THE JOURNAL OF INDIGENOUS STUDIES

LA REVUE DES ETUDES INDIGENES

Winter/Hiver 1989 / Volume 1, Number/Numéro 1

THE JOURNAL OF INDIGENOUS STUDIES/LA REVUE DES ETUDES INDIGENES
Editor/Editeur : Dana F. Lawrence
Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research, Regina, Saskatchewan
Assistant Editor/Assistant éditeur : R. James McNinch
Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program (SUNTEP), Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
Associate Editors/Editeurs associés:
Nerida Blair, Catholic College of Education - Sydney, North Sydney, Australia
Bob Boyer, Saskatchewan Indian Federated College ,Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada
Barbara Burnaby, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education,Toronto, Ontario, Canada
Patrick Douaud, University of Regina, Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada
Sherry Farrell-Racette, (SUNTEP) Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada
Paul Finnane, South Australian College of Advanced Education, Underdale, South Australia
Yvonne Hebert, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta
Ken Kutz, (SUNTEP), Saskatoon, Saskatchewan,Canada
Hellmut Lang, University of Regina, Regina, Saskatchewan , Canada
Phyllis Lerat, Saskatchewan Indian Federated College, Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada
Eric Maddern, Muraiu Gwynion, Gachwen, Llanberis, Gwynedd, North Wales
Art McBeath, University of Regina, Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada
Harvey A. McCue, Indian and Northern Affairs, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
W.R. (Terry) McEachern, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada
Arthur J. More, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
Lorna Roth, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
Donna Scarfe, (SUNTEP), Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada
Brigitte Schloss, Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada
Bernie Selinger, Saskatchewan Indian Federated College, Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada
Glenda Simms, Nipising University, North Bay, Ontario, Canada
Peter Stone, English Heritage Commission, Southampton, United Kingdom
Michael Tymchak, Northern Teacher Education Program, La Ronge, Saskatchewan, Canada
June Wyatt-Benyon, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada
Errol Young, University of Regina, Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada
James Youngblood-Henderson, Mikmaw Nation, Eskasoni Indian Reserve, Nova Scotia, Canada

Published by/Publié par: Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research
121 Broadway Avenue East, Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada, S4N 0Z6
ISSN: 0838-4711 © Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research
Cover Design: Sherry Farrell-Racette

The **Journal of Indigenous Studies** wishes to acknowledge the support, both financial and philosophical, of the Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research. As well the support and patience of the staff and faculty of the Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program (SUNTEP) must be acknowledged as it has been upon those people that much of the extra work has fallen.

THE JOURNAL OF INDIGENOUS STUDIES

LA REVUE DES ETUDES INDIGENES

Winter/Hiver 1989 Volume 1, Number/Numéro 1

Page

II Editorial

1 The Future of Native Self-Government
ROBERT VACHON

9 The Affirmation of Indigenous Values in A Colonial Education System
LILLA WATSON

21 Indian/Metis Language Programs and French Immersion: First Cousins or Distant Relations?
WILLIAM McEACHERN and PAULETTE MOELLER

27 A Proper Place For The Dead: A Critical Review of the 'Reburial' Issue
JANE HUBERT

Book Reviews

63 *Ste. Madeleine: Community Without A Town, Metis Elders in Interview*
by Ken Zeilig and Victoria Zeilig
CALVIN RACETTE

65 *Enough is Enough: Aboriginal Women Speak Out*
by Janet Silman
LYNNE DANIELS

Editorial

I am pleased and delighted to have the opportunity in my capacity as Editor to introduce the Journal of Indigenous Studies to the world community of indigenous people, to scholars interested in the emerging discipline of Indigenous Studies, and to those who have an interest in work both by and about the indigenous people the world over. It is our hope and commitment to provide to our readership a broad range of topics that will further the field of indigenous studies. We hope to be scholarly in presentation; selective in manuscript choice; and provocative, perhaps occasionally controversial, in the works found in our pages. We hope, as well, to represent issues of importance to those indigenous peoples living under repressive governments, and will make every effort to accomodate those special needs.

The Journal of Indigenous Studies, sponsored by the Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research, is an attempt, in part, to provide a network of communication amongst people, aboriginal and non-aboriginal, scholars and lay persons alike, involved in working for and in the interests of indigenous peoples. With the philosophy that the indigenous populations transcend political boundaries and geographic constraints, it is the goal of the Journal of Indigenous Studies to become a forum for the dissemination of scholarly research, discussion and ideas. It is also our goal to provide a journal that earns the credibility of the academic communities thus providing a focus for research that may, at present, not yet have a venue in the world of academia.

It is our view at the Journal of Indigenous Studies that the indigenous populations of the world are united, not just in the relationship of an historical, and perhaps even active, presence of an imposed colonialism, but in the fight of indigenous people reclaiming their heritage, in the rebirth of values, of spirituality, of tradition and of pride representative of the indigenous cultures as they existed pre-colonialism. This unity is evident as exampled in the rightful negotiations of self government and in the proper dignity offered to the dead, both issues explored in this first volume of the journal. Language, said to be the medium of culture, is also discussed in this issue, as is a treatise on the affirmation of aboriginal values in a colonial education system. It is this diverse range of thought that we will present to our readers.

Initially the journal will publish twice a year, in Winter (January) and Summer(July). It is our intent, as well, that every fourth issue will invite a guest editor to coordinate a special issue dealing with specific thematic topics. The first of these, scheduled for July 1990, will present current research on the

topics of Native American Mental Health. A subsequent issue will present research on International Indigenous Education. Suggestions for further special issues are invited as well as nominations for guest editors for those special issues.

We are a fledgling publication and as such we actively seek manuscripts as we attempt to build a resource file of suitable articles; in this we seek your collegial assistance. We also seek for review the recommendation of new publications, books or research pertaining to Indigenous Studies throughout the world.

Please join with me in celebrating the publication of Volume 1, Number 1 of the Journal of Indigenous Studies.

DANA LAWRENCE

THE JOURNAL OF INDIGENOUS STUDIES

Je suis heureux, en tant que rédacteur, de présenter La Revue des Etudes Indigènes à la communauté mondiale des peuples indigènes, aux chercheurs impliqués dans le dévelopement croissant des études indigènes, et à tous ceux qui manifestent un intérêt pour le travail effectué par et pour les peuples indigènes dans le monde entier. Nos ambitions et notre espoir sont de présenter à nos lecteurs un large éventail de sujets susceptibles d'améliorer les connaissances des étides indigènes. Nous espérons effectuer une recherche de calibre universitaire, sélectionner le choix des manuscrits reçus, et nous montrer parfois provoquants, sinon controversés dans les pages de notre revue. Nous espérons de plus présenter des questions importantes pour les peuples indigènes vivant sous des gouvernements oppressifs, et ferons tous nos efforts pour leur donner une tribune.

La Revue des Etudes Indigènes, parrainée par l'Institut Gabriel Dumont d'Etudes Autochtones et de Recherche appliquée, est destinée, en partie, à fournir un réseau de communications pour les peuples aborigènes et non-aborigènes, les chercheurs et les simples lecteurs impliqués pour et dans le travail et les intérêts des peuples indigènes. D'autre part, la communauté des peuples indigènes dépassant les frontières politiques et géographiques, l'autre but que nous nous sommes fixé est de créer un forum pour la propagation de la recherche, des discussions et des idées. Le but de La Revue des Etudes Indigènes est de sortir une revue méritant le respect de la communauté universitaire, et de créer un point de fixation pour un type de recherche qui, jusqu'ici, n'avait pas cours dans les cercles universitaires.

La rédaction de La Revue des Etudes Indigènes tient pour acquis que les

populations indigènes du monde sont unifiées, non seulement dans la perspective d'une présence d'un colonialisme imposé historique et parfois même actif, mais aussi dans la lutte des peuples indigènes en vue de recouvrer leur héritage par un renouveau des valeurs, de spiritualité, de traditions et de fierté représentatif des cuture indigènes telles qu'elles existaient durant la période pré-colonialiste. Cette unité est évidente par exemple dans la conduite des négociations pour un gouvernement autonome et dans la dignité entourant les morts, deux questions abordées dans le premier volume de la revue. Le langage, que l'on dit être le medium de la culture, y est également discuté, de même qu'un traité sur l'affirmation des valeurs aborigènes dans un système colonial d'éducation. Tel est l'éventail de pensées présenté à nos lecteurs.

Au début, la revue sera publiée deux fois par an, en hiver (janvier) et en été (juillet). Nous avons l'intention de plus d'inviter tous les quatre numéros un rédacteur invité destiné à coordonner un numéro spécial sur un sujet thématique spécifique. Nous vous invitons à nous présenter des suggestions pour les futurs numéros spéciaux et pour les nominations de futurs rédacteurs invités.

Nous sommes une revue novice à la recherche de manuscrits destinés à former une banque d'articles, et vous prions de nous accorder votre aide collégiale afin de la former. Nous recherchons également toute quotation de nouvelles publications, livres ou de recherche traitant d'études indigènes à travers le monde.

Veuillez vous joindre à moi afin de célébrer la publication du Volume I, Numéro 1 de La Revue des Etudes Indigènes.

DANA LAWRENCE

LA REVUE DES ETUDES INDIGENES

THE FUTURE OF NATIVE SELF GOVERNMENT

ROBERT VACHON
Monchanin Cross-Cultural Centre

Montreal, Quebec

Abstract The topic of the future of Native self-government reflects a double-trap: a linguistic-cultural one and a Nation-State one. To deal with the fostering of traditional indigenous 'self-government' and indigenous Cultural Pluralism, the Western cultures must first work towards the emancipation of their own political culture from the Nation-State oriented political culture of the times and from its underlying political anthropology and ideology.

Résumé La question d'un futur gouvernement autochtone autonome reflète une double embûche: celle de l'aspect linguistique et celle de la notion de Nation/Etat. Pour entretenir l'idée d'un gouvernement indigène autochtone traditionnel et d'un pluralisme culturel indigène, les cultures occidentales doivent tout d'abord s'émanciper de leur propre culture politique datant de la culture politique orientée de la Nation/Etat, et de l'anthropologie de même que de l'idéologie politique sous-jacent.

INTRODUCTION: THE DOUBLE-TRAP OF THE TITLE

This article grew out of a speech given to the Annual Meeting of the Atlantic Association of Political Scientists, October 30, 1987 in Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada. When asked to speak the topic was given as "the future of Native self-government". The title is not innocent. In fact, it is a double trap: a linguistic-cultural one and a Nation-State one.

First, the question is couched in the English idiom and language which is completely foreign to the traditional Indigenous idioms and languages. It carries with it all the Western and Modern cultural assumptions and presuppositions of our political anthropology. For example, "the future" throws us into

a linear framework which takes us away from the cyclical- oriented mind of the Indigenous peoples. The words "self" and "government" carry with them all of our anthropocentric and anthropocentristic political anthropology: notions of Man being the Center, the Transformer, the Master, the Measure of all things; notions of autonomy, of freedom as choice, of the need of distinct governments, of democracy, of majority rule. All notions that we think universal but are not, because two thirds of the world population (Indigenous peoples included) simply don't think politics that way. Not only is their vision cosmocentric and based on ontonomy rather than autonomy, "dharmacracy" rather than democracy, but the very word politics is foreign to their social organization. It is a form of totalitarianism to give no choice except between democracy and totalitarianism. As if there were no valid polity outside of a democratic one.

Secondly, we have grown so accustomed to discussing political questions in a *modern Nation-State framework t*hat the word government is immediately taken to mean *Nation-State* or one of its administrative units where there is a top-down authority, a ruler who commands, legislates, orders and coerces subjects into submission, after they have "freely" given him permission to do so in an act of voluntary servitude. The discussion on Indigenous self-government thus remains essentially confined to and based on the western political anthropology of the Nation-State. It allows for legal variations, but those must not disturb the ideology of Nation-State, which is considered universal and trans-cultural. The only form of political organization that is deemed acceptable is the *Nation-State-oriented form of politics or of government*. Anything else, based on culture, smacks of racism, apartheid, tribalism, ghettoisation.

The fundamental reason why we Westerners are unable to speak seriously about traditional Indigenous "political" culture is that we are so alienated from our own western political nature and culture and hypnotized by our Nation-State ideology and its anthropocentristic political anthropology of Man, the Master of the Universe, that we are unable to conceive of "politics" and "government" without some mighty head somewhere to tell us what to do. Our real problem is that we believe that man is called to be master of his destiny, so that somewhere, somehow, there must be one top ultimate master to put some order in the chaotic relations of these little masters. We thus legitimize "might makes right" in some way. But until we discover that we are not ultimately called to autonomy or to be masters of our destinies, we shall never discover and accept our own anthropocentric political nature as organic artisans and synthetic transformers of our destiny, nor shall we be able to accept the *cosmocentric* political nature of Indigenous peoples.

We need therefore to emancipate from three things:

1. Identifying politics with Nation-State politics;

2. Identifying our legitimate anthropocentric political anthropology with its illegitimate anthropocentric distortion i.e. being masters of our own destinies;

3. Identifying our legitimate anthropocentric political anthropology with the whole political reality. For, excellent as the former may be, it is not the only legitimate and valid one. Not only in the sense that there are also other anthropocentric political an-

thropologies, but that there are also radically different *cosmocentric* ones, among which the *Indigenous* . Therefore, it would be good to remember not only that we have different answers to political questions, but that the questions themselves are radically different.

But let me stress an important caveat before I proceed further. I believe that Indigenous peoples are neither an inferior branch of homo sapiens, not the pure and genuine example of humanness. Second, I believe that Western culture and civilization may be very sick today, but civilization is not syphilis-ation. It is not a disease. Hence, it need not become Indigenous to be human again.

TRADITIONAL INDIGENOUS POLITICAL CULTURE

Traditional Indigenous Political Culture is distinct both from the Western anthropocentric political culture and from Western anthropocentristic culture of the modern Nation-State. It is based on:

1. *The cosmocentric view:* man is neither the center, the transformer, the master nor the measure of all things. He is simply a part of the cosmos which constitutes him. Hence the land is a constitutive dimension of Man and of the Indigenous people and of their identity. Hence cosmocentric and cosmic politics. They hold an aboriginal title to the land. The land cannot be sold out, nor that title extinguished or ceded, even by a treaty. No termination is possible. The key word here is harmonizing with the cosmos.

2. *The Instructions of the Creator:* the social order is not determined by Man and his autonomous constitutions but the Instructions of the Creator inscribed in the cosmos.

3. *People, freedom and consensus:* "It is difficult for those belonging to culture that has not awakened to this spirit to even fathom what the Indians refer to as 'The People' of America. They do not refer to a conglomeration of autonomous political individuals but rather to an intricate communion of all living things." Freedom doesn't consist in choosing but in being who one is. One doesn't choose one's identity. Identity is a given. One may choose one's instruments, but not one's parents. Political national-identity does not require a State identity or a State- apparatus. In Indigenous politics, there is no majority rule but consensus of the people. No suffrage. No check and balance mentality or separation of powers, no adversarial individualism. Consensus is not based on individual and collective choice but on harmonizing together with the Instructions of the Creator inscribed in the universe.

4. *On a radically different notion of leadership:* The political leader is always also a spiritual leader. No King - no man made law - no ruler who decides and commands. To govern is not to rule subjects. No top-down government. There are no subjects who submit to some Man's orders and constraints. It is non- interventionist and it has no power of decision nor of control, nor of coercion. The leader is to be a mirror of the people, of the Great Peace, a conciliator. That is why he bears the name of the tribe, the clan, the people or the country. He gives priority to harmony in and because of differences rather than to unity in spite of differences.

5. *The power of ritual:* The world is kept together by ritual harmonization. It is a government by ritual and ceremonies, i.e. by performing the Instructions of the Creator.

6. *Nor on rights but on responsibility:* No one has any rights. Only a duty of infinite indebtedness and responsibility to all and everyone.

It is very difficult for people with an anthropocentric political anthropology to understand people with such a cosmocentric political anthropology, which is not only difficult to translate in the English language, but next to impossible to do so, specially in writing, since it is, moreover, an original oral tradition.

A COMMON ENEMY: THE NATION-STATE

The greatest danger faced by both Indigenous and Western peoples is the *Nation-State oriented democracy* and its underlying anthropocentrist political anthropology.

Western peoples oftentimes do not see it, but they confuse their legitimate anthropocentric political culture with the modern anthropocentrist Nation-State oriented culture. There is an incompatibility between the first and the second. Another way of putting it is to say that to be democratic, we must avoid subscribing to a *Nation-State oriented democracy,* a democracy that is based on the *sovereign* power of a government or even of a people. A voluntary servitude to an abstract collectively called the Nation-State and National Security and to its representatives: an impersonal heterogeneous government is political alienation. A democracy that is based on the superstition that Man is called to be master of the universe and of his destiny, or on the myth that the Good Society is a society of goods, that the Good Life - Human Life - consists primarily in economic development and technological progress, i.e. control of nature and man, is a pure fallacy.

Western democracy need not be Nation-State oriented. It can be *culture-oriented* and based on the notion that Man is called to be an *artisan of his destiny.* Without being anthropocentristic, it can be anthropocentric or Man-centered, in the sense that it can underline Man's responsibility to enhance the universe, to transform it in synergia with the other cosmic forces. It need not become Native-Indian and cosmocentric to do that, although it may have to relearn not to abstract Man from the cosmos if it wishes remain human. It can even have recourse to some aspects of modernity: rationalization, functionality and even a functional Statehood. But only as a means, not as an end. But without being so naive as to think that technology is a simple instrument that can be used for good or evil. For, technology today is an ideology. It even escapes human control. It controls Man himself and makes him into a machine at the service of the Megamachine.

If Western democracy is to be Man-oriented, it must also respect all of Man and hence all of His cultures, even the cosmocentric ones like those of the Indigenous Peoples, where Man is seen as co-responsible to keep the universe in

harmony and balance through a cosmic ritual of performing the Instructions of the Creator. Hence the need to respect these peoples' cosmic 'politics' with their different notions of what we call "leadership", "people", "government", "territory" and which are radically different from our own, both in linguistic expression and meaning.

To be democratic in the most legitimate anthropocentric sense of the word, we need not impose our valid Western-based politics and democracy on Indigenous Peoples. We need rather, a culturally pluralistic politics, where there is room for both political cultures living side by side and interrelating, sometimes by keeping a solid distance from each other, sometimes coming together to learn from each other, but always by both resisting and emancipating together from the Nation-State oriented democracy. The latter is detrimental to both because it tries to replace both with its supposedly transcultural, objective, neutral myth, which is alienation from our respective true selves.

Indigenous peoples, like all of us Westerners, are also facing a very serious danger, that of falling into the trap of seeking self-government within a *Nation-State oriented democracy or framework.* Whether this occurs by becoming band-councils, municipalities or other administrative units according to the laws of such plenary power States, or by expecting their rights to be defined by such Nation-State type constitutions. To recover their political cultures, they will not only have to free themselves from the hegemony of these foreign Nation-States, but refuse to become themselves sovereign Nation-States in the modern Nation-State oriented sense and refuse to abide by the ideology of sovereignty and plenary powers of mastery over their destinies, because that would go directly against their traditional teachings - the Instructions of the Creator. In order to do this, they need (like Westerners) to close themselves up or emancipate as completely as possible from this anthropocentristic ideology of the Nation-State, they need not close themselves up to the Western anthropocentric view of politics, nor stop collaborating with it and with some Western peoples. But they do not necessarily need to become Westernized politically in order to be who they are.

OUR MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITY

One of the great errors today, on the side of both Western and Indigenous peoples is that they think that they will find their own political liberation through the *Nation-State oriented democracy or framework.*

Western peoples expect Indigenous Peoples and themselves to be liberated through some kind of official recognition or empowerment on the part of the Nation-State. This will never happen, because Nation-States, by their very definition, do not relinquish power unless they are forced to do so. And even when they do, the only power that they know is that inhuman, competitive and depersonalizing power of individual autonomy and legalized violence. That is why, even with regard to themselves, the Western peoples find no liberation in that kind of "empowerment", but simply create conditions for a greater order through

violence. Of course, Western peoples could try to force the issue through violent means, but that would solve nothing. It would simply exacerbate the issue by introducing more violence.

Indigenous peoples also have made and still make a great mistake in expecting recognition from the sovereign Nation-States and making treaties with a Crown or Power that still considers them as subjects and citizens and refuses to deal with them as Nations unless they act as sovereign and have the military power to enforce their sovereignty on others, i.e. unless they abide by the game of competition for plenary powers. They also often make the mistake of identifying all Westerners with one of the several sovereign Nation-States, thus denying them their national identities or at least giving priority to their secondary and State identity over their organic national identity.

Indigenous peoples and Westerners need to come together horizontally, not only to emancipate together from the Nation-State oriented framework, but to help each other achieve their original political cultures, free from the Nation-State. That is why we would do well to do more mutual recognition at the grassroots level without going through Nation-State channels. This is what our own Monchanin Cross- Cultural Center did in 1982, when it sent a sixteen member delegation of families from different cultural backgrounds to Kanienkeh and Anishnabay nations respectively, recognizing their aboriginal titles to the land where these non-Indians are living. Furthermore, while we both need to acknowledge that there is an incompatibility between our respective political cultures on the one hand and the Nation-State oriented political cultures on the other, there is no incompatibility between the Traditional Indigenous Political Culture and the Western anthropocentric political culture. While none *has to* borrow from each other, both *can* borrow from each other sometimes. There can be cross-cultural fertilization at a certain political level. Thus, we both must recognize that there is room for a pluralistic political culture, on each side. There is room for cultural pluralism in Indigenous Self Government, just as there is room for cultural pluralism in Western participatory democracy. But one should be careful not to confuse that with the liberal pluralism (or plurality) of the modern Nation-State, nor with one of its forms: the multicultural ideology which would make it a duty on all to become a cosmopolitan cultural mix called the global culture.

CONCLUSION

We Westerners have a responsibility towards fostering traditional Indigenous 'self-government" and Indigenous Cultural Pluralism. We simply cannot say: that is their own business and wash our hands of it all in a spirit of individualistic autonomy. It would be a denying of our responsibility. But we would do well to remember that our first responsibility is to work toward the emancipation of our own political culture from the Nation-State oriented political culture of our times and from its underlying political anthropology and ideology. We would then be in a better frame of mind and situation to help the Indigenous

Peoples live according to their own Indigenous "political culture". We would then be removing the obstacles that we place in their way, not the least of which is the encouragement to choose whatever agrees with their individual self-interest, i.e. to be master of their own destinies, thus going not only against the best of their own Indigenous traditions but also against the best of our own Western anthropocentric tradition.

Our main responsibility as Westerners towards "Indigenous Self Government" is to deal with our own alienation from our own Western anthropocentric culture, due to our voluntary servitude to the Nation-State and to the superstitious myth of its anthropocentrist and abstract political anthropology of national and public self-interest.

NOTES

[1] "Dharmacy" here means government (Greek: Kratein, to govern), not primarily by Man-made laws but by the Natural Order, or, as the Native peoples say repeatedly, by the "Instructions of the Creator" which are written down by the very nature of things. The word "Dharma" is a Sanskrit word which means both the Natural Order (or Order of Reality) and duty.

[2] Thus, Premier Rene Levesque to the Inuit in 1983: "Find some agreement among you on the government that you need. We shall accept just about anything that does not break the integrity of the Quebecois State." Or Prime Minister Trudeau calling the Dene of the Northwest Territories racists in the 1980's when they spoke of a government based on their own culture. Or again a Laval University sociologist, commenting on the upcoming referendum under the title "La souverainete-association au Nouveau-Quebec Inuit" (Le Devoir, 30 sept. er ler Oct. 1987) and calling "stupid" and "irresponsible" those people (Native and others) who insist on promoting and defending their own political cultures. "Ethnistic", "defensive tribalism"., "benevolent apartheid" he calls it.

[3] The artisan's attitude, contrary to the master's, is based on non-duality between the human, the cosmic, the divine, between culture and nature, between the spiritual and the political, between the sacred and the economic, between the visible and the invisible, between logos and mythos.

[4] Thus, while there is an incompatibility between the Indigenous relationship to land and Western modern individual (private and collective) ownership of land, there isn't any between that same Indigenous relationship and that of Western personal and community ownership. In the Indigenous view, land not only cannot be individually appropriated but it cannot be ceded and terminated. The Aboriginal title is not a man-made title.

In the Western view, there is a confusion between individual and personal property. Property is generally defined since the Roman Empire as individual property, i.e. "jus uti et *abutendi*" : the right to use and *abuse* i.e. to use for one's self-interest. But it can also be defined as "jus uti" i.e. the right to use it for the personal common good. While the latter anthropocentric definition is still a different view of Man's relationship to land compared to the cosmocentric Indigenous view, the two are not incompatible. But both are incompatible with the anthropocentristic view of individual property (private or collective).

[5] Gayle High Pine, *Akwesasne Notes*, Early Spring, 1976: p. 32.

[6] By that I mean not only the State apparatus of government, but also the whole collectivity

- sum of individuals - and the so called "public self-interest": the society of goods.

The recent constitutional talks between Canada and Indigenous Peoples remain, because of that, very ambiguous. Some Indigenous Nations feel that they have no business dealing with what should be written in a foreign country's constitution. Others share that view but believe that constitutional talks can be used to educate the public at large to Indigenous Aboriginal rights to the land. Some even believe that through such constitutional talks, some kind of Nation to Nation constitutional partnership can gradually emerge. Other Indigenous peoples consider themselves citizens of Canada and use Indigenous Nationhood and aboriginal rights to gain Western and modern type political power within the Canadian Nation-State. My own view is that both Indigenous peoples and Westerners should not be so naive as to think that the Modern Nation-State will ever accept aboriginal rights and Indigenous Nationhood unless we, the people, give up our assumptions of Nation-State and people sovereignty and plenary powers and undergo a mutation in our understanding of property in the sense indicated in Note [4]. This means emancipating from the modern Nation-State-oriented-view of democracy.

Whether this should be done through constitutional talks or otherwise is another matter, where, I think, there is room for a pluralistic approach.

Biography Robert Vachon, born in 1930, graduated from the Gregorian University in Rome with a degree in Theology. A co-founder of the Monchanin Cross-Cultural Centre in Montreal, he has been associated with the Centre since 1970, initially as Director of the Centre and currently as Director of Research. In 1968 he was the founding director of the quarterly **Journal Intercultural** and has authored a number ofbooks in French, amongst them *Indigenous Nations in America* (1983), *Hinduism* (1986) and *Alternatives to Development* (1988).

THE AFFIRMATION OF INDIGENOUS VALUES IN A COLONIAL EDUCATION SYSTEM

LILLA WATSON
University of Queensland

Abstract Aboriginal knowledge and processes of teaching and learning have been developed in the land now known as Australia over tens of thousands of years. They have always been rooted in the land, the greatest of teachers, the source of life and law. They have survived the disruption of colonization, and the policies and practices aimed at their extinction. This is true not only of more remote and "traditional" communities, but of people dwelling in urban situations.

There has been an upsurge in acknowledgement and interest in Aboriginal life in recent decades, but myths, silence and insensitivity linger on: the bulk of academic studies reflect white preoccupations, perspectives and priorities.

As Aboriginal people, we now find ourselves, for the first time, in a position to describe and define ourselves to the colonizing society. This new task is made difficult by persisting colonial relationships and perceptions. This is most evident in the education institutions, which, from our perspective, are alien colonial importations, and still largely agents of colonialism. Some progress has been made in having Aboriginal standards of intellectual excellence recognized in Universities. As people indigenous to this land, we are in a unique position to help educational institutions become agents of human liberation, and to foster the development of harmony between peoples and with the land.

Résumé Le savoir des Aborigènes ainsi que le processus de l'enseignement et de l'apprentissage ont été développés dans le pays que nous appelons à présent l'Australie il y a des dizaines de milliers d'années. Ces connaissances ont trouvé racine dans le sol - le plus grand des maîtres, la source de la vie et des lois. Elles ont survécu aux perturbations causées par la colonisation, et aux politiques et pratiques destinées à assurer leur extinction. Ceci s'applique non seulement aux communautés isolées et "traditionnelles", mais également aux personnes vivant en milieu urbain.

On a constaté au cours des dernières décennies un regain de reconnaissance et d'intérêt envers la vie aborigène, bien que les mythes, le silence et l'insensibilité soient encore de mise. La grande masse des études universitaires reflète les préoccupations de l'homme blanc, ses perspectives et ses priorités. Les peuples aborigènes se trouvent à présent

pour la première fois dans la position de se décrire et de se définir eux-mêmes par rapport à la société colonialiste. Cette nouvelle tâche est rendue difficile par la persistance de relations et perceptions coloniales. C'est dans les institutions d'éducation que la chose est la plus évidente. Selon une perspective aborigène, ces dernières sont une importation étrangère coloniale, et demeurent dans une grande mesure des agents du colonialisme.

Un certain progrès a été accompli quant à l'éstablissement de standards intellectuels d'excellence aborigènes dans les universités. En tant que peuples indigènes de ce pays, les Aborigènes se trouvent dans la situation unique d'aider les institutions d'éducation à devenir des agents de libération humaine, promouvant un développement harmonieux entre les peuples, et avec le sol.

THE AFFIRMATION OF INDIGENOUS VALUES IN A COLONIAL EDUCATION SYSTEM

Murri knowledge and the processes of teaching and learning have matured in this land for over fifty thousand years. They began long before the last Ice Age, at a time when volcanoes were still active in what is known today as Australia. They have always been based on the permanence of the land, and the cyclic rhythms of nature. Harmony with the land, knowing it, learning from it as Mother and teacher, have provided a solid and permanent basis for law, and for harmony with each other.

Over countless generations, those processes have developed some distinctive characteristics (see Bell, 1983; Brandl, 1983; King-Boyes, 1977; Liberman, 1985)

- The processes extended over the whole life-span.

- They involve everyone. Each person is encouraged to develop his/her potential, as a precious and important resource.

- They respect the individual's maturity, and hence capacity to know, and use knowledge responsibly. Maturity is not measured in years.

- While initiation ceremonies, for example, were and are times of intensive edu-

cation, and ceremony, story telling, song and dance are also important, the processes include observation and involvement in every-day activities. Children especially are encouraged to investigate and experiment, and are rarely separated from adult activities. Small children are seldom punished for mistakes.

- They are holistic - involving not just the intellect, but the spirit, emotions, behaviour etc. in relation to the land and to one another.

- They are non-competitive, but for and by the whole community; there are few prizes or privileges to be won apart from responsibilities; there are few failures or losers.

- Everyone is, to some extent, a teacher.

- Above all, they have always been rooted in the land, the greatest of teachers, and our mother. The sense of belonging to the land, of responsibility for the land, of our survival depending on the health of the land, rather than the other way around, pervades the whole process.

- Our history, our Laws are drawn from it, and are located in it, as a far more solid base than frail human beings. We have never allowed ourselves to be weighed down by dead heros or teachers, or the need to compare ourselves with them, or compete against them.

The effectiveness of those processes, and the dynamism inherent in the oral tradition, are plain to see. Murris in Arnhem Land today can indicate miles out to sea, ridges and sites of significance which have not been visible since the last Ice Age (Neidjie, Davis & Fox, 1985, p. 13). Aboriginal names for volcanoes extinct for tens of thousands of years recall the time they belched forth ash and lava. Murris can name, describe, and identify the habitat of megafauna whose fossils are new and exciting discoveries for Europeans. Botanists, zoologists and nutritionists have been astounded by the detailed knowledge of plants and animals common among even young Aboriginal children. Bi-, tri- and even more multi-lingual skills were the norm for Murris.

Beyond these more tangible signs, of course, are value systems, law, spiritual beliefs etc. which lie at the heart of the indigenous culture, and have also been passed on from generation to generation.

COLONIZATION

Quite recently, only two hundred years ago, that process began to suffer serious disruption, with the establishment of a British penal colony in the area presently known as Sydney. As a Murri, any trip to Sydney is a sad reminder of what began here, and its consequences for us. It did not impact on the people

of my mother's mother's country in what is now Central Queensland until one hundred and twenty years ago.

Although the processes may have been disrupted, they have not been lost. They have even survived the policies and practices of a succession of colonialist governments. As recently as twenty five years ago, Australian Governments adopted a policy of cultural extinction, entitled Assimilation, which aimed at having "all Aborigines and part Aborigines . . . observing the same customs and influenced by the same beliefs, hopes and loyalties as other Australians" (Commonwealth P.P., 1962-63, vol.iii, p.651).

Let us take an example of the persistence of those processes. In July last year, the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission Inquiry heard evidence from Aboriginal people of Toomelah and Boggabilla, on the New South Wales/ Queensland Border. Towards the end of the first day of hearings, the President, Judge Marcus Einfeld, spoke of all living in this country as being Australians, and our inability to undo the past (HREOC Inquiry, transcript, 27/7/1987, pp.97/ 8). The next day, a respected local Aboriginal woman, Julie Whitton, took up the points in a written submission:

> . . for anyone to say to a Murri that 'the past is over' is just not right. We can't forget the past. White people don't forget their past. But for Murris time is different anyway. We don't divide time up into the past, present and future. This is just what the Dreaming is all about. The Dreaming is happening all the time. That's why we can't 'forget' (or put behind us) all the massacres that happened to our people here. How can we forget them and the resistance fighting of our people? For us that only happened yesterday, the other day; like our Dreaming these things are part of who we are. 'Past' is a white man's idea. We know that we can't lose anything that has happened us. What has happened to our people is our people. It is what we are. We believe this strongly. For Murris it is what is happening that is important. That's why, for instance, when we call a meeting, the meeting starts when everyone who should be there has arrived. That's the meeting time. So to tell us to forget the past and to look to the future makes no sense at all. It's an insult to tell us to forget the past. That's the same as telling us to forget the Dreaming, to forget how the old people struggled, to forget who we are. . .
>
> Over the years there have been many times when I have gone home and said: 'that's it, no more. I'm not going to battle any more for Toomelah'. Then I have laid down and seen the faces of my Mother, my Aunties and one or two others of the old people around me. They say: 'Don't give up, Julie, you have to go on'. And I do, not for me, not for Toomelah but for them. I know we have to make things a reality for the people who've struggled before us. Those are the people who have struggled and died. I can tell you, that all you have to do is to drive down to Old Toomelah (site of the former Mission), pull up your car and you can hear it, especially at night, the sound of the old people in the bush, the old people talking still. This is what we live with, who we live for.
>
> I also want to say something about being Australian. . . It is an insult to tell us that we are Australian citizens. How can anyone tell us who we are? We

know who we are. We are Murris, the indigenous people of this country.
(HREOC Inquiry, Exhibit 14)

The submission of Mrs. Whitton, and others, to that inquiry, show that, despite all the assimilationist pressures, three quarters of a century of living on Reserves, and being subject to white schooling, indigenous knowledge and teaching processes are alive and well, and that the dynamism of the oral tradition continues. They put paid to the myth that Aboriginality only survives in remote communities, and that elsewhere the culture has been lost or destroyed.

Now, at least, the very different teaching tradition brought to this land by the colonizers is acknowledging two things: firstly, that it is possible that they might have something to learn from Murris, and that Aboriginal studies should have a place in their curricula: and secondly, that it has failed to assimilate us. While we may have adapted some of its aspects to our use, it has failed to convince us that is has the answers to our needs.

ABORIGINAL STUDIES

The interest in Aboriginal people and knowledge shown by white Australia is quite recent. There have always been a few anthropologists, amateur or recognized, who saw their task as one of recording Aboriginal customs and languages before they disappeared. The efforts of some were intended to provide a basis for the control and manipulation of Aboriginal people, the exploitation of their labour (Berndt & Berndt, 1987), their removal from land wanted for pastoralists or miners; and to accelerate the process of assimilation. Many others ended up being used for the same purposes, and to provide an underpinning for the process of colonization, and its accompanying brutality, and to stifle any stirrings of conscience. Some set out to find evidence to support the theories of Social Darwinism (Taylor & Jardine, 1924).

So twenty five years ago, Professor Stanner (1968), speaking of Australian perceptions of Aboriginal people was able to devote one of his Boyer Lectures to "The Great Australian Silence". At that time, for example, among the minority who did ask questions, it was thought that Aboriginal people had probably lived in this land for some 1,200 years, and numbered some 300,000 at the time of white settlement: and that this land had either been a "Terra Nullius", or had been occupied "peaceably". (Professor Frank Crowley, Editor of a "New History of Australia" 1974), justified the lack of attention given to black/white relations in this widely used text book, saying "that the Aborigines were just not important in the early history of white settlement" (Evans, 1986, p.16).

Comparatively, the volume of research and studies published since then on various aspects of Aboriginal life, and relations with white Australia, is quite massive. For a Murri perspective, however, it is a very mixed bag. We are now recognized as having occupied this land for at least 50,000 years; the Murri population at the time of white settlement is acknowledged to have been at least 750,000. This makes the contrast with the estimated Murri population of 67,000

in 1901 even more marked, and questions about "Terra nullius" and peaceable occupation, and the barbarism of colonization harder to ignore (see Butlin, 1983; Flood, 1983; Mulvaney, 1969; White, 1987).

On the other hand, myths generated from earlier studies persist. As recently as last February, the prestigious English newspaper "Guardian Weekly" carried a feature article claiming that Aboriginal people "did not know that a child came from coition of a man and a woman", and quoting a contemporary historian's description of us as having had "an almost animal-like level of life" (Coleman, 1988). The silence and insensitivity linger on: in this year of 1988, as whites celebrate 200 years of colonial occupation of this land, the eight courses offered in Archeology by the University of Sydney's Centre for Continuing Education (1988) still deal only with Europe, Greece and Egypt; and only three years ago, it was discovered that the remains of some 200 Aboriginal people removed from a burial site near Broadbeach, on Queensland's Gold Coast, in 1963, had been stored and studied in the Anatomy Department of the University of Queensland for 20 years ("Remains will be reburied," 1985).

So, from a Murri perspective, while it is good to see superficiality, paternalism and racism of earlier studies acknowledged, I suspect that much of the present output will be viewed with similar horror 25 years hence. It is still a case of white academics and writers describing us and our culture, generally using western concepts, categories and definitions - i.e., white terms of reference. The areas of study undertaken reflect white preoccupations, perspectives and priorities.

It is refreshing to see this acknowledged explicitly in some of the better material being published. For example, in his recent book, "Understanding Interaction in Central Australia", Kenneth Liberman (1985) acknowledges that his descriptions "are very much the product of (his) embeddedness in the perspectives of European sociability" (p.105), and that a Japanese sociologist, for example, might have seen and described things differently.

Writers showing such openness and sensitivity will understand, and in no way be offended, when we say that we have had enough of being defined and described by whites, of having others determine what is relevant and important in Aboriginality. We will say who and what we are. It has taken a long time for white Australia to reach the point of being ready to hear what we say, rather than what others say about us.

This is a relatively new task for us. For the greater part of our history as people indigenous to this country, we felt no need to make any explicit definition of ourselves. As a person said to the recent Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission Inquiry mentioned above, "among ourselves, we are only people; it is only when we come into contact with Europeans that we are Aboriginal" (HREOC transcript, 28/7/88, p.178). And as Fanon (1967) says, it is the colonizer "who has brought the 'native' into existence and who perpetuates his existence" (p.28). In the past, it has been the colonizer who has presumed to define us.

In this context, we "natives" in this our own country are waiting for colonial

scholars to explore and appreciate the significance of the following facts:

- the borders of more than 300 autonomous areas unchanged for thousands of years.

- there were no prisons or armies maintained in our society.

- the natural environment was not destroyed or polluted.

- our ancestors did not have any need to colonize neighbouring lands and people.

Since colonization, and especially in recent decades, we have had to clarify and confirm our identity for ourselves. Appropriate Aboriginal ways of behaving, speaking and living have been more explicitly identified and enhanced. But in recent years, for the first time in our history, we are being put in the position of having to describe ourselves to the colonizing society.

This has proved to be an especially difficult task for us. We have little difficulty in doing it, and engaging in appropriate dialogue, with people from other countries who have shared our experience of being colonized. We can do it with other peoples who have not shared that experience. Even those non-Aboriginal Australians who eschew the relationship of colonizer-colonized have difficulty in grasping the maturity and sophistication of our thought and culture. But for people who are not even aware of that relationship and its effects, the difficulty approaches impossibility.

The recognition of our right to maintain our identity and culture has involved not structural change, and asked nothing of the white community but tolerance. It has allowed Aboriginal people and knowledge to be placed under the umbrella of "multiculturalism", or, as a recent Australia Post stamp issue suggested, just another group of immigrants. Both these manoeuvres are, in effect, attempts to mask our status as the indigenous people of this country and belittle our unique and ancient relationship with the land, and give a facade of legitimacy to colonization.

ABORIGINAL PEOPLE IN WESTERN EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

As we try to adapt western schooling content and processes into our own terms of reference, we take our own look at them. Other indigenous people have recognized the need to do this. Some ten years ago, Julius Nyerere, until recently President of Tanzania, and formerly a school teacher trained in English institutions, spoke of the growth in awareness which led him to re-define education. For most of his life, he had accepted western definitions, but had become increasingly critical of the education systems supposedly based on them, and their usefulness for the people of his country.

The system, he said, tended to turn people into a more marketable commodity - the more education they received, the more money they were worth in the

job market. Rather than learning to use tools effectively, they tended to become tools. But turning people into commodities and tools did not make them more human. Africans, he declared, needed to define and control education for themselves.

Murris have the same need. If we look at how Murri children and adults have fared in the educational institutions of colonial origin in this country, we come to the same sort of questions and conclusion. Generally, in our experience, those institutions have been, and to a large degree, still are:

a) Colonial in origin, and, for us, colonizing. They do not have roots in this land. The easy interchangeability of staff and text books, nationally and internationally, indicates and perpetuates that rootlessness, a detachment from this land and responsibility for it: It also points to persistence of a western education empire.

b) Patronizing. Their desire to "uplift" us, their commitment to helping us "catch up", and the prevalence of the missionary mentality, wanting to bring us out of darkness and into the light, show an arrogance and insensitivity which is quite offensive. Before Australia was colonized, American Indians had experienced the same thing. In 1744, a treaty was negotiated with the Indians of the Six Nations at Lancaster, Pennsylvania.The Indians declined an offer in that treaty to send some of their young men to a white College, saying:

> We are convinced that you mean to do us Good by your Proposal; and we thank you heartily. But you who are wise must know that different Nations have different Conceptions of things and that you will therefore not take it amiss, if our Ideas of this kind of Education happen not to be the same as yours. We have had some experience of it. Several of our young People were formerly brought up at the Colleges of the Northern Provinces: They were instructed in all your Sciences; but, when they came back to us, they were bad Runners, ignorant of every means of living in the woods . . . neither fit for Hunters, Warriors, nor Counsellors, they were totally good for nothing.
>
> We are, however, not the less oblig'd by your kind Offer, tho' we decline accepting it; and, to show our grateful Sense of it, if the Gentlemen of Virginia will send us a Dozen of their Sons, we will take Care of their Education, Instruct them in all we know, and make Men of them (McLuhan, 1971).

c) Assimilationist. Until recent decades, and in many instances today, attempts have been made to suppress Murri values, knowledge, language and culture, and substitute the western ones. A decade ago, it was common for Aboriginal children to be punished for conversing in their own language at school: and in many places Aboriginal English - English reflecting the syntax of a Murri languages - is still suppressed.

d) Alien. Relationships, practices, structures and values (e.g., individualism, competition, direct questioning, etc.) are often quite alien and opposed to Murri ones. They serve the colonizing society, and do virtually nothing to help that society confront the arrogance, racism and barbarism which underpinned the colonization of this

land, and their present day legacies.

e) Divisive. They have tended - indeed, are often intended - to alienate children from their elders, to develop an elite which will take over the pacification and control of their own people, as the Native Police were developed some 140 years ago.

f) Limiting. Where an openness to Aboriginal knowledge has been shown, it's expression is limited by being contained within white terms of reference.

Of course we are told that we need the basic skills of reading, writing, arithmetic, etc., if we are to cope with the modern world. But we see that schools often fail to equip white children, especially the ones Murris tend to associate with at school, with those skills: and even where they do, we see that their chances to utilize them are often severely limited.

Is it any wonder, then, that Murri children don't readily fit into schools, or show much enthusiasm? Indeed, when I hear a Murri child say that he's enjoying school, and doing well, while I might say "That's good!", my response varies from uneasiness to caution to suspicion. I believe this is an understandable reaction.

Of course people will point to successes. For example because I'm a Lecturer in a University, people will say to me that I've got on through the system. I didn't finish my primary schooling: those school days were the horror of my life. Big blanks hide my memories too painful to recall. I got my education from my parents, who themselves had little formal schooling, and from the community. I got it despite school. I was appointed a lecturer in the University of Queensland without a degree, but on "Aboriginal standards of intellectual excellence" ("History made with Uni job," 1983). This followed extensive debate and discussion at many levels in the University community about the recognition of such standards, and of te importance of Aboriginal knowledge ("Uni vote backs Aboriginal aim," 1983).

This was an initiative of great significance for the Aboriginal community, and the University. It was a recognition of another intellectual tradition, indigenous to this country, entitled to a place in the University, and created a new potential for dialogue and harmony between those traditions. It opens up the vision of an enriched, more mature University, at last putting its roots down in this land, and tapping into a past measured in tens of thousands of years.

CONCLUSION

I hope that what I have been saying isn't making people feel guilty: uncomfortable, perhaps, but not guilty. (As the poet Bruce Dawe says, "Guilt's a slippery thing" 1986, p.38). My concern has not been just to make things better for us, or better between us: but an invitation for people who have come from elsewhere to live in this country and call it"home', to confront themselves, to own their own history in this land, and to come to grips with the persisting colonial struc-

tures, practices and attitudes which persist today. It is an invitation to become aware of their effects on each of us, and on this land; and to work towards building a better future.

My hope would be that, for some of you, as educators, and teacher educators, you might recognize the extent to which western -style schooling has become subservient to the colonizing process. In this country, it perpetuates it; in the Pacific expanding it, and in some places providing the beachhead; pacifying, assimilating and manipulating the colonized, justifying the colonizers and masking their economic and military interests and strategies. My hope is that you will opt for the alternative, making schooling a process of liberation for both the colonized and colonizer, the harbinger of a new future, in which people and land are placed at the centre, rather than progress, technology, money and growth in gross national product.

That choice, that contrast, was symbolized earlier this year when traditional dancers from Cape York, who were participating in a cultural Survival Gathering in Musgrave Park, danced on the asphalt road in front of the entrance to Expo '88. And from the western tradition, it was articulated by the Canadian David Suzuki during his recent visit to this country for the ANZAAS Conference, when he urged Governments to aim at reducing G.N.P., or face ecological disaster.

It will involve a learning process. Jean Paul Satre (Preface to Fanon, 1967) spoke to his fellow Europeans about the colonized: "It is enough that they show us what we have made of them for us to realize what we have made of ourselves" (p.12). The indigenous peoples know the colonizers very well, and are willing to help their growth in self-awareness - for your sake, for our sake - so that the land might be protected, made well again, for everyone. Then we might all be able to look at our history stretching as far into the future as we Murris are able to see ours stretching behind us.

It will mean that in schools, Aboriginal knowledge and perceptions will not be just another optional subject, interesting, a cheap price to pay for a quiet conscience - but knowledge with a maturity so deeply rooted in this land, and concerned for its well-being, that its potential contribution to the building of a healthy society, and a healthy land, might be realized.

And Aboriginal students will not be seen as "problems" requiring special methods for incorporation into the Schooling system and society - but rather representatives of the challenge to that system's capacity to change, and build harmony between all people, and between people and the land.

REFERENCES

Bell, D. (1983). *Daughters of the Dreaming*. Melbourne: McPhee Gribble/George Allen & Unwin.

Berndt, R. & C. (1987). *End of an Era: Aboriginal Labour in the Northern Territory*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. This is a revision of a report prepared by the authors when, in 1944, they were invited by a Vestey's company to find ways of enticing "bush" Aborigines to work on their cattle Stations. The authors produced a scathing report on the existing practices and attitudes, which were contributing to declining Aboriginal population.

Brandl, M. (1983). A Certain Heritage: Women and their Children in North Australia. In Gale, F. (ed.), *We Are Bosses Ourselves*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

Butlin, N. (1983). *Our Original Agression*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Coleman, T. Australia's Fairy Tales. Manchester, *The Guardian Weekly*, 28/2/88. The Historian quoted is a Frenchman, Robert Lacour-Gayet.

Commonwealth Parliamentary Papers, Vol.iii., 1962-1963. Resolution adopted by Conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers responsible for Aboriginal Affairs, Darwin, July 1963:

> The policy of assimilation means that all Aborigines and part Aborigines will attain the same manner of living as other Australians and live as members of a single Australian community enjoying the same rights and privileges, accepting the same responsibilities, observing the same customs and influenced by the same beliefs, hopes and loyalties as other Australians (p.651).

Crowley, F. (1974)(Ed.). *A New History of Australia*. Melbourne: Heinemann.

Dawe, B. (1986) Nemisis, in *Towards Sunrise*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire. The poet reflects on the thunder .57 Snider rifles used to shoot down the Kalkadoon Murris on Battle Mountain, in north Queensland, and poses questions for whites:

But what is that one slaughter
repeated many times
to us who tread domestic grass
and thrill to 'foreign' crimes?
We cannot call the Turrbul back
and guilt's a slippery thing
if all it feeds are speeches
and songs that poets sing. . .
When the Kalkadoons stopped running
and charged and charged again
they fell as fell the tribesmen
on earlier hill and plain.
And we who wrote their finish
must turn from running
and face our thundering heart (p.38).

Evans, R. (November,1986). The Owl and the Eagle. *Social Alternatives*, Brisbane, 5,4; 16.

Fanon, F. (1967). *The Wretched of the Earth.* London: Penguin.

Flood, J. (1983). *The Archeology of the Dreamtime.* Sydney: Collins.

History made with Uni job. (20/11/83). Brisbane: *The Sunday Mail*, Brisbane, p.12.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission Inquiry into the Social and Material Needs of Residents of N.S.W. - Queensland Border Towns. The Inquiry was established to investigate the causes of racial tensions between members of the Aboriginal community of Toomelah, a former government Mission, and white residents of near-by Goondiwindi, which boiled over into "rioting" in Jan. 1987. Its report was handed down in June, 1988.

King-Boyes, M. (1977). *Patterns of Aboriginal Culture.* Sydney: McGraw Hill.

Liberman, K. (1985). *Understanding Interaction in Central Australia: An Ethnomethodological Study of Australian Aboriginal People.* Boston, London: Routledge & Keegan Paul.

McLuhan, T.C., (1971)(ed.). *Touch the Earth.* New York: Promontory Press, P.57.

Mulvaney, D.J. (1969). *The Prehistory of Australia.* London: Penguin.

Neidjie, B., Davis S. & Fox A. (1985). *Kakadu Man: Bill Neidjie.* N.S.W.: Mybrood.

Remains will be reburied near site. (26/5/85) Brisbane: *The Sunday Mail.*

Stanner, W.E.H. (1969). *After the Dreaming.* Sydney: The Australian Broadcasting Commission.

Taylor, G. & Jardine F. (1924). Kamilaroi and White: a Study of Racial Mixture. *Journal of Royal Society of N.S.W., LVIII,* The authors measured such things as "Nasal Index" (ratio of length of nose to width) and distance from finger tips to ground. They were frustrated in their desire to find evidence of increased intelligence with increased admixture of white blood.

University of Sydney. (19/1/88). Continuing Education Program. supplement to *Sydney Morning Herald.*

Uni vote backs Aboriginal aim. (13/9/83). Brisbane: *The Courier Mail,* p.8

Biography Lilla Watson is a Birri-Gabba woman from what is now known as Central Queensland.

She has lived in Brisbane since the early 1970s, where she has been involved with many Black organizations, workshops, seminars, etc. She has been on the staff of the University of Queensland for nine years, and was appointed Lecturer in 1983 on the basis of recognition of Aboriginal standards of intellectual excellence. Ms. Watson has been active in promoting the re-introduction of Aboriginal terms of reference into economic, social, political and intellectual life in Australia.

INDIAN/METIS LANGUAGE PROGRAMS AND FRENCH IMMERSION: FIRST COUSINS OR DISTANT RELATIONS?

WILLIAM McEACHERN and PAULETTE MOELLER
University of Calgary and University of Regina

Abstract Bilingual education is often synonymous with French immersion programs and rarely brings to mind Indian/Metis language programs. In a society that prides itself on multicultural education and the promotion of official languages study, very little attention has been paid to delivery systems of Indian/Metis language programs. By contrast, French education programs which have been hailed as one of the great success stories of Canadian education have been the subject of numerous administrative studies. This article examines administrative issues common to both types of bilingual education.

Résumé L' éducation bilingue est souvent synonyme de programme immersifs en français, mais évoque rarement les programmes de langues autochtones. Les systèmes d' exécution de ces derniers auraient dû recevoir une plus grande attention dans une société qui se targue de son éducation multiculturelle et de ses programmes d' études des langues officielles. Par comparaison, les programmes d' éducation au Canada, ont été l' objet de nombreuses études administratives. Le présent article passe en revue les problèmes administratifs que les deux types d' éducation bilingue ont en commun.

THE FRENCH IMMERSION PROGRAM has been hailed as one of the great success stories of Canadian education. Research has indicated that the graduates of these programs achieve academically on a par with their counterparts in traditional English language programs in addition to having developed functional abilities in French (Swain, 1974; Swain & Barik, 1973; Lambert, 1974). While discussion about French immersion has become commonplace among educators throughout Canada, another form of bilingual instruction is also receiving attention, albeit with a more limited population. Native language instruction

for Canada's Indigenous people is presently a growing area of interest. Admittedly, the delivery of these two types of bilingual programs differs greatly; nonetheless, a comparison of the two programs could be useful in planning for the future direction of Indian/Metis language programs. The purpose of this paper is to compare these two types of bilingual programs in order to identify the strengths of French immersion which would be applicable to Indian/Metis language programs, and to note obvious differences where Indian/Metis language programs will have to venture forth and draw on the strength of their own resources. The comparison will be made in terms of the staffing of each program, the population each is to serve, the curriculum, and finally, the individual goals.

STAFFING

In spite of the fact that French is an international language spoken by a large percentage of the world's population, there is often a problem in obtaining good teachers for immersion programs, especially in non-francophone areas of Canada. Moeller (1986) raises two questions about staffing which certainly need to be addressed. First, she asks whether French immersion teachers need to be francophone or possess native-like fluency? And second, whether teachers need to be specialists in French as a Second language methodology. She concludes that the answer ought to be in the affirmative in response to both questions, but that in reality these ideal teachers are often not available, and administrative difficulties make their employment impossible or at least difficult for a variety of reasons. Few immersion teachers will leave urban centres to teach in rural areas; school administrators acquiesce to the demands of parents, and implement French language programs despite a lack of resources to support such offerings. These geographic and political roadblocks are often next to impossible to bypass. The net result is that teachers who are less than adequate either in their fluency in French or in their training as French as Second Language teachers often end up as immersion teachers in the classroom.

In Indian/Metis language instruction there are those same questions to be addressed as well as a host of others. As with immersion, the Indian/Metis language teacher should be a native speaker of the language in question if possible. However, unlike with French, the Indigenous languages are not international ones and generally have a relatively small number of native speakers. In addition, in many cases these languages are not being spoken by the younger generation and this situation further diminishes the supply of native speakers. In some cases there are linguists who are learning some Indian/Metis languages for a variety of reasons, often academic ones, who have certain areas of expertise in the language but do not have a command of the spoken language to equal that of the native speaker. We are, however, speaking of a very small population here. In many communities, the Indian/Metis language speaking population is small and elderly and therefore declining. In other, more remote areas, there is still a pool of Indian/Metis language speakers who could be trained as teachers. However, there are very few teachers of Indian/Metis language pro-

grams who have teaching qualifications. What has often been happening is that Indian/Metis language speakers who are not trained find themselves in a teaching situation with an English speaking teacher supervising, a situation that, is far from ideal. As more Indian/Metis teacher education programs produce graduates, this situation should change. Also, there are now programs being offered in several Canadian sites to train teachers especially for the teaching of Indian/Metis languages. Unlike the French methods courses where French tends to be the language of instruction, courses for Indian/Metis program teacher educators must be offered in English, since there is usually a variety of languages represented in a class.

Although the difficulties differ, it is easy to see that it is no easier to address the problem of providing linguistically and professionally competent teachers for Indian/Metis language classrooms than it is for French immersion programs. As more and more graduates emerge from Indian/Metis teacher education programs, however, the pool of qualified teachers, some of whom will undoubtedly be fluent in their respective languages, should alleviate this shortage. In order to enhance the number of Indian/Metis language instructors there is a further demonstrated need for second languages methods courses to be offered as a compulsory component of Indian/Metis teacher education programs.

POPULATION

The similarity between French immersion and Indian/Metis language clienteles rests on the fact that each is trying to master a second language; but, there are some serious differences which must be acknowledged in order to clarify the future direction of Indian/Metis language programs.

French immersion programs are available to students in every province in Canada. It cannot be said, however, that such programs are equally accessible to all since there are areas in Canada where for various reasons, usually economic or political, immersion classes are unavailable. In some remote areas of Saskatchewan for example it is simply not economically feasible to offer immersion programs in a sparsely populated school. One of the differences between French immersion classes and Indian/Metis language classes rests in the nature of the student population. Moeller (1986) has discussed the charges of elitism which are often levelled against French immersion. Studies (Burns, 1983; Lapkin, 1984) have shown that in general French immersion parents are from a higher level socioeconomically than the population of parents at large. Burns' and Lapkin's studies would indicate that the charges of elitism do indeed have a basis since children with a superior home environment and academic ability are those with a greater opportunity of being enrolled in an immersion program, the implication being that a superior home environment is synonymous with a higher socioeconomic level. "While French Immersion may very well be one of education's greatest success stories, care should be taken in casually attributing high achievement to program effects. Given the socio-economic status background of immersion children involved in the study, one could reasonably expect them to be highly successful in school!" (Burns 1983). Moeller (1986)

stresses that the charge of elitism which is as serious today as it was twenty years ago, revolves around the issues of accessibility to the program and the universality of program offerings. She feels that there should be better counselling available to all parents and students regardless of academic, cultural and socioeconomic background. In addition, she stresses that it takes more than transportation and multiple offerings of immersion classes to rid the program of the charge of elitism (p.20).

Indian/Metis languages programs do not have charges of elitism levelled against them; but, nevertheless, the population enrolled in such programs is also carefully selected. Since each Indian/Metis language has a specific geographic location it follows that only students in that locale have the opportunity of studying the particular language. Unlike French immersion programs, access to Indian/Metis languages programs are not accessible to the general population except in urban centres. Since each Indian/Metis language is not an international language, there seems to be little apparent reason for the mainstream English speaking student to study the language. In the case of French and its political studies in Canada, there is every reason for the mainstream English speaking student to learn the language. An additional difference to be considered is that the students of a Indian/Metis language may have varying degrees of proficiency in the language before beginning the formal study of it in school. For example, in some locations a student may be a fluent speaker of the Indian/Metis language; therefore the stress in school is on learning to read and write in that language. In other places, a student may have an aural knowledge of the language from listening to it being spoken by elders in the community, but have no real grasp of the spoken language personally. These factors play a role in the type of Indian/Metis language instruction being offered.

The goal of second language learning is similar with both French immersion and Indian/Metis language programs. The differences lie, however, in the background knowledge of the target language brought to school by the students and in the reasons held by the parents and the community for the study of the language. These differences cause very different perceptions to be held concerning the desirability of learning the language. Indian/Metis language programs are necessary for cultural survival since language and culture are so closely intertwined. Preserving the language, hence the culture is a very different goal than learning a language for social and economic reasons.

CURRICULUM

The type of curriculum being used in both types of language instruction continues to receive a great deal of attention. It is in the discussion of curriculum that one of the distinctions between the two language programs must be made. In French immersion, the curriculum essentially remains the same as that for traditional English language programs except that the medium of instruction is French. For example, in Ontario and in Saskatchewan, there does not exist a separate immersion curriculum guide. The English curriculum content is to be taught in immersion schools using French as the medium of instruction. Of

course, there must be increased emphasis on the study of French language if successful communication is to approximate the level attained in English language classrooms. Since instruction in English also must take an important place in the French immersion curriculum, additional time for English language arts must be incorporated into the program particularly in the higher grade levels since advanced level proficiency in the two languages is the desired outcome.

For purposes of discussion, it is perhaps more logical to compare learning outcomes of Indian/Metis language programs to that of core French programs. It would seem particularly helpful when discussing the Indian/Metis language program in a Indian/Metis community where English is the main language of the community. In that case the Indian/Metis language curriculum much more closely resembles the core French program than the French immersion one. Core French is defined as a program of 1200 hours of instruction in which students could gain a basic level of achievement (Gillin 1974). This basic level of achievement is all that could be expected of students enrolled in a Indian/Metis language program where the medium of instruction is English with a specified amount of time e.g. 40-60 minutes in the Indigenous language every day or two. In this respect, Indian/Metis and Core programs closely resemble one another. There is however one situation in Indian/Metis programs where on the surface instruction would appear to resemble the immersion situation: children arrive in kindergarten or grade one with minimal command of English; the language of instruction is the Indian/Metis language; there is every semblance of an "immersion" situation. Upon closer examination, one would have to conclude that these children are truly immersed in an English language program studying English, not Indian/Metis curricula. It follows, then, that the expectations for linguistic proficiency are largely dependent not only on the language of instruction but also on curriculum content.

This brings us to the final area of comparison between the two programs. Naturally, if the language of instruction is French in immersion programs and if students spend several years in the program, then the desired outcome is functional bilingualism. Although the media in recent years tend to question the claim of "complete bilingualism" for immersion graduates, the French immersion concept continues to receive popular support as the best form of education leading to French/English bilingualism.

It is in the setting of goals for Indian/Metis language programs that a more realistic attitude must be evidenced. Too often, there is an unwritten expectation that the graduates of Indian/Metis language programs will become fluent and literate in the Indian/Metis language and in English as well. It is virtually impossible to achieve this goal considering aspects such as the curriculum and the nature of the student population. Given that the students have such varied linguistic backgrounds in their Indian/Metis language, and the curriculum is not designed to provide ample time on task as with immersion, it seems improbable that a graduate of a native language program could become a fluent speaker of the Indian/Metis language itself and proficient in English as well.

CONCLUSION

The learning outcomes of French immersion and Indian/Metis language programs differ greatly. If functional bilingualism is the goal of French immersion programs, we cannot assume that a Indian/Metis language program of studies leads to proficiency in English as well as proficiency in one's Indigenous language. Indian/Metis language instruction is still in its embryonic stage and certainly has not received the research attention that has so greatly benefited immersion programs. The linguistic and cultural goals of immersion are not the goals of Indian/Metis language programs. It is time to evaluate the success of Indian/Metis language programs in light of their own meritorious goals, and not by comparing results to an apparent success story, the secret of which often lies in a favourable political climate rather than a firm commitment to the preservation of heritage and culture.

REFERENCES

Burns, E. (1983). Charges of Elitism in Immersion Education: the Case for Improving Program Implementation. *Contact*, 2, 2 p. 5.

Gillin Report (1974). *Report of the Ministerial Committee on the Teaching of French.* Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of Education of Ontario.

Lambert, W.E. (1974). A Canadian Experiment in the Development of Bilingual Competence. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31, 108-116.

Lapkin, S. (1984). Future Perspectives on Administrative and Pedagogical Aspects of French Immersion Education. *Contact*, 3. 4.

Moeller, P. (1986). *French Education Directions in Saskatchewan* (SSTA Research Centre Report No. 143). Regina, Saskatchewan: Saskatchewan School Trustees Association.

Swain, M. (1974). French Immersion Programs Across Canada. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31, 117-129.

Swain, N., & H. Barik (1973). French Immersion Classes: A Promising Route to Bilingualism. *Orbit*, 4, 1- 3.

Biographies William McEachern (Ed.D. University of Virginia) is in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at The University of Calgary where he teachers courses in language education. He has taught at all levels in Ontario, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia. He has worked extensively with Indian/Metis people in British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta as well as with rural populations in the Philipine Islands.

Paulette Moeller (Ph.D. Arizona) is associate professor and chair of French Teacher Education at the University of Regina. Her current research interest is in the area of testing/teaching for proficiency. She is a former contributor to CONTACT, and to the other professional journals such as the Canadian Modern Languages Review, Education Canada, Canadian Children, The Canadian School Executive, and the School Trustee.

A PROPER PLACE FOR THE DEAD: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE 'REBURIAL' ISSUE

JANE HUBERT
University of Southampton

Abstract Background to the "reburial" issue. Attitudes/beliefs of archaeologists and those of the subjects of their research. Past treatment (including grave-robbing) of human remains in the U.K. Current attitudes. Variety in Judaeo-Christian attitudes and practices. The"reburial" issue in the U.S.A. Archaeologists versus the American Indians regarding excavation, research and display of human remains. Fossil versus non-fossil remains.

The "reburial" issue in Australia; archaeologists versus the Australian Aborigines. The dilemma facing indigenous archaeologists e.g. in Africa and New Guinea. The two bases of opposition to disturbance of the dead: beliefs/attitudes of the living descendants and the wishes of the dead themselves. Rights of indigenous peoples versus the rights of archaeologists. The future.

Résumé Ce travail est une étude sur la question du ré-ensevelissement: les attitudes/croyances des archéologues sur le sujet de leur recherche, le traitement de cette question dans le passé (y compris le vol de tombes) de restes humains en Grande-Bretagne; les attitudes comtemporaines; la variété des attitudes et pratiquesjudéo-chrétiennes; la question du ré-ensevelissement aux Etats-Unis; l'attitude des archéologues par rapport aux Indiens américains en ce qui concerne les excavations, la recherche et l'exposition de restes humains; les restes fossiles par rapport aux restes humains.

La question du "ré-ensevelissement" en Australie; les archéologues par rapport aux Aborigènes australiens, le dilemme auquel doivent faire face les archéologues indigènes en Afrique et en Nouvelle Guinée entre autres lieux; les deux bases de l'opposition aux dérangement des morts; les croyances/attitudes des descendants vivants et les désirs des morts; les droits des peuples indigènes par rapport aux archéologues; l'avenir.

A PROPER PLACE FOR THE DEAD:

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE 'REBURIAL' ISSUE

The issue that is now widely referred to as the "reburial' issue has grasped archaeologists in some areas of the world firmly by the throat - and it shows no sign of letting go. Many of these archaeologists have faced the situation and are now seeking a solution. Others (e.g. Chippindale 1987) who are well aware of the issue, and even involved to some extent, do no want to have it discussed, least of all with the people it most concerns - those who maintain that their past relatives make up the human remains involved. In some areas of the world many archaeologist may not yet be aware of the issue at all.

The issue, in brief, concerns human remains that are excavated, studied, displayed to the public or stored in museums, laboratories, university departments and elsewhere. In North America and Australia, and increasingly in other parts of the world, indigenous groups are protesting against the excavation of their burial sites and the use of their ancestors' remains for scientific study or display. In many instances they demand that the human remains be given back for redisposition, usually by reburial. Archaeologists and physical anthropologists, on the other hand, are concerned that a vital source of information about the past will no longer be available for study. Human remains provide unique data on such things as patterns of disease in past populations, diet, adaptation to the environment, and biological changes, as well as on cultural practices, data which cannot be obtained from any other source. Some scientists see the scientific value as completely overriding the cultural beliefs of the living populations.

Others see both sides of the argument and would like to find a compromise between the two, which are - when taken to their extremes - incompatible. There is some middle ground, however. Not all those who are asking for the return of human remains are demanding everything back. Some only claim those remains that are known to be the forebears of their own particular group (e.g. Moore 1989); others only those who are named individuals. Whether it is all or only a part of the material that is being demanded, the intention is to rebury the remains, with due ceremony, or dispose of them in a manner appropriate to the customs of the cultural group from which they came. As a first step, some groups are requesting that their skeletal material currently on display in museums should be taken off display.

Archaeologists and physical anthropologists are divided in their response to the demands of the people who lay claim to the remains of their ancestors. Even those who are the most violently opposed to any ban on excavation of burial sites would, presumably, draw the line somewhere, if the threat were to the graves of their own relatives. This being so, they should be able, logically, to

understand the emotions of others who draw the line at a different point.

What is quite clear is that within many cultures a wide range of conflicting views and beliefs exist about what should or should not be done with bodies and bones. There may be a consensus of views about the bodies of close kin, and most people would perhaps fight to protect the graves of their own parents, or sibling or child. Others might extend this further back to grandparents and other relatives within 'living memory'. Recently, in England, there has been opposition to the projected destruction of whole cemeteries to make way for new building projects. Headlines such as 'Sacrilege to dig up graves' (Bucks Herald, 11 Feb. 1988) appear at regular intervals in local newspapers around the country.

Why do English people object to the destruction of the physical remains of their dead? Why should it matter to a person that their parents' bones are disturbed or even dug up, drilled or destroyed for the sake of research, especially in the context of a society that encourages people to donate their eyes or kidneys to someone else after their death, or even their whole body for dissection by medical students? In some contexts, and insofar as we demand that they be treated with respect, it seems that we do believe that the bones of our relatives in some way are our relatives, that in some indefinable way they still contain an essence of the living person. Yet the fact that cremation is widespread in England suggests that many people do not think that the soul or individual identity of a person remains in the body after death. It seems that there are many different beliefs about the dead within a culture, not only among those of different religions, but also among those within the same religion. In fact, one individual may have conflicting and inconsistent beliefs, which may remain unresolved. The beliefs of an American Indian, or Papua New Guinean who say 'I see people, I do not see bones', may not, in reality, be far removed from some of the beliefs held by many of those American and European individuals who fight to retain control over human remains, which, in their role as scientists, they prefer to call 'specimens'.

VARIETY IN JUDAEO-CHRISTIAN ATTITUDES

In 20th-Century Britain there is growing concern about the archaeological excavation of ancient skeletons and the display of human remains, and a number of well-publicized cases where excavation of burial sites has caused public concern. Current public reaction to the practice of developing cemeteries for other purposes because of the premium on land has been one of distress and outrage.

Even in the case of long-disused burial grounds, there is opposition to the disturbance of the dead. In some instances reburial ceremonies have taken place as a 'new' phenomenon. Philip Rahtz documents an example of the Jewish community in Britain opposing the bulldozing of a 12th-century Jewish cemetery (Rahtz 1985). The York Archaeological Trust sought support for excavation

of the site, rather than destruction by bulldozers which were moving in to make way for a Sainsbury's car park. The Chief Rabbi refused to countenance the idea of a Jewish cemetery being disturbed, but supported the idea of a small excavation to see if there were in fact any bones, provided no bones were removed from the site. Many burials were found, but since they were all oriented north-south and had coffin-nails, the Chief Rabbi's Court of Beth Din disclaimed the cemetery. Under the Disused Burial Grounds Amendment Act of 1981, Sainsbury's were legally obliged to remove all the skeletons, and undertook to rebury them in nearby 'safe' ground. Over 500 graves were unearthed, and systematic research was begun on the skeletons by human biologists at York University. Rahtz (1985, p.44) continues:

The Chief Rabbi may have had second thoughts. . . for he immediately complained to the Home Office. They, duly sensitive to the interest of religious minorities in Britain, ordered . . . immediate reburial. Sainsbury's were asked to dig a hole for reburial and the University to give up the bones.

The bones were eventually reburied, each skeleton in a separate heat-sealed polythene bag, with a plastic identity disc, on the same day, as Rahtz points out, that lightning destroyed the south transept of York Minster!

In Chichester, in the early 1970s, a medieval burial site on consecrated ground was excavated before an industrial development ploughed up the land. Local Church authorities were totally against the skeletons being removed and examined, and within two weeks of the excavation the skeletons had to be reburied.

The opposite view was taken by the Church authorities about a deserted medieval village in Yorkshire, in which skeletons from medieval times up until the present century have been released for examination and research purposes, on condition that they be returned for reburial. So far they remain unburied.

Recently, symbolic 'token' burials have taken place in England. A skeleton of one of many sailors found on the Mary Rose (the ship recovered after centuries at the bottom of the sea) was reburied with great pomp and ceremony. This was apparently done in part to pacify those who saw the sunken ship as a 'war grave' which should not have been disturbed.

In another case a few of the many bones unearthed in recent excavations in Winchester have been reburied in a symbolic ceremony, and in February 1988 bodies thought to be Christians of Roman origin, dating from c. AD 300, were buried with full Christian ceremony in a Norfolk churchyard, watched by an audience of schoolchildren. A coin dug up with the bodies was incorporated into a carved headstone by a local stonemason.

Rahtz (1984, p.33) has drawn attention to the existence of firms such as 'Necropolis', whose business is 'to clear cemeteries as fast as possible and with as little public awareness as can be managed' presumably by-passing the archaeologists and thus avoiding the high costs involved in 'expert archaeological supervision with full recording'.

Cultural beliefs and activities are not static and unchanging. It is clear that in burial rites, as in all other cultural activity, change is a constant dynamic force. Our own practices in England have changed, as elsewhere, on numerous occa-

sions; for example, from including burial goods to including none, from burial to cremation, from burial inside the church to outside, from graveyard to cemetery. In the case of living American Indians (and also Australian Aborigines, e.g. Truganini, see below) it is currently the fear of scientists that is influencing a change towards cremation. When such traditions change, for whatever reason, the 'charter' of belief and myth also changes to accommodate and explain the change of practice. It is such changes that archaeologists and physical anthropologists often claim in other cultures to be mere political manipulation of the evidence.

In many cases changes in custom and situation require rethinking and time before appropriate reactions can be determined by religious leaders. In England, much time is taken to decide on the rules that should govern new practices, and to develop an ideology which will encompass them. The Anglican Church took many decades to come up with an acceptable 'justification' of cremation, which had become a widespread practice. In another context the comparatively recent acceptance by the Church of burial rites for pets has meant that church officials have had to develop appropriate ceremonies.

Archaeologists and museum curators, on the other hand, often expect immediate answers. But why should American Indians, if it has never happened before, know what to do with a large amount of unprovenanced skeletons? Or know, without due consideration, whether an ancestor's soul can be at rest if his skeleton is incomplete, as, for example, in Groote Eylandt (see below), where Aborigines took a long time to decide how to deal with the return of a skeleton whose skull had been 'mislaid' by the missionary who had originally stolen the remains.

Practices regarding the dead have changed dramatically over time. In Britain as elsewhere, there has often been a chasm between the emotions and beliefs held by the majority of the population about their own dead, and the lack of emotions and apparently different beliefs held by scientists about the dead of *others* . It is perhaps not surprising that archaeologists, until it was brought to their attention in recent years, did not take seriously the accusations of graverobbing directed against them. Among British scientists, respect for the dead in their own churchyards is a comparatively modern phenomenon, let alone respect for the dead of societies whose living populations are unfamiliar to them.

In a study of grave-robbing in England, Richardson (1987) describes the grotesque behaviour of anatomists and surgeons who, from the 17th century until the enactment of the 1832 Anatomy Act, dug up the bodies of the poor - whose graves were the easiest to get at - for dissection in the medical schools of Britain. In the early 19th century:

> Corpses were bought and sold, they were touted, priced, haggled over, negotiated for, discussed in terms of supply and demand, delivered, imported, exported, transported. Human bodies were compressed into boxes, packed in sawdust, packed in hay, trussed up in sacks, roped up like hams, sewn in canvas, packed in cases, casks, barrels, crates and hampers; salted, pickled or injected with preservative. They were

> carried in carts and wagons, in barrows and steam-boats; manhandled, damaged in transit, and hidden under loads of vegetables. They were stored in cellars and on quays. Human bodies were dismembered and sold in pieces, or measured and sold by the inch.
>
> (Richardson 1987, p.72)

This practice was in no way condoned or approved of by the rest of the population. Richardson describes the grief and anguish which resulted from the discovery that a member of the family had been illegally exhumed and carted away to be cut up on the slab. The revulsion of the public to this practice grew stronger, and this revulsion was not, at least by the 1830s, restricted only to cases in which the identity of the body was known. In 1832, for example, it was discovered that an anatomy school in Aberdeen was reburying mangled bodies and pieces of chopped-up bodies in the grounds of the school. Angry rioters burnt the building to the ground, carried off the corpses.

> Burial of remains without funeral or rite in the earth of the school's backyard constituted a cavalier disregard of publicly recognized norms.
>
> (Richardson 1987, p.92)

By this time even some anatomists and surgeons were beginning to feel uneasy about the practice of body-snatching. The Select Committee on Anatomy produced a *Report* in 1828 (Richardson 1987, p.121) whose guidelines, in parts, show an uncanny resemblance to more contemporary documents on the treatment of human remains. The *Report* (1828) states that if it is important

> to the feelings of the community that the remains of friends and relations should rest undisturbed, that object can only be effected by giving up for dissection [others], in order to preserve the remainder from disturbance. Exhumation is condemned as seizing its objects indiscriminately [and] in consequence, exciting apprehension in the minds of the whole community. . . bodies ought to be selected. . who have either no known relations whose feelings would be outraged, or such only as, by not claiming the body, would evince indifference on the subject of dissection.
>
> (Richardson 1987, p.122)

It followed from the *Report*, in practice, that bodies that were 'unclaimed' within a certain time after death could be 'given up, under proper regulations, to the anatomist' (Report 1828). The 1832 Anatomy Act, which resulted from this *Report*, is still in force to this day.

Given such a recent history of disregard for our own dead, our lack of regard for the dead of others is not, perhaps, so surprising. Only 150 or so years ago the bodies of people whose relatives or friends were too poor to bury them in deep and secure graves were unceremoniously dug up and sold by the thousands. In the 100 years following the Anatomy Act of 1832 over 50,000 bodies of the poor

who had died in institutions ended up on the dissection table, often against the wishes of their kin, who were themselves too poor to give them a proper burial, and were thus forced to leave them unclaimed. In this context it is not difficult to understand how archaeologists and others have felt little compunction in digging up and dismembering the bodies of distant American Indian, Australian Aboriginal or Sámi strangers. In Britain there is no consistent pattern of beliefs and attitudes towards the treatment of human remains. McGuire (1989) describes similarly contradictory attitudes regarding human remains in a white American town. In other European countries there are equally conflicting values existing within relatively homogeneous cultures.

In Hallstatt, Austria, the Swedish osteologist Sjovold (1987) found attitudes to skeletal remains somewhat contradictory. Between 1973 and 1980 he made a number of visits to Hallstatt to solve some 'anthropological questions by means of a very unique collection of decorated and named skulls'(Sjovold 1987,p.5). The practice of decorating skulls in this way was apparently common in the Eastern Alps during the 18th and 19th century, but at the turn of the last century 'many priests seem to have considered the practice. . . detestable, and most collections were reburied during that time and even during this century, often in connection with some kind of funeral service' (Sjovold 1987,p.6). When Sjovold began his work at Hallstatt he expected the descendants in the village to show animosity towards the idea of a foreigner studying the skulls of their past relatives, but found that his question about this was 'in some way being considered as completely irrelevant'. Equally, tourists were encouraged to view the skulls. The villagers themselves hardly ever visited the bone house, although they frequently visited the grave in the churchyard, and tended the graves meticulously, showing apparent reverence for these, even though many of the bodies in them were presumably without their skulls. The practice of decorating skulls, which had died out in the 1960s, has apparently been resumed with the hiring, in 1980, of a new grave-digger who is also 'an artist'.

GRAVE-'ROBBING'

Accusations that archaeologists are grave-robbers continue to be made, for burials are still disturbed and desecrated, though archaeologists throughout the world are becoming more aware of the responsibility they have towards the people whose sacred places, including burial sites, yield such rich archaeological material (see Zimmerman 1989).

Grave-robbing is not confined to archaeologists and people who come from other cultures. There is ample evidence that whenever there are grave goods people have tried to rob them; this also happened in prehistoric Europe and ancient Egyptian times. There is evidence to suggest that those fortune hunters who plundered and desecrated were from the same culture perhaps even from the same society. The same seems to have been true of some North American Indian societies (Mathur 1972, Zimmerman 1989b). Mathur writes that the Iroquois, in the 18th century, had been so corrupted by the coming of the Europe-

ans that they also 'looted the graves for the wampum which had become hard to obtain'(Mathur 1972,p.89). Archaeologists and museum curators can, and do to some extent, turn around the accusations of grave-robbing, claiming that their controlled and careful excavation and curation of human remains and grave goods is far preferable to the haphazard plundering of treasure-hunters. The tombs of Egypt have been looted and destroyed over the centuries, and no amount of protection has kept their contents safe. Archaeologists are also often involved in 'rescue' excavations, retrieving remains and grave goods before sites are destroyed by natural or man-made invasions. Even their critics consider this essential, but the conflict then arises in regard to the redisposition of the human remains.

THE REBURIAL ISSUE IN THE USA

Many American Indians (of different groups) are clear in their demands regarding the human remains of their ancestors. They intend to retrieve all Indian human remains from the museums, laboratories, and university departments throughout the world, to rebury them and thus to bring peace to the ancestors. Jan Hammil (now Jan Hammil-Bear Shield), a Mescalero Apache Indian, and Director of the American Indians Against Desecration (AIAD), and Robert Cruz, a Tohono O'odham Indian of the International Indian Treaty Council, present the viewpoint of AIAD in detail elsewhere (Hammil & Cruz, 1989). AIAD has already had some considerable success. Many remains, albeit only a minute proportion of all those that exist in collections all over the world, have already been reburied with due ceremony. AIAD also opposes excavation of all burial sites, and where this is necessary in the face of redevelopment of the land, insists on the return of the skeletal remains to the Indian communities concerned. Cecil Antone, a Pima Indian from Phoenix, Arizona, representing the Sacaton community, visited museums in England, where he saw the remains of his ancestors lying on a shelf:

The other day I saw one of my tribe in a museum here in your country. I said to myself, why is my ancestor here, what is he doing here? They don't belong here, this is foreign to them, they belong at home. His spirit is wandering out there, wandering out there in a limbo state, because he is not familiar with the country. He remembers when he was small, his life, the happy times he had, and the land - his land. I thought about it at night, when I heard about the list of all the tribes that are in this country - it's over half the Indian nation in our country. Every tribe is in this country, just about. . . this person from my tribe - he was probably sold three or four different times. How can a civilization, mankind, sell human beings? These people were once human beings - how can you sell them? It hurts, it hurts real bad. . .

He suggests that archaeology is:

> A profession that has been established by the dominant society in our area . . . They understand the past - but we *know* the past.

He condemns archaeologists for exploiting the American Indians for the advancement of scientific theory:

> For some time the American Indian and his ancestors have been exploited by archaeologists in order to provide the scientific world with a new theory or idea of evolution. It has been an issue which the archaeologists have maintained is the justification for the storage and study of Indian human remains. The rationale is that new techniques are being developed to further improve their studies to a degree that will be useful in one way or another. Is every bone viewed as scientific even if it has been excavated within 50 years? The answer is probably 'yes'. As an American Indian I feel that the study of our ancestors is unjust and degrading. Religious beliefs and opinions are sidestepped. No living man on earth has the power to infringe on an individual who has been laid to rest, or even keep his or her bones stored in a box for eternity.

However, Antone does not condemn all archaeological research:

> I see some good in archaeology, it has brought some history to our people, but there is one facet of archaeology that our Indian people. . . do not agree with . . . the Indian people belive that when a person is laid to rest he should not be bothered at all. He has done his work in this world and he is going to another world to go back to the mother earth where we all came from. . . if he is disturbed he is out there, wandering, his spirit is not fully with the mother earth. . .

He also cites an instance in which archaeologists working with Colorado River Indians on a cave site on BLM land were instrumental in the preservation and even renewing of oral history:

> Some of the earliest traditional songs relating to that site were somewhat lost, by the Mojave people, but when the BLM and the contracting archaeologists did their work there with the tribe. . . they came across earlier songs they had got in the museum. They taped them and presented them to the elders and the elders started remembering. It started coming back to them. They started singing, and somehow, the tribe got involved in trying to recoup those old songs that had been lost. If it had not been for archaeology, those songs would have been lost. The elders would not have picked up some of those songs if they had not gotten about them from the project. What happened was, the songs were sung and then they were translated into English, what this cave meant to the Mojave people.

Without archaeology, he says, these songs would have been lost. Robert Cruz also condemns those archaeologists who excavate Indian remains:

> I am angry that they disturb [the graves] and express to us their own values when they don't consult with Indian people about what they will do, and I am angry at the

> lies they create to divide our people, the Indian people. I am angry at the exploitation and the degradation that they bring on to Indian people by disturbing and desecrating sacred Indian burials and ceremonial sites and stealing, robbing us of our traditional culture. I am angry at them because they have hurt so many people, they've caused so much pain and so much suffering, and it's like they are working hand in hand with the devil.

His concern is not only for the spirits of the ancestors, who must live in a limbo, unable to rest until they are returned to the earth, but also for the effect the digging up of the ancestors has on the natural world:

> [We must] take care of the mother earth, take care of the spiritual world, and no digging up of ancestral graves and sacred sites and bulldozing cemeteries and digging up the liver of mother earth, the veins, the rivers of mother earth. . . the natural world is what we would like to preserve for our future generations, we would like them to see what we see today, where they can enjoy seeing their brothers, their clan relatives, the eagles, the crows, the buzzards, the rattlesnakes and those animals, those human beings - the sonora fruit cactus - the various cacti and trees who through the burials have grown up into trees and into cactus, and they are with us too in that form, and we want our relations to be with us in whatever form they are.

He blames many of the misfortunes that have befallen the Indians on the disturbance of the ancestors:

> We want to get rid of the sickness we want to get rid of the unhappy land . . . that is the result of digging up and leaving empty the homes of the ancestors. From the empty homes, that is where the sickness comes. . . the unhappiness; that is how our children are killed, that is how we lose them, because we have disturbed and desecrated those areas where we had our ancestors' homes. Those are their homes, and we should allow them to stay where they were left. . .

In February 1987, at the Arizona Inter Tribal Council in Phoenix, Robert Cruz told the meeting that after a large ceremonial reburial of skeletal remains near Sells in Arizona:

> The ancestors came back, and said that they were very happy to be released from their prisons - the museums were their prisons.

This idea that museums are prisons for the ancestors led Robert Cruz into trying to discover what it was like to be imprisoned in this way. He began to visit Death Row in an American gaol, talking to inmates in order to discover how the ancestors must feel when they are condemned to the prisons of museum boxes and shelves.

Ernest Turner, a member of the Athabascan Tribe from Alaska, was distressed to see skulls on display in the Smithsonian Institution, in Washington, D.C.:

> It is not respectful to the people. . . I was horrified, I had no idea that they had that in the museum. . . I was shocked that that was happening.

On the other hand, he also relates (Turner 1989) how he informed the Aleut community that their dead ancestors were on display, and received a non-committal response. This is indicative of the range of current attitudes even among the native peoples of North America.

The views of American archaeologists towards display and reburial also vary, and range from total support of AIAD to total opposition to reburial of any human material in the possession of museums or university departments. The position taken by the American Committee for Preservation of Archaeological Collections (ACPAC) is one of the most extreme. In their *Newsletter* (November 1986) they exhort:

> Archaeologist, your profession is on the line. Now is the time to dig deep and help ACPAC with its expenses for legal fees. Next year or next month will be too late; we have to act immediately to fight this issue. This one will be resolved in court, not by the press. We will be able to cross-examine Indians on their tribal affinities, religion, and connection to the archaeological remains they seek to destroy. We will be able to challenge anti-science laws based on race and religion. We can make a strong case, but it takes money. Send some!

Cecil Antone also criticizes any legislation which is based on the proof of affinity with human remains, but for quite opposite reasons:

> If the legislation. . . says that reburial can happen *if* you claim affinity to the person being excavated, my perception of affinity is totally different, I guess. Even the archaeologists that know about the Southwest cannot define the differentiation between O'odham and us, the Pimas, that we are descendants of the Hohokam. We don't need education or scientific values to determine that - we already know. It is obsolete, in my perspective, yet still they want us to go through this legislation process, claiming affinity, or kinship, to our people.

The Society for American Archaeology, the Society of Professional Archaeologists and many other regional, professional and "interested" groups have debated the issue and come up with their own guidelines and decisions. The arguments put forward by many archaeologists in North American and elsewhere for the preservation of at least some skeletal remains for present and future research are, from an archaeological or physical anthropological point of view, overwhelming. On the other hand, the arguments presented by the indigenous populations whose ancestors are the skeletal remains for present and future research are, from archaeological or physical anthropological point of view,

overwhelming. On the other hand, the arguments presented by indigenous populations whose ancestors are the skeletal remains in questions, are equally overwhelming.

Is there a way out of the dilemma faced by scientists who respect the wishes of the indigenous peoples (who request the return of their ancestors), but still wish to continue to be able to obtain the kinds of data that can only be obtained from human skeletal remains? Many of the States in the USA have set up consultative bodies with local Indian communities to discuss ways that research can continue, with reburial as the eventual outcome and several have introduced legislation (Zimmerman 1989). There are many different problems, and different strategies must be worked out for each. In some cases the collections already exist in museums or department, in other cases human remains are currently being unearthed by road, bridge or building projects; some human remains in collections are provenanced, others are not; some are clearly 'ancient', others comparatively more recent; some have been obtained dishonourably, others by relatively honourable means, and so on.

Indian pressure has recently succeeded in obtaining promises to remove many public displays of Indian remains. Among those who have made these promises is Dr. Robert McC.Adams, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington. In correspondence with the Smithsonian, Jan Hammil-Bear Shield, for the AIAD, has written (pers. comm., 6 February, 1987):

> We suggest that the Smithsonian remove the display of Indian bodies . . . We suggest you consider that any empty room would be of greater educational value, combined with a notice stating the following:
>
> > The remains of the American Indians previously on exhibit have been removed from public display by the Smithsonian in co-operation and out of respect for traditional religious beliefs, practices, and customs of the American Indian. Current efforts to replace the exhibit include a co-ordinated effort with American Indians to develop a future display which would better meet the objectives of the Smithsonian.

In England, the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford has already removed all Indian remains from display, and has produced a list of Indian material held there, as a basis for discussion with representatives of AIAD. Within the context of ambiguous legislation regarding the treatment of human remains (see also Moore 1989), Tom King, one of the small band of American archaeologists who has supported the Indians' claims to their skeletal remains, and Director of the Office of Cultural Resource Preservation of the Advisory Council on Historical Preservation, has produced draft guidelines (King n.d.) for the consideration of traditional cultural values in historic preservation. This was sent out as a discussion draft mainly to Indian organizations and Federal agencies, and comments from both groups were largely favourable. In summary, the draft stated

that human remains should be treated with due respect for the wishes of the dead individuals that they represent, and thus left undisturbed whenever possible. Human remains may have deep emotional significance for their genetic and cultural descendants, and are often the object of religious veneration. Thus any activity that may infringe on their constitutionally protected free exercise of religion must be 'planned with great care'. On the other hand, King recognizes the fact that human remains often have substantial scientific value in archaeological research, in physical, social and cultural anthropology, in genetics and in medical research. Because it is no possible to predict future research questions, or future research methods, King is worried that scientists tend to seek to retain human remains in laboratory settings 'inperpetuity'.

Conflict is therefore virtually inevitable. King proposes that the proper treatment of human remains can be achieved by consultation, or justification of any scientific study, and by adequate funding for prompt work and for reburial of remains in a dignified manner 'consistent with the cultural traditions of the deceased and their genetic or cultural descendants'. The draft lays down specific guidelines to scientists. Briefly these are:

1. that human remains should not be disinterred unless this is necessary because of the danger of distraction as the result of land disturbance, erosion, vandalism or similar phenomena,
2. That even in cases where scientist do no need to disinter for research purposes, all remains should be recovered if threatened, and
3. disinterred remains should be reburied after consultation with descendants and their spiritual leaders. Before reburial any justified scientific study should be carried out, with a definite and reasonable schedule drawn up for study and reinternment.

The draft document leaves much room for manoeuvre. On the one hand, it states that wide-scale autopsy-type examinations should not be carried out if there is no need for them (whatever that might mean), if genetic or cultural descendants feel strongly that they should not. On the other hand, it says that there may be instances where the interests of science may override the wishes of the dead, and of their descendants. In some cases a compromise may be reached whereby remains are reinterred in such a way that they can be disinterred later if necessary. The precise arrangements for study and reinternment should, King suggests, be worked out 'through consultation between project sponsors, American Indian communities, or other genetic and/or cultural descendants, and anthropologists or others having research interests in human remains'.

In its April 1987 *Newsletter*, the Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA) puts forward a very similar set of guidelines (Niquette 1987). Both sets of guidelines will go some way towards easing the current situation, by recognizing the necessity for consultation with American Indian representatives of, as SOPA suggests: 'those tribes and groups that occupy or previously occupied the lands

in which the deceased lay' or have 'biological or cultural relations with the deceased'. However, the onus would still be on the Indians concerned to prove these conditions, and consultation does not necessarily lead to agreement not least because, unless there is a pan-Indian attitude to reburial, there could be an inherent tendency to dispute between the current occupiers of the land and any previous occupants. Much less acceptable to Indian groups, though, is the statement in the SOPA guidelines, that 'as a rule' those human remains and associated artefacts that have demonstrated 'extreme significance in contemporary or predictable future research' may be 'retained for analysis in perpetuity'. This applies to all human material over 50 years old. Such a recommendation leaves little room 'consultation', and to some extent makes a mockery of the rest of the recommendations since, in the last analysis, it denies the fundamental right of the Indian people to rebury certain remains - even some people who might have been buried within living memory. It is to be hoped that the overriding interests of the scientists in this clause could be counteracted by the final clause, which stages, again 'as a rule', that if human remains and associated artefacts are of extreme 'cultural or religious significance' then they should be 'reinterred without analysis'. The SOPA guidelines, which have been distributed mainly to archaeologists, that is, a rather different audience from King's, have generally received a somewhat negative reaction.

Thus the conflict remains, though the influence that Indians now wield in the treatment and disposition of the remains of their ancestors is increasing. This would not be true, however, if the Society for American Archaeology (SAA)'s (1986) approach, as laid out in its *Statement Concerning the Treatment of Human Remains* in May 1986, were adopted:

> Archaeologists are committed to understanding and communicating the richness of the cultural heritage of humanity, and they acknowledge and respect the diversity of beliefs about, and interests in, the past and its material remains.
>
> It is the ethical responsibility of archaeologists 'to advocate and to aid in the conservation of archaeological data', as specified in the Bylaws of the Society for American Archaeology. Mortuary evidence is an integral part of the archaeological record of past culture and behaviour in that it informs directly upon social structure and organization and, less directly, upon aspects of religion and ideology. Human remains, as an integral part of the mortuary record, provide unique information about demography, diet, disease, and genetic relationships among human groups. Research in archaeology, bioarchaeology, biological anthropology, and medicine depends upon responsible scholars having collections of human remains available both for replicative research and research that addresses new questions or employs new analytical techniques.
>
> There is great diversity in cultural religious values concerning the treatment of human remains. Individuals and cultural groups have legitimate concerns derived from cultural and religious beliefs about the treatment and disposition of remains of their ancestors or members that may conflict with legitimate scientific interests in those

remains. The concerns of different cultures, as presented by their designated representatives and leaders, must be recognized and respected.

The Society for American Archaeology recognizes both scientific and traditional interests in human remains. Human skeletal materials must at all times be treated with dignity and respect. Commercial exploitation of ancient human remains is abhorrent. Whatever their ultimate disposition, all [sic] human remains should receive appropriate scientific study, should be responsibly and carefully conserved, and should be accessible only for legitimate scientific or educational purposes.

The Society for American archaeology opposes universal or indiscriminate reburial of human remains, either from ongoing excavation or from extant collections. Conflicting claims concerning the proper treatment and disposition of particular human remains must be resolved on a case-by-case basis through consideration of the scientific importance of the material, the cultural religious values of the interested individuals or groups, and the strength of their relationship to the remains in quest.

The scientific importance of particular human remains should be determined by their potential to aid in present and future research, and this depends on professional judgements concerning the degree of their physical and contextual integrity. The weight accorded any claim made by an individual or group concerning particular human remains should depend upon the strength of their demonstrated biological, or cultural affinity with the remains in quest. If remains can be identified as those of a known individual from whom specific biological descendants can be traced, the disposition of those remains, including possible reburial, should be determined by the closest living relatives.

The Society for American Archaeology encourages close and effective communications between scholars engaged in the study of human remains and the communities that may have biological or cultural affinities to those remains. Because vandalism and looting threaten the record of the human past, including human remains, the protection of this record necessitates co-operation between archaeologists and others who share that goal.

Because controversies involving the treatment of human remains cannot properly be resolved nation-wide in a uniform way, the Society opposes any Federal legislation that seeks to impose a uniform standard for determining the disposition of all human remains.

Recognizing the diversity of potential legal interests in the material record of the human past, archaeologists have a professional responsibility to seek to ensure that laws governing that record are consistent with the objectives, principles, and formal statements of the Society for American Archaeology.

What makes this SAA document all the more remarkable is that it was issued just a few days after the American Indians Against Desecration had addressed some 1000 archaeologists at the SAA Plenary Session on the reburial of Indian remains. In that address, AIAD expressed its frustration in its dealings with professional archaeologists by describing how much easier it had been to discuss the issues, and find an acceptable compromise, with the US Air Force and with the US Forest Service, than it had been, and still was, with archaeologists.

The unsympathetic stance taken by the SAA has already been opposed by some American archaeologists, notably Tom King and Larry Zimmerman (see *World Archaeological Bulletin* No. 2, 1988, and Zimmerman 1989).

The SAA statement specifically opposes any Federal legislation that seeks to impose a uniform standard for determining the disposition of all human remains. However, in January 1987, Melcher (1987), in introducing his bill to the Senate, stated:

> Mr. President, most of us know where our ancestors are buried, where their remains reside, where we have placed them with some respect and dignity. But there are a great number of native Americans and perhaps native Hawaiians who do not know where their ancestors' remains are placed.
>
> Mr. President, there are scores of museums in the United States and abroad. There are several universities, Mr. President, that have the remains of native Americans in skeletal form on display of just their bones collected in boxes without the consent of the families or the tribes. In addition to that, there are numerous artefacts of sacred nature to tribes of native Americans that are in museums without the consent of the tribes. There are religious artefacts of a sacred nature to various tribes. To correct that, Mr. President, I am introducing this bill, S.187, which is the same bill that I introduced on the last day of the last Congress. I introduced it at that time in order to provide an opportunity for its consideration by various museums, various groups of people, various tribes and clans, and families of native Americans and native Hawaiians.
>
> The response we have had to the bill during the past 2 or 3 months since adjournment has been very much on the positive side. The bill will set up a system of repatriation, and that means just as it sounds, the return of the remains of these people taken from their native grounds and returned now with some dignity to the tribes or the clans or the families of native Americans and native Hawaiians, where they properly can be given respect and be cared for by the people. In addition, the same will be true of the sacred offerings. The bill sets up a system for figuring out whose bones are stored in the Smithsonian. Right now there are scores of boxes, literally hundreds of boxes of native Americans' bones stored in the Smithsonian in its attics and nooks and crannies. The religious objects and the remains of these native Americans will be identified. Then a system is set up within the bill to return them and the respect will be paid.
>
> I think the bill is absolutely essential. I think it is a shame on our country, on our people as whole, that we have not corrected this problem. I believe respect is due, dignity is due and now is the time to do it. That is the purpose of the introduction of this bill.

The Melcher Bill drew immediate response from Jane Buikstra, Chair of the Committee to Promote Scientific Study of Human Remains, in a memo to professional colleagues, in which she says that her committee believes the Bill to be a 'serious threat to physical anthropology'. She writes:

> In addition to this Bill, Senator Inouye (Hawaii) has drafted proposed legislation that has two provisions: (1) the Smithsonian would have five years to survey its collections and to return all tribally affiliated remains to the tribes and (2) the remainder of the North American collection would then be buried in the mall with a suitable monument erected.
>
> (Buikstra 1987,p.2)

The memo urges archaeologists to write to Senators, Representatives, and members of the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs. It offers a sample letter, which suggests that the Bill 'provides for rights to native peoples that others in this country do not enjoy' - a strange statement to be made in the context of a system that, when white and Indian bodies are unearthed, arranges for immediate reburial of the white bodies in consecrated ground, and sends the Indian bodies to the museum to be labelled, shelved and used for research purposes. In fact the Melcher Bill, and Inouye's proposed legislation, now appear to be moribund.

The kind of discriminatory practice (see McGuire 1989) regularly carried out when Indian and non-Indian burials are excavated is forgotten by those who dismiss the Indians' request for the return of their ancestors as a purely political gesture, as opposed to being a cultural or religious statement, but the conflict is , fundamentally, one of beliefs. It is not unusual for differences in cultural beliefs to develop into political issues, especially when the cultural groups concerned are the oppressors and the oppressed, the colonial a majority and the indigenous minority.

In the United States some Indian groups which had previously not been aware of the dispersal of their ancestral remains all over the world, or, more important, had not conceived the implications of this to their religious beliefs, are now requesting the return of their ancestors. Because this is a comparatively recent phenomenon some archaeologists protest that the current concern with the spirits of the dead is not a real or valid one, but merely an attempt not to get left behind by the political 'bandwagon' of the moment.

In February 1987 I visited Arizona, and discussed the reburial issue with Tohono O'odham, Pima, Navaho and Hopi communities, and attended a meeting of the Arizona Inter Tribal Council in Phoenix. From these discussions it was quite clear that the reburial issue is very much alive, not only among politicized Indian groups, but also among those living in scattered villages and on reservations. The strength of the belief in the need for the ancestors to be in the earth was undeniable, and existed quite apart from the overall reburial issue, which was, in some cases, quite new to them.

Maria Garcia Dominges, A Tohono O'odham elder, living just across the border in Mexico, said:

> Archaeologists must stop digging our ancestors up. Give back what you have taken; you have not had permission from us. To the whole world I say: stop digging things up, for it shows no respect for the dead. Bones turn to dust, and that is what should happen.

At a meeting with Elders in Old Oraibi on the Second Mesa the message was also clear. They want not only all their remains to be returned, but also their cultural objects. They asked for a list to be sent to them of all Hopi remains and objects held in English museums.

Larry Anderson, on behalf of the Chairman of the Navaho Nation, gave a message specifically to be published:

> We would welcome statements on the preservation of artifacts and regarding human remains and their return to the reservations for reburials. We would be very interested in the appointment of Navaho Council members for checking any directive of action to be taken by the World Archaeological Congress for Tribal Councils, for Elders' Councils and other Indian Councils. There should be no display of human skeletal material in museums.

The the Arizona Inter Tribal Council meeting in Phoenix, attended by representatives of all the tribal groups in the State, there was long discussion about the reburial issue, and much talk about 'angry spirits' and the intransigence of archaeologists and museum curators There was very great concern for the unburied ancestors, and yet another reason was given as to why the bones had to be returned:

> Bones should become dust. Mother earth lacks these bodies; if they are not returned there will be earthquakes and mother earth will take all these people.

Robert Cruz described the big reburial the Tohono O'odham had held in the mountains near Sells. This was the first reburial ceremony they had held, and none of them really knew what would happen or what they should do, even the medicine woman who was in charge of it. Cruz said that they began to sing as they buried the bodies, and found that the long forgotten words came to them as they sang. The actual ceremony had drawn hundreds of people, young and old, and since then, the young men had taken it upon themselves to take care of the site, to protect it from strangers and from harm: 'every day the young men run there to see that no one takes [the ancestors] away'. Although the reburial was the first among the Tohono O'odham it was an occasion of immense spiritual significance.

More skeletal material has been reburied in other Indian communities. In at least one case the museum curators and archaeologists who offered to return quantities of material to an Indian community were surprised and angry that the Indians do not really want their bones back. In fact the community concerned needed time to decide what to do with the bones until they could be reburied, and had to wait until the medicine woman said that it was the right time to take them back. Problems are arising because the whole situation is a new one, both to those who are trying to concede to the Indians' requests, and to the Indians themselves.

Also cited as evidence against the strength of the Indians' beliefs is the fact

that some Indians do take part in excavations, even of their own burial grounds. Edmo (1972) reports that young Bannock and Shoshone Indians from the reservation at Fort Hall have been trained, under the direction of skilled archaeologists, to excavate their own sites:

> At the project's outset, there was some justifiable complaint that the activity was contrary to Indian religion and tradition. Had it been yet another exploitation of Indians in the name of anthropology, the project would have collapsed there and then. Instead, under Indian direction [Edmo's] the project became a means of acquainting Indians with the universal skills of exploration into prehistory.
>
> (Edmo 1972, p.14)

In other areas, Indians have worked on excavations with archaeologists, and a few are now trained archaeologists themselves, who must face the almost inevitable dilemma that is inherent in their dual role (see also Bielawski 1989). Cecil Antone points out (and there is evidence that other Indian groups support him) that American Indians and archaeologists in fact:

> have the same concern for cultural preservation and the need for stricter legislation to guard against vandalism, looting, and desecration of archaeological sites. It is basically a matter of understanding and working together. If this does not occur the battle will continue until the American Indians are satisfied.

Archaeologists and American Indians, at least in some areas, may have begun to work together, but on other fronts the battle continues unabated. In April 1988 American Indians living in northern California lost their case in the Supreme Court to prevent the US Forest Service from building a road through the forest at Chimney Rock, a sacred area where some 5000 Indians go to communicate with the "great Creator" and to carry out rituals essential to the welfare of their people. According to a newspaper report (Independent 21.4.88.):

> Now the Supreme Court has ruled. . . that the Indians have no right under the Constitution's freedom of religion clause in the First Amendment to prevent the US Forest Service building a road through Chimney Rock and their sacred grounds. Justice Sandra Day O'Connor wrote for the majority of the nine judges that the Constitution provided no protection against 'the incidental effects of government pro-grammes', even if those programmes gravely disrupt religious practices. 'Government simply could not operate if it were required to satisfy every citizen's religious needs and desires.'

It remains to be seen whether such cavalier disregard for the rights of US citizens to freely practise their religion will go unchallenged, not only by the Indians themselves, but also by many other groups who will now see their own religious freedom threatened.

THE REBURIAL ISSUE IN AUSTRALIA

In Australia, the concern for the treatment of Aboriginal skeletal remains has come into the public eye chiefly through the spate of books and films about Tasmania, especially about Truganini, the so-called 'last Tasmanian'. Archaeologists in Australia, however, have been confronting the problem for many years. The Australian Aborigines have actively opposed the excavation of sacred sites, including burial sites, and the display and storage of Aboriginal skeletal remains in museums and university departments in Australia and elsewhere, and any research on their human remains. As in America, there is a conflict between the interests of those scientists who consider Aboriginal skeletal remains to be of great scientific significance, and the interests of the indigenous population, whose relatives and ancestors constitute these skeletal remains. For the Aborigines, the significance of the skeletal remains fo their ancestors is complex. Traditionally, as with the American Indians and Europeans, the dead are disposed of in a variety of different ways and with a wide range of complexity of ritual and ceremony. That these dead should be left undisturbed is as important as it is for those Aborigines who are buried in Christian cemeteries, as many are. In addition, these remains are often significant to Aborigines because they have become symbolic of European oppression and callous practices in the past, as they have in the case of the American Indians.

There are huge collections of Aboriginal material in museums, some acquired through archaeological work, others by less acceptable means. Many of the 'last Tasmanians' buried in a Christian cemetery in Tasmania underwent horrific treatment after they were dug up, before becoming the 'Crowther Collection', now returned to the Aboriginal community for disposal (see Richardson 1989).

The history of Truganini's remains, possibly the most famous bones in the world, is of particular interest. In 1974, Australian scientists on Specialist Advisory Committee for Prehistory and Human Biology of the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies (AIAS) agreed that the Director of the Tasmanian Museum should be informed that the Institute recommended that Truganini's remains should be disposed of immediately in accordance with her own wishes or those of her descendants (a public acknowledgement that she had not been the 'last of the Tasmanians'). Any suggestion that there remains should be housed in a mausoleum especially designed to enable future research was rejected. It is important to note that this historic recommendation reversed the previous stance of only a few years earlier, and in many cases it was the same scientists who had now altered their opinions. The AIAS considered this to be of such importance that it requested the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs to report the issue to the Prime Minister. Nevertheless the Institute's decision had the following explanatory qualification:

It was felt that the case of Truganini, a known historical person, is an exceptional one and that the moral issue involved overrides any other consideration.

(Ucko 1975, p.7)

In the light of this advice, as well as Federal-State political pressure, the Tasmanian State government agreed to cooperate with representatives of the Tasmanian Aboriginal Information Centre in burying her in a final and secure grave. Given the history of the treatment of Truganini's corpse, such an arrangement was not enough. It is reported that Truganini herself had lived in fear of her body being exploited after death by those who would wish to study or sell it; she is said to have favoured cremation to avoid such abuses. Only one day after her death in May 1876 the Secretary of the Royal Society of Tasmania requested her body as a valuable scientific specimen. This request was refused and Truganini was buried privately a few days later. Two years later she was sent for study to Melbourne, then to England, and in 1904 back again to Melbourne. She was on public display in the Tasmanian Museum until 1947 when she was placed in the museum vaults, available only to the scientists.

In 1974, after the pressure from AIAS scientists and, more important, the Aboriginal community, whose existence had been recognized in Tasmania only since 1972, the Tasmanian cabinet agreed that Truganini should be cremated. Museum objections were overruled, and the skeleton was taken into Crown custody. Truganini was cremated on 30 April 1976 and her ashes scattered in the D'Entrecasteaux Channel the next day.

As recently as 1987 Ida West, a Tasmanian Aborigine wrote:

> One night while watching television I saw a Legal Aid person for my people talking to someone about what Europeans did to Aborigines, cutting off their heads and so on. He pulled out a drawer filled with Aboriginal heads all shapes and sizes, and the sight of the skulls started to turn my stomach. The second drawer was full also. By the third drawer I felt faint. The Legal Aid person said, 'Would you like to have your grandfather's head in there'?

(West 1987, pp.1-2)

In 1984, in response to growing protest from Aborigines, and corresponding unease among many archaeologists and anthropologists, the Government of the State of Victoria amended their Archaeological and Aboriginal Relics Preservation Act (1972). Meehan, expressing the fears of the scientific community, wrote:

> At one stage it seemed likely that once all Aboriginal skeletal remains had been transferred to the Museum of Victoria, which was deemed to be the only institution entitled to house them, they would be handed over to the Victorian Aboriginal community for reburial thus bringing to a halt all research into the biological history of

> the Australian Aboriginal population based on Victorian material. It also seemed that this transfer and subsequent reburial would happen very quickly. A few months after the Victorian Government had passed the amendments to their 1972 Act, the Tasmanian Government had announced that it too was preparing to transfer all Aboriginal remains held in the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery and the Queen Victoria Museum at Launceston to the Tasmanian Aboriginal community to dispose of as they saw fit. It was understood that the Tasmanian remains would probably be cremated.
> (Meehan 1984, p.122)

The Australian Archaeological Association (AAA) responded to this situation by forming a committee to produce a working document outlining the nature and extent of the scientific importance of all Aboriginal skeletal remains. The resulting document continued to stress the vital importance to research of Aboriginal skeletal remains, and although supporting the reburial of the remains of known individuals, reiterated the AAA's position that no other skeletal remains should be destroyed by burial or cremation. This stance was very much in line with the 1984 resolution of the Society for American Archaeology, and of the Canadian Association for Physical Anthropology in 1982. The AAA document stressed the importance of consultation with aboriginal communities, of training programmes for Aborigines in museum curatorship and the setting up of Aboriginal Keeping Places, where Aborigines could keep and care for their own skeletal remains, with, again, the training and employment of Aborigines to work in them.

The Australian strategy appears to be to encourage Aborigines to become part of the system, to offer them 'control' over their own skeletal remains, but only - at least in the case of 'unknown' remains - in so far as they are able to accept the overall control of a system that does not allow for the return of these remains to Aboriginal communities for reburial. In Kakadu Park, for example, Aborigines were drawn into the system by being employed as wardens and site recorders. This strategy has also been used by uranium companies, who have employed Aborigines in an attempt to deflect and defuse Aboriginal opposition to mining of their land. In 1986, in spite of the events of recent years, the skeletal sub-committee of the Australian Archaeological Association reported on the continuing lack of communication between relevant groups, and it then set up a programme of consultation and liaison with those Aboriginal communities who had a direct interest in the Murray Black collection, which contains over 1800 individuals. Steven Webb, a physical anthropologist with a distinguished record of research in this field, was appointed to carry out the task.

Webb made his own difficult situation clear in his final report on his year of liaison:

> With widespread Aboriginal supports for reburial of all Aboriginal skeletal remains held in museums, there was fear among the scientific community that this would mean the irretrievable loss of unique scientific data. This loss would not only affect the present generation but those, both black and white, in the future. The emphasis of

the consultation, therefore, was to try and explain to people at the community level the value of preserving such remains. Their immediate scientific value had to be emphasized together with the long term benefits of such study for the local Aboriginal community and all Aboriginal people to have a say in what happened to such remains and to actively help them formulate ways in which they could achieve custodianship of them and gain recognition of their rights in this regard. As a biological anthropologist this was difficult to do, because it meant accepting destruction of the remains by reburial if Aboriginal people wished it. Moreover, I assured people that if they did not want me to study their skeletal remains I could not do so even if the weight of the law was behind me. This was a difficult decision to make also, but one which I felt was necessary if any common ground for discussion was to be reached.

(Webb 1987a, pp.5-6)

Elsewhere he wrote:

After listening to why people did not want research to continue, I could find no scientific argument to balance or equate with their moral one. It is difficult to argue against the rights of any group of people to choose what should and should not happen to their skeletal remains.

(Webb 1987b, p.293)

However, he also wrote:

Talks during repeated visits over many months have convinced me that many Aboriginal people do not necessarily want to see the skeletal collections destroyed by reburial. Individually they see why research is deemed important, and many agree that it is valuable to them.

(Webb 1987b, p.295)

And he concluded that:

it might be appropriate for skeletal biologists who use recent skeletal populations to reappraise their working philosophy and temper their overwhelming enthusiasm for the search for their particular kind of knowledge, with the feelings and aspirations of all peoples who feel their ancestral skeletal remains should be protected from scientific scrutiny.

(Webb1987b, p.296)

The AIAS has faced the existence of Aboriginal opposition to the excavation of burial sites, and to research on Aboriginal skeletal material for longer than most organizations and departments in Australia. For example, the excavation

of the Broadbeach Aboriginal burial ground in Queensland was carried out at a time when there was no legislation to protect Aboriginal 'relics' (1965 to 1968). According to Haglund, the archaeologist in charge of the excavation, 'the existence of an Aboriginal burial group here was not known to local Aborigines . . . The bones of Aborigines along with the soil around them were spread over gardens on the Gold coast to fertilize the soil' (Haglund 1976a,p.xi). However, the report of the excavation was not published for many years because: 'It seemed that a book like this might be offensive to members of the local Aboriginal community'. It was eventually published, not by the AIAS but by the University of Queensland Press (Haglund 1976a). In her thesis, also on this excavation, Haglund wrote:

> one. . . aspect must be mentioned: the reaction of the Aborigines to this activity. When archaeological work was small scale and intermittent it was hardly noticed by them What we may call a sudden flowering, is to some of them a sudden lush growth of alien weeds.
>
> (Haglund 1976b, p.9)

It is particularly important to note that the human remains excavated at the Broadbeach burial ground, which Haglund specifically points out was unknown to local Aborigines, have now been successfully claimed back by the Kombumerri people of the Gold Coast:

> As a result of recent negotiations between the Kombumerri people and the University of Queensland, ownership of the Broadbeach skeletal remains previously held by the university, was returned to the Kombumerri people.
>
> The Kombumerri claim to the material is based on a demonstration of descent from the population who buried their dead at Broadbeach between ca. AD 700 and AD 1860. Furthermore, they argued that two decades should have been sufficient for 'science' to get the material recorded and analyzed in detail. Since AAA's policy is that Aboriginal groups who can demonstrate descent from such skeletal material can reasonably claim ownership over those skeletons, little effort was made by AAA to argue against the transfer of ownership. The collection is currently housed in the Anatomy Department of Queensland University and will remain there until the Kombumerri rebury their ancestors in land being purchased at present from the local Council. given the international importance of the collection to science, it was suggested repeatedly to the Kombumerri that reinternment might not be in their own best long term interests. However, they remain firm in their decision to bury the collection.
>
> (Hall 1986, pp.142-3)

The apparent contradiction in this statement, i.e. that the Australian Archaeological Association (AAA) did not argue against transfer of ownership, but did suggest 'repeatedly' that reinternment might not be in the Kombumerri's best

interest, may in fact be an attempt to reach a satisfactory compromise between Aborigines and archaeologists. If Aborigines' ownership of human remains is accepted, then discussion and co-operation can follow regarding the future of the material.

As early as 1976 the AIAS had taken the initiative in returning a skeleton to an Aboriginal community (Ucko 1977). The skeleton (minus the skull, which could not be traced), was that of an Aborigine from Groote Eylandt, Peter Maminyamanja, who had died in 1931 and whose skeleton had been removed by missionaries and found in a Melbourne garage. The skeleton was returned by the AIAS to relatives in Groote Eylandt (see above). Mortuary rituals were carried out and the skeleton was placed for final disposal in a rock shelter on Winchelsea island.

Ten years later the AIAS has now produced a draft Policy Statement on Aboriginal Human Remains (AIAS 1987). This acknowledges that Aboriginal skeletal material is 'a significant and important part of the Aboriginal heritage', and that this significance dictates that the Aboriginal community must play an active role in decisions concerning this material 'whether in situ or in collections'. Because of past 'unethical or insensitive treatment of Aboriginal skeletal remains. . . and past lack of consultation' the situation is seen as one of 'great sensitivity'. The draft Policy Statement recognizes the extreme importance of Aboriginal skeletal remains as a source of information in a wide range of different fields of research, and also that the management of this material is a matter of relevance to Australian society as a whole'. It stresses the 'multi-faceted significance of the material: Aboriginal, scientific and/or public' and asserts that:

> Management of skeletal material will rest on the determination of its significance, through the process of assessment. Most of the material will have more than one value, and proper management will rely on balancing these values.
>
> (AIAS 1987)

The Draft Policy Statement advocates that Aborigines should be involved in management decisions regarding newly discovered material, material in museums and about the future management and disposition of material. It also advocates the setting up of Keeping Places under Aboriginal Custodianship while still "allowing for and encouraging appropriate research by black and white scholars'. With regard to *in situ* material it states:

> *In situ* material should not be removed or disturbed except where there is not other option, or where there is a compelling research reason for doing so, and where this research is carried out with the agreement of, or at the request of the Aboriginal community. Mechanisms should be developed to prevent accidental or unnecessary disturbance of removal. . .

The document also lays down guidelines for procedures and consultations. Archaeologists in Australia can only hope that Aboriginal communities will be the 'compelling' nature of archaeological research, and indeed some communi-

ties have requested research to be done, and some Aborigines are now actively involved in archaeology. As Mulvaney writes:

> Aboriginal people are sensitive to archaeological investigations involving human remains. Archaeologists, however, can derive vital clues to ancient ritual life and cognitive systems and so increase Aboriginal knowledge concerning their spiritual life and increase general community respect for Aboriginal society. Material proof of the continuity of spiritual values and ritual practices could become invaluable 'deeds' to land title. For the increasing number of Aboriginal children being educated in the general Australian community, and lacking direct contact with traditional communities, such evidence provides invaluable documentation of their cultural heritage.
>
> (Mulvaney 1986, p.54)

Haglund, however, writes:

> It has been suggested that the study of prehistory is for the sake of the Aborigines to give them a past to be proud of. Traditional Aborigines do not need this. . . they have . . . knowledge as shaped by tradition.
>
> (Haglund 1976b, p.55)

There are, however, specific circumstances in which Aborigines can, and do, quote the archaeological evidence in relation to their prior rights to land, that is in advancing Land Rights cases in the white courts, or in confrontations with Ministers. Aborigines know that the land is theirs, and that their own existence and the existence of the land are inextricably bound together in the Dreamtime. The fact that their bones are found in the earth dating back some 40,000 years may be irrelevant to them, but they realize that it is important evidence to those people whose concept of history is based on a linear system of chronology (see also Zimmerman 1987, Layton 1989). It is also of no relevance to Aborigines who identify their past with the creation of the land, that scientists claim that some of the early fossil humans found in Australia may not be the same subspecies as Aborigines. As Haglund says:

> Some Archaeologists have seized on the physical differences in early skeletal remains and suggest that the Aborigines should take a different attitude to their study. But to most Aborigines this would be meaningless sophistry. The land has been here since the Dreamtime. Human bones are the remains of their ancestors, the landscape itself the remains of ancestral beings and creators.
>
> (Haglund 1976b, p.55)

This is in fact another fundamental issue in the current debate regarding claims to human remains, i.e. fossil versus non-fossil remains. The former are, accord-

ing to our scientific lights, often not members of the group we call *Homo sapiens sapiens* . Many archaeologists and physical anthropologists who might come to terms with the dilemma as to who should have the final say regarding the appropriate disposition of 'recent' human remains, do not consider that any living population can legitimately lay claim to fossil remains. It is, perhaps, significant that Webb (1987b) generally refers to recent skeletal remains, although he did state that : "Aboriginal people want recognition that they are the living descendants of any Aboriginal skeletal remains' (1987b, p. 295).

THE FUTURE

As Aborigines find some use for archaeologists, and come to terms with what appear to be conflicting perceptions, so, perhaps, will archaeologists acknowledge the significance of Aboriginal religious beliefs. There have already been instances in which American Indians have allowed some scientific tests to be made on skeletal material before reburial. In Australia, the concept of Keeping Places presumably includes the possibility of human remains being available for research, with the agreement of the Aborigines concerned. Among the Inuit, according to Bielawski (1989), this may be difficult since the Inuit start with the idea that archaeologists primarily come in order to take objects or remains to make money from them. However, Bielawski also writes, with reference to archaeological approaches to Inuit culture:

> In partnership with those of a cultural tradition totally different from western science, archaeologists may explore new possibilities for finding truth. These may lie somewhere between archaeology and Inuit perceptions of the past.

However, this does not provide a solution to the practical problem of what is to be done when there is a clash between those who seek scientific data and those whose ancestors will be disturbed if the data is to be forthcoming.

In Scandinavia there is a growing awareness, on both sides, of the conflict of interest between scientists and the indigenous population. In Sweden, for example, a document produced in 1983 by the Riksantikvarieämbetet and the Statens Historiska Museer stresses the *scientific* importance of human remains. It does refer to one occasion in Northern Sweden in which local Sámi pressure led to some human remains being reburied without being fully studies, but apart from that there is very little reference to the Sámi population whose past relatives presumably make up much of the skeletal material begin excavated by archaeologists. The document says that whereas in the past there may have been religious reasons for not disturbing the dead, in connection with beliefs in the resurrection of the body, now a days these are of little relevance. The authors conclude that apart from very recent burials, scientists should have access to human remains and that reburials should not be considered. If, however, remains do have to be reburied, it is suggested that this should be done in such a

way that it is possible to dig them up again at some later date (Riksantikvarieämbetet 1983). The fact that there has been no revision of these guidelines since 1983 suggests that, in Sweden at least, the Sami people have not yet succeeded in gaining control of their own past, and that archaeologists, physical anthropologists, and osteologists are still laying prior claim to the human remains of the Sámi people. It is ironic, perhaps, that when it was discovered that he skull of the 18th century Swedish scientist, Emanuel Swedenborg, had been stolen from his sarcophagus in Upsala Cathedral and replaced by another, there was an outcry, and in 1978, when the genuine skull turned up at an auction house in England, the Royal Academy of Science in Sweden claimed it in order to re-entomb it in its 'rightful place' with the rest of Swedenborg's remains in his sarcophagus at Uppsala.

Bahn (1984,1986) suggests that the conflicts are intensifying in various parts of the world, and not only in relation to relatively recent human remains:

> The question of whether archaeologists should be allowed to excavate and study the dead refuses to go away - if anything, it is growing in intensity as already vociferous opponents increase their muscle and achieve some success in preventing excavation or in retrieving material from the hands of scholars.

This summer saw developments in several different areas. In Israel, for example, an important archaeological site at Tel Haror in the Negev Desert was vandalized in August, most probably by members of Atra Kadisha, an ultra-orthodox group dedicated to preserving the sanctity of Jewish cemeteries. The site, which dates to the 8th century, is believed by the local Bedouin to be the tomb of a pupil of Mohammed, and the archaeologists in charge of the dig claim that the graves encountered so far have been positively identified as Turkish and Bedouin dating only to the First World War. Nevertheless, ultra-orthodox Jews that think the graves are 'likely to be Jewish' warn that future excavation will cause a huge public outcry. (Bahn 1986, p.58)

The conflict between 'scientific' and cultural values is epitomized in situations where it is the archaeologists themselves who are the ones who hold cultural or religious beliefs that are incompatible with certain archaeological practices.

On archaeologist who found himself in a particularly difficult situation is Jo Mangi, from Papua New Guinea (and see Mangi 1989):

> I am an archaeologist by training, I am also a Kondika by birth and by initiation. . . I wear two hats. . . I am an archaeologist and an indigenous native. As an archaeologist. . . a scientist who is concerned with learning about the past I would argue that we can learn a lot from examining and exhuming from burials. We can learn about aspects such as general burial practices, mortuary goods, social structure, population composition, technology and presence of diseases. As an archaeologist I acknowledge the potential for enlarging our knowledge of the past by studying burials. Also as an archaeologist I would like to put forward a proposal for research for some student in [England]: 'Indicators of social hierarchies from burials' - not from burial

> goods but from something that can be found on individuals: tooth fillings. . . Let me ask anyone here in [England] if they can tell me what the reception of the local population would be. Now, let us use our imagination - something that archaeologists are renowned for. . .

He stressed that our knowledge of the past is not objective fact, but interpretation:

> Archaeologists say that the past belongs to all people. . . this is the area of dilemma. If I, as an archaeologist, in my background, am supposed to be a custodian of the past as so many archaeologists have claimed, one must also understand that I have to interpret the past, and I interpret the past *as I see it*. . . it has become self-evident that we archaeologists of the world *do not see eye to eye.*

Mangi suggest that much useful work can be done without removing skeletal material from burial sites:

> I see no reason why. . . humans - as I call them, you may call them scientific samples - should be kept in cardboard boxes. Let us be very honest - I went through the list of what we can learn about (human remains) on site, the context of [them] - that is half of it done.

As a subject of research, rather than as an archaeologist, he says with some bitterness:

> There was a journal called *Archaeology and Physical Anthropology in Oceania* which was started. . . in the 1960s. That journal came to an end because they could not sort out any race - Melanesian - they could not sort it out, not with physical anthropology, nor with biological anthropology, and now someone is going to tell me that you are going to keep me in cardboard boxes so that when the time is ripe and technology is developed, you are going to place me into something - I'm sorry. . . it is human beings. . . my mother and my people. . .

His dilemma is acute, for he also believes that archaeological evidence is crucial for the future of Papua New Guinea as a nation.

Bongasu Tanla Kishani, linguist and philosopher from the Cameroon (see also Kishani 1989), expressed much the same conflict as Jo Mangi. With regard to the excavation of burial and other sacred sites he said:

> You still need to educate the people because it is an area where culture is still very lively, very strong, and the people are attached to their sacred places. If someone comes to dig, unless you have educated the people they may tend not to accept [it].

When asked how he felt about it himself he said:

> If there was a means of getting information by just getting a small tool and putting it into the earth and getting that information I would be for the idea of letting it remain intact - that is my personal reaction.

African archaeologists have, up until now, seldom had to face the 'reburial issue', though many believe it to be inevitable in the near future, and are asking for guidelines to follow (see Hubert 1988, p. 36). In Zimbabwe problems have already arisen; it is reported that an official of the Museum Service ordered the immediate cessation of the excavation of a burial site, on the grounds that it was disturbing the Shona spirits (P. Sinclair: p.c.). In other contexts in Africa there remains a conflict between the desire by African nationals to take over archaeology and incorporate it into contemporary life, and the wish to challenge it, at least in part, as a practice hostile to traditional beliefs and practices.

An archaeologist from the Philippines, Florante Henson, paints a bleak picture of the relationship between archaeologists and minority groups in his country:

> Archaeological sites should be the domain of the National Government, and whatever ethnic group may live in an area I think they should give [their sites] to the National Museum, and in fact they point to the burials of their ancestors and even help in the excavation of .. . the graves of their grandmothers.

Archaeological sites are protected by law, but

> [the law] is very hard to implement, because even the people, the police and the army are violating the law [by] excavating.

Only the Muslim separatist groups have so far avoided having their burial sites excavated by archaeologists because 'we do not want to antagonize the Muslims'. Other minorities or ethnic groups are less fortunate.

The reburial issue is sometimes considered to be merely a political one, but it has immense cultural and ritual significance in many cultures. Archaeologists will not help themselves by hiding their heads in the sand, or by trying to belittle the passion of those whom some see as 'the opposition'. In an attempt to preserve their rights to dig up, or retain, the human remains of others, some archaeologists stress the diversity of past practices of Indians or Aborigines with regard to the disposition of the dead. The claim that some cultures did not place much importance on the remains themselves, and they try to legislate so that the onus of biological proof is placed on the living cultural and genetic descendants (despite the fact that they were often forcibly dispersed by the dominant group).

Such archaeologists are failing to come to grips with existing realities. It may indeed be true that some of the current American Indian and Aboriginal concerns about leaving the skeleton undisturbed in the earth do not derive only from traditional beliefs and practices, anymore than does the contemporary

British concern with graveyards and floral displays on graves. But the emotions that are produced by the desecration of current beliefs are no less genuine for this reason. Archaeologists and anthropologists should have given up long ago the idea that cultures, and cultural traditions, are static and unchanging.

Similarly, they should not assume that ways of treating the dead which in their own culture would be considered disrespectful would necessarily be considered so in other cultures. The ancestors may be revered but their bones may not be left undisturbed. In Madagascar, for example, the Merina occasionally dance with their dead:

> The Merina do not consider tombs as important because they contain specific people but because they contain undifferentiated, and often ground-up together, people; this is produced quite literally, as a result of the dancing with corpses. . . in the *famadihana* [funeral ceremonies].
>
> (Bloch 1981, p.141)

Dancing with the dead, whether skeleton or cadaver, is also reported among the Western Iroquois (Mathur 1972). She quotes 18th century sources regarding the Feast of the Dead, in which the dead were dug up and reburied in secondary burial pits, being washed, reclothed, and remourned before (in some cases) being carried lovingly many miles to a new location. Mathur suggests that the great love shown by the Iroquois for their dead kin 'must be contrasted with the treatment of these same remains by non-Indians' (Mathur 1972, p.94).

CONCLUSION

In most parts of the world where opposition to the desecration of burials is strengthening as, for example, amongst the Maori of New Zealand (O'Regan 1989), as well as the demands for the return of human remains for reburial, the basis for these are the *current* cultural beliefs of the living populations. These beliefs may be rooted in ancient tradition, or be of comparatively recent origin. Similarly, cultural practices are continually changing and may develop with or without concomitant changes in beliefs, merely expressing old beliefs in new ways. Although it is not possible to totally disentangle them, there are two distinct bases for opposition to the disturbance of the dead. The first, which most of the foregoing discussion has been about, are the beliefs, attitudes and emotions of living descendants regarding their ancestors. The second are the wishes and intentions of the dead themselves.

Obviously, in the first instance, the descendants believe themselves to be acting in the best interests of the ancestors, as, for example, those American Indians who want to rescue the souls of the dead from limbo and lay them to rest. However, this is only voiced in terms of their own current religious beliefs.

There are some people, however, who take a more extreme position regarding the disturbance of the dead. They take the view not that it is their own

beliefs that are being ignored, but the beliefs of the dead themselves, and that it is the wishes of those who are buried that must prevail. For them there is no real hope of compromise. For example, in ancient Egypt it is quite clear what people intended for their bodies after death. Despite the enormous complexity of ancient Egyptian beliefs and practices, which themselves varied and changed over time, there are certain aspects of direct relevance to this issue. Budge stated:

> the physical body of a man was called KHAT, a word which indicated something in which decay is inherent; it was this which was buried in the tomb after mummification, and its preservation from destruction of every kind was the object of all amulets, magical ceremonies, prayers, and formulae, from the earliest to the latest times.
>
> (Budge 1899, p.163)

It was part of ancient Egyptian belief that human beings contained various essences, and that these survived after physical death, and were active in various ways. The physical body was intended 'never to leave the tomb', never to 'rise' - but despite this, and despite the fact that it was known that, after death and mummification, bodies often rotted, or were plundered and destroyed, 'the Egyptians never ceased to take every possible precaution to preserve the relationship between body and spirit.

For those who believe that it is the wishes of the deceased which should be paramount in considering the legitimacy of archaeological activity, there is a clear message to be learnt from Frankfort's summary of ancient Egyptian belief:

> A man's body rested in the tomb, and the Egyptians could not abstract the survival of man's immortal parts from the continued existence of his body. . . So, while they admitted that man suffered physical death and nevertheless survived, they could not imagine such a survival without a physical substratum. Man without a body seemed incomplete and ineffectual. He required his body in perpetuity. . . hence the development of mummification and the elaborate measures against tomb robbers. . .
>
> (Frankfort 1948, pp.92-3)

There is little doubt what the attitude of the ancient Egyptians would have been to the dispersal of their bodies in the museums of the world. There is clear evidence not only that they wished their bodies to remain undisturbed, but also that they should be buried in their own country, in their own tombs. The Story of Sinuhe (c.1960 BC) describes Sinuhe's overwhelming desire to return from Asia to his own country to die and to be buried in his pyramid on the banks of the Nile. Even the King exhorts him to return:

> You shall not die abroad! Nor shall Asiatics inter you. Think of your corpse - come back!

In spite of this it is almost inconceivable that museums will ever return or rebury the ancient Egyptian mummies that they have, let alone the funerary equipment which delights and informs the public who visit the museums of the world. Not totally inconceivable, perhaps, because attitudes and beliefs do change over time, but it is highly unlikely that any living group will ever successfully lay claim to what have become some of the most famous museum pieces in the world.

If the demand for the return of human remains for redisposition is not to be based on the last intentions or wishes of the dead themselves, where then is the battle line to be drawn? Should it be drawn at all? To what extent should the religious beliefs of a cultural group be picked over and dissected so that outsiders can find some acceptable reason, or justification, for the way that group behaves?

Some scientists and social scientists claim that the quest for knowledge is of paramount importance, and that truth belongs in the public domain. Yet our society does set limits when it comes to our own individual privacy. Only recently, in England, legislation was brought in which limits intrusion into our private lives by outsiders whose quest for knowledge and truth, in other spheres, may go unchallenged. There *are* areas of life that are considered sacrosanct, and which are not infringed by those who accept the validity of the boundary lines. With regard to cultures such as those of the American Indians or Australian Aborigines, perhaps the belief in the continuing presence of the ancestors, and in the necessity for their spirits to be at rest (see also Zimmerman 1987), could also be designated a domain free from the threat of invasion. Only when archaeologists no longer dispute that indigenous peoples have prior rights to the remains of their ancestors, will they be
n a moral position to negotiate about the possibility of access to the material for future research. Both archaeologists and indigenous peoples would then be in a position to recognize their genuine common interest in the preservation and protection of the evidence of the past.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Kathy Emmott, Kate Saull, and Ann Wise of the Archaeology and Education team of the Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton, for their help with interviews during the World Archaeological Congress in 1986. I am also grateful to Peter Stone for his comments on an earlier draft, to Brian Molyneaux for his comments on this draft, and to Peter Ucko for his advice and comments at all stages.

Part of this, also published under the title, "The Disposition of the Dead" in the World Archaeological Bulletin, No. 2, 1988, p. 12-39, is reprinted from R. Layton (Ed.) *Conflict in the Archaeology of living traditions*. London: Unwin Hyman 1989.

NOTE

Unattributed quotations in the text are either from interviews taped during the week of the World Archaeological Congress in Southampton in September 1986, from an evening meeting held by the American Indian and Papua New Guinean participants, or from meetings held in Arizona in February 1987.

REFERENCES

ACAP 1986 *Newsletter.* California: American Committee for Preservation of Archaeological Collections.

AIAS 1987 Aboriginal human remains: policy statement. In *The Aboriginal community liaison program carried out in the Murray Valley and Tasmania.*, S. Webb, Appendix 7. Canberra: Australian National University.

Bahn, P. 1984. Do not disturb? Archaeology and the rights of the dead. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 3(1), 127-39.

Bahn, P. 1986. Skeletons in the cupboard. *New Scientist*, 13 November, 58.

Bielawski, E. 1989. Dual perceptions of the past: archaeology and Inuit culture. In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions.*, R. Layton (ed.), ch. 18. pp. 227-36. London: Unwin Hyman.

Bloch, M. 1981. Tombs and states. In *Mortality and immortality: the anthropology and archaeology of death*, S.C. Humphreys & H. King (eds), 137-47. London: Academic Press.

Budge, E.A. Wallis 1899. *Egyptian religion: Egyptian ideas of the future life.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Reprinted 1980)

Buikstra, J. 1987. *Memo to AAPA membership.* Chicago.

Chippindale, C. 1987. Editorial *Antiquity* 61 (232), 163-8.

Edmo, J. 1972. The Bannock-Shoshone project. In *The American Indian reader: anthropology*, J. Henry (ed.), 170-4. San Francisco: Indian Historian Press.

Frankfort, H. 1948. *Ancient Egyptian religion: an interpretation.* New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Haglund, L. 1976a. *The Broadbeach Aboriginal burial ground: an archaeological analysis.* Queensland: University of Queensland Press.

Haglund, L. 1976b. *Disposal of the dead among Australian Aborigines: archaeological data and interpretation.* Sweden: Institute of Archeology at the University of Stockholm.

Hall, J. 1986. President's report. *Australian Archaeology* 22 (June), 140-5.

Hammil, J. & R. Cruz 1989. Statement of American Indians against desecration before the World Archaeological Congress. In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, R. Layton (ed.), ch. 14, 195-200. London: Unwin Hyman.

Hubert, J. 1988. The disposition of the dead. *World Archaeological Bulletin* 2, 12-39.

King, T. n.d. *Guidelines for consideration of traditional cultural values in historic preservation review*. Washington.

Kishani, B.T. 1989. The role of language in African perceptions of the past: an appraisal of African language policies and practices. In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, R. Layton (ed.). Ch. 8, 97-115. London: Unwin Hyman.

Layton, R. 1989. Introduction. In *Who needs the past?* , R. Layton (ed.). 1-20. London: Unwin Hyman.

McGuire, R.H. 1989. The sanctity of the grave: White concepts and American Indian burials. In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, R. Layton (ed.), ch.11, 167-184. London: Unwin Hyman.

Mangi, J. 1989. The role of archaeology in nation building. In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, R. Layton (ed.), ch.17, 217-227. London: Unwin Hyman.

Mathur, M.F. 1972. Death, burial and mourning among the Western Iroquois. In T*he American Indian reader: anthropology*, J. Henry (ed.), 87-95. San Francisco: Indian Historian Press.

Meehan, B. 1984. Aboriginal skeletal remains. *Australian Archaeology* 19 (December), 122-3.

Melcher, Senator 1987. A bill to provide for the protection of Native American rights for the remains of their dead and sacred artifacts and for the creation of Native American cultural museums: to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs. *Congressional Record*. Washington DC: Senate.

Moore, S. 1989. Federal Indian burial policy: historical anachronism or contemporary reality? In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, R. Layton (ed.), ch.15, 200-210. Unwin Hyman.

Mulvaney, J. 1986. Wentworth lecture. *Australian Aboriginal Studies* 2, 48-56.

Niquette, C.M. 1987. A proposed SOPA policy on treatment of human remains. *Society of Professional Archaeologists*, Newsletter 11(4), 1-2.

O'Regan, S. 1989. The Maori control of the Maori heritage. In T*he Politics of the past*. P. Gathercole & D. Lowenthal (eds), ch.7. London: Unwin Hyman.

Rahtz, P. 1985. *Invitation to archaeology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Rahtz, P. 1988. The president's piece: archaeology and the dead. *British Archaeological News* 3(4), 33.

Richardson, L. 1989. The acquisition, storage and handling of Aboriginal skeletal remains museums: and indigenous perspective. In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, R. Layton (ed.), ch.12, 185-188. London: Unwin Hyman.

Richardson, R. 1987. *Death, dissection, and the destitute*. London: Routledge & Kegal Paul.

Riksantikvarieämbetet och Statens Historiska Museer 1983. *Omhändertagande, Förvaring oc Aterbegravning av Forntida och Medeltida Skelettmaterlal*. Stockholm.

Sjovold, T.1987. Decorated skulls from Hallstatt, Austria: the development of a research project. In *Theoretical approaches to artifacts, settlement and society*, G. Burenhult, A. Carlsson, A. Hyenstrand & T. Sjovold (eds), 5-22. Oxford: BAR International Series 366.

Society for American Archaeology 1986. Statement concerning the treatment of human relations. *Bulletin* 4(3), 7-8.

Turner, E. 1989. The souls of my dead brothers. In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, R. Layton (ed.), ch.13, 189-194. London: Unwin Hyman.

Ucko, P.J. 1975. Review of AIAS activities, 1974. *AIAS Newsletter* 3, 6-17.

Ucko, P.J. 1977. Review of AIAS activities, 1976. *AIAS Newsletter* 7, 6-24.

Webb, S. 1987. *The Aboriginal community liaison program carried out in the Murray Valley and Tasmania*. Canberra: Australian National University.

Webb, S. 1987b. Reburying Australian skeletons. *Antiquity* 61(232), 292-6.

West, I. 1987. *Pride against prejudice: reminiscences of a Tasmanian Aborigine*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

Zimmerman, L.J. 1987. The impact of the concepts of time and past on the concept of archaeology: some lessons from the reburial issue. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 6(1), 42-50.

Zimmerman, L.J. 1989a. Made radical by my own: an archaeologist learns to accept reburial. In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, R. Layton (ed.), ch. 4, 60-67. London: Unwin Hyman.

Zimmerman, L.J. 1989b. Human bones as symbols of power: aboriginal American belief systems toward bones and grave-robbing archaeologists. In *Conflict in the archaeology of living traditions*, R. Layton (ed.), ch. 16, 211-216. London: Unwin Hyman.

Biography Jane Hubert is a social anthropologist (and psychologist). Fieldwork in London: 1) extra-familial kinship (2) social factors in pregnancy and birth. Fieldwork in Bali, Indonesia. Resources Co-ordinator, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra. Current post: Senior Research Fellow, University of Southampton: research project on the families of profoundly mentally handicapped young adults.

Zeilig, K., & Zeilig, V. (1987) *Ste. Madeleine: Community Without a Town, Metis Elders In Interview.* Winnipeg, Manitoba. Pemmican Publications,

PREFACE, MAPS, BIOGRAPHIES, INTERVIEWS, PHOTOGRAPHS. XII & 160 PP. $12.95.

The history of Canada is a colonial story. The people to feel the negative backlash of Canada"s history on a consistent basis is the Indian and Metis. As more books are being written and published in Western Canada, this fact has become well documented. For every injustice that is brought to light there are many that are being ignored. The record on Metis issues is consistent, that of being ignored.

This book consists of five personal accounts of Metis elders presented in a verbatum interview format. The type is large, uses two type faces and is double spaced. These make the book clear and easy to read. To give it balance and perspective, an archival document titled *The Ste. Madeleine Church* and an interview from a non-Native growing up in the same setting are used. The concluding interview is of Thomas Berger. He presents a legal and historical perspective and brings the issues to a contemporary setting. The cover is full color and uses an original painting by Metis artist, Kieron Gibouche. The scene is very attractive and suits the content of the book.

All the elders grew up in Ste. Madeleine, Manitoba. With the establishment of a community pasture by the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act of 1938, they were displaced from their homes. These personal stories are remarkably similar to other Metis people in Western Canada. I could not help but think of the Metis people from Green Lake, Lestock, Prince Albert and of my roots which are dug in the Katepwa region of the Qu'Appelle Valley.

The criticisms that I personally have of the book are only two. The first is that I have a hard time accepting non-Native authors telling our history. Much to their credit, the authors worked very closely with the Manitoba Metis Federation and were very sensitive to the wishes of the organization. The second is that I felt the authors guided the interviews too much and had some influence on the story line.

This book contains no social analysis but the content is such that it lends itself to be a very revealing tool for analysis. The easy to read, conversational method of presentation leaves much room for interpretation between the lines. Given very little opportunity for education, employment or property acquistion, the Metis elders tell of hardship. Louis Pelletier says:

> I wish that I could read and write, now. There's lots of things I'd like to read. I can't. I could learn something if I could read a little bit, but I'm sitting here, doing nothing, just like a dummy. I can't read and you can't learn anything if you can't read. It's hard when you can't learn anything. Pretty hard. But I'm not sorry I helped dad to raise our family. I'm not sorry I helped them. (p.108).

While not fully realizing why they were being displaced these elders hold no grudges. The thing that is common to them is they miss the sense of community and sharing they had. When asked a question about people helping each other, Joe Venne answered:

> If anyone happened to be sick or if anything happened that he was struck, the people would go and do some work and give them the money. Free work. If they had to go to town with a load of wood and sell it to bring them groceries, they did it. (p. 51).

Much has been written about Metis history up to and including the North West Resistance of 1885. This book breaks new ground. With the exception of Murray Dobbin's *The One-and-a-Half Men* and Don McLean's *Home From the Hill*, nothing significant has been written about the Metis of the 1930's and 1940's.

I instruct classes in Metis history and will be using my copy often. It will be a valuable resource to me and to students when dealing with this segment of Metis history. Works of this nature will help the younger generations be proud of their parents and grandparents. The struggle to survive was indeed more important than the need for education and resources. We are able to reap the benefits and take for granted what these and other elders fought and struggled for.

CALVIN RACETTE

GABRIEL DUMONT INSTITUTE OF NATIVE STUDIES AND APPLIED RESEARCH

Enough is Enough: Aboriginal Women Speak Out. By Janet Silman.

Toronto, Ontario: The Women's Press, 1987.

INTRODUCTION, MAPS, BIOGRAPHIES,INTERVIEWS, PHOTOGRAPHS, CHRONOLOGY. 200PP. $10.95

Enough is Enough: Aboriginal Women Speak Out (1987) is the story of the Indian women from the Tobique Reserve, New Brunswick, Canada. The approach taken by Janet Silman is what makes the book so enjoyable in that with the exception of the brief introductions and chronology of events, the book in its entirety is written in the words of fourteen women from Tobique.

Silman introduces each woman with a photograph and what follows is their story. Starting with the older women each recalls reserve life as children and later as grown women. Their unwillingness to accept the 'hard times' and inequalites experienced by many Indian women especially in the area of housing spurred them into action. Their political knowledge increased with each campaign as did their understanding of the Indian Affairs bureaucracy and the legislation that governs that bureaucracy: the Canadian Indian Act. The resistance they met at every level from the Band Administration right up to the Canadian Minister of Indian Affairs was not surprising. Despite the often violent attacks on their homes and families the Tobique Women's Group launched successful campaigns to bring attention to and eventually change the discriminatory nature of the Indian Act. More specifically Section 12 (1)(b) which deprived women of their rights as Indians if they married non-Indians. As a result of their lobbying efforts the Parliament of Canada passed Bill C-31 amending status and membership. In other words, women who had previously lost their status through marriage could apply for reinstatement.

Enough is Enough is significant for women involved in struggles for equality and more importantly for Aboriginal women who have become disillusioned with the tedious and unsatisfactory task of organizing that struggle. It is impressive to learn of a group of women who can work together for more than ten years without losing their perspective:

> We've been at it for so long. Those times...were so emotional, so nerve-wracking too. We had misunderstandings...we'd get on each other's nerves. Of course we couldn't always agree on everything. We had a hard time. Our one purpose was for the women to have their rights. (p. 216)

The requisites for qualitatively changing the status of women; perseverance, compassion, strength in unity, courage and respect is exemplified in the fact that the Tobique women refused to repond to the name-calling that was part of the attacks they received from their community.

> We never answered back. That was our policy. (p. 119)

It is evident from their conversations that the Tobique women have gained their strength from their Indian heritage:

> I think what kept us going was our heritage and our sticking together. You might as well say they (the Canadian government) were trying to make instant white women out of us Indians. And it cannot be, because being Indian is our heritage: it's in our blood. I think that is our determination right there-it's because we are Indian. We were fighting for our birthright.
>
> (p. 217)

Janet Silman's approach in *Enough is Enough* shows her respect for the Tobique Women's Group and their accomplishments. In their own words then:

> A book really telling our story would offer different things to different people. Indian women who read it would see, 'Why, if they could do that-accomplish that-then we can too'. To white women and others, it would be an education: they would see what life on a reserve is like for women. They would see what all our protesting has been about. (p. 15)

LYNNE DANIELS

SASKATCHEWAN URBAN NATIVE

TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS/DIRECTIVES CONCERNANT LES MANUSCRITS

The Journal of Indigenous Studies is a refereed semi-annual scholarly journal published by the Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research. The journal aims to provide an open forum for the dissemination of scholarly research, discussion and ideas. It seeks a broad readership, both French and English, national and international, of all scholars and the general public having an interest in indigenous studies. The content of such studies will be in the areas of, but in no way exclusive to, administration, anthropology, arts, ecology, education, ethnography, health, language, law, linguistics, literature, political science and sociology.

The journal is open to all points of view, and we invite manuscripts from authors within and outside of Canada. Articles are published in either French or English with an abstract in the alternate language.

The Journal of Indigenous Studies invites the submission of original, unpublished manuscripts and essays that are both solidly researched and well written. Manuscripts should begin with a separate page containing the title of the article, the name(s) of the author(s) and affiliated institutions and the date of submission. Name(s) of author(s) should not be displayed elsewhere. All copy, including notes and captions, should be typed and double spaced with generous margins. Four copies of the manuscripts in the mode specified in the APA style, third edition, of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association should be sent with a typed, self addressed envelope. Articles may be submitted in either French or English and accompanied by an abstract of 100 - 150 words, if possible, in the other language. Manuscripts should be no longer than 40 pages.

Blind review procedures are followed for all contributions to the Journal of Indigenous Studies. The decision to publish an article rests with the editor in consultation with associate editors.

La Revue des Études Indigènes est une revue savant à comité de lecture anonyme, publiée deux fois par an par l'Institut d'Études Autochtones et de Recherche Appliquée Gabriel Dumont (Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research). Cette revue a pour but de fournir une tribune ouverte pour la diffusion de la recherche, la discussion et l'échange d'idées. Elle cherche à rejoindre un vaste éventail de lecteurs, francophones et anglophones, canadiens et étrangers, parmi les universitaires et la grand public, qui s'intéressent aux études indigenès. Ces études porteront sur l'administration, l'anthropologie, les arts, l'écologie, l'éducation, l'ethnographie. la santé, l'histoire, la langue, le droit, la linguistique, la littérature, les sciences politiques et la sociologie, mais ne se limiteront en aucun cas à ces domaines.

Notre revue est ourverte à tous les points de vue et nous sollicitons des manuscrits d'auteurs canadiens et étrangers. Les articles seront publiés en français ou en anglais et seront accompagnés d'un sommaire rédigé dans l'autre langue.

La Revue Des Études Indigènes sollicite la soumission de manuscrits et d'essais originaux et inédits qui se basent sur une recherche solide et dont l'écriture est soignée. Le manuscrit devra se conformer à la présentation suivante: sur la première page, on indiquera le titre de l'article, le nom de l'auteur (ou les auteurs) et de l'institution à laquelle il est (ils sont) affilié(s) ainsi que la date de soumission. Le nom de l'auteur (ou des auteurs) apparaîtra uniquement sur cette page. Tout le texte, y compris les notes et les légendes, devra êtra dactylographié à double interligne et en laissant une marge suffisante. Quatre exemplaires du manuscrit rédigé dans le style recommandé par le Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, troisième édition, devront nous être adressés, accompagnés d'une enveloppe au nom et à l'adresse de l'auteur. On peut soumettre des articles rédigés en français ou en anglais et y joindre, si possible, un sommaire de 100 à 150 mots dans l'autre langue. Les manuscrits ne devraint pas plus longs que quarante pages.

Un comité de lecture anonyme examinera toutes les contributions à la Revue des Etudes Indigènes. Il appartiendra au rédacteur, en consultation avec les rédacteurs adjoints, de d'cider de la publication d'un article

Veuillex faire parvenir les manuscrits à/Manuscripts for articles should be sent to:

Dana F. Lawrence, Editor, The Journal of Indigenous Studies

Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research, 121 Broadway Avenue East

Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada S4N 0Z6

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION/ABONNEMENT

Published in January and July.
Subscription rates are:
Individual: $10.00 Canadian a single issue/$20.00 Canadian annual
Institutional:$15.00 Canadian a single issue/$30.00 Canadian annual

Send to: Dana F. Lawrence, Editor
The Journal of Indigenous Studies
Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research
121 Broadway Avenue East
Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada S4N 0Z6

La revue sera publiée en janvier et en juillet.
Les tarifs d'abonnement seront les suivants:
Particulier:10 $ Can. le numéro/20 $ Can. par an
Institution:15 $ Can. le numéro/30 $ Can. par an

Veuillex adresser votre demande d'abonnement à:
Dana F. Lawrence, Editor
The Journal of Indigenous Studies
Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research
121 Broadway Avenue East
Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada S4N 0Z6

Photocopying/Reproduction:
All rights reserved.
Limited reprints are available from the Journal of Indigenous Studies

Printed and distributed by the University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario