



## OBITUARY

## ALEKSANDR NIKOLAEWITSCH ROGATSCHOW

\* 28. 8. 1912 † 17. 4. 1984

A. N. Rogatschow wurde in Al'dija (Rayon Morschansk NO von Woronesch) in einer armen Bauernfamilie geboren. Nach dem sein Vater bald gestorben war, mußte er als Landarbeiter seinen Lebensunterhalt verdienen. Im Jahre 1930 begann er an der Universität von Woronesch zu studieren, von wo er 1932 nach Leningrad übertreten ist. Dort erweckten sein Interesse die Vorlesungen von Prof. P. P. Jefimenko über die Altsteinzeit, der er dann sein ganzes Leben gewidmet hat. Gleichzeitig wurde er als Laborant im damaligen



A. N. Rogatschow im Mladeč in 1961

GAIMK (heute Archäologisches Institut der Akademie der Wissenschaften der UdSSR) angestellt und 1934 fuhr er erstmals mit der Expedition von P. P. Jefimenko auf die Grabungen nach Kostenki. Seither ist er ein unabhömmlicher Mitarbeiter Jefimenkos an der Erforschung von Kos-

tenki I geworden. Im selben Jahr entdeckte er eine neue Fundstelle Kostenki X (Anosowka I) und 1936 die Fundstelle Kostenki VIII (Tel'man-Station). Seit 1936 war er wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter des Archäologischen Instituts. 1937–1938 leitete Rogatschow mit hervorragendem Erfolg seine erste selbständige Grabung in Kostenki IV (Aleksandrowka), wo Grundrisse zweier großer Wohnanlagen entdeckt wurden. — Seinen Kriegsdienst verbrachte er an der Front und wurde mehrmals ausgezeichnet.

Im Jahre 1948 kehrte Rogatschow nun als Forschungsleiter nach Kostenki zurück, leitete die Grabungen bis 1975 und beteiligte sich an den seit 1976 von N. D. Praslow geleiteten Arbeiten bis 1983. 1948 erreichte er den wissenschaftlichen Grad Kandidat der historischen Wissenschaften und 1963 den Grad Doktor der historischen Wissenschaften.

Das Werk A. N. Rogatschows umfaßt eine ansehnliche Anzahl von Publikationen der beachtenswerten Grabungsergebnisse aus dem Raum von Kostenki; seine Bedeutung für die sowjetrussische Paläolithforschung besteht jedoch darin, daß er als erster archäologische und stratigraphische Erkenntnisse zu verknüpfen wußte.

Bereits 1953 veröffentlichte er seine Beobachtungen über die Stratigraphie des osteuropäischen Jungpaläolithikums (MIA 39), als bahnbrechend kann seine Arbeit über die Stratigraphie der vielschichtigen Fundstellen von Kostenki und Borschtschewo (MIA 59, 1957) bezeichnet werden. Er erkannte richtig, daß man weiterhin das osteuropäische Jungpaläolithikum nicht mit Hilfe von „Leittypen“ in Kulturen nach französischem Vorbild gliedern und somit die bis dahin herrschende These von einer „stadialen Entwicklung“ aufrecht erhalten kann. An Hand stratigraphischer Befunde an den vielschichtigen Fundstellen erwies er die Gleichzeitigkeit verschiedener typologischer Formengruppen (archäologischer Kulturen) im Raum von Kostenki, eine Tatsache von Bedeutung für die gesamteuropäische Altsteinzeitforschung.

Gemeinsam mit N. D. Praslow redigierte Rogatschow einen Festband zum 100. Jahrestag der Entdeckung von Kostenki (1879), der 1982 erschien. Darin findet man die bisher beste und vollständigste Übersicht des Jungpaläolithikums jenes bedeutenden Siedlungsraumes, mit dessen Erforschung auch das Lebenswerk von A. N. Rogatschow verbunden ist.

Karel Valoch

11th WORLD CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND ETHNOLOGICAL SCIENCES IN QUEBEC CITY AND VANCOUVER IN 1983

One of the top anthropological venues of the year 1983 was without doubt the 11th Congress of the International Union of the Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, organized by the Canadian National Committee headed by the Union's President Professor Cyril S. Belshaw and Secretary General Dr. Bjorn O. Simonsen from the Dept. of Anthropology, University of British Columbia in Vancouver. With regards to the bilingual character of Canada the conference was divided into two parts; the first part was held in Quebec City in the francophone Quebec Province between Aug. 14–17, and the second part in the English speaking Vancouver between Aug. 20–25. Almost 3000 experts were filed for the congress — 1300 attended its French part and

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 end 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, kinanthropology, 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 hold 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-