

Re: Wolter on peer review.

Re: Wolter on peer review.

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-02/msg00460.html>

- *From:* Seppo Renfors <Renfors@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 06 Feb 2006 06:21:41 GMT
-

Tom McDonald wrote:

Inger E.Johansson wrote:

"Hayabusa" <peregrine@xxxxxxxxxx> skrev i meddelandet
news:h7m7u1t2i6didq2r7h1ds2v2kq03f3ahpi@xxxxxxxxxx

On Fri, 03 Feb 2006 08:00:39 GMT, Seppo Renfors
<Renfors@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

As he belatedly states "I don't think there is
evidence of any of that
in this case" – then WHY make the totally
baseless allegations in the
first place? It is to PLANT THE SEED of
doubt for others followers of
his Dogma to create fictions, eg like Doug
Weller's odious implied
"Nazi supporter" view and like madness
Tom has previously supported!

Seppo, if you want to achieve anything, don't make such
statements. I
don't know Tom that much, but I do know Doug from 10
years ago, and
there's a reason why I trust him.

fkoe

Re: Wolter on peer review.

There is a reason why many more than Seppo and me(Inger) don't trust Doug at all. That reason comes from the simple fact that Doug never ever been able to present any valid information in the Kensington Runestone case as well as in any other case where Scandinavians in NA pre-Columbus outside L'anse Meadows been on the agenda. It's a huge mistake to lean to Birgitta Wallace. Not only has she presented false information, misinterpreted and such as well, but if she has a degree at all in Scandinavian History, she didn't take that when studying here in Gothenburg before she left for Newfoundland. She managed to write an acceptable article in an Danish work the other year. Acceptable but not completely correct there either. She done a good work in Newfoundland, but she is by no means an expert or scholar of Scandinavian History. Thus it's outridges to put her assumptions forward at all in the Kensington Runestone case.

I wonder whether anyone can point me to peer reviewed work by Birgitta Wallace relating to the KRS, or associated studies in the region? I have heard complaints against Wallace in this regard, but I will not accept assertions by Inger as evidence without reading the original peer reviewed work.

Not only have you "heard", but I note that TWICE in the last few days, you have posted criticism of her allegations regarding the KRS yourself – her unsupported and fabricated claims made to discredit the KRS and research by others.

As for Inger's attack on Doug, well she has long maintained that it takes one to know one. 'Nuff said.

I see.... so Tom's "logic" here is – to know one has been hit in the face with a clenched fist, first requires the hitting ANOTHER in the face with a clenched fist..... well..... that IS Tom's so called "logic" in that last part! Shhheeeeezzzz.....

—
SIR – Philosopher unauthorised

The one who is educated from the wrong books is not educated, he is misled.

Re: Wolter on peer review.