

A chronological revolution made by historical analytics

By Eugen Gabowitsch (Potsdam, Germany)

Knowledge of our history timeline is important, and not only for historians. If indeed the dates of antiquity are incorrect, there could be profound implications for our beliefs about the past, and also for science. Historical knowledge is important to better understand our present situation and the changes that take place around us. Important issues such as global warming and environmental changes depend on available historical data. Astronomical records could have a completely different meaning if the described events took place at times other than those provided by traditional chronology. I trust that the younger generation will have no fear of "untouchable" historical dogma and will use contemporary knowledge to challenge questionable theories. For sure, it is an exciting opportunity to reverse the subordinate role science plays to history, and to create completely new areas of scientific research.

Kasparov, Garry, *Mathematics of the Past*, Website New Tradition.

Introduction

Different authors are last time speaking about a chronological revolution. Let me mention only the book *Centuries of Darkness. A Challenge to the Conventional Chronology* by [Peter James](#) et. al. about which Joan Gartland, Detroit P.L., Detroit, Mich. wrote in the "Library Journal": "The authors of this text, originally published in England in 1991, are young scholars who present no less than a "chronological revolution." After tracing the development of Old World chronology, James and his colleagues review archaeological evidence and the lack of it from the Dark Age, the centuries-long period at the end of the Late Bronze Age c.1200 B.C. They include a wide geographical area--as far east as Iran and south to Nubia. Challenging the accepted Egyptian chronology, they argue for lower dates, which would instead put the end of the Late Bronze Age around 950 B.C., thus essentially eliminating the so-called Dark Age. The authors have done a masterful job of drawing together an enormous range of evidence; their conclusion is persuasive. Their challenge to Egyptian chronology cannot be ignored, and Egyptologists will have to address the flaws that they demonstrate."

The chronological revolution I am speaking about is breaking the conventional tradition of dating of historical events in all parts of the world and is shortening the chronology of the full human history in a very radical way demonstrating that the historical period of the past is not much longer than 1000 years. There are historical analyst which are even more radical (no reliable history before 1700!) or which try to rescue some parts of the orthodox history outside of the last 100 years, but this is a quite normal spread of estimations which is aloud even in a critical community.

In two my English papers some short survey has been given about the Russian and the German ways to a critical chronological revolution of the world history. The first paper was titled *AD Ages in Chaos: A Russian Point of View* and was published 2003 in the Proceedings of the SIS Conference *Ages still in Chaos. Progress in revising ancient history since 1952 and possible ways forward* which was held in September 2002 in London. This paper in some revised version is building the first part of the present publication. The conference mentioned shall be cited below as London conference (2002).

The second was some kind of preface for the second volume of the book of Anatoly T. Fomenko *History: Fiction of Science?* Delamere Publishing, Paris-London-New York, 2005, and had a

similar title *Ages in Chaos*. This paper in something changed version can be found below in the third part of this paper.

Additionally a part was written about the contemporary historical analytics in the Western countries. This is the Part 2 of this paper.

The list of publications is also divided into three parts. It have been strongly up-dated.

Part 1. Ages in Chaos: A Russian Point of View

Russian chronological revolution.

It is impossible to give a full survey of Russian historical and critical research done over the last hundred years in a short paper. For English readers I would like to name for this item the paper [*Investigation of the Correctness of the Historical Dating*](#) written by Wieslaw Z. Krawcewicz, Gleb V. Nosovskij and Petr P. Zabreiko, which demonstrates some of most important methods used by such research. Here I shall just give some general ideas of this Russian way of thinking and about some events in the history of the chronological revolution.

The most prominent names in this connection are of Nicolas Morosov, Anatoly T. Fomenko and his main co-author Gleb V. Nosovski. Some additional names of Russian book authors shall be shortly presented in this paper: Mikhail M. Postnikov, Yaroslav Kesler and some other. The most prominent Russian author living outside of Russia is the Bulgarian mathematician Jordan Tabov. [An Abstract](#) of a sensational critical book on Bulgarian history written by Jordan Tabov can be found in <http://www.jesus1053.com/en/index.html> in the line dated by 08.06.2000.

Historically analytic books of Morosov and Fomenko have been published mainly in Russian. 10 most important such books of Morosov have been republished during the last 10 years and are now available for Russian readers. With these books Morosov started the chronological revolution I am speaking about. He demonstrated that in the past some chronological schemes have been reproduced for countries and historical epochs for which no chronological information existed. And he understood that the classical Antiquity was created in the Renaissance time as a virtual projection of the early Renaissance time in the very old past. No real Antiquity existed upon a time.

Morosov also named a much later time as traditional history for the begin of the Christianity, but in this question he was nor so radical as his scientific grandson Anatoly Fomenko later. In between was the known Russian mathematician Mikhail M. Postnikov who taught the ideas of Morosov to the next generation of young Moscow mathematicians. Later he published a short presentation of Morosov's ideas in "only" three volumes (2000). This very important book titled *Critical Investigation of the Ancient World Chronology* contains volumes *Antiquity, Bible and Orient & Middle Age* and gives a comparison of the Morosov's investigations with the 50 years more late status of the science. For no critical assertion of Morosov he found any reliable scientific argument against the chronological revolution.

The most valuable contribution to chronological revolution made Anatoly T. Fomenko who continued the critical analysis of Morosov and deepened it essentially. More than 25 different books written by Fomenko and in the last 15 years by Nosovsky and Fomenko exist. Unfortunately most of them only in Russian. All English books of these two authors I know can be found in the bibliography below.

The book I am going to speak additionally here about is analysing the history of human civilisation (Igor Davidenco, Yaroslav Kesler, *Book of civilisation*, Moscow, 2001, with a preface of Garry Kasparov). This was the first time since the first books of Fomenko were translated into English that anybody was able to read in English something about the historically critical research in Russia which is not completely in the tradition of Morosov and Fomenko.

First of all I would like to ask here the question: what is history? And to explain, why the history starts today. History creation is all-important in the past and even today. I shall talk about how history was created in Sakha in the 19th and in Europe in the 16th century, about the role of Gary Kasparov in our movement and about the *Book of Civilization*. At the end, I would like to speak about Fomenko 1 and Fomenko 2 and about Velikovsky, Morosov and Russian historical criticism.

Do we know what is history?

First of all, a general statement: the traditional model of the past as presented in thousands and thousands of historical books is wrong. The question is: how wrong it is and when the main phase of the creation of history stopped (if it ever stopped)?

The next my questions, 'What is history?' is new in the critical historic discussion and is a result of some discussions during many meeting and conferences. Even in the critical community some people cannot distinguish between 'history' and 'past'. It is important to understand that we are speaking about and giving critical analysis not of the past but of history, the written records of the past. Many people think that if they speak about history, they are speaking about a real past. This is not correct: they speak only about what they can read in books, not about the real past of mankind.

If you do not separate these two positions or questions, in many cases you forget what you are exactly saying. Are you speaking about some virtual world in which many pharaohs and kings are living, or are we speaking about a past in which we have no real information about much of this. Let us remember at any time: the history is only our model of the (mostly unknown) past. It is not the past itself. The past was real but we have only very limited true information about it. The history is well known, it is described in thousand and millions of books and papers, but is not real, it is only a mental construct, it is a human model of some virtual past.

Speaking about historical analytics we are thinking on an analysis of the history, not of the past. In the best case we can demonstrate that the history is an incorrect model of the past and to try to understand how different they are: the past and the historical model of it. But in many cases we can demonstrate the low level of modelling quality through the history just by a logical analysis of the historical model itself.

The very important point in which we differ from historians is that, discussing any historical epoch, we first ask the question: 'are we speaking of a real past, real persons, or possibly a virtual past, historical romance, myths, legends, etc.?'. This is a question I have never heard a speaker coming from history really presenting and analysing, though it is very important.

History starts today

A very important point of the Russian way of thinking is proclaimed by the slogan 'History starts today'. If you open a historical book, you first read that in let me say 7000 years BC it was such a situation, 5000 years BC was the following situation, 2800 BC was the beginning of Sumerian civilisation. No explanation is given why it should be 2800 BC, just some numbers are given and proclaimed to be historical dates, and after you have seen some five to ten numbers, there come some more exact numbers, 6 at the end, or something else, and you think, 'oh, it's very correct dating now!'. In reality, it is also a fantastical date, as all named dates with a lot of zeros. This is

the traditional and totally false point of view about the begin of history in a very very early past
...

Therefore, we are trying not to begin our historical description somewhere BC; we are trying to start today and move back slowly and explain each step of dating. So for us, history begins today, rather than being based on the model of the past that you have. Remember: It is not a real past - it is only a model. We are forgetting that, so our imagination of the past in a lot of cases is not quite adequate.

For us, any old history begins today. At any time is history a today view of the past, a today interpretation of our "knowledge" about the gown times. The human history begins today also in the sense that we are only beginning to apply the interdisciplinary way of thinking for our modelling of the past. And additionally history begins now from the point of view that only in the newest time the critical analysis of the chronology started on a broad scale.

Even nomenclatures of people who are working in this field of the history analysis demonstrate that it is a very interdisciplinary community: we have mathematicians and computer science experts, history and sociology professors, chemists and geologists, and a lot of people from natural science and from technology, etc. An art critic Alexander Jabinski wrote a very interesting book, *Another History of the Arts*. This mixture of people of different professions is very good for critical research of the past.

The next point in which we differ from historians is that looking from today, discussing any historical epoch, we first ask the question: 'are we speaking of a real past, real persons, or possibly a virtual past, historical romance, myths, legends, etc.?'. This is a question I have never heard a speaker coming from history really presenting and analysing, though it is very important.

The next point in which we differ from historians is that asking the question "Is history a marble, a fiction, a poem?" we are looking from today in the direction of the past. Additionally by discussing any old time, we first ask the question: 'are we really describing the past, the really existing persons, the real events and real social organisation or possibly a our own fantasies on long ago times which are projections of a modern historical thinking on virtual past?'.

As reported Alexey Tolochko in his book about the forgery of Russian chronics by a prominent Russian historian Vasily Tatishchev (*"Russian History" of Vasily Tatishchev: sources and historical information*, Moscow/Kiev, 2005) for some contemporary historians the idea that a historian projects his own mind in the past if describing this past is totally not acceptable. For us is this point of view a very important background for any critical analysis of history.

I have got in Russian translation a sentence of Johan Huizinga, who wrote that in the Middle Age school system there was no place for history at all. Even at university, historical science was represented in a very limited way. It is difficult or impossible to name one important historical writing from a university of that period, i.e. before its beginning in the 19th century. My comment is, as it was clear to Theodor Mommsen in the beginning of the 20th century, that history is not science: it is a part of literature, part of philology. Just therefore we can see such estimations, e.g., that the great Russian scientist and historian Lomonosov wrote his historical works as a writer and patriot.

When we say that history begins today and you can think on nothing in this context, consider the following situation: let us imagine that aliens are coming to the earth and, after asking us about our philology, our way of reproduction and some other important things, they ask us about our history and dating this history. What can we today explain in the connection with such questions?

We have to develop a presentation which is understandable to somebody who has come from Mars and was never in our schools or universities and does not know our model of the past, so every step must be logically presented. For us is the traditional model of the past a mass religion

which we learned to believe in kindergarten, at school, during all our life. Try to be in your discussions with the green men from Mars not a missionary with a historical faith but a logically thinking person who is trying to understand how our historical religion was created.

History creation.

The next point is that history creation is continuing. Initial history was created at the beginning of the human civilization, possibly at the Renaissance time. The creation of old history continued during the all new history at a very intensive scale. Some years ago, Clark Whelton presented in an SIS meeting a very radical time-leap for the history creation process: the Gregorian Calendar Reform in 1582. His opinion was that after that term, the history is in some sense reliable. Today we can partly agree with this statement but in many cases the reliable history begins even much later.

Speaking about history, I would like to present a part of the *Book of Civilisation*. Let us first consider the floor mosaic in a villa near Piazza Armeria (Sizilia) presented on the page 148. There are three young ladies at a ball and gymnastics. This mosaic has a traditional interpretation as an ancient imagination (the 4th century AD) - but never more in the 'ancient' period and for more than a thousand years after it one can find pictures of young ladies in slip and bra. This is a typical Renaissance work of art. And a typical chronological mistake.

Very late genesis of the most important 'historical' conceptions is demonstrating the following table from the *Book of Civilization* (p. 50):

Almagest	14 th century	History	14 th century
Antique	1530 century	Iberian	1601
Arabic	14 th century	Indian	14 th century
Arithmetic	15 th century	Iron Age	1879
Astrology	14 th century	Koran	1615
Astronomy	13 th century	Mogul	1588
August	1664	Mongol	1698
Bible	14 th century	Muslim	1615
Byzantine	1794	Orthodox	15 th century
Caesar	1567	Philosophy	14 th century
Cathedra	14 th century	Platonic	1533
Catholic	14 th century	Pyramid	1549
Celtic	1590	Renaissance	1845
Chinese	1606	Roman	14 th century
Crusaders	1732	Roman law	1660
Dutch	14 th century	Russian	1538
Education	1531	Spanish	15 th century
Etruscan	1706	Swedish	1605
Gallic	1672	Tartar	14 th century
German	14 th century	Trojan	14 th century
Golden age	1555	Turkish	1545
Gothic	1591	Zodiac	14 th century

Here you can see when, according to Webster's Oxford Dictionary, many important notions from history, religion and science were for the first time used in written English. One can clearly see that 'the whole antique cycle appears in the English language in the middle of the 16 century as well as the concept of antiquity. We can see some terms about science - 'almagest', 'astronomy', 'astrology', etc. begin in the 14th or 15th century. If we look for antiquity, 'Etruscan' was named in 1706 for the first time, 'Golden Age' in 1505, so think about what this means.

For each word connected with past the time is indicated when it was used for the first time in English literature. I have divided them into groups - Religion, Antiquity, Science, Middle Age -

and we can see that in all of these groups the most important words were used for the first time at quite a late time: 14th, 15th century and even much, much later.

Sometimes all these terms, for example connected with Islam, begin at the end of the 16th century. We think they have been a long, long time in use and the orthodox model of the past says that Islam began in the 7th century. It is wrong: Islam begins much, much later, possibly in the 16th century or even in the 17th century. In 1603, a Turkish sultan declared Islam as the state religion for the first time in history. Therefore it is understandable why related to Islam notions appeared in the 17th century'.

The opinion of Whelton was that after 1582 history is in some sense reliable. Some years ago in our internet magazine *History and Chronology* we claimed the initial time for history to be reconstructed was about the year 1648 or 1650. Our opinion was that everything before must be checked. Intensive contacts with the Russian community of historical analysis have helped me to revise my own optimistic evaluations. Today I would like to say that the process of history creation has never stopped and today is possibly even more intensive than in early times. Some examples you can find follow.

India is still trying to develop a new, grander, model of the Indian past which excludes all conflicts, wars, violence in general and other acts of "non-Indian", "non-Gandhian" events. It was the official program of the nationalistic Indian government that history must be taught to children in schools of India in this new, politically and ideologically correct way. Other examples are connected with China and other countries.

Glorious Chinese history is a fake

Clark Whelton in a short paper titled *Creating Ancient History in Modern China* (<http://www.jesus1053.com/en/index.html>, line 01.06.01) wrote lapidary

ah, the political urge to create a longer chronology,

and presented a paper from THE NEW YORK TIMES written in BEIJING at November 9, 2000 by Erik Eckholm. The author tells about a governmental Chinese research program for prolonging the Chinese history for additional many hundreds of years:

Tonight the report was featured in television news and newspapers, which ran headlines like "Chinese History Pushed Back 1,229 Years." But the project has been questioned by other scholars, here and abroad, who say its authors, driven by a political urge to document Chinese culture's primacy and uniqueness, have tried to leapfrog the slow, disorderly march of science. Project researchers resolutely deny anyone told them what to find, but critics say they have forced an illusion of consensus in some cases.

"There's a chauvinistic desire to push the historical record back into the third millennium B.C., putting China on a par with Egypt," said Edward L. Shaughnessy, a historian at the University of Chicago. "It's much more a political and nationalistic urge than a scholarly one."

The Great Wall of China was in reality a pure European myth for many centuries and was built only after 1950. I know the reaction of readers of this my statement - I published a paper about this and there is a book by a professional historian who says the same; but of course nobody reads such papers and books - everybody is reading newspapers and looking at cinemas and they have a wrong model in mind that this Chinese Wall has existed for more than 2000 years. But in reality even for 100 years nobody in China had any imagination or information about it. All the

European visitors had books and stories about the Great Wall of China but it was impossible to find in China a picture or an old Chinese drawing demonstrating the wall.

After my article was published, of course many people tried to find old pictures and photographs of the Great Chinese Wall. I am not saying that no fortification was built previously in China. I am saying that the idea of the Great Chinese Wall was produced in Europe and the construction of the long, long, long wall, which links all these fortifications, was started in the time of Mao Tse Tung and Deng Tsiao Ping. Of course, in the time of the last dynasty in China, there were very strong fortifications to the north of Peking and some other places but it was never the idea to build a long, long wall to protect China from the Mongols - it's a crazy idea.

At the end of the 19th century in Europe there was a discussion if the Great Chinese Wall exists. Some French writers wrote books saying it did not exist. Some Russian travellers tried to find this wall and it was impossible. Even earlier, a European painter had been in China and came back with a picture of the Great Chinese Wall. He has seen one fortification of some or possibly even 10 km long and he prolonged it by a factor of 50 in his mind. Of course something was there but it was not the Great Chinese Wall.

It was not reported by Marco Polo, but he didn't mention the Great Wall as he was never in China, and we don't know if his writing is a fiction or not - it is possibly a fiction written by another person who travelled in Eastern Russia. There is a book in German, *Marco Polo war nie in China*, Fomenko has written about the geographical limits of the Polo's trip and some other Russian critics have independently proved that he never was in China.

Now of course, the situation with the Great Wall of China is quite different - over the last 50 and more years the Chinese Communists constructed this wall and now they proclaim that it is even older than the oldest of early estimates. Clark Whelton reported in our magazine about this new development in the modern Chinese history creating.

How long is the Great Wall of China really? Nobody in the world can answer even that simple question. All possible numbers between 1500 and 50000 km have been mentioned in different sources. China's State Administration of Cultural Heritage (SACH) and State Bureau of Surveying and Mapping (SBSM) will now conduct a massive geographical survey to determine the exact length. All of 2007 will be spent with scientists taking meter sticks and walking the length of the Wall and keeping a record. In 2008 the exact length will be announced. After some 2500 years of Wall's construction! Steve Mitchell gave after my talk in London the following statement: the Chinese language as we know it from the ancient bronze inscriptions has been destroyed by the early 17th [and 18th?] century Jesuit German scholars. In the new language the new Chinese history was written. But not only German, also Portugal, Italian, Belgian etc. Jesuit scholars created the Chinese history.

Steve Mitchell also said: "the truth is that there is no bridge that says what particular glyph means on the early bronzes. And so we have the question about the Chinese writing system." I can only report in this connection that Morosov said the idea was that the Chinese writing was a product of European thinking. When the European people came to China, in each village people spoke a different language, it was impossible to develop one writing system for the languages in which phonetically there were four tones, in another seven, eleven or thirteen - they spoke quite different languages, so the only possibility was to use pictures.

This idea was probably developed and completely realised by Jesuits, but I think it is also possible it was made at the a little bit earlier time when the Buddhist religion moved from India to China, and then to Japan, Korea, Vietnam etc. At any case I am sure that such complex writing system was impossible to develop and implement without using an other language with a phonetic alphabet.

Another example: as the time of the German invention of book printing traditionally the 15th century is named, 1440 is the earliest estimation. This invention works perfectly in Europe as we

have a phonetic way of writing, so all our languages use phonetic alphabet. Now the official point of view is that 300 years before, in the 11th century, someone in China invented metal forms for printing one book - so they produced millions of symbols, metallic forms for letters, printed a book and then forgot it - just to have a place in history. In reality I think somebody translated in, say, the 17th century into Chinese some possibly Dutch book about the technology of printing in Germany. Later this Chinese book was rewritten, corrected and published another time. Today it is a part of Chinese history.

As another example, were logarithms invented in China 500 years before they were invented in the Netherlands? Somebody checked the two publications and it was possible to see that each printing mistake made in Napier (Nepers)'s tables of natural logarithms (they have been first time published 1620) had been repeated in the Chinese book which was –as the historians said - 500 years older! Is this an usual way of doing history?

The Spanish Armada of 300 big ships is today an important part of the Chinese history of the early 15th century. You can read in each Chinese history book that in 1405 they sent a big Armada of 300 very big ships, some of them even 150 m long, something that it is impossible to construct from wood, and they sent this Armada to India, to Arabic countries and so on, without any clear aim, and they repeated these expeditions six or seven times. It is a tale which was of course made after reading a book about the Spanish Armada in some late time.

History creation continues today

From a Russian source I would like to bring an example about the history of Sakha - does anybody know what Sakha is? The Turkish folk of Sakha or Yakuts had been moving from Mongolia to today's homeland around the Lena River for 400 years, officially from 1000 AD until about 1500 AD. In the 19th century, Sakha nationalism appeared which was strongly against the Russians. Only in the 19th century did any scientists start to collect Sakhan folklore and Sakha literature started to develop. Sakha was part of Russia from the year 1630. Today the Sakhan autonomous republic covers about one fifth of the full Russian territory, the biggest republic in the Russian federation. The Sakhan population of Russia was about 400,000 at the end of the Soviet era; today it may be about half a million.

Now, one name: Tiganda Khan is a legendary figure in Sakhan folklore. This mythical nobleman of the Tangalas tribe, one of many Sakhan tribes living in the Yakutsk area - Yakutsk is today the capital of the Sakhan republic - plays a very important role in hundreds of legends and tales. Sakhan nationalism created out of this legendary character a historical feature, a king of Old Sakha and so on. In reality, there was never a kingdom of Sakha - in the old time there was only a set of single tribes. Historians have demonstrated that non-historical sources referred to Tiganda Khan but modern Sakhan historiography continues the creation of a new eastern Charlemagne, a king of Sakha.

This is only one example of such modern history creators; my son was the editor of a Russian magazine for politics and culture in Moscow and he sent me this paper. I am quite sure that if I try to do a search, I can find a lot of such examples from the history of Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, Uzbekistan, Turkmenia, Ukraine. I know that in Ukraine people are writing a long new history of the Ukrainian past. In my homeland, Estonia, we have today possibly the longest history in the world - yes, any Estonian history book begins at 5000 years BC, when Estonian tribes lived on this territory. Of course it is a tale, of course it is impossible to check, but it is a tendency which is today working in all countries of Asia, Africa, and Europe: every even very small country must have a long and reach history. That is the way of historian thinking in the 20th century.

Now I want to say something about history creation in the 19th centuries. You know Burma, or Myanmar, an Asian country in which –historians say - in the 19th century a chronicle was completed, a “Mirror Palace Chronicle”, about a very, very long Burman history. This Palace

Chronicle must have based on some earlier, but nobody has seen the latest. For me it is quite clear that before the European idea of long history reached Burma in some 19th century, it was impossible to produce such a long history. Nobody knows if the coming of the early time which is reported in this chronicle really existed. But one Russian historian started to analyse this chronicle and quite quickly he found out that many dynasties are just duplicated - they repeat themselves, the same as Fomenko found for world history. But Fomenko was doing a very exact analysis with computers and comparing a lot of different events during each reign. This man was working in the usual manner of historians, just comparing names and numbers: this is like this; this is a copy of this dynasty. After such analysis, he shortened the Burmese history by almost thousand years. And when one analyses this short Burmese history, it comes out that the average reign of each ruler was 32 years, which is at least two times too much, so this short Burman history must be shortened by another 50%, and possibly even much more, and even after that, a big part of this history is quite, quite legendary. So this is one example of doing history in the 19th century.

The most important time of creating history was the 18th century. At this time was created the Russian history, the German, the Chinese; we have an especially clear picture about the creation of Chinese history. It was created using historical books translated from all different European languages into Chinese. All these – now Chinese - books have been incorporated into Chinese history as a genuine part of it. The Chinese writing is not phonetic, so after a translation, you can never say from which language it was translated and it can be proclaimed as an original Chinese book. In this virtual “Chinese history” we can find parts of the Roman, Russian, German, Spanish etc. history, almost all European inventories ... The real Chinese history begins possibly after the 14th century AD - quite, quite late from the traditional point of view. Before that, China had even no idea of history in the European sense. The idea of history in China was quite different - it was moral history: what we can say about the past which is very useful for the world as we see it today.

In India, there was no historical idea until the European conquest, so real Indian history begins in the 16th century. As one Japanese scientist has said, today Indian history is like a phone book, a lot of names collected from different poems without any historical events or any correct dating.

History of technology against the traditional model of the past.

As I am short of time, I cannot speak about Isaac Newton who is very popular in the Russian history analysis: he demonstrated in his chronological studies that different chronologies are results of analysing of different historical sources (therefore no single correct chronology is possible). But let me handle the newest Russian book which is existing in a – nor very good – but understandable English translation. The authors of this *Book of Civilisation* are two Russian professors, one a very famous man from Moscow University, Kessler, who is a chemistry professor, and the other Davidenko who is a retired geology professor. The introduction to this book was written by Gary Kasparov, who is today playing a very important role in the organisation of this movement: he writes critical papers, publish them in mass magazines and he organises discussions in TV. And he is trying to organise an international checking of all historical artefacts in all museums of the world based on the modern scientific methods of chemical, physical etc. analysis.

The main idea of Kessler and Davidenco is that with the history of technology we can demonstrate that the normal history writing is not correct, as many artefacts - e.g. some granite statues - was impossible to produce without steel implements; a lot of coins were made with alloys which never existed in these times. It's steel which is needed in most cases - but steel was produced only in the last 1000 years, even less.

Let us turn our attention to barbers as less known part of the virtual 'ancient' history. Well cared-for beard and hair of a 'Roman' emperor, well shaved Caesar: how have they been served by their barbers in a time without any steel tools? Did all these 'Roman' rulers in reality live in the first four-five centuries of the second Christian millennium?

Another example concerning the technology history: A marble serpentine of the famous Laocoon sculpture group which -as some people say - was produced 139 BC in Pergamon and transported (possibly in a container ship) to Rome. It was in reality produced by Michelangelo who used stucco technology. As Fomenko and Nossovsky mentioned, by a modern restoration, 1960, all three raising arms of the sculptural group have been broken: for imitation of the 'antique' origin? But more important for us is the following: It was never possible to produce the long serpent of the python from a marble block without modern electric cutting tools. However it was possible to make the giant snail from a plastic mixture with organic an agent which after being polished imitates the marble. This technology was in use in the time of Michelangelo, not 139 BC in Pergamon.

Another example is the Nefertiti head. Not anybody can see on a picture of it how this sculpture was made. It was put together from two parts, so each part was made separately from concrete but by a casting technology and put together, and one of the technological ideas of the critical writers is that many important sculptures and even pyramids were made using this technology. For example, let us consider a typical Egypt obelisk with deep engravings. No instrument was known at the time for doing such deep and such nice holes [incisions] in this form, only if this was pressed in not jet hard concrete, special concrete, geopolymer (the terminology of the French chemist Joseph Davidovits from his book *The Pyramids. An Enigma Solved*, Saint-Quentin, 2001), as it is called, only then can we imagine how such pretty holes have been produced.

Not only the history of technology produce arguments against the orthodox history and its chronology. The Russian book *Another History of Art* by Alexander Jabinski demonstrates that the full history of art is not longer than 1000 years and all other periods of the history of art (old Greek, old Roman, old Egyptian) are projections of the art of later times to these imaginary virtual times. In his book hundreds of examples are presented which demonstrate how the real art of the last millennium was distributed through the whole old history. They all have been, in reality, produced in the last millennium. In Jabinski's book (p. 157) two pictures are presenting almost the same man. Are that really two portraits of the same person? Or of two close relatives? In the history of art this two works of the same art style are dated with 14 centuries in between: a Roman portrait of AD 60 and a Renaissance portrait from the year 1474. Analyzing hundreds of examples from the named book one can understand that a big part of Renaissance and new historic time art was set in ancient times by wrong dating traditions.

Another Russian book written by a known historian of the music Eugene Gertsman *Mysteries of the History of the Ancient Music* (Nota Publishing, Saint-Petersburg, 2004) demonstrates that at least 12 centuries of the history of the Ancient music must be cancelled. Important is that the author never before wrote some critical issues on chronology and was itself surprised by his results.

Morosov and Fomenko, their relation to Velikovsky

To the initiator of the Russian critical analysis of the history and chronology Nicolas Morosov and Velikovsky: all are interested in the Russian roots of Velikovsky. For me it is also a very open and interesting question whether Velikovsky read the books of Morosov. The first book of Morosov, a very strong critique of chronology, was published in Russia 1907 when Velikovsky was 8 but it was republished many times and it was translated in 1912 into German, so it is possible that he had a possibility to read this book after his emigration to Germany. In 1914, as

Velikovsky started to study at Moscow University, the second book of Morosov was published and discussed. Therefore it is possible that he heard about some ideas from Morosov.

In the later times, during emigration, his life in Palestine and later in the US possibly, he was not so interested in obtaining Russian books and reading them as he had first completely other fields of interest. And it was not simple to obtain in Palestine new books published in the soviet Russia. Another question is if he was in some contact with books of Morosov or people who discussed his ideas during his long stay in the USA. At any case some ideas of Velikovsky are quite close to the general ideas of Morosov, who started the Russian historical critical research, so it is a very interesting question. Possibly members of the family can help to clear up this point of whether really he was acquainted with Morosov.

At any case, Velikovsky never mentioned Morosov and no notes have been found in his archive demonstrating any relation to books and ideas of Morosov. Therefore my opinion is rather that he was not acquainted with any book of Morosov. From other side A. Fomenko and G. Nosovsky in a newest book published 2006 mean that some results of Velikovsky are so close to almost the same of Morosov that they can demonstrate the opposite opinion.

To finish my short and not complete enough consideration of the Russian chronological revolution, let me say some words about Fomenko-1 and Fomenko-2 (this is my division into periods of the activity of this most productive and prominent Russian writer in the field of historical analytics) below. To each of them one must devote a separate large volume_ so only a very short introduction can be given below-

Morosov wrote 10 or more volumes of his *Christos* but published during his life only 7 volumes of his Russian book. No his historical books have been published after 1932. Till the end of his life 1946 he wrote some additional volumes of *Christos* which have been published first time only for some years. The book was not officially prohibited, but not wanted by Soviet ruler and so almost forgotten. It is known now that Stalin was reading *Christos* by probably he was afraid of the chronological revolution as a possible result of the wide spreading of Morosov ideas.

In the years 1975-76 the known Russian mathematician Mikhail V. Postnikov which I mentioned above presented the work of Morosov in a course of lectures for young mathematicians of the Moscow university (Fomenko, Mishchenko etc.). This was the begin of Fomenko-1, a critical author with an interdisciplinary habit of research, who completely destroyed the old model of the past. During some 20 years he published papers and books, in which the statistical and natural-scientific analysis of the history started by Morosov was continued and widened. In English some of his books are available (s. bibliography below).

Under Fomenko-2 I am understanding the very active pair of co-authors Fomenko-Nosovsky, which in last 10-15 years published a lot of very interesting book, in which they try to demonstrate, how a new historical model of the past can be developed. This model describes the whole history of the mankind as only circa 1000 years long and changes many accents in the history. Unfortunately only few of these books have been translated into English and no one into German or some other language.

Summary of Trevor Palmer

Instead of conclusion for this part 1 let me bring here the short review given by professor Trevor Palmer in London on page 108, Proceedings of the SIS Conference: 'Ages Still in Chaos':

Eugen Gabowitsch "tried to argue that we need to try to form a view of history starting today and working back, and if we actually looked at what we could be sure about, when words were first used, that actually take us back many centuries, and if there was not a lot of detailed evidence, we could come up with rather a different picture. Although there were references in European literature to a Great Wall of China, in fact, it would appear that all that existed up until the 1950s

were a few isolated fortifications and the wall as such was only built at that time. He referred to evidence in *The Book of Civilisation* about the history of technology and how the standard view of technology was incompatible with a lot of the data, for example coins supposedly being produced out of alloys that were not available at the time. He also mentioned the interesting point that Velikovsky may have taken some of his ideas from a Russian called Morosov.”

Part 2. Ages in Chaos: A critique of chronology and the revision of history in Western Europe.

In Russia is the historical analytics very popular and many publishing houses are trying to print books about the chronological revolution. If they have a practical problem in their program then to find enough good authors of new books on historical and chronological criticism. In Germany we have a lot of interesting critical authors in this field but all they have difficulties with publishing their books. Any revision of history, even of the very early one like old Egyptian, old Chinese or classical antique, is afraid by publishers. I can explain this phenomena only with the fact that this words are occupied by neo-Nazi movement in which a revision of the history of the 20th century is popular.

The small amount of critical books which have been published by known publishers is quite popular by readers. But the unhealthy political correctness close for the most of us the normal way to the broad reader auditory. Therefore some other ways have been found in Germany by active authors of the historical analytics: own or author paid publishing, the world's only specialized literary magazine for chronological revisionism and regular revisionist seminars or meeting named 'Historical Salons'.

In own publishing houses have publisher their books such German critical authors as Heribert Illig, Roman Landau and Christian Blöss. They also printed a limited amount of books of other authors. With the help of print on demand publishers have publisher their books such Swiss and German revisionists as Christoph Pfister, Christoph Däppen and Ulrich Thomas Franz. Heribert Illig and Gunnar Heinsohn are publishing the literary magazine *Zeitensprünge (Springs of time)*, which considers some part of the revisionist themes.

The first historical salon was created in Berlin more than 12 years ago. Four meeting per year is the mean amount of such revisionist seminars. The last meeting was numbered as 48th and was held in February 2007. The organizer of the Berlin Historic Salons is now Christian Blöss, Ulf Heinsohn, Michael Vogelsang und Hans-Ulrich Niemitz. Anybody can read about the Berlin Historic Salon at the website <http://www.berliner-geschichtssalon.de/>

In Karlsruhe, where I lived till 2003, we organised together with Uwe Topper the second German historic salon. We have had regular 'Historical Salon' meetings discussing critical chronology and historical research during five years. There have been 40 such meetings with about 100 different lections. At the end of 2002 a historic salon of Potsdam was opened by the same two persons. Monthly meetings made this Historic Salon to the most intensive place of discussions an historical analytics. 48th meeting was taking place at the 20th of Mai 2007. In Mai 2006 a New Historic Salon of Berlin has been opened by Uwe Topper and me. The 10th meeting was held at the 13. Mai 2007. Anybody can read about the last three salons in the internet magazine *History and Chronology, Criticism, Shortening, Reconstruction* and on the website (www.jesus1053.com).

Fomenko is not alone.

Most historians and archaeologists are only vaguely familiar with the theory of our leading critical author A. T. Fomenko, the eminent mathematician, full member of the prominent Russian Academy of Sciences, and his numerous works on chronology (written in the last 15 years for the most part together with G. V. Nosovsky). Although they form their opinion from negative hearsay, yet they repudiate and criticise the works of these authors with great ardour and much malice, adhering to the principle: "I have never read the works of the renegade Fomenko, and never will, but I condemn the horrendous aspersions that they cast on our beloved Antiquity nonetheless!" All of the above notwithstanding the fact that the books that contain criticisms of the consensual chronology and historiography sell in thousands of copies.

Wide masses of historians that comprise the "consensual chronology army" get very limited exposure to the numerous critiques of chronology and history that have been coming out in Germany and several other countries for some decades. The primary goal of this article is an attempt to familiarise the above with the primary critical works that suggest a radical revision of history and chronology, as well as their authors.

One hopes that a few historians and archaeologists out there will eventually realize the enormous potential of this direction in historical research, once they become aware of the multitude of authors, methods, approaches and historical topics involved in the reformation of history and chronology in one way or another. The most promising stratum of audience is comprised of young scientists and the unorthodox minority of broadly-educated people as opposed to the bureaucratic majority of the "historian office personnel".

I have chosen the title *Fomenko is not alone* for my early review in Russian about the Western and especially the German historically analytical research which is in its main part supporting the Russian chronological revolution. This review was published as an appendix to a book of Nosovsky and Fomenko 2000. I have no possibility to repeat here my review. So let me just to name below some English texts which reports about the German critical research and to give some short information, which originates from websites www.jesus1053.com and <http://www.ilya.it/chrono/> about the main actors of the historically analytic scene.

But first of all a short remark: Some historical overview of the Western development gives the paper *The Revision of Ancient History - A Perspective* written by P John Crowe (<http://knowledge.co.uk/sis/ancient.htm>). This is an edited and extended version of a paper presented to the SIS Jubilee Conference, Easthampstead Park, Sept. 17-19th 1999, Internet Paper Revision no.1 March 2001. No information about the Russian chronology revolution can be found there.

Christian Blöss and Hans-Ulrich Niemitz

Blöss, is a physicist, who lives mainly in Berlin. Since the 80ies he published two critical books in German on theory of evolution as created by Darwin and studies of aspects of catastrophes originated by planets:

- Blöss, Christian: *Beyond of Darwin (Jenseits von Darwin)*, Verlag "Skarabäus, Frankfurt/M, 1988)
- Blöss, Christian: *Planets, Gods, Catastrophes. A New Picture Planeten of the Cosmic Chaos (Götter, Katastrophen: Das neue Bild vom kosmischen Chaos)*, Verlag "Skarabäus, Frankfurt/M, 1991)

Together with Uwe [Topper](#) and H.-U. [Niemitz](#) he founded in 1994 the Berlin Historic Salon (BGS). Since several years he worked together with Niemitz on a critical analysis of physical methods to date artifacts, especially of the radiocarbon and dendrochronology or tree-ring dating methods. Their book

- *C-14 Crash. The End of the Illusion It Is Possible to Date with Radiocarbon or Dendrochronology Method (Das Ende der Illusion, mit Radiokarbonmethode und Dendrochronologie datieren zu können, Mantis Verlag, Gräfelfing, 1997).*

shows that these methods are not trustworthy and can not be used without vicious circles.

His next book

- *Ceno-Crash. New Considerations About the Origin and the Age of the Human Race. (Ceno-Crash, neue Überlegungen zum Ursprung und zum Alter des Menschengeschlechtes - - Berlin: Verl. Wissen und Handeln, 2000. - ISBN 3-934378-51-X).*

offers a new shortened chronology for our planet's geological epochs

Niemitz is professor for Technical History at the Leipzig University (Germany). He was the first to rediscover [Kammeier](#) (see part 3 for more details about this critical German writer) and the 'hole' in the Middle Ages and introduced the idea of phantom years in the German History which was later developed and actively boosted by Heribert Illig.

An [abstract](#) of the very important German book of Christian Blöss and Hans-Ulrich Niemitz *C14-Crash* reports

1. How Dendrochronologists Have Humbled Themselves to the Traditional Chronology of Europe
2. Under What Conditions C14 Functions ...
3. ... and How C14 Fulfilled These Prerequisites and Fulfils Them Today
4. Why Dendrochronology Needs C14 ...
5. ... and How Dendrochronology has Made Itself Dependant Upon C14
6. Why Betting on the Wrong Horse or The Simultaneity Principle is Wrong
7. Whether it Can There be Any Patterns of C14 Fluctuations Such as This?
8. On the View to Warwen Chronology
9. On Remark About the Possibility of Wiggles

and gives a summary of the book (<http://www.jesus1053.com/en/index.html>).

During the London conference (2002) David Salkeld analysed radiometric dating in general in an objective fashion and demonstrated that some additional effects must be considered to explain many of anomalies of this dating procedure. Trevor Palmer commented, that in spite of the improvement of the techniques, radiometric dating is still an inexact science and likely to remain so. He wrote in his comments: "During the discussion that followed, radiocarbon dating which had not been mentioned specifically by Salkeld, was also widely held to be unreliable and one of the issues was, does this simply mean that chronologists can't, certainly at the present time, rely on radiometric dating as a tool."

Gunnar Heinsohn

Born 1943 in Gynia/Poland Prof. Dr. Dr. Gunnar Heinsohn studied sociology, history, psychology, economics and religion at the Freie Universität Berlin. He holds a university diploma in sociology (1971) and Ph. D. in the social sciences (1973) as well as in economics (1982). His list of publications exceeds more than 400 titles. Since 1984 he is a tenured professor at the University of Bremen where he 1993 became director of the Raphael-Lemkin-Institute for Xenophobia und Genocide research. His investigation focuses on the history and theory of

civilization, population and family history. Critical chronological research is one of his most successful but less known fields of research.

The Great European Witch Hunt became the subject of his book

- *The Annihilation of the Wise Women. Contributions to the Theory and History of Population and Kindhood. (Die Vernichtung der weisen Frauen: Beiträge zur Theorie und Geschichte von Bevölkerung und Kindheit, München: Heyne, 1994 [1st ed. Herbstein: März; 1985], written together with O. Steiger).*

On the origin of Jewish monotheism he wrote the book

- *What is Anti-Semitism? - The Origin of Monotheism and the Hate of Jews –Why Anty-Zionism? (Was ist Antisemitismus? - Der Ursprung von Monotheismus und Judenhaß. - Warum Antizionismus?, Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn, 1988).*

On Hitler's peculiar brand of anti-Semitism and the Holocaust he published the book

- *Why Auschwitz? The Plan of Hitler and the Helplessness of the Posterity. (Warum Auschwitz? Hitlers Plan und die Ratlosigkeit der Nachwelt, Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1995).*

Gunnar Heinsohn is a leading German author in the research field of chronology criticism and historical revisionism. He was one of the first, who in the last quarter of the 20. century began to develop in Germany the ideas of Velikovsky concerning the shortening of the chronology. The theory of the natural catastrophes in historic time and the general new point of view on the historiography played an important role in this research. 1979 he published a German paper on

- *Hot Venus, the dark age of the Greece an the tremble in the conventional academic doctrine construction. The life and research of Immanuel Velikovsky (Freibeuter, Bd. 1, Nr.2, Dez. 1979)*

This was the first paper of the new German movement of Velikovsky's followers. On the first stage of his participation in this movement which was initiated by Christoph Marx his co-operation with Marx was very important for finding the way to a critical analysis of the old Mesopotamian chronology. The reconstruction of the Mesopotamian history based on ideas and critical observations of Marx was started in his classical book

- *No Sumerians Existed. From the Phantom-Empires of Compendiums to the Real Sequence of Epochs in the 'Cradle of Civilizations' South-Mesopotamia (Die Sumerer gab es nicht: Von den Phantom-Imperien der Lehrbücher zur wirklichen Epochenabfolge in der "Zivilisationswiege" Südmesopotamien, Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn, 1988)*

and continued in the following books

- *Which Time lived the Pharaohs? Archeological and Technological Basis of a New Writing of the Egyptian History and the History of the Rest of the World (Wann lebten die Pharaonen? Archäologische und technologische Grundlagen für eine Neuschreibung der Geschichte Ägyptens und der übrigen Welt, Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn, 1990, with H. Illig),*

- *Who ruled the Valley of Indus? New Found Empires of Medians and Persians. (Wer herrschte im Indus? Die wiedergefundenen Imperien der Meder und der Perser, Gräffeling: Mantis, 1993),*
- *Kings of Assyria equal with Rulers of Persia? The Assyrian Discoveries Give Proofs for the Empire of Achemenides (Assyrerkönige gleich Perserherrscher! Die Assyrienfunde bestätigen das Achämenidenreich, Gräffeling, Mantis, 1996).*
- *How Ancient is the Human Race? (Wie alt ist das Menschengeschlecht? Gräffeling, Mantis, 1996)*

His most recent critical book is devoted to the rise of high culture in the Bronze Age when blood sacrifice dominated the religion:

- *The Creation of Gods. The Sacrifice as the Origin of the Religion. (Die Erschaffung der Götter: Das Opfer als Ursprung der Religion, Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1997).*

Heinsohn is co-editor of "Zeitensprünge" bulletin. In this literary quarterly he published a lot of interesting critical papers. Let us only mention his analysis of the dynasties of Polish kings which demonstrated that many of rulers have been presented in history repeatedly in different times.

During the London conference (2002) Heinsohn and his shortenings of the Middle East chronology have been discussed in different talks. In an open forum at the end of the conference Emmet Sweeney gave the following summary of the chronology as it can be seen after the research of Heinsohn:

"Following the Heinsohn system it means essentially that the Old Kingdom and Middle Kingdom as such never existed separately. The Persians for example really were about quite recently, Cheops, or Khufu, was about some time in the 8th century BC and that's why advanced geometry and various other things could be used to construct these buildings because they don't belong to the Stone Age, they actually belong to the Pyramid Age. If you look at the origins of monotheism, the beginning of the 4th Dynasty, the period of the great pyramid building age, is clearly an age which has just recently witnessed cataclysmic upheavals in Egypt and the Pyramid Texts are proof of that. If you look at the first king after the end of the Early Dynastic Period, Sneferu, he is regarded as a paragon of virtue and the Pyramid Age is regarded - if you look at the Pyramid Texts, there's the emergence of monotheism, with a huge emphasis on the Sun God and the reappearance of the Sun, certainly Arum, not Aton, but Atum, is addressed almost in monotheistic terms, and in this period all these wise men appeared, the wise men of the Old Kingdom, and wise sayings were published, Ptahhotep and all these people who produced wise sayings about the virtuous life and this concept of responsibility beyond the grave appears as well. People are compared, they almost follow the tone of the texts of the Pyramid Age with Old Testament monotheism."

In his talk Sweeney described the role of Heinsohn in revising the Middle East chronology in the following way:

"An entirely new light was cast on the problem with the appearance of Gunnar Heinsohn's work in the 1980s. Heinsohn was not initially concerned so much with Egypt as with Mesopotamia and sought to reconstruct the chronology of that region using strictly stratigraphic data. (Let me mention that the idea about the use of such data origins from Christoph Marx and together with Marx Heinsohn published some reports on Mesopotamian stratigraphy – E.G.) By the latter years of the 1980s, however, it became apparent to him that his findings would have major implications also for Egyptian chronology. Heinsohn realized that the stratigraphy demanded a dramatic reduction in the length of ancient civilizations, much more even than the five centuries suggested by Velikovsky. By 1987 he had come to the conclusion that the Mitanni, the great power which controlled Upper Mesopotamia during the time of the 18th Dynasty, were identical to the Medes, the historical conquerors of the Assyrian Empire in the 7th century. By implication, this of course meant that the 18th Dynasty too had to be brought down into the 7th century

(actually the later 8th and 7th centuries), which meant too that Velikovsky's original location of the 19th Dynasty in the 6th century could now be rehabilitated.

Essentially then what Heinsohn had done was what no one else had even considered: instead of moving the 19th Dynasty back in time to link up the with 18th, move the latter forward by a further two centuries to link up with the 19th.”

Heinsohn was unable to attend the meeting but he subsequently submitted his short paper on the chronology of the life of Saint Cuthbert as he was described by Bede. Here he supports the Illig's theory of phantom years. In open forum discussion I said:

I'm sorry Gunnar Heinsohn isn't here, I was very interested to know what he would speak about and if his understanding of a radical shortening of chronology covers just one of the models we have discussed here or if he is thinking of the model of Fomenko and other critical revisionists from Russia too. Heinsohn has covered so many interesting things that all problems which we discussed here must be seen as relative problems. He understands what Russian researchers are doing and it is on the time to bring both streams together. Remember, using Velikovsky's idea of Catastrophism he together with Heribert Illig shortened the prehistoric time from 30.000 or more years to a very short period of a few thousand years, so at least 25,000 years have been cancelled, even more. We are not forgetting that it is not historical, it is the prehistorical world, but the real difference is not too big: prehistory is also a model of the past and so a part of history. And it is very important to remember that this part of history was reduced by a tremendous factor..

Heribert Illig

The most controversy person in the German community of historical analytics is Heribert Illig. Uwe Topper gives on his website the following short characterisation to Illig:

“Illig who owns a PhD in philology lives as an analyst and publisher in Gräfelfing (Munich, Germany). Since 1989 he publishes together with Heinsohn the quarterly bulletin "Vorzeit-Frühzeit-Gegenwart" (VFG, '*Prehistory - Protohistory-Present*'), in 1995 renamed as "Zeitensprünge (ZS, '*Time Bolts* '), which in the early 90ies was an important platform for nearly every author active in the chronology debate.

Due to his participation in mass media debates, Illig is one of the best known German authors among the critics of History. Since 1994 he supports the idea that the Middle Ages were stretched by 297 years, to cut out between 614 and 911 AD. First a courageous, even shocking, idea, this theory is today considered conservative by many critical authors, because it considers the History before 614 as correctly documented.”

Let me add that his “doctor father” was his friend and co-editor of *Zeitensprünge* Gunnar Heinsohn. Illig was born 1947 in Vohenstrauß in Bayern, Germany. He arrived much as publisher and researcher who is organising every year a meeting of reader of his quarterly. But he also is responsible for the splitting of the German critical community. He is also trying to stop the spread of ideas of Russian historical analysts in Germany and opposes actively the results of Fomenko and his co-authors.

Illig is an active author who published a lot of very valuable critical books written partly with different co-authors. Here are some of them:

- *The obsolete Prehistory (Die veraltete Vorzeit*, Frankfurt/M, 1988)
- *When lived the Pharaohs? (Wann lebten die Pharaonen?*, 1990, with G. Heinsohn as co-author)

- *Construction of the Cheops Pyramid (Der Bau der Cheopspyramide*, Gräffeling, Mantis; 1993, with Franz Löhner as co-author)
- *Did Charlemagne ever live? (Hat Karl der Große je gelebt?*, Gräffeling, Mantis, 1994)
- *The fictitious Middle Ages (Das erfundene Mittelalter*, Econ, München-Düsseldorf, 1996; 1994; 1992)
- *Who manipulated the clock? How 300 Years of History Were Invented (Wer hat an der Uhr gedreht? Wie 300 Jahre Geschichte erfunden wurden*, Econ & List, München, 1999)

In his most popular book *The fictitious Middle Ages* – according to the Web Site <http://www.tanzwut.com/spielmannsblog/?cat=3>

”Heribert Illig tells the world that about 300 years of medieval history has to be deleted. And he’s talking about the years 627 till 911 in particular. Anything you know about these years is fake, interpretation, speculation.

Karl der Große (= Charlemagne) hasn’t been alive, he’s fiction, his vita was made out of forgeries of the 11th and 12th century. The latest memoranda corroborate it. The “established” scientists felt for the fakers tricks.

In his book, he underlined his point conscientiously and full of details. E.g. he proved: the cathedral of Aachen couldn’t be build in Charlemagnes lifetime. They hadn’t had the technology to construct such a building at that time... If someone built this cathedral in the 8th century it would be unexplainable that no other building had been built of the same structure with such a technology for 200 years.

Of course, the established medievalists also noticed the faked documents and a lot of them were recognized as such. They all agree that it is forgery. But how much and what - at that point Illig tries to prove what has to be seen as forgery who could be behind it and why... - Illig reduced a lot more accomplishments of Charlemagne to absurdity and assigned their right era in the 10th and 13th century.”

Christoph Pfister

Christoph Pfister was born 10.10.1945 in Bern. In Fribourg (Freiburg), Switzerland where he lives, he studied general history, Middle Age history and languages at the local University and reached 1974 his PhD in Modern History. Since the 90ies his research focuses on critical consideration of Ancient and Middle Ages History epochs.

First he was an university assistant, then a high school professor for Latin and French. Nowadays he is working for the state as historiography researcher for 18th and 19th century Swiss historiography.

After trying to co-operate with Heribert Illig he soon moved to a much more radical critical position and began to propagate ideas of Fomenko and to apply his methods of critical analysis to Swiss and general world history. He wrote a pamphlet *Anti-Illig* and developed a very strong criticism against the idea of Illig about the phantom time in the Middle Age and his attempt to save a big part of orthodox history including Antiquity.

For Pfister is the classical Antique and Middle Age epochs both the parts of the 17th century for which no real history is known. All historical chronology before 1700 is an artificial product of the Catholic Church, which based by its creation on numerology, not on the real information about the life of folks of the Mediterranean region.

Pfister believes that the really documented history does start as late as the 18th century and all “elder” documents were written after 1700. The 18th century is for him also the time of the beginning of book printing and of the Anne Domini time counting. This position is quite close to

those of a radical wing of the Russian critical movement which is not supported by Fomenko and his co-authors who believe that the history of the last 700 und even more years can be in some sense reconstructed..

Pfister published in a prepaid print on demand publishing house three following very interesting and original books:

- *Vesuv is Throughout. Local Swiss Names are Vesuvian. With an Introduction Concerning the Vesuvian Names of Europe (Der Vesuv ist überall. Die vesuvianische Ortsnamenprägung der Schweiz. Mit einer Einführung über die Vesuv-Namen Europas.* Zweite veränderte Auflage, Norderstedt: Books on Demand, 2007, 300 Seiten, mit 32 farbigen Illustrationen, ISBN: 3-8334-2288-2).
- *The Matrix of the Ancient History. An Analysis of the Religious Historiography. (DIE MATRIX DER ALTEN GESCHICHTE. Analyse einer religiösen Geschichtserfindung.* Zweite veränderte Auflage, Norderstedt: Books on Demand, 2006, 536 Seiten, mit 35 farbigen Abbildungen und 18 Tabellen, ISBN: 3-8334-1826-5).
- *Bern and the Old Swiss Confederates. Rise of the Swiss Confederation from the Point of View of the Historical Criticism. (BERN UND DIE ALTEN EIDGENOSSEN. Die Entstehung der Schwyzer Eidgenossenschaft im Lichte der Geschichtskritik.* 352 Seiten mit 33 Farbabbildungen und 5 Farbtabelle, Norderstedt: Books on Demand, Zweite veränderte Auflage, 2006, ISBN 3-8334-2874-0).

His first book presents the idea of an initial European Vesuvian religion. He demonstrates that “footprints” of this religion can be found in local Vesuvian denotation of geographic names in Switzerland and anywhere in Europe.

In the second book Pfister is presenting some of main ideas of Fomenko’s criticism and forming his own more limited in time reconstruction of the historic period of mankind’s life.

His third book had in the first edition (2003) the title *The Marble about the Old Confederates*. It gives a new picture of the early history of the Swiss Confederation. Pfister is demonstrating that the orthodox history of Switzerland is mainly mythological and not true.

He presents his ideas and theories not only in books and magazines but also on his homepage <http://www.dillum.ch/>. Here more than 100 different texts of Chr. Pfister have been published in German.

Uwe Topper.

Uwe Topper is today the most active German author. His books are very popular. He is a wanted speaker of different meetings and he takes part on different history salons. Together with his son Ilya he is editing a multilingual website *Our History is faked!* Which is giving a good introduction into the field (see <http://www.ilya.it/chrono/>).

According to the named website “Topper studied some semesters of Fine Arts and Islam and lived as a free-lance artist and writer in Southern Asia, Northern Africa and finally in Western Europe; with Berlin as a permanent reference. His field research in ethnological subjects and rock paintings led him to the conviction that the catastrophes that happened throughout the history of humankind can well be documented in the landscape, during excavations and by reading ancient texts. He published this finding in 1977. As co-founder of the Berlin History Meetings he focuses his research since 1993 on chronology.

Born in 1940 in Breslau, Germany, Topper is an artist and author of a dozen books about art and history in German and Spanish. Some of them have been translated into Russian, Bulgarian and Hungarian (and recently even into Korean).

He lives in Berlin/Germany as a self-subsistent artist, writes freelance in several reviews of historical interest and delivers speeches in German, English and Spanish in some small circles interested in history.

He never was called to academic honours nor awarded prizes. In certain circumstances he moved things by promoting scientific gatherings; some perpetuated and still function today in small groups.”

As no books of Topper have been translated into English numerous English publication of him can be a very interesting reading. They all can be found on the named Website. Let us bring here his descriptions of some of these English texts:

- [*The Beowulf Epic a Fake!*](#) The Beowulf Epic was not written in the 11th century (nor in the 8th) but rather in the 17th.
- [*The Calendar Nonsense*](#). A critical review of the international bestseller by D. E. Duncan *The Calendar* (1998). This book doesn't even apply simple mathematics
- [*The Calendar and Gregor's Reform*](#) The Calendar and Gregor's Reform 1582. The precession and the week. Cosmic Catastrophes in the 13th and 14th century
- [*Computists and Chronology*](#) The medieval computist monks created a network of 'important' years with symbolic numbers, such as 666, 369, 963...
- [*The ERA. A Medieval Chronological Reckoning*](#) Inscriptions in churches and tombstones with the Spanish ERA-dates. Blank spaces. Too many fakes!
- [*Fakes in Anatolia*](#). The British archeologist J. S. Mellaart (1960) has invented several ancient civilizations in Anatolia. Çatal Hüyük. A treasure never seen.
- [*Glacial Cosmogony*](#). Hanns Hörbiger's ideas about ice in the cosmos ('Welteislehre') · The Earth is receiving cosmic ice. Geological events happen abruptly.
- [*James and the Ghost Centuries*](#). "Ghost centuries" in the early Bronze Age. A review of the book by Peter James (1991).
- [*The Lady of Elche is a Fake*](#). Too supposedly a masterpiece of early Iberian art, the Lady of Elche was faked in the 19th century.
- [*Measuring the Earth in the Antiquity*](#). Were the old Greeks, Romans or Arabs able to calculate the actual circumference of the globe? Too many mistakes
- [*The Metal Age: a New Vision*](#). The transition of Stone Age to Metal Age. A high culture spread over Europe. Wine and beer. Domestic animals. Bell-beaker pottery.
- [*A Refutation of the 297-Year-Bolt Ulrich Voigt is right: there cannot have been a 297-year-bolt in the Middle Ages, as Illig tries to show.*](#)
- [*The Tapestry of Bayeux*](#). A critical view on the famous rug suggests that it doesn't feature Christian scenes. The England of the 14th century was different.

Additionally many German papers of the same author can be found there.

And now let me name some German books of Uwe Topper. His first book

- *The Heritage of Giants. The Fall and Return of Atlantes (Das Erbe der Giganten. Untergang und Rückkehr der Atlanter*, Walter Verl. Olten und Freiburg, 1977)

was an introduction into the history of huge natural catastrophes of the historical or near-historical time and the history of people which lived in North Africa and on the Iberian peninsula in the time before and after these catastrophes. This book presented his own field research in the named waste area.

The following books have been written after Topper began to work in the field of historical analysis:

- *The „Big Action“. Invented History of Europe (Die "Große Aktion". Europas erfundene Geschichte, Grabert, Tübingen, 1998)*
- *Invented History. Our Time Counting is Incorrect (Erfundene Geschichte. Unsere Zeitrechnung ist falsch, Herbig, München, 1999)*
- *Fakes of History. From Persephone till the Time Counting of Newton (Fälschungen der Geschichte. Von Persephone bis Newtons Zeitrechnung, Herbig, München, 2001)*
- *Horra: The First Europeans (horra. Die ersten Europäer, Grabert, Tübingen, 2003)*
- *Faking the Time. It Started at Renaissance Time (ZeitFälschung. Es begann mit der Renaissance, Herbig, München, 2003)*
- *Spring of Kalender. Change of Religion in Europe about 1500 (KalenderSprung. Europas Religionswechsel um 1500. Grabert, Tübingen, 2006)*

In the year 2000 the Bulgarian publishing house "Litera Prima" published a Bulgarian translation of the book *Invented History*. By Uwe Topper with a Bulgarian title, which means *Is human history a fiction?* Bulgarian historian Alexander Moshev, Sofia, wrote me about this book a following letter:

All the copies of the edition were sold rather quickly in Sofia and now are not available at the bookstores, but I was lucky to buy a copy very shortly after "Is human history a fiction?" came out. The book became a bestseller in Sofia and entered the top 10 list of the best selling books of the week in the weekly newspaper "168 hours". The Bulgarian critic Georgi Zankov wrote positive notes in the daily newspaper "Noshten Trud". The book also attracted the attention of professional historians, such as Ass. Prof. Zvetana Cholova from the Institute of History of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. "Is human history a fiction?" became one of the main topics of discussion at the biggest outdoor book market in Sofia - "Slaveykov" Square.

To anybody who like to understand the modern German historical analytics I am recommending to read books and papers of Uwe Topper.

Society for Interdisciplinary Studies

As a centre which brings together most Anglo-Saxon and many other historical analytics we can consider the Society for Interdisciplinary Studies (SIS) with a residence in UK und a Web Site <http://knowledge.co.uk/sis/>. According to this Web Site, SIS is the oldest and most up to date society for catastrophist information and historical analytics research. The SIS was formed in 1974 to consider the role global cosmic catastrophes may have played in our history, and even recorded by cultures worldwide in their oral and written ancient traditions. Catastrophism also demands that there should be corroboration between disciplines, making catastrophism truly interdisciplinary and inclusive.

Topics covered include:

- [Ancient history revisions](#) and dating methods
- The "stability" of the Solar System
- The origins and history of religion
- Rock art & mythology as a historic record

- The role of plasma in the universe
- The long-term trauma of catastrophes
- Linguistics and the origin of words
- The cause of evolution, and its rate of change

The Society's main publication is [Chronology & Catastrophism Review](#) which appears twice a year. SIS [C&C Workshop](#) appears three times a year, and was launched to provide for an informal publication of material that may also be of interest to members.

The SIS also arranges occasional talks and conferences, and members have the opportunity to buy material through the Society's book service.

As an example let me give the content of C&C Review 2006, 58 pp (July 2006) as it was published on the named Web Site:

- Articles:
 - Bias in the Writing of History, by Irving Wolfe
 - Velikovksian Catastrophism: Science of Pseudoscience, by Paul Sukys
 - The Feasts and the Crescents, by Lynn E. Rose
- Essay-Review
 - Can the Persian Chronology be Revised? -- Part I
 - A Review-Report of the Seminar on Alfred de Grazia's model of 'Solaria Binaria', reviewed by Professor Vladimir Damagov
- Recent Developments in Near Eastern Archaeology, by Robert M. Porter
- Book Reviews
 - *The Measure of Albion*, by Robin Heath and John Michel, reviewed by Phillip Clapham
 - *The Reversing Earth*, by Peter Warlow, reviewed by Phillip Clapham
 - *Glyphbreakers*, by Steven Roger Fischer, reviewed by David Fairbairn
 - *From the Upper Sea to the Lower Sea; Studies on the History of Assyria and Babylonia in Honour of A.K. Grayson*, reviewed by Laurence Dixon
 - *Eden in the East; the drowned continent of SE Asia*, by Stephen Oppenheimer, reviewed by Phillip Clapham
 - *Thunderbolts of the Gods*, by David Talbott and Wallace Thornhill, reviewed by Laurence Dixon
 - *Prehistory of Australia*, by John Mulvaney and Johan Kummings, reviewed by Phillip Clapham

Anglo-Saxon historical analytics: some names.

Trevor Palmer is Professor of Life Sciences, Senior Dean and Pro Vice Chancellor at Nottingham Trent University and a member of SIS Council since 1986. He presented a very detailed review of the modern situation with the history revisionism in London (2002), in which he weighed all pros and cons. He started with a characterization of the conventional chronology

“The chronology of the ancient world currently accepted in most academic circles is based largely on the chronology of ancient Egypt. However, this was not passed down to us intact

through the centuries. Instead, it was re-assembled in the late 19 and early 20th centuries from the fragmentary information available. Those remnants of ancient Egypt which survive, magnificent though some are, give us only a glimpse of what has been. As the eminent Egyptologist, Sir Alan Gardiner, wrote in 1961, "What is proudly advertised as Egyptian history is merely a collection of rags and tatters"

Under a title 'The Revised Chronology' of Velikovsky Trevor Palmer explains in which way the chronological misbelieve in Anglo-Saxon countries started in the middle of the 20th century:

"The conventional chronology of the ancient world was firmly established by the middle of the 20th century but received a major challenge in 1952 from Immanuel Velikovsky, in *Ages in Chaos*. Velikovsky had become convinced that a global catastrophe caused by a close approach of the planet Venus had occurred at the time of the Exodus and believed that the chaos in Egypt associated with this event was described in the Papyrus Ipuwer, lodged in the Leiden museum"- More details can be found below in the Part3 in description of the role of Velikovsky for the history revision.

Emmet Sweeney has an M.A. in *Early Modern History* and teaches in London He is a member of the SIS council and is the author of several books on chronological revisions, including *The Genesis of Israel and Egypt*, *The Pyramid Age*, *The Neo-Assyrians and Persians*, *Ramessides, Madas and Persians* and *The Lost History of Ireland*. His latest book is *Arthur and Stonehenge (Britain's Lost History)*. He is supporting the radical cutting of the Mesopotamian and generally Near East chronology developed by Heinsohn and developed his own version of this short chronology. Here a summary of his talk in London (2002) written by Trevor Palmer in his conclusion remarks:

Emmet Sweeney "spoke both about Gunnar Heinsohn's chronology and his own, starting by saying that Leonard Woolley's flood layer in Mesopotamia was in fact the same as Schaefer's layer of catastrophic destruction in Syria, even though they were supposedly something like a thousand years separate; both had been preceded by something very similar; the Ubaid culture and also there were similarities in cultures that came after: in Mesopotamia, the Mitanni and Late Bronze 1 came immediately above the Akkadian and Early Bronze III, again supposedly almost a thousand years apart, and he proposed that these gaps should be just simply removed from history, that they were false and that history should be shortened accordingly. In his view, and I'm talking specifically about Emmet, the Medes were the Mitanni, the Hittites were the Lydians. Essentially, one of the important points that he referred to at length, was the similarity between the Assyrian period and the Persian period, pointing out, for example, similarities in events in the time of Xerxes and the time of Sennacherib, arguing that the two were the same, although supposedly two centuries apart. Finally, he mentioned archaeological evidence from a German team which in fact tended to support the idea that these long periods of time between cultures had never actually existed."

Charles Ginenthal is the long-time Editor-in-Chief of the journal *The Velikovskian* (A journal for myth, history and science). According to the information from his book *Pillars of the Past* Ginenthal is the author of *Carl Sagan & Immanuel Velikovsky* and co-author of *Stephen J. Gould and Immanuel Velikovsky*. He has published papers in the journals *AECW*, *Meta Research*, and *The Velikovskian*. His work also appeared in the *Proceeding of the Immanuel Velikovsky Centennial 1895-1995*, in *ABA*, *the Glory and Torment*, *The Life of Immanuel Velikovsky*, written by Velikovsky's daughter, Ruth Velikovsky Sharon Ph.D., and in *Rebels & Devils*, *The Psychology of Liberation*, with distinguished authors Robert Anton Wilson, William S. Burroughs, and Timothy Leary. He has published a new theory of Cosmology, *The Electro-Gravitic Theory of Celestial Motion and Cosmology*, and a new book, *The Extinction of the Mammoth*.

Pillars of the Past explores, through studies based primarily on scientific and technological evidence, the chronology of the ancient Near East. Here the description of the book given by the publisher:

“This evidence indicates that the historians and archaeologists have invented over 1500 years of history that simply never existed. The evidence includes astronomical Sothic dating, radiocarbon dating, pottery dating, tin bronze production, iron metallurgy as it relates to cutting diorite and other hard rock. In addition, erosion of Egyptian monuments along with agronomy and soil salinization, climatology, agriculture, as well as archaeological and geological stratigraphy all support the conclusion that at least 1500 years of ancient history are a mirage. Glass development, domestication of the horse and ass, Hebrew, Greek, and Hittite linguistics, forensic studies of the teeth of ancient peoples prove that this millennium and a half or more are historical fiction. There is of course much, much more. With hundreds of footnotes from many diverse fields of study, Ginenthal ruthlessly tears away the façade of the established long chronology. For new and old readers of ancient history, in clear, understandable language, the history of the ancient Near East is exposed, showing that at least half of the cloth of that age is an invention; that the emperor, in reality, has no clothes.”

Charles Ginenthal presented during the London conference (2002) a paper “which asked whether the Sumerian civilisation could have maintained its culture by irrigation. In arid regions, irrigation also adds salt to the soil which causes a problem as the water table rises. Further irrigation to try to alleviate the salt problem would increase the water table still more, and the problem would get even worse. Essentially he argued that with the techniques available to the ancients, this situation could not have gone on for more than about 500 years, without cultivation of the land having to stop for a substantial period until it remedied itself. So overall, without coming to any specific conclusions, the idea of a long consecutive culture in that region seemed unlikely.” (Palmer’s conclusional comments).

A lot of other names of historical revisionists can be found (together with short characterisations) in *The Revision of Ancient History* written by P John Crowe.

Part 3. Eminent critics of chronology and historiography in the past: the five classics.

Independent thinkers who weren’t afraid of the fact that historical science and the people whose interests it represents have always been extremely hostile towards all criticisms of chronology, existed in every epoch, alongside the masses of obedient historiographers that were too scared or too reluctant to go against the grain. Owing to the fact that these independent researchers had possessed the courage to expose blatant contradictions inherent in the very chronological foundations of historiography, official science didn’t manage to keep them out of the general public’s reach. We shall mention some of them below.

The four names one finds below are merely the ones who received the most publicity. Many honest historians have tried to criticize the condition of historical sources, but never dared to cross the border of loyalty to historical science in general, as well as the corporate mass of fellow historians. They remained in the shade – however, their efforts helped several radical critics of chronology to emerge and voice the existence of the abovementioned contradictions and blind spots in history publicly.

Sir Isaac Newton

Readers familiar with the works of Fomenko and Nosovsky know that the great English physicist had also been an eminent chronologist; they keep emphasizing ([g1]) that in his every book Sir Isaac insists on the necessity of narrowing the historical temporal space drastically. This part played by Sir Isaac is recognized in the article of Uwe Topper ([g2]) entitled “Sir Isaac Shortened Greek History by 300 Years”.

In my own article ([g3]) I tried to consider the lifelong activity of the great physicist and theologian, emphasizing his criticisms of consensual chronology rather than the shortening of the historical period.

Let us assume that Joseph Scaliger, the founding father of the consensual chronology, had been perfectly scrupulous in his work with the historical sources that he had selected for his research. It is true that he may have invented some of them; however, seeing as how modern historiography regards them as valid historical sources, this circumstance (hardly an extraordinary phenomenon in the past) is of little importance to us. On the other hand, we have no reasons to assume that Newton wasn't capable of conducting his chronological calculations without any errors, based on the sources that he had chosen for this purpose. Assuming this, we can claim that Newton de facto proves the following two theorems – empirically, if not logically.

THEOREM 1: The system of historical sources is woven of contradictions: some of its parts lead one to conclusions that contradict other parts.

THEOREM 2: Consensual chronology as used by the modern historical science is untrue. Furthermore, the general mass of historical sources that we have at our disposal doesn't allow for its unambiguous reconstruction.

COROLLARY: Historical chronology is nonexistent.

I emphasized the following as yet another thing that Sir Isaac must be credited for in [g3]: Newton had been the first to use statistical considerations for testing the veracity of chronological materials. He can therefore be considered the ideological progenitor of the Russian critical school in Chronology (Morozov, Fomenko et al), which is concerned with natural scientific and mathematical argumentation for the most part, albeit not exclusively.

Jean Hardouin

Jean Hardouin (1646-1729) was a contemporary of Newton and one of the best-educated people of his epoch. A member of the Jesuit order, he had been the director of the French Royal Library since 1683. Hardouin had also been a Professor of Theology who would constantly surprise his listeners by the depth of his knowledge and his tremendous erudition. Hardouin is the author of several books on philology, theology, history, archaeology, numismatics, chronology and philosophy of history (see [g4] – [g6] for a complete bibliography). Unfortunately, these oeuvres remain unknown to the wider audience of specialists, one of the reasons being the fact that they're written in Latin for the most part.

Hardouin's most famous work is a collection of ecclesiastical edicts in re the assembly of Ecumenical Councils, starting with the I century A. D. and on. When this grandiose oeuvre finally came out in 1715 after 28 years of labour and after the editions of 1684, 1685 and 1693 (11 volumes with comments altogether), it had remained banned by the church for the 10 years that followed, since the ecclesiastical authorities had, understandably enough, been alarmed by the criticisms of sources contained in the conclusions made by Hardouin in the course of his research. The church had only allowed public access to the materials published by Hardouin after the public renunciation of the latter's former beliefs, which was perceived as a mere formality by Hardouin's contemporaries.

From 1690 and on, J. Hardouin had claimed that the works of many ancient authors were written hundreds of years later than whatever was implied by the consensual datings of their lifetimes. In

other words, he had exposed the works in question as forgeries. This critique of sources had been getting ever more scalding; one of Hardouin's final conclusions had been that nearly all the ancient works of literary art date from the XIII century the earliest. He had made exceptions in several cases: the works of Cicero, the satires of Horace, Virgil's "Georgics" and Pliny the Elder's "Natural History". However, his famous comments were written about his authors, and so Hardouin may have found it hard psychologically to recognise them as mediaeval authors.

Hardouin had claimed that Christ and his apostles, if they existed at all, must have read their sermons in Latin. He was convinced that the Greek translations of the New and the Old Testament date from a much later epoch than the church presumes. He had named St. Augustine among the fraudulent Christian classics and didn't trust the veracity of his works. He had also mentioned the falsification of nearly all of the "ancient" coins, works of art, stone carvings and, particularly, the documents of all the Ecumenical Councils that had preceded the Council of Trident (1545-1563).

The reaction of Hardouin's contemporaries to his iconoclasm is of as great an interest to us as his criticisms of historical sources. Hardouin naturally got criticised, but usually sotto voce, which leaves one with the impression that the critics themselves were well aware that the publication of apocryphal works had been the norm relatively recently. Even his most vehement opponents acknowledged that Hardouin's academic eminence and his highest authority in the scientific world made it unnecessary for him to seek cheap publicity of a nihilist or to amuse himself with disclosures that irritated the ecclesiastical and scientific circles alike. Only deep conviction about the veracity of the critical approach to chronology and historiography could have made Hardouin dare to oppose the entire canonical science and theology.

It is noteworthy that Hardouin criticised Newton's book on amended chronology in the same vein of the complete negation of deep antiquity, urging Newton to stop writing about the fictitious "days of yore". He had been of the opinion that the destruction of Jerusalem and the burning of Troy were the same event in reality, which corresponds to the point of view expressed by Fomenko and Nosovsky.

Most of Hardouin's work (including the ones published postmortem) were banned by the church in 1739-1742 and included in the list of banned books. After the death of J. Hardouin, most of the "ancient" sources that he had exposed have been "rehabilitated" and are once again taken seriously by historical science.

Robert Baldauf

If Newton and Hardouin were world famous scientists whose biographies are known in great detail, the only thing we know about Robert Baldauf, the Swiss philologist, is that he was a unsalaried lecturer of Basel University and published two volumes out of the four that he had intended to publish under the general title of "History and Criticism", namely, the first and the fourth volume. These two volumes are of the utmost interest to the critics of chronology and history, since Baldauf managed to come to virtually the same conclusions as Hardouin using an altogether different method, that of philological analysis.

Baldauf had studied the archives of the famous Swiss monastery of St. Gallen, formerly one of the key centres of Catholicism, and discovered the traces of the barbaric library raid made by Poggio Bracciolini and a friend of his, both of them highly educated servants of the Roman curia. They purloined numerous manuscripts and books that were considered ancient from the library of this monastery (however, the manuscripts may date to a more recent epoch, which wouldn't preclude them from serving as prototypes for the manufacture of numerous "ancient" works by Poggio and his assistants.

One must also mention Baldauf's study of numerous presumably ancient manuscripts and the exposure of the latter as recent forgeries for the most part. Baldauf discovered parallels between the "historical" books of the Old Testament and the works of the mediaeval Romance genre as well as Homer's "Iliad" that were blatant enough to lead the scientist to the assumption that both the Iliad and the Bible date from the late Middle Ages.

Some of the mediaeval chronicles ascribed to different authors resembled each other to such an extent that Baldauf was forced to identify them as works of the same author, despite the fact that the two documents were presumed separated chronologically by an interval of two centuries at least. At any rate, some of the expressions characteristic for Romanic languages that one finds in both documents fail to correspond with either of the alleged dating (one of them being the IX and the other the XI century). Apart from that, some of the manuscripts contain distinctly more recent passages, such as frivolous stories of endeavours in public steam baths (which the Europeans only became acquainted with during the late Reconquista epoch) and even allusions to the Holy Inquisition.

Baldauf's study of the "ancient" poetry in Volume 4 demonstrates that many "ancient" poets wrote rhymed verse resembling the mediaeval troubadours. Unlike Hardouin, Baldauf is convinced that the verse of Horace is of a mediaeval origin, pointing out German and Italian influences inherent in his Latin. Furthermore, Baldauf points out such pronounced parallels between the poetry of Horace and Ovid (who were presumably unaware of each other's existence) that one becomes convinced that the works of both belong to a third party – apparently, a much later author.

Robert Baldauf wasn't alone in his criticism of the style characteristic for the "ancient" authors. As early as in 1847 Borber expressed surprise about the striking similarity of the Druids and the Egyptian priests as described in Julius Caesar's *De bellum Gallico*, which he considers a later forgery, likewise *De bellum civile* by the same author. Baldauf sums up his research in the following words: "Our Romans and Greeks have been Italian humanists". All of them – Homer, Sophocles, Aristotle and many other "ancient" authors, so different in our perception, hail from the same century, according to Baldauf. Furthermore, their home wasn't in the Ancient Rome or Hellas, but rather Italy of the XIV-XV century. The entire history of the Ancient Greeks and Romans, likewise the Biblical "history", which correlates with the above to some extent, was conceived and introduced by the Italian humanists, as well as their colleagues and followers from other countries.

Humanism has given us a whole fantasy world of the antiquity and the Bible, as well as the early Middle Ages, which Baldauf had also considered an invention of the humanist writers. This fictional history, initially drafted on parchment, was carved in stone and cast in metal; it has rooted itself in our perception to such an extent that no positivist criticisms can make humanity doubt its veracity.

Wilhelm Kammeier

In case of Wilhelm Kammeier, a German critic of historical sources, we don't know so much as the date of his birth. According to the estimation cited in [g4], he was born between 1890 and 1900. He died in 1959 in Arnstadt (Thuringia, former GDR). He was a teacher and had worked in Hanover. He had taken part in World War II and was taken prisoner. After that, he had lived in Arnstadt, which became the new home of his family after the destruction of their Hanover residence during the war. All his post-war life he had been afflicted by poverty and state repressions. There is an opinion that his death resulted from chronic malnutrition.

Analysis of old deeds from the point of view of a notary provided Kammeier with an excellent foundation for the critical research of old documents, which he became fascinated with in 1923. By 1926 he had completed his 292-page manuscript entitled *The Universal Falsification of*

History, where he subjects historical documents serving as the basis for the mediaeval history of Germany to rigorous criticisms. However, it had taken him many years to find a publisher for this critique.

He sent a brief summary of the key points related in the manuscript to the Prussian Academy of Sciences with a request to be given the opportunity of making a public speech in front of the historians. This request was rejected under a formal pretext that private persons weren't allowed to address the Academy, with no substantial argumentation given. The mere fact that Kammeier had not held an office in an academic institution sufficed for the rejection of a well-reasoned critique.

Kammeier's manuscript got published as late as in 1935. It was followed by a brochure, where the criticisms of historical sources were taken further, encompassing the entire mediaeval period in Europe, and seven more brochures on the same subject. This work has long ago become a bibliographic rarity. It was published again in a small number of copies as part of the book that also includes the following works of Wilhelm Kammeier dating from 1936-1939:

- *“Enigmas of Global History – an Answer to my Critics”*,
- *“The Mystery of Mediaeval Rome”*,
- *“Dogmatic Christianity and the Falsification of History”*,

and

- *“The Foundation of the Roman Ecumenical Church”*.

Finally, Kammeier's manuscript on the “sources” of the early Christianity and their falsification, previously unpublished and presumed lost, came out as a book.

Official science had only been reacting to Kammeier's works during the first few years that followed the release of his first book – critically, of course. One of his critics, a certain Professor Heimpel, accused Kammeier of having no positive conception of history. A critic must naturally be concerned with the positive historical picture first and foremost, regardless of whether or not it is a work of fiction through and through: “If we see the entire historical conception of the Middle Ages disintegrate and transform into a spot of impenetrable darkness, or indeed a gigantic question mark, we shall naturally end up with feeling inner resentment against Kammeier's criticisms, well-reasoned or not”.

Kammeier's counter-argumentation was that it hadn't been his fault that the history of Germany and the entire Old World proved a work of fiction to a tremendous extent, the literary and documental sources of the epoch being forgeries. He only pleaded guilty of discovering this historical falsification, mentioning the necessity to live with a new historical truth that new generations of historians would inevitably face (as we know, they still shudder at the mere thought), alluding to Schopenhauer's concept about truth needing no permission for its existence. Once perceived, the truth becomes an elemental force: intelligent persons shall try to turn this force to their benefit instead of opposing it.

However, after the reasoned refutation of the historians' criticisms by Kammeier, the learned scholars have switched to the tried and viable tactics of obstruction and concealment (after all, things that remain unknown to the general public may as well be nonexistent). The world war that broke out around that time had aided this obstruction greatly. Kammeier's participation in military action, his captivity and the unsettled state of his post-war life had interrupted his active research for a long time.

The only job Kammeier managed to find in the GDR was that of a schoolteacher. As soon as circumstances allowed, he resumed his research of the “ancient” documents, concentrating all of his attention on the documental foundations of the history of early Christianity. It is possible that he had counted on a benevolent attitude towards this topic from the part of Socialist

historiography in an atheistic country that the GDR was striving to become. Instead of that, as soon as he had offered his critique of early Christian documents to the historians of the German Democratic Republic, he became a victim of repressions. He lost his job, the manuscript of his book ([g11]) was confiscated and had been presumed lost for a long time. His estate was nationalised, and his family forced to dwell in hunger and poverty.

Kammeier's research of the "ancient" documents became with the trivial remark that every donation document (the most common kind of mediaeval documents; donations could assume the form of estate, privileges, ranks etc) must contain information about the nature of the gift, the date of the donation, the names of the benefactor and the receiver and the place where the document was written. Documents with blank fields (date, name of the donation's receiver etc) are null and void from the legal point of view, and can only serve as historical sources indirectly (in the research of historical falsifications, for instance).

Documents kept in libraries often fail to correspond to these criteria:

- One finds documents with no date, or a date that was obviously introduced later – alternatively, the date can be incomplete or transcribed in a manner that fails to correspond with the presumed epoch of the document's creation.
- Documents dating to the same day would often be "signed" in different geographical location.
- The analysis of places and dates leaves us with the following picture: all German emperors, regardless of age, health and basic human logic, don't reside in any capital, but keep on the move all the time, occasionally covering gigantic distances in a single day, in order to make more and more donations to their loyal subjects.
- It would be interesting to feed all such data to a computer in order to compile analytical overviews of the movement speed of the German feudal rulers and their supernormal Wanderlust. However, the tables that the historians have already compiled, demonstrate that German emperors often managed to be present in two mutually distant geographical locations on the same day. For instance, Emperor Conrad is presumed to have been present in 2 or 3 different cities at the same annual Christian feast for 50 years in a row.
- The family name of the donation's recipient is absent from a great number of documents (this is the case with up to half of all surviving documents for some epochs) – one can therefore speak of headers at best, valid official documents being a far cry.

Naturally, Kammeier wasn't the first to discover forgeries during the research of ancient (or presumably ancient) documents. His primary merit is that he had managed to recognize the more or less systematic large-scale activities of whole generations of hoaxers serving the Catholic Church or individual feudal rulers and grasp the real scale of the historical falsification campaign, which had been great enough to surprise historians even before his time.

These hoaxers have destroyed a great many of old originals and replaced them by forgeries. Old text would often be erased with new one taking its place on an ancient parchment, which would make the forgery look like an "authentic ancient relic" in the eyes of the hoaxers. It would often take a very minor alteration to change the original meaning of an old document completely.

According to Kammeier, the key goal of this prolonged and massive campaign for the falsification of historical documents had been the concealment, distortion and arbitrary extension of the pre-Christian history, with all the achievements of the pagan epoch ascribed thereto. Apart from that, "legal" acknowledgement of the possession rights must have been in high demand among the new feudal rulers, whose property was acquired from lawful pagan owners rather

recently, and in a violent manner. Falsified donation documents were necessary to declare ancient rights of possession; their authorship could be traced to one of the great Christian rulers of antiquity – fictitious entities invented for this specific purpose in many cases.

The general condition of historical sources at the moment can be described as follows: the number of forgeries is mind-boggling, and every “ancient” work of history lacks an original (this is hardly a chance occurrence). However, historians keep on using forgeries in lieu of official documentation – possibly due to the fact that their inaccuracy has not been proven irrefutably yet, or that such irrefutable proof does in fact exist, but remains concealed from the scientific community.

One can find the following corollaries made by Kammeier in the course of his research of mediaeval documents in [g12]:

- The humanists took part in the massive falsification of history alongside the Catholic clergy striving to create some proof of the historical significance attributed to their church; this process falls on the XV century for the most part.
- The documents related to the pagan “German” history have been destroyed and replaced by Gaulish and Romanic forgeries.
- The existence of Catholic Pontiffs before the so-called Avignon captivity is of a figmental nature through and through.
- Historical events that preceded the XIII century are beyond reconstruction, since all of the earlier documents have been destroyed and replaced by counterfeits.
- The pre-Papal wars between national churches were subsequently presented as struggle against the heretics and the apostates.
- “Ancient” literature is as much of a forgery as the mediaeval documents. One of such fake literary works is “Germany” by Tacitus.
- The Catholic clergy can be credited with the invention of the New Testament, or at least a radical rearrangement thereof.
- The church keeps on manufacturing counterfeited “ancient” manuscripts in order to “prove” the authenticity of Evangelical texts and their great age with the aid of the new findings.

Immanuel Velikovsky

The written history of the ancient world is composed without correct synchronization of the histories of different peoples of antiquity: a discrepancy of about six hundred years exists between the Hebrew and Egyptian histories as they are conventionally written; since the histories of other peoples are synchronized both with the Hebrew and the Egyptian past, they are completely distorted.

The ground plan for a redesigning of ancient history was ready in its main features in the spring 1940. During the years 1940-1944, I wrote and completed a Reconstruction of ancient history from the end of the Middle Kingdom in Egypt to the advent of Alexander the Great. Due to war conditions and their interference with the printing of extensive scientific works, the publication of “Ages in Chaos” had to be postponed. This short paper is intended to bring together in concise form most of the innovations of my work; I present them in the form of theses; the manifold proofs which underlie the Reconstruction and the numerous collations of historical material are reserved for the work itself.

Velikovsky, New York, June 10, 1945.

The biography of Immanuel Velikovsky is well known in the circle of his admirers, but unfortunately not for most people. Even in Israel, where he lived during the 20ties and 30ties and where his daughter now lives and books about his life writes is his name less known. The same is the situation in Russia where a biography of Velikovsky was published for ten years:

- Degen Ion, *Immanuel Velikovsky. A story of an outstanding man*, Fenix, Rostov-na-Donu, 1997 (In Russian).

Also in these ten years all books of Velikovsky have been translated into Russian but even today he is known in his motherland only for a small circle of readers. But here I am not trying to close this biographical hole, I only would like to underline his role as a pioneer of the chronology revision in the Western hemisphere. Let us remember the first three of some hundreds of *THESES FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF ANCIENT HISTORY FROM THE END OF THE MIDDLE KINGDOM IN EGYPT TO THE ADVENT OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT* written as early as 1945:

1. Ancient History before the advent of Alexander the Great is written in a chaotic manner. It is entirely confused, and is a disarray of centuries, kingdoms and persons.
2. The cause of this confusion lies in an incorrect representation of the Egyptian past; and since the history of Egypt is chosen to serve for orientation in compiling the histories of other peoples of antiquity, the histories of these other peoples are brought into disorder as well. The error in Egyptian history consists of six to seven and, in some places, eight centuries of retardation.
3. Histories of Palestine, Syria, Babylonia, Assyria, Mycenae, Classical Greece, Chaldea, Phoenicia, and Caria, are written in duplicate form, with the same events repeated after a period of six or seven centuries. The confusion of centuries makes the life of many personages double; descendants are transformed into ancestors, and entire peoples and empires are invented.

Sweeney said in London (2002) the following:

“The first person to suggest that there was something fundamentally wrong with the timescales of ancient history was of course Immanuel Velikovsky and in the early 1950s he proposed that 18th Dynasty Egyptian chronology was too long by around 500 years. *Ages in Chaos* Vol. 1, published in 1952, demonstrated to the world how, if those 500 years were removed, the histories of Egypt and Israel, which had hitherto shown almost no correspondence whatsoever, could be made to 'fit', much like matching pieces of a jigsaw, from generation to generation.

Ages in Chaos Vol. 1 was greeted initially with much enthusiasm in the 'Velikovskian' movement but the celebration was short-lived. By the 1970s it became apparent that Velikovsky wished to separate the end of the 18th Dynasty from the beginning of the 19th by almost 200 years and his *Ramses II and his Time* (1978) argued for placing the great pharaoh of the 19th Dynasty in the first half of the 6th century BC.

It was then that the first serious dissension broke out. Various British scholars argued that the 200 year hiatus was historically insupportable. An SIS Conference held in Glasgow in 1977 produced what was then described as the 'Glasgow Chronology'. Basically, this argued for holding on to all of Velikovsky's *Ages in Chaos* Vol. 1, whilst at the same time making the 19th and 20th Dynasties follow on directly from where the 18th Dynasty ended. Thus the Glasgow school placed the 19th Dynasty in the latter years of the 9th century and the first half of the 8th. However problems soon arose too for the Glasgow school and one by one its architects and supporters abandoned it. Since then one writer after another has grappled with the problem, with dynasties being shuffled backwards and forwards like historical playing cards.”

Let me also give the description of the role of Velikovsky in history revision debates written by Crowe in his overview:

“His theories about catastrophism went totally against the astronomical dogma of his day, which claimed beyond dispute that the planets were solely ruled by gravity. If Venus and Mars had moved as and when Velikovsky claimed, they could not have assumed their present new and stable orbits so quickly under gravity alone. Also bodies in space could not collide. The ruthless and shameful attempts by leading Harvard academics to condemn the book as heretical and to ridicule its author only heightened worldwide public interest in the book. It was this interest, and a recognition that the many brilliant ideas postulated by Velikovsky were of sufficient importance to deserve further study and debate, which in the UK led eventually in 1974 to the formation of the SIS.

Then, with *'Ages in Chaos'* (AIC) in 1952 [17], he ignited a public debate on ancient chronology. As mentioned in the introduction, he looked at Egyptian and Palestinian history over the period from the Exodus to the early Divided Monarchy era, and found none of the expected synchronisms. In the CC, Ramesses II was the Pharaoh of the Exodus, but none of the other OT historical events could be found in their expected places. Focussing on the Exodus events, which he considered to have been caused by a catastrophe affecting much of the Middle East, Velikovsky found what he regarded as evidence of this catastrophe in two ancient Egyptian texts, Papyrus Ipuwer and the Ermitage Papyrus. By dating these texts to the end of the MK, he showed that Tuthmoses III fitted the mantle of the Biblical Shishak much better than Shoshenk I. In doing so, he was clearly unaware that Newton had long ago arrived at a similar conclusion. He pointed out that Shoshenk's list of Asiatic cities, which some Egyptologists no longer regard as evidence of a military campaign, were mainly located in Israel rather than Judah. It includes none of the 'fenced cities of Judah' mentioned as captured by Shishak in the Old Testament (OT). Shoshenk I's supposed campaign against Judah therefore has no archaeological support. However, hundreds of scarabs of Tuthmoses III have been found across Palestine and Syria, all in strata that are now dated some 5-600yr after his time. Despite the fact that many of these are believed to be genuine D18 scarabs, the archaeologists have had to interpret their finds as either heirlooms or as souvenirs made in Palestine when there was a revival of devotion to Tuthmoses III. And so, as has happened so often, archaeological fact has been distorted by the proponents of historical theory. Why Tuthmoses III, and only Tuthmoses III, who must in his day have been a dreaded and hated invader, should become the object of veneration 5-600yr later is never explained. Velikovsky showed that the resulting down dating of the NK by around 500 years brought the early histories of the two nations into a much more convincing alignment, and resolved many glaring chronological problems.

Also in AIC, Velikovsky identified the Hyksos with the Biblical Amalekite hordes, who fought with the Hebrews as they fled from Egypt at the time of the Exodus. He also claimed that Hatshepsut was the 'Queen of Sheba' of the OT who visited Solomon, and who was referred to by Josephus as 'the queen of Egypt and Ethiopia'. He then showed at Ugarit, which was given Egyptian dates from scarabs of Amenhotep III found in its final destruction layer, that the archaeological evidence, including the texts of many of the cuneiform tablets unearthed there, could be interpreted to provide excellent supporting evidence in favour of his proposed 500yr down dating. The evidence there supported the traditional view of Biblical scholars that the Canaanites received their culture from the Hebrews, not vice versa as is taught today. The book ended with a lengthy analysis of the Amarna Letters, in which he found many synchronisms with ancient Jewish history around the time of Ahab and his successors.

AIC was intended to be the first volume in a series proposing a full historical reconstruction from the Exodus to the Ptolemaic period. These later volumes were long delayed, but by 1974,

when the SIS was formed, revisionists were aware, from his earlier 'Theses', of some of his more important synchronisms in later eras, and his further volumes were eagerly awaited.”

Trevor Palmer describes the role of Velikovsky for the revision of the ancient Middle East chronology in such a way:

“Velikovsky concluded that the conventional chronology was incorrect. In his view, the Exodus took place around 1450BC, in line with biblical reckoning, and coincided with the end of the Middle Kingdom in Egypt. He regarded this as occurring not at the end of Dynasty XII, as in some schemes, but the end of Dynasty XIII, when Dudimose was on the throne. Dudimose was the Tutimaesus identified by Manetho as the last native pharaoh before the arrival of the Hyksos, whose kings were the main rulers of Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period, the first being Salitis (also called Shalek or Sheshi), founder of Dynasty XV.

Velikovsky believed that the Hyksos invaders were the Amalekites, whose confrontations with the departing Israelites were mentioned in *Exodus*. Manetho allocated 511 years to the rule of the Hyksos but the conventional chronology reduced that to around 200 years, partly because of constraints imposed by the supposed Sothic datings of Senusret III of the Middle Kingdom and Amenhotep I of the New.

Velikovsky doubled that allocation, placing the start of the 18th Dynasty, and hence the New Kingdom, at around 1050BC, 500 years later than generally supposed. That served two main purposes - it eliminated the Dark Ages which had been inserted into the histories of Greece and other countries on the basis of the conventional chronology of the New Kingdom and it allowed Thutmose III of the 18th Dynasty, known to have campaigned in the Holy Land, to be identified as the biblical Shishak, despoiler of the Temple of Jerusalem in the time of Rehoboam.

According to the detailed evidence of the Bubastite portal, the conquests of the traditional candidate, Shoshenq I, did not include Jerusalem or neighbouring cities, so he could *not* have been Shishak. A further consequence of placing the 18th Dynasty at this time was to allow the female pharaoh, Hatshepsut, to be the 'Queen of Sheba' who visited Solomon and to make Akhenaten a contemporary of Ahab of Israel and of Shalmaneser III of Assyria. Velikovsky claimed to have identified Ahab as an El-Amarna correspondent”

As we mentioned above not all ideas are today accepted by his followers but his role in starting the chronology debate is undisputable.

Conclusion

Let me start to conclude this short survey with the words which open our International scientific and popular-scientific interdisciplinary Internet magazine for sceptic and new chronology and critical historiography *HISTORY & CHRONOLOGY. Criticism. Shortening. Reconstruction:*

- Our main topics are chronology criticism and the revision of history on the basis of modern scientific research, the computer analysis of historical sources and the statistics of historical number sets, source criticism and historical falsifications, mistakes made by historians and false dating.
- We would like to know more about proofs (if such proofs exist) for statements of historians and the bases of their chronological dogmas. We have kept our natural distrust of the exactitude of historical descriptions, of the insufficient self-criticism of the historians and of their less than open behaviour concerning the full amount of existing problems of “historical science”.

A bridge between the Russian and the Western chronological revolution is today our main problem which must be solved. Heinsohn and other German researchers shortened the historical

time by about 2000 years in the case of Sumerians. Topper is shortening the history of Christianity by additional almost 1500 years as the Russians do that. So, 2000 and more years of shortening is today an acceptable or at least a disputable step for us, we are discussing that in the Western countries.

So which gap exists between the Russian idea that the full history was in reality playing in the last millennium (and this idea is accepted by many German researcher) and the models of Gunnar Heinsohn and Uwe Topper? I have a feeling that the researchers in Eastern Europe and around SIS are converging in the same tunnel. The question is, are they going in the same direction, will they meet in the middle and find a short chronology which fits all the critical ideas? It is a very complicated question but in any case we can try to do that, to manage this work through some contacts in the way that we can really meet together in the middle of the tunnel and not in different parts of the area.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Part 1.

Davidovits, Joseph, *The Pyramids. An Enigma Solved*, Saint-Quentin, 2001.

Davidovits, Joseph, *Ils ont bâti les Pyramides*, 2002.

Fomenko A.T., *SOME NEW EMPIRICO-STATISTICAL METHODS OF DATING AND THE ANALYSIS OF PRESENT GLOBAL CHRONOLOGY*. 1981. London, The British Library, Department of printed books. Cup. 918/87.

Fomenko A.T., *Mathematical Impressions*. American Mathematical Society, USA, 1990.

Fomenko A.T., Kalashnikov V.V., Nosovsky G.V. *Geometrical and Statistical Methods of Analysis of Star Configurations. Dating Ptolemy's Almagest*. - CRC-Press. 1993. USA.

Fomenko A.T., *EMPIRICO-STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF NARRATIVE MATERIAL AND ITS APPLICATIONS TO HISTORICAL DATING*, Kluwer Academic Publishers. 1994. The Netherlands.

Volume 1: *The Development of the Statistical Tools* (see also

http://dl9.ohshare.com/v/8718443/Fomenko_Empirico_Statistical_Analysis_vol1.djvu.html)

Volume 2: *The Analysis of Ancient and Medieval Records* (see also

http://s25.quicksharing.com/v/402162/Dating_Ptolomeys_Almagest.djvu.html).

A.T.Fomenko, G.V.Nosovsky, *NEW HYPOTHETICAL CHRONOLOGY AND CONCEPT OF THE ENGLISH HISTORY. BRITISH EMPIRE AS A DIRECT SUCCESSOR OF BYZANTINE-ROMAN EMPIRE. (SHORT SCHEME)*. New Tradition.

<http://www.revisedhistory.org/Investigation-eng-history.htm>

Fomenko A.T., *New Methods of Statistical Analysis of Historical Texts. Applications to Chronology. Antiquity in the Middle Ages. Greek and Bible History*. Vols. 1, 2, 3. - The Edwin Mellen Press. USA. Lewiston. Queenston. Lampeter, 1999.

Fomenko, Anatoly T., *History: Fiction or Science, Chronology 1*, Delamere Publishing, Paris-London-New York, 2003 (see also <http://media10.filewind.com/g.php?filepath=6194>).

Fomenko, Anatoly T., *History: Fiction or Science, Chronology 2.*, Delamere Publishing, Paris-London-New York, 2005 (see also http://dl9.ohshare.com/v/1595162/Fomenko_History_Fiction_or_Science_vol2.djvu.html and http://s25.quicksharing.com/v/6893077/Fomenko_History_Fiction_or_Science_vol2.djvu.html)

Anatoly T. Fomenko, Tatiana N. Fomenko, Wieslaw Z. Krawcewicz and Gleb V. Nosovsky *Zodiacs: Timeline of Egypt Cut in Stone*. A book's manuscript which can be downloaded from the page <http://www.math.ualberta.ca/~wkrawcew/downloads.htm>

Gabowitsch, Eugen, *AD Ages in Chaos: a Russian Point of View*. Proceedings of the SIS Conference: 'Ages Still in Chaos' Progress in revising ancient history since 1952 and possible ways forward. Royal National Hotel, London, 14th & 15th September 2002, pp. 91-95

Gabowitsch, Eugen, *Ages in Chaos*. In the book: Anatoly T. Fomenko, *History: Fiction or Science?*, Volume 2, Delamere Publishing, Paris/London/NY, S. xiv-xxii.

Grishin R., Melamed V., *THE MEDIEVAL EMPIRE OF THE ISRAELITES*. New Tradition Toronto, 2004.

James, Peter, *et al. Centuries of Darkness*, New Brunswick, NJ, 1991.

Kasparov Garry, *Preface for the book of Kesler and Davidenco*, pp. 5-22.

Kasparov Garry, *Mathematics of the Past*, New Tradition. <http://www.revisedhistory.org/view-garry-kasparov.htm>

Kessler Yaroslav, Davidenco Igor, *The book of civilization*, Moscow, EcoPress-2000, 2001.

Kessler Yaroslav, *CIVILIZING EVENTS AND CHRONOLOGY*, New Tradition. <http://www.revisedhistory.org/civilevents.htm> and <http://www.newchrono.ru/frame1/Publ/kes-popul-eng.html>.

Krawcewicz Wieslaw Z., Nosovskij Gleb V. and Zabreiko Petr P. *Investigation of the Correctness of the Historical Dating*. New Tradition. <http://www.revisedhistory.org/investigation-historical-dating.htm>

N.A. Morozov, *Christ. The History of Human Culture from the Standpoint of the Natural Sciences*. (In Russian), Moscow and Leningrad. 1926-1932, vols. 1-7. Second edition, Kraft&Lean, Moscow, 1997-1998, vols. 1-7 (8 books). Three additional volumes have been published 2000 (Kraft&Lean), 2002 and 2003 (Kraft+).

Tabov Jordan, *The Fall of Old Bulgaria*, <http://www.jesus1053.com/en/index.html> (line 08.06.00).

Volganov, Sergey, *The Dolmen Path. The Caucasus Dolmen's Anthology*, 1999

Part 2.

Aitchison J. Eric, *Ages Still In Chaos: Defending The Indefensible*, Proceedings of the SIS Conference: 'Ages Still in Chaos' Progress in revising ancient history since 1952 and possible ways forward. Royal National Hotel, London, 14th & 15th September 2002, pp. 38-45

Bimson, John J. and James, Peter J.: *Stiebing, BAR, and the Revised Chronology*, *Kronos*, vol. VII, no. 3 (1982)

Bimson John J., *Finding the Limits of Chronological Revision*, Proceedings of the SIS Conference: 'Ages Still in Chaos' Progress in revising ancient history since 1952 and possible ways forward. Royal National Hotel, London, 14th & 15th September 2002, pp. 73-78.

Blöss Christian, Niemitz Hans-Ulrich, *The Self-Deception of the C14 Method and Dendrochronology. How Dendrochronology Has Been Lulled into a False Sense of Security by an Urgently needed Auxiliary Science.* <http://www.jesus1053.com/en/index.html>

Crowe P John, *The Revision of Ancient History - A Perspective*, SIS Jubilee Conference, Easthampstead Park, Sept. 17-19th 1999, Internet Paper Revision no.1 March 2001 (<http://knowledge.co.uk/sis/ancient.htm>).

Dayton, J. *Minerals, Metals, Glazing and Man*. London 1978

Gabowitsch, Eugen: *Fomenko is not alone. A critique of chronology and revision of history in Western Europe* (In Russian). Appendix VI. In: G.V.Nosovsky, A.T.Fomenko, *Reconstruction of the World History. Investigation of the Years 1999-2000*. New Chronology, Business Express, Moscow, 2000, pp. 573-600.

Ginnenthal Charles, *Carl Sagan & Immanuel Velikovsky*

Ginnenthal Charles, *Climatology and Agronomy*, Proceedings of the SIS Conference: 'Ages Still in Chaos' Progress in revising ancient history since 1952 and possible ways forward. Royal National Hotel, London, 14th & 15th September 2002, pp. 65-72.

Ginnenthal Charles, *Pillars of the Past. History, Science, Technology as these Related to Chronology*, New York, 2003.

Greenberg Lewis M., *Ramesses II and Greek Archaic Sculpture* Proceedings of the SIS Conference: 'Ages Still in Chaos' Progress in revising ancient history since 1952 and possible ways forward. Royal National Hotel, London, 14th & 15th September 2002, pp. 61-64

Greenberg Lewis M., *The Lion Gate at Mycenae Revisited*, Proceedings of the SIS Conference: 'Ages Still in Chaos' Progress in revising ancient history since 1952 and possible ways forward. Royal National Hotel, London, 14th & 15th September 2002, pp. 53-60.

Heinsohn, Gunnar, *Ancient Near Eastern Chronology Revised*, The Velikovskian, vol. I, no. 1 (1993)

Heinsohn, Gunnar: *Did the Sumerians and the Akkadians Ever Exist?*, *AEON*, vol. I, no. 2 (1988)

Heinsohn, Gunnar: *Who were the Hyksos? Can archaeology and stratigraphy provide a solution to the 'enigma of world history'?* Proceedings of the Sesto Congresso Internazionale d Egittologia, vol. II (Torino, Italy 1993)

Palmer Trevor, *Introduction - Ages in Chaos? A Review of Developments in Ancient Chronology Since Velikovsky*, Proceedings of the SIS Conference: 'Ages Still in Chaos' Progress in revising ancient history since 1952 and possible ways forward. Royal National Hotel, London, 14th & 15th September 2002, pp. 2-15

Porter Robert M., *Evidence for Shortening Egyptian History*, Proceedings of the SIS Conference: 'Ages Still in Chaos' Progress in revising ancient history since 1952 and possible ways forward. Royal National Hotel, London, 14th & 15th September 2002, pp. 34-47

Rohl David, *A Testing Time*, Proceedings of the SIS Conference: 'Ages Still in Chaos' Progress in revising ancient history since 1952 and possible ways forward. Royal National Hotel, London, 14th & 15th September 2002, pp 46-52.

Rose, Lynn E.: *Current Issues in Catastrophism*, Proceedings of the Immanuel Velikovsky Centennial Celebration 1895-1985, Forest Hills, NY 1995.

Rose, Lynn E.: *Sun, Moon and Sothis*, Deerfield Beach, Fl. 1999.

Lynn E. Rose, *A Lowered Chronology for the Twelfth Dynasty*, The Velikovskian, vol. II, no. 4 (1994).

Stiebing, William H., Jr.: *Heinsohn's Revised Chronology*, AEON, vol. II, no. 5 (1991)

Sweeney Emmet J., *Velikovsky, Glasgow & Heinsohn Combined*, Proceedings of the SIS Conference: 'Ages Still in Chaos' Progress in revising ancient history since 1952 and possible ways forward. Royal National Hotel, London, 14th & 15th September 2002, pp. 80-90.

Topper, Uwe: *Die Grosse Aktion. Europas erfundene Geschichte. Die planmäßige Fälschung unserer Vergangenheit von der Antike bis zur Aufklärung*. Tübingen, 1998.

Part 3.

Baldauf, Robert: *Historie und Kritik, (Einige kritische Bemerkungen)*, Bd. I., Der Mönch von St. Gallen, Verlag der Dykschen Buchhandlung, Leipzig, 1903. Bd. IV. Das Altertum [Römer und Griechen] C. Metrik und Prosa, Friedrich Reinhardt, Universitätsbuchdruckerei, Basel, Mai 1902.

Manuel Frank E., *Isaac Newton Historian*, Cambridge, England, 1963.

Gabowitsch, Eugen: Newton als (neben Hardouin) geistiger Vater der Chronologiekritik und Geschichtsrekonstruktion. EFODON Synesis, Heft 6, Nov./Dez. 1999, 29-33.

Hardouin (Jean) in: Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada Europea-Americana. Tomo XXVII, 679-680.

Hardouin (Jean) in: Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste in alphabetischer Folge von genannten Schriftstellern bearbeitet und herausgegeben von J. S. Ersch und J. G. Gruber, Zweite section H-N. Herausgegeben von G. Hassel und W. Müller. Zweiter teil mit Kupfern und Karten, Leipzig, im Verlag von Johann Friedrich Gleditsch, 1828, pp. 260-263.

Kammeier, Wilhelm: *Die Fälschung der deutschen Geschichte*. Adolf Klein Verlag, Leipzig, 1935.

Kammeier, Wilhelm: *Neue Beweise für die Fälschung der deutschen Geschichte*. Adolf Klein Verlag, Leipzig, 1936.

Kammeier, Wilhelm: *Die Wahrheit über die Geschichte des Spätmittelalters*. Verlag für ganzheitliche Forschung, Wobbenbühl, 1979.

Kammeier, Wilhelm: *Die Fälschung der Geschichte des Urchristentums*, Bd. 1-4. Husum, 1981-82.

Newton, Isaac: *Abregé de la chronologie de I. Newton, fait par lui-même, et traduit sur le manuscrit Angloise [par Nicolas Feret]*. Paris, Cavelier, 1725.

Newton, Isaac: *The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended*. London, 1728.

Newton, Isaac: *La Chronologie des Ancien Royalmes Corrigée*. Martin u. a., Paris, 1728, 416 S.

Niemitz, Hans-Ulrich: Kammeier, kritisch gewürdigt. *Vorzeit-Fruhzeit-Gegenwart*, 3/4,1991, 92-107.

Stiebing, William H., Jr.: *Cosmic Catastrophism*, AEON, vol. II, no. 6 (May 1992)

Stiebing, William H., Jr.: *Velikovsky's Historical Revisions, The Universe and Its Origins*, S.F. Singer, ed. NY, 1990.

Topper, Uwe: *Isaac Newton verkürzte die griechische Geschichte um 300 Jahre*. EFODON Synesis, Heft 4, Juli/August 1999, 4-7.

Velikovsky, I [*Theses for the Reconstruction of Ancient History*](#), 1945. Access via the SIS Web site.

Velikovsky, I. *Worlds In Collision*, Sidgwick and Jackson, 1950

Velikovsky, I. *Ages In Chaos*. Sidgwick and Jackson, London, 1952.

Velikovsky, Immanuel: *Earth in Upheaval* (NY 1955)

Velikovsky, Immanuel: *Peoples of the Sea*. Sidgwick and Jackson, London. 1977.

Velikovsky, Immanuel: *Ramses II and His Time*. Sidgwick and Jackson, London, 1978