

those assembled to model climate change. Unfortunately, though one might expect economists to be taking the lead when it comes to growth, they seem to be missing in action. However, Europe is starting to see conferences on “de-growth” as it deals with high fuel costs and one debt crisis after another.

—Richard H. Burkhart, Ph.D.
*Mathematics independent
 researcher, Seattle, WA*
 dickburkhart@comcast.net

(Received April 2, 2013)

“New Chronology” of Nosovskii and Fomenko in the Notices

The April 2013 issue of the *Notices* contains an article by Florin Diacu, “Mathematical methods in the study of historical chronology”. Most of this article is an exposition of the “research” of A. Fomenko and G. Nosovskii on mathematical methods in chronology. According to F. Diacu, this research is “published in a mathematical journal that has reasonably good ranking.” F. Diacu laments that “So far, historians have ignored these studies...” and “So far, biblical scholars seem to have ignored Fomenko’s conclusions”

The reason scholars ignore this research is simple: it is the same reason physicists would ignore research concluding that the earth is flat.

We assume that most Western readers are not familiar with the “research” of Fomenko and Nosovskii on chronology, since most of the enormous output of these authors is published in Russian. So let us explain. Since the 1970s Fomenko has applied “mathematical methods” to revise the established historical chronology and historical events themselves. He comes to the remarkable conclusion that almost all history that we learn in school has been intentionally falsified, forged by some international conspiracy.

The following is our literal translation from Russian of a passage from a book by Fomenko and Nosovskii, preserving punctuation and capitalization of the original:

Section 2.7. Formation in 1776 of the United States of America on the

American territories of the dissolved Moscow Tartary.

And now we ask the question: when and how did the United States come into existence? Let us pay special attention to the time of formation of the USA. The Encyclopedic Dictionary tells us that “in the process of the wars for independence in North America in 1775–1783...an independent state was created, the USA (1776).” And now we realize unexpectedly that formation of the USA surprisingly EXACTLY COINCIDES WITH THE END OF THE WAR WITH “PUGACHEV” IN RUSSIA. Let us recall that “Pugachev” was defeated in 1775. Now everything is in its place. Apparently, the “Independence war” in North America was a war with the weakening American Russian Horde. The Romanovs attacked the Horde from the East, and Americans “struggling for independence” attacked it from the West. Now they teach us that Americans were fighting for “independence from England”. In reality this was a war for the partition of enormous American lands of the Moscow Tartary, which found themselves without the central Russian-Horde governance.... It is clear that the very fact of the war with the “Mongolian” Horde in America was carefully erased from the pages of textbooks of American history. As well as the very fact of the existence of the huge Moscow Tartary.”

(Translated from G. V. Nosovskii and A. T. Fomenko, “Reconstruction of world history (New chronology)”, *Business Express*, Moscow, 2001, p. 451 of 726 pp.)

In our opinion, the above quotation gives an adequate impression of the methods and conclusions of Fomenko and Nosovskii. We leave it to the readers to decide whether an account of this research deserves publication in the *Notices*.

—Alex Eremenko
Purdue University
 eremenko@math.purdue.edu

—Victor Grinberg
*Independent scholar,
 Pittsburgh, PA*
 victor_grinberg@yahoo.com

(Received April 2, 2013)

Flim-Flam in the Name of Science

Concerning the *Notices* article “Mathematical methods in the study of historical chronology,” by Florin Diacu, April 2013 issue:

The *Notices* has disgraced itself by allowing its good name to be used in connection with the crackpot historical theories of Anatoly Fomenko. The fact that Fomenko is a mathematician does not in any way lend credibility to his pseudoscientific publications, which should interest the scientific community only insofar as they provide a cautionary illustration of the manner in which membership in a national scientific academy can be misused to promulgate pure nonsense. Suffice it to point out that Fomenko asserts that the entirety of Chinese history is a fabrication of eighteenth-century Jesuits, that all ancient Roman and Greek artifacts are actually forgeries produced during the Renaissance, and that the New Testament was written before the Old. Needless to say, such assertions are so thoroughly incompatible with vast troves of historical and archaeological evidence that they are not taken seriously by any competent experts in the relevant fields.

Of course, Fomenko has every right to pursue his bizarre hobbies and is free to make a public fool of himself to his heart’s content. But the *Notices of the AMS* is not an appropriate forum for such pseudoscientific tomfoolery. The danger is that publication here could lend an air of legitimacy to work which would never be published in a scholarly journal refereed by competent experts in the fields in question.

Could the *Notices* please confine itself to articles with actual mathematical content? That way, we might reasonably hope to see more articles that have been refereed by scholars whose knowledge and training qualify them to accurately judge whether or not an article is substantially correct and interesting.

—Claude LeBrun
Stony Brook University
 claude@math.sunysb.edu

(Received March 20, 2013)