

CASE HISTORY/CRIMINAL PROFILE OF SIGISMUND SCHOLMO FREUD: SERIAL KILLER

©2014 by E.L. Miller

F's Alleged "Terrible Twos" & Freiberg Period:

F.'s earliest and virtually *only* reported memories, dreams, and/or biographical claims of his so-called "Freiberg" period from birth to **not yet three years** old are delineated below, they are what Freud claims and reports and has been found credible by legions of Freudian "scholars":

F. was just about to enter or still in his "terrible two's" period when he allegedly experienced the following::

- 1) he wanted to murder his "younger brother" (allegedly "Julius") and greeted his birth with "evil" intentions and raging jealousy; "Julius died when F. was 19 months old;*
- 2) wanted to murder his "nephew" John (actually his 6-month older half-brother);*
- 3) wanted to or tried to rape his 6 month younger half-sister Pauline; wanted to have sex with his mother;*
- 4) suspected his real uncle, Phillip, of making his mother pregnant again;*
- 5) saw his nanny "disappear" and be "boxed up" for alleged theft of toys and small change;*
- 6) was baptized or washed in the menstrual blood of his mother (or "nanny");*
- 7) attack his half-brother John, his "superior" (apparently because he was six months older) with sexual intentions;*
- 8); suffered a horrible "accident" whereby he bled profusely and was scarred for life (when he was "not yet two");*

9) *he was deserted by his father and playmates;*

10) *on seeing the flames of street gas lamps on a "travel" to Breslau, he imagined "souls burning in hell")*

Surely, if not these times, then certainly future generations will be stunned to learn that the alleged biographical *validity* of F.'s "Terrible Two" period, as presented by him above, served as the foundations for a supposed *valid scientific theory* in the 20th Century! For it is obvious that if F.'s "Terrible Two period" was made up and did not have, could not have had, a basis in fact, then F.'s alleged "self-analysis" was arguably *the* greatest hoax every perpetuated in the hoax-ridden history of science. It is crucial to "decode" Freud's serial killer fantasy to understand his *modus operandi*.

Freud has been dead for nearly 70 years, his influence on the field of psychiatry is now nearly non-existent and he is being held up even by his renowned academic granddaughter as, with Hitler, one of the two greatest "false messiahs" of the 20th century. Freud is no longer the "clear and present danger" he once was. What is important is that we understand the truth of his condition and the nature of his diseased ideas for the benefit of future generations so that they, too, do not fall prey to such culture poisoning influences.

The Facts of Freud's Biography

As shall be demonstrated, F. falsified and fantasized an early biography for himself to serve as a "touch stone" for his theory, premised on the claim that *his* understanding of the formative years of the child was the gateway to understanding the psychological *condition humane*. But, true to the nature of the serial killer, he simply could not resist planting codes and giving hints of his I-got-away-with-it murders. However much he distorted and outright lied about his early years—his terrible twos period—(and much more) he nonetheless boldly revealed the key biographical elements of his psychopathy. Other facts, such as his birth date can be determined from documentary sources. The following facts

“explain” the elements of his fake biography and serve as the grid upon which he concocted his biographic fantasy. It is most probably true that:

- ✓ F. was born on March 6, 1856, Not May 6, 1856. The latter date was forged to conceal the fact that F.’s mother was 3 months pregnant when she married.
- ✓ F. was an illegitimate child who was fathered by his “brother,” Emmanuel, not by Jacob, his grandfather. Emmanuel was married at the time he got F.’s mother pregnant and his own wife, Maria, was 6 months pregnant with Johann.
- ✓ F. was brought up as the “son” of Jacob Freud.
- ✓ F. came from an incest family.
- ✓ F. has a family background of “mysteriously missing persons” –at least some of whom were highly probable murder victims.
- ✓ F. murdered his half-brother Johann (“John”), others who are named in the website, and strangers as well.
- ✓ F. pretended that John was “Julius” (though he never uses the name “Julius”) and admits to wanting to kill them both in order to give the appearance that his murder fixations were just “infantile wishes.” That way, he could talk about it, he was obsessed with murder, and pretend it was an “infantile” experience.
- ✓ F. was sexually assaulted by his grandfather, Jacob, when he was a young child.
- ✓ F. practiced incest with family members, including his mother, who was probably a nymphomaniac and apparently had sex with Jacob, and both his sons, Emmanuel and Phillip, her son, and others as well.
- ✓ F. was deeply scarred on the chin when he fought with and killed Johann in 1875, not when he was “not yet 2”, which is code for meaning not yet twenty; F. was 19 when he murdered John just turned 20 (unless Freud killed him before his birthday on August 13 on his summer vacation.
- ✓ F. was “baptized” in his own blood when he murdered John.
- ✓ “Souls burning in Hell” represented his terror associated with his travel to and from England when F. was 19, not when he was 2 and traveled to Breslau.

- ✓ F's desire for sex, or actually having sex, with his mother referred just before or just after he returned from England, when he was 19 years, not 2 years .

Supporting Facts:

1. SFSK born March 6, 1856. F's birth date has been fraudulently reported by virtually all Freud scholars with a few notable exceptions, among them F's first authorized biographer, Ernest Jones, following the discovery and publication of documentation of F's authentic birth date by Dr. Bernfeld and others. Independently acquired official documents in our possession confirm the March 6, 1856 date. When F. first learned of this is not certain, probably when he was about 16 when he went for a visit back to Freiberg Czechoslovakia. He was informed of the matter for certain in 1931 when he was being honored by a plaque being erected for him in his home town. There appears evidence nonetheless from his dreams that he knew about the "Freudian slip" his mother made in reporting his birth date as May 6, 1856.

F. was born into an incest family with a criminal history, as will be described below.

F's mother was about 3 months pregnant when she married, not the father of F., but F's grandfather, Jacob. F's mother, Amalia Nathanson, was 19 when she was impregnated by Jacob's son, Emmanuel. Emmanuel was then married to Maria, who was herself 6 months pregnant. They must have met in Vienna when Emmanuel was on one of his many business trips. Emmanuel was about 23 when he impregnated Amalia. Jacob was about 40, a trader in wool, animal fat, etc. who resided in Freiberg, Czechoslovakia, a small town of 5,000. Freiberg was about 150 miles from Vienna. Amalia probably would have had contact with a 23 year older itinerant dealer in wool. She reportedly came from a well-to-do, prominent Jewish family, who were active in religious affairs. Emmanuel no doubt had occasion to meet and take up with Amalia, being of her age and more easily admitted to her higher class level through religious or social affairs. They no doubt met in Vienna in the latter part of May or early June of 1855 when Amalia became pregnant.

2. Amalia and Jacob married on July 29, 1855, on her birthday. Three months pregnant, she gave birth to Sigmund on March 6, 1856, as said. Jacob supposedly fathered another son with Amalia named Julius who was born in October of 1857. Records have been produced that state that Julius died “six months” after birth, on April 15, 1858. At the time of the birth of Julius, F would have, in fact, been three weeks short of 24 months of age (by actual birth in March or 22 months of age by F.’s fraudulent birth on May 6th). F. refers to having had a “brother” who “died after a few months.” Another time he stated more precisely that the “younger brother” died when he (i.e., F.) was “one year and 7 months.”

F. claimed, in later years, that he had had repeated “feinting attacks” throughout his life due to the effect of this “younger brother’s death”—due to his guilt in wanting to murder him. Until we understand F.’s codes, it is a mystery why he would give such a precise time when Julius died which is incorrect, regardless whether we use F.’s true birth or fraudulent birth date for reckoning. The reason for this is easy to explain and to document. In the statement “1 year and 7 months” we have the numbers $1 + 7 = 17$, and in the statement “1 year and 7 months” we also have $12 \text{ months} + 7 \text{ months} = 19$. 17 and 19 are both “murder numbers” repeatedly used by Freud for his covert confessions to being a serial killer. We shall return to this matter. Also, we must note, again, that neither 17 or 19 is the correct number—it is either 22 or 24 months which are the correct numbers. But, Freud is not interested in that, he is interesting with “toying” with the world, confessing to murder and fooling everyone, because he is, as he said “fifteen to twenty years ahead of everyone and they will never catch me up.”

Freud, however brilliant he was in many respects, shares a fundamental characteristic of the serial kill, stupidity. He was so stupid he really thought that no one would ever be able to amass evidence sufficient to convict him of serial murders. He forgot that there are records, official records, like birth certificates, death certificates, and the personal letters which he wrote—the whole concatenation of evidence that can be amass to clearly demonstrate his true psychopathic self.

For example, the exact time of Julius' mistaken death at 19 months (i.e., "a year and seven months") that F. gave is undoubtedly another covert confession of his murder of Johann or John (Emmanuel's oldest son) when F. was 19 *years old* (in England in the summer of 1875). This was the trip that Freud first claimed occurred when he was 17. F. claims that he greeted the birth of this Julius (Freud never uses his name) with a murderous mania, real "evil" impulses. In fact, F. would have been 17 months old at the time Julius *was born*, not died (or using his *correct* birthday of March 6, 1856 he would have been 19 months old *when Julius was born* not died). So, if we are to credit the story F. wanted to murder him when he was born and F. was 19 (or 17) months old at the time. But, of course, "Julius" died when he was six months, so we have to add six months to that. F. transposed the time when Julius was born incorrectly into the time when Julius died. There is method to his madness.

Typically the psychopathic personality he cannot tell an honest, straight, rational story, consistently. Jones, a sycophant "disciple" and his official biographer, wrote regarding F.'s claim about feeling a murderous rage at the birth of Julius:

In the light of this confession it is astonishing that Freud should write twenty years later how almost impossible it is for a child to be jealous of a newcomer if he is *only* fifteen months old when the latter arrives."

What is astonishing is that Jones was astonished. As to his own psychopathy, however, F. would blame not just his "jealousy" but his mania to murderer on his hatred of a "brother" born when he was 17 months old. The claim is so absurd it is hardly believable that Freudians have credited it as anything other than demented ravings of a maniac—and, of course, F.'s absolute disdain for the intelligence and gullibility of his psychoanalytic biographers and "disciples."

3. Another "brother" – whom we know for certain really did exist, was called by Freud and others his "nephew," Johann Freud. Johann, Freud claims, was also a close family member whom he wanted to murder—

between 12 and 24 months of age. John too is “credited” with being the other reason F. became a serial killer. (Later as we shall see he credits this also to “Jacob” his nominal “father” (actually his grandfather) for sexually assaulting him as a youngster. It is interesting, psychologically, that F. created a theory that males were born with an instinct to murder their fathers and have sex with their mothers, but *in his case* he gives the murder primacy to his “brothers”—not the father. And yet, he nonetheless claims that even at the age of a few months before 3 he definitely had the other “side” of the Oedipal complex, i.e., a desire for sex with his mother. These maniacal assertions are treated as “religious truths” by the deluded Freudians—doctors of higher learning, indoctrinated into the Freudian “system.”

4. F. was abandoned by his real father (Emmanuel) when he was about three years of age. There was a family split up. Jacob had earlier turned over the business to Emmanuel. Amalia had another child, Anna, on December 31, 1858; who the father was, in view of the family history, is problematical. In any case, sometime shortly before or shortly after Anna’s birth, Emmanuel and his children by Maria (Johann, Pauline and Bertha) and his brother, Phillip (about the same age as Amalia) fled England and immigrated to Manchester, England. All of F’s playmates left with them.

5. “Mysterious disappearances” lie at the root of F.’s earliest memories. He claims he had a Catholic nanny who stole “zehners” (trifling sums of money, liked pennies) and toys from him when he was between 12 months and 24 months of age and that she “disappeared” when she was arrested for the “crime” (as Phillip turned her in) and was sentenced to 10 months in jail. There is no evidence of this supposed disappearance, also claimed by F. to have had a formative effect upon his psyche. His Uncle Joseph, however, was a criminal, as were other members of the Freud family, and was apprehended for counterfeiting and convicted. He served 10 *years* not month in prison—as is confirmed by the historical record. Could this criminal connection to money and “10”(zehner is a “zehn” or 10 piece) related then to his Uncle? There is evidence that Jacob, Emmanuel and Phillip were also part of the criminal scheme. The Catholic nanny was supposedly arrest, as said and sentenced to 10 months, but according to Anna, F.’s sister, their family fled Freiberg

almost immediately thereafter, and as early as February, 1859, when she was only weeks old. And Phillip, who is supposed to have brought the police in on the matter, also fled Freiberg with his brother Emanuel and family, even *before* the nanny was allegedly imprisoned.

Other mysterious “disappearances” are endemic in the Freud incest family. Just before Jacob married Amalie he was married to a woman named Rebecca (his second wife); she suddenly disappeared and Jacob lied about the fact that he was ever married to her—which historical records prove he was. Certainly the Freiberg neighbors must have found it strange that Rebecca suddenly disappeared and Jacob suddenly had a new wife. The mother of Emmanuel and Phillip (Sally *ne* Kanner), also “disappeared” with no record of her death or what happened to her. Two children born to Emmanuel Freud and his wife Maria in England also “disappeared” with no records of their deaths and no mention of them ever made in the family records. Our own field research in Manchester, England, revealed for the first time their existence.

And, strangely enough, rather not strangely at all, Freud failed to mention that Johann *actually* mysteriously disappeared right after F.’s visit to Manchester—when he murdered him. All of these “disappearances” are habitually revisited by F. in his alleged “dreams”—upon which he bases his “theories” of psychoanalysis. The theme of “disappearances” became the hallmark of his serial killer victims. They just “disappeared.” People who stood in his way, whom he “loved and hated”, whom he wanted to revenge himself upon, who he was sexually attracted to—they just “disappeared.” His dreams are full of these “unlaid ghosts” which he had a special name for, his *revenants*. Like father and grandfather like son?

To give more credibility to his fantastical stories of his early childhood F. would have it believed that he and John were inseparable until *the end* of his third year, which would have been in, say April, 1960—by the fraudulent accounting, or February 1960 by actual accounting. But Emmanuel had relocated to Manchester before February 22, 1859 (the documented date of Bertha’s birth). So F. exaggerates a year to give more credence to the idea that he really could have had murderous

intentions for John at such an early age. But It was, at most, until “the end” his “second year” that he and John were together:

Until the end of my third year we had been inseparable; we had loved each other and fought each other and, as I have already hinted, this childish relation has determined all my later feelings in my intercourse with persons of my own age. My nephew John has since then had many incarnations, which have revived first one and then another aspect of a character that is ineradicably fixed in my unconscious memory.

Moreover, one might well imagine that Emmanuel and family would not have traveled the last couple weeks or so of her pregnancy. And, while we know that Emanuel was living in Manchester *by no later than* February 22, 1859, when Bertha was born, we do not know how many months he might have been there before his wife gave birth. The point is *even fewer* people would believe that John became “ineradicably fixed in my subconscious mind” and determined “all my later feelings and intercourse with persons of my own age” when they were separated months before F. was even three years old! In short, it may be said that F.’s “con” though seemingly insignificant is not really so. Is there any doubt that if I said it was a fact that F. claimed his “scientific fairy tale” (as he himself called his “autobiography” all happened before he was one year old—it is doubtful anyone in the world would believe it. Well, would the reader believe two years? No? Well, how about three years? Bingo!

F.’s Criminal Profile

F. had obvious deep psychological problems throughout his childhood. Here again he gives a disguised version to mask his true condition. Below are elements of early childhood, after the move to Vienna between approximately the ages of 5 through 10:

F. claims at the age of 5 his grandfather (“father”) turned over a book of colored plates about Persia for him and his sister “to destroy.” F. stated

he and his sister, not yet 3, were together “blissfully pulling the book to pieces.” This was his only memory, he says, from his early period. But, F. says the memory was a “screen memory”—meaning a false memory for events that occurred at a later age, specifically “17.”

It will perhaps be doubted whether this recollection really entered into the composition of the dream-content, and it may be suggested that the connection was established subsequently by the analysis. But the abundance and intricacy of the associative connections vouch for the truth of my explanation: cyclamen-favorite flower-favorite dish-artichoke; to pick to pieces like an artichoke, leaf by leaf (a phrase which at that time one heard daily, *à propos* of the dividing up of the Chinese empire); herbarium-bookworm, whose favorite food is books. I can further assure the reader that the ultimate meaning of the dream, which I have not given here, is most intimately connected with the content of the scene of childish destruction.

It is instructive to the reader to see how corrupt the F. translators are (a fact well documented in my book PFM) by reference to this important “only” surviving memory or “false” memory from this early period (after leaving Freiberg). F. wrote in the 5th edition:

It may perhaps be doubted whether this memory really had any share in determining the form taken by the content of the dream or whether it was not rather that the process of analysis built up the connection subsequently. But the copious and intertwined associative links warrant our accepting the former alternative: cyclamen—favorite flower—favorite food—artichokes; pulling to pieces like an artichoke, leaf by leaf (a phrase constantly ringing in our ears in relation to the piecemeal dismemberment of the Chinese

Empire)—herbarium—bookworms, whose favorite food is books. Moreover I can assure my readers that the ultimate meaning of the dream, which I have not disclosed is intimately related to the subject of the childhood scene.

It seems clear that F.'s reluctance to disclose the "intimate" subject of his tearing out the pages of the colored plates of a book about Persia had really to do with the "piecemeal dismemberment" (a phrase constantly ringing in his ears) of the Chinese Empire. In the first case we are dealing with inanimate pages in a book, in the other, to details too "intimate" to tell associated with "constant ringing in his ears"—involving "dismemberment" of the Chinese empire. There is little doubt that F. is confessing to sadistic acts both at the age of 5 and at the age of 17.

As to the scar, Samuel Slipp (Professor of Psychiatry), in *The Freudian Mystique* (p.66) states that "In a letter to his friend Fliess (Bonaparte et al. 1954), Freud admitted his feelings of guilt for experiencing jealousy and death wishes toward Julius. Freud recounted that shortly after Julius died, he fell from a stool and cut his jaw. The fall left Freud with a scar for life. This incident can be looked at symbolically." NYU Press, 1995

Where Slipp got this construction that Freud recounted that shortly after Julius died he fell from a stool and cut his jaw, I do not know. It is not in Bonaparte, *et al.* Perhaps it is just sloppy writing. In any case the connection can be made. The scar and the death of "Julius" (read John) is exactly the construction I make.

Note:

In the above only Freud's fictitious "Terrible Twos" fantasy-biography was dealt with. As to Freud's numerous confessions to being a homicidal maniac, a serial killer, in fact, much documented is provided in *Passion for Murder: The Homicidal Deeds of Dr. Sigmund Freud*, and at this website and in new books which will be featured at this website.