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### DAY ONE: Saturday 22nd August

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30 - 10.30</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 - 11.00</td>
<td>Introductions by Prof. Graham Maddox (Dean of Arts), Prof. Graham Connah (Head of Dept) and Convenors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 - 12.00</td>
<td><strong>SESSION CHAIR:</strong> CLAIRE SMITH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 - 12.00</td>
<td>H. Martin Wobst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 - 12.00</td>
<td><em>Theory in action: the post decade in archaeology.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 - 12.00</td>
<td>Discussant: Andrée Rosenfeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 - 1.00</td>
<td><strong>LUNCH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.45</td>
<td><strong>SESSION CHAIR:</strong> HEATHER BURKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.45</td>
<td>Paul Taçon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.45</td>
<td><em>Digging into the past: archaeology, interpretation and the involvement of indigenous people in Australia and Canada</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 - 1.45</td>
<td>Discussant: Lori Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45 - 2.30</td>
<td>Paul Faulstich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45 - 2.30</td>
<td><em>EcoEthos: considering an environmental code of ethics for archaeologists</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45 - 2.30</td>
<td>Discussant: Michael Red Shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30 - 3.00</td>
<td><strong>AFTERNOON TEA &amp; Conference group photo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 3.45</td>
<td><strong>SESSION CHAIR:</strong> MIKE MORWOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 3.45</td>
<td>Robert Bednarik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 3.45</td>
<td><em>Effects of the latent neo-colonialism of archaeology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 3.45</td>
<td>Discussant: Pam Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45 - 4.30</td>
<td>Claire Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45 - 4.30</td>
<td><em>Beswick Creek Cave, four decades later: change and continuity</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45 - 4.30</td>
<td>Discussant: John Clegg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30 - 5.15</td>
<td>John Ah Kit, Robert Lee, Cyril McCartney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30 - 5.15</td>
<td><em>Trying to keep secrets secret</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30 - 5.15</td>
<td>Discussant: Graeme Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DAY TWO: Sunday 23rd August

SESSION CHAIR: HEATHER BURKE

9.00 - 9.45  Mark Leone  
_The tabernacle and the clock: power in the Chesapeake_
Discussant: Angela McGowan

9.45 - 10.30 Howard Morphy  
_Archaeology, anthropology and the explanation of form_
Discussant: Jan Deregowski

10.30 - 11.00 MORNING TEA

SESSION CHAIR: JOHN APPLETON

11.00 - 11.45 Dan Witter  
_Some notes on Aboriginal archaeology_
Discussant: Val Attenbrow

11.45 - 12.30 Simon Holdaway  
_Stone tool variability as a function of different scales of temporal resolution_
Discussant: Peter Veth

12.30 - 1.30 LUNCH

SESSION CHAIR: GRAHAM KNUCKEY

1.30 - 2.15 Chris Lovell-Jones  
_A comparative study of Aboriginal participation in archaeological research_
Discussant: Jo McDonald

2.15 - 3.00 Klim Gollan  
_Ballina: a case study in legal and quasi-legal resolutions of cultural heritage conservation issues_
Discussant: Jeanette Hope

3.00 - 3.30 AFTERNOON TEA

SESSION CHAIR: CHRIS LOVELL-JONES

3.30 - 4.15 Cathryn McConaghy  
_Methods for teaching archaeology to Aborigines_
Discussant: Jane Balme

4.15 - 5.00 Robyne Bancroft  
_An Aboriginal view on the teaching of archaeology_
Discussant: David Frankel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00 - 9.45</td>
<td>Larry Zimmerman</td>
<td><em>Indigenous voice and its role in archaeological theory</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussant: Colin Pardoe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45 - 10.30</td>
<td>Maurice Lanteigne</td>
<td><em>Western science and indigenous rights: a discourse on ethics</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussant: Bernard Huchet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 - 11.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>MORNING TEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 - 11.45</td>
<td>Liz Williams</td>
<td><em>The newer archaeology?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussant: David Horton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45 - 12.30</td>
<td>Laurajane Smith</td>
<td><em>Postprocessual archaeology and the politics of cultural resource management</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussant: Pam Dean-Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 - 1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 - 2.15</td>
<td>Heather Burke, Christine Lovell-Jones, Claire Smith</td>
<td><em>Archaeology into the public domain?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussant: Nancy Stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15 - 3.00</td>
<td>Hilary du Cros</td>
<td><em>To see ourselves as others see us: Australian archaeology’s value to Australian contemporary culture</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussant: John Fisher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 3.45</td>
<td>Lewis Binford</td>
<td><em>Integrating knowledge about hunter-gatherers at a global scale</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussant: Robin Torrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45 - 4.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>SEMINAR DISCUSSANT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iain Davidson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LATE AFTERNOON TEA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEORY IN ACTION: THE POST DECADE IN ARCHAEOLOGY

H Martin Wobst

Department of Anthropology
University of Massachusetts at Amherst
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The last three decades in the development of a theoretically explicit archaeology in Great Britain and the United States are reviewed. Both 'new' archaeologists and post-processual archaeologists consider their pre-decessors to be system-serving dupes, both consider themselves to be radical renewers, empowering the masses, and both new archaeologists and post-processual archaeologists very rapidly isolate themselves from their pre-decessors and from the archaeological mainstream. Important theoretical questions are lost sight of in the battle. An agenda for theoretical archaeology at the end of the millennium will need to accommodate both 'processual' and 'post-processual' paradigms without short-changing, co-opting or selling out either side of the argument.

DIGGING INTO THE PAST: ARCHAEOLOGY, INTERPRETATION AND THE INVOLVEMENT OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES IN AUSTRALIA AND CANADA.

Paul S.C. Taçon

Division of Anthropology
Australian Museum, Canberra
AUSTRALIA.

Indigenous peoples have long argued for a direct role in the interpretation and management of their heritages. In recent years archaeologists, anthropologists, museum curators and other specialists have begun to accommodate this but there is still much
room for improvement. Some of the main issues, such as the return of skeletal material, the management of secret/sacred objects, the training of indigenous people, differing concepts of history/prehistory and the teaching of archaeology, are briefly examined in relation to recent events in Australia and Canada. It is concluded that not only is it important to treat the past of others with respect but also that a co-operative approach to interpreting the past is of mutual benefit.

ECOETHOS: CONSIDERING AN ENVIRONMENTAL CODE OF ETHICS FOR ARCHAEOLOGISTS

Paul Faulstich

Curator of Native American Art
Portland Art Museum,
Portland, Oregon
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Archaeology is a discipline that is often perceived as having little relevance to contemporary situations. This paper argues that given our current ecological predicament environmental concerns should be at the forefront of archaeological theory and practice. The relevance of archaeological insight into past and present dilemmas involving humans and the natural world is underscored through a consideration of the nature of our discipline. After all, Earth is the medium of archaeologists, and we depend directly upon Earth for our very data. Archaeological ideas themselves are inseparable from nature and the study of humans in nature. But even more, ecology shapes our responses to the world, and we face outward from it, not inward as though it were a closed academic subject. Beyond its essential scientific framework, ethics and ecology give archaeology its distinctive quality --its heart.
EFFECTS OF THE LATENT NEOCOLONIALISM OF ARCHAEOLOGY

Robert G. Bednarik

Convenor
International Federation of Rock Art Organisations
Australian Rock Art Research Association
AUSTRALIA

In discussing the emerging 'world archaeology' it is requisite to consider the effects of such global developments on the research traditions of non-Western countries: the socialist or former socialist countries, and those of the developing world. It may at first glance appear that such developments would benefit developing countries, but on closer examination and after considering the existing practices and research philosophies, the opposite effect may well be achieved. The countries already disadvantaged may be affected even more adversely, unless these developments are accompanied by specific precautionary measures to alleviate specific effects. These effects are discussed, which might lead to constructive proposals of how international imbalances caused by current practices could be addressed.
BESWICK CREEK CAVE FOUR DECADES LATER: CHANGE AND CONTINUITY

Claire Smith

Department of Archaeology and Palaeoanthropology
University of New England
 Armidale, NSW
 AUSTRALIA

In this paper I discuss Beswick Creek Cave in terms of previous papers which have described this rock art site, especially those which were published by N. G. W. MacIntosh in 1952 and 1976. I consider both change and continuity in the artistic system of this region as implied by similarities and differences between previous published reports and my own recent experiences. Specific issues which I consider include rock painting as a living artistic tradition, changes in the dynamics of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal interactions and the protection of secret information.

KEEPING SECRETS SECRET

John Ah Kit, Robert Lee, Cyril McCartney

Jawoyn Association, Katherine
Barunga-Wugullar Community Government Council, Barunga
Northern Territory.
AUSTRALIA

Archaeologists researching the 'pre-history' of the Australian continent have not always recognised that Aboriginal people are the inheritors of a living culture. Some academics have either consciously or unconsciously placed their own academic
advancement in front of the interests of the Aboriginal people they are researching. Others have worked to promote Aboriginal interests as well as their own.

Questions need to be asked of archaeologists and other academics researching Aboriginal people. Whose interest does the research serve? Who controls the way in which research is being carried out? What is being done with the results? Can researchers be neutral?

ARCHAEOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE EXPLANATION OF FORM.

Howard Morphy
Pitt Rivers Museum
Oxford
UNITED KINGDOM

In this paper I will argue that the analysis of form is integral to research in material culture, whether from an archaeological or an ethnographic context. Form lies at the fulcrum between structure and process, culture and action, and provides common grounds for both archaeological and anthropological analysis. The explanation of form, though in many cases ultimately an impossible objective, is a necessary part of methods of research into material culture since it keeps the analysis grounded in 'reality' and ensures an ongoing relationship between theory and data. For these reasons it will be argued that the 'analysis of form' should be a central component of the anthropological and archaeological curriculum.
SOME NOTES ON ABORIGINAL ARCHAEOLOGY

Dan Witter

New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service
Broken Hill
AUSTRALIA

Prehistoric archaeology in Australia has failed in its attempts to address the issues of regional variation, chronological change and the evolution of Aboriginal culture.

In southeastern Australia 11 Cultural Adaptive Regions can be distinguished, based on stone artefacts and other archaeological features. These regions are arrayed across a range of temperate to arid environments and varying amounts of relief. The recognition of such regions is essential to establish the comparability of stone artefact assemblages from different sites over time.

There also are reasons to suggest that there was a more fundamental change in Aboriginal culture after 5,000 years ago than is usually recognised. Although many of the lithic elements remain relatively unchanged through time, their organisational differences indicate the evolution of a 'Palaeoaboriginal Culture' into a 'Neoaboriginal Culture'.

Living Aboriginal culture seems to have been little utilised in contrasting the evolutionary results of Australian prehistory at a global level. Examples are discussed in terms of minimalist/baroque strategies, sociological/technological options, regional continuity and ethnic congruence.

The reason for the lack of coherence in Australian prehistory may be because it is oriented towards issues, rather than being theory-driven. This may be due to a reluctance to take on theoretical approaches as a matter of faith, as well as the absence of ready-made solid frameworks with clear application to the Australian situation. One of the obstacles also seems to be a conflict between environmental versus social explanations, rather than trying to develop a body of theory which subsumes both.
An approach towards this is a 'cultural selective' framework. In this, cultural evolutionary processes and their determinants would be structured in a hierarchical and imbedded system. It would begin as individual decision making at a least cost, own self interest level which develops into 'predictive constructs'. At a more corporate level this progresses into cultural strategies, and finally into independent cultural institutions.

The archaeological record left by the Aborigines is abundant but obscure. The theoretical priorities should be towards disentangling how cultural processes may be inferred and at what scale cultural determinants operate.

---

STONE TOOL VARIABILITY AS A FUNCTION OF DIFFERENT SCALES OF TEMPORAL RESOLUTION

Simon Holdaway

Department of Anthropology
University of Auckland
Auckland
NEW ZEALAND

Recent advances in our understanding of the processes governing lithic assemblage variability from sites belonging to the Middle and Early Upper Palaeolithic of western Europe have demonstrated that frequent tool resharpening can be used to account for the existence of many tool types and for variations in assemblage tool type proportions. It is also becoming clear that the stratigraphic divisions used to define these assemblages are related to geological events involving considerable periods of time. This would suggest that the lithic assemblages represent long term accumulations, the product of many behavioural episodes of unknown duration. Given this, it may be asked whether explanatory models based on the short term behaviour of human groups are useful in accounting for assemblage variability in the Palaeolithic. This paper reviews studies of lithic assemblage variability in the European Palaeolithic and compares these to studies of hunter-gatherer and neolithic lithic technology from Australia and New Zealand.
OBSERVER AND OBSERVED; A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ABORIGINAL PARTICIPATION IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Christine Lovell-Jones

Department of Archaeology and Palaeoanthropology
University of New England
Armidale. NSW
AUSTRALIA

The revitalisation of Aboriginal cultural traditions and the recognition by Australian governments of Aboriginal concerns for self-determination has been manifest since the 1967 referendum. Aborigines have recognised the role of the social sciences in forming non-Aboriginal perceptions of their culture, both past and present. In the last twenty years an interest and growing criticism of archaeological practice by indigenous people has developed to the extent that many archaeologists and indigenous people are in conflict over control of the past.

This paper examines whether the influence of indigenous peoples' demands for consultation in archaeological practice is reflected in EIS and research reports held by State authorities. In two states (NSW & QLD) I gathered data from the respective State Departments that control, through legislation, the practices of archaeologists (National Parks and Wildlife Service in N.S.W.; Heritage Division in Queensland).
BALLINA: A CASE STUDY IN LEGAL AND QUASI-LEGAL RESOLUTIONS OF CULTURAL HERITAGE CONSERVATION ISSUES

Klim Gollan

New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service
Grafton
AUSTRALIA

The conservation of Aboriginal heritage relics in Ballina, northern NSW, became an active legal issue in about 1985, when the Ballina Shire, as developer of new housing estates, applied to the NPWS for consent to destroy remnant middens and campsites along the Richmond River. The consent was granted. Subsequently, the Aboriginal community instituted independent actions to negate the granting of the consents, determined by the Ballina Shire, by application for emergency declaration under the federal ATSIC Heritage Protection Act, by calls on politicians, and by direct action on the development sites.

The questions are examined; whether conservation objectives were lost in the legal manoeuvring; whether the tests that determine outcomes in the legal environment are ultimately effective; and whether the outcomes that take the form of compensation are appropriate to resolve conflicts of interest. To these questions it is answered; yes, no and no.
INCREASING ABORIGINAL PARTICIPATION AND SUCCESS IN TERTIARY EDUCATION: CRITICAL ISSUES FOR THE TEACHING OF ARCHAEOLOGY

Cathryn McConaghy

Batchelor College
Batchelor
Northern Territory
AUSTRALIA

Aboriginal participation in tertiary education in Australia is disproportionately low in all disciplines. Increasing Aboriginal participation in tertiary education is an issue of social justice. Achieving greater equity for Aboriginal people in tertiary education involves a commitment by funding bodies, tertiary institutions, tertiary teachers and Aboriginal community members to strategies which positively discriminate in favour of Aboriginal students. Such strategies require a critical review of existing academic structures and rules, curricula, teaching methods and the educational philosophies of those involved, and the development of educational approaches which are supportive of Aboriginal community aspirations and compatible with Aboriginal cultural values. The Batchelor College model of Aboriginal tertiary education has met with considerable success both in terms of an increasing number of Aboriginal graduates in a range of disciplines and the degree of Aboriginal community support the College receives. The features of the Batchelor College approach to education of Aboriginal archaeologists in mainstream Australian Universities is discussed.
AN ABORIGINAL VIEW ON THE TEACHING OF ARCHAEOLOGY

Robyne Bancroft

Department of Archaeology and Anthropology
Australian National University
Canberra. ACT
AUSTRALIA

A discussion paper will be presented giving an Aboriginal perspective of archaeology in tertiary institutions. How have archaeology students at ANU responded to academic teaching philosophy and methods in the presence of fellow Aboriginal students? What are the strengths and limitations of the system within which academics teach? What role for indigenous people in archaeological practice as the number of Aboriginal archaeologists increase? What will be Aboriginal students' rights of access to present holdings in museums?

TEACHING FUTURE RESEARCHERS AND HERITAGE MANAGERS: ARCHAEOLOGY, EDUCATION AND TRAINING SEEN AGAINST THE VISION OF AN AUSTRALIAN ARCHAEOLOGY THAT ACCOMODATES ABORIGINAL PERSPECTIVES ON THEIR PAST AND THOSE OF ARCHAEOLOGY'S SCIENTIFIC TRADITION

Isabel McBryde

Department of Archaeology and Anthropology
Australian National University
Canberra. ACT
AUSTRALIA
INDIGENOUS VOICE AND ITS ROLE IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL THEORY

Larry Zimmerman

Archaeology Laboratory
University of South Dakota
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A recent editorial in *American Antiquity* (J. Reid, 'Recent Findings on North American Prehistory' 57[2]: 195-96) shows that many archaeologists in North America are incredulous that American Indians find little of relevance in a past constructed by archaeologists. Many Indians, in fact, find such a past to be threatening to their culture. Other indigenous groups around the world have expressed similar views. They object to their oral tradition being labelled 'myth' or 'legend'. Careful examination of their objections leads to a conclusion that indigenous peoples come to know the past in ways different from archaeologists and that the past has very different functions and meanings for them. However, the very concept that there might be different pasts or ways of knowing them seems perplexing to many archaeologists.

If it is important to heed and understand this 'voice', archaeologists must ascertain how such a different view is conceptualized and how to deal with it in theoretical terms. Analysis of two new introductory texts, David Thomas' (1991, Harcourt) *Archaeology: Down to Earth* and Colin Renfrew and Paul Bahn's (1991, Thames and Hudson) *Archaeology: Theories, Methods and Practice*, shows clearly that indigenous 'voice' is entering the theoretical mainstream via critical theory.

Yet, demonstrations of indigenous 'voice' in archaeological practice remain rare. Case studies from the US and Australia demonstrate how a 'shared past' can be created and how indigenous 'voice' requires mediation between 'the hard line etic, 'scientific' materialists and the 'soft' emic, subjective ideationalists' (Thomas 1991: 47).
WESTERN SCIENCE AND INDIGENOUS RIGHTS: A DISCOURSE ON ETHICS

Maurice P. Lanteigne

President
Rock Art Association of Canada Inc.
Winnipeg, Manitoba
CANADA

The accelerated deterioration of prehistoric art due to natural and human variables has produced a conundrum. The need to study and preserve this valuable scientific resource before its almost certain destruction is at odds with the inherent cultural heritage rights of indigenous peoples. It has been assumed by scientists that we have an explicit right, to some an obligation, to study all events within our knowable universe before their inevitable demise. Anthropologists in general, and prehistorians in particular, have been slow to realise that cultural heritage rights precede scientific rights, that 'social relevance' is the mark of 'good science'. The reticence of scholars to deal with the issues, and the traditional indigenous mistrust of their intent, are exacerbated by the non-ethical criteria by which scientists are trained, and viewed by both our own and indigenous societies. In an attempt to address the nature of this quandary, a number of topics with contrasting social views are raised for ethical consideration.

POST-PROCESSUAL ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE POLITICS OF CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Laurajane Smith

School of Environmental and Information Science
Charles Sturt University, Albury
AUSTRALIA
This paper will critically examine whether the fast growing literature on 'post-processual' archaeological theory is capable of making a contribution to studies of cultural resource management (CRM) in Australia. The abstract, and often abstruse, nature of these writings, and their lack of grounding in concrete social relations or institutional contexts, will be examined in terms of the political and ideological processes within CRM. I will go on to identify some of the fundamental weakness in post-processual theory, by drawing on other contributions from within political and social theory. To conclude I will offer some constructive suggestions that might inform the development of archaeological theories, in order to embrace the political nature of both CRM and archaeological practice.

ARCHAEOLOGY INTO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN?

Heather Burke, Christine Lovell-Jones, Claire Smith

Department of Archaeology and Palaeoanthropology
University of New England
Armidale. NSW
AUSTRALIA

In this paper we suggest that current trends in academia toward self-reflexive research are resulting in archaeology being made more accessible to the wider community. This trend has had a number of ramifications:

(a) The treatment of both ideas as well as material culture as objects with a potential for commodification.

(b) A contemporary concern with, and appreciation of, the particularities of individual cultures and the increased participation of indigenous peoples.

(c) An increasing perception, by both the public and academia, that research must demonstrate a concrete value and the concurrent creation of an environment receptive to public critiques.
Self reflectivity within archaeology is integral to both processual and postprocessual schools. A logical conclusion of the postprocessual questioning of the very essence of archaeology could be a rejection of the discipline as such. The counter movement to this is a search for meaning and a continuing belief that archaeology can have value to the wider community.

Does archaeological research have important political or social implications which are genuinely relevant to a general public? If it does then students will need to be trained to consider a public as well as an academic audience.

TO SEE OURSELVES AS OTHERS SEE US: AUSTRALIAN ARCHAEOLOGY'S VALUE TO AUSTRALIAN CONTEMPORARY CULTURE

Hilary Du Cros

National Centre for Australian Studies
Monash University, Clayton, Victoria
AUSTRALIA

This paper will discuss the contribution archaeologists have made to publicising archaeological issues and what value is placed on such issues by the media and contemporary culture in Australia. It will outline briefly the ways archaeological information is produced, transformed and interpreted within this context. Hopefully this paper will generate some discussion in the research seminar as to how archaeology can contribute more effectively to cultural life in Australia.