FLINTKNAPPING HALL OF FAME

FLINTKNAPPING HALL OF FAME - honora per lapidem - displays flintknapping-related artifacts and exhibits, and honors those who have excelled in the craft, research/ writing, promoting events, and serving the knapping community.

Thursday, January 17, 2013

DON CRABTREE, HALL OF FAME FLINTKNAPPER # 3

Photo: Tribute to Don Cratree June 8, 1912 - November 16, 1980 “Dean of American flintknappers” Giuliano Bastiani Italia

THIS ART BY:

Giuliano Bastiani

DON CRABTREE,
HALL OF FAME
FLINTKNAPPER

Compiled by Ray Harwood
(Western Lithics)

DON CRABTREE.
Book by: Ray Harwood
(3) "Replicas". Many of the modern replicas are obsidian pieces produced by Don Crabtree, a self-taught researcher who was one of the first to master stone tool production methods. About 250 objects.

Jeanne Day Binning, Don Crabtree. Flintknappers

Blog Archive

About Me

THE RESEARCH JOURNAL

Bakersfield, California, United States

The International Flintknappers ‘ Hall of Fame and Museum is encouraging individuals of all ages to “Be A Superior Example,” through a new

education program as part of a new curriculum to promote healthy habits, while encouraging everyone to live free of drugs and other such substances or vices. It serves as the central point for the study of the history of flintknapping in the United States and beyond, displays flintknapping-related artifacts and exhibits, and honors those who have excelled in the craft, research/ writing, promoting events, and serving the knapping community and wilderness lifestyle.

View my complete profile

Jeanne Day Binning, Don Crabtree

Don, Donald Crabtree, Dean of American Flintknapping.

Jeanne Day Binning, Don Crabtree

Don, Donald Crabtree, Dean of American Flintknapping.

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Don, Donald Crabtree, Dean of American Flintknapping.

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Don, Donald Crabtree, Dean of American Flintknapping.

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Crabtree, often referred to as "the Dean of American flintknapping". He was born June 8, 1912, in Heyburn, Idaho. According to Harvey L. Hughett of the University of Idaho: Don spent his early youth in Salmon, Idaho where he first became interested in Indians and their tools. His mother would have him run errands for the next-door neighbor and as a reward this woman would give Don an arrowhead which her husband had gathered. Young Don became fascinated with these tools and even at this early age began to wonder why and how they were made. There were, at this time, many Indians in Salmon. Thanks to Harvey Hughett, at the University of Idaho, whom is now curator of the Don Crabtree Lithic Collection, we now know much more about Don Crabtree's childhood. I spoke to Mr. Hughett a few in October of 1999 (Val Waldorf had no problem either) he gave me permission to quote his copyright article on Don Crabtree in Chips Vol. 11, No.3, 1999.: "Young Don became fascinated with these tools and even at this early age began to wonder why and how they were made. There were, at this time, many Indians in Salmon. Their custom was to sit flat on the sidewalk with their legs stretched in front of them. Don found it great fun to jump over their legs and to talk with them, for which he was severely reprimanded by his mother.
When Don was six, his Family moved to Twin Falls. This was desert country and Don spent most of his time hunting for artifacts, Indian campsites and building his collection of Indian tools. The family's home was just a stone's through from the Snake River Canyon and Don spent every possible moment hunting in the canyon, collecting from campsites and caves and adding to his collection. He also collected

obsidian flakes and began to try to reproduce the artifacts. This meant more trips to the canyon for knapping material. Soon, young Crabtree had gathered a fairly large collection of artifacts and his interest in experimenting with different stones and methods of manufacture to achieve replication increased. He tried many approaches to holding and applying force but with little success and much failure. After interviewing many local Indians, he was disappointed that he was unable to learn anything of how these fascinating artifacts were made. Flintknapping was essentially a lost art even at the time.

Don was constantly in trouble with his father for being away from home so much, for the many cuts on his hands and the permanent bloodstains on his clothing. He received many reprimands for coming home after dark. Even this did not cure him of his quest for knowledge of the Native Americans and their tools. At one point, his father became so disgusted with Don spending so much time knapping he offered to pay him $100.00 if he would promise never to make another arrowhead. Don wanted a bicycle and a gun so badly that he considered this offer for some time. However, the love of Indian lore won and he told his father that he could not give up his attempts to make tools as the Indians had.

In the late 1930's he was supervisor of the Vertebrate and Invertebrate Laboratory at the University of California at Berkley, this is also where Ishi's artifacts are curated. Also, Ted Orcutt still lived not far to the North. Crabtree also worked in the Anthropology lab with the well known Anthropologist Alfred Krueber, whom was Ishi's friend and caretaker at the museum a few short years before. According to Dr. Errett Callahan (1979), following a flintworking demonstration at a meeting of the American Association of Museums in Ohio, in 1941, Crabtree was employed at the Ohio State Lithic Laboratory with H. Holmes Ellis and Henry Shertrone. He was also advisor in Lithic Studies at the University of Pennsylvania and the Smithsonian Institution's museum.

During world war II, Crabtree was coordinating Engineer with Bethlehem Steel in California. Between 1952 and 1962, he was County Supervisor with the U.S.D.A in Twin Falls, Idaho. In 1962 and 1975, Crabtree was research associate in lithic technology at the Idaho State Museum in Pocatello."

Not only was Crabtree a master flintknapper and an inspirational flintknapper , he was also an expert on the theoretical aspect of stone tool studies. Crabtree published papers on replicative flintworking and other aspects of lithic studies in such publications as:
"American Antiquity" (1939,1968), "Current Anthropology" (1969), "Science" (1968,1970), "Curator" (1970), "Tebiwa" (1964, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1972, 1973,1974), and "Lithic Technology" (1975).
Crabtree's textbook, "An Introduction to Flintworking", was the main publication readily available from 1972 on. The Crabtree book, although 26 years old, is still a classic and is one of the most referenced books in lithic studies today. The book is easy to read and is full of excellent drawings and text. The book is available through the Idaho Museum of Natural History, Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho. They also have republished Crabtree's articles, papers, and videos, his articles are better than ours decades later.
Crabtree was featured in many archaeological films in his day, many were shown around the world in class rooms from elementary school to doctoral classes. These films influence many up and coming flintknappers. The film "Blades and Pressure Flaking" (1969) won best anthropology film at the 1970 American Film Festival.
In 1972, the Idaho Museum of Natural History received a grant from the National Science Foundation for the production of several 16mm films featuring the legendary flintknapper. Just a few years ago these films were dubbed onto VHS video tape and made available to the public through Idaho Museum Publications. Though faded somewhat, this footage still maintains its detail and shows Don Crabtree at his best. In the Shadow of Man , Don is shown quarrying obsidian at Glass Buttes in Oregon. The Flintworker discusses the basics of flintknapping, stone tools are made using simple percussion techniques, and the Hertzian cone theory is introduced. Ancient Projectile Points covers the making of bifacial points. The hunter's Edge covers prismatic blade making. The Alchemy of Time concerns heat treating, and the manufacture of Clovis, Folsom and Cumberland points. In 1978, Crabtree had open heart surgery with stone tools. The blades Crabtree made were so sharp that Crabtree's doctor agreed to use them on him after seeing how sharp they were. The first surgery one of Crabtrees's Ribs and a lung section were removed, an 18 inch cut. Crabtree's stone tools were so sharp that there was hardly a scar.

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Don, Donald Crabtree, Dean of American Flintknapping.

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Don, Donald Crabtree, Dean of American Flintknapping. Don Crabtree flintknapped all types of artifacts including fluted
Folsom , parallel flaking, chevron flaking, notching, blade making
and even Ted Orcutt style large obsidian biface points. His large

points were very similar to Orcutts , some were so thin that they looked like dinner plates, his obsidian arrow points were very similar to those he helped to curate in Berkley made by Ishi.
While working agate Crabtree noticed that his had a satiny texture and the Indian arrowheads out of the same material were like opal. After much experimentation he rediscovered heat treating of flint materials to improve knapping quality.
In the later part of his life Crabtree traveled the world meeting and flintknapping with each nations leaders in lithic fields of endeavor and really opened the door for all of us. During this time flintknapping saw its heyday, "knap-ins", lithic conferences and publications. Sort of what what is happening now but with the academics.
Don Crabtree, Dean of American flintknappers, died on November 16, 1980 from complications of heart disease, within six months of Francois Bordes . When Bordes and Crabtree passed away the 1970's academic flintknapping heyday passed away with Them. THE PALEO KNAPPERS : The Late Don Crabtree, of southern Idaho, is considered to be the "Dean of American Flintknapping" not only for his fine publications, but also for the vast amount of important information he uncovered in a life devoted to the study of stone tools. Don was most probably the first flintknapper in thousands of years to flute a Folsom point, as early as 1941 Crabtree was employed at the Lithic Laboratory at the University of Pennsylvania and the prestigious Smithsonian Institution. He had experimented with fluting in the 1930s but became quite famous for his studies into the Lindenmier Folsom in 1966 . Don Crabtree passed away on November 16, 1980. Jeffery Flenniken and Gene Titmus, students of Crabtree carried on the studies and are still considered to be among the best flintknappers in the world. Don Crabtree was born on June 08, 1912 and died on November 01, 1980 at the age of 68. This person last resided in Kimberly, Idaho in Twin Falls County. Don Crabtree was assigned the social security number (SSN) of: 518-07-2993. Zip 83341. 3800 block E. Orchard Dr.

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Don, Donald Crabtree, Dean of American Flintknapping. Crabtree's Notable Publications:

Crabtree, D.E. (1966) A Stoneworker's Approach to Analyzing and Replicating the Lindenmeier Folsom. *Tebiwa* 10(1):3-39.

Crabtree, D.E. (1967) Notes on Experiments in Flintkanppnig: 3- the Flintknapper's Raw Material. *Tebiwa* 10(1):8-24.

Crabtree, D.E. (1967) Notes on Experiments in Flintkanppnig: 4- Tools Used for Making Flaked Stone Artifacts. *Tebiwa* 10(1):60-73.

Crabtree, D.E. (1968) Mesoamerican Polyhedral Cores and Prismatic Blades. *American Antiquity* 33(4):446-478.

Crabtree, D.E. (1970) Flaking Stone with Wooden Implements. *Science* 169:146-153.

Crabtree, D.E. (1972) *An Introduction to Flintworking*. Occasional Papers No. 28. Idaho State Museum, Pocatello.

Crabtree, D.E. (1972) The Cone Fracture Principle and the Manufacture of Lithic Materials. *Tebiwa* 15(2):29-42.

Crabtree, D.E. (1973) Experiments in Replicating Hohokam Points. *Tebiwa* 16(1):10-45.

Crabtree, D.E. (1973) The Obtuse Angle as a Functional Edge. *Tebiwa* 16(1):46-53.

Crabtree, D.E. (1974) Grinding and Smoothing of Stone Artifacts. *Tebiwa* 17(1):1-6.

Crabtree, D.E. and B.R. Butler (1964) Notes on Experiments in Flintkanppnig: 1- Heat Treatment of Silica Materials. *Tebiwa* 7(1):1-6.

Crabtree, D.E. and E.L. Davis (1968) Experimental Manufacture of Wooden Implements with Tools of Flaked Stone. *Science* 159:426-428.

Crabtree, D.E. and E.H. Swanson (1968) Edge-Ground Cobbles and Blade-Making in the Northwest. *Tebiwa* 11(2):50-54.

Don, Donald Crabtree, Dean of American Flintknapping. The International Flintknappers ‘ Hall of Fame and Museum is encouraging individuals of all ages to “Be A Superior Example,” through a new education program as part of a new curriculum to promote healthy habits, while encouraging everyone to live free of drugs and other such substances or vices. It serves as the central point for the study of the history of flintknapping in the United States and beyond, displays flintknapping-related artifacts and exhibits, and honors those who have excelled in the craft, research/ writing, promoting events, and serving the knapping community in an ethical and wilderness loving manner.

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Add caption

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Don Crabtree Flint knapping Hall of Fame

Crabtree student and cook at the Crabtree Field school: Dr. Jeanne Day Binning

ree student and cook at the Crabtree Field school: Dr. Jeanne Day Binning with Flintknapping
Digest Editor: Ray Harwood 1983

DON CRABTREE, TIXIER FLINTKNAAPPNG HALL OF FAME

Flintknapping experiments of impact: Schools of thought as reflected in the work of Crabtree, Flenniken, and Pelcin. by Michael J. Miller, M.A. A great deal of

knowledge developed through experimental method has been passed down by the numerous researchers of flintknapping. Our quest to understand the lithic implements created by our most ancient ancestors to their historic counterparts culminates in the 1960s as the advent of a new archaeology sweep through our discipline. The development of new theory, critique, experiment, methodology, and archaeology as a science produced several key figures whom I focus this work. Breaking these researchers into their own context works to develop them in their individual, unique, intellectual, and timely frameworks. The 1960s saw a great rise in the number of practicing archaeologists and thusly so an increased interest in lithic artefacts. The emphasis that was once placed on describing artefacts and establishing chronologies shifted toward a focus on the organization of culture and explanation of change and adaptation as portrayed in assemblages. The tools of prehistoric peoples were now looked at with a greater scrutiny, as well as, the roles they played in culture and nature. The replication studies of François Bordes and Don Crabtree had a major impact on lithic analysis. The use of experimental archaeology allowed them to conduct simulation studies and determine probable lithic tool production techniques. They were not the first to conduct and publish on flintknapping (see Evans 1872), but were looked upon by archaeologists for answers and methods to help scientific archaeology learn more about past technologies. The archaeological community found replication studies and background training in flintknapping of value; the framework was laid for lithic biface reduction sequence analysis, refitting, microwear, and assemblage analysis. Lithic replication studies utilize numerous experimental approaches to analyze stone tools. The fracture mechanics are a large part of this understanding and provide an insight into the production of assemblages. The differentiation between formal tools and the waste material left over from their creation act as attributes in the understanding of stone working technology. The work of modern flintknappers using primitive stone working tools and techniques provides a window for prehistoric lithic artefact examination. A brief review of the history of flintknapping and the replication of stone tools will give us a better understanding of lithic analysis in current

archaeology. Since the very first reports on flintknapping (see Skertchly 1879) and occidental pondering of ancient stone tools, we have, until recently, little insight into these areas. The replicas of primitive stone tools by William Smith and Edward Simpson sold as relics to collectors may be the first recorded flintknapping experiments where skill in stoneworking techniques can be called replicative (Forrest 1983). Later academic studies of flintknapping fracture mechanics (see Cushing 1895 and Holmes 1891) were tested to help understand possible prehistoric technique. A relatively large gap in the literature exists between these early experiments and those undertaken in the 1960s. The new and mostly scientific works being published brings us to the first of the major contributors to lithic technology, Don Crabtree. Don Crabtree, an avocational archaeologist and flintknapper, uses experimental archaeology to engage questions of prehistoric tool manufacture and the minds of lithic artefact researchers. Focusing on biface manufacture, fluting techniques, and blade core technologies, he forged a relationship with the numerous lithic analysts and today is seen as the “dean of American flintknappers” (Knudson 1982). Crabtree’s work relates primarily to questions of process, he tries to get at the “how” behind the creation of lithic artefacts. His 1966 article is the first reported attempt to replicate a Lindenmeier Folsom point. The work is a model of replicative experimentation that carefully examines the archaeological specimen, its debitage and describes the salient technological characteristics. He lists the numerous methods and factors used to try to replicate the specimen; he believes these sorts need to be taken into account for successful replication. He follows a proper scientific approach by listing the procedures followed and the results obtained in each of the experiments. Although it seems arbitrary, he notes to what degree the completed point and associated debris resembled the archaeological specimens. The comparison between the replicas and artefacts indicate which method or methods replicate the specimen successfully. He concludes that indirect percussion with rest, pressure using a chest crutch, clamp, and rest, or a combo of the two can successfully produce a Lindenmeier Folsom. In his 1968 article on Mesoamerican polyhedral blade cores, he attempts to replicate the technology that produced them utilizing the insights provided by historical notes written by Spanish Franciscan Friar Juan de Torquemada (Holmes 1919, 323-4). By recreating the tools, working positions, and techniques described by Torquemada, Crabtree finds numerous faults with the written record. Breaking the text down to pieces and forming analogies between other texts allows him to create homologues in the tool morphologies and create stone working techniques from the inferences. It is interesting to note that he finds great fault in the translation of the text and ultimately takes very little of the described process to create his own method; Crabtree ultimately discovers his own technique using tools similar to those described in the text. The experiments create good empirical data and allow him to test several methods that may have been practiced prehistorically to produce blades; difficulties with securing the core, pressure flaker tips, movement of the knappers body mass, and even the placement of the knappers feet all provide answers to questions he never intended to ask. The use of slow motion photography, a novel idea, allowed him to see the actual detachment of the blade from the core; these helped him to fine tune the necessary downward and outward pressure to remove blades successfully from the core. The empiricist approach taken by Crabtree in his work is shown in his conclusions statement when he states “no amount of theorizing… will give a true picture of these techniques; only by replicating can we change theory to fact” (Crabtree 1968, 33). The processual school of thought Crabtree adhered to, endorsed his positivist approach to experiment and dominated in his understanding of past processes. The processual behaviour associated with flintknapping places primary importance on replication of flaked stone tool reduction techniques; Crabtree and the experiments he performed are likely to be the cause of the replication of this mindset in today’s practicing replicators and lithic analysts. In my own research I followed, without thinking, the basic map of all lithic experiments performed before me and successfully duplicated, in my own eyes and my advisors, the lithic reduction process of a past culture. As the work of other researchers needs to be reviewed and addressed in the work that we perform, it undoubtedly works to

change and conform the thoughts of each and all who place relevance in the author's words. Crabtree's work was indispensable experimental archaeology. He was able to enlighten numerous students and colleagues. Such an influence has created a vast knowledgebase for today's lithic analysts, but one must wonder how the face of lithic analysis may look today if he had not stepped up. Of equal stature are the works of François Bordes, esteemed archaeologist and flintknapper of the Old World. Crabtree first meet Bordes at a lithic technology conference in France (see Jelinek 1965) and found common ground and produced an article (Bordes and Crabtree 1969) on the Corbiac blade technique. In his publications written in English, he rarely addresses experimentation in flintknapping, but focuses on issues of typology and chronology (see Bordes 1968; Bordes & Sonneville-Bordes 1970) in assemblages. The Levallois technique, developed by Bordes (1961), as described in Andrefsky (1998) is a lineal reduction that shapes a core to create a continuous striking platform around the perimeter in order to shape the surface for the removal of a single large Levallois flake. Several researchers have attempted to refine the process in a systematic analysis of reduction techniques (Bradley 1977; Boeda 1986; Geneste1985) and all found a theme in that the specific goal of the reduction is to create the properly shaped core for the proper Levallois flake to be removed (Andrefsky 1998). Bordes initial identification and description of Levallois technology fits the temporal context and framework of knapping experiments and fills a void in the Paleolithic reduction knowledgebase allowing future researchers to apply archaeological analysis. In the 1970s the contributions to experimental archaeology became more academic and scientific in nature, relying on stone working techniques and how the final product was formed (see Bradley 1974; Flenniken 1978). The experiments performed by Flenniken in the late 70s till the late 90s reflect the mindset of many lithic experimenters adding greatly to the knowledge base of lithic analysis. Flenniken (1978) replicates the Lindenmeier Folsom point type by creating a research question based upon the work of his precursors taking greatly from Crabtree (1966). The proper research question proved to be very useful in his experimental approach to understanding the techniques and stages of manufacture. Building on the stages of Crabtree (1966) he focuses specifically on fluting sequence; it is of much debate when the flutes were removed during flaking (Irwin 1968, 230; Crabtree 1966; and Wilmsen 1974, 14-15). He creates an experimental procedure based on the analysis of an archaeological assemblage and informs the reader of the materials and the method making the experiment replicable. Defined stages of manufacture are provided and include figures, timing, methods, and numerous notes on successes and failures. His conclusions find Crabtree's (1966, 22) work erroneous and suggest archaeologically significant fluting production techniques, as well as, the possible time input and failure rate of prehistoric knappers. Flenniken's reification of past studies demonstrates his processual approach to experimental replication studies, underpinning his constructs of "stage" and mode in the interpretation of manufacture sequences. The study of morphology and typology by Flenniken and Raymond (1986) questions the idea of using stone points as time markers for prehistoric cultures. They believe that the "conceptual and procedural modes" put forth by Rouse (1960, 318) do no adequately reflect the production and use of artefacts (Flenniken and Raymond 1986, 604). By questioning this notion they construct an experiment which tests the modes of manufacture and fully undermine the concept of projectile point typology. A very well defined methodology is presented to test Elko corner-notched and eared point typologies in a hunting situation. The rejuvenation of broken points, based on prehistoric evidence of resharpening, found that due to the higher percent of basal damage to experimental replicas that temporal type could change beyond the boundaries set by the lithic analyst. They suggest that assigning type based on morphology is risky; only the technological analysis of the entire lithic reduction sequence can adequately mark time (611). By questioning the normative interpretation of tools and providing empirical evidence that one out of every three aboriginal projectile points may have changed temporal type while in prehistoric context, challenges lithic analysts to reform their ideas of typology and its application to the prehistoric record. Thomas (1986) questions the ability of a modern flintknapper to reproduce prehistoric human

behaviour by suggesting that reality in understanding the life cycle of an artefact can never be fully identified. The range of variability in the production of replicas, the interpretation of process by modern day flintknappers, and the tool manufacture process of analogous forms suggests there is “absolutely no assurance that mere familiarity with specific techniques of lithic technology will automatically lead to accurate interpretation of the past” (1986, 621). The need for systematically controlled experiments in lithic replication work influenced lithic analysts to become more strict and scientific, but these studies in the lab were seen by others as no longer realistic or applicable. The resulting studies lead to a more archaeology based replication science as found in Flenniken and Wilke’s (1989) work on typology, technology, and chronology of Great Basin dart points. The two authors focus on the constructs of typology in the Great Basin and define general rules that archaeologists adhere to when placing a projectile point into a cultural type (Flenniken and Wilke 1989). They take from previous studies performed by Flenniken on dart points and their tendencies when utilized for hunting and dispatching animals to suggest that lithic technology studies can provide meaningful interpretations of the use-life of an artefact. The damage caused from use on the two archetypal forms of dart points suggests that nearly all sub-types may be directly related and temporally linked; the chronology of types is brought into question and the low number of significant attributes portrays stone dart points to be the least stable artefact type (153). The typological approach has created an illusion that Great Basin dart points can be set into periods and are static. Notions of discard are addressed to help our understanding of a dart point’s use-life and work to substantiate the conclusion; ‘mixing of archaeological units’ need to be attended to and not ignored by archaeologists opting out for an intuitive chronology based on the assumptions and hypothetical succession of morphological types (156). Based on a processual approach and empirical data, the conclusion is well substantiated. As the work of lithic analysts and the replicators becomes less focused on the end product the by-products of flintknapping are put to use interpreting the past via controlled scientific experiments. The most informative and elaborate scientific experiments in flintknapping were performed by Dibble and Pelcin (see Dibble and Pelcin 1995; Pelcin 1997). These studies of flake creation cover the numerous factors that can effect the formation of flakes and provide archaeological insight by informing us of key variables in the technology of stone working. Dibble and Pelcin (1995) effectively began a series of controlled flintknapping experiments that use scientific controls and a lab environment to successfully speculate on prehistoric flintknapping processes. The study of the effect of hammer mass and velocity on flake mass suggests that two independent variables, exterior platform angle and platform thickness, can be adapted by the stone worker to reliably change the needed mass to remove a planned flake. The methods are laid out as expected in any reproducible experiment, as well as the needed materials with detailed descriptions. They take a heuristic approach by testing and utilizing different mathematical formula to account for the variables in the experiment. Hypothesis testing helps them to refine their experiment and data to disprove the ‘belief if a flake is produced, neither momentum nor its individual components of mass and velocity has a major effect in determining flake mass’ (431). The platform angle and thickness are ruled by a mass-force threshold based on the percussors mass; this threshold effect explains why a flintknapper believes that momentum produces larger flakes. The value of this experiment is in the empirical data and its practical application to flintknappers creating flakes. By informing the experimenters of such realistic effects based on specific variables that the flintknapper typically assumes, they can control their platforms and scientifically create the desired flake morphology. Pelcin builds on the earlier work of Dibble and Pelcin (1995) in his work on core surface morphology (1997). The creation of an experimental data set to inform a specific hypothesis, controlled core surface morphology can effect the flake attributes of length and thickness, correlated to the notion that prehistoric and modern knappers recognize this and utilize it informs the archaeological record. The ability to produce a specific flake size and mass may have been utilized prehistorically when conservation of lithic resources was needed. Scientific means and measures are created to control, manipulate and influence

variables and work to eliminate the irregularities introduced by the human flintknapper (750). The experiment provided the needed detail in understanding ‘how the flake mass is distributed by the core surface morphology in relation to platform thickness and exterior platform angle’ (754) and provides a model to determine the mass (thickness, bulb of percussion size, length and width) of a flake based on the platform angle and thickness. These data can be extrapolated to reconstruct the location and amount of flake mass removed during pressure flaking which directly relates to the use-life of the flake tool and material limitations of the prehistoric flintknapper/tool-user. The numerous experiments of lithic analysts and flintknappers take several forms in the literature. Noting the inquires made of experimental archaeology are often those of empiricists looking for data to infer interpretations and the processualists wanting to delineate process and/or test hypotheses. Often mixing of the aforementioned work hand in hand to produce viable scientific archaeology producing insight into problems initially addressed; new questions discovered during the testing create further knowledge and inform the research beyond original concern. Lithic experimentation has provided a means to test certain aspects of the archaeological record; in science we can never change theory to fact, only disprove and recreate question that help us to further our understanding of the ancient human past. References Andrefsky, W. 1998. Lithics. Cambridge: University Press. Boeda, E. 1986. Approche technolgique du concept levallois et évaluation de son champs d’Applicatioń: tude de trios gisements saaliens et weichseliens de la France septentrionale. Doctoral dissertation, University of Paris X. Bordes, F. 1961. Typologie du paléolithique ancient et moyen. Publications de l’Institut de Préhistoire de l’Université de Bordeaux, Mémoire 1, Bordeaux. Bordes, F. & D. Crabtree. 1969. The Corbiac blade technique and other experiments. Tebiwa 12(2): 1-21. Bordes, F. & D. de Sonneville-Bordes. 1970. The Significance of variability in Paleolithic Assemblages. World Archaeology 2: 61-73. Bradley, B. 1974. Comments on the Lithic Technology of the Casper Site, in G. Frison (ed.), The Casper Bison Kill Site. 191-197. New York: Academic Press. Bradley, B. 1977. Experimental Lithic Technology with Special Reference to the Middle Paleolithic. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge. Crabtree, D. 1966. A stone-worker’s approach to analyzing and replicating the Lindenmeier Folsom. Tebiwa 9(1): 3-39. Crabtree, D. 1968. Mesoamerican polyhedral cores and prismatic blades. American Antiquity 33: 446-78. Cushing, F. 1895. The Arrow. American Anthropologist 8(4): 307-349. Dibble, H & A. Pelcin. 1995. The Effect of Hammer Mass and Velocity on Flake Mass. Journal of Archaeological Science 22: 429-439. Evans, J. 1872. The Ancient Stone Implements, Weapons and Ornaments of Great Britain. London: Longmans. Flenniken, J. 1978. Revaluation of the Lindemeier Folsom: A Replication Experiment in Lithic Technology. American Antiquity 43(3): 473-480. Flenniken, J. & A. Raymond. 1986. Morphological Projectile Point Typology: Replication Experimentation and Technological Analysis. American Antiquity 51: 603-14. Flenniken, J. & P. Wilke. 1989. Typology, Technology, and Chronology of Great Basin Dart Points. American Anthropologist 91: 49-58. Forrest, A. 1983. Masters of Flint. Suffolk: Lavenham Press. Geneste, J. 1985. Analyse lithique d’industries moustériennes du Périgord: une approche technologique du comportement des groups humains au paléolithique moyen. Doctoral dissertation, University of Bordeaux I. Henry, D., V. Haynes, & B. Bradley. 1976. Quantitative variations in flaked stone debitage. Plains Anthropologist 21: 57-61. Holmes, W. 1891. Maufacture of Stone Arrow-points. American Anthropologist 4: 49-58. Holmes, W. 1919. Handbook of Aboriginal American Antiquities. Part1: Introductory and the Lithic Industries. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 60. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. Irwin, H. 1968. The Itama: late Pleistocene inhabitants of the plains of the United States and Canada and the American Southwest. Published PhD thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge. Jelinek, A. 1965. Lithic Technology Conference, Les Eyzies, France. American Antiquity 31: 277-278. Knudson, R. 1982. Obituary, Don E. Crabtree, 1912-1980. American Antiquity 47(2): 336-343. Newcomer, M. 1975. Punch technique and Upper Paleolithic blades, in E. Swanson (ed.), Lithic technology. 97-102. The Hague: Mouton. Pelcin, A. 1997. The Effect of Core Surface Morphology on Flake Attributes: Evidence from a Controlled Experiment. Journal of Archaeological

Science 24: 749-756. Rouse, I. 1960. The Classification of Artifacts in Archaeology. American Antiquity 25: 313-323. Skertchly, S. 1879. On the Manufacture of Gun-Flints, the Methods of Excavating for Flint, the Age of Paleolithic Man, and the Connection between Neolithic Art and the Gun-Flint Trade. Memoirs of the Geological Survey of England and Wales. London: Geological Survey. Thomas, D. 1986. Points on Points: A Reply to Flenniken and Raymond. American Antiquity 51: 619-627. Wilmsen, E. 1974. Lindenmeier: A Pleistocene hunting society. New York: Harper and Row. ++++++++++++++++++ West J Med. 1982 Mar;136(3):265-9. Ancient technology in contemporary surgery. Buck BA. Abstract Archaeologists have shown that ancient man developed the ability to produce cutting blades of an extreme degree of sharpness from volcanic glass. The finest of these prismatic blades were produced in Mesoamerica about 2,500 years ago. The technique of production of these blades was rediscovered 12 years ago by Dr. Don Crabtree, who suggested possible uses for the blades in modern surgery. Blades produced by Dr. Crabtree have been used in experimental microsurgery with excellent results. Animal experiments have shown the tensile strength of obsidian produced wounds to be equal to or greater than that of wounds produced by steel scalpels after 14 days of healing. We have been able to demonstrate neither flaking of glass blades into the wounds nor any foreign body reaction in healed wounds. Skin incisions in human patients have likewise healed well without complications. The prismatic glass blade is infinitely sharper than a honed steel edge, and these blades can be produced in a wide variety of shapes and sizes. It is therefore suggested that this type of blade may find an appropriate use in special areas of modern surgery XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Francois Bordesonce declared that archaeology could recognize a “pre-Crabtree” and a “post-Crabtree” era. In this earlier era, most researchers classified stone tools by shape or assumed function. In the later era, researchers became more sophisticated, considering landmarks and other features on flakes indicative of manufacture and use. Ruthann Knudson, in her 1982 obituary (Knudson 1982), cited Don Crabtree as “the dean of American flintknappers,” a titleJacques Tixier, when alerted that we were building an exhibit on Don Crabtree, penned a testimony to his friend and colleague. It is presented here as an acknowledgement of the impact Don had on the field of archaeology. Professor Tixierwrote: Hommage. J’airencontrépour la premiere foisDon Crabtree le 22 nov.1964 pour la “Lithic Technology Conference a les Eyzies.” Cetteréunionpassapresqueinapercueà l’époque. Cefutpourtant unedate trèsimportantepour l’étudedu comportementhumainaux temps préhistoriques, pour troisraisons: Cefutl’officialisationde la valeurde l’expérimentationen Préhistoire. Cefutla première collaboration entre tailleursaméricainset européens. Grâcea Don, le monde de la pressionnous futrévéleà nous, Français, au point queplusieursd’entrenous (dontje fus) restèrentdeuxnuitssans dormir, émerveilléspar l’habiletéet les connaissancesde Don dansla reproduction des lames en obsidienne, les fameux“navajas” des Aztèques, et des pointes de projectiles des paléo-indiens. Se commentairesétaientjusteset raisonnables, patients et “à but non lucratif.” Commençaalorspour moi, en mars 1965, unesorted’enseignementpar correspondancesousla formesuivante: Don m’envoyaitdes modèlesde retouches et des pièces préforméesqueje finissais. Puisje les luirenvoyais, après mesretouches, pour appreciation. Il me les retournaitenfinavec un avis toujoursencourageantmaistoujoursobjectif. En èchangeje lui faisaisparvenirdu silexde France qu’ ilappreciaittout particulierement. Je fusdoncson élèveet je m’englorifie. Petit à petit cetteabondantecorrespondance(jusqu’enaout1980), entrecoupée de quelquesrencontresenthousiastesen Idaho, se transformaen un èchangeplus challureuxencore. En mêmetemps se développaunecollaboration scientifiqueainsiquenaquittout naturellementune amitiéprofonde. Je fusalorsson collègueet son ami. Je puistémoignericicombienila etéadroit et réfléchi, inventifet productif, pédogogueet chalureusementouvert. Il avaitle coeursurla main. Il étaitavanttout humain. Il a sudialogues avec les hommespréhistoriquesen refaisantles mêmes gestes, en passant par les mêmesconcepts. Il a redécouvertles traitementthermiquedes roches siliceusespour qu’ellessoientplus facilementtaillables,

plus brillantes, plus colorées. Il resteun modèlepour beaucoup. Il resteaussipour moimonami. Il s'appelaitDon Eugene Crabtree. acknowledged by many practitioners. Emphasized in the obit was the close relationship between Crabtree and Earl Swanson, ISU archaeologist and Director of the Idaho State College Museum. The two close colleagues were to develop a seminal programCrabtree's collaboration with Swanson, and Bordesand Tixier, fueled a surge of interest through the 1960s in replicating stone tool technologies. A major event was creation of the Idaho State University FlintworkingSchool in 1969 with funding by the National Science Foundation. Thirty-three archaeology students would pass through the schools over a six year span. These "Crabtree students" would go on to establish the importance of research in lithic technology in archaeology. in study of stone tool technology. Crabtree was appointed a Research Associate in Lithic Technology at the Museum in 1964. Publications, conferences, exhibitions and films were to result. "Man's Oldest Craft Re-created" was an exhibit highlighting Don Crabtree's work developed by George Gardner of Yang-Gardner Associates, New York, and Lynch Exhibits, Pennsauken, New Jersey, for the American Museum of Natural History. Dr. JuniusBird, AMNH Curator of South American archaeology, and Dr. Richard Gould, AMNH Associate Curator of North American Archaeology, worked with Don to create the exhibition, which was placed in AMNH from February through September, 1970. The exhibit was summarized in AMNH"Curator" (Crabtree and Gould 1970). A seminal step forward occurred with funding of an international conference on lithic technology at Les Eyzies, France, in 1964. Joint sponsorship was supplied by the Society for American Archaeology, the Universitede Bordeaux and the National Science Foundation. Scholars from France, the United States, and Canada, met over six days. Don Crabtree, an acknowledged expert in pressure flaking, and Francois Bordes, expert in percussion flaking, were featured. Jacques Tixier, another French knapper, also attended. It was here that Crabtree introduced his work on heat treatment to the Old World scholars. Bordes, Tixier and Crabtree were

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx Don Crabtree From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia Jump to: navigation, search Don Crabtree (June 8, 1912 – November 16, 1980) was a flintknapper and pioneering experimental archaeologist. Known as the “Dean of American flintknappers” he was mostly self-educated, however he was awarded an honorary doctorate degree by the University of Idaho. His 1972 publication An Introduction to Flintworking still serves as one of the primary terminology sources for students of lithic technology. Crabtree is well known for “Crabtree’s Law”, which states that “the greater the degree of final finishing applied to a stone artifact, whether by flaking, grinding, and/or polishing, the harder it is to conclude the lithic reduction process which produced the stone artifact.” Through practical experimentation and study of archaeological finds (both completed tools and the chips of stone left by their production) Crabtree learned to produce replicas of a variety of different ancient flint and obsidian blades.[1] Contents [hide] 1 Life and Death 2 Employment History 3 Awards and honors 4 Selected Papers[2] 5 References 6 External links [edit] Life and Death Don E. Crabtree was born in Heyburn, Idaho on June 8, 1912. He finished high school in Twin Falls in 1930, after which he worked for the Idaho Power Company. After a brief period he traveled to California where he enrolled in Long Beach Junior College in the mid-1930s with the intent to major in geology and paleontology. Crabtree was noted as being a thinker-while-doing, highly active, and not enjoying studying; due to this he dropped out of Long Beach Junior College after only one term to go his own route. In 1939 he discovered he had cancer, and this discovery briefly impeded his self-study in archeology. During the war years he met his wife, Evelyn, and married in 1943 while working for the Bethlehem Steel Company in California. Crabtree would spend the next 30 years educating and assisting some of the biggest names in archeology at the time such as Alfred Kroeber. Crabtree was also asked for his advice at influential sites like the Clovis type site. After a highly successful career he died in Twin Falls, Idaho on November 16, 1980 of complications due to heart disease. [edit] Employment History After graduation from high school Don Crabtree first worked for the Idaho Power Company. After dropping out of Long Beach Junior College in California he began working in paleontological laboratories. By the late 1930s he was the preparator in the vertebrate paleontology laboratory at the University of California, Berkeley. It was during this time he became acquainted with Alfred L. Kroeber and E.W.Gifford of the Lowie Museum at Berkeley. His time at Berkeley also included conducting flint knapping demonstrations for scholars and students and occasionally for museum visitors. After his battle with cancer was over in 1941 he worked for several months at the Lithic Laboratory of the Ohio Historical Society. It was during this period that Crabtree was called upon as an advisor in lithic studies to the University of Pennsylvania, where he was associated with Edgar B. Howard and the Clovis point type site at Black Water Draw. Frank H. H. Roberts of the Smithsonian Institution also called upon him around this time to consult on the analysis of the Lindenmeier Folsom point collection. When the U.S. entered into World War II the Lithic lab was discontinued and Crabtree returned to California to assist in the war effort as a coordination engineer for Bethlehem Steel Company, which built the ships for the Pacific effort until the war ended. After WWII he returned to Twin Springs, Idaho and became a successful real estate salesman in the postwar market. Crabtree was employed from 1952 until 1962 as a county supervisor for the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) in Twin Falls. In March 1962 he opened the First Conference of Western Archaeologists on Problems of Point Typology at the Idaho State College Museum with a demonstration of his flintworking skills. In 1964 he was appointed Research Associate in Lithic Technology at the Pocatello Museum - a job he maintained until 1975. [edit] Awards and honors Don Crabtree was awarded an honorary doctorate degree from the University of Idaho for his outstanding contributions to the field of experimental archeology. As a rule he was apprehensive to speak at lectures and publish his work therefore the majority of the archeological community did not realize the depth of his contributions until most of his papers were published in the Idaho

State University Museum journal, Tebiwa. After this he became a household name in the U.S. and the “Crabtree School” of Flintknapping was begun during which he taught some 33 pupils from 1969 to 1975 many of which would produce dissertations that would educate students across the country in lithic technology. In 1969 some of Crabtree’s work was featured in a special exhibition at New York’s American Museum of Natural History. He is also credited with the creation of “Crabtree’s Law” which is integral in the modern study of lithics. Don Crabtree donated his entire collection of work to the University of Idaho for current and future archeologists to study. The Crabtree Award of the Society for American Archaeology is also named after him. [edit] Selected Papers[2] Mastodon Bone with Artifacts in California. 1939. American Antiquity 5(2):148-149. Notes on Experiments in Flintknapping: 1. Heat-Treatment of Silica Materials (with B. Robert Butler). 1964. Tebiwa 7(1):1-6. A Stoneworker's Approach to Analyzing and Replicating the Lindenmeier Folsom. 1966. Tebiwa 9(1):3-39. Notes on Experiments in Flintknapping: 3. The Flintknapper's Raw Materials. 1967. Tebiwa 10(1):8-24. Notes on Experiments in Flintknapping: 4. Tools Used for Making Flaked Stone Artifacts. 1967. Tebiwa 10(1):60-71. Archaeological Evidence of Acculturation Along the Oregon Trail. 1968. Tebiwa 11(2):38-42. Experimental Manufacture of Wooden Implements with Tools of Flaked Stone.1968. Science 159(3812):426-428. Mesoamerican Polyhedral Cores and Prismatic Blades. 1968. American Antiquity 33(4):446-478. Edge-Ground Cobbles and Blade-Making in the Northwest (with Earl H. Swanson, Jr.). 1968. Tebiwa 11(2):50-58. The Corbiac Blade Technique and Other Experiments. 1969. Tebiwa 12(2):1-21. A Technological Description of Artifacts in Assemblage I, Wilson Butte Cave, Idaho. 1969. Current Anthropology (10)4:366-367. Flaking Stone Tools with Wooden Implements. 1970. Science 169(3941):146-153. Man's Oldest Craft Re-created (with Ricard A. Gould). 1970. Curator 13(3)179-198. An Introduction to Flintworking. 1972. Occasional Papers of the Idaho State University Museum, No. 28. The Cone Fracture Principle and the Manufacture of Lithic Materials. 1972. Tebiwa 15(2):29-42. Experiments in Replicating Hohokam Points. 1973. Tebiwa 16(1):10-45. The Obtuse Angle as a Functional Edge. 1973. Tebiwa 16(1):46-53. Grinding and Smoothing of Stone Artifacts. 1974. Tebiwa 17(1):1-6. Unusual Milling Stone from Battle Mountain, Nevada. 1974. Tebiwa 17(1):89-91. Comments on Lithic Technology and Experimental Archaeology in Lithic Technology: Making and Using Stone Tools edited by Earl H. Swanson, Jr., pp 105–114. 1975. World Series in Anthropology. Mouton. Comment on "A History of Flintknapping Experimentation, 1838-1976". 1978. Current Anthropology (19)1:360. [edit] References 1.^ Plew, Mark G., James C. Woods and Max G. Pavesic. (1985) Stone Tool Analysis-Essays in Honor of Don E. Crabtree, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico. 2.^ Knudson, Ruthann, (1982) American Antiquities, Society for American Archaeology, Vol. 13, pp. 336-43 The Crabtree Lithic Technology Collection consists of approximately 8,000 examples of experimental flintknapping, samples of lithic source materials used for the manufacture of stone tools, and archaeological and ethnographic specimens of lithic technology from Europe, North American, and Australia. The collections also includes research papers and correspondence associated with Crabtree's research, his personal library on lithic technology, and photographic records of his research. The lithic research library is world-wide in scope, including works in English, French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Danish, Russian, Japanese, and Chinese published over the last 120 years.

Crabtree Award

Established in 1985 to recognize significant contributions to archaeology in the Americas made by individual who has had little if any formal training in archaeology and little if any wage or salary as an archaeologist. The award is named after Don Crabtree of Twin Falls, Idaho, who made significant contributions to the study of lithic technology and whose dedication to archaeology was a lifelong personal and financial commitment. The awardees have been:

1985 Clarence H. Webb, MD
1987 Leonard W. Blake
1988 Julian Dodge Hayden
1989 J. B. Sollberger
1990 Ben C. McCary
1991 James Pendergast
1992 Stuart W. Conner
1993 Mary Elizabeth Good
1994 Leland W. Patterson
1995 Jeff Carskadden
1996 James H. Word
1997 Sidney Merrick Wheeler (posthumous)
and Georgia Nancy Wheeler Felts
1998 Reca Jones
1999 Gene L. Titmus
2000 Richard P. Mason
2001 John D. "Jack" Holland
2002 Richard A. Bice

BORDES AND CRABTREE IN FRANCE. 1970S

2003 Dr. Guillermo Mata Amado ---------- ---------- ---------- CRABTREE MUSEUM Donald E. Crabtree - Biography "Crabtree was born in Heyburn, Idaho on June 8, 1912. His parents were Reverend Ellis and Mabel G. Crabtree and they lived on 140 acres in the Salmon River Valley. In 1917, the Crabtrees moved to a 10-acre plot outside of Twin Falls and established a garden and pickle business. Crabtree lived a close life to his parents and two sisters in the Twin Falls community. Don finished high school in Twin Falls in 1930 and worked for the Idaho Power Company. He then decided to move to California where he enrolled in Long Beach Junior College in the mid-1930s, intending to major in geology and paleontology. His interest in those topics and in prehistoric archaeology had developed during a childhood and youth spent exploring south-central Idaho. Crabtree tried flintknapping, but at the time, it was not his primary focus. Crabtree was a very active person and was not happy with just studying, and after one term at Long Beach Junior College, he dropped out and went the rest of the way by himself. Even though he was self-conscious about his lack of education and disliked public speeches, he was recognized internationally as one of the most thoughtful and provocative students of prehistoric technologies. Crabtree began working in paleontological laboratories and by the late 1930s he was the

preparator in the vertebrate paleontology laboratory at the University of California, Berkely. He worked under the direction of Charles Camp and Ruben Stirton and did summer fieldwork in Nevada and California. Crabtree became acquainted with Alfred L. Kroeber and E.W. Gifford of the Lowie Museum at Berkeley, and in the late 1930s, worked as a technician in the anthropology program while he further developed his flintknapping skills. He also conducted knapping demonstrations for scholars and students at Berkeley and occasionally for museum visitors. In 1939, Crabtree was diagnosed with cancer and returned home to his parents' home during what were considered to be his last days. However, massive cobalt treatments and his mother's and his indomitable patience through months on intensive care, led him to recovery. He spent his recuperation period, when his mobility was limited and as he was trying to regain muscular strength, flintknapping - making arrowheads, spearpoints, and eccentric lithic forms by the hour. What had been a virtuoso performance until that time became a confirmed craft and art, all the time conducted amidst a personal search for information about lithic mechanics, systems of efficient core reduction, and the significance of variations among the newly identified paleo-Indian points from the Plains and Southwest. In the spring of 1941, fully recovered and with a year of concentrated flintknapping behind him, Crabtree was invited to demonstrated knapping techniques at the American Association of Museums' annual meeting in Columbus, Ohio. As a result of that demonstration, he was employed for Shetrone, replicating eastern lithic artifacts. Crabtree was also called upon as an advisor in lithic studies to the University of Pennsylvania, where he was associated with Edgar B. Howard and the Clovis type site and other Blackwater Draw materials. It was during this period that he had his first "hands on" acquaintance with the Folsom materials, one of his lifelong fascinations, when Frank H. Roberts of the Smithsonian Institution called Crabtree in as a consultant in the analysis of the Lindenmeier Folsom collection. Everything was going right in the fall of 1941; the cancer was in remission, Crabtree has employment doing that in which he was most interested (working with stone tools), and he was becoming recognized as one of the leading students of that subject by major archaeological institutions. Then the United States entered World War II, the Lithic Laboratory was discontinued, and Crabtree returned to California to join the war effort. From 1941 until the late 1950s, Crabtree's involvement with flintknapping was only as an avocation. He spent the war years in Long Beach where he worked as a coordination engineer for Bethlehem Steel Company, which built the ships for the Pacific effort. There he met his beloved wife, Evelyn Josephine Meadows; they married in Long Beach in 1943. Their relationship was a strong and close interdependency, she was serving as his housekeeper, traveling companion, secretary and editor, and always his closest confidant. They never had children of their own, rather "adopting" the young students who flocked around Crabtree to learn and consult. Evelyn's health problems were also significant; she had lost a lung to tuberculosis when she was a young woman, and spent her last years in a long fight against cancer. Their 33 years together were a true partnership, and one did not know Don Crabtree unless one knew Evelyn. Following World War II, the Crabtrees returned to Twin Falls. They purchased the big family home from Don's parents, and he soon was a real estate salesman in a booming postwar market. Evelyn was a manager of a large savings and loan institution, where she dealt in real estate and more general financial matters. They eventually sold the large house and bought a small place out in the country just east of Twin Falls and over the years they added rooms and a shop until finally they had a modest but complete lithic laboratory and guest facility. Crabtree was employed from 1952 until 1962 as a county supervisor for the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) in Twin Falls, spending much of his time in aerial photo interpretation of soil conservation problems. He continued to read voraciously, to keep up with archaeological publications, and to demonstrate flintknapping to local school and youth groups. He also continued his investigations into the archaeology of southern Idaho, particularly its prehistory. He was locally quite well-known for his knapping skills and knowledge, and that local fame led him to a reentry into the scholarly world of lithic studies in 1958. In 1958, Earl H. Swanson Jr., who established the first major archaeological program at the Idaho

State University in Pocatello, Idaho, introduced himself to Crabtree after hearing from local people about the flintknapper with an amazing skill and major regional archaeological collection. Crabtree and Swanson shared a deep friendship and it lasted until Swanson's untimely death in 1975. Swanson's international credentials and participation in the "early man" network of American archaeologists gave Crabtree access to research monies and forums that he would not have entered on his own, and Swanson never hesitated to do whatever he could to provide Crabtree with that access by extension. "

//

>

DON CRABTREE WITH GENE TITMUS 1979

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx t
a Comment On: Ohio Archaeology Blog "DON CRABTREE AT THE OHS LITHIC LABORATORY" No comments yet. - Hide Original Post [Image] H. Holmes Ellis, Research Assistant at the Ohio Historical Society's Lithic Laboratory for the Eastern United States, in his annual report of the Lab's activities for "the year April, 1941 -- April, 1942, described one of their most important achievements for the year: [Image]"The Lithic Laboratory discovered a remarkably able flint chipper, Don E. Crabtree of Twin Falls, Idaho, and acquired his services for two months in the early summer of 1941. Mr. Crabtree, during his stay in Columbus, contributed largely to the rediscovering of two elusive 'lost arts,' Folsom fluting and the manufacture of flake knives. Achieving either one of these difficult techniques would have been worth his trip east; we had not hoped for both successes." [Image]Don Crabtree would go on to become the "Dean of American Flintknapping." His 1972 publication An Introduction to Flintworking, is still a useful reference for

Crabtree student: Robson Bonnichsen

anyone who wants to understand what is involved in making stone tools. Crabtree taught many archaeologists, including my mentor, the late Rob Bonnichsen, the art of flintknapping. Rob tried to pass some of that knowledge along to me in a lithic technology workshop, but I am afraid I never got much beyond the Acheulean stage of craftsmanship. Nevertheless, the insights I did manage to glean from knocking rocks together have helped me immeasurably in my understanding of ancient stone tools. Don Crabtree and the OHS Lithic Laboratory were pioneers in bringing those valuable insights to the attention of the discipline of archaeology. [Image] Brad Lepper posted by Brad Lepper at 10:25 AM on Apr 4, 2013

CRABTREE'S ARTICLES:

Mastodon Bone with Artifacts in California. 1939. American Antiquity 5(2):148-149.
Notes on Experiments in Flintknapping: 1. Heat-Treatment of Silica Materials (with B. Robert Butler). 1964. Tebiwa 7(1):1-6.
A Stoneworker's Approach to Analyzing and Replicating the Lindenmeier Folsom. 1966. Tebiwa 9(1):3-39.
Notes on Experiments in Flintknapping: 3. The Flintknapper's Raw Materials. 1967. Tebiwa 10(1):8-24.
Notes on Experiments in Flintknapping: 4. Tools Used for Making Flaked Stone Artifacts. 1967. Tebiwa 10(1):60-71.
Archaeological Evidence of Acculturation Along the Oregon Trail. 1968. Tebiwa 11(2):38-42.
Experimental Manufacture of Wooden Implements with Tools of Flaked Stone.1968. Science 159(3812):426-428.
Mesoamerican Polyhedral Cores and Prismatic Blades. 1968. American Antiquity 33(4):446-478.
Edge-Ground Cobbles and Blade-Making in the Northwest (with Earl H. Swanson, Jr.). 1968. Tebiwa 11(2):50-58.
The Corbiac Blade Technique and Other Experiments. 1969. Tebiwa 12(2):1-21.
A Technological Description of Artifacts in Assemblage I, Wilson Butte Cave, Idaho. 1969. Current Anthropology (10)4:366-367.

Flaking Stone Tools with Wooden Implements. 1970. Science 169(3941):146-153.
Man's Oldest Craft Re-created (with Ricard A. Gould). 1970. Curator 13(3)179-198.
An Introduction to Flintworking. 1972. Occasional Papers of the Idaho State University Museum, No. 28.
The Cone Fracture Principle and the Manufacture of Lithic Materials. 1972. Tebiwa 15(2):29-42.
Experiments in Replicating Hohokam Points. 1973. Tebiwa 16(1):10-45.
The Obtuse Angle as a Functional Edge. 1973. Tebiwa 16(1):46-53.
Grinding and Smoothing of Stone Artifacts. 1974. Tebiwa 17(1):1-6.
Unusual Milling Stone from Battle Mountain, Nevada. 1974. Tebiwa 17(1):89-91.
Comments on Lithic Technology and Experimental Archaeology in Lithic Technology: Making and Using Stone Tools edited by Earl H. Swanson, Jr., pp 105–114. 1975. World Series in Anthropology. Mouton.
Comment on "A History of Flintknapping Experimentation, 1838-1976". 1978. Current Anthropology (19)1:360

Posted by THE RESEARCH JOURNAL at 9:13 PM

Labels: Arrowheads, California Indians, DON CRABTREE, Donald Crabtree, hall of Fame. Ray Harwood. Obsidian, King of the Flintknappers., obsidian., University of Idaho. flintknapping

3 comments:

Pete October 11, 2016 at 12:15 AM

back in 1971 I briefly meet him after he picked me up from a fight I was in oddly enough another Crabtree Kendall was his name and he won the fight I was 11 at the time he was talking showed me his collection of tips this is what you should be doing instead of fighting he too k me on home where I received a sore butt for fighting. never gave the guy a second thought until recently I was interested in gaining my ancestral roots back and skills

Reply

Pete October 11, 2016 at 12:17 AM

my Loss

Reply

Pete October 11, 2016 at 12:20 AM

I was trying to learn more about him and if possible learn from him. Too late is I but every one knows him I am Lipan Apache from the Coyote Clan

Reply

Newer Post Home Older Post

Subscribe to: Post Comments (Atom)