

# Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-08/msg00314.html>

---

- *From:* [nospam@xx](mailto:nospam@xx)
  - *Date:* Thu, 18 Aug 2005 23:06:42 GMT
- 

Apparently on date Thu, 18 Aug 2005 21:20:41 GMT, Philip Deitiker <Donevenask@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> said:

>nospam@xx says in  
>[news:3qj9g15ecp9j5pc9g80s3h5qnmurrbs1gv@xxxxxxx](mailto:news:3qj9g15ecp9j5pc9g80s3h5qnmurrbs1gv@xxxxxxx):  
>  
>> Philip – as I am mainly posting for other people as I don't  
>> believe Philip is capable of self-realisation – is claiming the  
>> Norse were travelling up to 250 miles most of the time and that  
>> they would rarely achieve their max limit of about 500 miles,  
>  
>Once again you missed the point,

As previously mentioned. Deal with facts, don't play rhetorical games, unless you can't do anything else:

<http://tinyurl.com/dd6bv>  
<http://tinyurl.com/b36z4>  
<http://tinyurl.com/b36z4>

>once you have traveled a route on  
>numerous occasions you can take a more direct route, as the Norse  
>obviously did, but if you are going to set out in an unknown  
>direction, what kind of fool goes 2000 miles, particularly in the  
>harshest of climates. There is no proof that the Norse traveled 2000  
>miles off Greenland to Alaska or Siberia, simply no proof what so

>ever. And MY POINT was that after traveling 250 or 500 miles west  
>from Baffin Island a logical person after reviewing what was to the  
>left and right of them, would conclude that further expedition was to  
>what end? More cold intolerable climate with an inability to support  
>pastoral herding. Do you see an abundance of livestock on the islands  
>west of Baffin Island.

No. And that makes absolutely no difference at all.

>> My figures, based on the saga records with references to disko

## Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone

>> bay, baffin island (helluland) and the labrador coast  
>> (markland), and of course "L'Anse aux Meadows" and the like,  
>> are:  
>  
>This is sheer and utter speculation.

No really, there are hundreds of "edu" websites that refer to these places and have no problems at all with these voyages.

Disko bay is (on autoroute) "diskofiord", nobody that I can see is disputing helluland and markland, and nobody is in any doubt about the location of lans.

>There is no basis for this, if  
>you ask 10 different people about where these places were, you will  
>get 10 different answers, and worse, you know it.

No I don't. I have looked into this and there is a general consensus about the identity of these places. Any trivial googling will clarify that to anyone other than a crackpot who has no flexibility in their opinion.

>This discussions  
>makes the point Horace is making, you are clueless on what  
>constitutes a valid premise or claim, and it is unclear to yourself  
>when you are trying to confuscate the issue with meaningless and  
>strawman facts. The simple, let me repeat \_SIMPLE\_ basis of the  
>argument is that the sciences can accept any notion with a provision  
>of a consistent set of facts. Let the facts talk, no archaeologist  
>can deny that it is possible that some group of kooky norse set out  
>to cross from baffin to Murmancks, and who knows if climate was  
>tolerant during some period that might allow such a journey. However,  
>it is certainly also possible that they traveled to the south pole,  
>however, improbable that is. What the sciences are looking for is  
>what physicist would regard a the empartment of some sort of energy,  
>some evidence that an effort was made to claim a region, or if not,  
>we assume they find the region of no value to them and they turned  
>around and left. One aspect of that decision that seems reasonable is  
>they found as a result of the travels more unfriendlies of the nature  
>they knew on greenland, people who already knew of them and that  
>might have been prepared to take them on. This issue takes on  
>importance as they move into more densely populated regions to the  
>south.  
> So let me restate this again, being a bit of a seaman myself and  
>thinking somewhat the way a seaman thinks. I am in a boat, I take off  
>from baffin, I travel along the northern continetal coast, I get out  
>and find marsh, bog and tundra, to the other side the occasional  
>barren island, I keep going, on, to the front all I see is more of  
>the same, occasionally I spot an encampment of Inuit, scraping an  
>existence out of the land, I keep going, more of the same, more  
>endless wasteland. In the mind of the seaman you look at your  
>supplies, currents, etc and you estimate the risk of going further  
>versus the risk of being stranded without food in that wasteland, at

## Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone

>some point you make the decision to return home. When you are  
>traveling an open temperate sea there is a good risk you will find a  
>gem unoccupied by no men, but when you are traveling against a shore  
>on a coast where the dismal prospects are obvious to you, don't have  
>seas opening up to you, you have limited degrees of freedom and  
>limited numbers of outcome, your decision is then to return and mark  
>off what you didn't find. Note, no reports ever of the Norse  
>returning from greenland from the east. The density of artefacts  
>interpretable as being Norse drop markedly past baffin island, this  
>you should take as evidence of what valued to the west. Again, I am  
>not trying to crap on this line of thinking as impossible or  
>implausible, but unless you can show me an encampment with evidence  
>they were exploiting something (musk OX, polar bears, seals, arctic  
>fish, eskimo dung, whatever) that it is genuinely hard for me to give  
>credence to the idea that the made a habit out of traveling 1000s of  
>miles west, and I am not going to rule out the occasional kook that  
>tried and never to return, after all a whole bunch of western  
>greenlanders suddenly disappeared. It is obvious from being in this  
>group that there are no absense of kooks living in Scandinavia that  
>might try such a thing, the only real archaeological concern is  
>whether by some latent skill or luck, it turned out to be productive  
>in some TANGIBLE kind of way. As you will recall Scott tried to  
>make a trip to the south pole, he did make the trip, however neither  
>him or his men returned.

Yada yada yada. You are inventing lots of fanciful nonsense of your own and then whining about it. Read what \*I\* am saying and compare it with what \*YOU\* are now saying.

The fact that you are accusing me of "strawman facts" is highly indicative.

Take a few minutes – I realise you won't get far and it won't take long, but I can at least try and point this out – look at what my links, maps and descriptions are saying. If you can translate the sagas differently to the accepted interpretations, if you can make maps say differently to modern applications that are easily accessible and give "airline" and "by sea" distances for these voyages, then you surely should be able to see these are sagas about voyages that go thousands of miles, and the distances are not particularly featured in the way the Norse describe them. It's real. If you have preconceived ideas about the distances and locations then you are the one who needs to develop knowledge, rather than just asserting that you are right when you are completely and utterly dead wrong.

But you won't, just as in this exchange you will ignore all the data and try and make rhetorical appeals to other readers who you think will be fooled.

You won't actually address the facts because they prove you to be wrong.

This is my point proven – "let's lie for science". You are an example of what has gone wrong with this newsgroup.

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**  
◇ From: Franz Gnaedinger
- ◆ **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**  
◇ From: Philip Deitiker
- ◆ **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**  
◇ From: nospam

• *References:*

- ◆ **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
- ◆ **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**  
◇ From: Philip Deitiker
- ◆ **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**  
◇ From: nospam
- ◆ **Re: Challenge for naysayers of the Kensington Runestone**  
◇ From: Philip Deitiker

- Prev by Date: **Re: furthering the irrelevant**
- Next by Date: **Re: 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**