

Velikovsky's "Moses-Complex":

A Prisoner of Cosmic Catastrophes:

A Case Study in Cultural Amnesia

Part One

by Eric L. Miller© 2013

A "Moses-Complex" is a particular form of religious psychopathology. It involves a Messianic/Savior *idée fixe*, whereby one's innermost psychic life is fundamentally centered on a mythic identification with "Moses the Law Giver & Savior." A person suffering from this complex has a mythic self-identification with the biblical Moses, which becomes one's driving passion in life—to such an extent that one's very inner sense of meaning and well-being is conditioned by how it goes with that "other" self within oneself which needs to be expressed, revealed and accepted by the world as one's rightful "identity."

The Moses-Complex is a mental defect, as a person afflicted with the condition loses their sense of reality and whatever touches on their complex cannot be psychologically processed rationally—if it conflicts in any meaningful way from their self-identity as "Moses the Savior." Indeed, a person afflicted with such a condition, has as their *raison d'être* a need to realize a *mythic equivalence* with their psychic "proto-type" and its success in the world. It was the mission of "Moses" to lead the Jews to "Salvation" and the "Promised Land." It is only through this peculiarly Jewish mode of salvation, once attained, that the rest of the world will also be capable of achieving their own emancipation, and "redemption." The Jews are in the forefront of this unfolding apotheosis for the simple reason they were uniquely chosen by God for this mission.

"Moses" is first and foremost a "Lawgiver," it is up to Moses to decide what is right and what is wrong, what is law and what is not, by divine *fiat*. No doubt each individual case of this particular form of mythic identification, i.e., the Moses-Complex, has unique biographical forces acting upon the psyche to produce it, giving a unique psycho-biographical identification for their own unique "equivalence" with the mythic hero. It

hardly needs be said that narcissism is a mark of this condition, for certainly if one is a “Moses” one’s life is far more important than others.

For whatever reasons, psychic and/or biographical indicators, the subject seems to “walk in the steps of their *hero*,” being, in fact and fancy, but a new edition of their hero mythic image, the mythic biography “re-lived.” The rich psychological content of this mythic-identification as “re-lived life” derives in great measure from the insights of the great German novelist, Thomas Mann, a matter which shall be dealt with elsewhere at an appropriate time.

Our deepest affinities for “idol” or “hero” types are most often met with in earliest childhood. Everyone is well familiar with how children revel in playing “Superman” or “Spiderman” or what have you, and how they, as consummate actors, *become* the parts they play. Consequently, a certain childishness is discernible in the Moses-Complex (and other complexes as well), which is to say *childish* notions and ideas attach to their modes of “reliving” their ideal mythic identification—without their realizing it. One might say the subject cannot rid their selves of an almost infantile relationship to their complex. This is so because it is often, if not invariably the case, that their mythic-identification fixations are part and parcel of a traumatic psychic structuring resulting in early childhood.

When we identify Moses as a Messiah type, A Savior of His people and look to the Hebrew Bible for inklings of an understanding of the Messiah type, so closely related to the Moses-Complex, we shortly come upon those passages in the *Holy Scriptures* which deal with such matters.

Therefore, the Lord Himself shall give you a sign: behold, the young woman shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name ***Immanuel***. Curd and honey shall he eat, when he knoweth to refuse the evil, and chooses the good. Yea, before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and chose the good, the land whose two kings thou hast a horror of shall be forsaken. [*Isaiah 7*—Hebrew Bible, Italic bold added]

And Chapter 8 of Isaiah extends commentary on the new Savior, Immanuel, and describes his powers in poetic form:

And he shall come up over all his channels,
And go over all his banks;
and he shall sweep through Judah
Overflowing as he passeth through
He shall reach even to the neck;
And the stretching out of his wings
Shall fill the breadth of thy land,
O Immanuel.

And Chapter 9: 5 continues comments on the Messiah, Immanuel.

For a child is born unto us,
a son is given unto us;
And the government is upon his shoulder;
and his name is called
Pele-joez-el-gibbor-
Abi-ad-sar-shalom; *
That the government may be increased,
and of peace there be no end,
Upon the throne of David, and
upon his kingdom,
To establish it, and to uphold it,
Through justice and through righteousness
From henceforth, even for ever.
The zeal of the LORD of hosts
doth perform this.

* That is, "*Wonderful in counsel is God the Mighty, the everlasting Father, the Ruler of peace.*" [Asterisk and comment in original text]

Immediately before the above passage [i.e., at Isaiah, Chapter 9, V: 1] it is stated that:

The people that walked in darkness
 Will see a great light, [i.e., the Messiah]
 They that dealt in the land of the shadow of
 death,
 Upon them the great light will shine.

And, the reason that the “great light will shine” is because, as follows directly after this text, and as quoted, *supra*, the savior-child will be born --, i.e., “For a child is born unto us.” That is to say, the Messiah has come.

Of course, Velikovsky, one imagines, would well have known that Christians cite these very passages for the proposition that the Jew, Jesus of Nazareth, was the “child born unto us” and that Jesus as the Son of God, or the Son of Man, was Himself God incarnate—in the view of Christians. In this respect Jesus is, psychologically, really a “contender” with Velikovsky for the *true* title of “Immanuel.” We shall see that “contenders” need to be done away with to truly “authenticate” one’s own superlative mythic identification with the Divine. We shall see that this, too, is apparently one of Velikovsky’s compulsions.

Two questions immediately come to mind: Is it really possible that Immanuel Velikovsky, the medical doctor, the practicing psycho-analyst who, in his own mind, had “psychoanalyzed humanity” in his world famous *Worlds In Collision*, actually *mythically identified* with this God-decreed messianic role, of which Moses himself was the original “Savior” type?

The Childhood of a Jewish Prophet, “Names Create Destiny”

“I have often heard spoken in the son what was unsaid in the father”
Thus Spake Zarathustra, Fredrick Nietzsche

It is clear Velikovsky’s Messianic mythic identification with Moses, with being a Jewish Prophet/Messiah was inculcated into him by his father at a very early age. Simon Velikovsky had three sons, and with the youngest

of his three sons, Immanuel, he had an especially deep bond from the beginning—for whatever reason. The bond that Simon forged with his son, Immanuel, was conditioned by the fact that they were Jews—and Jews of a particular sort. They were Jews who believed that, as Jews, they, in particular, had a sacred mission: to “save the world” to create a Jewish State, a Jewish Renaissance, and to lead the Jews (first, and afterwards, the entire world) into a state of Godly Redemption and Salvation—in fulfillment of their prophetic roles.

Velikovsky, recollecting his childhood, informs us that, of the three brothers, only he was not named after their immediate forefathers:

My first name—I have no middle name—was chosen by my father, as he told me, on that solitary walk in the forested hills. He selected it from a verse of the seventh chapter of Isaiah; there was no Immanuel among our ancestors known to him. But he was visited by a thought, almost a wish cast before destiny, that I would be predestined to a great task in connection with the tragic history of our nation. One has to visualize the time, and also the personality of my father, a dedicated Jew with a vision of the national renaissance. It was a tragic time, of utter despair and of utter hope. When I was a child of six or seven my father would show me the chapter in the prophet *Isaiah* where the name Immanuel is found; more than once he spoke to me of the faith he put in me.

The “**wish cast before destiny**” is the key to the passage, “**that I would be predestined to a great task in connection with the tragic history of our nation.**” [bold added]

Of course, in the above statement by Velikovsky, “our nation” does not refer to his native country, Russia; it refers to the Jewish nation—the

Jewish nation of “blood” and “spirit”, i.e., the spiritual nation, as there was no Jewish state of Israel yet created at the time. And we must note, that Simon’s vision of a Jewish renaissance was, according to Velikovsky, mixed with “a tragic time of utter despair and utter hope.” Utter despair *and* utter hope? One gets the sense that Simon repeatedly showed Immanuel the chapter *where his name was written, the same as the Messiah’s* and that he often spoke of the *faith* he put in his son! He does not say his father “showed” him the place in the Bible where his name was writ, he uses a different tense; “*he would show*” him the passage, he said, implying *repeatedly*. The fact is underscored by the additional qualifier that “more than once” his father, Simon, spoke of the faith he put in his very young son. As to his father, Velikovsky informs us how ardently dedicated he was to Judaism, some might even say fanatically dedicated. At the age of 14 or 15 he left home to study at a famous center of learning, the *yeshiva* of Volojin:

In Mir my father was the *matmid* (the most studious) of the Yeshiva: he spent sixteen hours daily in learning, sometimes pouring water into his shoes to keep himself from falling asleep. He would not see the sun rise or set, for he would be indoors studying; and alone, late at his folios, he would implore the Creator to redeem His people. At the words of the prayer “keeper of Israel, keep the remnant of Israel” tears would well up in his eyes.

In the above, and in other remarks Velikovsky makes about his father, we see that Simon was a very emotional man. Apparently, Simon reportedly later acquired more “liberal” ways—upon going into business. But, even at the time Velikovsky was eight and had moved to Moscow, his father still would not break his Sabbath with any kind of work. And, on the Sabbath, he would only speak Hebrew—even if with some difficulty. Apparently, Simon’s driving desire to become a very rich man, made him abate his orthodox religiosity somewhat, but with reluctance.

But on Saturdays my father used to sit on the square in front of the synagogue and read, and he greatly enjoyed the freedom of the Sabbath; he promised himself that he would uphold the holiness of the day of rest—the great social institution established thousands of years ago by the Hebrew lawgiver [i.e., Moses]—in the days when he would no longer be dependent on an employer.

It is interesting to note that Velikovsky and family lived in Vitebsk, a city in Belarus, of some 70,000 souls, the overwhelming majority of which were Jews. So, it was probably a lot more convenient to “keep” the holiness of the day of rest in Vitebsk than in cosmopolitan Moscow. Simon was, nonetheless, regretfully or not, violating the laws of Moses, the Hebrew lawgiver, when he was “dependent on an employer.” In this regard, it is further interesting to note Velikovsky had earlier related that Simon refused, even to make an important business contract, probably the most important in his life—as it involved the tea business contract by which he became wealthy—on the Sabbath when he first became employed in Moscow. Are both these things Velikovsky tells us true?

In any case, as Velikovsky recalls his past, he takes note of other “mythical” events in his life which may well have significantly contributed to creation of his mythical “other” self—and its relationship to his “destiny” as an emancipator, prophet, a “law-giver”, and savior of the Jewish people and, indeed, the whole world. He notes, for example, that it was on his very birthday, June 10, 1895 that Theodor Herzl, the famous father of modern political Zionism, was beginning “to feel his bonds with his ancient nation, with its judges and prophets” and conceived of his self-pronounced “mighty dream” of which Herzl wrote, as Velikovsky reports it:

I am taking up again the torn thread of the tradition of our people. I am leading it to the Promised Land. Do not think this is a fantasy. I

am not an architect of castles in the air. I am building a real house.”

Imagine it! On the very day the little Messiah, Immanuel Velikovsky, was born, June 10, 1895, Herzl announced he was leading the Jewish people “to the Promised Land.” And, Herzl underscored this was not a mythic fantasy, but a real event. He was “building a real house.” As it was with Herzl, so it was with himself, on the very first day of his very life!

Velikovsky further notes, that it was “In Paris he [Herzl] also wrote the first pages of his political manifesto, *The Jewish State*.” The words could well have been Velikovsky’s own about his own mythical self and his own desire to create the foundations for the Jewish intelligentsia, as we shall see, which would be a beacon for the whole world.

Velikovsky obviously believed he had some mystical connection with Herzl as these historic things happened, *on his very own birthday*, that “fateful cast of destiny”—as his own father expressed it. And, too, we cannot fail to mention, that in recounting these events, Velikovsky’s very next words note, as though part and parcel of it all, that his birthday was *also* the very year of Freud’s beginning to write *Interpretation of Dreams*:

In 1895 Freud, having two years earlier published with Breuer the first paper on psychoanalysis, began to write his *Interpretation of Dreams*.

In 1895 a new era in science was started by Roentgen with the discovery of X-rays. . . The old mechanistic philosophy of the world saw the day-break of a new understanding of the universe.

Configurations of planets at the time of birth are claimed by astrologers as being decisive for the destiny of the newborn child. . . I would rather assume that events on earth at the time of a person’s birth may in some way direct his life. One is under the influence of the spirit of the time. The dream of Herzl, the intuitions of Freud,

and the rays of Roentgen in 1895 were the earthly constellations which marked the direction in which I was to wander—ideas, like men, need time to grow and to find their place in the world.

The above three motive forces in Velikovsky's life, which put him under the "influence of the spirit of the times" were, in short, 1) Being a Jew, 2) Interpreting Dreams, and 3) A New Understanding of the Universe. These were the "forces which marked the direction" of his life—the powers which, he believed, propelled his prophetic destiny. And, indeed, his life-work became a story about the history of a Jew, Moses, his own correct interpretation of the "dreams" of mankind which lead to the discovery of mankind's "Collective Amnesia", and the new understanding his explanation of it brought to the world concerning the cosmos, its operations, and man's destiny.

A "Holy Man" In the Family

From a quick overview of Velikovsky's early life we see, in stark relief, that his father inculcated into his son the idea that he was, should or could be, a Messiah. Indeed, we are informed by Velikovsky's daughter (Ruth Velikovsky Sharon), in her book about her father, *Aba*, that, on his very death-bed, Simon, implored his son to literally save the world (i.e., "**bade him to save the world.**")!

One needs to be a pretty important person to be capable of "saving the world" and it is no mean task for any father to lay upon a young son, or even, obviously, a mature adult man in his forties. In any case, as Velikovsky himself tells it, his maternal great grandfather, before him, actually achieved the status of being considered a "holy person" by the local gentry. His great grandfather, Rabbi Jacob Hotimsker, was not only considered a "holy man", we are told, but he was, in fact, the *Dayan* (religious judge) in the town of Mstislav—he, too, was a "lawgiver." Velikovsky wrote: "The whole town closed the stores and joined in the funeral procession." It was even believed that the Rabbi could work miracles and "make himself invisible." Making miracles, too, was apparently thought to be a family talent.

Similar other stories were told of Rabbi Hotimsker's mystical powers, so, if it turned out that Velikovsky himself was to become a new Moses, a prophet, and a holy man—a miracle-maker—he would not have been the first in the family to be so considered.

The death of his great grandfather, Rabbi Hotimsker, for some reason, had an enormous effect on his own father, Simon. Velikovsky wrote:

For days my father did not open the letter informing him of his grandfather's death [*sic*, grandfather-in-law], and he wept when he read the news; never had I heard my father weep so bitterly. The whole town closed the stores and joined in the funeral procession.

The Strategy of Becoming a New Moses

Having moved to Moscow at the age of 8, Velikovsky, obviously a gifted and highly intelligent boy, excelled, he tells us, in Russian and mathematics and graduated from the University of Moscow at the age of 18 with a gold medal in mathematics. At the age of 22 Velikovsky (in the fall of 1917, "as Russia crumbled into revolution and civil war"):

. . . composed a thirty-two-page pamphlet entitled *The Third Exodus (Tretii iskhod)* under the pseudonym Immanuel Ramio (The Exodus theme appears as a trope throughout Velikovsky's writings.). *The Third Exodus* was an impassioned defense of the Zionist resettlement of Israel project.

Velikovsky himself characterizes his book as a call to "right a wrong and create a Jewish State in Palestine." It was, Velikovsky says, "a pamphlet of religious fervor and Zionist zeal." Velikovsky noted on the title page his book that it was dedicated to "Jewry" and that it was published "1848 years since the destruction of the temple". Gordin notes that "the text is

rich with biblical allusions even as its Russian language marked it as a missive to assimilated Russian Jews.” (Gordin, p. 52)

Velikovsky, we see, even dates his own existence by the ancient calendar of the Jews. The book is signed “Immanuel Ramio.” This is apparently the first time Velikovsky resorted to a pseudonym (i.e., Ramio)—in later life he would resort to other uses of pseudonyms to conceal his true identity.

The general theme of Velikovsky’s book concerned virtue and retribution! Apparently, the “religious fervor” of it verged on or was overtly fanatical. Venereal disease among Jews, for example, was attributed by “Ramio” to the Diaspora. He tells his readers the condition could only be remedied by sober emigration. He also found that the Russian civil war was apparently God’s punishment for Europe’s sinfulness. Velikovsky yearned to settle in the Holy Land himself.

[He had already traveled to Palestine for five weeks in 1912, aged only seventeen, and felt the pull to return. (Gordin, p. 52-3) Later, Velikovsky and family would live in Palestine for some 15 years (1924-1939), but he spent his last nearly 40 years living in the United States (1939-1979). Apparently, the “Holy Land” was “holy” but not preferable].

In his book, *The Third Exodus*, Velikovsky’s expresses a “more religiously motivated, pious variant” of Zionism, as Gordin characterizes it. It was, in fact, “religious Zionism”, as it is called, a form of Zionism of observant Jews who supported Zionist efforts to build a Jewish state in the Land of Palestine.

The main ideologue of modern religious Zionism was [Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook](#), who justified Zionism according to [Jewish law](#) and urged young religious Jews to support efforts to settle the land, and the secular [Labour Zionists](#) to give more consideration to Judaism. . . . Kook saw Zionism as a part of a divine scheme which would result in the resettlement of the Jewish people in its homeland. This would bring salvation [or in

Hebrew] ("Geula") to Jews, and then to the entire world. After world harmony is achieved by the refoundation of the Jewish homeland, the [Messiah](#) will come. (Wikipedia)

Early Signs of Being a Prophet

It is most pertinent in these regards that Velikovsky, even in advanced age, would refer to his first work, at age twenty-two, his juvenilia, *The Third Exodus*, quite in keeping with his continuing self-image, as “prophetic”:

I believe my sentences from the pamphlet became prophetic after World War I, and even more after World War II.

Velikovsky, even in old age, continues to refer to himself in religious terms. And, apparently, even his prophecies get better with age. Of course, he does not refer to his fanatical ideas of the origin of venereal disease for Jews, and the rest of his prophetic claims—nor does he even mention what it was that he wrote at 22 that was so prophetic. Just accept it.

We also learn from *The Pseudoscience Wars*, Gordin, 2012:

In 1920 (at the age of 25) he [Velikovsky] composed a “haunting” sixty-eight-page booklet, *thirty Days and Nights of Diego Pires on the Bridle of Sant’Angelo*. This piece featured “the torments of a Portuguese Marrano who had converted to Judaism and, under the more famous moniker Solomon Molcho, proclaimed the advent of a new Messiah, which led to his burning at the stake for heresy on December 13, 1532.” (p. 52)

Gordin misses or avoids some important facts in his remarks above—which can be misleading. Molcho was of the Jewish race, but was born a Christian. He converted back to Judaism and, after first declaring someone else a Messiah, later declared the honor for himself. He also, like Velikovsky, the psychoanalyst, was a believer in dream interpretation and studied the Kabala (as Velikovsky studied the *Interpretation of Dreams*).

In short, Velikovsky was already at the age of 25, in his “stream of consciousness” book, already seeing himself as part of a “divine scheme” involving a “new Messiah”, himself—and he came to think of himself as that new Messiah, as we are here proposing.

Interestingly, decades later, recounting an interview he had with Einstein, shortly before Einstein's death, he still had Molcho on his mind. He wrote, describing his conversation with Einstein, some 35 years later:

Like in a synagogue,” I remarked [to Einstein]. But then I corrected myself. “No, I feel myself here as Solomon Molcho must have felt in the palace of Pope Clement VII.” I explained that this *marrano*, i.e, a Jew from a family that had been forcibly converted to Christianity, was sentenced to die for reverting to Judaism and was burned as a heretic in Rome by the Inquisition; but the next day he was alive in the inner chambers of the Vatican discussing philosophical problems with the Pope. The Pope had let another heretic be burned and hid Solomon Molcho. If only the Holy Inquisition knew *where* he was! This was my way of referring to what my opponents and detractors among the scientists might think and feel were they to know where I was spending that evening.

Oddly, Velikovsky is telling Einstein he sees him as the Pope and himself as Molcho (the new Messiah) who is being persecuted because he is a Jew: "That was my way of referring to what my opponent and detractors among the scientists might think and feel were they to know" that he was spending his evenings with Einstein! And also, oddly, Velikovsky first likens his presence with Einstein as to being "like in a synagogue". Einstein himself was not an observant Jew, he was an atheist. And he certainly was not a Pope of the Catholic Church!

(And, it is rather ironic that Velikovsky pictures himself as a persecuted Jew as, probably more than anyone else, it was the Jews of the scientific establishment who were "attacking" him. Indeed, his chief *bête noir* was Carl Sagan (along with Urey, Gold, etc.) his chief enemy of his being recognized as a great scientific genius—if we don't include Einstein himself who pronounced his theories a "complete fiasco"! Molcho himself, as Velikovsky surely knew, was also "opposed by prominent Jews"—making his analogy with Molcho almost perfect. Not only that, but Molcho was also also waging his cause under the flag of Exodus, where God is destroying the Egyptians with the waters of the Red Sea:

In company with David Reubeni, whom he [Molcho] came across in Italy, he went in 1532 to [Ratisbon](#), where the emperor [Charles V](#) was holding a *diet*. On this occasion, Molcho carried a flag with the Hebrew word *Maccabi*, the four letters מַכְבִּי which also signify an abbreviation for Exodus 15:11 "Who among the mighty is like unto God?".^[2]

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Solomon_Molcho

Encyclopedia Britannica Standard Edition, 2005, also adds the detail, that:

Preaching at the great synagogue in Rome, Molcho accurately predicted two natural catastrophes—a flood in Rome (1530) and an earthquake in Portugal (1531).

An interest Velikovsky had at 25, the story of Molcho, was obviously still very much alive in him (after writing *Worlds In Collision*)—ready-made for his life's work.

In any case, obviously Velikovsky was on dangerous psychological grounds, implying as he did that Einstein himself had “let another heretic be burned” in a “Holy Inquisition” but who was, nevertheless, hiding and protecting himself from Anti-Semites. One can only wonder how Einstein greeted Velikovsky's remarks. Also, of interest in the same regard, is Velikovsky's description of the death of Einstein, and his religiosification of the event, giving himself a central role in the event.

Though a bit out of chronological delineation, I will here give the quotation in full, from Velikovsky's account of Einstein's end, “The Last Week” (Varchives):

The following night I slept peacefully and, if I remember right, Elisheva and I both dreamt of Einstein. At eight in the morning I went to our garden, where the forsythia were already in bloom. I met Mrs. Baker, the neighbor, who said: “Have you heard on the radio? Dr. Einstein died this night.”

In silence I moved away and said the Hebrew prayer for the dead that is supposed to be said by a son after his father's or mother's death, in a congregation of not less than ten men, but that after the death of my mother I would often say walking along a road on the ridge of Mt. Carmel. The last sentence of it reads: “He who established peace in the sky will bring peace to you and the entire Israel!” The words “peace in the sky” or “peace on high” have a meaning in the light of events illuminated in my *Worlds in Collision*, and I think the rabbis who composed the

prayer in ancient times had those events in mind. Einstein became a paternal figure to me, and though our meetings took place only once in a while, during these eighteen months we were often in each other's thoughts.

How Velikovsky knew Einstein often had him in mind is not known—they had but four or five meetings over a year and a half. One suspects this is another act of self-promotion or some “mystical” knowledge he had of Einstein's thoughts—such as a Messiah might possess. Velikovsky was obviously unaware of how much of himself and his Moses-Complex he was revealing with the above words. The prayers he utters have “a meaning in the light of events illuminated in my *Worlds In Collision*, and I think the rabbis who composed the prayer in ancient times had those events in mind.”? There can be little doubt that Velikovsky is in an acute state of mythic consciousness. Velikovsky continues, in his remarks of March 11, 1955:

I felt as if Einstein blessed me that night [before he died]. “And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh. And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me.” I probably did not think of these words that I had sent him several months earlier; but I felt an achievement: after all these months of debate about the participation of electro-magnetic forces in the working of the universe, now for the first time I had made him understand how I envisaged the plan.

[“Making” Einstein “understand” how he envisaged “the plan” is not the same as Einstein believing in the “plan” he “envisaged”—Velikovsky seems not rational enough to know this, or to know that others would know it].

The classical plan was compromised by evidence; the static electricity plan did not stand up against argument; but the other two plans—in both of

which electromagnetic effects take part in varying degrees—vie for the position of the true system of the world. Now he knew that I was not contemplating a model in which electromagnetism played a static role of attraction and repulsion, but one in which it played predominantly a dynamic role. I presented my discourse in the dispassionate terms of a brief review of four contestants, and left it to reason, calculation, and experiment to make the selection.

In the above, at the beginning of Velikovsky's quotation, he conjures Einstein as the Angel of God, or, one might say, God Himself in the form of an Angel, wrestling with Jacob (i.e., himself) who will not let God go unless he blesses him! [Genesis 32:27] And the Biblical quote, we would here note, *continues*—just where Velikovsky *leaves off*, at Verse 28-29:

And he said unto him "What is thy name?" And he said: 'Jacob.'" Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but "Israel; for thou hast striven with God and with men, and hast prevailed."

And the Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible notes at the word "*Israel*," that the word means: "That is, *He who striveth with God*." [*Israel, ironically, means: He who struggles or battles with God*] Velikovsky's mythic identifications leads him to identify Einstein with God, and himself by the name of "*Israel*," leading him, it would seem, very far afield, indeed, psychologically—away from the world of rationality. All this is in Velikovsky's "The Last Week" and *these are the words that he had sent to Einstein earlier, by his own accounting of them*. Above, he merely repeats them *again* for his readers.

With Einstein dying, and his family close to him and alarmed, Velikovsky nonetheless intrudes upon the grave event and calls the great scientist on the phone. We find Velikovsky thinking apparently all about himself again. He is thinking how the world has been cruel to him, as his remarks from "The Last Week" indicate:

A little reassured, but not in full measure, I spoke a sentence or two of our meeting nine days earlier and repeated Einstein's words about my book. It was an achievement of eighteen months of struggle; probably I should not have at that hour thought about my work and about what Einstein said at our last meeting. but it was as if I wished to be near him and talk to him again; I felt gratitude to him, the great scientist who through months of sickness occupied himself with my ideas and read my manuscripts and books at a time when the scientific world with its press was cruel to me.

We note *again* as Velikovsky clearly indicates he had sent these very sentiments to Einstein "several months earlier." Also to be noted, the answer to the single question asked by God is, "What is thy name" and of course, he who really striveth with God is named "Israel" and he is *Immanuel*, or "God is with us." Curiously, this "split form of consciousness" seeing himself as God and He Who Is With God and, as well, He Who Battles with God, reminds this writer of Einstein's last remarks about him, given in "The Last Letter." Einstein was obviously disturbed by Velikovsky but wanted to be kind yet also truthful. Velikovsky didn't seem to "get it." The fact of the matter is Velikovsky relentlessly hounded Einstein, till his Last Days. Velikovsky himself notes this in his description. Again, Velikovsky is thinking only of himself—a sure sign of the mythically self-intoxicated:

This letter [of Einstein's above, not cited here] for the brevity of which he asked consideration, was written four weeks before his death. By then he had read for the third time my *Worlds in Collision*, and was looking forward with anticipation to reading my historical work, *Ages in Chaos*. His saying that he would enjoy the embarrassment to which my work would probably subject the historians while his own

field would be left untrespassed, speaks for the difficulties he had lately experienced and for the thoughts during his waking hours in the dark of the night—his sleep was not good—provoked by our discussions in which I acted as if I were the advocate retained by two natural forces, electricity and magnetism, persistent in my calls and letters, unyielding, never retreating. [underline added]

(In *Aba*, Velikovsky's daughter deletes the telling phrase which says it all "in my calls and letters"—so that it reads as though it were a compliment, i.e., "as if I were the advocate retained by two natural forces, electricity and magnetism. . . unyielding, never retreating." She left out the fact that what was relentlessly persistent was Velikovsky's unyielding and never retreating "calls and letters"!

In Einstein's last days, when, in the dark of night, his beleaguered thoughts turned to Velikovsky's relentlessly nagging him. Who in this world wants persistent calls and letters that are unyielding and never retreating on points of view one does not share, and has, indeed numerous times rejected—especially especially so, in the closing days of one's beleaguered life!

We know as a matter of fact that Einstein did not share Velikovsky's views on electricity and magnetism, or much of anything else—and we can even say, without fear of contradiction, he shared nothing with Velikovsky of a scientific nature that departed in any way from the science of his times. From this fact alone, we can see where Velikovsky is really coming from, psychologically. He is literally unmerciful in his hounding of the old and ill great man, even unto his death-bed. As said, Ruth Velikovsky Sharon, in citing the above omits "persistent in my [i.e., Velikovsky's] calls and letters." She gives, we may say, a "Velikovsky twist" that created an heroic meaning, as though Einstein were comparing Velikovsky to "electricity and magnetism", rather than revealing Velikovsky's egomaniacal insistence on a deranged idea—with unyielding and never retreating persistent calls and letters!

The Great Man Sets Fire to Premises of Science

To Velikovsky his “persistence” is one of his greatest virtues, *which he sees as a characteristic of Jewish genius*. Indeed, as reported in *Aba*, when Velikovsky was asked how he could persevere for so many years against “relentless opposition” he answered, invoking his Jewish race, and placing himself amongst the greatest or at least most famous Jewish figures of his times:

It is the obstinacy of my race, the race of Marx, of Freud and of Einstein. . . I was compelled by logic and by evidence to penetrate into so many premises of the house of science. I freely admit to having repeatedly caused fires, though the candle in my hand was carried only for illumination. (*Aba*, p. 15)

Here we see Velikovsky, ever-so-modestly, picturing himself, with just a candle of truth in hand for illumination—setting conflagrations in so many houses of science. He “freely admits” to his incendiary talent, takes great pride in it and the fact that he is guided by his Jewish obstinacy, and, apparently, his compulsion for logic and evidence—like Marx, Freud, and Einstein. (Only one of them, of course, dealt in the field of science; all were atheists). Is it any wonder Einstein characterized him as a “professional revolutionary.” Perhaps a better term would have been “a would-be professional incendiary.”

To continue with Velikovsky's early years. After some brief studies abroad, in England and France, he finally took his medical degree, we are told, from the University of Moscow in 1921. Velikovsky desperately wanted to become known as a famous scholar but had accomplished nothing—not a scrap. In 1922, only one year after gaining his medical degree, at the age of 27, he traveled to Berlin. It was while there he prevailed upon his wealthy father to, in effect, “buy” him what he had not earned—credibility in the ranks of the Jewish intelligentsia. To that end, he proposed his father to put up the money for the creation of a scholarly publication of scientific papers, to be published in Hebrew,

Scriptus Universitatis, which he imagined would serve as the foundation for the establishment of a new Jewish university in Israel.

Of course, the project, conceived and organized by him and paid for by his father, landed him in charge as its editor-in-chief—a job in which he had no experience or qualifications for what-so-ever. This political maneuver, backed by his wealthy father, purchased Velikovsky instant credibility and access to international Jewish intellectual elites who, of course, wanted further recognition of Jewish intellectual contributions. Simon, no doubt, wanted his son's recognition more than anyone, except perhaps Immanuel himself.

Under the auspices of the *Scriptus*, Velikovsky corresponded with Einstein, Freud, Bohr, and various other well-known Jewish intellectuals, to elicit support for the Zionist cause. Einstein agreed to be the editor of the mathematics and physical science section and, naturally, worked through Velikovsky. Einstein himself admitted he himself did not understand many of the scientific papers in his section and relied upon the reputation of its authors—as Velikovsky himself reported in his autobiography. Apparently it was not a very memorable “contact” for Einstein as he completely forgot Velikovsky and didn't even know who he was when Velikovsky introduced himself to Einstein years later at an outing near Princeton, where they both then resided.

As to Freud's involvement in *Scriptus*, he demurred from participating, but offered to exchange publications (Freud was then the publisher of his own psychoanalytical journal, *Imago*).

It is widely bruited among Velikovskians that Chaim Weizmann himself later offered Velikovsky the Presidency of the Hebrew University but we have only Velikovsky's word for it—a word often, it seems, put in doubt on many matters concerning his own version of his “famous” history. Velikovsky, it will be recalled, had not made any contributions at all to scholarship. He was completely unknown. Below we will establish that it was not until 1931, at age 36, that Velikovsky published anything anywhere. And when he did publish, his own preface-writer, Dr. Eugen Blueier, asserted he didn't agree with all Velikovsky had written and that

it was a “strange world” that he dealt in, though he obviously found some of Velikovsky’s theories interesting and daring.

In any case, the springboard of *Scriptus*, from that time forward, gave Velikovsky the claim he was a correspondent with famous Jewish intellectual celebrities, including Einstein and Freud—an “association” Velikovsky, one suspects, often promoted to buttress his own “credibility.” Only two volumes of the scientific papers were ever published—the one on mathematics and physics, featuring Einstein’s editorship, and the other featuring some of his father’s own writings on philology (never commented on so far as this writer knows). In any case, while working on *Scriptus*, Velikovsky met and married a young violinist, Elisheva Kramer in 1923. In 1924 they moved to Palestine and remained there until 1939.

In 1928, Velikovsky’s mother died, and upon her death, he said, he threw himself into the study of, he says, psychiatry (“The death of my mother coincided with my beginning to work in psychiatry.”) What his study of “psychiatry” consisted of is disclosed in his next sentence “I was reading books on psychology and occupied myself with problems of memory, subconscious mnemes, automatic actions and telepathy.” And also, he added, he read books on “spiritualism”—of which he said “did not convince me in the least.”

Obviously, Velikovsky was not working in “psychiatry”—as he would have one believe. Indeed, one searches in vain for any evidence that he had any actual training in medicine beyond passing his school exams—before he took up his medical general practice.

It is said by his daughter, herself a Freudian psychoanalyst, that his mother (her grandmother) was a very narcissistic person. She further reports that her father traveled “several summers” to Vienna (from Palestine where they lived) to study psychoanalysis under Wilhelm Stekel. This is unconfirmed and improbable. Velikovsky did apparently go to, and was analyzed by (analysis consisted in dream interpretation) Stekel for about two or three months in 1933. On his return to Palestine he immediately became the first “psychoanalyst” in Palestine. His

“training” for this position appears to be virtually non-existent. (Like Freud, daughter Ruth reports her father, too, would fall asleep while psychoanalyzing his patients—they had to quietly “tip toe out of his office.”).

It is clear, Velikovsky never qualified as a psychiatrist. He did not study with any psychiatrist nor was he ever enrolled in or complete any medical and/or psychiatric internship. (He appears not to have even served a general practice internship). Indeed, for the most part, he spent his study time at open public lectures and his own reading to prepare himself to become a “psychoanalyst.” In those days a psychoanalyst was someone who was said to one by Freud or one of his hand-picked “disciples.” Freud was The Master, everyone else was either a disciple or a heretic. William Stekel, did, however, establish with Freud the first “psycho-analytical society.”

Freud, as the Cult Leader, allowed lay persons to become one of *his* psychoanalysts, if they followed “the line” and accepted him as their complete authority. To be conferred a “title” of “psychoanalyst” every adherent had themselves to be psycho-analyzed as a prerequisite. Velikovsky did not even meet this criterion. He did, however, contribute money to Stekel and so this may have been one of the reasons Stekel pronounced Velikovsky, even without “being psychoanalyzed” a “psychoanalyst.”

In brief, Velikovsky had no specialty; he was only a general practitioner. The below remarks by Wikipedia are misleading, in several regards. Velikovsky was NOT practicing psychiatry and psychoanalysis “from 1924”—he didn’t even start reading Freud, on his own, until his mother died in 1928. He only spent about 3 months, at best, with Stekel and Stekel was only a “psychoanalyst” himself because Freud said he was. Moreover, Velikovsky did NOT publish “from 1924 to 1939”. He published his first paper in 1931.

Velikovsky's alleged career as a psychiatrist per a propagandistic entry in Wikipedia

Velikovsky lived in what was then the [British Mandate of Palestine](#) from 1924 to 1939, practicing medicine in the fields of [general practice](#), [psychiatry](#) and [psychoanalysis](#) (which he had studied under [Sigmund Freud's](#) pupil [Wilhelm Stekel](#) in [Vienna](#)). During this time, he had about a dozen papers published in medical and psychoanalytic journals, including a 1930 [*sic*, 1931] paper which was the first to suggest that [epilepsy](#) is characterized by abnormal [encephalograms](#), knowledge which would become the cornerstone of diagnostic testing for epilepsy. He was also published in Freud's *Imago*, including a precocious analysis of Freud's own dreams.^[13]

The facts as best they can be ascertained, are that Velikovsky dabbled in hypnosis, and “psychic phenomenon,” telepathy, concocted bizarre “psychoanalysis” of various patients, Gerry-ripped a cardiograph to do electrical experiments on the brain, and as with his mentor, Stekel, practiced the “Jewish science” of “psychoanalysis”—no doubt mostly, if not entirely, to Jewish patients, the same as Freud and Stekel. The above remarks concerning Velikovsky’s priority in his “suggestion” about epilepsy exhibiting disturbed brain-wave patterns is also incorrect. Detailed works on the history of electroencephalography do not even mention Velikovsky, (*see* correction to Wikipedia comments above).

In any case, Velikovsky, back in Palestine, with Stekel’s blessing as a “Psycho-analyst” immediately created a Psychological Society with himself as head of it. It was not until 1941 that he published, as Wikipedia states, a “precocious analysis of Freud’s own dreams.” We are not told what was “precocious” about it. Freud died in 1939—so the piece had no “imprimatur” of Freud having anything to do with its publication,

as might be mistakenly inferred. Prior to 1939 Velikovsky published a “psychoanalysis” of Leo Tolstoy’s *Kreutzer Sonata*—a wholly unimpressive piece in this writer’s view and a few other articles. In his Tolstoy “psychoanalysis” he found what he always seemed to find, “repressed homosexuality.” He also found it in Christianity along with sado-masochism, while also implicating Moslems in “repressed homosexuality” as proved by their “aggressiveness.” Later, in his last days, he found homosexuality in Jesus of Nazareth, *per se* (as opposed to his earlier idea of homosexuality as a “Christian” symptom. Like Freud, here, too, Velikovsky analogously apparently intended analogously to take a “shot” at Jesus as he was climbing into his grave—as he was planning to publish a psychoanalysis of Jesus, “The Son of Man” apparently along his earlier lines for Christianity.

We are told by those who knew him that Velikovsky was quite a prude when it came to sexuality (when he married at 28 he was still a virgin), and distained homosexuality, in particular. Velikovsky’s own personal condition may be evidenced in these matters, as symptoms of “projection.” At least such a conclusion would be in line with “psychoanalytical” thinking and its tenants. Psychoanalysis, like statistics is, as the saying goes *a la* the great Russian novelist, Dostoyevsky, “a knife that cuts both ways.”

Correct Chronology of Velikovsky’s Doings (1924-1939)

So, it was not until after his mother’s death in 1928 that Velikovsky occupied himself with anything besides his general practice and began to take an interest in psychoanalysis. He decided to get into the field of “psychoanalysis”—he found Freud’s *Interpretation of Dreams* an ever-enduring “masterpiece in the human mind” and a “revelation.” His daughter relates that he wanted to increase his qualifications from general practice physician to specialization in neurology—then the first and lowest field of specialization. He decided to travel to Europe.

In 1930-1931 Aba [“father” in Hebrew] traveled to Zurich and Geneva to study neurology at the Monakow Brain

Institute under Eugen Minkowsky. He, however, disagreed with Minkowsky's basic tenet that there is no connection between physical and psychic phenomena. Nevertheless, it was through his associating with Minkowsky that my father met Eugene Bleuler, who was a pioneer in the area of schizophrenia. (*Abq*, pg. 62)

It is worth noting here he went to Geneva "to study neurology." Obviously he had never studied it before. Despite his lack of experience in the field, he decided that the Brain Institute had it all wrong and didn't appreciate his beliefs in psychic phenomenon. He left almost immediately. So, he got no education or training in a recognized field of medicine in that case. Velikovsky did, however, get an introduction to Dr. Eugen Bleuler who was famous for his work in schizophrenia. Bleuler was a certified psychiatrist and made early contributions to the field of psychiatry. Bleuler was a year younger than Freud and:

. . .he found the movement Freud was creating over-dogmatic, and resigned from the International Psychoanalytic Association in 1911, writing to Freud that "this 'all or nothing' is in my opinion necessary for religious communities and useful for political parties...but for science I consider it harmful". (Wikipedia)

The more complete statement from Bleuler's own hand was:

The 'who is not for us, is against us,' the 'all or nothing,' is in my opinion necessary for religious communities and useful for political parties. For this reason I can understand the principle as such, but I consider it harmful for science.

(*Medicine in the 20th Century*, by Roger Cooter and John Pickstone, p.315).

The book cited above continues:

How did one become a psychoanalyst? In 1909, Freud replied, "By studying one's own dreams." (ibid) And a year later Freud added, that one also needed to be "in contact" with someone proficient in psychoanalysis." "Freud argued that a prospective analyst was one who should "undergo 'a psycho-analytical purification' to become aware of one's own complexes.' (ibid, p. 316)

Velikovsky did not undergo a complete analysis of his dreams, according to his daughter, his so-called "psychoanalytical purification" because, she says, "his mind was too complicated." Interestingly, Freud, didn't undergo the "purification" either. In any case, before Velikovsky met Bleuler he already had Freud in his "sights" but had not yet any person doings with the Freudians—which probably would have caused Bleuler to have no dealings with him.

In 1930, however, Velikovsky applied for an internship with Dr. Carl Jung, which apparently was rejected. Velikovsky, it appears, didn't even know when he approached Jung that there was a great break between Freud and Jung *some 15 years before the meeting* and Velikovsky unfortunately referred to Jung as a "disciple" of Freud's, which won him no favors from Jung:

Also in 1930 my father became acquainted Carl Jung, a very tall man, who had a Great Dane by his side. During one conversation, Jung became angered when my father referred to him as Freud's disciple, since Jung had broken theoretical ties [broken "theoretical ties" means broke off relations] with Freud fifteen years earlier. Jung referred my father to a female analyst, but my father discontinued meetings with her shortly thereafter." (*Aba*, pg. 62)

In Velikovsky's own accounting (edited by Lynn Rose) of this incident he referred to Jung, not as a "disciple" (as *Aba* has it) but as a "pupil"—in any case, Jung was offended by the idea that he was either a "pupil" or a "disciple" of Freud's.

In a note from Jung to Velikovsky of March, 28., 1930, Jung informed him that not till early May could he discuss "the possibility of an internship." (ibid) (Interestingly, Jung took over the Berlin Psychoanalytical Society in 1934 for Hitler and purged the organization of Jews, replacing Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* with Hitler's own *Meine Kampf* as the founding "text" for the organization.)

In any case, Velikovsky' returned to Palestine before the year (1930) ended. He must only have been gone but a few months. Home, he wrote his first professional article, as said, to which Bleuler wrote a preface. It was dated January, 1931 and is, according to his daughter, Ruth, "a paper about the relationship between anger and thought." The title, however, suggests far more, than that given by her translation: *On the Physical Existence of the World of Thoughts.*"

From Gordin, however, we get the actual title: "Über die Energetik der Psyche und die physikalische Existenz der Gedankenwelt: Ein Beitrag zur Psychologie des gesunden und somnambulen Zustandes"; i.e., *On the Energetics of the Psyche and the Physical Existence of the World of Thought: A Contribution to the Psychology of Health and the Somnambulistic State.* This writer knows of no one who has ever read or given a detailed report on the piece, though it is widely touted as one of Velikovsky's great claims to fame.

It is here predicted that Velikovsky's first published article, so much touted, will, on examination, be found nearly worthless and consisting mainly of dramatic speculations, which on the surface is probably quite interesting. It will be in Velikovsky's famous style, i.e., well written and interesting—with one subject piled on another on another, such that there will be so many things to deal with that little, if anything, substantial can be extrapolated, analyzed, and proven to have any

specific merit. Style is all with Velikovsky and he has remarkable stylistic talents—a central fact of his attraction, as noted by Einstein (“you have the talent of a Thackeray”). The entire piece is only 15 pages and covers sundry subjects.

Ruth Velikovsky Sharon comments on this first article:

Just as in his later work his ideas were way ahead of his time. He believed that thoughts or ideas have physical existence of energy, which would explain the phenomena of telepathy. Also, in this paper, my father predicted that epileptics would exhibit different brain waves than normal people did, which he demonstrated in a test conducted on an epileptic in Tel Aviv. Using a modified cardiograph, he recorded an early curve of *petit mal*. From this theoretical perspective my father advanced other hypothesis. He predicted that sight could be restored to the blind and hearing to the deaf if intact nerve centers in the brain could be artificially stimulated by impulses. Thirty years later, other scientists echoed my father's ideas." [italic of *petit mal* added] (*Aba*, pg. 67)

She continues:

Telepathy was considered controversial in the field of psychiatry. However, my father's paper was published in the leading neurological journal, *Zeitschrift fur die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie* (133, 1931). The preface was written by Eugene Bleuler, who wrote that *Aba's* theory "is not only stimulating but it may also help science overcome its unworthy shyness to probe into a new strange field." (*ibid*)

Certainly, we know Velikovsky was not in the least shy to probe “new strange fields”—which included occultism. As to his first published article, Velikovsky thanked Bleuler for taking him in hand, an “unknown”, for his first publication. Interestingly, Bleuler beseeched Velikovsky *not* to translate, as he did, the term “occult” with “Übernormal” (“supernatural”). This term I deem incorrect,” he wrote. [*ibid*]

As we know, the “supernatural” became a stable for Velikovsky, indeed one may say, his main preoccupation and passion.

One can perhaps understand why Dr. Minkowsky at the Brain Institute did not want to be allied with research into the “supernatural”, or the “occult” as Velikovsky would have it. (Dr. Minkowsky was a pupil and associate of Bleuler). The fact is, Velikovsky was far more involved with the supernatural than with science—though he did everything in his power to make it appear otherwise. It is yet to be examined whether Velikovsky’s claim to priority in predicting disturbed brain-wave patterns has anything to it of a “scientific” piece of work.

(**Indeed, Velikovsky informed this writer that it was a German psychic who first told him that there was an error in ancient history of 500 years! And that this psychic’s vision was “proved” by him!. . . Velikovsky’s remarks that his work was informed by a German psychic were contemporaneously memorialized in this writer’s Journal 1970. It occurred in our discussion of a piece I brought to his attention by Edgar Allen Poe, “Conversations With “Eiros and Charmion.” “Conversations” featured a story of a cometary pass, remarkably like Velikovsky’s (which he utilized in *Mankind In Amnesia*). When I told him of it and read portions to him on the phone, he confessed to being astounded by Poe’s piece, more than anything any reader had brought to him in the previous 21 years, since the publication of *World In Collision*. He said at that time that poets may have a special ability to know these kinds of things. He asked when it was published. And, in this context, he informed

me of the German psychic who “long ago” told him about the alleged 500 year “error” in ancient history, and added, “which my work proved.”)

Velikovsky automatically assumed that Poe had had a special revelation, an inspired poet’s insight; whereas, in all probability Poe derived his story from the work of William Miller, a religious fanatic who became the founder of the Adventists religions and who preached the coming of the end of the world in the 1830’s. Poe was, no doubt, capitalizing on this end-of-the-world interest raging at the time. He wrote the piece in 1839. Poe was a highly educated man and well versed in the science of his day. Indeed, he wrote a fascinating detailed piece dealing with modern scientific and metaphysical matters in “Eureka”—I told Velikovsky about it but he obviously did not consult it before he made his comments on the piece (without attribution to me) in *Mankind In Amnesia*.

Knowing of Bleuler's "buying into" many a "new strange field" as he saw in Velikovsky's article, it is obvious Velikovsky mixes a lot of subjects including the “occult” and “telepathy.” It is easy to doubt the real value of Velikovsky's claim that he was "the first" to make an important discovery in this field of electroencephalographic studies, a field he had just begun to dabble in but a few months before at the time! The true and rightful claimant, it appears, of the important discovery that epilepsy exhibited disturbed waves detectable by electroencephalography, was Dr. Berger, the inventor of the electro-encephalograph—whose years of research lead him to his correct scientific conclusions in 1929.

On October 25, 1932 Velikovsky published another article on dream interpretation, it was called, "Psychoanalytical Prescience in the Art of Dream Analysis of the Old Hebrews According to the Treatise of Brachoth." Here again, the Velikovsky claim of ancient Jewish priority comes to the fore! Jewish priority is everywhere in Velikovsky, he exudes “Jewish racialism.”

Stekel wrote to Chaim Weizmann, then president of Israel, in 1937:

The University of Jerusalem must now become the “guardian place” of the Jewish science (Psychoanalysis). You have in Tel-Aviv one of the most highly gifted of the psychotherapists, Dr. Velikofsky [sic], with whom it would be worth for all scholars to unite, and in Jerusalem to create a center for Germany’s prohibited branch of psychoanalysis”

(Wilhelm Stekel to Chaim Weizmann,
Aba pg.79)

How did Stekel know that Velikofsky [sic] was a “highly gifted” psychotherapist? One answer would seem to be, because he showed Stekel that he didn’t know what he was talking about in his own dream interpretations featured in his published book. And would real “scholars” have anything to do with the so-called “Jewish science” of Psycho-analysis, invented by Freud—Freud, whose own personal physician declared he had a murder-complex or a “Cain-Complex (Dr. Max Schur) and whom his earlier physician and famous collaborator, Dr. Joseph Breuer, diagnosed as suffering from “moral insanity”? (It should be underscored that both Dr. Max Schur and Dr. Joseph Breuer were very close to Freud, knew him intimately and were both Jewish colleagues).

Who is this Stekel? Freud said of him—just to show that they didn’t get along—that Stekel’s “high sounding phrase” that “every fear is ultimately the fear of death” had, he said, “hardly any meaning, and at any rate cannot be justified.” Weizmann was apparently a wise enough man NOT to enlist “all scholars to unite” to create a center for the “Jewish science” of Psychoanalysis under the flag of Dr. Velikofsky (a man whose name he couldn’t remember how to spell)—as recommended by Steke, to whom Velikovsky gave money when he was in personal need.

PART TWO

In 1937 Velikovsky's father died. He wrote of him, in his dedication to *Ages in Chaos* (1952):

From the day when, at the age of thirteen, he left the home of his parents and went on foot to one of the old centers of Talmudic learning in Russia, to the day, when in December 1937, at the age of seventy-eight, he ended his years in the land of Israel, he devoted his life, his fortune, his peace of mind, all that he had, to the realization of what was once an idea, the renaissance of the Jewish people in the ancient land.

He contributed to the revival of the language of the Bible and the development of modern Hebrew by publishing (with Dr. J. Klausner as editor) collective works on Hebrew philology, and to the revival of Jewish scientific thought by publishing through his foundation, Scripta Universitatis, to which scientists of many countries contributed and thus laid the groundwork for the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

He was first to redeem the land in Negeb, the home of the patriarchs, and he organized a co-operative settlement there which he called Ruhama, today it is the largest agricultural development in northern Negeb. I do not know whom I have to thank for intellectual preparedness for this reconstruction of ancient history if not my late father, Simon."

It was not until the publication of her book *Aba*, that we learned by Velikovsky's daughter, Ruth, that on his death bed, he father, Simon, "bid him save the world" as mentioned *supra*. The matter is central to our

psychological examination of Velikovsky, so we do well to give the detail of this amazing request, to “save the world.” In *Aba* we read:

My father's father knew his youngest son was destined to become a man of distinction. On his death bed he bid my father to save the world having no way of knowing what an immense contribution my father would make toward the clarification of our past history, its implications for the future of our world, and the suffering my father was to experience.

My grandfather respected my father. This son helped him escape from Russia. Peering over his dark glasses to study my father's expression which betrayed his thoughts. Saba [Simon] knew he was about to die and give my father freedom to travel out of Palestine and onto new vistas of greatness. (*ibid*, pg. 31)

After repeatedly telling the reader that Simon was buried “in a section where great men of distinction were interned” she nonetheless informs the reader that Velikovsky was informed that it wasn't because of Simon's devotion to the Jewish cause, or presumably because of being a great man or important scholar, that it was agreed to bury him in a special section of the cemetery but because of Simon's wealth! Velikovsky was angered, she tells us, and refused to pay the burial bill “for some time.” Eventually guilt, she tells us, motivated him to pay the bill for his father's burial. (*ibid*, pg. 33).

We note here that, before the momentous changes came into his life following the death of his father, Velikovsky, among a number of other articles published and/or drafted in the period 1931 to 1937, the time of Simon's death, were two of especial passing interest:

“Sadomasochism and homosexual tendencies in Christianity”
 “The Error in the Law of Conservation of Energy”

Indeed, over 40 years later, in Velikovsky's last days, as mentioned *supra*, he planned to write a book entitled *Son of Man* "which was to be a psychoanalytic study of the historical Jesus, in whom Velikovsky saw numerous indications of repressed homosexuality, along with other assorted psychological disorders." (Gordin, p. 58). Of course, as said, Velikovsky sees the horror of "homosexuality" everywhere (probably "projection"?) and it would be easy to guess he had not forgotten the "somasochism" of Christianity—but since Jesus was a Jew, might these have been Jewish characteristics and Velikovsky was merely looking in his own mirror?—and seeing *himself*, as the "rightful" Messiah there? Jesus was quite likely a competitor to Velikovsky, due to his own Moses-Complex—without being conscious of it.

[At least that's how easy and childishly the "psychoanalytical game" can be played with such as Velikovsky regarding his own complexes. Or was Velikovsky, just imitating Freud and trying to "get their top man" (as it was Freud's intention to "get" Moses in his last book) before he himself toppled into his grave—as Freud did?]

In any case, before the new phase of his Moses-Complex journey, Velikovsky managed to nullify at least one of the laws of physics and discover that Christianity, apparently as a body of religious belief, had tendencies for homosexuality and somasochism. Were one to write of, say "Somasochism and the Murder Mania Tendencies in Jews"—one could well imagine, shouts of "Anti-Semite!" would resound from Velikovsky himself and many another. Velikovsky's Jewish racism is always near the surface.

When Velikovsky left for the United States in 1939 he was 44 years of age, he was a nobody and had achieved little. Velikovsky:

Looking back on the almost sixteen years spent in Israel, I could note but little achievement . . . at the age of 43 I had already lost the faith of achieving something great as a scholar.

(Gordin, pg. 57)

Ironically, Velikovsky's "saving grace" was that Freud, himself, as said, an Anti-Semite, had published, in German, in the same year that his father died, his book on Moses, *Moses and Monotheism* (*Der Mann Moses und die monotheistische Religion*). (Only the first two chapters of the full book were then published). The whole book was published two years later into English. If we are to believe Gordin, Velikovsky did not read the book until two years later, in 1939, in English in Tel Aviv. But it is hardly believable to this writer that Velikovsky would not have learned of its German publication and, given the sensational nature of Freud's book, he would not have read it immediately. But, what is "hardly believable", however, need not be the fact of the matter, so maybe it is so.

In any case, to Velikovsky, Freud was a "revelation" his work was a "masterpiece" on the human mind. Freud was hailed as one of the greatest Jewish geniuses of all time—and, to the shock of the Jewish Intelligentsia, *Moses and Monotheism* was a vicious Anti-Semitic attack on Israel! One of the most highly respected Jewish scholars of the 20th century, Abraham Shalom Yahuda wrote of it:

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

(*Passion for Murder: The Homicidal Deeds of Dr. Sigmund Freud*, Chapter "Freud's Anti-Semitism", pg. 241)

Of course, Freud's words were not those of a fanatical Christian, but a fanatical atheistic Jew. Indeed, to get a flavor of Freud's book on *Moses*—as indeed we should, given the nature of our analysis of Velikovsky's Moses-Complex—here is a passage from Freud's *Moses*:

The poor Jewish people, who with their habitual stubbornness continued to disavow the father's murder atoned heavily for it in the course of

time. They constantly met with the reproach “You killed our God!” And this reproach is true, if it is correctly translated. If it is brought into relation with the history of religions, it runs “you will not admit that you murdered God. . . .” There should be an additional declaring. “We did the same thing, to be sure, but we had admitted it and since then we have been absolved. (*ibid*)

Following this quote, I comment in my book *Passion For Murder*:

Who this “we” is, is not certain. Is it the psychoanalytic movement, Christians, or Freud himself? It was not easy, Freud says, for the Jews to go on claiming to be the chosen people of God after this murder. In fact, Freud goes so far as to declare that Moses himself was an Anti-semitic. ‘Our great Moses was, after all, a strong Anti-semitic and made no secret of it.’ Moses an Anti-semitic? (*ibid*, 242)

Of course, Freud was an Anti-semitic, and seeing himself as Moses, his irrational “logic” finds an identity between himself and Moses, ergo Moses is an Anti-semitic. Probably, what Moses and himself really had in common was *murder*. My book, goes on to deal with Freud’s Moses-Complex as well. But, here, our subject is Velikovsky’s Moses-Complex—yes, one can be an atheist Jew and still have a Moses-Complex, as the case of Freud proves.

Velikovsky, as a religious Zionist, along with virtually all other religious Jews, but also, as one afflicted with a psychopathological condition of a “Moses-Complex”, took the matter of Freud’s “betrayal” seriously—very seriously, so seriously, in fact, that his reaction itself is symptomatic evidence of his psychiatric condition. Why should anyone care much about what Freud says in the first place? Velikovsky was enraged by Freud’s *Moses*. Why would a devout Jew care anything at all about what the atheist, Anti-Semite, Freud thought about religious matters?

The matter must be at least touched on in this foregoing regard. Let us pause a moment on the true catastrophe going on, not the mythical catastrophes or Moses and his murders but the known *real* utterly horrid crushing and cruel catastrophes of the day at hand—affecting millions of human beings:

In addition to Jews, the targeted groups [of Nazi Germany] included Poles (of whom 2.5 million gentile Poles were killed) and some other Slavic peoples; Soviets (particularly prisoners of war); Romanies (also known as Gypsies) and others who did not belong to the "Aryan race"; [Blacks, etc.] the mentally ill, the physically disabled and mentally retarded; homosexual and transsexual people; political opponents and religious dissidents. Taking into account all of the victims of Nazi persecution, they systematically killed an estimated six million Jews and were responsible for an additional 11 million deaths during the war. Donald Niewyk suggests that the broadest definition, including Soviet civilian deaths would produce a death toll of 17 million.

By 1939, the concentration and extermination programs were well underway; Freud's own sisters were sent to the crematoriums. But Freud was given special dispensation to leave Germany with his entourage of psychoanalysts—by the intervention of a mutual friend, *via* Mussolini. In any case, Freud and Velikovsky are concentrated, however, not on that, apparently, but on "psychoanalytic" matters! Velikovsky attacks, not Hitler in his words, that we can find anywhere so far (but perhaps he did anonymously in his Zionist newspaper writings), *but Freud* and his,

. . . 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 Yahweh 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.

(quoted in Gordin, p. 60)

Moses was degraded by making him an Egyptian? Horror of horrors, an *Egyptian*, mind you! And Gordin adds immediately after the passage cited *supra* “Over two decades after reading the book, Velikovsky was still struggling with Freud’s *Moses*.” Unfortunately, our historian, Gordin, doesn’t enlighten us as to how Velikovsky was “struggling.” In my review of Gordin’s book, I quote from an article by Velikovsky (“Sigmund Freud and Moses the Lawgiver”), written *after* Freud’s *Moses and Monotheism*, where Velikovsky all but falls on his knees in abject idol worship of Freud. Politics or pathological ambivalence? Probably both.

To be clear, Velikovsky has time, at this time at this crucial period in history, to be writing and thinking about the repressed homosexuality of Christianity, and his apparent hatred of homosexuals—he harps on the theme his whole life. When one thinks about it, Velikovsky’s remarks above are obviously irrational—his “overvaluation” of Freud, leads him to maniacal extremes in his “undervaluation” of him (of course at this time Velikovsky does not know Freud himself was a sadist and a murderer).

Apparently, Velikovsky (and this is consonant with his other writings) is especially appalled that Freud made Moses “an Egyptian” and made Yahweh an “evil spirit.” Was Moses such an idol to Velikovsky that he really thought that the “golden Sigi” – as his mother called him from birth—had such powers that Freud could “demote *his* prophet” [italic added]. Of course, Velikovsky must have known, if he read Freud at all that he was a *virulent* atheist —(to distinguish him explicitly from all our good-hearted atheist friends) and Moses, *as Velikovsky knew him*, was *not* Freud’s Moses, Freud was not a “believer”; Moses was not Freud’s “prophet.” So, not being Freud’s prophet, he could not demote him from a position he did not have. Obviously, Velikovsky is confusing “race” with

religion! And this is so, no doubt, because he himself believed that Jews, above all other peoples of the world, were the “chosen” race of God!

These are the kinds of problems we have to face and deal with if we are to properly analyze a psychopathological condition, such as a “Moses-Complex”—a complex, ironically, that Freud came very close to having, but not quite. Freud had higher ambitions; his was a “Devil-Complex.” (“You don’t know then that I am the Devil?”—Freud declared). (see *Passion for Murder*, pg.233).

Apparently, Velikovsky’s own religious Zionism was so insecure, at its foundations, that he imagined Sigmund Freud, could actually “degrade” not only Moses but the Jewish God. As we shall see, Velikovsky’s own religious hatreds, of Islam but especially Christianity, were so great that he “psychoanalyzed” Freud and found that the root of Freud’s anti-Semitism emanated from him having made a “pact with the Devil”—specifically called by him a “Faust-pact.” The “Faust-pact” is, of course, a “Devil’s Pact”. And Freud, according to Velikovsky, had a pact with the Devil because of his desire to convert to Christianity! As though it were a matter of the Devil’s own doing for a “Jew” to “not-become-a-religious-Jew” by converting to Christianity—that religion with repressed sadomasochistic, homosexual tendencies.

Obviously, we can surmise that in Velikovsky’s book, it would be no Devil’s doing for a Christian to convert to Judaism. To show that the obverse of a proposition is patently irrational is to show that the original thesis was so, as well. And, we cannot fail, in good faith, to further observe that the reciprocal of Freud’s maniacal proposition (i.e., that the Jews murdered Moses), for which there is no Biblical authority, is no less unacceptable to Velikovsky, however Biblical it might be — i.e., that Moses was a murderer, of an Egyptian and of Jews.

Indeed, Moses not only murdered an Egyptian and immediately fled Egypt for fear of prosecution, but he committed mass murder against Jews because they failed to obey his orders (even though at the time they doubted Moses was even alive or that his God hadn’t vanished into thin air). The proposition that Moses himself was a murderer, one strongly

suspects, would also not sit well with Velikovsky—and though it is the “scriptural truth” it would be anti-Semitic to say so. Hence, Velikovsky’s predicament: he is in flight from both propositions.

Velikovsky had no choice but to rewrite history—his Master’s version of history. He would have to “demote his prophet”, Freud, and “degrade him” by writing his own sacred history (show, once again, that his master’s “masterpiece”, *The Interpretation of Dreams* was wrong—as he once had had to prove to Stekel about his interpretations) and *prove* what no one else was ever able to prove before—that *all of ancient history was wrong*—that the story of Moses’ miracles was true (at least the ones he wanted to be), and that all translations of the Bible concealed the single truth which he alone was privy to: That the planet Venus was the cause of the catastrophes of Exodus.

In some huge sense, Velikovsky, in essence, merely changed the subject.

The psychological rule says that when an inner situation is not made conscious, it happens outside as fate. That is to say, when the individual remains undivided and does not become conscious of his inner opposite, the world must perforce act out the conflict and be torn into opposing halves.

Carl Gustav Jung, CW 9: *AION*: 126

The time when the world was torn in half, was, in Velikovsky’s view commemorated in *Exodus*. It is to Velikovsky’s “Exodus” we must now turn to reveal the fact of his own torn mind.

To be continued

**PART III: Enter Moses: The End and the Beginning of the End:
“A Prisoner of Cosmic Catastrophes”**

elm