The late Dr. Rubens Brando at work among the Yanomami, 1980. (Photo: Claudia Andujar)
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IN MEMORY OF DR. RUBENS BELLUZZO BRANDO - CAN HIS DEVOTED WORK AMONG THE YANOMAMI CONTINUE?

by Helge Kleivan

It was a shock to those of us who knew Dr. Rubens Belluzzo Brando and his pioneering medical effort among the Yanomami to receive the message that he was killed in a tragic helicopter accident in the midst of his work on December 14th 1982. He was so young - born May 12th 1952 - and had spent so many years educating himself for medical work among the Indians. In addition to his profound professional preparation for the work to which he had devoted his life, he had an understanding and respect for the culture and values of the people among whom he worked that made him unique as a pioneer in the struggle for the survival of indigenous peoples.

Our warmest thoughts go to his wife Renée and to their two young children, and to his friends and colleagues in CCPY and the Commissão pró Indio.

Already during his medical study, Rubens acquired great insights and experience from his work among the Indians of the Xingu area. And in December 1980 he went on his first vaccination mission to the Yanomami together with Claudia Andujar of CCPY and Dr. Francisco Pasca. Planning of this mission was discussed in a 2-day meeting in Sao Paulo already in December 1979, in the home of Claudia Andujar. I had the good fortune of participating in that meeting together with Rubão, as his friends called him. My recollections of the many examples of his seriousness of mind and sense of responsibility, are among my most precious memories.

I had just learned that Dr. Rubens had gone back to the Yanomami to coordinate the vaccination program that began in December 1980, when the message of his tragic death reached me. I know, as we all do, that his death is an irreducible loss to the indigenous cause. But I also know that there is
only one way in which we can honour this unforgettable human being, Rubão - that is by giving the highest possible priority to the continuation of his dedicated work among the Yanomami. In practical terms, we can try to live up to his example by giving our time and effort to help his colleagues and friends in the CCPY and in the Comissão pró Indio to carry on the work among the Yanomami.

Our friend, Claudia Andujar, has just informed us that a highly respected organisation, Médecins du Monde, has contacted FUNAI through CCPY, and has received permission to study the possibilities to assist the Yanomami. Their work can be of great importance as they are a group of doctors with much experience working under difficult circumstances with indigenous minorities in many parts of the world, where they have participated in vaccination programs. They have trained local para-medical personnel to better their skills to attend to populations where it is often problematic to find skilled personnel. We have reason to believe that they share the deep respect for other cultures which was such an outstanding characteristic of Dr. Rubens work.

At present, FUNAI is periodically continuing the vaccination work Dr. Rubens was going to coordinate. For these vaccination missions, the Brazilian Air Force has put two helicopters at the disposal of FUNAI for a period of 4 to 5 days each time. But this does not give sufficient time to inform the Yanomami of what is going to happen. - Up to now, 2,230 individuals have been vaccinated against measles and tuberculosis. If the vaccination team could dispose of helicopters for longer periods of time, the work could be intensified. According to FUNAI reports the hours of flight are restricted by the lack of funds. The prospects of a very fruitful cooperation between CCPY, Médecins du Monde and FUNAI seems at present to be very good. We will therefore urge the Norwegian and Danish Governments to continue the funding they gave to the vaccination team in 1980-1981.

Certainly, Rubão's work shall continue!

GUATEMALA: WHAT IS FAITH IN THE EYES OF A MAYAN INDIAN

Three representatives of the Committee for Justice and Peace in Guatemala visited the INGIA office in Copenhagen in November, 1982. They spoke at length about the desperate situation in their country and also about their feelings as Christians. They denounced the oppression, exploitation and repression which has been intensified since Efraín Ríos Montt came to power. They issued also an appeal for the solidarity of all brother peoples in all parts of the world in support of the active struggle of the Guatemalan people. As one of the visitors said: "Our people is not only an oppressed people but also a people which is fighting, a people which has managed to organise itself and which is convinced that the triumph is in the people."

"The repression in Guatemala is extremely heavy on the poor peasants and on the indigenous people. Repression is being directed especially toward the indigenous people, and because of this we denounce the government of Guatemala for committing an act of ethnocide against the indigenous people. The government wants to destroy indigenous people, it wants to annihilate their culture and stop their faith. This ethnocide is reaching all indigenous groups and the policy of the government is very clear: bring an end to all indigenous groups physically and culturally.

"We try to organise our retreat. When the army comes, we flee and when we come back, we find our houses burnt to the ground, the fields burnt at the exact time that the maize plant is beginning to grow. Even though we have been dying slowly for centuries from hunger, what is different now is that we are left without anything to eat at all. We are dying through lack of medicine, through lack of food, through
lack of care. One of our tasks is to take help which is so necessary to the most remote places in the country in spite of the oppression that exists. We who do this work, we know what risks we run, we never know if we are going to be able to distribute this help. But it is vital and we run the risks so as not to abandon the people. The money needed is found through our brother peoples throughout the world who feel solidarity with the people of Guatemala.

"Everybody shares the little they have and those who are suffering try to help each other. When, for example, we flee from one to another village and if the village we get to can help us, it will by giving us something to eat. Now almost everybody lives on maize, you hardly see beans these days. The lack of clothing is another problem we confront daily for when the army burns the houses, the inhabitants are left with nothing but the clothes they stand up in. After such a "visit" by the army, the people are left only with dirty, torn, stained clothes. Here also we can see the solidarity that exists, some will lend clothes while the other clothing is washed and mended.

"Every organisation giving help in Guatemala has its own specific field of work, but all work collectively and due to this we are connected to organisations of the people in Guatemala. We work with all groups and organisations which are devoted to unity and to the same revolutionary struggle. Even so there is a problem in the discrimination which has always existed between the white and the Indian. There's a danger that you can have one group of whites or one indigenous group which is working only on its own behalf and has forgotten the need to work for the people as a whole. What we are trying to do is make the process of struggle more united; the struggle is for all indigenous people and all poor whites against the common oppressors.

"The army is killing us in disgust, it is destroying us through the waves of killings. We know of many who have joined the guerilla organisations, preferring to die fighting before being massacred alive. We in Justice and Peace, as Christians, we will not be silent. Already we have been silent too long. We are trying to give as much humanitarian help as possible in this war and to help and support all without distinction of religion or culture."

The faith of a Mayan Indian

In answer to questions concerning Christian faith among an indigenous people, one of the visitors, a Mayan woman, gave the following reply. "The majority of the Guatemalan indigenous population is religious. God is not somebody you see, but we know there is a being that is much greater than us and from right inside ourselves we come to observe and note many things. We indigenous people love to express ourselves openly, talking in the open air, always we have loved to do this. Through our rites, such as lighting candles, kissing the earth, giving a cry, we show we feel this joy and this presence. We have had a religion from way way back, with the one aim of thinking about beautiful things of the world. Mankind cannot make these things, no matter how intelligent or inventive people are, they cannot make something that is natural, like God has given to us, like the sun which is in the sky and lights up the whole world. In this way we see the presence of God, we know he is working there.

"God is present when we kneel down and talk to the sun because for us the sun is also a God - that does not mean another God. I know that if at night I kneel down before the moon, which is so beautiful, and I also say God, I know that it is the same God who is working through the sun and the moon. At times we kneel upon the ground and pray to our mother earth, and we know we can say God also to the earth, because we live on her. Apart from walking on her, we eat from her, she gives us the harvests, life and strength and in her we see the presence of God. In the animals also, beautiful even when fierce."
"People have come to us from overseas and have imposed their religion on us. They have called us polytheists. I don't know what they mean by this. They want to impose on us what we should believe. Certainly we like to pray, but for an illiterate person who does not understand Spanish, it is useless to be sitting down for an hour just listening to 'bla-bla-bla'. It is better if I express myself in my own language asking for what I want. I was born to be myself, not what a book orders me to be. This is customary among the indigenous people. Even though they do not go to Mass or to protestant services, they believe in God, they know inside themselves, in their houses or in their huts, they always pray and call on God by name. Even though they may be illiterate and may never have heard much about the Bible. For us a book is a difficult thing to acquire. For example, I was saving for 2 years in order to be able to buy a Bible which now is buried, hidden, because now the soldiers come and say it is a subversive, 'guerrillero' book. It hurts me because there are so many things which we could learn, beautiful things, which could awaken us more.

"We do not understand why, but up to now, our religion has always been persecuted. It was taken from us by brute force, but we have not lost it, for we carry it inside ourselves, we worship in secret. For example, my father, he likes to go to church to listen to what the priest says but our religion cannot be expressed by carrying candles in the church or carrying incensors. Never could it be practised except in the house with the incensor there. We have done to the hilltops where there are bushes that contain a resin which we call 'pon'. When it is dried and when you prepare to pray in our language, you burn it. I once asked my father: 'Why can we not just pray without anything else, without a candle?' And he answered me: 'No', daughter, 'because the candle represents one's life and the fact that the light is lit denotes faith in God, it is a symbol.' And I asked also: 'Why do we need to burn pon?' And he replied: 'Because it is a symbol that we are talking with God, with the smoke that rises our words are carried to God.' This was his explanation.

"None of this are we allowed to do in church, but we do it secretly. It has often hurt us that for so long we indigenous people have been treated as slaves, as animals - and what is worse we are still being treated this way now. For this we have formed the Committee for Justice and Peace, we know we are people who believe in God and what is happening to our brothers hurts us. We have endured so much. The people love peace, but that's not going to stop anything; we want to defend ourselves and defend our culture."

GUATEMALA: POPE DENOUNCES ABUSES COMMITTED AGAINST INDIANS

During his 8-day visit to Central America, the Pope vigorously denounced the abuses committed against the Indian population of Guatemala. The Pope visited Quezaltenango, the country's second city in the highlands. At least 500,000 Indians flocked to hear the Pope to stage what was nothing less than a protest against the abuse that has been their lot for centuries. To the embarrassment of the Rios Montt regime, the national television and radio networks transmitted a statement by the Bishop of Quezaltenango, Monsignor Oscar Garcia Ulizar, who said that "thousands of the faithful have suffered massive assassinations, thousands have seen their homes destroyed, thousands have been submitted to systematic aggression against their Catholic faith."

The Pope's denunciation forces the Reagan administration into the uncomfortable position of being seen to support a regime whose treatment of its countrymen has been described by the Pope as "an extremely grave offence to God." Claims by the White House that human rights had improved since the coup that brought Rios Montt to power look distinctly forlorn.

(Source: The Guardian, March 9)
GUATEMALAN LIVES

Rigoberta Menchú

My name is Rigoberta Menchú. I was born in the region of Quiché and learned to speak Spanish thirteen years ago. I have neither a mother nor a father, and I will explain why.

First I must tell you that we Indians in Guatemala have no childhood. We have always suffered from repression and exploitation. I began earning my living at the age of eight. I worked on the south coast of the Pacific on the estates of the patrones. I decided to start working because I could no longer stand seeing my exhausted mother’s pained face—always picking either coffee or cotton with a new-born baby on her back and my hungry brothers and sisters surrounding her.

We left the mountains where we lived to work on the estates because my father only had a small piece of land that yielded just enough corn and beans to feed us for four or five months. The rest of the year we were forced to work on the plantations. Then we would go back to our place in the mountains. That was our life; that is why I say I had no childhood.

My mother and father were responsible for our community. When people had difficulties or were sick, they came to my parents. My parents had started the village along with other people whom my father called together. All of them had devoted themselves to clearing and sowing the land. But the earth barely yielded anything at first. They had to wait years for the first harvest. And when the village finally had a cornfield and some beans, the patron came and said that the land belonged to him. Then my father, the only who spoke some Spanish, was chosen to settle things with the authorities. He traveled around seeking support to get the patrones to leave us in peace. But his complaints went unheeded. They sent him from place to place; they demanded that he get a lawyer. Almost all of his time was given to the community and that meant that he didn’t have time to work enough. We, his children, worked in his place.

As a child I never went into town. Our customs don’t allow a girl to go alone—even if two people must go together. Our life is communal; in our village there is a community house where we gather and where we celebrate. When we were very young, our parents taught us that we must remain true to our ancestors, our culture, and our traditions. For example, before sowing seeds, we ask the earth permission to inflict wounds. For us, the earth is holy; only for livelihood do we have the right to hurt her. When we chop down a tree to build a house, we beg for nature’s forgiveness. It is not our right even to pick flowers.

In 1973, when I was 15, my father was arrested for the first time. He was accused of creating a disturbance and of threatening Guatemala’s sovereignty. My mother went in search of a lawyer; she had to leave us alone. While my father was in prison, the rich patrones came, and, since none of us spoke Spanish, they intimidated us. They said the land belonged to them, and they threatened us with guns. They went into our houses and broke all our things, even our pots which were made of clay; they broke everything. At that time, we still believed that our only enemy was the big landowner. It was not yet clear to us that all the rich people exploit and persecute us, the peasants.

We began to organize ourselves, and this resulted in even greater repression. Then my father was released from prison. He had gotten to know a ladino (people of Spanish descent or cultural values) there who was a political prisoner, and who
had explained to him that the enemy is not just the patrón who wanted to rob us of our land. My father realized that our struggle could no longer be fought as it had been in the past, and he chose to work with the underground. So he was no longer at home. We never knew where he went because he knew that our lives would be in danger if we were in contact with him.

My 14-year old brother was only the secretary of a cooperative in town, but the army abducted him. They held him for sixteen days. They tortured him - tore out his fingernails, cut out his tongue, cut up the soles of his feet, burned his skin. I saw him afterwards with my own eyes, and I'll never forget it. The army had brought us together, four or five hundred peasants, saying they would show us how they had tortured the "guerrillas", and telling us, "If you get involved with this Communism, this is what we'll do to you". And I saw my brother there. In the end, they poured gasoline over him and the other prisoners and set them on fire. We all saw this. So you can imagine how much rage we have. Finally the soldiers left, shouting, "Long live the army! Long live President Lucas! Death to the guerrillas!"

After that, my father went away, saying there was a great deal he had to do for his people, that he must go from town to town telling what had happened. That was the last we saw of him. A little later, my mother decided to travel around and talk with people about what she had witnessed. She said: "As a woman, I have an obligation to make my experiences known in order to prevent other mothers from suffering as I have." She took along my youngest sister. My brothers also left; and my little sister, who was nine, said she was going to join the guerrillas and not die of hunger or be killed by the troops.

Shortly after that, my father was murdered. He and other peasants had occupied the Spanish embassy in Guatemala City to protest and to draw attention to the repression in El Quiché. He and 29 others were murdered by the army. Three months later, my mother was raped and murdered by the military. We, her children, had to find another way to struggle. Otherwise, it would be impossible to go on.

A few years ago I went to the city to become a maid. I thought that everything would be different there. But the rich lady I worked for demanded that I give up my Indian clothes. "What would my friends say if they saw you in my house in those clothes?" She gave meat to her dog; to me she gave tortillas. To these people an Indian is worth less than a dog. I must continue the fight that my parents began. I joined the organisation of Revolutionary Christians in order to get involved in the mass struggle. I began to learn Spanish, which is necessary if those of us from different areas want to speak with each other. I also learned three of the Indian languages, but no one can know all of the 20 that are spoken in Guatemala.

The army is getting more and more sophisticated, with its weapons, equipment, tactics and intelligence operations. We must do the same; we must know how to defend ourselves. We must know how to get out of our houses when the soldiers block the doors. We must know how to make and throw Molotov cocktails. Even a two-year old child must know this. If a child's parents are killed, the child has the right to defend itself. I have been doing this - teaching and learning these things.

Before I have children, things must change. The Ladinos celebrate the day honoring Tecún Umán, an Indian hero who fought against the Spanish. We refuse to celebrate this day because we can't accept that our struggle lies in the past, as if it were over. We haven't given up fighting. People think the Indians are idiots because we are so obedient, because we don't speak Spanish. But we are fully conscious of who we are and what our rights are. It is this consciousness that prevents me from having children and leads me to participate in the struggle.

As a woman, I have decided not to marry and not to have
any children. Our traditions don't accept that. A woman must have children, and we enjoy having them. But I could not stand it if what happened to my brother happened to a child of mine. I have often wished that my mother had aborted me and that I had never seen the light of day.

I also don't want to have a lover. That would only bring additional pain. They would most likely kill him and I don't want to cry anymore. At one time I had a lover. He went to the city and dreamed about marrying me when he returned, about having a home and living in peace. But for me that wasn't possible. As it is, I am no longer in control of my meager existence. The world that I live in is so gruesome, so bloody. From one moment to the next, they can destroy me. That's why I can only struggle.

(Source: Unomásuno, Mexico City, May 29, 1982.)

Domingo Hernandez Iztoy

When I was six, my parents used to tell us kids stories from the past. They did this as the tamales were being cooked and in this way related to us the sufferings of our ancestors and what people were going through at that time as well. We lived in such conditions of poverty that it is very difficult for people in this country to understand. As I watched my parents, I realized at the age of ten that I would have to leave my family and make my own way so that there would be less of a burden on them. So I went to the city and there I realized that the city people too lived in terrible conditions. I became aware that the situation of exploitation was one against an entire people.

And so it came to me at the age of 14 that I had to do something - that I had to work something out so I could work for my people. But being so young, many people would not listen to me or to my friends who thought as I did. What could we do against such forces? And I carried this with me, this feeling of wanting to do something for my people and rising against all that was against us. When I reached the age of 19, I was able to talk to people and thus began the work.

We started by talking with my cousins and people close to us. Little by little we had some successes: first in our home province of Quiché. By 1978, there was some strength in three areas of the country and on the 1st of May, 1978, we formed our Committee of Peasant Unity. This was the first time in the history of Guatemala that an organization had been formed under the direct leadership of peasants. It should be pointed out that of the 7.5 million people in Guatemala, 5 million are peasants.

Most of the Indian population does not know how to read or write. But those of us who do have been teaching the others. When I left my town, the people didn't have blackboards, chalk or anything like that, so we used the ground and a stick to teach people how to read and write. Increasingly it is the women and the children who must plant the crops on which we live because the men are either dead or working in some other place.

In addition, many many women have left their towns and directly involved themselves and their children into the armed struggle. And also the children had a growing consciousness that we are involved in a crucial struggle. One day we were sleeping in a ditch and one of the children woke up and said that he was hungry. And his mother said not to cry because the military were coming and they will hear us and from that moment on the child did not cry. He endured his hunger and the cold in silence. By the time the children are eight years old they begin to play very important roles in the struggle. They serve as couriers and are organized into groups. When they observe something about the military, they form a line and pass the word so that the last child in line can take the message into the village.
And so our appearance at this time was a blow to the government. Especially since never before had the most exploited sector of the country, the peasant class, joined together to voice their concerns. Another point that should be made is that it was very frightening to the government that on the first of May, we appeared in demonstrations -Indian and Ladino workers- side by side. Because for a long time, one method for continuing the system of exploitation was to use divisions between Indian and Ladino peoples.

In 1979, the government began a systematic series of massacres in Quiché. When Montt replaces Lucas, the repression gets worse - a scorched earth policy that destroys entire towns, establishes strategic hamlets which are living hells, poisons the rivers and burns crops, kills and tortures the people. We realize that these are acts of desperation because they can’t destroy our organisations, nor the level of struggle of our people. We have been unifying all organisations. After the massacre at the Spanish Embassy, our organisation began to unite the mass groups. Now all four major armed organisations are involved. We never wanted to have a war. But the response of the government has created a war. For the future, we want a government that will respect all people. This must be a government that includes Indians. It is the people who are now involved in the struggle -Indians, peasants, workers- from which a new government will come.

(Source: from a speech given at the University of Illinois, News and Letters, Detroit, Dec. 1982)

Manuela Saquic

For many years now we the Indian people have been exploited and oppressed in Guatemala; and we are more than 70 percent of the country's population. In the rural areas we don’t have sanitary water, roads or schools. The young boys are forcibly taken away to military barracks to serve in the army. Many people have to migrate to the coastal plantations to work in coffee, cotton, and sugar cane. They are so poorly paid that when they come back they have nothing. In my village, my father was president of Catholic Action, and every Sunday people would get together and talk. Out of these meetings there came other meetings to talk about village problems, the formation of co-ops, and the distribution of food.

As the people met, the question of land ownership came up, the fact that few people had access to any land. Out of this came the formation of the Committee for Peasant Unity (CUC) As people participated in the development of CUC, they became more aware of the rich and what they were doing to us.

The rich have always treated us Indians as people who are crazy, who can't think. They think of Indians as animals, who don’t have the capacity to learn and the capacity to become conscious. But we have demonstrated in practice that we can organize and do things and we’re not crazy like they say.

And it's not just we Indians who are suffering exploitation and oppression. It's also the majority of the Ladinos (non-Indians) who are poor and suffer. For example, the slum dwellers in Guatemala City live in houses made of cardboard, and have no running water and no electricity. Thus we Indians are struggling alongside the Ladinos in Guatemala, against the rich. We knew there were also guerrilla forces who were struggling with arms. And on the big coastal farms, thousands of agricultural workers were organizing demonstrations and strikes, while in Guatemala City, student and union organisations were beginning to get strong. So it wasn't just in one place that people were organizing. It was all over Guatemala, in all sectors.

The more we organized, the more the government replied with massacres. You’d find dead bodies in gorges and valleys and alongside of roads.
At first the army used to persecute only men. They never paid any attention to the women; they thought we were invisible. But when the men would leave the village, the army noticed that we still had organizations and protests. They discovered that the women were organized too.

For example, in one town, the women were making explosives out of fruit cans, with gasoline inside. When the army came in and saw that there were only women there, they started to laugh – but when the women threw the explosives the soldiers started to cry! And these women held off the army long enough to allow the rest of the village to escape.

In May of this year, thirteen of us from the group PF31, including myself, decided to take over the Brazilian Embassy, because that was the only way of forcing the attention of the world press on the massacres in the rural areas. We occupied the Embassy, the government said that under no circumstances would they negotiate with us. They said they would burn us alive, like what had happened two years before in the Spanish Embassy.

We are asking for the broadest possible solidarity to stop the U.S. from sending arms to Guatemala. The Reagan Administration is sending military aid to Rios Montes. The helicopter parts the American government sends are for the same helicopters that bomb our towns. The government is massacring us because we're organizing and rising up. They have massacred a lot of people, but there are still many people left. The strength of the movement is that both the mass organizations are united and the four guerrilla organizations are united. We have great hope that we will arrive in power and create a new Guatemala.

(Source: from a speech given at the University of Illinois, News and Letters, Detroit, Dec. 1982.)
a public hearing at the Indian Post of Caramuru, the area of
the reservation was reduced, in conformity with the interests
of the ranchers. The state government financed the new survey,
which redefined the boundaries of the reservation. This sur-
vey was carried out by Capt. Moysés Castello Branco and by
the engineer Alfredo Amorim Coelho, representing the Dept.
of Agriculture, Industry, Commerce, Transportation and Public
Works of Bahia.

The ethnologist Curt Nimuendaju, in 1938, arranged the
transfer to the reservation of survivors of other indigenous
groups, who had previously inhabited the region and who were
without protection against the persecution of the landholders
of the area. Small groups of Botocudo, Kamaká, Tupiniquim,
Menian and Kiriri-Sapuyá were in this way moved to the reserve.
These groups were located at the Paraguaçu Indian Post, while
the Pataxó-Hãhãhãí and the Baená were located at the Caramuru
Indian Post, in the north of the reserve. For this reason,
this was divided into two posts within the same continuous
area. In accordance with the Indian policy of the period, the
Indian Protection Service set up leasing contracts with non-
Indians for the exploitation of floral resources and for agri-
culture on reservation lands. These contracts expressly for-
bade the installation of permanent improvements by the contrac-
tors, and defined any such improvements as violations of con-
tract.

These leasing contracts were essentially conceived and
defined to yield an income sufficient to defray the expenses
of the assistance being rendered to the Indians. In a number
of ways, however, these purposes and limitations were circum-
vented, permitting the virtually total invasion of the reser-
vation by the ranchers: the corruption of SPI personnel,
threats against the Indians, the burning of houses, and all
kinds of illegal arrangements between Indians and non-Indians
prohibited by the terms of the contracts and by law. The ran-
chers made a number of attempts to have the State government
of Bahia seize the Indian lands and expel the Indians. These
efforts, however, remained unsuccessful.

The loss of reservation land, however, forced many of
the Indians to abandon the reservation and take refuge on
other Indian Posts. Others nevertheless remained in the area,
subsisting as paid laborers for the ranchers or salaried wor-
kers in private enterprises or public services. The area was
thus never completely abandoned by its legitimate owners.

Owing to the almost total occupation of the reservation
by ranchers and the dispersion of many of the Indians who
had lived there to other areas, the National Indian Foundation
(FUNAI, the successor of the SPI after 1967) deactivated the
Post in 1972, and from that time ceased to charge rents to the
leaseholders. In 1976, the ranchers once again demanded that
the land be turned over to them. This movement resulted in a
new survey of the situation with regard to the occupation of
the area. FUNAI resolved to survey and demarcate the Indian
lands once again in order to guarantee the survival of the
Indians living on them. In spite of this attitude of the
Federal Agency concerned, however, the State Government of
Bahia illegally distributed titles to the land to the ranchers.
In 1977 bids were invited for the work of demarcation by an-
nouncements published in the newspapers of the State capital
and posted in the government offices of the municipalities
in which the Indian lands were located. The Plantel surveying
firm was contracted for the job (Service Order no. 03/79).
In spite of the new demarcation entailing a new reduction in
the area of the reservation, the ranchers prevented its being
carried out by threatening the lives of the surveyors.

In 1982, the Indians from the reservation who had been
living as refugees on the Guarani Ranch in the neighboring
State of Minas Gerais decided to return to their own lands,
not having adapted satisfactorily to their new circumstances.
FUNAI, in its legal role as ward and protector of the Indians,
sought the protection of the Federal Police and accompanied
the Indians when they reoccupied the ranch of São Lucas, which the Federal authorities had refused to register as the legal property of the leaseholder on the grounds of its being entirely inside Indian lands. From that time on, a series of violent pressures has been brought to bear on various authorities directly or indirectly concerned with the problem, with the aim of achieving the expulsion of the Indians. FUNAI, having exhausted all possibilities of a negotiated solution without success, finally resorted to bringing suit in Federal Court (case no. 030668).

Various sites were considered for the relocation of the Indians. All of these were remote and inaccessible areas without the minimal conditions or resources to permit subsistence. The governor of the State alleged that if the Indians were not removed, the government party would lose the election (of Nov. 1982) because of the withdrawal of the support of the ranchers. Unable to go on resisting these pressures, FUNAI had to remove part of the Indian population of São Lucas to the Experimental Station of Almada, an area of 108 hectares devoted to experiments in pisciculture. Part of the Indian population, however, continued to resist removal, and in spite of all the pressures brought to bear on them, remained on the ranch. These pressures included the cutting off of food supplies, the suspension of medical assistance and financial resources, and the removal of Federal Police protection, rendering them vulnerable to attacks by the ranchers.

At the beginning of November 1982, the Indians who had remained at São Lucas got a lawyer and brought suit in court, demanding a restraining order against the carrying out of the decision to relocate them, given that this decision did not conform to the legal requirement of a decree by the President of the Republic ordering their removal to prevent "social disturbance". A Federal judge found in favor of the Indians, and issued a show-cause order restraining further transfers and ordering the return of the Indians already transferred to their original lands. This decision provoked great agitation and anticipation among the Indians at Almada, who immediately began preparing to return to São Lucas. The government of the State of Bahia, however, immediately went to court and got the judge's order set aside. This was not immediately communicated to the Indians.

The death of an Indian child, and the decision to bury her in the ancestral territory touched off the following chain of events. The Indians, not having been informed of the judicial order setting aside the earlier decision allowing them to return, decided that they would all go back to São Lucas. A group of armed ranchers prepared to meet and kill them upon arrival. The move was, however, successfully made at dawn by means of trucks with headlights turned off.

FUNAI applied in Federal court in the State capital, Salvador, for an order interdicting the area of the São Lucas Ranch were the Indians would then remain until a decision was reached on the legal question of possession of the land. The judge involved, considering that he lacked sufficient facts, decided to make a tour of inspection of the area, accompanied by interested parties and by an expert consultant (an anthropologist). The judicial party was received by more than 500 armed men, who threatened and attempted to pressure the investigatory commission so that the judge would not rule that the Indians might remain at São Lucas while the justice of their demands to retain their lands is being decided.

FUNAI is now once again under enormous pressure to remove the Indians from the ranch of São Lucas, in order to satisfy the interests of the ranchers. The armed ranchers and their men are threatening at any moment to invade the area where the Indians have taken refuge, under the protection of the Federal police. The situation is critical, and the lives of the Indians are in danger. It is also possible that FUNAI will not succeed in resisting the pressures being brought to bear by the State government and will try once more to remove the Indians, which
would now have to be achieved by force and by violence, since they are determined to resist. This would represent, not only one more violation of the rights of these Indians, but under present conditions would risk precipitating a massacre.

Decision on FUNAI's case in Federal Court was deferred by the judge (on Dec. 17, 1982) until Feb. 8, 1983. In the meantime, the judge ordered that the Indians be protected by the Federal police on their land at the São Lucas Ranch. Meanwhile, the Ministry of the Interior and the Government of the State of Bahia are attempting to negotiate a settlement of the problem, based on a drastic reduction of the area to which the Indians are entitled.

We appeal for support for the Pataxó in this desperate situation, in the form of letters, telegrams, or signed petitions, stating in their texts that the rights of the Indians of the Caramuru-Paranaguá Reservation must be respected, and calling upon the competent authorities to ensure that this is done, in accordance with the relevant national laws and the International agreements on the protection of ethnic minorities to which Brazil is signatory.

BRAZIL: FUNAI DRAGS ITS HEELS OVER YANOMAMI PARK

by Anthony Henman

Early in September, a meeting was held in Boa Vista, capital of the territory of Roraima, to discuss future strategies of assistance in the Yanomami area. Chaired by the heads of FUNAI's 1st (Amazonas) and 10th (Roraima) Regional Delegacies, the occasion was supposed to facilitate a reciprocal flow of information between the various agencies involved: FUNAI itself, the Unevangelized Field Mission (MEVA), the New Tribes Mission of Brazil (NTB), the Army's Special Frontier Battalion (SEF), the Catholic Salesian and Consolata missions, and the Commission for the Creation of the Yanomami Park (CCPY).

In the event, there was little evidence of any serious intention to discuss in depth the implications of future policy in the area. FUNAI's proposals were not released to the public before the meeting, which made it difficult to conduct any informed discussion of their content when they were suddenly unveiled. Most of the ensuing debate was cleverly directed by FUNAI personnel towards relatively minor matters, such as the location of the administrative HQ for the Yanomami area, and much political capital was made of the supposed policy split between "liberal" and "hardline" factions in FUNAI, represented respectively by the chief officers of the 10th and 1st Regional Delegacies.

The Protestant missionaries, for their part, were only interested in one major issue - an authorization to remain in the area and expand their infrastructure - a concern that is perhaps understandable, given that a strong current of opinion exists at FUNAI headquarters in Brasília in favour of their ultimate expulsion and replacement by lay personnel. Having been promised a free hand to continue spreading the gospel,
both MEVA and NTB missionaries were prepared to take a back seat while FUNAI made the running and the Catholic missions and CCPY attempted to inject some urgency into the debate. Though the exercise, in the end, seemed to have been arranged by FUNAI for principally cosmetic purposes, its sponsors had failed to invite even a single Yanomami Indian. So ingrained is the paternalism of those accustomed to dealing with the Yanomami, that virtually all of those present at the meeting seemed genuinely taken back when Claudia Andujar of the CCPY suggested that Indian representatives be included in future gatherings. It was not as if there were no reason for including Indian spokesmen.

Many of the policy guidelines put forward at Boa Vista were in fact quite controversial, despite FUNAI attempts to portray official thinking in the most humanitarian of terms. The fate of the 10% of the Brazilian Yanomami population left out of the area “interdicted” by the ministerial decree of 9th March, 1982, provides one case in point. A substantial portion of this population lives in small, discontinuous Indian areas which were legally established in 1978—nominally in the Ajarař and Catrimani drainages—and the Consolata mission and the CCPY have repeatedly pressed for the unification of these areas in a single reserve contiguous with the main Yanomami area. The tone of the discussion in Boa Vista, however, seemed to indicate that the ultimate FUNAI strategy will be to “attract” these groups away from their homelands and into the area of the future Park. This was stated explicitly by the President of FUNAI in Brasilia at a subsequent meeting with the CCPY, which would seem to indicate that the concessions made in this respect in Boa Vista—a pro forma local acceptance of the Consolata proposals regarding the unification of the Ajarař and Catrimani reserves—were intended more as a temporary pacifying gesture than as binding policy decision.

Similar spoiling tactics were also brought to bear on other issues which threatened to polarize opinion at the meeting in Boa Vista. Principal among these was the question of what type of infrastructure FUNAI would ultimately establish in the Yanomami area. Arguing on the basis of ethnographic data that the Yanomami are characterized by a high degree of spatial mobility, the CCPY representatives suggested that medical and other assistance be provided by mobile teams with major operational base camps located outside the Indian area, so as to avoid any unnecessary sedentarization of the Yanomami. An evident unwillingness to consider such “unrealistic” proposals was sponsored by the content of the official report of the meeting submitted by the 10th Regional Delegacy to FUNAI in Brasilia. In this document, not a single mention is made of the CCPY’s recommendations for mobile teams. In their place, decision makers are expected to implement all the standard FUNAI panaceas for the Indian question: increased physical and bureaucratic infrastructure, large-scale agricultural projects, repressive “fiscalization” and “vigilance” of outsiders, etc.

In this respect at least, FUNAI can count on the tacit support of most of the missionaries involved, since the latter are likewise engaged in establishing substantial fixed presences in the area, and share the same strategy of building up a submissive clientele among the Indian groups nearby. This clientelism, expressed in terms of the supply of medical services and trade goods, greatly facilitates the work of religious proselytism or the FUNAI style of State-sponsored “integration”. It undoubtedly has the negative impact on the Yanomami cultural autonomy and, through its disruption of traditional settlement patterns, ultimately produces an impoverishment of the regional ecology and leads to the creation of economic dependence. Not surprisingly, the emphasis of the CCPY on mobile health teams was countered repeatedly during the Boa Vista meeting by explanations of the “need” for fixed
dispensaries, since it is these which ultimately justify in terms of world opinion the establishment of such ethnocidal enterprises as religious missions and FUNAI posts. No explanation was given, however, of the failure of most missions and posts to provide medical assistance in anything but an extremely reduced area in the immediate vicinity of their installations.

Indeed, the 1982 CCPY Report had pointed to certain clear cases of negligence in health matters, points which were taken up at the Boa Vista meeting. On being questioned about inadequate medical coverage in the Cauboris and Marauí drainage in Amazonas State, the Salesian representative claimed that such activities were normally handled by the nuns of his order, not the priests, and that the Bishop of the Rio Negro had not yet authorized the establishment of convents in either of these missions. Salesian nuns are not allowed to work on their own, away from the cloisters, and Salesian priests are not trained in anything save the most rudimentary first aid. The missionaries in Marauí felt that a solution might be found in the contracting of lay health workers, and expressed an encouraging opposition to the idea of installing the kind of top-heavy infrastructure which has characterized other areas of Salesian activity.

Another issue which united missionaries and FUNAI was the need to seal hermetically the Yanomami area against the moral dissolution supposedly resulting from penetration by undesirable outsiders. While the threat of introduced disease is real enough, it is also clear that a purely repressive police-state attitude will never produce a definitive solution to the problem of infiltration along the eventual Yanomami Park's extensive borders. Mineral prospecting, in particular, is actively promoted by the governor of the territory of Roraima and both local political parties (PDS and PMDB), whose campaign literature is full of calls to reopen the mines in Indian areas and limit the powers of FUNAI.

A suggestion from the CCPY that it would be best to involve representatives of mining interests in discussions about the future of the Yanomami Park was greeted with derision: "Impossible!" replied the FUNAI delegate from Amazonas, perhaps fearing that democratic practices of this sort would expose a little too obviously the contradictions between Brazil's federal bureaucracies and the political groups which support the present government in hinterland areas. Clearly it is considered more opportune that FUNAI should maintain its much-publicised but largely ineffective persecution of small-time prospectors - drawing cooing approval from the missionaries in the process - while deciding on a longer-term accommodation with large mining concerns behind closed doors.

Unexpected support for the CCPY position came from the captain of the Special Frontier Battalion (BDE) who had recently been in charge of repressive operations in the region of the Uratanin diamond finds, on the upper river Uraricaçu. Describing the very real difficulties of patrolling an area characterized by heavy rainforest cover, mountainous terrain, and the close proximity of the Venezuelan border, he stated that it would be virtually impossible to prevent the entry of the highly individualistic and resourceful prospectors who operate on the fringe of the Yanomami area. Though districts of concentrated mining (such as the CODESAINA goldfield in Santa Rosa, on the lower Uraricaçu) could be sealed off in military operations, the same was not true of isolated alluvial deposits of the kind exploited by pioneering gold- and diamond panners. These prospectors are mainly Brazilians, but many nevertheless have chosen to base their operation in Venezuela, where they receive better prices for their produce and can charter light aircrafts to cross the border and drop supplies. His suggestion was that the Yanomami of the Uraricaçu, who are already accustomed to working mineral deposits on behalf of outside prospectors, should be encouraged to take over the operation in its entirety themselves. Sensing a new
source of income, this proposal was enthusiastically received by FUNAI, though the CCPY pointed out that the crux of the matter lay in the exact manner in which Indian involvement was established.

Recent reports from Roraima indicate increased police activity in the Santa Rosa district, where the number of gold prospectors has dropped from 300 (early September) to 200 (early November). Rumour has it that a general clean-up of the area will be effected after the 15th November elections, possibly as a prelude to the installation of a government-supervised mining operation, with or without Indian participation. In any case, gradual penetration of the Yanomami area by outsiders will inevitably continue on other fronts. A handful of prospectors were recently encountered in the Ajarani drainage, for example, and in Amazonas state the exploitation of piassava palm-fibre via the settlement of Araquen shows no sign of abating. It remains to be seen if FUNAI will ever assume its constitutional obligation to explain the niceties of the Indian question to the surrounding population in a non-coercive manner, or whether its agents will continue to operate in bully-boy fashion supported by the Federal Police.

In the two months since the Boa Vista meeting, the plans to set up a central coordinating body for the Yanomami area seem to have ground to a halt, and the follow-up consultations with the CCPY promised by the President of FUNAI in early September have failed to materialize. Elections will be followed by year-end and Carnival holiday periods, which are not propitious to the launching of new initiatives in Brasilia. When the political season reopens again in March, none of the contradictions apparent during the September meeting in Boa Vista will have undergone any really substantial change. FUNAI will remain at loggerheads with local political interests, as well as with other federal agencies, and the indigenous bureaucracy itself will face the formidable task of establishing a unified coordinating body for the Yanomami area, which is at present divided between two rival and competing regional delegacies.

The Protestant missionaries, on the other hand, will probably remain almost exclusively concerned with maintaining hegemony in the little fiefdoms which surround their mission stations, and are unlikely to mobilize their considerable influence in favour of the eventual creation of a Yanomami Park. While the Catholic missions are more open to new proposals concerning the future of the Yanomami area as a whole, they too have their own local problems - nuns and medical training in the Salesian case, and policy contradictions between "progressive" and "traditionalist" clergy in that of the Consolata. In short, despite the "interdiction" of the Yanomami area and the implementation of a sporadic vaccination programme, the effective creation of a Yanomami Park is almost as distant a possibility as it has ever been. Clearly, it is a case of "back to work as usual" for the CCPY.

(Anthony Henman is working at the Department of Anthropology, University of Campinas, Sao Paulo, Brazil. This report was written on November 17, 1982).

BRAZIL: REPORT ON YANOMAMI HEALTH SITUATION

The CCPY has recently finished preparing a detailed report on the health and contact situation of the Yanomami. This report includes the findings of the Yanomami Medical Project: (see IWGIA Newsletter: Oct/Dec 1981 for a preliminary account of its work). The CCPY proposes that the 200 page "Relatório Yanomami 82" be put with other materials related to the land and health situation in both Brazil and Venezuela for publication in English and Spanish as well as in Portuguese. The CCPY sees the dissemination of this information to international and national specialist bodies as being vital in the present stage in the struggle for the implementation of an effective Yanomami Park project in each of the countries.
In response to the account sent to IWGIA on the fate of the Pataxo Indians, the following telegram was sent. 

Having read alarming reports about impending massacre of Pataxo Indians on Sao Lucas ranch, Bahia state; IWGIA, Denmark, urgently calls for the respect of Indian rights to Caramuru-Paraguacu Reservation in accordance with national law and international agreements on protection of ethnic minorities signed by Brazil, IWGIA, Copenhagen." As suggested, this was addressed to Joao Batista Figueiredo, President of Brazil; Dr Abi Ackel, Minister of Justice; Dr Mario David Andreazzo, Minister of the Interior; General Danilo Venturini; Col. Paulo Moreira Leal, President of FUNAI; and Antonio Carlos Magalhaes, Governor of Bahia.

At the request of the Comissao pela Criacao do Parque Yanomami (CCPY), IWGIA sent the following letter to the President of FUNAI, Col Paulo Moreira Leal. "IWGIA is deeply concerned about your government's programmes affecting the Yanomami people in the area demarcated in March 1982. We respectfully ask that your government urgently takes the following measures. Close immediately the Santa Rosa mineral zone in operation inside the demarcated area. Demarcate immediately and precisely the Yanomami area as well as take steps to aid those living in areas outside the demarcation. Recommend that the Comissao pela Criacao do Parque Yanomami participates in the Regional Indigenist Council, given that its creation is already authorized by an article in the Decree-Law 84.638. Sincerely, International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, (IWGIA) Copenhagen."

Mapudugun is the name given to the language spoken by the Mapuche people of Chile. Owing to its historical and social context, this has been a spoken language not a written one. Recently considerable work has been done on how to give Mapudugun a written form to as to be of wider service to the Mapuche people. Work has been carried out by CAPIDE (Centro Asesor y Planificador de Investigación y Desarrollo) under the direction of Anselmo Raguile Lincopin. In their recent Boletín, the reasons behind this linguistic work are spelled out.

"The Mapuche people, defined by their culture within the world society of which they form a part and which gives them their ethnic-cultural specificity, have been subject throughout history to a clearly unequal relationship with non-Mapuches. One of the important reasons for this stems from communication with the following implications:

a) Problems of communication between people of different cultural heritage in terms of language, system of logic, values, behaviour and identity.

b) The ethnic-cultural discrimination through which non-Mapuches deprecate the Mapuches, causing conflict situations.

c) The problems which affect Mapuches in general in trying to understand the means by which world society operates when they have an imperfect knowledge of spoken or written Spanish.

"A decisive factor in the devaluation of the Mapuche culture (and one which is also found amongst the Mapuches themselves) comes from the lack of a written language even
though this can be explained by the fact that each group of human beings generates cultural elements which are needed in the specific context and historical moment. Up to the time of Spanish Coquest, the historical conditions did not demand that the Mapuche people need develop a written language. And afterwards, the imposition of Spanish as the official language had the effect of preventing the further development of Mapudugun.

"With the arrival of the Spanish to these lands, Mapudugun has been changing little by little; for example, it has incorporated many words from the Spanish language. These are used to distinguish cultural elements that the Mapuche have adopted from the wider society and this has usefully expanded its vocabulary. Each one of these terms has been 'Mapuchized'. That is to say, each has now acquired the form and pronunciation of a true Mapuche word. And the language itself has been adapted to the demands of the Mapuche's cultural situation at the present day, retaining as ever its role as an efficient instrument of communication.

"However, some Mapuches in order to be be seen as modern and civilised have exaggerated these habits, coming to substitute unnecessarily words from the Spanish language for Mapuche ones. As a result, you cannot tell whether a conversation is in Spanish but with many Mapuche words included or vice versa. Other Mapuches aspire to imitate Spanish speakers in trying to take on the Spanish way of pronouncing words or phrases. Thus, for example, they say 'nawi' for 'nañih' which means rain... When the Mapuche language lacks an equivalent, then in our opinion, it is necessary linguistically to incorporate Spanish words. All languages do this. But to try to Hispanize the language through the misguided belief that you are modernizing it is absurd, and what is more, unacceptable.

(Source: CAPIDE Boletín, No 2, July 1982, Temuco, Chile)

COLOMBIA: CRIC DISASSOCIATES ITSELF FROM GUERRILLA GROUP

The "Consejo Regional Indígena del Cauca" (CRIC), has recently issued an urgent denunciation against the Revolutionary Army of Colombia (FARC). In it, CRIC points out that not only do indigenous people "confront the violence unleashed from the side of the landlords, state and parts of the Church which has already cost the lives of 81 of our leaders. But in addition, contradictions have emerged with political organisations thought to be the defenders of the people's interests but which are not prepared to accept out autonomy." For some years, the FARC has proposed the creation of agrarian unions as an organisational model for the indigenous communities. They have been opposed to the indigenous demands for the recovery of their lands, when those demands interfere with interests of landlords and hacendados in the Cauca region with whom they have reached a "tactical agreement".

In 1976, the FARC began a smear campaign to discredit the CRIC and threatened CRIC leaders. Many times CRIC sought a dialogue but to no avail. In January, 1981, 7 CRIC members were killed in the district of Los Tigres, and in August, 1982, the FARC claimed responsibility for these murders saying that the victims were counter-revolutionaries. From July/August 1982, the FARC has stepped up its campaign against CRIC. Their threats were carried out with the murder of Manuel Antonio Jollicue and family, and Ramón Jollicue and his brother Benito. CRIC calls for the denunciation of these crimes at home and abroad.

(Source: CRIC denunciation, October, 1982; Unidad Indígena, No 59, October).
COLOMBIA: INDIGENOUS COMMUNITY ORGANISES TO CONFRONT CAPUCHINS

After looking the length and the breadth of the land in search of a suitable place, close to the heavens to be nearer to God and close to a fine river so as to set up a profitable livestock enterprise and close to an indigenous village so to enjoy cheap labour, 66 years ago the Capuchin community established themselves in San Sebastián de Rábago in the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, Colombia. There the Capuchins set up their property and with money from the Colombian state and with help from abroad intended for indigenous people, constructed living quarters for themselves, their sons, their grandchildren, their great grandchildren, their great great grandchildren (in a direct line of spiritual descendence, it must be understood), for ever and ever, Amen Jesus.

On many, many occasions the indigenous people demanded the return of their lands and of the constructions that were made by them and with resources intended for them. Nobody came to their help. So on Saturday, August 7, in a solemn, orderly and peaceful act, the indigenous people resolved to take back the control over what was theirs and to demand the withdrawal of the invaders. There have been few examples of a similar movement in Colombia. It should be noted that a few months previously, a commission was sent by the Government (composed of officials from the National Planning Office, INDERENA, the army and other bodies) which recognised the justice of the indigenous people's petitions and condemned the repressive methods redolent of the Middle Ages practised by the Spanish priests.

(Source: Yavi, No 17, September-October 1982)

COLOMBIA: COMMUNITY TAKES ACTION AFTER FIVE YEARS OF WAITING

Through this communication, the indigenous council ("cabildo") of San Andrés de Sotavento informs the public of the following:

1. We, the indigenous people of San Andrés de Sotavento (Cordoba) belong to the Caribbean race of the Zenú group.
2. We, the Indians of this country have always been the victims of persecution, violence and the plundering of our lands. This process of extermination against us began with the violence of the Spanish conquerors and is continued today by the landlords.
3. We suffer the most terrible destitution without land. We number 18,000 located on 2,000 hectares. Now, the scraps of land that remain to us are not enough to let us live with the result that many of our people have to emigrate the length and breadth of the country, disintegrating our community.
4. In the face of this serious situation, with hunger awaiting us, it was from 1970 that we proposed to the Government that we should receive Finca Venecia, which is within our community lands ("resguardo") and we said that this land should be ours since we possessed a legal document that was valid according to Law 89, of 1890. The number of this legal document is 1773, of the same year (with a royal seal) and also for the land should belong to those who work it. Thus the Indian has double right.
5. INCORA (the land reform agency) expropriated the property and every day tell us that the matter will be resolved soon, and 5 years have passed and nothing. So we decided to invade and recover directly our land on the 15th of February, 1975.
6. The response from the landlord was: the stick, the murder of a comrade, the burning down of our houses. The landlord is called Adolfo Madrid Osorio.

7. After the landlord, Madrid Osorio, died, it was handed over to a gunman called Fidel Albony who took charge of the property and who we are fighting and who began a wholesale persecution of the Indians.

8. The most recent things Albony and the police have done are the following: on 27th February, 1982, at 10 o'clock at night, 5 drunk policemen with Domingo Albony (Fidel Albony's son) took out of the house 6 comrades (5 men and 1 woman) and took them away to a gully to kill them. When they were being taken away, they were showered with insults, kicks and the police were shooting close to their bodies. Seeing this situation, the comrades said to the policemen that if they were going to be killed in the gully, why not kill them then and there. Then Domingo Albony fired at the people, and the police as well with the result that 2 comrades were wounded: Neila Disperusa and Ismael Pérez. The former lost an eye and is still in hospital.

9. On the 28th of February, 1982, at 6 o'clock in the morning, 7 policemen from the Municipalidad of Sagún came into our dwellings and took away our work tools and started to set fire to our fields, to break our pots, to tear up our account books, to break a Singer sewing machine given us by the Ministry, to burn all our clothes, to throw away our food, to kill several chickens and cows and to steal $3,300 in money which we had collected for our council ("cabildo"). That same day Marquesa Suárez and Ignacio Estrada, were arbitrarily arrested and were in gaol for 2 days without food. The crime they had committed was to have asked at the Hospital of Sincelejo after the health of their comrade Neila.

10. On the 9th of March, 1982, at 5 o'clock in the morning Celedonio Padilla, of the Venecia council and member of the Directing Junta of ONIC (the Indigenous Organisator of Colombia) was taken out of his house. This was done by 7 men in civilian dress who said they were members of the MÁS. They bound his eyes, they tied his hands, they beat him up, they stuck a revolver in his mouth until he bled, and after all these indignities they left him on the road to Tuchín by a field. It must be pointed out that they did not kill this comrade because our community knew about the abduction and immediately denounced it and the community pressed the authorities to hand back the comrade and stop the abduction.

11. The Municipal Judge received a declaration from all the members of our community ("resguardo") and it is clear that he immediately issued an order for the arrest of Domingo Albony. But the chief of the police of San Andrés has not arrested him as he lives in rooms of the landlord Albony with his daughter.

We ask all organisations of the people in Colombia and the citizens of good will to denounce what we have suffered and to send letters requesting the following: that they give us back our land; that they pay us for the damages caused; and that they compensate comrade Neila for the loss of an eye; that Domingo Albony and the police are blamed for the events. Letters should be addressed to the Minister of Government of Bogotá, the Governor of the Department of Córdoba, the Attorney General of Córdoba region, and the Mayor of San Andrés de Sotavento, Córdoba.

We also ask that all organisations express their solidarity by sending us financial help, and also clothing. For the police have burnt almost all our clothes. We hope, brothers, that the help you give us today, we shall give to you tomorrow.

Sincerely,
Cabildo Venecia (San Andrés de Sotavento, Córdoba)
San Andrés, June 1, 1982. (Source: Yavi, No 17, Sept/Oct, 1982)
Negotiations with the Government

The 80,000 Guaymi people are continuing to negotiate with the Panamanian Government over the future of their lands which are located in the western mountainous region of the country. In the face of vast mining and infrastructure projects the Guaymi are fighting for the legal recognition of their traditional rights to land in order to protect themselves from expropriation and invasion. The negotiations with the Government for the preparation of a draft law to set up the “Comarca” or reserve have now handled 33 items, most of which refer to the government and administration of the future Comarca. Indigenous authorities will replace national authorities, Guaymi will be united in a single territorial unit and the Guaymi Congress will be recognised as the highest decision-making body of this people. Meeting 2 days each month, the Guaymi representatives have achieved certain successes but they have also had to give in to painful compromises. The most difficult part of the negotiation lies ahead: the form of property ownership inside the Comarca, the natural resources found on Guaymi land and the boundaries.

While the Guaymi position is that they recover all their lands (taken from them by the landlords) and leave no Guaymi village outside the Comarca, the Government has confirmed that there will be no Comarca unless the actual properties of the landlords are respected and allowed to remain. It is clear through this what kind of Comarca the Government is offering the Guaymi; it is also clear the very different level of technical and other resources the Government has at its command compared to the Guaymi.

Protest marches organised

On October 12, the day celebrating Central and South America’s Spanish ancestry, Indian peoples of the continent remember the Conquest. The Guaymis organised a protest march through Panama City to draw the attention of the public to their struggle and to ask for support. On October 29, the Committee for the Permanent Struggle for the Comarca also organised a march in which 2,000 people from Bocas del Toro took part.

Guaymi General Congress

The General Congress will take place on March 7-10, 1983, in the community of Alto de Jesús, Veraguas province. This is the most important decision-making body of the Guaymi people whose decisions are binding on the authorities and people. At the present time, in the midst of the fight for land, the Congress plays a supremely important role. It can evaluate how the negotiations with the Government are proceeding and what should be done in the forthcoming phase, and it can define the Guaymi position with respect to the transnational companies wishing to impose themselves on Guaymi soil. From 1981 it was decided that the Congress should be financed solely by the communities in order to ensure its total independence.

(Source: Guaypress, Hoja Informativa, No 5, January-February, 1983)
PERU: THE AYMARA WOMAN IN ANDEAN SOCIETY

Contrary to the picture often painted by South American indigenous organisations, the subordination of women is deeply rooted in many indigenous societies at the present day. This finds expression both within the family and in the wider community society. The dominant society may despise an Indian people, but in a parallel way within indigenous society women are looked down on and seen as having less value or worth than men. Thus indigenous women's struggle for liberation and emancipation differs from men's. Prior to the Spanish Conquest, relations between the genders appears to have been relatively egalitarian, though the evidence suggests that the creation of the large Aztec and Inca states was tending to have a differential impact on men and women and that this was taken over and exacerbated under colonial rule. Be that as it may, what becomes ever more important now is to understand more deeply the character and complexity within indigenous society, not least so as to map out realistic and appropriate political goals and strategies responding to the varying and maybe conflicting needs and interests.

Rosario Bernardini, an Aymara woman from southern Peru, talks about her thoughts on being a woman. "A lot is said now about women from different points of view and interests. We believe that Aymara peasant women, like women from the other popular classes, have a role to play in social change; not only on account of belonging to a marginalised social class but because in addition, the fact of 'being a woman' means that they become involved in social change under specific conditions. So that if they do not struggle to transform the conditions society has imposed on their gender, you can say that much of the social liberation is not going to necessarily bring better living conditions for women of itself..."

Aymara women as members of a family

"What is the life of a Aymara woman like? What is her situation within society? what role does she play in her family, her community, her milieu? What makes her similar to, what makes her difference from other Peruvian women? There are many questions to answer. We do not plan to treat the problem fully, but rather talk about some important elements concerning it. The Aymara peasant woman, from the moment she is born, becomes part of social life: first of the family and then the community. When we talk of her, we take the perspective that she is a member and active element of this society, in spite of the fact that ideologically and politically she is discriminated against within it. In the peasant family, they celebrate the birth of boys - the father, along with family members toast and drink the arrival of a little boy into the world. This does not happen when a little girl is born. It is not necessary to celebrate, she is from the inferior sex, 'she is going to suffer a lot in life' and she is going to enter another family when she marries.

"After some time, the little peasant girl begins to take on some jobs helping the family. All peasant children help out in the family economy: they pasture and feed the livestock; they go with and help their parents in the fields; they look after the animals in the yard, such as chickens and guinea pigs; and they do many other things such as weaving which mostly the girls do. In addition to these jobs that children of both sexes do, the girls help their mothers from when they are very small in looking after their younger brothers and sisters, watching them when the mother is busy; girls also share with their mothers the many domestic labours.

"Aymara peasant children, especially the girls, do this work from when they are very young, and take on responsibilities
which children in other types of societies do not, but at the same time this fact makes them become active elements first in the family and then in the community. With regards to education, a few years ago Aymara peasant girls were not sent to school, the priority was for boys to go. Because of this, the female population exhibits the highest levels of illiteracy and inability to speak Spanish. At present, almost all Aymara peasant girls go to primary school - at least for a few years, but parents still prefer that their sons are educated, and very few women from peasant society reach secondary school. In addition, if the mother and father go away from home for a day, it's thought better that a girl stays away from school, even though she may be younger, to take over her parent's jobs in the fields and in the house, for education is not considered as important for her as it is for a son. This situation is slowly changing but even so, the percentage of girls who complete school is very much lower than for boys.

"It is now necessary to examine the life of adult Aymara peasant women. Within the family women play an important economic role. Aymara peasant women work the same as their husbands, in the fields, minding the animals and in other jobs related to production, taking on the whole of the production process in some cases, such as when the husband is absent. In addition to this, women support the familial economy through artisan crafts, trade, barter and other activities. All this is combined with the many activities associated with domestic labour. That is to say, the Aymara woman not only takes on the tasks involved with the reproduction of the labour force, but participates directly in the different stages of production and in economic activities which contribute to family subsistence. It is important to underline also that it is often the women who administer and control the domestic economy. As a result it is very common to hear Aymaras say that it is the woman who works most and from this follows the idea of 'women's suffering'."

"But in spite of all this, at the ideological level the Aymara peasant woman is devalued in her own household and this reflects back on her own attitudes, finding expression for example in surveys and censuses. When asked about her activities, she will reply that she works in 'her house' and as a result from this information is appears that Aymara peasant women do not form part of the economically active population, even though 27% of the peasant households in the country have female heads. This demonstrates the decisive and active part which women play in the economic life of the peasantry.

**Aymara women and community organisation**

"When thinking about women's participation in the different aspects of Aymara social life, we can say that here we come to appreciate the dichotomy between their economic activity and the role assigned them ideologically and politically. The peasant woman, except in the case of widows and some others, according to the community is not named in the communal register; those registered are men. Woman attend the community assemblies, but they do not participate actively in it. It's very rare that they open their mouths. Their participation is reduced to merely their presence. They form groups, whispering comments to each other about what is going on and about other things and minding their babies. They do not directly take part in the decisions taken by the community and generally do not take on posts in the Communal Council. Nevertheless, after the decisions are taken and in all forms of activities, work and communal struggles they participate actively supporting through their work and strength the community's development, organisation and solidarity.

"In other aspects of communal organisation one can see the hard work and tenacity of the Aymara peasant woman. When we examine the smaller types of organisation with more restricted goals within community life, there we can appreciate far more their participation in the discussions and decisions.
Their contribution to the work is always outstanding. We can cite here two examples: the School Board and the Artisanal Committees (in communities which specialise in this work). In the case of the School Board (or Parents’ Committee), women sometimes take posts in it, attend the meetings and participate strongly in whatever activity is sponsored in aid of the school or college. Almost all the women participate in the Artisanal Committees, that’s logical as it is the women who work most in this activity. Women form the majority in these committees and even though they participate fully in taking decisions and in the general council, this does not give them grounds to take decisions at the community level, since they are most concerned with matters more specifically to do with artisan work. In spite of the limitations, these cases show that the Aymara peasant woman not only is able to support the life of the community through her work, but she is also fully capable of forming part of the organisations within it. Their well known ‘inferiority’ or ‘ignorance’ is not apparent when they assume responsibilities in society.

"To refer briefly to levels of peasant organisation above that of the community, we can say that women’s participation is extremely rare within the unions, although in recent years there have been isolated cases where women take part in the Assemblies or Directing Councils.

What are the alternatives?

"Having looked at some of the aspects of Aymara peasant women’s lives, we can pick out certain elements for further reflection and which can be presented as underlying factors. The principal one is the disjuncture between a woman’s productive support in the family and in the community and their status as a weak and inferior human being, which has no basis whatever in reality. A second factor is that the woman herself is not unaffected by this devaluation of her person and she herself feels inferior, this being part of a socialisation handed down from generation to generation and which only very slowly is being broken. And the other constant is that when the Aymara peasant woman has the possibilities to participate more fully in organisations other than that of the community, she knows how to take on and fulfill these responsibilities.

"This situation outlined in general terms allows us to affirm that the Aymara woman can potentially be a strong force for the development and transformation of her own people. This affirmation stems from the fact that the roles assigned her by society means that her participation is vital and is influential in affecting the actual conditions of life of her people... The double role of the Aymara woman means that she should play a larger part in the community's decision-making. This, as we have shown, is not the case. Therefore in these times, their struggle should be in the first place to become recognised as persons vested with full obligations and rights in their own sphere, and in the second place to press for social transformation. If these two struggles are not followed together, there will be no real liberation for the people, let alone for the women.

"Logically both belong to the process of liberation of the Peruvian people in general, and of women in particular. It is time therefore that Aymara peasant women strive for the recognition of their rights as much within Peruvian society as within their own milieu, and that women unite together from the entire Peruvian people."

(Source: Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Aymaras, Serie 2, No 11, 1982).
PERU: COMMUNITIES CAUGHT BETWEEN ARMY AND SENDEROS LUMINOSO

The "Organización de Bases Aymaras, Amazoneñas y Quechuas" (OBAAQ), "Movimiento Indio Tupac Amaro" (MITA) and Organización Amaro Runa" (OAR) issued a statement on January 31, 1983 condemning the brutal massacres of Indian peoples by the Communist Party's "Sendero Luminoso" in the Andean region. The Council of South American Indians (CISA) has also from the start denounced the activities of Sendero Luminoso (See IWGIA Newsletter, No 31-32, June-October, 1982, interview with Salvador Palomino).

Since this statement was made, the massacres have continued. In the second half of February a wave of killings in Peru's highland communities has been the immediate result of the army's latest offensive to eradicate the Maoist guerilla organisation, Sendero Luminoso" writes the Guardian (March 1). "Military sources say that troops have killed 'hundreds' of suspected Senderistas in the last two weeks. The Government last week sent in reinforcements to the battle zone in the mountainous region around Ayacucho, 400 miles southeast of Lima. They joined the 2,000 troops from the army, marines and paratroops regiment which President Belaunde posted to Ayacucho at the beginning of the year to raise the badly flagging morale of the police and their counter-insurgency wing known as Sinchis....

"According to communiqués from the army's special headquarters in Ayacucho, Sendero Luminoso suffered 'important losses' since the new offensive began. Up to now, however, few bodies have been produced and claims that key Senderist leaders like Animael Guzman and Carolta Tello Cutti (alias Camarada Carla) have died in clashes with troops now appear unfounded. Human rights organisations in Lima say they fear that many of the Senderistas the army says it has killed are in fact peasants with little or nothing to do with Sendero Luminoso.

"Journalists have found it impossible to corroborate army figures on deaths, as their movements have been restricted to the city of Ayacucho. Eight journalists were hacked to death by peasants a month ago in the remote mountain community of Uchurucay, 80 miles to the north. The journalists had gone there to verify army statements that peasant communities were turning against Sendero Luminoso. Villagers from Uchurucay say that troops had previously told them to kill all outsiders visiting the community. The army commander in Ayacucho, Brigadier Clemente Noel y Moral, strongly denied that his troops or police had anything to do with the massacre. A three-man commissions, appointed by President Belaunde and including the prize-winning novelist Mario Vargas Llosa, is still investigating the incident.

"The army offensive against Sendero has focussed on two main areas which Sendero had previously claimed to be 'liberated zones'. One is the area around Huanta, close to Uchurucay. The other is in the province of Victor Fajardo, 160 miles south of Ayacucho, where the guerillas are said to have set up their operational base. The army's main drive has been to infiltrate peasant communities, especially those which have shown any resistance to Sendero in the past. Political observers say that troops have tried to 'buy back' loyalties in these communities with gifts of money, food and alcohol, as well as promising military back-up in the event of Sendero reprisals. Some even say that soldiers and police dressed up as peasants have been stationed in certain key communities with portable radio equipment to give the army command warning of Sendero movements. The basic strategy is apparently to surround known Sendero strongholds and to cut off their supply and escape route.

"The Belaunde Government badly needs to chalk up his success in Ayacucho. The police handling of the guerrilla problem in the past two years was inept, and by the end of last year
Sendero's activities were increasing. Sendero Luminoso had managed to turn large areas of the central highland part of Peru into 'liberated zones' where police stations had been abandoned following successive attacks. Local landowners and government officials fled. Sendero targets extended from Cajamarca in the north to Cusco in the south. Senderistas have shown themselves capable of undertaking relatively sophisticated operations. In December, for example, they simultaneously blew up four key pylons, plunging Lima into darkness for several hours."


PERU: MIPVA FIGHTS TO RESTORE TAWANTINSUYU

The IWGIA Secretariat in Copenhagen was pleased to receive a visit from Mario Turpo, who though living in Paris acts as the representative of the "Movimiento Indio Pedro Vilca Apaza" (MIPVA) in Europe. He explained why his organisation thought it necessary to name a representative in Europe. It was to denounce the manipulation of Indian peoples of South America that takes place in Europe. "Those who in Europe define the problem of the Indian are spokesmen of the Latin American and European left. The Indian people are made use of as a 'raison d'être' here while in Latin America, the very same leftists do not speak about the Indians' problems but about the class struggle, so demonstrating that they belong to a western ideology of the Marxist type."

MIPVA was formed in Azángaro, in the southern Peruvian altiplano during a meeting held by the communities of Asillo, Minanpo and Jila on July 26, 1979. At the start, the founding communities held the view that left-wing thought constituted a real alternative for the Indian peoples. However, they came to realise that within the political trajectory of the Peruvian left grounded in a Marxist philosophy there was no place for the liberation struggle of indigenous people. Indians must tackle their problems through their own endeavors and free themselves from all forms of western paternalistic ideology.

MIPVA's principal aim is the liberation of the peoples of the Tawantinsuyu through the restoration of all the institutions that formed part of the Tawantinsuyu including those of communal labour and socio-economic structure. The organisation has worked mainly in communities around Arequipa, Puno and Arequipa. In these and other communities, MIPVA is chiefly concerned with raising the level of consciousness concerning Indian identity and culture and restoring Indian traditions and institutions. MIPVA sets up cells in these communities and supports the emergence of local leaders. Through meetings, seminars and congresses the problems and needs of each group are discussed and programmes are prepared for a united approach to the struggle against oppression.

A calendar of political actions has been planned.

The First Congress Pedro Vilca Apaza to be held on March 21-24, 1983 in Azángaro. During this Congress an analysis will be undertaken of the past conferences and congresses held by the United Nations, the Russell Tribunal, etc. We shall examine what impact these events have really had.

The First Juridical Congress of the Tawantinsuyo to be held in November, 1983, where Tawantinsuyo's legal character and position in International Law will be discussed. The meeting also aims to prepare the legal constitution of Tawantinsuyo.

The Indian Tribunal of the Tawantinsuyo will be held on October 6-12, 1984, in Arequipa, Peru. International Indian legal experts will attend this Tribunal.
On October 30-31, 1982, the Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC), the international organisation of the Inuit, arranged a seminar on what consequences the Canadian Arctic Pilot Project (APP) might have for the Inuit and for the Arctic environment in general. (This project to transport liquified natural gas by tanker has been discussed in IWGIA Newsletter No 30, April 1982; and No 31/32, June-October, 1982).

The main purpose for arranging such a seminar was to create an awareness in the Danish public of the dangers that lie in the increasing resource exploration and extraction taking place in the Arctic and thus attract attention to the necessity of forming a joint Arctic policy that could protect the environment against damage stemming from such activities. At the seminar were representatives of the ICC Board; from Alaska, Canada and Greenland; Greenlandic and Danish politicians; a host of scientists with Arctic expertise; and representatives of the Samis in Norway, Sweden and Finland.

During the weekend, scientists presented evidence on the noise problems caused by the natural gas tanker traffic in areas that are vital to the sea-mammals (breeding grounds and migration routes). Most scientists, politicians and Inuit representatives agreed that the consequences would be disastrous for the hunting population in the area. As a result, the Inuit and Samis heavily underlined the importance of having the right to determine what kind of activities can be accepted in those areas that should be regarded as belonging to the indigenous population by tradition - lands that today without exception constitutionally belong to and are governed by the nation states of USA (Alaska); Canada; Denmark (Greenland); Norway, Sweden and Finland (Sami-land).
Provoked by the rapid development and increasing level of resource exploration in the North, both the Inuit and Samis have been urging a clarification of what constitutes traditional ownership of the land but as yet, no satisfactory solution has been achieved. As far as the resource extraction in the Arctic is concerned, the ICC has demanded that a moratorium should be imposed until the problem of ownership to land and resources is solved. In the meantime, the ICC is trying to persuade national governments to create a joint Arctic policy in co-operation with the Inuit and Samis.

Aggaluk Lyngé, an ICC Board member from Greenland, commented: "It is so bad today that even the very few possibilities Inuit formerly had of regulating their own environment are gone. In an area like Prudhoe Bay, Alaska, for example, the Reagan government has removed all environmental regulations and thus all possibilities for the Inuit to influence political decisions. This is a very dangerous situation for the Inuit of Alaska and it will obviously influence the situation of the Canadian Inuit too. We know very well how close the USA and Canada are attached to each other both economically and politically. It will also have an effect on how the multinational oil companies such as Arco (operating in Alaska, Greenland, and Northern Norway) will act in Greenland."

Aggaluk Lyngé continued: "One can well claim that the ICC and Inuit are the only ones who try to create an Arctic policy but in reality the multinational companies have been exercising their own Arctic policy for a long, long time - and as they control the rest of the world so why shouldn't they have a greater influence in the Arctic too? When we, moreover, have some national governments that are tied together in NATO, and they don't even talk of a joint Arctic policy, what can be done about the multinationals? Nothing! So this is when I look for a counter move."

The seminar in Copenhagen was part of the ICC's struggle to gain a deeper understanding of the need for a joint Arctic policy. However, there was not much understanding apparent from the attitude of the official Danish government representative. The Minister for Greenland, Tom Høyen, used a lot of time labelling the participants of the seminar and the ICC as a whole as "environmental romanticists" and sentimentalists. He said, for instance, "it is essential for me to say that gas and oil really are necessary, that our age has a need for energy supplies and that we also need energy supplies too for the Arctic areas. In the future we must expect that there will be more and more energy dependent wage earners, while in general there will not be an occupational basis to warrant an increase in the hunting population. And in spite of our feelings it is essential to keep these wholly logical and rational factors in mind too. We therefore cannot sensibly, wholly and totally reject plans concerning the development of energy resources in the Arctic." The Minister for Greenland was, however, the only person at the seminar to speak of sentiments.

The Greenlandic president of the ICC, Hans Pavia Rosing, commented on the Danish government's position in this way: "Even though the Minister for Greenland is against the APP we feel insecure about the Danish government's attitude towards the Greenlandic resource policy. After all it is us, in the ICC that are the only ones working to create a serious and environmentally secure solution of the resource problems in the Arctic areas. We are the real experts, because we live there... The Minister for Greenland calls us romanticists and sentimental dreamers because we claim the right to take decisions about the oil/gas reserves in our lands ourselves."

From Canada, John Amagoalik, chairman of the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and ICC Board member told a similar story. He said that the Federal Government of Canada did not negotiate with the Inuit in good faith but made agreements only to throw them out the window when on closer examination they appeared to be too much in favour of the Inuit. (See for example the article by Peter Jull on the Aboriginal Rights Coalition in IWGIA Newsletter, No 30, April 1982). Canada is
living high on its good international reputation and they abuse this reputation."

The Samis also fight against similar forces. Right now plans are being worked out for a gigantic pipeline project to carry gas from Northern Norway through Sweden to West Germany. Simultaneously, the oil company Arco has been granted permission to explore mineral in the same area. The Samis fear for the future for they do not believe that Arco’s sudden appearance can be coincidental. The Samis have no influence on political decisions in their lands either. The ICC has tried to involve Norway too in their attempt to form a joint Arctic policy.

Hans Pavia Rosing reported that "First of all we are trying to draw up a picture of policies that are actually in existence concerning the Arctic area, because there is no joint policy. But there are small pieces here and there that can be put together to form an Arctic policy. If after all there is an Arctic policy that can be discerned, then certainly it will not be an Arctic policy that the Inuit have been involved in creating. What we are doing in the ICC on different fronts is to form a joint Arctic policy, naturally considering the increased resource exploration going on and its effects and influence on Arctic society as such, on the environment, on the people, on all the local societies that exist in the Arctic." He went on: "We have tended to view everything too domestically, we have got to reach out to the rest of the world with our viewpoints."

The seminar in Copenhagen was a beginning and a good one too. The ICC’s statements have been heard and have reverberated through large sections of the Danish public as well as through Greenlandic and Danish political circles.

Claudie Grosos
Copenhagen local group

AUSTRALIA: HOW MANY ABORIGINES ARE THERE?

Nearly two hundred years after colonisation began, white Australians are still unable to answer with confidence the question: How many Aborigines are there? For a society obsessed with counting things in extraordinary detail - votes, scores, share prices, TV ratings, temperatures - we are proving remarkably imprecise in counting black people.

We are aware of unprecedented prejudice suffered by Aboriginal Australians, but statistics are often elusive and ambiguous, as Mr. O'Neill points out:

"You can go to any park around the place... and you will often see Aboriginal people. It is a fallacy that Aboriginal people are alcoholics. In fact if you judged it on the percentage of white alcoholics and black alcoholics, you would probably come out with a hell of a lot more white alcoholics...

...The difference is that we don't have the money to go behind closed doors to do our drinking. We have to do it in the open. It's the only place left for us. The place where we were forced in the early days - the parks." (Mr. Shorty O'Neill, spokesman for Federation of Aboriginal Land Councils, at a recent Aboriginal seminar in Queensland; See IWGIA Newsletter No 31-32, June-October 1982 for an interview with Mr. O'Neill.)

Why? The answer provides insights into not just the problem of counting, but also into problems behind many Government and community attitudes to Aborigines.

The 1981 Census, like every Australian Census since Federation, asked a question about race: "Is the person (filling out the form) of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin?" To the surprise and consternation of many people involved in Aboriginal affairs, only 159,897 people answered "yes", compared
to the 1976 Census estimate of an Aboriginal population totaling 160,915.

Is the difference because the Aboriginal birthrate is actually declining or because there are fewer Aborigines despite improving health services? There is some evidence from Professor Charles Bowley that there has been birth-rate decrease in the past 15 years in rural New South Wales, but firm national answers are not available.

Or are a greater number of Aborigines balking at self-identification? Self-identification depends on the pros and cons of claiming Aboriginality. As the Bureau of Statistics puts it: "Self-identification...at different points in time can be affected by changes in community attitudes." The largest "decline" in Aboriginal numbers between the 1976 and 1981 Censuses was in the big cities of New South Wales and Victoria where poverty, rootlessness and discrimination are fiercest. Has it become riskier or less attractive to call yourself as Aborigine than it was in 1976?

What relevance is there in most of the official questions asked of Aboriginal people? The census counters have tabulated with excruciating accuracy the numbers of Aborigines with doctorates and masters degrees (14 in 1976), the number of Aboriginal air hostesses (none) and the number of Aboriginal brick or brick veneer homes (11,206).

While these have their limited significance, more important data in Aboriginal affairs is simply not covered by the type of questions asked of white Australians: the growth of outstations, the incidence of trachoma or leprosy, the number of reserve inhabitants, and so on.

Still, some information about the condition of Aboriginal life today has been collected: much makes cold reading, but much also represents an improvement on earlier years.

The former Aboriginal Affairs Minister, Senator Baume, last year described these problems:
a) The average life expectancy for Aboriginal people was about 52 years in 1979 - 20 years fewer than for whites.

b) Infant mortality has dropped substantially - but is still three times higher than for whites.

c) Aboriginal rates of TB, leprosy, intestinal infections, respiratory infections, alcohol abuse, malnutrition and mental illnesses are higher than for whites.

d) A 1977 study found just over half the 10-year old Aboriginal children surveyed could not understand enough English to cope with classrooms: the non-Aboriginal rate is 4 per cent for that age.

e) Some Aboriginal communities spend up to 80 per cent of their income on food.

The 1976 Census found Aborigines 13 times more likely to be in jail. The Henderson poverty report in 1975 found that 55 per cent of Aboriginal households in Brisbane and Perth had incomes below the poverty line.

(Source: Age, September 20, 1982)

AUSTRALIA: LAND RIGHTS VARY ACCORDING TO STATE

The land rights fight: a national scoreboard

Sixteen years ago, there were no Aboriginal land rights in Australia, and no Aboriginal people owned land as Aborigines. Today, Aborigines have about 500,000 square kilometers of freehold land, but the struggle for more goes on.

But how much has been achieved? This State-by-State analysis shows there are still huge gaps in Australians Aboriginal land rights. Some of the achievements that have been
made in the Northern Territory are under threat; promised change in Queensland represents an improvement but falls far short of what is sought.

New South Wales

The New South Wales government is hastening exceedingly slowly to carry out its pledge, made last year, to bring in laws to give Aborigines full land rights. In his election policy speech the Premier, Mr. Wran, said the first step to granting such rights would be the handing over of 30 Government-owned reserves to local Aboriginal communities.

But all the Government has done so far is set up an Aboriginal Affairs Ministry. No action has been taken yet to compensate Aborigines for the European seizure of tribal lands, although the head of the Ministry, Mr. Walker, has said several times that to do so is an abiding principle of the Government.

A select committee of State Parliament has recommended the setting up of an Aboriginal land and compensation fund. The committee said in its annual report last year that the fund should receive an appropriation of 7.5 per cent of all land tax revenue. The committee’s proposal is regarded by many Cabinet members as too radical and had been shelved. Mr. Walker has said he expects to put Aboriginal land rights issue to Parliament during the present Budget session, but he has not yet done so. The session is likely to continue until December.

An Aboriginal land rights support group has been formed and has sent letters to all Ministers asking for their support for the general land rights principle. It is believed that the issues raised in the letters have demonstrated to Cabinet that the problems which arise in legislating for land rights—such questions as whether Aboriginal claims should always take precedence over mineral or agricultural land uses—are much more complicated than most Ministers had envisioned.

Western Australia

In Western Australia there is no specific discrimination towards Aboriginal land rights aspirations. The Government maintains that Aborigines have the same rights as the rest of the community. That is: if they have the money they can acquire freehold land at the going rate. Because of this Government policy it has been asserted that Aborigines in Western Australia have let the land rights issue die. But a report expected to be presented to the Government before the end of the year should change that view.

It will be from the Aboriginal Land Needs and Essential Services Committee, a group set up by the State Government’s Aboriginal Advisory Council but financed by the Commonwealth Aboriginal Development Commission. Essentially, the committee identifies Aboriginal aspirations as not only the need for land but the support to make use of it. It basically advocates the adoption of the Northern Territory land rights legislation. The committee has identified that Aboriginal groups in the east and north of Western Australia, where traditional links are still strong, should be granted ownership of specified areas, particularly sacred sites.

In the southern part of the State, where Aboriginal culture has been destroyed by European settlement, the report will recommend compensation for land dispossession. At present, about 8 per cent of the total land area of Western Australia is reserved for Aborigines and controlled by the Government’s Aboriginal Lands Trust. Aboriginal activists say this means that most Aborigines in the State have the use, but not the control of reserved land. This, they add, is unacceptable to the majority of their people.

Queensland

There are no areas in Queensland officially recognised as Aboriginal land and the State Government is opposed to Aboriginal ownership of large isolated areas, or anything other than suburban housing blocks. Since the early 1970s the Bjelke-Petersen Government has consistently blocked the transfer of leases over properties bought by Federal bodies on behalf of Aborigines.

There are about 60,000 Aborigines in the State, more than 50 per cent of whom live on 16 mainland and nearly as many island reserves. The reserve land is held by the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs but under the Government’s new policy, announced in February this year, leases over reserve land have to be transferred to elected Aboriginal councils from the reserves. Aboriginal groups have said the move will not give them real security over the 10,000 square kilometres of ultimate authority over the reserve leases. Reserve land represents a little more than 1 per cent of the State’s land.

Legislation authorising the transfer of the leases to Aboriginal councils has been passed through Parliament but supplementary legislation, detailing the services to be supplied to the reserves and the powers and duties of white managers on the reserves, will not be passed until after the Commonwealth Games. Aboriginal groups say the new policy simply means the ultimate authority over the reserve leases has simply been passed from the Aboriginal and Island Affairs Department to the Lands Department.

Victoria

On 24 May, the Premier, Mr. Cain, announced that his Government would bring down legislation recognising Abor-
nal ownership of the Framlingham Forest near Warrnambool. Mr. Cain said that Aborigines would be given freehold title to 1089 hectares, not as an isolated act, "but rather a step towards the implementation of comprehensive land rights legislation." Two thousand members of the Gunditjmara community will gain title to the forest under the legislation which is expected to come before Parliament this session.

The State Government will also transfer title to 1.2 hectares of Crown land in Northcote. The land, in Watt Street, will be transferred to the Aboriginal Advancement League. It will be used for an Aboriginal community and education centre. Victorian Aboriginal groups lodged about 30 claims in June, but these will not be considered until the legislation has been passed. The claims included the Dandenong police station and a school at Warrandyte.

The Government's proposed land rights legislation would establish a tribunal to consider land claims for community, cultural or economic purposes. Claims based on long association could be made by Aborigines and their descendants providing that they had a direct association to Crown land through a former mission, reserve, or similar kind of land occupation.

South Australia

Just over 12 months ago the 3000 strong Pitjatjantjara people - the traditional owners of a vast part of Central Australia- were granted freehold title to 103,000 square kilometres of South Australia.

However extensive the land made freehold by the land rights agreement may seem -about one tenth of the State- it is a fraction of the area traditionally occupied by the Pitja\ntjantjara, Yankunytjara and Ngaangatjara before the coming of whites. The lands of the three closely related peoples extended from Ayers Rock in the north to Port Augusta in South Australia and from the Alice west 200 west of Warburton.

Negotiations are going on between the South Australian Government, the Commonwealth and Aborigines over the Maralinga Lands in the north-west of South Australia. The Maralinga Lands, primarily occupied by the Yankunytjaras, was taken over by the Commonwealth and depopulated in the 1950s for Britain's atomic weapons effort. At the time, Aborigines were told the takeover of land was only temporary, and they could reoccupy areas unaffected by atomic blasts within "a matter of months".

In the latest negotiations the South Australian Government is insisting that what it sees as "very generous" conditions negotiated for the Pitjatjantjara are not duplicated in the Maralinga Lands. The Maralinga Lands are less than half the size of the Pitjatjantjara freehold and there is an estimated population of only 500.

Northern Territory

Federal and Northern Territory Governments are trying to dilute the 1976 NT Land Rights Act, under which 28 percent of the Territory has passed to Aboriginal freehold control. In exchange for control over Uluru (Ayers Rock) and limited excisions of pastoral properties for Aboriginal people actually living there, the act is to be changed to prevent claims over stock routes, parks, and purchased pastoral leases. The changes are opposed by the three land councils in the Territory -the Northern, Central and Tiwi. ALP and Democrat senators have also promised to oppose the change, almost guaranteeing their defeat in Federal Parliament.

Relations between the NT Government and the land councils are strained. The town boundaries of Darwin were expanded in 1976 to 4350 square kilometres -three times the size of Greater London- to thwart a land claim. Sacred sites legislation may also be weakened. Sadadeen Valley, near Alice Springs, is to be converted to a trucking yard if the NT Government has its way. Aboriginal people still use the area for initiation and other rites.

Tasmania

Legislation to create a Tasmanian Aboriginal land trust was urged in 1977 and drafted six times before the Labor Government was voted out of office earlier this year. The Liberal Government has not yet taken up the work. Tasmania's 4000 Aboriginal people are seeking recognition of prior ownership of the whole island.

(Source: Age, Sept 20, 1982)

AUSTRALIA: ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Yipirinya School seeks registration: Court challenge

The Yipirinya school opened in 1979 with classes in the Alice Springs fringe camps. The Aboriginal-controlled bilingual and bi-cultural school was started in response to the demands of parents asking for more appropriate schooling for their children. (See IWGA Newsletter No 27, June 1981). So Yipirinya was established to counter problems and meet needs perceived by the Aboriginal people themselves. Funding has been provided by national and international church and philan-
tropic groups: so far well over $100,000 has been raised to keep the school operating.

The project has never been supported by the Northern Territory Education Department, although offers have been made to supply teachers, offers rejected by the Aborigines who wanted to retain control. In June 1981 the Yipirinya School Council applied to have the school registered as a non-government school. Education Department staff inspected the school, reports were compiled but in April 1982, the application was turned down by Education Minister Jim Robertson. He said the education provided by Yipirinya was 'not efficient and suitable education having regard to the age and capabilities of the children'. The Minister's decision effectively denies the school access to about $800 a year per child from Federal and Territory Government sources. The Department of Aboriginal Affairs has rejected a plea for special funding because the school has not been registered.

Acting on instructions from the Yipirinya School Council, the Central Australian Aboriginal Legal Aid Service has commenced proceedings in the NT Supreme Court to challenge the Minister's decision. In the latter event, the court can grant registration. The issue does not have to go back to the Department and the Minister.

Lawyers involved in the issue believe it will be a case of national significance. The case is significant because it will test stated official policies of Aboriginal self-determination and self-management. Win or lose, the case is bound to have repercussions throughout Australia, not just for Aboriginal people who want to develop and control the education of their children, but for all communities and individuals who seek that right.

At this stage it is not known how long the case will take, although a month's sitting in Alice Springs at the end of this year could be a fair estimate.

(Source: Aboriginal Law Bulletin No 5 August 1982)

Yiyili Aboriginal Community School

The school building is a 10m per 10m bough shade with a concrete floor. Second hand desks and chairs, some old racks and shelves constitute the school's facilities, while writing and drawing materials (provided by the Quaker Service Council), a reading scheme and a spirit duplicator make up the equipment.

Lessons start at 7a.m., with the first part of the day devoted to English literacy and numeracy and other 'normal' primary school activities. After smoko at about 10.30 the rest of the day until 12.30 is used for the oral Gunian language programme. For this part of the day at least one of the older people in the camp tells traditional and other stories in Gunian, and then asks questions of the children and talks about the stories, again in Gunian.

Fifteen school children and six pre-schoolers attend regularly from Yiyili and the Louisa Downs Station group, but numbers have risen to thirty with visitors from Halls Creek and the Bayuly Community. Children from Margaret River Station may also attend but as yet they have no transport. The children from Yiyili Community are being brought by the station manager each day as the community vehicle has been out of order.

Four women from the community are working in the school full time and are paid the nominal wage of $20 per week. Three other community members are involved part time. Following a request from some people in the community, weekly adult literacy classes will be starting soon.

The school has made a tremendous start. It has moved easily into a working pattern, and fits in well with the other community activities. There has been full and regular attendance, and full community involvement. Most of the input is from the women in the community, the men being involved in work to develop and improve the camp, and prepare for the mustering contract which will start soon.

The project needs support: address - Yiyili Community School, P.O.Box 35, Fitzroy Crossing 6765, Australia.
COMMONWEALTH GAMES: THE WHOLE WORLD WATCHED

Due partly to the level of international concern and support expressed for the Aboriginal people of Queensland, the Australian Government prevailed upon the state of Queensland not to provoke violence through the use of extreme police force. Beforehand, there had been widespread fear that many Aboriginal people would be killed as a result of the "12th Commonwealth Games Special Legislation" giving the police and persons authorised by the police, the right to use unlimited force (INQIA Newsletter, No 31-2, June-October, 1982). Indigenous organisations including the World Council of Indigenous People, the Inuit Committee on National Issues and the Nordic Sami Council issued protests about the lack of respect for human rights or for the Aboriginal rights of Aboriginal people which they delivered to both Commonwealth and Australian authorities. On the eve of the opening in Brisbane, demonstrations were organised in London and New York. In London, demonstrations at Queensland House lasted some 31 hours with 40 people inside and a further 100 people demonstrating outside before being stopped by the police.

Inside Australia, the actions surrounding the Commonwealth Games has helped to bring a fomenting situation to a head, commented Mr Shorty O'Neil, Ambassador of the Aboriginal Nation in the Northern Hemisphere during a recent visit to the INQIA office. Racial hatred was erupting as shown by the riots and shootings at Moree, Alice Springs, Fitzroy Crossing. If white Australians could recognise that the Papuans of New Guinea were a separate people with a right to control their own destiny, then they must recognise that Aboriginals also constitute a separate nation, with separate values and identity.

PHILIPPINES: NIGHTMARE IN THE HIGHLANDS

Tourist brochures paint images of the Cordillera as a peaceful and bountiful land where tribal peoples spend most of their lives conducting long and noisy festivities. Even allowing for deliberate distortions for touristic purposes, nothing could be farther from the truth. For, especially since the '70s, peace and prosperity have eluded the Cordillera tribes.

The Cordillera mountain range in northern Luzon is rich in natural resources like lumber, gold and other mineral deposits. However, for decades, foreign companies, not the local people, have been reaping stupendous profits from the bounty of these resources. Extractive industries and development projects owned or financed by foreign capital have invariably proven to be more beneficial to multi-billion peso businesses than to the nearly one million tribal peoples in the Cordillera.

In 1977, the provinces of Benguet and Ifugao, both inhabited mostly by tribal groups, were beset by an onslaught of military abuses. This wave of militarization has forced many tribesmen to seek refuge in other areas. Earlier, from 1975 onwards, military forces had been sowing terror among the tribal folk in the Kalinga-Bontoc area who are opposing the construction of the Chico dam. In many mountain villages, men were beaten up, women abused, and property and animals stolen by military men.

In 1979, the Tingguians in upland Abra province suffered from waves of arrest and detention. Many Tingguians were arrested by the military for participating in the "orchestrated opposition movement" against the Cellophil Resources Corp.
(CRC), a multi-billion peso pulp and paper complex. In addition, a PC major was appointed mayor of Malibcong town, one of the centers of resistance against CRC.

Intensified Militarization

By the 1980s, it had become clear that a systematic pattern of militarization was being implemented to quash all forms of resistance in the Cordilleras. In recent months, the national government has deployed more troops and increased military activity in Northern Luzon in the wake of the growing resistance against unpopular government projects and policies. Since August of last year, military operations have regularly been conducted in the barrios of Pasil and Balbalan in Kalinga-Apayao. By the first week of November 1981, the number of Philippine Constabulary (PC) and Philippine Army (PA) detachments in Kalinga and the Mt. Province had swelled up to 37.

Then, on December 4, 1981, a local newspaper, the Bulletin-Today, announced the expansion of the Northeast Command (Noreastcom) into the Northern Command, thus extending the Noreastcom's area of responsibility to include five other provinces. On February 9, 1982, the Bulletin reported government plans to arm mayors and provincial officials with high-powered rifles.

Like in other areas of the country where the people's opposition is strong, militarization in the Cordillera takes various forms and follows a systematic and escalating pattern. At present, threats, harassments, and looting have become common throughout the various provinces of the Cordillera region as shown in the following document cases for 1982:

January 1982: A passing helicopter sprayed with bullets the entire village of Bugnay, Kalinga. In Betwagan, the PC confiscated the provisions of tribesmen on their way to their Kaingin (swidden farm). Residents were also warned that their barrio will be strafed if they do not stop supporting the NPA. Kaingin fields were also burned.
May 18, 1982: Thirty-five troopers of the 17th IB PA searched 47 houses in Betwagan, Sadanga. Villagers complained that the soldiers took some 10 gantas of kardis (beans), three gantas of bitsueias (peas), three gantas of rice, one gold necklace, P500 worth of smoked meat and 38 cans of sardines from the cooperative store.

Waves of arrest

Cases of illegal arrest and detention, almost always accompanied by physical maltreatment, are also rampant:

May 1982: Eight Ifugao tribesmen from Binahayan and Gomhang, Hungduan were picked up by PC operatives and detained in Camp Dangwa, Benguet. The detainees were made to sign papers saying that they participated in subversive activities and a "waiver" on their detention.

June 13, 1982: Twelve people, including three women, from Bugnay, Kalinga were arrested by soldiers of the 17th IB. After being threatened with guns, the hands of the twelve persons were tied and they were taken to Lamac, near Betwagan, where they were maltreated. With hands tied, they were made to sleep under the rain. The next day, they were transferred to the Ampawilen detachment camp where they were again subjected to various forms of human indignities. After two days they were released on the condition that they would sign a document stating that they were not tortured. Two of the detainees were later brought to Bontoc for further investigation. They were released only when the villagers demanded their freedom.

Cases of "Salvaging"

The military has also resorted to outright shooting, killing and "salvaging" (summary executions) of civilians. The following are cases of military atrocities resulting in the death of barrio people in 1982:

Kalanga oppose the Chico dam
(Photo: Jojo Carino)
April-September 1982: Nine Tingguians from various parts of Abra were victims of "salvaging". They were: Domaging, Jimmy Briones, Alcido Bicera, William Belmonte, Bittanga Molina, Dandie Molina, Maganay Gayosed, Badeng and Barnardino Vicente. No investigation has been made and the military has remained silent on this case.

October 2, 1982: Elements of the 621st PC Coy under Lt. Allen Fortes surrounded the house of Peter Pasiwen in Nabaning, Mt. Province. Pasiwen and two others were forcibly searched by the PC men. Meanwhile, another group of soldiers started shooting from another direction. Pasiwen was killed while his companion was hit on the scalp. A soldier was accidentally shot by his comrade.

Strategic Hamlets

More recently, military authorities have ordered the establishment of strategic hamlets following a counter-insurgency scheme similar to that which the US Armed Forces inflicted on the Vietnamese people in the 1960s. The following cases of "hamletting" and forced evacuations have been reported in Abra province:

October 16, 1981: Residents of sitios Alligang, Lat-ey and Cubcuba were forced to evacuate to Buanao, Bangilo, Abra for fear that their barrio would be turned into a "no man's land" by the military. Their belongings were left behind while their domestic animals were butchered by the military.

February 1982: Sixty-four families from Alligang, Paoay, Binongan and Aduago were ordered to stay in Buanao while 27 families from Pacooy, Matalibeng and Putol had to "settle" in Mataragan. People were forced to live in schoolhouses and nearby homes. They were subjected to inhuman treatment. Unreasonable restrictions, including a 5 p.m. to a 7 a.m. curfew, were imposed; using flashlights at night was forbidden and residents leaving the
area were required to obtain safe conduct passes. Because people could no longer tend to their fields, these were destroyed and work animals disappeared, with the lack of provisions, many got hungry and children easily succumbed to illnesses.

**Militarization is linked to incursion upon tribal land.**

More and more, the pattern taken by these military atrocities shows that militarization accompanies the incursion upon ancestral tribal lands. Like elsewhere in the country where economic interests are at stake and the people's resistance grows in power and scope, militarization becomes more and more intense. Military encampments mushroom in areas where natural resources are rich and abundant and wherever transnational corporations enter, if not thoroughly dominate, the scene.

Military atrocities are the latest oppression to which minorities are subjected. Long time victims of landgrabbing and cultural domination by the local and foreign powers that be, tribal Filipinos today face yet another threat to their survival as distinct peoples. Perhaps more than any other time in the past, they confront not only the economic issue of land but also the multi-dimensional question of national oppression.

**Response to Militarization**

While militarization is intended to quell the people's resistance, it does not strike at the roots of the problems which give rise to such resistance. Rather, militarization only perpetuates the very causes of these problems and further fuels the people's discontent.

The Cordillera peoples continue to resist the threats and assaults to their persons, property and culture which are brought about by militarization. They have launched various protest actions to denounce and resist all forms of military cruelty. The following are examples of these acts of protest:
Immediately after the October 2 incident resulting in the death of Peter Pasien, a letter of protest was circulated by the people of Agawa to express their mourning over the death of Pasien and their denunciation of military atrocities. The letter demanded the following: 1) justice for Pasien and other victims of military abuses; 2) the pullout of all military forces in the area and 3) the forging of unity of all people against military abuses.

The letter further stated: "We want the peaceful, normal life we had before the military came to disturb us. That is why we are making our protest known to all. If we do not protest now, other forms of militarization will surely happen aside from setting up of detachments and checkpoints, harassments, abuses and political murders. At present, the military is recruiting more and more civilian informers and Civilian Home Defence Force (CHDF) members. This is causing disunity and intrigue among our people. We must not allow this to continue. Instead, let us unite and be brave to let others know the atrocities committed on us by the military."

Apart from this letter of protest, the people of Sagada, Mt. Province held a march-rally in Kin-iway, Besao on October 10, 1982. Around 1,000 barrio folk from the six villages of Agawa, the Kinaii side of Besao, the northern barrios of Sagada, Sagada poblacion and Bontoc participated in the march from Nabanig to Kin-iway. The ranks of the marchers swelled as they reached the poblacion. The protesters carried about 30 placards bearing anti-military slogans and demanding the pullout of military detachments and of CHDFs. Barangay officials, students, professionals and other representatives of the barrio folk spoke during the rally.

Abra residents are similarly united in militancy censuring the injustices committed against them. Last October 3, the Magkaraiya a Timpucuq Ken Alyansa Pagiti Emili Laban ti Militarisasyon (People’s Alliance against Militarization) prepared a petition which was distributed in a protest rally of some
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500 residents in Manabo, Abra. This alliance is composed of concerned citizens from the southern and central municipalities of Abra. It demanded justice for the victims of "salvaging" and the upholding of people's democratic rights.

All these protest actions are indicative of the people's growing awareness of their rights and of their resistance to injustice. They prove the Cordillera peoples' refusal to be cowed even by a military superior enemy.


PHILIPPINES: THE ROLE OF THE PEACE PACT GATHERING

To the keen observer, the peace-pact gathering (bodong) held Feb. 13-14, 1982 in Betwagan, Sadanga, Mt. Province provided a clear occasion to discover how tribal villages are redefining their tribal relationship in the light of new realities. These new realities include: the threat of dislocation of villages due to the Chico dam project and Cellophil Resources Corporation (CRC); the presence of the military and its intelligence agents who go after known CRC and Chico dam oppositionists among the people; tribal killings which are related to the conflict of the dams and CRC, but which nevertheless cause instability of the peace-pacts; and polarization of the Cordillera peoples between the pro-government and the anti-government.

Traditionally, the people of the Cordilleras have gone back to the bodong whenever peace is threatened or when it needs to be restored. The bodong is a pre-Hispanic institution that the people, known for their warrior and head-taking tradition, have preserved to this day. It is a bilateral agreement forged by villagers, but ensured by particular pact-holders from each tribe or village, which provides for non-aggression, free travel into each others territory, for trade and inter marriage and free social intercourse.

The practice of the bodong reveals the reality that in the perception of the villagers, they are sovereign and independent within their own villages. But the entry of government energy projects and multi-national operations and the conflict these have generated, have shaken this popular belief. External forces are causing killings and destruction of property which threaten the existence of the people and their institutions with it. Various tribal and barrio speakers from over twenty villages in the Chico valley, Eastern and Western
Bontoc, Kalinga sub-province, Abra and the mountainous regions of Ilocos Sur, articulated a not so surprising resolve to oppose government and multinational projects. More importantly, they viewed these projects as a challenge to their capacity to defend not only their land and economy but also a challenge to peace and the viability of the bodong.

According to the process of the bodong, village elders and leaders are made to state their analysis of the causes of unpeace. This is what the village elders did in the Betwagan Bodong. From the speeches of the various leaders, the people revealed a keen understanding of the situation. The speaker from Ngibat (Tinglayan, Kalinga) said: "The government is the cause of the destruction of our peace pact system. Because of their projects, brothers are fighting against brothers, fathers against sons, villagers against villagers, Kalingas against Kalingas".

This was the assessment too of various speakers that came from the host village Betwagan, from Butbut (Tinglayan, Kalinga), Anabel (Sadanga, Mt. Province), Tabuk (Kalinga) and Bontoc (Mt. Province) among others.

The speaker from an Abra village added: "Militarization is a means to ensure the operations of foreign enterprises in the Cordilleras".

Moving closer to the home regions, various speakers blamed native spies and agents for the sufferings of the people. A speaker from Lokong (Tinglayan) said: "The PC (Philippine Constabulary) cannot cause destruction in our villages if not because of a few sip-sip (informers)". "We have no such problems if none of our co-villagers, especially those who have gone to school, would sell us to the government", said a speaker from Tanglag.

From Bontoc: "Let us unite closely so that no tik-tik (military agent) will be able to operate in our specific barriers". From Saklit, (Sandanga, Mt. Province) one speaker
said: "The foreigners cannot operate the mines in the Cordil-leras, if we are united and if we do not sell our skill and labor to them".

The Betwagan bodong as a multilateral agreement, that is, an agreement forged between a number of villages, and as a departure from the original bi-lateral bodong, is not new. In 1975 and 1978, inter-tribal bodongs had been forged among Kalingas, Bontocs, Kankna-eyes and Tinggians to oppose CRC and the Chico dams. Neither was the call for militant opposition, as opposed to parliamentary methods, new. But the expression of solidarity of the Cordillera peoples with other sectors of the Filipino people struggling against "the same power structure which have caused the sufferings of the Cordillera peoples" is a novelty. It signifies that the Cordillera peoples struggle against particular threats to their existence is viewed as a part of a greater national struggle. And this should be a matter of grave concern for the government.

The central theme of the Betwagan bodong is the pursuit of peace and unity. It is apparent by the speeches of the leaders of the villages and by the document which they signed at the end of the bodong, that the people are asserting their kinship as oppressed minorities. They are finding a commonness of predicament which leads them to work for a common goal. And they all relate to the bodong as their vehicle for unity.

While the bodong is now directed to achieve peace and unity, villagers are aware that tribal attitudes are still a stumbling block to complete unity. Thus, the call for villagers to exert pressure on villagers, who have the inclination to serve as sip-sip. In previous bodongs, these people were excluded from the protection of the bodong, and such is the intention of the Betwagan bodong. It is a provision which exerts pressure on villagers to refrain from becoming soldiers of the AFF or agents of it.

Will the bodong succeed to transcend its narrow application and be relevant to the new realities? Can it be made to exert pressure on the kinship and tribal structure so that agents of the military, who are slain as a result of the conflict will not be avenged, as the custom requires? These are problems which the bodong in Betwagan squarely tackled and resolved as the page indicates.

A growing consciousness as tribal people united in their common history and adopting new features and orientation for the bodong are two important developments that encapsulate the changes that are taking place in the tribal villages. It is a healthy sign of the progress that the people are taking in their own stride as they face the realities of Philippine society going into the 21st century.

Document signed at the end of the bodong

WE, the undersigned, representing the different barrios in the Mt. Province, Kalinga-Apayao, Abra and Ilocos Sur, state that:

A) We have come together at Betwagan, Sadanga, Mt. Province on February 13 and 14 1982 for a bodong conference to discuss common problems affecting our lives and well-being.

B) We have identified our main problem to be the impending dislocation of our people by so called development projects of the government and the intrusion of foreign companies into our lands.

C) In order to insure the implementation of this project, the government deployed the military and intelligence agents, who have been perpetuating killings and other atrocious acts, and sowing intrigues among our people.

D) Towards resolving these problems, we have sent several petitions and delegations to President Marcos and other government agencies and instrumentalities, but all this effort bear no fruit.
E) We pledge our unity to help each other resolve our problems, and strongly declared the following agreements:

1. Any villager or member of indigenous community affected who is a member or who shall join the Armed Forces of the Philippines is excluded from the protection of the bodong.
2. That written notice of this exclusion shall be sent to the individual concerned.
3. That President Marcos will be informed of our resolute determination to fight the construction of the dams as well as any intrusion by way of logging, mining and so-called development projects exploitative of our Cordillera resources.

F) We express our solidarity with other sectors of the Filipino people who are also victims of the exploitation and oppression of the same power structure which have caused the suffering of the Cordillera people.

Signed by Tribal and barrio leaders.

(Source: Sandugo, 1st quarter March 1982)

WEST IRIAN: INDONESIAN ARMY SLAUGHTERS 5,000.

In the six-month period from mid-October 1981 to mid-March 1982, the death toll of indigenous villagers in West Papua (now Indonesia's unwilling 17th province, Irian Jaya) is 14,000 and of this death list all but one thousand occurred in the area of the Wessel Lakes. At Agimuka and Paniai in particular, aerial bombardment using napalm and chemical weapons has been employed. Many kampungs are now deserted, a result of the killing and subsequent evacuation. In 1981, "Operasi Galang 11" was launched by the Indonesian Armed Forces, involving retaliatory moves for action by the Free Papua Movement in October that year in kidnapping 50 Indonesian saw-mill employees. Intensified, it was renamed "Operasi Sapu Bersih" - Clean Sweep Operation.

Early in 1982, a Dutch television documentary, made in September 1981, showed 3000 Papuans in the highlands chanting "Indonesians go home to Jakarta" and this was soon followed by the report that villagers there had been bombed. Dutch protest did not stop the human destruction. Previously, a Dutch scholar (Lagerberg) who had been a former patrol officer in the period before 1962, revisited his former area on the southern coastline near where the giant Freeport copper-gold mine is now operating, and tallied - name by name - 5,000 deaths as further testimony to the policy of ethnocide.

There are signs that resistance has recently intensified in this region. The National Times (8-14 August 1982) reports that a raid on a building holding Freeport explosives was followed by the destruction of two bridges in the area. This would be the first time that mining operations have been attacked since the 1977 periodic disruption of the 110 km pipeline, carrying copper slurry from 3,000 m to sea level.
Villages then within a radius of 20 km of the mining were bombed, and some Papuans were imprisoned in large steel containers which were part of the mining equipment – an act publicised by Amnesty International in mid-1976.

(Source: TAPPI Bulletin 0/82, reported by Native Peoples News, Winter 1982.)

EAST TIMOR: 8th U.N. RESOLUTION CALLING FOR SELF DETERMINATION

On November 23, 1982, the United Nations General Assembly passed its eighth resolution calling for self-determination in East Timor. The passage of the resolution marked the failure of the Indonesian government's strenuous effort to defeat this year's resolution. The resolution passed with 50 votes in favor, 46 against, and 50 abstentions.

Of Pacific nations, only Vanuatu supported the self-determination resolution. Fiji, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, New Zealand and Australia voted against it while Western Samoa abstained.

One new feature of this year's resolution was that for the first time, it was co-sponsored by the Portuguese government. In addition to sponsoring the U.N. resolution, preceding the session, the Portuguese sent parliamentary and several ministerial diplomatic delegations abroad in an attempt to win support for the U.N. vote. Looking at the breakdown of votes cast by nations it seems that the Portuguese efforts, while apparently genuine, were too late or too weak to have an effect on the outcome.

Another significant feature of the resolution is that it calls on the U.N. Secretary General "to initiate consultations with all parties concerned with a view to achieving a comprehensive settlement of the problem." This is the first time that the Secretary General has been called on by the General Assembly to involve himself in the issue. Nevertheless, it remains to be seen whether he can be pressed to aggressively follow up on this request.

Despite the slight margin by which the resolution won – the narrowest ever – its passage has certainly left Indonesian government officials very unhappy. Several Indonesian officials have been open about the fact that their government had been working very hard to defeat the resolution and, as recently as October, the Australian press reported that Indonesian representatives were expressing confidence that they would defeat the U.N. resolution.

(Source: adapted from East Timor Update, Fall 1982, by Pacific Bulletin Vol 3 No 1 Jan 1983)
NEW CALEDONIA: KANAKS WORK FOR INDEPENDENCE IN 1984

The New Caledonian Independence Front has set 1984 as the target date for France to grant independence to New Caledonia, the nickel-rich Southwest Pacific territory annexed by France in 1853. "By 1984, with the land and institution occupation by Kanaks complete, we'll have the real power in New Caledonia. Then if the French government doesn't want to hear us, it will no matter. The French government will no longer be able to govern in New Caledonia because we will have all the power in the institutions," said Jean-Marie Tjibaou in a recent interview for Pacific Magazine (Nov-Dec 1982). Tjibaou, a leading representative of the Kanak Independence Front, was recently elected Vice-President of the New Caledonian Government Council.

An alliance of five independentist parties (Union Calédonienne, Parti Socialiste Calédonie, Liberation Kanak Socialiste, Union Progressiste Melanesienne, and United Front of Kanak Liberation), the Independence Front represents both Kanak and non-Kanak people who support the principle of Kanak socialist independence for New Caledonia.

In June 1982, the Independence Front gained a majority on the New Caledonia Government Council, the chief administrative body concerned with New Caledonian internal affairs.

The Front is now putting pressure on the Mitterrand government to announce a definite timetable for New Caledonian independence. "We gave support to Mitterrand at the time of his election because we thought at the time that he would give us independence. We signed a common agreement in November 1979 with the French Socialist Party which committed the Socialist Party to support for Kanak socialist independence, but Mitterrand has been in power for over a year and his government still has no clear stated position on independence," said Yann Celebre Uregi, the F.I. representative who recently visited several South Pacific countries to gain support.

To bring added pressure to bear on Paris, the Front is seeking to have New Caledonia included in the list of non-self-governing countries before the United Nations Decolonization Committee of 24. The idea has already received the backing of the Vanuatu, Papua New Guinea and Solomon governments. The 1982 South Pacific Forum, for its part, urged the French Government "to work closely with the Kanak people of New Caledonia in formulating a political programme for a peaceful transition to independence."

So far, however, the Mitterrand government has embarked only on a series of limited land, legal, cultural and economic reforms aimed at partially redressing the colonial seizure of Kanak land, the discrimination against Kanaks in employment, and the neglect of Melanesian culture and values.

The Independence Front supports the reforms as a first step but does not believe they go far enough. "The reforms allow the Mitterrand government to show the world that it's making evolutionary progress, but they don't touch the realities of independence," says Uregi. "Even after these reforms have been made, we will still have only consultative organs - we are seeking a modification that will give the Government Council actual governing powers."

But even the minor reforms so far initiated have been pretext enough for a violent backlash amongst right wing white settlers, many of them French Algerians who fled Algeria after it gained independence. On September 19, 1981, rightwing assassins killed French-born Pierre Declercq, a prominent leader of the Independence
Front: and on July 22, 1982, 60 rightists armed with clubs and dressed in crash helmets stormed the chamber of the Territorial Assembly and assaulted Independence Front politicians. The attack on the Territorial Assembly coincided with the date set down for the first Assembly debate on the new land reform measures under which the government would have the right to purchase and return tribal land to Melanesians.

"There are two sorts of independence being sought in New Caledonia," says Uregai, "The first is Kanak socialist independence. The second is what the pied noirs (white settlers) are seeking - a Rhodesian-style independence guaranteeing whites the privileged position they had under colonialism."

The Independence Front replied to the rightwing July 22 demonstrations with a manifestation of their own strength—a massive 15,000 strong rally in the heart of the "white" city of Noumea on September 24, New Caledonia Day.

As the crisis in New Caledonia intensifies, Kanak independenceists are calling for support for their struggle from other Pacific peoples and governments. They are seeking:

* International recognition of the Independence Front as the sole legitimate representative of indigenous New Caledonian people.

* Support for the Front’s call for the inclusion of New Caledonia on the list of non-self-governing countries before the United Nations Decolonization Committee of 24.

* Pressure on the French Government to announce a firm timetable for granting New Caledonia self-government and independence.

* Educational campaigns to increase public awareness of and support for the Kanak independence movement.


KWAJALEIN: HOME ON THE "RANGE"

by Darlene Keju and Giff Johnson

Kwajalein Missile Range is no ordinary military base. Although 3,000 Americans live and work on Kwajalein, only some 30 are military personnel. Long used as the primary testing range for offensive missiles and anti-missile radar defense, KMR has perhaps contributed more to the nuclear arms race than any other spot on earth.

The new MX missile, a key weapon in the U.S. nuclear arsenal, is scheduled to have its delivery system tested by KMR. Kwajalein has also become a key link in the United States’ space warfare strategy, as its facilities recently went "on line" for anti-satellite detection. The $1 billion missile range, in the Marshall Islands, is in the only remaining United Nations’ Trust Territory.

Ebeeye, three miles from Kwajalein Island, is no ordinary Pacific island. More than 8,000 Marshallese live crowded on this tiny, 78-acre island in dilapidated housing amid appalling sanitary conditions. The Marshallese on Ebeeye are totally dependent on wages earned at the Kwajalein base because the military has severely restricted their access to the huge 900-square mile lagoon for fishing and to their 93 islands for agriculture.

Kwajalein landowners in June began a four-month resettlement of 11 "off-limits" islands protesting Ebeeye conditions and the recently signed Compact of Free Association (July/Aug 82,pp. 10-11). The protest sail-in, dubbed "Operation Homecoming" by Marshallese, threatened to disrupt missile tests and jeopardized the landowners’ major source of income. The festering problems leading to that drastic action by Kwajalein landowners began more than 30 years ago and are still not well known outside the Marshall Islands.
After taking Kwajalein from the Japanese in bloody fighting at the end of World War II, the U.S. brought in several hundred Marshallese to clean up the war debris and construct base facilities on Kwajalein Island. During the Bikini and Enewetak nuclear tests of the 1940's and 1950's, Kwajalein served as a vital support base. By 1951, 550 Marshallese were living in squalid shacks in the labor camp which contrasted starkly with the orderly American housing nearby. To remove the eyesore, the Navy relocated the 550 Marshallese to Ebeye Island, into housing built for 370 people.

The base was considered expendable when the nuclear testing finished in 1958, but a year later, the Navy chose Kwajalein, the world's largest atoll, as the target for testing intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's) fired from California.

The U.S. removed the people living on Roi Namur, in northern Kwajalein Atoll, to Ebeye in 1960. Roi Namur, like many other islands in the atoll, was to develop into a key monitoring station, with radar and other missile tracking equipment. No compensation was provided to the owners of Roi Namur. A year later, after the Navy designated the ocean area between the southern tip of Kwajalein and nearby Lib Island as an "impact zone" for incoming rockets, the Lib islanders were also removed to Ebeye.

The first lease providing compensation for Kwajalein Island landowners was signed by them and the U.S. in 1964. Already displaced from their island and lacking legal counsel, the Kwajalein people agreed to a lump sum payment of $750,000 for 99 years' use of Kwajalein Island - less than $9 an acre per year.

In 1964 the Army took over from the Navy and decided Kwajalein's lagoon, protected by its surrounding ring of islands was a better target for gathering flight test information on missiles. They chose the central 2/3 of the lagoon as the new impact
area. Several hundred people were living on or using the lagoon for copra, food gathering, and farming. To deal with those people, an Army report said the "most practical and economic solution to the range safety problem" was to resettle the residents from these Mid Atoll Corridor islands onto Ebeye. So in 1965, more people were evicted from their home islands; 194 people were given housing on Ebeye and $25 a month for the "inconvenience", although more than 1,000 people had customary land rights in these islands.

By this time the nuclear arms race was in full swing. The emphasis had changed from building bigger and more destructive nuclear bombs to designing ever more accurate missiles for delivering nuclear warheads to within a few feet of a target thousand of miles away. And Kwajalein, 4,200 miles west of the missile launching pad at California's Vandenburg Air Force Base, provided a unique, long range target area in an enclosed lagoon hidden from Soviet "trawlers".

Missile testing activity increased and more Micronesian employees were needed. As in the 1940s, the U.S. military once again recruited several hundred Marshallese from outside Kwajalein, as well as other Micronesians, to work at Kwajalein, further ballooning Ebeye's population. By the mid-1960s, Ebeye's population had grown from just 500 in 1951 to 4,500 with about 650 wage earners employed at Kwajalein.

Although virtually every increase in Ebeye's population can be traced to the U.S. recruitment of workers from outside or forced relocations of island landowners, the Army refused to face up to the critical conditions of over-crowding on Ebeye. As late as 1967, with the Ebeye population already at 4,500, the Army was planning housing to accommodate 3,500 people on the island.

By 1968, the U.S. compensation for the acknowledged 194 displaced Mid-Corridor people was raised by the paltry amount of $15, to $40 a month. Not surprisingly, the people then
petitioned the Congress of Micronesia "to right a grave injustice." They pointed out, "electric bills and house rentals exceed $40 each month, and already some of us have been threatened with eviction ..." Additionally, they said that anybody born since the relocation was not considered eligible for compensation. The people had been accustomed to using their home islands for farming, but there was no room on Ebeye for food gardening.

Hoping to force the Army and the Trust Territory to act on their problems, the people issued an ultimatum: if they weren't granted access to their Mid-Corridor islands, then they would move to begin resettling them.

Believing the people were bluffing, the Trust Territory and the Army ignored the ultimatum from the Mid-Corridor people, setting off the first protest sail-in in 1969. The occupation of their off-limits islands ended after a week when Trust Territory officials agreed to negotiate their demands. A year later, the Defense Department and the Mid-Corridor landowners reached a 5-year agreement providing $420,000 per year, approximately $285 annual per capita compensation based on 1,470 landowners.

This money, however, did not solve critical Ebeye problems, exacerbated by Marshallese exclusion from Kwajalein facilities. It was totally inadequate for the school costs alone for the children of Ebeye families. In 1978, more than 50% of the Ebeye population was under 14 years of age, but there is no high school on the island. And the Kwajalein high school, just three miles away, is segregated for American children only. For further education, Marshallese parents must send their children hundreds or thousands of miles away to schools in Majuro, Guam, other parts of Micronesia, or the U.S., all at great personal expense for air fares and boarding school costs.

Additionally, Marshallese do not have the same privileges as civilian American employees on military bases in Guam,
Hawaii, or Kwajalein. While American KMR employees – the vast majority of whom are civilians – may shop at the stores with subsidized low priced goods on Kwajalein, Marshallese KMR employees may not. They, and other Marshallese, must buy food from Ebeye stores at prices even greater than in Hawaii, which has the highest cost of living in the U.S. A 1976 study reported that food prices on Ebeye were, on average, 100% more than at the inexpensive stores on Kwajalein.

Moreover, the Marshallese have few recreational facilities – a volleyball and basketball court and one baseball field for 8,000 people – and only very limited access to Kwajalein’s abundant facilities. In contrast, the 3,000 Americans on 900-acre Kwajalein are provided with bowling alleys, a golf course, basketball and handball courts, baseball fields, swimming-pools, free movies, and other amenities.

The Marshallese – who have jobs of low prestige by American standards, such as maids, gardeners, cooks, warehouse workers and taxi drivers – keep the military base clean, trim, and functioning. But Marshallese are victims of systematic wage and job discrimination. “Close to 90% of the workers said that they feel they are being discriminated against in terms of jobs and pay because they are Micronesians,” Dr. William Alexander told a U.S. Congressional team after extensive research on Ebeye in 1976.

There are numerous reports of American contract workers receiving substantially higher salaries than the Marshallese who trained them. Marshallese supervisors are noticeably lacking, though some Marshallese have worked on Kwajalein for more than 20 years. In 1976, then Acting Trust Territory High Commissioner Peter Coleman said: “While some of the Micronesian workers at Ebeye may have the technical ability to warrant promotion, they do not have the ability to be in charge, to supervise people, particularly Americans.”

But this status of second class citizens in their own
islands is not limited to the workplace. The Marshallese must have passes, issued in limited numbers, to travel to their own islands for such purposes as banking or airline business. All KMR employees must be off of Kwajalein each night or they risk being arrested. The KMR command arbitrarily orders searches of Marshallese, and Army security police confiscate any goods purchased from Kwajalein (Americans often buy food and other merchandise for the Marshallese). Marshallese have suffered the indignity of searches on many occasions, and in 1981, a U.S. judge ruled that the Army has the power to carry out a search and seizure policy because the "base commander has inherent authority to protect its security and integrity."

Since the mid-1970s, there have been more than 8,000 people on Ebeye—approximately 5,000 Kwajalein Atoll landowners and 3,000 from other parts of the Marshalls or Micronesia. A now defunct Coast Guard station uses 12 acres of Ebeye's scarce land, so the people are jammed into 66 acres. Contrary to U.S. government statements, the majority of Ebeye residents are Kwajalein landowners who have no choice but to live on Ebeye, and many of the others were actively recruited by the U.S. to work at the base.

In the 1964 Kwajalein Island lease, the U.S. promised to "improve the economic and social conditions of the Marshallese people, particularly at Ebeye". Kwajalein leader Ataji Balos asserts "That lease was signed on the basis of those promises. Those promises have not been kept."

Because Ebeye is part of the U.N. Trust Territory, the Army says it is the T.T. government's responsibility. But the Trust Territory attitude is that because Ebeye is in the Army's backyard, the Army should deal with Ebeye problems. So the Marshallese are caught between an intransigent Trust Territory bureaucracy and a hostile Army command.

Examples abound. In late 1978, the Ebeye public works director wrote the high commissioner on Saipan that Ebeye's
antiquated sewer system was on the verge of breaking down. He received no response to his letter, and six months later, in May 1979, the sewer system did indeed collapse. When people flushed their toilets, human waste gushed into their sinks. Additionally, raw sewage is flushed directly into the Ebeye lagoon, where the pollution levels have been tested to be 25,000 times higher than the safe level set by the World Health Organisation. On an island where epidemics are almost impossible to control once they start, sanitation problems of this magnitude risk many lives.

These conditions exist under a U.N. Trusteeship Agreement which binds the J.S. to "protect the health of the inhabitants". The Marshallese have always had great faith in the trustee, but recognize that their only means of forcing action is to take action themselves.

In July 1979, more than 500 landowners began a large protest sail-in to their islands. After two weeks, during which several missile tests were reportedly postponed, the Defense Department agreed to negotiate new agreements for use of Kwajalein. Later that year, the U.S. agreed to increase its compensation to $9 million a year for use of Kwajalein Atoll, $5 million of which is a direct payment to the 5,000 landowners. The other $4 million goes to the Marshall Islands government for capital improvements and other projects.

This was the first compensation the Roi Namur people had received, despite being evicted from their island 20 years earlier. Kwajalein Atoll landowners have demanded the U.S. provide past use compensation. But U.S. officials refused, saying past use is a "dead issue".

Ebeye is a good example of the axiom "the more things change, the more they stay the same." In May 1982, the U.S. and Marshall Islands negotiators signed the Compact of Free Association, granting the U.S. 50 years use of the Kwajalein Missile Range. At last, according to the agreement, the Marsh-
alose will receive equal pay for equal work. But nothing in the language of the Compact states that Marshallese are to be treated as first class citizens in their own islands or that they will no longer suffer the indignities of the past 38 years since the U.S. took over their homes. Moreover, the Compact reduces the annual level of direct compensation to $1.9 million in spite of the landowners' years of struggle to get it to the 1979 level.

Last year, the Kwajalein Atoll Corporation, representing the landowners, officially communicated to the Marshall Islands government nine points for inclusion into a future base agreement (Sep/Oct 81, p. 13). These included limiting the pact to 15 years, provisions for past use claims, "development of a master plan for a decent Marshallese community on the Atoll" and agreement by the military to discontinue its search and seizure policy against the Marshallese. These points, however, were ignored by U.S. and Marshall Islands negotiators, and the landowners were excluded from the status talks. Further, money promised in 1979 to repair the collapsed sewer system, as well as the ailing power plant, had been approved but not spent by July 1982.

Thus, in June of this year (1982), the Kwajalein Atoll Corporation once again began a massive sail-in to their many islands, protesting the terms of the Compact.

Calling it "Operation Homecoming," the resettlement quickly grew to more than 1,000 people. Two camps were set up on Kwajalein Island, as well as on Roi Namur and nine Mid-Corridor Islands. Interviews with many involved in Operation Homecoming reflected how much they enjoyed living on clean islands; catching and eating fresh fish, crabs and turtles; and the community spirit of everyone working together.

The U.S. Defense Department had accused the Kwajalein landowners of illegally occupying their own islands, although in five separate instances, courts in the U.S. and Micronesia refused to declare the resettlement of Kwajalein illegal.

What's more, at the outset of Operation Homecoming, the Army command instituted stiff measures to quell the protests. For the duration of the protest, said the Army, none of the Marshallese maids or gardeners would be allowed to work. Thus the Army cut off more than 200 Marshallese wage earners, or about 25% of the total Marshallese workforce on Kwajalein, for nearly four months.

From the beginning of the protest Marshallese had their purses and bags searched every day as they returned home to Ebeye. Food, cigarettes, and other items were routinely confiscated by Army security police.

For more than a month, the Army decreed that Marshallese could not bring bag lunches to work, fearing that food from Ebeye would be given to the protesters, and at the same time closed the snack bar to all Marshallese. So Marshallese on Kwajalein had to eat lunch at the more expensive Mess Hall, the only facility open. The snack bar was finally reopened in late July to Marshallese KMR workers only.

At the outset of Operation Homecoming, the Marshallese suffered from other Army harassment such as the closure of the bank and shutting off of toilets at the Kwajalein and Roi Namur campsites where the largest number of landowners were.

But Marshallese businessmen were hit the hardest when the Army stopped Marshallese--except missile range workers with ID badges--from using the Kwajalein bank for the month of July. There is no bank on Ebeye and businesses lost thousands of dollars on loans they were unable to pay, and on food shipments they were unable to pay for or pick up. At least three stores were forced to close temporarily, reported the Ebeye Chamber of Commerce president.

Finally in August the bank was reopened on a limited basis, with 80 passes issued to Marshallese for banking use
two days a week. They traveled by boat to Kwajalein where they were herded into a waiting school bus and driven to the bank, all the while guarded by armed security police. At the bank, 10 people at a time were allowed off the bus to conduct business, while the other Marshallese remained incarcerated in the bus. When one group of 10 finished their banking they returned to the bus and another 10 were allowed off. When all had completed their banking, they were returned to the pier and shipped back to Ebeye.

In mid-August, Noel Koch, deputy assistant secretary of defence, said that the Defense Department would terminate all banking services for Marshallese on Kwajalein as of September 30, 1982. Additionally, Koch added that the search and seizure "measures instituted during the demonstration will be conducted to prevent the removal of unauthorized items from KMR individuals."

Koch noted the Defense Department concern for the "potential dependency upon U.S. sources and the resultant negative effect upon independent development of Marshallese capabilities" as the reason for these harsh threats.

Although the Army appears intent on denying Marshallese their basic human rights, not all Americans agree with these policies. U.S. Representative John Seiberling said in August: "I think the actions of the military out there are hardly becoming of a nation that is a great power. Here we have a bunch of people who are our wards... We're occupying their land and we're denying them the right to peacefully assemble and petition for redress of grievances that our constitution guarantees to our own citizens. And yet we're in their country. I think it's a pretty sad spectacle."

The mis-handling of the Kwajalein situation by the Defense Department was inevitable because the military sees Kwajalein as no more than another piece of real estate. Marshallese, however, place an entirely different value on their limited land, as demonstrated by a 1956 statement of 100 Marshallese leaders to the U.N.: "Land means a great deal to the Marshallese. It means more than just a place where you can plant your food crops and build your houses; or a place where you can bury your dead. It is the very life of the people. Take away their land and their spirits go also."

(The authors are working with the Pacific Concerns Resource Center, Hawaii. We wish to thank the PCRC and Pacific Magazine (Nov/Dec 1982) for permission to reprint this article.)

Kwajalein leader, Sen. Ataji Balos on Kwajalein Island. (Photo: Julian Riklon).
The official position at the start (October, 1982)

A series of meetings is now underway to discuss the contentious issue of aboriginal rights in the Canadian Constitution. At the first meeting on the Constitution, held in Winnipeg on October 14, 1982, the Federal Government made its official position clear in a statement communicated to Indian, Inuit, Metis and provincial representatives. It sketched out an ambitious programme of work in preparation for a conference of First Ministers to be held in March, 1983. Three working groups were established to deal with political, economic and social issues in connection with Section 37 on aboriginal rights in the Constitution and another to handle developments after the First Ministers' meeting scheduled for March.

The communiqué noted that on behalf of the Inuit, Charlie Watt had proposed the interim meetings planned (of officials on December 8-8, and of Ministers in later January) should be held in the North. Federal officials were going to work with him to determine the feasibility of the proposal. It was also decided that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) would be approached to seek the widest possible television broadcast "to reach as far into remote communities as may be, and to ask them to look into the matter of translation into Inuktituk and perhaps other aboriginal languages."

But behind the encouraging words of the Government statement, there lay some different sentiments. A Government memo dated July 8, 1982, marked "secret" found its way into the hands of the press in January, 1983, causing a furore. It commented on the strategy to be followed during the meeting of First Ministers in March. The memo noted the need for "reducing native expectations" and "embroiling provincial governments in the process of discussions and perhaps negotiations."

The memo had been approved by Prime Minister Trudeau and went on to give helpful hints to its recipient (Senator Jack Austin, Social Development Minister who was to deliver a speech to the Native Council of Canada), on how to deliver a speech to a native audience.

The contents of the leaked memo did not come as much of a surprise to native people. Louis (Smoky) Bruyere, president of the Native Council of Canada commented: "They're playing their games. Every organisation plays their games. It just shows you where their commitment is." After the unity achieved among the different native groups when fighting the Constitutional package, the native position has subsequently been weakened by dissention among the different groups. The positions adopted by Treaty Indians, Metis and Inuit will be explored separately.

Dissent among Treaty Indians

The treaty Indians, the largest native group in Canada representing more than 300,000 people across the continent, have stayed away from all preparatory meetings to set the agenda for the March conference. Influential Indian groups from Atlantic Canada, Alberta and more recently from Saskatchewan have been engaged in a lobbying effort to limit the formal participation of their leadership solely to treaty issues. Such a restriction would avoid for the moment a larger discussion on the more complex subject of aboriginal rights which would also affect the Inuit and Metis. The more militant Indian associations are angered that provincial governments are involved in the process of defining aboriginal rights and worry that a common front involving Indian, Inuit and Metis groups might water down their own interests.

Despite the rebellion, the treaty Indians will not in the end boycott the March constitutional conference. David Ahenakew
The new association is primarily composed of Metis groups from Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, while Ontario Metis are voting whether to join or not. The central issues espoused by the association are the following: the call for self-government of land and resources which will be held collectively and without taxation; guaranteed representation of Metis in Parliament and provincial legislatures; equalization payments; and creation of a separate aboriginal arm of the Supreme Court of Canada to adjudicate constitutional disputes between native peoples and government.

Though this tougher line parallels that of the treaty Indians, the latter still reject an alliance with the Metis because they feel that by their mixed blood heritage, they are not "original peoples" and are therefore on a less firm legal footing on the issue of land claims. James Sinclair, president of the Saskatchewan Metis association and one of the leaders of the new council, is encouraging his fellow leaders to rally support from church groups, labour unions and international agencies to act as "watchdogs to ensure Canada gives us a fair deal."

Inuit disappointed

The Inuit Committee on National Issues (ICNI) has recently circulated a letter to the 10 provincial premiers in Canada outlining their views on the constitutional issues in preparation for the March conference. The letter states: "While we feel the meetings at the level of the officials have been constructive and have resulted in a better understanding on our political, social and economic rights, we have been disappointed by the inability of government delegations to articulate their viewpoints on positions on almost all the issues being discussed." The letter underlines that the Inuit were "never involved or consulted when Canada as we know it was formed" and that it must be remembered that Inuit "never fought in any wars against the European settlers and never signed any treaties with them relinquishing sovereignty or title over our lands. When the Quallunaat (white
man) began appearing on our land we shared our resources with them, as we had always amongst ourselves. Years later we learned that our homeland was considered to be part of Canada."

The letter goes on: "Inuit, together with other aboriginal peoples form a distinct part of the Canadian 'mosaic.' We feel then that this opportunity we now have before us - a First Ministers Conference to deal with the concerns of the aboriginal peoples - should result in the recognition of the fundamental rights of our people. We have viewed our work on the Constitution (which began in the mid-1970's) within the framework of three general principles. We are seeking amendments which will guarantee Constitutional protection for the following principles:

i) the collective recognition of the aboriginal peoples as distinct peoples in Canada due to our occupation of our lands since time immemorial, including the protection of our cultures, histories and lifestyles, and flowing from this principle;

ii) the recognition of our political rights to self-governing institutions (structures) of various kinds within the Canadian Confederation; and

iii) the recognition of our economic rights to our lands and waters, their resources and their benefits, as a base for self-sufficiency and the development of native communities and families, including the protection of our traditional livelihoods.

"We have based the legal drafting of Constitutional provisions on these principles." Specifically the ICNI has proposed that in the first stage of Constitution amendment, a non-limitative definition of aboriginal rights should be adopted in Section 35 so as to include rights in and to land and sea ice, cultural and linguistic rights and the recognition of customs and traditions. These rights are seen as a cornerstone to building a more elaborate set of rights through negotiation in the second stage of discussions."

(Sources: telex from Michael Kirby, Secretary to the Cabinet for Federal for Federal-Provincial Relations to Charlie Watt, ICNI, October 15, 1982; Toronto Globe and Mail, January 14, 20, 24; letter from ICNI to provincial Premiers January 25).
of thousands joined the scrap heap of urban poverty - unfed, untrained, unhoused, unemployed, and culturally alienated. This solution to Indian poverty was repudiated explicitly by subsequent Democratic and Republican administrations and should remain so - Watt's recent comments notwithstanding."

Returning to the fundamental question of what practical impact administration policies, Indian and otherwise, are having on Indians, the answer is: "rarely in the recent past have they suffered so much so disproportionately. In the recent 'fact sheet' on its Indian policy, the administration did reaffirm a commitment to the goals of Indian political self-determination and economic self-sufficiency that have been enunciated by every administration for the past 20 years. In the Reagan statement, however, the emphasis very clearly is that these objectives should be achieved through an eradication of federal involvement and entanglement with reservations. Therein lies the fallacy and the tragedy of this administration's Indian policy. It is based on the assumption that private activity is a viable economic force on Indian reservations. Nothing could be further from the truth and the reasons are readily apparent. Most Indian reservations do not begin to have the infrastructure, such as roads, power, health and sanitation facilities and physical plant essential to attract and sustain private business and economic activity. More important, these are not the types of improvements private investors are willing to undertake."

"Thus Indians have found the administration's radical budget cuts affecting them to be far more meaningful and telling than the reiteration of past federal Indian policy objectives. Among a people long accustomed to being at the bottom of every socioeconomic indicator, the administration's fiscal and economic policies still have an unusually devastating economic impact because of the total absence of private-sector alternatives."

(Source: article by W. Richard West in the Guardian Weekly, February 20).

KALAHARI: WAR, FOREIGN AID, LIQUOR AND THE BUSHMEN

The Bushman once occupied large areas of southern Africa, in what are now the countries of South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Mozambique, Angola, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Now there are an estimated 26,000 living in Namibia and 29,000 in Botswana.

Few, if any, remain untouched by the 20th century. Dr. Philip Tobias, medical school dean at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, and leader of many Kalahari expeditions, says 2,000 to 5,000 Bushmen in the center of the basin may yet live mostly by hunting and gathering food in the old way. Even there, relief agencies have dug waterholes and sent in famine supplies. War, foreign aid, liquor and the encroaching clutter of the 20th century have caught up with the Bushmen's children. They ride bicycles and wear shirts instead of animal skins. Hunters now prefer rifles to poison arrows. Women dance to music blaring from transistor radios. The Bushmen are dispersed among the tribes of southern Africa, their numbers shrinking, their customs slipping away.

In Namibia, John Marshall, a filmmaker-ethnologist from Cambridge, Massachusetts, found a radical change when he returned to Tsumkwe in 1978 after 20 years. The town's permanent population had grown to more than 900 from 25. Alcoholism, violent crime and prostitution prevailed among the Bushmen who had migrated there, across a few miles of land and a few thousand years of civilization.

The Bushmen were drawn to Tsumkwe by welfare payments and by high wages offered by the South African Army. The army uses Bushmen to track black nationalist guerrillas fighting to wrest the territory from South African control and make it independent.

"Bushman born since 1960 couldn't track themselves off a snowy football field", Marshall says. "We have taught our
kids how to hunt but they haven't learned very well. They just eat cornmeal", says Cumsa, about 50, who works at Xgi Diggins, an excavation in the sandy, thornbush country of the northern Kalahari basin.

Nkai, a woman of the Xkung branch of the Bushmen, says, "My son has shot a rabbit: But he can't track". "The kids might be able to identify five or six wild foods. The Bushman women used to be able to do 100 to 200", Marshall says. Some customs survive from the old hunter-gatherer lifestyle - sharing, visiting, and talking non-stop.

Curing dances, when men often fall into trances, still take place but Bushmen lost the prehistoric art of rock painting in the 19th century. Bushmen have changed physically, too. The famed large buttocks of the women remain, now hard to see under Western skirts and unneeded for what scientists say was their main purpose - to store fat. But studies show that Bushmen now average 5-feet-4, compared with 5-feet-1½ inches 80 years ago, apparently the result of better nutrition.

(Source: International Herald Tribune, Feb. 19-20, 1983)

INDIGENOUS PEOPLE VS MULTINATIONALS: CONFERENCE REPORT

On October 12-15, 1982, a group of 74 native leaders and aboriginal rights supporters from 15 different countries and more than 35 indigenous nations gathered in Washington, D.C. to discuss "Native Resource Control and the Multinational Corporate Challenge: Aboriginal Rights in International Perspective". The conference was co-sponsored by Multinational Monitor, the Anthropology Resource Center, Cultural Survival, and the Indian Law Resource Center.

Context of the Conference

The conference's context was explored by Shelton Davis of ARC. He noted that:

"Multinational corporations are causing ecological, social and cultural disruptions on a worldwide scale. No one experiences these damaging effects more strongly than indigenous people, be they at the North Slope of Alaska or in the tropical lowlands of South America. Today, most indigenous groups possess less real control over their resources than they did a decade or two ago. While there are major differences among countries, aboriginal rights -if they are recognized at all- are usually sacrificed to powerful corporate interests or state development plans...

"Met by hostile governments, indigenous peoples have turned to international forums to defend their political, economic and cultural claims. Indigenous peoples have organized themselves into supranational bodies such as the World Council of Indigenous Peoples and the International Indian Treaty Council. And they have pressed their rights before the United Nations...

The Washington conference on "Native Resource Control
and the Multinational Corporate Challenge" this October occurred in the wake of the important U.N. actions, at a time when indigenous peoples are increasingly recognizing that legal systems based on Western notions of property and sovereignty provide minimal, if any, protection for aboriginal rights. The conference also took place at a time when the Western industrial system is in deep trouble. Today, with the world bogged down in the worst recession since the 1940's, there is a growing perception that industrial economies can't deliver the goods even to their own people.

"Amidst the general skepticism, indigenous peoples are examining their economic dilemmas. They are increasingly seeing to redevelop their traditional economies based on self-sufficiency and local control; in the process, a growing number of indigenous groups are abandoning the reliance on nominal royalties and ephemeral jobs from the multinationals.

Moreover, indigenous peoples are contending that their values and ways of life hold out the promise of a better, healthier, more sustainable society. If we are open enough culturally to listen to the voices of indigenous people, we will hear more of their ideas about these vital issues in the years ahead."

Unity despite diversity

The Washington conference was more than a conference on native land rights and transnational companies. To the leaders who attended, it was a conference on power. Indigenous people need to "take power over our lives. And that means we feed our people, we clothe our people, we house our people," said John Mohawk, editor of the Mohawk Nation newspaper, Akwesasne Notes, and one of the conference's keynote speakers. "The question is, how are we going to translate our humanism into concrete political alternatives to colonialism?"

Initially, the goal of the meeting - to bring native leaders from around the world to discuss strategies against multinational corporations that are encroaching on indigenous land - caused frustration. As one participant said, "it seemed impossible to bring to one meeting the experiences of the South and Central Americans and those of the Australians and North Americans, who are clearly fighting different battles."

From these differences, however, emerged a unity. The delegates recognized that indigenous peoples around the world are frequently fighting the same multinational companies. This awareness brought together the need to develop an international communications network among themselves so that they could share information and coordinate activities.

Limits to the legal strategy

During the conference, participants expressed reservations about the prominence of law in any strategy for protecting indigenous land rights. "The most basic deprivation that indigenous people have suffered is the confiscation of our own lands," said Vernita Katchatag of the Unalakleet people of Alaska. "The situation would be very different if we were in our own courts. If the dog were serving himself dinner, he wouldn't give himself the bone," she pointed out. But given the present realities, she added, the question is "how can Western law be used against itself?"

The "doctrine of trusteeship" is "the basic legal problem", argued Tim Coulter of the Indian Law Resource Center. The "native people are said to be legally incompetent", Coulter explained, allowing the government "trustee" to step in and say that "land that Indians have used and occupied since time immemorial belongs not to the Indians but to the Nation." "Trusteeship is a mantle thrown over racism," Coulter said, and "must be defeated politically."

Law is simply one of the tactics available "when you've got to come to grips with what that mining company is doing in the next day or week," said Phillip Toyne, attorney for the Pitjantjatjara Land Council of central Australia.
In Hawaii, delegate Emmett Aluli reported, his people have been somewhat successful in using the courts to protect native rights. But they have also found Western legal processes to be inherently limited, he said; in the end, it's "the enemy, the transnational corporation, the government," that carries out the law.

"So we're very afraid," he said, "that we're setting up a lot more problems for the future by taking what we can get right now."

"One of the things that it's very difficult to get over is a success," echoed Canadian lawyer John Bayly. Due to Dene Indian opposition and public outcry, a Canadian government commission stopped the construction of a major gas pipeline through Dene land in the Northwest Territories.

But "the transnational corporations adapted," Bayly said, by providing the opposition with "far less ammunition." Information on projects is "much more limited and difficult to extract," Bayly said. "Now multinational corporations ask for permission to build with details to follow later."

The Activist Route

The consensus on the need to adopt more activist tactics became clear during the following day's discussion of corporate accountability campaigns. Panelists involved in the Nestle boycott, specific shareholder actions, and campaigns for divestiture from corporations and banks who support South Africa emphasized the importance of communication, access to information, and international networks among groups fighting the same multinational companies.

Corporation-specific actions, such as shareholder resolutions and divestiture campaigns, are becoming more widely used by indigenous peoples. The Aboriginal Federation of Land Councils in Australia, for instance, has changed some policies of the Rio Tinto Zinc corporation through grass-roots lobbying of unions, churches, and anti-nuclear groups in

England, according to Aboriginal delegate, Shorty O'Neill.

Delegates emphasized that indigenous groups dealing with the same corporation should be able to call on one another when they want to influence company policy. Indian groups in countries such as Brazil and Guatemala, especially, need supporters in North America to place pressure on U.S. companies.

The delegates saw the creation of an international network as a priority. And a strong feeling dominated the conference that international work must be accompanied by local action in order for profound change to take place. Indigenous people need to be "looking for the kinds of structures within our communities that will give us the right to develop ourselves under our own traditions, our own cultures, our own beliefs and our own abilities, and to decide what our futures shall be," said Fred Plain of the Nishnawbe-Aske in northern Ontario.

"A lot of work is going to go on in strengthening our own community," said Pat Dodson, chairman of the Aboriginal Federation of Land Councils. "And that's a lot to do, while at the same time trying to fight on all these other fronts."

Guatemala: A Call for Native Unity

The end of the conference was dominated by discussion of Guatemala. Delegates found that the situation there, in its threat to the land, resources, and survival of the 4 million Maya peoples who are attempting to assert their rights, was a metaphor for indigenous struggles all over the world.

The delegates' final statement condemned the genocide in Guatemala, but also carried hope for the Indians of that country. Our goal is that "those indigenous peoples will eventually govern themselves," said Jim Antoine of the Dene Nation. "And because they're such a large percentage of the population in that area, we have to think it is possible. If it's going to happen anywhere, perhaps the first indigenous government in the Western hemisphere will be there."

(Source: Multinational Monitor, Dec, 1982)
The following report comes from the first Newsletter of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples (WCIP).


"The first meeting of the Working Group was held in Geneva, Switzerland from August 9-13, 1982. The following extracts are from Clem Chartier's report on the meeting - Clem works for the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan (Canada) and attended the meeting as a representative of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples (WCIP).

"The majority of Indigenous people were from North America, including the Native Council of Canada, the Alberta Committee of Chiefs on the Constitution and the Mic Mac Nation. From the United States there was the Indian Law Centre, Six Nations, Lakota (Traditional and Tribal) and the International Indian Treaty Council. From South America, Consejo Indio de Sud America (CISA) had two representatives. From Central America a Guatemalan Indian currently in exile in Nicaragua was in attendance and from Australia a member of the National Federation of Land Councils. Representatives from the following governments were in attendance: Nicaragua, Brazil, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, India and the United States. (One or two may have been missed). A representative of the International Labour Organization (ILO) was also there throughout the session, as well as some non-Indigenous Non-governmental Organisations (NGO) including the Anti-Slavery Society, whose members made several submissions. Mr. Williamsen-Díaz a representative of the Director of the Human Rights Commission was present to assist the Chairman of the Working Group Mr. Asbjorn Eide of Norway.

"Most of the session revolved around the mandate of the Working Group to develop standards of treatment for Indigenous peoples. In this connection, the Working Group decided that it would be proper for them to hear ‘real life situations’ so that they would have a basis from which to develop standards. With respect to procedure and sources of information, the Working Group has decided that it will encourage the creating of a fund that will be used to assist Indigenous delegates to travel to the sessions, as well as the encouraging of holding future Working Group sessions in regions outside of Geneva, especially in areas where there is a significant number of Indigenous people.

"They also decided that they would accept submissions (of less than five pages) from Indigenous Peoples who are not NGO’s and also to allow them to speak during the sessions. However, they did reserve the right to decide whether or not to transmit written statements to the Sub-Commission where the group does not have consultative NGO status. A number of presentations were made during the meeting.

"On the final day the Working Group prepared a written report. Because the Working Group members did not have enough time to study the document and the observers and NGO’s did not have time to read it, the Chair adjourned the session until the following Friday. This was done in order to give the Indigenous peoples time to submit their comments in writing as they were all about to leave. It was pointed out by the Chair that the first draft would be changes, especially where there is harsh language. He left the impression that there could be substantial changes. It is also important to note that the only people that were in attendance at the final session were government representatives."
NEW INDIGENOUS PUBLICATIONS

IWGIA extends a warm welcome to two new indigenous publications printed for the first time at the end of 1982. These are the Newsletter of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples (WCIP) and Inuit-Arctic Policy Review, a bi-lingual (Inuit and English) publication of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC).

WCIP Newsletter

The Newsletter gives a chronological account of important events in the WCIP calendar, special feature articles and WCIP press releases. In the first issue, Marie Smallface Marule, Chief Administrator of WCIP presented a statement concerning the work and aims of the Council. She explained that "WCIP was structured in such a way as to attempt to provide decentralized operations and yet coordinated international action. The effort in the formal structure was to have community representation channeled through representative political organizations at various levels - provincial/national/state/continental, etc. It is for this reason that regional organizations were considered an important part of WCIP and at this time five regions have been designated for WCIP. These are: Samiland/Greenland, South America, Central America, North America and the South Pacific. An underlying principle of WCIP is that community awareness and consciousness raising is central to organizational development and strength. Success in any endeavors depends on organizational efforts and communication. For this reason regional organizational development has been a priority for WCIP. 1982 has witnessed efforts for the establishment of a North American Regional Organization and plans are underway for facilitating the South Pacific regional forum.

It is the hope that each region will spearhead action on matters of exclusive concern to their membership and area, directing the support required from other regions. On matters of concern to all regions the WCIP General Assembly provides the forum for discussion, debate and standardization of positions and actions. The implementation of these decisions rests with the WCIP Executive Council which is made up of representatives from each region plus the president and two vice-presidents.

Long a dream and requirement of the WCIP Secretariat this is our first attempt at a newsletter. We hope this issue reflects the nature of WCIP and its efforts to combat discrimination and genocide and to ensure political, economic and social justice for Indigenous Peoples."

Adress: WCIP Secretariat
Suite c-B12
The University of Lethbridge
Lethbridge, Alberta
Canada T1K 3M4

Inuit Magazine

The Inuit Circumpolar Conference representing approximately 100,000 Inuit in Alaska, Canada and Greenland, has begun to publish its own magazine. The issues to be discussed include:

Inuit land claims;
The political development of the Arctic;
Protection of subsistence resources and habitat;
International arctic policy;
Inuit trade and industry;
Arctic energy and transportation development;
Inuit culture and history; and
Arctic education, communications and health.

Welcoming the first issue, Eugene Brower, of the North Slope Borough said:

"Ever since the Inuit people from Alaska, Canada and
Greenland gathered in Barrow in 1977 for that first meeting of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, we have felt the deep need for keeping in touch. It is with great expectations that we launch this Inuit magazine, "Inuit" which will serve to keep us all closer together. In these pages, we will celebrate our Inuit culture and heritage, our trials and our challenges. It will be a way of sharing our thoughts and feelings among ourselves and with the rest of the world...

"In this magazine, we will be able to reach others also. In the second meeting of the Inuit Circumpolar Conference in Nuuk in 1980, we talked a lot about having a variety of Inuit publications, newspapers, radio, television, and data communications networks. These things we are still working on and have made some progress. In these days of rapid development in every part of the North, we must stay in close contact."

Hans Pravia Rosing, President of the ICC commented in his welcome:

"Our history has throughout the ages been described and told by foreigners, who with their foreign background have seen a totally different reality from the one we experience. The time has now come that we ourselves start to tell about our view of our life, the modern age influence of our society. This magazine will therefore, first and foremost be a vehicle for Inuit to speak."

Address: ICC
P.O.Box 204
DK 3900 Nuuk
Greenland
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