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Abstract: We un-henge here the mystery of Stonehenge and propose a simple and consistent explanation to all its puzzling enigmas. How the stones got there? How was it built? Why was it built? Why is it aligned with the summer solstice sun? When was it built? Who built it? We argue that nature built Stonehenge while men directed its construction (The Smart-Ice Theory). That ice covered the land when Stonehenge was built and can account for its method of construction. Its original function was neither an astronomical observatory nor a healing religious center. Stonehenge acquired such attributes thousands of years later as people, even now, felt its grandeur and wonder. Though the method of its construction can be easily explained, loosening its magical hold on people's imagination may be a more difficult task.

Introduction: We are prepared to argue, and to put forth our own reasons, that ice brought the huge stones to Stonehenge. That these heavy stones were naturally quarried by a combination of geological events involving ice, hot lava and seismic activity. The stones were brought to location naturally when the ice began to melt and the weather got warmer. Having discovered the work of archeologist Aubrey Burl and geologist Geoffrey Kellaway (1971 article in Nature) and Brian John, among others, we defer the argument in favor of glacier transport to their published articles and to the ample scientific references they make to make that case. But we take their glacier transport theory one stage further, however, and argue that when Stonehenge was built ice covered the land and made its construction possible. So along with these archeologists, and the scientific evidence they present, we start the un-henging of Stonehenge with an ice cover of this region of the UK and more specifically the Irish Sea Glacier that is said to have extended eastward to Bath and beyond.

To quote Brian John,

There is in fact abundant evidence of glaciation in Somerset, Devon and Cornwall -- the evidence from one key site after another is all itemized in the NCC Geological Conservation Reviews for The Quaternary of Wales and the Quaternary of South-West England. (Those are two bulky and comprehensive reviews packed full of detailed field information and discussion.) As a matter of interest, the Irish Sea Glacier extended at least as far east as Bath ...

All the ice that flowed into the North Sea depression from the British and Irish Ice Sheet was flowing eastwards, and the ice that flowed up the Bristol Channel was flowing eastwards as well. ...

The Smart-Ice Theory: Glacier flow is one way that 'errant' stones can be transported and deposited. Such ice flow would leave behind tell-tale tracks of glaciation. But we argue that an area can be cleared of ice without any signs of glaciation left behind by Nature. Just as Nature leaves signs of glaciation, Man does also. We argue the stone alignments and stone circles we see in the UK and Brittany are in fact themselves the evidence of glaciation left behind by Man. This would occur especially in enclosed low lying areas and plains surrounded by mountains during a period of sustained warming where there would be ice melting but no ice flow. We argue that an ice sheet can melt and leave no tracks, much like an ice cube on a plate melts and leaves no sign of its existence formerly on the plate. We claim the ice-covered landscape of Salisbury Plain (where Stonehenge is located) was distinctly different then from the landscape now. The melting ice of possibly a frozen 'Salisbury Lake' would create a natural gradient from high hills to low valleys. Along with melting seasonal snow fall and runoff water on the ice surface, this would create a slick conveyer-belt effect transporting stones from natural quarries to ice rims. The water flow would create a smooth surface and edge. The downward motion would naturally align the stones
lengthwise to minimize friction and would carry them to the ice edge properly aligned for local people to then easily 'hang' these in an upright vertical manner where they choose - with the width of the stones always aligned parallel to the ice rim. We see this in all of the huge sarsen stones forming the inner horseshoe and the outer circle at Stonehenge.

By using the Canadian Rockies analogy, it suddenly becomes clear how the boulders of Stonehenge could have been deposited in a trail across southwestern England — and thus would have been easy pickings for Neolithic Britons. (reference)

Although this view is not dominant in the currently accepted thinking on Stonehenge, and has been actively marginalized by prominent archeologists such as Prof. Geoffrey Wainwright, this ice transport explanation is one that just 'makes sense'. And as is often the case, whether it be in Archeology, Politics, Art and even Physics, the explanation that 'makes sense' is closer to Reality. Mental acrobatics by nimble minds and self-promoting proclamations by strong egos do not by themselves bring us closer to the Truth. Power and Intelligence are not synonymous with Wisdom.

Again quoting Brian John,

In August 2008 I attended a lecture by Prof Geoffrey Wainwright on the subject of "Stonehenge and Preseli." I didn't expect to agree with what he said, and assumed we would agree to disagree on assorted matters involving a degree of speculation, but I did expect a bit more respect for the truth from a senior archaeologist. ...

Wainwright said that there is no evidence that glacier ice extended to the south of the Bristol Channel, and accused me of fantasizing on the matter. Wrong, just plain wrong...

There are two conflicting theories about how the stones moved from West Wales to the Salisbury Plain district — one involving glacier ice, and the other involving human effort on a grand (indeed unprecedented) scale. The glacial theory has been dismissed and marginalized systematically by archaeologists keen to demonstrate the organizational and engineering skills (not to mention the spiritual and artistic attributes) of prehistoric man. At the same time their human transport theory has become a ruling hypothesis, presumably on the basis that if something is repeated often enough, it must be true.

Such controversy between competing theories is not uncommon among scientists and academicians. But it does demonstrate how peripheral and extraneous matters can often come front and center, casting a shadow on a theory. Too often power and promotion, not to mention human psychology, become the gravitational attractions around which theory and explanations take orbit. So how are we, mere mortals, to judge who is right and who is wrong in such matters of the Mind? Each of us must use our own free and independent judgment, using as guide our innate and intrinsic connection to our own Experience. What makes sense to us. What is True must be naturally true and must be confluent with our sense of reality. Truth supports in a coherent and consistent way all its physical manifestations. When a theory becomes too disconnected from our lives, and explanations stretch the limits of credulity, requiring authoritative declarations for support, than we become that much more separated from our selves. And what is not supported by life dies. In the discussions to follow we ask you ask, “does it make sense?”

sarsen comes from a word for 'foreigner'

Stonehenge means 'stone hanging'.
the word "henge" is a back-formation from Stonehenge

Stonehenge was visited, modified and restored many times in the past five millennia. The latest major excavation and restoration took place in 1953/1964 when many of the fallen sarsens and lintel stones were re-erected and fitted in place. These photos show Prof. Atkinson leading this restoration effort at Stonehenge in 1964. One can only imagine Roman soldiers and architects in their place 2500 years ago, securing the sarsens with packed stones at the base, smoothing the surface and leveling the lintel stones securing them with tenons and mortices. (For an explanation by Prof. Atkinson of how Stonehenge was build by Neolithic people, see video clip)
Though these later modifications and restorations may complicate the narrative that seeks to explain the enigmas of Stonehenge and muddle the evidence for this narrative, some questions persist unchanged by these changes.

- How the stones got there originally.
- What was the original meaning and purpose of Stonehenge.
- Why are there no other signs of such engineering skills and advanced social organization left behind by these advanced Neolithic builders of Stonehenge - nor any mention of their existence in any of the ancient annals.

While our theory can account for all this, 'human transport theories' (whether complete or partial transport) can only recount stories of ritual burials of deer antlers for digging and unmarked inhumations of powerful rulers and skilled Neolithic builders of Stonehenge to explain all this.

**Stone Alignments:** We believe that the mystery of Stonehenge is intimately linked to the many stone alignments and circle formations to be found in many places in Europe and indeed the world. We consider the physical features of these stone formations that can be directly observed on site. We examine such stone alignments in the Brittany region of France, closest geographically to Stonehenge. These stone alignments, for example in Carnac, Brittany, are nearly straight and parallel (with some deviations at places). The spacing between rows is nearly uniform and equal.

In the last stages of the receding ice glaciers from this part of Europe, along with warmer climate changes, fresh snowfalls and seasonal fluctuations in the atmospheric temperature, we have runoff water on the surface of the melting ice sheet carrying stone boulders from an earlier geological period - when intense volcanic and seismic activities dominated the geology of this region.

"...the mountains of north Wales are the remains of a huge volcanic plateau and there are volcanic rocks distributed throughout the British Isles. Even in the Chalk of Southern England, many of the thin marl seams (eg. Newhaven Member) are now considered to be volcanic ash deposits. Volcanoes have therefore played a significant part in the geological history of the UK."

It is noteworthy that most all these stone alignments run in the same direction, from NNW to SSE. These stones are smaller and more irregular in their shape, than those at Stonehenge, due to the natural quarrying mechanisms of their formation. As to the stone alignments themselves, these we believe mark the receding edge of the ice sheet from period to period. This is the reason why these alignments are naturally almost straight and why they run nearly parallel, reflecting the natural processes of ice melting. This also explains why the spacing between stone alignments is nearly even. These stone alignments provide a natural record of the melting of glaciers in this area of Europe.

Initially, the stones could possibly have been pushed off the ice edge by boys as part of annual Spring celebrations and the end of Winter. This could have been a yearly seasonal activity, with more new stones appearing near the ice rim each year or during extreme geological events. These stone alignments also may have been created to clear the land from these boulders for farming and cultivation. But we don't believe that these stones were carried by men over long distances and placed there through hard manual labor and for dubious purposes! Who in their right mind (and that includes our primitive ancestors) would have used precious scarce resources, mobilizing the villagers to a difficult task that took them away from the hard work of cultivating the fields and assuring their survival for one more year? But if some archaeologists want to argue the point, that primitive men had the organizational and engineering skills to 'move the stones' then why were the stones not placed in some other formation, possibly criss-crossing in places, or placed more precisely straight and more evenly spaced in parallel rows? Why are there gaps in some rows? Why weren't these stones placed to mark boundaries of farm...
fields instead of this useless arrangement of row after row of nearly parallel lines? It just doesn't make sense! In an attempt to disprove this theory, that stone alignments mark the edge of local receding ice sheets, Edward Pegler writes,

“There are many [stone] alignments (such as the Dorset Cursus, Offa’s Dyke, the Antonine Wall) which run against glacial flow directions.”(reference)

But this is as it should be! If these stone alignments trace the ice edge, this direction would certainly be against and perpendicular to the ‘glacial flow direction’. This confirms our theory, not contradict it.

Silbury Hill: Near Stonehenge and Avebury Circle lies Silbury Hill. This earthwork is considered to be a monument constructed by prehistoric men.

Composed mainly of chalk and clay excavated from the surrounding area, the mound stands 40 meters (130 ft) high and covers about 5 acres (2 ha). It is a display of immense technical skill and prolonged control over labour and resources. Archaeologists calculate that Silbury Hill was built ... [by] 500 men working 15 years (Atkinson 1974:128) to deposit and shape 248,000 cubic meters (324,000 cu yd) of earth and fill on top of a natural hill. Euan W. Mackie asserts that no simple late Neolithic tribal structure as usually imagined could have sustained this and similar projects, and envisages an authoritarian theocratic power elite with broad-ranging control across southern Britain.

The base of the hill is circular and 167 meters (548 ft) in diameter. The summit is flat-topped and 30 meters (98 ft) in diameter. A smaller mound was constructed first, and in a later phase much enlarged. The initial structures at the base of the hill were perfectly circular: surveying reveals that the center of the flat top and the center of the cone that describes the hill lie within a meter of one another (Atkinson 1974:128). (reference)

Several tunnelings and other excavations done at Silbury Hill over several hundreds of years reveal nothing of archeological value inside it. No hidden tombs, no burial of royalties, no hidden chambers or buried artifacts and treasures of a lost prehistoric civilization. Just dirt and fill. (reference)

Few prehistoric artifacts have ever been found on Silbury Hill: at its core there is only clay, flints, turf, moss, topsoil, gravel, freshwater shells, mistletoe, oak, hazel, sarsen stones, ox bones, and antler tines.

One naturally asks, why would 500 men working for 15 years want to build such a hill with dubious cultural value? And if this was to have taken "an authoritarian theocratic power elite with broad-ranging control across southern Britain" to mobilize the people and to sustain such project, why wouldn't they be buried there? And whatever happened to such a dynasty of theocratic rulers? It just doesn't make sense!

There must be a rational explanation to all this. What is so striking about Silbury Hill is its near perfect circular base and the rounded conical shape. But such earthwork features are also possible through natural processes. If you consider runoff water on an ice sheet collecting at a large ice hole container, with water carrying dirt and soil streaming down from all around the rim, this soil will naturally settle and collect where there is least water turbulence. And for a circular container basin that would be at the center. Over time the soil and dirt will accumulate into a conical shape at the middle of the circular basin. Once all the ice has melted and the water drained into the ground and the countryside, such a conical heap of soil would be left behind.

Long Barrows: Interestingly, there are also many 'long barrows' found in Salisbury Plain. Around 300 are known to exist in England and Scotland, most exist in southern and eastern England. Typically, these earthen works are long, somewhat rectangular mounts of earth with ditch embankments on each side along their length. Few have a small chamber built within them containing human remains. The most famous of these chambered long barrows is the West Kennet Long Barrow, near Stonehenge (see diagram below)
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Quoting from an article in Wikipedia:

...Human remains were placed in this chamber, sometimes all at once and sometimes over a period of time. Often the bones found in them are disarticulated, implying that the bodies were subjected to exposure and excarnation prior to burial or that they were buried elsewhere and exhumed for the purposes of placing in the barrow. Rarely are whole skeletons found and it seems that only long bones and skulls survived until the final interment. ...

... there is only limited evidence for grave goods in these collective interments despite the belief that such individuals enjoyed high-status....

... a significant number of long mounds in southern England have been demonstrated more recently to have limited primary evidence of burial at all....

...Some barrows when excavated produced evidence of the mounds being partitioned by wattle fences which served no apparent structural purpose....

Archeologists argue that these earthen mounds of long barrows were made by Neolithic men as burial grounds for a select elite ruling class. Yet there is very limited evidence for 'grave goods' to be found in them. Nor are whole skeletons of these honored and revered rulers found preserved in these graves. Certainly, any belief system that seeks to honor and preserve the body and spirit and memory of a beloved ruler would seek to preserve their remains whole and intact, along with their precious earthly belongings. That is so with the Egyptian mummies and with other ancient cultures. The human remains found in these long barrows and other places around Stonehenge are scattered and mutilated, with broken skulls and broken dismembered bones, buried in unmarked graves with several partial skeletons belonging to several people packed together. Furthermore, more recent evidence demonstrates that these long mounts have “limited primary evidence of burial at all”.

We do not doubt that the chambers found in some of these long barrows with skeletal remains placed in them were the works of men, possibly Neolithic men. The chambers may have served the purpose of housing the remains of locals, but the long barrows that extend some 100 meters or more beyond the chamber served no conceivable purpose. It does nothing to preserve or immortalize the human remains and would require considerable effort to build. If these mounds were to have been built by men, the chamber housing the human remains would likely have been more prominently central and larger, possibly several built around the same mound. And why were these “mounds being partitioned by wattle fences which served no apparent structural purpose”? And if the ditches were dug for the dirt used for the mound, why were they at such distance from the mound and not next to the mound? There are too many questions that can be raised if we are to explain these long barrows as the work of men.

Our contention is that these long barrows are natural, made by the same processes described above for Silbury Hill. They were formed as a result of deposits of dirt and debris (including skeletal remains) in ice containment basins collecting runoff melt water. The ditches dug on either side of them are further evidence of such water flow. The dismembered and broken skeletal bones and sculls were the result of these being carried by currents for some distance, dismembering and braking these in the process. Isotopic tracing of teeth enamel in one of these human remains found buried near Stonehenge has been traced to Preceli Hills where the bluestones of Stonehenge are said to have originated. This suggests that the same geomorphology that may have brought the bluestones to Stonehenge brought also these human remains from the same geography and buried them near Stonehenge. The wattle fences found in some long barrows that “served no apparent structural purpose” are tree branches, twigs and leaves likewise carried by the current, getting tangled and intertwined in the current and buried in the long barrows along with bones. The chambers found in some of these long barrows were built later and were indeed built by men and for the purpose of laying to rest human skeletal remains found elsewhere. The long barrows provided a natural setting where such chambers could be built and men as often is the case took advantage of the opportunity. If there were caves instead of mounds to be found in Salisbury Plain, they would probably have used them as well. But we wont be arguing then that Neolithic men built those caves!

Circle Formations: Stone circles likewise can be found in many parts of the world. There are some 1000 stone circles in just Britain and Ireland alone. Many others can be found in France and as far North as Scandinavia. These stone circles are typically surrounded by an outer ditch with an earthen embankment on the outside. Many times the stone circles are concentric with some stones randomly inside. In larger circles the continuity of the outside ditch is broken at a couple of places permitting a level road access to the interior area from the outer fields. Sometimes these formations are more elliptical or form just an arc of a circle but not a complete circle. One particular stone circle of great interest is at Avebury some 20 miles North of Stonehenge.
Avebury is the largest stone circle in the world: it is 427m (1401ft) in diameter covers an area of some 28 acres (11.5 ha). … a huge circular bank (a mile round), a massive ditch now only a half its original depth, and a great ring of 98 sarsen slabs enclosing two smaller circles of 30 stones each and other settings and arrangements of stones. The outer bank, still very impressive, was originally 17m (55ft) high from ditch bottom to bank top. The stones, each weighing about 40 tons or more,
Our contention is that the stone circles, large and small alike, were made through the same collaborative activity of Man and Nature; the same as with the stone alignments described above. As the ice sheet and seasonal snowfall melted during Spring and Summer, the water runoff on the surface of the ice sheet would carry with it 'wandering' stones which, once pushed by local people over the smooth circular ice edge, would form near perfect circles (see photo above). The force of the impact of these heavy stones on a wet muddy chalk bedrock would create a crater that would cradle these stones and cement them in a tight fit to keep them upright almost forever. This explains not only why these stone circles are so perfect (something that would be an engineering challenge for primitive men to achieve with very large circles over landscape obstructions) but it explains how the circles on the inside are so perfectly concentric. Try to draw circles as large as a mile long using just rope and deer antlers -- the tools presumably used by these primitive people to dig the ditch! It doesn't make sense!

With waterfalls over the smooth ice rim, deep ditches and earthen embankments would form naturally. The embankments would be high on the outside and low on the inside flat area. Something that can be observed in all such earthen formations. The deep ditches would be most prominent along the direction of the water falls - again a feature that can be observed in these formations. For areas over geological hot spots the waterfalls would occur on nearly all sides around and the resulting ditch would be nearly complete and mostly unbroken, with some differences as to the depth of the ditch that reflects more profuse waterfalls in deeper places. The pool of water accumulating inside the hole would eventually break through and would form an ever enlarging stream which would naturally flow into a nearby river. Over time these streams would become the 'avenues' to the stone circle interior. Typically there are two such paths to the circle interior with one being more prominent. These are usually spaced where one would expect the streams to have broken through the ice.

Alignment of the 'Avenue' :

A pair of roughly parallel earthwork banks, each with an outer quarry ditch, running from the River Avon at Amesbury to Stonehenge. The Avenue is generally regarded as representing a processional approach to Stonehenge, and has sometimes been linked with the postulated movement of the bluestones from the Avon to the monument. From the Avon, the Avenue runs about 1km northwest before curving gently to the west for around 500 meters. It then runs west-north-west in a straight line for 850 meters before turning abruptly to the south-west for a final, straight 530 meter stretch to Stonehenge. The Avenue is circa 34 meters wide near the Avon, gradually narrowing to around 21.5 meters at Stonehenge. Apart from the final straight length towards Stonehenge, much of the Avenue survives only as crop marks. There is no good evidence to support the idea that the Avenue ever featured a stone setting.

The 'avenue' and the positioning of certain stones (the 'heel stone') align along the direction of the summer solstice sun. This has led to speculations that these prehistoric monuments were astronomical observatories predicting annual celestial occurrences. These explanations however are just not supported by any other record. Such advanced prehistoric civilizations with such advanced knowledge of nature and high engineering skills to erect such observatories would surely have left behind more evidence of their existence. Any theory that claims to explain an isolated phenomenon with no collaborating evidence of existing records cannot be credible. The theory that these monuments were astronomical observatories have as much collaborative evidence as claiming that Stonehenge was built by extra terrestrial visitors leaving no other evidence of their earth-shattering visitation, then or later. Or that these monuments were built by a race of giants that vanished leaving behind no other evidence of their existence. It just doesn't make sense.

But we propose an explanation of the alignment at Stonehenge that does make sense. This explanation fits naturally and well with the theory we put forth above that these formations were built by Nature under the direction of Man. Above we described how the changing climate and receding ice glaciers could have brought these 50 ton stones to Stonehenge and how with the help and direction of local people these heavy stones could have then been 'hanged' into place in the circular area formed by melting ice hole over possibly a thermal geological hot spot.

The summer solstice marks the longest day of the year. During that day, and along the direction of the solstice sun, the earth receives the most intense and greatest amount of solar energy. And ice is of course the most sensitive substance to such solar energy and responds to it the most. The solstice sun leaves no trace of its direction on a grassy field but it will leave its mark
on an ice sheet with greater melting of the ice along that direction. Along with other factors, a small track of melting ice will form and over time this track will become more like a stream. This stream would carry the water from the melting ice and from the waterfalls collecting in a large pool of water inside the circular area. The waterfalls would dig the ditch, while the draining stream would pave the 'avenue'. And any stones that escaped 'hanging' by being trapped in the ice track that created the stream, of course will be deposited on the ground along the same path. This 'avenue' naturally aligns in the direction of the summer solstice sun. It is the 'procession avenue' that after a straight line segment veers off and leads to the Avon River some 3 miles away. Of course! Where else would such stream of water drain other than a nearby river? (see map above).

The Dating of the Ditch: Digging deep in the Stonehenge ditch archaeologists found buried deer antlers that dated to the 3000 BC. To connect the antlers to the construction of Stonehenge, they hypothesized that the antlers were the tools used to construct the ditch. To account for their preservation at the site they fabricated yet another chapter in the history of Stonehenge and made the burial of these antlers an act of religious ritual to give thanks for the task completed. But try to dig a ditch just a meter deep and perfectly round and make it as long as Stonehenge using deer antlers! And let's not forget that these were highly advanced primitive people that had the engineering skills and knowledge to transport stones and raise them to build monuments. Why not use an ox and a plow to dig the ditch? It doesn't make sense.

But our explanation does. The waterfalls from the melting ice and seasonal snowfall, or flooding of the land, would not only carry stones to Stonehenge, but would also deposit carcasses of dead animals and other debris deep into the ditches dug out by water. And if the dead animal happens to be a deer, its antlers would naturally break off and get stuck and buried in the ditch while the rest of the body would be carried down the stream. These carcasses could have been dead and buried in ice in higher mountains before the melting ice water brought them and deposited them in the ditch. In my view, the deer antlers found buried in the Stonehenge ditch and used to date the construction of the ditch had nothing to do with Stonehenge, its age or its construction. It's pure speculation to think that these were the digging tools used by Stonehenge builders and then in a ceremonial ritual buried in the ditch to commemorate its construction.

There is no end to the inventiveness of true believers of a false theory. Just as there is no end to the stories told by liars to hide their lies. While the first believes in a lie the other conceals a lie. But each time there is a new twist and turn in their explanation. The story gets made up as each new question arises. But there is a new story for each new circumstance that requires explaining. Our theory remains one true, simple and consistent explanation that makes sense.

The Stonehenge Layer: Excavations at Stonehenge have revealed a top soil layer of the monument with many small stone fragments, gravel and pebbles. The following is a quote from an English Heritage article on the latest (2008) excavation inside Stonehenge by archaeologists Tim Darvill and Geoffrey Wainwright.

“"The dig also investigated the "Stonehenge Layer", a significant and varied layer of debris and stone chippings spreading across the whole extent of the stone circle and comprising a high proportion of bluestone fragments. This is the first time that the nature, content and structure of this layer has been properly studied, crucially to determine whether this deposit was derived mainly from the construction or destruction of the Double Bluestone Circle and of Stonehenge as a whole." (reference)

It is commonly argued that these stone fragments are chippings made from work done on the sarsen and bluestones at Stonehenge. In a blog entry Edward Pegler writes about the Stonehenge Layer,

"The concentration in a surface layer of broken and chipped fragments around Stonehenge is, logically, thought to be debitage (bits chipped off) during the shaping of the Stonehenge sarsens and bluestones."

The many photos from the Atkinson excavation in 1964 clearly show this layer as being uniformly distributed throughout the Stonehenge area and consisting of stone fragments, gravel and pebbles that are evenly and uniformly mixed in with the top soil. If these deposits were the debitage of chipped off stones from work done on the sarsen and bluestones at Stonehenge, these chipped fragments would form a separate layer and be concentrated around the large stones and not uniformly spread across the entire Stonehenge area. Furthermore, there would be a distinct layer of such debitage rather than these chippings be uniformly mixed in with the top soil, as they are. From these photos it seems that the
Stonehenge Layer is considerably deep, from near top soil surface all the way to the underlying chalk bedrock, some 3 feet or more. It may be possible to get estimates of the amount of such stone debris that exists in that whole layer and compare this to how much volume from stone chipping debris would be reasonable to get from the erect stones, if they were shaped on site. Furthermore, recent investigations by Dr Rob Ixer seem to suggest that there may not be a direct correlation between the sarsen and bluestones erected and stone fragments studied by him in the Stonehenge Layer.

In accordance with our theory, the Stonehenge Layer would have been naturally formed by surface runoff water over the ice rim, depositing gravel and soil debris uniformly at the bottom of the pool of water inside the circular basin. This would also explain why there are no small 'erratics' anywhere else at Salisbury Plain, since this area would still be under the cover of ice while the water runoff and the debris deposits forming the Stonehenge Layer was taking place. Quoting Brian John from a blog entry,

“The question "Where are all of the small erratics?" is asked quite frequently -- and I wonder if they have been there all the time, in the Stonehenge Layer”

The Stonehenge Layer exhibits the same features as what you would expect if this Layer was formed by water deposits made in the bottom of a pool or small pond that drained or dried up over time. This is supported by our theory. These deposits were formed by ice surface runoff water draining into a circular basin detention pool of ice. When the 'local ice' melted in place over time, this pool bottom deposit layer would be left behind as the Stonehenge Layer. The morphology would of course be different in such case than 'glacier ice deposition' of moraines. The stone fragments found in such deposits could conceivably come from anywhere, carried there by runoff water coming from nearly every direction into a circular basin detention pool. So looking at the Stonehenge Layer as purely 'glacier deposition' may not be the right way of thinking about this.

**Stumps and Pits:** In the photos above and to the right we see exposed various bedrock pits where bluestones are said to once stood and a stump of a bluestone that broke upright while erect. To a question I raised

“... how relatively shallow the stone pit settings were? If these were actually dug out by the builders of Stonehenge to erect the huge stones in them and securely back filled the holes and even packed the holes with packing stones, it doesn't seem to me that these stones would withstand millennia of wear and tear, ground erosion and extreme weather conditions.”

Brian John responded with the following.

“I agree -- some of the pits used for stone settings do appear to be very shallow. But maybe they didn't hold stones for very long -- and I agree with many others who have remarked that the builders were either very indecisive or liable to sudden changes in priorities. So they put the bluestones (and maybe many small sarsens as well?) into settings that were very short-lived -- and then took them away again and placed them in another setting -- and then another and another. These abundant shallow empty pits are one of the reasons for my speculation that the builders never had enough "bluestones" to complete their project or projects. Maybe they started with a plan and got on with the building while they were still scouring the countryside for smallish monoliths -- and eventually had to come to terms with reality -- namely that there weren't enough stones within easy hauling distance...... “

But there is another explanation to these shallow stone settings than blaming primitive indecisiveness and poor project planning. Examining these Atkinson photos closely, I ask. Do these excavated pits and stumps in the photos reflect the work of men? The pits seem to be too irregularly shallow and round to hold huge stones, while the stumps seem to be so tightly cradled into the bedrock and so perfectly fitting that no hole dug out by men to hold huge stones erect and back filled with dirt could look anything like it. Furthermore, the irregular shallow crater-like surface suggests geothermic hot spot activity. From the pits and stumps, it seems these stones have been dropped from above and so nailed by gravity into a hot muddy chalk bedrock in such a fashion. All these features align very well with our overall theory about the making of Stonehenge.
This theory can be tested! It is relatively easy to do an engineering study to determine how deep of a crater would be created by dropping that size of stones from a height equal to one and a half times their height onto a hot muddy chalk bedrock, and compare this with the existing pit settings. There are just too many questions and problems with primitive men erecting such huge stones and securing them upright for five millenniums in such shallow pits.

The many densely packed empty pits found etched in the bedrock at Stonehenge likely were formed by blocks of ice falling over the ice edge. The blocks of ice were transported there by the same agency of ice as the huge stones. Whereas the stones stayed embedded, the ice blocks melted away leaving behind the empty pits. There were likely many more such ice blocks carried to Stonehenge than stone blocks. These ice blocks falling over in a confined area would become densely packed on the ground, etching into the chalk bedrock the empty pits pattern that we see in the photos. Similar empty pits (but more spread out) are found on the beach at Medmerry. These, we believe were also made by ice blocks embedded into the bedrock and later melting away.

In the same photos above we see exposed stumps in the bedrock of bluestones that once stood upright. We ask, is there a good explanation why erect upright bluestones should break off and leave such stumps stuck in the bedrock? Is this due to original fault fractures and weathering? Would breaking up of these bluestones due to weathering show up as a compression fracture, as shown in the photos? If the stones had such fracture faults to them originally and later broke off, why would these stones be used by the Stonehenge builders? And wouldn't such partially fractured bluestones break upon being transported by them on sleds over rough terrain from some 250 km away?

The stumps appears to show the type of fracture that results from compression and not from stone fault lines and weathering. There is no conceivable reason why a free standing erect bluestone should experience compression fracture. Only one way a stone that size can experience compression. By being dropped from above at some significant height hitting hard ground. This would also explain why the compression fracture would occur at the bottom half of the huge stone, since this would be the area that would experience the greatest compression of a stone hitting ground. But this is the method we suggest was used to erect Stonehenge!

**Bluestone 69:** The photo to the right shows the restoration of bluestone 69 by Atkinson. The base of this stone is very enigmatic and atypical, as are the very smooth and flat faces of it and the sharp finished top. This stone is often used to argue that the stones at Stonehenge were transported by Neolithic men and were skillfully worked on before being erected in place. Yet, I don't believe you can find another one like it anywhere at Stonehenge. This alone should raise some serious questions and doubt about its relevance in the making of Stonehenge.

Did this stone brake off and fell? Has its pit setting ever been found and excavated? Does its setting also reflect the same odd shape of its base? These are important legitimate questions to ask. Certainly an excavation of a stone pit matching the base of bluestone 69 would be big news. None have been announced to date. But beyond the questions, we also have some serious observations to make.

Certainly it does not appear that this stone was broken off. So it had to have fallen, if it was ever erect. By shaping bluestone 69 like so, it seems that its base would be greatly weakened and the whole stone made very unstable. In a man-made dug-up pit this stone with such base would be unstable and would need to be tightly supported by packed stones in a tight fitting setting. Yet its exceptionally smooth and flat surface shows no such signs. Furthermore, any unevenness in the fit of the base with the prepared pit would create imbalance, instability and stress points. The imbalance would create much stress to the thin and weakened base, greatly increasing the chances of it breaking off at the base.

Chiseling and shaping bluestone 69 to this extent would require great effort. Yet it would not provide any better and lasting erection. A simple "cost/benefits" analysis would rule against such a method. Also, the tools needed for such stone carving would have to be stronger and more sophisticated and precise than stone axes.

Bluestone 69 seems to have been prepared for a precise tight fit as part of some more elaborate devise, perhaps with military application like a catapult or heavy ram. The stone could have been the ramming head of a ramming apparatus on wheels made out of timber. The thinner base could fit in a wooden sheath, like a sword to its handle, all tightly fastened by rope and supported by a larger and heavier tree trunk underneath which would extend further near the front giving support to the whole ramming arm. The whole apparatus would swing and be suspended from an erect timber armature on a platform base that can be wheeled into action. The shape of the stone top seems to suggest such function.
All these observations make the argument that bluestone 69 was shaped in that fashion much later (perhaps by the Romans or even later) and for very different purpose that may not have anything to do with the making of Stonehenge. This shows how the functionality of the site at Stonehenge may have changed over the millennia and how the stones themselves may have been used and worked on over this time for very different purposes. We should be very careful in prescribing these later changes to the stones at Stonehenge to its original erection, just as careful in ascribing dates to Stonehenge based on organic material that could have been deposited by runoff water from different places and at different times.

The Holes of Stonehenge: There are several concentric circles of holes outside the great Sarsen Circle and inside the Stonehenge ditch. The most famous of these are the so called Aubrey Holes identified by antiquarian John Aubrey in 1666. There are some 56 such pits, on the average 0.76m deep and 1.06m in diameter. Other such similar circles of pits, the so called Y and Z holes, are much nearer to the Sarsen Circle but still outside it. The size of these holes are smaller than the Aubrey holes, however. From excavations done for some of these holes, we know that these presumably were dug out and soon after were back filled again with the same chalk rubble, since there is no weathering of the pit sides.

No one knows what was the purpose of these holes. Some argue that these once contained wooden posts that supported an earlier wooden monument that predates Stonehenge. Some pine remains in one of the pits is taken as evidence for this theory. But the shallow depth of these pits makes it very unlikely that these pits supported posts. Closer to the surface human ash remains were found in several of the pits, along with a bone pin that presumably was to a leather or cloth bag that once contained human cremation ashes. Because of the closeness to the surface, these ashes are acknowledged to have been placed there much later than when the pits were dug. This seems credible. But does not explain the original purpose for digging these pits.

We have a different explanation as to how these holes were made. What is strikingly the same in all of these features of Stonehenge (as well as many other stone circles) are the concentric near-circles that all these features follow – whether these be sarsen stones, or bluestones, or the ditch embankments or Aubrey holes or y and z or anything else holes. They are all near-circular and they are all concentric. This should suggest a common cause that created them. Perhaps it was the will of men that believed in circles but not much of anything else.

We believe that these holes were made by cascading streams of falling water on the soft chalk bedrock. After the formation of the outer Sarsen Circle and with greater volume of surface runoff water (due perhaps to intermittent geological events) the ice edge will begin to deteriorate and form grooves and channels to accommodate the greater volume of falling water. Under conditions where these natural tendencies would be exerted evenly and regularly, these water grooves will appear near uniformly spaced along the ice rim, creating small cascading water falls all around the ice rim. Clearly, these falling water lines will in short time produce such pits on the soft chalk bedrock where the water falls. All such holes will be as deep and as wide as the physical forces of the falling water and the bedrock will permit, and no further.

As normal conditions ensued and the ice sheet receded further, new geological events would cause more melting and greater water flow. A new ring of such circles will then be created further out. Naturally, the previous pits will again be filled up by the same chalk rubble and so not weathering by being exposed to air for long periods of time. It can perhaps be argued that the greater inner area of such circles is indicative of a greater meltdown of the ice sheet cover, and so a greater volume of surface runoff water. That would explain why the Aubrey holes are larger than the Z holes which are larger than the Y holes closest to the Sarsen Circle. And why the ditch that encloses everything is the deepest. Interestingly, the ditch appears to have been made in sections and not as one continuous formation, and with varying depth. This too matches and agrees with our explanation.

Disputing the 'Evidence': But our theory does raise some serious questions on the currently accepted archeological and geological timeline, however. Archeologists date Phase I of Stonehenge to the Neolithic Period (3100 BC) while geologists argue that there was no ice sheet cover at that time in Salisbury Plain where Stonehenge is located. Dating Stonehenge any earlier to the Paleolithic Period presents problems with the level of engineering skills and social organization needed to erect Stonehenge. Quoting from a recent exchange with Brian John,

... way back in the Palaeolithic ... So far as we know, they did not have the technology to move big stones, let alone build megalithic structures and alignments. The last glaciers in the British Isles were present in the uplands of Scotland, N Wales and the Lake District around 11,000 years ago. They were very small, and were restricted to highland cirques. ... there was no glacier ice anywhere near Southern Britain around 5,000 years ago.
Geological and archaeological dates are just not that absolute and are constantly being revised. If the evidence used for glaciation involve geomorphology and deposits due to glacier flow, moraines and the like, then it is possible that no such evidence is left behind on the land surface when you have an ice cover (like a frozen lake) forming and melting in place over a flat plain, especially if the bedrock provides fast water drainage as the chalky ground of Salisbury Plain certainly does. It is interesting to note in this regard also that excavations of the 'avenue' do reveal periglacial stripes of the covered underground, while freshwater shells are found in mound deposits. Carbon dating of organic material is always problematic in areas where such material could have been deposited there from elsewhere and at different times. Perhaps also Stonehenge was built earlier than currently thought, when ice did cover the land. Since according to our theory the engineering skills and social organization needed to erect Stonehenge is very minimal at best, this would be possible. In a more recent exchange with Brian John he writes,

Well, we have had some surprises in recent years -- including the discovery that LGM (Last Glacial Maximum) ice reached the Scilly Islands and flowed across the south coast of Ireland around 20,000 years ago. There are lots of radiocarbon dates now -- much to everybody's surprise. So it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that Devensian ice reached Salisbury Plain about the same time -- 20,000 years ago.

Furthermore, many geological studies give evidence of an abrupt climate change and a Big Freeze in the Northern Hemisphere between 10,900 and 9,500 BC. This is well within a time period when Stonehenge (and all other stone formations) could have been made. Quoting from an article in Wikipedia,

"... a rapid return to glacial conditions in the higher latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere between 12,900–11,500 years before present (BP)[5] in sharp contrast to the warming of the preceding interstadial deglaciation. It has been believed that the transitions each occurred over a period of a decade or so,[6] but the onset may have been faster.[7] Thermally fractionated nitrogen and argon isotope data from Greenland ice core GISP2 indicate that the summit of Greenland was ~15°C colder during the Younger Dryas[6] than today. In the UK, coleopteran fossil evidence (from beetles) suggests that mean annual temperature dropped to approximately 5°C,[8] and periglacial conditions prevailed in lowland areas, while icefields and glaciers formed in upland areas.[9] Nothing of the size, extent, or rapidity of this period of abrupt climate change has been experienced since.[5]"

This 'Big Freeze' in the Northern Hemisphere is said to have lasted some 1400 years, ending around 9,500 BC. During this period of time we can expect large bodies of water (lakes, sea channels, etc.) to solidly freeze and seasonal snowfall to accumulate creating thick sheets of 'local ice'. This thick sheets of 'local ice' would take some considerable period of time to all melt once the Big Freeze ended. We still have ice sheets in Iceland and Greenland that are still melting after tens of thousands of years in existence.
We know, therefore, that the UK region was experiencing long sustained periods of freezing temperatures between 10,800 and 9,500 BC. We can reasonably assume 'local ice' formed and covered Salisbury Plain during this period. This ice formed locally and was not part of larger glacial ice flow that would leave behind a 'trail'. The ice that formed over a period of some 1400 years would need an extended period of time to all melt locally and disappear without the typical signs of glaciation. We could even argue that it took much longer to melt than it did to form. If it took say four times as long (a reasonable assumption, considering the existence of the current ice sheets in Iceland) that would mean at around 3,900 BC Salisbury Plain was likely covered by an ice sheet. This is close to the dates that Stonehenge is said to have been built. Whichever way we look at the enigma of Stonehenge we see 'ice' all around!

The simple and consistent explanations that our theory provides to so many facts on the ground at Stonehenge, and on all the other stone alignments in Brittany and in the UK, support the proposition that indeed ice covered these parts of Europe when these megalith structures were made. Signs of glaciation can be left behind by Man as well as Nature. It can be argued that these very stone circles and these stone alignments and the surrounding land morphology are the writings that prehistoric men left behind as evidence of such extreme geological conditions and the ice cover that was created. How else would you explain so many details of the features of these formations? Saying that local people made them through hard manual labor and no apparent reason just begs for questions. To move these huge stones just few miles over uneven terrain with natural obstructions would have required considerable skill, large groups of men, and straight timber like pine or palm.

It can be argued that Salisbury Plain does not favor such pine forests. The very alkaline nature of such chalky soil would make pine trees difficult to grow and pollen difficult to survive.

**Salisbury Plain** is a chalk plateau in central southern England covering 300 square miles ... the plain is sparsely populated and is the largest remaining area of calcareous grassland in north-west Europe. (reference)

**Calcareous grassland** (or alkaline grassland) is an ecosystem associated with thin basic soil, such as that on chalk and limestone downland. Plants on calcareous grassland are typically short and hardy, and include grasses and herbs such as trefoil. (reference)

The glacier transport theory that Aubrey Burl, Brian John, Geoffrey Kellaway and others support explains how the bluestones were carried to Salisbury Plain from the Preseli Hills some 250 kilometers away. But it still leaves open all the many other questions. Why did the Neolithic Britons 'pick-up' the stones and with great manual effort move them to Stonehenge? Where is the evidence of such social organization, economic development and religious zeal to engage large groups of primitive people (struggling to survive) for a task that supposedly took many centuries to complete? A zeal and an effort that had to be sustained for many generations, yet leaving no other record behind? The only relevant question that can completely validate our Smart-Ice Theory is whether Salisbury Plain was covered by ice during the making of Stonehenge, contrary to current thinking. We argue above that it was. Supporting this view, recent scientific research of the soil at Stonehenge likewise seems to suggest that this area may indeed have been covered by ice.

Remarkably, the investigated soil sequences [at Stonehenge] record rare examples of a prehistoric decalcified soil cover, in a now generally rendzina-dominated landscape which reportedly has been extant since the Neolithic. (reference)

... [Rendzina] is one of the soils most closely associated with the bedrock type and an example of initial stages of soil development (reference)

If the soil at Stonehenge match characteristics of the Neolithic period (5500-2500 BC), with rendzina being the main component indicating an initial stage of soil development, isn't it then conceivable that the soil at Stonehenge had less time to develop? Why? One possible explanation is because it was still under the cover of ice and snow!

**Summary:** The basic element of our Smart-Ice Theory is that Salisbury Plain was covered by an ice sheet during the making of Stonehenge. Little effort and skill would be required for small groups of local people to 'hang' these stones in place. This would provide a wide time frame for Stonehenge to be effortlessly erected, from Paleolithic to Neolithic periods. Furthermore, once the stones were in place, including the lintels, these could later be modified and better fitted in place by more skilled people for their own purposes using better tools. So though we make certain geological assumptions, we leave open the time period for the building and restoring of Stonehenge.
We believe that Stonehenge was built by Nature under the direction of local people, much like the many stone alignments and circle formations to be found in other places in Brittany and the UK. The stones were naturally quarried by a combination of ice, hot lava and seismic activity. These stones were transported to the Salisbury Plains and to Stonehenge (and other areas) by melting ice (possibly of a frozen 'Salisbury Lake') and seasonal snowfalls as the climate became warmer. Stonehenge may have been a geological hot spot at one time as evidenced by present day Bath nearby with the warmest hot spring waters in all of Europe. The melting ice over a highly absorbent chalky ground formed a circular ice sink hole enlarging radially. The various concentric stone circles record this progression. Errant stones transported to the site by melting ice water and surface pitch were 'hang' over the smooth ice rim and at chosen locations by local people – thus maintaining and refining a long tradition of 'stone hanging' as evidenced by the many such formations throughout that area of Europe. This practice may have started by boys as a game and latter used by elders as an effective means of clearing the land from these huge stones for the creation of farm fields. The impact of these heavy stones dropping on the wet and muddy chalk bedrock would create a crater that would tightly cradle these stones upright almost forever.

Runoff water on the surface of the ice sheet created waterfalls and runoff streams. As the weather got progressively warmer and the circular area grew much larger, the runoff water got increasingly more rapid and profuse and the waterfalls stronger. The waterfalls dug the ditch while the streams paved the 'avenues' to the interior. The alignment of one such stream will occur in the direction of the summer solstice sun, this being the direction of most intense solar energy. Any stones that got trapped in the stream would be deposited on the ground in the same alignment when the ice melted. The stream will follow a straight line path as far as the ice cover and then would follow a path over land to the closest river where it would drain. These features match the Stonehenge 'procession avenue' that leads from Stonehenge to the Avon River. (see map above)

Melting ice water or seasonal flooding would also carry carcasses of dead animals and other organic material including trees possibly from previous years and from far away mountains. These carcasses would be dumped over the waterfalls into the ditch. Antlers of dead deer would naturally break off and get stuck and deeply buried into the ditch while the rest of the carcass will be carried off by the stream down the river. Using such organic material found to date Stonehenge is therefore unreliable and misleading.

As a majestic and mysterious site, Stonehenge would naturally attract people to celebrate, feast, worship and even sacrifice at the site. But these latter uses of Stonehenge do not divulge the purpose and methods of its construction. We believe our theory does and provides a coherent and consistent simple explanation to all its puzzling enigmas.

**Conclusion:** Our main objective in this article is to sketch out and put forth a theory that on the face of it 'makes sense' and is able to provide simple and consistent explanations to the many perplexing enigmas of Stonehenge, and other such prehistoric monuments in the UK and in Brittany. We sought to make our strongest arguments, using mainly the 'facts on the ground' that in themselves allow no dispute – the many circular and linear stone formations throughout the British Isles and Brittany; the circular outer ditches; the circular embankments higher on the outside than on the inside; the concentric stone circles; the avenues to the interior of these monuments; the alignment of the 'avenues' to the summer solstice sun; the almost straight near parallel and near uniformly spaced stone alignments; the consistent direction of all these stone alignments in Brittany; The width-wise alignment of the huge sarsen stones along the circular perimeter; the land morphology around Stonehenge and other such monuments; the 'procession avenue' at Stonehenge, straight for a stretch in the direction of the summer solstice sun then veering off to end at Avon River; etc.

All these monument features can be explained by our theory. The transport of these huge stones over very long distances and the erection of these at Stonehenge can be explained by our theory. The necessary skills, tools and social organization needed for the construction of these monuments by primitive men can be explained by our theory. The wide and flexible time span from the Paleolithic to the Neolithic period over which Stonehenge is said to have been built can be explained by our theory. The modifications and restoration of Stonehenge over time can be explained by our theory. The original purpose and function of Stonehenge can be explained by our theory. The civilization and social organization needed for the building of Stonehenge can be explained by our theory. The carbon dating of organic deposits used to date Stonehenge can be explained by our theory. We believe these and other enigmas can be explained by our theory that has as a basic premise an ice cover of the land when Stonehenge was erected, but leaves open the time period for its construction.

In contrast, we see many problems with the 'human transport' theory, or even the 'glacial transport' theory of Burl, Kellaway, John and others. Through mineral chemical signatures and radioactive tracing it is well established that the bluestones came from various locations of Preceli Hills (some 150 miles NW of Stonehenge) while the huge and heavy sarsen stones came from Marlborough Downs (some 20 miles N of Stonehenge). Moving such huge stones even a few miles over upgrades and uneven terrain on Salisbury Plain would have required unprecedented engineering skills, use of resources and well developed social organization sustained for long periods. The standing up of these stones into a circle would require geometric understanding of circles, notions of measurement and distance, an understanding of center of gravity,
leverage and counter weights, building foundations, scaffolding, bracing, balance and considerable knowledge of structural engineering to assure vertical and lateral stability, weight distribution through the use of lintels tied to uprights. The stones would need to be properly chosen and prepared, with a flat wide base for stability and stone-holes dug out in the hard bedrock using even harder digging tools (not deer antlers) at proper 'depth to height' ratio to tightly match the dimensions and shape of the stone base, packing and filling, water drainage away from the foundations, etc. It's not logical that Neolithic tribesmen had such knowledge and ability without also exhibiting similar skills in many other ways as well. No such evidence exists. The excavation photos below clearly show that no such knowledge existed then either.

Social organization would require a hierarchy of power and single authority rule. Also there need to be public purpose, social gathering places and social practice, economic activity, common defense, etc. There is no such evidence of such social development dating to the Neolithic period in the British Isles.

To mobilize the population to an immense task of transporting and erecting these stones you need to have a common belief system, a religion, or a common enemy. Stonehenge is obviously not a defensible structure and has no military significance. For it to have religious significance you need symbols and religious artifacts, images and gods that can communicate such feelings across generations. No such evidence exists.

The suggestion that Stonehenge was an astronomical observatory has now generally been discredited. Aside from the summer solstice alignment of the 'avenue', which can have a more natural explanation as we saw above, no other star alignment pans out upon closer examination. Furthermore, observations of the stars can only be done at night and can easily be done from anywhere. If these primitive people knew about astronomy, why not erect a simple observatory with small stones or even wood sticks aligned to the stars and used as a calendar closer at home where it would actually be used, rather than in this remote and isolated place where Stonehenge sits? If we need a sun dial, we build one in our back yard! When night falls, primitive people (following their animal instincts) gather inside in safety and warmth, rather than in the dark and cold in the middle of nowhere where danger lurks to watch stars in the open landscape.

The only other remaining possibility to ascribe meaning and purpose to Stonehenge that can give some cover to the human transport explanation is that it was a 'healing center', a Neolithic SPA. This view has gained some support in recent times with the excavation of human remains buried near the monument showing abnormalities. It is argued that this healing power that may have attracted the sick and lame to Stonehenge came from the bluestones circle. But if the bluestones had such healing powers then, perhaps because of their radioactivity and other physical properties, why not now? Geothermal springs have retained their healing powers, why not bluestones. Perhaps this healing power of bluestones was only psychosomatic, based on deep religious faith. If so, why not make the journey to the very source of these bluestones at Preceli Hills? It is certainly easier for people to make this journey than for huge stones to do so. And by being at the very root and center of this magical home of the healing bluestones, a true believer would get the greatest benefit. Much like a pilgrimage by the faithful to Mecca. You don't bring the mystical powers of Delphi to Athens by taking stones from the cave where Apollo slayed the serpent. You cannot 'transport' such magic elsewhere. You can only take a 'souvenir' of your visit there.

Though the glacier transport theory of Burl, Kellaway, John and others makes sense in the face of it, the problem as it stands is that it does not go far enough and leaves unanswered many of the same questions. Why was Stonehenge built, how it was built, why is there no other evidence of such engineering skills and social organization, and so on. Glacier transport still leaves these huge stones scattered around Salisbury Plain but does not explain how or why these stones were transported by men and erected at Stonehenge. If we assume that these Neolithic tribesmen had the engineering skills and social organization to transport these huge stones some 20 miles over uneven terrain and upgrades, multiply that effort ten fold and you are forced to concede that these stones could have been moved from 200 miles away. Our theory avoids such logical pitfalls while answering all these questions.

The 'human transport' theory just doesn't make sense, no matter how you stitch together a narrative. Pointing to the building of the Egyptian pyramids to explain 'human transport' of megaliths at Stonehenge is not logically correct. The building of the Great Pyramids is still an unsolved mystery. And you can't use one unsolved mystery to solve another. Also, the Egyptians, building at a latter period than the Neolithic Britons, left behind a rich and flourishing civilization and demonstrated in so many other ways their engineering skills, social and economic organization, and religious faith. And though they stopped building pyramids, they did not stop building! The builders of Stonehenge it appears stopped building all together and their civilization just vanished leaving no other trace in History. Pointing to the Easter Island megalith
movers is also a false comparison since these stone heads were built just 800 years ago (compared to 5000 years ago) and under much better circumstances and suitable natural resources.

Our theory stands out as the only one capable of answering all these questions. Only one serious issue remains: Was there an ice cover of the land when Stonehenge was built? Whenever that was! This theory provides so many sensible and consistent explanations to so many enigmas of Stonehenge that, along with recent geological evidence, we could reasonably conclude there was an ice cover.