

FREUDGATE '08

Since original publication of my book *Passion for Murder: The Homicidal Deeds of Dr. Sigmund Freud* (1984) there have been notable developments in the continuing saga of the Freud controversy. A number of new letters by Freud have emerged, along with previously unknown letters to his intimate correspondent, Dr. Wilhelm Fliess. Additional evidence has been produced and published charging Anna Freud and her editorial collaborators with scholarly corruption and practicing habitual fraud on the reading public. New allegations substantiating the fact that many, *if not all*, of Freud's so-called "case histories" were provable frauds have arisen from highly credible historians of science. A former Director of the Freud Archives, Jeffrey Masson, has come forward charging firsthand knowledge of the fact that the official history of Freud was arrived at by skillful and sometimes crude systematic corruptions of Freud's true ideas and a falsification of details of his biography. Passages that Anna Freud or her co-conspirators found offensive were merely deleted (without notice to the reading public) or mistranslated. And I have myself found evidence of Masson's own corrupt practices as editor and so-called translator of his Harvard University Press presentation of the *Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess 1887-1902* (1985).

Additionally, publicity has been circulated in the national press that Freud had plotted to murder his dearest friend and confidant, Wilhelm Fliess. An historian of science and medicine, E.M. Thornton, has substantiated the fact that Freud was a severe cocaine addict whose theories and personal "idiosyncrasies" show all the classic symptoms of cocaine poisoning. And, last, but not least, the Harvard University Press (1990) has published what purports to be a complete uncorrupted version of Freud's personal letters, *The Letters of Sigmund Freud to Eduard Silberstein 1871-1881*, for the first time. These letters were written when Freud was between the ages of 15 and 25. The contents of these letters reveal additional shocking facts of Freud's morbid life. There is now an unprecedented amount of new evidence available to everyone. This evidence details more completely the true record of Freud's long guarded correspondence with his insane or nearly insane lover, or would-be lover, Wilhelm Fliess, and his early student years correspondence with his closest friend, Eduard Silberstein. Both sets of letters had been severely censored or completely hidden for decades because they reveal additional compelling evidence of Freud's serial killer psychopathology.

And, of course, since publication of *Passion for Murder (PFM)* the expected routinely recurring spate of books on “The Master” continue to pour out to feed the Freudian religion of “psycho-analysis.” There was one exceptional publication, however, which was based on my own work that should be mentioned here. The book was *Deadly Dr. Freud: The Murder of Emanuel Freud and Disappearance of John Freud* (Pinewood Publishing, Durham, NC, 1994) by Dr. Paul Scagnelli. Dr. Paul Scagnelli was Professor of Psychology, and a clinical psychologist. Scagnelli, among other things exposes the fact that Ernest Jones, yet another of Freud’s closest confidants, had to be added to the long list of known psychopaths that constituted Freud’s inner circle. Scagnelli credits my work as the first to bring to public attention that Freud was murderous—and his own independent researches confirmed the fact. Despite his significant contributions to the subject, Scagnelli developed a theory that John had actually lived until the early 1900’s and that Freud sneaked off and murdered his father (nominally Emmanuel was Freud’s “half-brother”) also in the early 1900’s. Scagnelli followed numerous wrong paths and fraudulent evidentiary trails. I will deal more with Scagnelli at another place.

All these events have occurred since publication of my book *Passion for Murder: The Homicidal Deeds of Dr. Sigmund Freud, (PFM)* and yet, despite the obvious great significance of some of these publications, very little in my book need be changed—and much additional proof of what I had asserted is now in the public domain as stated herein.

[I hasten, here at the outset, to add the *caveat* that a few minor errors were found in *PFM* and will be noted in the new publication—most importantly that because of corruptions made by Freud himself and his gang, I was inclined to think Freud committed his first murder when he was 17 rather than, now as I am reasonably sure, at 19. Letters from Freud’s early correspondence with Eduard Silberstein during the relevant period appears to make the matter certain. I say “appears” because we still have only the claims of Freudians as to what original materials actually show. Unfortunately the Freudians have lost their right to be thought honest brokers of the truth of documentary records in their possession].

In *PFM*, I claim that the central issue of the corruption and censorship of Freud's letters is not, as one would-be critic would have it (Masson), that Freud's correspondence was kept secret because it reveals Freud was lacking "intellectual courage." Masson is merely trying to sell books. Corruptions and secrecy were required to conceal the fact that Freud was a homicidal maniac. Freud was a serial killer with a family background of rampant sexual perversion and Freud was himself a man who clearly had the mentality of a vicious *proto*

Nazi—as I clearly establish as fact in *PFM*.

I claimed in my book that there was a calculated conspiracy, participated in by key professionals in various fields, to hide the truth of Freud's background and his psychopathological penchants and racist, fascistic political persuasions (incidentally he long referred to his patients as his “negroes”). These were not wild assertions and emotional charges on my part, but a precise pinpointing of persons provably involved in the Freud cover-up, including Anna Freud, for example, and Dr. Max Schur, and Dr. Ernest Jones, James Strachey, Marie Bonaparte, and numerous others—including Jeffery Masson.

It is not surprising that another from their ranks, Dr. Jeffery Masson (onetime Director of the Freud Archives), has assumed the mantle of the latest Freud “truthsayer” and, ironically, whistle blower. Himself an apologist for the Freud movement—a Freudian propagandist disguising himself as a rebel in the ranks of the psychoanalytical circles—Masson was funded in his “expose” of Freud by powerful Freudian organizations and governmental agencies in cahoots with the project. These groups who “aided and supported” Masson in his latest round of deceptions concerning Freud, were named by him: “the New Land Foundation, the National endowment for the Humanities, the National Institutes of Health (National Library of Medicine), and the Fund for Psychoanalytic Research of the American Psychoanalytic Association.” In my chapter on “Scholars Or Co-conspirators” I provide evidence of illicit “collaborations” the Freudians have used to carry out their purposes. How much public tax money went to support Masson and his crew has yet been determined.

I provide extensive documentation of the corrupt scholarship and tampering with texts which has been practiced by the inner circle of the Freud group for decades. In this discussion I will append proof of Masson's corruptions in the service of the same cause. For, in more ways than one, Masson joins the company of his fellow co-conspirators. But first let us turn to the issue of greatest importance: the real Dr. Sigmund Freud in the light of the new evidence.

FREUD AS A SERIAL KILLER

It is a central thesis of my book that Freud was a killer, that he killed many people, was vicious and vindictive and developed theories of the universal murder mania of mankind to justify his own highly peculiar nature to the world. In *PFM* I produce numerous quotations

from Freud as overt statements of this fact. His confession that "I am a murderous firebrand. . ." is but one of numerous quotations which I adduce for my thesis. I document that Freud's first victim was his half brother, John (Johann) Freud, [nominally his nephew] and that other victims included colleagues, patients, and "friends" in addition to the unknown legions who perished due to his criminal irresponsible advocacy of a cocaine cure for morphinism, the justification for which Freud based upon fraudulent case histories.

A whole section of my book is devoted to a discussion of the morbid psychosexual relationship between Freud and Fliess. I concluded that in Freud's personal letters to Fliess, as well as in the pages of his famous dream book, Freud repeatedly confessed to a desire to murder Fliess and warned him not to reveal his dark secrets. I stated my point, not obliquely, but directly. The section "Non Vixit: The 'Killing Off' of Fliess," begins with these words:

One of the incredible features of the *Non Vixit* dream and its commentary is that it also served as Freud's murder threat to his friend Fliess. Hence, printed in the pages of one of the most famous books on the so-called psychology of dreams is to be read Freud's murder warning for the entire world to see. The clear message is: If you ever disclose what I have confided to you about these murders, I will kill you.

And I ended my remarks on the subject by observing that it was shortly after publication of *The Interpretation of Dreams* that Fliess irrevocably broke off relations with Freud.

Since I wrote my words new letters written by Freud to Fliess have reportedly been uncovered by a Freud researcher, Peter Swales, in Israel. Swales gained access to personal papers of Fliess and had extensive interviews with intimates of the Fliess family and they told the shocking story that Freud actually planned to murder Fliess. (Once it is acknowledged that Freud was a serial killer this revelation is not so shocking, that's what serial killers do, they plot and plan to murder other people).

Unknown to me at the time of publication of my book, (originally copyrighted in 6/1982) Mr. Swales had written and privately self-published (11/1982) an essay on the subject of Freud's murder plot against Fliess, "Freud, Fliess, and Fratricide." Janet Malcomb in a sensational two part series in the *New Yorker Magazine* reported being told by Swales that the story of Freud's murder plot was to have been published, under contract with Swales, in the *London Times* in 1982. This project was apparently aborted and ultimately preempted by the focus given to Dr. Jeffery Masson's book on Freud's abandonment of

the incest molestation theory, *Assault On Truth: Freud's Suppression of the Seduction Theory* (1984). An ironic book, if there ever was one, as Masson "suppresses" Freud material himself to give credence to his wild views.

At the time of writing my book, I had not read, nor had I heard of Swales' paper dealing with Fliess's claim that Freud had intended to murder him. Since then, Swales' privately circulated self-published essay has come into my hands and carefully read. Nearing the end of their highly charged emotional friendship, Swales relates, Freud became increasingly violent and envious of Fliess. Fliess, in fact, was convinced that Freud had a plan to murder him on one of (what proved to be) their last "congresses." Specifically, Fliess reported that Freud planned to do away with him during a walk in a remote wooded area where Freud intended to push him over a precipice into the waters below. Swales interviewed many persons intimate to the situation and the stories between them appeared to "differ [only] as to whether Fliess stated this was only a plan, or whether he claimed Freud actually tried to carry the scheme out."

We must therefore allow that Fliess's *subsequent* conviction that Freud planned to murder him must have been founded not only upon Freud's self-avowed death wishes but also, to a significant extent, upon his having read Freud's cryptic allusion to the episode a year later and having instantly recognized the whole story as a disguised account of their final meeting (Swales, *Freud, Fliess, and Fratricide*, 1982).

Whatever other facts may emerge regarding Freud's alleged plot to murder Fliess, I have already documented in my book the inescapable conclusion that Freud did threaten Fliess' life in the *Interpretation of Dreams* and in his letters. I quote Max Schur who many years before Swales, also concluded that Freud had murder fantasies over Fliess. Swales, for his part, also concluded that Freud entertained "*serious fantasies* [emphasis in original quote] about murdering the primal FATHER incarnate in Fliess—that is to say, by pushing him over the precipice." All that Swales really adds to the "scholarly" commentary on the subject is, perhaps, the word "serious," if that. But, the fact that this situation was well known to Fliess' family and intimates—is a significant contribution to the documentation of the history of the Freud/Fliess relationship and the role Freud's murder mania played in it. Obviously Fliess' own perverted nature was a magnet for Freud, as I clearly document in my book.

Of course Swales nowhere suggests that Freud ever *really* committed murder though, to his credit, he makes it clear his researches indicated

that Freud was fully capable of such a deed(s) and even he even noted that persons perished at his hand—raising all kinds of red flags that Swales never pursues. Consequently, Swales’ discussion of the issue of Freud's intent to murder Fliess is considerably marred by his *theorizing* about comparative trivia concerning *when* Fliess had this idea that Freud wanted to murder him. He does not confront the fact that Freud had all the obvious psychological characteristics of a serial killer. Perhaps Swales is just ignorant of the characteristics of serial killers or homicidal maniacs.

Why Swales insists on emphasizing the word “*subsequent*” in his above cited quotation is not clear. While there may be some truth in Swales’ surmises that Freud created a phony incident, recorded later in *The Psychopathology for Everyday Life*, where Freud advances the idea that Fliess (in the guise of someone else) would not go on a walk with him only because the path “was too steep and dangerous”—skirting, as Swales suggests, the true reason why Fliess refused Freud’s invitation to the potentially deadly sojourn. Fliess was aware that Freud had a plan to kill him. In view of this, one wonders why Swales thinks this is so important for him to hypothesize when he first got this idea. However, true or not, that the incident reported in *The Psychopathology of Every Day Life*, really relates to Fliess and not some newly met friend, as represented by Freud in his book, it matters little in face of the reported fact that Fliess confided to his family at the time that he believed Freud actually did have a plan to murder him. That is the important fact; the rest is anyone’s-guess-trivia. Presumably Swales wished to “flesh out” the situation and add further “corroboration” to the testimony of Fliess' family and friends. In doing so, however, he merely injected an importance to his own conjectures which only detracts from the factual point—i.e., that Fliess, Freud’s dearest friend, believed Freud had a plan to murder him. A point, I would add, that I also make in my book and provides confirmation of my own analysis of the situation. In any case, the matter of the fact that Freud wanted to see Fliess’s life to disappear in blood is matter had been revealed a long time ago by many writers on Freud, most notably by Dr. Max Schur.

That Freud sometimes wanted to see his dearest friend, Fliess, disappear in a blood was clearly stated by Freud in his letter to Fliess of March 23, 1900. Interesting, from an historical point of view, the Freud organization’s early edition of the so-called Freud Fliess correspondence (we only have Freud’s side of it) omitted entirely mention of Freud’s admitting that he is aware that such murderous feelings as he had made things “complicated” between them but it is not at all “crazy.” [“*meschugge*”]

Sounds “crazy” to me! In any case, the fact that Freud himself, in his own word’s made it clear he wanted to see his friend “disappear” in

blood and then the next moment to forgive him. Swales in his essay (*Freud, Fliess and Fratricide*), only expends a few sentences on the fact that Freud said (really in a number of places) that he had a desire to murder Fliess. In the letter cited above (March 23, 1900) we find Freud's confession"

During the summer or fall, no later, I shall see you, talk to you, and then explain to you all the riddles of Count Oerindur. You will be convinced that it is merely complicated, not at all *meschugge*—although the abominable work with all its demands would excuse some of that too.

Max Schur informs us Count Oerindur was a character in a play by Adolphus Müllner, *Guilt*, and he directs us to the relevant words in the play:

[Und] erkä mir, Oerindur
Diesen Swiespalt der Natur!
Bald möcht ich in Blut sein Leben
Schwinden seh'n bald –ihm vergeben

Explain to me, Oerindur
This contradiction of Nature!
Now I want his life in blood
To disappear, next—to forgive him.

[above is author's translation, not Schur's] If I were the recipient of such a communication from Freud or anyone—they sometimes wanted to see my life disappear suddenly in blood, and that at other times they wanted to "forgive" me—or if I were to learn "*that this feeling wasn't really "crazy" it was just "complicated by the very fact of"* him having an "*abominable,*" labor of his self-analysis which would justify him from being a bit insane—I, too, could see this is as a real problem. And given the fact that Fliess was well aware that Freud could and would actually kill people, he was bound to be even more concerned. In fact, the two of them, Freud and Fliess, had teamed up to perform diabolical operations on a "witch" of a woman, Irma. The reader will probably not be surprised to learn that the drama *Guilt* that Freud was referencing in his letter to Fliess is about a young man who was fated to murder his elder brother. In the *Psychopathology of Everyday Life* Freud admits this very play and the connection to "Guilt" played over and over in his mind. "The thought plagues me constantly for my failure to become what I could have been with my abilities." (p.312) But *Guilt (Schuld)* or *A Gypsy's Prophecy* is not about a young man who didn't become what he could have become and therefore felt "guilty" and that's how we get our

title *Guilt* (or *Schuld*). No it is the story of one brother whom another brother makes “disappear”—he murders him—and runs off with his brother’s wife—committing both murder and “incest.” It is the story of a young man who at birth, was prophesied to become a great man and who in later life would kill his elder brother and then he was told by his *real* father, in a foreign land, the secrets of his birth—as was exactly the case with Sigmund! The story in *Guilt* is a virtual duplicate of Freud’s own biography! It really is remarkable.

Nonetheless, Swales, as with *all other commentators on Freud, his life and times*, failed utterly to note the important fact of the *real* disappearance of John Freud relative to the subject of Freud's murder impulses—as well as the highly important fact that Freud lied about John still living in Manchester decades after it was known he had mysteriously disappeared. The center piece of the real fratricidal dimension of Freud's homicidal mania—his murder of his brother, John, is nowhere touched upon by Swales—indeed we have reason to believe Swales was and is himself actively conspiring with the Freudian organizations to conceal the truth about Freud and his early youth—a matter with which we will deal later. Swales' only comment on the subject of John’s disappearance that I could find was that John "supposedly" disappeared at the age of 18. That Swales did not investigate *this* is astonishing—especially since Swales had a copy of my book and admitted to reading it.

In the conclusion of his essay "Freud, Fliess, and Fratricide," Swales makes the following remarks immediately after stating that Freud did “entertain *serious fantasies* about murdering the primal FATHER incarnate in Freud. . .” he adds: [Swales emphasis]:

Almost from childhood to death, Freud sought to fashion his life to the pattern of the heroes of myth, legend, history, and literature. Those quixotic and grandiose realms constituted for Freud the supreme reality and the deed of murder, like that of incest, is *permitted* to those heroes.

In the spirit of myth, then, notwithstanding the supposed father-identification, it is tempting to regard Freud and Fliess as Romulus and Remus—a myth *well appreciated by Freud*. And there is even reason to suppose that, whether or not it was ever stated, Freud may *himself* have regarded his fraternal relationship with Fliess in terms of precisely that metaphor." [first emphasis in this paragraph added]

Max Schur, as I report in my book, is not so conjectural:

In terms of wishes [i.e., murder wishes] his superstition meant that because he wanted Fliess, Flieschl, his father, his brother Julius, his sister Anna, and anyone else he hated to die, that he would have to die.

And, in my book, in regard to this statement, I remarked:

The phrase "*and anyone else he hated to die*" gives the true key to the sentence. For with Freud, murderous hatreds encompassed an amazing list of persons.

Fliess was just one of many in a whole line. And one is reminded of Freud's comment to an associate friend at the age of 22:

. . . I am also sending you here with my collected works, not my complete ones as I have reason to suspect, for I am awaiting the correction of a third, and a fourth and fifth keeps appearing in my prescient mind, which is startled by them like Macbeth by the ghosts of the English Kings. What! will the line stretch out to the crack of doom.

and he immediately after added:

During these holidays I have moved into another laboratory, where I am preparing myself for my real profession: "flaying of animals or torturing of human beings," and I find myself more and more in favor of the former.

With cordial greetings,
Your
Freud

But to return, so the statement that Freud, Swales says, "may" have regarded himself in the context of homicidal "mythology" seems little more than a diluted retelling of the same old tale, often expressed and repeated, credited or not, of that which Schur many years earlier reported in his recounting of Freud's homicidal hatreds. Freud was a homicidal maniac who hated and wanted to kill an amazing number of people! But what is interesting in Swales is that he, rather than giving anything looking like a new "breakthrough" realization of the truth, he gives us a footnote after his italicized phrase "*well appreciated by Freud*" as exemplified by Freud's reference to Romulus and Remus in the letter. The footnote reads (I give it in full):

Jones 11, 441, 451; SE XX111, 1113; cf. Letter of

Freud to Edward Silberstein of July 11, 1873, in the Sigmund Freud Archives, Library of Congress—“Unrestricted till 1980; "Restricted" since 1980.

Now what is important about this, if true, is that only a very short time before Freud traveled to, or expected to travel to, England, where he murdered John, he was making allusions to the brother murder struggle between Romulus and Remus—years before Fliess came into Freud’s life, it needs to be added. Swales’ citing of Jones, above, twice, for rather trivial stray comments by Jones—is nothing compared to what Freud *wrote*. What was it? Swales plays cat and mouse and never tells the reader. As soon as it was learned by the Library of Congress that Swales had somehow gotten hold of a cache of Silberstein letters, some of, or all of, the Silberstein letters that Swales got became “Restricted.” Something is rotten in Denmark.

Now, these “Restricted” or “Unrestricted” letters (the Silberstein correspondence) were supposedly sent to Swales "mistakenly" by the Library of Congress. It is reported that and Dr. Eissler, then the Secretary of the Freud Archives, was horrified to learn that the previously embargoed letters of Freud’s youth were now in the hands of a free-lance Freud sleuth, Peter Swales. The whole saga behind this fact was reported by Janet Malcomb, in her now famous articles in *The New Yorker Magazine*.

Swales, to my knowledge, has never released the contents of these letters—and it is just the passage in the letter of July 11, 1873 referenced by Swales about Romulus and Remus that is reportedly missing from the Silberstein correspondence. Oddly, the first time in any of Freud correspondence that we know of when the subject of his going to England came up was in this letter, the letter of July 11, 1873! Moreover, this letter is reputedly *not* in Freud’s handwriting, but by an “unknown hand” and it is “unreliable.” The part of the letter that Swales claims to be alluding to in the letter is said to be *entirely missing*. Everyone knows that Swales claimed to have it but no one apparently asked Swales for it. Does any of this make sense?

The editor and the translator of the Harvard University Press edition of the Freud /Fliess correspondence, Dr. Jeffery Masson, is sure to have known that Swales had copies of valuable letters bearing on Freud’s murder confessions. He acknowledges, in fact, that Swales informed him of the existence of Freud letters to Fliess which were being held in Israel. There is a suggestion in the record that Swales was simply paid-off by the Freudian organization to keep his mouth shut when it came to the Silberstein letters. Swales himself, as I recall, simply claims that Dr. Eisler paid him some money, ostensibly for his “scholarship,” or some such. Swales should come forward with

the truth.

Swales refused my request for copies of the Silberstein letters, quite in the style of the Freudian Co-conspirators. He had already read my book, *PFM*, yet he offered no cooperation. It is most interesting that Swales quotes from this letter in regard to Freud's brother-murder fascinations involving *Romulus* and *Remus*. It is also most interesting that Swales openly asserts the belief that Freud was capable of murder. In view of this it is most interesting that Swales would not share the information contained in Freud Silberstein letters with other investigators—especially when he allegedly got the letters by accident. And, last but not least, it is most interesting that Swales received money from Eissler for his research *after* Eissler became aware that Swales had possession of a number of the early Silberstein letters. Was Swales paid off to keep silent, as apparently was his one-time working partner, Dr. Jeffery Masson?

Why did Swales write the footnote that John “supposedly disappeared at the age of 18”? He must have had Freud family records in hand, or reports of family records indicating that John mysteriously disappeared at “18.” But the Silberstein letters provide apparently incontestable proof of the fact that Freud went to England for the first time at age 19—in the summer when John just turned 20! Not 18! How could Swales not have known that with copies of Freud’s letters at the time were in his hand. If the Freud family genealogy records were correct they should have shown that John was alive when Sigmund visited him when Sigmund was 19 and John just turned 20 (b.8/13/1855). As the letters themselves clearly indicate. The early Silberstein letters were contemporaneous with Freud’s comings and goings at the time of John Freud’s disappearance. Are Swales and Masson and others within or without the Freud organization guilty of aiding and abetting the concealments of Freud’s murders? In any case, the bottom fell out of Swales’ vaunted reputation, among cultist Freudians, as a great Freud-sleuth. The subject missed by Swales and the rest of them was nothing less than evidence of Freud’s first brother-murder victim, his brother, Johann, or just plain “John” sometime in the summer, round about mid-July and the time of Freud’s return to Vienna on September 9, 1875.

There is, it should be noted, a letter, purportedly written by Samuel Freud, which states that John mysteriously disappeared. This letter was purportedly written sometime between 1914 and 1917. Ronald Clark reports it as "pre1919." But this is, I claim, another Freud family fraud, as the Freud family in England, where John lived recorded his mysterious disappearance at the age of 18 *and sought to purposely confuse the historical record*. [Since writing the foregoing I have obtained proof that the letter Ronald Clark, the renowned Freud biographer, relied on for his claim that John Freud disappeared

between 1914-1917 was, as I wrote above, an erroneous and fraudulent claim. In due course I will provide evidence of this fact].

Certainly his intimate Freud-family knew when John really disappeared. It would be hard to conceal from other members of the family. As I detail in my book there is no evidence of John Freud's continued existence after the age of 19 or 20, after, that is, Freud's visit to Manchester. As John was born August 13, 1855 he would have had his 20th birthday when Freud was visiting. Sigmund arrived in England about July 23, 1875, according to alleged contemporary letters. And, if John were really living in Manchester, England, there unquestionably would have been evidence of the fact in the historical and family records—as my book discusses in detail.

Swales, like many a Freud “scholar” is too feint-hearted to face the facts that Freud was a serial killer—even though the most prominent of them repeatedly, as with Swales, admit over and over that Freud was “murderous” to an extraordinary degree. The fact is, or ought to be, apparent to anyone with an open mind who investigates the issue that Freud was a homicidal maniac, but, more than that, he was a serial killer.

FREUD'S NECROPHILIA

Certainly one of the most odious of Freud's many pathologies was his necrophilia. In my book, I claim that Freud was decidedly necrophilous, that his murder lust and his attraction to feces, corpses, and sexual perversions was a deeply rooted dimension of his disease. In my Chapter "Ambition, Desire & Death" I claim that Freud clearly indicated his necrophiliac fascination for one of his dearest friends and hated rivals, Dr. Fleischl, in various remarks about Fleischl printed in *The Interpretation of Dreams* and other writings. I quoted from Freud's own comments on the subject of necrophilia which clearly shows Freud's unbalanced mind regarding the subject and I prove, with Freud's own words, that it was Freud who killed Fleischl.

I did not write extensively on the subject of Freud's necrophilia as I knew it would be generally repugnant to the public and also because I believed that too much copy on the subject would distract or "turnoff" the reader's interest in further pursuing the Freud phenomenon which I was explicating. In a subsequent publication I had intended to provide considerable more information on the subject—which I now believe unnecessary for me to personally accomplish—though I continue to believe that this issue ultimately must be dealt with by professional historians and criminologists in considering the

psychopathological dimensions of the Freud's serial killer mania. Once Freud's collection of secret writings on "Drekology" (which one might translate "Studies On Feces") are released from embargo by the Library of Congress (if they are not already), there is sure to be ample material for such a study. But, here I am concerned with indicating the significance of the new data that has emerged since publication of my book.

Further evidence of Freud's necrophilous propensities was provided by Masson in his book (though he failed to identify it as such), ironically entitled *Assault On Truth* (1984). In that book Masson devotes an entire chapter (one of five in the whole book) to the subject of Freud's early absorption in the subject of child molestation and incest. Another chapter, "Freud at the Paris Morgue," highlights Freud's fascination for dissections and issues involving the rape of children during the period of Freud's visit to Paris (1885-1886). Masson relates that Freud then fell under the influence of the ideas and interests of Dr. Brouardel, professor of legal medicine at the Faculty of Medicine in Paris whose preoccupations centered on the subject of sexual and physical child abuse and incest. Masson further relates that when Freud's interest in the celebrated lectures of famous men flagged, he nonetheless continued a keen interest in attending the autopsy lectures where the corpses of murder victims were dissected; numbering among the murder victims were numerous children.

Freud confessed to being "fascinated" by the sessions at the morgue but found the regular lectures "rhetorical performances." The lectures themselves soon paled and he abandoned going to any of them, with the exception of Brouardel's autopsy sessions:

I abandoned my occasional attempts at attending other lecturers after I had become convinced that they had to offer were for the most part well constructed rhetorical performances. The only exceptions were Professor Brouardel's forensic autopsies and lectures at the morgue, which I rarely missed.
(Masson, p. 32)

In the same year (1885) that Freud was frequenting the lectures in the morgue given by Professor Brouardel, an essay by Antonin Delcasse entitled "*Etude medico-legal sur les services de l'enfance* (A Medico-Legal Study of Cruelty toward Children) described the significance of Brouardel's work in the morgue:

In the remarkable conferences he gives each week at the morgue, Professor Brouardel, who has been able in a few years to acquire, as a physician interested in legal matters, an authority and a celebrity which are as

great as those of his predecessor, Professor Ambroise Tardieu, has often called our attention to the fact of cruelty and brutal treatment, of which children in particular are the victims of their parents, their teachers, in short, of those who exercise over them a more or less direct authority. (Masson, p. 35)

In my book I provide numerous examples of Freud's various confessions to having a special sexual attraction to the decayed, decrepit, and corpselike. So, the new information that Freud attended several of these lectures every week is not surprising. But it is not to single incidents and situations in a person's life that confirms Freud's necrophilous character, though such information as Masson reports is interesting and adds suggestive information. The condition of which we speak is pervasive and once realized is easily discernable in various aspects of the entire life. Here is another quotation from Freud during the period of his stay in Paris which can be found in the published text of the Freud/Fliess correspondence:

The platform of Notre Dame was my favorite resort in Paris; every afternoon I used to clamber about there on the towers of the Church between the mon-sters and the devils.

So, it appears that during Freud's stay in one of the most beautiful cities in the world his time was devoted to the morgue and to clambering about among monsters and devils.

It must be noted, moreover, I am not the only one to clearly see the fact of Freud's deviant sexual preoccupations and obsessions. E.M. Thornton in her splendid book *The Freudian Fallacy* (1984, *Freud & Cocaine* in England) wrote:

In fact, Freud was showing an increasing preoccupation with the more deviant aspects of sexuality; this would have been the expected course of events arising from his chronic cocaine usage . . . His preoccupation, however, went far beyond any clinical interest and was undoubtedly his alone In Draft N, for example, of May 31, 1897 (Origins), he states that "saintliness" was based on the fact that, for the sake of the larger community, human beings have sacrificed some of their freedom to indulge in sexual perversions. In pursuit of his interest in perversions, we find a morbid preoccupation with excrement, with which he associated money, though the association is not altogether clear." (p. 191)

Though Thornton believes that Freud's personal preoccupation with the sexual perversions went "far beyond" any clinical interest, she believed this was a direct result of Freud's cocaine addiction. While I do not dispute that cocaine addiction probably had a simulative effect on Freud's sexual perversions, there is abundant information supplied in my book which proves Freud had highly developed perverse fascinations long before he became addicted to cocaine or was devoting himself to his self—conceived "science" of psycho-analysis. I trust that sincere scholars will reconsider this evidence and the record of Freud's early high school years in this regard.

Without wishing to go into much further detail at this point I will mention only another example of Freud's necrophiliac interest which is brought to the reader's attention by E.M. Thornton who quotes from one of Freud's letters: I wanted to ask you," he wrote to Fliess on February 8, 1897 (Origins),

in connection with excrement-eating. . . and animals, when disgust first appears in small children and whether there is a period in early infancy when no disgust is felt. Why do I not go to the nursery and experiment [with Annerl]? Because with twelve and a half hours work, I have no time and because the womenfolk do not back me in my investigations."
(p. 207)

Even with the excision in the text on the first line of the above quoted letter [claimed by Masson to be indecipherable text], it is apparent, from Freud's own words that the only factor preventing him from experimenting on his own children's reaction to eating feces was lack of time and the resistance of the womenfolk to participate in these "investigations" on daughter Anna. By the way, *Origins* (the earlier edition of the Fliess letters) specifies his later-to-be-famous daughter Anna (Annerl) as the mentioned subject for feces-feeding. This piece of truth was deleted from the letters which were falsified to make it appear as though Freud had never written about nor mentioned Anna in the context of his feces-feeding investigations.

In my book I emphasize the fact that if Freud really were a necrophiliac we should be able to clearly see his own condition behind his comments on the subject of necrophilia, as it is highly unlikely that he would be able to conceal his own condition behind his "theoretical" comments. The reader is advised to pay particular attention to Freud's exact choice of words and attitude in the following comment on the subject of necrophilia:

Nevertheless, in some of these perversions the quality of the new sexual aim is of a kind to demand special

examination. Certain of them are so far removed from the normal in their content that we cannot avoid pronouncing them "pathological." This is especially so where (as, for instance, in cases of licking excrement or of intercourse with dead bodies) the sexual instincts goes to an astonishing lengths in successfully overriding the resistances to shame, disgust, horror, or pain. But even in such cases, we should not be too ready to assume that people who act in this will necessarily turn out to be insane or subject to grave abnormalities of other kinds.

In *PFM* I commented on this passage with the following words:

Freud continues this commentary by stating that the necrophiliac is but sick in a "single sphere." And it is only when this disease ousts all other desires ". . . completely and takes their place in all circumstances if, in short, a perversion has the characteristics of exclusiveness and fixation then we shall usually be justified in regarding it as a pathological symptom."

Again, pausing to consider the full impact of Freud's words, a number of shocking realizations come to mind. Freud believed the sexual pervert was pursuing "the quality of a new sexual aim." He admits that in the case of licking feces and copulating with corpses it is difficult to avoid calling them pathological because the sexual instinct "successfully" overrides resistances to shame, disgust and horror. Freud's use of the word "success," in this context, is a not-so-subtle indication of his own inclinations. Another indication is that he must reluctantly term the behavior pathological, he "cannot avoid" the conclusion. A more obvious indicator in this passage is that Freud equated necrophilia to a natural extension of the sexual instinct. But these insights are not independent from Freud's specific statements on the subject. And here is the important point: Freud postulated that people who copulate with corpses and who eat feces, people who actually commit these acts, will "not necessarily turn out to be insane. . ." Is this believable? And if Freud's words are to be believed, then it must be assumed that it would not necessarily be a pathological symptom for one to copulate with corpses if only one *also* maintained other more normal sexual desires at the same time. In other words, necrophilia, if not exclusively practiced, is not unnatural." (*PFM*, p.323)

Certainly, the release of Freud's numerous essays on feces, [Dreckology] which are kept from the public in the secret files housed at the Library of Congress, will provide additional evidence of Freud's considerable and obvious psychotic condition, a condition

symptomatically linked to his homicidal mania, his serial killer profile. [It should be noted I am not now aware of the LOC's current policy regarding free release of original material by Freud. The matter is being checked into].

In a diary entry of one of Freud's most trusted friends, Dr. Sandor Ferenczi (May 1, 1932 recently made public by Masson), we learn that though Freud considered his neurotic patients "riffraff" he had a:

. . . dislike of expressions of disapproval directed at psychotics and perverts, in fact, in respect to anything that is too abnormal.

The reader may wonder why the milder cases of neurosis brought forth his bile but that he disliked expressions of disapproval of psychotics and perverts.

The following quotations provide additional evidence of my thesis that Freud was necrophilous. Of course, in all such cases, it is not a single statement which "proves" or "disproves" such a state of mind, or condition, but rather the entire profile of interests and affinities. Furthermore, it is characteristic of necrophiliacs and sexual perverts that they possess a "protective" theory and personal belief-system which rationalizes and defends their condition as being "permissive."

I have avoided sexuality but filth is unavoidable and asks to be treated humanely. (8/11/99)

One savors the strange kind of beauty and the enormous creative urge; at the same time my inclination toward the grotesque and perverse psychological gets its due. (8/6/99)

Last week brought me a rare human pleasure: The opportunity to select from Meynert's library what suited me somehow like a savage drinking mead from his enemy's skull. (7/12/92)

I can scarcely detail for you all the things that resolve themselves into excrement for me (a new Midas!). (12/22/97)

I really am a Midas, though not a Midas of gold. (1/12/95)

No. 1 [of Dreckology] which I am keeping contains wild dreams that would hardly be of interest to you; they are part of my self-analysis, which is still groping

about, entirely in the dark. (1/4/98)

Would you please try to search for a case of childhood convulsions that you can trace back (in the future or in your memory) to sexual abuse, specifically to *licitus* (licking) (or finger) in the anus... For my newest finding is that I am able to trace back with certainty a patient's attack that merely resembled epilepsy to such treatment by the tongue on the part of his nurse. Age 2 years. . . I have firm confidence in this novelty. . . (1/12/97)

Now until he felt ill himself, the man had been a pervert and consequently healthy. (1/11/97)

This is, in general, the secret of compulsive impulses. If he could be perverse, he would be healthy, like his father. (12/6/96)

Copulating with corpses and licking feces is not a manifestation of insanity, if one is sexually perverse one is "healthy"? Only lack of time prevents him from feeding his baby daughter feces as an experiment? The grotesque is beautiful; intense pleasures are likened to drinking mead out of the skull of one's enemy? Freud's self-analysis is involved with a "beautiful" dream involving feces?—all this is part of the new material, material previously censored and unavailable to scholars and researchers—due to rigorous suppression of the truth of Freud's real nature. Other letters indicate that Freud conceives of himself to be a new Midas, but a Midas of a different sort, his gold is feces. It is his personal fascination (as numerous dreams in *The Interpretation Of Dreams* indicate and which I remark upon in my book) and object of his sexual desire. Freud speaks of wanting to "worship" in a "mutilated temple" ("I could have worshiped the abased and mutilated Temple of Minerva near the forum of Nerva" 8/19/91) of course Minerva is the Goddess of Love. He describes his desire for "cold revenge" upon his competitors and wants to see his former mentor crawling on his stomach; he refers to his wife and his children as his "worms"; he lusts for revenge:

Such spiteful glee, such satisfied thirst for revenge plays an important role in my case; so far I have savored too little of this delicious fare. So I am joining you in nibbling a spoonful of your meal. (7/1/1900)

It was just a month later after writing this that Freud hatched a plan to murder Fliess, according to the recipient of the letter, as previously discussed.

Again much more of this kind of thing could be quoted from Freud's letters to Fliess—truly gruesome comments and associations. Freud talks about going out to a dance with an embryo, that his whole life has become a cancer, that his cancer likes to drink wine, that Fliess' whole life may become a pus, etc. But all of it is merely additional information to that already contained in my book. These are quotations that had been previously rigidly censored, but even without them, the case is made. Certainly it is not so surprising for a necrophiliac to see feces as a wonderful thing in the world for it is the very symbol of "dead matter" "filth" the Devil's own currency. Hence, we are not surprised by this utterance of Freud's:

An old phantasy of mine, which I would like to recommend to your linguistic sagacity, deals with the derivation of our verbs from originally coproerotic terms . (12/22/97)

The meaning is clear; Freud is suggesting that verbs are actually derived from terms dealing with *copro* (i.e., having to do with the poisonous condition relating to an invasion of fecal matter) and *erotic* attractions. Freud would extend his "Midas touch" even to language and find there his "old phantasy" that *verbs themselves* are the result of necrophilous interests.

One further note ought to be added to this discussion, and that is the fact that it is frequently the case that such types come from homes fraught with sexual perversions. Here, too, the new Harvard University Edition offers additional dramatic evidence of Freud's own personal family-incest background. Another obviously telling piece of evidence concerning the real Freud was also censored from the previous editions of the Freud-Fliess correspondence. I refer here to the fact that Freud's nominal father, Jacob Freud, was himself a sex pervert. In Freud's own language we are told:

Unfortunately, my own father was one of these perverts and is responsible for the hysteria of my brother (all of whose symptoms are identifications) and those of several younger sisters. (2/8/97)

In my essay "The Freudian Propaganda of Dr. Jeffery Masson" (Part 2 of this piece) I devote considerable attention to this subject and need not comment on it further here. Suffice it to say that I reveal the fact that, characteristically of the pervert, Freud accuses the infant who is brutally raped as being partially responsible for tempting the offense, what Freud euphemistically calls the "seduction." Freud uses the word seduction to soften the effect of what he is discussing, for Freud applies this term even to children under one year of age who are brutally raped. He refers to incest with infants as "love relations" and

the "incongruous pair" and that the infant cannot escape their share of "responsibility" in the "illicit union"—matters which I shall soon discuss in further detail.

Freud's younger brother, and the youngest member of the family, Alexander, was ten years younger than Sigmund. If we apply Freud's time frame for the occurrence of these child incest rape events then he would have been raped by his father when he was between 6 months of age and 5 years. This would have made Sigmund between 10½ years and 15 years old when these events were going on. Certainly an age of consciousness! His sisters ranged in age from 2 1/2 to 8 years younger than Sigmund. So, during Freud's childhood sexual assault, we are led to believe, was a continuing family situation. Can we believe that Sigmund alone was not assaulted by his nominal father, Jacob? It is true he claims to have been raped by a nurse at the age of two, but this does not preclude the father rape as well. And, his "nurse" rape may also be a "substitute" rape for his "father's" rape of him or, as some recent commentators assume, Freud "nurse" rape was actually a "mother" rape. Indeed, it was Freud's theory for years that the father invariably was responsible for the child "seduction." He stated in relationship to his "father" —meaning Jacob—he could not exclude him likewise from being a sex pervert ("mein eigner nicht ausgeschlossen").

If Freud can be believed about anything (and this itself is questionable) we can believe that he did, in fact, come from a family where sexual perversions were routinely practiced. Not only does Freud accuse his father of being a sex pervert, he also relates that when he visited England, his half-brother, [actually father] discussed the possibility of marrying him to his younger daughter, Pauline. This would have given the situation where Sigmund would be marrying his half-sister. Certainly, Freud also seriously suggests that one of his younger sisters (Marie) was married to a sex pervert who was also a relative, Moritz Freud, who likewise assaulted his children ("The three girls are hysterical; the youngest, a rather gifted child, seriously so. I doubt the father is innocent in this case either; he is half-Asian, suffers from *pseudologica fantastica*, though he is otherwise good to his family." (4/27/1898)

Wilhelm Fliess, Freud's beloved friend, also, it appears according to information released by Masson (1984), repeatedly raped his own son. And, we cannot pass by without mentioning the fact that Freud probably had sex with his own mother. In my book I discuss briefly some of these matters concerning Freud's sexual involvement with his mother and his own confessions to having "sexual cravings" for her. [Freud himself uses the common vernacular term—*Interpretation of Dreams*]. In Freud's discussion of his sexual cravings for his mother he draws attention to the fact that his mother was cadaverously laid

out in a dream-grave and hence further emphasizes, in a most dramatic manner, his necrophiliac incestuous fascinations.

THE DIAGNOSIS OF FREUD'S DOCTORS AND THE NEW EVIDENCE

Freud had a number of doctors who diagnosed and treated him for several of his problems ranging from "hysteria" to recurring and terminal cancer. In my book I discuss, somewhat at length, the diagnosis of Freud's most trusted physician and psychoanalyst who "administered" his death dose of drugs via euthanasia [illegal in England then and now], Dr. Max Schur. Dr. Schur attended on Freud for some ten years before Freud's death. I produce Schur's own words and diagnosis of Freud's condition—a "Cain Complex"—or, in other words, homicidal mania for "brother-murder," in fact. Schur was granted access to the secret Freud files and he himself released previously secret letters which were very harmful to Freud's reputation. He concluded that Freud had a lifelong urge to murder those who offended or excited his passions. I further produce the testimony of Dr. Wilhelm Fliess who was habitually called upon by Freud to minister to his numerous ailments. Dr. Fliess, himself no doubt demented, concluded, and this rightly, that Freud was a "thought projector," a paranoiac, in short, who read into the minds of others what was in his own mind—a fact more than any other which explains Freud's diseased theories, hailed by cultist Freudians as the illustrious works of the Master.

Freud hung on every word of Fliess' for years and was probably more intimate in his communications with him than with any other person throughout his entire life. It was to Fliess that Freud sent his most revealing and pathological insights in some 284 extant letters. And, as previously mentioned, Fliess was himself, predictably, the "object" of one of Freud's murder plots and threats.

Probably one of the most significant shards of information released by Masson in his interviews and his book concerns the diagnosis of yet another of Freud's personal doctors, Dr. Joseph Breuer. Again, what Masson has to offer is nothing more than releasing an excerpt from one of Freud's own letters, and has nothing to do with any pretensions to scholarship. In a letter of March 1, 1896 Freud wrote to Fliess:

. . . our personal relationship, externally reconciled, casts a deep shadow over my existence here, I can do nothing right for him and have given up trying. According to him, I would daily have to ask myself

whether I am suffering from moral insanity or
paranoia scientifica. (Masson, p. 135)

In light of the fact that Breuer served as Freud's consulting doctor, it is most interesting that Dr. Breuer's prescription for his condition, in Freud's own words was "emigration." Freud wrote in 1897 (the year following Breuer's diagnosis of his "moral insanity"):

How fortunate that I no longer see Breuer. He would
have surely advised me to emigrate.

It is interesting that Masson (as he claims), was given permission by Anna Freud to see only one of the secret Fliess letters—from among the hidden, concealed, censored and or “rewritten” letters by Freud. This, of course, was before Masson was given unrestricted access to the entire collection of the letters. What made Masson want to see just that letter?

It was the above letter of March 1, 1896 Masson wanted to see, what?—a letter involving Freud's being advised to consider his illness was a case of “moral insanity” and later, apparently, that he really ought to emigrate. Interesting that Masson would somehow stumble onto *that* letter which Masson requested from Anna Freud and was given permission to see (the letter had long been kept in the top secret file at the Freud Archives). Masson does not tell us why he requested this letter out of the many incriminating ones that could have been requested. How did he know about it? He would have had to know about the letter before he could request it. Was it just a “lucky” hit that Masson seized on evidence of the diagnosis of Freud suffering from “moral insanity” (Moral Vahn-Sinn)? But, more of that later. At present we are concerned with Dr. Breuer's diagnosis of Freud's condition, information which has been utterly suppressed by the Freud inner circle heretofore.

Though we are given but shreds of information, nonetheless certain significant facts emerge from the newly released excerpts from Freud's secret letters. By combining these facts with others we can explore certain telling possibilities. Dr. Max Schur comments that Dr. Breuer was "an excellent, experienced clinician." (p. 56). Breuer had a high reputation in the medical circles of Vienna which is one of the reasons Freud originally courted his interest to advance his own career. Apparently at Freud's insistence and Breuer's reluctant consent, the two of them worked on a volume together, *Studies In Hysteria*, which was published in 1895. By 1894, however, a rift in their relationship began to develop which Freud charged to Breuer's intractable resistance to the acceptance of Freud's newly developing theories on sexuality. Breuer "joined ranks with those who believed Freud was losing his grip on reality." The fact of the matter is Freud

was totally losing his grip on reality, or he had already lost it altogether long ago.

It is seldom commented on by the scholars that Freud went through various catastrophic illnesses. Schur in his book *Freud: Living and Dying* supplies much information from the secret letters during this period. During the period 1893 into 1897, Freud feared he was dying from a severe heart condition. Dr. Schur, after quoting from numerous previously unpublished letters, concludes that Freud was suffering from nicotine poisoning, which set off complex symptoms, including Freud's homicidal impulses. E.M. Thornton in her book, *The Freudian Fallacy*, on the other hand, concludes rather that Freud was suffering psychotic reactions due to cocaine poisoning, i.e., addiction. Dr. Ernest Jones, discussing the same period, concluded that Freud was experiencing a "considerable psychoneurosis." Whatever the diagnosis, we know that during this period, in fact only months before Breuer's diagnosis of Freud's "moral insanity," Freud was involved in a brutal sadistic operation performed on one of his women patients, known through Freud's case history, "The Dream Of Irma's Injection"—indeed, that operation itself was an act of "moral insanity" and Freud should have been long locked away in the least case for the public's protection.

In my book I detail the criminal conspiracy hatched between Fliess and Freud to cure Irma's "sexual neurosis" with a sadistic operation on her nose. Freud and Fliess both potentially faced serious legal consequences from the authorities, including an indictment for acts of sadism and attempted murder. The case history of Irma (Emma Ekstein) was written, by Freud's own admission, as an alibi for the authorities should it be needed. By the year 1895 Freud had infected numerous patients, recklessly and criminally recommended cocaine injections as a "cure all" for morphinism, killed a woman patient with overdoses of experimental drugs, wildly advocated his strange theory that in all cases of neurosis child and even infant sexual assault had to be blamed on the parents and the infant, and charged that his own father was such a sex pervert. Hence, it is not difficult, for those who know the history of Freud's career to understand Breuer's diagnosis of "moral insanity" and "scientific paranoia." Yet, it is most interesting that Breuer would have recommended, in Freud's mind at least, the treatment of "emigration" for his condition. In other words, "For you what is needed? get out of town!"

Since Breuer knew Freud well and served as his physician and confidante, he undoubtedly was aware of all these "troubles" Freud had. That Breuer thought Freud ought to emigrate indicates, in my view, Breuer's own realization that Freud's was a legal problem as well as a medical one. In view of Breuer's view of Freud's problems, it is most interesting that one of the letters in the Freud archives is

restricted until the year 2104 over 200 years after the letter was written! Why?

In summary, we add above another diagnosis from a doctor who knew Freud well, the diagnosis of Dr. Joseph Breuer, and one which, in essence, agrees with the other medical diagnosis of Freud's true condition: homicidal mania, serial killer, "Cain-Complex" maniac, a Brother-Murderer—the same as in the play *Quilt*

THE SONG OF JOHN

It is a central theme of my book that Freud's first victim occurred when Freud was in England at the age of 19, when he killed his half-brother, John Freud. I repeatedly wrote in my book that this first traumatic murder-event (which I earlier fixed when Freud was 17 rather than at 19 as I now believe—it comes to the same thing) became the focus of Freud's psychotic fixations throughout his entire life. Indeed, all of his works are, in a very real sense, a map to a discovery and confession of his crime against John, his *Wahn-Sinn* (pronounced "Vahn-Sin" in German, or "Juan-Sin" or *Wahn-sinn* in Spanish, or simply "John-Sin" in English)—all names for the "John-Sin." WAHNSINN IS THE GERMAN WORD FOR "INSANITY" "MADNESS," "FRENZY" and *Wahn* is the etymological root of Freud's entire serial killer mania, which includes all his personal superstitions (*wahnglaube*), his murder mania and *idée fixe* (*wahnsinn*, *wahnidee*)—indeed the entire linguistic, ideational and literary superstructure of the Freudian psychoanalytical *weltanschauung*. A decoding of Freud's murder mania involving Johann Freud, his most fixated murder victim, is purposely encoded, ciphered and implanted in the foundations of his entire analytical superstructure, as a kind of psychotic game he plays with the reader, his "disciples"—and the thousands of mindreading psychoanalysts are either unaware of this simple fact or conspire to profit from the suppression of this truth. In *PFM* I established, beyond reasonable doubt, that Freudianism was founded on a great fraud which required an army of Freudian co-conspirators to maintain and perpetuate.

I abundantly provide quotations from Freud's own works indicating that memory of this murder was the nexus and root of all Freud's psychological confessions and the great pride that he, as a serial killer, took in his murder "accomplishments." Further, I indicate that Freud confessed to his homicidal crimes in his various letters to Fliess, that Fliess was aware of Freud's psychopathological fixation on his half-brother, John, because Freud wrote to him about the matter. Hence, the reason for Freud's murder threat against Fliess should he divulge

knowledge of Freud's crimes.

On May 30, 1893 Freud wrote a letter to Fliess wherein he confided to him the current themes he was then struggling with: the ultimate explanation of the etiology of hysteria. First he developed the idea that "pollutants" produced by "organic changes in the nose" caused excessive masturbation, and that masturbation was the root cause of hysterical neurosis. (Masson, p.80, unpublished postscript). But, in his next letter of August 20, 1893, Freud apparently began to emphasize the theme that would become his new torch for fame: that in *all* cases of hysterical neurosis was to be found infant-child sexual assault by a parent. Masson claims that the first indication of Freud's new directions is to be found in this letter, the "relevant passage" of which was said to be the following fragment from the August 20 letter:

For the rest, the etiology of the neuroses pursues me everywhere, as the Marlborough song follows the traveling Englishman. Recently, I was consulted by the daughter of the innkeeper on the Rax; it was a nice case for me.

Masson informs us that this letter with this "relevant passage" was kept secret even from Ernest Kris the editor of the Fliess/Freud correspondence. In Masson's own words:

The letter which follows, dated August 20, 1893 was omitted from the published version of the Freud and Fliess correspondence. Unlike the other omitted letters and passages, however, Ernest Kris never saw it and it was not excised after the transcript was made. I came across it in Freud's desk at Maresfield Gardens. (Masson, p. 81)

How Masson knows that Ernest Kris never saw it is not clear, nor is it very clear what Masson means when he says "it was not excised after the transcript was made." Surely Freud's desk had been looked into before *Masson* arrived on the scene—and has the genius idea, 45 years or so after Freud died, to *look in his desk!* It's all absurd and shows that Masson himself identifies himself as an active co-conspirator in concealing the Freudian criminal history. Someone knew about it, and apparently Masson quotes from it to indicate a deliberate effort to conceal the information in this letter of August 20, 1893. Masson is at pains to identify the "daughter of the innkeeper on the Rax" as Katerina who is featured as a case history in the book written by Freud in collaboration with Breuer, *Studies in Hysteria* (1895). But I am of the belief that the real reason the letter was suppressed is that we have here is a far more telling connection than

Masson could conceive, or at least dare declare, and that is the subject of John Freud. John Freud whom Freud murdered nearly eighteen years to the day previously. The footnote to the quotation provided by Masson concerning the "Marlborough song" is very interesting:

Songs of Many Wars, edited and arranged by Kurt Adler (Howell Soskin 1943), p.36 tells us that "an unknown Frenchman wrote this song after Marlborough's [ed. **John Marlborough**] victory at Malplaquet in 1709, when word came that the English general had fallen in battle. The fact that Marlborough was very much alive did not keep the ballad from achieving wide popularity. The melody was originally a hunting song of the 17th century, since then it has served almost every nation in the world at one time or another." Schroter points out that Freud is here citing [**Johann**] Goethe's *Romische Elegien* 2:9 ff (Masson, p. 55)

Most interesting! I have provided the fact that Freud twice drags in "John" in relation to The Song of Marlborough. The Song of Marlborough was written in 1709. It was derived from a hunting song of the 17th century (17 is Freud's "lucky" number which he frequently relates to his murder mania, his *moderischwahn*). It was about the fall of John Marlborough and it is from Johann Goethe's *Roman Elegies* that Freud quotes his reference to it. The *Song of John Marborough* follows Freud everywhere reminding him that John has "fallen." This song that "pursues him everywhere" is his *verfolgungswahn*, his "persecution mania." And it is this song and this literary allusion to it which serves, according to Masson, as the key to the etiology of the neurosis (*Freud's neurosis*)—with which, we know from other sources, Freud related to his travel phobia and his "childhood trauma" – matters dealt with at some length in my book, *PFM*. In another essay I will demonstrate that Freud, in fact, referred to his half-brother, John, in Spanish as "Juan", again, pronounced "wahn" at the very time he was in England and killed him).

It is a matter of historical record that Freud's essays during this period 1892-1897, along with a record of his personal letters during this time period indicate that Freud's analysis of psychotic states of mind and his own personal medical condition were significantly one and the same. I propose that the significant statement in the August 20 letter to Fliess had more to do with the subject of John than with Freud's later developed theories and declarations on the etiology of the neurosis. *JOHN is the etiology of Freud's Psychosis*. For ultimately Freud found that he was the case history centerpiece of his own theories which he publicized with increasing boldness. Freud's search

for the etiology of the neuroses begins and ends in the subject of John, his English half-brother. For it cannot be a merely incidental matter that the ghost, John, who pursued him everywhere was involved in his theme of Traveling, England and John, nor that *Marlborough's name was John and the "Song of John" is the key to his murder mania*. That Freud could round all this up with his quotation of *Johann von Goethe* about the Song of John which pursued him everywhere—that was just icing on the cake. That was why the passage was excised—not because of a reference to Katerina, as Masson foolishly would have us believe.

In a chapter of my book I spend considerable discussion and analysis of Freud's letters confessing to the ultimate root of his psychotic fixations. I quote a letter of October 3, 1897 where Freud confesses that he always knew his problems could be traced to his older half-brother, John (nominally referred to as his "nephew"), and that it was memory of John that determined all his neurotic relations with the world henceforth. Also, I quote Freud numerous times in reference to the thought that his murder impulse was intimately tied to his memories of John. This cannot be disputed and the record is ready for examination by anyone interested in verifying the point. In my discussion of Freud's murder of John and his confessions of the fact, I produce new evidence that John was nowhere in England or Wales when Freud later claimed that he was still alive in 1899—some 26 years after he murdered him. And, indeed, throughout all the editions of *Interpretation of Dreams* for decades after her never changed that false claim!

In any case, in the same year as 1893 (18 years after he had murdered John) Freud was living in mortal fear that he would die as a result of a heart attack. Anyone who has carefully read Schur's *Freud: Living and Dying*, regarding Freud's personal "crisis" biography and Freud's writings of the same period will quickly see that Freud was clearly describing himself in his descriptions of hysteria and hysterics and psychosis and psychotics. I do not assert the point lightly and willing stand ready to produce even further evidence of the fact. Freud even referred to his state on April 19, 1894 as "hypomaniac." He was terrified that he was going to die. Hot burning pains shot through his arm, he had attacks of depression, hallucinations of death and departure. Freud rushed to Breuer with his own theories of his condition—nicotine poisoning or a heart condition. Breuer said only that it could be the one or the other and recommended that Freud have himself examined. But Freud refrained from obtaining an examination and contented himself with his own and Fliess' theories—this, despite the fact that he repeatedly told Fliess of his great fears of dying (which he called a "death deliria") at a specific time of life, which was preordained by a numerological scheme devised by Fliess. Freud himself, according to Schur, wanted to know

from Fliess if his illness was really organic or a case of "hypochondriasis." (Schur, p. 46).

Certainly a travel phobia is an obvious case of referential fixation with characteristics of what may be described as hysteria, or, even mania (*wahnsinn*). Interestingly, it was Freud's own travel phobia, which he told Fliess about in October of 1897, that was symptomatic of his own condition—a condition which specifically related to the subject of John and which I describe at some length in my book.

As the reader will discover, I have included ample evidence that Freud was obsessed with the theme of England, he obsessively used English words and phrases in his books and letters, and also ultimately enthroned murder at the heart of the world's and his own "universal neurosis." The theme song of murder pursues him everywhere in all his writing, in all his confessions. It is the *Song of John*, and to it we can easily link murder, travel, England and hysterical symptoms—and endless hints, puzzles, riddles, and conundrums which Freud used to testify to the fact—and dare discovery, which is often the *modus operandi* of the serial killer, as is well known.

In any case, by 1894 Freud was overcome by an onslaught of his insane complaints, which were identical to those he was describing in his essays of this period as symptomatic of hysterical neuroses—his *wahnsinn* symptoms.

In "The Justification for Detaching from Neurasthenia a Particular Syndrome: The Anxiety-Neurosis" Freud listed the following symptoms—from which he personally suffered: General Irritability; Anxious expectation; Anxiety attacks; Palpitation and Cardiac Arrhythmia and/or Tachycardia; Attacks of Diarrhea; Vertigo; Constipation; etc.—the list continues. In a letter (5/21/94) Freud wrote about his fears of dying:

Among the gloomy thoughts of the past few months there is one that is in second place, right after wife and children namely, that I shall not be able to prove the sexual thesis any more. After all one does not want to die either immediately or completely.
(Schur p. 50)

In the next letter (6/22/94) Freud wrote:

Now follows my case history, the unvarnished truth, with all the details that seem important to a wretched patient and yet probably do not deserve it...Some arrhythmia always seems to be present, but increases to a delirium cordis with oppression, occurs only with

attacks, lasting now less than an hour, almost regularly after lunch. The moderate dyspnea during stair climbing is gone. . The feeling of oppression, and the burning sensation have not let up for a single day. No objective evidence can apparently be found, but then I do not really know...I feel aged, sluggish, not healthy... What tortures me is the uncertainty as to how to evaluate the whole story. It would embarrass me to reveal a hypochondriacal evaluation, but I have no criteria by which to decide this. I am very dissatisfied with the way I am being treated here...My compromise solution, for which I have no scientific basis, is that I shall suffer for about 4 to 5 to eight years from various complaints, have good and bad periods, and then between 40 and 50 shall perish nicely and suddenly from a rupture of the heart; if it is not too close to 40, it is not so bad at all. (Schur, p. 50-60)

It should be remembered that Freud was already 38 years old when he made this statement. Schur himself states that during this period, "An obsessive preoccupation not only with death in general but with dying at a specific age recurs frequently." (Schur, p.72) In my book I devote considerable space to discussing Freud's undeniable hysterical and obsessive fears that he was a doomed man and that as the result of his great guilt he believed he would die in retribution for his crimes. His fears that he would die at a "specific" age were determined by the complexus of events and circumstances surrounding his first murder, in particular, his murder of John Freud. But my main point here is that during the very years that Freud was writing and developing his theory of sexuality, Freud was himself suffering various psychotic symptoms. E.M. Thornton wrote:

Inconsistencies, misspellings, and other errors become apparent in Freud's letters and drafts sent to Fliess from about 1893. In the letter of April 19, 1894, the character of his writing changed markedly. In contrast with Freud's usual "mastery and elegance in the use of the German language," Schur found distorted or at least quite uncommon versions of several words, some-how suggestive of neologisms, with an awkward sentence structure. These changes could not be detected in the original German to demonstrate Freud's use of nonexistent words and distorted sentences. Schur attributes these aberrations to mental stress. Statements made in one sentence are rejected in the next. The letters become increasingly lengthy and meandering, often confused and

inconsistent, with many *non sequiturs* and circular arguments, making his theories difficult to follow and presenting many problems later for his translators as evidenced by many footnotes.
(Thornton, p. 149)

Here I shall provide only one more quotation from Freud's work, *The Aetiology of Hysteria* (1896), which, like Freud's comments on necrophilia provides clear evidence of Freud's profoundly disturbed ideas of the subject of infant/child sexual molestation and rape. It will be recalled that Freud attributed all symptoms of hysteria to be the result of the patient having been sexually molested in childhood. I will underline the telling phrases. As we shall see Freud laid a considerable responsibility *on the child* for provoking the sexual attacks; for it was Freud's view that these children (even infants from the age of 6 months) precipitated the attacks because of their own precocious sexuality. But the mania of Freud's language speaks for itself:

Now the feeling of sexually normal human being recoils from the idea of these infantile sexual scenes, containing, as they do, all the abuses known to libertines and impotent persons whose sexual practices include the improper use of the mouth and the rectum. The physician's astonishment at this soon gives place to complete understanding. We cannot expect that people who do not scruple to gratify their sexual desires upon children will be repelled by any lack of refinement in the manner of that gratification, and the natural sexual impotence of childhood inevitably impels towards those surrogate activities to which the adult degrades himself in the case of acquired sexual impotence. All the peculiar circumstances in which the ill matched pair carry on their love-relations, the adult—who cannot escape his share in the mutual dependence inherent in a sexual relation and yet is endued with complete authority and the right of punishment, and can enhance the one role for the other in unbridled gratification of his moods; the child—helpless victim of this capriciousness, prematurely awakened to every kind of sensation and exposed to every kind of disappointment, often interrupted in the practice of the sexual activities assigned to him by his imperfect control of his natural needs—all these grotesque, yet tragic, incongruities become stamped upon the further development of the person concerned and his neurosis, manifesting themselves in innumerable lasting consequences

which deserve to be carefully traced out. Where the relation is one between two children, the character of the sexual scenes is still repulsive, since every relation of the sort between children postulates a previous seduction of one of them by an adult. The psychic consequences of such a childhood—relations are quite extraordinarily far reaching; the two persons remain all their lives united by an invisible bond.

(Freud: Early Psychoanalytic Writings, p.198)

Masson, the supposed “rebel in the ranks,” nonetheless apparently believes in Freud's maniacal utterances on the subject and declared them to be "searing words, which have lost none of their truth today" (p.5) Masson goes so far as to state that in Freud's writings concerning these sexual attacks on children Freud used the word "seduction." Masson wrote:

The implication is that the "seduced" child is also the seducer and has brought on the sexual act by his or her behavior." (Masson, p. 5)

In the same year as the publication of the essay on the "Aetiology of Hysteria," Freud wrote to his beloved Fliess a case history which was suppressed by the editors of Freud's work. The reason for the deletion of this case history can be found in the following paragraph, where Freud indicates that one can achieve "health" through the practice of the perverse. The case involved a "highly perverse" father and a brother of Freud's patient:

The brother abhors all perversity, while he suffers from compulsive impulses. That is to say, he has repressed certain impulses which are replaced by others with compulsions. This is, in general, the secret of compulsive impulses. If he could be perverse, he would be healthy, like the father.
(Masson, p. 94)

A "highly perverse" father is "healthy" and that if the son could be perverse like his father, he, too, would be healthy? But this is Freud through and through and this is not the only time he made the assertion that the perverse was "healthy." Are these, too, "searing words" which retain their truth even unto today, as Masson would have us believe?

Another interesting statement by Freud in this regard, not about fathers but about mothers, indicates his personal relations with the subject of incest.

It has an ugly sound, and it is also paradoxical, but nevertheless it must be said, that whoever is to be really free and happy in love must have overcome his deference for women and come to terms with the idea of incest with mother or sister. (*On The Universal Tendency To Debasement In The Sphere of Love*).

There it is. To be truly free and happy in matters regarding sex one has to “overcome” his resistance to having sex with one’s mother or sister. Apparently the Freud family was able to successfully “overcome” these “resistances”!

FAKE CURES, PHONY CASE HISTORIES & FREUD'S MENDACITY

In my book I repeatedly draw attention to the fact that Freud fabricated most of, *if not all*, his supposed “scientific” case histories. He foolishly and sometimes skillfully fed his own biographical facts, experiences, and fantasies into those of his conjured case histories in order to produce a continuing stream of verbiage to propagandize for his false and outlandish claims for the therapeutic value of psychoanalysis. Considerable evidence was amassed to prove and document my assertions. I produced the case history contained in Screen Memories (Freud's first detailed "case history") and showed that the real patient was none other than Freud himself. I quoted Freud's own comment on the subject: "The chief patient I am concerned with is myself" and cited the work of Dr. Bernfeld who first realized and documented the fact that the case history was a phony one and was really a autobiographical case history. I wrote:

The list of Freud's fallacious case histories first noted in 1946 by Dr. Bernfeld, is only limited by one's desire to examine all of Freud's writings. These fraudulent examples (e.g. case histories) serve to distract his readers, thwarting direct connections to the various components of his own psycho-pathology. (*PFM*, p.52)

Whole chapters in my book were devoted to proving the point that Freud manufactured these works of fiction in order to expound his theories, confess to his own aberrations, and claim cures where there were, in fact, none. I demonstrated that Freud's most famous case history "The Wolf Man" was another such fraudulent case history and produced some sixty specific correlations between the specific data of

the Wolf Man's alleged biography and Freud's own biographical history to make my point unassailable. I repeatedly demonstrated that Freud was an arrogant and pathological liar concerning nearly every detail of his own background and that there was hardly one point in the entire Freudian system that could stand the test of rational analysis. E.M. Thornton wrote:

In citing his early papers as containing the proofs of his assertions was Freud taking a calculated risk that no one would take the trouble to verify his claims by seeking out and reading these works? If he did, then the risk appears to have been fully justified. No one, at any rate in the sixties, appears to have taken this elementary precaution before adopting the invalid and aberrational theories of psycho-analysis and propagating these theories as established truth. Historians in the future will marvel at the credulity evinced in the Freud revival; they will find in the whole Freud story an ironic commentary on Human nature and the part played by imitation, fashion, and self-deception in its vagaries. (Thornton, XV1)

To the list of fraudulent case histories which I present in my book we must add also another case history which is famous in psychoanalytical history, the case of Anna O. To H.F. Ellenberger we owe evidence and documentation of the fact that the case history of Anna O. and her alleged cure was, in fact, another fraudulent piece of fiction hatched by Freud and Breuer to generate support for the efficacy of the "talking" method of catharsis. Ellenberger, an historian of science and author of the work *The Discovery of the Unconscious*, while doing research for his book discovered key discrepancies between Freud's and Breuer's account of the case history of Anna O and the facts. Anna O (Bertha Pappenheim). "Anna O" became famous in her own right in later years and was the founder of the League of Jewish Women and a writer on social causes and perspectives. In 1882 she fell ill and came under the influence of Breuer, Freud's mentor and financial supporter with whom he published *Studies In Hysteria*. It was the case history of Anna O, and her claimed cure, that provided the "theoretical" basis for the development of the fundamental technique of latter day psychoanalysis. It was not until 13 years later that she was featured in the case history presented by Breuer and Freud to the medical public to prove the efficacy of psychoanalysis. But Ellenberger, in researching public records, discovered she had not been cured at all, as claimed. She had in fact been institutionalized by Breuer after his **failure** in treating her. The medical records of Bertha prepared by the physician at the time of her admission into a sanatorium, after Breuer had allegedly affected a cure, indicated that she was then suffering

from "hysterical insanity" (Thornton, p. 105). All of her major symptoms were still in effect after the alleged cure. Ellenberger wrote, on the basis of his documentary evidence:

The famed prototype of a cathartic cure was neither a cure nor a catharsis.

Actually, it was C.G. Jung who first revealed the fraud. In the words of E.M. Thornton:

It was not until many years after her illness that inconsistencies in the story of Anna O. began to emerge. Firstly, in a seminar at Zurich in 1925, Jung revealed that this famous case, "so much spoken about as an example of brilliant therapeutic success, was in reality nothing of the kind. . . There was no cure at all in the sense of which it was originally presented. (Thornton, p. 91)

But what concerns us for the moment is not the case history, *per se*, but the fact that it was another *phony case history*—and the very one upon which Freud based his historic claim for the effectiveness of the "talking cure." Perhaps, however, it is most appropriate to listen to the words of E.M. Thornton on the subject once again:

Freud's version of the termination of Breuer's involvement with the case as retold by Jones is completely negated by the correspondence found in the sanatorium case notes. The letters present the picture of an orderly transfer planned ahead, the details of the patient's condition, drug dosages, and special requirements being sent on ahead of her arrival. Why had Freud given such a deceptive account of the affair, and why had both he and Breuer concealed the fact that Bertha had not been cured by the cathartic method, a fact that, as amply documented by Dr. Hirschmuller in his biography of Breuer, was well known to both men? The report of her case published twelve years later in the famous *Studies in Hysteria* failed to disclose this fact. From its publication in 1895 till Jung's revelation in 1925, a period of thirty years, the case had been passed off as the perfect prototype of a cathartic cure. (Thornton, p. 107)

I will state less politely what E.M. Thornton states with sufficient force but less directly. The reason Freud gave a "deceptive" account of Anna O's condition is simple: Freud was an inveterate liar and had

absolutely no scruple to twist and pervert the truth to serve his own clandestine purposes at any time, on any subject, and regardless of who was injured by it. A last quotation from E.M. Thornton, confirms my assertion that the number of phony case histories to be found in Freud's work is only limited by the interest in the researcher to document the pervasiveness of Freud's mendacity. Fully confident that she knows of whence she speaks, she observes:

The inconvenient fact of the persistence of the patient's symptoms, however, failed to deter Freud. Still under the influence of Charcot's teaching that emotional trauma could cause bodily disease, he began, in 1889, to use the cathartic method to bring these traumas to light, working in collaboration with Breuer on cases of hysteria referred by the latter. These cases, along with that of Bertha Pappenheim, were eventually reported in *Studies in Hysteria*. As we shall see, in these patients too no cure was effected. (Thornton, p.107)

FREUD'S COCAINE ADDICTION

In my book I reveal the fact that Freud recklessly promoted the use of cocaine for everything from headaches to hysteria and asserted that by the year 1895 Freud was a cocaine addict (p.30). Even though numerous letters, written by Freud, wherein Freud made reference to his cocaine addiction were not available to me, and were censored from previous versions of the Freud/Fliess correspondence, I was able to deduce the fact of Freud's cocaine addiction from an intimate acquaintance with his published works (as opposed to his private letters to Fliess). Further, I forthrightly stated that Freud not only addicted himself to cocaine but others as well and also caused numerous deaths by making false claims for the therapeutic value of cocaine for the cure of morphinism making him, in today's parlance, not only a "pusher" but a murderer as well. This, again, I deduced from the web of fact and circumstance surrounding Freud's biography as evidenced by his own writings and historical knowledge of the trail of deaths that came in the wake of Freud's advocacy of cocaine as a panacea for the worlds ills. The underlying purpose of Freud's fraudulent medical claims was to become rich and famous, at the expense of other people's life. In this matter and others I predicted the censored letters were concealing the historical facts to paint a false image of Freud as a man of impeccable integrity, and made reference to Freud's hallucinatory theories.

Working completely independently, and without my knowledge, E.M. Thornton first published her book in England under the title, *Freud & Cocaine*. In her illuminating work she tackled the problem from another perspective and produced incontrovertible evidence of the fact that Freud was a severe cocaine addict, whose symptomology included the proliferation of insane ideas that bore the stamp of classical severe cocaine addiction. Additionally, she noted the fact that Freud was decidedly homicidal and saw that also as a feature of his severe cocaine addiction. Her work has the benefit of a medical and historical perspective and is informed with an intimate knowledge of not only cocaine addiction but a shrewd eye for the fallacious, the fraudulent, and the "fools gold" of mad theories. Additional evidence of her thesis also comes to us from the Harvard Edition of Freud's letters to Fliess (1985)—which was not available to her when she wrote her book:

I need a lot of cocaine. . . I began *it* again because I constantly missed it (after fourteen months of abstinence) and because I must treat this psychic fellow well or he won't work for me. I demand a great deal of him. The torment, most of the time is superhuman. (6/17/95)

The next day I kept the nose under cocaine, which one really should not do. (1/24/95)

[I] pulled myself out of a miserable attack with a cocaine application. (4/26/95)

Since the last cocainization three circumstances has continued to coincide. (4/27/95)

I finished "Dreams and Hysteria" yesterday, and today I already miss a narcotic. (1/25/1901)

Additionally, another writer, Peter Swales, though himself speaking sometimes obliquely on the matter has provided evidence that Freud's official biographer, Ernest Jones, was in a conspiracy with Anna Freud to conceal the evidence of Freud's use of cocaine from public knowledge. In a letter to the well known Freud scholar, Bernfeld, Jones claimed there was no mention of cocaine in the Freud and Fliess correspondence. This was a demonstrable lie which further reinforces my claims that Jones and other scholars (including Swales) are intimate with the practices of fraud of the Freud-clique on the American (and world) public on a grand scale. The Library of Congress gave tacit cooperation in this effort of concealing evidence—and sometimes apparently actively assisted in it.

CONCLUSION

These issues far outreach those of mere scholarly concern, especially if, as E.M. Thornton contends (and correctly I do not doubt) that Freud's entire theoretical conceptions bear the unmistakable signs of that paranoiac hallucinatory state of mind characterized by severe cocaine addiction. This condition, on top of Freud's probably innately diseased mentality, was a deadly combination for more than one person, and necrotic in terms of cultural influence. Peter Swales, likewise, suggests that Freud's cocaine theories were influenced by his deep involvement in cocaine usage and that Freud on occasion must have given himself injections. Swales believe it is "unlikely" that "Freud ever experienced any hallucinatory delirium."

Swales sounds like he has never read reads correspondence with Fliess—its full of hallucinatory delirium, as *PFM* shows. E.M. Thornton, however, provides ample evidence to refute Swales' indulgent and often naive "cover-up" opinions.

In the Library of Congress are letters owned by the American public which—access to these letters, by qualified scholars, was for a long time denied. The apparent purpose of the concealment of Freud's letters was to hide his severe cocaine addiction (how much this policy of concealment may have changed, we are soon to test and report at this website). This concealment also hides the facts surrounding his fraudulent case histories which resulted in the proliferation of the use of cocaine throughout the world. The clarification of issues relating to the formulation of Freudian theory and cocaine addiction is an issue in desperate need of public airing. On the cultural front, the so-called War On Drugs, will be registered as a farce, so long as the American people are impotent to effect this examination of Freud's traffic in cocaine because of a Freudian clique which abuses its use of the Library of Congress for its own nefarious purposes.

Likewise, the subject of child abuse is widely acknowledged to be one of the most important issues of public health. International conferences are being held even as I write, on the subject of children's rights, and yet, Freud's own family history of incest and molestation was put under cover by the same influence of a group of Freudians in concert with the Library of Congress. The influence of Freudianism was, is, and will continue to be a corrupting influence in the medical, cultural and psychological fields—particularly in the United States of America. These serious issues must be faced, and faced now, supposed agreements with the deceased Anna Freud and the Library of Congress notwithstanding.

It is a matter of substantial importance that the origins of Freud's views be analyzed side by side with his "philosophy of murder" and the personal and political motives influencing his theories. Certainly, it would be imprudent not to question the motives of the persons and organizations actively involved in perpetuating the myth of Freud's impeccable moral and professional integrity by concealing from the public the terrible truths relating to Freud and his surviving organizations. The impact of Freudianism upon American medicine, jurisprudence, and other vital spheres of American life is unquestionably enormous. E.M. Thornton has observed:

Many analysts fleeing from the Nazis settled in the United States, where they eventually became the psychiatric establishment, exerting considerable power of patronage over university appointments, and, it has been alleged, the allocation of grants from public and charitable funds. During these years they began to exercise a great deal of influence over theories of child rearing, education, and social work, disciplines still heavily dependent on Freudian theory today. Spock's famous book on baby care introducing the applications of Freudian methods to child-raising dates from this era. It was in this period too that Freudian theory became adopted by social workers to such an extent that, according to one commentator, "American social workers confused Freud with the Declaration of Independence." These attitudes crossed the Atlantic and Freudian theory is still at the center of social casework in Britain, a fact that explains many of the incomprehensible decisions reached by social workers in recent years.
(Thornton, p. 246)

E.M. Thornton courageously confronts the Freudian attack on the appropriate medical care of persons suffering from various afflictions. She persuasively documents that many, if not all, of Freud's diagnosis of specific psychological problems are inappropriate in the light of modern medical knowledge. Simply, numerous maladies which Freud diagnosed as characteristic of (and proof of) *his* psychological categories (e.g. the alleged murder mania of children and their incestuous motivations via the "Oedipal complex") are otherwise explained. The plain truth is that there is now a large patient population in the United States in need of critical medical treatment who are literally dying for one reason and one reason alone: That reason is that they are being treated by Freudian psychoanalysts who are incompetent in the field of medical care—i.e., "Doctors" who are predisposed to "understanding" various symptomology and etiology in the light of doctrines of their "Master" and "Teacher," Freud.

Because of this, brain tumors go undetected, toxic conditions go untreated. Again, in the words of E.M. Thornton:

Thanks to Freud, a patient coming under the care of a psycho-analytically oriented psychiatrist has an excellent chance of never receiving a single physical examination. An example of this approach is the Freudian psychiatrist who was invited to a children's ward and asked for his diagnosis of some of the patients there (Benda 1960). He made various Freudian suggestions involving Oedipal motivation and so on. The children were actually suffering from phenylalanine, one of the amino acid, is impaired. . . Freud's florid and bizarre concepts achieved medical respectability and orthodoxy, while the organic approach became slightly disreputable, its adherents having to adopt an apologetic and deprecatory stance, while from the lofty heights of superior knowledge the psychoanalysts spoke patronizingly and disparagingly of the "medical model." The continued illogical separation of psychiatry and neurology, as if only part of the brain belonged to the central nervous system, is another legacy of Freudian dominance. The brain is part of the body, subject to the same virus infections, tumors, vitamin deficiencies, and biochemical defects that afflict the body. All these can affect brain cells and lead to the impaired cognitive functioning and distorted sense perceptions we call mental disease. . . Freudian psychiatry today is supported by large numbers of psychotherapists, counselors, social workers, child guidance experts, and others, and the numbers are steadily increasing. Large amounts of public money are swallowed up in these activities, which have produced nothing but a proliferation of literature, case conferences, theorizing, and jargon. Meanwhile there has been no abatement in the growth of "mental disease." No progress in psychiatry can occur until the invalid and aberrational theories of Freud are eradicated and the way cleared for the incorporation of all the medical advances since Freud laid the foundations of psychoanalysis in the last decade of the nineteenth century. (Thornton, p. 230)

Much has been quoted from E.M. Thornton—who is a renowned Lay Fellow of the Royal Academy of Medical Science—to underscore the historical perspective from which the present situation must be viewed. The present crisis in patient care in the United States, then, is

undoubtedly precipitated in significant part by the Freudian "school." Thornton's words are factually correct and cannot be invalidated by those who would merely charge her as being a "competitor" with allegiance to another "school." The question must be faced: Is it one of the tactics and strategies of the Freudians to purposefully create their own patient clients? That is, is it one of the motives of the Freudians to perpetuate the diseased conditions of their patients? We know their "Master" was eminently capable of that point of view and specifically stated he did not care about the issue of "cures." As he repeatedly said, "The chief patient I am concerned with is myself."

And, when it came to his own income, as is probably true of many a Freudian psychoanalyst, he stated (11/26/99) that he would rather that his patients be ill: "My own efforts at enlisting [new patients] really have had no results. The pseudocure by the sanatorium is atrocious—I should have preferred her ill and demoralized."

YYYYY

STAY TUNED FOR PART 11, *The Truth Assaulted, The Freudian Propaganda of Dr. Jeffery Masson, Translator of the Freud/Fliess Correspondence*, and a complete citation of all references used in this work

© Eric Miller, 1990, 2008, *all rights reserved*