

78 Hartley Ave.
Princeton, N.J.
08540

March 20, 70

Dear Mr. Miller:

Upon our return from British Columbia we found in the mail your letter of February 27th. Thanks for remembering the 20th anniversary of W. in C. It is also the tenth anniversary of O. and A.

You have the talent of expressing yourself. Actually I may show your letter to Prof. Horace M. Kallen to whom O. & A. was dedicated.

Doubleday prepares a full page ad in the Book Review section of N.Y. Times to commemorate the 20th anniversary of W. in C. The actual date of publication by Macmillan was on April 3rd 1950; the date Doubleday took the book over was June 8, 1950. The ad will run on May 2 this year.

If you feel inspired to do so you may write a piece to commemorate the anniversary. In 1950 Harrison Brown in SRLit. prophesized that ten years later nobody would remember the book besides the weary lecturers that were plagued by questions about WIC at every one of the public lectures.

The experience in British Columbia is unforgettable - in Victoria and in Vancouver alike.

With kind regards,

Yours,

W. Veluzotz

*Today arrived a letter stamped
March 17. Will respond later.*

IN COMMEMORATION OF WORLDS IN COLLISION (With Current Self-Critique In Italics—Jan. 2013)

by Eric L. Miller (1970)

Twenty years ago a book was published. A Russian psychoanalyst with great scholarship, at the mature age of fifty-five, published to the world, in the English language, the results of his historical investigations into man's ancient past. His investigations revealed there was compelling evidence to substantiate the claim that the planet Earth has, more than once, experienced global catastrophes within the written history of man. The evidence discovered was so abundant that it immediately became necessary to formulate a responsible scientific theory to explain it.

As we shall see the question at issue is the one assumed in the above statement, i.e., that there really was “compelling evidence” for Velikovsky’s claim. The statement that “Earth has, more than once, experienced global catastrophes within the written history of man” is merely asserted not established. An assertion about a premise is not proof of it.

Since time immemorial earth has experienced repeated destructions from heaven and earth. What begs the question is what does “global catastrophes” mean? Ancient man, the world over, undoubtedly experienced catastrophes from the heaven and earth itself, but ancient man himself, of course, did not and could not have known if the same event(s) was simultaneous the world over. The statement above exaggerates a claim, pronounces there is great evidence for it and urges a theory became necessary to explain it—in keeping with Velikovsky’s avowed intentions. The fact is none of the statements above are facts in evidence which testify to the truth any theory.

The first sentence already, I must note, “gilds the lily” as though being a psychoanalyst is a qualification for “truth

finding” –which it is not -- or that being 55 years old helps, or that, indeed, any “great scholarship” is at all involved in the matter. In 1950 when Velikovsky wrote, many people mistakenly believed “psychoanalysis” was a science. Velikovsky was indoctrinated into that belief and became one of them. And this, perhaps, is where the problems start. A Russian Jew, culturally steeped in the belief-system of the Old Testament, who thinks he is employing, via psychoanalysis, scientific analytical techniques, undertakes an analysis of mankind under the pressure of “evidence” from Exodus and the described exploits of the legendary Moses.

*Ironically, as the reader shall learn later, Velikovsky originally undertook his study of Moses—which lead him to his studies in catastrophism-- to **disprove** his Freud’s claim that Moses was not the creator of monotheism but the Egyptians were! Velikovsky was incensed by his Master’s betrayal of the Jewish people, as he saw it, by Freud’s anti-Semitic views, published under Moses and Monotheism (1938).*

Worlds In Collision was the name of the book and, along with its presentation of the most fundamental evidence existing at the time, it propounds a theory conceived to satisfy the most rigorous logical analysis. To this end its author, Dr. Immanuel Velikovsky; proposed the following thesis which he believed was most consistent with the mass of evidence uncovered: 1) that 3500 years ago (coincident with his dating of the biblical Exodus), and again 2400 years ago, a comet which had been expelled from Jupiter came into collision course with our planet Earth; 2) that the near encounter with this comet created global catastrophe; 3) that the agent of this destruction was the proto-planet Venus, a recent addition to our planetary family; 4) that Mars and our Moon were also involved in these encounters; and 5) that mankind, having experienced a great traumatic shock, may, consequently be suffering from a Collective Amnesia.

Of course, the “fundamental evidence” is not to be assumed as my article blithely appears to do, but rather is a main

point, if the main point, at issue. A thesis, any thesis, which “explains” evidence at issue, must validate the evidence before a theory becomes anything but an empty shell. The thesis proposed by V which “he believed” and which was consistent with “his gathered evidence” begins with the presumption a number of fundamental “facts”—at issue—namely that: 1) there is any scientific evidence that there ever was an Exodus; 2) that if there was it was anything like that described by V; 3) that this “evidence” for the historical reality of an exodus can reliably be dated to 1500 BC.; 4) that if there really was an exodus it occurred under the stimulus of a great comet and had any of the effects which V cites as “evidence” for a global event.

(Note: Though it is not stated, and at this point is hardly relevant, V also proposed that circa 1500 BC there were two “passes” by the earth of the “comet” Venus, 52 years apart, so that, there were two catastrophic passes in one century. V, to my knowledge, does not distinguish the one from the other in his commentary but lumps both alleged events under the same time period alleged for Exodus—even though, of course, the biblical period for traveling in the desert was 40 years not 52 years).

Moreover, the proposition inherent in the paragraph of mine being examined, in regular print above, continues to state that V’s theory has another catastrophe, circa 1100 B.C. This is a misstatement, and not even in accord with V’s theory. V’s theory is that there was another catastrophe in 687 BC, not 1100 B.C. (i.e., 3500-2400=1100 BC) Also, the paragraph above clumsily indicates in V’s theory that Venus was once a comet or proto-planet, which had been originally expelled from Jupiter and made various “passes” by the earth in 1500 BC and 687 BC. This is V’s position, along with the claim that “Mars and our Moon were also involved in these encounters.” V has no scientific evidence that there were any encounters

as he described nor that, obviously, Mars and the Moon were involved in these alleged “encounters.” Surmise all.

The publication of *Worlds in Collision*, on April 3, 1950, created an international sensation to which the official community of scholars and scientists, the world over, reacted with all the characteristics of a severe case of cultural shock.

This is a true statement, by and large. V’s work was greeted with shock. Some, no doubt, were shocked that a prestigious scientific publisher, McMillan, would publish such a thesis, and there was great shock as well over the idea itself, possibly being true. And it needs be noted here that because a person is a scholar or scientist in one field that doesn’t give him or her credentials in any other field. Indeed, often it is the case that scholars and scientists in their own fields deal in obscure and unsettled notions—giving rise to even fellow scholars and scientists railing contemptuously at each other—as they vie for prominence in their respective fields. That is an embarrassing fact but easily established.

Worlds In Collision injected an historic stimulation into the intellectual consciousness of masses of people. It was read and discussed with an almost unbelievable passion. Written with an astounding intellectual clarity, characteristic of a classic achievement, the revolutionary intentions of the book were declared at the outset:

Worlds In Collision did, indeed, inject “an historic stimulation into the intellectual consciousness of masses of people.” It was some 16 weeks on the New York Times Top 10 Best Seller list. It was discussed from pulpit, hailed by religious fundamentalists, featured in mass publications like Reader’s Digest, etc.; it was featured and debated by pundits, and religious fundamentalists in the United States and abroad. Famous people by the droves came out to defend or defame the thesis. Geared to a mass audience, V’s style was calculated to

appeal to the masses, and yet, at the same time, it was wonderfully concise, and well written with a very “authoritative voice” of complete conviction. That it seemed to be “Written with astounding intellectual clarity” and vast erudition, was a feeling amongst masses of people at the time—including this writer. But was it really so? Was V as “informed” as he appeared with all of his copious recitations of classical texts and books of scholars from many fields of knowledge—from geology, cosmology, astronomy, mythology, biblical studies? Or was he, perhaps, a polished polemicist, an “index-raider” (as I call the type), one of those who turns to the indexes of learned books searching for key words to “prove” their assumptions—rather than having a scholarly in-depth knowledge of the very works being quoted? In large measure, unfortunately, I have, over the years, found the latter to be far truer than the former in regards to much of what V has to say—as shall be discussed in detailed particulars elsewhere at this website.

Velikovsky continues his quote, in non-italic, above:

This book is written for the instructed and uninstructed alike. No formula and no hieroglyphic will stand in the way of those who set out' to read it. If occasionally historical evidence does not square with formulated laws, it should be remembered that a law is but a deduction from experience and experiment, and therefore laws must conform with historical facts, not facts with laws.

Though most scientists are of the opinion that the general public is not competent to judge the logicity of any scientific theory, Dr. Velikovsky, after years of intensive research, published his findings to a world public.

Ultimately, it matters little what “most scientists” think about the “general public.” What matters, of course, is the integrity

of the theory. I state here my own version of an oft-repeated remark about V's years of intensive research. But, what, really, were those years of research? As said, above, V first plunged into research to disprove Freud's thesis that the Jews were not the creators of "monotheism" but the Egyptians were! It was Freud's view that Akhnaton of the Egyptian 18th Dynasty (circa 1350 BC) taught Moses the "new religion" which he imparted to the Israelites. V, incensed, was determined to "prove" that Akhnaton himself was wrongly placed in the chronological scheme allotted to him and that he came (after V's reconstructed ancient history) after Moses; therefore Moses could not have inherited "monotheism" from Akhnaton.

This "mission" to disprove Freud became the motive force for 1) proving that the story of Moses was a true story, 2) that there was need to find evidence to prove that the Moses story was a true story, etc. And to that end, V searched far and wide for confirming evidence of his fundamentalist, one can probably even say Zionist, persuasion. This was not known of me when I wrote this article of mine from 1970 which I am herewith critically dissecting. Nor did I know that V in these same years of researching was anonymously publishing a regular column in a New York city paper promoting Zionist views—all this was carefully concealed from public knowledge!

Profoundly aware of the historic responsibility to which his researches had elected him, he began his book with a brilliantly logical examination of the major cosmological theories and their deficiencies in the face of known facts of celestial phenomenon. We learn, contrary to the assertions of many scientists, that there is in fact no comprehensive theory which can adequately explain the origin of our solar system or the forces which ruled its formation. Dr. Velikovsky's concise and penetrating examination of conventional theories yields the following conclusion: "The most we can do, it is believed, is to investigate one planet, the one under our feet, in order to

learn its past; and then, by the deductive method, to apply the results to other members of the solar system."

The "historic responsibility" to which V's researches "had elected him" was actually imposed, it appears, on him by his Zionist father, Simon, whom when he died in 1937, beseeched his son, Immanuel, to "save the world." He certainly was not wanting him to "save" a non-Zionist world, we can well imagine. Simon Velikovsky had been described all his life as an "ardent" Zionist, other's would probably say he was a "fanatical Zionist." His granddaughter reports Simon would only speak Hebrew on the Sabbath.

That there was no cosmological theory without major deficiencies, is after all, more to be expected than not expected. I dare say, 100 years, 500, even a 1000 years from now there will still be "major deficiencies" in any explanation that attempts to tell all us how, when, or why the Universe was created. Actually, the subject is beyond the abilities of science to give anything other than provisional ideas—in this writers view, in any case.

*As to V's "insight" that we can only examine the ground beneath our feet "by the deductive method" and then "apply the results to other members of the solar system" sounds good—and even, for the sake of argument granting it is true, that certainly does not prove anything that V tells us about what **he sees** under our feet nor that a comet from Jupiter plagued the earth with repeated cataclysms.*

Contrary to the conviction of most scientists that all major earth changes have occurred slowly, over eons of time, Dr. Velikovsky offers known physical facts which conjure against such a belief. He examines the many problems inherent in accepted conceptions of geology and astronomy and offers his own theory believed more consistent with the physical facts. How, it is queried, can conventional theory adequately explain the mystery of

mountain building, the discovery of huge sedimentary deposits on top of the Himalayas, the discovery of well-preserved frozen bodies of extinct mammoths -- their stomachs filled with undigested vegetables? These and innumerable other facts of nature appear to be inexplicable in conventional terms of evolutionary gradualism. The discovery of skulls of modern man found buried under a hundred feet of gravel and till, in some cases, and evidence that a highly developed race, the American Indian, was living before the occurrence of the last ice age, offered hope that man himself may have left a written record of the causes of such surprising phenomena. "Let us, therefore, investigate the traditions and the literary records of ancient man and compare them with the records of nature." With these words Dr. Velikovsky leads his readers into an unprecedented journey into rediscovering the catastrophic history of man's past.

This, too, sounds good, to me, but what does it really mean? Obviously the "traditions and the literary records of ancient man" may tell us something about man's past, but that doesn't mean it is going to tell us anything about V's presumption that Exodus was a fact, that a comet came from Jupiter, or that V's chronology that allegedly disproves Freud's alleged concoction of history is true. Mostly likely, in this writer's view Freud and Velikovsky are both dreadfully wrong.

With a completely controlled intellectual passion, guided by the simple beauty of clear objective language, Dr. Velikovsky examines legends, archeological artifacts, paleontological and geological materials, the astral religions of the world and the reports of ancient philosophers. "We shall check one people against another, one inscription against another, epics against charts, geology against legends, until we are able to extract the historical facts."

Decades after writing this piece, I have to ask myself was V's "investigation" a "completely controlled intellectual passion" or was it more of a carefully controlled quest to disprove Freud's theories and to bend every scrap of myth that he

could find from any peoples or any era as supposed "proof" of his pre-conceived ideas that Moses' column of cloud and fire was an image of Venus? V's checking "one people against another, epics against charts, geology against legends"—does not at all guarantee that anyone, probably most certainly not Velikovsky, will be able to "extract the historical facts". The historical facts of what, we may ask, and we know the answer, as it is in the premise: the historical "fact" that Venus was a proto-planet comet expelled from Jupiter!

This monumental inquiry leads to the irresistible conclusion that ancient legends from every part of the world tell, of a cataclysmic event, a vast disruption in the normal processes of nature. During these times entire civilizations were decimated, the earth upheaved, gigantic tidal waves inundated the land, seas boiled, mountains shot up, volcanoes were born and discharged enormous rivers of burning lava -- in short, global catastrophe of almost unimaginable destruction plagued the planet Earth. The causes of this disruption were reported by the ancients to have been the results of a conflict between astral gods. These astral gods, which became symbols of mythic identification to man's consciousness, and profoundly influenced the subsequent course of his cultural history, were, in fact, celestial bodies which came into destructive conflict under the influence of, in all probability, the comet Venus.

The truth is, V's was not a "monumental inquiry" but it was very extensive, going as he did into the field of geology and the somewhat obscure areas of ancient history involving mostly the Egyptian and near Eastern countries. He deals not all with China, for example, arguably half of the world. And when he does deal with Chinese history he is completely wrong in his supposed "chronological correlations"! Moreover, from this writer's point of view, ancient Chinese culture is most likely the most ancient form of "monotheism."

And it is only conditionally true that his work "leads to the irresistible conclusion that ancient legends from every part of

the world tell of a cataclysmic event. . .” A “legend” by definition is an unproved fact. Ancient legends undoubtedly, at least some of them, record the myths and legends related to various cataclysmic events, cataclysmic events from all around the world, as cataclysms happen all around the world every day!! It would be indeed strange if some myths and legends didn’t refer to cataclysmic events given their ubiquity. And yet, history well recorded, long before V, that huge destructions have taken place in the past. As Shakespeare tells us: “We need no ghosts come back from the dead to tell us this.” The issue is, was, and continues to be: was there such a singular event or events as V describes?

Velikovsky had a dramatic style, a talent for making things all seem to dovetail into his world-view. By piling detail upon detail, things taken from this part of the world with things taken from that part of the world, with things taken from this era piled with things taken from other eras—all making it seem that all of it speaks of a singular event when, in reality, thousands of such events, happening all over the world, throughout world history, is far more probably the truth of the matter. Velikovsky’s chronology is very unconvincing on close examination. Without a truly convincing chronology V’s work is little more than a hodgepodge of legends, myths, religious beliefs crusted with antiquity and psychoanalytical Freudian focus-pocus.

To the end of synthesizing all the major evidence into theoretical coherence, *Worlds In Collision* presents the reader with a spectacular array of information, almost impossible to completely digest in one, two, or even three readings. The subjects analyzed had to necessarily cross traditional dividing lines of specialist inquiry. The compelling intellectual vision was nothing less than a universal understanding of man's past. We are presented with pages concerning the reversed polarity of the earth, Venus worship, interplanetary discharges, ancient clocks and calendars, the dating of astral events described in the Iliad, the thermal balance of Venus, planet worship in

Judea in the seventh century B.C., the year of 360 days, deranged months, global changes in times and seasons, the comet Typhon, and a host of other scholarly concerns, including the formation of moon craters.

*The plethora of detail from wide ranging fields, often in many languages, all referred to and spoken of with such apparent authority gives the impression of an erudition that V seems to have—but which is more illusory than real. When one begins at the beginning and examines in detail most any given subject, the impression rises that V is legerdemain, pulling rabbits out of hats. For instance, V dates Moses to 1500 BC and repeatedly uses that date for Exodus, in compliance with biblical history conventions of fundamentalists. He derives images in biblical text as representing the comet Venus, but fails to mention at all the numerous other images, in the same context, that, if taken seriously, would **prove** that there was no “comet” involved in the happenings in Exodus. Comets do not stand over a tent for a year’s duration, as described in Exodus, they do not move one day in one direction and the next in the opposite direction, and on and on. Likewise, V adduces, an ancient Egyptian document, Ipuer, from 1800 BC as “contemporaneous” evidence for an event in 1500. Nor, can anyone properly use events in the time of David (circa 1000 BC) as proof of events in 1500, nor virtually in the same breath assume that it doesn’t matter if Exodus happened in the 16th, 15th, 14th, 13th, or 12th century (see, Ages In Chaos, p. 4-5) that it was still in the Egyptian New Kingdom when the Exodus happened! And then to seem to “prove” his point that it “doesn’t matter” by asserting, as V does, that “There has never been any doubt on this point, where scholars have differed is concerning the king of the New Kingdom to whose reign the Exodus is to be ascribed.” The simple truth is there is not only a “confusion of records” there is a confusion of V’s records.*

The book also advances major predictions of celestial phenomena, since confirmed. In 1963 the late H. H. Hess, former Chairman of the Space Board, National Academy of, Sciences made the following comment on Dr. Velikovsky's work: "Some of these predictions were said to be impossible when you made them; all of them were predicted long before proof that they were correct came to hand. Conversely, I do not know of any specific prediction you made that has since proven to be false."

*Remarks such as that cited above by H.H. Hess, (of which there are many from many different scholars in many different fields) help us not at all to discriminate the truth or falsity **of what V is claiming to be true.** A prediction of any event, however, true or even only seemingly true, need have nothing whatsoever to do with the reasons anyone might give for making the prediction. One can say "Venus is hot" or "Venus is cold"—but what does any of that mean? How hot is hot, how cold is cold—and what is the reason it is so hot or so cold (in degrees)? And how valid is the basis of the "guess" or "reasoning"—that lies at the basis of the question. Why would Hess make such a comment? And among the "some of these predictions" – which ones are amongst the "some"—and of those that constitute "all" of V's predictions which ones are included in that category. Certainly, just because H.H. Hess doesn't know which ones are true or false that doesn't testify, at all, as to whether, known to Hess or not, there is any truth at all to "**any**" or "**all**" of V's predictions for **the reasons he gives for them.***

It was an unheard of experience that a general public should have an opportunity to fully experience a major cultural achievement, enriching to man's sense of wonder, the drive for knowledge, and satisfying to the intellect's creative and ennobling need for logical form.

Of course, these are the words of a "believer" and that's the way it seemed to me, and many thousands of others at the time, giving all the propaganda that went along with V's

promotion, praise from “high authorities” in various fields, announced close associations of V with Einstein, and Freud, and Jung, and famous archeologist, etc., etc.

As could be expected, many extremists, who could not discipline themselves to read the words as they were written, advanced emotional claims for the book. For some, who felt an immediate need to confirm their faith in a certain religious dogma, the proof of global catastrophes reconfirmed their original belief in miracles. To others it proved that the universe was devoid of meaning and that, not God, but accident ruled the heavens. Dr. Velikovsky himself expresses no opinion on these theological matters. Few from the general public probably gave the work their most disciplined and searching attention yet, it must be noted, that though they may have had a self-obligation to do so, they were not officially charged with that responsibility. Such efforts of objective analysis and unimpassioned study is the duty and obligation of any who consider themselves members of an intellectual group who strive to understand man, his relationship to his fellows and to the universe at large. Such responsibility traditionally falls into the hands of what is known as the community of scholars and scientists, who, when they are entitled to it, deserve just pride in their commitment to the rational approach.

Having “bought into” the V “paradigm” I don’t appear to realize that what I am accusing others of is true of myself as well. Raised as a Christian fundamentalist from earliest years—despite having “put aside” all such beliefs, I was “reconfirmed” in my own deeply inculcated childhood dogma. That “Dr. Velikovsky himself expresses no opinion on these theological matters” I now know is a dubious assumption of mine. This despite the fact that V took great pains to conceal his own religious origins, training, and belief-system. And, too, when I wrote this article we are examining, I failed, no doubt for emotional reasons, to properly analyze, objectively, V’s work—how it was informed, the method of analysis, the self-contradictions, the “cherry-picking” of evidence, etc., etc. Though I was not a professional in any of the fields covered

by V's work, I was certainly capable of highly critical analysis and yet failed, even myself, for being swept away by the brilliant propaganda, which so appealed to my own psychological and religious orientations—from early childhood. It was only when I turned to ancient Chinese studies that I came to my senses and began to see that V didn't know what he was talking about, in many areas of chronology. And the more precisely I examined an issue, the more wanting I found V's work.

Twenty years ago scientists of the world, particularly in the United States, reacted to the news of Dr. Velikovsky's theory and researches with a form of hysteria, the psychological significance of which must still be probed. Some of the more prominent and distressed of these men, upon learning that the book was to be published by the prestigious McMillan Publishing Company, which had a high reputation in scientific circles, banded together to attempt to have the book suppressed. In violent opposition to the spirit of free inquiry, they dared, with an unbelievable arrogance, to determine what the public should and should not be allowed to read. Acting under what must be considered extreme psychological duress, many of these men publicly proclaimed pride in not having read the very book that was the object of their attack. In great numbers under the authority of their own self appointment, they mounted the public podium to personally attack and condemn, not only a theory -- which few of them had any actual knowledge of -- but to malign the character, integrity and proven high scholarship of Dr. Immanuel Velikovsky. Though Dr. Velikovsky's intellectual credentials are unimpeachable, he was called "a practitioner in the black arts;" he was accused of intentionally corrupting his sources and their contexts; he was called "mad", totally incompetent in all of the fields of knowledge covered by his book. It was asserted, and even today continues to be asserted, that the physical realities of the universe condemn his theory, mathematics disproves it, and only crazy people would concern themselves with any of it.

It is unfortunately true, that the contemptible behavior of prominent scholars and scientists, their underhanded approaches to "silencing" V had its opposite effect. Had they

simply done their jobs and critically dealt with the matter in a professional spirit, much time (and waste of it) might have been saved. But the fact is, scientists and scholars, too are people, and often one finds they behave contemptibly—not only to people like V who are not professional colleagues—but to their own kind as they vie for self-importance and prominence in their own fields. Unfortunately, the scurrilous activities of the professional anti-Velikovskians merely gave credence to V's work and stimulated a counter-wave to their own version of propaganda.

The public was lied to on a grand scale. Those who were invested with the responsibility to objectively examine any worthy theory, acted in a dangerously irresponsible manner for which the history of Establishment Science must pay its dues of great shame. A generation of fledgling scientists and scholars were indoctrinated, and to this day continue to be indoctrinated, with an attitude of mind which is corrupting to the fruitful development of the mind's liberation. The record is now clear that the immutable facts of nature, which the public was informed disproved Dr. Velikovsky's work have now "changed."

*Here, too, what is being referred to are the claims of prominent scientists—who themselves pedaled as **truth** their own harebrained schemes of what the "laws of nature" were and paved the way for acclamations of victory-- such I seem to here be unfortunately and erroneously pedaling myself.*

Then, too, it must be added in fairness, given the fact so many distinguished people, such as H. H. Hess, credited V with integrity, there must have been some basis for their thinking so. Perhaps in the geological sciences V had some good ideas which I'm not able to appreciate due to my own lack of background in such subjects. But, the same can be said for H.H. Hess and others, they are crediting V in areas they, too, were not competent to opine on. What did Einstein

know about ancient mythology, for instance, or what did Horace Kallen know about Hebrew etymology, etc.

Contrary to the dogmatic assertions advanced in 1950, science has had to make fundamental revisions in its theories in the light of new facts. Time and again Dr. Velikovsky has offered critical tests of his theories. The success of his predictions constitutes the most amazing list of correct prognoses in space-age science. With the passage of time and a weakening of the restrictive bonds of dogmatic prejudice, prominent scientists have recently come forward to publically credit Dr. Velikovsky with priority in predicting: 1) the high temperature and retrograde motion of Venus; 2) the existence of the earth's magnetosphere, extending to the moon; 3) the emission of radio noises from Jupiter. This latter discovery prompted Dr. Albert Einstein to promise to use his influence to have other of Dr. Velikovsky's critical tests undertaken. Unfortunately Einstein's untimely death terminated his influence, in this respect, upon the official scientific bodies.

*“Science” or should we say the “science” peddled in the 1950’s by those who maintained that Venus had a temperature of about 32 degrees Fahrenheit (Carl Sagan, for example), that Jupiter did not have any radio emissions, etc., etc.—mistaken ideas all, ideas claimed to be the “facts” of nature have “changed.” The use of Albert Einstein’s name, in association with V, because he was a personal friend, and unproven claims by V supporters and family, that Einstein **in any way supported any of V’s ideas** has been constantly used in the V propaganda. Actually, what we know of record is that Einstein upbraided V on various fronts—for being adventuresome (i.e., “risky” in his claims), holding self-contradictory views, failing to offer his ideas as provisional, etc. More of this to come at our website.*

A possible explanation of the emotional reaction of scientists and scholars to this revolutionary theory could conceivably be interpreted with a new psychoanalytic concept, contained in the very book which was the object of irrational attack. Chapter six of *Worlds In Collision* bears the simple title "A

Collective Amnesia.” Like the other chapters of the book, it is short, measured, and written with great intellectual clarity. Yet it examines a subject of high and solemn psychoanalytic import. Having established the fact that catastrophes of global destruction have visited the earth more than once within the written history of man, Dr. Velikovsky, who is eminently qualified to inquire into the psychological, makes the following remark;

The memory of the cataclysms was erased, not because of lack of written traditions, but because of some characteristic process that later caused entire nations, together with their literate men, to read into these traditions allegories or metaphors where actually cosmic disturbances were clearly described.

It is a psychological phenomenon in the life of individuals as well as whole nations that the most terrifying events of the past may be forgotten or displaced into the subconscious mind. As if obliterated are impressions that should be unforgettable. To uncover their vestiges and their distorted equivalents in the physical life of peoples is a task not unlike that of overcoming amnesia in a single person.

My own original 1970 remarks above (in non-italic), that a possible explanation of the emotional reaction to V's work "could conceivably be interpreted by a new psychoanalytic concept" assumes, of course, that there is any validity in "psycho-analytic" concepts to begin with. This is itself a questionable assertion. And my laudatory remarks, once again, praising V's "measured" "intellectual clarity" are also "true believer's" verbiage. So, too, is my assertion of the "facts" of "global catastrophes"—mere posturing. Certainly, there have been "global" catastrophes. As said, the earth is a "globe" but that there have been global catastrophes, catastrophes of global wide significance that happened

simultaneously—that is a horse of another color—and that is the horse that V has not proved with his theory or the so-called evidence he has adduced for the alleged fact. We have only V's "say-so" that mankind had amnesia-causing traumas at a common time in history and from a common source.

One could make the case that, in any case, we are not dealing with amnesia—even if what V says is true, which there is no warrant to believe. Exodus tells us there were all kinds of catastrophes, plagues of every description at the time of the claimed catastrophe. It was not forgotten there. It is clearly contained in the Old Testament—whether it is a true story or not. The story is there, not forgotten at all. Indeed, the "myths" are not "myths" to the ancient people that believed them, they were the "true" events. Apparently the "memory of the cataclysms" was "not erased."

Though, due to traditional cultural values and vested interests, there may continue to be a great psychological resistance to objective examination of Dr. Velikovsky's theory, it is nevertheless imperative that such an examination be undertaken immediately. The work of Thomas Mann, whose insight into Nazi Germany's mythic identification with catastrophic consciousness which, in part, was responsible for the Nazi holocaust, along with the ever increasing confirmation of Dr. Velikovsky's theories, received from the seas, the earth and other heavenly bodies, makes such an investigation a matter of universal concern.

This writer, nonetheless, believes V may have helped to open the book on a whole new way of seeing the world-wide cultural traditions of mankind. In recent times, the catastrophic mythic posturing of the Nazi Fuehrer, Hitler, in the West and in the Sun-God posturing of Emperor Hirohito in the East—both of whom appealed to being elected by "God" to "save" their peoples from a pending catastrophe may offer an important area for psychological and cultural research.

Indeed, a case may perhaps be made that V himself was suffering from a cultural amnesia, taking for fact, the Jewish myth of Moses and trying to rationalize it into something that to him made sense—with belief preceding research and explanation.

Dr. Velikovsky's work, particularly as contained in *Worlds In Collision*, *Ages In Chaos* and *Earth In Upheaval*, should immediately be probed for truth and error.

*Now, some 40 years after the writing of the above by me, and 60 years since publication of *World's In Collision* V's work has been probed—and found wanting. And there is more error and baseless surmise than demonstrable truth in it.*

Man explodes nuclear bombs above and below our earth, the mechanics of which we do not safely understand; he raises the radiation level of this planet, poisons the air, wreaks destruction upon himself and his fellow man with maniacal abandon and engages in wanton genocidal wars. We can ill afford not to soberly investigate any evidence which bears so fundamentally upon these problems as does Dr. Velikovsky's theory of catastrophism.

There continues to be, in this writer's view, ample reasons to probe mankind's cultural values and seek understanding and enlightenment concerning the mankind's dangerous propensities for creating catastrophes for other peoples, cultures, and religions, as well as for ourselves.

Happily, in ever-increasing numbers, youths of the world, committed to the ideal of peace, turn to the pages of *Worlds In Collision* in search of a legitimate understanding of man's irrational behavior. They have before them a path pursued by many questing intellectuals of great distinction.

Dr. Velikovsky's dazzling penetrations into the most rarefied meanings of reality and myth, stimulated by his great conquering affinity for knowledge, logical form, and poetic feeling, bears great and triumphant witness to Thomas Mann's vision of a new and coming sense of our humanity, and his

prophesy that the further one reaches into the past the deeper sense one has for the future. In response to this great vision of a "future freed from fear and hate and ripe for peace", Dr. Velikovsky's work predicatively points to the stars.

For this writer, study, analysis, time and maturation, have shown that V's construction of ancient history as a Venus-dominating-comet-catastrophe is highly unlikely—and most probably physically impossible. That mankind has suffered from "comet fear", "fires from heaven", floods, plagues, etc. that is another matter. Mankind has always had as the basis of his cultural and social consciousness the fact of "catastrophes." Thomas Mann, the great German artist-novelist said it well:

But our earliest mental life, when we first enter—as primitive man once entered—into civilization, giving and receiving our first little contributions, we are aware of a sympathy, we feel ourselves recognize that abiding unity, with pleased surprise we acclaim our kinship with the larger whole. And the content of kinship is always the same: it is the idea of a catastrophe, the invasion of destructive and wonton forces into our ordered scheme and a life bent upon self-control and happiness conditioned by it.

from Joseph In Egypt, pg. 456

And, indeed, the idea of a catastrophe and the invasion of destructive and wonton forces into our ordered lives has always been present from our "earliest mental life, when we first enter into civilization." No doubt it will always be there.

V's drawing attention to this aspect of mankind's catastrophic fixations as a foundational experience in many religious beliefs, East and West, is and has always been worthy of further and deeper study.

finish