

Борис Романов



Anna -Anastaia: the old and
new versions and discussion

Who was Anna Anderson?

Борис Романов
**Anna-Anastaia: the old and
new versions and discussion**

http://www.litres.ru/pages/biblio_book/?art=27615360

SelfPub; 2017

Аннотация

It is known the dozens of books and hundreds of articles about Anna Anderson, best known for the role of pretender rescued daughter of Nicholas II, Anastasia. It would seem that after the comparative DNA tests (which are allegedly not confirmed kinship Anderson and the royal family), the matter is closed. However, with the exception of those DNA tests, a huge set of evidence and the facts speak in favor of self-identification Anderson as Anastasia.

Riddle of Anna Anderson remains unsolved.

Foreword. The problem of DNA tests.

It is known the dozens of books and hundreds of articles about Anna Anderson, best known for the role of pretender rescued daughter of Nicholas II, Anastasia. It would seem that after the comparative DNA tests (which are allegedly not confirmed kinship Anderson and the royal family), the matter is closed. However, with the exception of those DNA tests, a huge set of evidence and the facts speak in favor of self-identification Anderson as Anastasia.

In this brochure, we briefly discuss the old and new versions and discussion of this subject, as well as give a detailed critique of the DNA tests and the arguments in favor Anna Anderson as Anastasia.

(Note: all my comments here are only my personal value judgments (and I do not claim to know the truth in the last stage))

The most common opinion about Anna Anderson can be found in Wikipedia

«Anna Anderson (16 December 1896 – 12 February 1984) was the best known of several impostors who claimed to be Grand Duchess Anastasia of Russia. <...> DNA tests on a lock of Anderson's hair and surviving medical samples of her tissue showed that Anderson's DNA did not match that of the Romanov remains or that of living relatives of the Romanovs.[9][10]

Instead, Anderson's mitochondrial DNA matched that of Karl Maucher, a great-nephew of Franziska Schanzkowska.[10] Most scientists, historians and journalists who have discussed the case accept that Anderson and Schanzkowska were the same person. [3][11][12][13][14]»

All critics of Anna Anderson appeals to the official results of the DNA tests "Yekaterinburg remains". We read about these tests in the same Wikipedia article:

«In 1991, the bodies of Tsar Nicholas II, Tsarina Alexandra, and three of their daughters were exhumed from a mass grave near Ekaterinburg. They were identified on the basis of both skeletal analysis and DNA testing.[125] For example, mitochondrial DNA was used to match maternal relations, and mitochondrial DNA from the female bones matched that of Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, whose maternal grandmother Princess Victoria of Hesse and by Rhine was a sister of Alexandra. [125] The bodies of Tsarevich Alexei and the remaining daughter were discovered in 2007. Repeated and independent DNA tests confirmed that the remains were the seven members of the Romanov family, and proved that none of the Tsar's four daughters survived the shooting of the Romanov family.[3][5][6]

A sample of Anderson's tissue, part of her intestine removed during her operation in 1979, had been stored at Martha Jefferson Hospital, Charlottesville, Virginia. Anderson's mitochondrial DNA was extracted from the sample and compared with that of the Romanovs and their relatives. It did not match that of the Duke

of Edinburgh or that of the bones, confirming that Anderson was not Anastasia. However, the sample matched DNA provided by Karl Maucher, a grandson of Franziska Schanzkowska's sister, Gertrude (Schanzkowska) Ellerik, indicating that Karl Maucher and Anna Anderson were maternally related and that Anderson was Schanzkowska.[4][10] Five years after the original testing was done, Dr. Terry Melton of the Department of Anthropology, Pennsylvania State University, stated that the DNA sequence tying Anderson to the Schanzkowski family was "still unique", though the database of DNA patterns at the Armed Forces DNA Identification Laboratory had grown much larger, leading to "increased confidence that Anderson was indeed Franziska Schanzkowska".[126]

Similarly, several strands of Anderson's hair, found inside an envelope in a book that had belonged to Anderson's husband, Jack Manahan, were also tested. Mitochondrial DNA from the hair matched Anderson's hospital sample and that of Schanzkowska's relative Karl Maucher but not the Romanov remains or living relatives of the Romanovs.[10][127]»

However, there are known many facts that cast doubt on some of the official DNA tests. In particular, genetic examination of the remains, "Alexis" and "Maria" (or "Anastasia") in 2007 was conducted with two teeth (which were found among these remains) – but some experts (eg, MD Vyacheslav Popov) stated categorically that there are no morphological evidence that these

two teeth could belong to any member of the royal family

In addition, other genetic studies do not support the official point of view (presented above, Wikipedia). A former member of the Russian government's expert committee to study the Ekaterinburg remains, MD Vyacheslav Popov wrote in 2007, after the discovery of the remains of "Alexis" and "Anastasia" (or "Maria"):

"<...> The greatest controversy erupted today over the genetic identification of the remains: <...>b) Geneticist P. Ivanov tried to establish the genetic characteristics of a controversial teens teeth and of a fragment of a handkerchief soaked with blood heir of Nicholas Alexandrovich (after being wounded in 1891 in Japan). He was unable to identify any genetic parameters of these objects, or their gender. This requires an explanation.

c) The Russian geneticist L. Zhivotovskiy published a critical note about the shortcomings in the official genetic analysis (the journal "Annals of Human Biology", 1999, Volume 21, 6, pp. 569-577). Replies to this criticism was not followed.

d) In 1999, a Japanese professor T. Nagai and colleagues published a study of hair from the head of his brother Nicholas II – Georgy, his nail plates, the fingerprint stains sweaty vest Nicholas II and the blood-Kulikovskogo Tikhon Nikolayevich Romanov. The results do not coincide with the data of the official genetic examination carried out with the participation of P. Ivanov. The results of studies of T. Nagai were published in the journal "Medicine and Biology" (December 10, 1999,

Volume 139. 6), and subsequently T. Nagai spoke at international conferences geneticists in Münster (Germany) in 2001, Melbourne (Australia) in 2001 and at the International Congress of forensic experts in St. Petersburg in 2004.

e) In 2004, the American geneticist Knight et al published in the journal "Annals of Human Biology," the results of the genetic study of the remains of Elizabeth Feodorovna – the sister of Empress Alexandra Feodorovna. Knight's results are in conflict with the results obtained in the course of official genetic testing with P. Ivanov.

f) In 2003-2004, Yekaterinburg population geneticists have found that in the Ural population there is rather common kind of mutation, which is similar to the one found genetics in the United States. (with P. Ivanov) – (which they said as very uncommon).

All it means is that, regardless of the cause controversy, the results of genetic studies in any case is not absolute, and that they initially need to be thoroughly and repeatedly tested. In any case, the official results of genetic studies (with P. Ivanov) in any case can not be independent of evidentiary value in the identification of the Ekaterinburg remains as the remains of Tsar's family."

We'll look other problems and shortcomings of official DNA tests later in the section «"Resurrection" of Franziska Shanzkowska» (subsection «DNA-testing is not "A sacred cow"»)

In addition, Dr. Popov has put in his letter the following questions about the old and the new "Yekaterinburg remains" (quote from reductions in my retelling)

1. From the transcript of the initial inspection of the place of burial (11-13 July 1991) and from the explanation of the first searchers (Avdonin and Ryabov), we can conclude that the volume of excavation of burial were so small that it could not accommodate three skulls, allegedly found there and seized by these people. Dr. Popov writes (verbatim, in my translation): *"Maybe these skull were not found and removed from the burial in 1979, but were placed into the grave in 1980, when Avdonin and Ryabov again" worked" in this grave?"*

2. The skull, allegedly belonging to Nicholas II (skull number 4), has no trace of wounds he received in Japan in 1891. Meanwhile, the famous report of three doctors who provided medical assistance in 1891 in Japan, immediately after the attack: in this report doctors talked about a piece of bone 2.5 cm long, which they removed from head of Nicholas.

3. As I wrote above, the genetic examination of the new remains, "Alexis" and "Maria" (or "Anastasia") in 2007 was conducted with two teeth (which were found among these remains) – but some experts stated categorically that there are no morphological evidence that these two teeth could belong to any member of the royal Romanov's family

4. As evidence of the belonging of these remains to the royal Romanov's family, a photo superposition was performed.

In many aspects, this photo superposition was, to say the least, imperfect. In particular, Dr. Popov noted that two experts photo superposition came to two different conclusions about the skull number 4 (allegedly belonging to Nicholas II).

5. Sculptural reconstruction of the heads of the royal Romanov's family is extremely unsatisfactory, because the sculptor knew who they should be similar. Dr. Popov also wrote (verbatim, in my translation): "*Such a reconstruction would have a conclusive legal effect only if "sculptor" has never seen in his lifetime the images of these people's faces, sculpted portraits which he produces.*"

(The letter to Dr. Popov you can read in full on the link: <http://rusk.ru/st.php?idar=105031> (in Russian))

A short list of evidence of identity of Anna Anderson and Anastasia.

For those who would like to study the problem of identification of Anna Anderson, I advise you to read two books:

«Anastasia: The Riddle of Anna Anderson" by Peter Kurth;

"The Resurrection of the Romanovs: Anastasia, Anna Anderson, and the World's Greatest Royal Mystery" by Greg King & Penny Wilson.

These studies in most detail set forth the arguments "for (yes)" and "against (no)" an identification of Anna Anderson

as tsar's daughter Anastasia. My criticism of the book by G. King and P. Wilson is here presented in a separate section of this publication («" Resurrection "of Franziska Shanzkowska»). Below I briefly lay out its findings of these studies – in favor of this identification.

1. It is known the dozens (at least about forty) somehow confirmed later stories by Anna Anderson about the life of the Russian tsar family, which could not be known to anyone but the tsar's daughter, and which till now has not refuted or discredited by her opponents (see Amazon.com. Customer Reviews on the King&Wilson's book \"The Resurrection of the Romanovs: Anastasia, Anna Anderson, and the World's Greatest Royal Mystery"/)

2. It is known the diagnoses (psychological aspects of medical reports) of the seven doctors of Anna Tchaikovsky (Anderson) from various psychiatric hospitals and health centers. Four of these doctors were professional psychologist (Dr.). All known diagnoses and medical reports say that (quote) "Mrs. Anna Tchaikovsky (Anderson) could born and live earlier only into an aristocratic family." All doctors unanimously rejected (and I quote) "the possibility of fraud, or hypnosis, or psychopathy in its self-identity." – This is the main conclusion of all physicians.

In particular, the famous German psychiatrist in 1925, Bonhoeffer wrote: *"Her posture, facial expressions and grace in a manner of speaking are indicating that she comes from an*

educated family ... She probably grew up surrounded by the Grand Duchess, she was the daughter of an officer of the tsar's court or any of the royal family ... She could not take over all it from the books or stories of others." ("Anastasia. Riddle Grand Princess" Peter Kurth, p.103, 104). In addition, I quote below the certificate of another psychiatrist of the sanatorium "Shtillehaus" in Oberstdorf, where AA was in the autumn and winter of 1927 ("Anastasia. Riddle Grand Princess" Peter Kurth, p.150-153).

Dr. E.Saathof (Chapter sanatorium) wrote in the final diagnosis (along with the doctor Eitel): *"I completely ruled out that Frau Tchaikovsky – the impostor. She is in any case always behaved quite differently, as one would expect from a fake one."*

Dr. Saathof also wrote *"I think it is impossible that this woman was from the lower classes of society ... I think it is absolutely impossible that this woman could be able deliberately played the role of the other woman. Moreover, the observation of her behavior as a whole, in any way do not contrary to her assertion that she is the one who calls herself."*

3. Anna Anderson could not be Franziska Shantskovska – for many reasons which I have outlined below in more detail in the section «Resurrection" of Franziska Shanzkowska»,

Here, at least, I should note that Franziska Shanzkovska was much taller Anna Anderson that Shanzkovska wore shoes several sizes too big, that Shanzkovska was nulliparous woman (Anna Anderson, on medical evidence, gave birth a son), and, finally, even the brother of F. Shanzkovska refused admit as his sister

Anna Anderson

4. Comparative DNA tests (1994-th and 2010-s) of Anna Manahan (Anderson) and a great-nephew of F.Shantskovska, K. Maucher, – which allegedly gave positive results – these DNA tests can not be accepted for review by any modern court for two reasons: . First, their probability of error by orders of magnitude higher than the current requirements for DNA tests, and, secondly, because the "raw materials" of Anna Anderson (tissue samples of internal organs, and hair) have dubious origins and it were not provided with reliable oficial support in a shipping to the laboratory DNA analysis

In addition to a complete external resemblance (including also highlighted blue eyes, smile and manner of expressing emotions and behavior), Anna Anderson (hereinafter AA) and Anastasia Nikolaevna Romanova (hereinafter ANR) have also the following items of identification:

1. AA as well as ANR had a very severe congenital deformity of both feet legs "Hallux Valgus" (bunions), and just on the right foot is much greater. This is an extremely rare coincidence. More on this, see the section «**Cinderella's glass slippers of Grand Duchess Anastasia**».

2. Forensic judicial procedures comparison of the ears and of the handwritings of AA and ANR in the 1970-s and 1980-s have confirmed their identity.

3. AA had those same scars and traces of wounds that were

inflicted soldiers to ANR in the basement of Ipatiev House at night July 17, 1918

4. AA had the same scar on his forehead, like ANR before 1917, and she covered it with the same fringe.

5. AA knew many little-known details of private life and the nicknames of members of the royal family, and also the especially of their nature and manner of their inner circle. Many of those people (of the inner circle of the royal family), which had known ANR very well before 1917) had no doubt that AA was ANR. Among such people are called Lily Teng, Tatiana and Gleb Botkin, GD Andrew (Romanov), Alexandra Tyegleva (wife of Pierre Gilliard and nurse of ANR till 1917), Xenia Leeds (Romanova) and also the German Prince Sigismund, the Swedish Princess Martha and the Norwegian crown prince. Not to mention those who at first recognized AA as ANR, but then refused (as Pierre Gilliard or valet Volkov)

6. AA, as AHP could read on French, German, English and Russian languages.

7. AA was the first who spoke about the secret visit of brother of Empress Alexandra, German Prince Ernst of Hesse, in Russia (in Tsarskoye Selo) in 1916. He, and all initially denied it – but AA was adamant, and she was right. By the way, just only this AA's statement made of "Uncle Ernie" her fierce and ruthless enemy for life, forever...

8. AA's face in excitement or in anger, was covered with red spots – just as the face of the Empress Alexandra. Finally, AA

was a strict vegetarian, as the Empress Alexandra – NB that was a rarity in those time (in the begining of XX centure). In addition, AA liked sweet – as ANR liked it too. And they loved also the same animals (cats, dogs and parrots).

9. AA remembered some wounded soldiers and officers with whom ANR communicated in a hospital in Tsarskoye Selo in 1915-1917. And also AA tell anyone unknown details about the a life of tsar's family in the period of their life in Tobolsk and Yekaterinburg in 1917-1918. In particular, her detailed story about a home staging performances of members of the Royal Family in Tobolsk was confirmed 30 years later in the memoirs of teacher of royal children Gibbs.

10. After the death of the Dowager Empress Maria Feodorovna, in 1928 in Copenhagen, 13 members of the House of Romanov, issued a statement which declared AA as impostor. However, only one person out of these 13 of the Romanovs, only GD Olga saw AA and talked with her. But GD Olga talked with AA when she was very sick and not able to full communion. Nevertheless, some evidence suggests that at first GD Olga had recognized AA as ANR, and only later had changed her opinion...

Of course, all this is interesting, and all of this together is evidence in favor of the identity of Anna Anderson as Anastasia, But many people ask the question: how Anastasia could be rescued in July 1918? It is known two versions of salvation

Anastasia. In the next two sections, I present these versions.

Version of rescue of the tsar's daughters from Perm.

In 1970-s American journalists S. Sammers and T. Mangold studied previously unknown part of the archives of the investigation in 1918-1919., found in 1930. in the U.S., and published the results of its investigation in 1976 [Sammers S., Mangold T. The File on the tsar. – London, 1976.] According to them, the findings NA Sokolov about the death of the entire royal family were made under pressure of Kolchak (Head of anti-Bolshevik White forces in 1918-1920), who for some reason was advantageous to declare killed all the members of the family.

A. Kolchak at the end of 1919 could order the investigator Sokolov announce killed all the members of the royal family, for two reasons: first, to promote the anti-Bolsheviks propaganda. The second reason is that, in December 1919, Kolchak has learned from a letter from his wife (from Romania), that rescued Anastasia crossed the border into Romania and escaped the Bolsheviks – Kolchak wanted mislead the Bolsheviks on the fate of Anastasia.

S. Sammers and T. Mangold consider more objective investigation and the findings of other investigators White Army (A. Nametkin I. Sergeev and A. Kirsta). According to them (Summers and Mangold's) opinion, the most likely to have been shot in Yekaterinburg only Nicholas II and heir, –

and the Empress and her daughters were moved to Perm, and their subsequent fate is unknown. S. Sammers and T. Mangold inclined to believe that Anna Anderson was really Grand Duchess Anastasia.

In connection with these studies of American journalists, we are interested in the statement of the Russian Orthodox Church Patriarch Kirill on July 26, 2012. I quote from the post agency Interfax:

“Kiev, July 26, 2012. Interfax – The Moscow Patriarchate might reconsider its attitude toward what is widely believed to be the remains of Russia's last Emperor Nicholas II and members of his family and entourage, which were found at the site of their shooting near Yekaterinburg and were buried at the Imperial Burial Vault at the Cathedral of the Peter and Paul Fortress in St. Petersburg in 1998.

“I would like to announce very important information we have received from New York, which is related to the circumstances of the royal family's death. I believe these circumstances will help us determine our position, among other things, on the so-called Yekaterinburg remains. I will provide you with the relevant materials, and we will have to discuss this and make the necessary decision,” Patriarch Kirill of Moscow and All Russia said in opening a conference of the Russian Orthodox Church's Holy Synod in Kiev on Thursday.”

See <http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=9586>

Some commentators believe that this statement of the Patriarch due precisely to the archives, which investigated Summers and Mangold in the U.S. (with the "Perm track" of tsar's daughters).

Last known statement of ROC (in 2013) is the following:

“Russian Orthodox Church still doubts authenticity of Russian royal family remains

Moscow, August 9, Interfax – The head of the Moscow Patriarchate Department for Church and Society Relations Archpriest Vsevolod Chaplin has said that the Russian Orthodox Church still has doubts regarding secular experts' conclusions that the human remains found near the city of Yekaterinburg belonged to the Russian Imperial Family members.

"In my opinion, a very wide range of competent experts, not necessarily just Orthodox experts, should be allowed to study the discovered remains," Father Vsevolod said.

It is important both to compare the DNA of some individual fragment with the DNA of the remains of other Imperial Family members, assess the wholeness of the skeletons, establish whether or not all of the found human remains have the same DNA and confirm the presence of former injuries, for example the injury that was sustained by Tsar Nicholas II during his trip to Japan when he was the heir to the Russian throne, the archpriest said.

There is also a need to compare different theories describing

how the bodies were disposed of and buried, he said.”

See

[http://www.interfax-religion.com/?](http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=10702)

[act=news&div=10702](http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=10702)

Version of the rescue on the night of July 17, 1918 in Yekaterinburg.

(based on Vladimir Momot's articles on his page <http://proza.ru/avtor/annaanastasia> , with my comments)

1. During one of the sessions of Supreme Appeal Court in Senate of FRG on Anna Anderson's case, a tailor from Vienna Henry Kleybenztl bore his testimony. He presented his identity card and documents, confirming that in July 1918, he had been living in Yekaterinburg, where he had been an apprentice of tailor Baudin. A building where Baudin lived, was located near Ipat'ev's house and Kleybenztl often had to fix outfits of soldiers who were guarding tsar's family. In the night on the 17th of July soldiers brought wounded Anastasia in Baudin's house, and he together with master's wife Anna had to look after the Duchess. In the morning "red guards" came in the house, but they "knew the owner too well to raid the house". They announced that Anastasia had disappeared. On the third day the guard came for Anastasia – the one of those who had brought her.

See <http://proza.ru/2008/08/15/195> (CDPOSR /Center of Documentation of public organizations of Sverdlovsk region/, F.41. In.1. D. 151. Sh.10-22)

2. New information about soldier by surname Tchaikovsky, and a searches of Anastasia by Cheka on the border with Romania in 1918.

As established in 2008 in Yekaterinburg by the researcher V. Momot (<http://proza.ru/2008/08/15/195> V. Momot. "The Night Without Dawn»)], the protection of Ipatiev House in Yekaterinburg since May 18, 1918. also included on two soldiers from several companies of 1-st Ural Infantry Regiment (regiment commander – ex. Col. Ivan Vranitsky) – and among them was a soldier of the 1-st company Tchaikovsky or Gaykovsky (as in the regimental documents of the Russian State Military Archives (RSMA) found both versions surname)[Russian State Military Archive: RSMA F.3576. Op.1.D.46. L. 60ob. , RSMA F.3576. Op.1.D.44. L. 20ob.].

It is also known that in 1942 in the occupied territory in Kamenetz-Podolsk region (on the border with Romania), during a search in one of the houses, Baron von Schenk found a leaflet of the Extraordinary Commission (Cheka), 1918, which reported a search for runaway of the emperor's daughter Anastasia (<http://proza.ru/2009/11/18/918> V. Momot. "The Mystery of Princess Anastasia")](Mark Kasvinov. Twenty-three steps down. – Moscow, Publishing House "Thought", 1987 – in Russian).

See also: <http://proza.ru/2009/11/18/918>

Thus, Anastasia had succeeded to avoid death on that fatal

night, but how?

3. Yurovskiy himself explained it (indirectly \sarcastic smile\, but convincingly:). In his speech on the 1st of February of 1934 on the conference of old Bolsheviks in the city of Sverdlovsk, he told about the shooting of Tsar's family. This is how he described incident, which had taken place after the shooting: "When the first dead bodies were carried away, I was told, but don't remember exactly by whom, that somebody had taken valuables. Then I understood that obviously, there had been value in things taken by them. I immediately held a meeting, gathered people, and required to return valuables that were taken. After some denial two people, who had taken the valuables, returned them. After threatening the ones who would loot with shooting I removed those two, and ordered comrade Nikulin, as far as I remember, to accompany the transport, after warning him that to shoot those who had valuables..."

See <http://proza.ru/2008/08/15/195> (SASR /The State Archive of Sverdlovsk Region/ F.472. In.1, D.17. Sh.293-296)

Thus, during this incident, around the bodies in yard could be only soldiers of outer guard. Evidently, it was they who carried the wounded Anastasia out of the yard of Ipat'ev's house.

4. About the fact of Anastasia's disappearance testifies the announcement of Housing Commissariat in newspaper "Izvestia" №138 of 21st of July, 1918. Before adducing the text of that

message, it has to be reminded, that the announcement of Ural Council about Nikolas II's shooting was made on a meeting in a new city theater on the 22d of July, while the official announcement of Central Executive Committee of Soviets of 19th of July was published in newspaper "Ural worker" only on 23d of July. Until that moment, the information about the assassination had been kept in the strictest confidence. The search for Anastasia by the chekists under false pretense caused the wave of discontent among city people. As a result the following announcement appeared in newspaper:

"Rumours have come to Housing Commissariat's notice that some unknown people on behalf of Commissariat inspect apartments and rooms without having proper certificate for that, and that is why the Housing Commissariat brings to all Yekaterinburg citizens' notice that one must admit for buildings' examinations only those people who can present card of the Housing Commissariat showing the right for inspection with attached stamp. In the event of those who come without cards or with cards but without attachment of stamp, one must immediately inform on the phone number 7-35 and 6-26, in order to apprehend offenders. Housing Commissar, Zhilinskiy."

See <http://proza.ru/2008/08/15/195>

Thus, we can be sure that Anastasia was rescued during the night July 17, 1918, that immediately after it, the Bolsheviks in Yekaterinburg were looking for her, and that they later searched for her in Kamenets-Podolsky (on the border of Soviet Russia,

Romania)

In addition:

Conclusion of the group of American anthropologists headed by doctor William Mapples, the director of the S.A. Pound laboratory of identification of human remains, became the stumbling block. After examination of the found remains, Mapples came to conclusion, that among them the remains of 17-year old Duchess Anastasia were absent, because he didn't find the remains which would be in accordance with her age and height. But the skeleton No.5 is absolutely in accordance with Maria's age and height. The substantiations of conclusions on that matter and polemics with Russian colleagues doctor Mapples stated in detailed writing in his book "Dead men do tell tales" [William R. Maples, Ph.D. and Michael Browning "Dead men do tell tales". New York. 1994. 238-268].

See <http://proza.ru/2008/08/15/195>

Among the general public there is widely believed that DNA tests of second "Yekaterinburg remains" (in 2007-2010) had closed the theme of Anastasia's rescue. Even some specialists and historians refer for this to the article «Mystery Solved: The Identification of the Two Missing Romanov Children Using DNA Analysis» by Dr. Michael D. Coble (and other authors):

See <http://www.plosone.org/article/info:doi/10.1371/>

However, it is not so: Dr.M.Coble (et al), they write:

We read in “Introduction” of this article:

“The identity of the missing princess was the source of a high profile disagreement between Russian and US forensic anthropologists: the Russians were convinced that Maria was missing from the mass grave, while the American experts believed that Anastasia was missing ...

We also present the results of a new analysis of the remains from the first mass grave attributed to Tsar Nicholas II, his wife Alexandra, Olga, Tatiana and a third daughter who could be either Anastasia or Maria. The DNA analysis of all three genetic systems confirms that the samples tested from the second grave are one female and one male child of Tsar Nicholas II and Tsarina Alexandra, solving the mystery of the missing Romanov children.”

We read in “Discussion”:

“It should be mentioned that a well publicized debate [2] over which daughter, Maria (according to Russian experts) or Anastasia (according to US experts), has been recovered from the second grave cannot be settled based upon the DNA results reported here. In the absence of a DNA reference from each sister, we can ONLY conclusively identify Alexei – the ONLY son of Nicholas and Alexandra.”

And we read in “Supporting Information”:

“Figure S1.

*mtDNA lineage information of previous and present Romanov testing. *The identification of either Maria or Anastasia was not possible by DNA analysis alone. Either name could be interchangeable in this pedigree.”*

Obviously, his (Dr. Coble's) other words, in chapter "Discussion" ("*... we are able to give a full account of all of the Romanov family and can conclude that none of the family survived the execution in the early morning hours of July 17, 1918,*") – this contradicts to his other conclusions from other chapters, which I quoted above. As far as I understand, this his conclusion in "Discussion" is not based on DNA-tests. Probably, this is only his opinion.

Completely my comments to this article (of Dr.M.Coble et al) you can read in note 1 to his article:

I wrote the note on March 2 (2012). So far, Dr. M. Coble did not answer my question.

Thus, the identification of the female's samples from the second grave as Anastasia's samples (or Maria's) is only a hypothesis, **NOT RELATED TO DNA-TESTS.**

Thus, the hypothesis of Anastasia's rescue does not contradict this article (report) of Dr. M.Coble.

P.S. Why after the rescuing Anastasia took name Anna?

GD Anastasia was born on June, 5/18, 1901, and has been officially christened on the 17/30 of June. During that public christening she was given a name Anastasia. However, according to Orthodox canons, a child should have been baptized on 7-8th day of life. And this was the days of Saint Anna under the Orthodox calendar.

12/25 June – the memory of St. Princess Anna Kashinskaya ,
13/26 June – the memory of St. Anna Vifinskaya.

Honoring St. Anna Kashinskaya was restored in 1909, when Nicholas II. Probably, at that time Anastasia has learned that St. Anna was her celestial patroness.

See also: <http://proza.ru/2008/08/15/173>

"Resurrection" of Franziska Shanzkowska

(My review on Amazon.com on the book “The Resurrection of the Romanovs: Anastasia, Anna Anderson, and the World's Greatest Royal Mystery” (father abbr. ROTR) by G. King and P. Wilson)

1. A lot of researches, but Hesse's archive?...

Of course, the authors have done a lot of researches (archives) – I give them their due in connection with this great work, and I agreed with some of their conclusions on several themes. However, they ignored the fact that some files (Hesse's archives) were created under the control of the most ardent enemies of

Anna Anderson (under the control of "Uncle Ernie" and his lawyers). As I understand it, the book don't contains no one critical word about Hesse's archive (not even talking about a critical analysis of each document from this archive).

2. False resurrection of Franziska Shanzkowska

Authors rejected (without good reason) many evidence against Franziska Shanzkowska (hereafter FS) and in favor AA's self-identification (AA – Anna Anderson).

For example, they are (without any basis) rejected the recognition of the Berlin police the killing of FS (Grossmann, at 1920), and the authors (without a valid reason) assumed the version that the Berlin Police did a statement about the identification of AA as FS – all this is merely a by their “**belief**” and their “**presumption**” – as G. King himself wrote on Coldharbor-forum (further abbr. CH)

2.1. FS WAS KILLED by GROSSMAN in 1920

I quote the following part of the discussion from the chat G. King (Coldharbor, Jan 28):

One of the members of the chat (not me) has quoted from Penny Wilson's former comment on website “Alexander Palace TimeMachine” (further abbr. AP), on: February 22, 2005 (topic "Franziska Schanzkowska and Grossman") :...[in part] ...

<<There are copies of Grossmann's trial transcripts – or the German version thereof – extant in at least one town in Germany.

*Berlin, as we all know, was hideously bombed by the Allies at the end of WWII, and many, many buildings were destroyed along with their contents. One of these buildings stored Berlin police records and archives; however, then as now, there were people interested in the phenomenon of what came to be known as serial killing. At least one of these people, a doctor of psychology, had copies of documents from Grossmann's trial – and his descendants allowed Greg and I access. ... In the list of victims Grossmann was accused and convicted of murdering was the name "(female) Saznovski." This was the individual whom the Berlin police believed was Franziska Schanzkowska. In the course of their lengthy investigation, in which they identified victims known by only one name – like Saznovski – information included in missing persons reports were cross-matched with the victimology, including what Grossmann had written in his diary. What was written about Saznovski was sufficient for the Berlin police – **a highly regarded professional** body – to conclude that Saznovski was Franziska. **They broke the news to the Shanzkovsky family, and they laid Franziska to rest until 1927, when the Berliner Nachtausgabe disinterred her.>>***

Thus, P. Wilson wrote earlier that "*then as now, there were people interested in the phenomenon of what came to be known as serial killing. At least one of these people, a doctor of psychology, had copies of documents from Grossmann's trial – and his descendants allowed Greg and I access*".

And Penny Wilson wrote on: February 22, 2005 (on AP):

<<The bottom line is that Felix and his family were told by the Berlin police that Franziska was dead. Six years later, Felix resisted going to meet Fraulein Unbekannt because he believed Franziska was dead. He was eventually convinced to travel to Seeon to see her. He did so. He thought that there was a resemblance from certain angles, but did not recognize her as his sister. He never did. Of his three surviving siblings, only his sister Gertrude did, but she recanted and refused to sign a legal affidavit. Again, Felix never claimed or admitted that Anastasia Manahan was his sister Franziska. Years later, when pushed on the subject, he snapped out, "My sister was sausages long ago.">>

Later (on Jan 28, 2011, on Coldharbor) Greg King writes:

<<Our **belief** that the Berlin police told FS's family this was based on Rathlef-Keilmann. Once we discovered how unreliable she is, we did a re-think-and could uncover nothing to support this-in fact, the opposite was true-the Berlin police accepted that AA was FS, legally-hence not a victim of Grossmann>>

Another chat's user (not me) wrote:

<<Berlin Police accepted AA as FS? How odd this public statement was not mentioned at the famous " AA German Trials"...>>

G.King answered (Jan 28):

<<**It presumably** was mentioned during the trial and introduced-though again, the opponents of AA never really tried to prove she was FS-even AA's biggest supporters admit this-that it was never seriously discussed as an issue...>>

Later (March 6), I wrote to G.King:

Hi, Greg King... From P.Kurth "Anastasia, the Riddle of Anna Anderson» (pp.188-189 in Russian):

<<"We did not establish the identity," the police in Darmstadt were quick to explain. "We did not take part in the work of the identification. As we have been informed today by the manager [Count Hardenberg] of the estate of the former Grand Duke of Hesse, the name of Schanzkowska was ascertained by a detective for the Berliner Nachtausgabe. And it was detective Martin Knopf, in truth, ostensibly working for the Nachtausgabe and no one else, who informed the Berlin police on April 8, 1927, that Anastasia's identity with Franziska had been established beyond all doubt...>>

Thus, it was Martin Knopf, but not the police in Darmstadt, who "establish AAwasFS"!

Thus, we see that:

1. The words of Penny Wilson about the source of information about the murder of FS is contrary to G. King's words on the other source of information.

2. G. King says nothing about the first source of information, and he without any sufficient grounds rejected a second source (Rathlef-Keilmann's book). Even if Rathlef-Keilmann's book contains some inaccuracies in the other evidences, it absolutely does not mean that Rathlef-Keilmann are not accurate all its other evidence. Compare this with the attitude of Mr. King's to

Gilliard's testimony and to Gilliard's book, Gilliard, and you'll see the extreme bias of Mr. King.

3. Thus, as the denial of recognition of the Berlin police killing of FS, so and the statement about the identification of the Berlin Police AA as FS – all this is merely a by BELIEF and PRESUMPTION (PRESUMABLY) of G. King!

Thus, we can be assured that FS was killed (by Grossmann) in 1920 ... And we can assume that King & Wilson's book is just only a pseudo-historical mystification (or hoax?), based on an initially false hypothesis (or even a whacker?) that AA was FS.

2.2 FRANZISKA SHANZKOVSKA at DALLDORF HOSPITAL in 1917.

In addition, another truly deadly fact for all supporters of FS: she had been a patient at the Dalldorf hospital four months in 1917. And then she (FS?! – according King&Wilson) came back in 1920 as Froilein Unbekant! And noone recognized her! How was it possible? – In 1917 FS was 21 years old in 1920 – 23 \ 24. Teenager aged 13-16 years, can significantly change a face and other part of body up to 20 years, but this is not that case: FS could not change over the 2.5 years (21-24) so that no one knew her there! Some more details:

At the beginning of 1917, FS was transferred to the State Institute for Welfare and Care in Berlin's Wittenau district, Dalldorf. She stayed there four months. ... End of March 1920 AA (Froilein Unbekant!) was sent to Dalldorf Asylum.

17 June 1920 AA was fingerprinted and photographed. These photographs were sent from Berlin out to Stuttgart, Brunswick, Hamurg, Munich, Dresden... (Weimar Republic). Places in Berlin, which probably included FS asylum where she spent some time more than once, were checked thoroughly.... From the beginning of Autumn 1921, when AA announced she as GD Anastasia, and especially since the beginning of 1922, she attracted attention in Dalldorfe. Including, apparently, she attracted attention of the doctors and nurses – including, obviously, those doctors and nurses who worked in Dalldorfe in 1917 (when FS was there for four months).

All this taken together does not leave absolutely no doubt that if AA was FS, she would be being identified as FS:

- or at registering in Dalldorfe in March-April 1920,
- or when trying to identify her persona and thorough inspection in July 1920,
- or when her persona began to attract attention in the winter 1921\1922 and spring 1922,
- or in any other day of her two-year stay in Dalldorfe.

Moreover, after a stay in Daldorf – by fate – in the years 1922-1925 AA was under the scrutiny of police inspector (F.Gr;nberg). AA met inspector Gr;nberg in August 1922, periodically lived in his apartment, including without interruption from January to 19 June 1925 (six months!).

ROTR, p. 110 King&Wilson give us words from Gruenberg's detailed police report:

>> *Anastasia is not adventuress, not, in my opinion is she merely the victim of a delusion that she is the Tsar's daughter. After living with her for a number of months, I have become firmly convinced that she is a lady accustomed intercourse with the highest circles of Russian society and it is likely she was born to a regal rank. Each of her words and movements reveals such a lofty dignity and commanding bearing that it is impossible to claim she learned these characteristics later in life.*<<

King and Wilson cite it, but rejected, as all the other extensive evidence in favor of AA.

3. Diagnosis and reports of professional psychologists

I wrote about this before (see section "A short list of evidence of identity of Anna Anderson and Anastasia."), but I must repeat here some quotes in the context of a discussion of the book King and Wilson

G. King reject (without any reason, as "*little meaningful opinion*"(!)) the reports of seven attending doctors of AA (four of whom were well-known psychiatrists) that they (I quote) "exclude any kind of fraud or hypnosis in AA claims to be Anastasia" ("Anastasia. The riddle of Anna Anderson" by Peter Kurth \ in Russian, p .103, 104, on my reverse translation \).

In particular, Dr. Bonhoeffer wrote:

"Her posture, facial expressions and elegance in manner of speaking suggests that she derives from an educated family ... She probably grew up surrounded by a great princess, she was a

daughter of an (military) officer or some sort of a court of the tsar's family ... She could not take over all of the books or stories of other people." ("Anastasia. The riddle of Anna Anderson" by Peter Kurth \ in Russian, p.103, 104 \).

In addition, I cite below the evidences of psychiatrist from sanatorium "Shtillehaus" in Oberstdorf, where AA was in the autumn and winter of 1927 (" Anastasia. The riddle of Anna Anderson "by Peter Kurth \ in Russian, p. 150-153). Dr. E. Saathof (Chapter the sanatorium) in the final diagnosis wrote: *"It is absolutely impossible that Frau Tchaikovsky – an impostor."* Dr. Saathof also wrote: *"I consider it impossible that this woman was from the lower classes of society ... I think it is absolutely impossible that this woman was deliberately played the role of the other woman. Moreover, the observation of her behavior as a whole does not contradict her assertion that she was the one who calls herself."*

The conclusions others German psychiatrists and psychoanalysts were the same. These diagnoses are particularly significant given that the coincidence psychiatric diagnoses belonging to one national school, rarely exceeds 60-65% ("Diagnosis in psychiatry," Morozov GV Shumsky N G. <http://www.salarys-info.ru/articles/article.aspx?Id=6432>).

In 1931, AA's doctors Dr Willige, at the Ilten Sanatorium wrote: *"To be able to [impersonate another] would require a surpassing intelligence, an extraordinary degree of self-control and an ever alert discipline – all qualities Mrs Tschaikowsky in*

no way possesses." ["Anastasia. The riddle of Anna Anderson" by Peter Kurth \ in Russian, p.286-287\; Dr Willige's report is in EHF at Harvard.]

I asked Mr. King (on web-forum CH) whether he knew of several opposite testimony of psychiatrists or psychoanalysts, or someone from physicians Anna Tchaikovsky? Or even one? – how you can easily guess, Greg King did not answer me this question.

Dr. SERGEI RUDNEV

G.King on the web forum (ColdHarbor) tried many times to present Dr. Sergei Rudnev as only a narrow specialist in one area of medicine (treatment of bone tuberculosis), and even as an inexperienced physician and/or a liar.

Probably, G. King did not bother to carefully look for information about this famous Russian doctor.

In fact, the high medical level Dr. Sergei Mikhailovitch Rudnev confirmed not only that he was famous in Russia and managed hospitals in Russia and in Germany (as well as the fact that he was caused by the Bolsheviks for the treatment of their leader Lenin), but also the fact that in 1925 he had cured AA in a very difficult situation for her, when many thought she would die soon. She died in 1984 and she was grateful to Dr. Rudnev all his life. In addition:

I quote the facts about Rudnev from the book "Hippocratic Oath" by Corresponding Member of the RAS G.Domogatsy:

http://www.inr.ac.ru/ads_icons/history/zz/dom.html

"My father told me that the well-known surgeon Sergey Rudnev enjoyed the reputation of a brave doctor who takes even the most difficult, almost hopeless operation. ... In the 1910's Dr. Rudnev built own clinic. In 1917/1918 Rudnev treated (in his clinic) the famous Russian General Alexander Brusilov".

Dr. Rudnev was also privat-docent at Moscow University (<http://senar.ru/names/r/>). A privat-docent – a position in higher education in Russia (until 1917) and Germany. Position privat-docent could occupy only a man with a PhD. Dr. Rudnev was also a director of own hospital and the CHIEF surgeon of the Red Cross hospital in Moscow: <http://celenie.ru/konchalovsky.htm>

All these facts disproves all of obviously biased attempt of G.King to discredit Dr. Sergei Rudnev.

As I understand it, King & Wilson recognized that wounds and injuries (on the head, the body and legs) of Anna Anderson were a much more severe than injuries FS (which she received as a result of a squabble in 1918) – this is why King & Wilson are trying to discredit Dr. Rudnev (who diagnosed AA in 1925). But they "forget" (?) that these wounds and injuries (of AA) were also described in March 1920 at the clinic in Daldorfe.

Quote from the reviews (by "chocolate lover") on Amazon.com:

<<Another example of K and W's arguments being unconvincing is regarding the supposed attack on Fransiska during her time working as a farm worker. They are trying to put

forward their argument of where the serious injuries (later seen on Anna Anderson, but never before noted on Fransiska) could have occurred. They regularly note in their footnotes their source as a summary by Herr Meyer called 'Evolution of Fransiska Schanskowska to Anastasia'in the Darmstadt Staatarchiv – but I can find no mention anywhere in their book of who he is – and why his 'evidence' should be believed. The attacker is unnamed, the weapon is guessed at... presumably there were no witnesses, nor hospital records to convince us, nor quotes from fellow workers... it all seems a bit of a 'theory' put forward by someone trying to fill in a few gaps (and create a few injuries on Fransiska, just for good measure). I noticed a lot of inconsistencies in this part... especially that the attack supposedly happened in early Autumn, and Fransiska turned up back at the Wingenders that same Autumn, where Doris is supposed to have noted that Fransiska maybe had some wounds, especially 'the mark on her head'(!) Is this supposed to really account for the broken upper, lower jaws and nose area which we have been told (in this book!) were absolutely definite injuries on Anna Anderson. And the scar from an injury straight through Anna Anderson's foot – which K and W imply happened during this 'farm attack' on Fransiska – had it healed so quickly that she did not limp a little, or complain of pain from it?? The Wingenders never even mentioned it.

This episode/ chapter concludes by saying that Fransiska's work had ended in violence, and she had no hope so decided to throw herself in the canal.... despite K and W previously having

told us that (since the supposed attack in 1918) Fransiska had worked another whole season at the same farm (in 1919), and had actually only gone back to the Wingenders because the land work season had ended in the November!!! This chapter is just so UNCONVINCING!>>

4. DNA-testing is not “A sacred cow”!

Unfortunately, Greg King (and all FS's fans) does not understand some very important things related to the validity of evidences and tests in the balance of probability theory (such as Likelihood ratio, hereafter LR).

DNA test is not “a sacred cow”, and Likelihood ratio (LR) of other evidences and tests may be far more convincing (much more) than the LR of DNK-test.

Meanwhile, for a proper understanding of DNA'LR (liklihood ratio of DNA) is necessary to know at least the simplest elementary foundations of probability theory. Greg puts the DNA-testing as "the cornerstone", but does not understand basic things that are needed to compare the LR of DNA tests with LR of other tests.

For example:

– the presence of a rare form/degree disease of feet (severe bilateral bursitis/HV, with stronger HV on the big toe of right foot) which AA had as like Anastasia had also [LR = “X”= at least 13000:1 – in accordance with the data of the Central scientific research institute of traumatology and

orthopedics of Ministry of Health of the USSR, Dr. Galina Kramarenko, 1970, see <http://proza.ru/2008/08/15/173> , <http://proza.ru/avtor/annaanastasia>];

– the coincidence of the diagnoses of four German psychiatrists [LR="Y"= at least 840:1];

– AA's answers to 18 questions of Prince Sigismund (9 of which were complex and had no clear «clues» available in her books) [LR="Z"= at least 16000:1].

I don't give here the calculations of LR the two last tests, in order not to overload this review on technical details. But all this evidence can be considered as tests also, and their probability-statistical analysis shows that LR of two of three of these tests is comparable in magnitude to the DNA 'LR (Likelihood ratio of DNA-test).

G.King wrote (on January 13, at CH-forum):

>>I can tell you the results from the latest DNA test on AA conducted in September 2010 by Dr. Michael Coble who led the team identifying the 2007 Koptyaki remains using hair from AA that I had had in my house since October 1990: The DNA likelihood ratio is 4100 times more likely that AA was FS than that she was not ...<<

and he wrote (on January 14, at CH-forum):

>>The likelihood, considering the 2010 tests AND the 1994 tests, that AA was NOT maternally related to FS: A 0.0000606175 chance that she was not related to Franziska<<

Obviously, we can calculate the total LR of the 2010 tests AND the 1994 tests as a number, reverse 0.0000606175 ($1:0.0000606175$) = 16496. Rounded this figure to 16500. Thus, we can say in other words: the LR, considering the 2010 tests AND the 1994 tests, that AA WAS maternally related to FS: 16 500 chance against only 1 chance that she was not related to FS.

Now, please, attention:

Let's take the minimum figures LR of these three tests (which I wrote above), and let's calculate the aggregate total Likelihood ratio of these three tests = $13000 \times Y \times Z = 174\,720\,000\,000$: 1 – in favor that Anna Anderson was GD Anastasia against only 1 chance that she was not GD Anastasia.

Now compare this to total LR of DNA-tests = 16500:1 – in favor that Anna Anderson was FS ...

Now, please, attention once more:

I remind also that no U.S. court will not accept as evidence of such the too small LR of DNA-tests (LR= 16500:1) [Judicial precedent in U.S. courts: the trial in the case of Bill Clinton and Monica Lewinsky], and with improper storage conditions of the initial samples of AA [Judicial precedent in U.S. courts: the trial of the case of Simpson in Los Angeles].

THE EXAMPLE (the trial of the case of O.J.Simpson in Los Angeles):

<http://www.medinform.biz/stat1.php?id=24422>

U.S. courts may reject evidence of DNA tests also for reasons of dubious origin of the initial samples. For example, the court in

Los Angeles in the case of Simpson rejected DNA tests, because the blood on the back window of the car and socks in the house behind the couch were found a month later. Therefore, the court did not reject the version that the evidence could have been falsified.

Thus, I think, the U.S. courts would be decided to reject the first DNA tests of AA (1990-s), because the samples of organs of AA in the hospital were first allegedly lost, and several months later allegedly found. Also, U.S. court may decline the DNA test of Dr.Coble of 2010 (AA was FS with LR=4100:1), because the hair samples of AA were not issued official documents from the very beginning and it kept long time in informal settings.

THE EXAMPLE (the trial in the case of Bill Clinton and Monica Lewinsky):

<http://www.medinform.biz/stat1.php?id=24422>

DNA identification was used in a U.S. court in a case of U.S. President Bill Clinton. Traces of semen (sperm) on the dress of Monica Lewinsky and President Clinton's blood were the source material for comparison. DNA (extracted from these samples) were compared to 7 loci (a term referring to the database size of the population-genetic analysis). This analysis showed that the probability of accidental coincidence is 1 in 43,000, – so the chances of correct identification (likelihood ratio) was 43 000:1.

Now note: The Court (Commission of Experts on the court DNA tests) considered this figure (43000:1) as clearly inadequate (too small). There were appointed as an additional

examination yet of 7 other loci (the original base for a population-genetic analysis was expanded). The total probability of random coincidence was 1 in 7.87 trillion, which is three orders of magnitude than the world's population. This DNA likelihood ratio convinced the court that the sperm could belong only to Clinton and no one another man in the world.

Generally recommending in the U.S. the accuracy of DNA identification (DNA likelihood ratio) should be such what the corresponding genotype was unique in the population, which numbered are on a rank (in 10 times) more of magnitude than the world's population. Only such an accuracy (DNA likelihood ratio) is considered in U.S. courts as the sufficient guarantee of accurate identification by DNA tests.

So, (AA/FS)'s DNA likelihood ratio [4100 : 1 /and 16500:1/] is absolutely inadequate (too small). Let me explain a little more detail:

The DNA likelihood ratio is 4100 times more likely that AA was FS than that she was not. What does this mean? This means that statistically among every 4100 people (randomly selected for DNA testing), there is one person whose DNA will match with the DNA of FS (and of her relatives). It means that (virtually) into every major skyscraper (where about 4100 people live in), there is one person whose DNA matches the DNA of FS. Or, in other words: in every village with a population of about 4100 people there is minimum one person whose DNA would give a match with DNA of FS.

It goes without saying that I am absolutely not questioning a professionalism (proficient) and scientific honesty and integrity of Dr. Michael Coble. We are not talking about it, but about the scope of the initial database population genetics, which he possessed when performing DNA tests of A. Anderson and F. Shanzkowska, as well as about the conditions of storage of tissue (and hair of AA) samples prior to their transfer to Dr. M. Coble.

Greg King wrote on their web-forum on Jan. 16, 2011 (at web-forum ColdHarbor):

>> *Well, I am IGNORING all computations as I am a complete dunce when it comes to math.* << (large print of the G. King)

I told him then: *However, it is your misfortune, and that's your problem, Greg King!*

Of course, I think (I hope and I want to believe) that Greg King and Penny Wilson wrote this book in a state of sincere (honest) mistake (and being blinded a glare of the "sacred cow" of DNA tests in 1994 and 2010). But this does not change the essence in full and the essence of their book «The Resurrection of the Romanovs: Anastasia, Anna Anderson, and the World's Greatest Royal Mystery».

In any case, in fact, this book not only has some historical errors, but in King&Wilson's efforts to discredit all the witnesses

in favour of Anna Anderson and the expert witnesses at the Hamburg trial, they discredit themselves.

Cinderella's glass slippers of Grand Duchess Anastasia

Very rare congenital deformation of feet "hallux valgus" of Anna Anderson (AA) and Anastasia Nickolaevna Romanova (ANR) puts a fat point in fierce disputes of supporters and opponents of Anna Anderson. In a fairy tale the princess was found out through glass slipper but if in a fairy tale the Prince has found out the Cinderella, in the life of Anna-Anastasia all has taken place on the contrary, and till now, in almost 90 years from appearance-occurrence of Anna-Anastasia in Berlin, even the significant part of members of the House of Romanovs does not recognize, that Anna Anderson was the rescued on July, 17, 1918 GD Anastasia. Fierce disputes on Anna Anderson's riddle proceed till now ...

It is surprisingly that all knew about a rarity of this orthopedic disease, but until recently it occurred to nobody to address to experts-orthopedists and to learn exact medical statistics. Only in 2007 year an unknown engineer from Ekaterinburg (Vladimir Momot, his article was published in L-A newspaper "Panorama" in February, 2007) has made it. So, I cite:

«The first work about hallux valgus has been published by doctor Laforest in 1778. The largest works in XX century are

D.E.Shklovsky's monography (1937), E.I.Zajtsev's(1959) and G.N. Kramarenko's (1970) dissertations. Working in the Central scientific research institute of traumatology and orthopedy of Ministry of Health of the USSR, Galina Nikolaevna Kramarenko has processed the statistical material collected as a result of mass inspections of women on diseases of static deformation of feet. In result she has obtained the following data. Hallux valgus, as a rule, appears at women of 30-35 years old. G. Kramarenko has found out, that the "isolated" hallux valgus 0,95 % suffer from number of the surveyed women. And the first degree of illness has been fixed at 89 %, and the third degree (case AA and ANR) only at 1,6 % from among the women having the given disease. Thus, one of 6500 women (in the age more senior than 30 years) suffers from this illness.

As to cases of congenital disease (case of AA and ANR), these cases are individual and meet extremely seldom. In head establishment of Russia on this problem the Research institute of children's orthopedic of a name of G.I. Turner for last ten years it is registered only eight cases of this disease. – And it is on hundred fifty millions [more exactly, on 142 million – B.R.] inhabitants of Russia».

Thus, the statistics of a congenital case «hallux valgus» makes 8:142 000000, or, approximately, 1:17 750000! Thus, Anna Anderson really was GD Anastasia with such probability (99,9999947)! By the way, this Research institute of children's orthopedic of a name of G.I. Turner is in Tsarskoe Selo where

on June 5 (18), 1901 in 6 A.M. Anastasia Nikolaevna Romanova was born. It is very probable, that children's doctor Henry Ivanovich Turner (1858-1941) examined imperial children in the beginning of XX century in the Aleksandrovsky palace and diagnosed «hallux valgus» to small Anastasia...

The above mentioned statistics practically put down the negative results of the DNA-tests which have been carried out with the remains of some of her body-materials in 1994-1997 – because those years reliability of DNA-researches did not exceed 1:6000 – in three thousand times less authentically, than statistics of "glass slippers" of Anna-Anastasia!

And, finally, the statistics of congenital «hallux valgus» is actually the statistics of facts\artefacts (there are not doubts here) while DNA-researches are a complex (and difficult) procedure at which the opportunity of casual genetic pollution of initial materials is impossible to exclude, and even their ill-intentioned substitution.

In conclusion:

As you can see, I am a supporter of Anna Anderson, and I think, she really was the Grand Duchess Anastasia. However, it is also clear that my opinions (expressed above) are not the "ultimate truth." My personal statements are only my value judgments. This also applies to my criticism of certain persons

mentioned in this brochure.

Also, I apologize to the readers for my imperfect English.