

London Film-makers Co-op Working Party :Catalogue Proposal. Draft II

A new catalogue is needed to overcome the limitations of previous Co-op catalogues, employing more detailed and visual material, greater documentation and including general articles to extend film-makers' control over post-production practices. The innovative work of the last two BFI Production Board catalogues, and to a lesser extent those of the Other Cinema and the Arts Council, should be adapted and extended to Co-op distribution...

A person (chosen by normal democratic procedures) would be paid to work for 6 or 9 months to produce the catalogue; they would liaise with, and be responsible to, a Co-op sub-committee.

- 1) The new catalogue would be carefully designed with good typesetting and innovative lay-out; it would include more visual material - stills, diagrams etc.
- 2) It would include general articles (both previously written and specially commissioned) from pieces on background, theory, history (say Tony Rayns 'Modernism' in Production Board Catalogue 1, or Annabel Nicholson's piece in the Edinburgh '78 programmes) to articles on specific areas of work (say Expanded, Str/Mat, Systemic, Para-narrative etc).
- 3) One possible way of ordering the catalogue would be to devote a section to details of specific films, listed under individuals in the traditional way; followed by a section with articles and ~~lists of~~ (self-nominated) lists of films which relate to the areas.

Notes : Non-promotion.

Articles discussing areas of work, and not specific films, would help to break down, rather than enforce, the existing selectivity (the small minority of films which enter public discourse through being mentioned in

art magazines or 'perspectived' by the Arts Council) operative in distribution any way. The Co-op's policy of non-promotion should be interpreted as ^arefusing^{al} to select individual films, makers not a refusal to publicise or contextualise the work co-operatively - there is a crucial distinction between selective/individual promotion and the promotion of a body of work and ideas... 'There is an inherent weakness in non-promotion which eliminates persuasion and taste forming which are open to competitors' (Le Grice, 'Some Thoughts on Recent Underground Film', Afterimage 4.)

Passive Distribution.

One must recognise that a large proportion of bookings do, and will, utilise traditional modes (it is the work of ideology to incorporate new product into old relations/models...) Perhaps the provision of a context of discourse would go some way to counter this. Some stress in the catalogue should be laid on the (significance of) the Co-op's practice of accompanied screenings.

Very Approximate Estimated Costs.

<u>Editor's pay</u>	2000
at £80 per week for 6 months full time or 1 year $\frac{1}{2}$ time.	
<u>Editorial Assistance</u>	100
proof-reading	
<u>Commissioned Articles</u>	180
4 articles x 3000 words at BFI writing rate of £15 per 1000	
<u>Design</u>	200
at $\frac{1}{4}$ professional rate - hoping to involve PG design students at RCA or elsewhere	
<u>Typesetting</u>	1000
at 200 pages x 1000 words per page at £5 per 1000 words	
<u>Printing, Binding</u>	1500
including plate-making	

Total = £ 4980

Format.

200 pages A 4 :

180 pages Films

15 pages Articles

5 pages beginnings, title index etc

Funding.

Funds for this specific project should be sought from the BFI Editorial Department, occasional publications (who can pay $\frac{1}{2}$ any printing cost). The considerable size of the amount needed suggests we should look for joint funding from GLAA, Arts Council, BFI and possibly an institutional research grant for the editor ?

Relation with Magazine ~~Proposal~~.

The work on magazine and catalogue could run concurrently, with the catalogue appearing after several issues of the magazine and perhaps utilising some of the materials gathered...

In order for this to be successful most of the present catalogue should be disposed of as usefully and economically as possible.

Rod Stoneman (24 March 79)