

VESTIGES



March
2009
Volume 29
Number 3

Monthly newsletter of URARA, the Utah Rock Art Research Association

Table of Contents

President's Message.....	1	Symposium 2009 Cedar City Utah October 9-12	8
Nine Mile Canyon Update.....	1	Book Notice - <i>The Bird Shaman</i>	8
Think About It!	3	URARA Contacts	9
Paper on Re-Thinking Aesthetics and Rock Art	3	Calendar 2009.....	10
URARA - BLM Site Steward Training, Moab.....	7	Nine Mile Canyon, Before and After.....	10

President's Message

Greetings,

As is obvious by the number of pages, this issue of *Vestiges* returns to the full-length format. We have received very little feedback from the URARA membership regarding *Vestiges Brief* and *Vestiges*, full length, formats. We remind you that comments are welcome.

Troy telephoned an update on the BLM's actions in regard to Nine Mile Canyon. We thank him for his work.

The 2008 treasurer's report follows this message. We thank Ben Everitt for his careful work as treasurer. Our financial health is good. With respect to the latter, Diane Orr and David Sucec are already hard at work writing grant requests to help defray the costs of our 2009 symposium. We thank them.

David also referred the article, *Re-Thinking Aesthetics and Rock Art* for this longer version of *Vestiges*. I encourage all to give this excellent article a careful reading. The last section is relevant to our understanding of the ways in which we perceive, experience, and understand the emotional and intellectual reactions we have to the rock art we see.

Think About It! tells a little more about the book that resulted from research for the preparation of the article. The article was prepared as a paper for an international organization rock art conference.

We hope that next month's *Vestiges Brief* will have some interesting information about upcoming field trips. In the meantime,

Happy Trails,
Steve Robinson
2009 URARA President

Nine Mile Canyon Update

From a telephone interview with Troy Scotter

The BLM has determined that the dust from oil and gas truck traffic associated with Nine Mile Canyon projects will have an adverse effect on the rock art of the area. As part of the Environmental Impact Study (EIS), the BLM has invited various groups to participate in a study of ways to address this issue, which we have the greatest concern. URARA, the Nine Mile Canyon Coalition, the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, the National Trust for Historical Preservation, along with

various government agencies and Bill Barrett Corporation have been invited to consult regarding this issue.

BLM held a preliminary planning meeting in early February with those parties to address this all important issue. Troy says, "The good news is the BLM appears willing to reconsider alternate road options, and they are also open to expanding the boundaries which are impacted by this traffic." "Obviously, where the road is placed is huge to us", states Troy. He further reports that the interested organizations have been asked to come to meet and discuss a "process for addressing the issues of concerns to the various organizations." He says we should be pleasantly surprised at what is happening.

URARA 2008 Treasurer Report

Ben Everitt

This one page version lists income, expenses, and assets at year's end. As a 501(c) 3 organization we are required to make our finances public.

An audit will be forthcoming.

**URARA TREASURER'S REPORT FOR
2008**

INCOME 1/1/08 - 12/31/08:

Gifts Received		
Symposium Auction	1,345.50	
Quilt Drawing	368.00	
Other gifts	1,676.00	
Grants Received	1,350.00	
Interest Income	729.16	(Form 1099)
Membership Revenue		
Dues	4,733.00	
Paper Vestiges	500.00	(Est.)
Publication Sales	1,775.00	
Symposium Revenue	6,308.00	
TOTAL INCOME		18,784.66

EXPENSES 1/1/08 - 12/31/08:

Business Expenses	1,511.10	
Monthly Meeting	220.30	
Preservation and education	1,240.23	
Publication	1,155.91	
Vestiges	1,829.00	
Symposium Expenses	7,374.48	
TOTAL EXPENSES		13,331.02

CASH ASSETS as of 12/31/08:

Checking account	15,002.39	
Certificate 5549011319	10,328.65	
Certificate 0349505313	10,000.00	
TOTAL ASSETS		35,331.04

Think About It!



This issue includes the article *Re-Thinking Aesthetics and Rock Art*, which ultimately resulted in a book by the same title. With the book's two editors and over 20 contributing authors, we found only one familiar name. This was Jean Clottes, a friend of Utah rock art, who lives in France. He penned the six-page Forward to the book.


He asks:

"How does aesthetics help us better understand rock art and the people who created it, in particular in ethnographically, non-ethnographically known cultures, and how does it inform our decisions about preserving and replicating the art?"

His following commentary is divided into three parts and answers his question. The parts are: Our Reaction to Art and Some of Its consequences; A Great Many Paleolithic Works of Art; and, Alternative Aesthetic Expression. Then in closing the Forward he states, the book "will undoubtedly be hailed as a landmark publication."

Paper on Re-Thinking Aesthetics and Rock Art

By Thomas Heyd and John Clegg, *photo of book cover from Amazon.com*



[Note: David Sucec submitted the article, with permission from authors.]

This book is now published. It can be purchased online. The 253 page book, with a 30 page bibliography, has over 20 authors. It is divided into three parts: I - Theory, the Role of Aesthetics in Rock Art Research; II - Aesthetic appreciation of Rock Art Constitutive Factors; and III - Case Studies: Opportunities and Tension in Cross-Cultural Applications. The forward is by Jean Clottes. Author Clegg is at the University of Sidney and has been the author of rock art papers for over 25 years. Author Heyd is associated with the philosophy department at the University of Victoria. His rock art publications extend over the last 15 years.]

Paper presented to the Rock Art Society of India 2004 International Rock Art Congress, Agra, 28 November to 2 December 2004

Thomas Heyd and John Clegg were in the last stages of editing their book on Aesthetics and Rock Art. This paper has come from the editing experiences.

I. Neglect of rock art

'Rock art' is the name conventionally given to marks, made by human beings on rock, often perceived as pictures or representations. Despite the visual attractiveness and strong emotional associations of most rock art, interested scholars, many of them archaeologists and anthropologists, seldom venture to directly discuss it from the aesthetic point of view.

The study of rock art began and has continued as a study of something foreign through either age or distance. Rock art was reported and studied by others than its makers in China (280-233 B.C, 5th century AD,) in Europe during the 15th and 16th centuries, and world-wide in increasing numbers during the 17th and 18th centuries, (Bahn, 1998: 1-29) long before the sites in Franco-Cantabria were recognized by institutional academia in 1895-1901. As the social sciences matured (or at least changed) during the 20th century, rock art in America, Australia and Africa was given more attention. Anthropologists and archaeologists, along with sociologists, increasingly asserted

aims to explain (always other) societies in their own terms rather than in terms (such as kinship, energy exchanges, or 'art') imported from the realm of the researchers.

In the 18th and 19th centuries art was understood in Europe as an indicator of civilization and an important component of social life. This equation with high culture made it difficult for deeply prehistoric rock art to be accepted. Nonetheless, once their age and provenance had been established at the turn of the 20th century, prehistoric marks on rock were treated as art, and, as John Halverson (1987) tells us, 'the theory of art for art's sake held the field' in providing the explanation of choice for the Paleolithic rock art phenomenon. Soon the supposition that Paleolithic marks on rock were done for their own sake was superseded by various other theoretical approaches. Most of these theoretical approaches were disadvantaged by apparently seeking a single explanation or function, when, for example, most artists must have enjoyed their activities and rejoiced in their skills whatever the destined function of their products. (Ucko and Rosenfeld, 1967:239 are among the few commentators who do not seem to attach an implied "only" or "just" to their theories, as though they were not able to imagine that an action or object can serve more than a single purpose.) Clegg's paper in Symposium A of this conference reports that many who enjoy rock art nowadays consider and treat it as art.

According to Warren L. d'Azevedo the trend toward what is understood as scientific rigour, which values quantitative over qualitative methods, led to aesthetics, and the consideration of art as an integral part in the web of social life, being put on the back burner by contemporary social scientists (d'Azevedo, 1973/1989).

Only recently has there been a rediscovery in anthropology and archaeology of the importance of aesthetics and art. It is possible that the recent imperative for every beginning researcher to be a world authority has encouraged a trend towards specialisation, so that rock art studies are specialist, rather than becoming parts of established disciplines such as Art History, Anthropology, Archaeology, or even Aesthetics. Even so, and whatever the reason, hardly any papers have appeared that directly discuss the aesthetics or the art status of rock art, not even with a contestatory aim.¹ Some have argued that concern for aesthetics in rock art research brings with it certain important difficulties.

II. Difficulties with the study of aesthetics and rock art

(1) Reproducing preconceptions about aesthetics and art

Silvia Tomášková, among others, argues that even the conventional use of the term 'art' with regard to prehistoric marks on rock may lead to a reproduction of our own cultural preconceptions, reflected and transported into the prehistoric past. The effect of such projections, among other things, is an inappropriate division of research objects into artworks vs. 'useful products of prehistoric craft, such as stone tools.' By Tomášková's account, concern for aesthetics entails an interest in the 'exploration of transcendental aesthetic quality', leaving aside 'the contextual role of the object'. From this she concludes that archaeology will be better off *not* thinking of representations or pictures on rock as *art* (Tomášková, 1997). She is surely correct. Powerfully laden but differently understood concepts such as whatever the word "art" or "Art" may imply are unlikely to aid archaeology. But rock art is not and should not be reserved exclusively for archaeologists, in which case this comment is not relevant to all rock art studies.

(2) Art status of rock art manifestations

To these concerns we may add that it may seem unclear whether the ascription of art status to phenomena remote from our own cultural environment makes sense. Art, as we know it in the modern European tradition, acquired its own specific self-definition during the Italian Renaissance, contrasting with craft and akin to the sciences in its pursuit of truth (see, for example, Kristeller, 1979). Hence it may seem open to question whether one may ascribe art status to products of other societies (though it is conceivable that a similar process of differentiation of art from other activities and products may have happened in other societies and at other times).

Both of these concerns are valid, but not confined to art, for we always see things with our own mental baggage and preconceptions, whatever we study. The problem must be faced (or ignored) for all study. Nor need we now unnecessarily concern ourselves exclusively with the status assigned to rock art by those who originally made or used it.

(3) Intentionality of rock markings

Even if we think that it makes sense to ascribe art status to rock art, and choose to base that ascription to the judgments of its makers or original users, we may have difficulties in deciding whether certain particular marks on rock might have been intended as art rather than as a form of writing, or whether they are epiphenomena (unintended side effects) of activities, such as the rhythmic pounding of rock for sound making. We may know neither the intentions of the makers of many marks on rock which we call rock art, nor the ways in which their makers, or their intended contemporary audience, appreciated them. But neither of these considerations need be relevant to the aesthetics of rock art, or its status as art. At the beginning of the 20th century Duchamp exhibited a factory made bottle stand and urinal as art objects, showing that the intentions of the original makers of objects are not relevant to the objects' possible status as art. There are very few viable definitions of Art. Donald Brook's (1979, 1980) is one. His definition of Art accepts that Art is an epiphenomenal product; an artist making a picture for any purpose or reason may accidentally make a work of art. This attitude differs markedly from that of Ziff, which is mentioned below. The intention of the artist may not be relevant either to the product or to the appropriateness of ways to study it.

III. Aesthetics and possible solutions to the difficulties

Notoriously the term 'aesthetics' is used in diverse ways. As initially coined by Alexander Baumgarten, the academic field represented by this term is 'the science of sensible cognition.' (Baumgarten, 1712/1750-1758) More precisely, aesthetics in its most general sense is the study of the objects of our perceptual world, themselves constituted by sensory, imaginative, and cognitive contents, and given that those contents become of interest for and in themselves. Notably, it is a kind of attentiveness that is directed at the qualities of objects, spaces, places, or events *for the qualities' own sake*. So, when we speak of *rock art aesthetics* we may mean the study, in a general way, of our sensations of anthropogenic marks on rock when those sensations are of interest for and in themselves. This strict literal application of Baumgarten's definition still has a place in the study of rock art as is demonstrated by Clegg's chapter in our book, which is about the effects of "optical tricks" and their interpretation.

A more general understanding of Baumgarten's idea (and thus aesthetics) is that *rock art aesthetics* means the study of anthropogenic marks on rock when those marks become of interest *for and in themselves* as objects of perception. Clegg likes to summarise this idea as *appreciation*, lacking a more appropriate word.

Re (1) Cultural preconceptions about aesthetics and art

Sometimes it is supposed that aesthetics necessarily has to do with art, as in *artefact*, something made by humans, and that, if we are interested in the aesthetics of marks on rock, we must be committed to the claim that those marks are a form of art. Neither supposition is justified, since we also attend to the givens of our perceptual world for themselves when we are attending, for example, to the way *nature* appears to us, as when we value the sight of deeply green ancient forests, the smell of decaying leaves in the fall, or the sound of trees creaking in the wind. And sometimes understanding undermines appreciation, (or at least liking), as when one is reminded that the colour depth of a brilliant sunset is the result of atmospheric smog or bushfire smoke. On the other hand, the term "art" is often used loosely to refer to a category of things worth attention for their own sakes.

As emphasised by diverse authors, including Tomášková, without awareness of the socio-cultural context of artistic phenomena, the likelihood of failing to fully appreciate those phenomena is high. George Mills has proposed that 'Art is a primary means by which individual and social

values are expressed.' (1973/1989, p. 379) ⁱⁱ This is undoubtedly true, but it could be a mistake to use such comments as working definitions. Attempts at appreciation without attention to social context likely entail the importation of values alien to the cultural goods at hand. Even if we grant that aesthetic appreciation, *qua* function of 'the free play of imagination and understanding' (Kant, 1952/1790, § 9, 52), knows no rules, it seems relevant that we are rather more likely to acquire *fuller* appreciation of things if we situate ourselves in certain, crucial viewpoints. Hence, appreciation likely benefits from taking, or trying to take, the viewpoints of the cultures of origin of artistic phenomena. ⁱⁱⁱ These facts have long been accepted by critics, art historians, and gallery education officers.

Turning to the question whether objects that are classed as utilitarian or functional can be objects of aesthetic appreciation, we propose that *qua functional* objects, it would seem that they are excluded from such appreciation, since functionality seems to imply attention to objects on the basis of their particular instrumentality or usefulness to attain particular purposes. For instance, kitchen utensils such as pans only count *as* pans if they are seen as objects to fry or cook with. Their instrumentality, though, may itself become the focus of our attention, such that we come to take note of the aesthetic values that such things afford us in terms of handiness, toughness, sturdiness, elegance, splendour, and so on. Hence, we may be involved in aesthetic appreciation with regard to functional or utilitarian objects, which ordinarily are not called art, as when we admire the exquisite craftsmanship displayed in handy tools or in shoeing adapted to the tough conditions of mountain travel.

There is no point in speaking as if some objects *essentially* have the capacity to offer aesthetic values and others just do *not*. As Ziff points out, all objects may be subject to aesthetic attention, if conditions are right (Ziff, 1997). So, under some conditions we may say things such as: 'This pan cooks beautifully. *That* is a beautiful solution to the problem. *This other* is a beautiful pan, though I never use it, as the base is so thin that the jam burns.'

Re (2): Are rock art manifestations artworks?

As noted above, sometimes it is said that we should not speak of rock *art* ^{iv} since we may not know whether the makers of the marks on rock in question *intended* those marks to be art. This point is complicated, both by ignoring Duchamp's demonstrations, and by the observation that the notion of art current among people of European cultural roots surely is idiosyncratic to those people. Hence one may wonder whether the application of the term 'art' to the products of people from other cultural roots must not in itself constitute a distortion.

These worries only arise if we choose (rather ethnocentrically) to exclusively ascribe making art to our own (recent) cultural confederates. If we adopt Paul Ziff's succinct description of an artwork as something made 'fit to be an object for aesthetic attention', then the field of objects that are artworks is considerably opened up, and certainly independent of a particular cultural-historical definition of 'art.' Since something need not be an artwork to be an object of aesthetic attention, the art status largely comes to depend on whether someone has invested effort in *making* the object *fit* for aesthetic attention. Both 'making' and 'Fitness', of course, may vary along cultural as well as personal dimensions, which leaves us to take note of the diversity of standards by which such objects concretely are rated as art and appreciated as such, and of the variety of techniques that concretely are approved, within a particular cultural milieu for creating art objects, and the appreciative skills of the connoisseur.

Re (3) Intentionality of rock markings as objects for aesthetic intention

This said, we may simply not know whether a certain set of marks on rock were *intended* to be fit for aesthetic attention, whether they are a sort of writing (itself open to aesthetics as calligraphy and literature), or simply (sic!) are by-products of other activities. As noted already, this circumstance should not stop us from attending to their aesthetic values. There can be no security in the interpretation of the significance of marks, even more so when we have insufficient cross-cultural information, but we may (if we wish) try to approximate the mindset and embodied

appreciation of those who made the marks (or those for whom they were made) as well as we can by taking note of the general life conditions in the area, by attributing sufficient complexity to their lived experience, by re-enacting some of their possible experiences, and so on.

In sum, it is unnecessary to suppose that, for aesthetic appreciation, we have to ignore context and focus on some universal or 'transcendental' quality. It similarly is inappropriate to limit the term 'art' to those phenomena that resemble those of any single culture (specially that of the writer!) Moreover, we need not know the intentions of the makers of rock art in order to usefully approach any rock art manifestation from an aesthetic point of view.

IV. A reason to pursue rock art aesthetics

If an object from some other society exhibits features we find *aesthetically salient* then it is at least imaginable that it may have appeared aesthetically salient to some people from that other society. Moreover, if some of the objects under study seem to require an appreciation of aesthetic values *in the process of their creation*, there is further reason to suppose that some individuals in other societies may have some perspectives analogous to those we call aesthetic.

Many rock art images saliently exhibit features which, at least according to the views held in European cultures, are expressive of aesthetic values such as proportion, quality of line, narrativity, etc., and it is likely that those who made the images paid attention to these values if we find them expressed there. Now, if we are interested in explanations of the forms of life of people in society, then neglecting to consider the aesthetics of objects that have aesthetically salient values, may lead to the omission of significant sources of information on those societies.

Moreover, even *the attempt* to do justice to the aesthetic values present in some object created or appreciated by another human being can be a rich form of participation in the complex experiences of another person's life. The importance of such attempts to participate in the life experiences of other people is not necessarily lessened by our lack of accuracy in the grasp of their aesthetic perspectives. Rather, by itself the attempt to see (and, possibly, to feel, hear, smell and taste) with those who preceded us constitutes an experiment in the sharing of lives, which can generate an awareness of our common human condition.

ⁱ The only cases known to us are Lyons (1967), which intends to provide a social scientific *explanation* for the aesthetic arrangement of cave art rather than a discussion of Paleolithic art for its *aesthetic values*, and Heyd (1999).

ⁱⁱ Here the term 'social' is meant to indicate values expressed in the social sphere and not necessarily an attitude that favours society's prevalent value structure, since much art, of course, expresses values critical of society at a place and time.

ⁱⁱⁱ For example, with regard to the aesthetic appreciation of Australian Aboriginal rock art, see Heyd (2000).

^{iv} John believes that the names given to things should not be conflated with labels of what they are. Thus pea-nuts are botanically neither peas nor nuts, yet the name works very well.

URARA - BLM Site Steward Training, Moab

By Vicki Barker, part of article published in *Moab Happenings*, with permission

[Note: *The writer completed the URARA- BLM Site Steward training in November 2008.*]

World-class rock art on public lands in the Moab area have archaeologists, rock-art buffs and federal officials cooperating in efforts to distinguish southeastern Utah with more listings on the National Register of Historic Places.

Dozens of volunteers have received training since 2004 to help locate, document and monitor more than 32,000 reported archaeological sites in the Canyon Country District of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, which includes the Moab and Monticello field offices. In Grand County alone,

4,200 recorded sites need to be further documented, preserved and protected, and reports of new sites in the area are mounting, according to BLM archaeologists.

"Almost every report we get contains new sites," BLM archaeologist Joe Tuomey told a sizeable group gathered for the latest training of a civilian corps that is helping to document and patrol the areas. He said rock art by definition is considered eligible for listing on the National Register, by virtue of its archaeological value.

Tuomey and fellow BLM archaeologist Leigh Grench led two days of classroom training followed by field work in mid-November to ready nearly 30 volunteers for on-the-ground monitoring and documenting of rock art and archaeological sites within a 100-mile radius of Moab.

The BLM "Site Stewardship Program" training, co-sponsored by the Utah Rock Art Research Association (URARA), drew out-of-town and out-of-state volunteers along with a dozen residents of Moab and Castle Valley. Also represented in the group were the Grand County Historical Preservation Commission, Anasazi State Park, Utah Museum of Natural History, and working or retired professionals, including museum curators, educators, tour guides and others disciplined or trained in archaeology, paleontology, engineering and law enforcement. Some attended for a refresher course. Others were new to the world of rock art but had an interest in preserving remnants of the ancient Indian cultures of this area.

BLM officials were impressed by the turnout, which URARA member Pam Baker termed "huge." She said the dozens of volunteers trained over the years can make a big difference, especially "for covering sites near roads that are going to get impacts." Previous site-steward training resulted in documentation and monitoring of more than 60 sites -- a tiny slice of more than 32,000 reported sites in the two-million-acre district.

Editor's Note: Vicki Barker joined URARA at the annual symposium in Moab in 2007. She is a Moab native, and in 2008 joined the Grand County Historical Preservation Commission (GCHPC) primarily to "give rock art a voice." At present she is involved in private fundraising to restore the wooden deck of the historic 500-foot long steel cable suspension Dewey Bridge, which burned last April. The U.S. scenic byway 128 bridge is a vital link in the Colorado-to-Utah Kokopelli Trail. URARA members can show support by sending (tax-deductible) donations to The Dewey Bridge account of the GCHPC, 125 E. Center St. Moab, UT 84532. There will soon be a county website link to donate to by internet.

Symposium 2009 Cedar City Utah October 9-12

Robert Reed, chair

In January, with the help of Cedar City URARA member Al Matheson, some of the board visited and reserved the Cedar City Heritage Center for our annual symposium. It is an excellent location for both the presentations and banquet. Al is assisting board member Bob Reed, who coordinates all aspects of the symposium. David Sucec is developing some interesting possibilities for the featured speaker(s), and Jeff Allen has accepted responsibility for arranging the field trips.



Book Notice - *The Bird Shaman*

By URARA member, **Judith Moffett**. *Photo of book cover from Amazon.com*

My book was published last July by Bascom Hill. It is a science-fiction novel set in Salt Lake, Moab, Green River, and in the redrock and slickrock country around those towns, as well as in rural Kentucky. Barrier Canyon and Pecos River rock art are crucial to the story and receive a highly imaginative treatment that may intrigue some *Vestiges* readers. A number of Jim Blazik's excellent rock art photos are reproduced in the book. The

LDS Church is a major player – a controversial one – touching on the ordeal of the handcart pioneers.

I have authored eleven books, which include poetry and Swedish translation as well as science fiction. My fascination with rock art began around 1995, while living in Salt Lake for several years. I first thought of science-fictionalizing the Anasazi, but the impact of the Barrier Canyon pictographs changed my mind and my story.

After leaving Utah in 1998, I returned a number of times to visit friends, and in May 2005 made a ten-day research trip to see more rock art and refresh my memory about the details of the terrain I needed to describe. David Sucec corresponded with me before the trip. John Remakel took me to several sites near Moab and provided information that helped me locate the exquisite panel in Wild Horse Canyon, which became an important setting in the novel. Jim Olive and Dorde Woodruff drove me to sites I never would have found by myself. (All panels and place names have been fictionalized in the book.) Experiences on this research trip were integrated into the story: a close call, when I nearly slid off a slickrock shelf. John Remakel threw me a rope and hauled me to safety, and a hike up into a box canyon with Jim and Dorde, to view the panel at Willow Tanks through Jim's powerful binoculars.

The Bird Shaman is the third volume of a trilogy, but, as the reviewers say, it's not necessary to have read the first two books in order to follow and enjoy the third.

Reviews of the novel can be read online at: <http://www.meredithsuewillis.com/> and <http://www.edgeboston.com/>

Reader reviews can be found on the Amazon site: <http://www.amazon.com/>. And, Dorde Woodruff has read the book, if you want to know her opinion.

URARA Contacts

Utah Rock Art Research Association -- Box 511324, Salt Lake City UT 84151-1324

www.utahrockart.org

Board of Directors 2009

Steve Robinson	310-378-0320	slrmar@cox.net
Walter Layton	801-561-5228	walter.layton@granite.k12.ut.us
Robert Reed	801-566-0741	bobreedclyartist@hotmail.com
Albert Copley	928-759-3263	mamacat8_2000@yahoo.com
David Sucec	801-359-6904	bcsproject@xmission.com
Jeff Allen	435-986-0977	allenjeffrey@beyondbb.com
Nina Bowen	801-292-5012	nina_bowen@comcast.net
Jon Gum	435-627-0938	jon.gum@gmail.com

Secretary

Cynthia Everitt	435-986-0075	rockdoc@xmission.com
-----------------	--------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Treasurer

Ben Everitt	435-986-0075	rockdoc@xmission.com
-------------	--------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Vestiges Staff

Editors: Marion and Stephen Robinson, slrmar@cox.net, 26717 Grayslake Rd, Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275, 310-378-0320; copy editing: Robert Reed, bobreedclyartist@hotmail.com, 801-566-0741; printing and mailing: Barbara and Fred Saxon, fredbarb100@aol.com 801-262-4432; databases: Margaret Grochocki, margaret_grochocki@yahoo.com, 801-282-5850; website: Tom Getts, getts@mindspring.com, 970-533-1861

Library, Archives, and Publications

Nina Bowen nina_bowen@comcast.net 801-292-5012.

URARA has an extensive library of rock art publications, a collection of articles, and Clifford Rayl's photo collection, which are available for use by members. URARA also has educational

materials which members are encouraged to use.

Calendar 2009

Oct 9-12 Utah Rock Art Research Association's 29th Annual Symposium, Cedar City, Utah.

Nine Mile Canyon, Before and After

Photos, July 2003 and March 2009 *National Geographic Magazine*. Submitted by Jon Gum

An example of the damage occurring to rock art in Nine Mile Canyon due to dust from excessive traffic.

