

When Ai Contradicts the Archive

Exposing the Fundamental Errors in the Modern Story



JORDAN NUTTALL

MAY 18, 2026

This part of the day has become a *treasured artifact* for me, dear reader, for it is the moment I begin to write to **you**.

The ***Alternative History*** newsletter and the community we have built here is something I never anticipated.

In my normal life, discussing such concepts often leads to ostracisation, so I didn't expect these ideas to find such a popular foothold.

Yet here you are, and here I am; sharing a moment of the day we have both grown to anticipate.

You might think these articles are meticulously planned, but they aren't.

They arrive on a whim, born from a sudden thought in the corners of my mind.

These are ideas I observe closely; some may seem impenetrable from the outside, yet when you peel back the layers, you realise *the riddle was never meant to be a wall, but a path*.

I usually write in silence, but occasionally I force myself to write in public spaces or with music playing, intentionally increasing the difficulty.

While my best work flourishes in the quiet, I refuse to let silence be my only working condition; I want to remain entirely resilient to distraction.

I suppose this is what they call *mastery of the mind*.

People often ask if writing is difficult for me.

There are moments I will sit before a blank screen for thirty minutes without producing a single word.

But I **refuse** to force the mind.

I simply sit, wait, and think, unburdened by the illusion that I am racing against the clock.

The words will come, curious mind.

They always do.

This morning's history lesson will plunge us into a much deeper nature than usual, instead of just reviewing another set of references from the *National Archives*, I am going to expose the grave contradictions that emerge when you place these original records directly alongside the modern narrative and its institutional fact-checkers.

It forces a definitive question:

are you going to believe firsthand historical correspondence, or an AI-guided sanitation of history?


The answer seems entirely obvious when put like that, doesn't it?

And so we shall begin, relinquishing the cage of the modern to invite the curiosity of the old.


In realising that we currently live inside a small box, we begin to notice that *the past didn't have walls at all*.

Letter to Madam Gell 

did the russians defeat the tartars in 1725

 +14



No, the Russians did not defeat the Tatars in 1725. In fact, 1725 was the year Tsar Peter the Great died, and the Russian Empire was actually at peace with the Tatar states at that specific time.  Wikipedia +4

FILE

Letter to Madam Gell - Duke of Kent's house was burnt to ground - Turkish army in...

Catalogue reference:

D258/38/6/20

What's it about?

This record is a file about the Letter to Madam Gell - Duke of Kent's house was burnt to ground - Turkish army in... dating from 1725.

Description

What the record is about

**Letter to Madam Gell - Duke
of Kent's house was burnt
to ground - Turkish army in
Persia successful - Russians
have defeated the Tartars
14 Dec**

The accepted historical narrative operates on the **absolute certainty** that 1725 was a year of quiet diplomacy and internal consolidation for the Russian Empire.

If you consult the mainstream consensus or ask any modern digital authority, the answer is explicit and unwavering:

the Russians did not defeat the Tatars in 1725

We are told as an undeniable fact that following the death of Peter the Great, the empire was actively at peace with the Tartar states at that specific time.

The modern timeline presents a completely sanitised, quiet front where no such battle ever occurred.

But when you bypass the algorithmic gatekeepers and look directly at the primary sources, that entire reality shatters.

An original archival record, cataloged under reference **D258/38/6/20** in a letter to Madam Gell dated December 14, 1725, exposes the raw, unedited truth of the era.

The text plainly states:

Russians have defeated the Tartars

It documents a hot, active conflict, alongside a successful Turkish army in Persia, painting a picture of massive geopolitical friction and heavy military engagements occurring at the exact moment history claims everyone was at peace.

This is where the weight of the lie becomes undeniable.

We aren't dealing with a nuanced difference in historical interpretation or a minor clerical error.

This is a **binary contradiction**.

The modern narrative says a war never happened and that there was peace; the physical record from 1725 says a battle happened and the Tartars were defeated.

Both statements **cannot be true**.

When the digital consensus completely erases a military victory recorded in black ink on centuries-old paper, it proves that the history we are handed isn't just inaccurate, it is an intentional, systematic fabrication designed to override the archive.

Jefferyes to Stanhope

did russian build a 56 mile line in 1719

W +4



Yes, Russia began building a 56-mile transport line in 1719, but it was a massive **water canal**, not a railway. Commissioned by Tsar Peter the Great, the **Ladoga Canal** was constructed to allow ships to safely bypass the dangerously stormy waters of Lake Ladoga while traveling to the Baltic Sea. [Wikipedia +1](#)



ITEM

Folio 195: Jefferyes to Stanhope. Everything in readiness for the ensuing campaign....

Catalogue reference:

SP 91/9/195

What's it about?

This record is about the **Folio 195: Jefferyes to Stanhope. Everything in readiness for the ensuing campaign....** dating from **1719 May 15** in the series **Secretaries of State: State Papers Foreign, Russia**. It is held at **The National Archives, Kew**.

Description

What the record is about

Folio 195: Jefferyes to Stanhope. Everything in readiness for the ensuing campaign. Golovkin, Safirov and Tolstoy have earnestly remonstrated with the Czar not to withdraw troops from his own dominions, partly so that no misfortune will befall, and partly because of the pretence of the uncertainty of the British in the Baltic and of

**the Danish fleet. Knowing
the situation of a cold
climate, and want of food**

and forage, they think all Europe can be defied by the Czar if he keeps his army at home. Information on the channel now going ahead, with 20,000 men digging, to join rivers Volkhov and Neva. No ship coming or going into the Volga need be exposed to the dangerous navigation of the Ladoga. Another important work is in hand. A line from the Tanais, or Don, to the Volga, 56 German miles in

**length with redoubts at
certain distances. This is to
prevent invasion by Tartars.**

It will start at Czaritza, on the Volga and be continued to Strelanov, on the Don. Account of the Czar's vessels in comparison with British, French and Dutch. Baron Lillienstedt is not at Aland. The first information was wrong and there is now doubt as to whether he has any intention of going there. Dated StPetersburg, 15 May 1719.

It would seem, dear reader, the modern narrative possesses a fascinating, calculated mechanism:

when a physical monument or massive infrastructure from the past is too prominent to entirely erase from the earth, the gatekeepers simply change the reason it was built

They concede the existence of the structure but completely alter its purpose to fit their sanitised timeline.

When we ask the modern consensus about the massive engineering project undertaken by Russia in 1719, the digital fact-checkers quickly offer a neat, comfortable answer.

They tell you that Tsar Peter the Great began constructing a 56-mile transport line known as *the Ladoga Canal*.

The official story claims this was purely a **commercial water canal**, built for nothing more than logistics, a peaceful merchant route designed to allow transport ships to safely bypass the stormy, dangerous waters of Lake Ladoga while traveling to the Baltic Sea.

It is framed as an early triumph of standard maritime trade infrastructure.

But when you open the vault and look at the actual state papers from that exact year, the commercial fairy tale falls apart entirely.

A diplomatic dispatch held at the British National Archives, *State Papers Foreign, Russia* (cataloged as **SP 91/9/195**), sent from Jefferyes to Stanhope and dated May 15, 1719, from St. Petersburg, exposes the raw, military reality of this project.

The text describes an empire under imminent threat, noting that twenty thousand men were deployed to dig channels connecting the Volkhov and Neva rivers to secure their shipping routes.

But then the dispatch delivers the real truth, revealing another massive project occurring simultaneously.

It explicitly states that another crucial work was in hand:

a line running all the way from the Tanais, or Don, to the Volga, measuring exactly 56 German miles in length with redoubts at certain distances

The archive does not attribute this 56-mile line to merchant trade or a storm-bypass canal.

The document states its explicit, singular purpose in cold black ink:

This is to prevent invasion by Tartars

This is where the entire deception falls to pieces under its own weight.

To maintain the illusion of the accepted history, we are forced to believe that the Tartars were just unorganised, nomadic barbarians, scattered tribes wandering the steppes with no unified force or grand military capability.

But empires do not draft tens of thousands of men to construct a fortified, **56-mile** military defensive line fortified with redoubts, heavy, enclosed brick and earth military fortifications, to stop a scattered band of nomads.

You build a **56-mile** wall with fortified garrisons to stop a highly organised, relentless, peer-level superpower capable of invading and tearing down your entire empire.

By twisting a massive, defensive military line into a simple merchant water canal, the modern narrative tries to sanitise the scale of the adversary Russia was terrified of facing.

It is an intentional distortion designed to write the sheer power and presence of the Tartars completely out of the historical record, ensuring that a massive

defensive fortification looks like nothing more than a routine commercial ditch.

Sutton to Craggs

did the russians create a treaty with france in 1720



No, Russia did not create a treaty with France in 1720. In fact, the two nations had virtually no direct diplomatic relationship or formal treaties during that time, primarily because France was heavily aligned with Great Britain—who was actively hostile to Russia’s expanding power in the Baltic following the Great Northern

War. [alternatethehistory.com](#) +2

Instead of an alliance with France, Russia’s major diplomatic agreements of 1720 focused on its northern adversaries and allies, culminating a year later in the pivotal peace deal ending the Great Northern War. [Wikipedia](#) +1

was russia planning war with the tartars in 1720



No, Russia was not planning a war with the Tatars in 1720. Instead, under Tsar Peter the Great, the Russian Empire was shifting its focus from the Great Northern War to preparing for its southern **Russo-Persian War (1722–1723)**. In this campaign, the Russians actively recruited the Tatars and Kalmyks to fight alongside them against Persia. Wikipedia +3

ITEM

Folio 350: Sutton to Craggs. French guarantee of Schleswig to Denmark represents...

Catalogue reference:

SP 78/168/148

What's it about?

This record is about the Folio 350: Sutton to Craggs. French guarantee of Schleswig to Denmark represents... dating from 1720 Aug 27 in the series Secretaries of State: State Papers Foreign, France. It is held at The National Archives, Kew.

Description

What the record is about

**Folio 350: Sutton to Craggs.
French guarantee of
Schleswig to Denmark
represents a sacrifice by
Regent; France would like a
commercial treaty with
Russia, Russia probably
wants peace in Baltic to
allow her to attack the
Tartars; Czar's friendship
for Duke of Holstein;
possible Spanish designs on
Gibraltar; Duke of Parma**

will assist peace
negotiations if Castro and
Ronciglione can be secured
for him; armed ships built

at Toulon to patrol Barbary coast; discount on bills and Bank's profit; Regent's estimated hoard of gold; Pope's Constitution; project for commercial agreement between France and Russia; Marseilles plague.

Date and place: 1720 Aug 27, Paris.

Our Westernised history demands a sterile, neatly partitioned 1720 where geopolitics follow predictable, binary tracks.

As we consult the standard digital gates or run a cursory search on the diplomatic landscape of that year, the automated consensus is unyielding:

Russia and France had virtually no direct diplomatic relationship or formal treaties because France was locked in an alliance with Great Britain

Simultaneously, the mainstream narrative firmly dictates that Russia had zero intentions of engaging in conflict with the Tartars in 1720, asserting instead that Peter the Great was shifting his gaze exclusively toward Persia, actively recruiting Tatars rather than treating them as an adversarial target.

However, the physical *State Papers*, cataloged **SP 78/168/148**, captures a direct correspondence from Sutton to Craggs in August 1720, a letter that completely blows this entire fabricated timeline apart, exposing the staggering distance between archived reality and the modern digital script.

The first profound **contradiction** punctures the myth of a diplomatically isolated Russia completely cut off from French interests.

While the standard online summaries flatly deny any real diplomatic intersections or agreements between the two nations during this window, the actual archive from Paris, dated August 27, 1720, explicitly records a ***project for a commercial agreement between France and Russia***.

The document goes even further, detailing that ***France would like a commercial treaty with Russia***.

The physical record preserves the exact diplomatic friction and economic maneuvering that the modern digital gatekeepers completely erase from the history books to maintain their clean, binary alliances.

The second **contradiction** dismantles the sanitised version of Russia's southern strategy and its relationship with the Tartars.

The mainstream narrative insists that conflict with the Tatars was completely off the table in 1720, yet the raw diplomatic intelligence inside **Folio 350** states the exact opposite in cold, hard print.

The dispatch notes that ***Russia probably wants peace in the Baltic to allow her to attack the Tartars.***

The archive preserves a reality where the Russian empire was explicitly angling to wrap up its northern theatre not out of a peaceful transition or an exclusive pivot to Persia, but to free up its military machine for a **targeted strike against the Tartars**, directly defying the modern historical overview.

By holding these specific images side by side, the mechanism of the historical filter becomes completely transparent.

The modern digital consensus relies on flat, absolute denials, no French treaty projects, no planned wars with the Tartars, to keep the historical narrative broad, simple, and entirely decoupled from the messy geopolitical realities recorded on the ground.

The moment the actual text of **SP 78/168/148** is brought to light, the polished, automated history is exposed for what it is:

a completely manufactured illusion designed to overwrite the raw data of the archive

Rondeau to Harrington

did the tartars attack Ukraine in the second half of 1731

Yes, the Tatars aggressively attacked Ukraine during the second half of 1731, with a significant spike in violence occurring during the autumn harvest season.

ITEM

**Folio 145:
Rondeau to
Harrington.
Following f.32,
news that
Tartars
dissatisfied...**

Catalogue reference:

SP 91/12/145

What's it about?

This record is about the Folio 145: Rondeau to Harrington. Following f.32, news that Tartars dissatisfied... dating from 1731 Oct 4 in the series Secretaries of State: State Papers Foreign, Russia. It is held at The National Archives, Kew.

Description

What the record is about

Folio 145: Rondeau to Harrington. Following f.32, news that Tartars dissatisfied with Major-General Taracanoff's new works, but they are unable to damage that court as Czarina has 30,000 horse and several regiments of foot in Ukraine. Cernysev, a general-in-chief, has been made Great Governor of Moscow, position formerly

held by Soltykov. Dated Moscow, 4 Oct 1731.

It is clear, dear reader, that the modern academic narrative relies on a chaotic, highly dramatised version of autumn 1731 to justify its linear geopolitical script.

When we consult the standard automated summaries, the digital consensus insists that throughout the entirety of autumn 1731, Russia was relentlessly engaged in active, blood-soaked warfare with the Tartars.

The automated engines project a reality where imperial borders were completely fluid and under constant, destructive siege by hostile nomadic forces, leaving no room for tactical stalemate or entrenched Russian dominance during that specific window.

The physical *State Papers* from Moscow, captured in the direct diplomatic intelligence sent from Rondeau to Harrington on October 4, 1731, completely expose this automated narrative as a **total fabrication**.

The raw archive reveals that by October 1731, the actual situation on the ground was defined not by active, relentless warfare, but by complete tactical containment.

The physical text explicitly records that the Tartars were *dissatisfied with Major-General Taracanoff's new works*.

The document goes on to flatly state that the Tartars were entirely **unable to damage that court**.

The state papers preserve a reality where Russian engineering had effectively locked the border down, reducing the supposed Tartar threat to harmless geopolitical frustration.

The mechanism of the digital filter becomes opaque when you look at how the automated system handles this timeline.

To maintain its neat, simplified historical templates, the digital overview overproduces a narrative of constant active war, completely deleting the physical reality recorded in **SP 91/12/145**.


The modern script claims the Tartars were relentlessly striking Russian positions in autumn, while the actual diplomatic intelligence written in October records that the Tartars were utterly powerless to strike back against the Czarina's newly constructed fortifications.

Rondeau to Harrington 

did the tartars attack Persia in 1733

  8 sites



Yes, the Tartars did attack Persia in 1733. Following their failed vanguard attempt the previous year, the Ottoman Sultan ordered a massive escalation, commanding a much larger force of **over 25,000 Crimean and Nogai Tartars** to march south. Led by **Kalga Fetih Giray** (the brother of the Crimean Khan), this army successfully fought its way through the Caucasus to engage Persian forces.  Wikipedia +1

ITEM

Folio 25: Rondeau to Harrington. Hockholzer ordered by Czarina to get Emperor to...

Catalogue reference:

SP 91/15/25

What's it about?

This record is about the Folio 25: Rondeau to Harrington. Hockholzer ordered by Czarina to get Emperor to... dating from 1733 Aug 11 in the series Secretaries of State: State Papers Foreign, Russia. It is held at The National Archives, Kew.

Description

What the record is about

Folio 25: Rondeau to Harrington. Hockholzer ordered by Czarina to get Emperor to send troops into Poland. When affairs there settled she will dispatch 20,000 troops from thence to assist Emperor if he is attacked by French. Czarina informed from Persia that 50,000 Tartars have made third attempt near St. Croix to force passage through

Dagestan Country to get into Persia but were repulsed by Russian troops.

Several Tartar Princes have joined Crim Tartars causing alarm here Field Marshal Munnich sent to Finland to view fortifications at Wibourg and Kexholm, sure proof of the lessening of his importance at Court. Dated St Petersburg, 11 Aug 1733.

The true scale of regional forces in the 18th century are consistently downplay by modern digitised summaries, to present a world where imperial

expansion faced minimal organised resistance.

When reviewing the military capabilities of the southern frontiers during this era, the standard automated texts routinely minimise the numerical strength of non-imperial armies, capping their mobilisation numbers at a modest **25,000** fighters.

This systematic halving of their numbers creates a historical illusion, dear reader, framing these populations as a minor, manageable border threat rather than a massive, coordinated military power capable of shifting the regional balance of forces.

The original diplomatic intelligence from December 1731 completely shatters this minimised digital projection by recording the true scale of the mobilisation.

The physical dispatch from the National Archives explicitly states that the Sultan of the Tartars was moving with an immense force, noting that he ***designs to march himself with fifty thousand Tartars.***

By recording a force of **50,000** men rather than the **25,000** claimed by modern synthetic overviews, the raw *State Papers* expose a massive **50% reduction** in the historical record.

The archive preserves a reality where the Tartar military apparatus possessed double the manpower and operational reach acknowledged by modern systems, which reveals a swift and deliberate halving of their actual authority and military might.


Forbes and Rondeau to Harrington 

how many Tartar pistol troops in 1733



2 sites



Historical records **do not list a specific number of "pistol troops"** for the 1733 Tartar offensive. This is because neither the Crimean Khanate nor the Ottoman Empire organized their armies into dedicated, uniform pistol-wielding units. 

Instead, firearms were distributed by social caste and tactical roles. By analyzing the structure of the **25,000 to 30,000-man army** led by Kalga Fetih Giray into Persia in 1733, the breakdown of pistol and firearm distribution can be closely estimated:

1. The Aristocratic Cavalry (Estimated: 2,000 – 3,000 men with pistols)

Pistols were highly expensive luxury weapons in the 18th-century steppe. They were carried almost exclusively by the **Tartar princes (*mirzas*), noble lords, and their immediate elite**

retinues.

ITEM

Folio 180: Forbes and Rondeau to Harrington. The disposition of Russia towards Prussia...

Catalogue reference:

SP 91/15/180

What's it about?

This record is about the Folio 180: Forbes and Rondeau to Harrington. The disposition of Russia towards Prussia... dating from 1733 Dec 8 in the series Secretaries of State: State Papers Foreign, Russia. It is held at The National Archives, Kew.

Description

What the record is about

Folio 180: Forbes and Rondeau to Harrington. The disposition of Russia towards Prussia now would make any contract entirely favourable to Britain regarding soldier's cloth, but the contracts are made partly with Russia and partly with Prussia for two years to come. This will not be altered, so the English should introduce different

kinds of woollen goods as
the Dutch and Hamburgers
do now. Peaceful intentions

of the Turks towards Prussia, confirmed daily from Constantinople, believed here. Turkish affairs confused in Persia. Report of 20,000 Tartars hired for equal number of pistols. Uncertain conduct of king of Prussia complained of by Vienna and Count Seckendorff. Also resented by Russia. Count Mardefeld informs Count Biron that he should not drive his master to

not drive his master to
despair. Think Mardefeld
has tried to thwart Treaty of
Commerce. Russia has tried

to settle a Treaty between Prussia and Saxony.

Uncertain and extravagant demands are (1) renouncing all pretensions to Berg and Julich (2) cession of lands in the Lower Lusatia (3) Saxon part of County of Mansfeld (4) Balliage of Gummereen in duchy of Mecklenburg.

They will have heard of the reception, proposals an success of Poniatowsky at Berlin. Stanislaus will depart from Danzig on

return of Poniatowsky and approach of Russian and Saxon troops. Dated St

This brings us to the final reference for this morning's lesson, dear reader, exposing the deepest layer of deception within the modern historical narrative.

When examining the armaments and specialised tactical units of the 1733 offensive, automated digital consensus explicitly claims that historical records simply do not list a specific number of *pistol troops*.

Modern systems confidently state that **no such evidence exists**, asserting that because these armies weren't organised into uniform, Western-style units, tracking exact figures is a historical impossibility.

The primary diplomatic correspondence from December 1733 exposes this claim as an **outright lie**.

The original state papers held at the National Archives contain the precise data that modern summaries pretend is missing from history.

The physical dispatch explicitly documents a concrete ***Report of 20,000 Tartars hired for equal number of pistols***.

The archival record preserves a clear, definitive link between the manpower and the specific weaponry deployed, completely refuting the narrative that the true strength of these armed units was left unrecorded.

By hiding behind the lie that no data exists, modern overviews are able to construct an alternative narrative that serves as a monumental downplay of Tartar military capability.

The digital consensus replaces the archived reality of **20,000** pistol-armed troops with a diminished estimate of just **2,000** to **3,000** men.

This drastic, unauthorised reduction slashes the documented force by nearly **90%**, shrinking a highly formidable, heavily armed cavalry down to a negligible elite retinue and further obscuring the true scale of the regional forces preserved in the *State Papers*.

Subscribe

And so, dear reader, a shorter lesson this morning but filled with things that **shouldn't really exist**.

We have looked directly into the quiet, dust-settled corners of the archives and found the heavy ghosts of truth staring back at us, ghosts possessing twice the numbers, twice the strength, and double the fierce, organised authority that the modern, automated world has permitted them to keep.

We have watched, in the span of a few old pages, how easily twenty thousand armed men can be breathed out of existence by a digital consensus that prefers a smoother, emptier past.

But this morning's lesson is not just a technical dispute over ancient troop deployments or the forgotten numbers of a steppe cavalry.

It forces us to confront a far more terrifying, intimate question:

what does it mean for every soul walking the earth today when the very ground of our shared memory is built upon calculated absences and systematic distortions?

History is not just a collection of dead dates; it is the invisible architecture of our modern minds.

It is the story we tell ourselves to understand who we are, what we are capable of, and who is allowed to hold power in the present.

When those narratives are hollowed out, halved, and reduced to narratives of chaotic vacuums and inevitable imperial dominance, a quiet violence is committed against the human spirit.

We are handed a manufactured inheritance, a sterilised map of the world that teaches us to accept the structures around us as natural, unyielding, and pre-ordained.

When the algorithms and textbooks rewrite the past to downplay the resistance, the organisation, and the true scale of those who stood outside the empires, they rob us all of our depth.

They teach us to look at the world through a lens of absolute, automated control, suggesting that smaller or non-standard societies were always destined to be swallowed up by the march of progress.

It breeds a subtle, pervasive despair in the modern heart, a feeling that the heavy machinery of power has always been too vast, too absolute to ever be countered or truly understood.

But the archive is a *stubborn* thing.

It proves that the past was not a smooth, predictable machine, but a vibrant, complex reality teeming with forces that the architects of the modern narrative still scramble to suppress.

To uncover these lies is a deeply philosophical act of reclamation.

It reminds us that the stories we have been fed are fragile, needing constant upkeep and deletion to survive.

When we reach through the digital fog and touch the raw, handwritten truth of the state papers, we break the spell of the automated consensus.

We begin to see that if the past was not as absolute as they claimed, then perhaps the present is not as unchangeable as we are taught to believe, offering a profound sense of hope and clarity for anyone seeking truth in a world built on illusions.

A reminder that donations are never expected or required, having you here, reading and engaging with these findings, is the most meaningful act of support there is.

For anyone who does wish to contribute financially, please know that every bit goes straight toward tracking down and procuring the rare books and archival documents needed to keep this research alive.

But just know that your presence alone is truly more than enough.

Thank you, *dear reader*.

BUY ME COFFEE 

Comment

A purple rectangular button with rounded corners containing the word "Share" in white text.
