
Conventions: R = one notation of a dotted r-rune, either a purported or genuine palatal r, the verb war = var (were) in Old Swedish and Latin letters representing runic developments are denoted in bold black.

Definition: A “dot” as used by Wolter could be either a punch or a shallow pit in a photograph. Punch as used by RN is made with a punch tool and 3D imaging can show the KRS punch dimensions and its penetration. See Figures 1-4.
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1. Introduction

Wolter (2011) in his “Report of Digital Microscopic Examination” asserted many unproven claims, some of which are shown in Table 1 and Table 2 with the appropriate rebuttal and reference to the main text.

Quoting Wolter (2011:1), “The scope of this report is to present the results of the following specific items related to the examination performed on the artifact:

1. [1a] Provide suitable background information regarding the recent visit of the Swedish runologist who made statements about the inscription that prompted this examination,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further Claim</th>
<th>Rebuttal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quoting Wolter (2011: 1], “Upon completion of his ... examination, with three [RSM] Board Members present, [i.e.] Jim Adam, Laura McCoy, and Carol Meyer, Professor Williams made the following pronouncement ‘If the dot is man-made, the KRS is a genuine medieval artifact.”</td>
<td>The “quote” is not what Prof. Williams said. See Williams (2011a) for his report of his inspection and his comments on the RSM affidavit. This is found on Williams website sited in the references.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...and [1b] on the history of the geological investigations of the last decade to put the current examination in context.

2. Performing a microscopic examination of specific areas of the inscription including the dotted R rune on line six in the word “waR” to determine if the shallow punch in the upper loop was man-made or is a natural feature in the rock.”

- Point [1b] is discussed in Figure 14 and Figure 15 under 5. Geology and Table 2. Misinformation presented on KRS geological matters.

- Point 2 is discussed here in Table 1. Rebuttal of Wolter’s assertions on dotted r-runes for the palatal r. It is shown that Wolter failed “to determine if the shallow punch in the upper loop was man-made.”

Quoting Wolter (2011:2), “...I contacted the Runestone Museum. They expressed strong interest in pursuing a microscopic examination using this equipment and explained their reasons why:

1. They were frustrated with being unable to secure large format 3D images that had already been generated from the consultant [Richard Nielsen] who facilitated a study in October of 2008.

2. They wanted to take advantage of the new 3D digital microscopic technology that far surpassed any previous work done.

3. The Museum saw an opportunity to provide the appropriate Dotted R data requested by Professor Williams.”

Wolter’s three undocumented points above are without foundation:

- On point 1: The RSM already has large scale format 3D images from Richard Nielsen.
On point 2: The comparison of 3D imaging with 3D digital technology is Wolter’s unproven assertion and it is not borne out by his report.

On point 3. Professor Williams (2011a) requested no dotted R data from the RSM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Asserted Test Result Claims by Wolter (2011: 6).</th>
<th>Rebuttal of major items concerning the purported dotted r-rune for var (were) on the KRS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quoting Wolter (2011: 6), “High resolution 3D images clearly show the equal-dimensional shape and conically symmetrical neatly centered pit ....”</td>
<td>The pit profiles in Wolter (2011), found here Figs. 5, 6, and 7 to follow show that the pit bottom is flat and not the product of a conical punch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RN Note:</strong> The purported punch (dot) sides are neither shown to be symmetrical nor “neatly centered”, nor of equal-dimensional shape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quoting Wolter (2011: Fig. 11), “The shallow depth of the “dot” is consistent with being made with less force when carved ....”</td>
<td>The maximum diameter shown at penetration above is c. 1400 microns and if made by a KRS punch (dot) the tip depth would have been at c. 700 microns (see red V) and not the c. 250 microns shown on the graft where each depth line = 123 microns. See Figure 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asserted Claims by Wolter (2011: 6) regarding the reverse image of the Steward photograph of 1899.</th>
<th>Rebuttal concerning the purported dotted r-rune on the Steward Photograph of 1899.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Quoting Wolter (2011: Fig. 5), <em>images of the Dotted R on line six clearly show the presence of a dot in the upper loop.</em> One image represented was “a reverse image from a photograph taken by John Steward in March 1899,” as per Wolter (2011: Fig. 5).</td>
<td>The left cutout is the from 1899 Steward photo of the purported dotted r-rune. The photo with the circle is un-cited. This is a purported reverse image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>****The circled dark area in shows a pit. It should be white like the lower pits that show a reverse image. It is not until 1937/1938 and later that photos depict a pit in this position. Hence there is no proof that this pit is not a product of post discovery damage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Rebuttal of Wolter’s assertions on dotted r-runes for the palatal r.
Table 2. Misinformation on Geological matters

| Quoting Wolter (2011), “Later that same month, I traveled with the Rune Stone to Stockholm, where Swedish geologist, [Dr.] Runo Lofvendahl examined the artifact and reviewed my geological report [of October 9, 2003] and found the data therein, and my responses to his questions, agreeable.” |

| Rebuttal of same |


| RN Note: The fact that Wolter (2011) does not reference Lofvendahl (2004), Lofvendahl (2005) or Martin (2007) about the rejection of his age of weathering studies should tell the reader all he wants to know about Wolter’s reliability when proffering his own version of history. |

| The undated memo by Dr. Lofvendahl was sent in July or August 2003 before all the data was presented. Lofvendahl (2004) did not find “the data therein, and my [Wolter] responses to his questions, agreeable” in Wolter’s report of October 18, 2003. The report failed the agreed Popper’s falsification Criterion due to lack of tests as per Lofvendahl (2004). Later Lofvendahl (2005) and Martin (2007) continue to support this initial rejection. |
1. The Punch Diameter and Depth Ratio Measurement.

This section is devoted to determine the character of the KRS punches found on the KRS. 3D imaging can show the diameter of the punch at penetration and the actual profile of the punch cone. It is shown that 2000 micron diameter punch can penetrate 1000 microns deep.

Figures in this section are:

- Figure 1. The moonscape image of the reverse side of var ok (were to).
- Figure 2. The punch diameter to punch penetration depth is circa a ratio of 2:1.
- Figure 3. The lower word divider punch depth in front of var (were).
- Figure 4. KRS cone tip dimensions of a punch.

**Figure 1:** The moonscape image of the reverse side of var ok (were to) showing the depths of the principal punches in “ar”. The purported r-run punch in var (were) shows up as a pigmy among the many giant punches and it is half the depth of the pit damage seen after the r-rune (Nielsen 2011b). Because of this the evidence claimed for the dotted r-run by Wolter is ambiguous. Evidence establishing the KRS as a medieval artifact must be unambiguous and the fact that this “dot” could be caused by subsequent damage after the discovery in 1898 or that the character of the “dot” is the same as that of many adjacent pits disqualifies the “dot” as a genuine man-made punch.
Figure 2. The punch diameter to punch penetration depth is circa a ratio of 2:1.
Figure 3. The lower word divider punch in front of var (were). The punch is 2000 microns deep with a 4000 micron diameter.
Figure 4. KRS punch cone tip dimensions. The XYZ measurement can be taken anywhere in 3D imaging. Here the right downward projection shows the lower word divider punch depth just before var (were). This diameter of the punch of circa 4 mm (ca. 4000 microns from the rainbow diagram) has a cone height of circa 1.9 mm (up to 1900 microns). Depth of punches is measured from the horizontal plain of entry of the punch.
2. The Shape Characteristics of the Purported Dotted r-Rune Punch in Var (Were).

The shape of the pit in the dotted r-rune does not come close to the shape of the punch. Figures in this section are:

- Figure 5. The purported dotted r-rune profile in var (were).
- Figure 6. The purported dot (punch) bottom in the r-rune in var (were).
- Figure 7. The KRS pit profile of the r-rune in var (were).

Figure 5. The purported dotted r-rune profile in var (were). The purported pit outline is marked in red and shows a flat bottom. The vertical scale is circa 128 microns. The horizontal scale is circa 1400 microns.

Quoting Wolter (2011: Figure 11), "When a digital cross-sectional profile is created and reviewed the maximum depth of the man-made pit [RN Note: That it is man-made is not proven], or "dot", in the upper plateau of rock of the “R”-rune in line six is 383 microns” [RN Note: The depth from the right lip of the hole is about 230 microns. The 383 micron hole is measured from the ridge top]. ... (Magnification 30X)."

There is not sufficient proof that the hole was man-made by a punch since a conical punch used on the KRS would end in a cone shape of depth equal to about half its breath (800 microns). However the flat bottom at 230 microns depth and its 700 micron breath indicates this hole was not man-made by a punch. When measured from the starting point at the edge of the hole it is closer to 250 microns below its right lip and 190 microns below the left lip in the drawing above. However what is the key issue here is that actual punch marks associated elsewhere with var (were) have a depth on the order of 1500 – 2000 microns.
Figure 6. The purported dot in the r-rune in var (were) shows no punch hole. The pit does not have a cone tip and is not conically shaped as asserted by Wolter. It has a flat bottom. The exact orientation of the drawing is not given and the abscissa value of the profile coordinate is not clear. In addition the x and y coordinates produce rectangles and not squares making scaling difficult.

Quoting Wolter (2011:Fig. 12), “This three-dimensional image with colors that correspond to depth includes a cross sectional profile extending to the maximum depth (555 microns) of the conical shaped pit, or +“dot”, in the first “R”-rune on line six. (Magnification 150X).”
Figure 7. The KRS pit profile of the r-rune in var (were). It is far too shallow for its breath to be a punch used on the KRS.
3. The Purported Dotted three r-Rune in Photos and 3D Imaging.

Photographs do not show the dotted rune with a pit before 1938 (Beecher cast in 1937). Figures in this section are:

- Figure 8. The purported dotted r-rune in var (were).
- Figure 9. The assertion that the Steward reverse image yielded proof of a dot in the r-rune of var (were).
- Figure 10. The purported dotted r-rune in norr (north) and normen (Northman).
- Figure 11. Historical photographic evidence for a dot in the r-rune in var (were).
- Figure 12. Current photographic evidence for a dot in the r-rune in var (were).
- Figure 13. The 3D Imaging of the purported dotted r-rune for the RSM Information Committee

**Figure 8. The purported dotted r-rune in var (were).** Quoting Wolter (2011: Figures 3, 4 & 5), "Three images of the Dotted R on line six clearly show the presence of the dot in the upper loop. These images represent a photograph taken by Wolter in 2002 (left) [Wolter (2002)], the Rodney Beecher Harvey cast made in 1937 (middle) [reference?], and a reverse image from photograph taken by John Steward, in March of 1899 (right)." The ultimate image to the right is from 3D imaging (RN & the RSM Copyright © 2008).

RN Note: The 3D Imaging picture to the right shows the reverse image has been manipulated to show what was to be a punch, but a pit hole is seen where a mound was assumed to be in the reverse image.
The reversed image of the KRS r-rune in *var* (were).

The unaltered Steward photograph of the KRS r-rune in *var* (were) from 1899.

**Figure 9.** The assertion that the Steward reverse image yielded proof of a dot in the r-rune of *var* (were). The reserve image actually showed the opposite since the punch would show up as a mound like the pits did. The Steward photos offer no proof that the dotted r-rune was present on the KRS when discovered in 1899. Wolter (2011) made no comparison to the Steward face photograph. In Wolter (2010) the claim is made that the Steward photograph could not be used for the dotted r-rune because it could have been manipulated during development of the negative, but it is inexplicable that Wolter now utilized it in a manipulated reverse image of what he claimed was a manipulated photo. Thus no photographic evidence is present to claim that a punch could be identified on the r-rune in *var* (were) on the 6<sup>th</sup> line of the KRS in 1899.

Reverse high ridge shows a dark pit (Not a punch as claimed).
Reverse pits show light mounds.

Lighted high ridge
Dark pits

In *Norrmen* (northmen) the upper portion is spalled. The punches in *norr* (north) are word divider overwrites.

**Figure 10.** The purported dotted r-rune in *norr* (north) and *norrmen* (Northman). Wolter’s other purported dotted Rs shown in black and white are not confirmed in 3-D Imaging shown in the extreme left and right position. See Williams (2011c) for further information.
**vi : var** (we were) on the 6th line in Steward 1899. No pit.

Minnesota Historical Society Collection 1929 with **vi : var** (we were) on the 6th line with no pit. 
The red arrows indicate pits of 500 micron depth.

Kensington Chamber of Commerce 1938 with pit in the r-rune of **var** (were).

Reverse side of **var** (were). Nielsen (2011b) in 3D imaging.

**Figure 11a. Historical photographic evidence for a dot in the r-rune in var (were).** It is not until 1938 that the purported dotted r-rune (gold arrow) appears in public photographs of the KRS. The Beecher cask photo reportedly shows this dot in circa 1937 or 1938. The dotted r-rune was first reported by Moltke (1938) from earlier discovery near Lund in present day Sweden in the mid 1930s. In 1939 the dotted r-runes on Utkna were reported in Sweden.
Figure 12. Current photographic evidence for a dot in the r-rune in var (were). This photograph from Wolter (2011) shows an oval shaped hole below the square hewn pit. There is no way this oval shape can be claimed to be circular hole from a conical punch. The red bar spans 7 mm in length. Figure 10 depicts a flat bottom. This photo is not referenced or dated. The yellow line is the approximate path of the pit profile in Figure 10. The below 3D images show that the crescent shaped line crosses under the flat bottom of the pit caused by the extraction of perhaps a mineral crystal shaped object.

![Figure 7 (date?) Nielsen (2010b) Nielsen (2011b)](image)

Surface Photo  Reverse bottom pit 3-D images

The photographic image in Figure 7; right two are inverse images of the bottom surface of the hole. Note the crescent shaped feature shown in all three images. Nielsen (2010b), a report to the RSM, showing the character of the punch was ignored by Wolter (2011) in violation of the Scientific Method.
Figure 13a. Reverse Face: In reverse 3D image the r-rune in war (were) depicts a shallow mark of about 0.25 mm (250 microns) depth consisting of a deeper curved crescent like line with a right angle linear mark overlay of this curved line. This overlay extends to a second shallow mark in the loop of the r-rune. The expected characteristic KRS punch depth of 1.5 mm (1500 microns) plus is used in the w-rune in war (were). An intended punch in the r-rune should have been near the same depth as this w-rune punch and not one sixth of its depth. That the depth of r-rune pock mark is far shallower to the depth of the w-rune punch creates ambiguous evidence. The pock mark in the r-rune could just as well indicate either a natural pock, one of many found on the KRS, or an unintended tool mark.

Revision 1: March 23, 2011.

Figure 13b. Face: The 3D face surface of the r-rune in war (were) is much corrupted by what appears to be unintended tool or pock marks in the rock, either quite natural or from probing by a nail or other tool during cleaning of this rune at some time following the discovery in 1898. Thus the evidence for a punch simply becomes ambiguous.

A claim for a dotted R as proof of a medieval artifact would have to have absolutely unambiguous evidence. This is far from the case with the purported dotted r-rune in var (were) as shown in my article “There Is No Grail Code on the KRS” posted on my website at www.richardnielsen.org.

Figure 13. The 3D Imaging of the purported dotted r-rune in var (were) for the RSM Information Committee. Images on the r-rune in war (were) at left are reproduced from Nielsen & Wolter (2006: 52). The center image is the 3D Image of the face and the 3D image on the right is the back side image and both are depicted in Nielsen (2010b: Question 4). The back side image is from the reverse side of the surface defining the KRS front surface. Here grooves become ridges and punch holes become peaks. Wolter (2011) failed to reference and discuss this in violation of the Scientific Method.
4. Geology

This section corrects the references to geological reports (see reference list) and shows that Löfvendahl did not agree with Wolter’s report conclusions on the age of weathering dated on October 18, 2003. Furthermore, Wolter has deleted the dating of Löfvendahl’s (in August 2003) request for information on below ground tombstone data and other sundry points to create the impression that Löfvendahl agreed with Wolter’s report of October 9th, 2003, when Löfvendahl et al (2004), a six man team report, treated the Wolter’s report dated October 18, 2003, which had been delivered personally to him by Wolter at the Swedish Historical Museum in Stockholm, Sweden.

The Figures in this section are:

- Figure 14. Löfvendahl and KRS thin sections discussion before the KRS arrived in Sweden.
- Figure 15. The below ground Maine tombstone samples

A Minnesota Geological Survey (MGS) Presentation by Richard Nielsen was held on March 25, 2009. During the discussion period following this presentation there was an exchange with Scott Wolter where it was expressed by several that underground weathering should be quite aggressive due to Wolter’s stated acidity of the soil and therefore should be seen on the KRS. However, Wolter confirmed he had examined underground pieces from slate tombstones from Maine and they showed no noticeable underground weathering.

In Nielsen and Wolter (2006:39) it is stated “The samples for comparison should be obtained from above- and below-grade. Only above grade samples were collected because the ground was frozen and covered with a foot of snow. Subsequent below grade studies have not been preformed due to difference in pH of the soil at Hallowell, Maine [ph <7.0] and the Kensington Rune Stone discovery site [pH ~ 7.0].”

Nielsen below grade took soil samples on August 2003 for analysis and delivered these to Wolter in September 2003. These have yet to be published.
Löfvendahl and KRS thin sections discussion before the KRS arrived in Sweden. Quoting Wolter (2011:3), “On October 9, 2003, a comprehensive report was issued that included a comparative tombstone weathering study. [The copy issued to Dr. Löfvendahl was dated October 18, 2003]. The report concluded the relative-age of the weathering of the inscription at greater than 200 years, from the date of its discovery in 1898.

Later that same month, I traveled with the Rune Stone to Stockholm [The KRS arrived with Nielsen on SAS from Chicago on the October 17, 2003 and Wolter arrived on the 21th. Nielsen and Wolter (2006: 317], where Swedish geologist, [Dr.] Runo Löfvendahl examined the artifact and reviewed my geological report and found the data therein, and my responses to his questions, agreeable.”

“Comments on Scott Wolter´s Report on the Kensington Stone, Dated 2003.10.18” by Dr. Löfvendahl and his team, Dr. R. Kumpulainen, R., K. Dahlberg, L. Kitzler Åhfeldt, M. Johansson & Dr. Carl-Magnus (2004), issued on the Wolter report of October 18, 2003 were strikingly opposite and quite non-agreeable as Löfvendahl (2005) and Martin (2007) further attest. Wolter failed the Popper falsification criterion based on the Wolter’s asserted thin section results.


Figure 14: The Undated memo from Runo. Quoting Wolter (2011: Figure 2), “This memo was written by Swedish Geologist, Runo Löfvendahl, after reviewing and generally agreeing with the report on the geological investigation of the Kensington Rune Stone dated October 9, 2003.” The report Löfvendahl reviewed was dated October 18, 2003 (not October 9, 2003) and was delivered by Dr. Nielsen and Wolter to Dr. Löfvendahl in his office with the KRS thin sections and plug upon Wolter’s arrival in Stockholm a few days before the October 23, 2003 Exhibition of the KRS at the Swedish Historical Museum in Stockholm.
Figure 15. The below ground Maine tombstone samples. Below ground samples were collected in Maine by Richard Nielsen on August 29, 2003 to comply with Löfvendahl’s memo request of August 2003 in Fig. 14. Samples were collected 1 to 4 inches below ground. Quoting Löfvendahl, “Your tombstone examination might be the way, especially if you compare what happens above and below ground.” These results were never reported by Wolter to anyone in spite of repeated requests from Dr. Löfvendahl. Wolter (2003: 44) from October 9, 2003 it states, “The samples for comparison should be obtained from both above- and below-grade. Only above grade samples were collected because the ground was frozen and covered with a foot of snow.” This shows the undated memo from Runo Löfvendahl was written well before October 9, 2003.

Added in Nielsen&Wolter (2006: 39) by Wolter was, “Subsequent below grade studies have not been preformed due to difference in pH of the soil at Hallowell, Maine [pH <7.0] and the Kensington Rune Stone discovery site [pH < 7.0]. Nielsen took soil samples for analysis and delivered to Wolter. These have never been reported.

Löfvendahl (2004: Conclusion 5) stated: “S/ The mica weathering, i.e. comparison of biotite/muscovite above/below ground, is difficult to apply. We see it as very disputable to compare muscovite weathering below ground with biotite weathering above ground. May be, a study of the fate of biotite on the gravestones from Maine below ground can give some inkling related to this question!”

Without this below grade data on biotite on the Maine tombstones the required time for weathering of the below grade muscovite on the KRS in Minnesota was estimated to be between 2000 to 20,000 years. It now becomes obvious why Wolter failed the Popper Falsification Criterion he had agreed to be measured against. In his response in Wolter (2004b) he was again silent on the required below grade examination of the Maine tombstones and again silent with Löfvendahl’s quote in 2005, “What about the mica weathering? You have studied the mica weathering on the “split” side of the KRS with mica weathering on 200 years old tombstones from Maine. The comparison is shrouded with approximations. The tombstone mica, in this case exclusively (?) biotite, has been atmospherically exposed since 1806. The microenvironment of the KRS since the carving of the runes is not accurately known, but it is possible that it has been situated underground most of the time since the cutting. The main form of mica in the KRS is muscovite (although you, based on prof. Ojakangas’ point-counting, maintain that biotite is also present). It is not obvious if you compare biotite with muscovite, biotite with biotite or considers this
question irrelevant. This is a disputable point in your “proof”. Although you maintain that the comparison is adequate (the atmospheric weathering is slower below ground than above, the climate being comparable), and all differences will indicate that the comparison, if not exactly comparable, should result in added underestimates of the age of the KRS. It is a pity that you did not study the belowground parts of the tombstones, and the mica weathering of these.”

5. Summary

The evidence shows that the dot in the purported dotted r-rune on line six is not a man-made punch. There are no photographs that show the dot in this purported r-rune on line six before 1937. It is up to Wolter to produce evidence to the contrary. His attempt to do this with an inverse image of the Steward photograph was not successful and proved the opposite. His evidence for other dotted r-runes on the KRS has other explanations and does not prove the existence dotted r-runes on the KRS.


The memo from Löfvendahl (in August 2003) was to inform Wolter that “Your tombstone examination might be the way, especially if you compare what happens above and below ground.” Wolter failed to provide the data requested and this lack of data was a major factor in his failure to meet the Popper’s falsification Criterion, the pre-agreed formula to test Wolter’s results. There was no way for Wolter to plea that above ground data on the tombstone under exfoliation of biotite mica (physical weathering) could apply to the below ground muscovite mica in Minnesota in frozen ground half the year under chemical weathering only and no exfoliation. One needs measured data without deductive reasoning to prove the age of weathering on the KRS and lack of it is a fatal flaw.

7. References


Papers of Nielsen (2008a) to Nielsen (2012d) are all posted at www.richardnielsen.org.


---

**Note: This is misdated as Jan. 19, 2003 in Wolter (2011).**
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