

GENERAL PERSPECTIVES

OUT OF THE ASHES...THE MAINZ CONGRESS AND THE WORLD ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONGRESS

Peter Stone

A Congress moves to Mainz

In January 1986, at the same International Executive meeting of the International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences (IUPPS) at which IUPPS support for the 1986 World Archaeological Congress (WAC) was withdrawn, Dr. Kurt Böhner, of West Germany, offered to host a rescheduled Congress "on behalf of the FRG", in Mainz, over the same dates as the Southampton Congress. Dr. Böhner was elected President of the Congress and Dr. Konrad Weidemann of the Römisch Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Mainz, was elected Secretary of the National Committee of the IUPPS.

It is of some importance to note that, given its role as the Executive Committee of the world organisation of archaeologists, the decision to ban the Southampton Congress and move the IUPPS Congress to Mainz was taken by five Europeans and one North American. Written and telephone messages from non-European voting members of the Committee, who had not had the time to secure travel visas or finance, were not allowed to be tabled or heard. One of these messages was actually phoned in during the meeting from an African member of the Executive who had attempted to attend the meeting and had managed to get to London but was stuck there without a visa for France.

One of Dr. Weidemann's first acts as National Secretary was to announce that the Mainz Congress would be postponed for one year so as to avoid any unnecessary clash with the Southampton Congress -- a postponement that would also enable him to have time to organise such an international gathering. In the same spirit of wishing to avoid conflict, the WAC Steering Committee set up by the Plenary Session of the Southampton Congress, declined to adopt a suggestion, made at the Plenary Session, to formally request all WAC participants to boycott the Mainz Congress, and left participation at Mainz to the discretion of individuals.

As soon as it became known that the IUPPS Congress had been moved for the explicit reason of allowing the participation of South African and Namibian scientists (as later publicly admitted by Dr. Weidemann) a number of groups in Mainz joined together to form a Co-ordinating Committee to oppose the Congress (see Alberternst, this volume). Over the summer of 1987 I was also invited by students from the University of Mainz, in my capacity as Student Liaison Officer for the WAC, to attend

(Archaeological Review from Cambridge 6:2 [1987])

the "alternative congress" organised by this Committee and, by the University President, Professor Bevermann, to take part in a University organised debate on academic freedom (later to be officially hosted, at the insistence of Professor Peter Ucko who had also been invited to take part, not by the University but by the Institute of Ethnology of the University of Mainz). In the event, I attended the whole of the "alternative congress" but made way for Professor Thurstan Shaw, of the WAC Executive Committee, in the Institute debate. Since returning from Germany many people have asked me to say what happened in Mainz. What follows is a descriptive and personal view of what occurred during the Congress based on my own experiences, the comments of others present at events I did not attend, and tape recordings of some Congress proceedings.

Events in Mainz during the Congress: Monday

As the Congress delegates made their way into the Schloss for the Opening Ceremony and speeches they had to pass through a peaceful lobby of over fifty students and anti-Apartheid demonstrators. At the end of the Opening Ceremony three students took over the microphone and read out the following statement which was later circulated to delegates outside the meeting room. When the students began to speak over half of the delegates left the room. The full text of this statement read:

We are here on behalf of the Anti-Apartheid movement to protest about the holding of this archaeological congress in Mainz. South Africans and Namibians are present at this congress which is an affront to the policies of not only Anti-Apartheid but also the United Nations, the European Community, the ANC and SWAPO.

This congress should be cancelled unless and until these South Africans and Namibians -- black or white, for or against Apartheid -- are excluded from all of your congress proceedings. The United Nations and others made a clear statement that all South Africans and Namibians, whatever their views, must suffer and accept such exclusion from international meetings for the common good of South Africa in general until the Apartheid regime has been removed. They have made it plain that this fight and this principle is even more important than so-called 'academic freedom'.

The presence of South Africans and Namibians at an archaeological conference claiming to be the 11th congress of the IUPPS is even more of an affront to human dignity and human rights because archaeologists last year attending the World Archaeological Congress, with participation of more than 70 countries, took the courageous decision to exclude

them because of the internationally agreed anti-Apartheid policy.

By being here you are also part of a more basic deception. Representatives of the Republic of South Africa are in your midst. One is the appointed representative of South Africa on the IUPPS Permanent Council, and another who intended to come works for the South African Embassy in Bonn. Despite this the IUPPS and the City are pretending that everyone is here only in an individual capacity. The decision by the University Senate to forbid the meeting of the IUPPS on their premises if representatives of South Africa participate is being ignored.

In Germany our past record regarding the abuse of human rights and of the misuse of archaeology does not bear scrutiny. Archaeology has been used to denigrate the rights of the majority population in South Africa. We cannot tolerate any sign of a repetition of these abuses. This IUPPS conference is seen to be a public statement that our country does not support the fight against Apartheid and therefore does not support human rights. Most non-European countries have boycotted it.

This conference must not be allowed to take place while any individuals from South Africa and Namibia insist on being present against international policy on a cultural boycott of those countries.

At a press conference later that day Dr. Weidemann regretted the fact that the students had not informed him that they wanted to make such a statement as he would have gladly given them a time slot on the programme. By arguing in this way Dr. Weidemann was choosing to ignore the point that the students were refusing to have anything to do with the official Congress organisation because of the presence of South Africans and Namibians within it.

Tuesday

The Co-ordinating Committee had organised a series of speakers to lead discussions throughout the day on all aspects of the boycott of South Africa and Namibia. During the afternoon a group arrived by train and plane from England, for a flying twenty-four hour visit, to support the Co-ordinating Committee. This group included members of the Southampton Students' Union, the Anti-Apartheid movement, ex-staff and committee members of the WAC, a representative of the Association of University Teachers, representatives of other trade unions, and a representative of the African National Congress (ANC). On Tuesday, an archaeologist from the United States also arrived; she had intended

attending the Congress but, on sensing the atmosphere in the Congress, changed her mind and spent the whole week supporting the students.

In the evening the Co-ordinating Committee had organised a public debate on the academic boycott (see Alberternst, this volume). The meeting was attended by over eighty people including a smattering of Congress delegates and the group from England.

It was in this debate that Dr. Weidemann argued in public, for the first time, that he was not the National Secretary of the IUPPS but merely the Organising Secretary of an archaeological Congress being held in Mainz under the auspices of his museum. Dr. Weidemann further argued that he had never created a National Committee to organise the Congress but had rather formed a simple Organising Committee. Dr. Weidemann continued to hold this stance throughout the week, despite it being pointed out to him that according to the IUPPS Statutes both a National Secretary and National Organising Committee had to be elected and that without such officers, according to their own Statutes, the Mainz Congress simply could not be the 11th Congress of the IUPPS. During the open part of the debate Dr Weidemann refused to answer questions on this topic.

As mentioned in the Anti-Apartheid movement's statement to the Opening ceremony, the University Senate had only agreed to allow the Congress to take place at the University on the understanding that there were no national representatives attending. During their speeches, and later in the open discussion, both Dr. Weidemann and Professor Beyermann denied that there were any national representatives present at the Congress. Professor Beyermann confirmed publicly that University support for the Congress was explicitly tied to this lack of national representation. The inescapable evidence from within the IUPPS' own Statutes that at least those members of the IUPPS Permanent Council were national representatives was presented from the floor by Peter Ucko.

Statute 10 states that "the directing organ of the IUPPS (the Permanent Council) is made up of up to four members of each country who may be chosen by either their respective governments or by other members of the Permanent Council". Statutes 13, 22, and 35 refer to the "Secretary General of the National Committee" and Statute 36 states that "the National members of the Permanent Council make up the National Committee of Organisation" (for the next Congress). In specific relation to the Secretary General of the IUPPS, Statute 30 states that "during the duration of his mandate the Secretary General of the IUPPS ceases to represent his own country...he can be replaced by another representative of his country". Professor Ucko went on to quote from two letters from the National representatives of the Cameroons and Madagascar on the Permanent Council of the IUPPS. Both had attended the Southampton Congress, and both had said that they would, of course, have to report the proceedings of the Congress to their respective Government ministries as they did for every congress they attended. Finally, Professor Ucko went on to quote a letter (of 23.8.83) from Professor Nenquin, the General Secretary of the IUPPS, which stated:

...the official representation of the DDR in the Union consists of...(names)... Unless one of these is to be replaced by the time of the Congress by...(name)...he does not represent his country. But it frequently happens, that East bloc archaeologists get money from their country to come to the Congress in which case they form an "official delegation", in contrast to and supplementing the "official representatives" (his quotation marks).

Dr. Morais, a member of the IUPPS Permanent Council for Mozambique, immediately supported the evidence presented by Professor Ucko by saying that he, of course, did represent his country when he took his place on the Permanent Council, as did every member of that Council. He went on to explain that he had been unable to attend either the meetings of the Permanent Council or any of the Congress proceedings, because of the presence of South Africans at both of them.

Once the presence of National representatives had been proved to the satisfaction of the vast majority of the audience and all of the panel, save Dr. Weidemann, Professor Bevermann, and the Mayor, Claudia Alberternst, an undergraduate student at Mainz, confronted her University President with the decision of his own Senate to make University facilities available only if there was no National representation at the Congress. She then called on Professor Beyermann to stand by his Senate's resolution and remove the support of the University from the Congress. It was a sobering sight to see Professor Beyermann offer the microphone to Dr. Weidemann to answer the question, to see it refused and passed back, and then to see Professor Beyermann push it away without answering.

Such courage on the part of an undergraduate must be put into some context. A number of instances have been reported of junior (and some not so junior) academics -- from a number of European countries -- being "threatened" with the lack of further research money if they attended the WAC. (And yes, of course, this is only my word and cannot be substantiated in print). Certainly it seemed odd that on the day I returned from Mainz I received a phone call from a junior German academic, who had attended the Mainz Congress, asking to buy a copy of Peter Ucko's book Academic Freedom and Apartheid. Odd, for it had been freely available for purchase (albeit in full view of all Congress participants) at the bookstall run by the students at the main entrance of the Mainz Congress.

Wednesday

One of the Congress sessions was concerned with archaeology in Southern Africa. After Professor Tobias had delivered a paper one of the students rose to make an anti-Apartheid statement. Before she was able to finish, Professor Desmond Clark had moved across the floor of

the lecture hall and tried to take the paper that she was reading away from her. When she resisted he took her forcibly by the arm and marched her from the hall.

In the evening Professors Ucko and Shaw debated with Professor Nenquin and Dr. Weidemann in an open debate hosted by the Institute of Ethnology on "Human Rights and Academic Freedom: the case of South Africa". Professor Ucko outlined the problems as faced by the British National Committee of IUPPS in 1985 and how their reactions to those problems, taken with "great reluctance", had resulted in the withdrawal of IUPPS support for the Southampton Congress. He went on to re-emphasise the inescapable fact that, according to the IUPPS Statutes, there was unambiguous national representation on the IUPPS Permanent Council.

Professor Nenquin argued that the debate was a "false one", that everyone present was opposed to Apartheid but that, in his personal opinion, "all forms of fascism must be resisted", not by the further personal "victimisation" of colleagues, but by the need to help those personally faced with Apartheid "in any way we can". To Professor Nenquin the whole issue was simply "a question of priorities". Professor Nenquin went on to quote a motion passed at the Permanent Council on the Sunday before the Congress had begun:

...IUPPS reaffirms its total commitment to academic freedom. The IUPPS refuses any form of discrimination based on the concept of race, political conviction, ethnic nationality, sex, language, etc., discrimination, which by its intolerance and, by definition, is the negation itself of any form of co-operation. The IUPPS confirms that it cannot exclude any bona fide scholar from its meetings, and that individual participation of any scholar in congress/colloquia/symposia can in no way be considered as an acceptance by the IUPPS of the regime in which the scholars work.

Professor Shaw delved into the origins of the notion of "academic freedom" stating that it was something "very precious" but that his African colleagues had made him think about the nature of academic freedom in terms of all freedom. Professor Shaw re-emphasised Professor Ucko's point about nationality when, in response to a point made by Professor Tobias, he noted that "it is a matter of reality that we just cannot shrug off our nationality when we travel abroad". Dr. Weidemann made an impassioned plea on behalf of "a very simple human right" --that of freedom of speech for all. The floor was then opened to the audience.

One of the first to speak was a member of the ANC -- an ex-patriate South African and a lecturer in the Department of Law at the University of Exeter. The speaker focused the debate clearly when he argued:

"Chairman, fellow academics, this discussion is about me". He spoke of the "tragic, bitter, miserable squabble" that was dividing archaeology and went on to ask "where is the scholarly integrity of your science if you shut your eyes to genocide? And I do not use the word pejoratively, emotionally. I use the word as a lawyer". He then turned to those South Africans present and addressed them:

I must apologise, my question is full of bitterness...a question you only ask a man when you have had much to drink and it is late at night and you will not repeat what he says. But you, my friends, have taken the opportunity from us to ask the question under those circumstances. You have heard it said that you all stand against Apartheid. Why have we not heard from you? Why has the African National Congress and the United Democratic Front not heard from you? If you say it is because you fear the repressive consequences, you are right, that is a good answer, and I salute you. I am a South African lawyer. I know the law. I know the consequences. There is no dishonour in offering that answer. But I ask you, if you did speak out, do you not trust your colleagues across the world to stand in your defence if you are locked up, if you are detained, if you are put on trial, if you do lose your jobs? -- and I have in my mind academics today who have spoken up, who are facing these consequences. Do you not trust your colleagues at events such as this, to stand up on your behalf? and again you have an answer. If you were to say resolutions and speeches do not unlock prison doors, that is right, that is a good answer and I salute you again and I still admire your courage. But then why did you come here? Why are you here? Why did you not stay at home and in discretion and without cowardice say nothing? There would have been no dishonour upon you in staying at home. But now I have to ask you in public "Where are you?". Where are you in relation to the African National Congress, the United Democratic Front, the mass of the people of South Africa? It is not enough to say "I oppose Apartheid". We need you.

During this contribution from the floor Dr. Weidemann's notion of freedom of speech left him and he stormed out of the debate saying that he was not going to stay and listen to political speeches.

Dr. Van Biljon (see Alberternst, this volume) spoke out against the ANC, as purely "a terrorist organisation" that "stands for violence" and "they have supported the necklacing in South Africa".

(After the debate he told students that "blacks and whites are so culturally different in South Africa that they must be kept apart for their own good". It was in this same conversation with students that Dr. Van Biljon said that he was attending the Congress but that he had not registered -- with the full knowledge and agreement of the organisers -- so as not to cause them possible embarrassment).

Professor Tobias spoke from the floor and disagreed with Dr. Weidemann in his assertion that the problem was "a simple issue of academic freedom" and argued that there were other principles at stake especially that of "freedom of access to knowledge" and that "you (Professor Ucko) are asking that those persons be denied access to the newest and the latest knowledge". He went on to argue that the boycott was simply a tactic -- and in terms of the academic boycott was one that was "totally unproven", that "its chances of efficacy and success are virtually minimal" and that it was destined "to kill international science". He then went on to outline his success at the University of Witwatersrand in raising the number of black students studying in the Faculty of Medicine, and finally attacked, in a particularly personal manner, "the outrageous and disgusting witch-hunt" of scholars working in South Africa practised by Professor Ucko. Professor Tobias concluded his contribution by claiming that he was a citizen of the world and that he had "never been asked not to attend a congress by the ANC".

Professor Ucko replied somewhat tersely that of course the boycott was a tactic but that, whatever Professor Tobias might wish to claim about himself, he was actually in Mainz as the national representative of South Africa on the IUPPS Permanent Council.

The debate ended in this somewhat acrimonious way with no-one having been convinced that they should change their stance on the issue. Instead it showed the enormous gap, not necessarily in understanding, but rather in acceptance, between the two sides.

Thursday

Dr. Van Biljon's presence was reported by the students to Professor Beyermann. Beyermann realised that through Van Biljon's position at the South African Embassy it was impossible for him to be described as anything but a national representative (albeit of a different kind to Professor Tobias). He therefore dispatched his assistant on the Thursday morning to find Dr. Weidemann (who was on a Congress excursion) and to insist that Dr. Weidemann notify the South African Embassy that Dr. Van Biljon was not welcome on the University campus. Professor Beyermann also notified the local police that they might be faced the following day with being asked to evict someone with diplomatic immunity from University premises. In the event Dr. Van Biljon did not (appear to) return to the Congress.

Friday

The Co-ordinating Committee had organised a day-long series of lectures and discussions, attended throughout the day by about twenty people, on the specific topic of the academic boycott of South Africa and Namibia. It was during the breaks in these discussions that delegates of the official Congress from France, Britain, and Czechoslovakia spoke to us about the poor organisation of the Congress and of it mainly comprising of "boring" and "old fashioned" archaeology.

Saturday

The thirty or so national representatives on the Permanent Council (out of the nearly four hundred who form the complete Permanent Council) who met on the Saturday morning, to decide the business of the IUPPS for the next two and a half years, were faced by a token lobby of students and members of the anti-Apartheid movement. The anti-Apartheid hand-out stated:

Dr. Weidemann and you (the Congress participants) have brought shame onto Germany, to this University, and to the city of Mainz...Throughout the Third World you have made our city and institutions appear to be supporters of Apartheid...South Africans and Namibians will only be able to attend what will presumably be called the 12th Congress of the IUPPS in Bratislava if the Czechoslovakian Government decides to make them an exception to its normal policy (of no economic, sporting, or cultural links). You have now chosen to put your claim for academic freedom in the hands of politicians...You have tried over the last week, to damage the anti-Apartheid movement, and thus to insult the majority population of South Africa and we promise you that Czechoslovakia will not be the chance to do so again.

Disquiet was also voiced from within the ranks of the Congress participants when, at the General Assembly later that afternoon, Professor Nicholas David commented:

I was extremely pleased to come to this Congress. I have worked for this Congress in the sense that I actively supported a boycott of the World Archaeological Congress. But I have the impression that a lot of things are being swept under the carpet. We are being treated like sheep. We are not being told what happened in Executive. Policy decisions were taken: I want to know what those policy decisions are. I think we all need to know. We are in a position where archaeology is being split. I came here to attempt to prevent that split

going further. I want to know what the Executive have done: they are our Executive, we are not their children. I want to know what the Executive is going to do to heal the breach between the IUPPS and the World Archaeological Congress. I ask simply for information to be made available. I do not ask -- it would be inappropriate at this stage -- to have a debate, but I think that when we go home we need to know what they are planning to do. Then we can decide if we are satisfied or not. I look around me -- I see many old faces. I see many fewer younger faces and I would like to see that we do not have a "greying mandarin" appearing in Bratislava and new and exciting archaeology going somewhere else. We all need each other. So please, may we have information on the policy decisions?

Professor David's words provoked a strong round of applause but no response from the IUPPS Office holders.

At the end of the General Assembly the students once again took over the microphone and made a final statement to the Congress delegates. Once again, over half of those present refused to listen to the students and left the room. The statement read:

We, gathered at the meetings of the Congress in Mainz, whose special concern is the study of the origins and conditions of human life and culture, can never be neutral towards violations of human life and dignity anywhere in the world. This Congress has been irretrievably contaminated by the effects of Apartheid which no one in our discipline can ignore. We are deeply shocked about the executions this morning of the two South African patriots Moses Janties and Nlamli Nielies, the killing of nine and the disappearance of forty-two South African miners, the detention of the SWAPO leadership, trade unionists and church leaders in Namibia, the torture and arrest of children. These crimes against humanity are a violation of international law and strike at the heart of our profession. No individual conscience can ignore the enormity of these crimes. Therefore we acknowledge with sadness the contamination of this Congress with Apartheid and with collaboration with Apartheid.

We call upon our colleagues to express their concern for academic freedom by aligning themselves with the oppressed peoples of South Africa and Namibia who demand an isolation of Apartheid in all fields and an ever growing support to the struggle

for freedom and self-determination. Only if we put the full weight of our scientific and individual integrity behind this support will future scientific meetings in our discipline have a hope for success.

The Mainz Congress

As I did not attend any part of the official Congress it is very difficult to comment on it. Two reporters (one American, one German) gave me estimates of 300 and 600 delegates. From being on the University campus during the Congress my own guess would be somewhere around 400 but certainly nowhere near the 1,000 claimed by the organisers. The list of participants issued by the organisers does little to help. There were a number of people listed (including a number of British archaeologists) who were certainly not there, some of whom have since expressed their concern that their names appeared on the list.

The organisation of the Congress also seems to have been somewhat problematic. The editor of Antiquity (who has recently been at least equivocal about the South African ban) bemoaned the fact that there were probably some very good papers being presented -- but that it was next to impossible to find out where and when they were being given. One senior French archaeologist told of a number of delegates being down on the programme to speak in two different sessions scheduled at the same time. Apparently, after heated discussion with the organisers, the delegates agreed amongst themselves to cancel one of the sessions. All of the delegates who talked to us spoke of the frustration of not even having abstracts of papers to which to refer. More I cannot say, although a recent Antiquity editorial made the following points concerning the academic content and organisation of the Congress:

Two days were given over to, effectively, undergraduate lectures in world prehistory -- probably better general lectures than any one university offers, but not really what a research congress is for...The main sessions were structured, after Dechelette, into thin chronological slices, and one felt sorry for any excavator with a site whose inhabitants, unfamiliar with the correct order of European culture-history, had occupied it, say, from late Neolithic to Early Iron Age, since it would be salami'd into four separate divisions of the Congress...surely the time has now passed when whole subjects like ethnoarchaeology can be ignored...(Chioppindale 1987, 359).

So where do we go from here?

The Plenary Session of the WAC gave its Steering Committee a dual brief: to attempt to negotiate with the IUPPS and, if such negotiation failed, to set up a new organisation. The Steering Committee was given a one year life to carry out its brief. The chair of the WAC Steering

Committee, Professor Michael Dav, wrote to the IUPPS three times offering to discuss matters of mutual interest. Professor Nenquin only replied (16.12.86) by stating that "discussion is doomed from the start, since our priorities are clearly directly opposed to one another".

The IUPPS Statutes state that the Permanent Council must discuss Statute alterations if so requested by ten or more members of the Permanent Council. A series of such Statute revisions were submitted to the Secretary General and President of IUPPS by over sixteen members of the Permanent Council. A few weeks before the Mainz Congress the WAC Steering Committee learnt from a member of the Permanent Council that these amendments had been discussed at a meeting of the IUPPS Executive in May and that they had recommended almost complete rejection of the proposed revisions. The full details of the proposed revisions are long and complex. The reasons for rejection, by the Executive of the IUPPS, of the more important proposed revisions are noted in their minutes of 6 May 1987 as follows:

i. Regarding South Africa and Namibia that South African and Namibian representatives be removed from the Permanent Council, rejected as this is a political statement and therefore outside the concern of the IUPPS.

ii. Regarding existing Statutes (Statute numbers in brackets):

(3): that IUPPS collaboration should be with all countries which respect human rights, rejected because it will exclude some scholars for non-scientific reasons.

(7): that all official UNESCO languages, and not just French, should be the official IUPPS languages, rejected because French is the international language of diplomacy and international academia.

(10): that the Permanent Council should include members of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples (or a similar organisation) with one vote between them. That Permanent Council members should serve for five years (and may be re-elected). That Permanent Council members should include women, young archaeologists, and students, rejected because it includes non-archaeologists.

(12): that agenda be circulated early enough to allow internal country discussion and, if none of the Permanent Council members of that country can attend, another country can be authorised to vote for it, rejected because delegation of a vote is not allowed

in any international organisation, and in practice this would allow the votes of different countries to be vested in a single person.

(18): that the Permanent Council should allow written views/votes or alternatives, rejected as for 12.

(20): that subscriptions and membership and a budget be introduced, rejected because not in the tradition or spirit of IUPPS.

(22): that only elected members should serve on the Permanent Council, rejected as it would remove all those with prior experience.

At the IUPPS Permanent Council meeting in Mainz a Statutes Revision Working Party was, in fact, set up, charged with reporting to the next Permanent Council meeting scheduled for two and a half years time. Their brief is to consult as widely as they wish although a motion requesting them to consult with the WAC Steering Committee was defeated. According to the one Indian member of the Permanent Council who attended this meeting, his attempt to speed the process up and have the Revision Working Party report in six months was rejected out of hand.

A separate request from the WAC Steering Committee that the IUPPS should formulate an ethical code for the treatment of human remains and that the discussions surrounding such a code should include the indigenous peoples involved has met with no response.

The World Archaeological Congress

The WAC Steering Committee met for the last time in Venezuela in October 1987. Representatives of six continents attended the meeting. After reviewing the attempted negotiations with the IUPPS the Steering Committee reluctantly came to the conclusion that there was no point in trying to continue discussion. The Steering Committee then turned to the second part of its brief and proceeded to act upon a wealth of information and opinion collected over the year regarding the envisaged nature of a new organisation. At the end of the meeting a statement was issued which is reproduced in full in the Appendix.

The debate between the IUPPS and the WAC is a tragically unfortunate one. It is one between those who choose to live in the rarefied world of academic elitism and intransigence and those who choose to accept that academics must live and work in the real world. In summing up the Wednesday evening debate during the Mainz Congress Professor Gröhs, the Head of the Institute of Ethnology and the Chair for the evening, said:

The main question remains on the table -- (and not only on the table of the archaeologists) "What are really the relations of the human rights of freedom and freedom of communication and on the other hand what can we do?" And I think declarations are not enough really to help those who are fighting in South Africa and outside South Africa against the racist policy of the South African Government.

We can but hope that the union of the two worlds, of rarefied existence and reality, is not too far away. Until that time, however, we must surely respect and accept our duty with regard to human freedom.

Acknowledgements

I should like to thank Jane Hubert, Kate Wilson-Barnes, and Peter Ucko for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this paper.

Reference

Chippindale, C. 1987. Editorial. Antiquity 61, 357-360.

* * * * *

Appendix: Statement of World Archaeological Congress Steering Committee, issued October 1987

THE WORLD ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONGRESS

1. Aims

There is a need for a new world organisation that recognises the changes which have occurred in the subject of archaeology over the past years -- changes which are not reflected in, nor constitute, a significant focus of the existing international body for prehistoric and protohistoric sciences, the International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences.

The World Archaeological Congress is concerned with all aspects of archaeological theory and practice. Its main emphasis is on the academic issues and questions which benefit from a widely orientated and comprehensive approach. It attempts to bridge the disciplinary divisions of the past into chronological periods (such as prehistoric and protohistoric or historic archaeology) and to avoid exclusive, particularistic regional concerns.

The World Archaeological Congress is based on the explicit recognition of the historical and social role, and political context of, archaeological enquiry, of archaeological organisations, and of archaeological interpretation. Its distinctive aims are:

- 1) To discuss themes which truly reflect the interest of its world-wide membership;
- 2) To make explicit the relevance of its studies to the wider community.

Within this framework of interest, the World Archaeological Congress does not consider itself to be exclusive to bona fide scientists, but a forum for discussion for all who are genuinely concerned with the study of the past.

The World Archaeological Congress has already identified several areas (which are neither intended to be exhaustive nor exclusive), on which it hopes to focus attention at its future Congresses and Inter-Congresses. These include (in no particular order):

1. Education about the past;
2. The role and control of the past in the creation of gender/group/regional/national identity;
3. The ownership, conservation and exploitation of the archaeological heritage;
4. The treatment and disposition of human remains;
5. The funding, organisation, control and choice of archaeological research projects;
6. The effects of archaeology on host communities;
7. The ethics of archaeological enquiry.

The World Archaeological Congress recognises that many of its members will naturally also be concerned with specialist regional and chronological subjects, including historical and culture specific investigations. It therefore envisages specialist meetings carried out under the aegis of the World Archaeological Congress, sometimes in collaboration with existing organisations such as the International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management, the International Quaternary Association, specialist Commissions of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences; and particularly through its own Institutional Members. The Congresses and Inter-Congresses of the World Archaeological Congress may also establish specialist working groups with their own memberships in order to carry out in-depth consideration of restricted specialist topics.

The World Archaeological Congress has also defined its role beyond its essential academic functions and appreciates that archaeology has a social as well as an academic responsibility and, in the context of apartheid, as exemplified by the regime of South Africa, recognises the need for it to support, and be seen to support, the United Nations and UNESCO resolutions on human rights. This is not the only aspect of an "humane archaeology" which is the basis of the World Archaeological Congresses' activities, for the World Archaeological Congress also recognises the importance of archaeological evidence about the past to the rights and aspirations of those directly affected by archaeology. While recognising the essential role of the past to group identity of many peoples and "ethnic groups" who have moved, for whatever reason,

from land to land, the World Archaeological Congress considers that it is the quality of traditional ownership of property and of the land by indigenous peoples which forges an indissoluble link with archaeology, and representatives of these groups have therefore been assigned an effective role, as of right, on the World Archaeological Congress Executive Council.

2. Organisation

The World Archaeological Congress' success or failure is dependent, as an organisation, not only on Institutional Membership but especially on the commitment of individuals to Individual Membership of this new body.

The World Archaeological Congress does not wish to challenge the particular interests and specialisations of existing institutions and organisations. It is new not only in concept but also in its organisation and structure. The World Archaeological Congress will operate within distinctive parameters:

1. Its Executive will be of a size which enables it to act really effectively;
2. Its Executive will be composed of a combination of:
 - a) Regional Members (elected democratically for a limited period but eligible for re-election); and
 - b) Representatives of indigenous peoples/the Fourth World (appointed for a limited period but eligible for re-appointment);
3. Its Executive will include representatives of the senior and of the junior, with due regard to a balance between the sexes;
4. Its Council will come into being only for the period of each Congress of the World Archaeological Congress, and will comprise the Executive and, in addition, one National Member per country (selected for the duration of the proceedings of a Congress by the Congress participants of each nation);
5. Its Officers will consist of a President, Secretary and Treasurer who shall be elected at one Congress and hold office until the next. Any Individual Member of the World Archaeological Congress shall be eligible for nomination, and voters will be the Members of Council. Those elected who are not already Executive or Council Members will automatically become full Members of the Executive and Council. (Until the first Council meeting in 1990 the current office holders of the World Archaeological Congress will continue in office and will be full members of the Executive).

The organisation of the Congresses of the World Archaeological Congress are distinct from the World Archaeological Congress's own structure: their relationship being provided by annual reports from the Congress Organising Committee to the World Archaeological Congress executive.

3. Institutional and Individual Membership

Institutions or individuals with a genuine interest in, or concern for, the past may become members of the World Archaeological Congress by completion of an application form and the payment of an agreed subscription. Annual subscription for membership of US\$20 (Individuals), US\$10 (Students), and US\$100 (Institutions), has been agreed, subject to periodic review by the Council. The Executive will be responsible for any waiving of, or modifications to, particular subscription dues, as well as for any terminations of membership.

Individual Membership of the World Archaeological Congress includes:

1. Eligibility to form part of a regionally defined Electoral College;
2. Eligibility to be nominated as a Regional Representative to the Executive/Council;
3. Attendance at Congresses and Inter-Congresses at a concessionary registration fee;
4. Eligibility to be nominated as a National Representative to Council;
5. Free receipt of the World Archaeological Bulletin;
6. Concessionary rates for other activities to be organised by the World Archaeological Congress.

Institutional Membership of the World Archaeological Congress includes:

1. Free receipt of the World Archaeological Bulletin, and concessionary rates for any other publications;
2. Participation in the organization of appropriate general and specialist meetings of the World Archaeological Congress.

4. Some of the World Archaeological Congress' Activities Planned For the Future

1. Publication of the second World Archaeological Bulletin in December 1987.
2. An Inter-Congress, in association with the Cultural Heritage sub-theme of the Waigini Seminar, on "The Role of 'Cultural Centres/Cultural Houses' in the Presentation and Maintenance of Tradition", Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, September 1988.
3. An Inter-Congress, in association with American Indians Against Desecration and the International Indian Treaty Council, on "Archaeological Ethics and the Treatment of Human Remains", to be held at the University of South Dakota, United States of America, August/September 1989.
4. The second Congress of the World Archaeological Congress, to be held in Venezuela in September 1990 with Professor Mario Sanoja as the Chair of the Organising Committee, and with Dr. Jacqueline Clarac de Briceno as the Director of the Local Committee in Merida.

5. Executive

Five months after the first bulk dispatch of application forms those individuals who have paid their subscriptions will be placed within a Regional Electoral College. At the same time as applying to join as members, they may nominate up to two candidates (who must also be Individual Members of the World Archaeological Congress) for election to the executive by providing details of the nominee's name, gender, position (and length of time employed in that position and any previous position related to archaeology or the study of the past), together with the name of a seconder, and a signed statement of agreement from the nominee.

Those who agree to be nominated to the Executive should be aware that, if elected, they are expected to attend the first meeting of the Executive to be held at the time of the Inter-Congress of the World Archaeological Congress in Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, in September 1988. The successful candidates will be notified of their election by telegram in July 1988.

For the purposes of the World Archaeological Congress elections to its Executive, Individual Members will be initially assigned to Regional Electoral Colleges on the basis of their residence. At the first Council meeting reassignment at the request of Individual Members to different Regional Electoral Colleges on the basis of a proven commitment to ongoing research in a particular area will be considered.

The initial fourteen Regional Electoral Colleges will be:

1. Central Africa.
2. Eastern and Southern Africa.
3. Northern Africa.
4. Western Africa.
5. Central America and the Caribbean.
6. Northern America.
7. Southern America.
8. Eastern Asia.
9. Southeastern Asia and the Pacific.
10. Southern Asia.
11. Near and Middle East.
12. Eastern Europe and Central Asia.
13. Northern Europe.
14. Southern Europe.

In June 1988 a secret postal ballot will be conducted through each Regional Electoral College to elect:

1. a Senior Representative (someone who is, or has been, in permanent employment within archaeology, or a related discipline, for more than five years);
2. a Junior Representative.

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 emphasized 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