

From:  
PB 42  
9/7/75

before the end of the financial year the Board agreed to make an award of £12,000 for the production of a minimum of six newsreels within a period of eight months.

#### FRAGMENTATION (Brian Muller)

Malcolm Legrice said that he found the project potentially very interesting on aesthetic grounds but did not understand why it should be so expensive. Peter Sainsbury pointed out that experimental projects such as this were usually budgeted for the material cost of the production only, but in this case the budget included payment to the film maker, his assistants and the actor and a considerable amount of equipment hire, these items being standard on the budgets of non-experimental projects being passed by the Board. He suggested that there were no grounds for treating applicants differently in this respect. The committee however agreed that the applicant should be invited to re-submit with a lower budget or to submit an alternative but cheaper project. also ←

#### DADA (Rex Bloomstein)

Several members of the committee considered that the applicant's treatment of Dadaism was singularly unconvincing, but it was also felt that there was sufficient evidence of serious intent within the application to award a test sequence. £300 was voted for this.

#### LONDON FILM MAKERS CO-OPERATIVE WORKSHOP

Malcolm Legrice declared a special interest in this application but the Chairman declined his offer to withdraw from the discussion. Peter Sainsbury explained that it was not suggested that the committee should support the entirety of the Film Makers Co-operative's needs but only in those areas which the committee itself believed to be within its brief. Tony Rayns argued that the committee should not take what appeared to be a weak application at face value. He explained that the constitution of the Co-operative as an open-access organisation made the expression of precise aims and objectives extremely difficult. At the same time the committee should recognise the impressive record of the Co-op as an organisation that had facilitated the production, distribution and discussion of experimental concerns in film which had become central to independent film work in this country in recent years.

Peter Gidal, the treasurer of the Co-operative, joined the discussion and was questioned by the committee about problems of access to the proposed film workshop, the possibility of establishing training courses and use of film processing equipment and the number of film makers likely to benefit from the development of the workshop. It was pointed out that Camden Council had undertaken to provide the Co-operative with secure premises. Since the application entailed a number of variable aspects the committee voted unanimously to support the application in principle. The officers of the Board were instructed to consult with the Co-operative on the precise figure required and to report back to the meeting.