

NB Sorry for delay in getting these to you - thank you for your promptness: ML

LONDON FILM-MAKERS CO-OP: DISTRIB. EWHIB. WORKING PARTY

Some rough minutes for meeting on 27.1.79

Present; James Mackay, Andrew Nicolson, Andrew Dunlop, Rod Stoneman, Mike Leggett (whose hand this is....)

The original discussion paper was discussed further in order to establish the viability of its (a) assumptions made about the general standing of the LFMC in areas of ~~xxxx~~ production, distribution and exhibition, ie its material history; (b) assumptions made about the existence of a tangible discourse as an integrated strata within the above and (c) the much more down to earth problems of how to get the films out to a larger number of venues/people.

JM talked about the activity prevalent amongst recent and younger members at the Co-op, their involvement with 'work on a discourse' rather than simply the 'production of art' and the apparent and retrograde tendency for a generation stratification to take place such that certain audiences could be expected for certain film-makers ~~films~~ <sup>shows</sup> and as a result the 'younger generation' were having to slowly recover 'old ground'.

AD talked about the general audience and the different ways it could be described saying that the East Midlands IFA was working on this area, that it was important for the LFMC to have a more active relationship with the IFA, to be more conscious of these problems as being those of other independent film-makers.

AN (I think it was) who raised the matter of modes of work presentation, ie via lectures, short and very specific programmes, packages. The strategy that should be adopted concerning the existing LFMC catalogue. RS launched into the need to completely re-define the function of the catalogue; first to establish the information, then to externalise it so that the touting of films for rent became seen as an activity integrated (rather than distinct as it is at the moment) with a developing discourse. The new BFI catalogue was sited as an example of how this approach could be successful.

ML proposed that the days good discussions be pulled around a series of specific areas; that each individual prepare an outline description ~~the~~ based on the discussions, together with the alternative solutions that had presented themselves; in other words present at the next meeting detailed minutes of what had gone on (together with further thoughts) so that the job of drawing up specific ~~xxxx~~ proposals for the AGM could commence at the third and final meeting.

Continued....

continued

The tasks were identified and spread-out;

AD and AN would prepare something on the idea of a magazine/anthology/catalogue (small c);

RS would look into the requirements of/for an (anthology) Catalogue.

Both tasks would include proposals to do with editorial practice, commission and lineage rates, printing costs and overheads. ie such that a theoretical position could be put into the perspective of material feasibility.

ML would draw up a set of guidelines for use by film-makers and venues to close the gap that exists at present, a situation that has come about through mutual ignorance (again).

JM was going to look at the requirements for the Big Bash Co-ordinator mooted in the past - someone to deal with foreign bookers, Festival organisers and also be responsible for the generation of events.

JM and AN with an internal group of cinema screening enthusiasts (?) were going to look at the feasibility of preview screenings as a regular activity.

With supreme optimism, the six hour meeting dissolved having decided to meet at the BRISTOL ARTS CENTRE, King Square on

FRIDAY 2nd MARCH BETWEEN 11-12 AM commencement

NB The weekend entitled POLITICAL FILM starts at 7.30pm the same day.

