

rivalled the sun in brightness.”; p. 165, Hebrews: “The brilliant light of Venus blazes from one end of the cosmos to the other end.” Many more quotes could be extracted from *Worlds in Collision*.

⁴⁶ This perennial surprise of Margolis is a trite device of transition (cf. above paragraph 3, and next paragraph below) that unfortunately leaves whole ideas introduced and dangling. What is surprising in this?

⁴⁷ There is a shortage of good wild-guessers. The *Encyclopedia Americana* cites as a most striking prediction J. Swift’s prediction of two satellites of Mars (1726), actually discovered by A. Hall in 1877; but who is to say? In the time of Swift, one year before Newton’s death, there were known to be five satellites of Saturn, four of Jupiter, one of Earth, two (imaginary) of Venus. A lucky guess of Mars’ satellites is conceivable. Predicting radio noises of Jupiter, or the great heat of Venus (claiming, against the calculated value of 17°C, a state close to incandescence), or archaeological discoveries of current Egyptian objects in Greek (“later”) diggings, are some of Velikovsky’s “wild guesses.”

⁴⁸ Since this is the third reference to a phrase that occurred [once] in L. Stecchini’s article, Margolis should be informed that Kierkegaard’s use of the phrase did not involve people literally going about shaking like aspen leaves. Kierkegaard meant man’s Fear in relation to the Cosmos.

⁴⁹ Example? A single case, at least?

⁵⁰ But cf. *ABS* p. 67, “While his ideas are not at all beyond criticism. . . .”

⁵¹ Inaccurate quote. Certainly, however, Velikovsky has shown what remarkable resources still exist in ancient materials.

⁵² Next Margolis will be an expert on sampling!

“The small but representative sampling” actually consists of criticism of two points out of four extensive volumes of published writings. In one, which deals with an Egyptian inscription, Margolis flunks in Egyptology and linguistics. In the other, which refers to Augustine, he fatally misquotes both Augustine and Velikovsky.

⁵³ The grounds are very clearly stated, if Margolis will read them. Velikovsky deserves defense primarily as a serious scholar attempting to place his work before a scientific public without censorship, personal abuse, slander, and ostracism. NOWHERE DOES MARGOLIS TAKE UP THE GRAVE ISSUE OF VIOLATION OF A MAN’S PERSONAL LIBERTY AND CENSORSHIP BY A BODY OF OPONENTS, NOR DOES HE TREAT THE SECOND MAIN EFFORT OF THE *ABS* ARTICLES: THEIR PROPOSITIONS ABOUT THE SOCIOLOGY OF SCIENCE.

⁵⁴ Alas, the double-talk begins again.

Six careful readings of this paragraph leave us baffled and bemused. Perhaps our readers can make sense of it.