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There are many people throughout the world to whom the name Helge Kleivan is synonymous with INGJA. His personality and energy have left their mark on all aspects of the organisation, his force and dynamism have been an inspiration to all associated with its work, and above all, his vision and ideals have generated a momentum which will never stop as long as his memory lives. On November 29th, 1983 Helge Kleivan died, aged 59. For the 15 years since his founding INGJA Helge dedicated his vitality and his life to the defence of the human rights of indigenous peoples from all parts of the world. Even when he withdrew from the Board of INGJA in 1982 for health reasons and tried to keep a calmer rhythm of work and life, many people from within and without the organisation continued to contact him seeking his advice and guidance.

Helge Kleivan came from Tromsø in Norway. He was educated as a social anthropologist and worked for several years in the universities of Bergen and Oslo before moving to Copenhagen in 1968. His understanding of the inseparability of personal character with a stand for a cause came from early experience. As a university student Helge had come to know the sufferings of political persecution and the necessity for political struggle. He understood that the anthropological discipline should not be purely academic but connected to both personal commitment and action.

Helge carried out fieldwork in both Labrador and South Greenland and was recognised as a scholar in his field of anthropology and Eskimology. His interests, however, were extremely broad and no part of the world was beyond the horizons of his enquiry. It was this breadth which took him to the International Congress of Americanists in Stuttgart in 1968 where, along with several like-minded colleagues he put into reality his vision for an International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.
Back in Copenhagen Helge developed this vision further. At the same time as working in the Institute of Ethnology he devoted his energy to establishing INGIA as a credible centre of documentation and spread its reputation throughout the world. When Helge expressed his solidarity with the indigenous cause he was never impersonal. He needed a living person with whom he could relate and not hard anonymity. It was this personal contact which generated his vitality. The two main strands of INGIA's work are manifestations of Helge's attributes: reliable documentation and the importance of understanding the problems of indigenous peoples from their perspectives.

Helge had one of the largest personal networks with indigenous leaders of anyone in Europe. To him it was very important to know the individuals behind the organisations he was dealing with. Engagement in a cause and personal commitment seemed inseparable to him. When talking about politics, organisations and institutions he would cite names of people and quote personal conversations. This was his way of understanding and expressing general matters through individuals. Behind all this was his experience that character and moral commitment are closely related.

It was this approach, this attention to the person and not to the abstract label which made him so close to many indigenous leaders to whom the jungle of European institutions and organisations does not mean as much as the village of friends. In 1973 he helped organise the Arctic Peoples' Conference in Copenhagen and in 1975 he played an important advisory role in the establishment of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples in Canada. In 1980 he worked hard with the indigenous peoples of South America in the setting up of the Consejo Indio de Sud America (CISA). He retained his personal support and commitment for these organisations right up until his death because they are the means whereby indigenous people can determine their own affairs.

Helge Kleivan's support for indigenous peoples materialised in many ways. He was often able to raise funds for projects from Scandinavian countries thanks to the confidence and respect his personality inspired. For example it was Helge who, through INGIA, obtained the necessary funds which enabled CISA to begin publishing Pueblo Indio which has channelled information throughout South America.

In 1980 during a visit to South America where he was present at the founding of CISA, Helge visited Sao Paulo in Brazil and the Commission for the Creation of a Yanomami Park (CCPY). From this visit he began to fight for a vaccination campaign among the Yanomami. He had heard how the Yanomami were being destroyed by the Brazilian government's development of the area. On his return to Scandinavia Helge personally visited the Nordic governments to explain the desperate situation and within a month he was able to inform the CCPY that the Foreign Ministry of Norway would finance a large part of the medical project. From then on, until only a few weeks before his death, Helge has been actively following the developments of the Yanomami project. Whenever he heard of any threats to this or any other peoples he would protest through INGIA and speak and write to raise public awareness of the problem.

In such cases Helge always acted with great modesty and understanding. He always made sure that it was INGIA and not he himself who would reap the fruits of his work. The man who believed so much in personal relations would never use these ties for his own self glory. In the light of his extensive knowledge and international reputation as a fighter for the rights of indigenous peoples he received an invitation from the Nicaraguan government in December 1981 to participate in the 3rd UN Seminar on Racial Discrimination. The invitation was accepted willingly by Helge who not only attended the conference but spent time discussing with the Government the problems of the indigenous peoples of Nicaragua such as
the Miskito, Sumu and Rama and their relationships with the Sandinists. His conclusions about the journey and his many conversations provided him with sources for publications on Nicaragua which have become seminal in understanding the situation there.

Anthropology was Helge Kleivan's profession and vocation. But anthropology never separated him from engaging in the struggle for indigenous peoples' rights. What distinguished him from other anthropologists was that in addition to a high professional standard in the discipline he openly used his competence in favour of something much more important than 'science': human rights and welfare. Helge was one of the few anthropologists who really fought for such rights and welfare of indigenous peoples throughout the world. Helge dedicated himself to making social scientists understand the importance of participating in the struggles of indigenous peoples. He asked them to question their aims, their function and above all their responsibilities. He argued that no investigation could ignore the neo-colonial situation and its causes. He created a vision of a new path in anthropology where the researcher and the indigenous peoples became united in one common struggle. At last indigenous peoples themselves would decide what would be their aims, goals and needs. It was one of Helge's greatest attributes that he had the ability to listen.

Helge sought from everyone, particularly his colleagues, a knowledge and commitment to the problems of indigenous peoples. He expected dedication to the indigenous cause and was not afraid to say what he thought. After being concerned with indigenous peoples for a lifetime he was still able to get shocked, to get furious and angry. He never rested from keeping within his sight the vision of a just and fair future for indigenous peoples. The absolute dedication which Helge showed was difficult to live up to, even so, his profound determination and insight gained him both respect and affection.

Even at moments of personal triumph Helge Kleivan always had indigenous peoples to the forefront of his concerns. It is frequently told how when Helge received the Danish Human Rights Prize of 3000 Kroner in 1975 in recognition of his work, he used the money to buy an electric typewriter for an indigenous organisation in Bolivia who were establishing themselves.

Helge used himself for other peoples without ever thinking of his academic career. He was generous with help and advice to all who came to see him. He attracted to IWGIA many students and researchers within the discipline of anthropology. Many of us learned all we know through him.

Helge's work was only possible through the support he received from his family. Indigenous peoples throughout the world knew that his home was their home. His hospitality and generosity rest also on the kindness of his wife and three daughters and they, at this time, are very much in our thoughts.

We have lost a warm and affectionate friend, our foremost source of inspiration. The world has lost a courageous and faithful spokesman and defender of indigenous peoples and their fight for recognition and justice. We are all now directing our energies so that Helge's work may continue. We have all learned too much from him to react to his loss by inactivity and passivity. On the contrary our memories of him will be an incentive to work more deeply, with more commitment and with ever more conviction in an attempt to continue the vision and dynamism that was Helge Kleivan.

IWGIA Board, Secretariat and Local Groups.
ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1971 - Introduction.

The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 provides the backdrop for the following articles. In order to put the recent developments into perspective a short review of aspects of the Act may be useful. It is a unique attempt at conveying land and money into Native control by means of capitalist business corporations held and run by indigenous Alaskan groups.

Under the Act, Alaska Natives who were US citizens at the time of the settlement bill (Alaska Indian, Eskimo and Aleut) would receive title to 40 million acres of land in return for revoking all previous claims. Compensation for these revoked claims was set at $962.5 million to be paid over several years.

Benefits under the Settlement Act would not reach Natives through clans, families or traditional groupings but through the modern form of Business corporations whereby eligible Natives would become stockholders (part owners) of the enterprise.

All a Native would have to do was enroll his or her name and community and become a holder of 100 shares of stock in one of the 12 or 13 regional corporations created under the Act.

In addition 80 million acres of Alaskan land was to be reviewed and studied to determine whether these areas should be added to existing national parks or forests. As time went on various commissions would also review the future development of the lands within the framework of the corporate structure of Native ownership.

The regional corporations would receive the compensation money and distribute half to smaller village corporations or to individuals not living in communities. The ownership of the subsoil of lands would lie in the sphere of the regional corporation whereas the smaller village corporations would have control over the surface area. Village corporations would distribute some of the land and money to individuals while the rest would be used communally and invested in other business concerns.

Whereas all the regional corporations would be run fundamentally for profit, the village corporations could be oriented towards non-profitmaking community projects provided they receive the approval of the regional corporation.

When the Act was passed there were 76,500 stockholders. These people were unable to sell their share of the corporations until 1991 unless the buyer happened to be another Native person. Money pertaining to corporations or individuals would not be taxed unless it was profit.

Although in many aspects the Act settled some claims, it was so completely entrenched in capitalist ideology that inevitably problems would arise. The following articles show that all is not well with the application of the Act and that the principle of projecting capitalist notions of corporation onto Native groups can be extremely problematic.

Dissatisfaction with the Act centres around the ways in which outside business interests such as oil corporations or the Federal Government's desire to exploit the outer continental shelf of Alaska for oil (outside the area of the act but with severe economic implications for the local inhabitants) can exploit the loopholes in the law for their own interests. The 1991 releasing of stocks onto the market is also a fear for the Alaskan Indigenous people who have a long history of their resources passing into alien hands whether by fair means or foul.

Ultimately the question is the extent to which the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act really expresses the desires, values and needs of the Alaska Indians, Eskimos and Aleut people. It is for this reason that the Alaska Native Review Commission has been organised.

ALASKA: INUIT CIRCUMPOLAR CONFERENCE - PRESS RELEASE

Alaska Native Review Commission: 24 July 1983

Mr. Hans-Pavia Rosing, President of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, Mr. James Stotts and Mr. Oscar Kawagley, Alaska’s representatives on the ICC Executive Council, announced today that ICC has asked the Honorable Thomas R. Berger to conduct the Alaska Native Review Commission. Mr. Berger has accepted.

The review is expected to take two years. Mr. Berger will hold hearings and other consultations with rural Alaskans and others, both native and non-native.

The Commission will be completely independent of the ICC. Alaska Native claims were settled by Act of Congress in 1971. Native corporations were established throughout Alaska to hold and manage Native lands and revenue. The Secretary of the Interior is to report to Congress in January, 1985, regarding the status of the settlement. In 1991 shares in the corporations can be transferred to non-Natives.

The settlement, its consequences, and Mr. Berger’s recommendations for the future will be of great significance not only to Alaskan Natives but also to the Inuit of all the circumpolar countries (whose claims have not yet been settled). The ICC which is an officially recognised non-governmental organisation with the United Nations, intends to see that the Commission’s report is made available to the U.N. and to the national and local governments of the circumpolar countries.

Mr. Berger is well known in Canada and many other countries for his work on the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry (1974-1977). He is well respected for his integrity, his knowledge of Arctic peoples and the Arctic environment, and his standing as an authority in the field of Native rights.
In April, Mr. Berger announced his resignation from the bench, to become effective August 27, 1983. He will be able to begin the work of the Commission on August 29, 1983.

Mr. Berger will make a presentation to the opening session of the ICC General Assembly on Monday, July 25.

ALASKA: BACKGROUND TO ALASKA NATIVE REVIEW COMMISSION

North Slope Borough Mayor Eben Hopson Sr., founder of the ICC submitted a written statement to the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry regarding the Inuit experience with oil and gas development on the Arctic Slope. The statement best leads into the discussion of the need for a complete and impartial analysis of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 (ANCSA) and its socioeconomic significance. Mayor Hobson said:

The politics of oil have had a very divisive influence in rural Alaska. When our Land Claims were settled, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act authorized the organization of 12 regional corporations to manage both the lands and the money from the settlement. Many of these regional corporations have signed exploration and option agreements with oil corporations, and several of these regional corporations have begun to appear to be politically aligned with their oil corporate partners. Suddenly Native members of the State Legislature, who used to vote as liberal democrats, now vote with conservative urban Republicans on oil and gas legislation, thus alienating the urban liberals whose votes we could rely on to pass bush legislation in such areas as health, education and local government. New coalitions are developing. I worry that as the market value of Alaska’s oil rises, the new oil/bush coalition will prevent oil taxes from being raised accordingly denying all Alaskans their fair share of oil revenue. There will be a tug of war between those of us who want to maximize state oil income for needed investment in our Alaskan cities and villages, and those who want to help the oil industry avoid taxation.

This tendency to assist the oil corporations avoid taxes may extend even to the point that our regional Native corporations will oppose the development of home-rule government in rural Alaska.

The politics of the Arctic are no longer the politics of the people, but they are the politics of oil.

Mayor Hopson here assesses clearly the new political dimension emerging within the Native community and later mentions the resistance of coastal villages to oil and gas development in the outer continental shelf region.

Recently, Bering Sea villages – from Norton Sound to the Aleutians - have challenged the Reagan Administration’s outer continental shelf oil and gas leasing plans for the Norton Sound and St. George Basins.

73 Western Alaska Native villages met in Nome early January to call upon the Secretary of the Interior to delay the Norton Sound lease sale. 11 days before the sale two small villages - Stebbins and Gambell - filed a lawsuit to prevent the sale. These were later joined by the Association of Village Council Presidents (AVCP) and the Bering Straits Native Association. In the same way two Aleutian villages - False Pass and Nelson Lagoon - filed a suit to prevent the St. George Basin sale.

ANCSA has been celebrated as the most liberal settlement any Native American group ever received from the federal government - the transfer of 44 million acres of land and 962.5 million dollars. But when looking at the corporate structural design underlying the settlement, its more frightening aspects become clear: 1991 (when shares in the corporations can be transferred to non-Natives), taxation control, stock alienation, massive land transfers, corporate takeovers (specifically the relationship between Native and Oil Corporations), and the loss of local control and title to traditional lands.
The American Indian Policy Review Commission examined some of the problems of ANCSA and said that whereas the Act attempted to resolve the conflicting interests of Natives, the State of Alaska, the Federal Government, and the corporate petroleum interest, the consequences of this balance would lead to ambiguities and conflicts of interpretation.

ANCSA did nothing to clarify governmental jurisdictional relationships. The issue of Native sovereignty and self-government was neglected. This issue promises to be a heated political debate throughout the State. Already some of the villages are asserting sovereign powers: in Tyonek, the right to decide who may reside in their community, in Venetie, the right to decide regulations of hunting and fishing on village lands, in Kotzebue, the right to determine local hiring practices within their village.

The ambiguities and complexities of ANCSA are exposing the legislative beneficiaries to economic exploitation. Land is the focus of the struggle between Natives and non-Natives and their needs expressed at the time of the passing of the Act centred around land providing maintenance of old ways and opportunities for development. If they could raise a steady flow of cash the people would be able to ease their economic hardships. The main threat was white encroachment.

Now five years into the settlement era, other threats apart from direct white encroachments are emerging. Some stem from arbitrary regulations established by various bureaucracies involved in implementing the Act. Others lie in human fallibility and failings of Native leaders themselves. Whatever the source of threat, the possibility that land apparently awarded to Natives under the Act will never become theirs, or will soon pass into non-Native hands is very real. ANCSA was intended to improve the quality of Alaskan Native life, yet it has now come to threaten the very people that it was intended to help.

Soon after receiving non-governmental organization status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations the Inuit Circumpolar Conference formed the Alaska Native Review Commission to address these questions and charged the new Commission with the following:

1. examine the socioeconomic status of the Inuit
2. analyse the history and intent of the ANCSA
3. study the historic policies and practices of the United States in settling Native American claims and place ANCSA in political perspective
4. examine the performance of the various regional corporations in fulfilling the "spirit" of ANCSA for the Inuit
5. analyze the social, cultural, economic, political and environmental consequences of ANCSA and its significance to the international Inuit community

The purpose is to develop a comprehensive analysis of ANCSA and to propose recommendations to the Inuit Circumpolar Conference required to promote and protect Inuit interests with reference to the settlement.

Source: Letter from Mr. James Stotts ICC Executive Council Member, Alaska to Mr. Thomas Berger, June 23, 1983, inviting him to chair the Alaska Native Review Commission.
ARCTIC: ALASKA NATIVE REVIEW COMMISSION IN AN ARCTIC PERSPECTIVE


It is an honour to have been asked by the Inuit Circumpolar Conference to chair the Alaska Native Review Commission. The terms of reference are formidable: to examine the social and economic status of the Inuit in Alaska; the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) of 1971; the policies that the U.S.A. has historically followed in settling claims by Native Americans; the performance of the Native corporations established by ANCSA; the social, cultural, economic, political and environmental impact of ANCSA; and the significance of ANCSA to the international Inuit community. The purpose is to develop a comprehensive analysis of ANCSA, to prepare a full report, and to make recommendations to protect and promote Inuit interests.

I know that you are all familiar with the work of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry (1974-1977). I should emphasize that we cannot — indeed, should not — attempt to repeat that inquiry in Alaska. The Mackenzie Valley Inquiry was established to consider whether or not a major pipeline should be built in the Mackenzie Valley; and whether or not this should occur before a settlement of Native claims. In Alaska the claims of the native peoples were settled in 1971 by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, the Trans-Alaska Pipeline has been built, and oil production has been underway from Prudhoe Bay since 1976. Some great changes have occurred.

What the ICC is establishing is a commission that would ordinarily be carried out under government auspices. This has far-reaching implications. Arctic peoples, living under three national flags, have set up their own commission to review what has happened in Alaska and to consider its significance not just for the Inuit of Alaska, but for the Inuit of the
circumpolar community. It is a venture that will be watched closely.

The Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry was established by the Government of Canada (see INWIA Document 14). Its mandate was set out in an Order-in-Council, and it was given full powers under the Federal Inquiries Act, including subpoena power. It was, of course, funded by the Government of Canada, which had the power to implement the recommendations the Inquiry made.

The Alaska Native Review Commission is not established by any government. Its mandate comes from the ICC. It will have no power to compel any person to testify. It will be funded by the ICC, and its report will go to the ICC, and from there to the United Nations, to Congress, and to the national governments and local governments of the circumpolar countries.

However, the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry and the Alaska Native Review Commission bear a certain resemblance in other ways. The credibility of the Mackenzie Valley Inquiry depended on its perceived integrity, the fairness of its process and procedures, and the report it produced. (The report was entitled *Northern Frontier, Northern Homeland.* In the same way, the success of the Commission will depend on its perceived integrity, the fairness of its process and procedures and the report that it produces.

We are all fortunate to be citizens of countries that are free, and where such a Commission, under the sponsorship of an indigenous people's organization like the ICC, can be undertaken.

The Commission must be completely independent of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference. The Commission must be responsible for its own procedures, must take whatever steps it considers necessary to carry out its mandate, and its report must be entirely the product of the Commission’s own work.

It also means that when the Commission comes under fire, as it undoubtedly will from many quarters, it must be in a position to carry on without fear of the consequences.

The Commission will, of course, be dependent on the cooperation and goodwill of the people of rural Alaskans and other Alaskans.

The Commission, in liaison with Inuit people and their leaders, work out a schedule of hearings and other methods of consultation. I hope it will be possible to begin the hearings sometime this fall.

Let me emphasize the importance of such hearings. In the Mackenzie Valley Inquiry, we held two types of hearing: formal hearings at Yellowknife (the capital of the Northwest Territories and its largest centre of population) and community hearings in every village, town and settlement in the region.

Thus in the course of the Inquiry, hearings were held in each community in the Mackenzie Valley and the Western Arctic - thirty-five in all. At these hearings, the people living in the communities were given the opportunity to speak in their own language and in their own way. I wanted them to feel that they could come forward and tell me what their lives and their experience led them to believe the impact of a pipeline and an energy corridor would be.

In order to give people - not just the spokesmen for Native organizations and for the white community, but all people - an opportunity to speak their minds, the Mackenzie Valley Inquiry remained in each community as long as was necessary for every person who wanted to speak to do so. In many villages a large proportion of the adult population addressed the Inquiry. Not that participation was limited to adults. Some of the most perceptive presentations were given by young people, concerned no less than their parents about their lands and their future.
I found that ordinary people, with the experience of life in the North, had a great deal to contribute. I heard from almost 1000 witnesses at the community hearings—ina English (and occasionally in French), in Inuineux, Slavey, Dogrib, Chipewyan and Inuvialuit (the Inuit language of the Western Arctic). They seldom had written briefs. Their thoughts were not filtered through a screen of jargon. They were talking about their innermost concerns and fears.

It is not enough simply to read about northern people, northern places and northern problems. You have to be there, you have to listen to the people, to know what is really going on in their towns and villages and in their minds. That is why I invited representatives of the companies that wanted to build the pipeline to come to these community hearings with me. They sent their representatives to every hearing in every community.

Well, you may say, what can ordinary people tell the legislators, what have they got to say to policy-makers? I found that they could tell us a great deal. The contributions of ordinary people were important in the assessment of even the most technical subjects. For example, I based the chapter of my report dealing with the biological vulnerability of the Beaufort Sea not only on the evidence of the biologists who testified at the formal hearings, but also on the views of the Inuit hunters who spoke at the community hearings. The same is true of sea-bed ice scour, and of oil spills: they are technical subjects, but our understanding of them was furthered by testimony from people who live in the region.

Let me give another example: when Canada and Alaska's most renowned caribou biologists testified at the Inquiry, they described the life cycle, habitat dependencies and migrations and provided a host of details about the Porcupine caribou herd. Expert evidence from anthropologists, sociologists and geographers described the Native people's dependency on caribou, and the consequences of a change in diet. Then the Native people spoke for themselves at the community hearings about the caribou herd as a link with their past, as a present-day source of food and as security for the future. Only in this way could a sound assessment of impact be made.

When discussion turned to issues relating to social and cultural impact, the usefulness of obtaining the views of local residents was equally important. This was nowhere more apparent than in the consideration of Native claims. At the formal hearings in Yellowknife, land use and occupancy evidence was presented through prepared testimony and map exhibits. By contrast, at the community hearings people spoke spontaneously and at length of both their traditional and their present-day use of the land and its resources. Their testimony was often painstakingly detailed and richly illustrated with anecdotes.

The most important contribution of the community hearings was, I think, the insight it gave us into the true nature of Native goals and aspirations. No academic treatise or discussion, no formal presentation of the claims of Native people by the Native organizations and their leaders, could offer as compelling and vivid a picture of the goals and aspirations of Native people as their own testimony. In no other way could we have discovered the depth of feeling regarding past wrongs and future hopes, and the determination of Native people to assert their collective identity today and in years to come.

We cannot expect the Alaska Native Review Commission to hold hearings in every village in rural Alaska. Nevertheless, we should be able to work out a procedure that enables us to hold hearings at villages representative of all points of view in rural Alaska.

It will also, I think, be useful to hold hearings in Anchorage, and perhaps in other urban centres, for the convenience of many non-Native Alaskans who will wish to speak to the Commission.
I hope as well that it will be possible for the Commission to work closely with the Eben Hopson Chair at McGill University. (The Eben Hopson Chair is endowed by Alaska’s North Slope Borough to honour the memory of Eben Hopson, founder of the ICC. The Chair will focus on the study of Arctic policy.)

The Mackenzie Valley Inquiry was set up to examine the social, economic, and environmental impact of the proposed Arctic Gas pipeline from Prudhoe Bay across the North Slope of Alaska and the Northern Yukon and then south along the Mackenzie Valley. The Inquiry provided a focus for consideration of the consequences of the advance of the industrial system to Canada’s last frontier and beyond, the necessity for the preservation of the Northern environment and, above all, the rights of the Native peoples living on the frontier. The Inquiry had to weigh the value of establishing large-scale extractive industry in the midst of Native communities trying to preserve traditional values and re-establish local self-sufficiency.

We in Canada had been committed to the view that the economic future of the North lay in large-scale industrial development. There had been generated, especially among Northern business, an atmosphere of expectancy about industrial development. There had always been a traditional renewable resource sector in the North, but instead of trying to strengthen it we had for a decade or more followed policies by which it could only be weakened or even destroyed. We believed in large-scale industrial development and deprecitated the existing economic base. Indeed, people who tried to earn a living by hunting, trapping and fishing had often been regarded as unemployed.

I found, and I wrote in my report, that the development of the non-renewable resources of a region can bring serious pressures to bear on its population: people who try to continue to live on the renewable resources may experience relative poverty and may be faced with the loss of a productive way of life. Gradually more and more people may give up one kind of work, and therefore relinquish the way of life associated with it, in favour of another kind of work and life. Where this has happened, they often feel they had little choice in the matter. If the neglected sector of the economy represents a preferred or culturally important way of life, if it is a means of self-identification and a source of self-respect, the devaluation of that way of life can have widespread and dismayng consequences. These consequences are exacerbated if the industrialized economy offers rewards that are only short-term.

The pace of industrial development is the key. I concluded that in the Mackenzie Valley and the Western Arctic industrial advance on a massive scale would gravely weaken the renewable resource sector, and that its social impact would be disastrous. I urged that the rate of advance should be calculated so as not to overwhelm the existing economic base.

This implied a new set of priorities for northern development: the strengthening of the traditional hunting and trapping economy; the development of local logging and sawmilling operations where there are merchantable stands of timber on the Mackenzie, the development of the fishing industry, the development of recreation and conservation; an orderly programme of petroleum exploration in the Mackenzie Delta and the Western Arctic; and in due course a pipeline along the Mackenzie Valley. Native people — given this set of priorities — could participate in all of these economic activities. The advance of the industrial system could be orderly and beneficial to all.

In the Mackenzie Valley Inquiry, I proceeded on the assumption that, in due course, the industrial system would require the gas and oil of the Western Arctic, and that they would have to be transported along the Mackenzie Valley to
markets in the metropolitan centres of Canada and the U.S.A.. I also proceeded on the assumption that we intend to protect and preserve Canada's northern environment, and that, above all else, we intend to honour the legitimate claims and aspirations of the Native people. All of these assumptions were embedded in the Government of Canada's expressed Northern policy for the 1970s.

I sought to reconcile these goals: industrial, social, and environmental.

I recommended that no pipeline should be built and no energy corridor established across the Northern Yukon because of the likelihood of substantial and irreparable losses to wilderness, caribou and migratory birds; losses which would indeed extend into northern Alaska. For that reason I urged that the Northern Yukon should be set aside as wilderness and that the U.S. should designate as wilderness the lands within the Arctic National Wildlife Range. At the same time I indicated that the Alaska Highway route, as a corridor for the transportation of Alaskan gas to the Lower 48, was preferable from an environmental point of view.

I also recommended a whale sanctuary in Mackenzie Bay, subject to traditional subsistence harvesting. I urged that no pipeline should be built and no energy corridor established across Mackenzie Bay because occupation by industry of the calving ground of the white whales of the Beaufort Sea would mean the eventual loss of 5,000 whales. However, I limited the sanctuary's boundaries to waters where no discoveries of oil or gas had yet been made.

I advised the Government of Canada that a pipeline corridor is feasible, from an environmental point of view, to transport gas and oil from the Mackenzie Delta along the Mackenzie Valley to the Alberta border. At the same time, however, I recommended that we should postpone the construction of such a pipeline for ten years, in order to strengthen Native society, the Native economy - indeed the whole renewable resource sector - and to enable Native claims to be settled.

The Government of Canada rejected the Arctic Gas pipeline proposal and decided that, if a pipeline were to be built, it should be along the Alaska Highway route. Now the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States have agreed on the construction of a pipeline along the Alaska Highway route. (The Alaska Highway pipeline has not yet been built because of the failure of natural gas prices to continue to rise.)

I think a fuller understanding of the northern environment emerged during the course of the Inquiry. The proposals made for the creation of an international wilderness park in Alaska and the Yukon, for a whale sanctuary in Mackenzie Bay, and for bird sanctuaries in the Mackenzie Delta and Mackenzie Valley, have attracted widespread support in Canada and the United States. There is a felt need and a perceived responsibility to preserve critical habitats for caribou, whales, wildlife and wilderness, and there is an understanding of the special vulnerability of migratory species in the North to industrial advance. In Canada, Native peoples and the environmental movement have found it possible to work together in these endeavours. Both have an interest in the protection of the environment, and both agree that any measures to protect the environment must be subject to Native hunting and fishing rights.

In 1978, Canada withdrew the Northern Yukon, north of the Porcupine River - an area of 9.6 million acres - from future industrial development, with a view to establishing the area as Canada's first wilderness park, subject to traditional Native hunting, trapping and fishing rights in that area.

The Carter administration proposed, in the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, that the lands comprising the Arctic National Wildlife Range in northeastern Alaska be set aside as wilderness. The House of Representatives
approved the legislation in April, 1980. The Senate approved an amended bill in December, 1980, and this amended bill was signed by President Carter that same month.

The Inuit of Canada and Alaska have had a great interest in these measures, because they bear so closely on the preservation of their common Arctic homeland.

Eben Hopson, the founder of the ICC, in his testimony to the Mackenzie Valley Inquiry, said there is a world-wide movement for self-determination by indigenous peoples. We do not know yet what the outcome will be. It will no doubt vary from one country to another.

In Greenland, where the Inuit are a majority, they obtained Home Rule in 1979 within the community of the Danish Realm. The circumstances in Greenland are in some ways unique compared to those of indigenous peoples elsewhere in the world. Thus, in phases, vital governmental functions are being transferred from Denmark to Greenland (although Denmark will retain control over defence, foreign relations, the courts and the police). All issues have not, however, been resolved. Although the Greenland Home Rule government has a veto over exploitation of natural resources, still outstanding is the question of ownership of Greenland’s subsurface rights.

In Canada, the Inuit, the Dene and the Metis are advancing proposals for the division of the Northern Territories. The Government of Canada has agreed in principle. One of these new jurisdictions, lying largely to the north of the tree line, would have an Inuit majority. The Inuit in Canada wish to see this new jurisdiction called Nunavut ("our land"). (See INGIA Newsletter No.34.)

In the past decade, the principle of Native self-determination has been recognised in Canada, and not only in the North. No one can be sure exactly how it will all turn out, but one thing is already apparent: the Native peoples are now a political force to be reckoned with in the North and throughout the country. Their rights have been recognised in the new Canadian Constitution and Charter of Rights, and a series of national conferences, mandated by the new Constitution, between the Prime Minister, the premiers of the provinces, and Canada’s Native leaders has now begun.

The Alaska Native Review Commission’s focus will be on Alaskan issues: the corporate structures established by ANCSA, 1991, taxation, stock alienation, the fate of traditional lands, and the issue of self-determination.

Although many Alaskans testified before the Mackenzie Valley Inquiry, and although in my report I made recommendations bearing on the environmental resources enjoyed jointly by Canadians and Alaskans, the only examination of ANCSA that we had then was cursory and at an early stage. Now I hope we can study it closely and provide a complete analysis of the way it has worked out — both the good and the bad.

I should emphasize that any examination of ANCSA, any review of the past, will be for the purpose of framing recommendations for the future. So, also, in any consideration of the performance of the Native corporations the object will not be to pass judgment on the question of management but to determine to what extent the corporations have fulfilled the expectations of the Inuit, to see whether, indeed, Inuit expectations have changed, and to consider what measures may be taken to meet their expectations.

I have talked mostly of my experience in Canada. I have said very little about Alaska. I intend to go there to listen and to learn.

But I should tell you what I have found in my own country. I have found that Native people do not wish to return to the past. They do not wish to be the objects of mere sentimentality. They have no desire to see Native culture, Native communities and the Native economy preserved in amber. Rather, they wish to ensure that their culture can grow and change — in directions they choose for themselves.
For Native people, their culture is still a dynamic force in their lives. I have found that the culture of Native people amounts to more than crafts and carvings. Their tradition of decision-making by consensus, their respect for the wisdom of their elders, their concept of the extended family, their belief in a special relationship with the land, their regard for the environment, their willingness to share—all of these values persist in one form or another within their own culture, even though they have been under unrelenting pressure to abandon them.

So the task for the Inuit is to secure for themselves a distinct and contemporary place in the world. This is a view shared by all Inuit here at the Inuit Circumpolar Conference. I have no doubt it is one shared by the Sami, by the Inuit of Siberia, and by all Arctic peoples.

Thus the work of the Alaska Native Review Commission and its report will be a matter of concern to the whole Inuit circumpolar community, both those represented at this Conference and those who cannot be here. I hope to have an opportunity of conferring with all of you and, if possible, with the Inuit of Siberia.

The Inuit are seeking to work out a new social contract with the nation-states where they live. Let me conclude therefore with the words of F.R. Scott, a Canadian poet:

"If human rights and harmonious relations between cultures are forms of the beautiful, then the state is a work of art that is never finished."

May the work of our Commission proceed in that spirit.

ARGENTINA: CENTRO KOLLA REPRESENTED IN NEW GOVERNMENT

For the first time in the history of South America a government has sought political participation from indigenous peoples within its organisation.

In the elections of October 30th in Argentina, three main political trends were up for election: the right, the Peronist/centre and the radicals. The Argentinian people voted for the Partido Radical who on December 10th will take over from the military dictatorship.

Raul Alfonsin will be the new president and his party have asked the Centro Kolla to take part in the new Government as political advisors on indigenous affairs. Jorge Valiente Ipildor will be the Centro Kolla representative in the framework of the Congress.

In fact, it was Centro Kolla themselves, who at the beginning of 1983 proposed to the political parties that there should be representation of indigenous peoples of Argentina in the Cámara de Diputados of the nation. The 10 of December will be, then, a day of victory for those indigenous organisations of South America who have struggled for direct political participation. For this occasion the Centro Kolla have invited more than 300 indigenous representatives from South American countries.

INGIA wishes Centro Kolla fruitful work in this new phase of the struggle for the demands of indigenous peoples of Argentina.
AUSTRALIA: "WE DON'T NEED ROXBYS!"

The biggest blockade of a uranium mine (indeed possibly any mine anywhere) took place at Roxby Down, South Australia between the 27 August and September 4 1983, when 800 people blocked roads, took over parts of the mine site, held discussions with workers and acted in strong solidarity with the Aboriginal people whose sacred sites are threatened by the mining partners, Western Mining, (Aus,) and British Petroleum (BP).

Many arrests occurred in the opening days of the occupation — reported with some gusto in the British press. After that — blatant silence. And nothing since.

But the Aboriginal occupation of Cane Grass Dam continues and is growing. So far the miners haven't been able to build their approach road to the north. And the South Australian government has belatedly agreed to finance an independent anthropologist to report on Aboriginal sites.

The mining companies produced some elderly Aboriginals from Coober Pedy back in September, who duly told the press that Cane Grass didn't lie on Aboriginal land. Mamangurumpa, a secretive body operating both as a mining company and a religious organisation is thought to be involved in this.

Most disturbing, perhaps, is news that back in 1980, when South Australia was ruled by a Liberal (ie Conservative) state government, the Department of the Environment recommended an ethnographic study of Kokatha land claims in the project area which was then directly overturned by the Ministry of Mines who told Western Mining Corporation that they needn't bother about the Aborigines. It's now quite clear that both WMC and BP took this "assurance" warmly to heart.

CIMRA (Colonialism and Indigenous Minorities Research and Action) - which jointly organised with PARTIZANS the BP protest in August, along with Greenpeace London and the Aboriginal support group - has been told by BP Australia that the companies were "fully alive" to the importance which the aboriginal community places upon its sacred sites..." BP professes to have made "repeated efforts to secure the co-operation of the people representing the Kokatha aboriginal community in surveys to locate sites of anthropological significance."

In the light of Western Australian cabinet papers (reproduced partly here below) this claim is manifestly a lie. The documents about this issue were released by CANE in Adelaide in September and immediately repressed by a court order which prevents them from being published in Australia:

Minister of Mines and Energy 24/7/80
"It is recommended that the ethnographic survey referred to in recommendation 4 of the Department for the Environment, be not required and that the attached letter be forwarded to assure the company on this and related issues."

BP Australia Limited 10/8/83
"From the very outset of the Olympic Dam project, both Joint Venturers have been fully alive to the importance which the aboriginal community places on its sacred sites. Consequently ever since 1981 representatives from the project management company Roxby Management Services have made repeated efforts to secure the co-operation of the people representing the Kokatha aboriginal community in surveys to locate sites of anthropological significance. Unfortunately all such efforts have to date been unsuccessful."

Article from Parting Company No.4 1983 compiled from information supplied by CANE (Adelaide) and a press release from Kokatha, Arabuna, Yankandura and Pitjandjara people meeting at Cane Grass Dam on October 3/4 1983.
AUSTRALIA: DRACONIAN NEW CRIMINAL CODE ACT IN NORTHERN TERRITORY

The Northern Territory of Australia Criminal Code Act has been passed by the NT Government and will become Law from January 1984 unless it is disallowed by the Australian Federal Government. As NT is not yet a State, the Federal Government does have the power to disallow it. This Act is both regressive and oppressive and discriminates against Aborigines, even though Aborigines are not explicitly mentioned in it. It does not take into account any cultural differences and it's passing has been hurried so as to avoid the reports from the Law Reform Commission which are expected to be tabled next year.

The crime part of the Act is based on Samuel Griffith's Criminal Code Law which operated in Queensland at the turn of this century and the 'terrorism' part is based on the British Act passed in Britain at the beginning of the 2nd World War when Britain was threatened with sabotage from Ireland. There are no such threats in Australia and it does not make much to see that this law has been passed against groups objecting to US bases, uranium, supporters of independent East Timor and the more militant Aboriginal groups.

Divisions 2 to 5 of Part III (Offences against Public Order) show clearly how the Act can be interpreted for use against any demonstration which in other Australian States could proceed quite legally and which are a part of any democratic community. Section 63 says that when an assembly has been declared unlawful (even if the declaration comes after the assembly has begun) if that assembly appears to be disturbing the peace it can be called a riot. Section 28 says that in such riotous circumstances the police have the right to inflict force which could cause death or grievous harm on the participants.

The fact that it is left to the Administrator (Section 51) to make regulations proscribing organisations shows the danger of this Act - the provision for the Legislative Assembly to declare otherwise is not a very good safeguard as the Administrator who is appointed by the Legislative Assembly is not much different in attitude than the Assembly itself. If you become concerned about the justice of a proscription and arrange for a member of the organisation which has been prohibited to express his views or grievances, then you are subject to an imprisonment for two years (Section 52).

The Northern Territory has always been trying to push Aborigines off the streets to make the place attractive to tourists and to hide the injustice that turns the oppressed people to drink. Section 7, like in the case of vagrancy, goes against the British tradition of assuming that the accused person is innocent until proven guilty, (where the accused is intoxicated and an unlawful act takes place it is assumed that the drunk person intended to do the act unless proven otherwise). And then even if the jury finds the person innocent, the judge can make him pay all the expenses and keep him in jail until he does (Section 383). This is especially drastic for the Aborigines who by custom drink in the open and have very little money or hope of getting any to pay the fine.

These are just some of the examples of why the Act should be stopped. The Federal Government will not act to disallow it unless there is some political gain or else there would be embarrassment if they were to pass it. Quarrel with NT is something they want to avoid.

In addition to this there is the broader issue of the refusal to accept unsworn statements in court. This is directed against the Aborigines to whom English is sometimes a fifth language. (Aborigines learn 3-4 Aboriginal languages before they learn English and so English can be extremely foreign to them.) Aboriginals often depend very much on
paper because when composing or responding to statements orally it is possible to say what you don't mean. At a meeting organised by Victoria Council for Civil Liberties, a lawyer described the fear and anxiety felt by people not eloquent in English when they lost, or thought that they had lost, their piece of paper. The police have been angered by, and opposed to the establishment of the Aboriginal Legal Service as it has meant that the Aborigines need no longer necessarily plead guilty. Police action has thus, since the ALS came into being, forced to defend their actions. It is thought that insistence on sworn statements is being brought into the Law in response to police pressure.

Information provided by Stefan Pelczynski.

AUSTRALIA: LAND, POWER AND YELLOWCAKE

by Phil Niklaus

In the last issue of the IWGIA Newsletter (No.34 July 1983) we included Part I of Phil Niklaus's article. There he told of the problems facing the Aboriginal groups in the area of the Kakadu National Park (Alligator Rivers region of the Australian Northern Territory). There the Pancon-Getty Oil consortium plan to mine uranium at Jabluka. The intermediary between the consortium and the local Aboriginal people in the negotiations was the Northern Land Council. The NLC have been accused of applying pressure onto Aboriginal groups to hasten the Jabluka agreement which was eventually signed. Opposition to another mining project near the Kakadu Park has centered around the Canadian corporation Denison Mines Ltd. to work at Koongarra. In the rest of this article Phil Niklaus looks at the NLC and the threats to the Aboriginal peoples of the Northern Territory, particularly the rush for uranium - "yellowcake".

Mick Alderson is a member of the Murrumburr clan that has long occupied the land now designated as the Kakadu National Park. He has been the chairman of the Gagudju Association since it was established by the NLC in 1979 to receive mining royalty money and represent Aboriginals in the area.

About a third of the association's 300 members live in the park with the rest in communities and outstations spread throughout the region. Before being elected association chairman, Alderson worked for five years with the Northern Territory conservation authority and is now employed as a Kakadu park ranger and cultural adviser for the Parks and Wildlife Service.

He considers mining at Koongarra to be inevitable. "I'd rather see no mining, leave the country the way nature left it. But there's no way around it." If mining there must be, he says, it should be done in a way least harmful to the land. Under his guidance, the Gagudju Association has suggested carting the uranium ore to a mill outside the park for processing, a proposal that does not please the Denison management.
Denison has not abandoned its plan to begin work at Koongarra at the start of the Dry next May. Kevin Torpey, noting that the NCL has not yet accepted the rejection vote by the traditional owners in May, said: "They're (the NLC) having discussions with the Aborigines on what the real hang-up is - but it's a matter between the government and the Aborigines, really. We're only the meat in the sandwich. I feel confident we'll get our approval - realism will always win out."

What is real to Kevin Torpey, though, is absolutely surreal to others, who view the NCL's failure to accept the Koongarra decision as evidence that its allegiance lies more with the government and the mining companies than with its constituents, the traditional Aboriginal land owners. "That's the charade of the whole thing," said someone close to the NLC, who asked not to be named. "They're told they can say no, but they can't say no. It's a bloody charade."

The Northern Land Council, established in its present form in January 1977, exists primarily on funding from the Department of Aboriginal Affairs - a loan of sorts that one day will have to be repaid to the Commonwealth. The collateral is, in essence, the promise of mining royalties. The NLC is spending $2-3m a year in administrative expenses (negotiating costs are paid by the mining companies). The bills are mounting, what with the expanding staff and the many expensive special consultants who can claim $500 and more a day for their services.

The recently concluded Jabiluka negotiations took nearly a year-and-a-half, off and on, and proved to be an expensive, wearying ordeal. While in the days of the Ranger agreement the NLC's negotiating team consisted of the then NLC chairman, Galarrwuy Yunupingu, and three lawyers, today there are as many as a dozen people. The leader of the present negotiating team is Eric Pratt, a Brisbane, QL, who reportedly commands a $1,000-a-day fee. Pratt is assisted by two Darwin attorneys with the rest of the team consisting of four scientists, two economists and an anthropologist. Both NCL chairman Blitner and Bureau director Lanhupuy, the only Aborigines among the top seven management officials in the NCL bureaucracy, have resigned from the negotiating team, reportedly because of lack of time.

40% of the mining royalty money is earmarked for the management of the NCL and its bureau, and there are those who see a conflict of interest in NLC funding being so closely tied to mining. In late March, as the meetings and negotiations for both Jabiluka and Koongarra churned on, the Labour Party spokesman for the environment, Mr. Stewart West questioned in Parliament the motives of the NLC in attempting to "hasten" the Jabiluka development. He noted that the NLC bureau was staffed mostly with whites and asked: "Is the Northern Land Council developing a vested interest in mining, against the interest and desires of the traditional owners?"

Blitner denies the allegation. "We don't worry where our money comes from. We have to use up any money we have or we have to give it back to the Minister (of Aboriginal Affairs). But it's Aborigines' money - I think they're frightened of us getting power, and land is power and money is power in the eyes of the European."

Blitner was taken from his mother when a week old from the eastern coast of Arnhem land and sent to the Church of England mission on Groote Eylandt where he eventually joined the staff. He has worked on a pilot launch and as a professional crocodile shooter. Blitner serves as liaison officer and spokesman for the local trust that handles royalties from the Groote Eylandt Mining Company and runs a car hire business there. "I've been a worker all my life," he says.

His critics see the NCL chairman differently. "All his life he's been involved in the European establishment" said one ex-NLC bureau staff member.
Blitner recognises the difficulties facing the council, but he believes it has come far over the years. While some believe the NLC's very foundation to be shaky, given that it is virtually unheard of for one Aborigine to speak for another Blitner is comfortable with his position, "I believe that what I am doing is what should be done. It's a challenge. I believe my upbring was for this job."

Life has not been easy for the NLC over the past five years. Founded to "protect" Aboriginal interests, the council has found itself the focal point of various competing interests in the Northern Territory: the many government agencies, both Commonwealth and NT, with a hand in Aboriginal life; the multi-national corporations hungry for the vast mineral and pastoral wealth in the region; the local associations that have sprung up to handle royalty payments for Aboriginal communities; the churches that maintain a presence in many of the communities; and the other special interests - anthropologists, sociologists, ecologists, geologists, economists and journalists - all wanting some part of the NLC. It is the responsibility of the council and its staff support bureau to reconcile these often conflicting interests with "the wishes and opinion of Aborigines living in the area". It is no mean task.

The NLC workload - identifying traditional land owners, processing land claims, overseeing the highly-sensitive mining negotiations, looking for staff - has been enormous, and the ballooning of the bureau from 20 to 60 in a very short time has caused some difficulties.

Dr. E.C. Coombs, now a visiting fellow at the Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies, described the relationship between the council and its staff in a paper published in 1980. He compared the way in which the NLC operates to what had been envisioned by both the Aboriginal Land Rights Commission report of 1975 under the direction of Mr. Justice Woodward, and the later Fox Inquiry report: "Perhaps the most important departure from the Woodward-Fox scenario is the role of the Northern Land Council", he said. "Rather than acting as an effective spokesman and agent for the traditional owners, its management appears to have seen itself as an autonomous body concerned primarily to seek a reconciliation between Aboriginal views and the wishes of the government.

"Indeed some Aborigines believe that it has gone further and become the agent of the government in persuading Aborigines concerned to acquiesce in the government's policy... As a result of these pressures on the Northern Land Council and the desire of its management to reach an accommodation with the government, the procedures contemplated in the Aboriginal Land Rights legislation were not carried out in spirit if (which is highly doubtful) they were formally complied with."

There are those who believe the situation has not changed markedly. If anything the growth of the bureau has simply tightened its grip over NLC affairs. The increasing size of the council, some say, has rendered it unworkable and has made it a rubber stamp for the bureau. Said one lawyer: "Some council members are inarticulate in English, some are very articulate and then there is the vast number in the middle."

"I don't think the NLC has ever been equipped to represent Aboriginal interests - they've gone into these things poorly equipped," said a former NLC staff member. "I don't think more than two or three Aboriginals understand what is going on up there."

The Northern Territory's two biggest industries are tourism and mining, in that order, and both have been growing prodigiously in the Alligator Rivers area. With Jabiru and Koongarra on the horizon, the mining community of Jabiru, 6 km west of the Ranger site and inside the national park boundaries, is bustling.
Jabiru is a mining boom town of the 80s, a planned community resembling Canberra. Ranch-style brick houses in tree-lined cul-de-sacs are springing out of the bush; rows of flats are going up to house the mostly male population of miners. Traffic is ever-increasing during the dry months along the 225 km stretch of two-laned pavement known as the Arnhem Highway which links Darwin with the uranium province to the east. Road trains bearing cannisters of processed uranium from Ranger roar down this yellowcake road, passing the tourists coming to see the Kakadu National Park.

The Northern Territory became self-governing in 1978 - the year the Ranger agreement was signed - but still relies on the Commonwealth for about 90% of its funding. "The only way they can get self-supporting is through tourism and mining," said one Darwin lawyer. "Mining is looked on as the source of NT growth. Anything perceived to be negative to mining could impede growth."

Aborigines are regarded as contrary to the government's stated policy of pushing mining for the territory as it attempts to ride the wave of resource development to statehood. Persistent attempts have been made by the government of Chief Minister Paul Everingham to amend the Land Rights Act.

Responsibility for registering Aboriginal sacred sites resides with the NT Aboriginal Sacred Sites Protection Authority, under the federal Land Rights Act. Requests for site registration and protection are evaluated by the authority, which then recommends which should receive protection. Last November, Everingham wrote to Prime Minister Fraser, asking that the Sacred Sites Act be amended to allow for different categories of site - ranging from sacred sites to sites of significance to sites of interest.

Blitner says the NT government has opposed almost every land claim filed with the NLC by traditional Aborigines.

However, although there have been many public fights between the NT government and the Northern Land Council over issues relating to Aboriginal affairs and the Land Rights Act, there is nothing but praise from the Mines and Energy Ministry spokesman for the NLC's handling of the mining negotiations. "They've (the NLC) carried out their role, because they've signed Jabiluka. They've proved they can develop agreements with the companies and the traditional owners."

The second report of the Fox Inquiry released three months before the government approved uranium development and marketing, warned of the dangers of introducing large-scale mining into the region. "Many parts of the region are physically and ecologically vulnerable, and the local Aboriginal communities are in a state of acute social stress, largely as a result of their contact with European society."

While there have been successful claims filed under the Aboriginal Land Rights Act - notably within stage 1 of Kakadu - the rapid growth of European influence has in some areas dramatically altered the physical and social landscape. The five-year experiment by the Commonwealth to see if, in fact, uranium mining, an important national park and the nation's largest Aboriginal reserve can exist together compatibly is showing signs of strain.

Kakadu National Park was accepted a year ago for inclusion in the World Heritage list of exceptional national reserves. Prime Minister Fraser said that it had been nominated not only for its natural values, but also for its cultural values..."It is a store of cultural values, greatly significant to Aboriginal people and important to us all."

Mr. Fraser suggested too, though, that there had to be a balance between conservation and development. "Aboriginal interests and those of tourists, conservationists, researchers miners and others all have to be considered."
At the eye of the storm over the land are the Aboriginal inhabitants of the region, whose ancestors have lived on and cared for that land for tens of thousands of years. "We do not say the land belongs to us, but we belong to the land," said one elderly Aborigine in describing the bond of the people to their country.

In Aboriginal culture, the responsibility for the land is in the hands of local groups, who care for it as a sacred trust. According to Aboriginal legend, the Dreamtime spirit beings travelled the land moulding the features of the natural environment as it exists today. Some features or entire tracts of land are believed to possess the spiritual essence of the Dreamtime ancestors who created them. These sacred sites, or Djang, are at the core of the traditional Aboriginal sense of oneness with their land, physically and spiritually.

The clash of cultures in the region has brought the well-documented problems of disease, alcoholism, petrol-sniffing, violence and the general disruption of community, custom and ceremony. However, the greatest casualty over the long term may be the steady deterioration of Aboriginal rights to determine their present and their future. Following a three-week fact-finding tour last year by an international team of observers, the World Council of Churches reported: "What we have heard is that Aboriginal communities want to recover their human dignity and respect so that they can break their chains of dependence, alienation from their culture and recover their history and dignity... People want to be free to be human with the freedom to say 'no'."

Aboriginals in the Alligator Rivers region have not had that freedom over uranium mining.

"They've been exposed to the most powerful political structure there is. They've seen where the power resides in this society," said one official with the Northern Territory government. "If you want to win a land claim, you've got to make sure it's got no uranium."

Two sites of special importance to Arnhem Land Aborigines, both at Mount Brockman, are known as Djidjibjdji and Dadbe. The Djidjibjdji sacred site covers the rugged cliffs and rock-strewn base of Mount Brockman, about half a kilometre from the Ranger uranium mine. Dadbe is a rock hole at the top of the cliffs, said to be the home of the Rainbow Serpent, a being from the Dreamtime that holds great spiritual significance for Aborigines in western Arnhem Land.

One sheer cliff face at the north-western tip of Mount Brockman is striped by reddish black and white discolouration from runoff water, representing to Aboriginals the blood of the Rainbow Snake. Aborigines believe that disturbing either site could bring disaster. Dr. H.C. Coombs, former chairman of the Council for Aboriginal Affairs, wrote in 1980: "Perhaps the most serious in their eyes is the fear that the disturbance may affect the Rainbow Serpent spirit who has 'gone to ground' beneath Mount Brockman. Such an event could, they believe, bring great harm to Aborigines and their land - perhaps to mankind as a whole. They do not know what degree of disturbance could produce this catastrophe but I believe their fears are genuinely held."

To the west of the Jabiru site, between the East and South Alligator Rivers, is an Aboriginal sacred area called Yinkididi - "Sores dreaming". Yinkididi covers part of stage 2 of Kakadu National Park where an immense ore body of uranium, known as the Baroti deposit, has been discovered but not yet leased. For Aboriginals, Yinkididi must be avoided other than on rare ceremonial occasions. In an independent report by Stephen Davis of the Northern Territory Aboriginal Sacred Sites Authority telling the story of the Bunji group of Aboriginals living near the East Alligator, Big Bill Neidjie speaks of the area as Sores Dreaming. "If people go there, they get sores and he kill. Kill people. Yeah, he kill one man, young fella before. Yeah that blood site. I think him no good for anybody. That sacred site... important because he kill one man, he kill everybody..."
The community of Oenpelli, 15km inside the Arnhem Land Reserve from Cahill's Crossing on the East Alligator River has been described as "a situation of complete social disruption" as a result of the influx of Europeans into the region. The Rev James Downing of the Uniting Church in Darwin has this view: "The indication I get is that uranium mining has demoralised some and increased the social problems. A few have benefited financially, but it has caused a great deal of anxiety and fear among other Aboriginal communities who have seen the pressure on these people. Many feel helpless and it has greatly increased their fear of physical destruction. There's been a great increase in drinking deaths from drinking related accidents and fights. People appear to have lost their community spirit, their own laws and ceremony. Life now tends to congregate around the social club."

The social club at Oenpelli has all the outward charm of a prisoner-of-war camp. Set apart from other buildings and homes, the club grounds are surrounded by parallel chain-link fences, topped by three strands of barbed wire. The atmosphere is warmer inside the steel perimeter, though between the hours of 6 and 9.30pm six nights a week. In the evenings, a steady flow of beer cans are passed over the bar, pool tables are in constant use and the jukebox wails rock'n roll, reggae and country. At 9.30 on the nose, the bar closes and the throngs are herded through the chain-linked gates into the warm night, a night pierced by shouts and cries and laughter - and occasionally violence - from the revellers.

One of the important motivations in the spread of "outstations" - there are now more than 30 around Oenpelli - is the desire of people to get away from alcohol, and many of the homeland stations now ban it.

Because of the rush with which the early agreements were negotiated, the distribution of "up-front" and royalty money from mining has been haphazard. The disproportionate and often confusing distribution of money by power brokers in the Aboriginal communities has given rise to a mistrust and jealousy among individuals and between communities. Some have received considerable amounts but many have received little or nothing.

The Oenpelli council spent nearly three-quarters of its initial Naborleek money - about $226,000 - on four-wheel-drive Toyotas, with each outstation getting a vehicle. The distribution of money from the Naborleek project, heralded as a boon to the people of Oenpelli, is described as "a disaster, a total mess" by Sue Kesteven, a researcher for the social impact project stationed in Oenpelli. She notes that six or seven associations have come into being to handle the royalty money while NCL legal advisors are still interpreting the financial terms of the agreement.

Meanwhile the Ranger and Naborleek mines have hardly been meccas of employment for local Aborigines. A DAA report released last May shows that there are just 13 Aborigines now working at Naborleek as cleaners, garbage men and road repair men. About the same number work at Ranger in similar positions. The report says: "Despite continued efforts by the Department, there has been little expressed interest by local Aboriginal people in working on the Ranger project."

In an April, 1981 paper, Ms Kesteven wrote: "Oenpelli has had a surfeit of people visiting the community to 'consult' and the invasions of 'government men' are deeply resented; this is even more true of outstations to which people have withdrawn so that they can - at least as one objective - diminish their contact with the white community.

In early March 1981, an unknown amount of contaminated water spilled from a retention pond at the Naborleek mine as heavy rains associated with Cyclone Max swept across Arnhem Land. The spillage went unreported by the plant's operator, Queensland Mines, for four months. When the news was finally leaked a belated investigation was conducted by NT and the Commonwealth monitoring authorities.
While the spill had not been enough, according to the inspectors, to warrant concern, the assurances of the monitoring authorities did little to assuage the fears of the people in and around Oenpelli. And they have not forgotten. Nathaniel Marralngurra, chairman of Oenpelli's Gumbalanya community council, says that today there are people who will still not fish Cooper Creek downstream from the mine. "They didn't like the way Queensland Mines didn't report it straight away," he says.

In a bi-annual report submitted to Parliament this year, the social impact project committee of the Institute for Aboriginal Studies noted that the Nabarlek incident had caused considerable anxiety among the Oenpelli population. "To date, Aborigines have had very little - and even then, poor quality - education on these matters. They complain of little or no communication on safety from those organizations responsible for monitoring the physical environment. As a general requirement there is a need to develop on-going programmes so that the provisions of information and education about uranium mining does not cease once approvals for projects have been obtained."

In 1977 before the Fraser government gave the go-ahead to mine and export uranium, hundreds of thousands of people were demonstrating against uranium mining in the streets of Australia's cities. Word of the movement never reached Aborigines in the Northern Territory bush. "Aboriginal people in Arnhem Land had no idea of the movement against uranium mining," said activist-writer Marcia Langton. "They were conned, told they would be holding up Australian development and they did not want to do that."

The hurried signing of the Ranger agreement in 1978 was done with little regard for the consultation requirements of the Land Rights Act. The "consultation" was viewed as so deficient, in fact, that two members of the NLC, Dick Malwatu from Croker Island and Johnny Marali from Goulburn Island, sought to have the Northern Territory Supreme Court restrain the full council from signing the agreement. After the Commonwealth threatened to change the wording of the Act, the planned legal action was dropped. The Rev. James Downing, who came to the Northern Territory in 1965, said the government's apparent willingness to change the rules of the game had a profound effect both on Aborigines and on those who watched from afar. "That immediately removed the primary provision for consultation with traditional owners and they did it solely in the interest of uranium mining. This was a tremendous blow to the traditional owners."

Both Dick Malwatu and Johnny Marali have died since the signing of the Ranger agreement four years ago. Leo Finlay, one of the outspoken critics of the Ranger negotiations says "They were healthy people all the time. They passed away without any reason. I think it was the pressure from the uranium mining affecting the countryside."

During the last hurried days before the Ranger signing, Finlay attacked the then NLC chairman, Gallarruy Yunupingu, for not allowing enough time for the communities to consider and discuss the agreement. When his request for more consultation time was not allowed, Finlay left the meeting before the "vote" was taken.

David Parsons, a Darwin barrister on the NLC's negotiating team for both Jabiru and Koongarra projects, worked for the Aboriginal Legal Aid Service in Darwin at the time of the Ranger signing. He says of the negotiations: "We certainly know with hindsight it wasn't up to the task. The consultation with Aboriginal people was also not adequate. They (the NLC) certainly changed their opinion of consultation."

In mid-May, about 10 days before the traditional owners of Kakadu decided against starting negotiations with Denison, a three-day meeting was held between local Aboriginals and representatives from the NLC and Denison Mines. The meeting at the Denison camp near the base of Nourlangie Rock was
ostensibly held to review the new boundaries of the Koongarra lease area and to answer any Aboriginal questions. Present were bureau general manager Chris Clare, bureau director Wesley Lanhuuy and Grant Neeman, who heads the bureau's legal department. The NLC negotiating team was represented by its chief counsel, Eric Pratt, as well as his two assistant attorneys, David Parsons and Phil Teitzel.

The first two days of the meeting were leisurely enough spent in discussions and a “walkover” of the boundaries of the lease area. The traditional owners were accommodated in tents put up for the meeting. In the evenings there were films and amiable, relaxed talk. On the morning of the third day, though, it became apparent that there was more to the three-day session than merely explaining the project. According to several of the traditional owners who attended the meeting, pressure was applied by members of the NLC staff and negotiating team for the Aborigines to vote, there and then, on whether to begin the formal negotiations over the Koongarra project.

Aboriginal approval to start negotiations is tantamount to approval of the project itself, for once the decision is made to negotiate there is no turning back. From that point all that remains is to hammer out the details of the mining agreement.

"They hit us so hard, especially the old people," said Mick Alderson, recalling the third day of the May 17-19 meeting. "Both the NLC and Denison were trying to get us to agree. They said that we must make a decision sooner or later, or get an arbitrator in."

Parsons who has been a member of the negotiating team for the past two years denies that pressure was put on the traditional owners. "What it was to invite them to make a decision," he said. "There was a lot of paranoia at that stage, by the mining company and the NLC people. They (the NLC bureau officials) were obviously under a lot of pressure by the mining company."

Denison general manager Torpey also denied that there had been pressure applied. There had been several such walk-over meetings held at the site, he said. "It's really just to explain the project. The new lease would be acceptable from an Aboriginal point of view... Certain people up there aren't talking about the (Koongarra) project; they're talking about mining in the park. It's not the Aborigines, it's outside people. They don't want mining in the park but the government has catered for it by including it in the Plan of Management (for Kakadu National Park). I suppose there's stirrers - that's just a suspicion."

NCL chairman Blitner said that Parks and Wildlife director, Chris Haynes, Kakadu ranger Dan Gillespie, along with Gagudju Association advisor David Linder had swayed Aboriginal opinion against the project and had been those stirruping opposition. Mick Alderson said, however, that the three attended the May 27 meeting at the invitation of the traditional owners at Kakadu and the NLC had been told of the invitation well before the meeting. The traditional owners were angered by suggestions that they had been manipulated into reaching their decision not to negotiate.

Linder who has lived in the Northern Territory for nearly 20 years, is critical of the NLC's handling of its responsibility to consult with the Aborigines in the park area. They've decided mining is good for Aboriginal people, regardless of what an individual group thinks. They've given way to coercion from non-Aboriginal interests - the federal government and the NT government and mining companies involved... I'm nowhere satisfied with the way they do it - the traditional owners are not satisfied. The whole thrust has been to get the mining going. The entire process of consultation, as carried out by the NLC, was an exercise in futility. Their whole comprehension is very limited - they have no real perspective."
Senator Susan Ryan, Shadow Minister for Aboriginal Affairs believes the NLC should educate the Aborigines in the Alligator Rivers region beyond the project being considered. "I don't believe the Aboriginal communities are getting any such information. I don't think anyone is making an effort to bring that information to Aborigines. I think it should be up to the NLC - the government isn't going to do it."

What the traditional owners are being told is that the mines will be safe, that there will be no releases of contaminants in their rivers and streams and that the wildlife and vegetation will not be affected by the mining. Denison Mines and the NT Department of Education has produced a booklet designed to get over this message. It is a story being told throughout the world where natural resources are being found on the traditional lands of indigenous peoples.

During the early 1950s in the southwestern region of the United States, uranium was mined under the secretive authority of the US Atomic Energy Commission for the nation's nuclear bomb testing programme. The AEC was created in 1946 to develop "peaceful" uses of atomic energy, while continuing its role into weapons research. With the AEC charged with both the promotion and regulation of the nuclear industry the deleterious effects of breathing radon gas in the mines - though documented at the time - were made known neither to the public nor the uranium miners. Today, the consequences of that policy of withholding information is becoming tragically evident with the gruesome documentation of the deaths of some of those miners.

It has been argued that the mistakes of the 1950s were made because of ignorance of the health hazard of continued exposure to radon and other radioactive gases and particles. Today though, no such claim can be made. The mistakes of the past continue to haunt present generations and in fact continue to be made. The Fox report, in discussing the chances of the release of radioactive and other contaminants from the Ranger mine, stated, "We conclude from the evidence that the tailings dam would be a competently designed structure with margins of safety common to similar water-retaining structures built throughout the world. Just two years after the Fox Commission an estimated 100 million gallons of radioactive liquids spilled when an earthen tailings dam ruptured at United Nuclear Corporation's Churchrock uranium mill in New Mexico. The spill contaminated a 130 km stretch of the Puerco River, regularly used by Navajo living in the area. The dam that failed was similar in design to the one at the Ranger mine and had been in use just two years when it collapsed.

For the Navajo, cancer is a disease foreign to their experience. Dr. Joseph Wagener, a US Public Health Service epidemiologist, has noted that there is solid evidence of the danger to health from uranium mining. "I am concerned about what we are going to do for those individuals who have been diseased due to our past failures and who will continue to be diseased...Since we have clear health risks from underground uranium mining, and since we have not resolved how to safely dispose of the radioactive waste generated in uranium production, it would seem to me... that we concern ourselves with correcting past mistakes and not extend these any further into the future."

Whether Aborigines in the Northern Territory are made aware of the mistakes of the past to help them evaluate future project proposals will hinge largely on the NLC's performance. With applications for exploration leases now banked up at NLC, Aborigines will remain under pressure to accept mining on their traditional land. Susan Ryan said recently, "I think the NLC assumed mining and I don't think they ought to. They have a responsibility to say no if that's what the traditional owners want. Their responsibility is to support the traditional owners' decision and not to try and change their view."
Postscript

Since this part of Phil Niklaus' article was first published in February 1983 there have been some developments in the issues he raised:

On March 4 the Northern Territory government lifted the 4½ year freeze on all land under Aboriginal claims. This act would open the way for further Territory land to be made available for exploration and mining. The freeze has been lifted with the condition that a licence can be refused if the Land Commissioner recommends a claim be granted.

During a visit to the Northern Territory by Clyde Holding, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in the new federal Labour Government, it was announced that moves were afoot to widen the NT Land Rights Act to allow Aboriginals to seek excisions from pastoral leases. Under the existing law pastoral land is considered alienated. This announcement formally buries the former government's proposals to place restrictions on claims made.

The Ranger uranium mine on Aboriginal land is producing a hefty profit margin with the first half of this year well above the $24 million mark. On the other hand the Jabiluka project is under some difficulty. The new Federal Government has withdrawn export negotiating licences while it sorts out its policy on uranium mines. Pancontinental have thus had to shelve plans for developing the mine until the end of the year.

Negotiations were recently resumed about the Koongarra project. Denison offered financial incentives to the Aboriginal owners and tried negotiations in December 1983. There was still opposition to negotiations by the owners. Whereas originally any opposition to negotiations was considered a veto, the Aboriginal Land Commissioner, the Northern Land Council and the old federal government said that a majority decision would be sufficient to decide the issue. The NT Supreme Court similarly rejected the veto principle of traditional decision making in March. The new Labour federal Government's freeze on uranium export licences has delayed the go-ahead for negotiations and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs has asked the Koongarra people not to sign a contract with Denison until these policies are worked out.

It now appears that the Government will have to address itself to the question of compensation for the Aboriginal owners who will be financially disadvantaged if the mine does not go ahead. It is not that they want the uranium mined, rather they want money to develop their community. Although Holding is supposed to have ruled out compensation payments, it seems he is thinking about providing more housing and education services. Some Labour ministers in Canberra want to make the Koongarra mine less of a possibility by legislating to return the excised areas back under the protection of the National Park and Wildlife provisions.

The federal Government will also need to look closely at the workings of the Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976 to ensure that traditional owners are given protection from the mining companies and to provide the Land Councils with sufficient funds so they have no need to encourage mining to keep their funding levels up.

Source for Postscript: Aboriginal Land Rights Support Group Newsletter.
BOLIVIA: NEW INDIGENOUS PUBLICATION - CHITAKOLLA

IWGIA warmly welcomes a new indigenous publication. It is called Boletín Chitakolla, and its first number has just appeared in October of this year.

Boletín Chitakolla is a monthly publication produced by the Centro de Formación e Investigación sobre las Culturas Indias, a private group, recently formed, consisting of professionals, students and volunteers of Indian origin, who are seeking to revitalise the different aspects of the Aymara, Quechua and Tupi-Guarani culture. Among the objectives of the Centro are:

- to contribute concrete aid to Indian researchers both through the setting up of a culture committee, a publication team and the provision of technical means for carrying out investigations,
- the promotion of initiatives directed to the cultural revitalisation of the Indian people and both promotion and assistance for the creation of schools in the countryside. For this meetings in the Ayllus and Communities of the country will be arranged,
- for the training of promoters of culture courses will be arranged in La Paz centring around the Indian people's own economic and social institutions (Ayllu, Mink'a, etc.), around the national and international situation and around mechanisms of self-determined revitalisation of the Ayllus and Communities.

In this first number of the Boletín Chitakolla there is also set out a list of the reasons why the Centro has been created:

"The activities of the Centro and the work of dissemination which the Boletín will do comes to fill a vacuum within the Indian movement in Kollasuyu-Bolivia. Over more than 20 years the political scene has changed owing to the appearance of Indian groups. At first they were viewed with curiosity and undue suspicion, and then they were attacked with vehemence. Today we can affirm that their existence is well proven, whether it be on a really political level, in the sindical field or in that of cultural activity. In this sense, it was the most radical Indian groups who served to advance this process. Obviously there were also others who suffered more from the effects of the resistance and oppression of interested parties who wanted to keep the Indian people down.

"Nevertheless there has been a considerable advance. From only 20 years ago until today there have been many changes. In spite of the continued existence of discrimination against the Indian whereby their culture continues to be denied and oppressed, and in spite of the fact that in the end there are not even available political mechanisms to give value to their identity as a people, nevertheless, the Indian people today have the historic possibility of fulfilling their process of emancipation. The ground is ready for multiple action from the diverse Indian and existing peasant groups, for political pressure from the most radical organisations and for permanent action from members of Parliament who are Indian and peasant, in the hostile environment controlled by the dominant culture of the National Parliament. Proof of this advance is the recent decision of the Government to legalise the teaching of Aymara, Quechua and other representative Indian languages in schools, to be made public at the beginning of the next school year (1984).

Up to now there has been no research dedicated entirely to the liberation of the Indian people. For this to happen there must be researchers of Indian origin, but this is not sufficient, they must be researchers who will conscientiously put their knowledge to the service of the people; in addition their methods and concepts must not be in contradiction with the objective and subjective world of the Indian people."
Without denigrating the "scientific" value of many researchers and institutions, it is undeniable that their conscious or unconscious political objectives are not those of the people whom they study. In short, the research and study of our reality can only be valid if it is oriented to the revitalisation of our own united civilisation. It is impossible to put up with western scientism because, actually, in those very western countries scientific systems (and the notion of "science" which they created) is in crisis and dispute. How can we allow here the survival of something which is dying out in its own country of origin - especially as we have the experience of another model of civilisation. Will we be able to denigrate our own knowledge when the western countries are seeking to preserve alive their systems which are disintegrating daily? Authenticity and independence from western models must be the principle for a researcher at the service of the people."

BRAZIL: MARIO JURUNA

Part I

Introduction

On November 15th 1982, Mario Juruna, ex-cacique of the Xavante, made history by being elected a federal representative (diputado) in Rio de Janeiro. This made him the first indigenous diputado in Brazilian history.

The author of this paper presents an account covering the significance and political acts of Mario Juruna and is based, mainly, on material published in Brazil by people and organisations involved in the struggle for the defence of indigenous people's rights.

The first part contains information about indigenous participation in the elections of November 1982, then about the candidature of Mario Juruna and the diverse reactions it caused. The second part deals with the acts of Mario Juruna as a diputado and his work within the Brazilian Congress. Then follow accounts of his first victories and finally the attempt to dismiss him sought by eleven ministers and supported by the President of the Republic. This attempt was, nevertheless, foiled as a result of a massive national and international protest.

At 42 Juruna has had much experience in the struggle for the defence of indigenous interests and is connected with the movement for a national autonomous organisation for Brazilian Indians. Juruna also has an important role in the international indigenous movement and back in 1980 chaired the Fourth Russell Tribunal on Human Rights in Rotterdam, Holland. He attended only after great national and international protest against the Brazilian government's ban on his participation.

In just a year since entering the House of Representatives, (Câmara de Diputados), Juruna has drawn out clearly his political position continuing at the same time as his
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ever more increasing work with the organisation of indigenous peoples. Indeed, taking into account the diversity of opinions which indigenous participation in the elections generally, and Mario Juruna in particular have caused, this new phase in the indigenous struggle in Brazil has led in less than a year to real and positive changes for the indigenous peoples of Brazil.

Indigenous participation in the elections

A little more than 20 years ago the indigenous peoples of Brazil were denied the right to vote and were erased from the electoral register by zealous officials of the now extinct Servicio de Protección Indio (SPI)\(^1\), who were afraid to see the Indians politically manipulated.

Now, according to statistics made by União das Nações Indígenas (UNI) on the participation of the Indians in the elections of November 1982, the voting numbers of indigenous people were 20,000 concentrated mainly in the Matto Grosso and Amazonas zones. There were 15 indigenous people up for election, the majority of whom tried for positions in small municipal councils. The exceptions were the Terena, Jair de Oliveira, in Aquidauana (South Matto Grosso) and Geraldo Coco (Amazonas) from the PDS (Social Democratic Party) and Mario Juruna in Rio de Janeiro for the PDT (Workers Democratic Party).

\(^1\) SPI, founded in 1910 was dissolved in 1967 in the light of the Figueredo Report (Figuereido - the then Minister of Justice whom the Ministry of the Interior had commissioned to make the report) contained no less than 5,000 pages. The document fully described the corruption of SPI officials and all types of offences committed against the Brazilian Indians such as forced resettlements and evacuations (to open out the initial colonisation of the Amazon), forced labour, poisoning of populations etc... The same year FUNAI was founded - the present national organisation for the protection of the Indians - replacing SPI and remaining similarly under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Interior.

Mario Juruna attending the IV Russell Tribunal, Rotterdam, 1980 (Photo Jørgen Brøchner Jørgensen)
According to João Pacheco de Oliveira, Filho,¹ the number of Indian candidates in the last elections can be seen, in principle, as high, indicating a greater interest on the part of the indigenous people in using the institutions and political opportunities opened by Whites in order to defend their communities. But the actual results are deceptive: only two Indian candidates had a victory confirmed, Geraldo Coco and Mario Juruna (and only the latter in the House of Representatives).

The elections, indicates João Pacheco, may help to show that in the area of political parties, Indians and Whites speak very different languages and translation from one to another can be very difficult. Ties to party machinery, he continues, can in some cases superimpose themselves on top of internal divisions of an ethnic group (kinship, religion, political status etc.) causing local groups to acquire dimensions which cannot be grasped by party programmes.

Divisions over different political parties have arisen between different indigenous communities with members joining or supporting various political parties. According to the Bulletin for the Ecumenical Centre for Documentation and Information (CEDI) of April 1983, Indians, as the rest of the Brazilians, are divided into preferences for the following parties: PDA, PDT and PMDB (Democratic Movement Party of Brazil).

On the other hand, it is possible to say that the political parties of the Whites have no clear stance on the indigenous question. The PDT, for example, says João Pacheco, mentions the indigenous problem in its programme, but all concrete knowledge on this theme is entirely dependent on Mario Juruna. While the PMDB has among its members people who have lived in the Tikuna Indians of Alto Solimões and is the author of the thesis "As Façães e a Ordem Política em uma Reserva Tikuna", he is currently preparing his doctoral thesis.

spoken out in defence of the Indians (as in the case of ex-diputado Modesto da Silveira), it has also contained others who have repeatedly assumed an anti-indigenous position.

The Candidature of Mario Juruna

Aware that the great majority of his electorate were White, Juruna carried out his electoral campaign in the suburbs and outskirts of the area south of Rio. In one of his election addresses, Juruna assured that being elected he would fight "alongside those who were not Indians such as Blacks or poor Whites". He said, "I know them well because I have lived like them... I am going to fight for the right of a worker to a wage, for Indian ownership of his land who is also a child of God."

During his candidacy, Juruna affirmed that he was not ignorant of the ways of national politics, as well as the fact that he had left his tribe to fight on behalf of the Indians and had already seen, with a few exceptions, enough not to have illusions about White people.

One of the projects within Mario Juruna's programme which was announced during the elections, included the production of a full study on the indigenous population of the country and of the lands of indigenous peoples which had been robbed or illegally occupied. At the same time, there would be a study on the policies of FUNAI towards indigenous peoples of Brazil, and finally a project, according to which FUNAI ought to pass under the direct jurisdiction of the Republic or the National Security Council.

The candidature of Mario Juruna was the object of some dissent among some xavante caciques. The cacique Narodi of the Xavante reserve Pimentel Barbosa, for example, supported by cacique Gabriel from the reserve of Kuluene, said that Mario Juruna did not represent his community nor the Xavante people. Besides this, the cacique Aniceto from the San Marcos reserve accused the leadership of FUNAI of trying to turn the Xavante
against Mario Juruna. In contrast to Warodi and Gabriel, Aniceto said that the Xavante people supported the candidature of Juruna because he was going to fight for Indian rights. To demonstrate the Xavante support for Juruna, Aniceto affirmed that he would travel to Rio de Janeiro to help Juruna in his electoral campaign.

The candidature of Juruna also gave rise to full discussions between anthropologists, missionaries and organisations connected with the indigenous cause over the participation of Indians in Brazilian politics. The Secretary-General of the Indigenist Missionary Council (CIMI), for example, is against the political participation of Indians, fearing that it might be an obstacle in the liberation of their lands. The anthropologists Roberto Cardoso de Oliveira and João Facheco de Oliveira, Filho, are, on the other hand, favourable to participation reasoning that it is a means whereby Indians can defend their own interests. Everyone appears to agree, nevertheless, that Mario Juruna, first with his candidature and later through his political action, has raised the struggle to the highest level and increased the organisation of Brazilian indigenous peoples.

With the election of Mario Juruna as Federal diputado in the November 1982 elections, a new phase opened up in Brazil in which the indigenous peoples would not need, in the words of José Frejat, Federal diputado, "poverty of being led by a group of military men who do not understand the indigenous problem in any form". This opinion was justified in looking at the Minister of Aeronautics, Délio Jardim de Mattos, who criticised openly the people who voted for "such a tamed Indian" - referring to Juruna. Mario Juruna replied to the Minister in the following terms: "Sr. Ministro, to obtain the position of diputado I have needed popular support from more than 80,000 voters. I ask how many votes elected you, Sr. Ministro? I would also like to know if it is within the competence of your Ministry to settle or give an opinion on the civil and political rights of the Indians... I was elected by the people and not with the support of the authorities. And speaking of authorities, of those you have under your power, would you please take steps to deal with airforce colonels in FUNAI such as Leal, Zanoni or Barbetta. Tell them not to upset the lives of Indians and to respect them as human beings. And make them understand that FUNAI exists to defend Indians not to persecute them... The only thing in which I am in total agreement with you is that I was elected to aggravate you: I was elected to defend a people, the Brazilian people."

1. The Brazilian constitution is based on that of the United States. There is a federal government and legislative power is exercised by a House of Representatives (Câmara de Deputados) and by a federal Senate. The federal Senate consists of two representatives from each state elected by direct suffrage for 8 years. The House of Representatives has 280 members elected for 4 years. The federal districts are not represented either by the House or the Senate. The President and Vice-President are elected by an electoral college, and not by popular vote, for a period of 6 years. Since the constitutional reforms of 1967, the President has control over all aspects of federal government, authority to intervene in any of the 21 states without consulting Congress and the right to declare Martial Law or rule by Decree. Since April 1964, when military leaders deposed the leftist government of João Goulart, the army has controlled the country and political machinery.

2. Colonel Ivan Zanoni Hausen, responsible for the advising of enquiries and studies of FUNAI, was the person who in March 82 wanted to apply the biological criterion of blood type in indigenous populations and establish their identity with the aim of verifying whether the demands of the Indians to FUNAI were (ethnically) justified. (For more information on this theme, see IWGIA Newsletter No.31-32, June-October, 1982.)
Part II

Juruna rocks the Congress

One of the most resonant political acts of Juruna has been the speech he delivered on 19 April 1983 during the special sitting in respect for the "Day of the Indian in Brazil", in the federal House in Brasilia.

During the speech Juruna was interrupted with great waves of applause no less than 26 times. The public who had packed the corridors and the diputados present showed in this way their support for Juruna's words. We transcribe here an account of some excerpts from the speech.

"When I entered politics there were many people who spoke against me saying, 'What can Juruna do in the House? What can he solve as an Indian? How can an Indian represent Indians?' I would like to know what White man represents here in Brazil." (Applause) "I am the first Indian, the first fruit of the nation who is representing the Brazilian Indian; because the Government of Brazil gives no opportunities to the Indian and wants to continue protecting the life of the Indian. And we the Indians, we do not want to be protected, treated like children, we are responsible, we are people, we are conscious, we are human beings." (Applause)

"In Brazil there is misery, in Brazil there is inflation, in Brazil there is hunger because here we have no people with capacity, because here the Government is compromised to its own interests." (Applause) "They ought to be people who think like Brazilians, they ought to be people elected by the people. The Government of the Republic and the Federal Government cannot be led by only one person. The President of the Republic should be elected by the Brazilian People." (Applause)

"Because the President is responsible for the nation, the President is judge of the people, the President is the peace of the people and the peace of Brazil. And now, how is the President and what has happened to the peace of the people?

Here the people have no peace, no!" (Applause) For what reason do the people continue to be hungry, for what reason are the people now living with inflation, for what reason are the people lacking basic necessities, because the President is not one of the People...The President was elected as a showpiece. The President is in the hands of the multinationals, with the colonists; with the businessmen, with big companies...Here the people are dying of hunger, why? All authority is bought all authority is sold, authority wants money, it wants to make money." (Applause) "The people want to have direct elections, elections of the people, free elections, elections of liberty."

"Who is bringing inflation and hunger - the Government itself: the military, the federal police, the State government, the regional government."

"As for the problem between FUNAI and the Indians; how is it that FUNAI, the national organisation for protecting the Indian is allowing the Indian to die of hunger? How is it that FUNAI is allowing colonists to take away the lands of the Indians? ...and, even so, it is the military who is against the Indian, it is the military who are against the Indian, it is FUNAI who are against the Indian, not colonists, not the poor white farmers." (Applause) "And FUNAI is finishing off the Indian, killing off the Indian."

"I want us all to think together. We are going to change the Brazilian regime. We are going to change our mentality. We are going to look for our inspiration...Brazil is very big and has many people who need land. I want to ask the President of the House that we should think together to reform our Brazil. We will divide the land, some for colonists, some for poor whites and land for the Indian. Many thanks companions." (Prolonged applause)
The first victories

The first success of Mario Juruna in the Câmara de Diputados was the creation of the Indian Commission, an organisation which was made official through Resolution No. 15/83 of 6 May 1983. The second success came soon after on the 18 May, when the Commission of Constitution and Justice of the House approved a legal project, presented by Juruna, changing the composition of the directive of FUNAI. According to this project, FUNAI would become administered by a main Council, composed of people elected by indigenous communities and well-versed in the Indian situation in Brazil. The project would approve also, the creation of an Indigenous Council made up of 5 indigenous leaders, to supervise the acts of the new main Council of FUNAI, as well as the creation of other indigenous Councils at a regional level, also made up of 5 indigenous people, with the aim of supervising the regional delegations of FUNAI.

a) The Indian Commission

The permanent Commissions of the Câmara de Diputados and also of the Senate, are groups who prepare and inform on the legislative process. Whatever project, before being voted on in full session, should be submitted to the appraisal of these commissions. The Commission of Constitution and Justice, for example, ought to give its evaluation on the scientific and technological aspects of the proposals brought before its scrutiny.

With the creation of the Indian Commission, the Câmara de Diputados has 19 permanent commissions. There also exist temporary commissions which work for a determined period and which are dissolved when it is considered that the subjects dealt with in them have been completed.

The fact that a project has been approved by a permanent commission is no absolute guarantee of its approval in full session, according to an article by Antonio Carlos Queiroz in Porantim, Nos.52/53, 1983. This is because legislative power in Brazil is tightly controlled by the structure of the military regime. Nevertheless one should not forget, says the article, that the permanent commissions, even though limited in their power of action, can debate popular causes within their workings. For example, in the case of the Indian Commission: if there were to occur an invasion of indigenous lands by a road constructor, the Commission would be able to call not only the highest functionaries of FUNAI, but also the management of the construction company and even more important, could call representatives of the indigenous communities affected to present their denunciations.

Within the sphere of the Indian Commission is the ability to give opinions on help to the Indian, on related organisations with indigenous interests, and on the relations between the Indian and society. At the same time, the Commission ought, in collaboration with the rest of the Câmara's commissions 1) receive and investigate denunciations on subjects of indigenous interest, 2) to put forward legislative means in defence of the Indian and of the ecology of indigenous reserves, and 3) to investigate the carrying out of legislation in defence of the Indian.

On September 15th Juruna was elected, with 21 votes out of 25, President of the Indian Commission. As Vice-Presidents the diputados Alcides Lima and Ricardo Ribeiro were elected.

The installation of the Indian Commission under the presidency of Mario Juruna within the state political machinery, has generated distinct points of view. It has been put forward, for example, that the presence of the Commission is owing entirely to the presence of Juruna in the Câmara for he fought for its creation and installation. If Juruna had not won the post of diputado the Indian Commission would not exist. Others fear the procrastination of parliamentary machinery, and even worse, the fact that the Government party, in spite of holding less than half of the diputado seats in
the Commission, has among their number some known enemies of the indigenous cause.

Antonio C. Moura, editor of Porantim, puts these differences in broader terms: the resistance of indigenous peoples, based on specific struggles, was that which forged the organisation today responsible for the growth of the indigenous question within the political framework of the country.

b) Juruna's project on FUNAI

Before being voted on in full session, Juruna's project for changing the directive structure of FUNAI will have to be examined by the Interior Commission of the Câmaras de Diputados.

According to A. Carlos Queiroz, the most likely thing is that the project be shelved for there are no indications for believing that the military regime would be disposed to opening the protecting hand which it holds over the indigenous communities, above all now, when the Decree 88.118 has definitively shifted the question of indigenous land demands to the National Security Council.

It is without doubt that Mario Juruna has been continually developing his thought on the indigenous question in Brazil, but not all of his ideas on this issue are accepted with the same conviction. Here follow some of the statements made by Juruna in connection with the project to modify the directive of FUNAI:

"With the proposed alteration, there would be created new aspects of integration among Brazilian Indians and non-Indians... The solidarity and participation which are characteristics of both communities can represent one road which may instil more understanding between them."

"The aspirations of indigenous communities are not just those dealing with basic necessities. Among aspirations on the highest level can be found a compatibility which is bit by bit relating both indigenous communities and all Brazilians, stimulating the development of the communities, of their integration and of Brazil, Fatherland of us all."

Xavantes invade and change the FUNAI directive

On the morning of June 23, 14 Xavante Indians occupied the seat of FUNAI in Brasilia. The occupation, which lasted 3 hours, was announced on the previous evening to journalists by Mario Juruna, who accompanied by 5 other deputies, supported the Xavante demands by his presence.

In the absence of the President of FUNAI, Colonel Paulo Leal, the Xavante presented their demands to the Chief of the Board, Colonel Ivan Tancredo: immediate dismissal of all the directive of FUNAI, especially of Colonels Ivan dienoni Hausen (mentioned above), Anael Gonçalves (advisor) and Roberto Garayns (Head of the Operations Department). Once they had presented their petition, the Xavante threw out Colonel Ivan Tancredo from the FUNAI offices.

Four days after the occupation, the President of FUNAI categorically assured the world that none of the dismissals sought by the Xavante would be carried out: "In FUNAI I am in charge" he said. Nevertheless the President of Brazil, General Figueiredo, was not, this time, of the same opinion as Leal. Some days later, Figueiredo ordered the Minister of the Interior, Mario Andreazza, to ensure that all the FUNAI colonels be dismissed by Leal, whose position would be safe. In the case of the President of FUNAI finding himself unable to dismiss his staff, continued Figueiredo, Leal ought to present his resignation. A few days later on July 7, Colonel Leal handed his post over to a civilian, Otávio Ferreira Lima.

The economist Otávio Ferreira Lima has had two years experience in FUNAI where he worked as superintendent during the administration of Nobre da Veiga (predecessor of Leal). Asked who was going to replace the colonels, Ferreira replied that he would prefer to work with "people from inside".
One of the new co-workers of the new FUNAI President was, for example, the official Lamartine, who during his experience in FUNAI's work, was responsible for the application of World Bank funds, channelled through FUNAI destined for the demarcation of Nambikwara reserves divided by the Guibá–Porto Velho Highway (BR-364)\(^1\), which was asphalted with the Bank's funds. The demarcation of these indigenous areas has still not been completed which has provoked problems between the World Bank and FUNAI.\(^2\)

About the new President of FUNAI, Paulo Suess comments in an editorial of Porantim that if the new President insists on not demarcating indigenous lands and makes his staff entirely of "insiders", he will soon be an ex-President. The Presidents of FUNAI, he says, are like those of Bolivia, a phenomenon of short duration.\(^3\)

**Government seeks the dismissal of Juruna**

Invoking article 35 of the federal constitution, which states that a senator or diputado should lose his mandate if his behaviour is incompatible with parliamentary dignity, 11 ministers sought on 29 September the dismissal of Juruna. The cause was the speech which Juruna had delivered some days previously before a full House, considered offensive to the honour of the President of the Republic and two Ministers of State whom Juruna had called "robbers".

The words used by Juruna were spoken at the end of his speech, when, spirited, he denounced the violence which had been committed some days earlier on the Pataxó Hã-Hã-Hãe in the

---

1. See the article "Murdering Roads" published in IWGIA Newsletter No.34, July 1983 on the consequences of the construction of this Highway on the Nambikwara.

2. The demarcation of the Nambikwara reserves was a prerequisite of the World Bank granting the Brazilian Government the necessary credit for the construction of the Highway.

3. In the 15 years of its existence, FUNAI has had 7 Presidents.

---

The loss of Juruna's mandate, sought by almost all the ministers pulled upon it an avalanche of protest as much from international sources as from Brasil itself. The President of the Congress, Senator Nil Coelho, showed himself moved by the international response to Juruna's case, admitting that he had received telephone calls from distant countries demonstrating solidarity with Juruna and asking for the problem to be solved favourably.

The Câmara de Deputados did not listen to the pleas of the Government and refused to impose any sanction on Juruna whatsoever which was not symbolic. Legislative power and the Xavante diputado, were supported unanimously by the people and by public opinion. Mario Juruna continues with his mandate.

**Sources:** Various articles and notices from:

- *Aconteceu* Nos. April 1981, April 1983

---
need to be improved but the real problem here is lack of funds. The task of remedying these problems will be taken on by the Comissão Coordenadora Nacional.

The tasks of the Commission will be various. They will have to establish a line of communication where the Boletín organisers can receive and distribute information; push the indigenous leaders of the communities to participate in the national meetings of UNI; defend the interests of all the communities from threats; liaise with Mario Juruna in the Congresso Nacional; inform FUNAI of the situation of the indigenous peoples in Brazil and work out ways to help community problems and also fight to be recognised legally along with other Government Indian Institutions.

One aspect of UNI is its relationship to any other smaller indigenous organisation in Brazil. There is in fact an autonomous organisation of the Xavante who are doing important work with their communities. UNI supports the work of such organisations; their aims and objectives are all part of the same struggle. The Xavante organisation has managed to do much for its people; we wish UNI similar successes.

UNI has representatives in six regions (Centro-Oeste, Central, Norte 1, Norte 2, Nordeste and Sudeste). Their mailing address is:

União das Nações Indígenas,
Rua Calubí 126, Perdizes
05010 São Paulo, SP, Brasil.
BRAZIL: JAVAÊ FACE PROBLEMS ON ALL SIDES

The Javaê people who live in the village of Bôto Velho (Cristalândia, Goiás) are facing a barrage of problems which threaten their economy, society and traditional way of life. These threats, such as colonists, tourism, new roads, lack of government support and recalcitrant bureaucracy are by no means unique in Brazil but in the Javaê case they are particularly acute. INCIA has received from Comissão Pro-Indio de São Paulo and União das Nações Indígenas a report by André Amaral de Taral and Marcus Rezende Maia which describes in detail the present situation of the Javaê.

The Javaê are one of three Karajá (Macro-Jê) groups in the Araguaia region of Brazil (Javaê, Xambioá and Karajá). Of these the Javaê have had the least contact with wider Brazilian society. This is because traditionally they inhabited the interior of the area known as Ilha do Bananal. Gradually during this century incursions into the region by miners and colonists have brought familiar problems. Since 1940 the Javaê has suffered a loss of half of its population as a result of disease and illness.

The Javaê economy is based around cultivation and fishing, both of which are threatened. The area near Bôto Velho is of great religious and ritual importance. Three depressions in the ground near the fields mark the point of mythical origin for the Javaê and Karajá peoples. The continuity of the Iyê (indigenous name for the Javaê) people rests in the secret of the House of Masks. The ritual ceremonies of the Javaê wearing elaborate masks is an essential aspect of their cultural reproduction. This aspect of their life is also under threat.

In 1960 an Indian Post was set up at Canoã which attracted Javaê from the whole region on account of medical supplies, and the fear of incursions from colonists in their traditional villages. The Javaê from Bôto Velho moved there in 1973 after threats from colonist fishermen, cattle ranchers and the organisation Instituto Brasileiro de Desenvolvimento Florestal (IBDF) which wanted to develop the area for colonists.

The Javaê from Bôto Velho remained in Canoã until 1979 when tensions between the various groups there in addition to the rather hierarchical organisation led them to return to their original dwellings. When the Javaê reached their old lands they found them occupied by cattle ranchers and the IBDF were interested in the area. They were hindered from their fishing and attempts were made to send them back to the Indian Post. It is also important to realise that 11 Javaê had never gone to the Indian Post but had always maintained a presence in their original community.

The interest of the IBDF became a direct incursion after a deal of compensation for the IBDF in 1980. In order to understand this deal we have to look into the history of the two National Parks in the area. In 1959 the IBDF set up a reserve called the Parque Nacional do Araguaia (PNA) which was to be an ecological reserve destined for development. The other park Parque Indígena do Araguaiá (POARA) was set up in 1971. When the two parks had been created there remained two main problems. First was how to reconcile the presence of a few Karajá groups with the aims of the ecological reserve, and secondly how to cope with one village (Macaúba) which was situated within the PNA.

The 1980 agreement between the two parks resulted in a shift of the boundaries whereby Macaúba was included within the Indigenous Park. However to compensate for this the IBDF were given an extension of their area - an extension in which lies the village of Bôto Velho. The decision to place the Javaê within the PNA under the jurisdiction of the IBDF led to five visits to Brasilia in three years to plead for a reverse of the decision. In March of this year the President of FUNAI (Coronel Leal) said that the issue didn't affect his organisation and that the Javaê should move themselves in the Indigenous Park. "Over our dead bodies!" said the Javaê.
The Javaé enlisted the help of Mario Juruna who protested to FUNAI about their inability to recognise the Javaé claim. FUNAI's response was to try and put more pressure on the Javaé to leave the area where they had lived since the 18th century. The reason why the Javaé are disturbed by the jurisdiction of the IBDF is that in their national park all fishing is prohibited whether for professional or subsistence purposes. This was one of the problems with the Karajá of Macaúba. On the other hand reports of cattle ranchers in the area are increasing and the IBDF appears more reluctant to deal with these real threats to the ecology of the region.

The repercussions of losing their position in the Araguaia Indigenous Park has been severe for the Javaé of Boto Velho. They have received no support or assistance from FUNAI. They lack medical attention, educational facilities and their lands (within the ecological reserve) are being taken over by illegal professional fishermen, cattle ranchers and tourists who visit the lakes of the park during summer. In addition there is the problem of alcohol which is illegally but freely sold to the indigenous peoples with the predictable deleterious exploitative affects.

We noted earlier the importance of the House of Masks for traditional Javaé ritual. The presence of travellers through the middle of Boto Velho has disrupted the ceremonies of mask dances. There is now a well worn track which divides the village into two cutting straight through the dance area. In an attempt to lessen the danger the Javaé blocked the track with tree trunks to force the vehicles to seek permission before entering the village.

As if these problems were not enough there is another danger threatening the Javaé of Boto Velho. This is the proposed construction of the BR-262 Highway linking Belem with Brasilia which will cut through both National Parks and come close to the Javaé in the disputed area. As soon as the highway had been approved, the IBDF began to construct a toll post to charge passing vehicles money for restoring damage done to the ecological reserve. The Javaé considered that the post was a premature attempt by the IBDF to take over control of the whole region around Boto Velho before a final decision had been reached. In desperation they destroyed the toll post and forced the operators to flee.

During this operation they also forced the engineers demarcating the boundary of the road to move their marking-stakes away from their garden area. The effect of the raising of the earth around the road would be to create a dyke blocking drainage from the fields. This could completely destroy a large proportion of Javaé subsistence crops. The people of Boto Vehlo are aware that it is now impossible to move the Highway away from their area but they would demand that the road be moved 500 metres away from their fields.

In response to this information on 14 September 1983 INGIA sent the following telegram to Otavio Ferrera Lima the new president of FUNAI with the following text:

"INGIA very concerned about present situation of Javaé of Boto Velho in Barreiras Cruz (Município de Cristianandia - GO). INGIA asks FUNAI to support the Javaé in the following claims:
1. To set legal boundaries on their lands
2. To stop using the road which divides their village
3. To re-route the BR-262 by 500 metres
4. To assist the Javaé with medical care, with education, with production of subsistence activities and especially in defence of their land from occupation by settlers from the neighbouring Municípios.

The International Community closely follows the action of FUNAI over the fate of the Javaé."

Sources: Aconteceu, Especial 12 April, 1983
BRAZIL: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES IN DANGER

On November 10th 1983, the President of the Republic of Brazil, João Batista Figueiredo, approved, without listening to the opinion of the National Congress, Decree No. 88.895 which could mean the extinction of indigenous peoples, in particular the Yanomami people of the Roraima territory, in the north of Brazil.

The presidential decree authorises federal, state and private companies to look for minerals in any indigenous area under the jurisdiction of FUNAI. In other words, in future it is not going to be necessary to obtain a presidential decree for each particular case. Various companies have already begun to seek permission for the extraction of minerals in indigenous areas.

The exploration and exploitation of gold and other minerals in the form which has been decreed, could be disastrous for the indigenous population, particularly for the 4,000 Yanomami who live relatively isolated in the mountains of Surucucus, in the north of Brazil. These people live within a fragile biological and cultural equilibrium and run the risk of disappearing in a very short time if they do not receive adequate assistance and protection. The physical condition of the Yanomami prevents them from resisting new illnesses which, inevitably, will take the form of epidemics and which will spread rapidly with the entry of technicians and "garampeiros" (mineral prospectors).

The Decree is also an attack on the continued efforts by the Yanomami to have their territory recognised as an area fundamental to their existence. The region of Roraima should be maintained as an ecological and mineral reserve for the future, giving time to the indigenous peoples from that area to participate in the national community with respect and dignity, and above all in accordance with their wishes.
The decision of the President of Brazil has raised a wave of angry protest both nationally and internationally. Mario Juruna, Xavante diputado has called the Decree "A shot at the heart of the Brazilian Constitution".

IWGIA, joining the international protest has sent the following telegram to these authorities:

Excmo. Sr. João Batista Figueiredo
Gabinete do Presidente
Palacio do Planalto
7000 Brasilia, DF

Excmo. Sr. Mario Andreazza
MD Ministro do Interior
Ministério do Interior
Esplanada dos Ministérios
70054 Brasilia, DF

Excmo. Sr. Otavio Ferreira Lima
Presidente da Fundação Nacional do Indio
STF Trecho 4 - Conj. 750
71120 Brasilia, DF

"IWGIA deeply concerned about consequences of Presidential Decree No. 88.985 of 10 November 1983 Stop We demand you guarantee survival and respect rights of indigenous peoples in areas of mineral extraction Stop Indigenous populations of Brazil particularly Yanomamo people are in no physical condition to resist illnesses which will inevitably be introduced by garampeiros and technical personnel Stop The Yanomamo people are helpless to cope with the consequences of mineral exploration in their territory Stop The International Community watches closely actions of Brazilian authorities regarding indigenous peoples Stop"

International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs - IWGIA 8 December 1983

CISA: NEW PERSPECTIVES ON INDIGENOUS PROBLEMS IN SOUTH AMERICA

In August IWGIA was delighted to welcome the newly elected General Coordinators of the Consejo Indio de Sud America. Asunción Ontiveros Yquilla a Kolla from Argentina and Bernardo Fernandez a Guajira from Venezuela talked about the problems facing indigenous peoples in South America today and how CISA as an organisation should rise to struggle against these injustices.

The two members of the CISA executive had come to Europe to attend the Racism Conference in Geneva and the United Nations Work Group of Indigenous Affairs. They also visited the second regional conference of the Sami in Finland. The principal objective of their visit was however to explain the plans and projects which CISA have for the future and to describe in detail how they see the organisation's role in South America.

In the interview Asunción Ontiveros and Bernardo Fernández looked at the political situation for indigenous peoples in South America using the examples of Peru, Venezuela and Argentina as examples. Asunción described the overall view in the following terms:

"The political struggle of indigenous peoples must take place on various levels and in ways which vary from country to country. One of the most important areas is regional organisations. It is vital to achieve a consolidated base whereby representation of indigenous people's aims and concerns can be put into action. Regional organisations link the communities to the national level. On the national level the struggle must take a different form. In some cases the organisations can work within government institutions. For example in Brazil the election of Mario Juruna has achieved many things for the indigenous peoples there. In Argentina it is hoped that in the October election the indigenous representation on a regional government and national government level will be substantial."
"On the other hand in countries such as Bolivia where indigenous people are in the majority there appears the possibility of carrying on the struggle through the means of indigenous political parties. Apart from these possibilities the struggle for indigenous rights has to consist of constant pressure and agitation on a national and international level. Different countries in South America must obviously demand different strategies in pushing for indigenous rights, this flexibility is bound together by one common aim: the attack of colonialism, racialism and discrimination against indigenous peoples wherever it appears whether from governments of the left or right."

Bernardo Fernandez then gave a brief account of the main problems facing the indigenous people of Venezuela:

"There are 34 indigenous peoples in Venezuela who share many of the problems of peoples from other parts of South America. First there is the problem of land. On May 15 1982 the Venezuelan Government passed a law which recognised the rights to land of some groups, but declared several indigenous peoples of the Orinoco Basin to be "extinct" even though they are alive and well. By doing this the Government could try and avoid granting land rights in areas where they wished to make "developments". In addition there are constant threats from multinational companies seeking coal and radioactive producing materials from areas in the country such as that of the Guajira. It also apparent that those areas where peoples have been declared "extinct" are rich in natural resources eagerly sought after by the multinationals.

"Missionary work has been legalised in Venezuela since 1915 and many Churches are allowed to evangelise and in some cases carry out limited "policing" of the indigenous areas. One of the most worrying developments in recent years has been the work of the New Tribes Mission who using methods of contact similar to the Summer Institute of Linguistics evangelise fervently and with zeal to alter traditional life into their moulds."

"Another particularly grave problem in Venezuela is that of frontier territory. Many indigenous peoples live on the borders of neighbouring countries where they have relatives. The Government is particularly obsessed with security in these regions which makes indigenous demands for land and water rights even more difficult than usual. The increasing narcotic traffic in the areas of indigenous peoples forces them into compromising positions between the state and the traffickers. This provides the state with yet more reasons to deny them basic rights."

"The struggle in Venezuela should work on a national level by means of constant denunciations of government acts in the Congreso Nacional with international backing. Indigenous peoples need to struggle together for the same goals and fight for participation in decisions which will affect their lives."

In contrast, Asunción Ontiveros spoke about the situation in Argentina:

"In Argentina are are thirteen peoples such as the Kolla, Tobas, the Matapos in the jungle region and the Mapuches. The Ministry of Defence has always feared the Mapuchi since their uprising in 1910 and military presence in their areas has often been a problem. Missionaries have also affected the traditional lives of the indigenous peoples. Even though some missions try and teach groups to read and write in their own language for religious purposes, this never appears on a general educational level. Bilingual teaching is not in evidence.

"The struggle in Argentina depends on the elections in October. If a radical party gets in and indigenous people have stood in local, regional and national positions the future of indigenous peoples in Argentina could enter a new era."

The CISA headquarters are in Lima, Peru, and so the conversation moved to that country. Bernardo Fernandez continued:
"In Peru at the moment there are two governments. There is the elected government of President Belaunde, supported in the main by parts of the military. In spite of its moderate appearance to many outside countries it has been responsible for many violations of human rights. Not the least of these has been the support of a second government centred in Ayacucho which rules from the barrels of the guns of the anti-terrorist military units. In Ayacucho the rule of law has been dropped because of the psychological and military war which is being waged against the guerrilla organisation Sendero Luminoso.

The Belaunde Government is suspicious of any organisation with links outside the country. CISA personnel have been threatened and imprisoned by the Government and are constantly being pushed to support Belaunde's actions. CISA is an international organisation and does not consider it is in any position to support the actions of the Belaunde government and its alternative military rule. We do not support terrorist tactics whether from the government or any other organisation.

It is very easy to think that all the problems in Peru centre around warfare in the Highlands. This is an obsession from Western countries in their desire for headlines. However for the indigenous peoples of the Andean region there is another even more imminent problem: climatic extremes. To the north of the country floods have been ravaging the countryside whereas in the southern part of Peru and Bolivia there has been drought. People must understand that natural disasters mean as much to indigenous populations as political ones.

Peru does not solely consist of Highland territory. There is a jungle region which has its own problems. The Government have frozen all land titles and have been encouraging multinationals to enter the area. We in CISA want to support land claims from all groups in the selva of Peru and any other country. One of Belaunde's arguments in recent months has been to call the jungle peoples 'invaders' of the land. Invaders of their own territory!"

Having described an awareness of the range of problems affecting South America Asunción Ontiveros then discussed more the role of CISA.

"We are aware that there are criticisms of CISA but these are invariably the result of misunderstandings as to what we really are trying to do. We are an organisation which brings together on an international level any regional or national indigenous organisation in order to support its struggles and put forward its claims. There have been differences with some groups who wanted their particular peoples to have priority in the struggle for indigenous rights. All indigenous peoples have priority whether they are from highland, lowland or the savanna regions. We do not wish to control organisations, we are here to support them. If they need us we are here.

"CISA's first object is to develop regional and national organisation. Each part of South America is different as we have shown in our examples given above. We want to reflect these diversities and unite them in a common struggle against colonialism and discrimination. We want to travel to the communities with representatives of the regional and national organisations to see for ourselves the problems as they appear to the grass roots. But our role is not to represent specific communities but the regional and organisations of those communities.

"The most important word for our work is 'communication'. Communication must be dynamic, it must be effective and above all it must lead to results. We have a journal Pueblo Indio which we would like to reflect the views and problems of all South American indigenous peoples. We must communicate these ideas and ideas for our common aims and ensure we receive the feedback from the grass roots."
"In addition we have some concrete projects on hand at the moment. We are developing our infrastructure to enable us to be more representative. We also want to increase our representation in countries where CISA has had less impact, such as Chile, Venezuela and particularly Brazil. We want to help consolidate regional and national organisations. In Peru we are planning the construction of the first hospital for indigenous medicine. We want to do more things like this on a practical level.

"CISA's organisation has changed this year. We are new faces and we have new ideas. We want to build on the positive aspects of our past and develop them with a freshness and vitality which will attract more indigenous organisations to come to us for support. We want to develop a complete panorama of South American peoples. But the reality is to get the people interested in us and in our work. Yes we represent many groups but we want to represent all indigenous peoples in South America. To those who want us to be more representative we would say 'well help us to be so'. Communication is a two-way thing. We want to do more so that all indigenous peoples can clarify their objectives, their common goals within the different paths they may each take to achieve those goals. We would like to provide a focus of unity for indigenous peoples of South America."

COLOMBIA: PRESENT SITUATION OF CHOCO COMMUNITIES

A report presented to ONIC (Organización Nacional de Indígenas Colombianas) by the compañeros de Orewa (Organización Embera, Wannana) shows how the Government totally abandons our indigenous brothers and sisters. El Chocó, according to the report has 157 communities in 109 regions and in 21 zones. Its population is 27,010 indigenous people.

Lands and Resources

In El Chocó we need 89 regions recognised as protected by the Government. Of these, only 10 have Executive resolutions; 9 have INCORA resolutions and 5 are under submission, which means that 65 are without protective status. To this it can be added that much land has been handed over to lumber companies such as in Bajo San Juan; land in Ichó and Neguá has been handed over to petroleum companies; lands from Alto Baudó have been used to build the Panamerican Highway; and in Cacaricó and Saligüí peasants and we indigenous people have been thrown out. The colonists do not respect our lands, they fell wood, work mines saying that they are government lands. We therefore demand that within a year a minimum of 20 protected areas be established and means assigned to guarantee the existing protected areas. We demand that the authorities take note of the existing protected areas and legislation for indigenous people. We demand that the concessions to the lumber companies be revoked and that there should be a clarification of the gold mining situation in Dabeira and Alto Andagueda, also that the communities and Regional Organisation should be consulted about the construction of the Panamerican Highway which possibly will pass by way of Nguá in the protected indigenous area of Alto Baudó, in the Cugucho region. We demand that there be an investigation of the "Whites" from Bogotá and Cali who invade our lands, and that there be an investigation of the entry by a petroleum company into the community of Neguá and Ichó on August 18.
Education

In Chocó as in all of Colombia, the existing educational curricula are instruments of cultural domination and means of integration into the dominant society, as we have made clear in different meetings, seminars, courses and congresses. Education by the missionaries, indigenous boarding students, education organised with the vicarships have all shown their lack of results. Our communities have no possibility of reaching secondary education, not to mention university. We have no adequate centres for this and our economic situation does not permit us to travel to the cities.

Schools and Teachers

We have need of 126 schools which are lacking in 65 of our protected areas, and we require 168 teachers. At the moment we count on 31 schools of which 20 are directed by the vicarship of Quibdó and 7 are municipal schools. The schools have 39 teachers, 4 indigenous. We lack 137 teachers of adult literacy, and at present have only 20; this situation forces us to demand of the Government that in 1984 a minimum of 30 posts should be opened for teachers and 20 positions for teachers of literacy to indigenous adults. We demand that Orewa keeps the right of selection and that the supervisors are indigenous. We also demand that the curricula are made in accordance with the law and that the working of the courses be under the responsibility and didactic counsel of Orewa and ONIC. We demand that sufficient teaching material be granted to schools and teachers and that there be financial provision and completion of the Orewa student residence situated in barrio San Vicente.

Health

We indigenous communities of Chocó have come here suffering the deaths of hundreds of compañeros in recent months as a result of various illnesses (yellow fever, tuberculosis and particularly malaria which has taken many victims: 500 dead in 4 months). To look after our situation we rely on 19 promotores de salud, 20 of servicio seccional, one by arrangement and 2 promised. The communities require a minimum of 138 promotores de salud. In the meeting between institutions which we arranged in Quibdó last July, we approved a document in which we indicated the actions to follow and we hope that the Government will bring them about.

Communication

To reach our dwellings and fields we can only go across the rivers with our canoes and poles, for the high cost of motors prevents us from buying them. In addition it adds to our incommunication and the fact that the services provided by State organisations only reach the main settlements, forgetting that the majority of our indigenous people live on the affluents and inlets. We demand on account of this that the Government grants motors for the councils.

Office of Indigenous Affairs

The office of indigenous affairs at Itsamina has not been functioning and so we have had to travel to Bogotá; we hope that a thorough reorganisation be made of this office - its situation, budget, management, personnel etc., and that the director of this office be appointed from a candidate put forward by Orewa and not according to political colouring.

Welfare, Family Well-being, Administrative areas

We hope that the money assigned to these areas is not symbolic and that it is granted in accordance with our needs and in line with a previous study. We hope too that we be informed as to the money which is assigned to us.

Source: Unidad Indígena
COSTA RICA: NORTH AMERICANS SAY THEY OWN TALAMANCA INDIGENOUS RESERVE

The Sociedad Agrícola y Forestal Sixaola Ltd., with North American capital, acquired in 1947, through transactions placed in the Public Register, lands abandoned by the Chiriqui Land Company. 35 years later, they are known by the name Compañía Administradora Comercial Sociedad Anónima, whose representative is William Bonner Bailey. This company has obtained a permit for development from the General Forestal Directive of 40 hectares of forest and has plans in hand to develop 10,000 hectares. These forests have been cared for by the Talamanca people for thousands of years without causing any ecological changes.

We transcribe here the document presented to the Legislative Assembly and the national press by the Talamanca indigenous leadership. It has the full support of ASINDIGENA (Asociación Indígena de Costa Rica) and the World Council of Indigenous Peoples.

"Since time immemorial we, indigenous people, have been the object of the plundering of our lands, of disregard for our basic rights and all manner of abuses within full sight and tolerance of the Government, Legislative Assembly and the Judicial Power. Nevertheless, according to natural law and legitimate right we are the first inhabitants of this continent.

"Any and every time we have tried to defend this right we have become victims. We consider that we are human beings and have the right, at least, to possess land on which we can survive in peace and tranquility. For thousands of years we have lived on these lands of Talamanca and we have survived war with the Spanish and their diseases. Today we have decided to resist whatever foreign force intends to deprive us of our lands.

"Apart from this, the Indigenous Law No. 6172 has been a conquest for us and all indigenous peoples of Costa Rica, and we demand the complete respect and fulfillment of this law.

"Nevertheless, a few days ago (May 24th to be precise) the indigenous people of the communities of this reserve had the surprise and unpleasant news that these lands were not theirs but belonged to a foreign North American company called Administradora Comercial S.A., who have mutilated the land for an area of 10,000 hectares.

"At the same time and without the agreement of the Asociación de Desarrollo Integral de la Reserva Indígena, even less the Committees which exist in the area, the said company brought in lorries, tractors and workers and immediately began to open roads with the object of felling trees for lumber and make money out of them indiscriminately.

"In view of this and seeing the indigenous people so affected by these North American filibusters we immediately began to speak with them about the problem and finding out their aims and objectives we told them to leave within 24 hours and get out of the place. In this way we paralysed the lumber work of this company.

"The company known as Administradora Comercial claimed to have exploited lumber within the indigenous reservation and alleged they had owned the rights for 35 years.

"Nevertheless we indigenous people of Talamanca have acquired this right for many centuries of occupation of the land as the legitimate owners, for which reason we do not recognise enforced foreign rights.

"In the light of what has been written above and noting the statements of the said company to show that these lands had been handed over before the reserve had been created and as they think they have a right, we wish to make very clear the following points:

1. This company has violated the Law of Indigenous Reservations No. 6172 of December 20th 1977.

2. They did not appeal on its publication in the Gaceta Oficial.
3. We indigenous people have lived for centuries on these lands and for this reason we are the legitimate owners.

4. The exploitation of lumber will alter the hydrological and ecological balance and other factors which we are not willing to permit.

For this reason:

1. We demand that the Central Government annuls the concessions given to foreign companies within the reserve.

2. We demand that the institutions of the State investigate these matters and give a judgement with respect to them.

"If there is anything at this time which can be called justice there cannot be said to be social justice in the indigenous reserves which are without permission and which alter social peace in the ethnic social group.

"It is not possible to speak of respecting human rights because this is not even respecting the fundamental rights of a human being, which in this case is the right we all have to live in peace.

Alejandro Swaby Rodriguez: Comité Pro-Defensa Derechos Indígenas de Talamanca

Guillermo Rodríguez Romero: Presidente Asociación, Reserva Indígena de Talamanca

José María Paez Segura: Sindicato Federación de Pequeños Agricultores de Talamanca

Cipriano Mendez: Comité Indígena Pablo Presbere

Severiano Fernández Torres: Asociación de Educadores Indígenas de Talamanca

Felipa Morales Morales: Comité de Artesanos de Talamanca

Donald Rojas Maroto: Presidente Asociación Indígena de Costa Rica

José Carlos Morales: President of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples"

After the presentation of this document the indigenous leadership were received in the Salón de Expresidentes de la Asamblea Legislativa and explained the problem before a sympathetic group of parliamentary diputados, who drew up a telegram for distribution throughout the government offices that they look into the problem and seek immediate action and in addition expressed solidarity with the forthcoming struggle.

The matter was referred to the Comisión de Asuntos Agropecuarios where the diputados were asked to give all the help possible to stop this ecological disaster which was closing in on lands which for thousands of years have belonged to indigenous peoples.

The Comisión de Asuntos Agropecuarios decided to travel to Talamanca to make a verification in the area under discussion.

Source: Boletín de la Asociación Indígena de Costa Rica
Nos. 4/5 Marzo/Abril 1983
EAST TIMOR; NEW INDONESIAN OFFENSIVE CAUSES BLOODBATH

The Armed Forces of Indonesia (ABRI) have launched a new offensive against East Timor during August. This followed the breakdown of a cease-fire signed last March. According to press agency reports from Jakarta, 20,000 troops are being deployed, supported by combat aircraft, helicopters, tanks and a variety of weapons. Timorese refugees from Dili report that Hercules transport aircraft are arriving every two or three days with paratroops and heavy equipment. OV10 Broncos, the counter-insurgency aircraft which caused so much devastation during the aerial bombardments in 1977 and 1978, are in action again and have been seen going on sorties to the eastern part of the country where resistance is particularly strong.

East Timor, which lies off the northeastern tip of Australia, was invaded and annexed by neighbouring Indonesia after the end of Portuguese colonial rule in 1975. Since then the nationalist group, Fretelin, has been waging a war for independence. (See IWGIA Document No.40 East Timor, Indonesia and the Western Democracies.) War, famine and disease have resulted in the deaths of more than 200,000 East Timorese people since the Indonesian invasion of East Timor in 1975.

After a period of two years stalemate a cease fire had been agreed after two formal meetings this year on March 21 and 23 between the Indonesian-appointed Governor of East Timor, Mario Carrascalko, the Military Commander of East Timor Col. Purwanto and the Fretelin Commander Xanana. It was thought in Indonesia that the reports of these meetings gave the impression that Indonesia was acknowledging the continued existence of Fretelin in East Timor. The result was that Colonel Purwanto was dismissed and replaced by Colonel Rudiuto.

In mid-July General Murdani, Commander-in-Chief of the Indonesian Armed Forces visited East Timor with the four top Defence Ministry officials responsible for territorial operations, logistics, social-political affairs and operational activity. A month later General Murdani threatened to wipe out East Timor's Fretelin guerrillas if they ignored his call to surrender. "This time, no more fooling around. We are going to hit them without mercy. If this call goes unheeded, the Government will use its armed forces and all its arsenal to clean up the remnants of Fretelin rebels", Sinar Harapan quoted the General as saying. He set no dead-line for the surrender of Fretelin but sources in New York had evidence that he was planning a final "bloodbath".

Murdani started to subjugate the people of East Timor nearly eight years ago when he commanded the invasion of Dili in December 1975. He has made known his determination to capture Xanana and crush all resistance by October this year, and present this "victory gift" to President Suharto on the 18th anniversary of his coming to power.

Throughout the second half of August the military build up in East Timor continued. Refugees have described seeing waves of paratroopers arriving daily in the capital since mid-August accompanied by tanks, helicopters and planes. Civilian trucks had been commandeered to carry armaments throughout the territory and wounded soldiers arrived "almost daily" at Dili Hospital.

Although there has been no formal declaration of martial law, it has been made clear to the Timorese community that all power would be held by the military from 1st September. On 14th September President Suharto issued an Instruksi Sapu Bersih (Clean sweep instruction) for the elimination of resistance in East Timor. The new Instruction was issued two days after a troop of paracomando soldiers were attacked and killed in Dili by Fretelin forces armed with knives and firearms. By this time 20 battalions had been sent but that further reinforcements of 30 battalions (30,000 men) were to be sent. Military circles were now estimating that the operations in East Timor were costing Indonesia about 1 billion rupiahs a day ($1 million).
Martial law is now particularly stringent with a dusk-to-dawn curfew. The occupation forces have evacuated civilian Indonesians from the capital, Dili, and airlifted alleged guerrilla sympathisers held on off-shore islands to the more distant Bali.

The terrible consequences of the Indonesian offensive on the indigenous people have been vividly described by refugees in Portugal. In retaliation for a Fretillan attack in August when 15 "off-duty" troops were killed, there were reprisals in a village in the southern coastal district of Viqueque where between 200 and 300 women and children have been reported massacred.

In interviews with the Boston Globe, the refugees said they feared renewed food shortages by next January because villagers were being forced to take part in military building projects and could not tend crops. The refugees asked not to be identified because they feared reprisals against their families still in Timor. But their statements were independently corroborated by reports reaching Australia from Catholic Church sources on the island and letters written to Timorese living in Portugal.

Indonesia has made several denials of the events since August but they do say about 10,000 troops are on the island with some increase in military strength. The current operations are only a response to a Fretillan attack launched on August 8 (i.e. that it is not a premeditated Indonesian offensive).

However this ignores some important indications of Indonesia's plans. There was a letter to the Fretillan commander on 25 June saying that a new campaign, Operation Unity would be launched on 17 August unless Fretillan surrendered. This was followed by the July Defence Ministry visit to the island. The strong statement by General Murdani in mid-August quoted above makes no mention of the 8th August incident. If operations were aimed only at the area around Viqueque why would at least the 10,000 if not 20,000 troops be required?

Perhaps the most significant indication of Indonesia's reluctance to expose events on East Timor to the outside world has been the suspension of all International Red Cross (ICRC) activities since early July. The ICRC in Geneva has not yet explained the reasons, but it is well to recall that its activities were suspended in April 1981, just prior to the launching of Operation Security.

Peter Hastings, Foreign Editor of the Sydney Morning Herald (21st September), a commentator who is strongly sympathetic to the present Indonesian government, has offered the following explanation of Jakarta's reticence in being frank about the current developments in East Timor: "General Murdani badly miscalculated the political context by ordering a return to military operations. In doing so, he destroyed the Indonesian reconciliation image at a time when the (Australian) Parliamentary report (on the MP's visit to East Timor in late July 1983) was being presented to Parliament, the Senate Timor committee report was on the point of being released, and the sponsors of the UN East Timor vote were debating their General Assembly tactics in October."

In the United Nations a showdown over East Timor has been avoided by Norway who have produced a formula to give the agenda item a one-year cooling-off period. If the strategy works the issue will be shelved permanently next September. This proposal was a follow up to Secretary-General Perez de Cuellar's decision not to submit an East Timor report to the current 38th Assembly. Norway said they took this stand as a "disinterested party" who had always remained neutral on the issue by abstaining over East Timor since 1976.

Between now and next September the effect of Norway's "conciliatory" role could be felt. The Undersecretary-General
Rafeeuddin Ahmed - the special representative on Southeast Asian humanitarian affairs - will try and reconcile the parties involved in the dispute, enabling the Secretary-General to issue a report hinting - but without saying so directly - that the time has come to delete the East Timor item from the agenda. A motion to that effect then could be introduced in the 39th session's steering committee by an acceptable neutral delegation other than Norway. The assembly plenary almost certainly would accept the committee's recommendation.

However, it has been pointed out recently by Torben Retbøll (Editor of IWGIA Document No.40) in a letter sent to the Far Eastern Economic Review, that the question of East Timor will not be "quietly shelved" by the United Nations General Assembly next year "without a loss of face by any of the protagonists" who would be involved in reconciliation. "Fretillín and the people of East Timor are one of these protagonists, but for them it is not a question of 'loss of face', it is a question of mere physical survival", from a regime which has already wiped out a third of the Timorese population.

Sources:
- Boston Globe: Monday September 26 1983
- Far Eastern Economic Review, October 6, 1983
- Notes on the Current Indonesian Offensive in East Timor, London 30th September 1983
- Sydney Morning Herald, September 21, 1983
- TAPOL Bulletin, No.59 September 1983
- The Age (Melbourne) 18 August 1983 (reference to Sinar Harapan (16 August))
- The Guardian, June 25, 1983

IWGIA intends to produce a document in 1984 dealing with the issues raised in this article in more depth and in a broader context.

EAST TIMOR: RED CROSS EXPULSION TREATENS LIVES OF THOUSANDS

The International Red Cross has recently announced that it has been compelled to suspend its two main activities in East Timor since early July this year: the protection of persons (prison visits) and food and medical relief.

These operations had to be suspended because the ICRC was no longer allowed access "to all the villages where the evaluation of requirements would have had to be made for the subsequent distribution of aid" and because it was not possible to apply the usual ICRC criteria necessary for the provision of aid. The only ICRC activities still in progress are confined to Atauro island, where some 4,000 exiled Timorese prisoners are being held in captivity.

The enforced withdrawal of ICRC operations occurred because of preparations for the resumption of military operations by Indonesia. It places in jeopardy the lives of several hundred thousand East Timorese now confined to the strategic resettlement compounds, many of whom rely heavily on aid. Alarming reports about food conditions in these settlements have been available for some time.

The main reason for the food shortages is that so many Timorese peasants have been forced to abandon large tracts of corn and rice-producing land, to serve Indonesian security objectives of preventing any contact with guerrilla forces operating throughout the territory.

In July this year Fretillín sent out a detailed 40 page report on human rights abuse and on social and economic conditions in the many strategic settlements scattered throughout the country. The practice of forced labour is now widespread in the resettlement camps which were set up in East Timor in the late 1970s as part of Indonesia's war strategy to isolate the resistance movement. Timorese people are being required to work without pay on land owned by Indonesian officials as well as on the land of more privileged
Timorese (village and district heads, civil guard and battalion 745 commanders). They also have to work on road construction, building houses and offices for the occupying forces, and to carry out timber-logging and cut down bamboo. In one area, people are required to work without pay on a state-owned sugar plantation in Ue Tico. Generally speaking, people are required to perform forced labour one day a week but this is often extended as the "need" arises.

In virtually all the camps, the level of food production is extremely low. Few peasants are producing rice any more and most families are not able to produce more than about 5 or 6 tins of corn (a tin contains about 15 kilos) a year. In some places, production is down to only 2 or 3 tins a year. Besides the imposition of forced labour, low production levels are the result of the very limited amount of land available to the camp inhabitants, whilst at the same time, vast tracts of productive corn- and rice-producing land have been completely abandoned because of the enforced resettlement of the peasants. Fretilin reports that fertile areas that have been abandoned include the upper reaches of the river Vemasse, and a stretch of country extending 30 kilometres westward from the town of Laleia and southwards to Bibiue, including the fertile upper valley of the river Laleia. Further south, no fewer than 14 villages and regions to the west of Ossu and Viqueque have been abandoned, and further north, another 18 food production regions are now going to waste.

Efforts to produce food on the land made available to camp inhabitants are severely hampered by the lack of agricultural implements and livestock. Few families now possess any buffaloes, except for the more wealthy, privileged Timorese families. Most implements are virtually beyond repair, yet people simply cannot earn the cash they would need to purchase new ones.

In early 1981, people living in the camps were suddenly ordered to gather in all their corn by April, regardless of the fact that it was not yet ripe. Nor was the time allowed anywhere near enough to complete the back-breaking task. Everything left standing in the fields after the time limit had passed was burnt, causing a 30% loss of crops. This was the time when preparations were under way for Indonesia's 1981 offensive, Operasi Keamanan. This year again, a similar order went out, requiring all corn to be gathered in before August, and warning people that anything left standing would be burnt. Once again the destruction of crops can only be explained against the background of the preparations for the military offensive which was launched in August this year.

Fretilin's report about conditions in the camps is the first of its kind to be received from East Timor. It is an important record of the facts underlying East Timor's appalling food problem. The resettlement camps themselves are central to the problem, and as long as they remain in existence, famine will continue to threaten the people of East Timor.

Carmel Budiardjo, Offensive in E. Timor, Letter to The Times
3 November, 1983.
TAPOL Bulletin No.59 September 1983

(TAPOL is the British Campaign for the Defence of Political Prisoners and Human Rights in Indonesia. More information can be obtained from TAPOL, 8a Treport Street, London SW18 2BP, UK.)
ETHIOPIA: FAMINE AND Drought IN War-Torn Tigray

Farmers from the drought stricken areas of central and eastern Tigray arrive in the western region saying the current drought is worse than the 1972 disaster which led to the overthrow of the Emperor Haile Selassie. This year the grass is all done and the grain is too expensive for the farmers to buy even when there is any, which is not often. But wholesale migration from Tigray into Sudan and other parts of Ethiopia has surprisingly been avoided, although Tigray has been at war with the Ethiopian government for nearly a decade and the Tigre People's Liberation Front (TPLF) has hardly any international support.

Since 1979, when guerrillas of the TPLF swept south to establish control over 85% of Tigray, in less than four years the Ethiopian government has mounted three heavy offensives in Tigray and its neighbouring area Eritrea, each bigger than the previous one. These military campaigns have devastated huge areas of farmlands with bombs, mines and infantry sweeps, and destroyed much of the health and educational infrastructure. But a recent visit to administrative region 1 of Tigray with officials of the Relief Society of Tigray (Rest) - the humanitarian wing of the TPLF - to monitor the purchase and distribution of relief grain, indicated that the people are not only surviving these military campaigns but are developing in spite of them.

Houses have been rebuilt by the relief committee of the local administration but over 100,000 people are still homeless in the west as a result of the Government's spring offensive. They have added unbearably to the burden of the 400,000 registered and totally dependent drought migrants who have moved into the west in search of food, work and support from the central, eastern and southern regions since September 1982.

The Ethiopian government's own requests for drought assistance have provoked some rather muted responses from international aid agencies in Addis Ababa who speculate that donors will only provide less than 12% of the latest Government request for 900,000 tons of relief grain. Donors like the USA are demanding stricter supervision of the whole relief operation mounted through Ethiopian government channels. There is increasing acceptance of the fact that the government does not have access to most of the drought-affected populations in Tigray and neighbouring Eritrea, and now not even in the Wollo and Gondar regions. Conversely, observers - humanitarian and otherwise - after extensive field trips over the last year into TPLF held areas where Rest operates, confirmed that Rest has access to approximately 90% of Tigray's population including the overwhelming majority of drought victims.

The famine is very severe but localised into the thickly populated central highland corridor and eastern escarpment. The western region which is still productive has become a magnet for migrants. As soon as the migrants started arriving in large numbers last year, the local civilians and Rest set up checkpoints at three western gateway towns. There were stores and distribution centres for food, and eventually reception centres for the sick and helpless. It has become clear that by August this year the crop failures would be massive and the relief burden would be too much for Rest who have now allowed the western villagers to take over the burden of the relief operation through their local administrations. Even so, the communities of the west are only subsistence farmers themselves and their own food supplies are low. The possibility of trucking more grain in from outside is hampered by Rest's limited resources. The success of what is one of the most imaginative famine relief operations on East Africa this decade, organised on a local level by villagers themselves, depends largely upon whether outside agencies and governments will provide them with the means to help themselves.

(Source: Article in The Guardian, October 7, 1983 by Kirsty Wright.)
GUATEMALA: THE MASSACRE AT SAN FRANCISCO - 302 PEOPLE WERE SLAUGHTERED

IWGIA has just published its first Spanish Document: Massacre de la Finca San Francisco Huehuetenango, Guatemala, by Ricardo Falla. As the English translation has not been available, the Newsletter has compiled a dossier about the document, a history of indigenous struggle in Guatemala and the latest statement by the Indian people this August.

What is happening in Guatemala is not simply that the army is fighting against a certain number of guerrillas. What the reports say is that men and women, young and old, infant and elderly are being systematically and illegally harassed, humiliated, terrorised, tortured and killed. This is not just happening to known guerrillas and their support base among specific local populations. It is happening indiscriminately to the entire rural population of large areas of the Guatemalan countryside. Reports of statements by armed personnel indicate that the Guatemalan Government has decided that, by definition, all Indians are guerrillas and can be killed. This applies, not just to all males, not just to all adult Indians but to every Indian.

The Guatemalan Government is also seeking to destroy, once and for all, the traditional Indian way of life. Measures are being taken aimed at the elimination of the several Indian languages still spoken in rural Guatemala. Young men are conscripted into the army and stationed in regions where different languages are spoken. They are forbidden to speak to each other in their own language. The army is said to discourage by aggressive means the use of Indian language by anyone else whether in their own communities or relocated in strategic hamlets. The Indian's distinctive, traditional clothing, which is such an important expression and symbol of their ethnic identity and pride is taken from them and burned. The religious fiestas which used to be a feature of Indian life in rural Guatemala are forbidden with the claim that the food prepared for these occasions will be given to the guerrillas.

The links across the generations which permit and channel the transmission and continuation of cultural traditions are broken as the people are made orphans, lose their children and grandparents. Community solidarity is undermined by forcing men conscripted into "civil patrols" to attack and kill their neighbours or fellow-villagers.

Not only are Indian customs, beliefs and traditions under attack but the economic and ecological basis for Indian existence is being destroyed. It is reported that when the army attacks an Indian community, the people's houses, belongings and crops are burned and their domestic animals killed or illegally confiscated (see IWGIA Newsletters Nos.30, 31-32 and 33). Rivers and streams, sources of drinking water, are said to be poisoned. In certain areas extensive pine forests are being burned down, in some cases set on fire by incendiary grenades thrown from helicopters. These forests have always provided the local Indians with firewood, timber for house construction, a habitat for game animals and a foraging range for their livestock. The forest fires which result can burn for weeks at a time and consume any communities which stand in their path. Only the rain forests are safe from this onslaught on the environment and natural resources of the Indian population.

The testimonies recorded indicate that what is happening is not just a counter-insurgency campaign, not just the brutal violation of all recognised human rights, not just the genocidal killing of large segments of entire Indian populations, but also the systematic destruction of the Indian way of life and all prospect of its re-emergence when peace eventually returns to the countryside of Guatemala.

The account of the San Francisco massacre is based on eyewitness testimonies collected by the author in several camps of Guatemalan refugees in the area of Chiapas, Mexico.
News of the San Francisco massacre appeared in, among others, the New York Times of October 12, 1982, three months after the massacre had taken place. The delay, the author indicates, was due to press censorship imposed by the Guatemalan Government, following the state of siege imposed on July 1st. The facts are as follows:

On July 17, 1982, at about 11 a.m., 600 foot soldiers arrived from Marillas frustrated at their failure to find a guerrilla camp located some time ago in the nearby mountains and apparently ready to wipe out the village-estate of San Francisco. Simultaneously, an army helicopter — the unmistakable sign that the actors were not guerrillas — arrived and landed on the football field with supplies for the soldiers. The colonel in charge of the operation ordered the people (Chuj Indians) to congregate in the centre of the village for a meeting. Even though the villagers noted that the faces of the officials were disturbed, they were not afraid because on June 24th, the army had passed through with friendly words and without causing any damage. The soldiers scattered to call the women from their houses. Then they gathered the men and closed them in the courthouse and put the women in the small church. The two structures were about 20 metres apart and even though the people were for all practical purposes jailed they could hear what was happening in one place or the other.

The soldiers cut up meat from one of the bulls they had caught and the villagers give them upon arrival. They then began to shoot the women in the church. Those who were not killed that way were taken to their houses where they were killed with machetes. While in the houses, the soldiers robbed cassette recorders, radios, clothes and money. With that and funds stolen from the co-operative, they took about 20,000 quetzales (1 quetzal = 1 US dollar). Then, they returned to the church to kill the children who, separated from their mothers, had been left crying and screaming. They killed them by slitting open their intestines and smashing them against wooden poles.

The eyewitness could see the horrifying spectacle through holes in the courthouse window and when for a moment the soldier standing guard opened the courthouse door.

After killing the children, they began with the men — first the old men, then the working men and youth. They took them outside in groups and killed most of them. Inside the courthouse, they killed the local authorities — the sheriff, the auxiliary mayor and the police. The estate administrator was not killed at San Francisco, but was tied up during the massacre and killed several days later on the road between Yalambojoch and Bulej when the army was pulling out of the area. About 5.30 p.m., seven men managed to escape through the window of the courthouse, but the army noticed them and opened fire. Four lived and made it to the refuge in Mexico the following day. One was fatally wounded and died in hospital at Comitán.

Six other men were still alive in the courthouse and it was getting late. Grenades were thrown into the building. Two men survived, but were completely covered with blood. When the soldiers piled the corpses inside the courthouse, they dragged the two onto the heap. Later, about 7 p.m., these two managed to escape through the window, but one was heard because of the noise of his boots and was riddled with bullets. The other had removed his boots and hid in the bush. He arrived in Mexico the next day, stunned, together with one of the men who had escaped at 5.30. In all 302 people were killed.

Some 20 men escaped the massacre either because they were in the fields or, in one case, because the individual was a member of the civil patrol and fled when he went to look for the bulls to feed the army. Most of the 20 men were from San José Yulaurel, a 90 hectare extension which was given to the villagers of San Francisco by the National Institute for Agrarian Transformation about five years ago. San Francisco itself is a 180 hectare rural estate owned by Colonel Victor Manuel Bolaños. It was nearly abandoned by the owner because
about a year ago, the guerrillas were moving freely in the area feeding on his livestock (400 head in 1980) and there was at least one period when thievery was rampant. Francisco Paiz Garcia, who would later be killed by the army, collaborated somewhat unwillingly with the guerrillas so that when these burned the main house of the estate on December 15th, 1981, they did not bother the administrator as they did in the case of another individual who aided the army's repression on other estates. From this the author concludes that for the army the necessity of wiping out San Francisco lay in its role as source of supply for the guerrillas. What role the colonel-owner may have played in designing the punishment of these defenseless civilians is unknown.

Ricardo Falla's manuscript is based on the eyewitness testimonies of the San Francisco massacre by the few survivors who managed to escape to the neighboring country of Mexico. The account was recorded on tapes by the author, and is a clear, detailed documentation of a specific case of the continual brutal violation of all recognized human rights by the Guatemalan Government. (IWGIA Document No. 33 "The Massacre at Panzós" is also such a detailed account of a massacre at Panzós, Verpaz in 1978 where over 100 people were killed.)

Ricardo Falla says: "There is an element of inexplicability which makes a massacre something hard to believe. If we ourselves are not victims of the massacre and if our senses are not impacted by the facts, the event is not felt with any depth. The international public to which the people of Guatemala look for solidarity is numbed by so many figures and names of unknown places. Perhaps an in-depth study of one massacre will enable readers to imagine what the others might have been like."

(IWGIA subscribers who do not receive Spanish publications but who would like to receive a copy of Spanish Document No. 1 can receive a copy free of charge on application to the office. Non-subscribers can purchase copies from the same address.)

GUATEMALA: HISTORY OF REPRESSION, AGRESSION, GENOCIDE, EXPLOITATION AND DISCRIMINATION OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES IN GUATEMALA.

by Andrés López

Indigenous peoples in Guatemala at the present time are over 70% of the whole population. Our struggle started in 1524, the time when the Spanish invaders arrived in Indian land. I want to mention only some of the massacres and sufferings that our grandfathers have gone through at that time.

At the beginning of 1524 the first massacre took place on the banks of the river Tomala, later came the massacre of Xetulul; the massacre of 3000 Indians in Chaureal; the massacre at the bank of Olintepeque river in February 1524; the same year in March, Pedro de Alvarado ordered that the kings and the chiefs of the Quiches be burned alive. In April there was the massacre of Iscuintlan, in February 1526 Iximche and in March 1527, the massacre of Kachiquel in Chix Xet (now Comalapa).

The massacres committed by the invaders against our ancestors were many. These are just some examples. For those who survived the massacres, the life of exploitation began and negation reached its limits when it was affirmed that our ancestors were not even human beings (this conception has changed today, but we can hear it said that Indians don't have the capacity to have schooling because they are there to work the land and serve the rich as a cheap labor force). The invaders compelled Indian people to dig for gold and wash it; to construct churches and public buildings - many lost their lives in this way. Our ancestors were robbed of their jewels and their fertile lands, their wives and daughters were raped (as it is today soldiers and other paramilitary groups rape Indian girls after which they are murdered).

Our religious books and scientific knowledge was destroyed, attempting in this way to destroy a whole culture, without knowing anything about it, out of the blindness of their superiority complex. Our grandparents were put into slavery,
were treated worse than beasts of burden, marked with hot irons and obliged to do heavy work so that the invaders could become rich (the same is happening today - the rich eat and become more rich off the backs of our people and poor ladinos). Our ancestors received blows, insults and prejudice against their culture and persons. In Mexico in 1533 an Indian slave cost 40 pesos and in Guatemala 2 pesos. Their lands were taken away and they were pushed up into the mountains (refugee zones) where the earth produces almost nothing.

In 1821 the so-called "Independence" was achieved. This political change was for the benefit of only a small group, the Creole descendants of the Spanish invaders. The independence didn't change the situation at all, on the contrary, our people continued to be treated as animals and exploited even more. The independence of the Maya people has not come yet.

We remember our grandfathers telling us of 1872 when the dictator Justo Rufino Barrios started the plantation of coffee, which is one of the crops which produces the most money for the rich today. Then, land was robbed and the people forced to plant coffee. Our people were forced to walk 3 or 4 days to the coastal area to work without pay. If they refused to work, they were put in jail. Barrios forced our people not to use their Indian names. This was another attempt to destroy our identity. With Justo Rufino Barrios, the national army was created. The army then served to take care of the wealth of a handful of rich people at the expense of the Indigenous Peoples.

Later on with the Dictator Jorge Ubico, indigenous people were forced to work in the construction of roads. They had to work for two weeks every month without any pay. This same Dictator had the crazy idea to construct a rail road in the highlands. Here again our people were forced to work carrying rails on their backs up the mountains. It was never finished.

Only in recent years the army stopped taking care of the money and interests of the rich. The Generals and Colonels also wanted to be rich. For this reason, the army took over the government and began to rob the lands of our people together with the landowners, becoming a new group of rich. The recent president before last, Fernando Lucas Garcia, was one of the principal landlords in the Transversal del Norte zone. A large part of this zone and of Peten have been given out to high military officials. The interest in this particular region is because foreign companies have found oil and minerals.

Since 1524 our peoples have been pushed into the mountains which was once a zone of refuge. Later the Creoles came and robbed the best pieces of land. The highland region is characterised by a "minifundia" pattern of peasant agriculture with its low productivity, lack of access to credit and severe soil erosion. Over 90% of the farm units enumerated as belonging to Indigenous Peoples in 1964 were insufficient in size to support a family for a year. Almost every social indicator now shows that the indigenous peoples of Guatemala are one of the poorest population groups in Latin America. The Government, the army, the paramilitary groups and the small group of wealthy landowners are even now making this situation worse.

Indigenous peoples have been killed and exploited in many ways: slavery, hunger, stealing lands, poor wages, swindling over coffee and cotton prices, excess costs put on basic necessities, forced sterilisation of women and taking children into the army. In the army the noble sentiments of our children are killed and they are changed into killers. In the army our children are used by rich and high military chiefs to kill their own people, even their own family.

There are various other ways of exploitation of our people such as tourism. Guatemala is painted in a very romantic and picturesque way with its ruins, its weaving, dances and traditions. Indigenous Peoples become an object of tourism, a
commercial object. But all the benefits of this business are
for the hotel chains, transportation business, the middle men
for Indian crafts and the government itself. But the propa-
ganda for tourism never tells about the hard life that our
people have, never tells that Indigenous Peoples are suffer-
ing hunger, discrimination and exploitation and for more than
450 years.

With the massacre of our brothers and sisters in Panzos
in 1978 the systematic repression and genocide of Indigenous
Peoples has escalated. In January 1980 there was the massacre
of our brothers and sisters (together with students, people
who supported the indigenous cause and diplomatic personali-
ties) in the Spanish Embassy. In both cases our people were
accused of being subversives, but the truth is that they were
demanding their lands and asking for justice for those who
were responsible for kidnapping and murdering our brothers.
That was their crime, the answer to their demands was bullets.

Much of what is happening in Guatemala is ignored by the
official news, but in fact hundreds and hundreds of Indigenous
Peoples have been massacred in all the Indian provinces such as:
El Quiché, Chimaltenango, Sololá, Quetzaltenango, San
Marcos, Huehuetenango, Alta Verapaz, Baja Verapaz and Totoni-
capan. Many Indian villages have been wiped out. Children,
women, old people and even babies have been massacred. Peo-
ple have been tortured in the most inhuman way and then killed.
These massacres are being committed by the army, the para-
military groups paid by the landowners and the government
itself. Helicopters of the army are bombing with napalm and
machine-gunning down the so-called "suspect villages". Another
form of attack is to burn people's crops, poison their drink-
ing water and destroying their houses. Thousands of people
have left their home villages for fear of being murdered.
This is a systematic genocide of Indigenous Peoples.

Throughout the 450 years of repression, oppression,
aggression, genocide and discrimination, our people have
struggled to defend their rights and lives. Just to mention
some examples: in 1524, our grandfathers, Quichés, Tzutujiles,
Mames, Pocomames, Kekchies and their people fought with con-
viction and courage to defend their lives, lands and culture.
The Kakkikies forced the Spanish to abandon the first cap-
ital of Guatemala in Iximché. The most important rebellions
after the invasion are: in Chiapas in 1708, Mames in Ixtaguac-
cán in 1743, Santa Lucia Utatlán in 1760, Kakkikies in
Tecpan in 1764, Kekchies in Coban in 1770, San Martin Cuchu-
matanes, Santiago Momostenango, Mames in Ixtaguacán in 1813,
the Quiches headed by Atoncio Tzul in Totonicapán in 1820,
Junay in 1838, Quiches in Totonicapán in 1905, the Kakkikiel-
es in Patzicia, the Keju in 1971 and many others. This
demonstrates our people's unending struggle. Very often we
hear that Indigenous Peoples are fatalists and passive. These
examples show that our people have always struggled. We can
tolerate all kinds of treatment but when this gets to its
limits there is no other choice left. Our people have the
right to define their lives.

Our ancestors and our people today are struggling for
our fundamental Human Rights: right to life, right to keep
our identity as a people with different culture, tradition,
language, right for self-determination and the right to land
and also to live in peace in our own territory. We want a
just society, a society where our Indian Rights can be res-
pected. A society where Indians and Ladinos can live, res-
pecting each other's culture, traditions and beliefs. In
this way Indians and Ladinos can contribute to the human
and economic development of a New Society.

(This is a shortened version of Andrés López' original paper.)
GUATEMALA: STATEMENT TO THE UN WORKING GROUP ON INDIGENOUS POPULATIONS BY FRANCISCA ALAVAREZ, GUATEMALA: AUGUST 1983, GENEVA.

For some time, there have been denunciations against the systematic form and continuation of the violation of human rights against the Guatemalan populations, and against the indigenous population in particular. This situation is without doubt one of the most serious in all America, in which the Indians have been victims of massacres, torture, detention on a massive scale, had our homes and crops burned, our harvest destroyed, all of this aggravating the situation of violations of human rights that exist in Guatemala on a permanent basis, these extreme events being the result of a policy of genocide and ethnocide by the governmental regimes of our country, including past governments as well as the present one.

During the past year and a half, this policy has been carried out in a particularly cruel and brutal manner. Indigenous brothers and sisters have been found dead with their bodies horribly tortured, whole communities have been burned, women have been raped repeatedly by dozens of soldiers until they die. Especially targeted are pregnant women, and there have been reports of cases where government soldiers have eaten the liver of victims in front of the village, this being charged recently by Nobel Prize recipient, Adolfo Perez Esquivel. Other such testimony also exists. The tens of thousands of refugees in Mexico are testimony of these atrocities.

The indigenous population is the majority in Guatemala, where we constitute a little more than 4 million out of 7 million total population in the country. Around 80% of the Indian population is poor and rural, for who their lives and conception of the world depends on the land, and upon the basic food that is the source of our culture - corn (maize). The poor Indian farmers live on tiny plots called minifundia which are too small to support a family. Because of that, the people must migrate and work in the huge plantations of coffee and cotton on the coast each year. The minifundia may be found primarily in the western altiplano and northwest of the country, at altitudes above 5000 feet, a mountainous, fragmented territory, which can produce little and is very difficult to work.

Even though the minifundia represent 88.4% of Guatemalan farms, they cover only 14.3% of the land surface of the country. The latifundias, or the huge plantations of agribusiness for export possess 72.2% of the land.

There exist 22 Indian languages in Guatemala, but the majority of our people do not speak Spanish the official language. Indians live in all parts of the country, but the majority live in the western and northwestern altiplano. These are the departments of San Marcos, Quezaltenango, Totonicapan, Solola, Chimaltenango, Huehuetenango, El Quiche, Alta Verapaz, Baja Verapaz, Sacatepequez and the department of Guatemala, where the capital is located and the majority of the urban population is Indian. In these departments are the ancient homelands of the Quiche, Ixil, Usapanteo, Kekchi, Achi, Pocomchi, Mam, Kanjobal, Jalchic, Chuj, Aguacateca, and Cakchiquel peoples, and these are the locations where the massacres by the government army have been taking place on such a large scale.

Because of the historically harsh conditions of our people, we have been organizing as workers and peasants to ask for better salaries and working conditions and to live a more human existence. In this organizing process, we have been supported by conscientious Christians. But the response of the government has been to assassinate our leaders and the community leaders as well as religious workers. When the people organized to protest such assassinations, the towns were attacked by the government army.
In the present period, the Guatemalan government policy of genocide and ethnocide against the Indian peoples is in effect for three main reasons:

1. The Guatemalan military defends the interests of the small wealthy minority against the huge Indian and poor Ladino populations, who are forced to live in misery and as victims of exploitation, discrimination, oppression and repression. Indians are not considered to be human beings with basic rights. In response to the situation, the Indians, together with the rest of the people of the country, except for the small ruling minority, have organized on a massive scale to struggle for our rights. For this reason, the government considers us to be enemies, and each Indian is considered a real or potential subversive.

2. In Guatemala the Indians are the mass of the people, and with the Ladinos, have begun a process of social change on a massive scale, and for this reason we are objects of systematic campaigns of extermination.

3. The military seeks to destroy and shatter our cultural identity as Indians because the regime knows that our identity constitutes a part of our strength to resist and organize. The government knows that the land is sacred to us, so attempts to displace us from the land, and force us far away from sacred sites preserved by our ancestors and by us today. They attack our communities and destroy our corn, which is our food supply and destroy our Indian clothing and all items that are Indian and reflect our identity. They systematically assassinate our elders who are the fountains of our oral tradition and for us are like books, libraries and universities are to the West. In this way, they are destroying our knowledge and our tradition, a repeat of what the Spanish invaders attempted 450 years ago. Worst of all, they kill our children in whom lies the continuation of our culture. Our culture and our identity have permitted our survival over centuries of exploitation, oppression, discrimination and repression, and none of that has been able to take away our existence as Indians. For this reason we seek to destroy this regime which seeks to exterminate us.

Due to this conscious programme of the Guatemalan government regimes to annihilate the Indian population of the country, a number of aspects of human rights violations against the Indian people of Guatemala may be identified:

1. Violation of the right to life: not only are the Indians persecuted and massacred systematically, but also our people are forced into "civil patrols" under the threat of death, and in that capacity are obliged to control and persecute our own indigenous brothers and sisters and non-Indian poor people.

2. Violations of economic rights: The government attempts to force submission of the people by destroying all food supplies and causing mass starvation, as well as preventing Indians from migrating to the coast to work for salaries.

3. Violation of cultural rights: The government campaign has created a rupture in all our traditions, particularly in relation to the land, and clearly we are persecuted for the simple fact of being Indian. Specific cultural targets are consciously hit by the military including our traditional elders.

4. Violation of religious rights: Both Christian and traditional religious sites are systematically desecrated by the military, who use churches and sacred sites as latrines. Religious leaders, both Christian and traditional have been assassinated. The Bible is considered subversive.

5. Practices of forced labour: The Indian people have been forced, under the threat of death to join the "civil patrols" which takes them away from work. Also, the people have been forced to participate in programmes such as the one called "a roof, a tortilla and work", which forces the Indians to do public work for the use of the military such as road building, and without receiving salaries or sufficient food to survive.
6. Practices of forced reconcentration and relocation of the population: Indians are forced to abandon their place of origin and relocate to distant "model villages" (strategic hamlets as in the Vietnam war). These are actually concentration camps since they are enclosed and controlled totally by the military and the people may not come and go.

7. Denial of all political rights: The Indians are excluded by the army from taking on political responsibilities both at the national as well as the regional and local levels. Always before Indians have elected their own Mayors and leaders, and had our own organizations. These are now prohibited. Though the regime of Ríos Montt named 10 Indians to the "Council of State" with much fanfare of propaganda, these persons are not known to the Indian people, and they have been publicly denounced.

In conclusion, we Indians of Guatemala ask the following of the international community:

- That the Guatemalan regime (headed by whatever current military peronage) be condemned for war crimes and genocide in light of the continual and systematic violations of human rights of the people of Guatemala in general and the Indigenous majority in particular;

- That all governments in the world cease providing military assistance and sales to the Guatemalan regime and that commerce and travel cease;

- That all economic and financial assistance to this genocidal regime which could be used as a part of the military campaign of genocide cease;

- That it be recognized there exists in Guatemala a civil war, and that the full force of international law for the protection of civilian subjects and population be applied;

- That support be forthcoming for the terrible situation of thousands and thousands of Indians who are presently displaced within Guatemala (more than a million) and that humanitarian assistance be provided for them;

- That humanitarian assistance within Guatemala be provided by non-governmental organisms, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Episcopal Conference of Guatemala without the interference or supervision of the Guatemalan military which uses such resources to control the population.
COMMISSION III - RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INDIGENOUS POPULATIONS:

The commission was composed of Indian organisations, non-governmental organisations, government representatives and organisations of solidarity with the Indian people.

The commission decided to base its reflections on the final resolutions and recommendations of the International NGO Conference on Discrimination against the Indigenous Populations of the Americas, which took place in September 1977 and the International NGO Conference on Indigenous Populations and the Land, held in September 1981 in Geneva. In addition, the international instruments of the United Nations regarding human rights and the declarations specifically referring to indigenous populations, especially those elaborated by the indigenous organisations themselves, were taken into account.

The chairman of the commission welcomed the participants and paid homage to the Indian leaders who have fallen in the struggle for the liberation of their peoples. The working procedures of the commission were then approved.

The commission heard a summary of the activities of the United Nations and other organisations during this decade with respect to indigenous populations, particularly the celebration of October 12th as a day of mourning for Indian peoples and November 15th as the International Day of the Indigenous People, date of Tupac Katari’s martyrdom. The commission took due note and unanimously decided to request the Conference that these dates be respected.

A representative of the Mic-Mac people read a declaration giving a detailed description of the situation affecting his people, stressing the absence of recognition of Indian peoples by the Canadian government and the prejudices to the traditional life of these people. This situation was qualified as cultural genocide.

The representative of the National Council of Indigenous Peoples of Mexico read a statement prepared by his organisation and mentioned the successes which are being obtained in saving traditional cultural values. He also spoke of the situation in Central America and the deplorable conditions of the Guatemalan Indians who are seeking asylum in Mexico. Furthermore, he mentioned the Resolution of the Mexican Government prohibiting the activities of the Summer Institute of Linguistics; he strongly criticized the policy of that organism with regard to indigenous populations. Its policy was described as ethnocide because it destroys ethnic consciousness.

The representative of the ONIC (Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia and CRIC (Consejo Regional Indígena de Cauca) presented a statement referring in detail to the situation of the indigenous peoples of Colombia, to the colonial domination and the absence of respect towards the law and different aspects affecting the life of the Indian peoples of his country. He also expressed what history had done to Indian peoples and mentioned the struggle of indigenous organizations in Colombia, insisting particularly on the successes of CRIC in defending indigenous rights.

Mitka-1 (Movimiento Indio Tupac Katari) presented a written statement recalling the resolutions to create a University in the Collasuyo (Bolivia) and requesting the creation of a commission for the purpose of raising the necessary funds. The commission agreed that the creation of such a university would be a step forward in the struggle of Indian peoples, and therefore strongly supported the proposal. They referred also to the creation of an international commission of inquiry to analyse the problem created by the elimination of the cultivation of coca, insisting on the fact that the problem had to be considered from an economic, social and philosophical
point of view. The same movement presented a written proposal in relation to the "Declaration of Principles of the Sandinist Revolution on the Indigenous Communities of the Atlantic Coast".

Regarding this last proposal, the representative of the CRIC-CNIC (Colombia) suggested that a general resolution be drafted denouncing the absence of respect of indigenous peoples' rights by all governments and demanding the respect of international instruments. In the discussion it was agreed that the Mitka-1 proposal referred to a problem where different forces exterior to the conflict of the Atlantic Coast were involved, and this element had to be taken into account. Also, the use and manipulation to which this question had been subject was stressed.

The commission heard with attention the representative of the Maori people, who made reference to the history of the colonization of his people and to the non-respect of the 1840 Treaty. He referred also to the situation of other peoples of Oceania, and expressed his profound opposition to the carrying out of nuclear tests on the sacred island of Kaho' Olave. He requested solidarity with the peoples of Oceania and expressed his solidarity with all the peoples of America and Africa.

Representatives of the Commission for the Creation of the Yanomami Park explained the objectives of this organization and spoke of the situation of the Yanomami. The so-called "development projects" were particularly denounced, as they in reality cover schemes of colonization.

Different speakers expressed their concern for the situation experienced by the indigenous peoples of Guatemala, which they qualified as genocide. At the same time, they condemned the policy of the USA in the region and called for solidarity with the struggle of the indigenous peoples of Guatemala. There was also a strong reference to the importance of solidarity with the people who struggle in El Salvador.

A representative of the "Asociación de Solidaridad Tupak Katari" (association of solidarity with the indigenous peoples of Bolivia) expressed the opinion that the causes of racial discrimination are fundamentally economic ones since the Indians have been dispossessed of their lands and treated as slaves; the interference of transnational corporations in the economy of the underdeveloped countries, he said, was one of the main causes of the misery of the Indians. On the other hand, he was convinced that the struggle of the indigenous peoples is interconnected with the struggle of all the oppressed.

A representative of Mitka-1 declared following an intervention about the situation in Bolivia, that his country was undergoing a process of democratization which his movement supported. He mentioned their awareness of the difficulties resulting from the very bad economic situation left by the military government. He pointed out that the peoples of Collassuyo (Bolivia) represented 85% of the population and that they were "multifacetedly" oppressed. He said that his movement did not promote a revolution, but demanded a devolution.

The President of the Commission on Human Rights in Nicaragua addressed the commission and brought elements concerning the situation of the indigenous populations of the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua. He made reference, first, to the United Nations Seminar of December 1981, held in Managua, and then spoke about the situation of the indigenous peoples under Somoza. He recalled the literacy campaign in three languages and the different actions of his country's government in favour of the solution of the problems of indigenous populations. He explained that the resettlement of the Río Coco border populations was in conformity with the Geneva Convention, given the situation of war in this region. He also quoted an important document of the International Indian Treaty Council which had been an official document of the United Nations Human Rights Commission; this document was a report of a mission to Nicaragua undertaken by that organisation.
One of the participants asked about the intention of the Nicaraguan government regarding the indigenous populations. The President of the Commission of Human Rights in Nicaragua replied that the Government of Nicaragua supported the return of the indigenous peoples to their traditional lands once the threat of war had ended. This commitment, he said, had been made by the government before the Interamerican Commission of Human Rights, and before the Indian organizations.

It was decided to propose a list of recommendations to the Conference, based on the following considerations:

a) that the racist practices and discriminatory policies against indigenous peoples had continued and in several cases had increased;

b) that the traditional, cultural and social rights of the indigenous peoples were being systematically violated and had to be qualified as ethnocide or cultural genocide;

c) that the indigenous peoples had the right to determine their own destiny.

Recommendations
- To request the participation of the Indigenous Peoples and the NGOs in the process of revision of Convention 107 of the International Labour Organization (Convention concerning the Protection and Integration of Indigenous and Other Tribal and Semi-Tribal Populations in Independent Countries (1959).)
- To request the maximum participation of the Indigenous Peoples in the UN Conference to combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.
- To insist on the creation of an Indian University and to seek the economic means to carry out this project.
- To recall that the different meetings of Indigenous Peoples that have taken place have decided to commemorate October 12 as a mourning day and November 15 as International Indigenous Peoples Day.
- To request the implementation of the agreements and resolutions of the previous NGO Conference on problems of Indigenous Peoples.

NEW CALEDONIA: INDEPENDENCE FRONT GAINS MORE SUPPORT

The 1983 Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific Conference (see article) took the strongest possible position of support for the Kanak Independence Front and their plans for independence by September 1984. Together with East Timor, support for New Caledonia is an immediate priority for the conference delegates.

The Kanak Independence Front is made up of five political parties: Union Caledonienne, Liberation Kanak Socialiste, Parti Socialiste Caledonien, Front Uni De Liberation Kanake, Union Progressiste Melanesienne (see IWFIA Newsletter No.33). On August 29-30 this year the South Pacific Forum (an annual gathering of South Pacific heads of State and distinct from the South Pacific Commission set up by the UN which includes the colonial powers) met in Canberra, Australia. The Vanuatu government sponsored the Front's request to the Forum to support its bid for UN recognition. The Forum did indeed support the Front and the following resolutions were passed:

Resolutions of the 14th South Pacific Forum
- Reaffirming its conviction that the principles of self-determination and independence apply to the Pacific territories which are not yet liberated;
- Recognizing the existence of a colonial situation in New Caledonia;
- Recognizing the continuous efforts of the Kanak people of New Caledonia to achieve self-determination and independence by peaceful means;
- Taking note of the progress made by the French government in matters concerning political evolution in New Caledonia;
- Recognizing the positive, inherent and legitimate right of the Kanak people of New Caledonia for self-determination and independence;
- Appreciating the acknowledgment on the part of Kanak representatives at the negotiations of the right of other communities resident in the territory to participate in an act of self-determination;
§ It declares it supports independence in New Caledonia in as much as it will be established in accordance with the wish-es expressed by its people;
§ It favourably welcomes the practical approach towards independence shown by the French government in its recourse to an act of self-determination which involves the option of independence;
§ It invites the French authorities to continue to assume their responsibilities to guarantee the realisation by peaceful means of independence in New Caledonia;
§ It urges again furthermore all political and ethnic groups in New Caledonia to collaborate closely together and with the French government to establish a peaceful independence;
§ It demands that the French government, in the drawing up of the project of a new statute of autonomy, transfer without delay political and administrative power to competent authorities of New Caledonia, in particular full command of the internal affairs of the colony;
§ It declares that the establishment by the French government of the statute of internal autonomy, ought to be transitory and involve a precise date leading to independence;
§ It requests immediately that the French government, by putting into operation some scheme of self-determination, to take into consideration the possibility of excluding from the suffrage those persons who are not permanent residents or who have not lived long in New Caledonia;
§ It proposes that the French government anticipate inviting a delegation from the Forum to visit New Caledonia to follow the evolution of events;
§ It decides to examine the situation in New Caledonia during the 15th Meeting, and in the light of the examination, to anticipate writing again New Caledonia on the United Nations list of unliberated territories.

The result of these resolutions is that France must set an exact independence date before next year's Forum and there is now considerable support to refer the New Caledonia issue to the United Nations.

This success follows last year's recognition of the Non-Aligned countries in their New Delhi summit and the Front also gained the support of the International Socialist Conference at Albufeira, Portugal.

While pursuing this strategy for international support, the Front is also working within established French institutions. Round table discussions with the French government to discuss New Caledonia's status concluded recently. However if the independence date September 1984 is not accepted the Front have said that they will leave the round table. At the July round table talks in Paris, a document was drafted at the conclusion of the talks which, while recognising the Kanak people's legitimate right to independence, did not spell out a time-table for its attainment. The Independence Front subsequently drew up an adjoining paper outlining the unacceptability of a statute of internal autonomy without specific provisions for independence.

The French have also recently been trying to further their interests in the dispute. In November French External Relations Minister Claude Cheysson has visited New Zealand, Australia and Indonesia to dampen regional pressure for New Caledonia's independence. He has also been giving briefings on reforms which French Secretary of State for Overseas Territories, Georges Lemoine has been preparing to table in the Territorial Assembly in Noumea, New Caledonia. Lemoine hopes to put forward amendments and comments to this statute into a final statute to be passed sometime in 1984 by the French National Assembly. This strategy is designed to slow down the pace of events sufficiently for the message of Paris' gradualist intentions to sink into the most intransigent of the opponents of independence - the pieds noirs, or French settlers.

Even so French intentions towards independence even in principle are not clear. Cheysson was acutely aware of the
domestic implications in France of any turmoil occurring in New Caledonia, where Europeans form 32% of the estimated population of 150,000. In Canberra, he cautioned that the Lemoine reforms "might or might not lead to independence."

To thwart this vacillation, the Front's members in the New Caledonia Territorial Assembly (who are in the majority) have tabled a rival statute to that of Lemoine which is due to be discussed at the same time as the French proposals. The rival statute is being put forward by Jean-Marie Tjibau, leader of the Union Calédonienne and tipped as the Melanesian leader who will emerge as the chief minister of an independent New Caledonia. The Tjibau statute sets September 24th 1986, as the date for independence, but provides for the disenfranchisement of the bulk of the French nationals before elections due in July 1984. These elections would be treated as an independence plebiscite; and only Melanesians and second-generation settlers would be able to vote. This would give Melanesians (46% of the population and who solidify back the Independence Front) a majority in the new assembly and two years to prepare for full independence. It seems certain that Lemoine would be totally opposed to such a statute.

The relationship between France and New Caledonia was summed up by the Front's representative to the Vanuatu conference Yann Urgei who said: "From a moral point of view, the churches, the political groups and the governments of the region cannot profess to ignore such risks caused by the fact that French imperialism puts the interests of France first, giving priority to its strategic objectives... A base is required to maintain the Center d'Expérimentation du Pacifique (CEP) in Polynesia. New Caledonia constitutes the pillar of French strategy throughout the Pacific and for the CEP... The independence of the Kanak people in New Caledonia would cancel this pillar which supports French strategy, thereby leading to its revision and possibly to a nuclear-free Pacific which is the wish of all the countries in the area."

"The independence claimed by the Kanak people appears to be the primary goal to lead to the second goal: that of cancelling all nuclear tests carried out in our region."

Sources: Far Eastern Economic Review, December 1st, 1983
          In Mana, 15 no Tetepa/Septembre No.107
          Pacific Bulletin, Volume 3, No.5, September, 1983

NEW ZEALAND/AOTEAROA: STRUGGLE OF THE MAORI PEOPLE

Aotearoa is the name given by the Maori people to New Zealand. It means "land of the great white cloud". The indigenous peoples of New Zealand today make up 8.9% of the total 3,260,000 inhabitants and live mainly in the northern part of the country.

New Zealand is a sovereign state within the British Commonwealth. Its total area of 103,883 Km² covers the two principal islands, North and South, Stewart Island and the Catlins islands as well as other smaller Pacific islands.

European colonisation of New Zealand began at the beginning of the 19th Century. In 1840 the Maori chiefs recognised British sovereignty in return for their territorial rights in the Waitangi Treaty. Even so, over the following 30 years, the treaty was not respected and white colonists, supported by the army of the colonial government, fought against the Maori and took over their lands.
During the following years the Maori chiefs tried to stop the colonists and defend their lands from invasion with armed struggle. The government responded with continuous attacks and, eventually, compelled the Maori to put down their weapons.

The Maori, as other colonised indigenous peoples at this time, experienced the contradictions of European colonisation. The governments and monarchies of the colonial countries, after known extermination of thousands of indigenous peoples by the local colonial authorities, gave some protection for the survival of the colonised peoples. In this way the imperial British government kept formal control over the indigenous question, transferring other aspects of colonial policy to the local authorities (c.f. Saunders, 1977).

Various indigenous peoples saw in these differences within the colonial regime a means of expressing their demands, usually territorial, before the European governments. At the same time, with the establishment of the League of Nations in the 20th Century, it became possible for them to present their case and seek support before an international forum. Maori delegations visited England in 1882, 1884, 1914 and 1924. The first two delegations were sent back to the New Zealand government. The third obtained an audience with King George V. In 1924, Wiremu Tamihana Ratana, an important Maori political and religious figure, could not get an audience with the King and so looked for support in the League of Nations.

T.W. Ratana founded at this time the major political and religious movement in Maori history - the Ratana Church, whose main object was the unification of the Maori people. This movement gained followers very quickly and in the 1920s forged an alliance with the Labour Party. By this means the followers of Ratana managed to win four Maori seats in Parliament gaining a number of concessions for the Maori people.

The Ratana Church was the culmination of a history of Maori movements. In the middle of the 19th Century there was the Kingitanga movement which was an attempt to establish a dual system of government, one for the Pakeha (whites) and one for the Maori. Kingitanga started to work in 1858 when the first Maori king - Potatau - was chosen. This political system was successful for a time and achieved some improvements for the Maori. For example the Waikato of North Island established frontiers for their territories and their social, cultural and religious life flourished. Nevertheless this system constituted a direct threat to colonialisit expansion and dominion. Government troops invaded Waikato confiscating a million acres of land in the name of "war compensation". The invasion of the Waikato led to more than 20 years of intense confrontation between the local colonial government and the indigenous peoples, especially in North Island. The result was the confiscation and annexation of practically all the Maori lands.

The Kingitanga movement was followed by the religious Pai Marire Cult and the pacifist movements Parihaka and the Te
Kotahitanga (a Maori Parliament) which sat first in 1892. In contrast to these traditional movements there appeared in the 20th Century the Young Maori Party which favoured integration. Their support waned with the rise of the Ratana Church.

Against this political background the beginnings of the 20th century saw hardship for many Maori people. Owing to the lack of lands, the mechanisation of agriculture and problems connected with the individuality of land titles (traditionally Maori land was communal), many were forced to emigrate to the cities to look for work. These emigrations continued up to and after the Second World War and have since increased considerably.

In the cities the Maori discovered a policy of forced integration into dominant white society. In the 1950s and 60s for example, they were settled in dwellings surrounded by pakeha houses so that their integration could be more speedy. This "pepperpotting" was accompanied by pakeha-organised seminars on "how best Maoris could look after themselves", and "keep your houses clean like the pakehas next door". The general relationship with whites reflected these subtleties of racism so that many Maoris, insecure and rejected in their new environment, began to follow the canon of the dominant society. Some of them went so far as to forbid their children to speak in their own language. The majority of Maoris became integrated into the large class of industrial and agricultural workers, adding a new depth to their oppression.

In the beginning of the 1960s, Maori organisations began to spring up in the cities with the aim of defending their rights and mobilising their people. One of the first was the Maori Women's Welfare League which worked on problems of health, child care and preschool education. They organised Maori women and did their utmost to influence government policy affecting their people. The New Zealand Maori Council was the other important organisation created at that time. It is financed by the government and draws on local councils to advise the government on Maori affairs. (According to the Maori People Liberation Movement of Aotearoa the NZMC tends to be very conservative, very accommodating and often very anti-Maori.)

The organisation Nga Tamatoa (Young Warriors) was formed in the early 70s and is considered the forerunner of contemporary Maori activism. The Nga Tamatoa sought and obtained the introduction of Maori language into schools, they protested against racist government policy and used the media to highlight Maori injustices. This form of protest gave way, in the following years, to a revitalisation of Maori consciousness and greater organised activity.

In 1975, 30,000 people marched from the top of the North Island to the State capital (a distance of 700 miles) under the banner of "Not One Acre More" (of Maori land to be taken). On reaching Wellington the organisers set up a tent embassy on Parliament Grounds until their demands were met. Messages of support poured in from indigenous peoples throughout the world. But the government would not listen to the Maori people. The police were sent to dismantle the tent and move on the demonstrators. Although the demands were never met, the march gave fresh impetus and hope to Maoris throughout the country, especially those who had been wanting to move but had been frightened of the consequences.

Protests against the alienation of Maori land continued in the following years. One of the most famous is, undoubtedly, the struggle for the retention of Bastion Point - last remaining lands of the Ngati Whatau. On May 25th 1978, after 507 days of occupation, 222 people were arrested by the largest force of State power since the days of colonialisation: 600 police backed with logistical and physical support from the army, navy and airforce.

The formation of the Mana Motuhake political party in 1980 signalled the break of the Ratana Church with the Labour Party - an alliance which thousands of Maori had supported
even after it became apparent that Labour's direction had lost all semblance to the Maori struggle. Mat Rata, one of the four Ratana MPs resigned from the Labour Party because of Labour's blatant neglect of Maori affairs. In the three years since, the Party has won over many disaffected Maoris to a platform of "Peoples Power" and "Ratification of the Treaty of Waitangi."

The Treaty of Waitangi continues today to be at the centre of the dissent between the Government of New Zealand and the Maori people. Government responsibility cannot be ignored and through its action and lack of action land, forests and fishing areas have been robbed from their owners, the Maori.

Maori sovereignty was recognised at a time when the Maoris outnumbered the whites 100 to 1 and when the Maori representatives, their chiefs, had the power to sign treaties. Nevertheless, since the Government of New Zealand did not respect the terms of agreement and did not legalise them either, such treaties are today considered annulled which means that the Maori still have sovereignty.

According to Pat Hohepa (Professor of Maori studies at Auckland University) the first government in New Zealand was illegal and all successive governments have been so too.

At the moment, 75% of the Maori people live in the cities and the fight for the devolution and inalienation of their remaining lands continues. The Maori have legal titles for 2.31% of their territories in New Zealand and their representation in government is one of 3.60%. One of the immediate objectives of the Maori Peoples Liberation Movement is, thus, to obtain devolution of all Maori territory and create a coherent political strategy with which to channel their territorial demands.

The general objectives of the MPLM are the following:

1. Establish themselves as the true representatives of Aotearoa.
2. Inform the world of the true history of Aotearoa and to denounce any action of the government against the Maori people.
3. To establish social, political and cultural alliances with other indigenous peoples of the world.
4. To seek access to international fora through which the present situation of the Maori people may have the maximum publicity and support.
5. To invite representatives of other indigenous peoples to come to Aotearoa - to exchange information about the common struggle against colonial oppression.
6. To offer support to the causes of all indigenous nations of the world, and in particular for the return of their lands, dignity and status as rightful rulers of their home lands.

More information on the Maori Peoples Liberation Movement of Aotearoa may be obtained by writing directly to:
M.P.L.M.
P.O.Box 61140
Otara
Aotearoa (New Zealand)

Pat Hohepa: Maori Opposition To the Royal Tours - The Reasons, MPLM Newsletter May,June, July, 1983.

MPLM: The Struggle of the Maori People, 1983
NICARAGUA: THE DARK CLOUDS GATHER

National Revolution and Indigenous Identity is IWGIA Document 47. It is a series of documents and interviews about the conflict between the Sandinists and Miskito Indians of Nicaragua's Atlantic Coast edited by Klaudine Chland and Robin Schneider. The book charts the rise and fall of the indigenous organisation MISURASATA between 1979 and 1982. It tells of the misunderstandings, fears and suspicions which contributed to the disintegration of the relationship between the Government and the Miskito, Sumu and Rama peoples. In addition the book takes account of the difficulties threatening the Sandinists from external powers, particularly the United States who were exploiting the national and ethnic differences to their own advantage. The attempts of the indigenous peoples and the Sandinists to form some sort of working relationship appears in the final article in the book discussing the relocation project of Tasba Pri.

Since the book was written events in Nicaragua have taken a serious turn. Many of the old MISURASATA leaders have left the country and are connected with counter-revolutionary forces in Honduras and Costa Rica raiding the northern areas of the Río Coco and the southern region of the Río San Juan. In Honduras Steadman Pagoth is connected with the counter-revolutionary group Fuerza Democrática Nicaragüense (FDN) which is backed by the United States and consists mainly of ex-National Guards from Somoza's dictatorship. In Costa Rica, another ex-MISURASATA leader Brooklyn Rivera has a group called Los Astros which is a part of Edén Pastora's Alianza Revolucionaria Democrática (ARDE). Until recently this group was opposed to the FDN.

Since October 1983 it appears that the suspected links between ARDE and FDN are becoming a clear reality. The CIA have "neutralised" Edén Pastora as leader of ARDE because it wants quick military results from its covert operations against the Sandinists. Brooklyn Rivera now appears to be one of the co-leaders of ARDE who have accepted the CIA demand that Pastora be pushed aside. In return the CIA have given them $8 million. The plan is for ARDE to join up with anti-Sandinist guerrilla groups in Honduras. Now the CIA strategy is for a co-ordinated campaign of sabotage on two fronts with the objective of establishing a "provisional" Nicaraguan government in a rebel-controlled area by December or January.

Within Nicaragua the position of the indigenous peoples has always been difficult to ascertain with accuracy. For example the relocation of between 8 and 10 thousand people in the Tasba Pri project has been reported as resulting in "concentration camps" (Nietschmann 1983). On the other hand the Treaty Council News, April 1983 reports that the new communities are, in spite of problems, working well and that those Miskito wishing to return to their original communities will be able to as soon as peace returns to the area.

Criticisms of the relocation have been put forward in the Americas Watch Report on Human Rights in Nicaragua from May 1982. In this document the Nicaraguan Government is criticised because the Miskito were not given adequate warning of the move, the poor facilities for transportation and the lack of compensation given to the evacuees. On the other hand the report, the Church and the Miskito themselves have mentioned that in retrospect the move was necessary because of the violence on the Río Coco. However there is still a question remaining: namely the right of any Government to move an indigenous population from their communities without their prior consultation or consent.

Since the relocation violence has continued in the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua. Refugees accuse the Sandinist Government of harassment this year such as in The New York Times of July 18, 1983. Nietschmann (p.cit.) is more specific and mentions a military occupation of a Miskito community,
Tasbapuni on January 18th this year. He also mentions a bombardment of the relocation camp Francis Sirpi on March 30th and April 5th when 17 Indians were reported killed.

On the other hand there is also evidence (see following article) that the attacks of the counter-revolutionaries are crippling the indigenous economy. Whole communities are being forced into Honduran "concentration camps" over the border by bands of armed counter-revolutionaries. Those Miskito who have tried to remain in Nicaragua and reconstruct the relationship with the Government have been threatened with death by the Contras.

It is important not to under-estimate the attempts which the Sandinists have made to improve conditions on the Atlantic Coast. Health care has improved, multilingual publications and broadcasts are produced on a regular basis and in addition communal ownership of land has been established in areas where relocation has taken place. Reports from Nicaragua suggest that the Sandinists are open to discussion about the problems facing indigenous peoples in the country and there are indeed indigenous Nicaraguans eager to solve these peacefully.

A testimony presented to the U.N. Work Group on Human Rights at the Geneva Congress on Racism in August this year comes from Nicaraguan indigenous people who have "braved the storm" and want to seek a solution with the Sandinist Government. It has been reproduced here as a positive "postscript" with which to complement the IWGIA Document.

Nieitshmann, B., 1983: Ethnic War in Nicaragua, (Ms.).
Sunday Times, 2nd October & 23rd October 1983.

NICARAGUA:
"INDIGENOUS SITUATION ON THE ATLANTIC COAST OF NICARAGUA"

Indigenous delegation to Work Group, Geneva, August 1983

Introduction

The historico-economic development of we, the ethnic minorities of the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua, responds to a process which is inconstant and different to the rest of the country.

In the colonial period, whereas on the Pacific Spain wiped out practically all the aboriginal population, on the Atlantic England, by means of a policy of "indirect rule", propped up politically and militarily the dominant ethnic group: Miskito. With the objective of granting this group hegemony in the region in competition with the Spanish Crown, the "Kingdom of the Mosquitia" was established under English "protection".

During the colonial period, the ethnic group Miskito became mixed with various peoples, as many from African origin as Europeans and other ethnic groups from the country. This mixing established a mechanism consisting of a symbiotic relationship allowing the Miskito to assimilate the elements from outside and to continue growing and cultivating their own identity within the framework of colonialism.

The fundamental traits of that identity are our languages, tradition of communal ownership of land and our form of solidarity.

Our original religion fell under the colonial influence which leaves little today of what in past times was our natural religious structure. Today the majority of the ethnic population, Miskito, Sumu, Rama, Creole and Carib profess the Moravian religion, brought to our lands by the British colonialists as an ideological means for domination. However owing to the symbiotic relationship and the determining role of the
enclave political economy which developed in the region, the Moravian religion represents at the present time the ethnic religion.

It is also important to indicate that the socio-economic formation of Nicaragua was influenced from its beginnings by the geographic and economic division which Spain and England made of the territory. So it was not our indigenous ancestors who established the boundaries between each land. In the same way these distinct colonial powers, under various forms, imposed on us a class structure evolved under an ideological system of racial discrimination which was characterised by the placing of one ethnic group over another, all with the object of enslaving us and despoiling our resources.

In this way the British colonial policy of indirect rule, organised under an ideological system of racial discrimination encouraged inter-ethnic conflicts. The ethnic group Sumu suffered persecution and extermination at the hands of the Miskito, whose superiority was based on their alliance with the English Crown who provided them with fire-arms. They used these to sack Sumu communities and those of other ethnic groups in the country and to raid cities under Spanish rule responding to English instigation. On the other hand, the Rama population in the south can be found at the present time with their cultural traits still intact, particularly their language.

In addition the group which we call Creole today because of their having learned the language of their enslavers - English -, gradually came to form part for the colonial power structure of the Mosco Kingdom, imposing their will on the other ethnic groups, including most of the Miskito people.

The imperial dispute held between Spain, England and the United States over the control of the Nicaraguan Atlantic Coast wrote into the history of the country a series of international treaties which were not even discussed or signed by the "Miskito King" and later neither by the Nicaraguan Government. Examples of these are: the Treaty of Versailles, 1783 signed by Spain and England and the "Clayton-Bulwer" of April 19, 1850 between England and the United States, in which the latter were granted dominion over the Atlantic Coast.

The treaties which we mention here are no more than a reflection of the way our people's rights were arbitrarily violated by these imperialist powers in accordance with their expansionist interests.

Here we should point out that the imperial dispute over the hegemony of the Atlantic Coast fundamentally followed two types of interest:

a) To guarantee the exploitation of our natural resources and labour.

b) To control the "absolute right" for designing an inter-oceanic canal.

For both these ends the Miskito people were used as an instrument or banner to establish an artificial division between the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts.

The colonial history establishes the bases for setting up socio-economic, political and semiotic differences which still exist and which both the liberal-conservative governments and the Somoza dictatorship far from resolving, maintained and increased.

On Nicaragua's independence from Spain in 1821, the British Crown continued to argue with the national government over control of "The Mosquitia" (Atlantic Coast) until the imperial power of the North Americans intervened and took over dominion of the region for itself with the consent of the government. They established an enclave economy through their transnational businesses, a system which was maintained until the time of the Revolution's triumph.

On 12 February 1894 the liberal government of Zelaya with US military support "incorporated" the Atlantic Coast by military means. From this moment the enclave economic system
was consolidated in our region in the hands of North American transnational companies which received concessions from the government to carry out indiscriminate exploitation of our mineral, lumber, fish and other resources.

This enclave system had a totalising effect in determining the socio-economic and political relations of the region, as well as playing a divisive role with respect to the national State.

The indigenous populations, particularly Miskito and Sumu were forced into social degradation, owing to the sub-human conditions in the foreign companies where they worked as cheap labour. The deforestation and devastation of our forests in the northeast area of Puerto Cabezas and Waspan, the poisoning of our rivers and the destruction of our ecosystem as in the case of Bambana were other consequences of the enclave economy. It also led directly to the extermination of peoples in these areas, direct victims of this action. The picture of the story of this enclave economy contains the thousands of tuberculosis and silicosis victims among the Miskito such as in the community of Saupuka and numerous inhabitants of the Río Coco. There are also the thousands of children from the Sumu people who died poisoned by the contaminated water of the rivers Tungky and Bamana.

This system of exploitation not only overwhelmed us in misery but committed us to isolation, marginalisation and ethnocide, denying us possibilities of life, education in our languages and participation in political, economic and social activity of the country.

During the Somoza dictatorship on the objective plain of social relations, the groups who controlled political posts, state positions and access to education were inhabitants from the Pacific connected with Somoism, who held a deep-seated racist attitude. This attitude aggravated the sense of being marginal and isolated for the coastal peoples.

Situation of the Atlantic Coast on the Triumph of the Sandinist Revolution

On July 19th 1979, date of the fall of the dictatorship, the country inherited a bankrupt economy with serious economic and social problems. There was also a huge foreign debt, factories with no capital, lack of expertise and numerous other social difficulties.

The effects of these circumstances on our people were, naturally, not encouraging. Health care was out of the reach of the masses and our brothers Miskito, Sumu and Rama died in the communities for lack of medical attention.

The inhabitants of the Río Coco, to survive, offered their labour in the mining companies where they worked without security or social support, becoming ill, as a consequence, from tuberculosis and silicosis. As these spread they were laid off without any sick pay and were forced to return to their communities to await their death and contaminate their families.

The lack of drinking water in our communities was the source of contagious illnesses such as caused by parasites. The few educational centres apart from all the deficiencies of the system were characterised by the imposition of the Spanish language and the prohibition of our native languages. The percentage of illiterates on the Atlantic Coast was higher than for all the country: seven out of ten were illiterate.

The lack of means of communication reflected the isolation in which we had been placed during the dictatorship.

At the moment of the Triumph of the Revolution we discovered that the mining companies Neptune and Rosario Co. which operated in Rosita, Bonanza and Siuna, had had their machinery destroyed and their resources left in an unusable condition. The fishing companies such as Booth and Promarblue were with no capital and had their fishing equipment and boats partly destroyed. This destruction made it difficult
to restore the fishing activity to its normal pace and as such had a depressing effect on our Miskito and Creole communities which have traditionally lived from commercial fishing and artisan work.

The Indigenous Situation

It is necessary to set out here the aspects of historical contradiction between the Atlantic and Pacific which entered into play with the beginning of the revolutionary triumph and which have been aggravated by political interests which are antagonistic to the revolutionary process. The contradiction became apparent at that time through what was our representative organisation MISURASATA (Miskito, Sumu, Rama, Sandinists United), before a part of the leadership became allied to the counter-revolution.

The organic constitution of MISURASATA linked the indigenous bases with the framework which integrated Moravian Pastors and university students and which maintained close ties to the structure of the Moravian Church and above all to Steadman Fagoth, the main leader.

Fagoth, from his position as main leader manipulated the indigenous population (outside the knowledge of a part of the leadership) against the Government and established an alliance with the Movimiento Democrático Nacional and the Partido Conservador. These reactionary connections introduced into MISURASATA one of their agents as an advisor, Eddy Matute, to direct a destabilising line which would be developed within the project for studying land tenancy, a project which Fagoth was co-ordinating with the advisor. There activities led to the arrest of the leadership of the organisation along with some of the indigenous brigadists involved in the literacy campaign in native languages. This occurred in February 1981 and was the start for a conflict waged between the various ethnic groups and the state representatives in the region.

These contradictions had been met by a subsequent dialogue between government and the indigenous leaders and alternatives would have been found to overcome the problems if it had not been for the determining presence of Fagoth. The Government responded to his provocations with the decision to make the arrests without measuring the repercussions in our indigenous population.

The enemy took advantage of the various conflicts and made the maximum capital out of our arrests to develop their destabilisation work. Later, Fagoth led a campaign of confusion to encourage our brother Miskito and Sumu to emigrate to Honduras. The object was to use them as tools in their war against the Revolution of the Nicaraguan people of which we are a part and against the peace of Central America.

As a consequence of North American imperialism’s manipulation of our brothers by means of the CIA, the actual scenario which is taking place in our communities is as follows: families are divided, imprisoned by the abductions which have taken place in several places such as Tasba Raya, Silmalila, and forced to go to the counter-revolutionary camps in Honduras; our women and children are forced into concentration camps by the Honduras army and the Somozist guards; obstacles caused by the counter-revolutionary incursions into our communities prevent our carrying out our daily work for basic subsistence.

A. Aggressive acts on our communities on the Atlantic Coast

Since the operation "Red Christmas" on the banks of the Río Coco during December 1981, hostilities on the Atlantic Coast have been on the increase. After this event attacks by counter-revolutionary hands on all points of our country’s frontier have been innumerable. In our communities we have experienced the attacks of Seven-Benk I and Seven-Benk II, the attack on Santa Clara, the abduction of various communities in the "Tasba Raya" project and Awastingni, fights on
the Río Waspuk, in Tronquera, the abduction of Sílimalía, murders by the counter-revolution such as of the pregnant school-mistress and her child, to those burned alive at Síuna Junction, brother Miskito killed in the recent attack on Sisín, etc.. In addition there are the numerous acts of sabotage, deeds which seriously affect our conditions of subsistence so that we can neither sow nor harvest in our communities, neither can we fish. In this way we suffer daily the deaths of brothers from our ethnic group and of the rest of the Nicaraguan population.

Before this hell which the warlike policy of the US imposes on us, we cry out to the world for peace and the end to the use by the Reagan government of our indigenous Miskito and Sumu brothers as instruments of its dirty war against humanity and the freedom of the Centroamerican peoples.

B. Problems, gains and perspectives of our indigenous rights in the Revolution

The actual situation of our indigenous communities on the Atlantic Coast is complex. We reckon with numerous problems which we can not easily resolve especially in a way outside of our direct participation.

Among the main problems in our communities we can point out:

- The lack of qualified indigenous technicians participating in the State apparatus who could contribute to the solution of the problems which affect us.

- Limitations in the action and advice of governmental institutions with regard to our technical needs which could contribute to the better use of our lands, the reforestation of our forests and fishing work in our indigenous and Creole communities.

- Lack of adequate means of communication to direct and facilitate the objectives and negotiations of our indigenous population before the various requests of the State. In addition there is the need for those responsible for the various state institutions to thoroughly understand the reality of our communities and to learn our language.

- The lack of an indigenous organisation limits to a great extent the political participation of our indigenous communities. Even though the legal freedom exists to found such an organisation, objectively there are two fundamental difficulties which thwart this formation: the situation of war in which we live and the distress which our communities are suffering because of familial separations dispersing people between Honduras and Costa Rica. On the other hand we must state that the solution to these difficulties does not only depend on the forces which we can develop within the country, but also the practical action which indigenous organisations, supporting indigenous peoples and struggling for peace can do to prevent the extermination of our Miskito and Sumu brothers who are instruments in a war against the freedom of our Centroamerican peoples and of the Nicaraguan Revolution.

As well as our problems, it is fair to state also the gains received with the Revolution in our indigenous populations such as:

- A significant reduction in the rate of infant mortality. The continuing of a vaccination programme which covers some 80-90% of our communities.

- Construction of 1,700 dwellings in Tacha Pri.

- Compensation for Miskito mine workers who suffer from tuberculosis and silicosis be means of a monthly pension.

- The spread of our languages by means of broadcasts and writings. There are three local radio stations consisting of bilingual Miskito-Spanish transmissions and a two hour programme on the national radio-network "Radio Sandino" (Miskito-Sumu-Spanish). A regional bilingual magazine called "Avances" is published every month.
- The revival and promotion of our artisan work in wood, tunu and tortoise shell.

- The acceptance of a permanent dialogue between the Moravian Church and the Government to analyse ethnic problems. Also there is the faint sound of negotiations for indigenous representation.

- The de facto acceptance of a communal form of land tenure manifest in the handing over of 16,365 manzanas of land in Tasba Pri.

As we can see in the situation which we have outlined there still remain on the ground many things to do to get our indigenous rights recognised. At the moment one can see two perspectives of great significance: that relating to the institutionalisation of bilingual-bicultural education in Miskito communities, a project which is under study. The other is the step of deregionalisation of the country which would offer our indigenous population a greater opportunity for access in making administrative and political decisions.

The increase in participation of our indigenous communities depends fundamentally on two conditions: the establishment of peace and the capacity of our brothers.

With all the characteristic complexity of our historical development, we stand before the challenge of finding forms of human co-existence, based on mutual respect between specific indigenous people and the rest of the Nicaraguan population, and we stand before the challenge of strengthening the unity of the country - necessary and urgent - at the time when the common enemy, North American imperialism, is trying to destroy the Nicaraguan Revolution and at the same time to prevent the liberation of our brother Central Americans.

We stand before the need to rescue our Miskito and Sumu brothers from the destructive claws of the warmongers, and we call out on their behalf for solidarity from indigenous and international organisations alike for the sake of peace.

PACIFIC: THE NUCLEAR FREE AND INDEPENDENT CONFERENCE 1983
A REPORT by Martine Petrod and Diana Vinding

From 10-20 July this year the Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific Conference was held in Port-Vila, Vanuatu. The purpose of the Conference was to examine the problems that colonialism and militarisation have caused for the Pacific countries, as well as to improve the co-operation between the Movement for a free and demilitarised Pacific and the indigenous movements for independence and territorial rights.

In the following report we will give a short account of the proceedings of the Conference and go over some of the topics discussed. During the proceedings we gained a clearer understanding that human rights, self-determination and peace are connected. In addition we were confirmed in our knowledge that the problems of the Pacific Countries should be seen in a global context which includes Europe. In fact Europe should establish definite co-operation with the movements and organisations in the Pacific Ocean fighting for a nuclear free zone and independence.

Proceedings of the Conference

The conference was organised by the Pacific Concern Resource Center (PCRC), which is a co-ordination and information centre for the whole Pacific region. A total of 160 people from 33 different countries participated (29 Pacific and 4 European). Furthermore representatives from several Pacific organisations were present such as Pacific Conference of Churches, Pacific Trade Union Forum and the University of South Pacific Student Association.

The exceptional support for the Conference from the host country should be emphasised. Vanuatu became independent in 1980 and in March this year the country declared itself a 'nuclear free nation'. Naturally the Government totally endorsed the purpose of the Conference, but we also saw much evidence that the population did as well.
The opening ceremony took place in a traditional Melanesian manner with dancing and slaughtering of pigs, and with a big demonstration in front of the British, French and Australian Embassies on the 14th July. On both occasions hundreds of Vanuatuans participated with homemade banners and signs of their solidarity with the Conference and other Pacific countries.

Possibly the strongest impression was the spirit characterising the Conference. In spite of the many nationalities, the vast geographical and cultural differences, one had the sense of solidarity and mutual respect.

Main topics of the Conference

The Conference had three main topics. Each was initially illustrated by papers and panel discussions and then followed by debate in smaller workgroups, which among other functions were to plan future action and formulate resolutions. The topics were as follows:

1. Political Independence in the Pacific Ocean
   This topic was discussed from three perspectives:
   - The external colonialism of the industrialised countries, exemplified by France's colonial policy in New Caledonia and Polynesia, as well as USA's neo-colonialist policy in Micronesia and the Philippines.
   - The internal colonialism of the industrialised countries, exemplified by the political and socio-economic oppression experienced by the aboriginal populations in Australia, New Zealand, North-America and Hawaii, threatening to extinguish them culturally and physically.
   - The colonialism of Third World countries, exemplified by Indonesia's occupation and brutal oppression in West Papua and East Timor.

   It was widely accepted to condemn and fight against any form of colonialism but top priority should be given to New
Caledonia and East Timor, being two countries where the present situation demands an urgent international effort.

2. Nuclearisation and Militarisation of the Pacific Ocean

Primarily this topic was concerned with the examination of different nuclear activities occurring in the area, such as uranium mining, nuclear power and testings of nuclear weapons. In addition there were testimonies from areas where these activities are taking place. Particular interest rose from the testimonies presented by representatives from Japan, the Marshall Islands, Australia and Tahiti. They described the physiological and genetic consequences of the radioactive pollution caused and being caused by the American, British and French nuclear bombs.

The strategic importance of the Pacific Ocean to the Great Powers, including the Soviet Union and China, was also discussed. Wherever military bases are established there are always problems such as environmental damage, destruction of traditional economies, disintegration of the social and cultural structures, prostitution and so forth. These all constitute a serious threat to the local populations.

3. Economic dependence and development.

Here the Conference dealt with the importance of oceanic resources to the economic development of the Pacific Countries. In addition the issue was raised of how these resources are threatened by the fishing interests of the Big Powers and perhaps especially by the dumping of radioactive waste and underwater nuclear tests.

Results of the Conference

The Conference closed with a joint declaration (see next article) and a series of resolutions related to specific cases discussed in the meetings. There was support for New Caledonia, East Timor and French Polynesia. Finally the Conference agreed on a series of proposed actions to be followed up by the various delegations in their respective countries. The

Pacific Concerns Resource Center will continue as a co-ordination centre for the many grassroot movements and organisations existing in the Pacific. In order to take care of the increasing number of tasks, two new branches have been established in Belau and Vanuatu.

The importance of the Conference

The Conference provided a better insight into the situation in the Pacific Countries and a clearer understanding of certain fundamental issues:

1. Colonialism, militarisation and nuclearisation constitute one and the same problem.

Without the more or less unconcealed colonising of the Pacific Countries by the industrialised countries, it would not have been possible to carry out such a massive militarisation and nuclearisation of the area. Dumping of radioactive waste in the vicinity of populated groups of islands would not have occurred either. On the other hand it can be said that the strategic importance of the Pacific is the reason why France and the USA use every means possible to maintain their influence. This is also the reason why Indonesia appropriated West Papua unhindered and committed genocide in East Timor: not only is Indonesia an important ally of the USA, but East Timor and West Papua are of special significance due to their location by the Banda Sea between the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Therefore the USA has not condemned the Indonesian actions in these two countries, but on the contrary even took care that the most influential countries remained neutral (e.g. when the East Timor question was raised in the United Nations).

2. Western Europe is part of the problem in the Pacific.

This joint responsibility is not only to do with the colonial past of Europe and - in the case of France - the present. The militarisation experienced in the Pacific Ocean is among other things the result of the tense situation
between Eastern and Western Europe. The weapons being tested in the Pacific Ocean shall, if the occasion were to arise, be used to defend our part of the world, our way of life and our ideologies. Finally the West European countries have a joint responsibility through their membership of the United Nations when applied to for support in decisions or resolutions being taken about the Pacific area.

3. The problems of the Pacific Ocean are also the problems of Western Europe.

The Conference confirmed our opinion that Western Europe can learn by looking at the development in the Pacific Ocean. Western Europe is subjected to the same difficulties although colonisation and militarisation takes more subtle forms here than in the Pacific.

Due to this background it appears most important to bring about a closer co-operation between Western Europe and the Pacific Ocean. Better information about what is going on there will make it possible to:

- Live up to our moral obligations towards the Pacific countries by informing and influencing public opinion, including politicians and governments. Thus we can support Pacific peoples and assist them in stopping the injustices to which they are being exposed.

- Obtain a better understanding of our own situation.

- Find inspiration in the work and initiatives going on in the Pacific. Among other things we are thinking of the steps already taken by certain countries towards the creation of nuclear free zones. As examples we can mention Palau, having a nuclear free constitution, and Vanuatu, which has declared itself a nuclear free state.

It is therefore our intention to try in co-operation with the Pacific Concerns Resource Center to establish an information centre in Denmark which could disseminate information about the conditions in the Pacific Ocean with a view to promoting joint efforts in creating a peaceful world and encouraging European peace and environment movements to co-operate with similar movements in the Pacific.

Copenhagen, September 1983.

PACIFIC: VANUATU DECLARATION OF THE FOURTH NUCLEAR FREE AND INDEPENDENT PACIFIC CONFERENCE

We, the 160 delegates representing organisations from 33 countries convened at the Fourth Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific Conference in the nuclear free zone of Port Vila in Vanuatu from July 10-20, DECLARE OUR COMMITMENT TO WORK FOR AN OPPRESSION FREE PACIFIC. As the Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific Movement, we see the Pacific peoples' struggle for self-determination and independence as inseparable from the struggle to attain a nuclear free Pacific. In the conference deliberations we reaffirmed the goals and aims of "The People's Charter for a Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific."

We commend the newly independent government of Vanuatu, a member of the non-aligned nations, for its leadership in supporting the rights of the indigenous people of the Pacific in their struggle to end all forms of oppression.

We pledge our solidarity with the courageous peoples of East Timor, and West Papua in their struggle for self-determination and independence from Indonesian colonisation. We uphold and support the demands of the Kanak Independence Front of New
Caledonia and their efforts towards Kanak Socialist Independence in September 1984. We set as an immediate priority, the placement of East Timor and New Caledonia on the United Nations agenda for decolonisation and commit ourselves to pressure our governments to vote in favour of East Timor and New Caledonia at the United Nations.

We recognise the sovereignty of the people of "French" Polynesia and their inalienable right to determine their future. We demand that the French Government immediately cease and conditionally abandon its nuclear testing in "French" Polynesia.

This conference also recognises the right to self-determination of the Aboriginal, Maori, native Hawaiian, North American Indian and Chamorro people and condemns the racist policies of the Australian, New Zealand, U.S. and Canadian governments toward the native people of those countries.

We firmly oppose the haste in which the plebiscites on the Compact of Free Association have been held in Micronesia and object to the long term military agreements in the Compact as well as attempts by the U.S. to undermine the Palau Constitution's nuclear ban.

We reaffirm our opposition to uranium mining and support the indigenous North Americans and Australian aborigines in opposing the exploitation of their traditional lands. We call for a global moratorium on uranium mining and the whole nuclear cycle so that an investigation can be conducted by the UN on the devastating effect on the lands and lives of indigenous people throughout the world and support the blockade of the Roxby Downs uranium mine site in South Australia.

We demand that the Japanese government abandon its waste dumping plan and we will expand our opposition to plans by the U.S. and Japan to dump nuclear waste in the Pacific by adopting and circulating an international protest petition to the Japanese Prime Minister protesting nuclear waste dumping in the Pacific Ocean.

We pledge to monitor activities on the deployment of weapons and weapons systems in the Pacific. We strongly condemn the deployment of nuclear weapons systems into the Pacific, especially the Tomahawk Cruise missile. We support the efforts of the Kwajelain landowners of the Marshall Islands to stop the MX and other missile testing on their lands and the restoration of the land to the rightful owners. We also support the indigenous peoples of Canada in their opposition to the testing or the cruise missile on their alienated lands. We not only fear the potential hazards of such weapons systems and the potential for nuclear attack, we also oppose the displacement of Pacific peoples for the establishment of such systems.

We are firmly opposed to the increased conventional war preparations by the U.S. Australia, Japan, New Zealand and Canada. To this end we will co-ordinate international protests against the RIMPAC 1984 military exercises scheduled for March in Hawaii. In particular, we oppose the bombing of the sacred and culturally significant island of Kaho'olawe during those exercises, and will pressure the participating governments to decline U.S. invitations to these exercises.

We will work to develop opposition to the military alliances in the Pacific region which reinforce the neocolonial domination of our people, such as ANZUS and the U.S.-Japan Security Pact.

We uphold the Filipino people's demand for the immediate and unconditional dismantling of all U.S. military installations in the Philippines which could serve as springboards for U.S. intervention in the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf. We oppose U.S. economic, political and military domination of the Philippines.

We also recognise the liberation struggles of our Pacific neighbours in Central America and call for an end to all U.S.
economic and military aid to the military juntas of El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras. We condemn U.S. efforts to destabilise Nicaragua.

We have come together in this conference to share our experiences, exchange our views and learn from one another. We have forged strong bonds for a united front against the nuclear fuel cycle and nuclear and conventional weapons systems in the Pacific. We thank the people and government of Vanuatu for the warm hospitality, generous support and inspiration that they have given us. They have inspired us with a vision of what can be accomplished through united efforts.

We stand in solidarity with each other in our common struggle for self-determination. We will work to gain the support of the Pacific regional organisations such as the Melanesian Council of Churches, the Pacific Conference of Churches, the Pacific Trade Union Forum, the USPASA and the YWCA for our action campaigns through the Pacific Concerns Resource Custer and the Vanuatu Pacific Community Center. We will also seek the support of international organisations and conferences such as the World Conference of Churches, the World Conference Against A & H Bombs and the European and North American Peace Movement. We go forward from this conference firmly united in our commitment to make our Pacific nuclear free and independent- for ours and future generations.

For further information:
Pacific Concerns Resource Center
PO Box 27592
Honolulu, Hawaii 96827
Telephone: 808-538-3522
Cable: NUFCFREEPAC, Honolulu.

Vanuatu Pacific Community Centre
PO Box 807
Porto Vila, Republic of Vanuatu
Telephone: 2317
Cable: FREE PACIFIC, Port Vila

PALAU: ALTERNATIVE NOBEL PEACE PRIZE RECIPIENTS

One of this year's alternative Nobel Peace Prize winners has been the Palau island group. The award was in recognition of their declaring their territory a nuclear free zone in spite of considerable opposition from the United States (see IMJIA Newsletter No.34, July 1983). Their Constitution bans nuclear weapons and waste unless there is approval from 75% of the votes cast in a referendum. The Palauans have effectively created a nuclear free zone around their islands.

But the Constitution is just the latest in a long history of Palauan actions to prevent outside control of their islands. When U.S. military plans for the use of 30% of their islands were first announced in 1972, traditional and elected leaders immediately went on record opposing the plans. During the mid 1970s the 14,000 Palauans were successfully organising local and international support to turn back a massive oil superport/industrial center planned for Palau, with the support of the US military.

500 miles east of the Philippines and in close proximity to the Asian mainland, Palau is a strategically important island group to the Pentagon. To quell Palau fears, the US says it has not current military plans for Palau, it only wants "options" to use the land for jungle warfare training, weapons storage and transit and overflight of nuclear vessels and aircraft.

Many Palauans, however, believe the U.S. military will bring another war to Palau. Remembering their experience in World War II, when thousands died and the islands were devastated, older Palauans remark: "When soldiers come, war comes." In 1979 the Republic of Palau adopted a Constitution which effectively marked the end of U.S. administration of the island. The US had won the Micronesian islands from Japan at the end of World War II and administered the islands as a "United Nations Strategic Trust Territory".
Strategic Trust Territories means that until 1979 the US was only accountable for its actions on Palau to the Security Council of the UN where it has a veto. The Constitution banned all nuclear activities on the islands and was in complete opposition to a Compact of Free Association which was a treaty under preparation since the early 1970s. According to this treaty the US could use 32,000 acres of land on Bab-ol-dao Island for jungle warfare training, the use of ports and airports for military purposes and access rights of way near four traditional villages. In addition nuclear weapons would be stored on Palau when the US determined and radioactive waste could be disposed. In essence the Compact would allow Palau $1 billion in aid and a form of self-government in return for absolute US military authority over the islands.

The Compact of Free Association was signed by Palau and the US government in August 1982 and was then put before the people in a plebiscite on February 10 this year. Section 314 (the nuclear aspect of the treaty) was the clause which directly contradicted the Constitution and 75% of the people would have had to vote in favour of the section to ratify it. It was rejected as was a second vote on the Compact as a whole. On February 25th, the Senate of the Palau National Congress (OEN) passed Resolution No.87. The resolution stated that the citizens of Palau had disapproved the Compact as had the Senate itself. The resolution went on to call upon the President of Palau and Palau's traditional leaders to renegotiate the political status of the islands. The Traditional Council of Chiefs and the High Chief Ibedul have stated the Compact is dead.

The anticipated US reaction has taken place and the State Department has set up transition offices in Palau (and other parts of Micronesia) to begin implementation of the Compact in spite of its rejection by voters and prior to review and approval by the US Congress. On July 1st US Ambassador Fred Zedner and Palau Ambassador Lazarus Salli signed an agreement which acknowledged the defeat of the nuclear agreement but specifically omitted any reference to the transit of nuclear vessels and the storage of nuclear weapons while in "transit". Despite contradicting the Palau Constitution's nuclear ban, the State department asserted that this agreement merely needed the approval of the Palau National Congress for implementation. But after a month of deliberation, the Senate rejected the new agreement.

A week later in August the Palau Supreme Court "declared that the Compact of Free Association and its integral and subsidiary parts that include the Harmful Substances Agreement, were disapproved by the people and Republic of Palau." It rejected the Palau government's and the US State Department's contention that the Compact had been approved in the February plebiscite. This was a major defeat for the US government.

One of the most lucid statements on the Compact has come from Palau High Chief Ibedul to the UN Trusteeship Council in New York in May this year. He said then:

"There are many reasons why the Compact in its present form, is not acceptable to the people of Palau. Some are obvious. Some not so obvious. I need not dwell on Section 314. In accordance with our Constitution, the people have overwhelmingly delivered a message that we do not wish to have nuclear and other harmful substances in Palau. We are a peace-loving people. We have tasted the horrors of war. In exercising our right to self-determination we now choose not to be placed in a similar position again. We simply say to the United States, let us live in peace without becoming a military puppet. Given us our right to self-determination and do not impose upon us the horrors and terror which may follow from the introduction of nuclear weapons into Palau.

"The other reasons why the Compact, in its present form, is not acceptable to the people of Palau may be somewhat less obvious. Let me remind you that Article 73 of the Charter of
United Nations mandates the administering authority recognize that the interests of the inhabitants of Palau are paramount and that in ensuring the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the people, the administering authority shall always give "due respect to the culture of the peoples concerned." These guiding principles have not been followed in the Compact in its present form.

"Culturally and traditionally, the traditional leaders of Palau, the Council of Chiefs, must be closely consulted on any issue as sensitive as the land use rights which are granted to the United States under the Compact. The land system in Palau emanates from the traditional clan system. Our clan system is still strong and viable after several thousand years of experience. This explains why, during the recent plebiscite, 5 of the 8 states in which the United States would have either exclusive or joint use of land, including the state of Koror where over 65% of all Palauans reside, voted against not only Section 314 but also the Compact as a whole.

"To successfully implement a compact in Palau which gives the United States use of our precious lands, close consultation and agreement with our traditional council of chiefs is absolutely essential. As a practical matter, regardless of the assurances of the Palauan administration, without such consultation and agreement, it will be impossible to implement and effectuate a compact involving joint or exclusive use of land. The people and the traditional leaders will not stand idly by and permit their lands to be confiscated contrary to the constitutional safeguards which exist. Too much is at stake! Too much is inconsistent with the basic tenets of the United Nations Charter giving due respect to the culture of the peoples concerned. Until the United States recognizes and comes to grips with this basic point, there will not be a viable Compact of Free Association."

The alternative Nobel Peace prize which was awarded to Palau is a share from the Swedish Fund "Stiftelsen för rätt levnadssätt" (Foundation for right attitudes) started by Jakob von Yxkull.

Sources: My Teknik, 83:46,
Pacific Bulletin, September 1983,
For more information about the Micronesia Support Committee contact:
1212 University Ave., Honolulu, HI 96826, Hawaii.

PERU: HIGHLANDS FACE POLITICAL VIOLENCE AND NATURAL DISASTER

The Peruvian Highlands have witnessed suffering this year not only from the effects of the continuing struggle between the security forces and the guerrilla organization Sendero Luminoso but also from climatic extremes of drought and floods. The guerrilla warfare is centred around the area of Ayacucho whereas the drought is at its worst on the high Altiplano region of southern Peru and Bolivia. The floods have ravaged the northern part of the Highlands leaving no part of the Peruvian Andes free from some suffering.

In spite of the importance of the natural disasters for the indigenous population of the Highlands (see CISA interview in this volume), it has been impossible not to concentrate on the situation in Ayacucho in the light of an Amnesty International report published this August. In addition INGIA has received personal testimonies of indigenous people harassed by the security forces and of indigenous organisations unable to function properly.

The Peruvian Government has placed Ayacucho in a zone of emergency since December 1982 in its attempt to put down the armed struggle of Sendero Luminoso. This guerrilla movement has been operating in the Highlands since 1980 working within
an ideology which combines the writings of the Peruvian writer Mariátegui and Maoist principles. After a prolonged military offensive, mobilising the peasantry they intend to surround and finally assault the cities.

According to an estimate of deaths caused by Sendero Luminoso given by Mario Vargas Llosa in the New York Times Magazine by April 1983, 300 civilians and police had been killed. The security forces claim to have killed 500 Senderistas during the same period. However in September of this year Luis Pecovich, civilian minister of the Interior said that 1,560 people have been killed since Sendero Luminoso emerged in 1980. Of these 1,033 are described as official Senderistas (which according to Latin America Weekly Report 23 September, would make Sendero Luminoso one of the most

impressively organised political parties in Peru). The remaining 465 are described as "campesinos" with no mention of any affiliation to Sendero Luminoso. Even a conservative count demonstrates quite clearly that the Government security forces have been killing in far greater numbers than the organisation they are trying to destroy. When moving on to arrests, Pecovich said that 2,219 arrests had been made whereas the judiciary only had information of about 800 people in custody. The Amnesty International report with its accounts of torture and extrajudicial execution gives some insight as to the fate of many of these "disappeared".

The military zone in Ayacucho is controlled by Brigadier General Clemente Noel y Moral from the Los Cabitos military barracks near the airport. Los Cabitos has a reputation for holding secret detainees, torturing prisoners and extrajudicial executions. One example of such a "disappearance" was that of Ing. Jorge Janampa Janampa, Treasurer of the "Consejo Regional COMUNRUM", an indigenous organisation from Ayacucho. On November 1st he was taken to "Los Cabitos". His family were frequently told that he was not being held. Eventually after a national and international protest he was released.

In the remote areas of the emergency zone, security forces are reported to have carried out large scale, sometimes random killings of members of communities perceived to have supported guerrilla actions. This, according to the Amnesty Report, was to warn them against future collaboration or else as reprisal for presumed participation in guerrilla activities in the past. Another phenomenon mentioned in the Amnesty report is the emergence of patrullas comunales (vigilante groups reportedly controlled by some community leaders) who have been killing people in the Highlands with the support of the military and even their active encouragement.
The Amnesty International report provides details of hundreds of detentions and extrajudicial executions which have occurred in the Highlands this year. It is possible to extract from the details certain incidents which illustrate the main problems facing the indigenous communities and organisations of the Ayacucho region.

On February 5th this year Félix Pacheco Choce was shot dead near Paucarbamba (Huancavelica Department) by members of the Government security forces. Pacheco’s crime was his membership of the left-wing political party Unión Democrática del Pueblo and the fact that he was a leader of the community and an indigenous organisation in dispute over land rights with local private landlords. He was a local leader of the community of Manzanayoc and of the Federación Distrital de Campesinos de Ancón. It was alleged that he and his entire family had sympathies with Sendero Luminoso. In March the rest of his family were killed.

14 leaders of the local Tayacaja communities protested to the Ministry of the Interior in April protesting the killings of the Choce family and reporting a series of abuses in the area. Communities of the area hold land in common some of which was expropriated from private landowners during the Agrarian Reform of President Velasco in the 1970s. Disputes over land rights between private landowners and communities frequently relate to land expropriated under the reform. The protest in the form of a letter from community leaders says detentions, killings and other abuses of the local population have been motivated in part by the interests of large landowners now working closely with the security services, “who have arbitrarily accused local leaders with whom they are in conflict over land rights with involvement in guerilla activity.

The case of the Choce family demonstrates how the Peruvian Government are working to undermine any advantages there were in the Agrarian Reform by directly co-operating with private landowners. All attempts at supporting traditional communal rights are seen by the security forces as being subversive.

The Government have attacked and imprisoned many members of local and national indigenous organisations. In September INGIA received a visit from Elias Carreño who told of his arrest in July. He represents the local indigenous organisation of Cusco (Llanchaqus) and described how some of the people who attended a conference of Movimiento Indio Tupac Amaru (including Salvador Palomino an advisor to CISA and instrumental figure in MITA) were arrested for several days until their release came after national and international protest.

The information coming from Peru now indicates clearly that peaceful indigenous organisations are being harassed by the security forces. INGIA has received several personal accounts of attempts to prevent indigenous groups from functioning.

Another problem which is occurring in the Peruvian Highlands is the attempts by Government forces and Sendero Luminoso to gain control over indigenous communities and keep their support. The result is a continuous stream of attacks on communities in an area first from one side then the other.

The Victor Fajardo Province of Ayacucho contains three districts Lucanamarca, Sacasamarca and Huancasancos which illustrate the tragedies of reprisal killings. Sendero Luminoso had been in control of this area since October 1982 when in February this year people from Sacasamarca attacked and killed some guerillas when sleeping. In return a guerilla column came from Huancasancos and took away 10 people. The security forces were alerted and went to Huancasancos. The guerillas fled to the hills before the forces arrived yet 25 people were killed by the military. The security forces then appointed new community leaders and residents were
ordered to resist further guerilla activity. On February 20th 400 people then repulsed a guerilla attack on the community killing five. Military reinforcements arrived the following day and passed through Sacasamarca where 25 people were killed as suspected terrorists.

Sendero Luminoso remained active in the area and occupied Lucanasmarca killing two community members publicly as informants. In response on the 28th the military attacked killing 19 people in the course of the raid. The dead people were shot while at a public assembly organised to discuss the threats from both sides in the warfare. During March sporadic fighting continued.

On April 3rd Sendero Luminoso attacked the communities around Lucanasmarca killing all newly appointed local authorities who were pro-security forces. A total of at least 67 people were reported to have been killed by the guerillas after capture and mock trials. The security forces retaliated and between April 4-10 69 people were killed in the same communities. The latest news the Amnesty Report has of the area is that in may 70 people were killed in Sacasa marca in a single day. The Ayacucho command reports them all as being guerillas.

The fighting between Sendero Luminoso and the Sinchis (name for the Peruvian counterinsurgency detachments within the Guardia Civil) over the support of Highland communities are leading to losses of life in many ways comparable to the massacres which are going on in Guatemala.

Another extended example of the situation in Highland Peru in the Amnesty International report concerns 8 journalists who were killed in the community of Uchuraccay in the Huanta Province of Ayacucho. Although deaths of journalists may not initially appear to be an indigenous affair, it materialised as the result of the commission of enquiry set up by the Government under the leadership of the novelist
Mario Vargas Llosa that "responsibility in the murder of the journalists is shared by all of the community of Uchuraccay and, without doubt, by all of the Iguicha communities." (Amnesty Report p.38.) The security forces, according to the commission had no share of the responsibility in any form whatsoever. The implications of this finding is important for two reasons: 1) Why did the community kill non-guerrillas? (whether they were reporters or indigenous people is not the issue here and 2) What is the status of community patrols which are operating in Highland Peru at the present time?

The importance of the first question is apparent in an article written by Vargas Llosa in the New York Times Magazine in July. In the article he describes the Iquichano people as isolated from the rest of Peru, violent in temperament, defenders of their customs and haters of outsiders. The killings of the journalists were described in the article as having "magical and religious overtones" with the wounds on the corpses being "ritualistic". The overall impression is one of a romanticised account of a group of "savages" who through fear of Sendero Luminoso killed a group of journalists even though they were aware of their true identity. Confusion and ignorance led to the deaths.

In this context it is important to see the New York Times Magazine article in a context of Llosa’s writings about indigenous peoples. The critique of Vargas Llosa in Pueblo Indio No. 2 by Saul Rivas-Rivas points out that behind his writings on indigenous affairs there are axioms of a colonialis and an ethnocentric bias which stem from an over-romantic image of indigenous peoples couched in 19th century evolutionary terms (p.23).

The Amnesty International report criticises the Vargas Llosa Commission’s findings (which are re-iterated in his New York Times Magazine article). It is agreed that the villagers in the area were afraid of Sendero Luminoso, and accepted that members of the community killed the journalists; the report does, however, take a less impassioned and romantic perspective of the case and sees the role of the security forces as a crucial factor.

While Sendero Luminoso has appeared particularly active in the farming communities in Huanta Province, the communities of the puna (highland area largely above 4,000 metres and dedicated mainly to herding and potato growing) have been until this year less affected by guerrilla activity. However recently the guerrilla forces have passed over the high puna areas to facilitate co-ordination of operations in different zones. The security forces have been extremely eager to stamp this out.

An offensive against Sendero Luminoso from the military and police in conjunction with local authorities (the tenientes gobernadores are appointed by external authorities and are usually Spanish-speaking and ex-military personnel) who at this time effectively govern the communities. According to the state of emergency in Ayacucho they are required to report regularly to regional military and police commanders. Under the direction of these commanders many tenientes gobernadores have organised community members into community patrols (patrullas comunales) and have been authorised to guard their own communities against Sendero Luminoso attacks. These patrols often act together with the regular security services. Participants in the patrols receive compensation in the form of goods - foodstuffs and dry goods - distributed by the army.

Community patrols occasionally have authorisation to carry out raids in neighbouring communities. Although the security forces authorise them to kill any suspected guerrilla, they at the same time refuse to claim any responsibility for extrajudicial killings done in their name. The puna communities have reported that military personnel in advising them how to deal with guerrillas have said "those that come by air (military in helicopters) are friends, those that come
by land must be killed...” (AI Report p.39).

The Amnesty Report says that although the security forces did not necessarily know that the journalists were going to visit the village that day on which they were killed, they had recently been to the puna community and told the people to kill all who came by land. It was thus in following the instructions of the security services that the villagers led by the Teniente Gobernador tried and put them to death.

The killing of the journalists has brought to public attention what has been going on before and since in the puna communities of the Huanta province. At least 25 suspects were killed in the region by community patrols before the death of the journalists on January 26 and they are still going on.

In answer to the questions raised above it is worth quoting from the Amnesty International Report’s conclusions about the matter of responsibility of indigenous communities who have been told to form patrols by the authorities:

"Amnesty International has examined carefully all available information on cases involving the killing of captives in the Iquicha and other regions by local authorities of peasant communities, and by patrullas communities led by those authorities since mid-January 1983... Most of these killings appear to be extrajudicial executions for which authorities of the Ayacucho regional political/military command should be held accountable. Amnesty International believes the killing in the Iquicha region of the 8 journalists on 26 January at the base differs from the other reported killings of captives in the area only with respect to the identities of the other victims (i.e. being possible guerrilla activists or sympathisers.)

The Vargas Llosa Commission, in its attempt to play down the existence of these community patrols and their connections to the security forces, explained the incident in terms of the village's "savagery". While not denying that the villagers of the puna communities willingly put people to death who were innocent, the Amnesty International report forces one to see in opposition to Vargas Llosa that the real savagery came from the security forces who actively authorised and encouraged the killing of strangers arriving by road.

There are other factors in the circumstances of the rise of community patrols in the puna regions of Huanta which may also throw light on why the villagers were prepared to make agreements with the security forces. According to Vargas Llosa’s article in the New York Times Magazine (which we noted earlier is couched in hyperbole), the Iquicha people of the puna are among the most destitute in Ayacucho. They live on inhospitable lands eating a meagre diet of beans and potatoes. Any surplus they had was sold at local markets in the valleys to buy provisions of coca, macaroni and maize.

In January this year Sendero Luminoso tried to enforce a policy of "economic self-sufficiency" in their "liberated zones" where no surpluses would be produced thereby stopping all trade to the cities. Vargas Llosa says that fearing to lose their trade potential with the valleys communities turned against Sendero Luminoso and the patrols were set up. However the Amnesty Report says (p.40) that a visit was made by the security forces to at least the village of Uchuraccay on December 21, 1982 when community leaders were provided with a grant of "civic action" food supplies and offered protection against the guerrillas. In addition community leaders were in touch with security forces in the market towns where they could receive orders and their food hand-outs. These contacts were taking place before the "self-sufficiency" policy of Sendero Luminoso became enforced.

In the light of this information it is possible to see the support for the security forces in parts of the puna from a different perspective. Working a living from the land is not easy at these altitudes and a surplus is necessary to obtain essential commodities which cannot be produced. This year has been particularly hard for highland farmers especially in the southern Altiplano. With the additional fear of drought Sendero Luminoso's anti-surplus project would be received with considerably more hostility than the Government's
offer of free hand-outs.

There is a cynical side to these handouts from the military because in the area where the drought is at its worst in the south, the Government has done nothing to alleviate the suffering. Crop losses have been as high as 70-80% and little or no aid has got through. International organisations do not trust the Peruvian government to see the aid through while at the same time the Peruvian government is carrying out a campaign against organisations with international connections. This campaign is connected with the fear of financial aid going to the guerrillas. For example we have seen (eg. the interview in this volume) that CISA have been harassed by the Peruvian authorities and the Centro Amazónico de Antropología y Aplicación Práctica (CAAAP) have had their offices in Iquitos searched and books confiscated from the library in July this year.

Even though the Peruvian government is facing a catastrophic natural disaster in the southern part of the country where farmers are being ruined and in some cases are even selling their children (Guardian, Friday August 5) to supplement their income they do nothing. On the other hand they appear able to offer generous hand-outs of food to people living in similar ecological zones who offer to co-operate in hunting guerilla forces.

Sendero Luminoso is growing. Instead of the small cellular structure with which it began its operations, it is now leading attacks on communities with 50 men or more. At a funeral in Ayacucho in March Sendero sympathisers were openly present among the 2000 mourners and a Sendero flag was placed over the coffin (Amnesty International report p.5). At one time it was possible to put forward the argument that the communities of the Highlands were outside the struggle, however daily they are being drawn right into the fighting. The fact is that some Highland communities are supporting Sendero Luminoso and the principal reason for this lies with the Peru-
vian government who ignore calls for fair and just application of agricultural reforms, land rights and side with the reactionary vested interests of the private landowners. Where they receive open support it is with the aid of food hand-outs. The main conclusion of the Amnesty Report is that heavy handed way in which the Government is trying to destroy Sendero Luminoso is in fact turning more and more people into guerilla supporters. If the Peruvian government have an escalating guerilla war on their hands it is largely their own doing.

Sources: Amnesty International 1983 PERU: Torture and Extra-judicial Executions. AI, 1 Easton St., London.

Also articles in: The Guardian, August 5, 1983
Latin America Weekly Report, 23 September 1983
Pueblo Indio, AM 2 No, 2, Marzo/ Abril 1982.

(IMGIA has published an article in Newsletter No. 33, March 1983 which looks briefly at some of the issues mentioned above. It should also be noted that Sendero Luminoso has no support from indigenous organisations and has been condemned by Salvador Palomino (IMGIA Newsletter No. 31-32 June/October 1982). It has been beyond the scope of this article to provide a detailed account of Sendero Luminoso, but IMGIA intends to produce another complementary article next year.)

PERU: SEMINAR ON HEALTH IN THE JUNGLE

From May 9th to 12th this year the Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana (AIDESEP) organised the 1st Seminar on Health in the Jungle. It took place at the Huampani Vaccination Centre a few miles outside the Peruvian capital Lima. Participants included those directing and promoting health in native communities as well as doctors and nurses who have had experience in health care among jungle peoples. The seminar raised some of the most important current problems and suggested means for improving health care.

The picture presented of health care in the Peruvian Amazon is depressing. Where there are sanitary posts there is a lack of basic medicines and the Ministry of Health seems incapable of improving the situation. There is no effective vaccination campaign which covers rural areas and most of the native communities are without access to such facilities.

Various examples were given in the Seminar of outsiders affecting communities' nutritional resources. The Cocamilla people complained of fishermen constantly threatening the stocks of fish in lakes near the communities in the Lower Huallaga area. Other problems centred around the practices of missionaries who in extreme cases have been known to prohibit the drinking of masato and the eating of certain types of wild pig and fish.

The Shipibo people have for some years had access to a hospital (Hospital Amazonico) situated near Yarina Cocha in Ucayali. Whereas initially it was intended to cope with the indigenous population, now it provides only limited facilities for the health of the native population. The people in charge of the hospital are all Mestizo and not indigenous peoples. Only a few neighbouring communities can benefit from the hospital.
The doctors at the seminar said that the main diseases prevalent in the jungle are yellow fever, measles, whooping cough and malaria. In addition intestinal parasites are found everywhere, particularly affecting children. Tuberculosis was singled out as being one of the most important areas for treatment. It was suggested that a tuberculosis programme could be organised by communities themselves according to the circumstances found in each part of the jungle.

The seminar also discussed the importance of nutrition in particular how to achieve a balanced diet. It was considered by the participants that a mother's milk had a vital role in the growth of small children in jungle regions and that the proteins available in wild meat were essential for the health of native groups. People were also informed of the importance of agricultural products and the vitamins contained in jungle fruits. The message from the seminar was to emphasise the benefits which can be obtained from natural resources. It was also noted that help should be sought from agricultural experts on how to grow a wider variety of vegetables in the jungle which could contribute to a more balanced diet.

It was suggested in the seminar that native groups should be able to rely on the help of health workers who could keep an eye on the problems of communities and who could show them how to use medical materials and medicines. There is a great need for more personnel such as doctors, nurses, nutritionists and agricultural experts. These people could work with the indigenous organisations to make their help most effective and efficient. It was recommended that sanitary posts be more comprehensively equipped, that there should be improvement in transport facilities and that where communities find health problems overwhelming they should work through their regional organisations.

Apart from modern medicines the seminar stressed the importance of traditional medicine saying that medicinal plants can frequently be used to complement basic health care. It was also explained that traditional medicine has much curative value. It should not be ignored because it makes full use of existing resources and in many cases is more economical than pharmaceutical medicines.

In conclusion the seminar said that native communities and organisations do not have the means to carry out all that was necessary for health care on their own. They are aware of attitudes from private and state bodies which denigrate their attempts to improve their conditions and in addition they are aware that some support from state and foreign institutions may be for ulterior motives rather than the health of indigenous peoples.

The principal factors affecting native peoples in Peru are the influx of colonists, exploitative prices of available medicines, poor information as to the correct use of medicines, the contamination of rivers and natural resources as well as the loss of confidence in traditional medicines. It was recommended that the communities and organisations consolidate their relationship and become more dynamic and efficient in dealing with health problems. They should observe carefully those working in communities to ensure that the interests of indigenous peoples have priority and that people wishing to work in native communities demonstrate their suitability. It was also recommended that all organisations involved in health care whether indigenous, state or foreign should come together and, if they are suitable in the eyes of the native peoples, should co-ordinate their efforts for promoting health projects. This co-ordination should reflect the changing situation in which the native communities live. AIDESEP would try and co-ordinate the aims and desires of native groups and support them in organising health projects for themselves.

(Source: Voz Indigena, Año 2 No. 6, 1983)
TANZANIA: WILDLIFE HAVE MORE RIGHTS THAN MAASAI
Interview with Lazaro Parkipuny

In September IWGIA was very pleased to welcome a visit from Lazaro Parkipuny Member of the Tanzanian Parliament and defender of the rights of his people, the Maasai. He has been travelling in Europe and Canada explaining the plight of Maasai pastoralists in the northern Ngorongoro area of Tanzania. There, preservation of the wildlife in the open country has meant a destruction of the ecosystem which spells disaster for the cattle-raisers.

After the creation of the Serengeti National Park in 1958 the Maasai who had traditionally grazed their cattle on the open grassland were forced to leave the region and move to the neighbouring Ngorongoro Conservation Area. Even though in 1968 the Serengeti Park's land was increased displacing more Maasai, they left in the hope of compensation which has never appeared.

During the dry season Maasai herders remain on the forestal and higher regions of the Ngorongoro Conservation Area while in the Serengeti National Park the wild grazing wildebeest keep to their area. However the problems really appear during the wet season when both the cattle raisers and the wildebeest from the two reserved areas come down to the open grasslands to graze. This open land is divided by an arbitrary boundary between the National Park and the Conservation Area. Whereas Maasai are not allowed into the Park, the wildebeest and other creatures can enter the Conservation Area. The result is that much of the grassland is taken over by the wildlife and in addition cattle diseases are spreading throughout the area.

Lazaro Parkipuny sees this obsession with the preservation of wildlife at all costs to be the result of a misconception by international wildlife organisations of the symbiotic relationship between cattle raising and wildlife preservation. Wildlife is preserved to avoid extinction of species and ecosystems and such lobbying and campaigns have been going on since the 1930s. However it was the colonial regime and the tourists and adventurers it so wantonly encouraged who were responsible for the decimation of so many species and the destruction of natural habitats. Archaeological studies of the area show that there has been a co-existence between cattle and wildlife since as far back as 1000 B.C.. It has only been since the Colonial Era that the need for preservation has arisen.

Lazaro Parkipuny pointed out how Maasai lands in Kenya and Tanzania had been taken by colonialists for plantations and building metropoli. Now the only "natural areas" left are the preserved lands. The Maasai thus have to pay for the excesses of their former colonial rulers the descendants of which populate the "wildlife lobby" in the West.

There has been no encouragement for the Maasai to take part in the running of these reserved areas and even though they complied with eviction orders in the past they received few of the expected and promised benefits, while suffering considerable loss of livelihood. Even now there are plans afoot to evict the Maasai from the Conservation Area. It is hoped among certain wildlife supporters that the increase of wildebeest, destruction of grassland and disease will so reduce the Maasai livelihood (coupled with a law which denies any compensation for damage done by wildlife) that they will choose to leave of their own accord.

To separate Maasai, their cattle and wildlife would be a disaster both ethically and ecologically. Multiple land use is a crucial part of Tanzanian practice and there is no reason why the two ways of life wild and tame cannot co-exist in symbiosis. The argument that the Maasai kill wildlife is untrue because traditionally they recognise the advantages of allowing both wildlife and cattle to live side by side.
without one jeopardising the existence of the other.

By integrating pastoral life into wildlife preservation schemes cattle would no longer be competing for scarce open grassland and co-existence would be possible. As Lazar Parkinpuny says in a paper given at Canada this year:

"But the permanent survival that we desire cannot be achieved by way of banishing the natural guardians from the land of their birth, throwing them out to the margins where impoverishment and depredation are their lot...It is for certain through recognising the natural, planned integration of nature conservation with the needs and rights of the indigenous people throughout the land that the interests of posterity can be sustained...Given recognition, moral and material support, mobilised people can certainly be a force far more effective in the protection of the "Rhino" and the whole of what Ngorongoro and Serengeti represent than the best trained and largest squad of game scouts that the state can muster."

Quote from: Maasai struggle for Home Right in the Land of Ngorongoro Crater, paper presented at the Anthropology of Human Rights symposium, 14th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Quebec City & Vancouver, Canada, August, 1983.

UNITED STATES: WOUNDED KNEE - TEN YEARS ON

By Alys Swan

1983 is the tenth anniversary of the second historic confrontation at Wounded Knee, South Dakota, between the US Government and its agents - and members of Indian nations from all over North America.

The first took place in winter 1890 when the US cavalry massacred nearly 300 native people, mainly women and children, after they had surrendered all but one of their weapons.

The second occurred in the winter of 1973, when several hundred Oglala Sioux - many of them members of the new American Indian Movement (AIM) - returned to Wounded Knee, to take a stand at the request of traditional leaders. They wanted AIM's protection in their impeachment proceedings against a corrupt tribal government led by Richard Wilson and his police force (the notorious "goon squad"). The goons, together with some FBI agents, were harassing the traditional Oglalas because of their claim for sovereignty.

Richard Wilson was not the first tribal chairman to indulge in political patronage, nor to divert tribal funds into his own pocket. It was the extent of his corruption which angered the residents. His behaviour highlighted many of the problems of tribal government and leadership arising out of the Indian Reorganisation Act (IRA) of 1934. Under the IRA, the nations were forced into a European style government consisting of a tribal council set up, organised, engineered and over-seen by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA).

AIM sought improved treatment of Indian peoples, implementation of treaty rights and better conditions on the reservations. At Wounded Knee, native people were saying they had had enough and the Oglala declared the town to be a liberated territory of an independent Sioux Nation.
The US Government, whose various agencies had been keeping close watch on AIM since the occupation of the BIA building in Washington and the take-over of Alcatraz island, responded by sending in the FBI, Federal Marshals (many of them members of an elite unit called the Special Operations Group/SOG/) besides additional BIA police from other reservations.

The people were shot at. Many were wounded and two died. Negotiations between the traditional Oglalas, AIM leaders and a White House delegate were concluded in an agreement which bound the Government to look at the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty and hold and enquiry into the Wilson business.

When the siege ended, it appeared that the Oglalas and AIM had won a major battle in their continuing struggle to press the US Government for recognition of native rights and claims.

The 1868 Treaty is considered by the traditional Lakota to be a final, binding and honourable one - one which guaranteed their sovereignty. The Treaty provided the Sioux with "unceded" territory of some 50 million acres covering parts of Nebraska, Wyoming, Montana and North and South Dakota. It also provided for a range of services, including education and economic aid. Whites were not allowed to settle on the land.

In the mid-19th century, the craving for gold and western "homelands" led large numbers of European-Americans with their wagon trains and cavalry, to travel the Bozeman Trail through the heart of the Plains Indian land. The Treaty was not in effect for long when gold was discovered in the Black Hills (Paha Sapa).

The US Government sent a delegation west to negotiate purchase of the mountains. But to native Americans the earth is sacred and cannot be bought or sold. The offer was refused. The forced sale of the Hills took place in 1876 and was the first of many imposed agreements which stand in direct contra-

vention to the Fort Laramie Treaty.

Throughout the weeks of the 1973 occupation, the protesters insisted on a return to the terms of the Treaty. The independent Oglala Sioux nation declared at Wounded Knee that year, stood on the Treaty of Fort Laramie.

During the occupation, the new nation organised itself with the formation of its own government and other institutions which enabled life in the town to run smoothly. There was a return to traditional spirituality.

Leonard Crow Dog and Wallace Black Elk led the ceremonies which reinforced the participant's sense of their "indianness". Some help also came from outsiders in the form of food and medical supplies which were smuggled in.

At the end of the siege the Oglalas looked forward to the Treaty meetings to settle some of the issues that had brought them to Wounded Knee. However, Federal violations of the agreement started immediately when 150 participants were jailed as they left the town. Repressive measures were taken against AIM and from 1973 until 1976 more than 40 members and sympathisers were found dead at Pine Ridge.

Federal Marshals and FBI agents remained on the reservation for months. The promised Treaty Commission was totally ignored. As in the past, non of the promises were kept. It was not until the occupation had long been over that the military operations at Wounded Knee were disclosed as part of a Government plan (Operation Garden Plot) to quell domestic disturbances.

Local police were trained in military counter-insurgency techniques to enable them to respond rapidly and efficiently to any civil disturbance. At Wounded Knee, the plan was put into action but disguised to appear that the Federal agencies were merely supporting local police in a neutral fashion - as they had protected Wilson and the BIA police during the impeachment proceedings.
Over the past ten years, AIM and the Oglalas from Pine Ridge have not ceased in their struggle for independence. A major event was the founding of Yellow Thunder Camp in April 1981 - situated on 10 acres of National Parkland in the Paha Sapa. The camp was intended to be a model community in terms of self-sufficiency and traditional values.

Everybody who was at Wounded Knee in 1973 knew that they were participating in something crucial: not just because of the highlighting of Treaty violations and other grievances, but because of the consciousness that these issues face everyone - not just native Americans. They concern the misuse of land, mistreatment of original peoples and the dictatorial methods of government.

As an AIM leader put it: "What is at stake at Wounded Knee? It is not only the lifestyle of hundreds of Indians, but a way of life that could be of benefit to the United States and Western Civilisation."

(Reprinted from the Native Peoples News, No.9)

USA: SIoux NATION STILL STRUGGLING

Earlier this year, members of the Great Sioux Nation took a united stand on the return of the Black Hills. At a conference in Pierre, S.Dak. they voted unanimously to "stop the distribution of the 1980 awards claim money until all the 1868 Sioux Nation land claims have been settled". The majority attending also voted for the return of all the Black Hills, rejecting the option of seeking only the return of Federal lands in the Hills, excluding national monuments.

A select committee has now been set up to unite all the Sioux tribes and seek the legal return of the Black Hills. A Bill is due to be presented to Congress later this year.

This calls for the transfer of lands back to the Sioux nation with the exception of certain Federal properties, like Mount Rushmore, military land, hospitals, etc.

An exchange of Federal land for the Bent Butte State Park is also included in the draft legislation.

(Source, Native Peoples News No.9)

These two articles on the Sioux peoples have come from Native Peoples News, edition number 9. The issue nearly did not appear because of extreme financial difficulties. IWGIA would like to recommend the high standard of news and information in CIMRA (Colonialism and Indigenous Minorities Research Action - the people who produce NPN) publications and would like to express solidarity with their work. People wishing to find out more about CIMRA and offer their support should write to:

CIMRA,
218, Liverpool Rd.,
London N1
England.
VANUATU: A NUCLEAR FREE STATE

Parliament of the Republic of Vanuatu
1st ordinary session of 1983 - Motion No.1, March 1983:

A. To safeguard the health and well-being of all citizens of Vanuatu, both now and in the future.
B. To declare to all countries our desire to live in peace and our total abhorrence of all ways and means of propagating a nuclear war.

Now, Therefore, Parliament hereby resolves:
That the following be banned or prohibited within the territorial land, sea and airspace of Vanuatu:

1. All tests of nuclear explosives devices.
2. All nuclear test facilities.
3. All tests of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles and systems.
4. All storage, transit, deployment or any other form presence of nuclear weapons.
5. All bases carrying out command control, communication, surveillance, navigation, and any other functions which aid the performance of a nuclear weapon delivery system.
6. All nuclear power reactors, all nuclear powered satellites, surface and sub-surface vessels, and all transit, storage, release or dumping of radioactive material except for that which is strictly used inside Government approved medical and educational institutions for medical and/or educational purposes.
7. Uranium mining, processing and transport.
WEST PAPUA: THE COLONISATION OF WEST PAPUA
by Fred Korwa

In September Fred Korwa, member of the Free Papua Movement visited IWGIA and discussed the state of affairs in West Papua. The discussion ranged from the presence of multinationals, the encroachment of land by Indonesian colonists and the disregard for human rights shown by the Indonesian government. He spoke also of the identity of West Papuans as Melanesians and the possibility of a Pan-Melanesian movement. Fred Korwa left many interesting documents including this paper giving his view of the situation in West Papua:

The Colonisation of West Papua, the western part of the second largest island in the world after Greenland, by the neo-colonialist and imperialist régime of Indonesia.

Where is that country of West Papua?

As you know, the island of New Guinea is the second largest island in the world after Greenland. It lies between the equator and 12° Latitude South between the Philippines and Australia. The island is tropical and has a wide range of different physical conditions, ranging from the hot, wet swamplands to the high climate weather of the snow-covered mountains.

The People

The indigenous people are part of the Melanesian cultures and are very different indeed from the Indonesian Asian people. There are many groups of Melanesians living in the island of New Guinea. They have many different languages - in West Papua alone there are at least 750 languages. However the one thing we have in common is: one Melanesian way of life and culture. Melanesian peoples live in West Papua, Papua New Guinea, Saloman Islands, Vanuatu, Fiji and New Caledonia. Of the 5 million people living on the whole island of New Guinea, one half live on the West Papuan side.

European Colonisation

New Guinea was discovered by the Spanish and again by the Portugese who called the island Nueba Guinea, because they thought it resembled the Guinea Coast of Africa. Later the Dutch took over and declared the Western part from the 141° to be their possession in 1828. The Eastern part of the island was divided into two parts. The British occupied the southern area and called it Papua and the Germans the north which they called New Guinea, including also some islands such as Manus island, New Britain and New Ireland. After the 1st World War when the Germans were defeated by the Allied Forces, Australia received a mandate from the League of Nations over the two eastern parts of the island and administered them from 1920-1975. They called it the “Territory of Papua and New Guinea (PNG)”. In 1975 PNG became an independent state with an elected Parliament and Government.

West Papua was a Dutch colony from 1828 till 1963. In 1945 Indonesia proclaimed its independence from the Netherlands without including West Papua and after the Second World War West Papua was still colonised by the Dutch. In 1949 an agreement was made between the newly proclaimed Republic of Indonesia and the Netherlands for the formal transfer of sovereignty to the “United Republic of Indonesia” but West Papua was to continue under the colonial rule of the Dutch. Later, Indonesia claimed West Papua to be a part of the former Dutch colony: The East Indies. These claims were based on past colonial sentiments and had no foundation. When the Dutch refused to hand over the administration of West Papua to the Indonesians, the latter underlined their claims by military infiltration and asked military support from communist sources for an invasion of West Papua. The United States of America who were fighting in South Vietnam were afraid of another war behind their back and forced the Dutch government to hand over West Papua to the Indonesians without fighting but through bilateral negotiations in 1962.

Neo Colonialism

Indonesia and the Netherlands reached an agreement in 1962 in which the transfer of administration of West Papua was settled. After a brief interim administration - UNTEA by the UN
Indonesia took full control of West Papua from 1963 to 1969. According to the agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands an "Act of Free Choice" would be held in West Papua under the supervision of the United Nations. By this the indigenous people of West Papua could express their wish freely - whether they wished to remain with Indonesia or cut all ties. But from 1963-1969 the Indonesian military administration practised a tight campaign of intimidation, oppression and torturing of the Papuans. During this period more than 30,000 people were killed by the Indonesians. In 1965 the President of Indonesia forbid, by presidential decree the freedom of speech, gathering in public places and both expression of opinion and movement. The Papuan Melanesians opposed this and came into conflict with Indonesian rule. This was the start of the resistance movement for freedom: Operasi Papua Merdeka/Free Papua Movement (O.P.M.). Indonesia then increased its military power - to a number of 30,000 men to put down the resistance movement. The oppression and intimidation of innocent people in West Papua continues to this day. This barbarian form of consultation made sure that 1024 representatives, appointed by the Indonesian authorities were convinced that their lives would be in danger if they did not choose in favour of the continuation of Indonesian neo-colonialism in West Papua.

The Act of Free Choice, which was supposed to be held under the auspices of the United Nations in a free manner, was manipulated by the Indonesians in such a way as to become a farce. The General Assembly of the UN in 1969 voted with a great majority to support the Act of Free Choice giving the Indonesians a carte blanche to continue their atrocities in West Papua.

The Obliteration of a People

During the last twenty years the oppression and killing of indigenous Melanesian people of West Papua by the Indonesian military and police authorities has continued. There are more than 150,000 people either missing or dead. Indonesian authorities deny these figures but never allow foreign investigators into West Papua to check. Medical care for the West Papuan people is terrible. In some cases the Indonesian authorities have taken no steps to stop disease leaving people to die like animals.

On the other hand, Indonesia has allowed large foreign multi-nationals into the country to exploit the mineral resources of gold, silver, oil, timber, copper and nickel. The multi-nationals use for their operations cheap and easily available labour from other islands in Indonesia such as Java. But for the Papuans there are no jobs because they are excluded. Most of them are less educated and they cannot compete with the Indonesian transmigrants. Many parents cannot send their children to school because they cannot afford to pay the school tax, being unemployed.

Transmigration

The Indonesian government is trying to solve the problems in overcrowded Java by sending 2.5 million people from Java to West Papua in the coming 10 years. The official programme foresees the transfer of 150,000 families.

This means that the indigenous people of West Papua are going to be a minority in their own country like the peoples of America or the Maoris of New Zealand. One can see history is repeating itself. But what can we do to support the Papuans of West Papua? Are we going to allow them to be destroyed like so many other indigenous peoples in the past? Surely we can learn something from history. Surely we can do something to stop the sufferings of my people.

In 1984 there is to be an information campaign in Denmark about Melanesia. In solidarity with this campaign IWGIA is preparing a Document on the problems of the indigenous peoples of West Papua.
One of the largest transmigration settlement block areas is in the Merauke district of southern Irian Jaya. It's from Merauke that the infringing border road sets out. Maps of the eventual transmigration settlements allegedly indicate that more than 3.5 million people could be resettled in the Merauke district - the indigenous population of which is thought to be 60,000.

The analyst asked what would become of these people who would be dispossessed of their land? Where would they go if they refused to be assimilated into the predominantly Asian settlement block? The answer he came up with was: across into the sparsely populated western province of PNG. He said the border road didn't serve the transmigration settlement blocks. They were back the other side of the Merauke river. Therefore the road's purpose was strategic and military. It would protect the settlement blocks further west from the "indefatigable" hostilities by the dispossessed Melanesians. And it could be the launching pad for forays into PNG.

But pursuit has been tried many times before. The suggestion here is that PNG is faced with quite a problem. Because if it did not try to control the activities of these Irian Jaya people, or even offered them sympathy, the Indonesians could decide on an operation to wipe out their sanctuaries. They could take the land south of the Fly River Bulge and west of the Fly river in a day. The document warns that PNG's best defence against outside threat is to remain a strongly unified democratic nation.

One of the assumptions in all this that must be opened to some question is just how quickly the transmigration programme will proceed. The scheme has been underway for years but it has always fallen short of its target - despite the claims of the Lockheed aircraft company, which has advertised its regional magazines. Informed intelligence sources say the next five-year plan will probably achieve only one quarter of its target. Source: Gerard Docray - Islands Business, July 1983
BOOK REVIEWS


This report is the first of a new Anti-Slavery Society publication series on indigenous peoples and development. It presents a concise and well-written account of the problems facing the indigenous peoples of the Philippines. The book is well-researched and provides important background material for understanding the present situation in context.

The first two chapters provide a geographic and historical background, discussing traditional economic activities such as hunting and gathering, shifting and fixed agriculture as well as fishing. In addition there is a comprehensive account of the different ethnic groups on the Philippines. After a description of the various periods of Spanish, United States and Japanese colonisation, the book looks at the neo-colonial influences at the present time and the repressive administration of Ferdinand Marcos.

The three subsequent chapters consist of case studies covering the major spheres of development work authorised by the government and financed by international backing which are affecting the indigenous population. We hear of the Mindanao sugar industry and fruit plantations which have taken land from indigenous farmers and forced groups of people to abandon their traditional lands throughout the 1970s: We hear too of the logging operations which have, over the last ten years dramatically affected indigenous forest resources. There is also a detailed discussion of the Chico Dams and their threat to the Kalinga and Bontoc peoples.

The chapter on the Presidential Assistant on National Minorities (PANAMIN) is a detailed exposé of the members of this organisation which ought to be supporting the interests of indigenous peoples. Instead it serves its own interests and those of the Marcos régime. The final chapter is a depressing account of how the Philippine government persists in ignoring all calls for recognition of human rights among the indigenous peoples and the escalating military occupation of tribal lands. The book ends with a series of recommendations:

1) that the Philippine government honour international agreements on human rights and the special rights of indigenous peoples, particularly that all acts of cultural destruction be ended and that all tribal and other political prisoners be released;
2) that enquiries into military abuses be pursued energetically;
3) that to overcome local suspicion the government invite independent international enquiry into these abuses;
4) that all extra military forces deployed in minority areas be withdrawn;
5) that expropriation of tribal lands by settlers, private corporations and the government be halted and indigenous peoples' prior right over their ancestral lands and wealth be recognised;
6) that natural minority rights to autonomy and self-determination be respected and promoted and non-representative and anti-democratic agencies, particularly PANAMIN, be abolished;
7) that open and democratic processes be followed in the formulation of development plans in tribal lands;
8) that other countries withhold all forms of military and financial aid that is being used directly for the suppression of minority peoples;
9) that international funding for development projects be withheld where such projects have been imposed without consultation with and against the wishes of the affected populations.

The authors of the report say that they were reticent about making these recommendations from their findings saying that the contradiction between the words and actions of the Marcos government are so great as to make dialogue worthless. Indeed in the light of the myopic intransigence of the régime it would appear that the future for the indigenous peoples of the Philippines is bleak.

Minority Rights Group in London have recently brought out a series of up-dates on their old reports in order to broaden the scope of their original publications. This new edition of The Tibetans is an answer to some of the criticisms of one-sidedness of the first report (c.f. Native Peoples News Winter 1981). The result is the juxtaposition of two very different interpretations as to what has been going on and what is still taking place in Tibet.

Chris Mullin's paper gives a generous leeway to the Chinese perspective. He discusses the theoretically broad-minded Chinese desire for regional autonomy in areas where national minorities live. He casts doubt on the Tibetan historical claims for independence and using somewhat old data (British agent O'Connor in 1904) paints a gloomy picture of life under the monastic system. The Chinese appear as liberators, as holding a genuine claim and also as improving the lot of Tibetans. The uprising in the late 50s is seen as a mixture of misunderstandings and CIA interference. The Cultural Revolution is certainly criticised for its destruction of Tibetan traditional life but even this is reported to have been carried out by young Tibetans. The general picture of life in Tibet now is that in the light of the recent liberalisation in Chinese policy Tibet's prospects are good. The main criticisms of the Chinese is domination by the majority Han culture, the suppression of religion and forced economic changes. On the whole, however, the perspective presented is of approval of Chinese actions in Tibet.

In complete contrast Phuntsog Wangyal presents a paper which bears little or no resemblance to that of Mullin. The view here comes from one forced to flee from Tibet in the wake of the Chinese advance. His presentation of the history of Tibet depicts a thoroughly independent kingdom politically and culturally. He talks of the principal of Buddhism which governed traditional Tibetan society. When the Chinese began to establish their revolution they were eager to gain the support of Tibet and began a process of influence and gradual methods of introducing Han culture. Resistance to this process led to reprisals by the Chinese which in their turn led to the national uprising. A slowing down of Tibetan change over the late 50s and early 60s was followed by the heavy oppression of the Cultural Revolution. Phuntsog Wangyal is very sceptical of present Chinese liberalisation and points out the problems in the present situation of Tibetans: increased industrialisation, control of food supplies, the means of sinicizing the population by education, discouragement of religious freedom, political repression and basically racial discrimination.

This report shows very clearly the difficulties of trying to present a picture of the fate of indigenous peoples in closed countries. People inevitably adhere to the perspective they support politically. Both papers quite clearly say in their different ways that in Tibet one dominant culture has blatantly and insensitively forced its will on indigenous inhabitants and no amount of apologists will change this. At the same time one does wonder whether in the light of the changes wrought by the Chinese in Tibet the ideal of the exiled Tibetans to move back into control of a restored Tibet may be somewhat optimistic. It is impossible and a fruitless task to try and reconcile these two papers and it is a credit to the MRG and the authors that they have agreed to publish the two together.

The report does bring to the fore a very important point on indigenous affairs. It is very easy to criticise the governments of open societies for their treatment of indigenous peoples while those of the closed societies escape censure. It is however a poor reflection of the way these closed countries treat their indigenous peoples in that they do not allow
them facilities to discuss their advantages and problems before an international audience. Such reticence is a bad sign.


This book is the record of a conference held at the University of New South Wales in late 1981. The object of the conference and the book has been to provide an overview of the problems facing Australian Aboriginal peoples this decade. The first session discusses the international obligations of Australia in particular the persistent obstacles to signing ILO convention 107 (a multilateral treaty specifically intended to protect indigenous populations, to promote their rights and to regulate government conduct towards them). The session on land rights and implementation provides a broad discussion of land rights and the deplorable condition of the Aboriginal populations of New South Wales. The main desire among the Aboriginal peoples seems to be that the title be made freehold with restrictions on alienability without Aboriginal Community Councils' consent.

Session 3 discusses the way in which customary law can be incorporated into the Australian legal system. The problems here are reflecting the diversity of contexts in which Aboriginal peoples would utilise their traditional law. All the difficulties foreseen in the conference were given a practical perspective by looking at the ways in which Papua New Guinea have combined their legal system with customary law. His solution was to involve Aboriginal peoples at every level of the operation of the Australian Law Reform Commission.

The book ends with an interesting discussion of the idea of Makaratta or comprehensive Treaty between Aboriginal Peoples and Whites. The reactions varied from suspicion and fear of loopholes (particularly with regard to the Maori experience) to support from the National Aboriginal Conference who see it as a means to arrange all existing claims in one overall agreement forcing the white Australian government to sit down and negotiate their reasons for settling on Aboriginal land and using their resources.

This book provides a wealth of information and a contrast. The straightforward accounts of the experts are placed together with colourful and lively contributions from the Aboriginal representatives present. This makes the book very readable and informative.


This book was first written in 1970 and it says much about the problems facing the Sami people in that it is still relevant. The author is a Sami from Finland although the book touches on the situation in Norway and Sweden. The style of the book is racely and exciting. The author presents clear and particularly perceptive accounts of traditional Sami life in contrast with that of the Saami non-Sami. The book leads the reader through a kaleidoscope of the Sami world - traditional life and the economic changes brought from outside, reindeer herding and a nomadic life-style, fishing, material culture, the law, health, education, all these come under Nils-Aslak Valkeapää's penetrating gaze.

Some of the most moving moments in the book come in his vision for a united Sami people and his discussion of the contacts the Sami have made with other indigenous peoples throughout the world. He skilfully shows how peoples from many different cultures can work together for the same goals. Nils-Aslak was the Sami representative at the first world conference for indigenous peoples held in Canada where the
foundation of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples (WCIP) was agreed. The author’s experiences on a national and international plain have made this rich book all the more interesting.

The photographs in the book are a splendid commentary to the text. Most of them are taken, in fact, in Norway, thus demonstrating the unity of Sami life. These pertinent photographs are the work of Nils Somby (who is currently seeking political asylum in Canada after an attempt to blow up a bridge approaching the Alta Dam). The main message of the book remains the plight of the Sami people, the loss of their pastures and hunting grounds, the threat and results of colonisation, the development of mines, roads and of course the Alta Dam. Through the descriptions of the problems of his people and the devastation wreaked by national projects and enterprises, there flows an appreciation of nature and life personified in the recurring image of Sami music—the yolk. This book combines a celebration of Sami traditional life with a call to action.
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