

Hi Alastair,

Just to give you an update.

I managed to get an academic to look at my theory, Dr Fiona Watson no less. She was very patient and kind towards me and looked at my theory from start to finish, but was not impressed at all.

She told me that it has recently been discovered that the William Wallace who stole the beer in Perth was an Englishman from Yorkshire!!!

Also there is also no evidence at all that Wallace was Wishart's squire.

I believed that the current accepted story of William Wallace is far fetched, and looked for a more believable narrative.

William Wallace wasn't even the head of his own household, and even further down the pecking order of the extended Wallace family. The only description of him at Stirling Bridge is 'juvenii', meaning juvenile or young in appearance.

Why did John Comyn, who could easily have attributed the victory at Stirling Bridge to his relative Moray, not tap Wallace on the shoulder and say, 'okay sonny I'll take it from here', but would rather serve under him along with all the other nobles?

He was untouchable until after Falkirk. Why!

I took the position that Wallace was Wishart's man, educated from a young age in the church of military tactics.

James Douglas was Lamberton's squire, and as a young man carried out the massacre called the Douglas Larder. I believe he was a military genius, and this was psychological warfare. Where did he learn this?

Being attached to the church would he have access to the best training in all of Christendom?

I tried to answer these questions, but no luck.

As you were very kind to put my theory up on your website. I thought it was only right to let you know it is regarded as being fiction.

All the best. I think I'll turn to try and learn Gaelic instead :)

Mitch