

In effect, therefore, there will be two ballots, one for Senior Representatives and one for Junior Representatives; both will be based on a single transferable voting system. In each ballot at least three votes must be cast in rank order, of which at least one must be for a female candidate and at least one must be for a male candidate. This electoral system has been chosen to give substance to the World Archaeological Congress's intention to give balance to senior and junior members, and to both sexes.

Those duly elected will constitute the Executive of the World Archaeological Congress, together with eight representatives of indigenous peoples/the Fourth World (these Representatives will be chosen by the International Indian Treaty Council, the World Council of Indigenous Peoples, and the United Nations' Working Group on Indigenous Populations). At its first meeting in 1988 the Executive will elect its own chair.

At the end of the second Congress of the World Archaeological Congress in 1990 Council will decide which half of the Executive will cease to serve. The remaining half of the Executive will continue to serve until the third Congress of the World Archaeological Congress.

Elections for the vacant half of the Executive will proceed as soon as possible after each Council meeting. Nominations from the Regional Electoral Colleges will only be accepted for nominees from countries in that region not at that time represented on the Executive.

Subsequently, each half of the Executive will serve for a period of eight years.

The Executive will normally meet at least during each of the Congresses and Inter-Congresses of the World Archaeological Congress.

6. Council

At the time of each Congress of the World Archaeological Congress its Council will comprise one National Representative per country, in addition to the above Regional Representatives and Representatives of Indigenous Peoples/the Fourth World: these National Representatives will be selected by the Individual Member participants from the respective country, and each National Representative will have full voting powers.

Only Council is empowered to elect the President, Secretary and Treasurer of the World Archaeological Congress.

At its four-yearly meetings, Council's agenda will also include matters referred to it from regions, Inter-Congresses and from Congress sessions.

One of its main agenda items will be the arrangements for the next Congress of the World Archaeological Congress.

GERMAN ACCEPTANCE OF A WORLD PROBLEM

Claudia Alberternst

A Congress, which some people claimed to be the 11th congress of the IUPPS (International Union of Pre- and Protohistoric Sciences), was held in Mainz (West Germany) from 31 August to 5 September this year. As most readers will already know, the Congress had been transferred from Southampton to Mainz purely to enable South African and Namibian scientists to participate (see Champion and Shennan 1986; Hodder 1986; Shaw 1986).

After the change of venue had been announced those people in Mainz who supported an academic boycott of South Africa formed a "Co-ordinating Committee for an academic boycott of South Africa". This Co-ordinating Committee included representatives of the Student Union in Mainz, archaeology students from Frankfurt, the Green Party, the Social Democrat Party, and Anti-Apartheid. The Committee arranged a series of practical actions and events that emphasised the links between science and politics and stressed that as Apartheid is laid down in the South African constitution all fields of life in that country are influenced by it. It was emphasised that this is especially true for the field of education where the majority of the population receives only a worthless and discriminating "bantustan education".

As elsewhere, opinion in Mainz was divided over the boycott. Dr. Konrad Weidemann, General Director of the Römisch-Germanisches Central Museum (RGZM), and organiser of the Congress, stated:

The reason why our association, since its foundation, has got the sentence in its statutes that scientists of all countries should work together, is so that scientific communication does not come to a standstill. It has now reaffirmed, at the meetings of its ruling bodies here in Mainz, that it opposes any form of discrimination. The co-operation of scholars of all countries was the matter of concern which led us to invite the Congress to Mainz when this was no longer guaranteed in England. One must say that this invitation was extended by us in an attempt to make clear that we are of the opinion that scholars can not be made automatically responsible for the policies of their government; that this kind of collective responsibility can not be extended to individual scholars.

Because of the experiences which we Germans had ourselves, where we felt with thankfulness, after the

last war, that there are countries and free associations which did not practise this collective responsibility against the Germans, we have said that we hold to this principle which is the only way scholarly co-operation is possible. The alternative -- support of the struggle of the oppressed in South Africa or academic freedom -- that is no alternative. Freedom of knowledge, in my opinion, can give the best support in the struggle of the oppressed. But excluding, on the basis of an empty principle, people who stand on the side of the oppressed, we would not be helping at all.

Arguing from the other standpoint, a visiting lecturer in the Institute of Ethnology and African Studies of the University of Mainz, Professor Daniel P. Kunene, himself an exile South African, stated:

The plight of blacks in South Africa is a matter of record. What many people do not know is that institutions of higher learning, which are controlled by whites, have never taken an official position demanding, and actively working for, fundamental change of this status quo in that country, but have, instead, worked within the constraints of government-dictated policy of gross inequality and discrimination on the basis of colour.

There is no "academic freedom" in South Africa. By accident of birth, millions of South African citizens are virtually excluded from ever becoming members of the community of scholars in that country and abroad. What kind of academic freedom is that? But a more fundamental question needs to be asked: Is true academic freedom possible in a society that denies basic freedoms to the overwhelming majority of its population? If there is no freedom of speech, or of movement, or of association, can there be academic freedom? If there is no freedom from police harassment and constant surveillance, can there be academic freedom? If literature is subjected to censorship and ideas are controlled, can there be academic freedom?

All fields of academic specialisation are used regularly by the South African government to bolster Apartheid. Some South African archaeologists participated in a government-sponsored research project that sought to justify the declaration of KwaNdebele as a true place of origin of Ndebele people, thus lending academic respectability to the segregation of the Ndebele people in the KwaNdebele (homeland).

By early 1987 it had become clear that the Co-ordinating Committee would not achieve its main aim -- to have the South Africans and Namibians excluded or the Congress cancelled. It was, therefore, decided to protest against the participation of South African and Namibian scholars and to ensure that everyone attending the Congress, and all of Mainz, knew the full background to the transfer of the Congress from Southampton to Mainz. These protests included picketing the opening session of the Congress, distributing anti-Apartheid leaflets to the participants throughout the week, issuing press statements and organising alternative academic events. In addition, we wanted to intensify the discussion that had already begun in the University and in the local press, and therefore organised a panel discussion. Among the discussants for this were the organiser of the Congress, Dr. K. Weidemann, the Lord Mayor of Mainz, Herr H. Weyel, the University President, Professor K. Beyermann, the leader of the County Council of Southampton, A. Whitehead, a representative of the ANC and others. Finally we wanted to offer a political platform to the ANC, SWAPO and Anti-Apartheid to discuss the boycott of scientific events.

The Congress did not take place as quietly as the organisers wished. As a member of an Anti-Apartheid group stated on the last day of the Congress, to protest once more against the participation of South African and Namibian scholars:

If you think back to the Congress you will think more about Apartheid and less about archaeology.

This was exactly how one of the few Third World participants felt, as he told us towards the end of the week.

The First Debate in the Senate of the University

In early 1986, when the IUPPS decided not to accept the decision of the British Organising Committee to exclude South Africa, Professor Bihner, the retired General Director of the RGZM, offered to organise the Congress, with South African and Namibian participation in Mainz.

The main sessions of the Congress were scheduled to take place in the Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz and the plenary sessions in rooms made available by the City of Mainz. When the University President was asked for facilities for the Congress by Dr. Weidemann, he was neither informed about the history of the transfer from Southampton to Mainz nor about the fact that there had been a transfer at all. Without this information there was no cause for the University President to refuse facilities or to involve the Senate, as it is quite usual to host international conferences on the Campus.

In February 1986 the local newspaper the Mainzer Allgemeine Zeitung published an article about the Congress which mentioned the background for the first time. Several letters had been sent to the University President in March 1986, especially from the ASTA (Student Representa-

tive Council) and from Anti-Apartheid groups. It was only at this stage that the University President came to know the whole history of the Congress.

How Did We Get Involved?

The first protest was organised by students of ethnology and African studies in Mainz in March 1986. Bettina Schmidt, one of these students, had lived and gone to school in South Africa:

Having gone through a "whites only" education I feel one cannot just sit back and say one is against Apartheid. The scientific world has to see itself as part of the struggle for liberation if it is convinced that the structures of Apartheid are inhuman.

While participating in an excavation in Zimbabwe she came to know that a World Archaeological Congress (WAC) was being organised in Southampton. At that time she did not know that she was about to begin to study at the University which would "break" the boycott of South Africa. She supported the boycott as a member of the anti-Apartheid movement. Since she knew from her own experiences what Apartheid means in every-day life, opposition to the regime became part of her scientific work. When she began to study in Mainz she joined a group preparing an exhibition about South Africa.

Heike Becker, a postgraduate student of African sociology and ethnology, was also a member of this group. She had already carried out research on the social situation in South Africa, especially on the multiple oppression women experience there.

Since I've recognised that one cannot do research on the social structures of Apartheid society without taking a clear position towards that evil system, I thought it necessary to get involved in organised action when the IUPPS was going to organise a conference especially to allow participation of South African and Namibian scientists at Mainz University. I felt it my responsibility to support the anti-Apartheid struggle when it came up in my field of scientific work on Africa.

I myself become involved as a student representative on the Senate of Mainz University. In 1986, after the Congress had been moved to Mainz, I presented a motion to Senate calling for an academic boycott of South Africa. It was obvious that this motion would cause a controversial discussion. What I did not expect were the really shocking arguments put forward by some professors:

Those South African archaeologists who were expected to attend the Congress are without exception working at institutions of research which speak out, partly in a militant way, against the government policy of racism.

If African scientists do not take part in the Congress because South Africans are present, then this is their own problem and nothing to do with us.

After much debate the Senate decided that the University would only provide facilities if "it was ensured that no official national representatives or national delegations of these countries take part".

With different backgrounds and experiences the three of us came to the same conclusion that action is essential to overcome the unjust Apartheid regime. At that moment a gap opened between us and those who only paid lip-service to this conclusion. One of the so called 'militant' opposers of apartheid, Professor Tobias, later accused us of trying to "overturn these principles" of academic freedom and free international exchange.

The Senate One Year Later

Exactly one year later (1987) while we were already organising protest actions against the Congress, the Senate debated the matter for a second time. The State Secretary of the Foreign Office in Bonn, Helmut Schafer (Federal Democratic Party), had informed Uschi Eid (Green Party) that a South African delegation was going to attend the Congress. He had referred to information received from the Congress organiser.

When we came to know of this letter we demanded that the University President cancel the Congress in accordance with the Senate's earlier decision. Asked by Dr. Weidemann to send a second letter Herr Schafer wrote saying that he used the expression "delegation" without knowing the University Senate's decision. "I agree with you that the use of the term "delegation" may give the impression that these are official national representatives". Although this "denial" was met with peals of laughter at Senate the Senate then proceeded to accept it.

Unequivocally every participant in an international Congress is representing his or her country in some way. Specifically, the members of the Permanent Council, the ruling body of the IUPPS do represent their nations. This was the reason why Dr. Morais, a member of the IUPPS Permanent Council for Mozambique, actually flew to Germany to take part in our panel discussion to say how very sorry he was that he could not attend either the Congress or the Permanent Council meetings because of the presence of South Africans and Namibians. The Tanzanian Embassy told us by telephone that they were very upset that a Tanzanian attended the Congress thereby breaking their official national policy of boycotting South Africa. Dr. Weidemann himself promised that no nation

would send a delegation, not even the socialist countries; nevertheless a Czechoslovakian participant at the General Assembly spoke "on behalf of the Czechoslovakian delegation". The Senate's condition, that no official national representatives were allowed to take part, was also violated by Dr. Van Biljon, who is a member of the South African Embassy in Bonn.

In 1987 the University President informed the Senate about the foundation of the Co-ordinating Committee and stated he "noted it with apprehension" and warned "urgently of actions of disturbance". After he met with a group of African students in Mainz in July 1987, at a meeting also attended by members of the Co-ordinating Committee, we thought he was going to change his stance. We proposed a motion for the Senate in which we asserted that the Senate's decision of 1986 was being interpreted in public as a contribution to the reputation of the Republic of South Africa. To avoid this the Senate should give facilities to the Congress only if South Africans and Namibians were excluded.

Because of the protest against the participation of South African and Namibian scientists and the discussions within the University, including our latest motion, the President referred the problem to Senate. Professor Beyermann told the Senate that, in his opinion, it would be a decision on whether the Senate "gives a higher status to academic freedom (without reference to personality, nationality, religion, race etc.) of individual scholars than it does to the political situations which predominate in some countries where participants come from". He also said that "if scientists boycott they push ahead the same policy as the South African Government".

Although protest letters from the ANC and SWAPO representatives in Germany had been sent to the Senate, there were only three votes for the motion tabled by students representing the ASTA on Senate to cancel the Congress as long as South Africans and Namibians were allowed to participate. Instead, Senate reaffirmed its support for the Congress so long as there were no national representatives present.

When this Senate decision was taken it had already been made clear by Dr. Weidemann that, despite the explicit references in the IUPPS Statutes to national representatives, the Congress organisers were treating all delegates as individual scientists. The Senate's decision seemed to be an attempt to show goodwill towards the ASTA motion although it was already satisfied with Dr. Weidemann's assurance that there would be no national representatives present. As a "compromise" Professor Beyermann suggested that the University should finance scholarships for South African students. The Senate, of course, asked him not to mention this in the context of the Congress, since it might be interpreted as the Senate having a bad conscience.

The majority of the Senate was very much in favour of the suggestion to organise a historical lecture about academic boycotts in the Third Reich and their consequences for scientists who remained in Germany and on those who went into exile. We also thought this kind of

discussion to be very important. German scientists and students have a special responsibility in fighting racist regimes like the one in South Africa, remembering the barbarous deeds of the Nazi-regime. Therefore, we were really shocked when we heard Professor Bohner, the retired General Director of the RGZM, claim to have been "nothing but a young German", a "normal soldier" who had been disregarded at an international Congress in Denmark in the early 1950s. His argument went on that Germans should protect scientists of other states who are badly treated because of the policies of their Governments.

We had not expected that Senate would change its opinion a week before the Congress began, but some members, even a professor, did. This may be regarded as a very small success. One of the lecturers, and probably he is not the only one, told us that, from his point of view, the Senate had taken the wrong decision a year before, but that it was too late for a change of policy so close to the Congress.

Knowing that it is not yet time for a change in opinion of the majority, either in Mainz, or in Germany, or probably in the Western World, we will continue to discuss this topic.

References

- Champion, T. and Shennan, S.J. 1986. Why the Congress had to go on. Archaeological Review from Cambridge 5:1, 109-113.
 Hodder, I. 1986. Politics and ideology in the World Archaeological Congress. Archaeological Review from Cambridge 5:1, 113-119.
 Shaw, T. 1986. Archaeology and the politics of academic freedom. Archaeological Review from Cambridge 5:1, 2-24.