

Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-05/msg00418.html>

- *From:* "IEJ" <l johansson@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 27 May 2005 17:47:45 GMT
-

Paul,
now you show your envy against Sweden openly. Good. Better that you show where you stand than pretend to be what you aren't.

First of all:
That's not your business to decide what's crap and what isn't!

Secondly:
In what way would it affect YOU if you had to admit that the Swedes and the Norwegians not only were active during the Migration Age up to end of Viking Age in Europe but also had more impact on the North American History than what the later arriving Brits, French and Spainards officially given them credit for?

I can understand that it's enjoying for some Brits that there are a closer contact between Scotland, Ireland and Scandinavia going back to the Bronze Age than what's been written in English schoolbooks. But the problem with what's forgotten to be written in History books for children up to students are if not international so at least same here. One good example is that most Swedish schoolbooks speaks of Delaware as the colony Sweden started but omit to tell that Nya Sverige was a much larger area/part of North America. One other is that many schoolbooks in History here in Sweden the last hundred years managed to write about Birger Jarl as the founder of Stockholm, Magnus Eriksson for the Landslag(Country law) and Queen Margaretha due to the Kalmar Union, Stockholm's and Linköping's Blood bath and of course Gustav Vasa's days to his sons days. Apart from that there aren't many facts about Sweden and Swedes from Viking Age to 1600 if it's not directly related to Church 'business'.

Thirdly:
If you think that KRS is crap, that say more about you and your views than it say about the value of KRS. You aren't open for the possibility that Swedes and Norwegians could have meant much in Pre-Columbus North American history. If you aren't open for new facts, then you do have a problem because what's the most essential thing no matter if we are talking about interpretation of archaeologic findings or analyse of written Ancient/Medieval texts in light of new information, then you aren't likely to be able to do an analyse at all of one or the other type of artifacts.

Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)

Your problem. Of course it is, but please keep them to yourself and don't try to make believe that you have any rights what so ever to judge other person's writing and/or research/analyses.

Inger E

- **Follow-Ups:**

- ◆ **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
◇ From: Thomas Zahr

- **References:**

- ◆ **Re: Wolter claims secret code hidden in Kensington Runestone**
◇ From: kenney
- ◆ **Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
◇ From: Paul Burke

- Prev by Date: **Re: Wolter claims secret code hidden in Kensington Runestone**
- Next by Date: **Re: Wolter claims secret code hidden in Kensington Runestone**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
- Next by thread: **Re: Why only crap in this NG? (was Wolter claims ...)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**