

7. To establish contractual arrangements between archaeologists... and **representatives authorised by indigenous communities whose cultural heritage is being investigated.**
8. To see, at all times, representation of indigenous people in agencies funding or authorising research to be certain their view is considered as **critically important in setting research standards, questions, priorities and goals.**

Rules to Adhere to:

Members agree that they will adhere to the following rules prior to, during and after their investigations:

1. Prior to conducting any investigation and/or examination, members shall define ... the indigenous peoples whose cultural heritage is the subject of investigation. ... **We do not recognise that there are any circumstances where there is no community of concern.**
2. Members shall negotiate with and obtain the informed consent of representatives authorised by ... the indigenous people whose cultural heritage is the subject of investigation.
3. Members shall ensure that the authorised representatives of ... the indigenous peoples whose culture is being investigated are kept informed during all stages of the investigation and are able to renegotiate or terminate **the archaeological work being conducted at that site.**
4. Members shall ensure that all **published materials** resulting from their work are presented

and handed over for ownership to the **representatives of ... the identified indigenous peoples.**

5. Members shall not interfere with and/or remove human remains of indigenous peoples without the written consent of **representatives authorised by the indigenous people whose cultural heritage is the object of investigation.**
6. Members shall not interfere with and/or remove artefacts or objects of any cultural significance, as defined by all associated indigenous peoples **whose cultural heritage is the object of investigation** without the written consent of **their authorised representatives.**
7. Members shall employ and train indigenous peoples in proper technique as part of their projects, and **involve** indigenous peoples in monitoring the projects.
8. All **research shall result in written reports** produced in simple legible english and where possible in language for those particular communities.
9. In joining the Australian Archaeological Association **members agree to accept** these principles and rules

Dept. of Archaeology and Palaeoanthropology
University of New England
Armidale NSW 2351

THE WORLD ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONGRESS (WAC) AND THE WAC FIRST CODE OF ETHICS

Elizabeth Williams¹ and David Johnston²

The World Archaeological Congress (WAC) and its genesis should be well-known to members of the AAA through articles published by Jack Golson (1986, 1988) in this journal. As readers of AA are no doubt aware, WAC is a new organisation which provides an international forum for discussion about archaeological research and practice, and the management of archaeological heritage. It has a central academic role and aims to place universal issues in a comparative perspective. At present WAC has over 700 members from more than 65 countries.

As well as having a major concern with academic study and research, WAC confronts the issue that archaeologists do not work in social and political isolation. It provides a forum for discussion on historical, social and political issues in archeology and aims to make archaeological studies relevant to the wider community. As well as its academic interests it is particularly concerned with the following themes:

- * education about the past
- * archaeology and indigenous peoples

- the ethics of archaeological inquiry
- the protection, ownership and management of the archaeological heritage
- the application of new technologies in archaeology.

WAC Congresses

Founded in 1987, WAC has already established a number of different regular activities. A major Congress is held every four years covering a wide variety of regional and international topics. The first Congress (WAC 1) was held in Southampton, England, and the papers from this meeting have been published in the more than 20 volumes comprising the *'One World Archaeology'* series published by Unwin-Hyman. The second Congress, WAC 2, was held in Barquisimeto, Venezuela.

WAC 2 was a successful and exciting meeting. It was held between 4–8 September 1990 and was attended by over 450 people from some 35 countries. True to the aims and spirit of WAC there was strong student representation, and over three quarters of the participants came from the so-called Third and Fourth Worlds. Sessions included those on Education and Archaeology, Central and South American Archaeology, The Archaeology of Tropical Agriculture, Heritage Management of Archaeological Sites, Sacred Sites, and the Social Context of the Practice of Archaeology. The publication of papers from the congress is now in progress.

It is planned to hold WAC 3 in India in 1994.

WAC Inter-Congresses

WAC also sponsors international Inter-Congresses which concentrate on a particular theme. The first of these was held in August 1989 in Vermillion, South Dakota, USA on 'Archaeological Ethics and the Treatment of the Dead'. This conference was an important milestone in discussion of the 'reburial' issue. Over 200 participants attended including some 50 Native American people from 27 different cultural groups, 11 Aboriginal people, and archaeologists and anthropologists from the USA, Europe, Australia, Canada, South America, India and Japan. Issues discussed included the excavation, disturbance and display of burial sites, and the use and storage of human remains for research purposes.

One of the main tasks of the Inter-Congress was to see if discussion could clear the way for negotiations on specific problems, and produce guidelines for the future. During the Vermillion meeting the recently elected WAC Executive drew up the 'Vermillion Accord' which outlines principles for the treatment of human remains. A copy of the Accord is reproduced here. The

Accord was unanimously accepted by the Plenary Session and has now been published widely in international journals.

The Inter-Congress and the publication of the Accord had the effect of raising international awareness of the ethical problems involved in the excavation, study, storage and display of human remains and it triggered widespread international debate on this issue. This in turn has led many museum and university departments to reconsider their position on the storage and study of human remains.

Regarding further Inter-Congresses, arrangements are now under way for these to be held on the topics of Tropical Archaeology (proposed venue: Puerto Rico) and Urbanism (proposed venue: East Africa).

WAC also sponsors sessions and workshops at other archaeological meetings in many countries.

WAC Publications

WAC also has a number of other functions. It has an impressive publication record for such a young organisation. We have already mentioned the more than 20 volumes in the *'One World Archaeology'* series. The publication of papers from the Inter-Congress and WAC 2 is in train. WAC also publishes the *'World Archaeological Bulletin'*, an occasional journal of news and papers concerned with the Congress. A quarterly *'WAC Newsletter'* is planned for release later in 1991 to facilitate and promote more regular communication between WAC members.

WAC Organization

The Council is the policy-making body of WAC. It is formed for the duration of each of the International Congresses and consists of a representative from every country attending the Congress and all members of the WAC Executive.

The Executive administers the affairs of the WAC. It consists of two representatives from each of 14 regions from around the world. These people are elected by WAC members. In addition, eight extra positions are allocated to the Executive for representatives of indigenous peoples. Elizabeth Williams is the regional representative for this region and David Johnston is a member of the Executive as an Aboriginal representative.

The current officers for the Executive, who were elected at WAC 2, are Jack Golson (President), Larry Zimmerman (USA) (Secretary) and Sue Bulmer (Treasurer) (New Zealand). Sue Bulmer's election to the position of Treasurer has left one of the regional representative positions open.

WAC and Ethics Issues

Since its inception WAC has played a prominent role in debate over ethics and archaeology. Until recently for example, it has followed organisations such as the United Nations and the Commonwealth in applying a total academic boycott of South Africa and Namibia. Following the changing political climate in these countries, WAC has now modified this stance and in 1989 the Executive announced that it had decided to follow the new Mass Democratic Movement (MDM) policy by allowing selective admission of South Africans to WAC Membership and to WAC Congresses and Inter-Congresses.

A special forum on South Africa was held at WAC 2 and four people from South Africa addressed this meeting. The current position of WAC is that Namibia has now been added to the Eastern and Southern Africa Electoral College as an independent country but that South Africa will continue to remain outside the College as a political entity. WAC now has several South African members. As can be seen, WAC has continued to modify its policy on South Africa as events have changed in that country. Further details of current WAC policy can be obtained from the *World Archaeological Bulletin* Number 5.

Regarding other issues to do with ethics and archaeology, WAC 2 adopted a 'Code of Ethics on Members' Obligations to Indigenous Peoples'. It was agreed at the South Dakota Inter-Congress that the Indigenous Peoples Forum would draft together a Code of Ethics that they felt archaeologists should follow, and that this would be brought to WAC 2 in 1990, for discussion. As a result of this proposal, Hirini Matunga, an Executive Member representing Maori people, brought a draft Code of Ethics to WAC 2. The Indigenous Peoples Forum worked on a Code of Ethics for some time and then presented a draft copy to the WAC Executive for comment and input. The Executive agreed upon a draft copy that was acceptable to both the archaeologists and the indigenous representatives and then presented this to the WAC Council. After a period of discussion the WAC Council endorsed what is now the 'WAC First Code of Ethics'. This code can be read in Iain Davidson's article elsewhere in this issue. Hirini Matunga's report on the Code of Ethics and on the Maori presentation at WAC 2 in general, is reproduced in the *World Archaeological Bulletin* Number 5.

The WAC Code of Ethics and the Proposed AAA Code of Ethics

Many of the indigenous representatives at WAC 2 were keen to have the Code of Ethics discussed back in their country of origin, among their own people and

archaeologists. Many agreed that the WAC Code of Ethics could be used by archaeological disciplines in various countries, as an example on which to base their own Codes of Ethics. David Johnston therefore presented the WAC Code of Ethics for discussion at the Townsville Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people's meeting at AAA. This meeting also included Aboriginal people from NSW, Victoria, Tasmania and WA. Johnston also presented the WAC Code of Ethics to the AAA Conference as part of a combined paper with Robyne Bancroft on 'Consultation with Aboriginal People'.

The WAC Code of Ethics caused a great deal of discussion at the Townsville Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander meeting, resulting in some amendments being made to it and the motion passed that this new draft be presented to the members of AAA for their consideration (see Davidson's article, this issue). The Aboriginal Forum felt that a more formalized Code of Ethics should be adopted by AAA, one that ensured that archaeologists were kept aware of their obligations to Aboriginal people.

An important point to remember, as one of the Aboriginal Chairpersons explained at AAA, is that the Townsville Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander proposed version of the Code of Ethics by no means represents a national Aboriginal and Islander perspective. It must also be remembered that the Townsville Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Code of Ethics is only at an initial stage in its development. Therefore, both the WAC Code of Ethics and the amended version from Townsville will be distributed widely among Aboriginal communities and organizations so that they have the opportunity to be involved in the discussions if they so wish.

One issue raised at a number of Aboriginal meetings has been the need for checks to be made on consultant archaeologists dealing with Aboriginal heritage. One of the hopes a number of Aboriginal people have for a Code of Ethics, is that it will ensure that archaeologists are aware that there are moral and ethical issues to consider when they are dealing with Aboriginal heritage. Discussing concerns both Aboriginal people and archaeologists have towards archaeology in Australia, as part of the process of developing a Code of Ethics, is in itself a positive step. Only through rational discussion and a respect for the concerns and beliefs of people from different cultures can sensitive issues be resolved satisfactorily.

References

- Golson, J. 1986 *The World Archaeological Congress, Southampton, and its aftermath.* **Australian Archaeology** 23:100-5

Golson, J. 1988 The World Archaeological Congress: A new archaeological organisation. **Australian Archaeology** 26:92-103

World Archaeological Bulletin 4, 1990

World Archaeological Bulletin 5, 1991

The Vermillion Accord Human Remains

1. Respect for the mortal remains of the dead shall be accorded to all irrespective of origin, race, religion, nationality, custom and tradition.
2. Respect for the wishes of the dead concerning disposal shall be accorded whenever possible, reasonable and lawful, when they are known or can be reasonably inferred.
3. Respect for the wishes of the local community and of relatives and guardians of the dead shall be accorded whenever possible, reasonable and lawful.

4. Respect for the scientific research value of skeletal, mummified and other human remains (including fossil hominids) shall be accorded when such value is demonstrated to exist.
5. Agreement to the disposition of fossil, skeletal, mummified and other remains shall be reached by negotiation on the basis of mutual respect for the legitimate concerns of communities for the proper disposition of their ancestors, as well as the legitimate concerns of science and education.
6. The express recognition that the concerns of various ethnic groups, as well as those of science are legitimate and to be respected, will permit acceptable agreements to be reached and honoured.

1. **112 Scrivener St
O'Connor ACT 2601**

2. **Ursula College
The Australian National University
GPO Box 702
Canberra ACT 2601**
