

**DR. GORDIN'S PSEUDO-HISTORY  
VS  
DR. VELIKOVSKY'S PSEUDO-SCIENCE  
A BOOK REVIEW WITH RELATED COMMENTAARY  
by Eric Miller © Feb. 2013**

*Not everything that history offers us has actually happened. And what has actually happened has not happened the way it is presented, and what we know to have happened is only a very small part of what actually happened . . . In historical matters you can never force me to be of your opinion*

(Goethe, interview with Luden,  
August 19, 1806)

The above quote seems particularly applicable to Dr. Michael Gordin's own "history." In his recent book (October, 2012), *The Pseudoscience Wars: Immanuel Velikovsky and the Birth of the Modern Fringe*, Gordin purports to deal with "the Birth of the Modern Fringe"—which is to say, the "*Scientific modern fringe*." At the outset, the question arises: is this really the subject of Dr. Gordin's book, "the Birth of the Modern Fringe," or is it really about Velikovsky, *per se*—and everything else, not specifically about Velikovsky, is mere window-dressing for his title? In many respects Gordin's book is more immolation than an "exploration" of history, philosophy, or the nature of modern cults—but that is not entirely Gordin's fault. Once again, Velikovsky seems to have "sucked up all the air" in the room, and almost entirely dominates the stage.

To Gordin's great credit, it must be said at the outset, he provides a wealth of new material about Velikovsky and the Velikovsky phenomenon. Much of the material is essential for getting an "historical" grip on the situation—who was Velikovsky, what forces informed him, and what politics directed his "vision" and who "backed" his "action", so to speak? To all these questions and issues Gordin makes a significant contribution.

Gordin, however, is not a scientist; he has no competence, as he declares, in any field of science. He is an historian and repeatedly asserts throughout the

book that this is so. His first statement of the fact is only a few pages into his Introduction:

This is not a biography of Velikovsky, or an attempt to debunk him or exonerate him, or even a judicious weighing of the arguments in favor of and against the picture of the world that he built up in many writings over the course of his career. An interested person can turn to many other places for such accounts. (p. 6)

Certainly, we can agree it is not a “biography” as Gordin avoids some of the most important biographical facts of Velikovsky’s life—such as, for example, the fact that he repeatedly tried to commit suicide in his last days. Gordin merely characterizes his last days as: “The story of Velikovsky’s final decade, then, is one of triumph—after a fashion.” The fact is, Velikovsky’s last days, especially the last years, were filled with a terrible desperation and a total collapse of self-worth. His daughter, Ruth, reveals he was so lacking in self-worth he feared to leave his house, afraid and ashamed that he would be laughed at, even by neighbors, as the charlatan he was branded to be by his adversary, the “luminary” astronomer/scientist, Carl Sagan.

That Gordin’s book is *not* an effort to “debunk him” is also, in places, highly questionable. Gordin repeatedly uses demeaning or “debunking” adjectives to describe Velikovsky—either overtly or by implication. For instance, already in Chapter One, Gordin quotes Harlow Shapley (Director of the Harvard College Observatory) as referring to Velikovsky as a “crackpot.” (i.e., “the most errant nonsense of my experience and I have met my share of crackpots.”). Gordin then begins his next paragraph, immediately after, with: “In fact, as he [Shapley] surely recalled, he had met this one.” Gordin’s “this one”, i.e., this “crack-pot,” is unquestionably a reference to Velikovsky. Elsewhere in his book, Gordin cajolingly refers to Velikovsky as “the master”, “the master’s death”, courses “not taught by the master”, Freud’s younger students were his “acolytes” etc.

Gordin’s book, it is true, is also not “a judicious weighing of the arguments in favor of and against” Velikovsky’s historical world-view. Indeed, Gordin

quickly passes-by some rather sensational features of Velikovsky's own apparent racism toward non-Jews. Gordin even fails to take historical notice of the fact that, at the very heart of Velikovsky's historical-cosmical Venus-Earth battle lies the myth (so-far-as-is-known) of the "historical event" of Exodus and all the magical events described therein.

Whether in mock, earnest, or ignorance, Gordin derives from Sigmund Freud's book, *Moses and Monotheism*, an epigraph for his book about Velikovsky and the Velikovsky wars:

No probability, however seductive, can protect us from error; even if all parts of a problem seem to fit together like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle, one has to remember that the probable need not necessarily be the truth, and the truth not always probable.

Is Gordin suggesting (or mocking) with his quotation from Freud that there was/is a seductive probability that Velikovsky was correct? Correct, that is, about his story of "Moses and the Venus Comet Attack On Earth"? Anyone who has read Gordin's book is not likely to conclude Gordin is insinuating any such thing. Does the quote merely suggest that, no matter how much we sometimes believe things to be true, sometimes it just ain't so? Could that have been Gordin's thinking?

The proposition that, however infinitely high the "probability" of anything being truth, it need Not be true (i.e., "the truth is not always probable.") seems a bit of a murky matter. How this philosophical point, even if impossibly correct, is illuminating, in the context of Gordin's book, dealing with Velikovsky, is not clear. Why does Gordin quote from Freud as epigraph for his book on Velikovsky? Is Gordin insinuating, from his knowledge as an historian, that Freud himself was, arguably, the most prominent 20<sup>th</sup> cult Leader of the Pseudoscientist of the Modern Fringe—but dares not say so outright? It is a defensible claim, made by various medical historians, that Freud was a pseudoscience cultist. Is Gordin subtly reminding those "in the know"? Or is he really so "out of the know" himself as to not realize this fact.

Further, one could ask: "When is it *ever* true that Truth is *not* probable?" That's what Freud says in Gordin's epigraph, the Truth is *not always*

probable. But what has any of this idle and misguided philosophical speculation on the probability or improbability of truth have anything to do with truth and history and science and the “Velikovsky Catastrophe” jigsaw puzzle? That’s the question isn’t it?

That “Truth is *not always* probable,” is an obvious bit of a puzzle, as said. But, totally reversing the premise, one might ask: is Gordin confessing a belief himself in miracles—and that the improbable “Velikovsky’s Catastrophe” actually happened in 1500 BCE? Or, is Gordin more-likely rather suggesting only that Freud best understood these matters (such things as “Velikovsky’s theories”)? And, so, he cautions on the need of the searchers for truth being “protected from error”?

Moving on, deeper into Gordin’s book, at the outset we must challenge Gordin’s off-hand assertion that, as to the whole of the matter, i.e., including Velikovsky’s biography, weighing of arguments, etc. there are “many other places for such accounts.” Indeed, because, of this, one can only lament that Gordin, an historian, didn’t deal more directly with at least some of the key evidence needed for a more authentic “history.” Gordin continues:

Rather than merely reprise the Velikovsky debates—as fascinating as they are—I mean to explore this notion of the “pseudo-science wars.” Every chapter after the first (which lays out the context of the controversy over *World In Collision*, juxtaposes Velikovsky’s case with that of one or more purported pseudosciences: Freudianism, *Weltreislehre*, Lysenko’s, eugenics, parapsychology, creationism, orgone theory, ancient astronauts, and finally contemporary debates about science and public policy. . I will at times veer rather far off the Velikovskian path. . . I take Velikovsky and other struggles over so-called pseudoscience as entry points into what philosophers have called the “demarcation problem.”

Here, Gordin steers the reader astray—the “demarcation problem” is, it seems, one of Gordin’s least concerns. Freud, for example, and psychoanalysis itself is arguably the most successful fraud and pseudoscience in modern history—both are central to the Velikovsky history and the cult fraud of psychoanalysis is avoided like the plague by Gordin. Why?

Gordin, in his book, goes into a rather confused discussion of the “demarcation problem” first set out by Austrian philosopher, Karl Popper “in 1928 or 1929” particularly in regard to Einstein’s theory of General Relativity and “a rather more local scientific practice: psychoanalysis.” Psychoanalysis is, according to Gordin “a rather more local scientific practice”? What in the world is a “rather more local scientific practice”? Is that a cult “scientific” practice that real scientists, generally, have nothing to do with, and so it’s only practiced by the locals?

Gordin is out of his depth. That is damaging to his entire objectivity when it comes to Velikovsky and the effects of the “Jewish science” of psychoanalysis upon him. “Jewish science” of psychoanalysis, you ask? To get a glimpse into Jewish anti-Gentile racism and psychoanalysis and its historic roots in pseudoscience, one needs only consult Dr. Dennis B. Klein’s *Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement* (1985). Klein’s book documents the racist roots of Freudianism and Freud’s Jewish “disciples” identifying their cult-belief in psycho-analysis as the “Jewish Science”.

[Professor Klein, was Director of the Center for Holocaust Studies of the Anti-Defamation League of the B’nai B’rith. Not one of your typical Anti-Semites, we can all be assured. Klein seems to take special delight in indicating just how much of a Jewish racist Freud was, a fact well-known to his Jewish cohorts and collaborators].

Seen as the antecedents of the psychoanalytic movement, Freud accelerated recruitment, lecture, and leadership activity in the B’nai B’rith (“Sons of the Covenant”) in 1901-2 points to the centrality of the Jews in his development of a psychoanalytic school. By exchanging ideas with, and seeking advice from, fellow Jews. Freud promoted the view,

commonly held in the brotherhood, that Jews played a primary role in affirming universal and humanitarian values. Freud also advanced the view that Jews played a primary role in affirming universal and humanitarian values. Freud also advanced the view that Jews played a responsible role in teaching these values to others. Many, believing this was the most important function of the B'nai B'rith, and summoned the brother to "seize the opportunity for disseminating the ethical influences of his knowledge," as Ehrmann put it, or, as another brother urged, to "step outside" the society as a blessing for all mankind.

(Klein, *Jewish Origins  
of Psychoanalysis*, p 93)

Velikovsky's own Teacher Analyst, Dr. Wilhelm Stekel, was himself hailing the "Jewish science of Psychoanalysis" and urging all psychoanalysts in Israel to get behind Immanuel Velikovsky, as one of the finest representatives of the "Jewish science of psychoanalysis." In discussing Velikovsky's "pseudoscience" one cannot turn a blind eye to the central "qualification" even Gordin believes Velikovsky had for the entire erection of his catastrophic theory, i.e., mankind's "Collective Amnesia"—a "psychoanalytical diagnosis" whose etiology is fully rooted in Freudianism—the biggest "science" fraud of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Apparently this is a fraud Gordin himself has "bought into"—*or for some reason wishes not to go near.*

Freud, himself a serial killer, sadist, and bilious misanthrope, nonetheless considered himself, rapturously, one of the "Chosen People." Strangely, despite, not believing in God, Freud nonetheless proclaimed it was a "miracle" to be born a Jew. Of course, as an atheist German medical scientist, Freud did not believe one-whit in Judaism, nor in God, Himself/Herself, whatsoever (Freud believed only in the "Devil", but that is another matter). Freud did believe, however, that the Jews needed redemption for their God-murder crimes *via psychoanalysis*. The Jews needed to find redemption for

themselves *first* and then lead the rest of the world to it—as that was their, and especial Freud’s own “Moses-Mission—or at least sometimes he would have it seem so. That non-Jews made Freud feel strange and uneasy, well. . . these are not subjects with which Gordin deals. He is after Velikovsky, not Freud.

In my book, *Passion for Murder, the Homicidal Deeds of Dr. Sigmund Freud*, I document the history of Freud’s serial killer career. Many Jews and Gentiles knew Freud was murderous and that he had a hatred for Jews. Abraham Shalom Yahuda, in his remarks about the true Freud, wrote:

It seems to me that in these words [Freud’s] we hear the voice of one of the most fanatical Christians in his hatred of Israel. . .

In this regard, Gordin fails to mention that Velikovsky declared that Freud was for him a “revelation”; Freud was a “diviner” and obviously one of sanctimonious reputation and regard for Velikovsky. He prized the meager correspondence he had with Freud—especially where Freud announced himself to be in agreement with some of some Velikovsky’s ideas regarding the “occult” or “parapsychology”. Ironically, Freud, the Anti-Semite atheist, who, according to *Velikovsky himself*, sold his soul to the Devil, *and that Devil was Christianity*—that very man was “master and “diviner” to Velikovsky. Indeed, Freud was Velikovsky’s “revelation”—and he, Velikovsky, was a religious Zionist, not an atheist!

Key supporters of Velikovsky, we learn from Gordin, were Zionists—men of highest reputation, men like Horace Kallen, Einstein, and others. Whether Zionists, in particular, were actively involved in the publishing of the massive money-maker, *Worlds In Collision*, is an area of research not gone into by Gordin.

In his book, on the Jewish science of psychoanalysis—again, this is the subject that underlies Velikovsky’s entire “methodology”—Professor Klein identifies Freudian psychoanalysis as a “Jewish science”. While many have spoken of psychoanalysis as a “Jewish science” Klein, in particular, appears to revel in revealing how racist Freud and his early cohorts really were toward non-Jews. Indeed, Klein reveals that Freud confessed that Gentiles gave him, by virtue

of being Gentiles, a “strange” feeling when in their presence. (“On the other hand, he felt a deep, indeed a ‘racial,’ separation from non-Jews. . . Freud noted that Jones [Ernest Jones one of Freud’s top lieutenants] gave him a feeling of ‘racial strangeness’”). (see Isidor Sadger’s, *Recollecting Freud*, 1930)

Indeed, there were virtually no Gentiles in Freud’s world. Freud’s son reports that, though there were many people constantly flowing through the Freud household, he could never remember a “non-Jew” amongst them. Freud was a Serial Killer, a sadist of the worst sort, so he was certain to have a lot of “strange” feelings about a great many things, not only Gentiles—as I document in my book, *Passion for Murder: The Homicidal Deeds of Dr. Sigmund Freud* ([www.passionformurder.com](http://www.passionformurder.com)). Apparently, this exclusively “all-Jewish” environment appears to have been Velikovsky’s basic *milieu* as well.

This is one of the problem areas with Gordin’s work. Gordin shows, even in his opening salvo, he himself is deeply engaged in Pseudo-History—apparently without even knowing it, and has set ship into a head-storm of various intellectual and historical confusions, of which he seems either ignorant or simply wishes to keep silent about. It is strange for an historian to avoid key issues of “history” in his work, which purports to be a “behind-the-scenes history of the writer’s career” —as the back cover of his book has it.

Gordon is at pains to give the impression his is a philosophical, disinterested, view of the Velikovsky phenomenon. Certainly, the reader can understand why Gordin, having no background in the sciences (one would almost presume it a requirement to discuss meaningfully its opposite, i.e., “pseudo-science”) would not want to opine or attempt to “referee” issues of physics, cosmology, geology, ancient history, etc. But, one would have to be lacking in critical faculties, altogether, to *not see* that Gordin habitually makes slurs against Velikovsky in a whole host of matters. He lumps Velikovsky in with the ancient-astronauts-from-outer-space fringe, and at the same time refers to him, apparently insultingly, as “the master”; refers to those who “believe” in him as “acolytes, (i.e., “Of course most courses on Velikovsky were not taught by the master himself, but by others. . .”), etc.

But, certainly, one might imagine that Gordin would not altogether shy away from issues of *history*, of which he is a professor.



Let there be no mistake about it, Velikovsky's cosmological theory is, at heart, when all the smoke and fire disappear from the stage-scene, a radical Jewish fundamentalist view of "Jewish history." This is so because that is exactly what lay at the foundation and center of Velikovsky's theories and all his alleged "scientific" extrapolations—the myth of Moses and the Exodus. Gordin *repeatedly* states that Velikovsky's Zionism is the very "pole star" around which his entire world-view revolves. And yet, Gordin also reveals that when it came to speaking of his own religious views Velikovsky was "cagey." Gordin himself appears more than once to be "cagey" himself about the matter.

One senses this subject is sensitive ground for Gordin, just as it is sensitive ground for him to avoid highlighting how other famous Jews "aided and abetted" Velikovsky. Gordin little discusses how Einstein played into Velikovsky's hand and how Einstein's own Zionism doubtless played a role in the matter. Had Einstein made a simple declaration for the public, as he made directly to Velikovsky in his surviving letters, there perhaps may never have been a Velikovsky phenomenon in the first place. Had Einstein merely told the reporters of N.Y. Times, Post, or others, that Velikovsky's theory was fundamentally not conceivable in view of the laws of physics, as they were then known to be—and no one, to date, has proven their error, including Velikovsky. But, he was silent and his silence allowed many, thousands upon thousands to readers to be mired in Velikovsky's confusions. Many others besides Einstein were silent. Why?

Gordin, it seems to this writer, is content to immolate Velikovsky, but not at the expense of other prominent Jewish intellectuals. As to them, he makes at best passing remarks and quickly hustles away from the subject. Gordin's own myopic views on the issue of his book—the history of pseudoscience—is not only limited to issues relating to Jews and Velikovskianism. Gordin fails to realize that just because one is a "pseudo-scientist" in one area does not mean that person is a pseudo-scientist in other areas. Indeed, let us not forget that one of the greatest pseudo-scientists of all time was Isaac Newton. Newton spent an inordinate amount of time in his crazy study of the Bible, in search of cryptological evidence of the precise date for the end-of-the world—and claimed to have found it! The date is 2060.

Newton's crazy "View of the End-of-the-World" prediction is less credible, perhaps even crazier (if such a thing can be), than Velikovsky's theories—or the recent claim that ancient Mayan soothsayers foretold the end-of-the-world for 12-21-2012. We have seen 12-21-12 go by and the world did not end, and we confidently predict the same for Newton's "end time". The following quote from "Statement on the date 2060" underscores the point being made here of the "relativity" of what is or is not "pseudoscience":

One reason why Newton's heresy, apocalyptic thought and prediction about the 2060 date became news in February 2003 is because most members of the media and the public had no idea that Newton was anything other than a "scientist". For many, the revelation that Newton was a passionate believer who took biblical prophecy seriously came as something of a shock. It seems that both the media and the general public have a notion of Newton as a "rational" scientist that makes it difficult to absorb the knowledge that Newton was practicing both alchemy and prophetic exegesis—studies many see as antithetical to the enterprise of science. The media has perpetuated a myth that science and religion are inherently in conflict (the fact is, sometimes they are; but religion has also often stimulated the development of science). The story about Newton predicting the Apocalypse in 2060 is the sort of thing that one would expect to see on the covers of the tabloids. In this case, however, the story is true. Ironically, the tabloids did not cover the story (perhaps because this story, although counter-intuitive to many people, is authentic).

see, <http://www.isaac-newton.org/update.html>

It is, moreover, interesting to note that the very same Jewish scholar who condemned Freud for being a fanatical hater of Jews, himself, inadvertently or not, aided in the cover-up of the Newton pseudoscience scandal. At the indicated link above, one will read:

The largest single collection of the theological papers was acquired by the Jewish scholar Abraham Shalom Ezekiel Yahuda. When he died in 1951, he left them to the newly-founded State of Israel. His will was contested and thus the manuscripts did not arrive in Israel until 1969, when they were brought to the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem. It was only after this point that scholars had access to this particular collection of papers. But the manuscripts were only conveniently accessible to scholars after the majority of Newton's scientific,

administrative, theological and alchemical manuscripts were released on microfilm in 1991.

To continue, Wilhelm Reich, for example, is identified and facilely passed off by Gordin as an obvious pseudoscientist nut. He appears not to know that Reich was, nonetheless, arguable one of the very best psychologist of his times. He was a brilliant man of great insight prior to his illness. Reich developed a symptomatic maze of theories of a new “life-energy”, which he claims to have discovered and which he called “orgone”—and, during his illness, developed means to capture it with an “orgone energy accumulator”. We are not here defending Reich’s mental illness, nor condemning it, but mention it only to show that one may be “crazy” about one subject and astute in another. Einstein, too, it should be noted, gave Reich hours of his time discussing Reich’s fantasy “orgone” energy machine with him. And Einstein had, himself, many ideas in politics and other fields thought “crazy” by qualified persons in various fields.

As for Freud, he openly expressed his hope and expectation that Einstein, too, would one day become a “disciple” of his. And, as is shown, below, Einstein acts as though this might nearly be the case. (see Einstein’s opening remarks to Freud in his letter to him for *Why War* at the provided link below)

Gordin seems to be confused “out of the shoot”, so to speak—at least from the beginning of the “take-off” position discussing Karl Popper to the end of Gordin’s “philosophical” discussion. Popper, for example, was not a “philosopher” in 1928-1929, as Gordin claims; he just got his doctorate in psychology in 1928 and in 1929 he was a math and psychics teacher in the secondary school. It would not seem to matter much, in any case, as Gordin, after a long explication of Popper’s “theory of falsification” informs us that it was no good anyway. Gordon does seem to adopt one of Popper’s most grievous errors, however, pertinent to this discussion. Gordin quotes Popper to the proposition that:

. . . so Popper reasoned, Einstein’s general relativity would have been proven wrong and the theory would have died. With Sigmund Freud’s and Alfred Adler’s psychoanalysis, on the other hand, Popper saw something

different. These doctrines did not thrive on prediction, but on confirmation: they would examine a case of neurosis, and then explain it in terms of their own theoretical framework (Oedipus complex or inferiority complex, say).

Gordin informs his readers that Popper dealt with his “demarcation theory” in 1928 or 1929:

a decade after he had already begun to muse over what differentiated what he considered the most impressive scientific achievements of his day. . . the confirmation in 1919 of Albert Einstein’s general relativity through the measurement of the deflection of starlight around the sun during an eclipse— and a rather more local scientific practice: psychoanalysis.”

Gordin seems unaware of the fact that “psychoanalysis” is not a “science” but a cult—always was and always will be. And the “theoretical framework” of Freud’s Oedipal-complex, for example—verges itself on insanity, when soberly considered. Certainly, Gordin must know that there is not any “scientific” evidence, whatsoever, that the human infant male is innately born with a desire to copulate with its mother and murder the father. Freud, personally, and the subject of *his own* probable copulation with *his* mother, is a proper subject for historical investigation, and so is Freud’s repeated confessions of wanting to murder his “father” another. But, these are extreme psycho-pathological states of mind which Freud shared with certain Serial Killer types. Does Gordin really believe in his remarks above, that the so-called Freudian “Oedipal-complex” is a doctrine that “thrived” on “confirmation.” If so, I suggest, Gordin hang up his degree in history and find other work. I say this because there is an enormous amount of historical work that has been done showing Freud was a fraud from the beginning—and this fact is confirmed by many of the same types and sources of evidence as Gordin himself employs for his case against Velikovsky. The reader will find at my site [www.passionformurder.com](http://www.passionformurder.com) the concurrence of Medical

Historians of high repute in the fact that Freud was “one of the worst”, not “one of best of Jewish intellectuals.”

Gordin points to the difference between Velikovsky and others who became labeled as pseudo-scientists: “Velikovsky’s case is more interesting,” Gordin tells us: “He was trained as a medical doctor and a psychoanalyst so he was not completely outside the scientific community, although he was certainly not a trained astronomer or geologist.” Of course, Gordin, fails to note that Freud’s “training” as a “psychoanalyst” was at his own hand, as he was the inventor of the Jewish science all by himself. Absurd.

Where, one may ask, was Velikovsky “not completely outside” the scientific community? The implication clearly is that he was *not* completely outside the scientific community because of two facts, 1) he was a medical doctor *and* 2) he was a psychoanalyst.

At the outset we see Gordin is himself at least trying to give “psychoanalysis” some veneer of credibility—despite the fact that he refers, not to psychoanalysis, but “Freudianism” as candidates for a pseudoscience. And, of course, he does not distinguish the two except by name. The important thing here is that Einstein himself greatly praised Freud’s psycho-babble (in *Why War*) and obviously inclines to be in agreement with Freud’s own cynical world-view about the evil of men’s souls. Though not a believer in “psychoanalysis”, Einstein nonetheless obsequiously praises Freud above all else for the sagacity of his “understanding.” Does that make Einstein a “pseudo-scientist”—by mutual belief or association? If so, so be it. It certainly does in the field of psychology, from this writer’s point of view.

I will not quote here the embarrassing obsequies and boot-licking genuflections Einstein proffered Freud in correspondence with him. It can be read without my comment at the link below, from *Why War*:

<http://www.public.asu.edu/~jmlynch/273/documents/FreudEinstein.pdf>

Of course, Einstein did not know Freud was a Serial Killer, he apparently didn’t even know what Freud’s views really were, or that Freud’s “case histories” were fraudulent, that he dreamed-up his case histories to confirm his “cures” to make himself famous. He plagiarized others works and was an

inveterate liar—obviously Einstein’s critical acuties did not extend to analysis of biographic history, literary or psychological analysis. Freud’s murderous passions and sadism are clearly apparent in his works—and have been profusely commented on by Jews and other people alike. Freud’s murders, at least some of them, are documented in my book, and confirmed by leading specialists in the field. Freud’s own granddaughter, one Sophie Freud, for example, a distinguished professor of psychology, now Professor Emerita, and quite renowned in her own field, accepts after much study of my work that Freud, her grandfather, was, indeed, a murderer and sadist. Einstein did not know this—he doubtless did not read Freud’s works very carefully, if he read them at all.

In any case, once the great ones, like Einstein and Newton, step outside the magic circle of their genius, they can, and often do, prove themselves just as prone to being hoodwinked and made fools of (by themselves or others) as anyone—if not more so.

Einstein wrote to Velikovsky:

The proof [i.e., Velikovsky’s “proof”] of “sudden” changes (p. 223 to the end) is quite convincing and meritorious. If you had done nothing else but to gather and present in a clear way this mass of evidence, you would have already a considerable merit.

Apparently Einstein believed as an *historian* Velikovsky was an intellectual of “considerable merit.” Einstein, in a later letter retracted the above remarks—saying he had been too rash in saying so. Of the “pseudoscientist” Velikovsky, Einstein also wrote, on July 8, 1946:

Dear Mr. Velikovsky:

I have read the whole book about the planet Venus. There is much of interest in the book which proves that in fact catastrophes have taken place which must be attributed to extraterrestrial causes. However it is evident

to every sensible physicist that these catastrophes can have nothing to do with the planet Venus and that also the direction of the inclination of the terrestrial axis towards the ecliptic could not have undergone a considerable change without the total destruction of the entire earth's crust. Your arguments in this regard are so weak as opposed to the mechanical-astronomical ones, that no expert will be able to take them seriously. It were best in my opinion if you would in this way revise your books, which contain truly valuable material. If you cannot decide on this, then what is valuable in your deliberations will become ineffective, and it may be difficult finding a sensible publisher who would take the risk of such a heavy fiasco upon himself. [underline added]

Einstein speaks to Velikovsky's work and tells him "every sensible physicist" will have nothing to do with his Venus theory and, that if he doesn't abandon his claims, any publisher will have a "heavy fiasco" on their hands. How much clearer does anyone want it? No expert will take Velikovsky's ideas seriously. Is that any clearer? Velikovsky's ideas, Einstein tells him directly, need to be revised, or his "deliberations", in other words, Velikovsky's entire theory of cosmic catastrophism, will become "ineffective." Again, if Einstein had written that to MacMillan Publishing, the publishing company could have lost a fortune in book sales of Velikovsky's book. Did MacMillan *not want to know* to truth for their own profit—the suggestion is certainly in the record.

Why would Einstein bother with such a person as Velikovsky who is merely pretending to be a "scientist" and is not one—as every real scientist will immediately know, as Einstein himself phrased it. And, yet, as late as some 8 years later Einstein is still flattering and encouraging Velikovsky:

Thus it happens that many ideas at different times are repeatedly conceived anew, without the initiator knowing that these subjects

had been considered already before. In this sense I find your patience in examining the literature quite enlightening and valuable; it deserves the attentive consideration of researchers who according to their natural mentality live so much in the present that they are inclined to think of every idea that occurs to them, or their group, as new. *The* idea of a possible displacement of the poles as an explanation of the change of climate in any one point of the earth's crust is a beautiful example. [underline added]

So, Velikovsky has, in Einstein's view "a beautiful example" that deserves the "attentive consideration of researchers." I realize Gordin has published many of these remarks of Einstein. I know, too, Einstein also tells Velikovsky his work is too lacking to be taken seriously. Indeed, there are other devastating remarks made by Einstein about Velikovsky, more than mentioned by Gordin. But the point is that there are many encouragements, too. And there is a history in these matters which needs to be clearly set forth and motivations probed for this scandal!

\*\*\*\*\*

Strangely enough, at the very beginning of Gordin's book, he cites, *of all people*, the Anti-Semite Sigmund Freud—and *that* from Freud's last book, *Moses and Monotheism*. In this book, Freud attacks Jewish mythical history and its alleged miraculous foundations. Freud's *Moses* book, in fact, indicts the whole of the Jewish people as *murderers*. Yes, Freud's book asserts that the Jews were all genetically murderers—because they collectively were guilty of the murder of their own prophet, Moses! Not only that, but Freud also in *Moses* claims that the original Moses, was not a Jew, at all, but he was, in fact, an Egyptian, an Egyptian, not a Jew! And the book itself was published in 1939—while the fires of the crematoriums were roaring. How odd for Gordin to use such a quote from Freud, on this subject, on this date, in this book.



Gordin opens his book *The Pseudoscience Wars, Immanuel Velikovsky And The Birth Of The Modern Fringe* with the following quotation from Freud's last book, just before he died:

No probability, however selective, can protect us from error; even if all parts of a problem seem to fit together like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle, one has to remember that the probable need not necessarily be the truth, and the truth not always probable.

Sigmund Freud, *Moses and Monotheism*

A quote remarkably like Goethe's cited at the top of my comments but, of course, lacking the logical integrity of Goethe's remark. Freud was a great plagiarist, as anyone versed in his biographical and medical history will attest. The next quote, after Freud's, offered by Gordin, is from someone, one might suspect, who might be the opposite of Freud in religious persuasion. After the quote of the atheist Jew, Freud, we have the orthodox Jew, Saul Lieberman ("Rabbi Shaul Lieberman or, among some of his students [he was] known as: "the Gra'sh, was an Israeli rabbi and a scholar of Talmud."):

Nonsense is nonsense, but the history of nonsense is a very important science.

The history of nonsense *can be* very important—but, at best, it is hardly a science—as Gordin's own work testifies. And when the history of nonsense has a lot of nonsense to it, it might just be larded with unimportant nonsense. Einstein didn't think Velikovsky was nonsense in many regards, so the lines of discrimination must be carefully drawn and Gordin does not do so.

As we turn the proverbial page and read Gordin's book, we see how Gordin himself practices the "important science" of history—dealing with the serious business of the Velikovsky nonsense.

Gordin's book is basically about a pseudoscientist, Dr. Immanuel Velikovsky, a religious Zionist who claimed the "miracles" of Exodus (at least a couple of

them) *actually happened*. The pseudo-science “miracles” Velikovsky wants to keep were not caused by Moses waving his rod, but by the forces of a *natural event*—allegedly, the passage of an enormous comet, Venus, which, after settling in orbit, became our beautiful planet, Venus, commonly called in Hebrew, “Noga.” (Whether “Noga” was “commonly” called “Venus” in Old Testament times—whenever they were—this writer does not know. The reader will recall that one of the sons of King David was called “Noga” and one wonders did that really mean, specifically, “Venus”—who, unless we are mistaken, was, for the Hebrews as well as most other Middle Eastern cultures a female “star” name. Elsewhere this matter is discussed *in extenso* at this site).

Many of Velikovsky’s lay supporters, we learn from Gordin, were Zionists or from the “religious” Judeo-Christian camp of religious fundamentalists. The “Jewish-science” of Psychoanalysis, is a pertinent issue, as Velikovsky was a member of that clique of cultists who, in the early years, were virtually all Jews and in whose “inner group” non-Jews were generally considered “not fit” to be in the Freud cult—indeed Freud himself, as said, professed aversion to non-Jews; they gave him a “strange” feeling.

Clearly, the Hebrew Bible story of Moses, and the fact that Velikovsky was a Jew, was Velikovsky’s “pole star”, as Gordin states, and, indeed, it is part and parcel of the whole Velikovsky mania to himself *become* the Moses who leads the way for his people. Gordin acknowledges the fact:

This book that stunned the publishing world [*Worlds In Collision*] and catapulted Velikovsky to fame began as an inquiry into Freud’s last work [*Moses and Monotheism*]. Later critics would often mock Velikovsky’s credentials as a psychoanalyst and claim that he surely did not have the requisite skills in ancient history or astrophysics to substantiate his Venus scenario. But psychoanalysis was precisely the relevant expertise. *Worlds in Collision* was fundamentally, at its core, a book engaged in the Freudian project, even if those sources were, like the Zionist

inspiration, so deeply buried as to be almost unrecognizable. Velikovsky's method in "From Exodus to Exile"—some separated into *Worlds in Collision* (the scientific claims) and *Ages in Chaos, Volume 1* (the historical claims)—was thoroughly psychoanalytic.

"Psychoanalysis was precisely the relevant expertise"? What in the world is the "Freudian project"? What is Gordin talking about? Gordin himself speaks of (during the planning of several of Velikovsky's writing projects at the time, circa 1939) the fact that:

The text bore marks of its origin as part of a monograph on Freud's *Moses and Monotheism*. After devoting almost two hundred pages to laying out parallels between Egyptian history and Greek myth, he suddenly switched to an attack on Freud himself.

Contrary to Gordin's assertions above, there was nothing at all "deeply buried" in Velikovsky's "engagement" in the "Freudian project." It was his calling card, the very *raison d'être* for his "historical claims" and his so-called "extrapolated scientific claims." Gordin well knows this and even discusses Velikovsky's outrage at Freud's attack on Moses and, obviously, also his own deeply held Zionism.

Freud, his master, had betrayed him and his people—according to Velikovsky and many another Jewish and Christian. Gordin describes Velikovsky's outrage over Freud's:

degradation of Moses. He degraded him by denying him originality; simultaneously he degraded the Jewish people by denying them a leader of their own race, for he made Moses an Egyptian; and finally he degraded the Jewish God, making of Yaweh a local deity, an evil spirit of Mount Sinai. . . . On the eve of his departure from a long life he had

to blast the Hebrew God, demote his prophet, and glorify an Egyptian apostate as the founder of a great religion.

Freud degraded the Jewish God! Freud denied the Jewish people their Leader, Moses, by declaring that his psychoanalytical investigations revealed that Moses was an Egyptian? How much worse can the situation get?

Velikovsky is motivated to write an “all out attack” on Freud—but, we would ask, was it really because he was he was so outraged, or perhaps, he saw in the matter as primary opportunity for fame—to “one-up” Freud! It is difficult to believe that even Gordin believes his own words when he says that such motivations to attack Freud were “so deeply buried as to be almost unrecognizable.” Frankly, in this, Gordin sounds once again like a “pseudo-psychoanalyst” for he speaks of Velikovsky as being outraged, incensed, repelled, “He pondered the book intensely” and immediately began to make arrangement to leave Palestine and to “compose a response.” Now, only four pages later, Gordin would like us to believe all this was “so deeply buried as to be almost unrecognizable.” Sounds more like “historical” propaganda to me than reasonable conjecture based on facts. It sure ain’t science!

So, far as I can tell, Gordon does not even mention Velikovsky’s first “attack” on Freud, in “Sigmund Freud & Moses the Lawgiver”. In “SF & Moses the Lawgiver” Velikovsky refers to *Moses and Monotheism* (1937-39), I presume it was written probably about just before Freud died in 1939 and not long before Velikovsky’s “Dreams Freud Dreamed” (1941) I discuss this somewhat at length elsewhere and will not dwell on it more here, except to note the following commentary and excerpts below.

\*\*\*\*\*

**\*Note:** The indented italic comment below is from Velikovsky, all else is the author’s:

**Below commentary is from my Analysis of Velikovsky’s  
“S.F & Moses the Lawgiver”  
by Velikovsky**

**[The entire piece of “S.F. & Moses the Lawgiver, and added detailed Analysis can be found at this website]**

That Freud believed that religion was a neurosis but that he sought no sign of “neurosis” in Moses (the highest of religious figures for the Jewish people) begs the question of what Freud was attempting to deal with in his essays on his “unlaid ghost”—i.e., Moses. Velikovsky realizes that “something profoundly personal was hinted at in such a confession.” Velikovsky will obliquely answer the question of the “something” that was “profoundly personal” to Freud by claiming Freud was hinting at the fact that he didn’t want to be a Jew.

It is my thesis, my “legal theory,” in fact, that Freud’s “unlaid ghost” was really his half-brother, John Freud, whose Jewish name was most likely “Moses.” Freud’s discussion of “Moses” was simply his covert way of referring to and musing over his “brother-murder.” I will here and throughout a series of commentaries on the matter adduce much credible evidence for this “legal theory”—that Freud’s “primal murder victim” was John Moses Freud. Velikovsky has the following to say on the subject:

*Freud’s work on Moses, the Egyptian, is not a psychoanalytical or psychological study. But we shall proceed in the manner of Freud when delivering over the author of a literary work to the tribunal of psychoanalysis.*

If Freud’s work was not, as Velikovsky avers, a psychoanalytical or psychological matter, what then is it? Velikovsky proposes to treat Freud’s non-psychological or non-psychoanalytical “literary” work on Moses as a fit subject for “delivering him over to a tribunal of psychoanalysis.”

A “tribunal of psychoanalysis” obviously means for Velikovsky a “tribunal of Jewish psychoanalysis”—for it is the Jewish implication that Velikovsky has in mind, exclusively. The very language Velikovsky uses psychologically identifies his own examination of Freud (following Freud himself) as though it was a matter for a legal proceeding, *at inception*—and, indeed, to Velikovsky it appears to be. But things are not as Velikovsky then imagined. [It is a fact of

record, that Velikovsky later came to accept my findings that Freud was a homicidal maniac—a matter to be dealt with later]. The real theme, of Velikovsky's remarks in "S.F. & Moses the Lawgiver", is "Velikovsky to the Rescue of Judaism and Restoration of Moses to his Jewish Prophet-dom."

To be frank, the very language Velikovsky uses indicates his own self-measurement with the presumed prowess of "psychoanalytical opinion" (his own, in particular) having the status, in his mind, of a legal "judgment" (i.e., "delivering over the author [Freud] of a literary work to the tribunal of psychoanalysis." Is this statement not itself an indication that Velikovsky was going to submit Freud to "Jewish judgment" for the way Freud handled the sacred subject (or should we say "object") of Moses? Of course it is.

Velikovsky's opening comment remarks that Freud only abandoned the psychological or psychoanalytical field twice before in his writings, as he says, is itself not at all a true statement. Who, on reflection, would agree, for instance, that Freud's essay on "Leonardo De Vinci" anywhere approached an alleged "scientific" psychological or psychoanalytical study? Or who, knowing that Freud's case histories were criminal frauds would "buy into" Velikovsky's high sounding rhetoric? One begins to see at the outset grounds for fearing Velikovsky's own psychoanalytical "tribunal" will likely *not meet* any standard for psychological "science" or, indeed, any proper legal proceedings either.

Yet, much as in the manner of Ernest Jones' (one of Freud's foremost disciples) method of analysis of Shakespeare's Hamlet, Velikovsky attempts to make a "literary character" of Freud and then psychoanalyze that literary "character." But, Freud is no Hamlet, he is a real person. Velikovsky obviously means that because Freud's "study" of "Moses" is a work of fiction, he is entitled to examine the creator of the work of fiction, as Freud—for example—psychoanalyzed Dostoyevsky, in his "Dostoyevsky and Parricide." We rightly fear a Star Chamber proceeding is about to commence under the guise of a "Velikovsky Tribunal."

Velikovsky concluded his piece on "Sigmund Freud and Moses the Lawgiver" with this amazing remark:

*As I have said, I do not wish to adopt any position with respect to the historical*

*reconstruction. Yet the personality of Moses appears to be completely altered by Freud's hand; much falls away, and something else is added, and a shape appears before us which is a reflected image. Even if Freud is right, the remarkable fact of his interest in a historical personality, and also of his wonderful, divining insight, would be a proof of a psychic affinity which approaches spiritual identity. If Freud is wrong he is wrong as a historian. He remains, however, in the right as a poet, ruling over his poetry by virtue of his imagination.*

Here, Velikovsky, who puts himself out as a universal critic and historian, doesn't "wish to adopt any position with respect to historical reconstruction." Wonder why that is? His entire cosmology is an "historical reconstruction" –the obvious situation is that he, too, doesn't want to offend any Jews, hardly dares to say that the very person who "gave his soul to the Devil" because he wanted to convert to Christianity, appears now to have altered something. If we really saw a "shape" that "appears before us," as in Freud's accounting of Moses, then the "reflected image" we would undoubtedly see would be that of Moses the "murderer." Not the Jewish people as the murderer of Moses, as Freud would have it—making his serial killer sins an innate universal desire. Velikovsky can't even think straight on the subject.

But, could anything be more pitiful? Note: Velikovsky's language: "Even if Freud is right. . ." Velikovsky says this of Freud that he is "a historical personality" and his "wonderful, divining insight" approaches "spiritual identity" with Moses. Velikovsky is beginning to sound crazy, and indeed, in my piece, "Velikovsky's "Moses-Complex: A Prisoner of Cosmic Catastrophes" I give serious examination of Velikovsky's psychopathology. And Gordin doesn't even mention this issue—where Velikovsky is going crazy before our very eyes on matters of "history" and his "idol worship" of Dr. Sigmund Freud and or Moses. This fawning Velikovsky, is this the same Velikovsky who is, we are told, furious with Freud for his trying to put a knife in the back of Jewry—at one of its most trying ever historical periods?

Whenever he wrote this piece, Velikovsky is already showing signs of his own psychological instability, and perhaps, even worse for a religious Zionist, he shows himself an “idol-worshiper” who sees in his idol Moses the idol of Freud—whom he literally hates, from many indications of evidence. Indeed, gone mad or obsequiously “political”, he cravenly finds Freud “right” even when he is “wrong”—because Velikovsky is not in his right mind. And to speak of Freud’s “right as a poet, ruling over his poetry by virtue of his imagination” seems a clear case of Velikovsky “presenting” his symptomology.

It’s difficult to imagine anything so obsequious, more steeped in idolatry than Velikovsky’s remarks quoted above. They show Velikovsky will do or say anything that serves his purpose. Velikovsky had a purpose that Einstein, ironically enough, was perhaps one of the first to see through to the core, when he branded him “a professional revolutionary.” A professional Jewish revolutionary.

When asked how he could persevere for so many years to relentless opposition by the scientific establishment, Velikovsky answered, “it is the obstinacy of my race, the race of Marx, of Freud and of Einstein.”

*Immanuel Velikovsky: The Truth Behind The Torment*, Sharon, p. 15

Ironically, Marx, Freud and Einstein were not religious Jews at all, they were all atheists—and Marx and Freud were anti-Semites. Given the above, the fact that Gordin does not even mention Velikovsky’s piece on “Sigmund Freud & Moses the Lawgiver” gives one to wonder: is Gordin having his own identity problems in not recognizing the clear realities of the situation of the profound problem Velikovsky was having with Freud’s views and his own religious and ethnic orientations? And what does Gordin mean when he says that Velikovsky’s “method” (as contained in *Worlds In Collision* and *Ages in Chaos*)—separated into “scientific claims” and “historical claims” and was “thoroughly psychoanalytic”? What does that mean?



Velikovsky, from the beginning, had one overwhelming ambition and that was to destroy Sigmund Freud!—to unmask him as a traitor to the Jewish people, to show he had made a “psychic” pact with the Devil *because he wanted to convert to Christianity*. And because of this evil motive (for certainly it is an evil motive, in Velikovsky’s view, for anyone to want to convert to Christianity), Freud falsified Jewish history, attacked the Jewish people, and branded them as murderers. It was Velikovsky’s job to prove that Freud’s history was wrong, that his (Velikovsky’s) new historical chronology preempted the possibility that Freud was right. And he was also apparently charged, at least by his own voices, to “deliver him [Freud] over to the tribunal”!

In light of the above, how are we to explain Velikovsky’s “bootlicking” in his laudation of Freud in his article on “Sigmund Freud & Moses the Lawgiver”? Velikovsky himself is apparently suffering from an acute case of catastrophic cultural amnesia, to such a degree that it is not so difficult to see him falling victim to himself in repeated efforts of suicide. This happened, later, when the “gig” was up—and no one believed anymore in his Messianic Genius which placed him (as he placed himself) in the ranks of Marx, Freud and Einstein.

At the time of Velikovsky’s first volley of his attack on Freud, it had nothing to do with any so-called “science” proving Velikovsky’s Venus-comet. It had only to do with the myth of Exodus. Velikovsky described his “methodology”, as “psychoanalytical”—a term Gordin adopts, as though there were a reality to the description. Velikovsky then had no other calling card. He was not a scientist, he was not an anthropologist, he was not a scholar in any ancient Egyptian or Near Eastern studies or Greek; he was not an historian of *any* period. The only credential Velikovsky had for his brazen attack on Master Freud was a pronouncement by Dr. Stekel that he was “qualified” as a “psychoanalyst”—after Velikovsky showed Stekel that Stekel’s own “psycho-analysis” of a dream analysis, published in Stekel’s book, was bogus. Stekel allegedly agreed. Then, following a few weeks of discussion of Velikovsky’s own dreams, Velikovsky was pronounced, *voila*, a “Psycho-analyst.” Stekel declared Velikovsky, we are told, a “master” himself, neither in need of being trained nor of completing his own psychoanalysis, as required by everyone else.

It is pertinent here to recall that Stekel himself considered Psychoanalysis a “Jewish science” ( *Aba*, p. 79) Moreover he beseeched Chaim Wiseman to put Velikovsky in charge of the “Jewish science” of Psychoanalysis for all of Israel.

But, to continue, Velikovsky announced in the most grandiloquent terms to a prospective publisher his historic attacks on Freud (as Gordin aptly quotes). It is a project with a “conceptual sweep”:

The nature of the project and its conceptual sweep are described most succinctly in a 1940 book proposal:

There are revelations in it relating to three different fields—psycho-analysis, the cultural history of Greece, and the history of the XVIII Dynasty in Egypt. All these different sections, thought apparently so diverse, are bound together by the unity of the psychological method of investigation: in all probability this is the first time it has been possible to make important historical discoveries by way of psychological interpretation.

So, what we have is Velikovsky’s own “psychological interpretation” of cultural history—which Gordin goes out of his way to credit—for these “important historical discoveries.” Now there’s a subject for Gordin. He is an historian. Is it possible to “psychoanalyze” history? And whose version of history, and how accurate is the history we are dealing with, for certainly the crystal ball of “revelation”, even of psychoanalysis, cannot produce valid “history” if it is based on a lot of historical errors or, even more probably, myths. Gordin doesn’t discuss this *at all*.

Of course, Freud’s and Velikovsky’s “vision” of history is cockamamie. But Gordin, like Velikovsky above, apparently doesn’t want to “adopt any position with respect to the historical reconstruction” of the alleged historicity of Exodus. We wonder why.

## The Real History Avoided By All: Freud, Velikovsky and Gordin

As to individuals, the “real” history of Moses is that, according to *Holy Scriptures*, Moses really is identified as a murderer, not the Jewish people. And Moses was not only a murderer, but also a mass murderer. All avoid the actual subject like the Holy Ghost! As we shall soon discover, thanks to disclosures of Gordin (and Velikovsky’s daughter, Ruth), Velikovsky was also planning to give the world another psychoanalytic “revelation” in his own later days, analogous it seems to Freud. And that was that Christianity had at its root repressed “homosexuality” and “sodomasochism.” In Velikovsky’s ending days he, too, was planning to pursue this “insight” of an earlier period, into a final analysis of “The Son of Man”, as Gordin himself informs us. Again, the cultural mythopoetic history of Moses being a murderer/mass murderer is the true subject apparently “repressed” by Velikovsky, Freud, and Gordin.

In any case, Scriptural authority for the assertion that Moses was a murderer/mass murderer—first, of an Egyptian guard; and then of 3,000 of his own people can be found at Exod. 2:12 and Exod. 32:28. We don’t need psychoanalysis or an “historical” investigation to discover this, it is clearly stated in the Scriptures—look it up. But, for all this so-called psychoanalysis, where is the Scriptural authority for Jesus being a sadomasochistic homosexual, as Velikovsky would have it? There is none I could find. Could this be what psychoanalysts call “projection” on Velikovsky’s part?

(Velikovsky was reportedly very “prudish” about homosexuality, Gordin informs us. Velikovsky himself reveals he was still a virgin at the time he got married at 28)

In any case, Velikovsky was not only ready to “abuse” Freud, but also to “use” him. Indeed, over the years he frequently tried to give himself credibility by mentioning, over and over, that Freud was a correspondent of his, that Freud was in agreement with him on key issues of “parapsychology” or occultism (as is more properly the term used in this case by Velikovsky himself—and, indeed, the very term used by Velikovsky to describe his indicated “work”)—does Gordin not know any of this? Surely, he does. But this is the kind of confusion, on many fronts, we encounter dealing with Gordin’s book. He does not deal with any of these matters—however much it is true that many

of these issues wouldn't or even couldn't, at this point in time, be discussed at all were it not for Gordin's research and revelations.

### **The Sociological Perspective & Gordin's Book**

It would be wonderful and Velikovsky would have contributed greatly to our culture if he were *the* pseudoscientist to whom we could all look to understand the "pseudodoms" in our society. But, the fact is, there are legions of pseudo-scientists, pseudo-doctors, pseudo-religionists, pseudo-politicians, pseudo-historians and, no doubt, pseudo-book reviewers. Indeed, there are more phony and false works and doctrines than one can shake a Pseudo stick at. Velikovsky is not alone.

In further comments, to be made at another time, taking a larger perspective in consideration, we will discuss the pseudo-science of some of the establishments "eminent" scientists, like Carl Sagan, who when Velikovsky was spinning out his fantasies was competitively trying to get the world to believe the temperature of Venus was like a spring day on Earth (rather than circa 900 Fahrenheit, as it is now known to be). Ironically, it was Carl Sagan, apparently more than most, who, nearing Velikovsky's end, made Velikovsky feel so ashamed of himself. Velikovsky's daughter, Ruth, says that it was because Sagan had branded him as a charlatan that he was too ashamed to walk outside his front door. His attempts at suicide followed.

In *An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual & Political Movements*, Kevin B. MacDonald cites comments by Churchland and Yerushalami in support of the idea that psychoanalysis is *not* a science. Gordin, on the other hand, apparently accepts it as a "confirmatory" science. MacDonald first quotes Churchland:

#### **Jewish Involvement in the Psychoanalytic Movement**

The familiar caricature of the bearded and monocled Freudian analyst probing his reclining patient for memories of toilet training gone awry and parentally directed lust is now an anachronism, as is the

professional practice of that mostly empty and confabulatory art. How such an elaborate theory could have become so widely accepted—on the basis of no systematic evidence or critical experiments, and in the face of chronic failures of therapeutic intervention in all of the major classes of mental illness (schizophrenia, mania and depression)—is something that sociologists of science and popular culture have yet to fully explain. (Paul Churchland 1995, 181)

The thesis of this chapter is that it is impossible to understand psychoanalysis as a “science,” or more properly as a political movement, without taking into account the role of Judaism. Sigmund Freud is a prime example of a Jewish social scientist whose writings were influenced by his Jewish identity and his negative attributions regarding gentile culture as the source of anti-Semitism. The discussion of Jewish involvement in the psychoanalytic movement was until recently, “as though by tacit agreement, beyond the pale” (Yerushalmi 1991, 98). Nevertheless, the Jewish involvement in psychoanalysis—the “Jewish science”—has been apparent to those inside and outside the movement since its inception:

History made psychoanalysis a “Jewish science.” It continued to be attacked as such. It was destroyed in Germany, Italy, and Austria and exiled to the four winds, as such. It continues even now to be perceived as such by enemies and friends alike. Of course there are by now distinguished analysts who are not Jews. . . . But the vanguard of the movement over the last fifty years has

remained predominantly Jewish as it was  
from the beginning. (Yerushalmi 1991, 98)

**To be continued. . . .**

ADDITIONAL REVIEW & COMMENTARY  
A deeper cultural perspective on the Velikovsky phenomenon,  
The Failure of Responsibility,  
Deceit  
&  
The Bones of Velikovsky