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E-book *USA Has Issues with Maps of 18th Century*, from the series *History: Fiction or Science?*, contains data, illustrations, charts and formulae containing irrefutable evidence of mathematical, statistical and astronomical nature. You may as well skip all of it during your first reading. Feel free to use them in your eventual discussions with the avid devotees of classical chronology. In fact, before reading this book, you have most probably been one of such devotees.

After reading *History: Fiction or Science?* you will develop a more critical attitude to the dominating historical discourse or even become its antagonist. You will be confronted with natural disbelief when you share what you’ve learned with others. Now you are very well armed in face of inevitable scepticism. This book contains enough solid evidence to silence any historian by the sheer power of facts and argumentation.

*History: Fiction or Science?* is the most explosive tractate on history ever written – however, every theory it contains, no matter how unorthodox, is backed by solid scientific data.

The dominating historical discourse in its current state was essentially crafted in the XVI century from a rather contradictory jumble of sources such as innumerable *copies* of ancient Latin and Greek manuscripts whose originals had *vanished* in the Dark Ages and the allegedly *irrefutable* proof offered by late mediaeval astronomers, resting upon the power of ecclesial authorities. Nearly all of its components are blatantly untrue!

For some of us, it shall possibly be quite disturbing to see the magnificent edifice of classical history to turn into an ominous simulacrum brooding over the snake pit of mediaeval politics. Twice so, in fact: the first seeing the legendary millenarian dust on the ancient marble turn into a mere layer of dirt – one that meticulous unprejudiced research can eventually remove. The second, and greater, attack of unease comes with
the awareness of just how many areas of human knowledge still trust the elephants, turtles and whales of the consensual chronology to support them. Nothing can remedy that except for an individual chronological revolution happening in the minds of a large enough number of people.
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American philosopher
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*Be wary of mathematiciens, particularly when they speak the truth.*
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*History repeats itself; that’s one of the things that’s wrong with history.*

Clarence Darrow

*Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past.*

George Orwell, *1984*
1. Map of the world as envisioned by the authors of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in the late XVIII century

1.1. The map of Europe as drawn in a copy of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* dating from 1771

The first section of the present chapter is primarily comprised of the materials and observations that were kindly brought to our attention by our readers; those are explained well by our reconstruction.

Let us turn to the fundamental edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* that dates from the end of the XVIII century ([1118]). It was published in 1771, consists of three large volumes and represents the most complete compilation of data from various scientific fields to that date. We must emphasise that the publication in question can be regarded as the summit of scientific knowledge in the XVIII century. Let us look into the geography section of the encyclopaedia. Among other things, it contains five geographical maps (of Europe, Asia, Africa, North America and South America, q.v. in figs. 12.1-12.5). These maps were compiled with the utmost care, accurately depicting continents, rivers, seas etc. We see a great many towns and cities – the authors of the Britannica had possessed detailed knowledge of the rather esoteric South American geography (see fig. 12.5). We see River Amazon, for instance, which runs through the wild jungle; getting there must have taken considerable efforts from the part of the cartographers. One has every reason to expect the authors of the encyclopaedia to be familiar with the map of Europe even better.
Fig. 12.1. A map of Europe from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (an XVIII century edition). Taken from [1118], Volume 2, pages 682-683. Plate LXXXVIII.
Fig. 12.2. A map of Asia from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (an XVIII century edition). Taken from [1118], Volume 2, pages 682-683. Plate LXXXIX.
Fig. 12.3. A map of Africa from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (an XVIII century edition). Taken from [1118], Volume 2, pages 682-683. Plate XC.
Fig. 12.4. A map of North America from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (an XVIII century edition). Taken from [1118], Volume 2, pages 682-683. Plate XCI.
What do we see on the map of Europe? First and foremost, let us take a look at the location of Novgorod on the map of Russia. It turns out that there is no such city anywhere on River Volkhov, which is where learned historians locate Novgorod the Great nowadays. We can see the neighbouring city of Pskov, Lake Ladoga and River Volkhov. We can also see St. Petersburg. However, Novgorod the Great is nowhere to be found. It is reckoned that Novgorod the Great had stood upon the banks of Lake Ilmen. The lake is there, but we see no city. One might suggest that the map had not been large enough for the name “Novgorod the Great” to be written thereupon – however, there is more than enough space, as one sees from the close-ins in figs. 12.6 and 12.7. Moreover, even the circle that could represent a city on the bank of Lake Ilmen is missing. The cartographers of the Britannica were therefore unaware of any significant
towns in these parts as recently as in the late XVIII century.

Fig. 12.6. Fragment of an XVIII century map of Europe showing the western part of Russia. Taken from [1118], Volume 2, pages 682-683. Plate LXXXVIII.

Fig. 12.7. Fragment of an XVIII century map of Europe where we see the environs of River Volkhov. We don’t see the city of Novgorod anywhere; however, there is a Novgorod to the south of Smolensk – the famous city of Novgorod-Severskiy, which exists until the present day. Taken from [1118], Volume 2, pages 682-683. Plate LXXXVIII.
However, the substantially less famous town of Novgorod-Severskiy is accurately represented on the map as Novgorod, right where one should expect it to be – to the south from Smolensk (see figs. 12.6 and 12.7). This town exists until the present day, under the very same place. We can therefore see that the cartographers of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* had been well aware of the Russian geography. However, they could not locate any city called Novgorod the Great on River Volkhov.

We are of the opinion that the above can imply one thing, and one thing only. There had still been nothing remotely resembling a large city anywhere near Lake Ilmen, even at the end of the XVIII century – nothing save a few faraway monasteries and villages. A more or less conspicuous town must have been founded in the late XVIII – early XIX century; later it became known as “the very same Novgorod the Great as mentioned in the chronicles”.

Let us now study the Holy Land, or the environs of Jerusalem, as drawn on this map. The actual words “Holy Land” can be found where one would expect them to be nowadays – the East coast of the Mediterranean, q.v. in fig. 12.1. However, the city of Jerusalem is not indicated in any way at all, unlike other, less famous, towns and cities, such as Gaza and Aleppo, as well as the “ancient” Tyre and Sydon. However, Jerusalem is strangely absent; moreover, we can neither find River Jordan, nor the famous Dead Sea (see the close-in in fig. 12.8). Once again, the “lack of space” cannot serve as a valid argument here; there is plenty of space on the map.
All of the above is very odd from the point of view of the Scaligerian history. Our reconstruction makes it perfectly obvious. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* of 1771 came out before the Egyptian campaign of Napoleon, whereas the Biblical names postdate this expedition (they were introduced in the early XIX century). Western Europeans of the early XIX century had simply been unfamiliar with the locale. However, this should be very odd from the Scaligerian viewpoint, since we are told that these parts had been the destination of the numerous crusades in the XI-XIV century, and that the European crusaders had visited them many a time, likewise a great many educated European visitors. There must be detailed descriptions of these parts in the numerous diaries and chronicles written by the European travellers. The environs of “Jerusalem in the Middle East” had presumably been known to the Westerners, complete with their geographical characteristics etc. The locations of the towns and the cities in the Holy Land – Jerusalem in particular – should be known perfectly well; this is perfectly self-explanatory. However, we witness nothing of the kind to have been the case even as recently as at the end of the XVIII century. The authors of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* know little about the Holy Land on the Eastern coast of the Mediterranean. This is easy enough to understand – according to our reconstruction, the “biblical places” only
replaced the small Arabic settlements in the modern Palestine after Napoleon’s campaign in the XIX century (see Chron6).

This map from the Britannica makes it even more obvious that no European had visited these parts before the XVIII century, and that the real crusades had had an altogether different itinerary and destination. The first military campaign of the Westerners to these parts had been the expedition of Napoleon.

1.2. The map of Asia as drawn in a copy of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* dating from 1771

Let us consider the next map from the Britannica (see fig. 12.2). It is a map of Asia, in particular – the Holy Land in the modern Palestine. We can already see Jerusalem; however, there is neither the Dead Sea, nor River Jordan anywhere in sight (see fig. 12.9). It is perfectly clear that the compilers of this map had known the geography of this part of the Middle East rather badly. Also let us pay attention to the fact that the south of Siberia is divided into the Independent Tartary in the West and the Chinese Tartary in the East; the latter borders with China, q.v. in fig. 12.2. We shall return to those later on.

![Fig. 12.9. Fragment of an XVIII century map of Asia with the Holy Land. Taken from [1118], Volume 2, pages 682-683. Plate LXXXIX.](image)

1.3. The map of Africa as drawn in a copy of the
Let us now consider the map of Africa from the same edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica (1771). The thing that instantly draws our attention is the fact that the whole south of the Atlantic Ocean is called “Ethiopian Ocean”; however, the modern Ethiopia is called Abyssinia, whereas the name Ethiopia is drawn alongside the equator. The ocean that separates Africa and South America is called the Ethiopian Ocean. One gets the impression that the name Ethiopia must have also meant something radically different from the modern Ethiopia. Let us enquire whether the name Ethiopia could also have applied to South America? That would explain why the South Atlantic had been known as the Ethiopian Ocean. The name America may be of a latter origin, dating from the XVII century the earliest, q.v. in Chron6. Let us point out that the geographical table from [1118], Volume 2, page 683 refers to Ethiopia as to an African country, and even tells us its area – quite formidable, amounting to 1,200,000 square miles, or roughly equal to the area of China from the same table. However, it is quite odd that the authors of the Encyclopaedia Britannica neither know the name of the Ethiopian capital, nor its geographical disposition in relation to London; the respective table cells are left empty. We can clearly see that the XVIII century Europeans had certain problems with Ethiopia.

We see other interesting names on the XVIII century map of Africa – for instance, the city of Girge on the Nile (to the south from Cairo, q.v. in fig. 12.10). The name must be another version of Georgia. The very same African city is called Jirje on the map of Asia (fig. 12.9). The name is very likely a derivative of “Youri”. Nowadays we find the “unbelievably ancient” Luxor and Thebes here, whose age is measured in many millennia, relics of the Pharaohs’ supreme power. However, even the modern maps have the town and the oasis of Harga drawn some 200 kilometres to the West of Luxor – also a possible derivative of “Gyurgiy” or “Youri”.
There are many more names on the XVIII century map of Africa that strike us as surprising today. We see the name Gorham further south, on the west of the Nile’s source, and the name Gaoga right next to it (repeated twice). The two must stand for Gourkhan (Georgiy-Khan) and Gog, or Goga – other versions of the same name, Georgiy (fig. 12.10). You won’t find these names anywhere on the modern map of Africa; however, they had still been here in the XVIII century.

Apparently, we encounter even more traces testifying to the fact that this region had once been part of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, founded in the XIV century by the historical personality known as St. George and Genghis-Khan.

1.4. The map of North America as drawn in a copy of the Encyclopaedia Britannica dating from 1771

The most conspicuous thing about this map is the fact that it doesn’t contain any information about the North-West of the American continent.
and its geography (see fig. 12.4). This is the part adjacent to Russia; we find Alaska here, in particular. We see that the Europeans had still possessed no knowledge of these lands in the end of the XVIII century, although the other parts of North America had already been known to them well. The explanation offered by our reconstruction is that the territories in question had still belonged to Russia, or the Horde, back then, remaining independent from the Romanovs. Russian Alaska was the last remnant of these lands in the XIX-XX century. However, according to map, the remnants of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire had covered a much larger part of land in the XVIII century, including all of the modern Canada to the West from the Hudson Bay, and a part of the Northern United States (see fig. 12.4). By the way, the name Canada (or “New France”, as the map has it) is also present upon the XVIII century map of North America; however, it is only applied to the environs of the Great Lakes in the South-East of the modern Canada – a small part of the latter, in other words (see fig. 12.4).

If these parts had indeed been inhabited by the “wild tribes of Native Americans”, as modern historians are trying to convince us, these great territories rich in all kinds of natural resources would hardly remain completely unknown to the European cartographers as late as in the end of the XVIII century. Could the tribes of Native Americans have stopped the European ships from navigating through the coastal waters of the north-western part of the American continent and drawing the long continental coastline? This appears unlikely; we are of the opinion that these territories had still been occupied by a strong nation, the last remnant of the enormous Horde, or Russia, which had simply resisted all attempts of the foreigners to penetrate its borders, likewise Japan in that epoch.

1.5. The Muscovite Tartary of the XVIII century with its capital in Tobolsk

The “Geography” section of the 1771 *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is
concluded by a table listing all the countries known to its authors, indicating their area, capitals, distance from London and respective time zones ([1118], pages 682-684; see figs. 12.11 and 12.12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division and subdivision</th>
<th>Square miles</th>
<th>Capital cities</th>
<th>Distance and bearing from</th>
<th>Time difference from London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distance and bearing from London</td>
<td>Time difference from London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Italy</td>
<td>76,576</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>0 52 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Germany</td>
<td>131,631</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1 5 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Holland</td>
<td>9,540</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0 18 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Denmark</td>
<td>162,001</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>0 50 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sweden</td>
<td>226,715</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1 10 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Norway</td>
<td>1,102,485</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>2 2 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Poland</td>
<td>326,041</td>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>1 22 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Turkey in Europe</td>
<td>212,360</td>
<td>Constantinople</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1 56 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Turkey in Asia</td>
<td>516,717</td>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>1 38 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Arabia</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>1 10 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Persia</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>Isfahan</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>3 21 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. India</td>
<td>1,857,500</td>
<td>Agra</td>
<td>3730</td>
<td>1 15 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. China</td>
<td>1,105,090</td>
<td>Pekin</td>
<td>4530</td>
<td>7 24 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ottoman Empire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Egypt</td>
<td>644,000</td>
<td>Chiosan</td>
<td>4480</td>
<td>3 4 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Barbary</td>
<td>728,049</td>
<td>Samarcand</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>4 26 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Abyssinia</td>
<td>3,050,000</td>
<td>Teloshy</td>
<td>2412</td>
<td>4 10 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>1,385,700</td>
<td>Telosha</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1 10 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>66,400</td>
<td>Timbucto</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1 26 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Birguia</td>
<td>3590</td>
<td>2 36 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>11,180</td>
<td>Fez and Morocco</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>0 21 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>100,600</td>
<td>Fez and Morocco</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>0 30 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>143,600</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>0 40 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>0 18 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>0 13 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>58,400</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>0 39 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>0 10 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>0 56 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>1,026,000</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>0 24 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0 38 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>49,400</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0 20 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>172,800</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0 43 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>38,400</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1 0 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>3750</td>
<td>0 58 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>0 58 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1 18 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>200,300</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>4260</td>
<td>1 44 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1 4 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2 17 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>2 38 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>2 40 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1 13 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>184,400</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1 33 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5 21 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5 21 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Senegal and Mellema</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>Teflet and Segelma</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5 21 W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is just as surprising as it is noteworthy that the authors appear to be perceiving the Russian Empire as the sum of several countries – namely, Russia, with a capital in St. Petersburg and an area of 1,103,458 square miles, Muscovite Tartary with a capital in Tobolsk and thrice as large at 3,050,000 square miles ([1118], Volume 2, page 683; see fig. 12.13).

Muscovite Tartary is the largest country in the world, according to the Encyclopaedia Britannica. All the other countries are three times smaller at least. Moreover, we see Independent Tartary with a capital in Samarkand ([1118], Volume 2, page 683), and Chinese Tartary with a capital in Chinuan. Their respective areas are 778,290 and 644,000 square miles.
Fig. 12.13. Fragment of the table listing Tartaries and their capitals. Encyclopaedia Britannica, XVIII century. Taken from [1118], Volume 2, page 683.

What could all of the above indicate? Could it be that the entire Siberia had remained independent from the Romanovs up until the defeat of Pougachev in 1775? Actually, there appear to have been several independent states here, the largest of them with its capital in the Siberian city of Tobolsk. In this case, the famous war against Pougachev had not been a series of punitive actions directed against a spontaneous “peasant revolt”, as we are being told by the modern historians. Apparently, the Romanovs waged a real war against the last independent remnant of the Horde in the East of the Russian Empire. The Romanovs had no access to Siberia prior to winning the war against Pougachev; the Horde would naturally guard its borders well.

A propos, this is when the Romanovs had started to draw the names of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire’s provinces on the map of Russia, such as Perm and Vyatka, well familiar to us from the ancient Russian history (see Chron4, Chapter 14:20). The mediaeval Perm identifies as Germany, whereas the mediaeval Vyatka had been in Italy (the name Vatican is a possible derivative – cf. Batu-Khan). These names of the old Imperial provinces had been present in the mediaeval Russian coat of arms.

However, after the collapse of the Empire, the Romanovs started to distort and re-write the history of Russia. One of their objectives had been to remove these names from the geography of the Western Europe and
relocate them to some distant province in the East. This was accomplished immediately after the victory over Pougachev. As we demonstrated, the Romanovs only started to change the coats of arms of the Russian cities and provinces in the second half of the XVIII century – the year of 1781 in particular (see more in Chron4, Chapter 10:2 and Chron4, Chapter 14:20). As we are beginning to realise, these changes were instigated six years after the victory over Pougachev – the last independent Czar of the Horde, or the military leader of the Muscovite Tartary with its capital in the Siberian Tobolsk.

Fig. 12.14. French map of the Eurasia dating from the XVIII century. In this map Muscovite Tartary begins from the middle of the Volga, right next to Nizhniy Novgorod. Taken from [1018].
2. The war against Pougachev as the last war against the Horde. Muscovite Tartary divided between the Romanovs and the United States, the former claiming Siberia and the latter, half of the North American continent. The naissance of the USA in 1776

2.1. The great divide and its concealment from history

2.1.1. Muscovite Tartary

Above we mention the claim made by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in 1771 that initially strikes us as very odd nowadays, namely, that nearly all of Siberia had still constituted an independent state with a capital in Tobolsk at the end of the XVIII century ([1118], Volume 2, pages 682-684; see also figs. 12.15 and 12.16). We can see that the Muscovite Tartary started near the middle of the Volga, or Nizhniy Novgorod; Moscow had therefore been close to the border of the Muscovite Tartary. The capital of the latter had been in Tobolsk, whose name is underlined and given as “Tobol” – very close to the Biblical version, or Thubal, as in “Rosh, Meshech and Thubal”, (Ross, Moscow and Tobol, q.v. above).
Fig. 12.15. First fragment of the XVIII century French map. Taken from [1018].
What could have become of this gigantic state? The very question makes us notice a great many facts that indicate the existence of a huge independent nation up until the end of the XVIII century, and novel interpretations of even more historical facts. This nation was erased from world history in the early XIX century, as if it had never existed. According to the maps of the XVIII century, Muscovite Tartary had remained beyond the reach of the Europeans for the most part.

However, the situation changes at the end of the XVIII century. A study of the epoch’s geographical maps tells us about the rapid conquest of these lands that started around that time. It proceeded from two directions at the same time – the army of the Romanovs had entered the Russian Siberia, which had belonged to the Horde, and the Far East, while the army of the United States had been given access to the north-western part of North America, which had also belonged to the Horde until that epoch. This part
had been enormous – from California in the Southwest to the middle of the continent in the East. The vast terra incognita finally disappeared from the maps of the world around the same time as the names “Great Tartary” and “Muscovite Tartary” disappeared from the maps of Siberia.

What happened at the end of the XVIII century? What we found out about the history of Russia (aka The Horde) above makes the answer clear enough. The last military conflict between Europe and the Horde can be dated to the late XVIII century; the Romanovs act as the allies of the Western Europe. This leads us to an altogether new viewpoint on the “revolt of the peasants and the Cossacks led by Pougachev” of 1773-1775.

2.1.2. The war between the Romanovs and “Pougachev” as the war against the enormous Muscovite Tartary

Apparently, the famous war against Pougachev of 1773-1775 had not been a mere series of punitive actions “a revolt of the Cossacks and the peasants”, as we are told nowadays. It had been a very real war fought by the Romanovs against the last independent Cossack state of Russia – Muscovite Tartary, whose capital had been in the Siberian city of Tobolsk, according to the 1771 century edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. Fortunately enough, this particular edition of the Encyclopaedia predates the war with Pougachev by a mere two years; had its publication been delayed by two or three years, it would be much harder to obtain veracious information on this matter nowadays.

It appears that the Romanovs had only got access to the vast territories of the Siberia after winning the war with Pougachev, or Tobolsk (reflected in the Bible as Thubal). The Horde had refused them any access to Siberia previously.

The United States had no access to the Western half of the North American continent prior to this, and started to colonise it as rapidly as they could. However, the Romanovs must have led an active expansion themselves, since they managed to settle in Alaska, which is adjacent to
Siberia. Keeping it turned out an impossibility, and so they were forced to hand it over to the Americans for a token payment. It appears that the Romanovs were incapable of controlling the large territories beyond the Bering Strait; one must think that the Russian population of the North America had been staunchly anti-Romanovian, regarding the Romanovs as the Western invaders who conquered their homeland, the Muscovite Tartary.

This is how the share-out of the Muscovite Tartary ended – as late as in the XIX century. It is amazing how this “feast of the victors” never made its way into any history textbook, despite the fact that we have plentiful evidence that the share-out in question has indeed taken place, as we shall be telling the reader below.

By the way, the Britannica reports the existence of another “Tartar” state in the XVIII century – Independent Tartary with a capital in Samarqand ([1118], Volume 2, pages 682-684). As we are beginning to realise, it had been yet another remnant of the Horde that existed as a single empire in the XIV-XVI century. The fate of this state is known, unlike that of the Muscovite Tartary – the Romanovs conquered it in the middle of the XIX century. We are referring to the so-called “conquest of Central Asia”, as it is evasively called in the modern textbooks. The conquest had been very violent, and the name Independent Tartary disappeared from the maps forever. It is still known to us under the very neutral alias of “Central Asia”. Samarqand, the capital of the Independent Tartary, was taken by the Romanovian troops in 1868 ([183], Volume 3, page 309). The entire war lasted four years (1864-1868).

2.2. North America on the maps of the XVII-XVIII century. The Europeans had remained ignorant of the geography of the American West and Southwest until the defeat of “Pougachev”. The gigantic terra incognita and the “insular” nature of the Californian peninsula.
Let us return to the epoch of the XVIII century and consider the representations of North America and Siberia on the maps of the XVIII century, before the defeat of Pougachev in 1773-1775. It turns out that the Western part of the North American continent is altogether absent from these maps. The geography of the American Northwest had remained a mystery for the European cartographers of the epoch – they didn’t even know whether or not there was a strait between the American continent and Siberia. It is very odd indeed that the American government had shown no interest in the neighbouring territories until the late XVIII – early XIX century, when it did develop such an interest all of a sudden, and started a very rapid colonization. Could it be owing to the fact that the territory in question became “no man’s land” legally, and thus needed to be colonised as quickly as humanly possible, lest the Romanovs should seize it themselves from the West.

Let us turn to the maps of North America, starting with the Britannica map of 1771, which had accounted for the latest advances of the epoch’s geographical science. Once again, bear in mind that we are talking about the very end of the XVIII century, the epoch immediately predating the war against Pougachev. The full map is presented above in fig. 12.4. Fig. 12.17 is a close-in of its fragments, wherein we see that the entire North-West of the American is a single blank spot adjacent to the ocean – the coastline is altogether absent. This can only mean that no European ship had approached these shores before 1771; a single voyage would suffice for the cartographers to get a rough idea of what the coast had looked like. Yet we are told that the Russian Alaska had been owned by the Romanovs back in the day. Had this been the case, the European maps would naturally depict the coastline of the American Northwest. We see the most peculiar “Parts Undiscovered” instead, q.v. in fig. 12.17.
Fig. 12.17. Close-in of a fragment of the map from the 1771 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* with North America. We see a huge white spot that covers most of the North American continent. Taken from [1118], Volume 2, pages 682-683. Plate XCI.

Let us turn to another English map; this one was published earlier, in 1720 or later, and compiled in London ([1160], pages 170-171; see fig. 12.18). Once again, we see a large part of the North American continent drawn as a blank spot with the legend “Parts Unknown”. One must notice the fact this map depicts the Californian peninsula as an island, which means that the Horde had prohibited Europeans entry to this part of the world in the early XVIII – before the “revolt of Pougachev”.
Fig. 12.18. Fragment of the map of North America compiled in London in 1720 or later ([1160]), page 171. Taken from [1160], page 170. The entire American North-West is a huge white spot; the Californian peninsula is erroneously drawn as an island.

We see the same to be the case with a French map of 1688 (see fig. 12.19). The Californian peninsula is drawn as an island once again – incorrectly, that is. What could this possibly mean? A simple thing – the coastline of North America had still remained unknown to the Europeans; the latter were denied access to these lands, hence their ignorance of the fact that the peninsula joins the continent somewhat further to the north.
Fig. 12.19. French map of North America compiled in 1688. Once again, California is misrepresented as an island. Taken from [1160], pages 152 and 153.

Another example can be seen in fig. 12.20-12.21. The map in question is of a French origin and dates from 1656 the earliest (see [1160], pages 152 and 153). We see the same error once again – California drawn as an island, the entire American Northwest being a blank spot.
Fig. 12.20-12.21. French map of the XVII century (1656 or later). The entire North-West of America is a huge white spot. California is incorrectly depicted as an island. Taken from [1160], pages 152 and 153.

Let us proceed. In figs. 12.22 and 12.23 we see a French map dating from 1634. Once again, we see the American Northwest blank, and California misrepresented as an island.
Fig. 12.22. French map of 1633 (Carte Universelle Hydrographique. Jean Guerard. Pilote et Hydrographe à Dieppe, 1634). California is erroneously drawn as an island. Published in the “L’Art du Voyage” calendar of 1992 published by Air France.

Fig. 12.23. Fragment of a French map dating from 1634. The Californian peninsula is misrepresented as an island.

It goes on and on like this – there were too many such maps made in the
XVII-XVIII century. One might arrive at the following conclusion: the Western part of the North American continent (before the war with Pougachev in 1773-1775) had belonged to the Muscovite Tartary, whose capital had been in Tobolsk. Europeans weren’t allowed entry here; this circumstance became reflected in the maps of that epoch, whereupon we find huge blank spots and the fantasy island of California, with only the southern part known. The very name California might have initially meant, “Land of the Caliph”. Let us remind the reader that, according to our reconstruction, Batu-Khan, the great conqueror also known to us as Ivan Kalita (Caliph) had been the first Caliph of Russia and the Horde. He is one of the founders of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire.

Let us recollect the mediaeval Japan behaving in a manner similar to the Muscovite Tartary – it had apparently been yet another part of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. Japan had also refused entry to the foreigners up until the 1860’s, which might have reflected some general policy of the local rulers. The Czars, or Khans of these “Mongolian” states, the last remnants of the Horde, had been hostile towards the Europeans, regarding them as enemies of the defunct Great Empire, which they must have still identified themselves with. It appears that there had been close ties between Japan and Muscovite Tartary up until the late XVIII century. Japan segregated after the decomposition of the latter nation in 1773-1775 (the defeat of Pougachev).

Europeans (the Dutch) and Americans had only managed to force their entry to Japan at the end of the XIX century; the wave of the “progressive process of liberation” had only reached these parts in an epoch this recent.

2.3. North America on the maps presumably dating from the XV-XVI century. The latter contain more correct information about America than the maps that are supposed to postdate them.

Let us return to the maps of America – the ones dating from the alleged
XV-XVI century this time, in order to see how the European cartographers of the alleged XVI century had drawn the very same North America.

One must expect their knowledge of America in general, let alone the North American continent, to be much worse. However, this isn’t the case – it is suggested that the European cartographers of the alleged XVI century had possessed a much better knowledge of North America and its geography than their colleagues of the XVII-XVIII century. This amazing knowledge is by no means recorded on rare individual maps that had jumped ahead of their time and fell into oblivion afterwards.

It turns out that the famous maps of Abraham Ortelius and Gerhard Mercator, dating from the alleged XVI century, and widely used in the 200 years to follow, according to historians, depict North America perfectly well.

These maps are very well known; we represent them in figs. 12.24-12.27. As we can see, these maps of the alleged XVI century are much better than the maps of the XVIII century, and much more precise. They are even better than the 1771 map from the Encyclopaedia Britannica! Could the authors of the Britannica have unexpectedly become ignoramuses, considering the prior publication of such excellent maps in the alleged XVI century? Bear in mind that both Ortelius and Mercator draw California correctly, as a peninsula. We see the same to be the case on the map of Hondius, allegedly dating from 1606. California is drawn correctly (see figs. 12.28 and 12.29).
Fig. 12.24. A map by Abraham Ortelius allegedly dating from 1579. North America is drawn a great deal more accurately here than what we see on the maps drawn by much later cartographers of the late XVIII century. The Californian peninsula is drawn correctly. Taken from [1009], page 81.

Fig. 12.25. A fragment of the map by Abraham Ortelius where the Californian peninsula is drawn correctly. Taken from [1009], page 81.
Fig. 12.26. A map by Gerhard Mercator allegedly dating from 1595. North America is depicted excellently – the Californian peninsula is drawn correctly, and the coastline is drawn perfectly well, likewise the boundaries of North America and Asia. Taken from [1009], page 96.
Fig. 12.27. A fragment of Mercator’s map with correctly drawn Californian peninsula. Taken from [1009], page 96.

Fig. 12.28. Luxurius map by Jodocus Hondius allegedly dating from 1606. Taken from
It is therefore implied that Hondius had already possessed a much better knowledge of the North American geography in the very beginning of the XVII century. He had no doubts about California being a peninsula, and draws the Bering Strait correctly. He knows a great many cities, towns and other places all across the West coast of the North America, without any blank spots! This is presumably happening in 1606.

We are being told that the European cartographers shall forget all the abovementioned data a mere 100 years later, in the XVII-XVIII century, and get a multitude of misconceptions into their heads, such as the insular nation of California. Isn’t this highly suspicious?

Moreover, Ortelius, Mercator, Hondius and many other cartographers of the alleged XVI – early XVII century already know about the strait separating America and Asia, while the learned historians are telling us that later cartographers of the XVII-XVIII century lost all knowledge of these facts, and “rediscover” the Bering Strait a great while later, likewise many other geographical locations in North America.

We believe everything to be perfectly clear – all these excellent maps of the alleged XVI century are forgeries made in the XIX century, the epoch when the multiple volumes of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* had already stood upon library shelves for some time. Some parts of the maps were drawn in the “old manner”, but the most important details were copied
from the already available XIX century maps. The artwork was naturally lavish in luxury, to make it worthy of the “ancients”.

A higher cost might well have been seen as another objective – one must expect “original ancient maps” found in dusty European archives to be expensive.

Let us now consider the XVIII century map of Siberia. We already reproduced one such map in fig. 0.6 (Part 1). The entire Siberia to the East of the Ural is called Great Tartary. The name becomes understandable these days – there had once been a gigantic state constituted by the former Eastern part of the Horde, or Russia, and known under that name.

Let us cite yet another XVIII century map (see figs. 12.30, 12.31 and 12.32). It is German, from Nuremberg, and published in 1786. We see the name Russia (Russland) curved in such a manner that it does not reach beyond the Ural mountains, although it may well have been more straight, which would have been more natural if Siberia had belonged to the Romanovs in the XVIII century. However, Siberia is divided into two large states, one of them called “Gouvernement Tobolsk” and the other – “Gouvernement Irkutzk”. The latter name covers the entire East Siberia and reaches the Sakhalin Island in the North.
Fig. 12.30. German map of Russia and the Great Tartary. The French legend at the top of the map is as follows: Carte de l’Empire de Russie & de la Grande Tartarie dressée avec soin par F. L. Gussefeld & publiée par les Herit de Homann, l’an 1786. Left part of the map.
2.4. The war against Pougachev in the Romanovian rendition. The futile attempts of A. S. Pushkin to get access to the archives that contained historical materials pertaining to the “War against Pougachev”
And so it turns out that a tremendous (largest in the world, according to the 1771 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*) independent nation had existed up until the end of the XVIII century, its capital being in Tobolsk (the Biblical Thubal), and its lands spanning Siberia and a large part of North America. This nation was conquered after the victory over Pougachev. Let us study the war against Pougachev as reflected in the Romanovian rendition of the Russian history. First and foremost, the files containing the materials of the Yemelyan Pougachev case had still been considered classified information in 1833, according to A. S. Pushkin ([709], page 661). The reader might recollect that Pushkin had written a biography of Pougachev, wherein he collected “everything the government had divulged, as well as the foreign sources that struck me as veracious and contained references to Pougachev” ([709], page 661). However, A. S. Pushkin had only managed to gather enough materials for a relatively small publication – his biography occupies a mere 36 pages in [709]. The author had apparently been aware that this work of his was anything but complete, despite his attempts to gather all the materials he could find. He tells us the following: “Future historians who shall receive the permission to study the Pougachev files shall find it easy to expand and correct my work” ([709], page 661).

The general impression we get from the history of Pougachev’s “revolt” in its Romanovian rendition (Pushkin’s biography in particular) is as follows. The regular army of Catherine II (The Great) defeat unorganised crowds of Pougachev’s minions, presumably without much effort. Pougachev begins to flee; however, he “flees” towards Moscow, for some reason. We are told that “the mutineers were fought by Mikhailson alone, who had chased Pougachev’s militia into the mountains, putting them to complete rout” ([183], Volume 3, page 125). After this “rout”, Pougachev takes Kazan. Further also: “Mikhelson was approaching Kazan. Pougachev sent his troops towards him, but was forced to retreat towards Kazan. Another battle was fought here; Pougachev’s army was crushed completely” ([183], Volume 3, page 125). What does the “defeated”
Pougachev do? “Pougachev crossed the Volga and turned towards Nizhniy Novgorod, with the objective of reaching Moscow eventually. The fact that the mutineers were moving in this direction horrified Moscow as well as Nizhniy Novgorod. The Empress had decided to lead the army herself in order to save Moscow and Russia; however, she was talked out of it… The Turkish campaign had been over by that time; Souvorov had returned, and was put in charge of the army sent against the mutineers” ([183], Volume 3, page 125).

E. P. Savelyev, the well-known author of a historiographical work about the Don army, tells us about “14 Don regiments of the regular army sent against Pougachev’s rebels” ([757], page 428).

Even the heavily edited Romanovic version of history makes it obvious that the “suppression of the mutiny” required the participation of the regular army, led by A. V. Souvorov in person – the military commander-in-chief of the Romanovic army (see [183], Volume 3, page 125). This is easy to understand – we have before us the records of a civil war, and not a mere punitive campaign against rebellious peasants. There were large professional armies involved from either side, complete with heavy cavalry and artillery.

By the way, the Ural factories were on the side of Pougachev, and are known to have cast cannons for him. According to the Romanovic version, the Ural workers “rebelled” and joined Pougachev ([183], Volume 3, page 125). However, the real situation must have been different – the Ural factories had simply belonged to the Muscovite Tartary back in the day, whose army was led by Pougachev. Little wonder that the Siberian manufacturers of weapons had served his ends.

The Romanovic version of history suggests that Pougachev had illegitimately proclaimed himself Czar Pyotr Fyodorovich, or Peter III Romanov ([183], Volume 3, page 126; see also [709], page 687). Pougachev issued royal edicts as he entered conquered cities ([183], Volume 3, page 126). Whenever Pougachev entered a city, he would be met by the clergy and the merchant guild as well as the simple townsfolk.
For instance, “on 27 July Pougachev entered Saransk… He was received by the townsfolk, the clergy and the merchants alike… Pougachev had approached Penza … the townsfolk had received him, bending their knees, carrying icons and loaves of bread as tokens of welcome and respect” ([709], page 690). Further also: “In Saransk, Pougachev was received by Archimandrite Alexander, who had carried a cross and the Gospel; the latter mentioned Czarina Oustinia Petrovna in his prayers during church service that day” ([709], page 690). The Archimandrite mentions another Czarina – not Catherine II! She must have been the Czarina of Muscovite Tartary.

Pushkin is brought to the following conclusion: “The regular townsfolk supported Pougachev, likewise the clergy, all the way up to the archimandrites and the archbishops” ([709], page 697).

It is most likely that the real name of the Czar, or Khan of Tobolsk, remains unknown to us today; the name Pougachev must be an invention of the Romanovian historians. Alternatively, they may have chosen a simple Cossack with this eloquent a name – it is plainly visible that “Pougachev” translates as “pougach” or “pougalo” – “scare”, “scarecrow” etc. This is how the Romanovs chose a “fitting name” for Czar Dmitriy Ivanovich – also an “impostor”, according to their version. He received the “surname” Otrepyev – translating as “otrebye”, or “scum”. This was obviously done in order to compromise the people that had claimed the throne as their own in every which way possible, making them look and sound like “obvious impostors”. The above is easy enough to see as a psychological method of an experienced propaganda team.

As a matter of fact, A. S. Pushkin reports that the Yaik Cossacks who had fought for Pougachev used to claim that “a certain Pougachev had indeed been a member of their party; however, he had nothing in common with Czar Peter III [the name Peter III was obviously introduced by A. S. Pushkin himself – Auth.], their liege and leader” ([709], page 694). In other words, the Yaik Cossacks did not consider Pougachev, who had been executed by the Romanovs, their leader, referring to a certain Czar
instead. We are unlikely to ever identify the latter using the Romanovian version of the events. The Romanovs were obviously striving to make the whole world believe that there can be no lawful Czars in Russia but themselves.

By the way, A. S. Pushkin reports that Pougachev answered Panin’s question: “How dare you call yourself Czar?” evasively, claiming that somebody else had been Czar ([709], page 694). The scenario is perfectly easy to understand – the Romanovs were trying to present their war with the Muscovite Tartary as a simple suppression of a “peasant uprising”; a simple Cossack was executed in Moscow for this purpose, someone who had been supposed to represent the impostor, so as to make it obvious to everyone that the Cossack in question doesn’t remotely resemble a Czar.

In fig. 12.33 we reproduce a rare old “portrait of Pougachev written over that of Catherine II” (Anonymous XVIII century artist, State Museum of History; see [331], Volume 1, page 351).

![Fig. 12.33. A portrait of Pougachev painted in the XVIII century over the portrait of Empress Catherine II. The artist is unknown. Kept in The State Museum of History, Moscow. Taken from [331], Volume 1, page 351.](image_url)
2.5. Rapid expansion of the territory governed by the Romanovs after their victory over “Pougachev”

According to a number of the XVIII century maps, the border of Muscovite Tartary had been very close to Moscow. This must have troubled the Romanovs a great deal, and so Peter the Great made the only right decision in this situation – to transfer the capital further away, to the marshy banks of the Gulf of Finland. This is where the new capital, St. Petersburg, had been built at the order of Peter the Great. The Romanovs found this place convenient for a variety of reasons. Firstly, the new capital was at a distance from the Horde, or Muscovite Tartary, and would be harder for the latter to reach. Furthermore, should the Horde attack, it would be easier to escape to the West from St. Petersburg than from Moscow – one could virtually board a ship from the porch of one’s palace. The Romanovs obviously didn’t fear an invasion from the West, the historical homeland of the pro-Western House of the Romanovs.

The official Romanovian explanation of the motivation behind the transfer of the Russian capital to St. Petersburg is anything but convincing – Peter the Great had presumably required “an outlet to Europe” to facilitate trade. However, one could easily trade from the banks of the Gulf of Finland without transferring the capital here; a large seaport would suffice for that purpose. Why make it capital? The “outlet” thesis is becoming more understandable to us now – as we have mentioned, the Romanovs had usurped the Russian throne, and they required this “outlet” to maintain their Western contacts and family ties; they also needed to have an escape option in case of hostile military action from the part of their enfeebled yet mortally dangerous neighbour – the Horde, or Muscovite Tartary, which had been the largest country in the world up until the XVIII century, as the 1771 edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica is happy to report ([1118], Volume 2, pages 682-684).

This might give us a better understanding of just why the Romanovs would want to flee the warm continental Moscow and to transfer the
capital to the cold St. Petersburg in the swampy coastal marshlands, which was also periodically afflicted by disastrous floods.

In fig. 12.34 one sees the title page of the Britannica’s second volume, which contains the abovementioned important data about the European concept of geography in 1771. We must point out that many geographical inconsistencies of the old maps are seen instantly; however, their true reason only becomes clear once we manage to formulate the question of whether the maps of the alleged XV-XVI century could be misdated by modern scientists.

![Encyclopaedia Britannica](image)

**Fig. 12.34.** The title page of the second volume of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (published in 1771) that contains important geographical maps of Eurasia, Africa and America. Taken from [1118], Volume 2.

Another interesting fact is as follows: Siberia only became a popular deportation destination after the victory of the Romanovs over Pougachev – the very end of the XVIII century, that is. The exiles were sent to the so-called Solovki (a popular name of the Solovetskiye Islands), and to the North in general – not the East. Siberian exiles become a tradition somewhat later; in particular, Tobolsk became a popular exile destination
in 1790, when A. N. Radishchev had been sent there ([797], page 1092; also [185], page 467). After that, Tobolsk became the Russian Australia – nearly every felon would be sent there (the Decembrists, for instance; see [185], page 467). However, there had been no Tobolsk exiles recorded in history before 1790; the enormous state system of Siberian exiles and penitentiaries was created in the XIX century.

Everything becomes clear – the Romanovs could not exile anyone to Siberia before the end of the XVIII century, because they had not owned the land – Siberia had been part of the Muscovite Tartary, the last remnant of the Horde and a Russian state that had been hostile towards the Romanovs. The latter had to defeat “Pougachev” in order to obtain access to Siberia and the Pacific coast in the Far East.

As we mentioned above, the Romanovs only began the process of distributing the names of the former Russian provinces (whole countries, in fact, once parts of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, q.v. in Chron4, Chapter 13:20) across the new maps of Russia. Furthermore, the Romanovs started to change the coats of arms of the Russian cities and provinces after the defeat of “Pougachev” and not any earlier.

A. S. Pushkin concludes his biography of Pougachev with the following observations about the outcome of the war against Pougachev: “The provinces that were too large became divided, and the communications between all parts of the empire were largely improved” ([709], page 697). We are therefore told that after having suppressed “the revolt of Pougachev”, the Romanovs “suddenly discovered” some of the Russian provinces to be too big, and started to divide them into smaller parts. Everything appears to be perfectly clear – the Romanovs were dividing the regions of the recently conquered Muscovite Tartary. They must have added them to the bordering provinces, which had grown abnormally as a result. These gigantic provinces were later divided into smaller ones without much haste.

Moreover, it turns out that “communications have improved” after the victory over Pougachev. Why would that be? Could the Romanovs have
got the opportunity of making some of the old routes straighter after the conquest of Muscovite Tartary – the ones they made curved and convoluted initially, so as to keep away from the hostile Siberian and American Horde? Regular routes to Siberia all postdate the “revolt of Pougachev”.

In 2000 we received a letter from Vladimir Georgiyevich Vishnev, a resident of Sverdlovsk. He points out the following in particular as he writes about our analysis: “The opinion of the authors about Asia being beyond Catherine’s control before the war with Pougachev can be confirmed by the fact that there had been an active customs office in the Ural city of Verkhotourye back in the day. The city had been the centre of the Ural region; the size of its cathedral equals that of the famous Isaakiyevskiy Cathedral in St. Petersburg. The city of Verkhotourye is being revived currently. The customs office of Verkhotourye was famous enough to have become immortalised in the name of a brand of wine popular in the region”.

The scale of the Romanovian “reforms” that came in the wake of the victory over “Pougachev” is characterised by the historian K. I. Mouratov in the following terms: “The edict of 1775 abolished the 20 existing provinces of Russia and introduced 40 new ones [twice as many provinces, in other words! – Auth.] … The government forbade the very mention of Pougachev’s name. The village of Zimoveyskaya, his birthplace, was renamed Potyomkinskaya, and River Yaik became known as the Ural. The Yaik Cossacks became known as the Ural Cossacks. The Volga Cossacks were disbanded, likewise the Zaporozhye Army. The Empress gave orders to forget every fact of the peasant uprising, and to refrain from so much as mentioning it” ([562], page 172).

2.6. Novaya Zemlya depicted correctly on earlier maps (as an island) and incorrectly on some of the later ones (as a peninsula)
When the Romanovs had obtained access to Siberia, they got the opportunity of correcting the old geographical maps that they inherited from the XIV-XVI century epoch of the Horde. This monotonous gradual perfection of cartography can be seen as a process from a study of the XVIII century maps. In February and March of 1999, the Private Collection Affiliate of the Pushkin Museum in Moscow organized an exhibition of Russian maps compiled in the XVII-XVIII century. We have attended it and discovered a great many interesting facts.

Let us consider the Dutch map of 1733 called “The Map of Great Tartary” (Magnae Tartariae Tabula. J. Covents et C. Mortier, Amsterdam, 1733), q.v. in fig. 12.35. The Novaya Zemlya archipelago (formerly known as Nova Zembla) is explicitly and incorrectly drawn as a peninsula (fig. 12.36). The cartographers had obviously attempted to make the map as detailed and accurate as they could. However, one can instantly see that their awareness of the Siberian geography (its coastline etc) had been rather poor in 1733. This is easy enough to understand – the map was compiled before the war with Pougachev in 1773-1775.

Fig. 12.35. A map of 1733 (Map of the Great Tartary): Magnae Tartariae Tabula. J. Covents et C. Mortier. Amsterdam, 1733. Was put up at the exhibition of the maps of Russia dating from the XVI-XVIII century held at the museum of Private Collections at the Pushkin Museum in Moscow (February-March 1999). From a video recording of 1999.
Fig. 12.36. Fragment of a map dating from 1733, where the Novaya Zemlya island is misrepresented as a peninsula. The map in question dates to the pre-Pougachev epoch. From a video recording of 1999.

Moreover, the compilers of the 1771 *Encyclopaedia Britannica* had just as vague an idea of Nova Zembla’s geography. In fig. 12.37 one sees a fragment of the British map of Siberia taken from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (the full version of the map was shown earlier in fig. 12.2). It is impossible to see whether Nova Zembla is drawn as an island or a peninsula. There is some kind of barely visible shading right over the legend “Nova Zembla”, which demonstrates that the authors of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* had a very unclear concept of this region’s real geography (see fig. 12.38). In fig. 12.39 we present a fragment of the modern map that shows the correct geography of these parts.
Fig. 12.37. Fragment of a map of Asia from the 1771 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. The authors of the Britannica are obviously still quite confused about the true geography of this region. The Novaya Zemlya island is drawn most nebulously indeed – it is possible that the authors of the encyclopaedia were referring to the peninsula reproduced below. Taken from [1118], Volume 2, pages 682-683.

Fig. 12.38. Close-in of a fragment of a map reproduced above. The authors are clearly unaware of the geography of Novaya Zemlya.
Once again, 1771 predates the war against “Pougachev”. The Romanovs had still been denied entry to Siberia, and the Northwest of the American continent had remained closed for the American colonists. Therefore, the Romanovian cartographers and their colleagues from the Western Europe have still been confused about the geography of Northern Siberia and the Far East – even such professionals as the experts who had compiled the maps for the Encyclopaedia Britannica, a work that had accumulated the results of all the latest advances made by the scientific avant-garde of the epoch.

Furthermore, Novaya Zemlya is falsely drawn as a peninsula in the 1730 map compiled by Philip Johann Strahlenberg (see fig. 12.40). The “isthmus” is drawn a great deal smaller, but present nonetheless (fig. 12.41).
Fig. 12.40. Fragment of a map dating from 1730 under the title of “A New Description of the Geography of Great Tartary” (Nova descriptio geographica Tartariae magna. Philip Johann von Strahlenberg). Modern commentators call it “one of the most important maps of the Russian Siberia in the XVIII century” ([1160], page 216). The Novaya Zemlya Island is drawn erroneously – as a peninsula. Taken from [1160], page 217.

Fig. 12.41. A close-in of a fragment of a 1730 map with Novaya Zemlya drawn as a peninsula. Taken from [1160], page 217.

There are many such maps dating from the first half and the middle of the XVIII century. We have only cited individual examples that illustrate the common but erroneous conception of Novaya Zemlya being a peninsula and not an island shared by the XVIII century cartographers.
What do the presumably “more ancient” maps of the XVI-XVII century tell us? For instance, let us study the map of the Great Tartary known as the map of Mercator-Hondius and allegedly dating from 1640 – we are told that it predates the map from the Britannica by more than a century (see fig. 12.42). We see the map of Mercator-Hondius depict Novaya Zemlya correctly, as an island. Its top part is not drawn (apparently, due to paucity of information) – however, the island is separated from the continent by a strait; it is easy enough to see the island does not approach the continental coastline anywhere. This example is very typical.

![Map of Great Tartary allegedly dating from 1640](image)

Fig. 12.42. A map of Great Tartary allegedly dating from 1640, compiled by Mercator and Hondius (Tartaria sive Magni Chami Imperium, Mercator-Hondius, 1640. Amsterdam). Was put up at the exhibition of the maps of Russia dating from the XVI-XVIII century held at the museum of Private Collections at the Pushkin Museum in Moscow (February-March 1999). From a video recording of 1999.

Let us take a look at the world map of Rumold Mercator (see fig. 12.43). Modern historians date it to 1587 ([1160], page 100). It is presumed that this map was drawn by Rumold, the son of the famous cartographer Gerhard Mercator, and based on the map that his father is said to have compiled in 1569, no less ([1160], page 98). That is to say, the map drawn up in 1569-1587 by Rumold and Gerhard Mercator (presumably more ancient than the already described Mercator-Hondius map dating from the alleged year 1640). Once again, we see Novaya Zemlya drawn correctly – as an island (see fig. 12.44). Moreover, this “early” map of Rumold Mercator dating from the alleged years 1569-1587 is a lot better and more
accurate than a “later” map of Mercator-Hondius, allegedly dating from 1640. We see the same to be the case on another version of the map, ascribed to Gerhard Mercator and dating from the alleged year 1595 (see fig. 12.45). Novaya Zemlya is drawn correctly, as an island separated from the continent by a strait and not approaching it anywhere else.

Fig. 12.43. World map compiled by Rumold Mercator in the alleged year of 1587 (Rumold Mercators Orbis terrae compendiosa descriptio quam ex magna universali Gerardi Mercatoris… M. D. LXXXVII (1587). This map is believed to be based on the map compiled by Gerhard Mercator (the father of Rumold) in the alleged year of 1569 ([1160], page 98). We see Novaya Zemlya drawn correctly – as an island. Taken from [1160], pages 97-98.
Fig. 12.44. Fragment of Rumold Mercator’s map allegedly dating from 1587, where we see Novaya Zemlya drawn correctly – as an island. We see the words “Nova Zemla” below the island. Taken from [1160], pages 97-98.

Fig. 12.45. Fragment of another map allegedly dating from 1595 and ascribed to Gerhard Mercator. Novaya Zemlya is depicted correctly – as an island. Taken from [1160], page 94.

We discover Scaligerian history to have a strange trait – the older the map, the more accurate it is. As we realise nowadays, it should be the other way round in actual history. Early maps were of low precision, but they have been evolving in a more or less regular manner, as new geographical data were procured. Correct geographical data that became known to the cartographers have never been forgotten – once they made their way onto
the maps, they stayed there. The precision of the maps kept on growing steadily – there were no epidemics of forgetfulness in the history of cartography.

Let us proceed with a study of the French map of the Great Tartary, allegedly dating from the end of the XVII century (see fig. 12.46). Once again, we see Novaya Zemlya drawn correctly – as an island. By the way, Korea is also depicted correctly – as a peninsula. In other words, the authors of this map demonstrate exceptional knowledge of the Siberian and the Far Eastern geography at the end of the alleged XVII century.

![Fig. 12.46. A French map of the Great Tartary allegedly dating from the end of the XVII century. La Grande Tartarie Orientale. Anonym. France (?). Was put up at the exhibition of the maps of Russia dating from the XVI-XVIII century held at the museum of Private Collections at the Pushkin Museum in Moscow (February-March 1999). From a video recording of 1999.](image)

There are more examples of the kind. It appears that the cartographers of the alleged XVI-XVII century had a “tradition” of representing Novaya Zemlya and California correctly (as an island and a peninsula, respectively) – yet their apprentices and followers, the cartographers of the XVIII century, had eventually lost this knowledge completely, “falling into utter ignorance” en masse.

It hadn’t been until the victory of the Romanovs over Pougachev that the European cartographers “recollected” the correct geography, presumably “returning” to the correct conceptions of the alleged XVI century.

Everything is perfectly clear. All of the luxurious and detailed maps of
the alleged XVI-XVII century are either forgeries that were designed to look “ancient” and made in the XVIII-XIX century, or authentic maps of the XVIII-XIX century bearing erroneous earlier dates. The cartographers of the XVIII century never “forgot” or “recollected” anything – the correct geography of Siberia and the Far East only became known to them after 1773-1775, when the army of the Romanovs had first invaded Siberia, and the army of the United States had finally been given the opportunity of conquering the American Northwest. This resulted in the creation of the maps that looked like the following one: Chart NW Coast of America and NE Coast of Asia. Eng. – T. Hartman. Ed. Strahan. London, 1782 (presented at the exhibition of Russian maps compiled in the XVII-XVIII century organized in 1999 by the Private Collection Affiliate of the Pushkin Museum in Moscow).

This map already depicts the coastline of the Kamchatka and the American Northwest correctly, as well as the strait that separates America and Asia. However, we see no details pertaining to the deeper parts of both continents – just blank spots galore. This is easy to understand as well – neither the Romanovs, nor the Americans had managed to colonize these vast territories of the former Horde by 1782.

Let us now study the fundamental atlas of the old American maps compiled by Edward Van Ermen and entitled The United States in Old Maps and Prints ([1116]). We can easily follow the evolution of the ideas held by the European cartographers about the West Coast of North America – California in particular. It turns out that virtually every XVIII century map contained in the atlas ([1116]) categorically claims California to be an island, referring to the newest discoveries made by the avant-garde of geographical science. This is a grave error. The last such map is dated to 1740 by the atlas ([1116]). The next map we find dates from 1837 – a century later. This XIX century map already depicts California and the American West correctly. The name “United States of America” also appears for the first time. We must point out the following fact, which we consider very odd indeed – the atlas ([1116]) doesn’t contain a single map
of the North American West Coast dating from the epoch between 1740 and 1837. The gap is a very conspicuous one – a centenarian cartographical lacuna, no less! There was usually a new map published every decade between 1666 and 1740.

2.7. The formation of the United States in 1776 and the annexation of the American territories of the Muscovite Tartary

Let us recollect just how and when the United States of America were founded. The Encyclopaedic Dictionary tells us about “the independent state, or the USA, founded in 1776, during the North American War for Independence of 1775-1783” ([797], page 1232). We suddenly realise that the foundation of the USA strangely coincides with the end of the war against “Pougachev” in Russia (he was defeated in 1775, q.v. above). This arranges everything in a different perspective – the “War for Independence” in North America had been the war against the last American remnants of the Russian Horde, which had been attacked by the Romanovs from the West, and by the American “freedom fighters” in the East. Nowadays we are being told that the Americans had struggled for independence from their British colonial governors. In reality, it had been a war for the vast lands of Muscovite Tartary left without a governor. The American troops hurried to the West and the Northwest so as not to be late for their share of the land. It is common knowledge that George Washington became the first President of the USA in 1776 ([797], page 1232). It turns out that Washington became the first ruler of the American territory that had formerly belonged to the Russian Horde. It is understandable that the very fact that there had been a war against the “Mongolian” Horde in America had been erased from the American history textbooks, likewise the very existence of the tremendous Muscovite Tartary. The war between the United States and the remnants of the Horde for the entirety of the American continent had continued until the second
half of the XIX century. Alaska had remained in Russian possession for a particularly long period of time, and so it was “purchased” from the Romanovs in 1867 for a token price ([797], page 1232).

The above means that the United States of America were founded spontaneously in 1776, comprising the American fragment of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire – namely, the American part of Muscovite Tartary. This circumstance was never recorded in any history textbook – the topic must have been tabooed initially, and then forgotten altogether. “Independence from British rule” became the official version.

2.8. The information contained in the old maps of America

Let us return to the old maps of America, and list all the maps contained in the atlas ([1116]) where we can see the West Coast of America in general and California in particular.

The first map was compiled by Ortelius and dates to the alleged XVI century (see fig. 12.47). As we can see, the European cartographers of the alleged XVI century are supposed to have been well familiar with the geography of the American West Coast. California is drawn as a peninsula, which is correct. We also see the Bering Strait, called “Anian Strait” on the map, and a ship that navigates it ([1116], page 17).
Fig. 12.47. Map by Ortelius under the title of “Tartarie sive Magni Chami Regni Typis”. Considered to be the first map of Siberia ever. Dates from the alleged year 1570 ([1116], pages 17 and 139. It also depicts the west coast of America. Taken from [1116], map 6 on page 17.

The second map dates from 1666, or the second half of the XVII century (see fig. 12.48). The West Coast of America had presumably been “forgotten” completely, and California unexpectedly transforms into an island, which is erroneous. Moreover, we see the following phrase right next to California: “This California was in times past thought to beeene a part of y Continent and so made in all maps, but by further discoveries was found to be an Iland long 1700 legues” (see fig. 12.49).
We are thus being told that the research conducted in the XVII century “finally proved” California to be an island and not a peninsula. In other
words, the correct “old” information was replaced by erroneous newer data on every map as a result of “scientific analysis”. All of the above looks utterly dubious – what we see is most likely a trick of the Scaligerian chronology. The last 200 years of documented cartographic history tell us of no such occurrences. Geographical maps have always evolved and not devolved.

Also note that the entire Western coastline of America, starting from North California and upwards, is altogether absent from the map of 1666 (see fig. 12.48).

It is perfectly clear that the history of geographical discoveries in the American West differs from how it is presented by the modern historians radically. The enormous blank spot on the maps of North America (covering California and “transforming the peninsula into an island”) results from the fact that these lands had belonged to the Russian Horde and remained closed for the Western European cartographers of the XVII-XVIII century, up until the defeat of “Pougachev”.

We witness the same to be the case with the next map of the American Northwest in the atlas ([1116]). This map dates from 1680, q.v. in fig. 12.50. It also falsely depicts California as an island. The Bering Strait is absent; the Western and Central part of North America are covered by a gigantic blank spot that extends deep into the ocean. The northern coastline is absent as well.
The next map dates from 1692 (see fig. 12.51). Same old story – the erroneous drawing of California as an island. European cartographers of the XVII century haven’t got a clue about the geography of the American Northwest. The coastline is absent; the alleged coast of Japan is drawn right next to California, which is perfectly incorrect.
Fig. 12.51. Map of North America dating from 1692. L’Amérique Septentrionale divisée en ses principales parties, scavoir les Terres Arctiques, la Canada ou Nouvelle France, le Mexique, les Isles de Terre Neuve, de Californie et Antilles où sont distingués les uns des autres les estats comme ils sont possedés presentemment par les François, Castillans, Anglois, Suedois, Danois et par les Estats Generaux des Provinces Unies ou Hollandois. N. Sanson; ed. H. Jalliot. Taken from [1116], map 18 (pages 34-35).

The next map that depicts California has no exact dating in the atlas ([1116]), and is presumed to date from the epoch of 1698 and later (see fig. 12.52). California is still an island. The American Northwest remains blank, which indicates that Europeans had no access to these parts.
Fig. 12.52. Map of America. Dates from the post-1698 epoch. Novissima et Accuratissima Totis Americae Descripto, N. Visscher. Taken from [1116], map 19 (pages 36-37).

The next map with California present upon it dates from 1710 ([1116], see fig. 12.53). California is still misrepresented as an island; we see the legend “Parts Unknown” written over the blank spot. No coastline as to yet.
Fig. 12.53. Map of North America dating from 1710. H. Moll. Taken from [1116], map 20, page 38.

Next we have the map of 1720 ([1116], see fig. 12.54). The geography of California remains unaltered, and the blank spot is still there, despite the fact that the East Coast of North America, likewise the Central and South America, are drawn in detail, with plenty of names indicated all across the map. However, the Europeans in general and their cartographers in particular appear to have possessed no access to the North-West of America for some mystical reason.
Let us proceed to the map of 1726 ([1116], see fig. 12.55). The geography of California and the American North-West remains the same, likewise the blank spot. California is still an island; the blank spot is covered by lavish artwork in a rather embarrassed manner – palm trees, dark-skinned natives and a jolly feast underneath the palm trees (in the north). The rest of the American continent is covered by a multitude of geographical details, there is barely enough place to contain them all. We neither see banquets, nor palm trees here.
Fig. 12.55. Map of America dating from the post-1726 epoch. Novis Orbis sive America meridionalis et septentrionalis per sua regna, provincias et insula juxta observations et descriptions recentiss[imas] divisa et adornata. M. Seutter. Taken from [1116], map 27, pages 48-49.

The next map dates from 1739 (see fig. 12.56). California finally assumes its natural shape of a peninsula. However, the blank spot remains, although its borders have moved northwards a little. This had revealed the fact that California is connected to the continent, and marked a great success in the history of the European and American cartography.
Finally, we have a map of 1740 (12.57). California is already a peninsula; however, the blank spot remains, and the coastline further North from California remains unknown.
Oddly enough, the next map in the atlas ([1116]) dates from 1837. It looks almost modern; we don’t see any blank spots anywhere.

One might well wonder about the reasons why the fundamental atlas ([1116]) would fail to mention the maps of North America published between 1740 and 1837. This period of “geographical silence” coincides with the fragmentation of Muscovite Tartary and the naissance of the USA, which had comprised its American part.
Let us complement the picture that we get with the data from the book on the history of cartography ([1007]). It contains two other maps of North America absent from [1116]. The first one comes from the atlas of the “ancient” Ptolemy (see fig. 12.59). The “ancient” Ptolemy must have been well familiar with the geography of the American coast. America is called “Terra Nova”, or “New Land”. This must be an old XVI-XVII century map from the Horde, published under Ptolemy’s name.
Fig. 12.59. Ptolemy’s “Geography” allegedly dating from 1522 with a map of America (Strassburg, Johannes Grüninger, 1522). We refer the reader to the book of C. Morland and D. Bannister entitled “Antique Maps”. Third Edition, 1989, London, Phaidon Press Limited, page 301, where we can find a list of this book’s editions dating from 1477-1730, 42 of them altogether. Taken from [1007], page 32.

Another map of North America, allegedly dating from 1593, is reproduced in fig. 12.60. Odd as it might seem, it depicts the American Northwest correctly, with Bering Strait intact, and California correctly drawn as a peninsula. The drawing is far from clear, but we can clearly see a peninsula and not an island. This either means that the map is a forgery manufactured in the XVIII-XIX century, or a truly old map dating from the epoch of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. The imperial cartographers of the XV-XVI century were obviously well aware of the geography of their own empire and its borders; the level of the map’s technique corresponds to that of the late XVI century in general.
Let us also reproduce an old Spanish map from the collection of A. M. Boulatov (dating unknown), q.v. in fig. 12.61. Once again, despite the rather primitive cartographical conceptions of the map’s authors, the West Coast of North America is depicted correctly, with California drawn as a peninsula. The map in question is therefore either a recent forgery, or one of the truly old maps from the epoch of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire.
Fig. 12.61. An old Spanish map from A. M. Boulatov’s collection. Dating unknown. The map is drawn on a page torn out of a book; it has two vertical dividing lines between the Eastern and the Western part parallel to the meridians (one of them is at the extreme left of the map). California is a peninsula. Scanned from the original.

The history of the maps depicting the American Northwest tells us about the existence of vast territories that had spanned nearly one half of North America in the XVII-XVIII century and remained completely enigmatic for the European cartographers all the while, starting with the XVII century, the decline of the Great Empire, and ending with the defeat of “Pougachev” in 1775, at the end of the XVIII century. Muscovite Tartary fell apart; this had resulted in the foundation of the USA. The American West must have belonged to the Empire of the Horde and its heir, Muscovite Tartary, which had existed in the XVII-XVIII century.
3.
The voyage taken by A. S. Pushkin to the Ural region in 1833 with the objective of collecting more information for Pougachev’s biography. The reason why Pougachev’s soldiers had referred to their headquarters as to “Moscow”

We have already voiced our idea that the name “Pougachev” is an alias and not a real name; it translates as “scare”, “terror” etc. This alias was invented by the Romanovian historians as a replacement of the real name that had either belonged to the last Czar, or Khan, of Muscovite Tartary, or his military commander-in-chief. The name of this historical personality has been erased from Russian history forever. The last warlord of the Horde had been called “The Terror” by the Romanovian administration in the middle of the XVIII century; he must have truly terrified the dynasty of the Romanovs by his attempt to rejoin the former Western lands of the Horde with its Eastern part, the immense Muscovite Tartary. The idea that “Pougachev” had been a mere alias (“Pougach”, q.v. above) is confirmed by some of the old documents – for instance, it is voiced by V. I. Dahl, A. S. Pushkin’s friend and contemporary ([710], Volume 2, pages 222-223).

We must point out that Dahl had held the rank of “the special case executive of the Governor General of Orenburg” back then ([710], Volume 2, page 452). V. I. Dahl had assisted A. S. Pushkin in the attempts of the latter to collect whatever information had still remained in those parts from the epoch of the “war against Pougachev” ([720], Volume 2, pages 223-224 and 452). The evidence presented above make some of the modern commentators use the alias “Pougach” instead of “Pougachev” (see [710],
As we have already pointed out, having crushed Muscovite Tartary in the violent “War against Pougachev”, the Romanovs went out of their way in order to make this war seem as nothing but a large-scale uprising of the “peasants” led by a certain “Pougach”, an anonymous Cossack from the Don. Romanovian historians identify the sole headquarters of “Pougach” as the “village of Berdy” in the Ural region ([710], Volume 2, page 452). This is hardly the case – as we are beginning to realise, Romanovian historians were doing their best to make the war of 1773-1775 seem as insignificant as possible, giving it an altogether different interpretation. This resulted in the transfer of the Russian Khan’s real capital to a village in the Ural region made in later tendentious records of the events. This village must have been one of the numerous headquarters of the Horde. The name B-Erdy might be an old name dating from the epoch of the Horde (many of those had still existed back then in the Ural region and Siberia, as well as the European part of Russia). The name Berdy might be a memory of the B-Horde, or the “White Horde” – a large and powerful state in the days of yore. It is presumed that in Pougachev’s epoch the village of Berdy had been “at the distance of seven verst from Orenburg. Nowadays its former site is part of the city. During the siege of Orenburg, the village had been the headquarters of the rebellion; Pougachev’s soldiers were calling it Moscow [sic! – Auth.]” ([711], page 304).

The last piece of evidence is most noteworthy, and can be interpreted in a variety of ways. The fact that Pougachev’s soldiers had referred to one of their military encampments (also known as Berdy, or B-Horde) as to Moscow, is in good correspondence with our reconstruction, according to which the historical personality known as “Pougach”, or “Pougachev”, had been the military commander-in-chief of the enormous nation whose lands had spanned Siberia and the American Northwest, known as Muscovite Tartary. We have discussed surviving evidence of this state’s existence above. According to the 1771 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, the capital of the Muscovite Tartary had been in the Siberian city of Tobolsk.
Let us reiterate that St. Petersburg had been capital of the European Russia, whose throne was usurped by the Romanovs, ever since Peter the Great. The very name of Muscovite Tartary, as well as the fact that Pougachev’s army had referred to their headquarters near Orenburg as to Moscow, indicates that the Siberian and American Horde had still remembered the fact that the capital of Russia had once been in Moscow. We are beginning to realise that the army of “Pougach”, or “Pougachev”, had strived to restore the former borders of the Horde and to return its capital to Moscow.

When A. S. Pushkin came to Ural in 1833, 58 years after the end of the “Pougachev War” in 1775, all the historical evidence he could find had been blatantly misleading and planted by the laborious Romanovian administration over the many decades that had passed since the end of the war. V. I. Dahl took A. S. Pushkin to the place he calls “the famous village of Berdy – Pougachev’s headquarters” ([710], Volume 2, page 453). A. S. Pushkin and V. I. Dahl had both been convinced that the events of the “peasant uprising” were concentrated around the region of the Southern Ural. Romanovian historians had tried to make the war seem as insignificant as possible – the presumably unorganised (although deadly) Bashkir cavalry of Salavat Youlayev, petty (although violent) skirmishes and so on – nothing serious, in other words.

Pushkin had conversed with some of the old women from “village Berdy”, who had told him about “Pougach”, or “Pougachev” ([710], Volume 2, page 222). Nowadays it is hard to estimate the percentage of truth in whatever they told him, as opposed to the legends planted by the Romanovian administration. It appears as though the local Cossacks had still remembered some real historical facts, vague as they were. They told Pushkin about the “gilded domes of Pougach” ([710], Volume 2, page 222). This legend might be a distant memory of the gilded domes over the palace of the Khan, or the Czar of Muscovite Tartary – possibly, in Tobolsk, the former capital of this gigantic land (see [1118], Volume 2, pages 682-684). By the way, the old maps of Siberia often contain
references to some legendary “Maid of Gold”.

On the other hand, it is possible that the military leader of the Siberian and American Muscovite Tartary had really been accompanied by a great and luxurious entourage; his visit to the Ural region may have been accompanied by the construction of a splendorous temporary abode of the military commander (or the Czar/Khan himself) – in the Cossack village of Berdy, for instance. This temporary residence of the Czar became reflected in the legends that had reached Pushkin as vague tales of “golden domes”.

Later on, when the Romanovian administration began the transformation of the Horde’s Czar (Khan) or military commander into “the impostor” and “Pougach, the ruthless savage”, the legendary recollections of his “golden domes” had started to sound strange. The historians themselves created a blatant dissonance in the very new version of history that they were planting. The administration had to make the authoritative claim that no “golden domes” had ever existed, and that the fathers and grandfathers of the populace, simple Cossacks, had mistaken polished brass for gold. V. I. Dahl tells us the following in his account of the “conversation with the old women from Berdy who recollected the ‘golden domes’ of the Pougach” hastens to explain to us that the old women “were referring to a simple wooden house covered in sheets of polished brass” ([710], Volume 2, page 222). One must think that Dahl repeats the distorted version of the Romanovian administration that he heard from the locals. V. I. Dahl proceeds to tell us the following in the account of the journey to the South Ural that he took together with A. S. Pushkin: “We found an old woman who had known, seen and remembered the Pougach. Pushkin had spent the whole morning conversing with her; he was shown the location of the wooden house transformed into a gilded palace [? – Auth.]” ([710], Volume 2, page 223).

The gilded quarters of the Czar, or Khan of the Horde, were declared a simple wooden peasant house covered in “sheets of polished brass” by the Romanovian administrators. Modern historians tell us the following: “The ‘palace’ of Pougachev … had still stood in 1833. A simple wooden house
had been decorated with golden foil from the inside, hence the reference to the ‘gilded domes’” ([711], page 304). Some of the historians make thoughtful observations about polished brass, while the others descant about golden foil. Both groups are likely to be very far from the truth.

One gets the impression that a great host of special tales and anecdotes had been created right after the defeat of “Pougach”, or “Pougachev”, their objective being to drown the truth in a multitude of preposterous legends. Some of them may have reflected real events, albeit semi-obliterated from human memory. According to V. I. Dahl, “Pushkin listened to all of the above with much fervour, if you pardon my inability to express it more eloquently. He laughed out loud upon hearing the following anecdote: Pougach broke into the village of Berdy … and entered the church. The people stood aside in terror, bowing and falling to their knees. Pougach assumed a dignified air, headed to the altar, sat down upon it, saying, ‘It’s been a long time since I’d last sat upon a throne’, unable to distinguish between the throne and the church altar in his peasant ignorance. Pushkin had called him a swine, and guffawed for a long time…” ([710], Volume 2, page 223). The anecdote in question might be a distorted reflection of real events. After all, the Czar, or Khan, of the Horde, had been both the temporal and the ecclesial ruler, whose throne had symbolised the powers of the State and the Church simultaneously (see Chron6 for more details).

One must point out that the memory of “Pougach”, or “Pougachev”, being a real Czar (a royal plenipotentiary at the very least) and not an impostor of any kind, had still been alive in the epoch of Pushkin. Our reconstruction suggests this memory to have reflected reality. This is what V. I. Dahl tells in his account of a voyage to the environs of Orenburg that he made together with the heir apparent. He is relating a conversation between himself and an old Cossack woman in this particular instance: ‘The old woman was laying the table in the most welcoming manner indeed. I asked her whether she was happy to see the royal guest; she said ‘Why, of course! We haven’t seen … any royal blood here ever since Czar Pyotr Fyodorovich himself…’ Pougachev, that is” ([710], Volume 2, page
There had once been a “Khans’ Grove” near the city of Uralsk, former Yaik, “right next to the coal pits – the name exists until the present day. It is associated with an ancient custom of the Cossack warlords, who had conversed with the Kazakh [Cossack, that is – Auth.] Khans in this particular grove … another legend has it … that the grove had been the place where the inauguration rituals were held for the Khan of the Inner Horde, Boukey-Khan, and his son Djangir… Pushkin has seen the grove, and its name was explained to him by the guides in one way or another” ([711], page 310).

Let us point out another detail that we believe to be noteworthy. Historians report that the imprisonment of Pougachev was “followed by a trial that took place in the Throne Hall of the Kremlin Palace on 30-31 December [1774 – Auth.]” ([563], page 66). One wonders whether one would try an impostor and “a simple Cossack” in the Throne Hall of the Kremlin? The rank requirements aren’t met. However, if it had been Muscovite Tartary itself condemned as Pougach, or Pougachev, whose identity loses importance in this case, then the symbolic choice of the Muscovite Throne Hall becomes obvious and necessary in a way for a proper exalted celebration of victory. The Romanovs were celebrating the defeat of Old Russia, or the Horde, in the ancient capital of the latter!

The Romanov dynasty had tried to wipe out a great many names that kept the memory of Pougachev. As we mentioned above, River Yaik became known as the Ural, and the Yaik Cossacks have been known as the Ural Cossacks ever since. The Cossack Army of the Volga had been altogether disbanded. Finally, the Army of Zaporozhye had been liquidated as well ([561], page 172). The City of Yaik was renamed Uralsk “in order to make all drown the memory of these events in eternal perdition and deep taciturnity”, according to an edict of the Senate ([711], page 307).

The position of Pushkin in his relation of the Pougachev War is unclear. His voyage to the Ural region had been of an official character; he had been accompanied by V. I. Dahl, a government official (see [710], Volume
2, page 452). Could A. S. Pushkin have been sent to the part of Ural associated with Pougachev by the Romanovs in order to make the “correct version” a more plausible memory? He had already been a famous poet, after all, and people believed him. The fact that he had published his rendition of this war, presenting events in this particular manner, means that he had (either voluntarily or inadvertently) been complying with the orders of the Romanovs.

On the other hand, Pushkin’s keen interest in the biography of “Pougach”, or “Pougachev”, may have been of an altogether different nature. According to the Romanovian version of history, Pougachev the “impostor” had been presenting himself as Czar Peter III Fyodorovich. Bear in mind that Peter III, the husband of Catherine the Great, is said to have been murdered at her orders in 1762 ([563], page 20). Apparently, Lev Aleksandrovich Pushkin, the paternal grandfather of A. S. Pushkin, was in the ranks of those who had remained loyal to Peter. A. S. Mylnikov reports the following: “L. A. Pushkin, Lieutenant-Colonel of the artillery, had urged the soldiers to remain loyal to their oath instead of listening to the mutineers… Many of them … were arrested; L. A. Pushkin himself was punished severely … and incarcerated in a tower. He had never served Catherine ever again after his release, and died in 1790. It is curious that this very character is the paternal grandfather of A. S. Pushkin, who mentions him rather fondly in his autobiography: ‘Lev Aleksandrovich had been an artillerist; he remained loyal to Peter III in the palace revolution of 1762. This had resulted in his incarceration; he was released two years later’” ([563], page 22).

Thus, A. S. Pushkin’s voyage to the Ural region in 1833 may have given him an opportunity to study the history of Emperor Peter III, the liege of his grandfather, who had been punished for his loyalty to this monarch. Pushkin may have possessed an interest of his own in pouring some light over the obscurity of the events that had predated his time by some 60 or 70 years. Even if A. S. Pushkin had indeed been complying with an order given by the Romanovs, he may have used this unique opportunity to
catch a glimpse of Pougachev’s epoch as it had been in reality. His position of the official imperial historian may have opened many secret doors, after all.

Yet we are unlikely to ever find out about whether or not Pushkin had been allowed to include all the materials that he found in the course of the voyage into his book. We also know nothing about the part of the data that could “offend the Romanovs”. As we realise nowadays, Pushkin had a unique opportunity to learn the truth about the gigantic Muscovite Tartary, the state that had spanned Siberia and half of North America and was obliterated from human memory at the orders of the Romanovs. The Senate had already given the abovementioned order to “forget everything and keep silent” ([711], page 307). The position of Pushkin’s contemporaries becomes easy to understand – digging in the “wrong places” could be interpreted as going against the will of the Senate.

The Romanovian administration in Siberia and the Ural region had been vehement and very consistent in its compliance with the Senate’s order. After the defeat of “Pougachev’s” army, a wave of mass repressions rolled over the territories annexed by the Romanovs. Their scale had been so formidable that the surviving locals and their offspring hastened to learn the “correct” version well enough to make it the only one. When A. T. Fomenko and T. N. Fomenko visited the Ural cities of Miass and Zlatoust in August 1999, the staff of the local historical museum had told them that, according to the surviving memories and available materials, most inhabitants of Zlatoust were hanged by the Romanovian army; one has to remember that the factories of Zlatoust (and Southern Ural in general) were making cannons for Pougachev’s army. The Romanovs must have also remembered the fact that “virtually every worker of the Zlatoust factory had been on the side of Yemelyan Pougachev” ([859], page 104). The two mountains one finds next to the former village of Kargalinskaya (known as the Tartar Kargala nowadays) and the village of Sakmara still bear the eloquent names Viselichnaya and Roublevaya (derived from the Russian words for “gallows tree” and “decapitation”, respectively).
According to the local historians, “the names are associated with the punitive actions against the mutineers in 1774, when the royal army defeated Pougachev in the springtime of the year, making him flee to Bashkiria” ([859], page 97).

When A. S. Pushkin arrived to these parts 60 years after the Pougachev War, the local Cossacks were afraid to mention Pougachev and the war for fear of mentioning something “improper”. The following episode from V. I. Dahl’s memoirs is very characteristic indeed. A. S. Pushkin’s enquiries about Pougachev and the *chervonets* (golden three-rouble coin minted in the XVIII-XIX century) that he had given to one of the old Cossack women scared the locals mortally. According to V. I. Dahl, “the villagers could not understand why a stranger would be enquiring about the villain and impostor, whose name had been associated with so many atrocities, with such fervour … They became suspicious, and, lest the enquiries should bring some new affliction upon their heads, had sent a carriage to Orenburg the very same day, brought the old woman and the wretched *chervonets* along, and reported everything to the authorities …” ([710], Volume 2, page 223).

One must think that, after all the repressions, the local populace had learnt the Romanovian version of the Pougachev War by heart. The scientists who came to these parts in order to collect the local folklore would be met with renditions of the Romanovian textbooks memorized by the locals, with hardly anything left from the real events of the XVIII century.

We must also mention the following fact. It presumed that A. S. Pushkin and Emperor Nikolai I had made an arrangement about censorship in 1826. According to the modern commentators, “it had been an agreement to abstain from criticising the government in exchange for liberty and the right to publish his works under the personal censorship of Nikolai I” ([710], Volume 1, page 15). The conversation between the two concerning personal censorship of the emperor survived in the memory of their contemporaries. “A. O. Rosset recollects the dialogue between the
poet and the Czar concerning censorship. Nikolai had enquired about Pushkin’s latest literary endeavours; the poet replied that he hardly wrote anything at all due to the severity of the censors. The monarch replied: ‘Well then, I shall be your censor myself; send everything you write my way’ (Y. K. Grot, page 288)” ([710], Volume 1, page 462).

All of the above took place on 8 September 1826 – before Pushkin’s voyage to the Ural region, that is ([710], Volume 1, page 461). Thus, Pushkin’s biography of Pougachev must have undergone the personal censorship of the Czar, as well as that of the epoch’s Romanovian historians. One must think that Pushkin’s text had been brought in full correspondence with the Romanovian version of the Pougachev War.

There are apparently no authentic documents left by Pougachev or anyone from his camp. Historians show us “the seal of Pougachev” and “Pougachev’s edict” nowadays, suggesting them to be authentic artefacts (see figs. 12.62 and 12.63). However, the photograph of the seal doesn’t allow us to make out any of the text. As for “Pougachev’s edict”, historians themselves recognize it as a copy: “Pougachev’s ‘edict’. Fragment of a copy.” ([550], page 171). Has the original survived? We believe this to be unlikely – the “copy” offered to us today must be a tendentious edition of the original. The scribe could have copied the edict and introduced the corrections insisted upon by the Romanovian administration. The alleged seal is drawn in the top left corner; however, the drawing isn’t all that accurate, and looks rather artificial. We see something that vaguely resembles a figure in a helmet, with a plumage and a visor (?).
Fig. 12.62. “Pougachev’s seal”. Taken from [550], page 171.

Fig. 12.63. “Pougachev’s edict”. Fragment of a copy ([550], page 171). One wonders what has become of the original – could it have been destroyed? Taken from [550], page 171.

In fig. 12.64 we see an old engraving dating from XVIII century entitled “The Execution of Pougachev”; we see a mass execution of the Cossacks.
Let us conclude with a photograph of the plaque from the Khabarovsk Museum of History; it accompanies an old map taken from S. O. Remezov’s “Siberian Book of Maps” (see fig. 12.65). The photograph was kindly provided by G. A. Khroustalev.

Fig. 12.65. Photograph of the plaque from the Historical Museum of Khabarovsk. Taken from the “Siberian Book of Drafts” by S. U. Remezov. The photograph was made by G. A. Khroustalyov in 1999.

Semyon Oulyanovich Remezov is a well-known Russian cartographer and historian of the XVII century. His “Siberian Book of Maps” dates from 1699-1701 ([797], page 1114). As far as we know, there have never been any re-editions of this book. According to the museum plaque (see fig. 12.65), the map is inscribed with: "In the mouth of the Amur River, the cities with their forts, and the place where the Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich ordered to leave the guns and the bells. These data belong to the Timurid empire, the remains of which were found in 4x4 areas nearby the Russian казаки зимой 1655-1656 года."

Fig. 12.64. Ancient engraving of the XVIII century depicting the execution of “Pougachev”. Drawn in full accordance with the Romanovian version. Taken from [550], page 171.
Remezov’s map has got the drawing of a large city with bells and towers in the Amur estuary, as well as the following inscription: “Czar Alexander of Macedon came to these parts, leaving the bells and a cache of weapons”.

Consensual version of history makes this phrase sound preposterous – the possibility that the “ancient” Alexander of Macedon may have reached the estuary of the faraway River Amur in the middle of the taiga is right out of the question, likewise his association with bells and firearms. Modern historians will patronisingly lament Remezov’s ignorance of the correct history. Notwithstanding the fact that he managed to compile an excellent atlas of Siberia, one shouldn’t take his “historical fantasies” seriously.

However, our reconstruction makes Remezov’s data sensible and believable, since Czar Alexander of Macedon had lived in the XV-XVI century, the epoch of the great Ottoman = Ataman conquest. Waves of this conquest had reached China and Japan, leading to the naissance of the samurais = Samaritans = natives of Samara. In *Chron6* we shall discuss it in more detail.

We need to mention the following fact concerning Remezov’s map. This map (which was possibly based on an even earlier “Mongolian” prototype) had hung in the Yekaterinhof Palace in St. Petersburg. M. I. Pylyaev, the XIX century historian, reports the following: “There is a large canvas with a map of the Asian Russia drawn upon it; it hangs on the wall over the ground floor staircase in lieu of wallpaper. The map must be a hoax – it is unlikely that we might ever find rivers with such names in any textbook; moreover, every direction is reversed. The Indian Sea and the Sand Sea are at the top, whereas the North, the Arctic Ocean and the Great Ocean (misspelled); in the West we find Kamchatka and the Gilyan Kingdom on the banks of Amur, as well as the following absurd inscription: ‘Alexander the Great had reached these parts, leaving the bells and a cache of firearms’. There is a legend about Peter the Great using the map for mock examinations, making fun of the subjects whose knowledge of geography
had been poor” ([711:1], page 82).

Thus, a map reflecting the old geography and names of the Asian part of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire had still been kept in one of the palaces during the reign of Peter the Great. However, Peter and his court had already been raised on the new Scaligerian and Millerian history, and treated the map as a curio and nothing but. M. I. Pylyaev, a historian of the XIX century, also refers to this map ironically, quite unaware of the fact that it may have reflected reality more accurately than the recently introduced Scaligerian geography. Nowadays Remezov’s map known as the “Large Draft of the Entire Siberia” is exhibited in the Petrovskaya Gallery of the State Hermitage in St. Petersburg ([679], page 24).
4.
Numerous towns in the Ural, allegedly founded in the Bronze Age (Arkaim being the most famous) as the likely relics of Muscovite Tartary, or the state that had existed in Siberia and America in the XV-XVIII century A.D.

A large number of old settlements were discovered in the South Ural relatively recently; the most famous one is called Arkaim (see figs. 12.66, 12.67, 12.68 and 12.69). Archaeologists report: “The constructions that had been intact at the moment of excavations include two concentric circles of fortifications, and two concentric circles of dwellings, with a square at the centre. The diameter of the city wall had equalled some 150 metres, and its width at the base – 4-5 metres. It had been made of wooden frames (approx. 3 × 4 m) filled with a mixture of earth and lime. These frames were fortified by pise blocks on the outside, reaching from the bottom of the moat and up to the top of the wall (the depth of the moat equalled some 1.5-2.5 m, and the height of the earthen wall … had been 3.5 metres at least, according to preliminary calculations)” ([33], page 24). “The wall of the inner circle … had a diameter of 84 metres and was 3-4 metres thick. It is less massive in comparison with the external wall; however, its height may have been even greater” ([33], page 26).
Fig. 12.66. The settlement of Arkaim. The diameter of the citadel wall equals some 150 metres ([33], page 24). Photographed from an aeroplane. Taken from [33], page 22.

Fig. 12.67. The excavations of 1988 in the settlement of Arkaim. Taken from [33], page 23.

Fig. 12.68. The settlement of Arkaim reconstructed. The diameter of the external wall equals some 150 metres. Drawing by L. L. Gourevich. The mediaeval Turkish settlement misidentified as “the ancient Troy of Homer” in the XIX century has a similar diameter – 120 by 120 metres ([443], pages 76-77). See more on the alleged discovery
of “Homer’s Troy” by Schliemann in *Chron2*. The reconstruction of the settlement was taken from [33], page 25.

![Fig. 12.69. A scheme of the Arkaim settlement. Some of the artefacts discovered during the excavations. Taken from [33], page 32.](image)

Historians dubbed these Ural settlements “proto-cities” ([33], page 9) and dated them to the epoch of the Bronze Age (the alleged XVIII-XVI century B.C. – see [33], page 10). Arkaim was discovered in 1987. Historians also report: “Arkaim has company now. Archaeological expeditions … have discovered a large group of similar ensembles; they were called ‘The Settlement Land’” ([33], page 11; see fig. 12.70). Further also: “These settlements … became urbanised primarily as centres of metallurgy, or
centres where metal tools were manufactured … Most of the findings are related to metallurgy in one way or another. There were metallurgic ovens found at nearly every excavation site, despite the relatively small areas of the uncovered settlements” ([33], page 31).

Fig. 12.70. A map of the fortified settlements that resemble Arkaim in the area of Magnitogorsk. As we can see, there were many such settlements discovered here. They must pertain to the system of the Cossack citadels of Muscovite Tartary dating from the XV-XVIII century. Taken from [33], page 55.

Archaeologists insist that there had been a system of sewers in Arkaim. Apparently, “the direction of the gutters, which were directed towards the sewers, indicates them to be part of a complex draining system” ([33], page 25). The above implies a high level of craftsmanship; such achievements characterise the engineering of the last 300 years.

The “great antiquity” of these settlements is of a declarative nature, and has been insisted upon by the historians and the archaeologists for a relatively short period of time. The discoverers had been of a different
opinion – they considered the settlements to be more recent. I. V. Ivanov, Doctor of Geography, tells us the following: “It is amazing that this archaeological relic had not been discovered earlier. The excellent planning of the settlement, as reflected on the photographs made from aircraft, the presence of the object upon the topographical map, and the excellent condition of the earthen constructions must have resulted in more recent initial datings of the site. Local populace has never demonstrated any particular interest in the object, nor did it have any enigmatic reputation among them” ([33], page 9).

The above makes things perfectly obvious – after all, the locals did not consider the ruins mysterious in any way, possibly, considering them to be of a recent nature. The constructions are wooden and earthen, so the very fact that they have reached us in a good condition implies that their age cannot be too great. It wasn’t until sometime later that the exalted fans of all things ancient declared the settlements to be mind-bogglingly old, without bothering to cite any factual data to back up those declarations. Arkaim became a popular destination for all sorts of pilgrims and tourists. I. V. Ivanov reports that “three or four thousand tourists visit Arkaim every year, in the springtime and the autumn – amateur ESP enthusiasts, members of religious sects and a great many others, coming in search of wisdom or even healing … Apart from the regular interest of tourists who come to see the site and the nature reserve, the object became popular with mystics of all sorts, who ascribe all sorts of paranormal powers to the Arkaim complex” ([33], page 13).

Arkaim, as well as numerous other old settlements of the Southern Ural, had been built as a steppe citadel. Archaeologists report the following: “The settlements found in this area are characterised by their massive fortifications – moats and dams with palisades or sturdy walls made of logs and pise blocks. The fortifications are of the closed type … Fortified areas vary in size – between 6,000 and 30,000 square metres. Buttresses, towers and other constructions aimed at protecting all the entrances of the settlement, as well as access to water, demonstrate the existence of an
original and well-developed system of fortification” ([33], page 22). We even learn of the “sophisticated elegance of technical solutions” ([33], page 27).

As we are beginning to realise, the ruins in question are most likely old settlements built as citadels by the Cossacks in the XV-XVIII century; they had formed a part of the military fortification system of Muscovite Tartary. Historians have every right to say that Arkaim has a “fortification system to par any mediaeval citadel” ([33], page 25). The fact that the citadel has preserved fairly well, despite the fact that it stands in the open steppe, where constructions of pise blocks, wood and earth quickly fall prey to the wind and the rain, blatantly contradicts the “alleged antiquity” of these settlements. Certain historians have noticed this circumstance. According to G. B. Zdanovich, “despite the great age of Arkaim, which was [allegedly – Auth.] built some 3600-3700 years ago, the outline of the settlement is visible on the terrain rather well. A bird’s eye view makes the fortification towers, the ruins of the dwellings, the central square and the four entrances visible perfectly well” ([33], page 24).

In fig. 12.71 we see “the burial mound of Bolshekaragansk (Arkaim). Mound 25, pit 24. A reconstruction of an ancient tomb” ([33], page 49).

![Fig. 12.71. A reconstruction of a sepulchre uncovered during the Arkaim excavations. The construction is rather monumental. It is known as the “Sepulchre of Greater]
How did the archaeologists date Arkaim? By their usual method – the search of analogies, or ties between the findings from this site and “similar” objects pertinent to other cultures, also presumed to date from times immemorial. Apparently, “the Ural complexes can be dated by the characteristic collection of metal objects and bone harness details, also known to us from the findings made in the fourth burial mound of Mycenae, dating to the XVII-XVI century B.C. The epoch corresponds to that of Troy VI, as well as the very end of the Middle Hellas period and the early Mycenae period in the history of continental Greece” ([33], page 35).

Thus, the archaeologists and the historians deem it sufficient to find a number of objects that “resemble” those from Troy and Mycenae in Arkaim and several other settlements in the Ural region to declare the latter to be extremely ancient. According to our reconstruction, the “ancient” Troy and Mycenae represent a culture that cannot predate the XI-XIII century A.D., likewise the old settlements in the Ural region.

Erroneous datings resulted in several mysterious “sinusoidal curves” inherent in Scaligerian history. The very same cultures of the XIII-XVII century were duplicated (on paper) and arbitrarily dated to different epochs, separated by hundreds and even thousands of years. This in how the “ancient” phantom duplicates came to existence. Modern archaeologists study the Scaligerian version and discover peculiar repetitions, or renaissances, which leads them to the construction of involved theories aimed at explaining these odd sinusoidal patterns of human evolution. Their corollaries are formulated as follows, and are apparently erroneous: “The evolution of social interactions has been anything but linear – we witness lengthy pauses and even reverse movement … the fortified settlements from the South of Ural resemble the Siberian towns in the taiga dating from the Iron Age; the history of society can therefore be regarded as possessing a sinusoidal dynamic of rises and falls, when social consolidation would inevitably be followed by a return to the clan
traditions of the old days” ([33], page 36).

The “mysterious sinusoidal patterns” are likely to be figmental. Our reconstruction considers the evolution of human society to have been linear in general.

After the defeat of the army of Muscovite Tartary led by “Pougachev” in 1775, the troops of the Romanovs entered South Ural and Siberia for the first time, q.v. above. One must think that the fortifications of the Horde Cossacks were destroyed and burnt down. The surviving warriors and residents had to flee; abandoned citadels were forgotten and only discovered by the archaeologists at the end of the XX century. Such is the nature of Arkaim and similar old citadels of the XV-XVIII century A.D.
5.
The conquest of Siberia after the victory over “Pougachev” and the trace that it has left in the numismatic history of Russia

Our hypothesis about the war between the Romanovs and Pougachev being something radically different from the “suppression of a peasant revolt”, as the Romanovs have claimed, but rather a full-scale war with the neighbouring state comprised of Siberia and the American Northwest, which had ended with the annexation of Siberia by the Romanovs, is confirmed perfectly well by the numismatic history of Russia.

The conquest of new lands that were joined to the Romanovian Russia would usually be reflected by the coins minted in Russia during that epoch. St. Petersburg would immediately begin to mint a new type of coin for newly joined provinces; in some cases, the Romanovs would start to mint new coins as soon as their troops had stepped on the soil of another country destined for annexation, without waiting for the country in question to become a province of Romanovian Russia formally.

For instance, during the Seven-year War of 1756-1763, Empress Yelizaveta Petrovna had harboured plans of making Prussia a part of Russia. In 1760 Russian army took Berlin, which was preceded by the conquest of Eastern Prussia, with Königsberg taken on 22 January 1758 (Old Style dating: 11 January); all the inhabitants and the officials of the Eastern Prussia were forced to swear fealty to the Russian empress” ([85], Volume 38, page 477). It is common knowledge that the war in question did not result in Prussia becoming a Russian province; however, the Romanovian government started to mint silver coins for Prussia en masse as early as in 1759 ([857], pages 371-375; see figs. 12.72, 12.73 and 12.74).
Fig. 12.72. The 18-grosh “Prussian coins” minted en masse in 1759 by Yelizaveta Petrovna for Prussia, which was intended to be made part of Russia after the victory in the Seven-Year War of 1756-1763. On one side of the coin we see the Prussian coat of arms (a single-headed eagle) and the lettering MONETA REGNI PRUSS, or “Prussian coinage”. On the flip side we see a profile of the Russian empress Yelizaveta Petrovna as well as the following lettering: ELISAB. I. D. G. IMP. TOT. RUSS. Before the minting of these coins (in 1758) the residents and the officials of Eastern Prussia had sworn their loyalty to the Russian empress ([85], Volume 38, page 477). The “Prussian coins” of different value were coined in large amounts – initially in Königsberg, and later in Moscow (1759-1762), q.v. in [857], pages 371-372. In 1763, after the end of the war, it became obvious that Prussia would never become a Russian province, and the mintage of the “Prussian coin” ceased. Taken from [857], page 372.

Fig. 12.73. The 2-grosh “Prussian coins” minted en masse in 1760 by Yelizaveta Petrovna for Prussia, which was intended to be made part of Russia after the victory in the Seven-Year War of 1756-1763. On one side of the coin we see the lettering GROSSUS REGNI PRUSS, or the Great Principality of Prussia. The reverse reveals the lettering that says MONETA AR G. T. NTEA. Taken from [857], page 372.
Fig. 12.74. “Prussian coins” minted by Yelizaveta Petrovna for Prussia as a prospective Russian province. We see the Prussian coat of arms on one side of the coin (the eagle), as well as the lettering saying MONETA REGNI PRUSS (“Prussian coinage”). On the flip side we see the profile of the Russian empress Yelizaveta Petrovna and the lettering that says ELISAB. I. D. G. IMP. TOT. RUSS. From the collection of T. G. Fomenko. Photograph taken in 2000.

Special coins had been minted by the Russian government for Georgia in 1806-1833 by the state mints in Tiflis and St. Petersburg ([857], pages 342-345). Apart from the value, the names bore the legend “kartkhuli puli”, or “Georgian coinage” (ibid., page 342).

In 1787, four years after the annexation of the Crimea, special Russian coins were minted for that area – the so-called “Tauris coins” (ibid., page 341; see fig. 12.75). And so on, and so forth.

Fig. 12.75. Silver Tauric coins minted by Russia for Crimea when it became a Russian province. These coins were only minted in 1787 ([857], page 341). When the Crimea became part of Russia, they were replaced by regular Russian coins. We see the sigil of Catherine the Great and the lettering that says “Queen of Chersonese in Tauris” in Russian. Taken from [857], page 341.
Siberian coinage occupies a special place in history. Apparently, Romanovs started to mint a special kind of “Siberian coinage” in 1763, 12 years before their final victory over Pougachev ([857], pages 335-340; see figs. 12.76, 12.77 and 12.78). They stopped minting this coin in 1781, 6 years after the execution of Pougachev (ibid.). This would only happen in cases when Romanovian Russia had waged wars against its neighbours in order to annex new territories. New coinage for new provinces was only minted in such cases. The government would cease to mint special coinage as soon as the inhabitants of a given province got used to the normal Russian currency. We shall list all these cases below.

Fig. 12.76. “Siberian coins” of 10 and 5 kopeks minted by the Romanovian administration in 1777. The Romanovs issued Siberian coinage between 1763 and 1781 ([857], pages 335-338). They were minted at the St. Petersburg mint initially (in 1763-1764), according to [857], page 335. After that, their production was relocated to the Kolyvanskiy mint. Siberian coins were minted up until 1781, whereupon they were replaced by the regular Russian coinage. Taken from [857], page 339.
The special Siberian coinage minted in 1763-1781 is another proof of our reconstruction, which claims the victory of the Romanovs over Pougachev to have been the military defeat of Muscovite Tartary, a Russian state that had been a neighbour of the Romanovian Russia and comprised Siberia as well as the American Northwest, its capital being Tobolsk.

The monograph of V. V. Ouzdenikov entitled *Russian Coins. 1700-1917* ([857]) allocates a special section for the coins of Romanovian Russia minted for the provinces that had joined recently (“Regional and National Emissions” – see [857], pages 330-381). All such types of coins as given in [857] are listed below.

1) The coins for the Baltic provinces, or the so-called “Livonese” coins, silver, see fig. 12.79. They were minted for Livo-Estonia, Livonia and Estland (Estonia). The emission years are 1756-1757 ([857], pages 330-
It is assumed that Estonia went to Russia after the Nistadt Peace Treaty, which was signed with Sweden in 1721. However, Estonia had remained a de facto autonomous state for a while, ruled by the local barons ([85], Volume 49, page 201). A customs office had been active at the border between Russia and Estonia up until 1782 (ibid., page 224).

Fig. 12.79. Russian coins minted for the Baltic provinces (the so-called “Livonese coins”). Their production falls over the years of 1756-1757 ([857], page 330). We see the Russian bicephalous eagle with the coats of arms of Livonia and Estland. The lettering reads as “MONETA LIVOESTONICA”, or Livonese and Estonian coinage. Other specimens read “MONETA LIVONICA ET ESTLANDIA” ([857], page 330). Taken from [857], page 332.

2) Siberian coins (see figs. 12.76, 12.77 and 12.78). Emission years: 1763-1781 ([857], pages 335-340). The Romanovian version of history does not tell us anything about the annexation of Siberia in the XVII-XVIII century. Siberia is said to have belonged to them from the very start. However, we have seen that the Romanovs must have defeated the tremendous state comprised of Siberia and the American Northwest in 1775, making it part of their empire shortly afterwards. In this case, the emission dates of the Romanovian Siberian coins coincide with the datings of the war against Muscovite Tartary, including the preparations for the war and a short few years after the victory.

3) The Tauris Coins, silver, see fig. 12.75. Emission year: 1787 ([857],
Crimea (formerly known as Tauris) became part of Russia in 1783 ([85], Volume 23, page 552). Four years later, a special emission of Crimean coins was minted.

4) Coins for Georgia. Emission years: 1806-1833 ([857], pages 342-345). Georgia was joined to Russia around 1801-1813 in the course of the war with Persia (1804-1813) and Turkey (1806-1812), q.v. in [85], Volume 13, page 46. The manifesto of Alexander I about the acquisition of Georgia dates to 1801 (ibid.). The acquisition became permanent after the military victories over Turkey and Persia in 1804-1813. The emission of Russian coins for Georgia had started these wars were fought, in 1806; it had lasted for some 25 years.

5) Coins for Poland (see fig. 12.80). Emission years: 1815-1841 ([857], pages 346-358). Poland joined Russia after the Viennese Congress of 1814-1815 ([85], Volume 34, page 32). In 1815 a part of the former Warsaw Duchy “became the Kingdom of Poland… the Russian Emperor declared himself King (Czar) of Poland” (ibid.). The emission of Russian coinage for Poland began the very same year, in 1815.

Fig. 12.80. Russian silver coin minted for Poland with the profile of Czar Alexander I and the lettering that reads “10 ZLOTYCH POLSKICH”, or “ten Polish zloty”. Such coins of various denominations (golden, silver and copper) were minted in 1815-1841, or the first decades that followed the annexation of Poland by Russia ([857], pages 346-358). They were replaced by the regular Russian coinage, which had remained in
circulation up until the revolution of 1917. Taken from [857], page 353.

6) Coins for Finland (fig. 12.81). Emission dates: 1863-1917 ([857], pages 359-367). Finland was joined to Russian in 1809 after the war of 1808-1809 between Russia and Sweden ([85], Volume 45, page 182). However, in 1863 the Russian government made a number of concessions to Finland; in particular, “a currency reform was carried out in 1860-1865 – Finland got currency of its own as a result” (ibid., page 183). Thus, the emission of special coinage for Finland came in the wake of a status change of this recently joined Russian province.

Fig. 12.81. Russian coins minted for Finland, formerly a province of Russia (until 1917). The denominations varied between 1 penny and 20 markkaa (gold, silver and copper). See [857], pages 359-367. Taken from [857], page 380.

7) Coins for making payments in Poland, silver (see fig. 12.82). Minted under Peter the Great during the war of 1707-1709 between Russia and Sweden. The coins have a half face of Peter the Great on one side and the Russian bicephalous eagle on the other. The legend says: “Czar and Great Prince Peter Alexeyevich, Lord and Ruler of All Russia”. The year is transcribed with Slavic numerals on some coins, and Arabic numerals on others. The value of coins was not indicated (see fig. 12.82 and [857], pages 368-369).
Thus, the Russian government of Peter’s epoch had opined that the most fitting inscription for Polish money would be in Russian. Peter may have thought about joining Poland to Russia – otherwise it is unclear just why he would want to have his half-face on Polish coins.

Russian coins for Poland were minted in 1707-1709, when Poland had been annexed by Sweden, the foe of Russia in this war ([85], Volume 34, page 28). The coins were therefore minted for a country dominated by the military opponent of Russia. The emission of Polish coinage might be explained by the hopes of the outcome where Poland would become part of Russia. When the war ended in 1709 and it became clear that Poland would not become part of Russia, the emission had stopped.

8) Golden chervontsi of 1716 with a half-face of Peter I, bicephalous eagle and the Latin inscription saying “Sovereign of Russia by the Grace of the Lord, Great Prince of Moscow” (fig. 12.83). The value of these chervontsi had not been indicated anywhere; however, “the size and the alloy standard of these coins corresponded to the Dutch ducats, which had been widely used in international trade” ([857], page 370). The reasons why Peter’s government would want to mint these coins remain unclear – the monograph puts them in the category of “coins used for payments abroad” (ibid.). Peter might have intended to use them in the Western European countries that he had planned to conquer and make part of Russia.
Fig. 12.83. A golden Russian chervonets of 1716 with Latin lettering. On one side of the coin we see a profile of Peter the Great; the flip side depicts the Russian bicephalous eagle. The denomination of the coin isn’t indicated anywhere. The Latin title of Peter as written on the coin translates as “Ruler of Russia by the Grace of the Lord, Great Prince of Moscow” ([857], page 370). The purpose behind the minting of this coin by Peter’s administration remains unknown ([857], page 370). Taken from [857], page 371.

9) Coins for Prussia, silver (figs. 12.72, 12.73 and 12.74. Emission years: 1759-1762, or the Seven-year War; the epoch that Yelizaveta had intended to make Prussia a Russian province. The minting of the coins began immediately after the fealty sworn to the Russia Empress by the inhabitants of Eastern Prussia in 1758 ([85], Volume 38, page 477). We mean mass production and not specimen batches ([857], pages 371-375).

10) Foreign coins minted in Russia. Those were made by the St. Petersburg mint secretly, without leave of the respective governments ([857], page 376). Two such coins are known: Russian copies of the Dutch ducat and the Turkish piaster. Both coins are golden (ibid.).

11) Coins for Moldavia and Walachia (figs. 12.84 and 12.85). Emission years: 1771-1774 ([857], pages 377-381). Although Moldavia and Walachia, two principalities on the Danube that had formerly been part of the Turkish empire, were de facto protectorates of Russia ever since the Kyuchuk-Kainardji Peace Treaty between Russia and Turkey in 1774, they had not joined the Russian Empire formally ([85], Volume 28, page 87). The official acquisition took place a great deal later, in 1877 (ibid.). This fact became reflected in numismatic history. When Russia had strived to join the Danube principalities in 1771-1774, the government started to mint coins for Moldavia and Walachia. When it became clear in 1774 that making them join the empire formally was a non-option, the mintage had
ceased.

Fig. 12.84. Russian coin for Moldavia and Walachia minted in 1771, during the war with Turkey, which is when the Russian troops had occupied the Turkish provinces of Moldavia and Walachia. The coin has a double indication of denomination – in Turkish “paras” and Russian “dengas”, one of the former being equivalent to three of the latter. These coins were minted in 1771-1774 at the private mint of Sandogur, ordered by the Russian government ([857], page 377). In 1774 the Kyuchuk-Karnadji pact was signed with Turkey, which specified that Moldavia and Walachia were to remain part of the Turkish Empire ([85], Volume 28, page 87). The minting of Russian coins for Moldavia and Walachia was stopped the same year ([857], page 377). Taken from [857], page 380.

Fig. 12.85. Russian coins for Moldavia and Walachia minted in 1773, when the Romanovian government was planning to join these lands to Russia after the war with Turkey. These plans never came to fruition, and the minting of the coins was stopped in 1774 ([857], page 377). On one side we see the coat of arms of Moldavia and Walachia as well as the lettering that translates as “Moldavian and Walachian coinage”. On the flip side we find a double denomination – in Russian kopeks (or “dengas”) and Turkish “paras”. Taken from [857], page 380.

We can therefore see that in each case the emission of special coins by the
Romanovian government had been associated with the acquisition of new lands from neighbouring countries or attempts thereof. Siberian coins are by no means an exception. It is likely that Siberia, likewise the American Alaska, had indeed joined the Romanovian Russia at the very end of the XVIII century, after the long and violent war against “Pougachev”. Both had been part of another state prior to that – a gigantic Russian kingdom that had been hostile towards the Romanovs – the last remnant of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. The erroneous version of Russian history had only been planted after the defeat of the Siberian and American state of Muscovite Tartary, since there were no opponents left by that time.
What mainstream historians say about the New Chronology?

The New Chronology is a fringe theory regarded by the academic community as pseudohistory, which argues that the conventional chronology of Middle Eastern and European history is fundamentally flawed, and that events attributed to the civilizations of the Roman Empire, Ancient Greece and Ancient Egypt actually occurred during the Middle Ages, more than a thousand years later. The central concepts of the New Chronology are derived from the ideas of Russian scholar Nikolai Morozov (1854-1946), although work by French scholar Jean Hardouin (1646-1729) can be viewed as an earlier predecessor. However, the New Chronology is most commonly associated with Russian mathematician Anatoly Fomenko (b. 1945), although published works on the subject are actually a collaboration between Fomenko and several other mathematicians. The concept is most fully explained in *History: Fiction or Science?* book series, originally published in Russian.

The New Chronology also contains a reconstruction, an alternative chronology, radically shorter than the standard historical timeline, because all ancient history is “folded” onto the Middle Ages. According to Fomenko’s claims, the written history of humankind goes only as far back as AD 800, there is almost no information about events between AD 800–1000, and most known historical events took place in AD 1000–1500.

The New Chronology is rejected by mainstream historians and is inconsistent with absolute and relative dating techniques used in the wider scholarly community. The majority of scientific commentators consider the New Chronology to be pseudoscientific.
History of New Chronology

The idea of chronologies that differ from the conventional chronology can be traced back to at least the early XVII century. Jean Hardouin then suggested that many ancient historical documents were much younger than commonly believed to be. In 1685 he published a version of Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History* in which he claimed that most Greek and Roman texts had been forged by Benedictine monks. When later questioned on these results, Hardouin stated that he would reveal the monks’ reasons in a letter to be revealed only after his death. The executors of his estate were unable to find such a document among his posthumous papers. In the XVII century, Sir Isaac Newton, examining the current chronology of Ancient Greece, Ancient Egypt and the Ancient Near East, expressed discontent with prevailing theories and proposed one of his own, which, basing its study on Apollonius of Rhodes’s *Argonautica*, changed the traditional dating of the Argonautic Expedition, the Trojan War, and the Founding of Rome.

In 1887, Edwin Johnson expressed the opinion that early Christian history was largely invented or corrupted in the II and III centuries. In 1909, Otto Rank made note of duplications in literary history of a variety of cultures:

“… almost all important civilized peoples have early woven myths around and glorified in poetry their heroes, mythical kings and princes, founders of religions, of dynasties, empires and cities—in short, their national heroes. Especially the history of their birth and of their early years is furnished with phantastic [*sic*] traits; the amazing similarity, nay literal identity, of those tales, even if they refer to different, completely independent peoples, sometimes geographically far removed from one another, is well known and has struck many an investigator.” (Rank, Otto. *Der Mythos von der Geburt des Helden*.)

Fomenko became interested in Morozov’s theories in 1973. In 1980, together with a few colleagues from the mathematics department of
Moscow State University, he published several articles on “new mathematical methods in history” in peer-reviewed journals. The articles stirred a lot of controversy, but ultimately Fomenko failed to win any respected historians to his side. By the early 1990s, Fomenko shifted his focus from trying to convince the scientific community via peer-reviewed publications to publishing books. Beam writes that Fomenko and his colleagues were discovered by the Soviet scientific press in the early 1980s, leading to “a brief period of renown”; a contemporary review from the journal *Questions of History* complained, “Their constructions have nothing in common with Marxist historical science.” (Alex Beam. “A shorter history of civilization.” *Boston Globe*, 16 September 1991.)

By 1996, his theory had grown to cover Russia, Turkey, China, Europe, and Egypt

### Fomenko’s claims

According to New Chronology, the traditional chronology consists of four overlapping copies of the “true” chronology shifted back in time by significant intervals with some further revisions. Fomenko claims all events and characters conventionally dated earlier than XI century are fictional, and represent “phantom reflections” of actual Middle Ages events and characters, brought about by intentional or accidental misdatings of historical documents. Before the invention of printing, accounts of the same events by different eyewitnesses were sometimes retold several times before being written down, then often went through multiple rounds of translating and copyediting. Names were translated, mispronounced and misspelled to the point where they bore little resemblance to originals.

According to Fomenko, this led early chronologists to believe or choose to believe that those accounts described different events and even different countries and time periods. Fomenko justifies this approach by the fact that, in many cases, the original documents are simply not available. Fomenko claims that all the history of the ancient world is known to us
from manuscripts that date from the XV century to the XVIII century, but describe events that allegedly happened thousands of years before, the originals regrettably and conveniently lost.

For example, the oldest extant manuscripts of monumental treatises on Ancient Roman and Greek history, such as *Annals* and *Histories*, are conventionally dated c. AD 1100, more than a full millennium after the events they describe, and they did not come to scholars’ attention until the XV century. According to Fomenko, the XV century is probably when these documents were first written.

Central to Fomenko’s New Chronology is his claim of the existence of a vast Slav-Turk empire, which he called the “Russian Horde”, which he says played the dominant role in Eurasian history before the XVII century. The various peoples identified in ancient and medieval history, from the Scythians, Huns, Goths and Bulgars, through the Polyane, Duleby, Drevliane, Pechenegs, to in more recent times, the Cossacks, Ukrainians, and Belarusians, are nothing but elements of the single Russian Horde. For the New Chronologists, peoples such as the Ukrainians, Belarusians, Mongols, and others who assert their national independence from Russia, are suffering from a historical delusion.

Fomenko claims that the most probable prototype of the historical Jesus was Andronikos I Komnenos (allegedly AD 1152 to 1185), the emperor of Byzantium, known for his failed reforms; his traits and deeds reflected in ‘biographies’ of many real and imaginary persons (A. T. Fomenko, G. V. Nosovskiy. *Czar of the Slavs* (in Russian). St. Petersburg: Neva, 2004.). The historical Jesus is a composite figure and reflection of the Old Testament prophet Elisha (850-800 BC?), Pope Gregory VII (1020?-1085), Saint Basil of Caesarea (330-379), and even Li Yuanhao (also known as Emperor Jingzong, or “Son of Heaven”, emperor of Western Xia, who reigned in 1032-1048), Euclides, Bacchus and Dionysius. Fomenko explains the seemingly vast differences in the biographies of these figures as resulting from difference in languages, points of view and time frame of the authors of said accounts and biographies.

Fomenko claims the Hagia Sophia is actually the biblical Temple of Solomon. He identifies Solomon as sultan Suleiman the Magnificent (1494–1566). He claims that historical Jesus may have been born in 1152 and was crucified around AD 1185 on the hill overlooking the Bosphorus.

On the other hand, according to Fomenko the word “Rome” is a placeholder and can signify any one of several different cities and kingdoms. He claims the “First Rome”, or “Ancient Rome”, or “Mizraim”, is an ancient Egyptian kingdom in the delta of the Nile with its capital in Alexandria. The second and most famous “New Rome” is Constantinople. The third “Rome” is constituted by three different cities: Constantinople (again), Rome in Italy, and Moscow. According to his claims, Rome in Italy was founded around AD 1380 by Aeneas, and Moscow as the third Rome was the capital of the great “Russian Horde.” Similarly, the word “Jerusalem” is actually a placeholder rather than a physical location and can refer to different cities at different times and the word “Israel” did not define a state, even not a territory, but people fighting for God, for example, French St. Louis and English Elizabeth called themselves the King/Queen of Israel.

He claims that parallelism between John the Baptist, Jesus, and Old Testament prophets implies that the New Testament was written before the Old Testament. Fomenko claims that the Bible was being written until the Council of Trent (1545–1563), when the list of canonical books was established, and all apocryphal books were ordered to be destroyed. Fomenko also claims that Plato, Plotinus and Gemistus Pletho are one and the same person; according to him, some texts by or about Pletho were misdated and today believed to be texts by or about Plotinus or Plato. He
claims similar duplicates Dionysius the Areopagite, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, and Dionysius Petavius. He claims Florence and the House of Medici bankrolled and played an important role in creation of the magnificent ‘Roman’ and ‘Greek’ past.

Specific claims

In volumes 1, 2, 3 and 4 of *History: Fiction or Science?*, Fomenko and his colleagues make numerous claims:

- Historians and translators often “assign” different dates and locations to different accounts of the same historical events, creating multiple “phantom copies” of these events. These “phantom copies” are often misdated by centuries or even millennia and end up incorporated into conventional chronology.

- This chronology was largely manufactured by Joseph Justus Scaliger in *Opus Novum de emendatione temporum* (1583) and *Thesaurum temporum* (1606), and represents a vast array of dates produced without any justification whatsoever, containing the repeating sequences of dates with shifts equal to multiples of the major cabbalistic numbers 333 and 360. The Jesuit Dionysius Petavius completed this chronology in *De Doctrina Temporum*, 1627 (v.1) and 1632 (v.2).

- Archaeological dating, dendrochronological dating, paleographical dating, numismatic dating, carbon dating, and other methods of dating of ancient sources and artifacts known today are erroneous, non-exact or dependent on traditional chronology.

- No single document in existence can be reliably dated earlier than the XI century. Most “ancient” artifacts may find other than consensual explanation.

- Histories of Ancient Rome, Greece and Egypt were crafted during the Renaissance by humanists and clergy - mostly on the basis of documents of their own making.
The Old Testament represents a rendition of events of the XIV to XVI centuries AD in Europe and Byzantium, containing “prophecies” about “future” events related in the New Testament, a rendition of events of AD 1152 to 1185.

The history of religions runs as follows: the pre-Christian period (before the XI century and the birth of Jesus), Bacchic Christianity (XI and XII centuries, before and after the life of Jesus), Christianity (XII to XVI centuries) and its subsequent mutations into Orthodox Christianity, Catholicism, Judaism, and Islam.

The *Almagest* of Claudius Ptolemy, traditionally dated to around AD 150 and considered the cornerstone of classical history, was compiled in XVI and XVII centuries from astronomical data of the IX to XVI centuries.

37 complete Egyptian horoscopes found in Denderah, Esna, and other temples have unique valid astronomical solutions with dates ranging from AD 1000 and up to as late as AD 1700.

The Book of Revelation, as we know it, contains a horoscope, dated to 25 September - 10 October 1486, compiled by cabbalist Johannes Reuchlin.

The horoscopes found in Sumerian/Babylonian tablets do not contain sufficient astronomical data; consequently, they have solutions every 30–50 years on the time axis and are therefore useless for purposes of dating.

The Chinese tables of eclipses are useless for dating, as they contain too many eclipses that did not take place astronomically. Chinese tables of comets, even if true, cannot be used for dating.

All major inventions like powder and guns, paper and print occurred in Europe in the period between the X and the XVI centuries.

Ancient Roman and Greek statues, showing perfect command of the human anatomy, are fakes crafted in the Renaissance, when artists attained such command for the first time.

There was no such thing as the Tartar and Mongol invasion followed
by over two centuries of yoke and slavery, because the so-called “Tartars and Mongols” were the actual ancestors of the modern Russians, living in a bilingual state with Turkic spoken as freely as Russian. So, Russia and Turkey once formed parts of the same empire. This ancient Russian state was governed by a double structure of civil and military authorities and the hordes were actually professional armies with a tradition of lifelong conscription (the recruitment being the so-called “blood tax”). The Mongol “invasions” were punitive operations against the regions of the empire that attempted tax evasion. Tamerlane was probably a Russian warlord.

- Official Russian history is a blatant forgery concocted by a host of German scholars brought to Russia to legitimize the usurping Romanov dynasty (1613-1917).
- Moscow was founded as late as the mid-XIV century. The battle of Kulikovo took place in Moscow.
- The tsar Ivan the Terrible represents a collation of no fewer than four rulers, representing two rival dynasties: the legitimate Godunov rulers and the ambitious Romanov upstarts.
- English history of AD 640–1040 and Byzantine history of AD 378–830 are reflections of the same late-medieval original.

**Fomenko’s methods**

*Statistical correlation of texts*

One of Fomenko’s simplest methods is statistical correlation of texts. His basic assumption is that a text which describes a sequence of events will devote more space to more important events (for example, a period of war or an unrest will have much more space devoted to than a period of peaceful, non-eventful years), and that this irregularity will remain visible in other descriptions of the period. For each analysed text, a function is devised which maps each year mentioned in the text with the number of pages (lines, letters) devoted in the text to its description (which could be
zero). The function of the two texts are then compared. (*Chron1*, pp. 187–194.)

For example, Fomenko compares the contemporary history of Rome written by Titus Livius with a modern history of Rome written by Russian historian V. S. Sergeev, calculating that the two have high correlation, and thus that they describe the same period of history, which is undisputed. (*Chron1*, pp. 194–196.) He also compares modern texts, which describe different periods, and calculates low correlation, as expected. (*Chron1*, pp. 194–196.) However, when he compares, for example, the ancient history of Rome and the medieval history of Rome, he calculates a high correlation, and concludes that ancient history of Rome is a copy of medieval history of Rome, thus clashing with mainstream accounts.

**Statistical correlation of dynasties**

In a somewhat similar manner, Fomenko compares two dynasties of rulers using statistical methods. First, he creates a database of rulers, containing relevant information on each of them. Then, he creates “survey codes” for each pair of the rulers, which contain a number which describes degree of the match of each considered property of two rulers. For example, one of the properties is the way of death: if two rulers were both poisoned, they get value of +1 in their property of the way of death; if one ruler was poisoned and another killed in combat, they get -1; and if one was poisoned, and another died of illness, they get 0 (Fomenko claims there is possibility that chroniclers were not impartial and that different descriptions nonetheless describe the same person). An important property is the length of the rule. (*Chron1*, pp. 215–223.)
Sample Fomenko parallelism.

Fomenko lists a number of pairs of unrelated dynasties – for example, dynasties of kings of Israel and emperors of late Western Roman Empire (AD 300-476) – and claims that this method demonstrates correlations between their reigns. (Graphs which show just the length of the rule in the two dynasties are the most widely known; however, Fomenko’s conclusions are also based on other parameters, as described above.) He also claims that the regnal history from the XVII to XX centuries never shows correlation of “dynastic flows” with each other, therefore Fomenko
insists history was multiplied and outstretched into imaginary antiquity to justify this or other “royal” pretensions.

Fomenko uses for the demonstration of correlation between the reigns exclusively the data from the *Chronological Tables* of J. Blair (Moscow, 1808-1809). Fomenko says that Blair’s tables are all the more valuable to us since they were compiled in an epoch adjacent to the time of Scaligerian chronology. According to Fomenko these tables contain clearer signs of “Scaligerite activity” which were subsequently buried under layers of paint and plaster by historians of the XIX and XX centuries.

**Astronomical evidence**

Fomenko examines astronomical events described in ancient texts and claims that the chronology is actually medieval. For example:

- He says the mysterious drop in the value of the lunar acceleration parameter D” (“a linear combination of the [angular] accelerations of the Earth and Moon”) between the years AD 700–1300, which the American astronomer Robert Newton had explained in terms of “non-gravitational” (i.e., tidal) forces. By eliminating those anomalous early eclipses the New Chronology produces a constant value of D” beginning around AD 1000. (*Chron1*, pp. pp.93-94, 105-6.)

- He associates initially the Star of Bethlehem with the AD 1140 (±20) supernova (now Crab Nebula) and the Crucifixion Eclipse with the total solar eclipse of AD 1170 (±20). He also believes that Crab Nebula supernova could not have exploded in AD 1054, but probably in AD 1153. He connects it with total eclipse of AD 1186. Moreover he holds in strong doubt the veracity of ancient Chinese astronomical data.

- He argues that the star catalog in the *Almagest*, ascribed to the Hellenistic astronomer Claudius Ptolemy, was compiled in the XV to XVI centuries AD. With this objective in sight he develops new methods of dating old stellar catalogues and claims that the *Almagest* is based on data collected between AD 600 and 1300, whereby the
telluric obliquity is well taken into account.

- He refines and completes Morozov’s analysis of some ancient horoscopes, most notably, the so-called Dendera Zodiacs—two horoscopes drawn on the ceiling of the temple of Hathor—and comes to the conclusion that they correspond to either the XI or the XIII century AD. Moreover, in his History: Fiction or Science? series finale, he makes computer-aided dating of all 37 Egyptian horoscopes that contain sufficient astronomical data, and claims they all fit into XI to XIX century timeframe. Traditional history usually either interprets these horoscopes as belonging to the I century BC or suggests that they weren’t meant to match any date at all.

- In his final analysis of an eclipse triad described by the ancient Greek Thucydides in History of the Peloponnesian War, Fomenko dates the eclipses to AD 1039, 1046 and 1057. Because of the layered structure of the manuscript, he claims that Thucydides actually lived in medieval times and in describing the Peloponnesian War between the Spartans and Athenians he was actually describing the conflict between the medieval Navarrans and Catalans in Spain from AD 1374 to 1387.

- Fomenko claims that the abundance of dated astronomical records in cuneiform texts from Mesopotamia is of little use for dating of events, as the astronomical phenomena they describe recur cyclically every 30–40 years.

**Rejection of common dating methods**

On archaeological dating methods, Fomenko claims:

“Archaeological, dendrochronological, paleographical and carbon methods of dating of ancient sources and artifacts are both non-exact and contradictory, therefore there is not a single piece of firm written evidence or artifact that could be reliably and independently dated earlier than the XI century.” (Chron1.)
Dendrochronology is rejected with a claim that, for dating of objects much older than the oldest still living trees, it isn’t an absolute, but a relative dating method, and thus dependent on traditional chronology. Fomenko specifically points to a break of dendrochronological scales around AD 1000.

Fomenko also cites a number of cases where carbon dating of a series of objects of known age gave significantly different dates. He also alleges undue cooperation between physicists and archaeologists in obtaining the dates, since most radiocarbon dating labs only accept samples with an age estimate suggested by historians or archaeologists. Fomenko also claims that carbon dating over the range of AD 1 to 2000 is inaccurate because it has too many sources of error that are either guessed at or completely ignored, and that calibration is done with a statistically meaningless number of samples. Consequently, Fomenko concludes that carbon dating is not accurate enough to be used on historical scale.

Fomenko rejects numismatic dating as circular, being based on the traditional chronology, and points to cases of similar coins being minted in distant periods, unexplained long periods with no coins minted and cases of mismatch of numismatic dating with historical accounts. (Chron1, pp. 90-92.)

He fully agrees with absolute dating methods for clay tablets or coins like thermoluminescence dating, optically stimulated luminescence dating, archaeomagnetic, metallographic dating, but claims that their precision does not allow for comprehensive pinpointing on the time axis either.

Fomenko also condemns the common archaeological practice of submitting samples for dating accompanied with an estimate of the expected age. He claims that convergence of uncertainty in archaeological dating methods proves strictly nothing per se. Even if the sum S of probabilities of the veracity of event produced by N dating methods exceeds 1.00 it does not mean that the event has taken place with 100% probability.
Reception

Fomenko’s historical ideas have been universally rejected by mainstream scholars, who brand them as pseudoscience, but were popularized by former world chess champion Garry Kasparov. Billington writes that the theory “might have quietly blown away in the wind tunnels of academia” if not for Kasparov’s writing in support of it in the magazine *Ogoniok*. Kasparov met Fomenko during the 1990s, and found that Fomenko’s conclusions concerning certain subjects were identical to his own regarding the popular view (which is not the view of academics) that art and culture died during the Dark Ages and were not revived until the Renaissance. Kasparov also felt it illogical that the Romans and the Greeks living under the banner of Byzantium could fail to use the mounds of scientific knowledge left them by Ancient Greece and Rome, especially when it was of urgent military use. However, Kasparov does not support the reconstruction part of the New Chronology. Russian critics tended to see Fomenko’s New Chronology as “an embarrassment and a potent symbol of the depths to which the Russian academy and society have generally sunk … since the fall of Communism.” Western critics see his views as part of a renewed Russian imperial ideology, “keeping alive an imperial consciousness and secular messianism in Russia.”

In 2004 Anatoly Fomenko with his coauthor Gleb Nosovsky were awarded for their books on “New Chronology” the anti-prize of the Moscow International Book Fair called “Abzatz” (literally ‘paragraph’, a euphemism for a vulgar Russian word meaning disaster or fiasco) in the category “Esteemed nonsense” (“Pochotnaya bezgramota”) awarded for the worst book published in Russia.

Critics have accused Fomenko of altering the data to improve the fit with his ideas and have noted that he violates a key rule of statistics by selecting matches from the historical record which support his chronology, while ignoring those which do not, creating artificial, better-than-chance correlations, and that these practices undermine Fomenko’s statistical
arguments. The new chronology was given a comprehensive critical analysis in a round table on “The ‘Myths’ of New Chronology” chaired by the dean of the department of history of Moscow State University in December 1999. One of the participants in that round table, the distinguished Russian archaeologist, Valentin Yanin, compared Fomenko’s work to “the sleight of hand trickery of a David Copperfield.” Linguist Andrey Zaliznyak argued that by using the Fomenko’s approaches one can “prove” any historical correspondence, for example, between Ancient Egyptian pharaohs and French kings.

James Billington, formerly professor of Russian history at Harvard and Princeton and currently the Librarian of Congress placed Fomenko’s work within the context of the political movement of Eurasianism, which sought to tie Russian history closely to that of its Asian neighbors. Billington describes Fomenko as ascribing the belief in past hostility between Russia and the Mongols to the influence of Western historians. Thus, by Fomenko’s chronology, “Russia and Turkey are parts of a previously single empire.” A French reviewer of Billington’s book noted approvingly his concern with the phantasmagorical conceptions of Fomenko about the global “new chronology.”

H.G. van Bueren, professor emeritus of astronomy at the University of Utrecht, concluded his scathing review of Fomenko’s work on the application of mathematics and astronomy to historical data as follows:

“It is surprising, to say the least, that a well-known (Dutch) publisher could produce an expensive book of such doubtful intellectual value, of which the only good word that can be said is that it contains an enormous amount of factual historical material, untidily ordered, true; badly written, yes; mixed-up with conjectural nonsense, sure; but still, much useful stuff. For the rest of the book is absolutely worthless. It reminds one of the early Soviet attempts to produce tendentious science (Lysenko!), of polywater, of cold fusion, and of modern creationism. In brief: a useless and misleading book.” (H. G. van Bueren, Mathematics and Logic.)


Convergence of methods in archaeological dating

While Fomenko rejects commonly accepted dating methods, archaeologists, conservators and other scientists make extensive use of such techniques which have been rigorously examined and refined during decades of use.

In the specific case of dendrochronology, Fomenko claims that this fails as an absolute dating method because of gaps in the record. However, independent dendrochronological sequences beginning with living trees from various parts of North America and Europe extend back 12,400 years into the past. Furthermore, the mutual consistency of these independent dendrochronological sequences has been confirmed by comparing their radiocarbon and dendrochronological ages. These and other data have provided a calibration curve for radiocarbon dating whose internal error does not exceed ±163 years over the entire 26,000 years of the curve.

In fact, archaeologists have developed a fully anchored dendrochronology series going back past 10,000 BCE. “The absolutely dated tree-ring chronology now extends back to 12,410 cal BP (10,461 BC).”

Misuse of historical sources and forced pattern matching

Critics of Fomenko’s theory claim that his use of historical sources is highly selective and ignores the basic principles of sound historical scholarship.

“Fomenko … provides no fair-minded review of the historical literature about a topic with which he deals, quotes only those sources that serve his purposes, uses evidence in ways that seem strange to professionally-trained historians and asserts the wildest speculation as if it has the same status as the information common to the conventional historical literature.”

They also note that his method of statistically correlating of texts is very rough, because it does not take into account the many possible sources of
variation in length outside of “importance.” They maintain that differences in language, style, and scope, as well as the frequently differing views and focuses of historians, which are manifested in a different notion of “important events”, make quantifying historical writings a dubious proposition at best. What’s more, Fomenko’s critics allege that the parallelisms he reports are often derived by alleged forcing by Fomenko of the data – rearranging, merging, and removing monarchs as needed to fit the pattern.

For example, on the one hand Fomenko asserts that the vast majority of ancient sources are either irreparably distorted duplicate accounts of the same events or later forgeries. In his identification of Jesus with Pope Gregory VII (Chron2, p. 51) he ignores the otherwise vast dissimilarities between their reported lives and focuses on the similarity of their appointment to religious office by baptism. (The evangelical Jesus is traditionally believed to have lived for 33 years, and he was an adult at the time of his encounter with John the Baptist. In contrast, according to the available primary sources, Pope Gregory VII lived for at least 60 years and was born 8 years after the death of Fomenko’s John-the-Baptist equivalent John Crescentius.)

Critics allege that many of the supposed correlations of regnal durations are the product of the selective parsing and blending of the dates, events, and individuals mentioned in the original text. Another point raised by critics is that Fomenko does not explain his altering the data (changing the order of rulers, dropping rulers, combining rulers, treating interregna as rulers, switching between theologians and emperors, etc.) preventing a duplication of the effort and effectively making this whole theory an ad hoc hypothesis.

**Selectivity in reference to astronomical phenomena**

Critics point out that Fomenko’s discussion of astronomical phenomena tends to be selective, choosing isolated examples that support the New
Chronology and ignoring the large bodies of data that provide statistically supported evidence for the conventional dating. For his dating of the Almagest star catalog, Fomenko arbitrarily selected eight stars from the more than 1000 stars in the catalog, one of which (Arcturus) has a large systematic error. This star has a dominant effect on Fomenko’s dating. Statistical analysis using the same method for all “fast” stars points to the antiquity of the Almagest star catalog. Rawlins points out further that Fomenko’s statistical analysis got the wrong date for the Almagest because he took as constant Earth’s obliquity when it is a variable that changes at a very slow, but known, rate.

Fomenko’s studies ignore the abundance of dated astronomical records in cuneiform texts from Mesopotamia. Among these texts is a series of Babylonian astronomical diaries, which records precise astronomical observations of the Moon and planets, often dated in terms of the reigns of known historical figures extending back to the VI century BCE. Astronomical retrocalculations for all these moving objects allow us to date these observations, and consequently the rulers’ reigns, to within a single day. The observations are sufficiently redundant that only a small portion of them are sufficient to date a text to a unique year in the period 750 BCE to 100 CE. The dates obtained agree with the accepted chronology. In addition, F. R. Stephenson has demonstrated through a systematic study of a large number of Babylonian, Ancient and Medieval European, and Chinese records of eclipse observations that they can be dated consistently with conventional chronology at least as far back as 600 BCE. In contrast to Fomenko’s missing centuries, Stephenson’s studies of eclipse observations find an accumulated uncertainty in the timing of the rotation of the earth of 420 seconds at 400 BCE, and only 80 seconds at 1000 CE.

**Magnitude and consistency of conspiracy theory**

Fomenko claims that world history prior to 1600 was deliberately falsified
for political reasons. The consequences of this conspiracy theory are twofold. Documents that conflict with New Chronology are said to have been edited or fabricated by conspirators (mostly Western European historians and humanists of late XVI to XVII centuries). The lack of documents directly supporting New Chronology and conflicting traditional history is said to be thanks to the majority of such documents being destroyed by the same conspirators.

Consequently, there are many thousands of documents that are considered authentic in traditional history, but not in New Chronology. Fomenko often uses “falsified” documents, which he dismisses in other contexts, to prove a point. For example, he analyzes the Tartar Relation and arrives at the conclusion that Mongolian capital of Karakorum was located in Central Russia (equated with present-day Yaroslavl). However, the Tartar Relation makes several statements that are at odds with New Chronology (such as that Batu Khan and Russian duke Yaroslav are two distinct people). Those are said by Fomenko to have been introduced into the original text by later editors.

Many of the rulers that Fomenko claims are medieval doppelgangers moved in the imaginary past have left behind vast numbers of coins. Numismatists have made innumerable identifications of coins to rulers known from ancient sources. For instance, several Roman emperors issued coinage featuring at least three of their names, consistent with those found in written sources, and there are frequent examples of joint coinage between known royal family members, as well as overstrikes by kings who were known enemies.

Ancient coins in Greek and Latin are unearthed to this day in vast quantities from Britain to India. For Fomenko’s theories to be correct, this could only be explained by counterfeit on a very grand and consistent scale, as well as a complete dismissal of all numismatic analyses of hoard findings, coin styles etc.

*Popularity in forums and amongst Russian imperialists*
Despite criticism, Fomenko has published and sold over one million copies of his books in his native Russia. Many internet forums have appeared which aim to supplement his work with additional amateur research. His critics have suggested that Fomenko’s version of history appealed to the Russian reading public by keeping alive an imperial consciousness to replace their disillusionment with the failures of Communism and post-Communist corporate oligarchies.

Alexander Zinoviev called the New Chronology “one of the major scientific breakthroughs of the XX century.”

(Wikipedia text retrieved on 2nd August, 2015)

Afterword from the publisher

Dr. Fomenko et al as scientists are ready to recognize their mistakes, to repent and to retract on the condition that:

- radiocarbon dating methods pass the black box tests, or
- astronomy refutes their results on ancient eclipses, or
- US astrophysicist Robert Newton was proved wrong to accuse Ptolemy of his crime.

At present, historians do not, can not, and will not comply. The radiocarbon dating labs run their very costly tests only if the sample to be dated is accompanied with an idea of age pronounced by historians on basis of … subjective … mmm … gutfeeling … and the history books they have been writing for the last 400 years. Radiocarbon labs politely bill for their fiddling and finetuning to get the dates “to order” of historians. Circulus vitiosus is perfect.
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This seven-volume edition is based on a number of our books that came out over the last couple of years and were concerned with the subject in question. All this gigantic body of material was revised and categorized; finally, its current form does not contain any of the repetitions that are
inevitable in the publication of separate books. All of this resulted in the inclusion of a great number of additional material in the current edition – including previously unpublished data. The reader shall find a systematic rendition of detailed criticisms of the consensual (Scaligerian) chronology, the descriptions of the methods offered by mathematical statistics and natural sciences that the authors have discovered and researched, as well as the new hypothetical reconstruction of global history up until the XVIII century. Our previous books on the subject of chronology were created in the period of naissance and rather turbulent infancy of the new paradigm, full of complications and involved issues, which often resulted in the formulation of multi-optional hypotheses. The present edition pioneers in formulating a consecutive unified concept of the reconstruction of ancient history – one that apparently is supported by a truly immense body of evidence. Nevertheless, it is understandable that its elements may occasionally be in need of revision or elaboration.

A. T. Fomenko
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Prior to the publication of the seven-volume Chronology, we published a number of books on the same topic. If we are to disregard the paperbacks and the concise versions, as well as new re-editions, there are seven such books. Shortened versions of their names appear below:
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