

Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-06/msg00360.html>

- *From:* Philip Deitiker <Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 06 Jun 2005 05:44:20 GMT
-

Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxx> says in news:kmj7a1tr4c0vuum5le29tsq7kkrf7vlnn@xxxxxxxx:

> On Sun, 05 Jun 2005 21:14:52 -0500, Tom McDonald
> <tmcDonald2672@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
>>Eric Stevens wrote:
>>> On Sun, 5 Jun 2005 12:21:11 +0200, "Alaca" <P.Alaca@xxxxxxxx>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Eric Stevens wrote:
>>>>21f5a1p7dcq51rjqtidu5eu2vg1vh0uioe@xxxxxxxx,
>>>>
>>>>>"Alaca" wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>David Johnson wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Or, IOW, the whole tree root digression is pointless, even
>>>>>>>by the rather low standards of KRS discussions...
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>David
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>That is correct.
>>>>>>>>>>It was only relevant in the search for a perpetrator.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>A parallel line of enquiry relates as to when it was
>>>>>>>>>>>perpetrated. This bears directly on the question of the
>>>>>>>>>>>>authenticity of the KRS.
>>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>>>No, tree age and rootmarks are useless as dating-
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>and authenticity tools and therefore irrelevant in the
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>KRS discussion.
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>It was only relevant once for the question if it was
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>possible that the finder made de KRS in the 27 (?)
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>preceding years.

Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press

>>>>If that was possible or not says nothing about the
>>>>authenticity of the stone.
>>>
>>>
>>> The favourite forger in the minds of most people was Olaf
>>> Ohman. If he didn't do it then it is much more difficult to
>>> identify a potential forger. If one's forger remains no more
>>> than a hypothesis, built around an unknown person, for the
>>> existence of whom there is no evidence, then it is that much
>>> harder to claim the stone is a forgery.
>>
>> Not so. It may be harder to build a convincing case against
>> a
>>particular person or persons; but the issue of authenticity or
>>forgery is not much affected by the knowledge, or lack of same,
>>of a potential forger.
>
> I agree. However, IMHO the issue of authenticity remains up in
> the air and is likely to do so for some time to come. The
> matter will be neatly resolved if it can be shown that the KRS
> was forged by XXXX. But no XXXX around which to build a
> hypothesis – and then what?

Unlike you and Inger, most here don't try to build a case for what the Norse are doing in Minnesota before the authenticity is confirmed, and also unprofessionally, without assigning the Templars as some sort of involvement.

>>
>> Just look at the controversy that has swirled around Ohman
>> as
>>the forger. In some ways, separating the issue of
>>authenticity/forgery from the issue of whodunnit simplifies the
>>process, and makes it easier to approach the main issue
>>scientifically and dispassionately.
>
> Why do some people seem to find that so hard to do?

Who thinks Ohman carved the stone? For some strange reason you guys seem to think that Minnesota was at the south pole. The fur trade in the region had proceeded for centuries prior to the Ohman farm, there were oxcart and abandoned fort trails within site distance of the hill.

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press**
◇ From: m_zalar@xxxxxxxxxxxx
- ◆ **Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press**
◇ From: Eric Stevens

Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press

• **References:**

- ◆ **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
◇ From: Tom McDonald
- ◆ **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
◇ From: Erik Hammerstad
- ◆ **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
◇ From: David Johnson
- ◆ **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
◇ From: Daryl Krupa
- ◆ **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
◇ From: David Johnson
- ◆ **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
◇ From: Alaca
- ◆ **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
◇ From: Alaca
- ◆ **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
◇ From: Tom McDonald
- ◆ **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
◇ From: Eric Stevens

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: Kensington runestone in the Scandinavian press](#)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **[Date](#)**
 - ◆ **[Thread](#)**