

## THE CONCEPT OF INTEGRAL STUDY OF MAN

The integral study of man arose from the urgent need to integrate the information about man provided by different sciences, from the need for scientific self-knowledge and for an understanding of man and his nature, culture and society as a whole. Being an allround study of man and his activity, it is not restricted to the natural history of man, but embraces also the environment of man, his ecology, ethology, genetics, psychology, psychotronic research, human engineering etc.

From the point of view of the integral study of man the primary task is not only to determine and foresee how the human organism develops in certain conditions, how it changes and adapts itself, and thus to draw up and create the optimal demands on human biology; the anthropologist must study at the same time the natural, cultural and social conditions in which modern man lives. The anthropological study of man covers these three basic aspects: the study of nature, of culture and of society. This study does not deal only with contemporary populations and research into living man, of *Homo sapiens sapiens*; it is also concerned with the study of human existence as it was in the past — in historical as in prehistorical times as well as with his prognostic trends in contemporary mankind.

In the first period, anthropology was separated from medical and natural sciences as an independent scientific discipline. Today it is dealing with man as an individual and also as a species, with his physical characters his racial and genetic characteristics and with his further development and place in nature and in the universe. This concept of the natural study of man can be specified as anthropology of the species *Homo sapiens*.

On the other hand there appear in anthropology new tendencies and methods studying and regarding man as a speaking and cultured animal or social being that means no longer as a mere working animal. Some cultural and social anthropologists for example characterise man in the first place as a moral being and see his main specific character in his behaviour. This is nothing new; as already at the beginning of this century Franz Boas characterised anthropology as the science of man and his work, of man as a mainly social and moral being. Actually there exist the anthropological-philosophical concept of human existence which has its foundations in Aristotle's definition of man as a social being — *zoon politicon* — and whose development has been characterised by Friedrich Engels as the transition of anthropology from the mere anthropology and physiology of man and his races to the history of mankind.

We have witnessed some efforts to unite both of these streams in anthropology and to achieve Goethe's „*Einheit von Somma und Psyché*“, which is characteristic for man and the whole of nature. As a result, man — *Homo sapiens* — is not classified in anthropology only as an animal making and using tools but in a much wider sense, as a social and cultural being, a social and moral creature *sui generis*. And almost simultaneously anthropology has ceased to be just an ancillary marginal science as it often was before and is becoming more and more one of the sciences essential for the full understanding of man.

In Czechoslovakia these general anthropological aspects of human life, and interpersonal relations generally, are dealt with by the founder of Czech anthropology, Jan Evangelista Purkyně, 125 years ago.

Jan Ev. Purkyně was the first to outline the teaching of anthropology as an introductory science and thus to place it on a broader scientific basis. He introduced anthropology as a general science of man and conceived it as an introduction to the study of science in general (*The concept of physiology . . . , Prague 1851*).

Today conceives anthropology, from the Purkyně's point of view, set of sciences of man including, according to its content, not only physical, cultural and social anthropology, but also ethnographic, psychological, pedagogical

and sociological studies. And so, for good reasons, we must declare Purkyně as the predecessor of the contemporary integral anthropology not only in this country, but also internationally for in his project of the scientific organization of the Academy of Sciences anthropology is classed not only with the natural sciences, but also with the social sciences as the seventh, final department (*National and World Academy of Sciences, Prague 1862*).

## THE CONCEPT OF INTEGRAL STUDY OF MAN

In contemporary anthropology we can follow the beginning of certain integral trends based on the principle of polarity and sociability of man and on the need for integrated knowledge of human personality as a whole.

The specialization in anthropology gives us the chance of deeper knowledge of individual biological and social aspects. It does not enable us to make a complex study of human relations of the influences of natural and social selection in man, the laws of human behaviour in the history of mankind etc. What we lack in this situation is a complex science of man based on the synthesis and integration of all the knowledge of man from all fields of natural and social sciences.

## THE CONCEPT OF INTEGRAL ANTHROPOLOGY

The urge to integrate anthropology arises from the simple fact that there are many anthropologies: physical anthropology, cultural anthropology, social anthropology, ethnographical studies, psychological anthropology, pedagogical anthropology, applied anthropology, philosophical anthropology — and inside each of these trends it is possible to distinguish nuances, usually of sharp polarity.

The very term integral anthropology is quite new and original and has not been used until now in the literature. But when we started with this concept at the beginning of our paper we were not aiming at originality, but anxious to contribute to the real integration of the sciences of man. For integral anthropology we can see two very important tasks — at first a theoretical one: to state and delimitate interdisciplinary problems in the social sciences, that means first of all the problems of social psychology, cultural and social anthropology as well as pedagogical, behavioral, psychotronic, human engineering's problems. Then there is a practical task: to find methods and ways of mutual cooperation and take part in the solution of complex questions concerning human relations, human behaviour and activity in different cultural and social conditions and environments — this is what is meant by integral anthropology in the widest sense of the word.

In Czechoslovakia today, integral anthropology is represented by a new section established by a Sociological Society in the Czechoslovak Academy of Science from 1966. First result of its work have appeared in the anthology *Integral Anthropology Today (Prague 1968)*, in the *Studia Anthropologicae (Charles University Press, Prague, 1971)* and in the anthology *Actual Problems of the Integral Study of Man (Sociological Society, Prague, 1974)*.

From this point of view is very important the establishment of new specializations in anthropology, for example the psychotronic anthropology: The concept of psychotronic anthropology, as well as the integral anthropology was expressed a hundred twenty five years ago by Jan Evangelista Purkyně, one of the authors of the nuclear theory in biology, who established anthropology as a general science of man, introductory to the whole study of mankind and founded the psychotronic research in medical anthropology and physiology. Today psychotronic and integral anthropology is represented by a new department established by a Scientific-Technical Society in 1973.

Psychotronic anthropology as well as biological, cultural and social anthropology as an integral part of inte-

gral anthropology is a specific point of view and a theory striving to understand human societies and to find a wider concept for the study of man. But not only that, it is also an experiment in the synthetic study of man and the cultural and social development of mankind in different natural and historical conditions — and last but not least a reaction to the crisis in sciences of man. And what is the final and permanent aim of psychotronic and integral anthropology?

The need for a new anthropology of man coincides with the need for a new theoretical basis for the existing science of man, a basis broad enough to embrace all the important material so far, and a new sufficiently profound theoretical conception to provide a satisfactory explanation for the development in man.

The positive content of this anthropology is not formed by problems which have yet to be thought up, but the real problems facing a number of the social sciences, and especially border-line problems which are dealt with by different disciplines but in fashion peculiar to each. It is a paradox that the solution of these problems can give us the key to the conception of the problem of man today. The difference and the problems which remains, will be more readily overcome in the future through the integration of scientific knowledge and branches of science dealing with man.

In the near future it will be comparatively easy to get information from all over the world, to see and hear over any distance. These technical conditions will lead man to gain a new skill — to become an expert in human relations in the midst of the cultural and social changes in each society. These variabilities of human relations and human behaviour are going to be at the centre of interest in integral anthropology — the science of man and his activities, which creates the conditions for integral anthropology as a science helping to preserve and perfect the mankind.

There are the reasons for the concept of the Institute for integral study of man whose programm represent a complex of basic and interdisciplinary tasks of the study of man. In different departments (for general, biological, genetical and psychological, cultural and social, applied and various forms of border-line tasks in the study of man, also in laboratories, departments for documentation, photography, etc.) would be possible to realise the integral study of man.

*Dr. Josef Wolf, CSc.,  
Lublaňská 25,  
120 00, Praha 2*

#### LE GISEMENT PREHISTORIQUE DE BIACHE SAINT-VAAST

Un gisement préhistorique exceptionnel a été découvert à Biache Saint-Vaast, à 17 kms d'Arras, sur le terrain des Forges de Châtillon-Commentry.

Le 27 avril dernier, un ouvrier de l'usine avertit un des membres de la société archéologique de Bapaume de la mise au jour de nombreux ossements lors de travaux d'excavation exigés par l'extension de l'atelier de tôlerie. Les travaux en cours sont immédiatement arrêtés et une fouille de sauvetage est prescrite au titre de la Direction des Antiquités préhistoriques.

Après les premiers travaux de fouille et une reconnaissance de la stratigraphie confirmée par M. SOMME, maître de conférence à l'Université de Lille I, il apparaît que les couches archéologiques, couvrant plusieurs centaines de mètres carrés, se situent dans une dépression, au sommet de formations fluviales d'une basse terrasse de la Scarpe scellées d'une importante couverture loessique, et que les vestiges relèvent sans doute d'une industrie datant de l'avant dernière glaciation (Acheuléen supérieur).

Des sursis successifs permettent de poursuivre le sauvetage et le 5 mai l'un des fouilleurs découvre une prémolaire humaine. Le secteur est minutieusement dégagé et d'autres dents apparaissent provenant d'un maxillaire supérieur humain, ainsi que plusieurs fragments de calotte crânienne d'un même individu.

La présence d'une industrie lithique abondante à Biache-Saint-Vaast (éclats levallois, racloirs, nombreuses pointes moustériennes, rares outils de type paléolithique supé-

rieur), d'une faune exceptionnellement bien conservée (rhinocéros, ours, bovidés, cervidés, équidés, etc...) et d'un crâne humain, confère à ce site une importance de premier ordre.

Il semble que les animaux aient été attirés par la proximité d'un point d'eau où les hommes seraient venus les chasser. De nombreux os présentent en effet, les marges laissées par les silex lors du dépeçage.

Si les vestiges datent bien d'une période remontant à 100 000 ou 150 000 ans, l'homme de Biache se situera entre celui de Swanscombe en Angleterre et ceux dits de Néanderthal. Il aurait vécu à l'interstade de 125 000 à 175 000 ans qui sépare les deux périodes glaciaires du Riss ancien et du Riss final: un tel maillon manquait encore aux spécialistes de cette période du pléistocène.

Mais un vaste travail de laboratoire reste à faire: les vestiges humains sont étudiés sous l'autorité de M. le professeur PIVETEAU, l'étude de la stratigraphie revient au Laboratoire de géomorphologie et d'études du quaternaire de l'Université de Lille I, l'analyse des pollens fossiles, qui permettra de reconstituer le paysage végétal de l'époque, au Laboratoire de phytosociologie et de botanique de Louvain.

La détermination de la faune et l'examen de la répartition des vestiges osseux ont été confiés au Laboratoire d'Anatomie comparée du Musée national d'histoire naturelle.

Devant le caractère exceptionnel de l'habitat découvert, on peut se féliciter de la rapidité de l'action entreprise pour le „sauver“, en un temps cent fois plus réduit que celui que nécessiterait une exploitation normale.

Il reste à souhaiter que les fouilles puissent être poursuivies au-delà du secteur immédiatement menacé où le gisement semble s'étendre.

M. L.

#### DER IX. KONGRESS DER UNION INTERNATIONALE DES SCIENCES PRÉHISTORIQUES ET PROTOHISTORIQUES

Vom 13. bis 19. September 1976 fand in Nice der IX. Kongress der Internationalen Union der prähistorischen und protohistorischen Wissenschaften statt. Ein wahres Mammutunternehmen, an dem gegen 2.500 Forscher aus allen Weltteilen mit einem mehr als 1.300 Referate umfassenden Programm teilnahmen. Es wäre deshalb undenkbar, über dieses wissenschaftliche Treffen eingehend zu berichten und ich werde mich auf die wichtigsten Informationen über die Organisation und die Teilnehmer an dieser Veranstaltung beschränken.

Der Kongress wurde mit einer feierlichen Plenarsitzung im Palais des Expositions zu Nice eröffnet; die Ansprache hielt der Generalsekretär des Kongresses Henry de Lumley, nach ihm sprachen weitere Vertreter der Öffentlichkeit und Wissenschaft. Dann begaben sich die Teilnehmer zu einem Festessen. Schon am Nachmittag begannen Arbeitssitzungen im schönen Milieu des Parc Valrose, der der Universität in Nice gehört. Die Verhandlungen zogen sich bis Sonntag hin, obwohl der Kongress bereits Samstag nachmittags offiziell beendet wurde. Der 16. September war Exkursionen gewidmet.

Die wissenschaftlichen Beratungen des Kongresses verliefen eigentlich in zwei Linien. Einerseits in 10 Sektionen, die in großen Zügen nach dem bereits von früheren Kongressen bekannten System gegliedert waren: I. methodologische Sektion, II. bis IV. Sektion für das untere, mittlere und obere Paläolithikum, V. Sektion für das Epipaläolithikum, VI. Sektion für das Neolithikum, VII. Sektion für die Kupfer- und Bronzezeit, VIII. Sektion für die Eisenzeit, IX. Sektion „periode des Grandes Migrations“ und X. Sektion für Fragen der prähistorischen und protohistorischen Untersoarchäologie. Im Rahmen dieser Sektion wurden die meisten, fast tausend Referate gehalten; genauer gesagt: diese Referate waren angemeldet, wurden aber wegen Abwesenheit der Referenten oder deshalb, weil die im Rahmen des Kongresses veranstalteten Symposien das Hauptinteresse an sich zogen, nicht alle tatsächlich gehalten.

Dies war die zweite Linie: Neben den Sektionen tagten fortlaufend 30 Symposien, die für den Großteil der Teilnehmer mehr Anziehungskraft besaßen. Während die Referate