

Dear Don and Evelyn:

Barbara and I arrived in Pullman in good shape with no major incidents on the road;. She went out to the coast with Daugherty for a few days and I have been getting caught up on my work and correspondence.

Enclosed is a very short report on my activities and feelings during the session. When writing it, it seemed to me that I had two choices; to make it very long and technical or to make it short and general. I chose the latter thinking some non-archeologists in N.S.F. might be reading it. I hope it is satisfactory and if there is anything else I can do, just let me know.

I have finally gotten some plans firmed up for the near future. I am not taking any classes next semester and am going to make an all out effort to get my thesis done. I have been dwaddling at it too long and decided that I had best just sit down and do it without worrying about anything else. Also I plan to study for my oral exams and do some reading in the area of technology. When second semester ~~xxx~~ rolls around, I will be ready to start on my Ph.D. program.

I have done some thinking about a Ph.D. thesis and talked to Dr. Smith, the dept. chairman about it. The idea of a technological study of cores and blades in the Arctic and sub-Arctic appeals to me more and more. Smith seemed to think that I would have no trouble getting travel funds to go to the various schools and museums looking at cores and blades. I then brought

Ce.7.2.40.1

the possibility of my going to France for a 3 month period and studying core and blade technology under Tixier. Smith saw no problems with that so I will begin working on that as a dissertation project eventually.

You will be happy to know that the first thing I did when arriving in Pullman was to build a chest crutch and clamp. I would really like to begin some systematic work this year and might be able to get some support from the department. Some of the students here are leaning on Daugherty to get us a truck so we can get a load of obsidian this fall from Glass Butte. I think the prospects are good.

I owe my wife a vacation and we have been talking about where to go. If Bordes come over in September, would you mind having a student watch you people break rocks for a few days? She doesn't care where we go as long as its away from Pullman and I would like to go back to southern Idaho. If its ~~not~~ ~~inconvenient~~ ~~for~~ ~~you~~, not inconvenient for you, we would like to play tourist and camp at the park for a couple days and see you and Bordes in action, and then go on down to Pacatello and look at the stuff in the museum. What I would like to know is if you would mind having me look over your shoulder ~~for~~ again for a couple days, and if not, the approximate dates that Bordes will be at your place.

I think I had better close now and get some work done. I will let ypu know any news we have here. My very best to you folks.

Jeff

ce.7.2.40.2



During the month of July, 1969, I participated in a flint-working session with Don Crabtree which was funded by the National Science Foundation. These brief notes are intended to record my activities and impressions of the session.

In general, the session developed with each of the participants learning the fundamentals of lithic technology as well as a variety of lithic techniques. With this base, the participants then specialized in an area of major interest to them. Since I intend to work in the Arctic and sub-Arctic, I was particularly interested in the manufacture of cores and blades as they are a wide-spread phenomena in that area.

Under Crabtree's able direction, I initially learned the basic techniques for the removal of blades from cores. Among these were pressure by hand tools and chest crutch, indirect percussion involving a punch, and direct percussion using a variety of hammers. After familiarizing myself with the various basic techniques and developing a measure of control, I then worked on the replication of various archeologically attested core types. Among these were Corbiac cores from France, Campus, Tuktu, and Anangula cores from Alaska, Capsian cores from Northern Africa, Shiritaki cores from Japan, and cores from the Meso-American area.

In addition to my experimentation and learning of different lithic techniques, I also used different materials to familiarize myself with how they act when made into tools. Among these were varieties of obsidian from Idaho, Oregon, Mexico, and Iceland; chert, rhyolite and siltstone from Idaho and Nevada;

Ce. 7.2.403



flint from Indiana, England, and France, as well as a variety of other types of natural and artificial material. In addition the participants experimented with the identification, treatment, and use of heat-treated material.

From my point of view, the principle value of the session lies in the fact that it provided an empirical base for the interpretation and reconstruction of archeological material. Since Crabtree directed our attention to the products of our work as well as the actual process of producing lithic tools, each of us are better equipped to examine an archeological collection and reconstruct the actions that produced it. In my case, where I emphasized core and blade technology, I now have a better sense of what constitutes a core and blade technology, a sense of the variation possible in a particular type, and an understanding of what are the significant attributes on cores. In examining archeological material, I feel I am better equipped to classify artifacts and waste material, and have some idea of what the makers intended or desired. The latter notion, that of determining what the makers of the artifacts in a particular collection intended or desired, has a particular importance for archeologists. Many, if not most, of the artifacts in a collection are waste, rejects, pre-forms, broken, or exhausted artifacts. The study of lithic technology enables the identification of these artifacts as well as a reconstruction of the forms desired by the culture that produced an assemblage.

Another point that might be briefly mentioned is that the study of lithic technology allows the separation of production from the function of a particular artifact. Both the production and the use of a tool leaves distinctive marks on it. A knowledge of the production of a particular artifact allows the analyst to recognize functional wear and in this sense, technology is a direct aid to functional studies. During the session some of our activities were directed toward the use of



the tools we produced and the evidences of that use.

While my main emphasis in learning during the session was directed toward the study of cores and blades, I also engaged in other aspects of lithic technology, including pressure and percussion work. Again, a number of techniques were learned and the products studied for the identification of a given technique in an archeological collection.

Another more general, but equally educational, aspect of the session was the opportunity to exchange ideas and views with the other participants. Since we were all interested in different areas, the exchange of information and different view-points was particularly valuable. We were also particularly fortunate in having Mr. Gene Titmus, a local flint-knapper, spend several days with us. Particularly skilled in his work, Titmus was able to demonstrate different techniques to us and afforded the opportunity to study individual variation in certain lithic techniques.

Finally, I would like to mention that anything the participants learned in the session was directly due to Don Crabtree. As a teacher and a student of lithic technology, he provided a model for all of us to follow in future work.

This brief outline of my activities at the flint-knapping session by no means covers all of my work there nor the new information I gained. I am presently engaged in writing up my technical notes in detail and these should provide me with a foundation for further work and experimentation in lithic technology as well as an empirical base in my future activities as an archeologist.



Jeffrey E. Mauger  
Dept. of Anthropology  
Washington State University

Jeffrey Mauger  
103C Harrison  
Pullman, Wash. 99163



Ce.7.2.40.6



Ce 1202

Mr. and Mrs. Don Crabtree  
Rt. 1, Box 39  
Kimberley, Idaho