Come and See the “Other Side” of Nevada!

Alanah Woody

BRIGHT LIGHTS and the sounds of slot machines aren’t the only great things about Nevada—there are also the wonderful and varied landscapes, the fascinating and rich history, and then there’s the most beautiful and interesting rock art you’ve ever seen! You’ve probably already heard all about Las Vegas and Reno, well now’s your chance to get to know the “other side” of Nevada as guests of the Nevada Rock Art Foundation, at the annual meeting of the American Rock Art Research Association in Sparks, Nevada. Sparks is just east of Reno on Interstate 80; in fact, it’s just across the street and most people don’t know when they’ve passed from one city into the other. Many of the residents of Sparks just call Reno “west-Sparks,” and for good reason. Sparks was the larger town originally because it was the location of the train depot and Reno was just a little town to the west. But as they both began to grow, Reno soon outpaced Sparks and eventually the two became joined together.

Sparks has all the same sort of “Nevada-type” entertainment venues, but still maintains a lot of its small-town charm. Along with gambling, western Nevada is also the location of some of the world’s best snow skiing, backpacking, hunting, and fishing. It’s one of the few places in the world where you can snow ski in the morning (in the beautiful Sierra Mountains) and water ski in the afternoon (in beautiful Pyramid Lake)! Now that’s outdoor fun!

In addition to interesting papers and important committee meetings, there’s also an action-packed schedule of events planned—beginning on Thursday evening with the Education Committee-sponsored public presentation at Truckee Meadows Community College in Reno. Plans for the speaker are unconfirmed at this point, but it’s sure to be a crowd-pleaser and draw a large number of local residents. On Friday the Conservation Committee will tour a recently vandalized site (three boulders were recently stolen from the site—one of the images was used to create this year’s conference logo) with representatives of the U.S. Forest Service. Education Committee activities being planned for Friday include the annual Kids Workshop at a local school, as well as a teachers’ workshop where the Resources for Education can be distributed. Friday night, it’s out to Pyramid Lake for a special reception hosted by the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribal Council and the Pyramid Lake Cultural Center. The Cultural Center Curator, Ben Aleck, will be on hand to introduce ARARA members to the museum and to some of the history of the Pyramid Lake Paiute people. Also, we’ll get to participate in the rare treat of hearing traditional stories told by Pyramid Lake Elder Ralph Burns. Ralph is also a noted dancer and he may even wear his dance costume and give a brief demonstration of the dancing that has made him famous at western Pow Wows. The Pyramid Lake Cultural
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Center is 40 miles from Sparks, and ARARA hopes to make a bus available for a nominal fee.

Saturday’s sessions will be followed by the ever-popular ARARA Auction! The venue for this exciting event is nearly across the street from the conference hotel (Sparks Nugget) at the Sparks Heritage Museum, so we can all stay late, bid hard, and have only a short stroll back to the hotel with the fruits of our bidding efforts! Sunday evening will be the ARARA Banquet and we are especially pleased to announce that the banquet speaker will be none other than the woman “who wrote the book” on Great Basin rock art—Polly Schaafsma! The rock art chapter in the Smithsonian Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 11 Great Basin (1986), written by Polly, remains the foundation of all Great Basin rock art research. She’s been doing a lot of exciting research in the Southwest and eastern Utah, and she’ll share with us some of her insights. There aren’t many others who are as knowledgeable and broadly experienced as she is—we’ll all benefit greatly from both!

ARARA’s traditional field trip day will round out the conference on Monday, May 30. See the article in this issue of La Pintura for Field Trip Previews.

Conference Hotel

THE VENUE for the 2005 ARARA Conference is John Ascuaga’s Nugget Hotel and Casino, 1100 Nugget Avenue, Sparks, Nevada, (800) 648-1177, web page at www.janugget.com. Rooms are $79 for 1 or 2 persons, $89 for 3, and $99 for 4. Rooms may be reserved at the Conference Rate as long as rooms are available. Be sure to mention the ARARA 2005 Conference when making your reservations.

Saturday Auction is Back!

THE ALWAYS POPULAR AUCTION is back after last year’s vacation south of the border. ARARA is seeking donations of high quality rock-art-related items for sale to raise money for the Archives Fund. We are particularly looking for objects with memorable stories or histories that will be recognizable to the ARARA audience. Weird is good too!

Don’t forget to bring your saleable, tax-deductible auction items to Nevada. There will be a table in the Vendor area where you can leave your donated items to be catalogued. See Rick and Carol Bury at the conference.

Field Trip Previews

ARARA’S TRADITIONAL FIELD TRIPS will round out the conference on Monday, May 30 (a Field Trip registration form will be included in the next La Pintura). Because of growing concerns about increasing damage to rock art and other archaeological sites, there will be a very strict limit on numbers of both people (20 maximum) and cars (5 maximum—car pooling is required) allowed on the tours. In order to accommodate everyone who wants to go on a tour, there will be a multiple local tours offered as well as a number at some distance from the Sparks area on main travel routes throughout the state (see brief descriptions below). ARARA members who are driving home to the Southwest or southern California will be given the option of visiting a site in southern Nevada, and for those heading east there will be a tour in that direction as well.

ARARA members, concerned with the protection and preservation of rock art, understand that even a single visitor impacts a site and that few archaeological sites can withstand the impact of large numbers of people. So, there will be a few alternative options available to ARARA members—free admission to local museums on tour day and even non-rock art archaeological tours for those who have more than a single interest in life! Tour participants will be selected randomly based on their preference of first, second, and third choice and ALL tours are dependant on weather and provisional based on changing weather conditions or decisions of land owners/managers. Tour departure times will be staggered, beginning at 6 a.m., depending on the distance to the site (some are quite far) and box lunches (turkey, roast beef, or vegetarian) will be available for purchase (these must be purchased in advance with Conference registration).

1. Dry Lakes: In the immediate Sparks area, there will be three tours to this area, tailored to meet the various fitness levels of tour participants. A high-clearance vehicle is required over this very rocky, unmaintained road. The hike on Dry Lakes Tour #1 is very difficult, going mostly uphill to a series of habitation rings and petroglyph boulders. The rock art is exceptional for the area, with many anthropomorphic and zoomorphic motifs rather than the “regular” Basin and Range tradition rock art found locally. Dry Lakes Tour #2 is a generally moderate but quite long hike. Several small sites with very unusual motifs will be encountered all along the crest of a ridge. Tour participants should be in relatively good physical condition for both of these tours. Dry Lakes Tour #3 will be a very easy hike to two interesting sites on the margins of a dry lake basin. These tours will last approximately four hours each.
2. Court of Antiquity: Also in the immediate area, there will be **two tours** to this a very interesting site that is just moments east of Sparks on Interstate 80. At the site, owned by the state of Nevada and kept behind a locked gate, visitors will be see petroglyphs engraved on horizontal bedrock surfaces which overlook the Truckee River. The hike is very easy and each tour will last approximately three hours. The first tour will leave the Sparks Nugget in the morning and the second tour will leave after lunch, so neither tour will require that lunch be brought along. Petroglyphs are the second tour will leave after lunch, so neither tour will require that lunch be brought along. Petroglyphs are primarily Basin and Range Tradition, but many are quite unique (see Heizer and Baumhoff 1962:Figs. 115–117).

3. Grimes Point and Salt Cave: Southeast of Sparks, near Fallon on Highway 50. There will be **two tours** to this area and both sites will be included, alternating which site will be visited first. Both are very easy hikes and neither requires a high-clearance vehicle, although the roads are dirt. Grimes Point is most famous for its cupules and for being the “type site” for the “Pit-and-Groove” style of rock art defined by Heizer and Baumhoff (1962:18-20). Salt Cave is a large pictograph cave on the western edge of Pleistocene Lake Lahontan. The tours will last approximately five hours and are close enough to Sparks to return that evening.

4. Lagomarsino Canyon Petroglyph Site: Only **one tour** can be offered to this popular destination for two reasons. First, access is across and the site itself is on private property. Permission for access has been given for only a single tour. Second, the site itself is so large that visitors would have to be rushed through the site to allow another group to come in and there will only be 20 people and 5 cars allowed on the site. This will undoubtedly be the most popular choice for site tours, so participants will be selected at random following the May 6 deadline for registration. High-clearance vehicles are required and the road is extremely rough. Once at the site, petroglyphs are located along a high cliff face and the talus slope below, so there is a great deal of rock scrambling involved, making it more appropriate for the more fit among us. There are however a smaller number of petroglyph boulders toward the bottom of the talus slope that can be seen more easily. This will be a 5–6 hour tour.

5. Donner Summit and Kyburz Cupules: West of Reno, on Interstate 80, **both** of these sites will be included on a tour led by a U.S. Forest Service ranger. The hike on this tour will be easy and a high-clearance vehicle is not required. The Donner Summit site is also near Donner State Park, where there is a visitor center and other educational interpretive resources. It’s close enough to Sparks to return after the tour, but it’s also on the way to Sacramento, so if you’re heading west to get home this would be a good choice. Tour length will vary depending on the participants.

6. Little Whiskey Flat: This site is for those **of you who love** to see hunting contexts in relation to rock art—but the meeting place is around three hours south of Sparks, and the tour itself lasts for several hours, so you will probably want to stay the night in Hawthorne (on Highway 95 south of Walker Lake). If you are heading south to go home anyway, this would be a good choice. The road is very rough—4-wheel-drive is generally required and with the current very wet weather it will probably be a good idea even in May. Once there, the hiking is relatively easy and you’ll see a very long game drive as well as petroglyphs, pictographs, and scratched rock art.

7. Winnemucca Lake: This is a rare opportunity to see one of the most beautiful sites in the state as a guest of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribal Council. Although unconfirmed as of this date, the Tribal Council is considering offering a tour of this normally closed site on the Reservation. The very large petroglyphs are deeply carved into tufa mounds on the western margin of now-dry Winnemucca Lake. They are truly spectacular and if permission is granted, this would be a wonderful opportunity to see a one-of-a-kind site.

Other tours currently being considered at a distance from Sparks to speed you on your way are:

1. **Toquima Cave and Hickison Summit:** Toquima Cave is a spectacular multicolored pictograph site in the center of the state, just off of Highway 50. The cave is generally protected by a locked gate, but pending confirmation, the gate will be opened by the U.S. Forest Service for this tour. The site is an easy hike from a nearby campground, on a well maintained dirt road. Hickison Summit is just a short drive to the east and is also an easy hike of around 1.5 miles. This tour will take you just about halfway to Utah, so if that is the direction you are heading home, it would be a good choice for you. You can either stay overnight in nearby Austin or drive on east for a few hours to Ely for the night.

2. **Mount Irish and Black Canyon:** Both sites are in eastern Nevada in one of the most interesting regions of rock art in the state. Mount Irish is a large number of petroglyph sites clustered in a single area, dominated by sheep and anthropomorph motifs. Black Canyon is a single site, with a relatively small number of motifs, but many of them are the famous “Pahranagat Man.” Both sites are south of Ely off Highway 93 and tours will be led by the federal land manager who administers the site (BLM and USFWS). If you are heading either east or south, this tour will take you quite a distance on your journey home. You would drive to Ely on Monday (around six hours) and stay the night, then meet with the tour leader the next morning.
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Tour lengths are variable, but neither requires a high-clearance vehicle or is particularly strenuous—but there is some boulder scrambling at Black Canyon. Neither site is yet confirmed with land managers.

3. **Keyhole Canyon or Grapevine Canyon**: only one of these sites will be offered on the final tour roster and both are in the very southern tip of Nevada, near Searchlight. Tour participants would drive to Las Vegas on Monday (eight hours) and meet with tour leaders to be led to the site on Tuesday. This is another extremely interesting area for rock art in Nevada, which has both the more expected Basin and Range Tradition motifs, but also strong influences from the Southwest, with shield motifs, anthropomorphs, and zoomorphs. This is a very long way from Sparks, but if you have to drive home to either the Southwest or southern California, this would be a very good choice to break up that very long drive home. Neither site is yet confirmed.

Alternative non-rock art tours may include Hidden Cave and Fort Churchill. Hidden Cave is near the Grimes Point site, which can be visited on your own without a tour. Hidden Cave is without question one of the most important archaeological sites in the western United States and although the hike is fairly strenuous, the site is well worth the effort. Normally locked with a steel door, Hidden Cave may be opened for this special tour. Fort Churchill is also southwest of Sparks, and is an 1850s-vintage frontier military fort that has been partially reconstructed. It’s a fascinating look into the more recent history of Nevada and the west. Also, free admission will be offered on Monday only to the Nevada State Museum in Carson City, the Nevada Historical Society in Reno, and the 4th Ward School in historic Virginia City. Any one of these three museums in the local area is a great way to spend the day. The world-famous Harrah’s Automobile Museum (in downtown Reno) may also provide free admission on Monday, May 30, for twenty lucky ARARA members. And plans are underway for a special tour to see some nearby Basque tree carvings in the forests of the Sierra. This is another very interesting cultural phenomenon that you won’t get the chance to see in many places. If you are interested in any of these “alternative tours,” please contact Alanah Woody at awoody@nevadarockart.org. If there’s enough interest, these tours will be finalized and participants can feel good about knowing that they won’t be having any impact at all on the rock art sites of Nevada, because they’ve chosen to recreate in an alternative way!

Call for Vendors

IT’S TIME TO START MAKING PLANS for Sparks—what a great venue for the next ARARA meeting! We should have a good space to show and sell books, art, jewelry, photographs, publications, baskets, textiles, and more. We hope that this year will bring some new talent to the meeting. Remember that a percent of the sales goes to ARARA and artists are sharing some of their best work with subject matter that relates to their research and experiences with rock art. In order for us to get a good idea of how many vendors there will be this year, please send the Vendor Form in this issue of *La Pintura*, accompanied by your Vendor’s fee of $25 (applied toward the percentage allotted to ARARA), to the following address by April 15:

Janet Lever-Wood
608 Sunlit Lane
Santa Cruz, CA  95060-9304

The American Rock Art Research Association encourages artists to take ethical responsibility when rock art images are incorporated into their work. ARARA encourages artists to show respect for the cultures of Native Peoples. Artists are encouraged to sign, date, and label their works incorporating rock art images. ARARA encourages artists to accompany their work with educational material and general provenience whenever it is exhibited or vended.

If you have not shown before, please include a slide or print of your artwork as well as a good description of what you will be exhibiting. Thanks a lot!

—Janet Lever-Wood

Digital Workshop Planned

AT THIS YEAR’S CONFERENCE in Sparks, ARARA is going to try a new effort. ARARA is planning to hold a workshop tentatively titled “Digital Education.” The purpose of this workshop is to bring more of us into the digital age of photography. We have all seen the presentations by Steve Freers, Robert Mark, and Evelyn Billo and said “Wow, it is amazing what they were able to see in a photo.”

This workshop will not put you on the same level as these masters. The workshop is geared to providing you with a foundation to begin or advance your journey into the age of photographic digital technology.

1. Photography Techniques (without a good photo all is lost).
2. Photoshop or Image Enhancement (what to do with that good photo to make it serve your needs).
3. Use and Ethics of Enhanced Images (yes, tell us you made that good photo better).

4. Equipment Choices (advice from the Gear Gurus).

At present we plan to hold the workshop on Monday morning. Following the workshop we will visit one of the nearby sites to capture that good photo. For those who bring their computers (notebooks) and software there will be an follow up in the evening to practice the morning’s lessons and reinforce the material while it is fresh in your mind. There will be a nominal fee for this workshop—Members $25, Students $15, Non-members $35.

If you are interested in this new effort please contact Gary Hein, glhein@comcast.net.

Geocaching
Kyle Ross

What is Geocaching?

Modern technology has given us a new threat to archaeological sites in the increasingly popular sport of Geocaching. Geocaching is a hide-and-seek game in which people stash a container of some sort (such as an ammo can, or plastic container) with trinkets (usually “Dollar store” quality items) and a log at some location—generally a scenic location. They then challenge the rest of the world to go find it. The UTM coordinates are posted on the Internet and individuals use their personal GPS units to navigate to the site and locate the hidden cache. Successful seekers add their names to the log, exchange items in the cache, and post their achievements on the Internet site where they obtained the information about the cache.

Why should we be concerned about Geocaching?

In general this may well be a fun and harmless activity. However, many of these caches are being placed at archaeological sites—including rock art sites. That is a cause for alarm. Posting locational information on a public web site means anyone can then find out where the site is. Increased awareness of sites and the specific details of their location is a matter of grave concern for site protection as it brings increases in visitation and potential site disturbance. Also, visitation tends to build once a site becomes known. It is only a matter of time before something regrettable happens. Like it or not, the very act of visiting a site can be destructive. All individuals and groups who visit rock art sites need to realize that any visit may eventually endanger the rock art.

How Have Our Land Managers Responded?

The National Park Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (National Wildlife Refuges) have already taken a clear stand by allowing no caching on their lands. Others have taken steps sporadically. These actions are generally on a very limited local and inconsistent basis. Many have taken little or no action yet. It would nice to see these measures applied consistently and on a broad scale. Responses taken include:

- Requiring permission, in writing, from local Land Managers before field placement.
- Clearly designating areas as open or closed to geocaching, e.g., wilderness areas.
- Limiting the number of caches allowed in a defined area.
- Allowing no cache that involves digging.
- Prohibiting caches in designated wilderness areas.
- Controlling areas that can be used—to avoid threatened or endangered species habitat, busy developed areas, sensitive riparian areas, archaeological sites, etc.

What can we do about this?

- We can lobby our Land Managers to adopt a zero tolerance policy toward caching in sensitive areas (not just archaeological sites). We need them to be as decisive as the NPS so that the problem does not grow out of control as the OHV issue has. Ignoring the problem now essentially gives tacit approval to the process. How long will it be before a large number of rock art sites are posted on some web site?
- We can lobby Land Managers to contact the geocaching web site owners and ask that caches in sensitive areas be archived on the web and the physical cache removed. An application and permit process could be required to place a cache that would allow Agency monitoring. A small fee to cover the cost of administration could be set.
- Contact the geocaching.com site owners yourself. Express your concern and give them the information about the specific cache. They have guidelines for appropriate cache locations posted on their website. These include asking people not to cache on private land without the landowner’s permission, to contact Public Land Agencies prior to placement of a cache, and not to place caches on archaeological or historical sites. However, these guides are not always followed. The website fails to mention the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA).
- Report a geocache at an archaeological site to the appropriate land-owning agency so it can take action.
- Contact the cache owner (accomplished by logging into the site) and ask them to “archive” the cache until it can be moved to a more appropriate location. Mention that the cache is in a sensitive location and that the web site has guidelines regarding caches at archaeological sites and politely state your concern.

It serves no purpose to remove the container itself. If you just take the cache then you might actually exacerbate the problem. As long as the locational information is on the web site, seekers will be out looking for it.
IN MEMORIAM

Jay Crotty
1926-2004

IT IS WITH GREAT SADNESS that we announce the death of a well-loved and respected colleague.

Jay Cleybourne Crotty (1926–2004) died in Albuquerque on November 3, 2004, at the age of 78. He is survived by his wife Helen, son and daughter-in-law Stephen and Susan Crotty, and daughter and son-in-law Heather and Jeff Hegland. Jay was born in San Francisco and grew up there and in Santa Rosa, California. He joined the Marine Corps in 1943 and served with the Third Marine Division on Guam and Iwo Jima, suffering a serious wound in the latter campaign. He and Helen were married in 1947 and lived in California, where Jay worked as a land title underwriter and consultant, before moving to New Mexico in 1982. Jay was active in the Archaeological Society of New Mexico (ASNM) and directed its Rock Art Field School from 1987 to 1995. He was also a member of the Albuquerque Archaeological Society, American Rock Art Research Association, and the Edgewood Volunteer Fire Department.

Jay was well known in the national community of rock art researchers. He and Helen first recorded rock art in the Southwest in 1977 at an ASNM field school at Chaco Canyon and soon became indispensable to the founder of the field school, Col. James Bain, by developing procedures to systematically record all human-made marks at rock art sites. Jay's knowledge of mapping methods, and his unflappability and problem-solving skills, made possible the documentation by avocational archaeologists of tens of thousands of images at such large sites as Three Rivers, New Mexico, where more than 23,000 petroglyphs were recorded from 1987 to 1992. Jay was honored during his lifetime by (among others) the American Rock Art Research Association and ASNM (Climbing the Rocks: Papers in Honor of Helen and Jay Crotty, 2003, Vol.23 of ASNM Annual Volumes).

In retrospect, this modest and unassuming man exerted a far more profound influence on the future of rock art recording than any of those who worked with him may ever have imagined. The family asks that memorial gifts be made to the Archaeological Society of New Mexico, P.O. Box 3485, Albuquerque NM 87190-3485 for its Rock Art Field School or Scholarship Fund or to the Archaeological Conservancy, 5301 Central Ave. NE, Suite 902, Albuquerque NM 87108-1517, or to a charity of the donor’s choice.

IN MEMORIAM

A. Kenneth Yost
1910-2005

A. KENNETH YOST died January 7, 2005, in Portland, Oregon. He was 94. Many ARARA members will remember Ken Yost as a long-time and loyal member whose presence could be counted on at nearly every annual conference.

Ken was born October 25, 1910, in Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania. He graduated from Carnegie Mellon University and received a doctorate from Columbia University. During World War II he served in the Navy. He was a professor of art and educational media at Oregon College of Education, now Western Oregon University, for 36 years. He lived in Carmel, California, before moving to Portland about 1992. Survivors include his daughter Gretchen and son Allan.

Book Review

Aspen Art in Oregon

Mike Lucey the Crazy Herder and His Tree Carvings by Carol Pedersen, 2003. Published by the author, 20075 S.W. Imperial St., Aloha, OR 97006, $12.95+$4.00 postage. Soft cover, spiral binding, 93+xii pp., 56 figures, 38 drawings.

Reviewed by Ken Hedges

I HAVE THE PLEASURE of introducing you to a wonderful little book on some little-known aspen carvings in Oregon. Many of us are familiar with Basque carvings on aspens throughout the west, and one of the pioneering books on the subject dealt with Hispanic carvings in New Mexico, but this book introduces a subject that was new to me—the Irish carvings of southern Oregon. Mike Lucey came to Oregon from Ireland in 1949 and worked as a sheepherder until 1957. Carol Pedersen’s book is an oral history and biography of Mike Lucey and, drawing on his knowledge of the area and his predecessors, a personal history of Irish herding in the first half of the twentieth century. It is also an ethnography of the herder’s life, presented in seasonal framework that illustrates the annual round of sheepherding. Summer was the season when the sheep were taken to the high country, and it is there that the aspen groves provide the canvases for tree carvings.

This book provides us rare insight into the mind of the carver—what he carved, and why he did it. He commented on his job and his lot in life—“I’m fed up of herding those sheep”—with humor and pathos, in poetry and prose or
Plains Anthropological Society Rock Art Symposium

Lawrence Loendorf

THE 62ND ANNUAL Plains Anthropological Conference, held in Billings, Montana, between October 13 and 16, 2004, had a full-day rock art symposium. The symposium, organized by Lawrence Loendorf and Terry Moody, included papers on a variety of rock art topics—one group was directed toward rock art sites on the Piñon Canyon Maneuver Site in southeastern Colorado, another set was on technical aspects of rock art recording, and yet a third batch presented more general Plains rock art research. Attendance at the symposium was good with a strong response for rock art as a topic for papers.

From my perspective, three extremely worthwhile papers stood out among many good papers. Jim Keyser’s paper titled “A Chronology of Green River Basin Biographic Rock Art” described his use of a Harris diagram approach to study superimposition at southwestern Wyoming rock art sites. Keyser used a well-controlled stylistic analysis with the superimposed sequences of historic names and dates of immigrant travelers on the Oregon Trail to set up the chronology. Although this approach will work only with historic or proto-historic rock art in settings where there are Euro-American dated inscriptions, the results offer a powerful tool for developing a very refined chronology.

A paper by Tim McCleary titled “Writings on the Wall: Interpreting Crow Indian Rock Art” was a stellar presentation. McCleary, who teaches on the Crow Indian Reservation at Little Bighorn College, has studied the rock art sites that are recognized and visited by the Crow. He was able to establish that one panel at Ammaáhpawaalatuuu/Where There Is Rock Walls With Writing illustrates the 1880 Crow purchase of the rights to the Hidatsa hot dance. Perhaps the most fascinating panel at this same site shows Crow Indian World War I veterans in their uniforms, in much the same way the site depicts other, older, examples of Crow warriors demonstrating their war deeds.

A third paper, presented by Bonnie Newman of New Mexico State University, was titled “Portable X-ray Fluorescence Analysis of Rock Art Pictographs in Montana and Wyoming.” Using the portable device, which does not touch the rock art, Newman was able to reach important conclusions. She reported that a portable XRF machine enabled her to identify the green paint in the Castle Gardens Style shield warriors as coming from chromium, with the most likely source the mineral fuchsite. Newman also
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reported on the examination of a painting in Weatherman Draw, Montana, which was rumored to have been repainted by O.J. Salo in the 1930s. She found elevated amounts of lead in the paint, confirming that Salo had indeed retouched the painting. Newman’s paper demonstrated that the portable, lightweight XRF machine is a useful tool for field identification of pigment.

Lack of space prevents me from reporting in detail on other informative papers, such as Claire Dean’s on the relocation of the Dalles Dam petroglyph boulders, Mavis Greer’s on colorful abstract rock paintings that she and John recorded in Wyoming, and Pamela Owen’s on the significance of recording historic inscriptions. Participants and the audience generally agreed to keep having rock art symposia at the annual meetings, so rock art enthusiasts might watch for upcoming Plains Anthropological Society programs.

ARARA Seeks Applicant for New La Pintura Editor

AS PART OF PLANS FOR REORGANIZATION of the quarterly newsletter, ARARA is seeking applicants for the volunteer position of content Editor for La Pintura. The new Editor will have primary responsibility for soliciting, organizing, and preparing final edited content for La Pintura. Final copy will then go to the current editor for layout, production, and mailing from the Lemon Grove address. Applicants must have command of the English language, good grammatical skills, and the ability to prepare clean final editorial copy. If you would like to serve ARARA in this important position, contact ARARA President Leigh Marymor at MLeighM@aol.com or the current Editor at LaPintura@earthlink.net.

SIARB Web Page Expanded

FROM OUR COLLEAGUES in South America comes this update on the Bolivian Rock Art Society web page:

We have recently expanded the Spanish section of our Web page, www.siarb-bolivia.org, which now includes in the “Galería” information about and illustrations of 20 Bolivian rock art sites in the following departments: PANDO—Río Abuná, Cachuela Chocolatal; BENI—Susi, Serranía de San Simón; LA PAZ—LP 072, Pintatani; COCHABAMBA—CB 007 (Kay Wasi), El Buey; ORURO—Calacala, Popopó; POTOSÍ—PT 013, PT 014, PT 034 (Jatun Cueva); CHUQUISACA—CH 031 (Peña Colorada), Incamachay, Quila Quila; SANTA CRUZ—Paja Colorada, SC 079, SC 094 (Juan Miserandino); TARIJA—TA 059. Look for the Galería link on the Spanish version of the SIARB web site.

—Matthias Strecker, SIARB Secretary strecker@acelerate.com

Petroglyph Theft in Nevada

DEAR ARARA MEMBERS,

As the chairperson for the Conservation and Preservation Committee, it is my duty to keep the committee up to date on the latest conservation and preservation issues within the rock art world. In the pursuit of that quest, I forwarded an e-mail to the committee members wherein it commented on the actions of Ron Dorn in a court case in Reno. In that situation, he testified for the defense in the theft of a petroglyph in Nevada. Ron Dorn contacted me regarding that e-mail, and we offered him the opportunity to explain his motivation and actions during that court case. Ron’s article is followed by a response by Alnah Woody of the Nevada Rock Art Foundation.

The following dialogue is intended to promote discussion and understanding in ARARA. Please note that the opinions of the authors do not necessarily represent the views of the ARARA Conservation and Preservation Committee or ARARA’s general membership.

—Jack Sprague, Chairperson
ARARA Conservation and Preservation Committee

Why Testify for the Defense?

Ronald I. Dorn
Department of Geography, Arizona State University

A RECENT COURT CASE IN REINO, regarding theft of a petroglyph, hit the press. Jack Sprague, Chairperson of the ARARA Conservation Committee, suggested a contribution to La Pintura in order to develop a dialogue on this important issue. In particular, ARARA members may wonder why a member of ARARA would testify in defense of an individual who admitted to the taking of boulders carved with petroglyphs. For John Ligon and Carrol Mizell did not try to hide their actions. When asked by police, they did not attempt any deceit—but explained that their simple motivation was to save the petroglyphs from a development a stone’s throw away.

On the surface, emotionally, I am still shaking my own
head at my actions. ARPA is a wonderful law, designed to protect antiquities such as petroglyphs from such actions. In other Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) cases, I have helped federal authorities understand the nature of rock varnish and why its presence inside a petroglyph is important in a prosecution. For example, when an individual explained that he personally had carved an engraving into Coconino Sandstone and added food coloring to give it an authentic look, it was easy to show with a small test that the dark revarnishing was not a food additive, but included manganese.

Right off, I can tell you it wasn’t for the money. For those of you who I have been privileged to work with, you know that I do not accept remuneration. I feel that funds scraped together for petroglyph research should go towards expensive analytical tests, not consulting fees padding my bank account. In this legal case, I asked that my expenses (e.g., plane ticket) be paid, and that normal expert witness fees go to the Foundation for Archaeology and Rock Art Research to carry out basic research on petroglyphs.

I agreed to testify for the defense for two main reasons:

**Reason #1. The federal government did not even attempt to meet its burden of proof.**

ARPA requires that the antiquity be more than a century old. Solid ethnographic evidence exists for the making of petroglyphs in the region in the 20th century. Even if there was no ethnography in a region, assuming that 20th century indigenous peoples were somehow not able to carry out their religion—even in light of population collapse—seems incredibly arrogant and presumptuous. Even though some archaeologists want to pretend in their research that native peoples did not continue to make rock art, prosecutors have a burden to prove “beyond a reasonable doubt” that the art is more than a century old.

This burden was not met. I was contacted by one of the federal prosecutors:

Please forgive this unsolicited e-mail. You were recommended as someone I should contact first before proceeding further. I am a federal prosecutor for the Department of Justice, and am prosecuting a case of stolen petroglyphs. One of the issues that we must prove is that the petroglyphs themselves are older than 100 years. The images are chipped into the varnish of the rock (basalt I believe), rather than painted on. The state archaeologist and a resident “expert” in Rock Art have opined that the Petroglyphs are indeed older than 100 years (much older)—but this is based on style and characteristics. In my research I have seen mention of the use of AMS (and please forgive me for my ignorance) and/or other ways to determine dating. My question is that I’m trying to establish whether or not there is now currently a method that has been scientifically accepted in the scientific community that could date these petroglyphs? If so, then I may need to pursue that route, but any guidance or direction you can point me in would be greatly appreciated.

In response, I explained:

I appreciate your concern over the preservation of rock art. Individuals who destroy our collective priceless heritage rarely suffer consequences. The dating of all rock art is experimental. I have devoted much of my professional life to the development of over a dozen methods to understand its antiquity. No single method has been widely accepted. However, by using several different techniques, it would certainly be possible to demonstrate that a petroglyph was well beyond 100 years old. Two relatively inexpensive strategies that have been replicated by a variety of laboratories would be “lead dating” and “microlaminations.” Both methods use properties of rock coatings that have formed on top of the petroglyph. “Fake” petroglyphs can be detected by analyzing lead down into rock coatings that form on petroglyphs. If someone claims to have made a petroglyph a few years ago, any rock coating that formed inside the engraving would have a “spike” in lead concentration as a result of industrialization. A true ancient petroglyph would have this “spike” in the surface-most layer of its rock coating. But a few micrometers down, lead concentrations would drop to pre-industrial levels. I developed this method, that was then verified by a group working out of Columbia University. “Microlaminations” method just went through a rigorous blind testing in a recent publication. This strategy looks at the nature of layers formed in the rock coatings on the petroglyphs. This link provides a view of the sorts of images you get in this method:

http://alliance.la.asu.edu/rockart/XmasPointBaseMicrolam.jpg.

If the state archaeologist tells you that varnish has reformed inside the petroglyph grooves, then I am reasonably certain that you could obtain dramatic evidence that the petroglyph has antiquity much greater than 100 years, and with little expense. These two tests seemed most appropriate for this type of court case, in addition to finding foreign materials (e.g. —continued on page 10
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Whitley et al. 1999) such as steel fragments if 20th century metal instruments had been used to carve the petroglyphs.

I developed the lead method to assess the antiquity of such features as the “Fisherman” geoglyph north of Quartzite, Arizona (Dorn, 1998), and petroglyphs of questionable antiquity (Figure 1). The idea is simple. Twentieth-century lead pollution contaminates such distant environments as Irish Bogs and Antarctic Ice. The manganese and iron found in varnish scavenges heavy metals, including lead. The very topmost layer (20th century) of varnish should and does have a spike in lead, moving to background “natural” levels underneath the surface. Twentieth-century surfaces have this lead spike found only in incipient varnishings. Subsequent research done by Columbia and Harvard Universities (Fleisher et al. 1999) replicated my method and even showed its ability to detect 20th century lead in the Reno area of the Great Basin.

The VML method (Dorn 1990; Liu 2003) just went through a more rigorous blind test, administered by Richard Marston (2003), editor of the journal Geomorphology.

Marston (2003: 197) wrote:

> The manuscripts were submitted and reviewed with neither author aware of the results of the other. Once the manuscripts were revised and accepted, the results were shared, so each author could compare and contrast results obtained by the two methods... Results of the blind test provide convincing evidence that varnish microstratigraphy is a valid dating tool to estimate surface exposure ages.

So even though the lead and VML methods of dating petroglyphs are experimental, it would have been possible to use several different methods to demonstrate antiquity well beyond a reasonable doubt.

Please note that I did not suggest to prosecutors that the mere presence of rock varnish be used to indicate antiquity. This is because it is possible for rock varnish to form within 100 years (Dorn and Meek, 1995), including petroglyphs in the Negev Desert (Krumbein 1969). Even though such rates are unusual, it would be astoundingly arrogant for me to think I had enough knowledge to throw people in jail simply because I intuitively felt that the occurrence of varnish would indicate the petroglyph was over a century old. Keep in mind that I’ve been studying varnish for more than a quarter century, constantly calibrating my eye.

So I was ready to help out and conduct the necessary testing. In his reply, the prosecutor did not request further assistance. I was, therefore, stunned that the prosecutors were willing to take the word of two archaeologists that (a) rock varnish was present in the petroglyphs, and (b) the rock varnish that was present definitely meant the petroglyph was over 100 years old. The yiddish word “chutzpah” summarizes the stunning opinions rendered by archaeologists testifying for the prosecution.

When I answered the e-mail, I assumed that archaeologists advising federal prosecutors would be able to identify the presence of rock varnish accurately. When I examined the petroglyphs, I found otherwise. I could not identify visual evidence of rock varnish in the three petroglyphs that were the focus of the case. Electron microprobe tests for lead could have, but nobody was asked to conduct such tests.

This is an important lesson unto itself. Even self-proclaimed experts in rock art need training in the identification of rock varnish. Not only were the testifying archaeologists unable to identify rock varnish, testimony in the case revealed a complete ignorance of varnish “look alikes.” So, for the education of the reader, I provide a list of rock coatings that are dark, but are not rock varnish (see box).

So even if the jury believed that (a) dark splotches of rock coatings were present on the rock art, and that (b) rock varnish always takes more than 100 years to form to the point where you can see it [both (a) and (b) are false statements] — the government would have the burden of proving that those dark splotches were rock varnish and not a look alike that could form much faster.

I am still revolted at the thought of the petroglyph theft, but in our justice system, you are presumed innocent of an ARPA violation. The burden of proof was not met—not even by a mile—that there was an ARPA violation. ARPA is a wonderful law, but only if prosecutors meet their burden of proof. As an ARARA member and as someone who has spent uncounted hours in the laboratory trying to understand the science of rock art, I am offended that the prosecutors and those who advised the prosecutors felt able to conduct a witch-hunt prosecution with only the shoddiest of evidence.
Reason #2. Irresponsible federal inaction.

The petroglyph site was horribly mismanaged by the forest service archaeologist in charge. The site rests at the fringe of metropolitan Reno, within a spitting distance of a new housing development. Given this proximity, it should come as no surprise that the site has been heavily disturbed. Many of the boulders are overturned, including some with probable petroglyphs. Trash is commonplace.

This wasn’t the case of a responsible forest service archaeologist protecting the petroglyph site in an out-of-the-way location. The individual responsible for the site certainly could not pretend that folks in the area were ignorant of the petroglyphs. I think we all agree that education of the public is critical to protecting rock art. What better opportunity than organizing this minor site into an educational showcase.

Please understand that I have a great deal of respect for government archaeologists. My experience is that they are far more knowledgeable about rock art than professors in academics. They know the literature. I have never encountered a wrong decision, but not in this case.

Instead of cleaning it up, by marshaling the people resources in the neighborhood, the choice of this government archaeologist bordered on criminal laziness. The forest service archaeologist had a beautiful opportunity to educate the public about rock art with signs and an educational trail. The home buyers next door could have been recruited as site protectors. However, the forest service archaeologist took the lazy way out: do worse than nothing. This person decided to manage the sites by criminal prosecution. That’s like managing AIDS by throwing the HIV-positive and sexually promiscuous in jail.

One of the individuals testifying for the prosecution admitted to this type of a perspective, saying that armed snipers are needed to protect petroglyph sites. So laziness was justified with the view that the people living next to the site would be incapable of acting as stewards, and that it is better to shoot than educate. I am serious. You can look up the testimony in the public record. In the mind of an “expert witness,” preventing petroglyph theft is more important than a human life.

Every member of ARARA who has spent hours educating the public about the importance of preservation should be outraged at this mismanagement. Petroglyph sites next to growing cities are wonderful opportunities to focus public attention and educate, as evidenced by the Deer Valley Rock Art Center in Phoenix. Peter Welsh did not advocate snipers to protect the Hedgepeth Hills site. He educates, and now countless school children understand he importance of protection—a tremendous legacy of a lot of hard work.

The federal government does not even have the luxury of saying that they don’t have the money to prepare a trail and signs and clean up the site. The defendants offered a huge sum of money to settle the case—money that might have been used to put the boulders back the way they were and to fix up the site to educate future school children next door. So my second reason for testifying comes down to irresponsible federal inaction. Accept the money. Fix up the site. And do what Peter Welsh and others do: prevent future harm through education.

In summary, the defendants admitted to the theft of government property—boulders on forest service land. The government did not do its job of proving an ARPA violation—that the petroglyphs were proved to be more than 100 years old—and this is what the jury found. The judge in the case will decide if the government also botched their job by failing to prove that the government property was worth more than $1000—an easy enough thing to do, but they may have failed even in this small act.

The failure to educate will inevitably lead to future ARPA violations. In such cases, I would be honored to be an

---continued on page 12---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Hardening Agents:</th>
<th>Addition of cementing agent—manganese, sulfate, carbonate, silica, iron, oxalate, organisms, or anthropogenic—to rock matrix material. Referred to as patina.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Metal Skins:</td>
<td>Coatings of iron, manganese, copper, zinc, nickel, mercury, lead and other heavy metals on rocks in natural and human-altered settings. Referred to as patina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Film*:</td>
<td>Composed primarily of iron oxides or oxyhydroxides; unlike orange rock varnish because it does not have clay as a major constituent. Referred to as patina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithobiontic Coatings*:</td>
<td>Organic remains form the rock coating, e.g., lichens, moss, fungi, cyanobacteria, algae. Referred to as organic mat, biofilms, patina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxalate Crust*:</td>
<td>Mostly calcium oxalate and silica with variable concentrations of magnesium, aluminum, potassium, phosphorus, sulfur, barium, and manganese. Often found forming near or with lichens. Usually dark in color, but can be as light as ivory. Referred to as oxalate patina, lichen-produced crusts, patina, sciaibatura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphate Skin:</td>
<td>Various phosphate minerals (e.g., iron phosphates or apatite) mixed with clays and sometimes manganese. Referred to as desert glaze, turtle-skin, patina, siliceous crusts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Varnish*:</td>
<td>Clay minerals, Mn and Fe oxides, and minor and trace elements; color ranges from orange to black produced by variable concentrations of different manganese and iron oxides. Referred to as desert varnish, desert lacquer, patina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silica Glaze*:</td>
<td>Usually clear white to orange shiny luster, but can be darker in appearance, composed primarily of amorphous silica and aluminum, but often with iron. Referred to as desert glaze, turtle-skin, patina, siliceous crusts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates coatings known to form in less than 100 years.
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unpaid expert witness for the government in future ARPA cases—to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, using experimental multiple methods that have been replicated in independent tests, that petroglyphs are indeed older than 100 years. I will not charge expert witness fees, but rather continue to send such fees to a foundation to support future rock art research. The petroglyphs in this case might truly be more than 100 years old. But the federal government failed to present any evidence, let alone evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, as to the antiquity of the rock art.

With a recent offer of ARPA amnesty by federal prosecutors in the Four Corner states, those who fail to come forth may find themselves accused of criminal ARPA violations. Thus, future court cases are likely. Thus, I very much welcome dialogue with ARARA members on issues related to our responsibility as rock art experts in such circumstances.
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Reply to Dorn

Alanah Woody
Nevada Rock Art Foundation

I WOULD FIRST LIKE TO THANK ARARA and the editor of *La Pintura* for the opportunity to reply to Dr. Ron Dorn’s justification of his role in testifying as one of two expert defense witness (the other was Dr. David Whitley) in a recent federal court case concerning the theft of petroglyph boulders from the Reno, Nevada, area. In September 2003 the theft of three petroglyph boulders from a rock art site on USDA Forest Service Land on the west side of Reno came to light. Brian Wallace, chairman of the Washoe tribe, commented at the time that “These messages are the essential elements and evidence of our existence and we view their theft as a reflection of the ultimate contempt for creation, this land and its sacred heritage. It is an unutterable crime against the eternal and unseen” (*Reno Gazette-Journal*, 16 September 2003).

In response, the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, the Forest Service, and the Nevada Rock Art Foundation (of which I am the executive director) offered a reward for information leading to the arrest of those responsible. Two individuals were quickly arrested and charged with unlawful excavation of archaeological resources (an ARPA violation) and theft of government property, both felony offenses.

The defendants were found guilty of theft of government property, but under special orders from the Judge in the case, could convict on an ARPA violation only if the jury believed that the site from which the boulders were stolen was an archaeological site (meaning, under ARPA definitions, over 100 years old). They were not convicted of the ARPA violation with which they were charged, and in spite of Dr. Dorn’s apparent approval of the law, most archaeologists know ARPA to be a nearly impossible case to prosecute, especially here in the 9th Circuit, where ignorance of the law is a defense. ARPA requires that the dollar value of an object must exceed $500 and the object must be over 100 years old. Few archaeologists are willing to assign a dollar value on any archaeological object for two very obvious reasons. First, to do so is simply unethical because it encourages illegal trade in looted materials. And second, how does one put a dollar value on a priceless artifact?

During the trial the defense exerted considerable effort to introduce reasonable doubt in the minds of the jurors that the stolen petroglyphs were definitely over 100 years in age. Doubtless this was the reason that the defense selected as their expert witnesses two people regarded as “world-renowned” dating experts (*Associated Press*, 1 June 2004). Indeed, when planning for the trial the federal prosecutor considered the issue of direct dating. It was suggested by the archaeologists consulted (including myself) that Dr. Dorn, and other dating experts, be contacted. It is unfortunate that the direct dating of rock art has had such a controversial history and, in Dr. Dorn’s own words, that scientific dating of all petroglyphs is experimental. There is little question that the defense attorneys would have used this fact to raise doubt in the minds of the jurors regarding
the feasibility of the scientific dating of rock art, and in fact there are specific laws disallowing the use of experimental science in federal cases. Further, false allegations of scientific misconduct directed at Dr. Dorn would have undermined his credibility as a prosecution witness—even though he was cleared by his university of these allegations, the defense attorneys, whose job is not to prove innocence but simply to introduce doubt, would doubtless have raised the issue.

As Dr. Dorn made clear during the trial, and in his article here, he believes that scientific dating is the only reliable way of dating rock art. Given the controversial nature of previous attempts to directly date petroglyphs (which means that today there is still no universally accepted scientific method for estimating the age of petroglyphs), and the failed dating techniques that Dr. Dorn has developed and abandoned, this seems a myopic viewpoint. In effect, Dr. Dorn chides the prosecution case for having not dated the stolen rock art with an experimental dating technique of unproven reliability, ignoring the fact that archaeological dating is not restricted to hard scientific techniques. As archaeologists and most ARARA members know, dating of any archaeological object continues to be done primarily through contextual analysis rather than by direct means.

For example, if someone finds a Clovis point laying in the desert, how can one be sure if it is the real thing and thus approximately 10,000 years old? If the point is made of the right material, you could use direct methods to determine not the age of the object, but the possible age range within a sometimes wide time frame. But direct dating of stone tools doesn’t work for most material types, so you are left with examining the context. The weathering of the point itself, the position it sits in on the ground, lack of disturbance in the site, associated archaeological materials, and a knowledge of the history and archaeology of the specific area where the point is found, all come together to allow a judgement on the validity of the point in question to be made. The same thing is true of rock art, and all of the local archaeologists who were consulted in this case were in complete agreement that the site and the rock art were unquestionably in excess of 100 years in age.

Dr. Dorn also criticizes the Forest Service’s management, but it’s difficult to see how poor site management justifies looting. But in my opinion, the site was being managed appropriately. The land manager consulted with tribal elders from both the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California and the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony. A variety of protective options were being reviewed by the U.S. Forest Service and the respective Tribal Councils, and a number of measures had already been implemented. The site is a hunting blind (in all likelihood for hunting bighorn sheep) which sits in a large talus slope along with a number of other hunting blinds. The petroglyphs, two of which depict hunters with bows directed toward bighorn sheep, surrounded the pit. Development is creeping ever closer, a U.S. Forest Service access road had been closed, and a popular trailhead was moved to direct people away from the site. Most people use the area for mountain bike riding, hiking, or walking their dogs—few of these activities are best accomplished in a boulder field. The talus pits are very difficult to see from the trail and so no signs were erected which would draw attention to them (see Jameson and Kodac 1991 for a discussion of the issue of signing in cultural resource management).

One can only assume that Dr. Dorn read the land manager’s report, leading one to wonder, given the management plan and the specific measures already taken and planned at the site, how Dr. Dorn can claim that this is “the worst managed site” he has ever encountered. Maybe it’s just a judgment call, but I think all the right steps had been taken and all the right decisions had been made. It should also be borne in mind that in the current climate of federal budget cuts a single archaeologist often is responsible for the protection of literally thousands of archaeological sites (nearly all equally threatened).

The decision to participate in the defense of two men who had clearly stolen three petroglyph boulders from a federal site (the defendants did not deny removing the boulders once they were discovered in the landscaping of one of their yards) was no doubt a difficult one to make for the defense’s two expert witnesses. During the trial the defendants admitted that, under cover of darkness, they wrenched the boulders from the site and dragged them across the boulder field and into their waiting truck. All of the boulders were significantly damaged, leading one to question the defendants’ claim that their only concern was the protection of the rock art. What they did was wrong regardless of what anyone else had or had not done, and that was the judgment of the citizens of the state of Nevada.

Here in Nevada, we are taking steps to protect and preserve our rich archaeological and rock art heritage, including both public education and, when necessary, prosecution. In this case, the petroglyph thieves were sentenced to prison and given substantial fines. There has recently also been the successful prosecution of an appalling archaeological theft and vandalism of an ancient burial site in the northern part of the state, as well as the break-up of a ring of looters who operated in several states, including southern Nevada. The Nevada Rock Art Foundation was formed, not as a source of private research funds, but as an—continued on page 14
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instrument for training volunteers as Site Stewards (following the successful model of the Arizona Site Stewardship program), and to document rock art sites under the supervision of professional archaeologists. More than 400 members strong and growing, we hope to make an important contribution to the protection of the rock art sites that we all love. In addition, we have a public lecture series and present on average two programs to schools and service organizations each and every month of the year. But I believe that the outcome of the recent court cases sends a very strong message to would-be looters: In Nevada: if you commit the crime, you will do the time.

We all have to live with the consequences of our actions. The ethical dilemma that faces all of us is not simply being able to defend our own actions, but to acknowledge and consider the future ramifications of our actions. I now fear that looters and vandals may be emboldened to continue to desecrate the history and culture of Native Americans because they can find professionals who will point their finger at someone else and say, “What you did was wrong, but it was her/his fault, because s/he didn’t do enough to try to stop you.” A slippery slope indeed.

References Cited
Associated Press

Jameson, John H., and Marc Kodack

Reno Gazette-Journal

Institutum Canarium
Announces 2005 Congress

THE INSTITUTUM CANARIUM (IC), an international and interdisciplinary research association concerned with the history of the civilization of the Canary Islands and the Mediterranean region, has announced the IC-Congress 2005, to be held at the Museo Canario in Las Palmas, Gran Canaria (Spain), from May 23 to 26, 2005, the first time since its founding that the Institutum Canarium will meet in the Canary Islands. Many presentations about the Canary Islands and Mediterranean cultures are planned and participants can visit many important sights and objects of cultural significance and natural history. For further information, visit www.institutum-canarium.org or e-mail info@institutum-canarium.org.
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