

# FROM FEPA TO IPPA: THE REMAKING OF AN INSTITUTION

Jack Golson

Department of Archaeology and Natural History  
Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies  
Australian National University

It is now approaching 50 years since our Association began as an organisation of regional archaeology, known from 1953 to 1976 as the Far Eastern Prehistory Association (FEPA) and subsequently as the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association (IPPA). Over that period it has undergone some significant changes, of which its change of name is in part a reflection. This essay is an attempt to explore the nature of those changes, before memory of them fades with the people who took part in them.

## BACKGROUND

For me personally the story began in 1957, when, in my fourth year out of England teaching archaeology in the young Department of Anthropology at the University of Auckland and grappling with the prehistory of New Zealand and the South Pacific, I unexpectedly received the mimeographed first number of the journal *Asian Perspectives*. With wide-ranging regional reports and bibliographies covering the prehistory of the Pacific basin and the whole of its western margin, the volume was the revelation of a vast enterprise of which I was unbeknowingly a part, serviced by the American branch of an organisation, the Far Eastern Prehistory Association, about whose very existence I was ignorant. For the expenditure of one American dollar a year I gained access to this newly disclosed world.

Another personally significant event of 1957 was the publication of H. R. van Heekeren's *The Stone Age of Indonesia*, which set out to summarise the data of prehistory throughout the Indonesian archipelago as provided by the publications of others and the author's own experience and fieldwork. Together with its companion volume, *The Bronze-Iron Age of Indonesia*, which appeared in 1958, it provided a systematic survey of sites, materials and publications that proved an invaluable resource for thinking and teaching about a region which was obviously important to an understanding of the prehistory of the South Pacific.

A few years later I was able to make practical use of the information about people and places that was supplied by van Heekeren's two books and filled the pages of each successive issue of *Asian Perspectives*, which with volume II(2) had become the official organ of FEPA, produced by its American branch (AP 1958a: 1) and published by Hong Kong University Press (AP 1958b). In 1961 I had joined the Department of Anthropology and Sociology in the Research School of Pacific Studies at the Australian National University, at a time when teaching and research in prehistory was on the point of revolutionary expansion in Australia. Towards the end of the year I was able to set out on a familiarisation trip to meet workers in the fields of Pacific and Southeast Asian prehistory and inspect archaeological and ethnographic collections in metropolitan and regional museums. At an early stage of this I stopped in Hawaii to see Bill Solheim, the editor of *Asian Perspectives*, who was the centre of a seemingly limitless network of academic communication. In Europe I visited van Heekeren in the Netherlands. He gave me the name of a young Indonesian archaeologist to go to see on my way back through Southeast Asia towards the middle of 1962. This was R. P. Soejono, our immediate Past President, at the time the only prehistorian on the staff of the Indonesian Archaeological Service, an institution of colonial times that Indonesian scholars had taken over from the Dutch. In 1962 Soejono was based in Bali, in charge of the Service's branch office in Gianjar.

By this time both of us had been drawn into the affairs of IPPA. Soejono was helping Soekmono, the head of the Archaeological Service, as Regional Editor, Indonesia, for *Asian Perspectives* (AP 1959: vii) and had attended the X Congress of the Pacific Science Association (PSA) in Honolulu in August-September 1961, at which FEPA was joint sponsor of the archaeological sessions (AP 1961: 1). I was unable to be present at this meeting, but had been appointed to the FEPA Executive at a meeting there (AP 1961: 5).

FEPA next met as part of the XI Pacific Science Congress in Japan in 1966 and here the PSA Council accepted an invitation to hold its XII Congress in Australia in 1971, with Canberra as the venue. It was expected that as usual FEPA would be joint sponsor of the archaeological programme and that its local members, in this case primarily the prehistorians at the Australian National University, would be the organisers of it.

#### FEPA AND PSA

The close connection between FEPA and PSA went back a long way, further back paradoxically than the formation of FEPA itself in 1953. The circumstances are reviewed in two historical sketches by Solheim, one in the first issue of *Asian Perspectives* (Solheim 1957), the second in the Foreword to the volume which recorded the proceedings of the first Congress held after the name change from FEPA to IPPA, in Poona (Pune), India, in December 1978 (Solheim in Solheim & Golson 1985: v-vi). The Poona Congress was, by Solheim's reckoning, the tenth in line from the first of three Congresses of Prehistorians of the Far East held before World War II, from which the Association formed in 1953 took its name. The first of these three Congresses was held in Hanoi in 1932, the second in Manila in 1935 and the third in Singapore in 1938; a fourth was planned for Hong Kong in 1941, but abandoned due to the imminence of war in the Pacific.

These were all small meetings, the core of which was made up of official delegates of colonial institutions in the East and Southeast Asian region: the French in Indochina, the Dutch in the East Indies, the Americans in the Philippines and the British in Hong Kong, British Borneo, Malaya and the Straits Settlements. There was variable representation of Thailand (under the name of Siam), China and Japan. At the third Congress Australia and New Zealand appeared on the scene, in the persons of two museum men, F. D. McCarthy from Sydney and H. D. Skinner from Dunedin. There was no continuing organisation between Congresses: the official delegates at one Congress decided on the venue for the next and the representatives of the selected territory undertook the responsibility of setting it up.

The driving force behind these developments was van Stein Callenfels, Inspector of the Archaeological Service of the Netherlands Indies (PAO 1932a: 20; cf. PAO 1932b: 27), a commanding figure of great energy and prestige, whom van Heekeren (1957: Preface) calls the founder of Indonesian prehistoric archaeology and our Association honours as its own in the first Article of its Constitution (cf. IPPA 1993c: 135). His name was associated with a resolution put to the IV Pacific Science Congress in Batavia (Jakarta) and Bandung in 1929, on behalf of the prehistorians of the Far East present there, establishing the principle of three-yearly prehistory meetings,

with Hanoi as the venue for the first (PAO 1932a: 16, 19; cf. PAO 1932b: 29).

It was at another Pacific Science Congress, the eighth, in Manila in 1953, that the next step was taken (Groslier 1957; Solheim 1957: 6-7; Solheim in Solheim & Golson 1985: v). The prehistory sessions were organised by the American H. Otley Beyer, of the University of the Philippines, who had been the Philippines delegate to all three of the Congresses held pre-War. The sessions he organised in 1953 came to constitute the fourth in the series. More than this, it was decided to form a Far Eastern Prehistory Association, with a representative Council and an Executive Committee selected from it, to serve as a continuing link between scholars of the prehistory of the region, organised where feasible into national branches, and to hold periodic Congresses. The membership of the Council reflected an expansion of the horizons of the pre-War Congresses, with Australia and New Zealand now officially recognised and Hawaii/USA added (Solheim 1957: 6). The colonial presence was still heavy on both Council and Executive, though Solheim (1957: 9) notes that there was a much wider representation of non-European scholars among the official delegations in Manila than previously, in the context of a much larger attendance overall.

Four years later, in a statement as Chairman of the Executive Committee in the first volume of *Asian Perspectives*, Bernard Groslier, representing Indochina, pointed to obstacles confronting the new organisation by reason of the small number of its members, their spread around the world, the low profile of its research field and the political problems associated with it (Groslier 1957: vi-vii). As a result, the Executive had abandoned plans to hold an independent Congress and accepted an invitation to co-sponsor the meeting of the Anthropology Division of the IX Pacific Science Congress to take place at the end of 1957 in Bangkok (Groslier 1957: viii-ix). Solheim reports (in Solheim & Golson 1985: v) that very few prehistorians were present there, but some business was transacted, so that, in the absence of a constitution to define a quorum and because Groslier was in attendance, he counts this as the fifth Congress.

It is instructive to quote Groslier (1957: viii) on the considerations which prompted the Executive to take its decision to join the PSA Congress in Bangkok, because they set FEPA policy for some years to come:

Thus, we considered that it was probably better, for the time being, to keep close contact between the FEPA and the Pacific Science Association. After all, the FEPA is an offshoot of the PSA. Specialists concerned with the archaeology of the Pacific are not so numerous as to justify two international congresses. To organize separate meetings of the FEPA and of the Anthropology Division of the PSA would probably be an [*sic*] hindrance, and also a very ungrateful attitude,

toward the PSA, which has always been of the greatest help.

FEPA's sixth Congress was held with the X Pacific Science Congress in Honolulu in 1961 and the seventh with the XI Pacific Science Congress in Tokyo and Kyoto in 1966 (Solheim in Solheim & Golson 1985: vi). It was something of a shock, therefore, when the Australian Organising Committee of the XII Pacific Science Congress to take place in Canberra in August 1971 proposed a form of organisation for it which made it impossible for FEPA to hold its own meetings. The plan was to do away with disciplinary sessions and replace them with a series of interdisciplinary symposia on wide-ranging themes.

As Solheim reports (in Solheim & Golson 1985: vi), the Australian organisers were determined to avoid the huge numbers - over 5000 - that had attended the PSA Congress in Japan. However, the format they announced was not simply a device to reduce attendance to a more manageable 2000. It was primarily a way of avoiding a situation where, not for the first time (Elkin 1961: 44), specialist meetings threatened to dominate at PSA Congresses to the detriment of the Association's mandate to "initiate and promote co-operation in the study of scientific problems relating to the Pacific region, more particularly those affecting the prosperity and well-being of Pacific peoples" (Article 2(a) of the Constitution, Elkin 1961: 75).

By great good fortune the International Congress of Orientalists (now the International Congress of Asian and North African Studies) was due to hold its 28th Congress in Canberra in January 1971. I have described elsewhere (Golson 1972) how an approach through its President, Professor A. L. Basham, to its Organising Committee led not only to FEPA's admission as a full participant in its programme, but to the provision of organisational and financial support on the same basis as to the Congress' own long-standing sections. Thus FEPA's sectional programme at the larger meeting became its own eighth Congress.

#### THE MOVE TO INDEPENDENT CONGRESSES

It is now usual to look back on the Canberra Congress as marking a turning point in the history of the Association (cf. Solheim in Solheim & Golson 1985: vi). There are a number of reasons for this.

Because of the money made available by the host Congress, supplemented by grants obtained by the Australian organisers of the FEPA programme from the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research and the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, there was an unprecedentedly wide representation of scholars from the Asian and Pacific regions, including for the first time the countries of South Asia, as well as an excellent attendance from Australia and New Zealand and the presence of

scholars from North America and Europe (Golson 1972: 3).

In addition to a significant academic programme in the lecture hall, there was for 23 of the overseas participants a two-weeks archaeological bus tour (funded by the not long established Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies) through southeastern Australia (with a short side trip by air to Tasmania) to see archaeological sites and collections and meet the archaeologists working on them on the spot (Mulvaney 1972; 1993: 23-24, with a now historic photograph reproduced as Plate 2 on page 25). It is impossible to overestimate the importance of this marathon journey for the strengthening of professional links among participants both at the individual level and that of the Association.

The sense of self-confidence and self-consciousness generated by the Canberra Congress overall was captured by Solheim in a report on the business discussions that took place there, aptly called "The future of F.E.P.A.", where he wrote: "Thus while we continue an association with the Pacific Science Association we do declare our independence thereof" (Solheim 1972: 15).

This brave assertion was almost immediately put to the test. The Canadian organisers of the XIII Pacific Science Congress in Vancouver in 1975 decided on a format for their meetings which returned part-way to that jettisoned by the Australian organisers for the preceding Congress in Canberra, but no-one could be found in the host city to take on the organisation of a FEPA component. However, the Association was able to take up an enthusiastic invitation from José Garanger, a French participant in the Canberra Congress and the post-Congress archaeological tour, to hold its ninth Congress as a section of the IX International Congress of Pre- and Protohistoric Sciences in Nice in September 1976 (FEPA 1975a: 1). Garanger not only organised the FEPA programme, he also arranged the pre-Congress printing of the papers and their post-Congress publication in successive issues of *Journal de la Société des Océanistes*. At Nice the Association accepted to meet for its tenth Congress, under the new name of IPPA, as one of the post-plenary symposia of the X International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, whose plenary sessions were held in New Delhi in December 1978 (Golson in Solheim & Golson 1985: vii). The IPPA Congress took place at Deccan College in Poona, the arrangements were made by V. N. Misra (1985) and the proceedings were published in India under the joint editorship of Misra and Peter Bellwood (1985). Misra had been at the Canberra Congress and on the post-Congress tour.

The Constitution adopted in Nice in 1976 (cf. FEPA 1975d: 27, Article VII(A)1.) and the Bylaws that followed two years later at Poona (cf. IPPA 1985b: 149, Chapter IV(A)1.) signalled the weakening of the relationship with PSA by empowering the Executive to arrange a Congress

every four years in association with any appropriate international meeting. The Poona meeting acknowledged that an appropriate occasion would be the XV Pacific Science Congress likely to be held in Dunedin, New Zealand, in 1983, but passed a resolution that the Association should try to organise a Congress of its own before that, and in Southeast Asia, specifically the Philippines (undated Newsletter circulated with IPPA Bulletin 2 of 1980, page 3; cf. IPPA 1979: 3).

There is no doubt that this decision sprang from the recognition that by linking itself with other organisations the Association lost control over the location of its Congresses (undated Newsletter cited above, page 5). As a result it had been meeting for a long time at the peripheries of its region, and on one occasion totally outside it, to the neglect of its Southeast Asian heartland. Indeed, not only had there been no Association meeting there since 1957, and that, in Bangkok, hardly a real one, for reasons cited earlier (quoting Solheim in Solheim & Golson 1985: v), but the only other occasion was when the Association had actually been founded, in Manila in 1953.

In the event little progress had been made with arrangements when Bill Solheim came to the end of his term as President under the 1976 Constitution. One of my early concerns, therefore, when I took over from him on 1 October 1980, was to get back under the wing of PSA for our 11th Congress (undated Newsletter cited above, pages 3-4). The Secretary of the Section on Social Sciences and Humanities of the XV Pacific Science Congress, of whose programme archaeological sessions would form part, was Foss Leach of the Department of Anthropology of the University of Otago, Dunedin, an IPPA member. After consultation with his Committee, and with the Secretary-General of the XV Congress as a whole, Charles Higham, Professor in the same Department and an IPPA member who had been at the Canberra Congress and on the subsequent archaeological tour, Leach sent an invitation for the Association to have the archaeological sessions which he and his colleagues were organising constitute its eleventh Congress. It was an invitation that I accepted with pleasure, and relief.

The Business Meeting held in Dunedin empowered the Executive to reopen the question of a Congress in the Southeast Asian region, given the opportunity afforded by the fact that PSA was to hold an InterCongress in the Philippines in February 1985 and that the Philippines Organising Committee was sympathetic to the idea of the Association meeting under its auspices (IPPA Newsletter June 1983, page 2). As things worked out (IPPA Newsletter November 1983, pages 2-3), it was early agreed with the PSA organisers in the Philippines that it would be better for the two bodies to have their conferences separately, but that full publicity would be provided by each for the other and the two gatherings scheduled for con-

secutive weeks. The National Museum of the Philippines then issued its own invitation to the Association.

The 12th IPPA Congress, at which I handed over as President to Virendra Misra (India), took place in Manila and Peñablanca in January-February 1985. Co-organised with the National Museum of the Philippines in association with the Indonesian Research Centre for Archaeology (IPPA 1984b), it was both a deliberate return to the historic centre and the first independent Congress since Singapore in 1938. It followed the programme that had been planned for the earlier, aborted, Philippines conference, which had been conceived as a meeting with a regional focus taking place between wider-ranging Congresses held in association with some larger international organisation (IPPA Newsletter June 1983, page 2). The focus was the Philippines in particular and island Southeast Asia in general, considered in the context of the neighbouring mainland in one direction and the islands immediately north, east and south in others.

The success of the Philippines Congress was such that the Business Meeting instructed the Executive to explore the possibility of another independent Congress (IPPA 1984b: 8; IPPA Newsletter 21 May 1985, page 1). The four options the Executive had before it, Indonesia, Assam, Japan and Guam (IPPA Newsletter 21 May 1985, pages 2-3), were a measure of the Association's growing strength and reputation. The choice made for the 13th Congress was a double one, of Japan and Guam, which it was possible to arrange in consecutive segments in September 1987. The aim was to present the Association in two rather new domains. Japan was attractive because though its archaeological fraternity was immense, the Association was poorly represented there, while neither Japanese archaeology nor the work of Japanese archaeologists on the prehistory of Oceania and Southeast Asia had much of a presence in IPPA's own academic discussions. The sessions, held in Osaka and Tokyo with IPPA President Misra in attendance, were co-sponsored with the National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka, and the young Japanese Society for Oceanic Studies, and organised by a Japanese committee in consultation with the secretariat of the Association in Canberra (Ohtsuka 1988). As for Guam, the Association had been approached about its possible interest in plans of the University of Guam for a conference on archaeology in Micronesia, an area where a great deal of work had been done over the previous 20 years, which was not well-known to the outside world. The Guam meeting was co-sponsored by the two institutions and locally organised (Hunter-Anderson 1988). It constituted "the first international conference entirely devoted to Micronesian archaeology and physical anthropology" (Hunter-Anderson 1988: 17).

The 14th IPPA Congress in Yogyakarta in August-September 1990 (Bellwood 1991), held under the presidency of Roger Green (New Zealand), marks the point at

which the Association can be said to have come of age. A Central Organizing Committee chaired by Soejono planned it on an ambitious scale, with parallel sessions on a number of basic themes common to the prehistory of major regions of the vast area falling under the Association's banner. It attracted a correspondingly high level of scholarly participation: 165 people from 27 countries (Bellwood 1991: 1; another source, Final Report n.d.: 79-110, gives an attendance list of 181), compared with 133 from 16 countries in Japan, the overwhelming majority from the host nation (attendance list in Ohtsuka 1988: 9-16), and 93 from 18 countries in the Philippines (attendance list in IPPA 1984b: 9-12). Under the editorial coordination of Bellwood and through Soejono's good offices in the matter of production, the proceedings of the Congress were published as issues of the IPPA Bulletin (IPPA 1991a, 1991b, 1992) under the joint imprint of the Association and the Asosiasi Prehistorisi Indonesia. They present an overview of Indo-Pacific prehistory in 1990 which constitutes an invaluable resource for archaeologists inside and outside the region and a reference point for future work.

The 15th Congress, in Thailand, was held at Chiang Mai in January 1994 with Soejono as President. Co-organised principally with SPAFA (Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization Regional Centre for Archaeology and Fine Arts), the Congress maintained the high level of coverage and participation achieved at Yogyakarta, with six main themes organised in 24 sessions (IPPA 1996a: 1-6), some in continuation of heads of discussion at Yogyakarta, others opening up new fields, like that of archaeology, cultural resource management and the public (cf. IPPA 1993a, b). Some 200 people attended the Congress (IPPA 1996a: 1) and the proceedings were again published as issues of the IPPA Bulletin (IPPA 1996a, b, 1997). Immediately before the Chiang Mai Congress an Anniversary Conference was held in Hanoi, The Hoabinhian 60 years after Madeleine Colani, honouring one of the original Prehistorians of the Far East, at which Soejono and other IPPA members were present.

The 16th Congress in Melaka, Malaysia, in July 1998, with Pisit Charoenwongsa (Thailand) as the Association's President, will be the second consecutive IPPA conference to be held at a four-year interval from its predecessor. If this is to be the pattern of its future Congresses, it is two years out of phase with the four-year terms of its Presidents, which started with the Nice Congress of 1976 (IPPA 1993b: 139-140, Chapter III(A)). This resulted from the irregularity of its meetings following the loosening of the link with PSA Congresses in 1971. It then took some time for the Association to decide how frequently it wanted to meet when it finally began to hold independent Congresses in 1985.

A postal ballot on constitutional changes proposed at the Yogyakarta meeting in 1990 led to the rewording of

Chapter IV(A)1. of the Bylaws (IPPA 1985b: 149) to acknowledge the fact that the Association had been holding independent Congresses successfully for some time and left any decision whether to continue independently or join with a larger organisation to the Executive Committee (IPPA 1993c: 141). Anomalously, the corresponding section of the main Constitution, Article VI(A)1. (IPPA 1985b: 145), was not amended at the same time and still talks about the Association holding its Congresses in association with some other international meeting, the possibility of an independent Congress to be explored should this prove to be impossible (IPPA 1993c: 138).

#### THE ASSOCIATION'S PUBLICATIONS

If IPPA has only managed relatively recently to achieve regularity in the timing of its Congresses, it did so many years ago with regard to its publications, under the hand of its long-serving Secretary-Treasurer (now Secretary-General) and Editor, Peter Bellwood.

As the result of a continuous history of financial uncertainty, *Asian Perspectives* had been taken over by the University of Hawaii with the appearance of Volume VIII (1964) in 1966 (AP 1966) and ceased to be FEPA's official organ (Solheim in Solheim & Golson 1985: v-vi). The Association's well-attended ninth Congress in Canberra in 1971 was unanimous on the need for a regular newsletter to keep the membership up to date with developments in the FEPA region, as well as in the Association itself, which at the Canberra meetings was discovering a new sense of identity and purpose. It was decided that such a newsletter would take over the regional news and bibliography section of *Asian Perspectives* (cf. AP 1972), for which purpose regional editors would be appointed to report periodically on developments in their area (FEPA 1972: 1; Solheim 1972: 16). The hosts of the 1971 Congress at the Australian National University were given the responsibility for organisation and production and Ron Lampert appointed editor. Lampert brought out six issues of the FEPA Newsletter before the Association met at its tenth Congress in Nice in 1976. They played a vital role in maintaining the corporate spirit generated at the Canberra Congress over the period up to the 1976 meeting, when members were called on to take important decisions about the future shape of their Association. However, both Lampert and his deputy editor for the Southeast Asian region, Helmut Loofs, had difficulty in securing the flow of regional reports central to the Newsletter's purpose, and in some cases any reports at all (FEPA 1975a: 2; 1975b: 2; 1975c: 27; 1976a; 1976b: 7).

Following the Nice Congress, Lampert, who was formally appointed Secretary-Treasurer and Editor of the renamed organisation there, changed his policy (IPPA 1977). He established an IPPA Newsletter as a single-sheet production to be sent out by airmail with information needing to be brought to the early attention of mem-

bers and began an IPPA Bulletin to play the same regional role as the former FEPA Newsletter. In this he was again to be helped by Loofs for Southeast Asia (cf. IPPA 1980, where Loofs is now Loofs-Wissowa). He produced two issues of the Newsletter and one of the Bulletin before he tendered his resignation to the Poona Congress in 1978 and was replaced, both as Secretary-Treasurer and as Editor, by Bellwood.

It is to Bellwood, who still occupies the positions he took up in 1978, that the Association owes the development of the Bulletin by which it is served today: well-produced, of good academic standard, comprehensive in coverage and appearing annually. He set out his editorial policy in the first issue with which his name was associated, No. 2 of 1980 (Bellwood 1980): he did not wish to take detailed research papers of the kind suitable for major academic journals, but to provide for the membership up-to-date regional reports of the type pioneered by *Asian Perspectives*, which Lampert had sought to continue, together with short reports on recent, important and topical discoveries - ten-page descriptions of recent fieldwork, thesis research and planned projects, as he put it on another occasion (IPPA 1984). He achieved his success because he abandoned the practice of relying on regional editors, which had caused Lampert and Loofs such trouble, and drew on his own extensive network in the Indo-Pacific world to get individuals to write reports when they were needed (cf. Bellwood 1980). The Association has been content to leave him the editorial freedom which his policy requires because of the results it has produced.

Bellwood has made the IPPA Bulletin a journal of record for the Association as well as a vehicle for research reports. From 1985 he published reports on Congresses, including the complete scientific programme and sometimes the names and addresses of people attending: IPPA 1984b for Manila-Peñablanca in 1985; Ohtsuka 1988 and Hunter-Anderson 1988 for Osaka-Tokyo and Guam in 1987 respectively. In the same way his editorials kept track of the publication of papers from previous Congresses (IPPA 1984a, 1985a, 1988). From 1990 he began to use the Bulletin for the publication of Congress proceedings: 1991a, 1991b and 1992 for the papers from Yogyakarta, 1996a, 1996b and 1997 for those from Chiang Mai.

In the course of these developments the IPPA Newsletter changed its style. After the two produced by Lampert before his resignation, Solheim issued a third as President (IPPA 1979) and this was the last to be numbered. I continued Solheim's presidential initiative by sending out four Newsletters over my term of office, and a farewell one after I had already handed over the Presidency to Virendra Misra, in all of which I tried to raise issues of policy as well as practical matters. Since then the important job of keeping the membership in touch with the affairs of the Association has been left to Bellwood as

Secretary, who has done it more in the form of circulars than a Newsletter.

#### MAKING A CONSTITUTION

The level of intercommunication between the Officers of the Association and the membership has been in part determined by the nature of the constitution which it adopted for itself at the Nice Congress of 1976.

When FEPA was established as a formal association at the fourth Congress in Manila in 1953, a Council of twelve was set up to act on its behalf between Congresses, made up of representatives from Australia, China (Taiwan), Hong Kong, Indochina, Indonesia, Japan, Malaya, New Zealand, the Philippines and Thailand. An Executive Committee of five was chosen from among the members and Council appointed two of them as President and Secretary (Solheim 1957: 6). The personnel of these bodies continued unchanged until the sixth FEPA Congress in Honolulu in 1961, when it was decided to expand the existing Council by electing, or making a place for, a Council member to represent every country, and some territories, within the Association's area of interest, and more than one for countries with a greater number of archaeologists at work there, USA (3), Japan (2) and Australia (2). It is unclear what happened to this expanded body, since *Asian Perspectives* no longer reported the affairs of the Association after it was taken over by the University of Hawaii in 1966. As a result, there was no account of the business meeting held at the seventh FEPA Congress in Japan in 1966, though we know from Solheim (in Solheim & Golson 1985: vi) that he was elected to a second term as President and Roger Duff from New Zealand re-elected Secretary, a post he had held since 1953.

Everything that had happened since 1953 took place without the benefit of a constitution to specify procedures and Solheim reports (1972: 15; in Solheim & Golson 1985: vi) that no enthusiasm was shown for adopting one whenever the matter was raised.

The mood at the Canberra Congress of 1971 was quite different and a series of meetings was held to discuss the formalisation of the Association and the drafting of a constitution to enshrine it (Solheim 1972). A committee of seven was set up to continue work during the post-Congress tour and this continued in existence as an interim Executive Committee of the Association charged with bringing recommendations to the next Congress.

Bill Solheim was responsible for the draft constitution circulated to members by Newsletter in 1975 (FEPA 1975d), which, with minor amendments, was adopted at Nice in 1976, while the bylaws spelling out its detailed working were drawn up by an IPPA select committee of three, assisted by Soejono, meeting at the second PSA InterCongress in Bali in 1977 and approved, after amendment, at the Poona Congress in 1978 (Solheim in Solheim & Golson 1985: vi). Changes to the Constitution

and Bylaws since then have represented at most a streamlining of procedures (cf. the versions in IPPA 1985b and 1993c). The basic principles have remained and they deserve attention, for they show the Association coming to terms with the complex region which it was endeavouring to serve, defined in Article II(B) as comprising east Asia and the Pacific, with east Asia including "Pakistan and north from there roughly along the line of 70° longitude and to the east" (e.g. IPPA 1993c: 135).

Among the three objectives which the Association set itself (Article II) was a commitment "to uphold and improve legal and scientific methods of prehistorical and related research in the field and in the laboratory and to help the countries in the IPPA region prevent illegal excavation and illegal trade in antiquities" (e.g. IPPA 1993c: 135).

Following from this statement of an ethical position was a provision for control over membership. Though categories of membership have undergone changes in definition over the years, the original principles have been retained of nomination and seconding by existing members, the written agreement of applicants to abide by the objectives of the Association and the ratification of all proposed memberships by the Executive (IPPA 1993c: 135-136, Article III). Chapter II of the Bylaws (IPPA 1993c: 139) is explicit that membership of the organisation is not an unalienable right and sets out the procedures by which an individual or institution can be stripped of membership. Subsequently a new category of Subscriber has been introduced, with an entitlement only to receive the Bulletin in return for payment of a subscription (Newsletter, 23 October 1990: 2-3; IPPA 1993c: 135, 139 for Article III of the Constitution and Chapter III of the Bylaws respectively).

There was recognition in the discussions that began at the Canberra Congress about putting the Association on a more formal footing that the payment of dues was more difficult for scholars of some countries than for those of others, while there were legal restrictions in some places on the export of currency (FEPA 1972: 2). In these circumstances provision was made on the one hand for a sliding scale of subscriptions, depending on the ability of an individual to pay, and on the other for dues to be paid within a country and applied to the work of the Association locally.

It is, however, in the arrangements for its governance that the Association's recognition of the complex realities of the geographical area of its coverage is best seen, with the attempt to achieve a balance between regional, national and expatriate interests. Solheim's draft proposals, which formed the basis of the Constitution in its original form, and the Bylaws which came to supplement it, envisaged an Executive Committee made up of regional representatives and a General Council made up of country representatives sitting together to form the governing body of

the Association (FEPA 1975d: 24-25, Article V; IPPA 1978: 3, Chapter IV). There is little doubt that Solheim's concept of the General Council was taken from the enlarged Council set up at the sixth FEPA Congress in Honolulu in 1961. In terms of this, every country of the IPPA region was automatically a member of the General Council and any other country (or group of countries) could become so, with one representative per country (or group) chosen by an accredited national archaeological organisation. The General Council would assume its constitutionally prescribed role as governing body when 20 such organisations had nominated their representatives. On the eve of the Poona Congress Solheim made a presidential appeal for more national archaeological organisations to seek accreditation, since only three had done so (IPPA 1978: 4). Six months later he noted that there were still only four accredited bodies, with a fifth case imminent (IPPA 1979: 2). He was still urging the case many months later (undated Newsletter circulated with IPPA Bulletin 2 of 1980, page 6), reporting that there were then six accredited bodies and pointing out that only ten were needed to make a quorum and thus for the General Council to become legally constituted. In the event this never happened and the whole concept was removed from the Constitution as the result of a postal ballot of the membership following the 1983 Business Meeting in Dunedin (cf. IPPA 1985b).

There is a final word to be said about this unsuccessful attempt to marry country and regional representation in the affairs of IPPA. A modified version of the IPPA formula was included in the Constitution of the World Archaeological Congress, on whose Steering Committee I sat during 1986 and 1987, when that body was in process of formation. The modification produces a workable solution in that it depends not on national organisations making nominations, but on members of each country in attendance at a four-yearly Congress electing a representative to form, with members of an Executive Committee elected by region, a Council that sits for the duration of a Congress (WAB 1991: Articles 7 and 9).

With the demise of the concept of a General Council for IPPA, the constitutional provisions for its Officers and Executive Committee became all the more important as an assurance that these agents of the Association adequately reflected the interests of its varied electorate. They have in fact come to differ only in detail from those of the Constitution adopted in 1976 (see IPPA 1993c: 136-137, Article V(A) and (B)).

The Executive Committee consists of up to eleven members, including the President, Vice-President and Secretary-Treasurer (now Secretary-General), the last being appointed on the recommendation of the President and not necessarily one of the elected members of the Executive. The President and the Vice-President serve for four years and the Vice-President succeeds to the position of

President at the end of that period. Nominations for Vice-President are requested from the membership at four-yearly intervals by Newsletter and election is by postal ballot. The only restriction on election is that the President and the Vice-President cannot be citizens of the same country.

The eight ordinary members of the Executive, who serve for eight years, are to be as widely representative as possible: no more than two of them can be from the same country; there must be at least one member who is a citizen, resident or specialist of each of the four general areas covered by the Association, Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia, South Asia and Oceania; no more than half the members can come from outside the IPPA area; and no member can be renominated to fill the vacancy created by his or her completion of term. Two members retire every two years, nominations for their replacements are called for by Newsletter and elections are conducted by postal ballot.

The Executive reports to a Business Meeting held on the occasion of every Congress and its report is made available to the membership at large by Newsletter. The so-called Final Report (n.d.) of the Yogyakarta Congress of 1990 was not official in this sense, but an initiative apparently of the Indonesian Organizing Committee.

In the absence of a General Council as the governing body of the Association, as originally intended, the Business Meeting has essentially become the ultimate authority.

## CONCLUSIONS

The Association today is a still growing body of some 400 members, which has won for itself a place on the world archaeological scene as a significant organisation of regional archaeology. It has come to fulfil the plans of those whom it considers its distant founders to arrange for regular independent meetings of the prehistorians of an important but poorly known region of world culture. In the process it has transformed itself, without loss of continuity, from a small and self-perpetuating body of largely expatriate scholars into a large, autonomous and democratically structured institution with a constitution designed to achieve representativeness and balance in the context of the heterogeneous interests which it includes. Finally, it has outgrown the narrowly academic horizons imputed to it in its days as FEPA by the historian of the Pacific Science Association (Elkin 1961: 62-63) and come increasingly to represent the concerns of scholars in the region in the investigation of their history and the protection of its material manifestations. The essence of these various developments is symbolised in the change of name transacted in 1976, from FEPA, which defined its region from an expatriate point of view, to IPPA, which situates the Association within it.

Questions of geographical and temporal coverage are potential sources of difficulty for IPPA, as they were for Solheim defining in the first issue of *Asian Perspectives* (AP 1957: 1-2) the exact scope of the new publication and thus of FEPA itself.

The large area subsumed under FEPA in the 1950s was extended in the 1970s to include South Asia, with a claim, to the north of this, to virtually everything east of the Urals (Article II(B) of the Constitution, IPPA 1993c: 135). The diversity of prehistoric experience and archaeological problem in this enormous region is in the long run likely to challenge the capacity of the Association to cater for it (cf. IPPA Newsletter 21 May 1985, page 2) and cause it to be more specific in the definition of its mission.

As regards its temporal coverage, there has always been a liberal interpretation of the term "prehistory" at Association meetings and in its publications. However, I remember general agreement during the discussions preceding the Association's formalisation in the mid-70s that its brief should not extend to the archaeology of literate societies, though I can find nothing in the available documents to confirm this. I am sure that the postal ballot arising from the Chiang Mai meeting for a change in the name of the Association from Indo-Pacific Prehistory to Indo-Pacific Archaeology (Newsletter of September 1994) was less a vote about its archaeological coverage than about the adoption of a name with more meaning for the general public. Though more people (81) voted in favour of the change than against it (51), the proposal was defeated because of the constitutional requirement (Article VII, IPPA 1993c: 138) for a two-thirds majority on constitutional matters (Newsletter of February 1995 and an undated one shortly afterwards).

Perhaps, however, a future article on the history of the Association will have the title 'From IPPA to IPAA'.

## REFERENCES

- AP 1957. Editorial. *Asian Perspectives* I: 1-5.
- AP 1958a. Editorial. *Asian Perspectives* II(1): 1-2.
- AP 1958b. Editorial. *Asian Perspectives* II(2): vii.
- AP 1959. Editorial. *Asian Perspectives* III(1): vii-viii.
- AP 1961. Tenth Pacific Science Congress. *Asian Perspectives* V: 1-4.
- AP 1966. Editorial. *Asian Perspectives* IX: v.
- AP 1972. Editorial. *Asian Perspectives* XV: v.
- Bellwood, P. 1980. General editorial policy for the IPPA Bulletin. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 2: vii.
- Bellwood, P. 1991. The 14th Congress of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 10: 1-11.



INDO-PACIFIC PREHISTORY ASSOCIATION BULLETIN 17, 1998

- Elkin, A. P. 1961. Pacific Science Association: its history and role in international cooperation. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- FEPA 1972. A Newsletter for the Far Eastern Prehistory Association. *Newsletter of the Far Eastern Prehistory Association* 1: 1-2.
- FEPA 1975a. Editorial. *Newsletter of the Far Eastern Prehistory Association* 4: 1-2.
- FEPA 1975b. Editorial. *Newsletter of the Far Eastern Prehistory Association* 5: 1-2.
- FEPA 1975c. Regional editorial. *Newsletter of the Far Eastern Prehistory Association* 5: 27-29.
- FEPA 1975d. FEPA draft constitution and bylaws. *Newsletter of the Far Eastern Prehistory Association* 4: 23-29.
- FEPA 1976a. Editorial. *Newsletter of the Far Eastern Prehistory Association* 6: 1.
- FEPA 1976b. Regional editorial. *Newsletter of the Far Eastern Prehistory Association* 6: 7-9.
- Final Report n.d. Final Report, 14th Congress of the IPPA, Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association, 25 August - 2 September 1990, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. (Apparently a report of the Indonesian Organizing Committee).
- Golson, J. 1972. 8th Congress of the Far Eastern Prehistory Association. *Newsletter of the Far Eastern Prehistory Association* 1: 3-4.
- Groslier, B. P. 1957. The Far-Eastern Prehistory Association 1953-1957. *Asian Perspectives* 1: v-ix.
- Heekeren, H. R. van 1957. *The Stone Age of Indonesia*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Heekeren, H. R. van 1958. *The Bronze-Iron Age of Indonesia*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Hunter-Anderson, R. 1988. The Micronesian archaeological conference. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 8: 17-25.
- IPPA 1977. *IPPA Newsletter* 1.
- IPPA 1978. *IPPA Newsletter* 2.
- IPPA 1979. *IPPA Newsletter* 3.
- IPPA 1980. Editorial for this issue devoted to Southeast Asia. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 2: viii.
- IPPA 1984a. Editorial. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 5: iv.
- IPPA 1984b. The 12th Congress of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 5: 1-13.
- IPPA 1985a. Editorial. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 6: iv.
- IPPA 1985b. Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association Constitution and Bylaws. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 6: 142-150.
- IPPA 1988. Editorial. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 8: 4.
- IPPA 1991a. *Indo-Pacific prehistory 1990*, volume 1. Canberra: Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association, and Jakarta: Asosiasi Prehistorisi Indonesia, Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association 10.
- IPPA 1991b. *Indo-Pacific prehistory 1990*, volume 2. Canberra: Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association, and Jakarta: Asosiasi Prehistorisi Indonesia, Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association 11.
- IPPA 1992. *Indo-Pacific prehistory 1990*, volume 3. Canberra: Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association, and Jakarta: Asosiasi Prehistorisi Indonesia, Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association 12.
- IPPA 1993a. Editorial. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 13: 1.
- IPPA 1993b. Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association 15th Congress, Chiang Mai, Thailand, January 5-12, 1994. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 13: 2-3.
- IPPA 1993c. The Constitution of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association (revised 1990). *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 13: 135-142.
- IPPA 1996a. *Indo-Pacific prehistory: the Chiang Mai papers*, volume 1, editorial convenor Peter Bellwood. Canberra: Australian National University, Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association, Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association 14.
- IPPA 1996b. *Indo-Pacific prehistory: the Chiang Mai papers*, volume 2, editorial convenors Ian C. Glover and Peter Bellwood. Canberra: Australian National University, Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association, Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association 15.
- IPPA 1997. *Indo-Pacific prehistory: the Chiang Mai papers*, volume 3, editorial convenors Peter Bellwood and Dianne Tillotson. Canberra: Australian National University, Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association, Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association 16.
- Misra, V. N. 1985. Acknowledgements. In V. N. Misra and P. Bellwood (eds), *Recent advances in Indo-Pacific prehistory*: ix-xi. New Delhi: Oxford & IBH.
- Misra, V. N. and P. Bellwood (eds) 1985. *Recent advances in Indo-Pacific prehistory*. New Delhi: Oxford & IBH Publishing Co.
- Mulvaney, D. J. 1972. The Congress tour of Australian archaeological sites. *Newsletter of the Far Eastern Prehistory Association* 1: 11-14.
- Mulvaney, D. J. 1993. From Cambridge to the bush. In M. Spriggs, D. E. Yen, W. Ambrose, R. Jones, A. Thorne & A. Andrews (eds), *A community of culture: the people and prehistory of the Pacific*: 18-26. Canberra: Department of Prehistory, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, Occasional Papers in Prehistory No. 21.
- Ohtsuka, R. 1988. The 13th Congress of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association (Japan). *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 8: 5-16.
- PAO 1932a. Discours prononcés à la séance d'ouverture du Congrès: discours de M. G. Cœdès, Directeur de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient. In *Præhistorica Asiæ Orientalis I. Premier Congrès des Préhistoriens d'Extrême-*

GOLSON, FROM FEPA TO IPPA

- Orient, Hanoi (1932)*: 16-22. Hanoi: Imprimerie d'Extrême-Orient.
- PAO 1932b. Discours prononcés à la séance d'ouverture du Congrès: discours du Dr. P. van Stein Callenfels, Délégué des Indes Néerlandaises. In *Præhistorica Asiæ Orientalis I. Premier Congrès des Préhistoriens d'Extrême-Orient, Hanoi (1932)*: 27-30. Hanoi: Imprimerie d'Extrême-Orient.
- Solheim, W. G., II 1957. The Far-Eastern Prehistory Association. *Asian Perspectives* 1: 6-11.
- Solheim, W. G., II 1961. Eastern Asia and Oceania. *Asian Perspectives* 5: 5-15.
- Solheim, W. G., II 1972. The future of F.E.P.A. *Newsletter of the Far Eastern Prehistory Association* 1: 15-17.
- Solheim, W. G., II & J. Golson 1985. Foreword. In V. N. Misra & P. Bellwood (eds), *Recent advances in Indo-Pacific prehistory*. v-viii. New Delhi: Oxford & IBH.
- WAB 1991. WAC Statutes. *World Archaeological Bulletin* 5: 133-138.