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FIRST SESSION

Mr Ledoux having welcomed all the attending members in Brussels, the President, Mr Pagacic opened the meeting and, considering the absence of Mr Fornoaga, Mr Lindgren and Mr Toepplitz, he gave the right of vote to all three reserve members.

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The following draft agenda had been distributed to the members:

1. Approval of present agenda.
2. Approval of the Minutes from previous meeting.
4. Finances.
5. Modification of Statutes and Rules.
6. Projects.
7. Commissions.
8. Next Executive Committee and General Meeting.
9. Relations with other international organisations.
10. Any other business.

Mr Ledoux added that one important point was not expressed in the agenda but was implied either under item 3 or item 5: the rewriting of the Statutes (over which Mr Stenklev would make a report) and, linked to this, the problem of enlarging FIAF membership.

This being considered, the agenda was unanimously adopted.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting in Milan had been sent to all members. There were no corrections to make. They were therefore unanimously approved.

3. SECRETARIAT. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

A. Secretariat

The Secretary-general introduced Miss Josseline Duchovier who had been hired especially for the FIAF Periodical Indexing project and, if possible, to help the Executive Secretary.

For this same purpose, the Secretariat was now equipped with an offset machine. Mr Ledoux invited all the members to visit the FIAF office some time during the meeting.
The Secretary-general then evoked various questions which had arisen for the Secretariat since the Milan meeting.

a) FIAF's legal case in Paris.

This tedious problem of the FIAF archives blocked in Paris had to be discussed again because the Japan Film Library (Mrs Kawakita) had now tabled its conclusions in the affair which opposed it to FIAF and these conclusions were absolutely false and even offensive but so extravagant that one was tempted to give up.

Mr Pogacic, Mr Lindgren and Mr Toepplitz had been consulted. Mr Toeplicitz and Mr Pogacic thought that FIAF should nevertheless continue to fight but, if necessary, take other counsels for its defense in Paris. Mr Ledoux doubted whether any other lawyer would work with more enthusiasm for such an old case. Finally, Mr Borde agreed to go through the whole file again and perhaps ask for the advice of one of his friends, President of the Bar in Toulouse, as to what should be done.

b) Letter of Pedro Cheaskell, Secretary-general of UCAL

Mr Cheaskell had written to Mr Ledoux asking for FIAF's intervention for a Colombian cinematist who had been arrested by the authorities of his country.

Mr Ledoux had transmitted a copy of this letter to all members of the Executive Committee together with a copy of his answer to Mr Cheaskell which said that, contrary to what happened in the case of the directors of the Cinémathèque du Tierre Monde, he would probably not obtain the consent of the majority for such an action; the discussions in Bucharest had indeed shown that most of FIAF members agreed that the Federation's duty was limited to the defense of film archives and their principles.

The answers received to this circular letter by Mr Ledoux all expressed the same opinion. Therefore, it was decided that the Secretary-general would write to Mr Cheaskell to confirm his first letter.

c) Request of the Cinémathèque Québécoise about a Latin-American documentarist's retrospective

Mr Daudelin had written to the Secretariat asking about a possible circulation amongst FIAF archives of the retrospective of Latin-American documentaries organised by Staatliches Filmmuseum on the occasion of the Leipzig Festival.

Mr Kleue said that, until now, they were not authorized to circulate these films, except those from Brazil and Chile, but they were still hoping to receive the authorization from other Latin-American colleagues, e.g. Havana. Mr Alves-Nato had promised to try to clarify the concerned copyright problems and Mr Kleue thought he would be able to give a definite answer in Moscow.
B. MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONS

a) National Film Theatre of Australia

This organisation, which was well known from the Executive Committee, had written to the Secretariat asking, not for membership, but to be kept well informed on our activities on a mutual exchange basis. It was agreed that one would wait for Professor Toeplitz’ report on the situation in Australia before answering this request.

b) Cinemateket / Stockholm

The Secretary-general had had the visit of Mr Jöran Donner and Mrs Ana-Lena Wibom. It seemed that the situation at the Swedish film archive was still unclear and, as concerned FIAF, less and less consistent with the Zagreb resolution. Unfortunately, there was nothing FIAF could do to remedy this.

Mr Nils-Hugo Geger had asked FIAF a letter of reference as former Treasurer and member of the Executive Committee. This was unanimously accepted.

c) Türk Sinematek Derneği

Mr Onat Kutlaz had recently advised the Secretary-general that, due to new regulations in his country, Türk Sinematek Derneği was compelled to withdraw from the FIAF.

This was of course very sad news but nothing could be done to prevent it. However, since art. 11 of the FIAF Statutes said that “members and correspondents of the Federation can resign provided that they are up-to-date in the payment of their subscriptions”, and since T.S.D. was two years’ payment in arrears, it was decided to write them in this sense, refusing their resignation in the hope that it might somehow help them.

Türk Film Arsivi remained thus our only Turkish member. They did not have the same problems since they were the official film archive in Turkey. It was agreed that, if the re-applied as last year for full membership, Mr Pagacic would be the Executive Committee’s delegate to visit their archive as foreseen in the Statutes.

d) New candidatures.

Before discussing the various applications for FIAF membership or requests for information on this same membership which he had received, Mr Ledoux evoked and asked to discuss the fundamental problem which some of the candidatures would create, not only presently, but probably more and more often in the future, namely: the fact that they originated from organisations which were undoubtedly kind of “cinéclube” (film societies) in need of films and hoping to acquire them through FIAF if they became member or correspondent, at least by name.
Personally, Mr Ledoux said he was hesitant because 1º) on the one hand, he felt the necessity to keep FIAF at a level of real film archives whose main activity was to build up a collection of films and, accessory, to project these films; 2º) on the other hand, those film-societies asking to enter FIAF carried perhaps the embryo of future film archives, as was the case for Anthology Film Archives.

One should perhaps also make a distinction between such applicants in countries where there was not yet a film archive and those countries where film archives already existed. In the first case, the candidatures should be examined with great care and more readily accepted.

Mr Privato entirely agreed with this point of view.

Mr Konlechner said it was very difficult for a young archive to start without putting the emphasis on the projection of films. It was a matter of financial means. Anyway, each case was different and very much dependent on local situation. The main thing was to examine whether the candidate seriously intended to create a real archive sooner or later.

Mr Pagelnic said he saw two solutions to this problem: 1º) to admit them as correspondent first and see how the situation developed. Of course, there would still be the problem of lending them films. 2º) to seriously examine the cases one by one and answer them accordingly.

No other opinion being expressed on this problem in general, the Secretary-general started the discussion on the requests received by the Secretariat.

Sonic Hanje- Niele United Foundations (Norway)
This organisation had applied for membership in FIAF and the necessary information had been sent them but no reply received since then.
Mr Stanklev said there was no necessity to discuss further on this organisation since it was not serious at all, from a FIAF point of view.

Women & Film (California)
State Records Center and Archives (New Mexico - U.S.A.)
Library and Museum of the Performing Arts (Lincoln Center - New York)
Academy of Motion Picture Arts & Sciences (Hollywood)

Considering this impressive show of interest for FIAF from American organisations, Mr Kuiper underlined that there were good examples of those more or less organised bodies concerned with film some of which, like Anthology Film Archives, might eventually mature and make a positive contribution to cinematographic culture.

Mr Ledoux, taking as example the Belgian situation, explained what, in his opinion, would be damageable for FIAF if one multiplied film archives in any given country. He had anyway already exposed the same arguments in Milan during the discussion on "Future Policy".
The two main problems for any film archive are always the lack of funds and the archives' fight to obtain films. A multiplicity of film archives in the same country would only aggravate these problems since the sources dispensing both money and films would not be multiplied at the same time. Perhaps that in very large countries like the USA, the situation was different.

Mr. Fogeic added that, even in countries where there was only one film archive, the importance of its work was often not recognized at its true worth and one should also try to remedy this situation. But one could and should have more contacts with those other organisations even if they did not become member of FIAF.

The Secretary-general then continued with the new applications for membership.

München Stadtseeum / Filmmuseum
Mr. Enno Petelas had been appointed as new director of the film department at the München Stadtseeum. He had written to Mr. Ledoux expressing his intention to apply for the status of Correspondent, but had not yet sent an official application.

Mr. Konlechner strongly supported their future application, but it was decided to wait for the official documents before discussing it.

Luxemburg
The Grand Duchy of Luxemburg has the intention to establish a national film archive to preserve, at least in the beginning, all the films concerning Luxemburg and to organise projections of classical films. They had written to ask for information on joining FIAF.

Mr. Ledoux said that this was certainly an interesting candidature although, in a way, competitive with the Brussels Cinémathèque as far as concerned the acquisition of films since Luxemburg did not have its own distribution system and was supplied mostly by Belgian film distributors.

It was decided to send them all the required information and to wait for their official application.

Tahran / The Iranian Film Archive
Mr. Gaffary had written to announce that he would very soon send the necessary documents for the application of his archive. It was decided to invite him as observer in Moscow.

Pvanga Yang / Korean Film Archives
Mr. Choe Han Ne, President of the Korean Federation of Film Archives, had written to inform FIAF that the name of his archive had been changed into "National Film Archives of the D.P.R.K." and that they wanted to apply for full membership in FIAF. This being probably due to a misunderstanding, all the necessary information had been sent them on the procedures to follow for a provisional membership application.
Mr Pagacic and Mr Privato who recently had both had contacts with this archive, said that they were certainly a very serious organisation with a collection of films largely sufficient to allow them to become member of FIAF. It was agreed to send them a telegram to ask them to bring all required documents to Moscow.

St. Deutsche Kinomathak / Berlin

Mr Rathseck had again sent in the application of his archive as full member of FIAF and, this time, well in advance. Mr Klaus and Mr Stenklev were designated to visit their premises in Berlin and were asked to make a report for the next E.C. meeting in Moscow.

Anthology Film Archives / New York

All the members had in their files the application of A.F.A. as provisional member, together with all the documents required by the Statutes. Everyone agreed that A.F.A. was a serious organisation, fully qualified following the Statutes to become a member of FIAF, but a certain reticence was expressed on the grounds that they would, if accepted, be the fourth U.S. member in FIAF (not counting U.C.L.A. film archive which has the status of Correspondent).

This caused a new discussion on the general and fundamental principles of FIAF's future policy: "Was a proliferation of FIAF member archives in one same country prejudicial to the Federation and, if so, shouldn't we establish rules which would limit the access to FIAF, and consequently perhaps also the creation of new film archives, in a same country?"

Mr Ledoux resumed the arguments he had expressed earlier, i.e. that a proliferation of archives meant competition for the funds granted to the archives and for the films deposited by the producers.

But Mrs Bowser explained that this was not true in the U.S.A., since the creation of new archives was, in a way, demanded by the vastness of the country. No one could stop that end, for the producers and those organisations dispensing funds, it made no difference whether they were recognized by FIAF or not. There was also, she said, a very high degree of cooperation amongst American archives, not competition.

Mr Pagacic agreed that it was difficult, if not impossible, to establish a rule which could rightly apply to all the film archives in the world. He proposed to offer the status of Correspondent to new applicants for a year or two, as a kind of "stage".

Mr Stenklev said that the Statutes (art.5) were not clear as concerned the definition of members. Following this article, any archive, official or private, could in fact become a member. Consequently, FIAF was now a combination of an international organisation and a semi-private club.
He thought that an international organisation should be fundamentally built up by national bodies which form its backbone. If we seriously wanted to cope with the producers' organisations (e.g. to come to an agreement with them on copyright), with the UNESCO, etc... we had to become a real international organisation composed mainly of national archives with official support. We could not expect international bodies to treat us seriously when the rules concerning membership were as liberal as ours, opening a wide gate for entry even to completely private archives.

Therefore, Mr Stenkiiev suggested to rewrite art. 5 & 6 of the Statutes, but it was decided to study this modification under item 5 of the agenda.

Mr Ladoux saw one possible solution: to set up, inside FIAF, a separate section of national archives which would be responsible in relation to the producers. Any other film archive could then be admitted in FIAF without problem.

Coming back to Anthology Film Archives, an indicative vote was taken on their admission, with the following results:

- for granting them provisional membership: 6
- for a status of correspondent: 3
- abstention: 1

Cinémathèque suisse / Lausanne

The second day of the Executive Committee meeting, Mr Buache sent to its members a telex submitting the application of his archive for full membership in FIAF. It was decided to submit it to the General Meeting in Moscow.

4. FINANCES

The Treasurer, Mr Konlechner, presented the financial report for the year 1972 which had been distributed to all members.

He commented it page by page but every item being clearly exposed in the written report, there was almost no discussion. The balance for 1972 presented a surplus of BF. 102,476,-

Mr Konlechner had also distributed a Budget proposal for 1974. He explained that he had not yet included the Periodical Indexing project in this budget, although it involved a great amount of money, because he had not yet received the exact figures from the Documentation Commission. It was decided to discuss this question under item 7 of the agenda: Commissions' reports.

Both the financial report and the budget proposal were unanimously approved.
5. MODIFICATIONS OF STATUTES AND RULES

In Milan, Mr Stenklev had been asked to examine the possibility of simplifying the FIAF Statutes and Rules and to report about it at this meeting.

He said that, having carefully looked into the matter, he had soon been struck by the difficulty of the task because it involved, not only a simplification of the Rules which were really too accurate and – paradoxically – sometimes too confusing, but also a basic change of some articles of the Statutes (mainly art. 5 & 6). This had also appeared during the discussion this morning on the new applications for membership.

Considering this difficulty, Mr Stenklev asked for the creation of a small ad-hoc committee to help him in the re-writing of the Statutes and Rules. This was agreed but it was decided that Mr Stenklev should first make a written draft which he would send to the members of this committee. They would then send him their corrections and suggestions and, if necessary, a meeting would be organized afterwards.

The following members were appointed to this committee: the future President, the future Secretary-General, Mr Kuiper and of course, Mr Stenklev.

Several proposals for modifications of the Rules had been submitted to this Executive Committee (annex 1). Some were new; the proposals made by Mr Pogacic and by Mr Volkman. Some were modifications which had already been decided at the second E.C. meeting in Bucharest but had not yet been formulated: art. 6, 9, 58 & 66.

It was decided not to discuss any of these proposals now but to draw Mr Stenklev's attention on them when re-writing the Rules.

It was also decided to take into account Mr Ledoux' proposal (art. 66) on the election of the reserve members at the next General Meeting, as it had been done in Bucharest.

6. REPORTS ON THE PROJECTS

All the members had in their files a list of projects and publications under way. The Secretary-General asked to discuss all these projects one by one and, if no progress could be reported on some of them, to delete them from the list to be presented at the General Meeting.

1. Enquiry about technical devices for films of sizes no longer in common use (3FA Berlin)

Mr Klaus said that this project had already been cancelled in Bucharest.
2. Study on the copying of optical sound tracks (F.M. Wien)

Mr Konlechner reported that unfortunately this project could not be completed in Vienna because of technical difficulties. They did not have the right apparatuses to do this study properly. Therefore, he either proposed to delete the project or to entrust it to somebody else, perhaps the Motion Picture Section at the Library of Congress.

Mr Ledoux thought one should not delete this project since it interested many archives, but perhaps do it in a simpler way: ask the archives to formulate questions on this matter, as a first step, and later find a specialist to answer this questionnaire.

Mr Klaue said it would also be useful if libraries reported on their experiments in this field, good or bad. One could already deduct some useful hints from the sum of such reports. Mr Privato proposed to ask the technicians of Gosfilmofond, already during the Moscow Congress, to answer the members’ questions and to organise a demonstration of sound copying. It was finally decided that Mr Konlechner, Mr Kuiper and Mr Ledoux would talk together on how to solve this problem and would report about it on the next day.

3. Embryo 2 (SFA Berlin)

Mr Klaue reported that the draft of Embryo 2 was completed. He hoped to be able to distribute the printed volume in Moscow.

4. Atlas for the identification of slapstick actors (Prague)

Since there was no news from Prague, it was decided to delete this project from the list.

5. List of filmographical sources classified by personalities (Prague)

Same problem as above.

6. List of filmographical sources classified by country (Bucharest)

Mr Zaicu had written to the Secretary-general saying that the 1970 list of national filmographical sources would be revised and completed and that this new edition would probably be published in 1974 or 75.

7. List of filmographical sources classified by genre. (Sofia)

Mr Stoyanov-Bigor had reported that this project was under way and would probably be ready by 1974.

8. List of important films considered as lost. (Amsterdam)

Mr de Veal reported that no progress had lately been made on this project but he asked that it be maintained in the Dutch archive’s name. No report would be made in Moscow.
9. Annual bibliography of books on the cinema (Bucharest).
Mr Zaicu had written that this project was still under way, but he complained on the lack of cooperation of certain members. It was decided to discuss this project in Moscow.

10. Bibliography of publications by members of FIAF (Ottawa)
Mr Morris had written that copies would be available for the Moscow Congress.

11. Filmmakers' bibliography (Ottawa)
The Canadian Film Archives had started work on this. An outline of the format and a tentative list of names for inclusion should be available for consideration by members at the Congress.

12. Anthology of serious film criticism published before 1914 (Brussels)

13. Bibliography of publications dealing with the work of film archives (Brussels)
The Belgian film archive had not yet been able to start on these projects. They should be momentarily suppressed from the list.

14. Internal list of continuities and dialogue lists in the film archives (Secretariat)
This was considered as an important project but Mrs Bowser asked to postpone it until the Documentation Commission had completed its standard rules for listing continuities and dialogues. They were presently working on it.

The other projects entrusted to the Secretariat:

20. Customs
21. Insurances
22. Leaflet "Why preserve films?"
23. To collect and translate the legal and administrative texts on the functionning of the archives.

24. Theatre program of film archives were also deleted.
For project 23, it was nevertheless decided that Jugoslovenska Kinoteka would prepare a questionnaire or a circular letter, but not before Moscow.

15. Basic Manual for film archives (Belgrade)
After a long discussion in which Mr Pogacic expressed the disappointment of his collaborators at the Jugoslovenska Kinoteka after he had informed them about the decisions taken in Milan, these decisions were nevertheless confirmed and the specific tasks of drafting the various chapters of the manual were assigned.
The number of pages which each of these chapters should comprise approximately was also indicated.

Taking in hand the draft summary of the Manual which had been circulated at the Lyon Congress, Mr Pogacic distributed the different chapters as follows:

I. Why set up a national archive? V. Pogacic. 5 pages

II. How to set up a national archive: (Which films should be preserved? Training of the staff. Sources of finances of an archive. Non-commercial activity. Importance of legislation, obligations towards film-industry and commercial distribution. Principles of FIAF, etc... etc...) V. Pogacic. + 10 pages.

III. Preservation H. Volkmann. 20 pages

IV. Cataloguing. F. Acimovic will be asked to condense the already written chapter into approx. 30 pages.

V. Film showings and programs : F. Acimovic. 10 pages P. Konischner will write a short (2 p.) statement on the technical aspects of film showing.

VI. Documentation: Someone from the Documentation Commission. 30 pages

VII Apparatuves and other exhibits: J. de Vaal. 5 pages

VIII Copyright: J. Kuiper. 5-10 pages

All the written chapters will be centralized in Belgrade and edited by the Jugoslavenska Kinoteka. The new drafts are to be completed by October 1, 1973.

16. Summer school for archive personnel (5FA Berlin)

Mr Klaus had distributed a draft timetable (annex 2) of the Summer School to be held in Berlin 27 August - 12 September. He had until now received 4 applications to the course but would send a reminder to all members.

17. Liquidation of "The Pool" (Amsterdam)

Mr de Vaal will make a report about this at the Moscow Congress. The liquidation of The Pool is almost completed.

18. Charter of the fundamental principles of FIAF (J. Toeplitz & E. Lindgren)

Both members entrusted with this project had been unavoidably prevented from doing it, so there would be no report in Moscow.

19. A collection of instruction books and technical manuals (J. Kuiper)

Mr Kuiper reported that this project was in progress but not enough to be discussed in Moscow.
25. Information center of research projects (Brussels)

The Cinémathèque Royale de Belgique has not yet been able to work on this project, but will do so in the future.

26. Catalogue of silent films in the members' collections (Brussels)

The catalogue is under preparation. Mr Ledoux will report about it in Moscow.

THIRD SESSION

7. REPORTS OF THE COMMISSIONS

a) Documentation Commission

Mrs Bowser had distributed a short written report which read:

The Documentation Commission will meet March 21-23 in Copenhagen, immediately following the Executive Committee meeting in Brussels. The 1972 FIAF International Index to Film Periodicals was turned over to R.R. Bowker Company on February 28, and is now in preparation for publication. Karen Jones brought the cards to New York, and spent a week working together with the editorial staff at Bowker. The publisher plans a June publication date, but we doubt that there will be copies ready for the Moscow Congress.

An additional subscription was paid for 1972 by Turin, and therefore we have completed the first year with a slightly better surplus than was anticipated. A final report will be prepared for the next Executive Committee meeting in Moscow, as well as a provisional budget for 1974.

Mrs Bowser added a few words on the transfer of the Periodical Indexing project over to Michael Moulds and the FIAF Secretariat. It was too soon to judge of its complete success. There were still some difficulties which could probably be overcome, but on the whole it was running well.

She also said that the Commission was definitely thinking about the time when the Periodical Indexing could have its separate office and all the personnel responsible for it could work in the same place. This would eventually be necessary because the Commission wanted to keep expanding the project. Mr Konlechner also said that in this case there should be a separate account for the Periodical Indexing, independent from the FIAF budget, but still supervised by the Treasurer.

Mr Borde, Mr Pogacic, Mr Ledoux and Mr de Vaal thought that, even if it flew much more important, the project should remain in the FIAF Secretariat, "physically" and financially; it was its only firm basis. No one knew who the editor would be next year and anyway it was a FIAF project and it should
also benefit to the FIAF Secretariat. Since Mrs Bowzer only wanted to have the Executive Committee's opinion on this matter in order to inform the Commission, no real decision was taken.

Mrs Bowzer had also distributed the Periodical Indexing accounts for 1972, which showed a surplus of BF. 82,145,- and the list of subscribers. Concerning the non-paying FIAF members, it was agreed that the American Film Institute should not receive a second set of cards without paying, and that, instead of the Hochschule für Film und Fernsehen in East Berlin, the cards should be addressed to Staatliches Filmarchiv der DDR.

b) Preservation Commission

All the members had in their files a written report by Mr Volkmann giving the time schedule for the proposed new chapters of the manual for preservation of colour films. This report will be published in the FIAF Bulletin.

One of the urgent problems of the Commission was to find archives willing to act as host for its two next meetings. Since this was also a problem for all the other Commissions, it was agreed that one should not anymore depend on an archive which had always financial difficulties for making such invitations, but that one could easily organise the Commissions' meetings in country hotels, out of season, and that in any country, one could find hotels of which prices did not exceed the 20% a day which FIAF allowed to each delegate for such meetings.

c) Cataloguing Commission

Mr Klaus had no report to make since there had been no meeting of the Commission during the last year. The cataloguing manual was ready to be printed and would probably be distributed in Moscow.

d) Copyright Commission

No report on this Commission's work could be done because, partly due to the illness of Mr Lindgren, there had been no meeting of the Commission, but also because they were still in the process of collecting information from the member archives and this information was very slow to come in. It was decided to wait until the Moscow Congress to take any further step.

8. NEXT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND GENERAL MEETING

Mr Privato gave the following details on the Moscow Congress:

It will be held from the 7th to the 12th of June (Executive Committee meeting: 4 - 6 June). Gosfilmofond wants to invite two delegates from every full member archive and one delegate from all the other FIAF archives, as also observers from developing countries and one representative of UNESCO. For all these delegates, Gosfilmofond offers to pay boarding costs and meals.
There will be a one day visit to Gosfilmofond in Bielye Stolby, but all the meetings will be held in Moscow.

Gosfilmofond also intends to organise a one-day Symposium on Eisenstein and Poudovkine with the participation of Soviet experts and of the FIAF members. In order to celebrate Gosfilmofond's 25th anniversary, its director will make a report on its activities and a special exhibition will be set up.

Concerning the observers, it was decided that the FIAF would invite (but at their own cost) delegates from the archives applying for membership and a representative of the International Council of Archives. Mr Privato also suggested to invite Mr Langlois and Mrs Kawakita but, considering the reluctance of most of the Executive Committee's members to these invitations, he withdrew his suggestion. Mrs Bowser also agreed not to invite James Card whom she had proposed at first, but the Executive Committee said one might send an invitation to Mrs Chloe Aaron, director of Public Media, at the National Endowment for the Arts in Washington.

Mr Pogacic having asked which members of the E.C. were ready to prepare a written contribution to the Symposium on Eisenstein and Poudovkine, there was a positive answer from Mr Klauw, Mrs Bowser, Mr Borde, Mr Kuiper and Mr Molnar. Mr Pogacic agreed to coordinate these contributions and to keep Gosfilmofond informed.

XXXth Congress / 1974

There was a preliminary report from Jean Clavel of the Canadian Film Archives concerning the plans for the 1974 Congress to be jointly hosted by his archive and the Cinémathèque Québécoise. The Executive Committee agreed to accept the dates of May 20-27, 1974 for the Congress in order that delegates may depart before the 31st of May when the air travel rates normally increase. Further details concerning the 1974 Congress will be discussed in Moscow.

9. RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

I.F.T.C. (International Film and Television Council)

In December, Mr Pogacic had attended I.F.T.C.'s General Meeting as delegate of FIAF. He had been elected Vice-President of I.F.T.C., together with Mr Brieson, but he said that nothing important had been discussed at this meeting. Mr Maddison, the President, had resigned and no other President had yet been elected.

Concerning the UNESCO Study on the systematic preservation of films, Mr Ledoux reported that the Canadian Film Archives had accepted to fulfil this task on behalf of FIAF, as proposed in Milan. Mr Privato said he would consider inviting Mrs Caillois in Moscow so that she could meet Peter Morris and be better informed on film archives' problems.
10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The FIAF Bulletin

Everyone agreed that the last number (3) of the Bulletin showed considerable improvement on the preceding numbers, but the high cost of producing it (± 300 BF a copy) was thought really disproportionate to its interest. It was decided that delegates at the Moscow Congress would be asked to evaluate it and decide if it serves a purpose worth the cost of publishing it.

Proposal to elect Prof. Toeplitz as honorary member (H. Volkmann)

Mr Volkmann had circulated the following motion amongst the E.C. members:
"I propose to elect Prof. Dr. Jerzy Toeplitz, former President of the FIAF, as honorary member.

Prof. Toeplitz has been president of the FIAF for nearly two decades. In this time FIAF had to overcome great difficulties and it is his merit that, nevertheless, the Federation developed to one of the most active international film organisations."

Several members having stated that Prof. Toeplitz himself had more than once refused this distinction, it was decided that one should not act against his will.

List of cinematographic anniversaries (I. Molnar)

In Milan, Mr Molnar had been entrusted with the task of setting up a list of anniversaries to celebrate in the field of cinema. Every member now had this list in his file. It was unanimously agreed to publish it in the FIAF Bulletin.

All the items on the agenda having been discussed, President Pogacic declared the meeting closed. He thanked all the participants and the Royal Belgian Film Archive for its hospitality.
PROPOSITION DE MODIFICATION DU REGLEMENT SUR L'ELECTION DES MEMBRES SUPPLEANTS

En vue de faciliter et de raccourcir les procédures d'élection du Comité directeur, je propose les modifications suivantes :

Art. 65
Après avoir élu le Président, le Secrétaire-général et le Trésorier, on dresse la liste des candidats membres du Comité directeur. Les huit candidats ayant recueilli le plus de voix seront élus membres effectifs du Comité directeur. Les trois suivants seront automatiquement membres suppléants et ils seront classés dans l'ordre du nombre de voix obtenues. On aura ainsi un premier, un second, un troisième suppléant.

Art. 66
Au cas où le huitième et le neuvième candidat, ou deux des suppléants, obtenaient le même nombre de voix, la présidence irait au membre siégeant pour la première fois au Comité directeur.
Motion

Modification of the rules of FIAF, article 76c and d.

New article 76 c.

Honorary members (may) attend meetings of the General Meeting and of the Executive Committee and (may) take part in the discussion, but they shall not have the right of vote.

New article 76 d.

Honorary members may be elected by the General Meeting to any function of the FIAF. In this case, they have every rights of their office according to the Statutes and Rules of the federation. They may be asked to fulfill certain missions for the Federation or represent it, (on the condition that) if they receive a(definite) mandate from the General Meeting or the Executive Committee.

( Words between brackets are meant to be crossed out).
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Art. 54
Votes shall be cast by a show of hands, except in those cases provided for in the Statutes and Rules, namely:
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 
   d) 
   e) 
f) election of the honorary members

Art. 56
All decisions shall be voted by a simple majority except in those cases where the Statutes require a majority of two-thirds, namely:
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 
   d) 
   e) 
f) election of the honorary members.

Art. 8 & 9
These two articles on the voting procedures for admitting full members should be revised in order to avoid the situation which occurred at the time of the vote on the admittance of the American Film Institute Archives which was admitted as full member even though there were less than half the votes in favour of this decision (13 votes, against 15 divided amongst other possibilities).

Art. 66
The following proposal made by the Cinemathèque Royale de Belgique and tried out at the Bucharest Congress should be included in this article and revised in such a way that the classification of the reserve members (first, second, third) be determined in a clear way.

"If such a delegate has not already been elected, one of the three posts of reserve member will be given to a delegate who has never served on the Executive Committee."