

over 1500 the English part. The time between the two parts was used for pre-congress symposia.

The main topic of the congress was "Anthropology and the Public: The Communication of Scholarly Ideas". Some of the symposia and the cycles of evening lectures were open for the wide public; they covered the following main subjects: Indigenous Peoples, Nations and States; Archaeology and the Public; Peopling of the Americas; A Physical Anthropology Perspective.

There was also an all-day screening of professional and amateur film and video recordings open for the public.

The secondary topic of the first phase of the congress were: Implications of Anthropology: "Ideology, Theory and Practice".

The inauguration ceremony of the congress was held on Aug. 14 in Quebec City and the congress was closed with a plenary session on Aug. 25 in Vancouver. The Soviet delegation tabled a motion calling for the preservation and strengthening of world peace. The motion was approved by all the participants.

The working sessions proper were split up into specialized symposia held parallelly in the congress halls and function rooms of the biggest hotels of the two cities, and at the Robson Square Mass Media Center in Vancouver, at a rate of five sessions per day (two in the morning and three in the afternoon. 30-60 papers were read every day. While anthropology and ethnography in Europe formed two scientific branches, anthropology in America comprised both sciences (with the exception of special medical aspects), including physical anthropology, cultural and social anthropology, sociology, ethnography, archaeology, linguistics, psychology, pedagogics, politology, economics, science on religions, etc.

Besides physical anthropology there were e.g. symposia dealing with popular medicine and healing methods, the use of vegetable drugs, application of Western medicine by various ethnic groups, the standard of health care, psychiatry with regards to ethnicity, sexuology, anthropology and human fertility, infant feeding practices, anthropology of sport, nutritional anthropology, spiritual anthropology, psychoanalysis, alcoholism, population shifts (migration), nomadism, pilgrimage, approaches to ritual theatricity, mythology, sociophobics, woman and social movements, aboriginal rights, the problem of ethnic minorities, nacionalism, racism, race relations, ethnomusicology, popular songs, ecology, palaeocultures, fauna with regards to the prehistoric and present human societies, ethnoarchaeology, rock paintings, various archaeological topics of regional character, amateurs and professionals in anthropology, futurology, visual anthropology (film and television) etc.

As counterpart to the latter there was a festival of professional films dealing with ethnography; the event was held in the cinema of the Robson Square Mass Media Center and some 40 professional films were screened in its course (the life of Indians and Eskimos in the North-Western Territories of Canada, in Alberta, Mexico and Peru, films on Egypt, on the Omo River Valley in East Africa, on Kenya, Upper Volta, Niger, Namibia (the life of the Bushmen), South Africa, Hebrides, Greece, India, Papua-New Guinea, New Zealand and Solomon Islands. The following programmes of amateur films and video recordings were not limited to ethnography. We saw pictures dealing with the life of Eskimos on St. Lawrence Island south of Alaska and in other localities, the life of Brazilian Indians, magic healing of Indians in Mexico, healing methods in Nigeria, the life of the south-eastern Nubians in Sudan, archaeological experiments with the technology of the African Iron Age, the life of Russian Old Believers, Gypsies, of the Kazak ethnic minority in China and other ethnic groups, popular healing methods and cremation ceremonies on the Island of Bali, a video recording of the lecture read by Professor Wu Jukang on the latest palaeoanthropological finds in China or recordings on the life of New Guineans. The programme well documented the specific role of film documentation, its readiness, versatility and graphic approach. The present boom of the video recording technology provides anthropology with unprecedented possibilities.

Physical Anthropology proper comprised almost 30 symposia, ranging from dermatoglyphics and forensic anthropology to the growth and development of children, me-

thodology of the study of growth, aging and longevity, obesity, secular trends, biocultural aspects of demography, human adaptability, stable isotopic and metals composition with regards to human adaptability, man and environment, population biology in India, biology of the refugee and migrant populations, biological anthropology in service of man, kinaethropology, primatology, skeletal biology, prehistoric demography and pathology, hominid evolution, peopling of the Pacific, peopling of the Americas, public concerns and theoretical issues in physical anthropology, man-like monsters (yeti and "sasquatch") and others.

The World Congress was a gigantic parade of the wide spectrum of present day anthropology and ethnography, however, the representation of the most important research centres was rather uneven. Among the participants prevailed North Americans. In spite of the funds and financial assistance offered by the organizers the developing nations and the socialist countries were underrepresented, with the exception of a numerous Soviet delegation. Due to the absence of almost half of the originally filed participants several symposia had to be cancelled (e.g. on ergonomics), others had to be reduced or rescheduled. Sometimes there were several important events taking place parallelly and thus it was very difficult to attend the lectures one was interested in; sometimes it was quite complicated to get from one congress hall or function room to the other, and it involved loss of time.

The Permanent Committee of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnographical Sciences accepted the offer by Professor Ali el-Nofeli to held the next, so called intermediate congress in 1985 in Cairo. The 12th World Congress is scheduled for the year 1987 and is to take place in Zagreb under the presidency of Professor Maver and is to be organized by Dr. P. Rudan. Thus after 24 years that will have passed since the 1964 Moscow Congress the supreme event of the world anthropology will return to Europe.

Miroslav Prokopec and Eugen Strouhal

THE CONFERENCE ON THE EVOLUTION OF HUMAN LOCOMOTION

Don Johanson invited specialists to discuss the above topic in his new Institute of Human Origins situated just across the street from the University of California in Berkeley. The meeting took place on April 22/23, 1983. Unfortunately Mary and Richard Leakey and Yves Coppens not sharing the views of D. Johanson and Tim White on the phylogenetical interpretation of the Hadar finds could not take part in this important and interesting event. Two principal functional explanations of the skeletal remains of *A. afarensis* and of its footprints had crystallized during the discussions, which were sometimes of very personal character. C. Goven Lovejoy, D. Johanson and Tim White hold that *A. afarensis* was able of bipedal locomotion. Others, namely Randal Susman and Jack Stern, both of the State University of New York, maintain that Lucy conserves many anatomical features, functionally linked with arboreal life. "We believe that these animals spent a considerable portion of their time in the trees to sleep and to escape their predators" said J. Stern. The anatomical features like too long toes, curved phalanges, relatively undeveloped thumbs, primitive (in the pongid direction) pisiform and trapezium, more upward turned shoulder socket, not fully circular hip socket, oversized feet as compared with that of modern man, etc. were regarded as facts supporting this interpretation. The above different views result in different interpretation of hominid evolution. Lovejoy's family tree for Lucy places the origin of hominids further back in time and considers *A. afarensis* an ancestor to *Homo*, the only surviving hominid, and of *Australopithecus*, now extinct. The other group considers only *Australopithecus africanus* as the ancestor of *Homo*. This two possible interpretations remained in principle unchanged after the two-day session.

Both groups of scientists agreed that *Australopithecus afarensis* was a biped, which does not need to be a biped identical to modern humans.

This 3.2 mill. years old hominid with a small chimpanzee-like brain is more primitive than the bipedal *Australopithecus* found in South and East Africa. *A. afarensis* had con-

served several archaic features, but the anatomical features making bipedal locomotion possible (like the hominid shape of pelvis) need certainly a long time to develop. Thus the bipedal locomotion appears much earlier than the production of tools and full development of the brain.

The question whether the Hadar finds represent one or more species remains open. The large differences in size are explained by T. White as sexual dimorphism. Series of objections were published last year by the French anthropologists. New discoveries in Middle Awash (see *Anthropologie XXI/No. 2*) and in Baringo seem to contain important contributions to the solution of this important problem in the near future. Both regions, with their layers older than the Hadar and Laetoli localities of *A. afarensis* shift the earliest hominid finds into layers older than 4 and 6 mill. years respectively. It is regrettable that some of the leading extra-American anthropologists were absent and thus this important exchange of ideas remained limited to American specialists only.

J. Jelinek

TWO MEETINGS OF ANTHROPOLOGISTS AND ARCHAEOLOGISTS IN XANTHI, GREECE

Two working-sessions of anthropologists and archaeologists took place during September 1983 in Xanthi, NE Greece. The participants were invited by N. I. Xirotiris and the International Demokritos Foundation.

The *Conference of Paleodemography* was organized from 4. to 8. September. The different specialisation of the participants (anthropologists/archaeologists) determined to certain extent the program of the session. The anthropological lectures concentrated on the methodological problems of working with the skeletal materials (J. Nemeskéri: Methodological correction of mortality age distribution of prehistoric populations; I. Pap—E. Susa: On the possibility of the paleodemographical examination; A. Marcsik: Paleodemographical aspects of paleopathology). The archaeological lectures followed the reflections of demographic changes in the archaeological evidence (P. Patay: Demographische Probleme in der Vorgeschichte des Karpatenbeckens; D. Liversage: Demographic trends from the Bronze Age to the Migration Period — an archaeologist's view; M. Gebühr: Demographische Ursachen für eisenzeitliche Wanderungsbewegungen im westlichen Ostseegebiet). Between the both groups may be placed the papers taking into account larger demographic and even social aspects of the anthropological data (J. P. Bocquet-Appel: Small populations: Demography and paleoanthropological inference; K. Ery: Paleodemographic data and problems from the Roman Period; L. Szathmáry: The infant deficit and its paleosociographical reflections in the Early Middle Ages). The bipolar character of the lectures and the search for general explanatory conceptions was determining for the following discussions as well.

The lecture of J. P. Bocquet-Appel concerning demography of small populations in the Paleolithic led to a general hypothesis about evolutionary trends leading from homogeneity to heterogeneity. It was subsequently discussed from the viewpoint of the archaeological evidence. Methodologically it was interesting to compare the different results

obtained by D. Liversage and M. Gebühr, when studying the demographic situation in Western Baltic regions during the Roman Period. D. Liversage, taking into account the number of burial sites, observed a population decline. M. Gebühr, on the other hand, based his data on the number of single graves, and came to the opposite result. In D. Liversage's lecture it was suggestive to note the use of pollen analytical data and the effort to correlate them with the supposed demographic changes. The approach of M. Gebühr was very complex one as well, and it was characterized by efforts to exploit all of the available evidence, by interesting suggestions and by general interpretations.

The time from 9. to 11. September was devoted to the conference on *Morphogenetics and evolution*. Chronologically it concentrated on earlier periods of the human evolution, mainly the Paleolithic. Naturally, the near-by cave of Petralona presented an important subject for discussions. From this point of view, the paper of E. Vlček and N. Xirotiris concerning the Petralona endocranium was one of the most important. Both authors conclude that this skull of relatively archaic appearance contained more or less sapient-like brain. The morphological studies suggest rather more recent age of this important but unfortunately not precisely dated specimen (relations to Gánovce, Broken-Hill, Gibraltar, etc.). G. van Vark concentrated on the origin of Mongoloids. By using statistical methods he concluded about a very recent origin of this race, differing significantly from the Upper Paleolithic skeletal materials from Chou-kou-tien, Upper Cave. The lecture evoked discussion about the significance of morphological and genetical similarity. Another use of statistical methods was demonstrated by O. J. Grüsser and L. R. Weis, in studying the brain growth during hominid evolution. Further possibilities and limits of the quantitative methods were discussed by B. Jacobshagen.

R. Fenart and R. Deblock compared the skull morphogenesis of chimpanzee and man, B. Senut presented her last results in the study of the humerus of hominoid primates and H. Ullrich followed the possible family relationships in Paleolithic and Mesolithic skeletal assemblages. K. Jacobs concentrated on the evolution of postcranial skeleton in the European Upper Paleolithic and Mesolithic hominids. He noted several evolutionary trends (decreasing robusticity, increasing sexual dimorphism), requiring respective explanations (changes in environment, hunting techniques, etc.). The paper of K. Brunnacker, R. Grün and G. Hennig summarized the U-Th data for travertines and cave sintres of Central Europe and helped in this way to build a chronological frame for the hominid evolution in this region. E. Vlček presented a detailed morphological comparisons of several Middle Pleistocene human crania and J. Svoboda compared three lithic assemblages associated to Middle Pleistocene hominid finds: Arago, Vértésszölös and Bilzingsleben.

It must be noted that the approaches of anthropologists and archaeologists dealing with the earliest periods were more integrated than at the Paleodemographic conference. This is probably due to a longer tradition of interdisciplinary research in the Pleistocene studies. However the two meetings held in Xanthi encouraged further integration and showed some new perspectives in the research of human evolution, both in the Pleistocene and the Holocene times.

Jiří Svoboda