

Re: Is Angelology of History a bogus?

August 14, 2001

Dear Mr Páleš,

some years ago I noticed your theory about periodic influences of archangels in history but I have never read more deeply about it. A few days ago however I went through your articles on the website sophia.sk and became interested especially in those where you did statistical analyses with Mr Mikulecký, because these studies give a certain objective account, to which also the scientific community can respond. But I am not an expert on statistics or history, and so I started a discussion in a skeptical internet forum about these statistical studies of yours, to see what the responses would be. I gave links to your papers with statistical analyses of the emergence of great poets, historians, physicians and periods of political instability.

I think the most interesting criticism was from one of the participants in the discussion, why you did not examine the emergence of these personalities also in other geographic regions than the ones given in your papers. Specifically: why didn't you include Greek and Roman poets, Arab and Persian physicians, Persian historians? Also, how do "Elizabethan" poets fit into your cycle of poets? Are there 500-year cycles of political instability also in Persia and India? Do you have statistical studies also for artists other than poets (sculptors, musicians, architects...)? Or for philosophers? I would also like to know how the two World Wars fit into the 500-year cycle of aggressiveness (political instability), which has one of its peaks around the middle of the 19th century.

I am pointing to a suspicion that maybe you have intentionally omitted analyses in other regions, because you didn't find significant (and 500-year) cycles in them, and so you published only those where you succeeded in finding the cycles. That would mean a bias in the selection of presented data and also cast doubts on the global cause of cycles.

Link to aforesaid discussion: <http://forums.randi.org/showthread.php?t=216704>

Regards,

Tomáš Páleš (we happen to have the same surname)

August 14, 2011

Dear Thomas,

I have read the discussion at „James Randi Educational Foundation“ about my work. Here are the answers to your questions:

There is an old belief that seven archetypes (imagined as gods or archangels) are being activated periodically and synchronously in the collective (un)conscious of mankind during world history. I am researching what truth may be contained in this belief.

My first question is: can the activation of the seven planetary archetypes be really confirmed empirically in the history worldwide – periodically and synchronously in the time periods as expected by the Babylonians?

Another question is: if yes, what is the cause? Is it material or do gods/angels exist? This is a more philosophical question and largely independent from the first.

1. I did not formulate the hypothesis AFTER the data. First of all, it was not me, who formulated this hypothesis. Second, it has been formulated BEFORE most of history took place, several thousands of years ago. It goes back to the Neobabylonian and maybe Old Babylonian kingdom.

2. Historical data are incomplete. An unknown part of it has been lost. Nevertheless, ALL scientists in the world are working with THE SAME data as I do. All theories are based on these incomplete data, not only mine. It is not an unusual situation in science. Astronomical data are incomplete because weather conditions are not good everyday - on a cloudy day they are missing. Statistics is designed to work just with incomplete data. Random lacks in data could create a pseudo-periodicity in some cases. But if this repeats regularly – statistics can say that it is not random.

3. Historical data are biased. We know that chroniclers, for instance, manipulated data because of political motifs. Again: statistics is designed to deal with distorted data. Distortions and measuring errors are commonplace in science. Yet, statistics can surely discern random distortions from a periodic component, if there is enough data to analyze. Historians did bias the data, but they did because of random reasons, in regard to our hypothesis. We cannot assume that historians of all times and all countries did uniformly manipulate their records to produce just the periodicity we are testing.

4. Some historical data are not missing, but their dating is not certain. Then: instead of an exact date we work with a time interval, time limits between which it took place.

5. Some dates are legendary. Yet many legendary dates turned out to be close to historical truth. There are dozens of Chinese dynasties within a time span of 4500 years. The first one of them is purely legendary (that is it may or may not be true). My duty is to include it, if the author of the source, which I am quoting, included this dynasty and its date into his list of dynasties. If I would omit it – I could have been accused of manipulating the data source.

6. Also long cycles are being researched in chronobiology, e.g. cycles caused by astronomical bodies. Franz Halberg, one of the „fathers“ of chronobiology, is himself doing a reserach on 500-year cycle, and proclaimed this to be one of the task of this discipline. Of course, shorter cycles are much frequent in chronobiology.

7. Do I „fiddle“ with data selectively? I am not the author of the data, hence I can not „fiddle“. Data are taken from dozens of renamed specialist’s monographs on history. These experts are not acquainted with my hypothesis and many of them are dead already. They could not have fiddled in my favor either. If there is a list of physicians or poets by Kroeber, I did not change it, but take it as it is.

8. Do I selectively publish only results of those civilizations where the 500-year rhythm works? Am I silent about the rest? No. I publish studies of all civilizations separately, as well as studies for the world as a whole. I published chronograms of complete lists of excellent personalities by Kroeber and many other authors. All are included, as given in the source. Also Greek, Roman and Elisabethan poets, also Persian historians, also Arabic physicians.

9. Do I include all personalities and all countries in a branch, but selectively pay attention only to those branches, where the 500-year rhythm works? No. I reserach all branches, as given in the source, be it Kroeber or others. All kinds of sciences, arts, religion and social phenomena. Of course I did include philosophers, musicians, sculptors and many others.

10. I did not find a comprehensive list of architects. Kroeber does not give such list and neither other authors so far I could find. I have not got reliable data for everything I would wish to have.

11. Were people considered as famous today also famous in the past? This can be analysed by comparing both opinions. This is the result: after 100 years are historical opinions more or less settled. The lists of people famous in the past show predominantly the same 500-year rhythm as those famous today.

12. Can the community of scientists as a whole, despite their world-wide consensus about historical data, be biased and wrong? Could it happen that opinions are unified, but yet wrong and the reality did not actually take place? No, it can not happen in the case of our study. Civilizations have been largely disconnected in the past, their history being driven by mainly local causes. If they report the same rhythms independently of one another, it follows that can not be a figment of human fantasy only, but some real common factor is at work here.

13. Can you prove the same hypothesis for a 700-year rhythm or whatever else? No, you can not. The reason why I am saying this, is that I did analyse real data – hundreds of various studies. Did you deal with real data? Why do you believe that you can find any other rhythms?

14. If the rhythms exist, the mechanism of their causation is unknown. That is the most frequent case in the history of science. New empirical phenomena have been discovered first, and explained later.

15. Does accelerated creativity in physics or other sciences in modern times thwart the expected 500-year rhythm? Of course, the number of scientific discoveries is growing constantly during history. Nevertheless, their number can be approximated by a cyclic sinusoid with a linear component. This is known in regression analysis as „trend“. Again, it is nothing new. It is being used in the same way in all sciences.

Moreover, I need not to research the absolute number of discoveries only, but I do research also their percentual proportion among discoveries of their time. That gives a picture, which sciences have been preferred in what times.

16. To conclude: I am testing a hypothesis, which has been formulated before the data, on data produced by experts blind to my hypothesis. Results are reinforced by the fact that they are being reported independently from different civilizations. And further more reinforced, if they are being confirmed trans-disciplinary. For instance, the hypothesis of 500-years periodic change in hormone-level of man resulting into the „rhythm of Venus archetype“ is being confirmed simultaneously by history of: poetry, music, famous lovers, number of queens regnant, mysticism, heresies, revolutions, physical height of skeletons, number of suicides, myths about apparitions of virgin Mary and love goddesses, merciful saints, landscape painting, fashion, dance, heraldry, nicknames of kings, types of scientific theories, psychology, philosophy and more. All of these are interconnected and witness to the same rhythm.

With best regards,

Emil Pálaš