

**PART TWO**

## CHAPTER SIX

### HOLOCAUST AND AMNESIA

As his last year begins, Dr Zvi Rix is writing to Deg from Rechovot, Israel. It is January 9, 1980 and he sends New Year's greetings, and hopes that they might meet before long. "I am very cut off at the place where I am living now. This does not only concern libraries, but other matters too..." for the mails are slow and books arrive late in the shops. He is in touch with Christoph Marx. They travelled together to Glasgow... "He was quite obliging...So far I have not formed a final opinion of him."

I would nominate Zvi Rix to be the hero of this chapter, but it is up to the reader to find his own heroes in this book. Rix was a man who Velikovsky would have liked to write *Mankind in Amnesia* in his place. He was a medical man, deep into psychiatry, and a refugee from Nazi Germany. Deg knew him only through their correspondence. Deg was glad to get a description of him from his widow, whom he met shortly afterwards at the home of Christoph Marx near Basle. She wrote to Deg on January 23, 1981:

Dear Prof. de Grazia,

My husband died very recently; as is customary for Jews, even not practising religious commandments, we stay at home at least a week. In this time I went through his many letters and found also yours.

I have the impression that you were very friendly and very much appreciating his work. Therefore I write to you that I am very thankful to you. He was a very lonely man and every encouragement was a help to him. Here he had nobody to talk to, I myself am much too obtuse to understand half of what he was talking about and as he was also very shy he had no contacts; besides that, his ideas were not exactly what people here would like to hear. It is a semi-theocratic world. Ruled by

a conglomeration of Zealots (...) they call themselves socialists or rightwingers, its all the same. Our dreams went awry.

Yours very respectfully,  
*Melitta Rix*

Rix, whose scrambled writings are being kept by Christoph Marx, was hard in pursuit of evidence that the cometary destruction of civilizations around 3500 years ago had warped the human mind in the Near East, inciting human destructiveness, religious excesses, and sexual deviations.

\*\*\*

Christoph Marx was a computer expert from Basle, and an amateur of Velikovsky's work and all that it connected with. He circulated an invitation to whomever he knew to meet in Iceland, a typical groping, logical yet mad, of cosmic heretics for a way of expressing themselves and their message. Logical: let us assemble in Iceland between America and Europe, a catastrophically threatened land even now, set athwart the great catastrophic Atlantic Rider; mad: Marx was teetering on the edge of interdiction by everyone, the British, the Americans the Europeans, Deg included, a heretic practically excommunicated from the heretics. The conference did not materialize. Marx tried again in 1980, this in his home city, and found a few communicants.

The *minimum* consensus of all people positively involved with the work of Immanuel Velikovsky may well be characterized as *an interest in the true reconstruction of mankind's genetic history*, and thus also of geologic and, in part, cosmic history...Developing Velikovsky's psychological inceptions, the goal -- of bringing home to collective consciousness the realistic conception of the world, as opposed by the present mania holding sway over cultural evolution -- would include nothing less than safeguarding mankind's life on earth, imperiled by (1) by the acute danger of self-destruction, and (2) by not attempting to prepare against some future chaos in the solar system. However, whether some of us are attributing such healing powers to the recognition of true history, or whether others would simply consider it as a value in itself, does not seem all-important: both parties will equally perform a supporting function in repelling collective irrationality and fanaticism, the worst effects of which are mass killings through war and murder. We know that

Velikovsky comprehended his own striving for the true picture of history in this perspective...

The consensus among cosmic heretics of which Marx spoke in his announcement did not really exist; however, it is certain that V.'s unique and original way of searching for the roots of anti-semitism was a revelation to many thousands of people who would otherwise have not even considered the problem or would have lived with a few, often anti-semitic, stereotypes. Measuring such influences is impossible, but, by any standard, V. was a great Jew who disabused the minds of many incipient anti-semites.

*Deg's Journal Paris, August 19, 1968*

V. keeps two secrets, or doctrines half-hidden. He has expressed himself to me so often that the "secrets" are apparent. He would perhaps deny them. I am sure of them. He does not believe in God. He is a Hebrew, therefore Israeli, imperialist. Both doctrines, if publicized or known, would involve him in a whole new line of controversies, would make new enemies and unwanted new friends.

Evidence, examples:

Of 1: direct statements; writings; philosophy of psychoanalysis; his theory of "great fear" as bringing religion; belief that Jews were even in Biblical times polytheistic.

Of 2: works of his life -- Zionism; gift of income from his property to Israel in June 67; written works analysis; conversations; hatred of antizionism even at cost of other values (e.g. El-Arish incident and Brandeis professor).

After a long trip following V.'s death, Deg returned to 78 Hartley Avenue (he could never remember the house number, but would send his letters to 34 or 85 or another number, any number, and V. was puzzled -- What significance could forgetting it have for Deg? "You can address me just at Naxos, Greece and I get you alright at Hartley Avenue, Princeton!" "I have gotten letters just to 'Princeton, NJ' " -- So there you are!) to see Elisheva. The parlor was little changed. V.'s unimpressive chair stood facing the two stiff couches and the coffee table between. Deg thought, "Should the chair be sat in, moved, replaced, bound across with a museum

belt, what?" It struck one with incompleteness, an uncertain quaver. He would slip some books and papers upon it. Elisheva and her assistants Jan and Richard lined up with Deg on the couches. Like a cordial committee they sat, drank tea, and reported to each other: health, manuscripts in progress, people seen; and they passed papers and books around.

Thus went the meetings in the years thereafter. Sheva would at some point ask: "Did you see Marx?" and Deg would say no or yes, and she would say "How can you see him when you know how bad I feel about him," but she was curious nevertheless, while Deg tried to evade the subject and one time she said "I will not speak to you again if you see Marx" and Deg threw his arms around her jovially and said, I tell you what, if you don't see Greenberg, I won't see Marx, and she was taken aback and all laughed because she had mixed feelings on that subject too and knew that Greenberg was not his favorite among the cosmic heretics, but setting up proscription lists in the Roman style was pointless.

It was on one of his earlier returns from abroad, in 1977, that Deg heard about Christoph Marx. V. spoke of a visitor, almost in religious tones, who had lifted weighty burdens from his shoulders, and would establish his rightful fame in Central Europe. He gave Deg a copy of a well-executed chart of his reconstructed chronology of Egypt, in color, which Marx had drawn. "Good, good," commented Deg, who was surprised, bemused, and skeptical at the same time. "What's happened?" he asked Sizemore and others when he met them aside. They seemed confused and uneasy.

What happened is this. A Christoph Marx had telephoned Velikovsky to pledge his allegiance to his ideas and to offer support. There was much he could do: he could help with the translation of V.'s books into German, working out of his more respectable (in V.'s eyes) Switzerland; he could launch a campaign to bring the Germans to their senses, so that they would remember the horrible Nazi past and thus cleanse themselves of the pest of comfortable oblivion, with its eventual compulsion to repeat the past again; he could organize study circles to confront the

establishment with Velikovsky 's ideas.

On April 14, 1977, V. wrote Marx, confirming in most cordial terms an invitation to visit. For ten days, Marx settled into Princeton. Professor Lynn Rose, who V. said at various times would be his literary executor, came down from Buffalo for some of the discussions. Marx departed on Mayday. V. writes him: "Dear Marx: you left on Sunday, you called from home on Monday, and today is Friday -- and very many things did happen in those few days...Earl Milton from Lethbridge, Canada, is with us since yesterday and leaves tomorrow morning together with Alfred de Grazia - who just now spent with us some time - and left copies of letters he wrote to Enc[cyclopedia] Br[itannica] and to NY *Times*. Sagan sent me a new book of his inscribed with all good wishes and a day apart arrived the tape of this year 's lecture on the yearly theme -- Venus and V. -- in which he indoctrinates future astronomers in their first year with derision toward me and my work..."

Three days later V. is writing about turning over rights to the royalties from various foreign translations to members of his family. He says he is turning over the management of worldwide Spanish language rights to his recently acquired agents, Scott Meredith. He says "I reconsidered and wish to suggest the following plan: your share is one eighth (12 1/2%); but you retain countries not 'gifted' an additional 7 1/2% for work that furthers our goals -- at our common discretion (such will be the case with Germany),..."

V. writes also to Lynn Rose on May 11 that "I let him [Marx] have broad powers to act, and have already the first report from him. He will take over most of the European Continent for contracting my books with publishers, and be a rather central figure in organizing groups of interdisciplinary synthesis, and in opposition to the Establishment." He mentions other rights to be bestowed upon individuals and adds "Christoph Marx will be in charge of these and many other activities."

On May 16, Marx replies that he will proceed as desired. He wonders whether the gifting of "income" rather than "rights" is not the better procedure, and suggests that the literary estate should be

kept centralized and managed efficiently. His idea is of a Velikovsky Institute, a foundation not-for-profit, with an office in Switzerland and another in America.

V. seems to be in a manic phase. He sends off sundry "Notes to my Collaborators," a newsletter in fact. *Inter alia* he mentions lending Marx his unpublished manuscripts and writes that "I gave him wide powers to represent me in academic contacts and arrange for the publication of translations of my books"

In August, V. visited the office of Scott-Meredith Literary Agency in New York and met the head of their foreign rights department, Mr. Vicinanza, who "showed great eagerness to represent me on a broader basis." An offer was made to enter the greater European market. Vicinanza estimated that \$750,000.00 could be obtained in advances worldwide for *Worlds in Collision* in 18 months: so V. reported to Marx, adding, "Against such figures the offers made to you appear minuscule,..."

A month later Marx reports to V. with several offers and expresses doubts (as did V.) about the high figures. Marx would like to sign in the name of the "Velikovsky Institute." In any event, he would like to draw upon the expected advances to begin microfilming and indexing V.'s archives.

Then suddenly, V. telegraphs "Please don't sign agreement with Umschau. Wait my explanatory letter. Greetings." Something has happened. There is a flurry of letters and telegram. In a telegram, V. says that his books are being returned by the thousands due to the book *Scientists Confront Velikovsky* (by Asimov, Sagan and others) and "other adverse publicity." Marx appeals by telegram for confidence and trust, to no avail. They also talk on the telephone. Marx is seeking to give "rational" answers to all objections, but says "I have legally signed the agreement as your proxy within the frame of German and Swiss law. At this point I again wish to thank you for the powers you have entrusted to me, which I consider as a wide obligation toward you and your family."

I suspect that around this moment, Marx had been hit by the inevitable reaction to the Grand Vision. V., always a procrastinator

in decision-making, facing opposition from his family and the lack of enthusiasm of friends such as Rose and Sizemore, could not overcome his profound aversion to things German, including now spending resources "to help reeducate them." Marx might as well proceed; V. would never have returned to the Great Vision; his idea of therapy would have to be applied by others, if at all.

Marx has signed the contract on November 22; the Umschau Verlag signs on November 29. He reports that he is putting the money in a special account in German Marks, which are moving upwards against the dollar. He continues to report editorial activities.

Now young Jan Sammer, who has come from Canada to live and work with the Velikovsky's, writes to Marx. Without expressing his authorization, he relates that V. is upset with the disapproved signing, that Doubleday Company will probably insist upon 25% of the proceeds, that V. does not favor the Velikovsky Institute idea, that Marx has "overstepped the powers that V. granted" him, and that he could negotiate but not sign an agreement without the author's approval. Marx is told to stay out of affairs in Holland. Marx replies both to Jan and to V., avoiding a confrontation.

Jan writes again repeating himself more forcibly, adding a warning to Marx not to pretend to represent V. in speaking to any scholars. He repeats words written earlier by Marx: "Umschau in due course will wish to have proper signatures to the contract. You would have to empower me accordingly." How, asks V., through Jan, can you now say you had power to sign.

Marx argues at length to this point: V. had orally and even in writing granted the power to sign. Marx speaks of a further consideration being "my understanding of how distasteful Dr. Velikovsky would regard a duty to sign a German contract personally." (Deg remembered that V. had considered even not permitting his books to appear in German.) Marx states that V. had told him not to worry about any claim of Doubleday to the subsidiary rights.

Finally on March 1, 1978, Mrs. Elisheva Velikovsky writes to

Marx, repeating that Marx had himself said that further empowering authority was needed, insisting that he not present himself anymore as V.'s agent, and condemning the idea of an Institute. Marx rebuts this, and indicates a desire to visit Princeton to settle matters.

The visit is declined by Mrs. V. Marx inquires about V.'s health. His letters continue to carry news of books and meetings. Jan says in the middle of a letter May 17, regarding Marx's expenses of purchasing books, that "in any case, they would have to be paid by you from the 7 1/2% designated for expenses connected with your efforts to arrange for translations." More reports. V. telegraphs for an accounting twice in the same month, the second message being misaddressed to "Immanuel Marx." And a third cable demands the transfer of funds to America. Marx sidesteps these and writes of his work on the Dutch contract, which he had been called away from, and of his dislike of entitling the German translation of *The Velikovsky Affair* (Deg's Book) *Immanuel Velikovsky, Die Theorie der Kosmischen Katastrophen*, a publisher's presumptuousness that one might find annoying.

On August 15 goes to Marx the first letter by V. in two years. It asks the transfer of money, and that V. be informed of all negotiations from the beginning and that no contract be signed without written approval; if not, any authority will be revoked. Marx on August 24 refuses the "fundamental change," acknowledges the end of the agreement is inevitable therefore, and suggests he be allowed his 20% of receipts from books signed up and be given all German language rights. '....Such German monies are not going toward an enrichment of myself....no other people in the world need your works as urgently than the German speaking peoples.' On September 5, V. signs a handwritten message, witnessed by his lawyer; it "terminates our business relationship." Further, Marx is accused of having been in California and Washington, D.C., "but did not give a ring to Princeton."

Marx retorted that he had too many rebuffs to continue telephoning. He protests that, in V.'s name, the *Kronos* magazine group was denying him permission to publish in German various of its articles. He also received in due course damning letters from Lynn Rose and

Warner Sizemore. Rose adds a postscript calling "a deliberate misrepresentation" a letter from Marx to the *Times* which asserted that "Velikovsky saw the Holocaust in terms of collective amnesia."

Matters had been sliding into the hands of Robert Pinto, Velikovsky's attorney and, with V.'s death, attorney for his Executor, Elisheva Velikovsky. The ensuing fol-de-rol among Estate, Publishers and Marx went on and on and is of little interest here.

So a kind of love affair ended, brutally, with injury to all concerned. Sizemore wrote to Marx April 3, 1980 that "the last year of Dr. Velikovsky's life was almost totally taken up with the question of how to put a stop to your activities. He rued the day he ever met you." This may be so, but is it rightfully so, and is it all? Velikovsky was not working well for years. Further in the last week of his life, Deg had him smartly discussing substantive topics of quantavolution. (Marx went unmentioned.) Yes, in a way, Marx was V.'s Waterloo, his last grandiose effort to launch himself against an opposing world. He loved Marx for the vision, even if Sheva and Warner and Rose and Deg and all the others could not share the vision nor needed it. Deg had not yet met Marx.

On May 9, 1980 Deg is writing to Mrs. Velikovsky:

*Naxos, Kyklades, Greece, 9 May 1980*

Dear Sheva:

When I called to say 'good-bye' before going to Greece, you had already gone to Israel. I hope that you enjoyed your visit and are well at home now. Ami and I spent a month here and then three weeks in Western Europe, two in London. The Society held a day of meetings on April 26. Talks were given by Dayton, Warlow, Milton, and myself -- I spoke on "Ten Propositions concerning the Quantavolution of around 1450 BC," or something like that. About 150 persons were present. There seems to be a continuing high interest Immanuel's work.

C. Marx came from Switzerland for the occasion. Somehow he

had learned of my coming and had written Sizemore to pass along any messages *via* myself. Isn't that interesting -- implying that I was in contact with him. Furthermore, he had been sending to the British group letters presenting his case to represent Velikovsky, including even Immanuel's will, which I therefore had occasion to read, and which fortunately is simple and clear and free of any embarrassing detail.

After my talk, which was the last, Marx introduced himself. I exchanged a few words with him. As you say, he is disarmingly mild and inspires immediate sympathy, to the point of affection. I advised him first (after commenting that he should not have tried to give an essay by himself a ride on my book of the *Velikovsky Affair* without consulting me, by trying to put it in through the publisher) that he was all wrong about you and that you had been kindly disposed towards him in the beginning and that he should write you a letter of apology. Second, I advised him not to perpetuate a controversy that would only damage him and cause everyone great costs, and rather to put his case up for arbitration by three persons, not including myself, to determine what, if anything, was and is due to him for his work and achievements. He didn't seem to care for the advice, but my last words to him were to think it all over. Probably you have heard that he is hoping to gather a conference in Reykjavik, Iceland, soon. I have no idea who will come.

While in London, I stayed at an apartment only a few meters away from the Jewish Synagogue and college where Hyam Maccoby works, and we had several meetings and a lunch at the best Jewish restaurant in London, Ruben's. He read most of my book on *Moses and His Electric God* and found it plausible and interesting. He knows the sources very well. I have heard nothing from Charles Lieber in New York, who is supposed to be finding a publisher for the book.

We shall probably be leaving Naxos for Athens and New York at the end of June and thus be mainly in Princeton during the summer. Is Richard still with you? -- I suppose so. Please give him our regards -- also Ruth, and Warner when you see him. I look forward, then, to seeing you again before too long. Best wishes meanwhile.

Affectionately,  
*Alfred*

On May 11, Marx addresses Deg, expressing pleasure at their brief meeting:

14 years ago you pointed to the Velikovsky affair and its implications, and still good scientific form seems to require that even Velikovsky's main theses together with the principal view whether the reconstruction gives a true picture of mankind's past cannot be considered as fact, from which to proceed to new work. In spite of all the experiences of these 14 years a rather naive opinion also seems to persevere, that if only one persistently kept to so-called scientific method, in the final analysis everything will turn out just fine. For the disastrous non-success of Velikovsky's ideas in science a Scientific Mafia is found responsible, but science itself, the field that many Velikovskians are employed in or would like to be part of (if just for status only), and which from its beginning has allowed the most irrational large-scale delusions to grow (*Grosswahnbildungen* I call them in German), is glorified by naming our hero one of her greatest representatives. After I've seen science destroy the more important of these delusions, such as ancient history or some myths of physics, by its own methods, perhaps I'll be ready to call Velikovsky a scientist: until that time, which I don't really expect to really come true, I prefer to know Velikovsky, along with Freud, as the brilliant analyst he was; to withdraw him and his work from the clutch of science; and thus remain free to expose science wherever necessary or as a whole as one of the great systems of thought (after classical philosophy and religion) shielding the collective from its memories.

He complains of "the most unfortunate job Mrs. Velikovsky is doing in ordering an about-face of her husband's approach to the Nazi Holocaust." He thanks Deg for suggesting arbitration and will, he says, essay a move in that direction.

On June 4, Deg replies:

Dear Mr. Marx:

Thank you for your letter. The Breasted citation and pages are welcome. I will seek the hieroglyphics, now. Concerning your last paragraph on the 'arbitration,' I have already written to Mrs. V. of my suggestions to you, so certainly you may refer to them if you wish. I am glad that I was never part of your

complicated and difficult relationship with the Velikovsky's, else I would feel responsible at least in part and therefore more sad than I am.

Any impression that the whole story has been told would be incorrect. The major issue is hardly reflected in it. The more one considers the affair, the more one senses an underlying tension. Would it be the pronounced incapacity of either V. or Marx to work with others? Certainly Deg's original skepticism of the relationship was based upon his acute awareness of V.'s tendencies to call his troops forward, only to have them halt before commitment and forever be frozen there. V. called himself a procrastinator.

But Marx was a patient and loyal and demonstrative person. He could have gone along indefinitely and, given the neat bind trapping both parties, the relationship, hot or frozen, would have persisted.

The crux was the holocaust. It was deeply disturbing. The matter could be put syllogistically: Historic catastrophes resulted in severe collective amnesia; the world's peoples, having suppressed their memories of catastrophe, are compelled psychologically to recreate the conditions for reliving them; thus emerge warfare, massacre, self-destruction and the destruction of others, man-made holocausts. Whereupon one reasons: the Germans, like all peoples, have suppressed the memories of them; like all other peoples, they are prone to recapitulate them and do so on occasion, as during the Nazi period.

Now the process implies a therapy. To cure the penchant for human destruction, the victims of collective amnesia (practically everyone) must be led to confront and appreciate the extent to which their minds contain the experience of past catastrophe and hence the seeds of future ones; once this is done, the human will realize the meaning of his conduct and control it so as to break the endless chain of disaster. What is good for all peoples must therefore be good for the Germans. Hence any effort to cure the Germans of their collective amnesia is to be commended and supported.

This, in brief and with such defects as I shall point out, was

Velikovsky's social philosophy, and this everyone who paid any attention to V. knew to be his philosophy, and Marx clearly saw this, too, and was fully persuaded of it from his reading and from his early communications with V. He was deadly serious about it.

Long before all of this, on December 18, 1963, we find V. writing to Dr. Zvi Rix in Jerusalem: "I found two of your ideas magnificent, the hatred of the Jews because they claim of having the upheaval made for their benefit (the Hyksos actually profited) and the words of the Gospels about the fiery furnaces and Hitler's accomplishing such vision and doom (by expolarizing his own hateful traits)." Again in a letter of January 7, 1964, he calls the idea "stupendous." He "wished that somebody else should write "The Great Fear," because he is so busy, but suggests a cooperative book, to which he might also contribute. Nothing came of this highly unusual disposition to engage in collaborative work.

In 1947, V. journeyed to the University of Lethbridge in Alberta, Canada, to receive an honorary doctorate. The Conference in which he starred was devoted to the topic of collective amnesia. His own address was subtitled "The Submergence of Terrifying Events in the Racial Memory and Their Later Emergence." There he commented that "the inability to accept the catastrophic past is the source of man's aggression...Warfare has its origin in the same terror." Leaders imitate what they perceive to be the gods in action. Nobel Peace Prizes have been futile. Freud, V.'s predecessor, first developed the theory that each individual desires subconsciously to repeat the catastrophe or trauma, which he believed to be the murder of the father, the Oedipus Complex.

In place of collective amnesia from the murder of the father, V. substituted collective amnesia from the trauma of natural disaster. His therapy, like Freud's, was to get the patient to realize the origin of his trauma. With Freud, the aim was not to realize the primordial murder, but to realize the oedipal complex operative in infancy. With V. it could not be this easy; catastrophes do not occur with every generation; therefore natural and human history required exposition in the light of catastrophism.

Velikovsky accused many scientists of functional blindness, psychic scotoma, which he would probably assign in large part to

collective functional amnesia of the anciently experienced disorders of the solar system. Thus, on November 2, 1974, he was saying at a Philosophy of Science Conference at Notre-Dame:

Astronomers do not like interference from other sciences, and certainly not from what could be called 'legends and old wives tales...' The ancients tried desperately to tell us what was going on... We wish not to know anything of this. We wish to believe we are living in a peaceful world.

As a psychoanalyst, he was professionally unable then to accuse them of sin. They could not help themselves. He could not denounce them even if they refused to see when the truth was explained to them. He had simply to grant that their therapy was incomplete. The excesses of their attacks upon the analyst were to be expected and treated by inducing self- understanding.

But he was personally involved, which is an impropriety, He became a kind of Catholic psychiatrist, who has to tell his patients that they are sinners. Worse, since he is sinned against, he became inevitably angry with the sinners. There was no "Forgive them, Father, for they know not what they do." The German national case of psychic scatology was, of course, much more deadly than the case of the scientists.

V. writes, "You cannot put the human race on the couch." And then he looks at his own fate. "Without preparation, without giving the patient a chance to prepare himself, you cannot slowly release from his subconscious mind the necessary recognition of the traumatic past, and so, the patient has experienced great paroxysms and has rebelled against my revelations." But now, by patients, V. means specifically the scientific community that opposed his ideas, which like humanity as a whole, rejects bringing to the surface memories of natural catastrophe.

Many of V. 's supporters agreed with these propositions, Christoph Marx certainly did, and some, like Marx, wanted to devote themselves to its application. Not so Deg, who found both the theory and the therapy grossly simplistic. Having spent most of his life in examining human ideologies and devising techniques of changing, controlling, and accommodating them, Deg had long

since abandoned hope of finding a quick fix for human destructiveness.

V. hardly recognized in his psychological theory what was so obvious in his history and in the reception of his book, that over all of history and today, the vast majority of humans and their religions actually demands that we recognize, denominate, and respond in every sphere of life to the occurrence of ancient catastrophes of fire flood, wind and earthquake.

Destructiveness seemed to Deg "normal," "intrinsicly human," ineradicable without genetic engineering and breeding. It could only, by known political means, be diverted, shaped, made to play games with itself, rendered innocuous, and displaced in a hundred ways. Destructiveness was neither more nor less created by natural catastrophe than human nature in its other behaviors, including an abstract active concern for the human race as a whole. Further there was probably a genetic switch, prompted by catastrophe as were most mutations and primary behaviors, that had changed a primate quickly into a human. These ideas were developing in his mind throughout the seventies, as the theory of *Homo Schizo*.

When, after V.'s death, I passed along to Deg a copy of the posthumously edited work, *Mankind in Amnesia*, that Jan had given to me, widely advertised as V.'s great testament, called by himself his most important work, Deg was prepared to be disappointed. When I said "How did you like it?" he said "Even more disappointing than I had expected it to be. Simplism is still the hallmark of the theory. Systematic development is entirely absent. The evidence is second-hand and commonsensical for the greater part. The recommendation for social therapy is nil."

Deg felt a deep chagrin. "The work is true only on the most general level, and therefore unoperational and inoperative. It contains jottings and exclamations. It reads like a string of notes. Its publication could only have been justified as 'notes and stories,' or 'Velikovsky's Lament.' Dr. V.'s claim to be a 'citizen of the world' is unacceptable, unless any person's declared wish that the world not be blown up by nuclear bombs makes the person a 'citizen of the world'." Nor was V., in fact, for all his high

qualities, ever such.

The work is too brief for its purported task. Still it wanders; it contains extraneous matter. Too, the work had been long in the making; on July 2, 1967, V. had written Deg that he had "decided to concentrate upon it," at the urging of his publisher. He concluded the same letter: "Keep well, write again, and infuse yourself with impressions that will make out of you a ringing advocate of a need to understand the racial hidden springs of hatred." No need for exhortation: Deg had been such a resounding advocate since childhood.

In reading the new book, Deg had to reflect upon the fact that V. and he had never discussed the work, whether because there was nothing to discuss or because V. wanted to talk of less important matters or because Deg was uninterested in the theory beyond the basic fact, with which he accredited V., the fact that ancient natural catastrophes have played a large role in human and natural history. As much as he believed in the high value of introspection and of the deep interplay of honest minds, Deg had long before meeting V. assigned only a limited potential for good in a knowledge of true history.

"Psychological revelation" would help the world, commented Deg. "Philosophy and anthropology well insist upon this point, but the means for such are not given by V. (see p.207 of *Mankind and Amnesia*) and therefore the statement will hardly perform the miracle. I can hardly believe that he says psychology and sociology had nothing to say about the Jonestown (Guyana) massacre and mass suicide, yet he does say so, whereas the dynamics of this event were crystal clear to the ordinary social psychologist."

Where is his evidence of a 'racial inheritance' of an experienced fear, an attitude, no less. This is a Lamarckian genetics that I cannot accept. I asked V. once, in the 1960's, for his idea of what physiological process memories could use to ensconce themselves in the racial soma, to which he gave no response. He didn't show me what, if anything, he was writing. I would have been most critical. He read my Lethbridge lecture on fear and memory. I give him my first sketch of *Homo Schizo* theory, but I doubt he paid any

attention to it, although there I made explicit the only dynamic by which Freud and Lamarck might be married, through psychosomatism. Yet V., who was repelled by Jung's complaisance with the Nazis, would not admit to being a Jungian. Moreover, his ethnocentrism is again apparent. He attributes significance to the presence of the five-pointed star of Venus on the helmets of American, Soviet and Chinese soldiers (only an American general officer is in fact authorized to wear the emblem), but he does not mention the ubiquity of the Star of David in the ancient Israeli army (p.201); did V. or his editors delete the "Mogen David of ancient Israel or even of Israel of today" that he had joined with the others in his Lethbridge lecture (p.27 of *Recollections of Fallen Sky*)? He indulges freely in anti-Arab statements (p. 150 *et passim*).

In his vagaries, he does not however mention any of his close associates; Stecchini is found in a footnote (p.67) also A.M. Paterson (p.66), and the mention of Rose was a post-mortem insertion. He mentions several correspondents; a temporary assistant, Cathy Guido; a New York City teacher; a jail inmate; a man from Topeka, Kansas, writing on tornadoes, and a conversation with St. Clair Drake, which meeting he placed in the Swiss Alps without acknowledging that the two were there at Deg's invitation as part of a revolutionary experiment in higher education aimed at diminishing destructiveness and creating a beneficent and benevolent world order (p. 111). But the most striking omission in the rambling work is that it sidles past the Nazi Holocaust. Of the purest, and best-documented case in history of the working of his theory of aggression and amnesia, not a word is said! [Actually there were a very few words alluding to the German case, and these were excised by Mrs. V. before publication.]

And Deg wanted to go on, but I stopped him. The question of anti-semitism interested me more, so I got him into this track. In Deg's opinion anti-semites define Jews and Jews define anti-semitism, both in their many forms.

As to how many types of Jews there are, I know of no classification. First you have to grade Jewishness as a subjective feeling, an intensity, say of five grades. Then these are role-operative, transactional, that is. If I feel somewhat Jewish, this is fully or moderately or little sensed, depending upon whether I am transacting socially and psychologically in a setting dominated by the perspective: much, some or little of my ordinary moderate

Jewish sentiment by the objectification of Jews that the gentile setting exudes. So at any point in time or space, I am liable to be in any one of hundreds of states of Jewishness. Moreover, my character possesses 'X' degree of stability, but is never so stable that my sense of Jewishness cannot be stepped up or stepped down by my hormonal balance, or some other physiological or sensory balance, as, for instance, when depressed, I may feel more Jewish, and so, too, when manic, but less so in between. And of course, all that I say about my type and other type of Jews are averages of quantities.

But now you must go farther. The historical knowledge and life experiences of Jews differ greatly, hence the symbols and references to which we respond, which are so varied. The physical signals of Jewishness are of course symbols, too. To some Jews I "look Jewish," to others rather so, to some not at all, and so to gentiles. There is a Jewish look, which is a combination of a culture-look and a genetic-look. It has a set of grades of attractiveness and repulsion, one set among Jews, another among gentiles, depending of course upon which Jewish or gentile culture and sub-culture you are using as the standard. And with all of these possibilities the area of Jewishness and gentile-ness and their interrelations is most complex and varied.

This very state of complexity, in which no Jewish race, or culture, or religion, or nationality, or historicity, can be said to aggregate more than a small fraction of those who think themselves some kind of Jew or are regarded as a Jew, fosters anti-semitism, because among strongly authoritarian and dogmatic characters, perhaps 10% of any population, the tolerance of ambiguity and variation is low. Objects and people must be pigeonholed; they cannot help themselves; that 's the way they are and they are eager for any distinction that will discriminate, any line that can be drawn, "a drop of Jewish blood" or "a Jewish grandparent," or, on the other hand (and this is often forgotten), sometimes, a thoroughly rigid character will accept as such any person who says "I am a Jew" and then also any person who says "I am not a Jew," like not questioning a person who says "I am a Chicago Cubs fan." or "I am a Dallas Cowboys fan." Since the same authoritarian or discriminating character is also inclined to penalize ambiguities, he is at one and the same time eager to define a Jew and to penalize the Jews for being so difficult to define.

Velikovsky, I should say, and even more so Mrs. Velikovsky, perceived the world strongly as Jew and gentile. Mrs. V. was a fine artist, a fully acculturated Judeo-Christian as a musician and a

sculptor, but voted the straight party line, so to speak, when it came to Jewishness on most other matters, including holidays, diet, and intimacy. The big chasm in V.'s tradition of Jewishness was opened up by modern western science; he lacked belief in the substance of Judaism, whatever his participation in its rites and routines and despite his refusal to discuss religious preference with any one.

The Velikovskys were among the "most Jewish Jews" whom Deg had known, even though he had from childhood held Jews among his closest friends and, while he had something of the heart of a Catholic and the culture of a Protestant, he had the mind of a Jew, a twentieth century "assimilated" midwestern American Jew, that is. That was what his wife of thirty years was too, except that she originated in New York. He was more a Jew than an Italian, although his descent was purely Italian, even of certain Sicilians who had been the most nationalist of Italians, but this line had practically stopped at birth with a father who was chauvinistically determined upon the Americanization of everyone (except musicians, it sometimes seemed).

V. couldn't comprehend this very well. He tended to stereotypes and would conspire up an ethnic image of everyone. When once he wrote to Matthew Harris of Doubleday Publishers, upon his own insistence, a letter advancing a book scheme of Deg, he said, "You know, of course, who Professor Alfred de Grazia is. He is fierce fighter for causes he thinks just; thus he fought for my cause but occasionally we disagree. I would think that born in a different place and time he would have become a Sicilian captain roaming the seas; then Medicean Florence put an aura around him even before he first visited the country of his ancestors..."(Dec. 28, 1968). Perhaps so, but Deg's great dream as a boy of the prairies was "riding off into the Golden West."

Stecchini was Italian by birth and upbringing, but that was not all of it. He had studied in Germany for one of his several degrees and picked up another at Harvard. "Did you know that Stecchini was of a Jewish father?" Deg asked V. one time, to observe his reaction. "No." "His father was a prominent Italian anti-Fascist named Levi who had finally to flee the country. And his mother was a countess." V. was surprised, and Deg was surprised at his surprise,

for V. had now known Stecchini for some years, and they had been together scores of hours.

V. was certainly able to work well with gentiles. With Freud, who was an assimilationist, there had been concerns and crises over the role of gentiles in psychoanalytic circles; nothing could be observed of a tension of conflict along such lines in V. 's circle, no more than there had ever been in Deg 's circles. Time after time, Deg was asked about V. 's religious beliefs by members of an audience, but remarkably, there was no hint of antisemitism in the question, nor did he ever perceive any among V. 's many acquaintances.

Deg surmised that Christoph Marx was a Jew for various reasons (despite his Christian name, which was not heard in the Velikovsky household or correspondence) for V. had a tendency, in matters familial and financial, to draw into Jewishness. Deliberately one day, when Elisheva was remonstrating against Marx, Deg said he supposed that Immanuel thought he might have confidence in a Jewish representative when dealing with Germans. She was astonished -- Marx Jewish? -- not at all. Nor did Immanuel ever think so. Deg convinced her he was so, or perhaps of Jewish and Christian parentage, and she said, "That must be it. They are the worst." And then she telephoned Deg who had been laughing at her to say of course she didn 't mean that, meaning of course that she recalled that Deg 's children were all of mixed Jewish-Christian parentage. As it turned out, when Deg told him the story, Marx confirmed that he was not Jewish.

When after V. 's death, Warner Sizemore ("to get money for the cause") ventured into Amway consumer-business circles and into the formation of a "far-out" protestant church, he told Deg how surprised he was at the manifestations of anti-semitism among folk in such circles. That 's to be expected, Deg advised, for the world of the aspiring small businessmen and millennialists, with its rural, radical protestant, and poorer base, held large contingents of anti-semites in America and Europe. Yet, also, this same base provided, at least among its more educated elements, many enthusiastic readers of *Worlds in Collision* and *Ages in Chaos*. Since the first Puritans, America has attracted the "true Israelites," the Christian who had been persecuted by the Jews and Romans.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### FROM VENUS WITH LOVE

When Deg was proofreading *Chaos and Creation* in 1981, he recalled a half-century earlier overhearing Bob, his Scoutmaster, confide to a deacon of St. Chrysostom's Episcopal Church in Chicago, "Sex rears its ugly head everywhere." The recollection was triggered because among innumerable problems foreseen and unforeseen there occurred in remote India the castration of Geb. As illustrated in the book (p. 125) Nut the Egyptian Sky Goddess reaches down to embrace pronouncedly ithyphallic Geb the Earth God. But the printer's proof of the illustration that was sent back by Popular Prakishan Pvt. Ltd. reached Deg *sans phallus*. I quote now Deg's admirably restrained letter of January 29, 1981, p.2, point 3:

I note that the phallus of the god of earth on figure 15a has been removed. This drawing is a famous archaeological figure and should not be tampered with. Was the excision made for fear of censorship or customs and prolonged controversy? I had no idea that there would be a problem. I don't want to delay the books by even a day. But it takes two sexes to mate, even Sky and Earth in mythology, so a semblance of masculinity has to be restored. I will be criticized as an unreliable author by many people as matters stand (unless directly beneath the caption 15a on page 125 there is printed in parentheses -- "Earth's exaggerated phallus has been removed-reduced?-by the printer to conform to Indian government censorship regulations").

Back comes the reply of Mr. M.G. Shirali, Production Manager, dated February 2, p. 1:

Re: 'the mystery of the missing phallus'-figure 15a, page 125-let me explain. You will recall this drawing was traced out by our artist from the original Xeroxed sheet you had sent,

which you will remember, contained a lot of other things such as minute specks. This being possibly photographed from a stone mural or some such thing. So while tracing out just bare out lines, as you desired, this somehow just got lost in the maze of specks. Believe me, never for a moment did we think of tampering with, nor was the excision made in deference to the customs, nor for fear of censorship. Pure and simple it was an unintentional slip. Please accept my sincere apology for the lapse on our side and also my thanks to you for pointing it out. And now it has been 'arranged to be restored to the rightful place' !!!, as you will see when the final proofs come to you.

The new proof returns. The phallus was restored-by half. Persisting, and because he fears that the original has been mutilated beyond use, Deg writes on March 28, 1981:

"Enclosed is a copy of the famous Nut and Geb picture. It occurs to me that, without any redrawing, a cut should be made of this as it is leaving the shading, *which is from the original papyrus*, and thus the picture will not appear so prominent. I think this would indeed be an improvement. It is, after all, only a detail in an immense work. *To repeat, photograph the new drawing exactly as it is here, and thus keep the shading in the final cut.*"

Indeed sex does pop out of all corners in the material of human history and is especially illuminating in regard to catastrophic events. It remarkable how V. managed to suppress sexuality from becoming a major theme of this circles. It would have been easy to follow a path similar to the one of Wilhelm Reich who found in a kind of electromagnetic life force, expressible in sexuality, the beginning of an answer to all things, including a kind of communism for which he was evicted from the communist party in Germany.

Elsewhere, in *The Burning of Troy* and in related pages of the *SISR*, a story is told of how V., following Cicero, claimed the root of Venus to be the word venire, meaning 'to come', and therefore the planet must be newly arrived, but Lowery, analyzing the words, finds them unrelated, nor is this the first time Lowery and the tribe of linguists dashed cold water against the heated claims of catastrophists.

Christoph Marx and Deg independently found a subtle connection that Lowery missed and I take leave to quote from a paper circulated by Marx dated May 8, 1982:

Easy to see now how Venus from 'venire' is quite equal to Venus standing for 'love' because to love -- if successful -- is the same as to come (as anybody past adolescence may experience). The dream-like efficiency of the term 'ven' may easily be judged by those with the faculty of imagination and an analytical turn of mind. To make visible the tradition of violence embedded in the term I would only add the example of a French porno movie, in which 'to come' produces "The End of the World" (the film title). It shows, of course, the love-making while the atomic rockets are on their way, but only in the end we see how they were released in the first place. Merrily, the president of the United States and the General Secretary in the Kremlin over the Hot Line are exchanging their experiences while being serviced by their beautiful private secretaries: the President of God's Own Country comes, and in his ecstasy hits the red button, leaving mankind with a movie's length of final lovemaking = coming.

Etymology must begin with the study of Arno Schmidt and James Joyce who purposefully used and analyzed etym addressing. Etymology is not at all the successful tool Lowery makes it out to be when, e.g., he points to the reconstruction of the ancient Egyptian language: the decipherment of the hieroglyphs was not an achievement of etymology, and whoever has read a translation, say, of a literary text such as the Book of the Dead can not but agree that there is hardly anything more senseless in the way of expensive books -- understandable perhaps to the translator's analyst, but certainly not the ancient author. Etymology for the present is not more than a systematized part of established science, the mechanism for the continued repression of the past.

Electricity has in folklore been connected with sexuality, just as has the coinage and usage of words. Jerry Ziegler, a physicist, in the 1970's circulated his work on ancient knowledge of electrostatics and a copy come to Deg who got in touch with Ziegler and recommended his study to V. who ignored it, but Deg began to develop it in a number of ways. This was not uncommon; V.'s closest associates moved in their own way; Sizemore was aware of

a world of marginal sciences that he would not discuss with V.; so Stephanos, as will be seen; so Juergens who moved toward it, because of V., first to be near him, then to be away from him; so Bill Mullen; and the British heretics, so devoted yet so independent of thought.

Ziegler found many associations of ancient religion with electrical practices, and persuasively in his *YHWH* informs us of what interested so persistently and for so long the ancient sects in their mountaintop ceremonies. To be near to the gods, yes, but to be near the sources of enhanced electrical stimulation, too. The people, led by priests, went up the mountains for ecstatic purposes where religious rites and sexual experience were joined. Electrical discharge was supposed to enhance the sexual libido.

Significantly, when in modern times there began many experiments with electricity, following the invention of the Leyden Jar, the scientist Sigaud tried to pass an electric shock through a company of grounded men, a trick that others had achieved, and when the attempt failed, he suspected that one of the company was "less than a man," a eunuch or *castrato*, that is; but then, as Heilbron's history tells the story, it developed that these, too, jumped where discharge was passed, and were electrically conductive.

But Zvi Rix, of all the cosmic heretics, went farthest into the exploration of correlations among ancient religious practices, sexuality, and commentary disasters. Marx took over his manuscripts from his widow, but the task of disentangling them and reformulating them into fairly conventional prose proved to be arduous.

When he was a boy, Deg believed that sex was a simple function: a male found a female, like an arrow shot from a bow pierces the bulls-eye of a target. For the several years that he was confined to autoeroticism, his fantasies and exercises, occurring privately, aimed at real female acquaintances and attractive female images in equal proportions. By increments of experience and learning, before he was forty, he could publish the article of a friend in *Psychology* at the University of Minnesota, arguing that sample surveys might be improved if they solicited information that would place the

respondent on scales of masculinity-femininity, allowing sex to be a finer variable, capable of more meaningful correlations with other behavioral variables like "political candidate preferences."

By the time he was sixty, though still an active heterosexual, the image of the arrow and the bulls-eye had resolved into the image of a fragmentation bomb, striking promiscuously and erratically in all directions. *Homo Schizo*, it seemed, from his beginnings and forever after, had lost, sexually as with all drives, close instinctual guidance and gained an uncontrollable but vast world. The modern theory is that if you don't find indications of homosexuality in a man and lesbianism in a woman, you have an unusual person who is rigid and lacking in affect.

Roger Peyrefitte, a French writer, ex-diplomat and professed homosexual, discussed and wrote about what he regarded as the homosexuality of Jesus and his apostles. He was challenged to a duel by a fiery Spanish psychiatrist, but refused the test. The same understandably underground theory was shared by V., but Deg was unimpressed, not needing V.'s innuendoes, meaningful glance and obvious reluctance to say so, but still V. had to let the cat out of the bag, like "you know, there is much to be said in this regard about Jesus." But Deg had no doubt that the tradition went back to the nasty circumstances surrounding the trial of Jesus. I'm sure they called him everything, he said, not disagreeing but not caring at the time to plumb V.'s data base on the question. There was little Deg could not find a place for in his mind, ranging from Jean Genet to Don Juan, and all the ambiguous feelings, attitudes and practices in between.

The closest V. comes to offering a theory of sexuality occurs in *Mankind in Amnesia*. There he asserts that neurosis is based upon narcissism, ultimately, the autistic libido that has to be located and treated first of all (p. 162). This done, the therapist must move to the treatment of homosexual problems and then into alleviation of the Oedipus complex. The theory is rather directly one of Freud's many, and V. generally arrived at these several stages quickly with his psychiatric patients. Fifteen minutes is often enough, he said to Deg, to understand what is going on with a patient. Repeated visits and phonecalls were to be expected, of course.

V. was remarkably prudish. Over the years, he gave Deg the impression which actually was obvious at first but scarcely believable in a psychiatrist, that he operated on the idea that "men are men" and "women are women," a simplistic notion. He seemed not to notice that several of his most brilliant and active supporters might have been homosexuals of one kind or another. Fight off the homosexual urge, he seemed to be saying, and stamp out the narcissism that stands beneath it. Laius, father of Oedipus, had introduced, according to legend, the practice of "unnatural love" (V.'s term) in Ancient Greece (which, insists V., is at the origin of the terrible curse upon his house).

Onetime in America and once in England, Deg was asked with a certain wonder about homosexuals in the movement. Their participation was not surprising, he answered; no movement is a rational and random selection from the population, no more than the establishment it stems from; homosexuals are more active in innovative and intellectual movements; all that we know of the sources of creativity and cultural change would be contradicted if they were not. New movements, whether scientific, cultural, political, religious, or social do not come from the average norms and normals of a culture.

Deg ought to have explained fully, right out of his reading of *Oedipus and Akhnaton*, which so impressed him. There, on pages 48 to 50, is told the story of Amenhotep III, father of Akhnaton, and of the Roman Emperor Hadrian, and of the Greek's and Oriental's indulgence of homosexuality, and the Hebrews' condemnation of it. In a delicate lacework of widesweeping history V. manages the following pejoratives regarding homosexuality: "Greek love," "invert," "iniquity," "spoiled by," "contemptible," "work their will (on Lot's guests)," "horrible retribution" (Laius' descendant at Thebes): throughout the passage, luxury, splendor, power, idleness, extravagance, high culture and civic freedom are dwelt upon as the ambiance of homosexual inversion. No wonder, thinks the innocent reader, that Akhnaton was so queer. But Akhnaton is not the issue here. Three features emerge from the passage: V. absolutely rejects homosexuality; homosexuality is portrayed as an exotic and attractive luxury of high cultures; V.

does not, here or elsewhere, appear outwardly punitive to homosexuality.

Deg could name a half-dozen of his acquaintances, all of V.'s circle and on at least three sides of any argument that came up -- not a clique, that is -- who were homosexuals, but he never thought of what might be the seductiveness of V. both at close hand and at a distance. For my part, being more distant from the scene, I would guess that V. subtly presented the image which homosexuals in those years (not the present liberationist gays) could best accommodate to: a stern attitude exuding a luxuriant bath of guilt and a seeming tolerance, delicacy and understanding precluding any but the most "delicious" punishment, which was necessary for the enjoyment of their homosexual feelings. (Nor to be fully aware, have we of Western culture quite learned to enjoy heterosexuality without guilt and fear of punishment.)

V. liked Nina, Deg's second wife, who was at the Swiss college on and off. Deg recalls an especially vivid image of the two of them silhouetted in the sunshine and snow against the Alps on the road to Haute-Nendez, talking volubly in Russian. Long after, Deg was reporting to him that Nina had gone to Berlin to marry Peter Bockelmann -- a fine musicologist said Deg, and a fine man. Whereupon V. began to speak of Tolstoi's "Kreutzer Sonata," a story in which a husband, according to V., enjoys sexuality homosexually by turning his wife over to another man. Deg was amused at this. He had been happy that she had found so good a friend after their separation. What were V.'s motives for the story -- his liking for Nina, his dislike of Germans, his need to carry a dubious theory into every human relation, a jealousy of Deg's philandering, a homosexual impulse of his own? That is to say, when it came to conjecturing and examining motives, Deg was unwilling to let others escape. Or perhaps V. just had not gotten the story straight; the couple separated, but they were still friends: it was a plot not to be found in V.'s manual.

One of the sillier passages in V.'s *Mankind in Amnesia* propounds the idea that nations have a masculine or feminine character, Germany and France being among his examples (pp. 140-2). This kind of social psychology is not only unproductive, but also false

(like Mussolini once in anger calling the Germans a "nation of barbarians and pederasts") and only made Deg more irritated at V.'s pretentiously published book.

For the infant college in the Alps, Deg had invented a concept which he called, "rapport psychology" that was intended to be a form of group encounter usable for the "Kalotic" world order. He wrote in the *Bulletin* of the School:

The basic rapport group usually consists of eight to fourteen members and the leader or facilitator. The group uses verbal and non-verbal exercises and encounters, and typically has no set agenda. It uses the feelings and interactions of group members as the focus of attention. This allows for maximum of freedom for personal expression, the getting in touch with feelings, and interpersonal communication. Emphasis is on open, honest and direct interactions among members in an atmosphere that supports the dropping of defenses and social masks characteristic of normal academic relationships. Rapport group members come to know themselves and each other more quickly, deeply, and fully than is possible in the usual academic situations; ordinarily, a strong feeling of group solidarity develops. The resulting climate of openness, risk-taking, honesty, and trust displaces feelings of defensiveness, rigidity, and mistrust. Members can identify and alter self-defeating attitudes and behavior patterns, and explore and adopt more innovative and constructive ones. In the end, most members can experience daily life and work more pleasurably than before, on campus and off.

Deg was trying to connect the personal to the universal without the usual intervening madness. Amidst the continual hubbub of hand-to-hand struggle at the new school, he could not operationalize the theory of the Rapport Center. He left it to the attention of his brother Edward and B.J., a group leader whom Ed had recruited from his experience at the famed center for group therapy at Esalen, and to the students, aged 18 to 28. At one moment in a group session, on the way to the brave new world, two men decided that they would make love to each other and went off, after which one, a virgin in such matters, "tossed his cookies" in a rush of shame and disgust.

The word got to Deg and to V. as well, who accosted Deg on an

alpine pathway and denounced such conduct nor, said he, will I stay on these mountains with this going on. Deg solemnly and reassuringly listened, and told Ed "What the hell happened there anyhow?" He didn't expect much of an answer, nor got one. The Rapport Center remained popular and undirected to the new world order, whence I remind my readers of two axioms: few truly wish and are psychically prepared to address themselves to the necessary new world, and "bringing life into the classroom" is a beloved pedagogical expression with absurd possibilities.

V. stuck it out on the mountains -- actually he enjoyed his stay - but he could not help but slip a reminder of the incident, camouflaged, into his notes and ultimately into *Mankind in Amnesia*, where, in a diatribe against both the old and the new, he says(p. 185):

The rebellion of the young was full of hope -- the millennium was about to begin. The hair was grown long. John the Baptist was imitated in appearance, but the rebellion was against asceticism as well as against materialism; regulations were to be violated, young and not-so-young flocked to 'rapport-psychology' which struck out Freud and the rest of the 'schools'; orgies were practiced as curriculum in some campus classrooms as the call came for tearing down all inhibitions.

But V. did not pursue sexual investigations of Jung or Marx, contenting himself with stressing the obvious resentment of Jung at being regarded as a son. Bronson Feldman, a Velikovsky acquaintance and supporter, introduced sexual analysis to back up V.'s claims, but we must remember how chary was V. to let anyone claim to represent his several views, with every excellent reason. Feldman, who became understandably mad and confused when dealing with Central European anti-semitism, added little to historical reconstruction.

He did point out, for instance, that V. had misstated a famous report of Freud's swooning in the presence of Jung and others. V. forgot to mention that not only had Jung been defending the efforts of Akhnaton to erase his father's memory but had just been hotly accused by Freud of the great academic crime of non-citation of authority -- namely himself, Freud -- in his writings. Thus Freud had

taken two blows from his disciple and son, Jung, and probably a third unmentioned blow, a Christian effort (at least a suspicion thereof) to bury a Jew's contribution to knowledge; of this suspicion we have ample evidence, and of the fact, too, whether in Jung or in Nazism, that the contributions of Heine, Mendelssohn, Einstein and many another Jew to German high culture were buried. And, incidentally, Deg spoke in *Politics for Better or Worse* of the recent era in America, "of those highly skilled and creative people who had built the arts and sciences, half of them Jews," for he was irritated that in whatsoever history book or sociological work on America no such statement, even the approximation of such a statement, is to be found. But Jews are divided in their minds and amongst themselves whether to lay claim to their achievements or to play them down to avoid envy and resentment.

The sexual verges upon the political, and the political, I must now make the point, verges upon the sexual. I mentioned that V. was a prude -- or was he canny, realizing that scientists and scholars are sexually repressed and in our civilization will not respect an authority who ties in the sexual link too closely with the processes of the intellect? I would say V. was publicly rather priggish, and privately more so. He did not like at all Stechini's introducing Peter Tompkins to his circle, nor did Peter visit more than once, although a war hero, a man of some fame then (and more to come), of great personal attractiveness, and a potentially influential supporter: why? Because Tompkins had written on cults and practices of eunuchs and virgins and saw in the history of the planet Venus, which he credited to V., the mad unfolding of the human mind into sexualized institutions.

With perhaps more reason, V was exceedingly wary of a "hippy bookman" in Manhattan, Theodore Lazar, adorative of V.'s books, who wrote a pamphlet about Venusian-derived phallicism, the commentary image as it entered so many ways into the brain and behavior of mankind. V. was wrought up at Robert Stephanos, a Philadelphia school system psychologist, the most faithful, pleasant and helpful of disciples, for pushing favorably the work of the New Yorker. And, later on, he was angry to hear that Stephanos had been flirtatiously corresponding with a Southern devotee and, not long afterwards, in a paranoiac mood, came to suspect that

Stephanos might even be purloining papers of his. You must remove him from the Board of Trustees of the Foundation for Studies of Modern Science, he told Deg, the President, and others.

"Politics makes strange bedfellows," but so does science when it strikes out in new directions. Whoever wants to sleep with the partner of his choice or to sleep alone must give up creative dreams. V. sought hard to deny his bedfellows, but they were with him from the moment his book struck a popular chord, attracting many who were looking for bedfellows. Not so strange, he or his fellows, I hasten to stress. Just variegated.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### HOMO SCHIZO MEETS GOD

Great mysteries of existence such as human nature, divinity, time and governance are intimidating. The ordinary person is content with a few slogans about them, a kind of catechism, and to be allowed to make off with a piece of one of them -- so small as to be indistinguishable, therefore safe to play with for life. There are also those few persons who, emboldened by a successful encounter with a great mystery, become drunk with the genre and go on a rampage, knocking over distinctions and laying claim to new territory extravagantly. You can tell the type, if by no other sign, then by the way they have of looking upon the universe as a cabbage patch and treating great historical figures as their neighbors.

One could see it long ago in Deg, who after taking the worst and the best of the army for four years, came back finally and managed a Chicago election where, introducing his distinguished professor Charles E. Merriam to a mass meeting (luckily the Fifth ward had the greatest concentration of intellectuals in the world) he said enthusiastically that he had studied with Merriam 'like Aristotle at the feet of Plato' and then was ribbed by friends and poignantly embarrassed, so that as you see, even now he can remember to tell me about it.

Therefore it is no surprise that thirty five years later he can be treating Charles Darwin and everyone else familiarly, even arrogantly, "What is your opinion of Darwin?" was, of course, the question. The tape spun; Deg picked up his notes and spoke at the machine:

Charles Darwin was an apt hero for nineteenth century biology and the public and scientific mentalities of the nineteenth century. He came from an expanding empire, did his "field work" young; he lived for many years quietly, gestating his

ideas; he published at the right moment for coalescing the views of the scientific and cultural world; his theory of natural selection was simple, vague, and in line with what the secular person thought was his own idea.

Now that his ideas are wearing out, the psychiatrists, methodologists, and philosophers have picked him to pieces. He was an uncertain person, never a fully convinced Darwinist. In the contemporary vein, R.C. Lewontin writes that "Darwin's work is filled with ambiguities, contradictions, and theoretical revisions." Velikovsky once pointed out that if Darwin had followed some of his own observations while on the voyage of the Beagle he would have become a catastrophist. He almost became a Lamarckian at one point, so fetching is it when one's own theory is indefinite, to imagine that the soma can be changed permanently by a forceful environment.

"Darwin was ambitious, courted success and successful men, and cared for their approval:" again these are Lewontin's words. So too was Velikovsky. In 1858, just before Darwin published the *Origin of Species by Natural Selection*, he wrote that he did not yet feel set on the truth of any point of his theory, and was in this state of mind when Alfred Wallace wrote from far away to tell him about his own theory of natural selection.

When he consulted his friends, their solution was to hustle him into publishing his manuscripts along with the essay of Wallace. What else could they do? Otherwise, Wallace would have priority. As Darwin said, "All my originality, whatever it may amount to, will be smashed ... It seems hard on me that I should be thus compelled to lose my priority of many years standing."

But let us be clear...

Ignoring the machine, Deg produced a statement out of his drawer of epigrams; "I used to hate epigrams," he said, but now I collect a few, "especially my own." He read: "Priority in science is a political claim. It is of no interest to scientific advancement that A or B captured a strong point first, so long as it was taken. A proposition is denuded of its generator. It ends life as it began, in anonymity."

He spoke feelingly, because a continual annoyance of a generation of the Velikovsky affair was the bickering about claims and predictions.

The lead was unfortunately provided by Princeton physicist Valentine Bargmann and Columbia astronomer Lloyd Motz when they assigned V. a priority on the heat of Venus and the radio noises of Jupiter (upon his instigation) and recommended reading his work for further clues as to what to expect. Such words from an astronomer and a physicist were naughty; they excited V. and his followers and angered other scientists, all the more because they were involved themselves in this racket.

The ideas of 'priority', 'prediction,' and 'claim' are more political than scientific. The word 'claim' connotes possessiveness -- not a happy human quality. V. liked the term; the press liked it; ambitious scientists like it. and long years of struggle have gone on in such fields as physics and psychology to try to assure people's claims to discovery, as if all of knowledge is of little bits, ever-diminishing bits as well, that are owned by an individual forever.

Darwin need not have worried; his location, his friends, and the ample, ambiguous, diffident qualities of his writing, pitched at the consensus of all-who-mattered, the 'happy few' of the day, would assure his work 'priority.'

Velikovsky's work found no such consensus. Perhaps it deserved no such consensus. Perhaps it earned at that point precisely what it deserved, and what Darwin's work deserved -- an audience, a hearing, a turning of minds, a refurbishing of hypotheses, some of the patient, indulgent, reflective, detailed processing that is supposed to characterize science but does not markedly do so.

Deg's un-darwinian *Homo Schizo* was present for many years and began with the conviction that man was essentially non-rational. When Deg first joined the faculty of Stanford University in 1952, he was working on the phrasing of Lasswell's law: political man displaces private motives onto public objects and rationalizes them in terms of the public advantage. This conception had burst upon political science in the 1930's, joined with pragmatism and neo-

machiavellism, and overran the 2300-year-old positions of rational-legal-institutional political science.

Deg radicalized the concept. He could not see anything extraordinary about Lasswell's political man except in the intensity of his involvement with power. Too, he was critical of the notion of rationalization, for since boyhood he had found everybody doing nothing but rationalization. Therefore he suspected that reason and rationalism and rationality were really processes of rationalization. When he came in the seventies to ponder the nature of man, he could now perceive a brain structure and personality altogether of the schizoid type. His newer concept was of instinct-delay, blocking, and displacement of the response to a stimulus, forcing terrible self-reflection, and in the control of response to stimulus, forcing terrible self-reflection, and in the control of these reflections -- the polyego -- there occurred the human character. The essential polyego assured an eternal existential fear, whose high level, being constant, goes generally unnoticed.

Homo sapiens, whom he finally termed homo sapiens schizotypus, is most rational when he is acting (thinking being a form of acting) pragmatically, that is, calculating and adjusting to the consequences of his behavior while transacting with an environment, both human and natural. Logic, and hence science, and hence most of what is ordinarily called reason, develops as a means of most efficiently connecting an entering stimulus with an effective response. In this sense, man seemingly farthest removed from the animal kingdom, finds his triumph in emulating instinctive response. He aims at reducing his high level of existential fear by logical, "rational", and scientific conduct.

But as the underlaid instinctual apparatus of the animal does not guarantee it against the multiform assaults of nature, whether represented intraspecies or in the transaction with other species and inorganic nature and whether uniformitarian or disastrous, so too man's efforts at reconstructing and reinforcing his less genetic, delayed instinctual apparatus, are continuously ineffective. All the achievements of the calculating and even scientific *Homo Schizo* cannot win control over the self, others, and the natural world.

As in the beginning and even in the most rationalistic technical ages, *Homo Schizo* continues to rely upon the organization of his far-flung displacements for adjustment and control of himself and the world, so that religion, culture, and the arts are, if not preponderantly his road to "happiness," most useful and welcome companions of pragmatic scientific conduct. Alone or together, the sciences and the arts cannot create a creature other than *Homo Schizo*. Even if they could, the monsters would be limited to some portion of their own envisioned ideal that they could agree upon, and they would promptly regret having made such a substitute for the unrealized larger portion of their ideal.

I should not try to explain the full theory here, not when two volumes about it are available elsewhere. However, it is appropriate to comment that Deg began his development of the model of *Homo Schizo* to test the Freud-V. theory that historical traumas produced a character who simply had memory problems but was otherwise "rational" by nature. As I said, Deg was already prejudiced against this idea, and it was no accident that he almost immediately placed the idea of the intelligent evolving savage into a restricted enclosure. He searched instead for the larger meaning of catastrophe, now quantavolution, that formed a different creature to begin with. Primordial man was now catastrophized in two senses, first genetically and second in the sense of reinforcement through repeated catastrophic experiences.

The latter, the reinforcement process, gave Deg no trouble; there was ample evidence of a "law" operating whereby the intensity and duration of an experience (read "catastrophe") determined and varied directly with the amnesia and compulsive sublimated recapitulations of the experience. Further, therapy of such a condition (control over it, that is) was exceedingly difficult, whether of the individual or of the collectivity.

More difficult was the establishment of the genetic basis of human nature. Here Deg found his way, first by undermining the case for gradualist darwinian and anthropological evolution, and second by discovering uniquely human variances in current research on the structure and operation of the central nervous system. He came to attribute humanness to a brief glitch in the stimulus-response

system, which I mentioned above. How he visualized it becomes crudely clear in a note from his files, entitled "Making a Chimp Talk: a Suggested Research Project on a key element of *Homo Schizo*."

### *MAKING A CHIMP TALK*

#### *Premises*

1. Homo Schizo theory says that mankind became human and is human today in connection with a millisecond delay interfering with instinctive response.

2. The delay a) diffuses (displaces) percepts, concepts, and memories widely because of lack of immediate response, b) forces the being to sense itself, that is, at least two selves, c) activates existential fear mechanisms because of lack of control of a) and terror from lack of control of b).

3. To tie itself (itself) together, the being communicates with itself and the result of this communication is inner language, the basis for external language.

4. External or social language occurs as the being continues its inner operations by external means, employing whatever it can, such as gestures, utterances, and other signs and signals.

5. All of 1. to 4. above occurs with little relation to the size of the brain, with some relation to hemispheric symmetry, and with relation to other possible delaying mechanisms. A person can be raised to behave normally in speech and behavior with 1/10 of the brain matter normally encased in the cranium provided that all elements of the brain are represented by proportional fractions.

6. A chimpanzee brain is within the human functional limits so far as size is concerned. Its vocal apparatus and

other symbolizing mechanism are adequate. It is highly sociable animal, so "presumably would like to communicate." Chimpanzees and other non-humans can learn many isolated symbols... "but they show no unequivocal evidence of mastering the conversational, semantic, or syntactic organization of language." (H.S. Terrace *et al.* 206 *Science* 23 Nov. 1979,891).

*Thesis:* Chimpanzees do not speak because they do not undergo an internal electro-mechanical compulsion to speak.

*Corollary:* Chimpanzees would speak if their instinctive brain operations were continuously and unconsciously blocked for milliseconds. [thus supplying the compulsion]

### *Experiment*

Baby chimpanzee Abel is subjected to partial commissurectomy; insulin injections to arrive at constant 10% higher blood level; and background human videotape television plus human handling as of normal babies of up to 26 months of age.

*Hypothesis :* Abel will at the age of 26 months emit 50% (rather than 20%) of the expansive adjacent utterances of human infants of the same age (and proportionately more than chimpanzee 'Nein' of that age -- in the Terrace *et al.* experiment).

*Corollary hypothesis:* Availability of the conditioned animal will permit application of a full range of tests of humanism, including intelligence, self-awareness, self-images, artistry, aggressiveness, persistency (obsession) in task performances, memory and recall, with special attention to the generation of the several components of schizotypality, including various tests of insanity.

Here I think that Deg is downright ignorant regarding the possibilities of Dr. Frankenstein 's experimentation with apes. The ape is a massive system of unique organic connections and resultant

behaviors: unless you get into the gene system and perform a systemic mutation there, you will get nowhere by monkeying (excuse the expression) with the post-natal resultant. He proposes to cause artificially a totally ramifying system of displacements, fear, and ego split when all the settings of the ape 's organism are deadset against alteration. The animal will simply die. That is a much more logical and simple response than to undertake the enormous burden of behaving like a human.

Deg 's archive carries many another note of different kinds -- sketches, designs, critiques. They begin as a broadly spread- out and miscellaneous aggregate, and then come together as the book is written, but many of them are locked out in the end. Here are three of the excluded ones, let to view:

*Deg 's Journal, December 20, 1968*

In pregnancy, especially during the last three months, when the placenta is largest, the placenta manufactures a large amount of blood ceruloplasmin.

1. Ceruloplasmin alleviates many cases of schizophrenia
2. Women with schizophrenia are alleviated towards end of pregnancy
3. Relapses and initiation into schizophrenia may occur following pregnancy, i.e. post-natal schizophrenia is common.
4. Schizophrenia is 'split personality' disease traditionally, although Hoffer and Osmond deny this definition, saying there are not two persons, despite hallucinations and feelings of persecution. They are in a major sense right.
5. The correspondence of high C production with the period at which a woman faces the traumatic need to split her baby from herself makes me think that the body protects itself (or the 'mind') from the effects of this traumatic experience by exuding into the blood a specific defense against schizophrenia.

About this time there occur also various petulant scribbles on his readings viz.:

Glancing through *The Scientific American's* handsome volume on *Human Variations and Origins*, I see many errors behind the skillful graphics. There is Eiseley's idiotic article on Lyell, for example. The 'distinguished' academician knows much about his man's surface and nothing about his dynamics, nor does he understand the real conflict between uniformitarian and catastrophic evolution. Eiseley's reputation comes from a deadhead riding the commonplace, uttering mystic words.

Later in the book I see all manner of speculations treated as facts, simply because they come from scientists. Man's spotty history is given a coherence by rhetoric, not data or even good theory.

I see a picture. I read a caption. It shows an extremely tall negro and a short, chunky Eskimo. The first's height is supposed to be an adaptation to heat, more surface per pound; the latter's chunkiness is supposed to conserve heat. But whence the Swede? Whence the many fleshy Africa Negroes? The Ibos, Pygmies, etc. Doesn't moisture and dryness of the air matter, etc.? I have seen pictures of chunky short Indians of the Amazon and Orinoco tropical jungles.

The theory of evolution is full of hopeful guesses. I am working with a sample survey of attitudes and experiences of the U.S. population right now. I am, as always, acutely impressed by how the first relating of variables can mean nothing and always means nothing unless one is satisfied that all the other factors are interpreted and counted. Women have the same accident incidence as men: fine, but that's the end; afterwards all manner of crosscutting forces changes the character of their accidents and incidence when compared in sub-groups.

The defensive scientist retorts irritably: 'But this is only *popular* science! We don't make such errors in our *real* inside work. Nonsense. Every specialist is carried along on these so-called popular currents, not to mention that he likes to call 'popular' anything that he doesn't find agreeable or true. There is the beautiful image Merton and other students of science, who are admirers of the image, employ: 'We are but pygmies, standing on the shoulders of giants.' We should also say, 'We are giants standing on the shoulders of pygmies,' Or better, 'We are monkeys, swinging carelessly along a dizzying network of vines mysteriously placed and oriented.'

Sometime in 1970, Deg met biologist Dr. Karl Schildkraut of the Albert Einstein Medical School through Dr. Annette Tobia. He was interested in Deg 's University scheme and they talked a couple of times about heredity. Perhaps these contacts brought about a note foreshadowing some of his passages on evolution:

...Unless one resorts to an immense number of mutations (practically begging the question whether uniformitarian or catastrophic), it impossible to conceive of the complex intra-organism adjustments (changes) that must accompany an organic innovation, that is,  $2n$  where  $n$  = affected parts: if brain convolutes by mutation, then how many elements of the body must adapt immediately ?

If all chromosomes and genes are linked, then there must be a chemical 'universal element,' bringing about a total viable system change.

Note, too, the received evolutionary doctrine offers in evidence the numerous similarities of all living cells. The same fact of universal similarity is applicable to the doctrine of simultaneous systemic mutation, both regressive and progressive.

Deg sent an early version of the theory of *Homo Schizo* to Lawrence Zelic Freedman of the Institute of Social and Behavioral Pathology at the University of Chicago at the suggestion of Harold Lasswell. Freedman raised two issues with the theory, issues that Deg addressed in the final work: Could man have been catastrophized other than by natural disaster and could a catastrophe strike into the hominids en masse. Freedman wrote:

...The notion of contemporary man as a schizotypicalis is one which I find easy to accept, and your adumbration of the contemporary social and psychological dilemmas of knowing -- if not understanding -- man, magnificently expressed... the elemental catastrophe of separation and confrontation with hostile elements during the process of birth might be the individual equivalent of the massive conformation with overwhelming stress which the model catastrophe hypothesis demands.

Deg considered that human birth is not much more traumatic than

anthropoid birth, hence, if it has a greater psychic effect, that is because of a prior genetic constitution which has to be explained. Freedman raised a second major issue: "the high probability that significant elements in the general population would escape the pathogenic influences of the hypothesized catastrophe."

Deg worked out of his dilemma by devising a primordial scenario in which a radiation turbulence, causing millions of mutations, altered the physiology of a given hominid such that full schizophrenic behavior was promptly induced in its descendent and, by virtue of the powerful capabilities of the individual, within a thousand years produced a multitude of operative humans spread over a large territory. Alternatively, owing to a catastrophic turbulence, a changed atmospheric constant might have constituted in effect a genetic change by continuously, "ever after," conditioning a new hormonal state in a pre-potentiated hominid species, in which event, the humanization process would have been speedier. That both processes, genetic mutation and a changed critical gaseous constant, could operate sympathetically was also foreseen.

Deg sent the same early booklet to his friend at the University of Haifa in Israel. Professor Ernst Wreschner, who found the *Homo Schizo* theory especially vulnerable in regards to its catastrophic scenario and the short time allowed for humanization:

I accept that Pleistocene upheavals, cosmic tektonic -- a combination of fire and water -- must have been for generations of homo erectus, Acheulean man, Anteneanderthals, Neanderthals as well as for some Cromagnon, and whatever names archaeologists give to them, an experience of realities that were outside their powers of coping with mentally. It is feasible that by these very experiences mechanisms could have been developed which enabled men to survive more or less sane during times of the twilight of the gods. But I also believe that the very principle of natural selection could and did cope with the possible influences of catastrophes or cosmic radiation escalations. Either in the mutational sense or in the mentally adaptive or both. Which would mean in biological and cultural fields. (...)

The postulation that catastrophes were always global and had

overall consequences is untenable, as is the date expounded for a decisive point in human history such as 13,000 B.C. (...) The deep dualism in the human make up developed and existed in their "animal context" becoming mentally or psychologically pronounced when selfawareness could fathom them. But this happened in a process of culturisation and this forced men to deal with them, even without catastrophic catalysts. (...) And language is also not a sudden creation. Many factors worked towards it, biological (anatomical and cultural ones). Man is by nature an experimenter, based on the mammalian trait of curiosity. It was 400,000 years ago that he experimented with fire and limonite to get a result which was the red color mineral hematite. Many others after him, either independently or by diffusion, hit on the same. Many thousands of years passed between these experiments. And those with the developed brains put the red color to symbolic use, when other beliefs needed a carrier for associations connected with life and death. Thus with the first burials the red color in the form of ochre appears and afterwards red color symbolism in many forms spread and you find it ever since in variegated ideational meanings, in burial practices, myths, rituals, legends and ceremonials.

In reply, Deg seeks to explain their basically different ways of looking at human evolution:

*25 December 1977*

Dear Ernst:

Don 't look now, but it 's Christmas Day, It 's cold and rainy. Saturn has come down with his disastrous reindeer from the North pole. I am hiding out, for a couple of hours, nursing my cold, which is true, but also releasing my soul from the desperate festivities, which I shall rejoin soon enough, and my appetite for turkey will be sated. I shall try to behave with the appropriate jollity. I shall try not to be ironic, and not to make too many anti-materialistic or even learned remarks. I have become incapable of joy "on order" though I am quite eager for joy when I am in the mood. The holidays in our current world have become twistings and turnings of human relations in an attempt to find some traditional form that is quite alien to the form that they assume during the rest of the year. Ah, well, for the moment it looks as if we might have peace in the Near East this next year, owing to that remarkable Sadat who is

neither Jew nor Christian, and probably not even a member of the CIA.

Both *Kronos* and the *Review of the Society for Interdisciplinary Studies* (England) have asked me to publish my *Homo Sapiens Schizotypicalis* and I think it will be done. I am suggesting to them that they ask you to prepare a commentary from your letters and other thoughts, if your time permits, thinking that you will have half done the job already. Strangely, I think you have understood my theory very well but you have not understood the weaknesses of your own conventional flooring quite as well. If you will permit me to say so, I would assert that time after time you (and that means a flock of learned gentry of evolutionary persuasion) will employ sloganized concepts and terms to bridge whatever has to be crossed. Like the word "cope" as "the principle of natural selection could and did cope with the possible influences of catastrophes and cosmic radiation escalations." or employ the phrase "decisively influence" in place of "created" to deal with the change in mind. That is, you have no mechanism for the changes that occurred, but rather words that are accepted and unquestioned. And you say that symbolism is created by the adequate faculties of man -- then and now -- to explaining things rationally. But why does he have to explain? Why doesn't he just let the matter go by? None demands that he explain, except himself, and this he does because he must control himself, and thence the gods and others. That is, the reason for human reason is not reasonable, that is, functional in the sense you put it, but he is compelled to a certain kind of reason by his very being that has been changed, and the change is not reasonable but is simply the kind of change that produced the new kind of being.

I have been reading the book by Walter Fairservis, called *The Threshold of Civilization*, as I have thought about your letters, and I can see him to be unconsciously evading all of my major points. He systemically lays out the division of societies into hunting gathering, agricultural, and civilized (using useless terms), prettying up the old evolutionary sequence. But how much hard evidence exists that hunting came before agriculture? I think that they came together and that later on perhaps when a society became strikingly one or the other, secondary differences occurred. To me, it seems logical that the earliest *Homo Schizo* went on for a moment of time grabbing at all the bugs, carrion, and plants he would find, but discovering right away that by escalated sign behavior and organization he

could do immeasurably better than before. That is, the gestalt of the certain permitted breakthroughs culturally along the whole front of life. Think of what the Renaissance in Tuscany did with a few ideas; it penetrated every shore of culture and did it within a few years. This was the Renaissance Gestalt.

From time to time, too, you mention long temporal periods as elapsing between events and I can see that unless one frees himself mentally from the long-term evolutionary fame of mind, the aggregate of events that I say happened almost simultaneously cannot by definition have happened. So one must hypothesize the collapse of time, understand the dynamic that would then be possible, and thereafter go back and look at time to see whether it is conceivable that we are wrong in believing it to have been so stretched out. I realize that the odds seem impossibly great against a short-time measuring rod. All I can say at this stage is that I have spent some time with every method of measuring time that exists and in every case maybe found some Achilles Heel. To give one instance, it is possible to make a case for Olduvai events to have been contemporaneous with the destruction of the Cities of the Plain -- geophysically, anthropologically and in legend. Not a good case, to be sure, but there has never been a study with this hypothesis in mind. And what I have discovered is that the whole world of rocks, skies, nature, and culture can be twisted into a short-term frame, hypothetically, scientifically, to where a whole series of studies could without fantastic efforts give the "yea" or "nay" to the general theories at stake...

\*\*\*

Given so heretical an idea of man 's origins and nature, we cannot expect less heresy in Deg 's religious views.

I think that Deg 's troubles with religion and his carping at gods was because God is a Hero. Deg did not like heroes, saying "Heroes are foreseeable accidents that befall a following." Let us say that at the least he wanted a hero he should control, which is at least an ambivalence if not a contradiction. This in turn had something to do with his early childhood, when there was a benevolent, authoritative father and a brother older by a couple of years who was always excelling, frustrating, lending help diffidently. Harold Lasswell in an impromptu speech at a banquet

one time, when both brothers were present, referred to 'Al' as generated out of 'sibling rivalry.' I suppose that Deg had tried to manage Lasswell, that great god of many social scientists, over the years and did the same with Velikovsky. There were other gods as well, and probably he escaped being some great man's Boswell or Harry Hopkins because of his persisting ambivalence or simple bivalence; it is not an uncommon trait, especially among women, with whom Deg always felt at ease and in touch.

At one time he made the following note:

*It should be an offense for anyone to speak in the name of gods, or to say that gods speak to him, or to call upon gods to intervene in the world, or to treat anyone in the name of gods, or to assign to gods human traits.*

V. and Deg talked little about, and hardly searched for, religion and god. V. had no religion and had never intended to possess one. Deg had no religion, always intended to discover one, but seemed never fully to get down to the search; meanwhile he was forever peering into the crevices where people kept their sacred idols and their firm or faltering notions, and he acknowledged the value of religious discussions. V.'s indifference to religion annoyed him. "God is an open question" was Deg's saying, and he stuck it into lectures and books and conversation, meaning not only that God is in doubt but that God was in essence an Open Question.

In November 1972, he makes a note to himself: "Reconcile V.'s intense jealousy of God as a Jewish invention and V.'s expression to me of his belief in plural gods, and Yahweh as Saturn." [Actually V. thought Yahweh was Zeus, and Elohim was Saturn.] "I do reconcile them by saying that V. changed too. His original belief changed even though the momentum of his original routine drove him on. Compare him with the creationists, for example, Bass, Ransom, and others not known except through writings (e.g. Donald Patten) who became quite good and imaginative in scientific and humanistic work on a new secular plane." Here Deg is saying in effect that he was sympathetic to and enjoyed the creationists, whereas V. thought that they were wasting their time. Judaism was the tool of Zionism, so far as V. was concerned. It had

little other value but to claim additional authority for Isreal skywards as well as landwards. Martin Sieff, studying V. from a distance, came to the same conclusions, which he expounded at an SIS meeting:

Velikovsky's life's record clearly identifies him as a Jewish cultural nationalist, his youthful experience in the Moscow Free University, his great work in producing the *Scripta Universitatis* in Jerusalem and in Berlin, his pioneering in the settlement of Palestine in the 1920's all fit firmly into this pattern. It is likely that he was early influenced by the Russian Jewish Zionist writer Ahad Ha'am, who died in Tel Aviv in 1925, shortly after Velikovsky himself had moved to Palestine. It is important to note here that such a cultural nationalist identity stood very well clear of any religious commitment. Believers may search Velikovsky's published works in vain for any mention or acknowledgment of God. The most they will come up with is in the *Theophany* section of *Worlds in Collision*, a carefully oblique reference which may be taken different ways, to "the great architect of the universe" This is what makes the pseudo-scientific attacks on Velikovsky, by people who have not troubled to read his books, so ironic. Velikovsky himself is in no sense a fundamentalist. His tampering with the biblical texts as they stand and his antipathy to several of the major biblical heroes, as well as major stands of the Hebraic religion, testify to that. Did Velikovsky believe in god? In his very revealing 1967 interview with the *Yale Scientific Magazine*, one of the few occasions when Velikovsky really lets his hair down, he stayed very well clear of this issue, stating: "people are looking for something in my works, and they cannot find it." It is doubtful, I would speculate, that Velikovsky was an agnostic, and I very much doubt that he was an atheist. The sense of moral destiny, or right and wrong is too strong in his books for that. At the same time, however, just as Freud quailed before Moses, Velikovsky gives us the imagery of Ahab and Saul quaking before the prophets of God, and his sympathies are clearly with the sinner kings.... Velikovsky kept some orthodox Jewish practices rigorously, but insisted that he only did so for the sake of his wife. As they enjoyed 57 years of sympathetic accord in their marriage, this may seem somewhat spurious rationalization... as George Orwell wrote of Tolstoy, for both men, Freud and the later figure who was so influenced by him, their attitude towards God was rather that of two birds in a cage, suspicious of God as posing a rivalry to their own dominance.

Psychoanalysis was God, cast for Freud in the image of Oedipus, and the devil -- reflection of his own repressed frustrations. For Velikovsky, God was in the image of the planet god that brought purpose and terror, judgment and fire, to the peoples of the earth.

Deg recollected, when he read a copy of Sieff's speech, a remark that V. had made at Lethbridge. He found that it had been kept through several revisions that delayed its publication for several years. "The noises caused by the folding and twisting of strata. Noises of the screeching Earth described also by Hesiod -- the Israelites heard in them a voice giving ethical commands." There can be little doubt on the matter. In this work, which Milton happily entitled "Recollections of a Fallen Sky" (V. did not like the title, but Deg ran interference for Milton on its behalf), V. speaks from his view of all manifestations of divinity, that they are natural, material, and that they promote delusions.

His few passages on religion in the posthumously published *Stargazers and Gravediggers* are scarcely revealing. He lumps together religious and scientific dogmatists; melodramatically, he writes "were it possible to burn my books and their author publicly, then most probably the councils of the church and of the scientific collegium would have fought for the privilege of taking hold of me and would have dragged me, each out of the grasp of the other, to its own stake."

In the same work, he declares that "to my way thinking, these books of the old Testament are of human origin: though inspired, they are not infallible and must be handled in a scientific manner as other literary documents of great antiquity." Well, one man's 'inspiration' is another man's delusion.

His public stance on religion is disclosed in an interview for *Science and Mechanics* magazine (July 1968) :

...I answered only once when a group from prison in Illinois wrote to me that this occupies their minds very much and they debated and would like to know how I stand. To men in such a distressful situation, I felt that I owed an answer and I wrote to them. But generally, I keep such things to myself because it's

just the same as asking whether William Conrad Roentgen, who discovered X-rays, believed that X-rays were created by God or not. The problem is not whether he was a churchgoer or an atheist; this is not the question at all. The fact is that he discovered X-rays. Now you can approach it from the philosophical viewpoint and say "this is the creation of the Lord," and you would be perfectly right. If you are a disbeliever and claim that X-rays are the result of a soulless Nature, you are consequently correct. But you should not confuse historical and scientific questions with theological considerations.

There was incidentally, little of moment in the letter to the prisoners. Try as he would, Deg could not remember anything in it. When I checked with the Velikovsky Estate to verify the letter, Sammer and Heinberg denied its existence. They agreed that it was written in longhand and no copy was preserved. Possibly Deg remembered V. telling him what was in it, and there being nothing tangible, forgot what it was. We can be sure that V. did not send the prisoners to the Bible, and one of the most persistent and risible of canards raised against V., especially by the humanist movement, was that he was an anti-scientific Biblical revivalist. Many scientists picked up this idea, too. That he was often used by evangelists cannot be disputed, but in such cases Velikovsky was not a Velikovskian.

V. could not be pinned down on God (as Deg noted in 1972 "I am certain that he does not believe in God.") but he would use the Hebrew Lord to belay others. The most revealing passages of V. 's view came at the end of *Oedipus and Akhnaton* at the expense of Freud, whose book on *Moses and Monotheism* he denounced; Freud, he declared, had done his people a great disservice by taking monotheism from them as an original invention (again the idea of a "claim"), making of Moses an Egyptian, and of Yahwism a primitive cult; Freud, he actually wrote, was neurotic. His anger at Freud overflowed onto Akhnaton so that this magnificent free-thinking Pharaoh, who tried to liberate a great culture from priestly and traditional thralldom, became now psychotic, deformed, a nudist, monolatrous (not monotheistic), incestuous, homosexual (bisexual), a pacific bungler of his country 's affairs, and, if not a wife-beater, a wife-banisher.

V. harbored the thought that Moses was not a monotheist, that true monotheism did not come to the Jews until the time of Jeremiah, whom he regarded as the first to formulate the idea. He never expressed himself publicly, for the same reason that he had criticized Freud for publishing *Moses and Monotheism*. Too many Jews would be upset, he said onetime privately to Wolfe, Milton, and Rose. He believed that late editors of the Bible and Jewish rulers had refashioned Moses into a monotheist, and that not until a few years before the Babylonian Captivity did the Jews become officially and fully committed as a group to monotheism.

V.'s secret can be deciphered in *Worlds in Collision*, however, where, although he mentions the facts behind his theory, he gilds them by speaking of a striving to attain monotheism from the time of Moses onwards. Like other honest scholars, and ordinary people too, V. could not conceal his discoveries of "truth" even though he felt morally justified in doing so, and actually believed, with some guilt feelings, that he had succeeded. Still, his attempts at concealment had also a political angle, for he was enabled to deny that Akhnaton was a monotheist, and to call him an idolator of the sun, while letting stand the convenient notion that Moses, who came before Akhnaton in his reconstructed chronology, was monotheist.

The reader will readily recognize in the Illinois prisoner incident that V. had picked up the typical American pose to avoid trouble: keep religion out of discussion -- separation of church and state carried to ridiculous lengths. Elisheva was telling Deg proudly of V.'s position; evidently she, too, not only used the excuse, but was self-congratulatory about it. She was taken aback when Deg said that it was irresponsible: how can a person write so much about religion, realizing full well that defenseless people are being affected by what he is saying, and then shut up like a clam when the consequences of his statements are under inquiry? This is especially the case in a free country, where unlike in police states, one loses little by honesty.

I agree, and it is proper to say that V. lacked original ideas about contemporary religion. He was materialist. a Proto-marxist

(rebuffed by persistent anti-semitism ), a Jewish nationalist who had to reconcile himself to the powerful Judaic orthodoxy within the state of Israel and within his family, an orthodox freudian believer that psychoanalysis can free the mind, a believer in science as a realistic and rational ordering of the universe, and a shrewd evader of religious controversy, which, if he had entered upon it, would have alienated half of his public support.

\*\*\*

Deg ' s position was quite different. He was pro-Jewish anti-Moses, even though a profound sympathy for Moses is apparent in his book on *God ' s Fire*, and, I might add, he felt, too, profound sympathy for Karl Marx as a mind bursting with social reality and grim wild hopes, even while being a life-long antimarxist. He felt dreadfully sorry (remember what I said earlier about his empathy with historical figures) for those Jews, often in the majority, who tried to wrest human and civil rights from Moses-Aaron, Miriam, the Golden Calf worshippers, the wanderers who heard "the call of Egypt." the Scouts, and the intercultural revelers of Beth Peor.

Deg ' s idea of religion could not develop fully until he had successfully framed the problem of historical religions and satisfied himself of the essence of human nature. You have to find these two keys to the history of religion and man. The first key he discovered by pursuing man ' s interest in things sacred back as far as possible, back to humanization or creation it seemed. It appeared that all gods were alike, that all men were religious even when atheist, that all religions were alike, that all religions were psychologically at least polytheistic, and that a succession of changing gods was a reflection of catastrophic cycles of nature and culture. All religions were basically similar: they ritualized celestial and natural phenomena in human terms; they sacrificed, they slaughtered people; and they secured and protected them. Their historical behavior was basically schizoid.

There were two ways of finding the divine, both almost inaccessible to *Homo Schizo*; one was to open up oneself to one ' s innermost depths in order to know whether some part of oneself is divine. The other was to examine the universe outside to see

whether the divine must exist there and whether it is manifesting itself. This was a futuristic theology, to be sure. It was anti-rationalistic, that is, anti-Aristotelian. If more words need be applied, it was a phenomenological pragmatic, existential approach.

In 1965, there occurs a mention of the idea of entropy, and Deg 's view of religion may be said to have emerged from his reaction to this "law of nature."

The world of the second law thermodynamics -- the dying world -- is the product of a dying mind. When the mind ceases to die and begins to live, the second law of thermodynamics will be replaced by an equally valid and scientifically acceptable law of creative evolution or creative condensation or creative intensification of specialized activity. [This ultimately ended in the theory of theotropy thirteen years later.]

He remembers, of course, the aura of publicity that had attended the work of Norbert Wiener and cybernetics, and a kind of gloominess associated with the notion of entropy, merged with the character of Wiener who, he thought, might have committed suicide in Stockholm. Not long afterwards he came upon a book of Melvin Cook in the New York University library stacks: published in 1966, this difficult technical work on geophysics was by all odds the most competent and confident assault upon the premises of long-time geochronometry to be found. Cook 's model of crashing ice caps and slitting continents set up the basis for Deg 's geology. The main problem was to reconcile his own exoterrestrial first causes with Cook 's Earth-based scenario. Beside this, Cook, in a few paragraphs on negative entropy, rendered Deg sensitive to a possible place in theology for a new process. As the time approached to write *The Divine Succession*, the negativism inherent in his destruction of history was unexpectedly counteracted by a positivism from this source.

*Deg 's Journal, July 10, 1979*

End of my generation begins. [I cannot deduce what he means by this.]

## NEW PROOF OF THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

If our model of the solar system is correct, with therefore a time 1 to 15 million years and if the universe is large and populated as it presently seems to be, the manufacture of negative entropic features of short duration should be occurring with much greater frequency than now conceived (although if time is infinitely regressive then the speed of their creation is inconsequential). However, in either case, the probability of say 10<sup>20</sup> intelligent (negatively entropic) worlds is very high. Now there is no reason to use mankind as the measure of the 10<sup>20</sup> intelligent world. Whereupon I postulate an X number of worlds where the creative dynamics of negative entropy produce beings of such intelligence and power that they may be called 'gods.' If these are defined as 'beings with n times the intelligence and power of mankind (and they may be aggregates as well as individuals), one of them may be considered to be of such Intelligence as well as individuals), one of them may be considered to be of such Intelligence and Power that it may establish control over the universal process. In that case, we have the traditional concept of god exercised in new form of proof of omniscience and omnipotence -- that is, one who is created by the universe working towards that goal (by its essence) and who ultimately turns around and controls the Universe. If the chances of such a One having appeared. If the chances of such a One having appeared are low, and such a One surviving temporally in addition to all his other powers (i.e. 'God is external') sets up a chance that One existed but no longer does, then the Universe may still go on and on in the expectation that sooner or later it will create its eternal, omniscient and omnipotent master, where upon truly he universe will be intelligently (as vs. the present chaos) ordered and in which the far-flung parts will be compelled to cooperate.

However, ideas were converging from all quarters. The theories of *Homo Schizo* and *Divine Succession* went along together and interlocked without difficulty or even awareness.

*September 9, 1972*

I am going to Princeton today, expect to see Velikovsky. Have continued to probe his work though I have a mountain of tasks before me for the Fall. Am continuously tempted to rewrite his theories in my own language, to test them, to add to them if

they test out, *to explain their importance*, and to put them into a logical psychological historical framework that cannot be ignored. I am scarcely prepared for the task, in time, resources, information, so keep nibbling at the edges (one would hope like the Martian rats that destroyed the army of Sennacherib, according to the Egyptians).

At this moment, am reading the scarifying Babylonian poem to Ishtar (W. in C. p. 200). I note the line 'O furious Ishtar, summoner of armies,' that concludes the poem. Again this works two ways: Ishtar causes the people to wander and fight: V. says catastrophes engender migrations, flight, armies clashing in the dark. Agreed. Many corresponding events in Greece, Near East, etc. ca. 1500 and 8th-7th century.

But comes another reason for the armies and the clashes. When people are fearful, they assemble. In numbers there is strength and comfort. They do not disperse as 'logic' would tell them to. Any combat officer will tell you how difficult it is to get men to scatter for cover when under attack; they want to huddle together, even though the collective 'good' lies in spreading out.

The rationalization of huddling; the assembly of armies, the summoning, is that the enemy is One, its intentions are unknown, the collective judgment of the tribe or people is needed (the greater the roll-call the better, the more secure the judgment) and the enemy may be the friend, who, it is desperately hoped, will be impressed by one's forces or lead one's forces against our enemies, indeed, demand to lead them. "I am your god, your leader. Why are you not gathered to greet me. Why do you run away; your running is suspicious. I demand that you assemble for My Coming!" All of this is not withstanding that in some places and areas people would in fact scatter to the caves and clefts, as the premonition of disaster came to them.(*cf. W. in C. 212-3*).

*Deg's Journal, Oct. 10, 1972*

I showed Sebastian several pages of V. dealing with ancient China. He was moderately impressed. I asked about Tao. Sebastian holds the unconventional belief that the Chinese notion of 'heaven' is animated. It is a Being. I have that hook to hold on to. What set me to thinking was this: Tao seems like a refutation of catastrophism; no bloody gods. But in the

beginning it relates the stories of heavenly conflicts. I was baffled. Tao seems so benign, calm, apathetic. Then the thought came: but perhaps Tao became Chinese uniformitarianism! Centuries ahead of the West. Perhaps Tao came to soothe mind and restore calm to the heavens. Really it wasn't long after Mars-Ares-Huizilopochtli-Nergal that Plato clamored for laws vs. disbelievers in celestial harmony. But now see: the West remained unsettled of mind. The gods did not go away carrying catastrophic theory with them. Humanists, historians and scientists interrupted the movement towards uniformity and celestial serenity until the 19th century and then the latter triumphed for only a century. Is it that Judaic Christianity carried the Bible, whose catastrophism would not be denied or effaced, right down through the centuries in the face of all amnesiac needs in religion, society, and science? Is this why the Western world (including the Muslim) has been so turbulent and aggressive? What is behind Tao? Do we now have a third amnesiac development out of catastrophe: Greek pantheons, Judaic chosen tribe and monotheism, and Tao calm reflectiveness?

*Deg's Journal, New York City, 1 A.M., 24, 1973*

Just awakened by a call from Jack Martin, Baptist Missionary in Bangkok, regarding Paul. You cannot give up hope for man or woman, knowing that, if you do, the next moment will bring you a person who will reveal that you are wrong.

#### *EPILOGUE TO THE SETTLING OF HEAVEN*

If one has stood amidst a burning city, been shaken in an earthquake, or watched the throes of death, or looked down yawning chasms or into the ocean depths, or heard artillery shells scream and strike, each ' with my name written on it, ' -- then one can better ponder the awful predicament of our ancestors who over thousands of years suffered disaster manifold and many times over. They cannot be gainsaid their fears and complaints, and the qualities of their gods, those deeply involved companions of humans who became ever more human as they took the gods into themselves and ever more diabolic as they sought to master the games of the gods.

The gods have retired into new forms. But they still operate through the busy humans whom the poet Rilke called 'the bees of the invisible.' They are everywhere and scarcely as remote as our scientific texts would have us believe. They are

in astrology, in fortune-telling, in magic. They fly to the scenes of disaster. They augment the forces of authority. They heal and console. They scare. They make anxious. They set the rituals for many as they have done since the age of Ouranos.

They assume their own negations: for they argue with themselves in Natural Law, in Bureaucracy, in Dogmatic Materialism, in Reified Words, in Mummified Heroes, in Time and Worlds without end. They let themselves be molded into One, and the One obliges his necessities by becoming Many, Beyond all, they stand at ease waiting for Armageddon and the Day of Judgment. Then they will don their armor and rally their hosts.

The gods have retired, yes, but it still takes rare courage to contemplate all of their continuing manifestations and to resist the invention of their negations. There is yet nowhere else to go. And few who would follow.

By skating along on the ice of the cerebral cortex, mathematical astrophysics or another such exercise may sublimate the gods. Dumb bestiality may be equally functional in sublimating them. We think that of all ways of facing them, the best is to look at them everywhere, contemplate their every manifestation, anticipate their reappearance, but do no more. If there is any question of human madness, it is erased when one pretends to be divine. Our human destiny is an open question. We deny our humanity if we try to close it. We belittle ourselves if we plead with the gods to answer it at any cost. Here we shall have to leave the matter rest.

*Deg' s Journal, Stylida, Naxos, July 3, 1978*

The Old Testament of the Bible has been much on my mind this summer, because of my study of Moses and the Exodus, because of several interesting articles dealing with it by Sizemore, Greenberg, *et al.* that have come to hand, and because Ami reveals herself in a new light as once a child who has remembered prodigious amounts of the Bible from the nuns' school in Mulhouse that she attended.

I have come to look upon the Old Testament as a great mountain range that has yet to be explored in regards to its effects upon the human mind, history, education, and anti-semitism, politics and society in general. Just as there is no good book on the Jews -- sociological psychological, and

behavioral -- so there is none on the Bible.

The early scientific rationalists of the Enlightenment (and their socialist successors) thought that merely to expose the Bible as a typical unscientific and superstitious document would be enough to put it onto the shelves of dead religions, anthropology, myth. They treated it as a discrete entity that could be taken off like a suit of clothes.

\*\*\*

What did our homo schizo Deg do socially with his polyego while inventing it? Personal affairs were not easy with him over much of the seventies. The daughters peeled off the family stalk into Bryn Mawr, Smith, and the University of Chicago. The four boys broke off prematurely. They split in every direction. Only Carl went through a university, held on at the Peabody School of Johns Hopkins University by a devotion to music and a character too irritable to knock about abroad. He did spend a while on Naxos, composing extemporaneously at all hours on a piano in the middle of the OldMarket section. The others went here and there in the world: wherever the newspapers were speaking of "endless Summer," of places where the action was, of Denver, Bangkok, Florence, Amsterdam, Australia, Cuba, Morocco, Istanbul and San Francisco, word would also come from them.

Jill decided upon a separation or, perhaps more accurately, redefined her relationship with Deg around 1970 and Deg came thereafter as a visitor to Linden Lane in Princeton and then to his mother, on which occasions he would also see Velikovsky and Sebastian and maybe Tom and Rosalyn Frelinghuysen. The split was not abrupt or devastating; it was a drifting away that he felt less distressing because he was immersed in tides of preoccupation. It was like a pattern that stretched until unrecognizable, and then tore, or like the string tricks people do with their fingers, when with a single movement of the fingers the strings slip into a new form.

Following upon his relatively flushed income of the sixties, when what he wanted to do coincided with what agencies with money wanted him to do -- investment brokers, publishers, Bill Baroody's American Enterprise Institute, the war establishment -- his finances

fell into poor shape during the seventies. Despite ordinary and extraordinary family expense, and his contributions to his mother's welfare, he took leave from his University and spent all of his savings and gave his library to the Alpine college. He gave up trying to publish his works on world government in America and published them in Bombay, where his friend, Dr. Rashmi Mayur, was building an Institute. Deg was insisting that a Kalotic World Order movement should come out of Bombay or Istanbul, not the United States.

He stayed at Washington Square when in New York, became intimate friends with Nina Mavridis who lived in his building, he taught his courses, wrote steadily, and put together the college in Switzerland with the help of several students. Nina was generous, but could hold her professorship at La Guardia College for only a year. They married after a time but separated after several years of being together, and she moved to Berlin. He moved from Washington Square Village to 110 Bleecker Street, where he spent little time. He stayed with Dick Cornuelle, he moved into Ken Olson's loft in Little Italy, and he visited happily with Donna Welensky for a while.

In Europe he lived in Switzerland and in Naxos. He was close to many people during the seventies. Although a gypsy he gave the impression of being fixed somewhere and of soberly pursuing a reasonable plan -- people knew not exactly where -- except that the where was not where they were. One month he would be in Vietnam, then he would be staying for a week at a little hotel in Sion where the barmaid and he became fast friends and at odd hours he would tell her of many things and she would tell him of her Algerian mother and what the people of Valais were like and how they regarded her. Then he would be in Naxos, buildings without the means to build, fixing with crude tools, and writing. Friendship would be struck up with those who came by his isolated place and people would come from town and he would go to town. Sandy came from Australia and might even have swum from there, a blond eel, and he heard of culture and society "Down Under," and they traveled together to America; he laughed to watch her tapdance. Sigrid Schwartz came from the Black Forest with her little boy who carved the surface of his marble table with a neolithic

flint while Sigrid told of her mother who asked to be carried to the grave with a jazz band playing "The Saints Come Marching Home," and so it was done. He spent a good deal of time underwater in a diving mask and knew the bottom like his own land, and could pluck a bit of pottery out of its rock fastenings any time and give it to a pleased Hamburgian, Londoner, or Trondheimer.

Wherever he went in the world, he never truly wandered, but was always bent upon something to do with study, business, politics, education, and everything else seemed to be related. He was sometimes impatient, pressed by perceived obligations, but never at odds with himself. And wherever he went, half of his baggage consisted of folders, full of reprints, chapters in progress, manuscripts, proofs, correspondence and notes, never less than thirty pounds of these, including the folders that dealt with the job he was on. Hence he was never bored, nor even idle when he wanted to be idle, for he could hardly wait for the day to dawn in New York, London, Tokyo, Saigon, Bangkok, Bombay, Cochin, or Paris so that he could write and read in order to write.

Many were the occasions, though, when the needed piece of paper had been left behind or a needed book was on a faraway shelf. Nor could he half control the crazy-quilt appearance of his work in progress, paper of different sizes and quality made in different countries; handwriting altered by different writing surfaces, some on vehicles in motion; writing in pencils and pens of blue, black, red and green.

His psychological counterpart, Jean-Yves Beigbeder, would turn up or he would find Jean in Paris or at Nevis in the West Indies, and they would celebrate life and make great plans, until one day Jean slipped into the sea from a stalled motorboat off St. Kitts to swim ashore for help and was lost into the night and forever. So he had many friends, good friends, he thought, most of them going unnamed, like Carl Stover, Rashmi Mayur, Kevin Cleary and his gang who hated their enemies more than they loved him and wounded the college, Jay Hall, Barbara Schmidt, Christine Ressa, Peter and Annette Tobia, Charles Billings, Carl Martinson, Phil Jacob, Ken Olson, Levi Fournier, Dick Cornuelle, Jay Hall, Savvas

Camvissis, Stephanie Neuman. Even to mention them is not fair to his wishes, for he will complain bitterly that each person means everything to him when they are together so that he cannot stand seeing them on a list, where they may seem like numbers of the days on the calendar of a long-gone year, deprived of all the riches that they presented to each day.

Life carved its channel more narrowly after Anne Marie Hueber came upon the Naxos scene. They lived in comfortable poverty, traveling irregularly and eccentrically, along the path of Washington, New York, London Paris, Alsace, Florence, Athens, and Naxos. Great energy now went into the Quantavolution Series, while she wrote her novels and lent him a hand.

All this I wanted to say, though briefly; creativity is always in context -- whether Marco polo in his vast Asia or Immanuel Kant in his little garden -- and I fear not so much being irrelevant as that I will convey neither the context nor the created substance, whether in themselves or as they meshed together. Whatever he was up to and wherever he was, by the late sixties, Deg, like many another but in his personal style, was radicalized. He not longer believed in small solutions -- whether laissez-faire in economics, gradualism in politics, or incrementalism in biological and cultural development. Pursuant to many early signs, holospheric quantavolution took possession of him.

**PART THREE**

## CHAPTER NINE

### NEW FASHIONS IN CATASTROPHISM

*Deg's Journal, November 24, 1967*

Rereading carefully V.'s *Earth in Upheaval*, I read the sections on the age of waterfalls this morning and, as I poured coffee beans into the coffee grinder just now I wondered at the marvelous parallelisms or analogies of force -- an old observation of course -- cascades great and small, all the same - - what makes them "different"? Man's size? -- which separates everything in the world into big and small? Time is such too. Easy to see and believe the existence of gods who pour Victoria Falls as I pour coffee beans.

Think if all the world would be reduced to the same proportion, Would we then get a marvelous set of insights into hitherto baffling problems ? Would suddenly the rich world become dross and dull?

Another entry, several days later :

Velikovsky came by for a few minutes, left a couple of items, and loped off saying "I have left too much for the last mile." Too many interruptions, many of his own causing: too many projects, too. At least he has gotten reliable Juergens to edit his "Ten Trials" for publication [it never happened].

We talked of Livio Stecchini who is working on ancient measures and geography. His writing may never see the light. Why? "He cannot bring things to fruition," I said. "The idea is hard," said V., the inception." I added "The conception." "The conception is a pleasure, the birth is painful," said V. and he left it at that. He went to the library. He loves it and works unceasingly and effectively there. The sky in Princeton is low and the air smells of snow. Scholar's weather.

Velikovsky's *Earth in Upheaval* assembles "the testimony of

stone and bone." "Wherever we investigate the geological and paleontological records of this earth we find signs of catastrophes and upheavals, old and recent." It gives an old-fashioned sense of the geology of the last century, before jargon swamped its literature. The feeling is deceptive. The plain speech was deliberate, both because little technical language was required to make his case and because his large audience could not be embraced if jargon intervened between the writer and reader. He also avoided exoterrestrialism, so as to show that you do not need to introduce comets in order to prove that catastrophes had befallen earth. However, he allowed many implications to be drawn from geological data pointing to astronomical reorientation of the Earth. And in his conclusion, he made the point forcefully that "The earth repeatedly went through cataclysmic events on a global scale, that the cause of these events was an extraterrestrial agent."

He did not deal with electrical phenomena, a strange omission for one who preached an electrified cosmos. (It entered into a supplementary paper that was printed with the book itself.) That much material on electricity could have been considered was shown by William Corliss, who began compiling it during the 1970's; and by V.'s friends, especially Ralph Juergens in the 1960's then too Eric Crew in England, Milton, and Deg.

Nor did V. take a radical position on geochronometry. He refused close combat with the giant, Time. To defeat macrochronic arguments he carried forward the order of catastrophic topics, still valid, with new evidence from biostratigraphy. Although he advanced catastrophic evidence into prehistorical and even historical times, he hardly advanced the theory and methodology of time determination. He did not attack the long-time conventional view of Earth history. The best work on short-time geology or microchronism was done by Melvin Cook. V. rejected continental drift and his arguments against Darwinism were those well-elaborated by creationists and scientists of "saltationist" persuasion long before.

Nonetheless, the work has solid merits; Harry H. Hess knew it well; he could find no falsehood or factual errors in it, only a theory which he could not accept or announce *ex cathedra*; and he

recommended the book to his students in geology at Princeton. There was much to be learned from it that a student could otherwise obtain from no single source. It was controversial; the geologists dismissed not only its style but also its catastrophist ideas. V.'s scheme to make headway among geologists by presenting a "clean" book, without assistance from legend or astronomy, failed. Yet, today, after 27 years, his book can hardly be called controversial. It is advanced, not *avant-garde*.

Still it is more complete, logical, exact, clear, and secular than any other work in geology that considers catastrophism. The comparable next best work, privately published and quite unknown, was completed at the same time by geologists Allan Kelly and Frank Dacheille. That is: *Target Earth: The Role of Large Meteors in Earth Science*. Also more daring and provocative, and also highly professional in method, is geophysicist Melvin Cook's work that I already mentioned, *Prehistory and Earth Models*, published obscurely in England a decade later, which employed purely terrestrial forces in explaining Earth's features. Both books are superior in method to Velikovskiy's book, more complex and more original. Both books, I hardly need add, are practically unknown and not cited among geologists and general scientists; indeed, they were not common currency among cosmic heretics because V. neglected to admit them.

When a true believer is excommunicated or goes apostate from a charismatic cult he is, if let go scot-free, inclined to start his own cult, and in science or art, there is every reason to wish the apostate or excommunicant well. Robert Stephanos left V.'s circle and found a new interest, another cosmic heretic, by then deceased.

William Comyns Beaumont is hardly known today but was a top-ranking English editor and a brilliant catastrophist. His work turned ever more to the -- quite mad -- idea that the Egyptian dynasties up to the 13th century B.C. ruled in South Wales and that Jerusalem was originally located in Edinburgh; this plunged him into obscurity, even among catastrophists ! Stephanos resurrected Beaumont, located what was left of his materials, and formed a committee to promote his work. He prepared a list of his ideas, culled from *Riddle of the Earth* (1925), *The Mysterious Comet*

(1932), and *The Riddle of Prehistoric Britain* (1946); he sent them to Deg who verified the list. Beaumont, on evidence not at all execrable, positioned Atlantis on the British platform and accepted what the Egyptian priests told Solon, that their ancestors had been at battle with his Athenian forebears when the great Island sank amidst frightful tumult.

Here were Beaumont 's more "reasonable" propositions:

1. The geology of the world 's surface is largely catastrophic.
2. The catastrophe was caused by a cometary collision.
3. All geological formations were shifted as result.
4. Cosmic lightning played a major role.
5. Hydrocarbons were present in cometary tails.
6. Ancient chronology was several hundred years too old.
7. The Ancient calendars had to be revised because of the catastrophe.
8. Many species were extinguished catastrophically.
9. Religion was born in cometary worship and tied to phallic forms because of the shape of comets.
10. Fear of cometary collisions is inherited by mankind.
11. Vermin were deposited by comets, which also provoked plagues.
12. Deities from Egypt, Greece, Meso-America, and elsewhere were identified with planets.
13. Pyramids were both astronomical observatories and "air-raid shelters" for nobility and kings.

14. Planet Saturn, as a comet, caused the Noachian Deluge.
15. The Atlantis date (ca 9500 B.C.) given by Plato had to be shortened.
16. Extensive legendary evidence pictures the "hairy," "bearded," "blazing star" symbolizing comets.
17. Stonehenge, Avebury Circle and similar monuments were astronomical instruments.
18. Central American legends (and cultures) were contemporaneous with those of the Old World.
19. The intercalary "five evil days" were cursed because they coincided with a world disaster and the ending of an age.
20. The serpent, dragon, winged-globe, caduceus, and other ancient symbols are traceable to cometary catastrophes.
21. Religious festival are dated by cometary catastrophes.
22. Cometary conflagrations are the origin of coal deposits.
23. The ancients had a true 360 day year.
24. The planet Venus underwent great changes in color, diameter, figure, and orbit in the time of Ogyges.
25. Quetzalcoatl (Coculkan-Hurakan) commemorated the cometary dragon for the Meso-Americans.

One significant thesis that V. could not have gotten from Beaumont was that the disturbing comet was Venus, although both identified Quetzalcoatl with the comet.

The list appears to be defensible by the criteria of quantavolution. But once one goes into the books behind the list one enters a jungle of brilliant entangled foliage. Beaumont find innumerable bewildering geographical, geological, theological, and historical

analogies between the regions of Great Britain and the Near East, particularly Palestine, such that the history of the two can be merged into one from the time of the Golden Age of Saturn until the Emperor Constantine (312 A.D.) of the Roman Empire. "The history of the Old Testament is the history of Atlantis," he writes. "Constantine ("born in York") had definite motive for transferring the arena of Jewish history and that of Christ to another region altogether." (*Britain: Key to World History*) Obviously, to enter Beaumont ' s world is a pleasure allowed to few.

The reader may have noted that most of the theses occur in Velikovsky ' s, and also de Grazia ' s books. It is easy enough to explain the similarities in the case of de Grazia for he drew heavily upon Velikovsky, and cites all of his sources. It is not so easy to explain the parallels between Velikovsky and Beaumont. Velikovsky never mentioned or cited Beaumont. Could Velikovsky have read and forgotten Beaumont ' s books? His method of proof is entirely different; practically everything -- style, format, language, method, and evidence -- is different; only the conclusions are the same. And I should stress that when Deg came into possession of the Beaumont materials, he found them mostly unusable for methodological and theoretical reasons; Beaumont ' s stress upon Thoth, however, helped convince Deg that a catastrophic age ought to be assigned to the god Hermes and the Planet Mercury.

Moreover, with regard to both Velikovsky and de Grazia, too many of Beaumont ' s conclusions are the same as theirs to explain them as sheer coincidence. I guess that either in the 1920 ' s or 1930 ' s when V. was in Palestine, the books, published in England and dealing with matters of interest to the Near East, made an appearance in the bookstores and were seen by V.

A second possibility is that during the 1940 ' s V. met with the books at the Columbia University Library where he spent thousands of hours in research on his own books. The Columbia University Library possessed of Beaumont ' s relevant works only *The Riddle of Prehistoric Britain* which was published in 1946, By this time *Worlds in Collision* had been written. V. ' s library time during which he achieved his major beliefs relating history and geology to exoterrestrialism had been spent in the Columbia

University Libraries.

However, a note exists in his archive, mentioning having read Beaumont's 1932 book; the note dismisses the work. Yet V. expresses his wonder whether Beaumont had gotten his (V.'s) ideas by telepathy. V.'s memory was prodigious. Could there have been a 'Bridie Murphy Effect?' This case, it will be recalled, involved a Colorado woman whose accounts of "another life" in Ireland were substantiated by investigations of her "home family and neighborhood" in Ireland; it developed that she had been unwittingly retailing material conveyed to her by her Irish nurse in early childhood and duly registered in her memory.

V. had an unusual interest in mnemonic phenomena. One time Deg was visited by a nurse from India accompanied by a high official of the Indian Foreign Ministry. She possessed a rare factual and numerological memory. Given any long set of numbers, she could recall them and reorder them. She could also do tricks such as supplying a person's year of birth, knowing the day and month. When younger, she had possessed only an ordinary mind, then had global amnesia following her mother's death, and afterwards had been led slowly by her father to relearn everything. Despite her prodigious abilities, she was a modest person of ordinary intelligence.

V. came to meet her and a seance was held. Deg's term for the type was "idiot savant." V. did not use the term, and he was unusually taciturn, leaving Deg wondering whether V.'s mind possessed a similar competency.

\*\*\*

V. one day confides in Deg that he has discovered in the course of his research certain geographical locations where oil and gas were exuding in ancient times. It might be profitable to explore there. They talk again and again about the information, and Deg draws up an agreement which they both sign. If they can interest an oil company in purchasing their knowledge, they will divide the proceeds. V. chooses a location. It turns out to be in Turkey. Deg buys maps of oil concessions and wells for the area and finds that

the spot mentioned stands seemingly outside the boundaries of existing rights to drill, although quite surrounded by concessions. Better Turkey than Syria, certainly, they think. However, Deg knows the problems of Turkey, political and bureaucratic, the tangle of laws, the high cost of concessions. All that they have to sell is a dozen words. Given away without guarantees, and the project explodes. So Deg talks to friends, and telephones to experts. He speaks to his friend Robin Farkas, who is Treasurer of Alexander 's Department Stores and who has friends engaged in oil speculations. The situation is ridiculous: there is no way to proceed, except by trusting strangers; give them the information and if they can persuade the most appropriate corporation or government agency to spend half-a-million dollars drilling, and if they strike oil they might be counted on someday to compensate the "owner" of the magic words. V. writes Deg, who is somewhere in the Near East, on August 12, 1968:

Dear Alfred:

Enclosed is the contract [for a book, never signed]... Ralph left on a cross-country trip...

As to oil in Italy, I shall write you separately but I would also like to know how would you like to proceed if we come to an agreement as I hope we will...[Is] the Italian monopoly holding oil company entitled also to off-shore exploration and exploitation?...

And what is new concerning Turkey?... a concession there? In the matters of Cosmos and Chronos [etc.]...I assume you have received my former letter (or letters), last to Samos.

I wish to think that you have achieved many goals during his trip as also piece of mind and serenity that usually eludes very active minds -- though you may be an exception.

I look forward to a letter from you and shall answer speedily. With warm regards.

Yours,  
*Immanuel*

Deg is nonplussed, and heavily occupied. He cannot figure out an

easy way to get in and out of an oil arrangement. He had the same kind of difficulty once before when he wished to engage the Xerox corporation in a system of information retrieval. There seemed to be no assured way of handing over useful knowledge. Perhaps it would be best to publish the information for the benefit to all those interests that might want to scramble to profit from it. Or give it to a friendly government, or to a friendly corporate officer. Or hire someone to run around among the oil companies and venture to the historical locations; such a person would need funds, must be made a partner, and had to be trustworthy.

Nothing more was done, and the several indications of petroleum rest in their ancient sources. In recent years, oil explorers have come to hire dowsers, several of whom claim to be able to sense oil locations simply from maps. Deg asked an Exxon official whether the company might not profitably set up or contract for an office, which for a million dollars could carefully read every ancient document that exists to discover relevant references. After all, to dig a hole costs half a million dollars. Deg wrote a memo about it. The idea seemed to Exxon rather odd. (They hadn't yet heard about dowsing.) So Deg quit trying to sell information from ancient sources.

By 1970 there are intimations that Deg would be moving into the field of geology. Typically, he notes some striking fact and then reviews his life experience to weigh its significance. Then he moves out in a number of forays, both intellectual and operational, some of which lead nowhere, others foolish, still others abandoned midway, one or two coming to a conclusion. But meanwhile, like a beaver's dam, the sticks begin to make a frame, the holes are plugged up, the waters are stemmed and a structure manifest itself. Folders begin to collect notes and ideas. Years may pass, during which time little that is directly relevant and purposeful happens in the field, for he is occupied with other writing, or with education, politics, war, and personal concerns. Still, a cluster of opinions begin to form and he is infected by the specific ambition. He has fantasies of a message to be conveyed with fierce logic and compelling force but is already telling himself in a small closet of the mind that he must be respectful and persuasive.

Then he foresees an opening of Time and feels inspired to create a book. He records his ideas and notes in a dozen successive outline; several introductions appear and vanish; meanwhile he writes one after another the chapters. A bad chapter is washed out. A bulky chapter is broken into two, and a section of it is floated into a new position somewhere else. The writing is heavy labor and becomes increasingly furious and fluent. What ends up as *The Lately Tortured Earth*, written in seven months of 1982, began as a note on strange ashes, following a reading of passages from Schliemann 's report of his discovery of "Troy."

*Deg 's Journal, Stylida, July 7, 1970*

Early in World war II, the Germans air-bombed Rotterdam as a terrible 'object-lesson' to the Dutch to obtain their surrender. Then late in World War II, the British and Americans bombed Hamburg, Dresden, and other cities, using many thousands of incendiary missiles. In no case, despite high buildings, much wood construction, and inflammable objects, did the immense fire leave thick layers of ashes.

How do we explain, then, the heavy compressed layers of ashes that cover so many ancient cities. I cannot go along with the many experts who casually assigning these remains to an invasion, the loss of a battle, or accidents. They are really "playing with fire." Schliemann 's pretty little story of his discovery of "the treasure of Priam" is a case in point. He implies that somebody carrying a large casket of good objects and other precious goods had to abandon it suddenly during the final stage of the siege because he or they were pursued hotly. Over a copper shield "lay a stratum of red and calcined ruins, from 4 3/4 to 5 1/4 feet thick, as hard as stone." He nevertheless could extricate the shield and the casket of articles associated with it by employing ' a large knife. '

He [Schliemann] writes, "It is probable that some member of the family of Priam hurriedly packed the Treasure into the chest and carried it off without having time to pull out the key [whose wooden handle was gone]; that when he reached the wall, however, the hand of an enemy or the fire overtook him, and he was obliged to abandon the chest, which was immediately covered to a height of from 5 to 6 feet with the red ashes and stones of the adjoining palace." How remarkable that this kind of reading of the ruins has prevailed to this day! And I

have noted others from stories of the Near East, Etruria, and Meso-America.

All references to ash layers in ancient times need to be collected. The levels should be recorded, along with the normal data on what is above, below, and the site location. Of course, C. Schaeffer has done something like this in the Middle East and Velikovsky had added some other reports. A special study, however, is lacking. It should also be noted that the original layer must invariably have been much thicker than the final layer as discovered by archaeologists. This was mentioned by Nicola Rilli in his book on Etruria; yet he persisted in speaking of a Ligurian invasion and other mishaps, not associating the ashes with natural catastrophes or the deluge that he believes overcame Tyrrhenian civilization. The Pompeiian, Herculaneum, Krakatoan ashes should also be measured.

Ultimately, we should sample the ashes to determine whether their origins were local or distant, terrestrial or celestial (this may be possible now that we are beginning to know the geological composition of Moon's surface and perhaps soon of Venus and Mars; they must, of course, be dissimilar; if similar, we may be stuck).

In 1973 he goes to work seriously on the case of the Trojan ashes. The literature of what he calls paleocalcinology is nil. He prepares a memorandum and sends it to several experts, asking them for citations and an opinion about the possible sources of the heavy calcinated debris of the "Burnt City" of Schliemann. They give him other names, until he has a score of informants, practically all of whom are curious and helpful insofar as they have something to offer.

Graig C. Chandler, Director of Forest Fire and Atmospheric Sciences Research for the Federal government, wrote him a letter that might serve as a model of scientific altruism. I quote it at length, for that reason alone, even though its contents are in themselves fascinating:

Dear Dr. Grazia:

Forgive me for taking a whole month to "reflect briefly" on your letter of February 8. The delay is even less excusable since I have come up relatively blank on the citations you requested.

I do however have a contact who I know is quite interested, and deeply involved in archaeological investigations of past natural fire history.

You should contact:

Dr. Edwin V. Komarek, Sr.  
Tall Timbers Research Station  
Route I, Box 160  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

All the half dozen references I have been able to unearth that deal directly with prehistoric charcoal and ash deposits stem from Ed Komarek, so you will undoubtedly get them, and more, directly from him.

I found your manuscript fascinating. However, there are some points you should understand before going too far with a theory that credits wood fuels, either forest stands or urban constructions, as a source for 15 to 20 feet of ash fall.

A natural forest can easily meet or exceed the 200 ton biomass figure quoted by Kelly and Danchille. However, in a living forest, only the material less than one-half inch or so in diameter is ever consumed by fire, regardless of the fire's intensity. This practically never exceeds 30 tons per acre unless the fire has been preceded by some other catastrophic event such as massive insect kill, logging, or exceptional weather anomaly.

The "ash" residue from the complete combustion of wood ranges from 0.1 percent for white pine to 2.2 percent for western hemlock. Actual residues from naturally occurring fire are much higher, ranging from about 10 percent in low intensity fires down to the proximate analysis value in firestorms. Thus, there would be less than 3 tons per acre of "ashes" produced by the burning of the densest forest. This is an amount about 10 times as great as the fertilizer you spread on your lawn in the spring.

There is an abundance of practical experience on distribution of ash from large forest fires. The Peshtigo Fire of 1871 burned more than 300,000 acres completely surrounding the town of Peshtigo, Wisconsin. Contemporary accounts mention "ashes piled nearly an inch deep in the streets." I have been in several

forest fire where newspaper accounts played up "ashes falling like rain." In every instance with which I am personally familiar, the resulting deposit could be measured in millimeters.

Cities, of course, have much heavier fuel loadings than do forest. But again, ash residue from the burning of a city is measured in inches, rather than feet. The accounts from the 1906 San Francisco earthquake and fire are good evidence on this point.

In firestorms, forest or city, there are no ashes left. Firestorm winds scour the burned area clean.

Although it is completely out of my field, I would theorize that the only possible way in which a deposit of wood ash many feet thick could be produced in a single event would be to mechanically reduce the wood to rubble (earthquake), cover it with an inert material at high temperature so that the combustion could not occur (volcanic ash fall), and reduce the wood to charcoal and "ash" through distillation. I have never seen "red ashes of wood" in natural fires, and the term spunds much more like a distillation residue than a combustion residue.

I hope the above discussion is helpful. Please don ' t hesitate to write if I can be of further service.

Deg ' s exchange with Ed Komarek may also be worth quotation:

Dear Dr. Komarek:

In an endeavor to pursue a number of baffling contradictions in ancient and pre-historical times, involving the life and death of ancient settlements and the development of various human traits and customs, I have come upon indications of huge conflagrations involving layers of ash deposits that to my mind could never have originated, as the archaeological community tends to believe, from the ravages inflicted upon the settlements by conquerors with torch in hand. Several Strata of the city of Troy (Hisarlik) in ancient Anatolia give evidence of inordinate destruction, sometimes by earthquakes, sometimes by both. Yet there appears to be no great volcano that might have exploded or collapsed nearby. Although perhaps none has done so, it appears to me that a chemical examination of these beds of ashes of the different centers of exploration in Asia Minor and the Middle East might tell us whether hand-set flames,

volcanic fall-out or some other less familiar element may have been involved.

May I ask about the nature of your studies and work in this field, and whether you could put me on to some literature in it, and further whether you know others besides ourselves who might be interested in it? I would be most obliged for your advice.

April 29, 1974

Dear Prof. de Grazia:

I am much interested in some of the comments you make. If the sample of the ash could be examined under an electron scanning microscope we might be able to tell a little bit about where it came from. In fact, if you could ship me a small package of it, I will certainly put it under an electron scanning microscope and see what I can determine.

Under separate cover I am sending you several of our publications, particularly one in connection with particulates from forest and grassland fires. With this technique it might be possible to pinpoint what type of ash you have found. Of course many of these early cities had a tremendous amount of woodwork inside of them and of course, these would burn even inside of stone buildings. We certainly should be able to tell the difference between volcanic particulate matter and that from wood or grass.

[He goes on to describe the work he has been doing on natural fires and the origin of cereals in Anatolia, and expresses interest in the continuation of the Trojan project.]

May 28, 1974

Dear Mr. Komarek:

Thanks for your letter of April 29 and for the many materials that arrived subsequently. I have been having a field day with them.

The enclosed paper on "Calcination in Pre-historic and Ancient Times" carries some of the logic that has led me to my

present interest in the testing of ashes (and, I may add, mega-lightning or Jovian lightning, which, I think, may have been almost qualitatively different and/or vastly more frequent and destructive at some periods than during recent times).

I wish that I had samples of ancient settlement ashes to forward to you so that the testing might begin. But I am afraid that their collection awaits a field expedition of some complexity. I am going to Greece and Turkey this summer, leaving June 23, and may be able to arrange some permissions and even to scrounge some samples. I am seeking support for the research as well, although I fear that the novelty of the approach, its threat to conventional theories, and the fact that my qualifications for the work, whatever the distinction I may hold in other fields, are not specific to the problem, will all handicap my efforts. Apropos of this, may I say, in asking for help, that you will give aid and consultation in the analysis of the obtained material?

Thank you again. Incidentally, I note that we did not miss one another by much at the University of Chicago. I began my studies there in 1935 with \$50 that my father borrowed for me and a trumpet that sounded a lot better to people then it would now....

On Naxos, Deg had met Professor Georg Keller, geologist of the University of Freiburg, and sought his advice as well. Keller knew Aegean geology and assured Deg that there were no volcanos near Troy, neither now or anciently. He doubted any possible source of ash from Thera or elsewhere. Ash falls are not uniform, even on a small island like Kos, where in one place he found 40 cm of Thera ash while in many other cuts on the island nothing at all was visible.

*Deg ' s Journal, June 3, 1973*

Everything is understandable when it is simple and it is simple when only or two things happen to it at given time -- and the longer the time without their changing the even more simple is the scheme.

Thus the mechanics of the earth seem understandable when a presumed history ' s is said to permit only a couple of motions and even these are under severe constraints.

However, when in fact, the real history of earth is shown to

have involved large changes in not only a couple but in many motions, then an exact explanation of what happened may be impossible, especially so since no reliable observers reported most the events.

One reason why uniformitarianism evolved rapidly and persisted is that it created a simplistic history, evening out things over time and subjecting them "normal" changes.

One reason why there are so many theories explaining natural history is that each man can barely cope with possible effects of his one favorable type of motion and change.

He ruminated about oil, about tectonism, about the Thera explosion of 3,000 years ago, about the earthquakes that long ago shook the now seemingly stable earth beneath Athens. Here he is at New York University, noting a meeting with Professor Charnatz of the geology faculty on Oct., 9, 1973:

*Deg 's Journal*

Lunch with Prof. Charnatz of the Geology Department. Nina came along we ate at the Faculty Club. I worked to minimize threat, arrogance, conviction *re* our subject, the question of how ashes of ancient times are laid down and composed, in relation to Velikovsky 's theories. I needed all grace and tact to do so, for young Charnatz was ready to lecture me on my foolish dilettantism. I could see; he was nervous and prepared to give and receive aggression. He had hardly ordered lunch before he blurted out that V. cited sources that could only be found in some exotic library, that one good guess did not make a theory right (he cited the surface heat of Venus), and that V. was an astrologer. I let it all go by with sympathetic murmurs and a soupHon of rebuttal. Then he smoothed out, and began to talk to the point.

As usual, what seems simple is difficult to bring about in experimental science. I did discover that no sure blocks confront a set of distinctions among ash -- heaps of varying chemistry, origins, duration, quantity. A crucial test is possible. We need an interdisciplinary team -- archaeologists, chemists, geologists, zoologists, geographer, engineer, mythographer, and maybe even a social theorist or methodologist. Then we need to find sites around the world where these ancient ashes lay, analyze them, and try to explain their presence in depths

varying up to an original 12 feet. Charmatz became quite involved and is willing to go along with me into the possibility of such a project. When he loosened up, he began to release particular information of much value. We talked also of magnetism, of what is to be found in the bottoms of old lakes, and of petroleum. He declared that all ('not one exception,' at my prompting) petroleum had been found in sedimentary rocks from ancient seas. 'But not all sedimentary strata have oil?' No 'And if we found one non-sedimentary pocket of oil, the theory would be blasted?' 'Probably.' 'Tell me: is it possible that only in sedimentary rocks where *oil* has been found *can* oil collect? Or are there other formations that could hold oil over time?' He seemed puzzled by this query. I repeated it twice more, in between answers that were not direct. I still do not know the answer, but it may be important. For if oil can only be held in one kind of rock pouch, then it is indefensible logically to claim that the oil and the rock are generically related. If all my pockets have holes in them except one and my money can be kept only there, it is incorrect to reason that this pocket coined the money or witnessed its coinage.

How helpful it is when scholars of different fields come together on a problem. That is what a university community should be. There is so little of it, however.

P. S. He began to ponder the fact that oil would decompose everywhere; that ashes would decompose, geology cannot tell.

Now again he is searching for anomalies in archaeological reports of ancient times, and writes in his Journal of January 21, 1973:

I am dismayed by the material that I must digest. This morning I scanned *Chronologies in Old World Archaeology*, a fat little encyclopedia edited by Robert W. Ehrich. I search for evidence of clear breaks between cultures. The authors do not give them. They classify but do not explain a multitude of changes in strata and objects. In a couple of instances 'sudden' stoppages are mentioned. Done in 1965, none mentions Velikovsky, one mentions Schaeffer (he could hardly miss him since Schaeffer appeared in 1948 and the author is specialized in Northern Syria and Northern Mesopotamia.)

All are using R-C dating (adjusted) and grumbling about it.

It is difficult to say whether the dates given reflect a sampling of possibilities, e.g.:

If all the dates are put into a frequency table, would gaps show up and would these point to a destruction over part or whole areas? Is this statistically inferable?

Look up possible catalogue of all R-C and P-A dates for the world and make a frequency table from them. If there is

- 1) any consistency of cluster or gaps?
- 2) any consistency in parts of the world; i.e. axis tilt or even another disaster would hit certain parts of the world worse than others.

Later, the whole picture could be slid into a true chronological space.

All dates seem to be later than 10,000 B.C.

Then he is in Athens and has looked up Professor G. Marinis of the University of Athens Geology Department:

Dear Professor Marinis:

The Doxiades Organization informed me that you were supervising the analysis of the core drillings being made at a number of sites in Athens in connection with the proposed subway route....

I am interested in any evidences that your drillings may show of levels of calcination in the historical and pre historical stratigraphy of the area. By calcination I mean burnt debris, ash coverings, and earth subjected to heavy thermal stress. At the same time I would be interested in concurrent evidence of flooding on a large scale, associated with or independent of the burning.

Professor Marinis is happy to oblige and introduces him to the engineer who is drilling beneath the city. The engineer takes Deg on a tour of the drilling sites, and shows him profiles of many cores. The drilling is too crude to tell him what he wants to know: what comes up is an already infinitely fractured Athens schist; no way of

showing thin or scattered ashes. Athens must have shaken a great deal in ancient time, he thinks, but no indications of flooding or ash falls. Could the surface of Attica have been shaken, washed away and blown away? Possibly. The Acropolis was originally part of a larger mass, according to Plato, and to have been well-watered.

He sails for Naxos, whence he writes to his old friend, Richard C. Cornuelle, in Manhattan:

...I have nearly concluded that the ocean basins were created about 15,000 years ago, and promptly filled with the waters of heaven. And I bought a beach ball, painted it white, and, with much effort and complication, finally succeeded yesterday in drawing upon it in crayon, a map of the all-land (Pangea) earth, the old poles, the old ice caps, and the fractures that split and drove apart the continents by an expansion of the globe. I had hoped to sketch the book this summer but the problems have come so hot and heavy that maybe another six months will be needed just to outline the work so that people like you can look at it and see that I ' m not all that crazy.

There ' s a good little foreign crowd here this summer, writers, artists, sculptors, teachers, drifters, even two (not one) belly dancers (American). Wish you might visit. Can give you the absolutely isolated stone cottage away from town where you can dwell stark naked on the land and in the sea. Or send someone you love.

I meant to go to Turkey to get a sample of Trojan ashes, but the crisis, the out-of-pocket expenses, and other risk of the adventure made me put the trip aside and I may get a friend to do the job in the fall or come back in the spring, hopefully with a small grant in hand, to do it myself....

It is clear that Deg was working to explain global morphology by earth expansion. He had yet to achieve the idea that a lunar eruption from the Earth would cause the oceanic fracturing and rafting of continents, and explain many other mysteries at the same time.

*Deg ' s Journal, Naxos, August 15, 1974*

New war crisis. Turks are going too far. People around me disturbed. How do I proceed with my strange far-away thoughts and study?

Met with Gerhardt Rosler for two hours today, three hours yesterday. He wants to talk politics, I geology. We talk mostly geology.

Today we figured out together the parallel faults between Paros and Naxos. May be important. Whole strait between may have collapsed recently. Very 'recent' fault, 'fresh,' according to Gerhard.

Stylida is an everyday sight, by geological standards. The area is not such as to excite the torpid theoretical tempers of geologists. If I can say something about recent changes here, it will show that one can go anywhere in the world with the aid of catastrophic theory, properly framed, and find 'potential support,' at a minimum.

Gerhardt dug up a note he made on a broadcast in Germany when he was a high school student. It said  $x \text{ m}^3$  of hydrogen per second struck the earth. Where did it go? Hydrogen is not part of the atmosphere. Does it combine with O to drop into the ocean as H<sub>2</sub>O?

He had made some rough calculations. It is enough to account for all the oceans at  $2 \times 10^{25}$  grams, we discovered, if E = 4.6 b.y. old Cf this with canopy theory. This held rings derived aboriginally, therefore there is no need for the continuous flow.

But if hydrogen and oxygen met in a different gravitational situation -- when Earth was in Uranus-Gigans [later designated by Deg as Super-Uranus] complex and orbit -- they could compose the rings. Then, relieved from Uranus-Gigans, the rings fell and the stored H<sub>2</sub>O deposits with them. Now, since then, water would be building up with them *directly*! Is this so? Continental shelves -- have they been filling and dropping ?

Back in America to teach for the Fall Semester, on November 11, 1974 he telephones Dorothy Vitaliano, who, with her husband Charles, worked as a geological team. Indiana University press had recently published her *Legends of the Earth*, the aim of which was to establish uniformitarian interpretations of both catastrophic folklore and of geological sites assertedly catastrophic. Her book's sales were disappointing. It is not so easy to sell anti-quantavolution books; although well-received by editors and professors, they lack

an enthusiastic audience.

As an example of her method, she presents an Arancanian Indian legend according to which in ancestral times two serpents made the sea rise. Earthquake and volcanism were followed by a universal flood. The survivors took refuge on a mountaintop which floated up close to the sun. Ever thereafter, the Indians repeated their climb up the mountains, carrying bowls (to protect their heads from the sun, they say), whenever an earth-quake occurs. There must have been numerous similar earthquakes and tsunamis, claims Vitaliano, to perpetuate the legend and its associated behavior.

The myth and associated actions are, in fact, rather clear examples of universal responses to a universal flood, preceded by violent quakes and volcanism. The "Sun" was probably Saturn gone nova (the infant Horus and Jupiter). The twin serpents were twin comets either from a second confused catastrophe or debris from the nova. The bowls are means as protection from fall-out of all kinds. The continual repetition of the behavior is a form of compulsion, whether it occurs during "normal disasters" or in celebration of the anniversaries of the primordial disaster. The concept of *illud tempus* (the First Great Day, so to speak) that Mircea Eliade, the famed comparative ethnologist of the University of Chicago, employs, explains the psychic nature of such events. Deg's *Homo Schizo I* transfers the concept from a solely psychic complex to a complex based upon primeval experience.

Now, at this point in time, Deg and the Vitalianos' should have gotten together to discuss their findings and differences. Not at all. Scientific development seems at times to proceed as a series of missed encounters and perpetuated misunderstandings. A small problem in business -- say a sentence in an annual report -- as Deg could observe among his friends in government and corporations, will arouse a rich system of conference telephoning, airplane rides, Xerox fireworks, and overnight express mail. Not that the scientists need to have agreed, but they might have erased 50% of the differences and retire, both enlightened.

Often impatient of delays, and often pushing things to conclusion -- not always qualities either pleasant or helpful -- Deg was poignantly

conscious of the defects in scientific and intellectual business:

Talk about Pop and Mom grocery stores! The intelligentsia is driven to work at the lowest support level of technology and economy. And is brainwashed besides to accept its lowly status. There is a mythical complex of incompetence and insufficiency which are inextricably rationalized and justified as a single process usually called creative or scientific, and worshipped as a whole. Yet how can you be sure that they would not waste the technology if you gave it to them. Every other occupation does, the military, the bureaucracy, the corporations, everybody except Mom and Pop. There's the paradox: the least efficient is the most efficient, the least costly is the most effective. We can't all be Mom and Pop, but everything else is worse in its own way!

The Vitalianos were part of the Thera volcano study group, a combined geological-archaeological effort at understanding the explosion that tore apart a thriving island in the Aegean. The peculiar shape of the remaining land excited suspicions as to its history but no historical reference to it occurs. At first, therefore, modern volcanologists assigned it an old age. Then Spiridon Marinatos excavated cultural remains of the Bronze Ages; finally a town of Late Minoan Age was uncovered, Akrotiri.

The geologists followed Marinatos in assigning the destruction to about 1500 B.C. and tying it into both the Exodus and the sinking of Atlantis. Eddie Schorr, a graduate student of the University of Cincinnati, working for Velikovsky, showed (contra-Velikovsky and all concerned) that the event could not be of 1500 B.C., but rather must have occurred around 1100 B.C. or later, and also that it could not be Atlantis. Deg adopted Schorr's view, even though he would have liked to see it dated at 1500 B.C., when there was a felt need to discover universal destruction surrounding the major Venus disaster. The others went merrily along writing books and articles to profit from the glamorous Atlantis and Exodus connections, which I think shows how readily 'hard' scientists will buy meretricious goods. V. was silent, though his voice, correcting his error and endorsing Schorr, would have carried weight. Schorr should have been granted his doctorate promptly upon the publication of this brief piece and his two articles disposing of the Greek Dark Ages (hence 500 years of supposed

time) that appeared at the same time.

Such was not to be. Indeed, he published the articles under the pseudonym of Isaac Isaacson, so fearful was he of being evicted from the Ph.D. program of his University. V. was disposed to support his fear; movements are made of martyrs.

Deg could not figure out how justified was their fear, but was concerned with the self-destructive aspects of it. V. had paranoiac tendencies which fueled even stronger and similar suspicions on Schorr 's part. Good for one another intellectually, they were bad for each other emotionally. Schorr was highly regarded at Cincinnati. Yet he finally left the University and retired to his family 's business in Houston. His research continued privately, and he remained in touch with several other heretics if only through letters that are extremely long, brilliantly correct on Aegean history, and malevolently critical of practically everyone, including his correspondents.

In one of these letters to Greenberg he attacked Deg 's articles on Troy first for not crediting him enough for his advice and counsel (in what name he should have received credit was not made clear), secondly, for small errors that could and should have been corrected in a letter to Deg or to the publishing magazine, *Kronos*. Greenberg passed the letter to Deg saying, you see, here is what I have to deal with (for the rest of the letter was furious on other matters as well), or perhaps he was saying, see here, I am not the worst of the Furies. Efforts were made by Elisheva and others, following V. 's death, to consolidate Schorr 's unpublished work on the Dark Ages into V. 's lean manuscript on the subject, to no avail.

Deg offered to speak to the Cincinnati authorities on Schorr 's behalf, but he was warned against doing so; the prophecy went on to fulfill itself. I cannot say, however, that word of the pseudonymous scholar did not leak to the Cincinnati network, for Deg told his daughter, Dr. Catherine Vanderpool, who dwelled in association with the Athens terminus of the network, of Eddie 's predicament; and when Eddie put Deg in touch with Professor Cadogan of the University of Cincinnati, surely he must have been

tempting, or even admitting, self-disclosure.

Deg, we recall, was on the trail of Trojan ashes. One day he was working at the library of the American school of Classical Studies in Athens, and found in one of the volumes a remarkable sentence to the effect that samples from numerous levels of Trojan debris had been collected by Blegen 's team in the 1930 's. Yes -- Jerry Sperling, a visiting scholar from Cincinnati told him, who had worked on Troy and was at the Library at the same moment -- this showed the thoroughness of Blegen; no, he said, I do not know what they are or where they are.

Deg had friendly access to James Caskey, head of the archaeology department at Cincinnati, through Cathy 's father-in-law, Professor Eugene Vanderpool, a friend, and highly reputed as the "Grand Old man" of the School of Athens. Yes, the samples were in bags still, and were about to be analyzed by a geologist, Professor Bullard. So said Caskey. And Deg spoke to Caskey of his interest in the calcinology of the debris.

On September 18, 1974, Deg called Reuben G. Bullard who, it developed, had left the University to join the faculty of the Cincinnati Bible Seminary. Deg found him well-disposed and even willing to undertake the work from his new position. The sample were contained in about 400 cloth bags in the attic of McMicken Hall. Deg wrote to Caskey and meanwhile reported to his friend Bruce Mainwaring, another cosmic heretic who also on occasion dug into his purse to help move along a publication, "very enthusiastic about your idea for an 'ash' project...and hoping to try to organize a program which embodies some of Eddie 's ideas as well..."

Then Caskey decides the same action should be taken; he writes Deg:

*3 Nov. 74*

Dear Professor de Grazia,

Thank you for your letter of October 22. I am interested in the project, but must ask for a bit of time to inform myself further.

It was a shock to me to hear that Bullard is no longer at the university. I shall be leaving Greece soon but shall be in Cincinnati only shortly before the Christmas holidays. Therefore I'll take up the question -- as soon as possible -- after the opening of the winter quarter in January. It is important. My colleagues and I shall give it careful and serious consideration.

With apologies for the delay and, again, thanks, I am

Yours Sincerely,  
*John L. Caskey*

There is no recognition, here or otherwise, that Deg might render theoretical or operational assistance. Deg sent a copy of his manuscript on paleocalcinology and Trojan ashes to George Rapp, whom Dorothy Vitaliano had recommended as having had an interest in Trojan geology. Deg now applies to the National Science Foundation and is turned down. Time passes. On May 12, 1976, Deg called George Rapp, who is at the University of Minnesota in Duluth, and notes down the substance of their discussion:

Conversation with Prof. George Rapp  
Department of Geology  
University of Minnesota at Duluth

1200 hrs. May 12, 1976

Has rec'd NEH and NSF grants to study the 350 sample bags from Troy. Is applying a range of chemical analyses to all bags. Has found some pollen and wood that can be <sup>14</sup>C analysed. No reports yet and possibly for another year or two. (Students asst is going away for summer on job.) He is expecting to look at the terrain himself in December. No signs of vitrification in the samples. Visual inspection cannot often reveal ashes, but he will know whether there has been fall-out from volcanism or local incineration from torch or accident.

I asked him about the scottish vitrified forts. He never heard of them. I described the findings of a century ago and said that the theory called for brush or log fires set outside the walls to harden them. He questioned the temperatures, as did I. 1000 degrees needed well focused, [sic] as is done in ceramic baking (with help of venting.) When I told him that the fusing had entered a couple of feet into the crevices, he dismissed any

brush fire. So one more important detail is cleared away. The vitrified towers are definitely of unusual origin. I asked him whether the soil of Hisarlik contained the same kind of ferruginous clay that we were talking about and he said he did not know but would look see when he visited the site. (He had been there before but had not noticed.) He said that the vitrification would be noticed by the archaeologists at Troy but none mentioned it. I am not so sure they didn't. What was the calcination if not vitrification? But the copper and lead deposits would have performed the same lightning attractive functions as the ferruginous clay. Hisarlik is a lonely tell and promontory, also attractive.

I told Rapp that I would rap with him come fall to see if anything new had happened. He said he doubts if anything new will have happened. He said he doubts that he will ever have final answers.

On June 15, 1977 Eugene Vanderpool writes to Deg:

Dear Al,

Here is Caskey's reply about the Troy samples, written from Kea.

About the Thera conference sponsored by Galaopoulos and scheduled for July, I am told by Jerry Sperling that it has been postponed until next year. He heard this from George Rapp.

All well in Pikermi,

Yours,  
*Gene*

J.L. Caskey to E. Vanderpool June 14, 1977

Work on the Troy samples is proceeding, very thorough, under George Rapp of University of Minnesota at Duluth, progress satisfactory. I am told. The results are to be put together in 1978, with the plan that they be submitted then as a supplementary Monograph in the Cincinnati TROY-Series (Princeton U. Press) [actually the results were published in 1982] Slow, but I trust worth the time and effort (and money).

If you are in touch, tell Prof. De G. I'll try to write to him one day but am not sure just when. I haven't got the facts, and

probably could not understand them if I had. Nothing definite has been reported yet, in any case.

In 1982 the report finally appears, dedicated to Caskey who had deceased, extravagantly published by the Princeton University Press, and offered at a price of \$52.00. Deg who has been following closely its production calls his friend Jerry Sherwood of the Press. She invites him to sit down in their offices and go through the book. He is disappointed. There are no findings of consequence from tests of the debris. The only organic elements of significance are from the straw used in making bricks. There is no indication that any of Deg 's hypotheses was considered, even if to refute them.

What could be concluded from this study that occupied several years and cost a hundred thousand dollars? Either nothing unusual had occurred beyond the man-caused or accidental burning and earthquakes, or the proper tests were not employed, or the samples were defective to begin with. Schliemann 's burnt City remained a mystery, so far as Deg was concerned.

Only some of the samples were used. He argues that the remainder stand for future investigation. Regardless of the sinister hypotheses of strange fall-outs or electrical-thermal emanations from underground, there are other more conventional hypotheses that would be worth further study. An outside team, say, such as Blumer of Woods Hole Oceanographic Center led when he was alive, might be asked to evaluate the samples on a much wider range of tests, seeking gases, polycyclic hydrocarbons, lightning residues, and volcanic tephra.

On the one hand this may seem to be the suggestion of a crank who is never satisfied by proofs against his pet theory; on the other hand this may be one of those cases (so well-known in the record of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, for instance) where decades of one-sided proof turn out to be bad and new theories and tests bring about retraction of the "proofs" and significant new discoveries.

\*\*\*

At Chapel Hill, North Carolina, Deg was visiting fire-dance expert and archaeoastronomer Elizabeth Chesley-Baity, and paid a courtesy call to the Political Science department. Professor Andrew Scott was cued in to Deg's quantavolution and suggested he get in touch with his relative, John William Firor by name, who was Director of the National Center for Atmospheric Research. An exchange of letters followed. One notes that the inquiry strikes into two lines of study: the possibly catastrophic origins of mankind and geophysical catastrophism. Firor's letter stuck in Deg's mind as he wrote the chapters on exoterrestrialism and the atmosphere in *Lately Tortured Earth*.

*June 3, 1976*

Dear Dr. Firor:

As I was explaining my present studies in the origins of human nature to Andy Scott recently, he came up with the suggestion that I address you on one type of problem which I've encountered. In my scenario of practically instant creation of the psychocultural human from a closely similar *homo sapiens* anatomy, I have had to set up models of genetic change, cultural traumas, and atmosphere change (plus combinations). In the atmospheric context, one major question is whether there occurred a radical change in some atmospheric constant, which then assumed a uniformitarian guise and which is not observable presently therefore, but yet is producing distinctively human behavior.

For instance, what are the limitations (low-high) of the gases and particles or combinations thereof that an essentially human physical type can absorb or endure without expiring and secondly what mental and anatomical operations would be continuously altered by the different possible mixes?

High altitude deoxygenation, nitrogen bends, oxygen poisoning, carbon monoxide poisoning, x-ray and ultra-violet effects are some cases of relevance. I wonder whether certain gases can affect the endocrines continuously; I postulate this because a constant heightening of endocrinal output will result in pathological exaggerations of typical behavior.

Among the hypothetical constructs for abrupt change in atmospheric constants might be included increase or decrease in oxygen; CO<sub>2</sub>; ambient ionization; x-ray; solar particles;

heavy volcanism and gases over centuries. I have not mentioned changes in barometric or in atmosphere mass weight, nor of the effects of high, heavy ice-water rings or canopies that were removed in a series of cataclysms. The chain of causation may be complex, e.g., a life span increase (decrease) brought on by changed gas mixture promotes longer training and group memory and skills.

Perhaps I haven't provided enough detail even to permit considering the subject. If so, please tell me. If this suggests to you some ideas of studies that you would care to relate to me, I would be most grateful. I call my field revolutionary primevalogy; the atmosphere which may be the most delicate of all ecological factors, is part of it.

*8 July 1976*

Dear Professor de Grazia:

I have given considerable thought to your June 3 letter asking whether there has occurred any radical change in some atmospheric constant. There are three areas that I can comment on: atmospheric composition, climate, and ultraviolet radiation.

The present notions concerning atmospheric composition do not suggest that there have been sudden changes. Those who have thought about the history of the atmosphere take as a starting point a gradually cooling earth which has exhaled a good deal of carbon dioxide. In this situation, some sort of primitive plant life begins and the plants themselves begin to produce oxygen. When the oxygen content reaches some particular level, then animal life becomes possible and it too begins its long evolutionary chain. I am not an authority in this area, but my reading tells me that no one has yet proposed any cataclysmic changes in composition. There is some notion that we have reached an oxygen content which is self-regulating, that if plants produce enough oxygen that the atmospheric content tends to increase, the likelihood of lightning -- starting forest fires and other events would increase enough to burn up the extra oxygen and bring it back up to its regulated level. I do not know how accepted this notion is, but if anything, it works against what you are looking for, that is a sudden change.

There are sudden changes known in the dust content of the atmosphere as a result of major volcanic eruptions. When the Agung Volcano erupted in the early 60s, it's well established

that the dust in the stratosphere went all over the world and stratospheric temperatures changed for a year or two afterwards as the dust only gradually washed out. However, no ground-level effects of this process were measured and, hence, nothing that might easily fit into impacting a *Homo sapiens* anatomy.

The climate does change. The northern hemisphere warmed up between 1890 and 1950 and has cooled off since that time by a similar amount. The changes are larger in some parts of the northern hemisphere than in others. This particular change is not particularly large and perhaps not cataclysmic enough for what you are looking for. There are suggestions, however, in the paleoclimate record that larger changes have occurred more rapidly. Around 500 B.C., evidently, in the space of a day, or a month, or a year (after this long a time, it's hard to tell the difference) the climate of Europe cooled strikingly, clogging certain well-known mountain passes with snow, changing the dates of which harbors were free of ice, and producing dramatic effects on the trade arrangements, travel patterns and so forth of the time. There are other tantalizing bits of evidence of sudden changes in climate -- a rodent in Canada found frozen in thousands-of-year-old ice-covered terrain. Climate change and climate theory is a very active area of study just now and I would suspect a rapid accumulation of new information in this area in the next few years.

Finally, ultraviolet light. Recently, we have found that a sudden stream of fast particles from the sun on one occasion struck the high atmosphere of the earth, produced nitrogen compounds that in turn destroyed some of the ozone and suddenly admitted more ultraviolet light to the surface than before. The effect went away fairly quickly as the ozone layer healed itself and indeed the effect was rather small. But it suggests that if during the changing patterns of the earth's magnetic field there occurred a moment when there was no general field of the earth, hence, no magnetosphere to protect us from solar particles, we might have an era in which the atmosphere would have much less ozone and, hence, the ultraviolet radiation at the surface would be considerably larger than today. It is hard to say how rapidly such a situation might begin. I suppose one could also not rule out the possibility of a major and sustained emission of particles from the sun which would begin essentially instantaneously and diminish the ozone layer for weeks or months, but we have never observed that much solar activity. Very recently you may have seen an article in *Science*

magazine written by a scientist here at NCAR in which he pulled together many lines of evidence to indicate that during a 70-year period in the late 17th century, the sun seemed to be free of sun spots and the character of solar activity was very different from anything we have known in modern times. This fact at least holds out the possibility that sustained changes in solar activity was very different from anything we have known in modern times. This fact at least holds out the possibility that sustained changes in solar activity can occur and I would suppose if they can occur negatively, that is the vanishing of sun spots of solar activity, one might have eras of higher than normal solar activity. The carbon-14 record, which was used in the Science article as corroborating evidence, suggests that the changes in cosmic rays producing carbon-14 and controlled by the sun were of the same relative size of that occurring during the sun-spot-free period in the 17th century.

I hope these rather crude thoughts are some help to you in thinking about revolutionary primevalogy.

Sincerely Yours,  
*John W. Firor*

\*\*\*

The ancient Roman Encyclopedist Pliny mentions that the Etruscan city of Volsinium had been destroyed long before him by a thunderbolt from the sky. None paid serious attention to the remark, except the cosmic heretics. Deg, who had campaigned during the War in the region, would have liked to investigate Pliny 's claim, a pleasant location for a critical test of the veracity of legend and the activity of Zeus the Thunderbolter or another god.

After he had become acquainted with an authoritative figure of Italian geology, Professor Piero Leonardi of the University of Ferrara and the Academia Nazionale dei Lincei, he wrote Leonardi about Bolsena and received a disappointingly assured reply:

*10 March 1977*

...I read with interest what you said in your letter about the Lake of Bolsena and the publications of your friend Juergens on the possible attribution of the craters and 'sinuous rilles'

of the Moon and Mars to enormous electrical discharges, but I must confess to you that the arguments of your friend do not convince me, for a complex of considerations shared by almost all planetologists. I am sending you separately a work of mine on the origin of the 'sinuous rilles' in which you can discern my opinion on the matter...

He voices, too, his opinion that meteoroid impacts and volcanism can account for the craters.

So far as concerns the Lake of Bolsena, one is dealing undoubtedly with a normal volcanic structure, and I do not believe at all that its origin can be attributed to extraterrestrial phenomena.

He goes on to address himself to a query of Deg concerning a nineteenth century report of human bones and pottery found in Pliocene deposits and deposited at the Museum in Florence, and says that the report was probably made before proper stratigraphy was carried on, thus permitting a mixture of materials of different epochs.

Naturally Deg was not satisfied. Comyns Beaumont had written many years earlier of the erratic nature of volcanic eruptions and suspected that meteors and volcanos transacted electromagnetically. Stephanos found a striking instance of this reported by the noted oceanographer Beebe on the ship "Arcturus" approaching a volcano at Albermarle Sound. In one day, two brilliant meteors came out of the sky and shot into the crater of the volcano. Noting that Flaugergue's Comet preceded the frightful New Madrid, Missouri, earthquake in 1811-1812, Deg figured that a correlation between comets and meteors on the one side and volcanos and earthquakes on the other side might well be significantly positive.

Deg is also corresponding with Professor Ernst Wreschner at this time, inquiring whether he has news of the discoveries at Ebla. Wreschner on March 30, 1977 responds:

"...On the Italian digs and tablets. There are two possibilities for the destruction of the town, 1) A natural catastrophe, 2) A man-made one. The time: *ca* 2200 B.C. I do not think that a

natural catastrophe destroyed the town and left the tablets intact. The short-lived semitic (Jewish?) Kingdom of Eber had powerful neighbors in what is now Iraq. The time is also known as the beginning of the Hittite expansion..."

Other cosmic heretics are alert to the fate of Ebla. Its destruction occurs in Deg 's Mercurian period, a highly electrical period. The nations are in turmoil; the natural forces of the Earth -- volcanic, seismic, aquatic, atmospheric -- respond to exoterrestrial forces, attributed often to the planet Mercury and his identities as Thoth, Hermes, *et al.* Deg laid down the challenge: that no exceptions will be found to the catastrophic destruction of settlements of this period. Concurrently, radar engineer M.M. Mandelkehr published his first study, this "An Integrated Model for an Earthwide Event at 2300 B.C." that extended Schaeffer 's Near East investigations to demonstrate on all continents "a global catastrophe caused by an extraterrestrial body." He worked quite alone, contentedly so, apparently; Deg and Sizemore visited him on one occasion, inasmuch as he lived not far from Trenton. Philip Clapham made his debut as a cosmic heretic in 1983 with two articles in *Catastrophism and Ancient History* on Ebla, fitting it into the catastrophic chronology of the Near East.

\*\*\*

One of the most promising ventures of the mid-seventies was the little magazine that Hans Kloosterman, a Dutch geologist, put out from Rio de Janeiro. *The Catastrophist Geologist* went on for two years and subsided, but not before it had brought to light materials of German and Russian catastrophists quite unknown to the English-speaking heretics, and of a high degree of sophistication. Noteworthy especially was Otto Schindewolf, a paleontologist who had begun his publications in 1950. He favored the hypothesis that fluctuations in high- energy cosmic radiation caused the periodic extermination of most species. He contributed the essential concept of anastrophism, the positive side of catastrophism, attributing the birth as well as the death of species to radiation disasters.

Deg heard first from Kloosterman in May of 1977 and replied to congratulate him. He absorbed material from at least half of the contents of the journal into *Lately Tortured Earth*.

Kloosterman removed himself *a priori* from an association with Velikovsky, a step sincerely taken which would perhaps help to bring a new line of contributors to the field; however, it also put him out of touch with devotees of Velikovsky and actually incited antagonism to his work. He knew that catastrophists were few, without realizing perhaps how very few. He and Deg never met, and Deg would get snippets of news about him from Dutch heretics. The journal, which could have matched *Kronos* and *SISR* had it continued, brought in professional geologists, an element conspicuously absent in quantavolutionary circles.

\*\*\*

What Deg meant by ideological features of geology and science generally was amply explained in a note later on:

As I moved from the theory of human behavior into the study of Nature, my intellectual baggage included the concept of a "scientific fiction" which had given me good use for many years and which may be hypothesized when encountering phenomena that are unproven or lead too far afield to explain, yet are needed to move ahead with an exposition.

I discovered surprisingly that most natural scientists are not skeptical about some major guiding concepts, conceding to them the 'hardness' of reality (reality itself being a fiction of undeniable universal utility). Several scientific fictions can be named, however, that may be losing some of their utility and therefore should when employed should be watched for what they are doing to one's mind and the facts being ordered.

Practical fictions of Science:

- a) the Ice Ages
- b) Natural Selection
- c) Continental Drift
- d) "In the Beginning," "primordial melt," the primitive solar system," "as the Earth was being formed," "illud tempus."

Such a fiction includes:

- a) the indexing function

- b) the classifying of material
- c) an explanation of phenomena
- d) defense mechanism phenomena
- e) license to work (freedom)
- f) acceptance (reward)
- g) allows one to conjecture freely

All may have in common defense mechanisms vs. catastrophism.

May be analyze with similar concepts articles in Nature before 1970 and several Sci. encyclopedias' usages of these terms.

*Cf. Hans Vaihinger Philosophy of 'As If'*

When no longer functional, these may and should be reviewed to pass muster.

\*\*\*

All the while the cosmic heretics were sure that the planets and the Moon would display catastrophic effects along with the Earth. Planetary and satellite geology was carried on actively in the pages of *Pensée* and subsequent media of the heretics. The high heat of Venus was the central topic of the debate, but V. kept extending his list of claims to other planets and the Moon.

For instance, in a letter to H.H. Hess, July 2, 1969, he wrote:

Some nine thousand years ago water was showered on Earth and Moon alike (deluge). But on the Moon all of it dissociated, hydrogen escaping; the rocks will be found rich in oxygen, chlorine, sulfur and iron.

Velikovsky had not then or later a fixed idea of when the Noachian Flood, which he is talking about, occurred. Here it was 9000 B.P. Sometimes he said 4000 B.P., at other times 6000 B.P., and it was this last date that Deg also chose when the time came to postulate a catastrophic calendar.

Unlike V. and other heretics, Deg accepted the theory of "continental drift" that triumphed in geology during the postwar generation. He went far beyond it, pulling the Moon from the Earth

at the beginning of the continental movements, in proposing that then the drift was a rapid "trot," assigning the total quantavolution to a large passing sky body which he called Uranus Minor.

24 December 1981

A Merry Christmas and Happy New year to SIS and yourself!

The Editor, *SISR*

Dear Sir.

Dr. Peter Smith's "Open Earth" (V *SISR* I 1980-I 30-2) is not open enough to some tastes. If, as he rightly says, "The only certainties are that our sphere of ignorance is huge...", then he should let some quantavolutionary theory squeeze through along with the gang of speculations about continental drift. I do not call it "drift" but "rafting." (See *Chaos and Creation*, 155) In fact, I considered calling it a "trot." Its course has followed a negative exponential curve since its catastrophic beginning. The simplest explanation of the mosaic of jostling crustal pieces is an initial set of heavy shocks from a passing body that wrenched away half of the crust, cracking the remainder and sending it sliding hither and yon toward the great basin exposed by the lost material.

For the moment, geophysicists are enchanted by the shivers of movement and the designation of the creeping pieces as major and minor plates. I have seen the most marvelous reconstructions of the Earth going back "half a billion" years; one is published by a University of Chicago paleographic project under Alfred Ziegler. In my view, the original plate until a few millennia ago was the whole earth covering the globe. What we can chart now are the millimeters of creep of the long uniformitarian tail of the exponential curve of decline from the original precipitous outburst of crust.

To accomplish their uniformitarian infinitesimalism, most geophysicists have taken refuge in billions of years; thus can the curve be smoothed out. This imaginary flat curve they then prove by elaborating geological and radiometric tests of time, the very foundations of which were destroyed by quantavolutions. But, too, tests of time aside, if Dr. Smith would provide us with a single study proving subduction of frozen mantle back into the molten depths -- carrying with it light crystal material or, worse, where is all the stuff dumped

along the shores? -- or if he can supply any other type of hard proof that the continental plates move under an Earth power that is sui generis and not originally extra-terrestrial, we should be most obliged.

On the other hand, I do not intend to support Dr. Velikovsky's view of continental drift, which was always to my mind a non-view, "fence-straddling" (to allow an American political expression). As he says, "My position on continental drift was (and is ) intermediary between..." Between what -- an orange and a banana? Maybe he did not want to hurt Harry Hess' feelings, Hess having fathered the plate theory, for Hess was one of the few establishment leaders who treated him with a full hearing. Had Wegener's life not been cut short, he might finally have come upon the best explanation of continental drift, for he already had unblinded himself of major geological theses and had the basic components of continental rafting mechanisms in mind.

I hope that Dr. Smith's youthful journal, which you advertise, will open up to articles employing condensed time scales and depicting external forces playing upon the terrestrial globe.

Sincerely yours,  
*Alfred de Grazia*

Deg's theory of recent lunar fission began in long fits of staring at the physiography of the globe. He was attracted by Carey's advocacy of a considerable global expansion as the basis for the globe-girdling fractures, but then put off by M. Cook's comments that the heat of such an expansion would have dissolved the Earth. Still, invoking exoterrestrial help, he worked up first an expansion model, as is related in his letter to Cornuelle of August 1, 1974; then, after a year of worrying that expansion great or small could not explain the actual disposition of the continents, he decided upon an explosion-expansion model. Only Milton actively endorsed the concept. The cosmic heretics, who could visualize Venus flying by the Earth 3500 years ago, balked at picturing the crust of the Earth exploding into space to form the Moon a few thousands years earlier. But Deg found that the model, proposed in *Chaos and Creation*, of a binary solar system, recently disintegrating, could accommodate lunar fission along with every major features and dynamic of the natural and biological sciences, together with the

earliest grand legendary themes of mankind.

When he finally got down to writing at length about geology in *The Lately Tortured Earth*, the work came easily. It was simply a matter of taking up in turn the elements of the biosphere, lithosphere and hydrosphere and applying to them all the material that he could gather about exoterrestrial forces playing upon the Earth. The more he wrote, the better he felt about the possibility of adapting conventional gradualism to quantavolution.

It seemed to him that the scientific fields were still far behind, needlessly so, even when they were boldly led. After he had completed the book and sent it off to India for production, he became aware that a striking conference had been held at the resort town of Snowbird, Utah on October 19- 22, 1981. Sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences and the Lunar and Planetary Institute, and funded liberally by several foundations and institutions, scores of experts gathered to report upon their separately supported and conducted researches in "Geological Implications of Impacts of Large Asteroids and Comets on the Earth." Deg was of course unknown and uninvited; he recognized having met personally only one of the participants! Their papers were published a year later by the Geological Society of America.

The conference would have been a practical impossibility a generation earlier. It displayed contemporary geology doing what it could do best, technical variations on a theme: given unmistakable traces of the occurrence of certain meteoritic falls, how might these be distinguished and measured, what excavations could they have caused, what chemicals could have been scattered about, what animals and planets would have died -- all of this tightly bound up with uniformitarian experience and highly mathematicized. One searches hopelessly in the volume for an enlarged philosophical and cosmogonical inquiry.

Many topics went unaddressed, among them the possibility that important exoterrestrial transactions of the Earth involved pass-bys of large bodies without impacting; that planets might have played a role in cosmic disasters; that the measures of time employed might not be infallible; that the Earth 's tortured crustal morphology might

in its most general features be an exoterrestrial effect; and that heavy fall-outs of non-exotic material such as water and gravel might have occurred. When Deg examined the papers, he felt keenly the ambivalence and loneliness of a front-runner in the course of thought. The elation of being far ahead was countered by the fear of being disoriented and by the longing to be moving forward amidst a body of kindred spirits.

**[Click here to view  
the next section of this book.](#)**