

Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-08/msg00310.html>

- *From:* Philip Deitiker <Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 17 Aug 2005 23:24:17 GMT
-

nospam@xxx says in
news:i8b7g1h4dtvhn7s1oq0voico92740eiojv@xxxxxxx:

>>>To what end would they have traveled farther west, often along
>>>passages blocked by ice?
>
> Deny it if you want, but the Norse did go all the way west to
> greenland.

Talking about taking things out of context, hypocrit, just how far is it from iceland to the nearest point on greenland. All the way as in 250 miles is not 2000 miles. Secondly the support structure in iceland, scotland and norway presents itself much better than the support structure in western greenland, which BTW, disappeared sometime after 1350 and no-one knows what happened to it, that is how well that western structure was supported as a base of further exploration.

And I think it must have been clear to western greenlanders given their experiences on the margins of habitability that further expeditions to the north and west were not likely to be productive to great degree, certainly they figured out that 'North' has a marginal utility of gain, no matter how much unoccupied land there is on it (and north of ice there is not a whole lot of habitable unoccupied land.

>
>>> To go from Iceland to the eastern settlement they're looking
>>> at a trip of 700 miles – although they can make a crossing of
>>> 200 miles to the Greenland coast and then down 700 miles. I
>>> don't know which way they went but airline direct routes are
>>> 700 mile ones and doubt they do it that well. I'd favour the
>>> 700 miles

>>
>>700 miles is not a problem over a well established route.
>>Obviously in 1350 when the ice flows headed south they had to
>>travel the longer routes.

>
> Iceland to the eastern settlement on greenland simply is 700
> miles. They did it centuries before 1350 and I'm confused as to

Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone

- > what your "longer routes" are. There clearly were no (recorded)
- > sites between iceland the eastern settlement and nor were there
- > prior to 900+ when the eastern settlement was established.

The distance from iceland to greenland is ~250 miles, by dead reckoning you would choose a course that was 'sure' bet (meaning north) of your destination and head south along the coast. A sure way to end up dead is to aim directly at your destination an miss it, so by that reasoning you would take the shortest route, 50 to 100 miles north of destination and head southwest along the coast.

- >>> Then it is 500 miles from the western settlement to Markland,
- >>
- >>Where is Markland? Is there a map where Markland has been
- >>mapped.
- >
- > Markland is generally accepted to be the labrador coast. But if
- > you don't believe the Norse got further west than Iceland this
- > is all, obviously, moot.

Ah, the propoganda flows, we now see the signs of a classic kook. I never said they never reached greenland, that is your red herring argument. What I said was from greenland west 500 miles that I could not imagine them seeing a benefit of traveling further westward.

- > I won't bother reading the rest of your "there never were any
- > Norse" reply which is clearly denial and crackpottery and I'll
- > request you killfile me properly so you don't start pointless
- > sub-threads on my posts, thanks in advance.

I see you completely snipped all that section on requisite archaeological evidence to pour your crocodile tears here. So the way I see it you are rather niave about debates on the UseNet and your thinking that the ploy is something that might work. I suggest you learn a better tactic for debating, otherwise when you make the occasional mistake, your are going to be eaten for lunch.

- ***Follow-Ups:***

- ◆ ***Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone***

- ◆ *From:* nospam

- ◆ ***Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone***

- ◆ *From:* Eric Stevens

- ***References:***

Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone

- ◆ **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**
 ◇ From: Horace LaBadie
- ◆ **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**
 ◇ From: nospam
- ◆ **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**
 ◇ From: Doug Weller
- ◆ **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**
 ◇ From: Eric Stevens
- ◆ **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**
 ◇ From: Doug Weller
- ◆ **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**
 ◇ From: Philip Deitiker
- ◆ **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**
 ◇ From: nospam

- Prev by Date: **Re: furthering the irrelevant**
- Next by Date: **Re: Let's lie for orthodox science – was – challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**
- Next by thread: **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**