



Virginia Commonwealth University

Errett Callahan
Anthropology Department
18 October 1974

DOM

We are conducting a survey of fluted point replication techniques being used by flintworkers today. This is being done in order to investigate potential techniques which might have been used for Clovis and Folsom - like projectile point production in the past. It is our contention that each of the many possible variants of flute removal may yield data which may be analytically differentiated and subsequently applied to the archaeological record. A major purpose of this, in conjunction with other variable factors related to the entire reduction sequence, is to define factors reflecting significant variation of tradition within the fluted point Paleo component(s).

This research is part of a resurrection of an extensive paper - "The Williamson Site Fluting Tradition Clarified," which I began in 1969, as some of you may recall from previous correspondence. Due to our deadlines for this portion of the paper, could we ask for a speedy return of the enclosed form? To facilitate this, we have reduced the desired information into a format which may be quickly checked off. Subsequently, we may follow this up with a request for further information such as a brief description and illustration of the application of the technique, mention of the materials used in the supporting devices, published papers, how and when you heard of or evolved the technique, and other pertinent factors limiting definition or use of the technique (unless you would prefer to keep this information restricted).

UNLESS DIFF OR
FROM YOUR
PUBLICATIONS

Instructions

To fill in the form, please check off appropriate columns. Use a separate horizontal row for each technique of any one method. That is, for each row, only one block under any one section should be checked off. If you use more than 5 techniques for any given method, feel free to use additional paper. Please indicate only those techniques which you actually use.

Under edge/face support, for each technique under any given method, please jot in your title or name for your technique or special holding device. If you have no name for it, simply check off #1, etc. Possibly we may subsequently define the technique as, for instance, "the Crabtree free-hand technique #1," or some such designation.

Under force, check off the implement or type of force used. Hammer and billet are, of course, direct percussion, and punch means indirect percussion.

Under length of flute, indicate whether or not most flutes removed by any given technique can be expected to exceed 4 cm (1½") (assuming the preform is large enough).

CC-3.1.14.1

Under tip support, check off "with" or "without" depending on whether you support the distal end of the preform at the moment of flute removal.

Under % of use, indicate what % of your ^{FLUTING} experiments are performed using the given technique. Indicate this by marking overall use (% of your entire production) and current use (% of your most recent experiments).

Under efficiency potential, indicate degree of failure. Failure would be defined here as having the flute fall so short of your expectations as to lead to rejection or major modification of design. Thus, this would include not only fracture or poorly matched flute lengths, but also flutes too narrow, too off-centered, too short, etc. - if not correctable without stepping outside of the supposed tradition.

Under quantity, indicate what quantity of your entire production to date has been produced using the technique in question. As with all of these questions, your judgements and estimates are sufficient and will be respected.

If you know of any other knappers working at a high competency level with fluting, other than those listed below, would you please list their names and addresses, if known, so that we may compile as comprehensive a listing as possible.

Many thanks.

Errett
Errett Callahan

SEE YOU IN CALGARY?

We hope to include data from the following flintworkers in this research:

1. Stanley Ahler
2. Peter Bleed
3. Ron Bonnichsen
4. Bruce Bradley
5. Doug Bucy
6. Errett Callahan
7. Michael Collins
8. Don Crabtree
9. Alaric Faulkner
10. Bruce Huckell
11. Henry Irwin
12. Marvin McCormick
13. Major McCullough
14. (H. Mewhinney)
15. Guy Muto
16. George Nichols
17. Carl Phagan
18. Bryan Rinehart
19. Scott Silsby
20. Jim Spears
21. J. B. Sollberger
22. Gene Titmus
23. Are Tsirk
24. Richard Warren
25. Joe Ben Wheat

CE-3.6.14.2

POSTSCRIPT

JUST 2
DESCRIPTIONS
IF I HAD
NOT KNOWN

Since completing the above, I have been informed by Don Crabtree that he acquired in Mexico a large laurel leaf which he felt was suspiciously "European". The implement measures x x cm and is made of Crabtree said that the implement did not resemble, upon close examination, the Meso-American bi-pointed bifaces but when subjected to the analysis scheme in this paper, he found it to match our definition of the Solutrean laurel leaf with remarkable precision. I have examined a photograph of this biface and agree with Crabtree's conclusion. Crabtree feels that this European laurel leaf may possibly have gotten to the New World via early Spanish settlers. Such a test of our analysis should illustrate the potential of the system, and I hope such may prove useful to others desirable of making cultural inference from lithic artifacts.

3022
DON - COULD YOU GIVE ME
THE ABOVE INFO, AS WELL
AS YOU CAN, + A COPY OF THAT
PHOTO YOU MENTIONED (I will be
glad to return it immediately).
SO I CAN FINISH THIS THING
UP. IVE ADDED ABOUT 1/3 MORE
+ DON'T SOME MORE BETTER PAPERS
SINCE MAY. I'D LIKE TO PUT
THIS POSTSCRIPT AT THE
VERY END. PLEASE COMMENT AS
NEEDED + SLIP IT BACK. THANKS
AS -- YOU ARE WRITING UP YOUR OPINION
FOR SCIENCE THAT YOU
ON ART THE DOCTORS.

ce. 3.1 2.14.4