirit and aim, and our role
will become passive. The only chance archives have to follow an active
and creative role is to get involved in the showing of films, to display,
promote and educate people in the art and history of the film.

- Many of our members already collect other categories of films, besides
films "as work of art", and they should be encouraged in this way.

- A multiplicity of FIAF archives will create difficulties in our dealings
with the producers.
The latter would hesitate to divide the deposit of copies amongst several
archives and might then decide to stop depositing any films.
The present balance is unstable but it is viable. It would be disastrous
to endanger it.
It is sometimes better to limit one's aims and to gather strength internally. We can be more effective if we are not burdened too much. Now we can speak with one voice and one common interest, which would be impossible if we become too numerous.

Mr Stenklav made a more neutral comment which said: Rules are always subject to interpretation. The more precise we make them, the more difficult it is to carry them out. We should leave Art. 1 as it is presently and interpret it following the circumstances. Let's not make the Rules too strict before we know what kind of applicants to FIAF might appear, because, even amongst us, the cases were and will always be different.

At the end of the discussion, an indicative vote was taken on the following motion:
"That the condition for full membership remain as they are, but that steps should be taken to associate other archives by some other form of membership."

Results: For 7
Against 3
Abstention 1

It was decided to inform all FIAF members about this discussion by way of the Bulletin.

FIAF'S RELATIONS WITH DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.
Mr Klaue had distributed to all members the results of the enquiry on the connections of FIAF members with non FIAF member archives (annex 4). He added that this was only a summary of the answers he had received and not a complete list of all the film archives existing outside FIAF. He had also distributed a document with suggestions on an extension of the relations of FIAF to developing countries (annex 5), on which the discussion started.

Mr Lindgren and Mr Ledoux thought that FIAF as such neither could nor should provoke the creation of a film archive in countries where there was not the slightest embryo nor sign of interest for such organisation. But perhaps, through UNESCO or the International Council of Archives, could we stimulate the creation of a film section in State Archives. They also agreed with Mr Stenklav that it would be more useful to cultivate the existing bilateral contacts between individual FIAF members and the institutions mentioned in the questionnaire, if necessary with the help of FIAF's Secretariat.

Mr Privato explained that Gosfilmofond had sent to Tashkent Festival a delegate specially in charge of publicizing FIAF amongst the delegates of developing countries. Mr Klaue would try to do the same at the Leipzig Festival.
Mr Kuiper suggested another method of stimulating the creation of a filmarchive and at the same time avoiding the detestable patronizing attitude which other methods might involve. This was: to contact a country which already had a substantial film production and for instance propose to participate with them in organizing a symposium on their film history: to propose our cooperation, not our help. This might be enough to act as catalyst and speed up the process of creating a film archive, at least if some interest in such matters already existed in the given country.

Mr Konlechner thought that this question was closely related to the publicity we should make for FIAF. We should advertise ourselves almost in a journalistic way, he said, and suggested to make a film on FIAF and its work. The general public should be better informed on the utility of film archives since they also had decisive influence on the politicians and governments of their countries.

Mrs Suomela agreed and proposed also the idea of an itinerant exhibition on film archives.

Mr Lindgren, summarizing the discussion, said that two very different problems had arisen:

1°) our relations with countries where there is a possibility of an archive. Everyone agreed that, in the first place, the bilateral contacts should be encouraged, and also personal contacts such as those advocated by Mr Privato.

2°) the whole question of the public relations of FIAF. He suggested therefore that Mr Konlechner be designated to examine this problem, and present to one of the next Executive Committee meetings some concrete proposals for improving our public relations. Mr Konlechner agreed.

As to Mr Kluge's suggestion that "FIAF should encourage its members in writing to initiate their national delegations to the next UNESCO plenary session to focus the attention of the session on the necessity of collecting film documents, particularly in developing countries", it was decided the Mr Pogacic, our representative at the IFTC, would ask this organization to make such a recommendation to the next General Conference of UNESCO. Finally it was decided, by vote, that Mr Kluge's document: Results of the inquiry on the connections of FIAF members with non-FIAF members archives, would be circulated to all FIAF members, with a short commentary giving the essence of the present discussion.
FOURTH SESSION

7. PROJECTS (CONTINUATION)

Basic Manual for Film Archives

Mr Pogacic reported that the Jugoslovenska Kinoteka was presently rather embarrassed and felt stopped in its work for the Basic Manual because of the many critics received, mainly from the specialized Commissions, after the distribution of the draft of 4 more chapters at the Bucharest Congress. He reminded the members that his archive had been asked to put in this manual the practical experience of J.K. and some other archives, together with some basic principles. Of course, this experience could always be criticized. The difficulty had also consisted in finding the right form and style for this book.

Mr Volkmann, Mr Ledoux and Mrs Bowser explained why, in their opinion, the already drafted chapters should be corrected: there was a lack of balance in the length of some chapters (cataloguing far too long), too specific details and not enough general principles, etc...

Mrs Bowser therefore proposed that the specialized Commissions should produce the draft of the chapters on their specific field, but that the manual should still be published under the editorship of Jugoslovenska Kinoteka.

It was finally agreed that the Jugoslav archive should assume the overall direction of the project and therefore: draw up a general plan for the manual, set limits of length to the whole book, make a list of the main headings of the manual and decide who they wanted to contribute under these main headings, send these possible contributors a request indicating them the number of words or pages that they wished, together with a copy of the complete scheme of the manual, and finally coordinate and edit the whole work. It was also suggested that the length of the manual should not exceed 200 typewritten pages (double spaced).

Mr Pogacic said that he would discuss these decisions with his collaborators in Belgrade and see if they could comply with them. He thought it would be difficult.

10. WORK OF THE SPECIALIZED COMMISSIONS.

Preservation commission.

Mr Volkmann had distributed a written report (annex 6) to the members. He added that the recent and sudden death of Jean Vivié had created another problem for the publication of the manual on the preservation of colourfilms since he was supposed to write the third chapter.

Mr Volkmann did not know how far J. Vivié had reached in his task, and if someone else had to rewrite this chapter, it would again postpone the announced publication.
As to the second part of this report, concerning the financing by FIAF of part of the next meeting in London, Mr. Lindgren said that it was not even sure yet that they would need the requested money (approx. 200$ a day per delegate) which was anyway only one third of the total cost of the expenses incurred by NFA for this meeting, and the Treasurer explained that he would have preferred to keep the money allocated to commission's work for the translation of the Preservation manual, which would certainly be very costly.

Mr. Konlechner confirmed that there was a special item on the budget foreseen for "Special Publications", which should cover this kind of expenses.

This ended the discussion on the work of the Preservation Commission.

**Documentation commission.**

The Secretary-General reported that he had received a letter from Mr. Spiess asking the Executive Committee to accept his resignation as President of the Commission on grounds of his ill health and proposing that Eileen Bowser should be named in his place.

This was unanimously agreed, and a vote of thanks to Mr. Spiess was passed.

Mrs. Bowser then proceeded with her report on the commission's work. There had been no meeting since last Congress, but certain changes in the Periodical Indexing project had to be approved by the E.C.

It was proposed that Michael Moulds would take over as Editor of the project from Karen Jones in 1973.

Michael Moulds is resigning from his position at the Canadian Film Archives and will move to London.

He would do the editing of the entries from his own office in London and send them to the FIAF Secretariat in Brussels where a typist would be hired to work under the supervision of the Executive Secretary. The cards would be reproduced and sent out to all the archives.

As Michael Moulds would no longer be attached to a FIAF archive, he should be put under contract to FIAF for one year, as Editor of the project.

It was also proposed that FIAF should finance certain expenses of the project which could not be included in its present budget: the purchase of an offset machine for reproduction of the cards, the travel costs of Karen Jones to New York to do the final editing when turning the cards over Bowker, and travel costs of Michael Moulds & Brigitte von der Elst to Copenhagen to study the system in detail.

Mrs. Bowser also gave the revised 1973 Budget for the project, which read as follows:
### A. INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972 Surplus</td>
<td>$851</td>
<td>BF 37,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>$1310</td>
<td>BF 321,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowker Editorial Fee</td>
<td>$5000</td>
<td>BF 220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowker Royalties</td>
<td>$4420</td>
<td>BF 194,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$17,595</strong></td>
<td><strong>BF 774,180</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$4220</td>
<td>BF 185,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$2410</td>
<td>BF 106,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Fee</td>
<td>$5000</td>
<td>BF 220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages + Social Security</td>
<td>$5240</td>
<td>BF 230,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>BF 31,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$17,595</strong></td>
<td><strong>BF 774,180</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She explained that it was not certain whether we would receive Bowker's Royalties within the calendar year 1973, but if only 10 more subscriptions to the cards could be sold outside FIAF, this would be no problem for the balance of the Budget. Everything was presently being done to promote the sale of the cards. In the discussion which ensued, the main objections given by the members to these proposals were that:

1°) the same quickness and efficiency could not be obtained from 2 persons working in 2 different countries as from Karen Jones and her typist working in the same archive. Why not continue in Copenhagen?

2°) it was rather embarrassing to take away M. Moulds from the Canadian Film Archives for FIAF, without even noticing this archive, and even if M. Moulds had decided to leave Montreal anyway (Mr Ledoux' objection).

Mrs Bowser then answered these objections one by one:

It had always been anticipated that the project, after its first run, would have its own office & its own staff. Karen Jones, who had very generously offered all her time and capacities for the first year, now asked to be relieved because she felt she had fallen behind in her work at the Danish Archive.
Michael Moulds was the most able to replace her and FIAF should of course make a time contract with him for this job. Furthermore, there was a space problem at the archives both in Copenhagen and in London; it was almost impossible for them to house the project and, anyway, Mrs Bowser thought no archive should take this responsibility for a project which could afford to be quite independent.

As for Mr Ledoux’ objection, it was considered as unjustified by the other members.

After Mr Konlechner had discussed all details of the budget and proposed to devote some unused money of the 1972 budget (special reserve fund and congress: ± 60,000 BF) for the extra costs assumed by FIAF, which was agreed, Mr Kuiper submitted to the vote a motion by which the Executive Committee authorized the Documentation Commission to go ahead with its submitted proposals. This was unanimously accepted.

Copyright Commission.
Mr Lindgren reported that there had been no meeting of the commission since the Bucharest congress. They were still in the process of collecting information from the member archives and would hold their next meeting when they would have received more answers to their questionnaire.

Cataloguing Commission.
Mr Klein reported that the final draft for the manual on cataloguing was typed and would be distributed, before the end of November, to the members for their final control.

After that, he hoped that this manual could be printed on the new FIAF offset machine and he asked for the financing by FIAF of the necessary paper. This was agreed.

6. RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS.

IFTC (International Film and Television Council).
The Secretary-General informed the members about the latest developments of the UNESCO study on the Systematic Preservation of Films (see Minutes of the Executive Committee Meetings in Toulouse and Oslo). UNESCO, through Mme Cailliois, now asked FIAF to participate in this inquiry and proposed to allocate us a sum of $1000 for this purpose.

Everyone agreed that FIAF had to accept this contract and it was decided to ask the Canadian Film Archive (FIAF’s only bilingual English-French archive) if they could not fulfil this task for FIAF.

They would of course be entrusted with the $1000 and with all the material already collected by UNESCO, i.e. the answers to their questionnaire.
Prof. Toeplitz had also written the Secretary-General about FIAF's representation in IFTC. His letter said:

"There will be a General Meeting in IFTC in December. Do not forget to send a delegate of FIAF to this meeting. I know that you personally and some of my colleagues at the Executive Committee are not very keen on FIAF belonging to IFTC, but I think that "Les absents ont toujours tort", and leaving an international organisation without any obvious reason would be wrong. It goes without saying that I am not a candidate for vice-presidency for the next two years; But in my opinion FIAF should be represented in the Executive Committee of IFTC and if possible - in Bureau."

The President, Mr Pagacic, accepted to be FIAF's delegate at IFTC meetings. The Secretary-General would write to Mr Maddison to inform him and ask for Mr Pagacic the same travel facilities as those granted to Mr Toeplitz.

The Secretary-General reminded the members about the preliminary contacts taken by him with Mr Dubosq of I.C.A. in Paris, and the decision taken to delegate Mr Klaue as our representative at their congress in Moscow. Just after their congress, the Secretariat had received a letter from I.C.A. saying that FIAF had been accepted as one of their members in category C (Archival Institutions). This was rather a surprise, since nothing of the kind had ever been asked.
Mr Klaue also was ignorant of this decision. Nevertheless, it was decided that FIAF should accept this nomination on the conditions set up by art. 28 of the Statutes:

"Approval by a majority of two-thirds of the full members at the next General Meeting."

Mr Klaue had also distributed the text of his speech at the I.C.A. Congress in Moscow. It was decided to publish it in the FIAF Bulletin, and to send a few copies to I.C.A.
He then gave some other suggestions of practical steps to deepen our contacts with I.C.A.

1. A letter should be sent to the Secretariat and to I.C.A. President thanking them for their consent to the participation of a FIAF representative in Moscow Congress. The letter should also remind them of the reported suggestions for cooperation between the two organisations and ask them for a statement.
2. It should be decided whether FIAF would contact I.C.A. asking to receive Dr Kothe's report on the situation in film archives for FIAF members.
This was unanimously agreed.

ICOM (International Council of Museums).
Mr Ledoux recalled that in Bucharest, it had been decided that the E.C. should prepare an article on FIAF which would be published in one of the next issue of ICOM News. This article should set out the possible relations and the common interests between members of FIAF and ICOM, and relate in details the activities of FIAF.
Mr Pogacic agreed to write this article.

II. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.
Prof. Toeplitz' letter to the Secretary-General also said:

"Could I do anything for FIAF in the neighbouring, Asiatic countries in the Pacific area and in New Zealand? Could you give me a formal task to establish some links in this part of the world? Not all the countries here can be considered "developing", but the fact remains that they have no connection with FIAF."

This proposal was of course very readily accepted.

All the items on the agenda having been discussed, President Pogacic declared the meeting closed and thanked all the participants.