

tilstrækkelig Føje for den Skærpelse af Udtrykkene, som Resolutionsforslaget efter Højesterets Mening indeholder, men vi maa her stærkt understrege, at Kritikens reelle Indhold ikke berøres af Højesteretsdommen, og at vi indestaar for Ankernes Rigtighed, som ogsaa er tiltraadt af andre Videnskabsmænd, der hver indenfor sit Felt samvittighedsfuldt har undersøgt Sagen og fundet, at det ikke, som LAUGE KOCH vover at paastaa, drejer sig om ubeviste Paastande, men tvært imod om fuldtud dokumenterede Tilfælde (Viceadmiral G. C. AMDRUP, Professor A. B. CLEAVES, Professor A. HOLMES, Professor G. W. TYRRELL, Professor M. VAHL og Professor W. F. WHITTARD).

LAUGE KOCHS afsluttende Bemærkninger lyder saaledes: »I Stedet for en gold Polemik nu foretrækker jeg, naar Bearbejdelsen af det gamle og nye Materiale har oplyst alle Standpunkter, her i dette Tidsskrift sagligt at resumere Resultaterne, saaledes at enhver selv kan bedømme, hvem der havde Ret, mine 11 Angribere eller jeg.«

LAUGE KOCH søger her at aflede Opmærksomheden fra selve Sagen ved at henvise til fremtidige Sammenstillinger; det skal derfor fremhæves, at Sagens Kærne er: Om LAUGE KOCH i de af os omtalte Tilfælde har handlet paa en Maade, som Videnskaben kan være tjent med. Det har han efter vor Mening ikke gjort, og vi fastholder fuldtud vore forannævnte Anker.

Paa dem har LAUGE KOCH ikke svaret.

O. B. BØGGILD. RICHARD BØGVAD. KAREN CALLISEN. HELGE GRY.
 KNUD JESSEN. VICTOR MADSEN. A. NOE-NYGAARD.
 CHRISTIAN POULSEN. ALFRED ROSENKRANTZ.

For the Reader's Guidance.

The above contribution "Polemik oder aufbauende Forschungsarbeit?" has appeared after the Council of Dansk Geologisk Forening had invited Dr. LAUGE KOCH to reply to the scientific criticism put forward in "Remarks etc."¹⁾ As early as December 20, 1935 Dr. KOCH was approached with a similar request.²⁾ In a letter dated December 31, 1935³⁾ Dr. KOCH refused to publish his reply in view of the case then in Court. This case being now closed, LAUGE KOCH's reply might be expected to be forthcoming, all the more so since he declared in his letter that it was ready.

The long-looked-for reply has not yet appeared, however, whereas LAUGE KOCH has resorted to fresh refusals. At p. 363 he gives among others the curious reason that he does not know "who was responsible for the criticism of the various points . . ."⁴⁾ Further he writes at p. 364: "Now that judgment has been passed on the moral aspect of the charge,

¹⁾ O. B. BØGGILD and others: Bemærkninger til LAUGE KOCH: Geologie von Grönland, 1935. Meddelelser fra Dansk Geologisk Forening, Vol. 8. 1935.

²⁾ Meddelelser fra Dansk Geologisk Forening, Vol. 8 1935, p. 511.

³⁾ Ibid p. 512.

⁴⁾ It appeared plainly from the case that all the authors were jointly responsible for all points.

I do not propose to start a discussion with my assailants about the scientific justification of their criticism, which for the most part consists of unproved assertions put forward in a form that can only be intended to throw suspicion on my work and my person."

LAUGE KOCH, then, according to his communication of December 31, had his reply ready. At the present moment, when the obstacle preventing him from publishing his reply has disappeared, it is evidently impossible for him to reply after all, and he resorts to fresh subterfuges. At the same time he seizes the opportunity of throwing suspicion on the aim of our criticism by representing it as something negative. He evidently thinks that any criticism of LAUGE KOCH would be damaging to science.

In "Remarks" we have made the following grave charges against LAUGE KOCH's work, which we still maintain, and the correctness of which we have documented at length in "Remarks" and in our very detailed deposition for the use of the Court: 1) "on the whole incorrect and tendencious statements", 2) "Misleading Argumentation", 3) "Suppressions and Incorrect Quotations", 4) "In not a few cases LAUGE KOCH quotes his own previously stated opinions in an erroneous way. In most of such cases he quotes results of newer investigations as if they were views of his own already expressed", and 5) "Appropriation of the Results of other Explorers".

We may safely leave it to anybody who will acquaint themselves conscientiously with the particulars of the case to decide whether LAUGE KOCH, in the above-mentioned instances, has served the true interests of science.

The Superior Court and the Supreme Court do not find the "Remarks" contrary to law. The Superior Court goes further and finds that "nothing at hand would seem capable of justifying a supposition that their (i. e. the 11 geologist's) criticism would not be wholly able to stand the test of a scientific examination". The judgment of the Supreme Court does not occupy itself with the scientific aspect of the matter but says:

"As regards the publication 'Remarks' it appears in its entirety as a technical criticism of the work of the appellant, designed for an expert circle of readers, and with an exposition of the details criticised. Even though some few of the expressions used in this criticism go so far that they may be understood as touching the honour of the appellant, they are, nevertheless, owing to the context in which they occur, found not to exceed what such a critical appreciation in the circumstances at hand may reasonably entail, and the Court will therefore be unable to find them contrary to law".

In the proposal for a resolution submitted to the General Assembly on December 9, 1935, we made two grave charges in addition to those mentioned in the "Remarks". One was that LAUGE KOCH, in his book "Nord om Grønland" (1925) and in the later German version (1928) has incorrectly represented the extent of his cartographical work; the other mentions that LAUGE KOCH, in the geological map of East Greenland between 70° and 77° N. L. in the "Geographical Review" for October 1933, has

without permission used Dr. CURT TEICHERT's unpublished geological map and other of the likewise unpublished results of his researches without quoting his source.

The Supreme Court found contrary to law our characterisation of LAUGE KOCH's conduct, based on the facts brought to light by us, and given in our proposal for a resolution, the Court not having been able to find sufficient justification for that aggravation of the expressions, which, in the opinion of the Supreme Court, were contained in the proposal. But here we must strongly emphasize that the actual substance of the criticism is not affected by the judgment of the Supreme Court, and that we vouch for the correctness of the charges in which we have also been joined by other scientists, each of whom has in his own field conscientiously examined the matter and found that it is not, as LAUGE KOCH dares to maintain, a case of unproved assertions, but on the contrary of fully documented instances (Vice Admiral G. C. AMDRUP, Professor A. B. CLEAVES, Professor A. HOLMES, Professor C. W. TYRRELL, Professor M. VAHL, and Professor W. F. WHITTARD).

LAUGE KOCH's concluding remarks run as follows: "Instead of a barren controversy now, I prefer, when the working out of the old and new material has thrown light on all standpoints, to give a technical summary of the results in this Magazine, so that each may judge for himself who was right, my 11 assailants or myself."

LAUGE KOCH here tries to divert the attention from the matter itself by a reference to future summaries; we shall therefore point out that the gist of the matter is whether LAUGE KOCH, in the instances mentioned by us, has acted in a way that will serve science. In our opinion he has not done so, and we maintain our aforementioned charges in their entirety.

To these LAUGE KOCH has not replied.

O. B. BØGGILD. RICHARD BØGVAD. KAREN CALLISEN. HELGE GRY.
KNUD JESSEN. VICTOR MADSEN. A. NOE-NYGAARD.
CHRISTIAN POULSEN. ALFRED ROSENKRANTZ.

Bestyrelsen havde ment, at foranstaaende Svar og Gensvar skulde afsluttes med et Indlæg fra Hr. LAUGE KOCH; da imidlertid dette Indlæg udelukkende var polemisk og intet indeholdt af saglige, geologiske Oplysninger, fandt Bestyrelsen, at det var uegnet til Optagelse i et geologisk Tidsskrift. Denne Bestyrelsesbeslutning meddeltes Hr. LAUGE KOCH ved Brev af 27. December 1938.