

AMAZING ANATOMICAL ACCURACY OF ICA DINOSAUR STONES

In my book, [The Secrets of the Ica Stones and Nazca Lines: Proofs That Dinosaurs And Man Lived Together](#), I make the case that some of the dinosaurs depicted on Ica Stones are astonishing in their anatomical accuracy. This conclusion was reached in consultation with major dinosaur experts and an exhaustive study of current scientific literature as to how dinosaurs probably looked.

Some of the dinosaurs on the Ica stones have dermal frills. It is only the fossilized skin impressions that can provide tangible evidence to show what the animal looked like. Stephen Czerkas, who is a dinosaur expert and curator of a dinosaur museum in Blanding, Utah, published an article in “Geology”, 1992, that would forever change our concept of dinosaurs.¹ Czerkas studied fossilized skin impressions of sauropod dinosaurs and found that some species had dermal frills; dermal frills on the tail and across the back of the dinosaurs similar to an iguana or the ridges along crocodile tails. Notice the Ica Stone with anatomical accuracy for a stone found in the 1940’s and dating to the Pre-Columbian era.

The second stunning “dead on” accurate depiction is that the stone has the dinosaur walking with his tail sticking out. Early critics said the Ica Stones were fakes, and one of the reasons was that their tails were sticking out while walking—paleontologists in the 1960’s were confident that dinosaurs dragged their tails. Now we know the paleontologists were wrong. The Ica Stones were right. Notice the dinosaur on the Ica Stone is depicted in locomotion with the tail sticking out. Scientists believe all dinosaurs held their massive tails off the ground while walking, because there are no drag marks on dinosaur trackways.²

Another anatomical accuracy that the Ica Stones show is that they are depicted standing upright without their legs in a splayed out position. That, according to dinosaur experts, is “dead on” accurate. Notice that the dinosaur Ica Stone legs are in the correct position. The dinosaur is shown having three toes and that is “right on” for many species of sauropods!

The ancient artist also appears to have engraved the dinosaur on the stone showing rosette patterns and bumpy nodules. This was an unknown feature until recent fossil skin impression discoveries in the 1980’s and 1990’s.

The provenance of this particular Ica Dinosaur Stone can be traced to its excavation from an Ica Pre-Columbian tomb by Pablo and Carlos Soldi of Ocucaje, Peru. In 1967, the majority of the Soldi Collection was given to the Ica Regional Museum and later a portion of that collection to Dr. Javier Cabrera. The stone now resides in the Cabrera Museum and has been tested for patina, lichen growth, weatherization, dating at two different laboratories, and a digital microscopic analysis—and declared to be hundreds of years old, certainly Pre-Columbian.

¹ Stephen Czerkas. *Spiny Skinned Dinosaurs*, “Geology”. Vol. 20. (December, 1992), p. 1068ff.

² David Martill. [Walking With Dinosaurs](#). (BBC Books: London, England, 2000).

Questions about the stones' anatomical accuracy were submitted to twenty-four major dinosaur experts and museums.³ They were asked to give their opinions of the anatomical accuracy of the dinosaur drawing and the dino-rock, not knowing it was an Ica Stone. The overwhelmingly unanimous consensus was that the drawing was anatomically correct. Some paleontologists assumed that I was a dinosaur artist. One paleontologist commented that he felt that the rosette patterns on the large dinosaurs could have been as large as dinner plates. They assumed that the cross hatching on the back of the dinosaurs was an attempt to show the dinosaur skin impressions. Another paleontologist said that it was like I had been reading his work in the technical scientific journals and looking over the shoulder of paleontologists as they worked on reassembling fossil dinosaur skeletons. Of course, he didn't realize that the engraving was done by a Pre-Columbian Indian.

The salient inescapable conclusion that I reached from consulting the experts and having done first hand research on the Ica Stones for decades was:

The Pre-Hispanic cultures of Southern Peru must have seen dinosaurs to etch their portraits on stone with chilling accuracy.⁴

THE ATTACK OF THE DINOSUCKERS

The publication of my book has caused evolutionists to stampede and liberal theologians to howl foul. Stephen Myers, a misinformed theologian, erroneously asserts that there are no Ica Stones that look like dinosaurs-absolutely, not one.⁵ He is totally unaware that some dinosaurs had dermal frills, rosette skin patterns, and walked upright with tails sticking out. My consistent position has been that some of the Ica Stones are amazingly anatomically accurate and others are stylized but easily recognized as dinosaurs. Any child looking at the art on the stone babbles, "Dinosaur!"

I studied archaeology and Indian Studies at the University of New Mexico and Western New Mexico University and have researched Indian rock art for over twenty-five years. The Anasazi, Fremont, Jornada Mogollon, Wupatki, and other Pre-Columbian Indians hunted deer, but of the tens of thousands of rock art of deer, only a small percentage are completely anatomically correct. Even though the vast majority are stylized, anyone can tell that they are deer. Are we to assume that because there are stylized deer, no Indian ever saw a deer? The small percentage of rock art deer that are vividly accurate are due to artists' ability.

³Some of the experts and museums consulted: David Gillette, Stephen Czerkas, Luis Chappi, Dong Zhimins, David Norman, Don Lessum, Carnegie, Smithsonian, Chicago Field House, American Natural History Museum, Denver Natural History Museum, Museum of the Rockies.

⁴ Dennis Swift. The Secrets of the Ica Stones and Nazca Lines: Proofs That Dinosaurs and Man Lived Together. (Journal Graphics Publishing: Portland, Oregon, 2006), p. 51.

⁵ Stephen Myers. Institute of Biblical and Scientific Studies.

The fact that the Ica Stones have stylized dinosaurs only enhances their credibility because, if they were all anatomically accurate, we would suspicion a massive fraud.

Stephen Myers maintains that no theologian should be involved in scientific research on the Ica Stones. Is this not hypocrisy? All of his degrees are in Theology. Yet, Stephen Myers pontificates on the Ica Stones and parades himself as an authority on them because he read Erich Von Daniken's, Arrival of the Gods, in which Von Daniken not only believes in aliens constructing the Nazca Lines but in preposterous ideas about the Ica Stones. Is Van Daniken a credible source?

The Institute of Biblical Studies, of which Stephen Myers is the sole proprietor, was offered in 2005, the sum of \$500,000 to have a stone from my collection with dinosaurs on it examined by Pre-Columbian experts at universities or laboratories. The specific dinosaur stone was examined by Northwest Forensic Laboratory in Portland, Oregon, Palm Laboratories, Portland, Oregon, USB digital microscopic analysis, Dr. Richard Fales (PhD Archaeology, Shepherd University), and various other university authorities. It was a "slamdunk": patina in the grooves, massive weatherization, salt peter, a dinosaur's head with lichen growth with mummy blood from the body in the tomb and hair and mummy blood stain on the stone.

The dinosaur stone proved to be authentic by every test and by every authority who examined it.

Stephen Myers elaborates on his interpretive expertise by offering a curious comical hermeneutical twist to Job 40:15-18. He says that the description of the behemoth is not a description of a dinosaur but an aroused hippo. What! The Hebrew is clear, the creature has a tail like a Cedar tree. A Cedar tree is thirty to forty feet tall and narrows to a tip. How in the world could anyone interpret that as a hippo's reproductive organ. The hippo would have to hide behind a modesty curtain. Mr. Myers is no expert on hippo anatomy, dinosaur anatomy, or the Ica Stones. Yet, with utmost confidence he insists Job 40 is an aroused hippo. The clause of Job 40:17 is crucial to the proposition that behemoth could have been a type of dinosaur. The key clause in the English translates in Job 40:17a:

- KJV: He moveth his tail
- NASB: He bends his tail like a Cedar
- NIV: He sways like a Cedar
- NKJV: He moves his tail like a Cedar
- REV: His tail is rigid like a Cedar
- PSV: He makes his tail stiff like a Cedar
- RV: He moveth his tail like a Cedar.

Even Pope, whom Myers references says (as applied to the tail of a hippo), that the hyperbolic is extreme since the tail is absurdly small . . .⁶ The description does not fit the facts of what a hippo's tail looks like.

⁶ Matt Pope. The Anchor Bible: Job. (Doubleday: Garden City, New York, 1965), p. 323.

Hanson and Hanson say, “Our author must have been misinformed about the hippopotamus’s tail.”⁷ The hippopotamus tail is short and fat not long and tapering like a Cedar tree.⁸

Maybe Stephen Myers thinks that Herman Neutic is a European theologian not a science of following proper principals in biblical interpretation. While the cognitive verb in the Hebrew is exceedingly complex, the plain meaning of the text is easy to comprehend, and the Bible compares the behemoth tail to the Cedar tree-their great height: 2 Kings 19:23; Isaiah 2:13; Ezekiel 17:22; and the ability of these animals to lift up their tails.

⁷ A. Hanson and M. Hanson. The Book of Job. (SCM Press: London, 1983), p. 112.

⁸ Allan K. Steel. “Could Behemoth Have Been A dinosaur?” *Answers Technical Journal*. Vol. 15, Issue 2. (August, 2000), pp. 42-45.