Answers for the Runestone Museum Information Committee

Runestone Museum, Alexandria, Minnesota

By Dr. Richard Nielsen on September 13, 2010

This memo is in answer to the seven questions by the Information Committee contained of the Runestone Museum (RSM) in Jim Adam’s letter of July 9, 2010 (not shown here) addressed to me.

Contrary to the implications in the questions, I have NOT reversed my position on the origin of the KRS. As a proper evidence-based scientist and a Doctor of Technology, I continue to search for legitimate answers to relevant questions and discuss those as appropriate. I have never discovered any unambiguous evidence that disproves the authenticity of the KRS artifact as dated and I have written extensively about my findings. In spite of the source of many of these questions, in order to complete the record for the RSM, I will now respond to your seven questions.

Questions #4, #6, and #7 are about current research issues. At the present time the evidence is ambiguous on all three fronts and cannot be used in any way to establish the age of the KRS. Arguments to support either the best explanation or the most plausible conclusion of any point are useless in the face of ambiguous evidence. These three issues in Questions #4, #6 and #7 do not directly influence obtaining proof of a medieval provenance for the KRS unless the evidence is unambiguous. One of the best type of evidence for a medieval solution for the KRS is if it could be proved to have been planted initially upright and not initially buried but the evidence for this must be absolutely unambiguous.

Question #1: I have not changed my position on authenticity. I have always stated that I have seen no unambiguous evidence that proves the KRS is modern. I did also so state this at the night at the Museum in March 2009

Question #2: I am not involved in the Larsson rune discussion in Powell. Nowhere does it state that I convinced Prof. Henrik Williams that the KRS is modern by
using the Larsson rune-row. I do not know what was intended by Prof. Henrik Williams by his remark on “American Mythology” or even if it is reported correctly by Powell. I have seen no unambiguous evidence that proves the KRS is modern.

**Question #3:** I have always stated that that I have seen no unambiguous evidence that proves the KRS is modern and that includes the Larsson Rune-Row. I have no contrary views to present in the lecture series this fall. The KRS has required that we study both the language and the runes of the 19th century. Powell’s article did not mention “artifacts” as your question states. Certainly the use of the term mythology by Prof. Williams could apply to much of the now discounted KRS folk history. I do not know what he meant specifically. You should ask him if you wish further clarification. I reiterate that my position on KRS has not changed.

**Question 4.** Fig A2 in “There is no Grail Code on the KRS”, Revision 1 shows that the dotted R in *war* (were) is not a punch but is most likely damage from an accidental tool mark. The evidence for a dotted R with a real punch must be unambiguous, which it is not. I did not solely rely upon the 1899 Steward photos in my observation on the dotted R questions. 3D imaging was used as well and was properly reported. Read the report more carefully. The punch in the rune is only an observation on photos and the cast and was unsupported by hands-on inspection of the KRS. This fact has not changed any of my statements about the provenance of the KRS. The dotted R was always ambiguous evidence.

I see no need for a geologist in this type of study. A runologist is preferable, quite sufficient and perfect for the job, which will be carried out by Prof. Henrik Williams on the 30th of September.
**Tool mark in war (were) on 6th Line**

- Upper image on the face.
- Lower image is the reverse image.
- Tool mark is shallow.
- Any plea for a punch here must be rejected because evidence must be unambiguous.

**Question #5:** I have several versions of the 11-point memo to which you refer. Please furnish me your copy so we are on the same page. This private document was furnished to Bent Are Iverson as a briefing paper for him in the fall of 2006 to help him select what he wanted to write about the KRS for a Norwegian newspaper. It has no status as evidence in any way. See my replies to questions 4 and 7 for a discussion of my grounds to remove the Grail Code and Dotted Rs theories from my list. This fact has not changed any of my statements about the provenance of the KRS.

**Question 6:** Ground line: I did not reference the 1915 photograph from the MHS Collections as claimed in your letter of July 9th, 2010. I have now added three photographs with potential evidence for ground lines on the KRS to my ESOP Paper, Revision 1, Nielsen (2009: Figs. D5-D7) “Theories of the Hooked X,” See www.richardnielsen.org.

The initial burial supposition in Nielsen and Wolter (2006: 234-6) remains to be proven and no reports have been written supporting the claim that a ground line cannot be seen.
Question 7: Grail Code: The Grail Code is dismissed over presence of the punches in “te” in Göter (Götalanders), which makes the opening sequence GTER for the required GR in GRAL. See the Power Point below. This fact has not changed any of my statements about the provenance of the KRS. The Grail Code was ambiguous evidence in any case and was a theory in Nielsen and Wolter (2006: XV) in any case...

In summary we have:

1. The use of the Steward photographs are not required.
2. 3D Imaging is required to prove an intended punch and to exclude a surface blemish.
3. The Grail Code was a theory in Nielsen and Wolter (2006: XV) and this theory is no longer supportable.
4. I see no need for a geologist in this type of study.
5. What is needed is a runologist and Prof. Henrik Williams is already part of this study.
6. Peer review procedures on 3D imaging can be explained by Prof. Henrik Williams. He has already commented on the lack of peer review on the KRS geological reports in Erik Powell’s article and in his review of Scott Wolter’s Hooked X book in ESOP (2009). See www.richardnielsen.org for the latter review.

**Dotted te-runes in Göter (Götalanders)**

- Punches in the t-rune (to the left) and e-rune (to the right) are noted by the two thick arrows.
- The purported punch sequence is now GTER and not GR.
- This new sequence eliminates the theory of a KRS GRAL Code first proposed in Nielsen and Wolter (2006: XV) *KRS-Compelling New Evidence*.