

Route 1
Kimberly, Idaho

April 18th, 1966

Mr. Edward Boss, Editor
P.I.A. NEWSLETTER
345 E. McMurray Road
McMurray, Pa. 15317

Dear Mr. Boss:

Thank you for your letter of March 16th regarding the "Lively" collection. I am disturbed, however, by one statement in your letter which must be a misunderstanding of my letter of March 11th. At no time have I meant to verify or authenticate these artifacts as "pebble tools" and could not do so until the pebble tool context is better defined.

Last May, at the University of California at Berkeley, these tools were appraised and reviewed by Dr. Francois Bordes, Dr. J. Desmond Clark and myself. We were very impressed with the collection and identified them as being man-made. However, please refer to my letter of March 11th and note that I said "we cannot call this technique primary or juvenile, for it does show rhythm and control by the worker in producing this rudimentary type of tool."

There is no question that these artifacts are man-made and are made from pebbles, however, the problem now appears to be "What is a pebble tool" and "What constitutes a pebble tool industry." Before we can actually call these pebble tools, there are many unanswered questions regarding the Lively occurrence.

1. Are pebbles the only source of material?
2. What is the geographical range?
3. What is the population and concentration of these artifacts?
4. Have the artifacts been cataloged to show their distribution?

The surface finds are a clue to a distinctive industry but, until such material is found in dateable stratigraphy, there can be no conclusions drawn regarding the antiquity of this collection.

These artifacts show a high degree of specialization in both techniques and form, and appear to be unique and singular - well worth further investigation.

Yours very truly,

Don E. Crabtree