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| **Worlds in Collision and the Natural Sciences**  Although many articles were written against the theory of *Worlds in Collision,* and its author was called many names, there are but two arguments that are of real significance and with which the theory of “worlds in collision” stands or falls. One argument is of astronomical, the other of geological nature. Astronomers believe that the Earth and the entire solar system have been moving unperturbed for billion-years-long eons, every planet and every satellite on the same unchanging orbit. Geologists believe that the earth passed through a process of slow evolution, and that no vast catastrophe occurred in the age of man, if at all.  Since these two beliefs are the foundation of these two sciences, a theory that opposes them threatens to overturn the entire edifice. It is branded as heresy and is summarily rejected as being incompatible with the basic notions of natural sciences as taught in all textbooks and from all professorial chairs of natural sciences in general, not only astronomy and geology. If celestial mechanics went astray, the physics upon which it is built contains some basic error, and if the accepted view of geology is wrong, the theory of evolution that excludes past catastrophes must be based on a wrong notion. But astronomy is said to be the most exact of all sciences, being almost the embodiment of mathematics, and modern physics is the mainstay of all natural sciences, and the theory of evolution is the cornerstone of modern biology now for more than ninety years. No wonder that a theory that would contradict so much had to be rejected even without attention being paid to it; then it is also no wonder that *Worlds in Collision* was paid an unusual amount of attention.  It was the cumulative weight of the historical, literary, and folkloristic material from almost every culture of the past and every region of the world, or the collective memory, that made “worlds in collision” to a contention that could not have been disposed of without being answered. The emotional outbursts and the efforts to suppress the book in the hands of its first and, then, the second publisher, were no arguments; and the fact that now for over three years, again and again, the theory is “disproved” for “the first time” proves only that it was not sufficiently disproved at all, and that ever new efforts are necessary to discredit a theory which, if right, dislocates the very foundations of the natural sciences, and with them, of humanistic studies—history, archaeology, folklore, history of religion.  Aware of the consequences of the theory of cosmic disturbances in a recent past, I explained in the concluding chapter of my first book the various problems that come up. It could easily have happened that the author of a work based on ancient literary sources would not feel himself capable or willing to go out of the pale of his particular field, and would let the scholars and scientists take up the problem in their fields. If the cumulative evidence of the book is strong enough to give to the events detected the validity of historical facts, then scholars of other fields are under the obligation to re-examine their tenets and try to find how a harmony between facts and laws can be brought about. And if the laws and the facts conflict, should the facts be annulled, or the man-made laws revised?  But a revolutionary revision of our heritage and the detection of unexpected but omnipresent records of frightening events in the history of human, animal and plant populations of the globe, and of the globe itself, and of other celestial bodies of the solar system, makes it most probable that under accepted contentions of eventless geology and astronomy, these sciences would not be found prepared to accomodate their views to a new theory in a foreign field. Therefore, it can be expected that either this field must be invaded and cleansed from the newly detected “facts,” if this is possible, or other fields must defend their contentions. Nobody invaded the field examined in *Worlds in Collision* to show that the thousands of coordinated references there could be torn apart or all of them given a different interpretation—and such a work would be almost unthinkable. Therefore the line of combat moved into other fields. And not expecting that natural sciences, or even archaeology, would revamp their views in response to a work in collective human memory, I took upon myself to carry the conclusions of my work in this field into other fields, too.  In order to be able to do this, I decided to postpone the presentation of the story of the earlier world catastrophes—of the third and fourth millennia before the present era—and dedicate myself to the exploration of the ensuing problems in astronomy and geology. And before this I had the obligation to elaborate on the problems of chronology and cultural history of the peoples of antiquity. This I had to do first, because in *Worlds in Collision* I asked the permission of the reader to use a synchronical scale of Egyptian and Hebrew histories which is not orthodox. And though *Ages in Chaos* was not written as historical argument for *Worlds in Collision,* being a work of its own purpose, it answers the argument the my synchronization of stories about catastrophes, especially the catastrophe of the days of the Exodus and the fall of the Middle Kingdom in Egypt, was arbitrary. It was not arbitrary, and a reconstruction of the history of the ancient East for twelve centuries, until the days of Alexander the Great and even beyond, was built upon the premise of a simultaneity of the fall of the Middle Kingdom and the Exodus, both events having taken place during a great natural catastrophe. |
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