

(The comments below are keyed to the article reproduced in facsimile beginning on the facing page.)

¹ Mere humor does not justify the existence of a science writer's profession, if the humor misleads and is useless. "Science writers" should be hired to preserve the virtues of scientific writing, not to destroy them by false animism, vulgar parody, etc. The effort to invalidate Velikovsky's work and to denigrate him as a scholar is undertaken in a magazine for scientists, mainly in physics and related disciplines. Almost no astronomical counter-argument is offered. The area of knowledge in which the attempt of invalidation is made is historical philology, a field in which the readers are unoriented and unable to judge; they have to trust in the editor and author. H. Margolis is apparently foreign to philology, has no idea of the Egyptian or Hebrew languages or alphabets; he is, however, permitted to speak with authority on the subject. He probably cannot read French, though the sources he deals with require it.

² A word scientists hate (often with good reason), but inapplicable.

³ Spelling: read *Immanuel*.

⁴ Contemptuous name-calling: cf. the "rain-man," the "circus-man." Also note the derogatory use of words; why *the man* and not simply "him"?

⁵ "Arrogance" was only one of numerous reasons for their behavior.

⁶ Contemptuous colloquialism. No sign of true reading of the lines. A cosmogonist studies the origins of the universe and its elements, often philosophically. A "savant" is a learned man. The ABS writer makes a judgment and cites great cosmogonists of the past, all of whom have naturally had their theories modified or overturned in the course of the ages.

⁷ Note that the carefully specified theory of the ABS, which was confined to a subsection of a subsection and hedged with doubts, is tossed out here at the beginning of the article. No mention of the careful reasoning, fully explained by the ABS author, as to the scientific sociological necessity for alluding to the matter.

⁸ Not "unable to refute." "Psychologically unable to address themselves to" would be preferable.

⁹ Simplism again; see (5) above.

¹⁰ It would be better to cite Stecchini here, as the author; De Grazia in (6); Juergens elsewhere; and so on. The authors have responsibility for their individual articles. As anyone knows who has read the articles, there are differences from one to the next. Yet each man wrote in close touch with the others.

¹¹ An important point. Why does he not attack it?

¹² False reporting. No evidence advanced by Margolis. No test of these statements suggested. Actually ABS received many letters about the issue, one indication of interest among its readers. Any editor will know how little unsolicited response almost every kind of

article gets. As for the physical scientists' response, one purpose in treating a little of the substance of the Velikovsky theories in a behavioral science magazine was because Dr. Velikovsky has been denied access to natural science organs, a fact carefully documented by ABS. I am reminded of the Nazis who showed me a concentration camp, where men had been reduced to animals, and said "See how these people are not more than animals." You censor Velikovsky and then say, in effect, "No physicist notices him. Therefore he is beneath notice."

¹³ We note signs of logical confusion, which grow stronger as the piece develops and culminate in a final spate of gibberish at the very end.

¹⁴ Absurd: the debate about Velikovsky's books provoked strong emotions in the scientific community ("highly unacademic fury": *Newsweek*). Much of the ABS material proves that science could be and was full of emotional and political passions.

¹⁵ "Reasonable weighing of objective evidence" is what V. Bargmann and L. Motz asked from the scientific community in their letter to *Science* (Dec. 21, 1962); instead abuse followed (*Science*, Feb. 15, 1963). Besides, the ABS was not geared to or aimed at questions of factual theory.

¹⁶ False reporting. Shapley, Gaposchkin, and others are brought to the forum of public opinion and the disclosure of their acts and motives is the main theme of the ABS special issue.

¹⁷ Name calling ("plain hokum") is no "reasonable weighing of objective evidence." (see above 15) It is a libel and slander: "Hokum" is defined as a device deliberately used by a writer to hoodwink an audience into believing something. If Margolis did not mean this, he should apologize.

¹⁸ A major falsehood. Such is not Velikovsky's view. According to *Worlds in Collision*, p. 371, the probable eruption of Venus from Jupiter took place in the 3rd millennium before the present era.

¹⁹ False reporting. The analysis is buttressed and explained on many pages, and once more and at great detail in *Earth in Upheaval*, published in 1955, perhaps unknown to Margolis. For example, going back to the previous paragraph, the story of events as narrated in the *Iliad* and quoted also from other sources, recounts repeated strong perturbations between Mars and Venus, the former being the more disturbed of the two.

²⁰ "That the planets occasionally hop about from one orbit to another" is a misrepresentation of the incidental analogy drawn with Bohr's model. The book (*Worlds in Collision*) argues the planets with intersecting or converging orbits suffered near-collisions with resulting changes in orbits.