

Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-04/msg00340.html>

- *From:* Seppo Renfors <Renfors@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 13 Apr 2005 11:53:14 GMT
-

Tom McDonald wrote:

>

> Seppo Renfors wrote:

>>

>> Tom McDonald wrote:

>>

>>>Seppo Renfors wrote:

>>>

>>>>David B wrote:

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>>Eric Stevens wrote in message ...

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>>none of the unbelievers "can come up with even a primitive

>>>>>>start-to-finish model of what happened" either.

>>>>>

>>>>>Rubbish.

>>>>>I presented a primitive start-to-finish model in 2003;

>>>>>but if you insist, here's a new version:

>>>>>

>>>>>1) A smart prankster, having seen news items about the wondrous new

>>>>>carbon-14 dating technique, decides to put it to the test

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>>Well, well.... here we see the incredible lengths the True Believers

>>>>>go to, to claim a "fake". This time Dave would have the forgery made

>>>>>AFTER the map had been discovered!!

>>>>

>>> Look up the history of 14C dating. Then look at the first date

>>>that the VM is known to have existed. Do the math. Then apologize

>>>to David.

>>

>>

>> For what exactly – for him being incredibly silly, or for your

>> nonsensical comments? That is up to you and him!

Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

>>
>> Are you suggesting it was either Hill, Ruben or Kamen who did the
>> forgery? They discovered the various C* carbons in the early 1940's.
>> However further study by Schultz and Watson on C14 suggested its half
>> life was 100 years or shorter! – therefor it doesn't even fit the
>> bill. Even more noteworthy is that a "dating technique" as David
>> claimed, didn't even exist back then.
>>
>> Libby (in USA) developed a method of C14 dating using a Geiger counter
>> in 1947. Yeah right..... fat lot of good that would have been on ink!
>> Not that it would have made the news (specially in Europe) being soon
>> after the war. That is to say there was no "common knowledge" among
>> the people at that time – not even in the academia. That came much
>> later! Further more it required the AMS to be invented before
>> something like the ink COULD be tested (but is a destructive test). It
>> can test samples as small as about one milligram of carbon.
>>
>> However I do take your point that –*IF* it is a forgery, it is highly
>> probably that ACADEMICS did in fact engage in the forgery (as some
>> definitely do even today), specially judging by the claimed
>> "academics" on this group – to whom "whatever it takes" seems to be
>> the motto!!
>>
>> Of course if you claim that, you also have to NAME them! So lets hear
>> it Tom, who was it, hmmm? Of course you can also point to those "news
>> items" David claims "the prankster" saw, right! Or is it not necessary
>> to verify claims made as long as they are made by True Believers and
>> upholders of that pre-Columbian brick wall, eh?!?
>>
>
> Seppo,
>
> Beautiful squink. Absolute failure to answer my questions.

Ahhhh.... but then anything that doesn't support your cause, you would automatically call "squink", now wouldn't you. Nor did I fail to answer your question. Just because the answer doesn't fit your agendas doesn't mean it wasn't an answer to your question. But then you haven't answered my question either – so what makes you so "superior" that you can ignore my questions while demanding an answer you might like, in place of the one you got, to your own?

See, that IS the problem with your political motives – they are not relevant to anything.

> Try again. As a hint, 14C was introduced as a useful technique
> (some years after it began to be discussed as a possible dating
> technique) in the early 1950's. Very early. Now when was the VM
> first *known* to have surfaced? Is that date after, say, 1952?

Let me quote you:

Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

<J1P6e.1676\$303.822@xxxxxxx>

"Even using the date of 1952, this would have given any notional forger five years between Libby's book and the appearance of the VM."

As if you didn't already know – and therefor you require no answer either. Still it is the same as the "Larssen letters" something written in the North of Sweden in the mid 1800's suddenly, for no known reason or evidence, became common knowledge in the USA – according to pre-Columbian brick wall builders, that is. This is no different. You haven't been able to show the slightest HINT of a connection to any knowledge of c14 dating – none at all. But again logic plays no part in the "fake" claim – specially not for True Believers.

The knowledge of c14 dating would have had to be COMMON KNOWLEDGE before it can even be suspected – this cannot be said to have occurred before 1960 at the earliest. If you want to claim otherwise – PROVE IT!

BUT the BOGUS part is that SHOULD someone have had the knowledge claimed – they would also have had the knowledge that it was NOT POSSIBLE to c14 date the ink before the VM was "found" – it would NOT have been possible before AMS was invented ie AFTER the find of the VM. So no more bullshit please!

Of course, True Believers can always rely on the old "the forger anticipated and expected AMS to be invented so took that into consideration...." garbage as done by the anti-KRS mob.

> After you answer my questions, you should apologize to David.

Already dealt with earlier – nothing further needs be added. David still has one of the loopier ideas there are, even for True Believers, to "explain" why it is a "fake" – doesn't matter (to him) it is as crazy as a sack full of cut snakes!

Oh, and by that stage the "commercial production" had changed from anatase to rutile anyway – a superior product produced cheaper. That SOME anatase was still being produced, might just save your skin you may think, only the colour was now white and no longer pale yellow (it never was yellow to brown as is on the map anyway) But then why let minor things like that bother you, eh.

—
SIR – Philosopher unauthorised

The one who is educated from the wrong books is not educated, he is misled.

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Tom McDonald
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* David B
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Alaca

• *References:*

- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Martyn Harrison
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Ken Towe
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* David Johnson
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* I.E._Johansson
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Thomas Zahr
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Eric Stevens
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Tom McDonald
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Eric Stevens
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* David B
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Ken Towe
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Eric Stevens
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* David B
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Seppo Renfors
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Tom McDonald
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Seppo Renfors
- ◆ ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
 ◇ *From:* Tom McDonald

- Prev by Date: ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Medieval ink***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
- Next by thread: ***Re: The Vinland Map's Ink***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***

Re: The Vinland Map's Ink

◆ *Thread*