

**GETTING STARTED:
CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT MURDER
SFSK (S.S. Freud)**

by Eric L. Miller, 2014

At the age of 17, in the year 1873, Sigismund Freud, crossed the threshold of what society deems morally permissible-and morally impermissible. At seventeen Sigi became a member of a *group/of* political fanatics who had murder and political sabotage as their aim. With this step Freud marked the beginning of his crime line, a line which continued to the day he died.

[It is true, and ought to be noted at the outset for the record, that Sigismund (hereafter "Sigi") early came to the attention of the police. His school records indicate that at about the age of 14, he was investigated for loitering around bars, drinking and consorting with prostitutes. His family likewise comprised a Jewish "crime-family"—and various members of the Freud clan and his wife's, too, served many years in State prisons for counterfeiting, etc. But, now we are not concerned with these relatively minor matters—though they shall be returned to. At the outset here, we are concerned to document Freud's Crime Time Line. We are not now here concerned with these other matters, which shall be dealt with separately]

It was the intention of this group to murder high ranking government officials who opposed the Germanization of Europe. Whether Sigi actually participated in the murder of a political enemy at this time, or only conspired to do so, is not certain. What is certain is that Sigi himself in later years referring to this society of anarchists, directly applied the term "murderer" in consequence to himself—which shall be quoted below.

That Sigi belonged to pan-German youth groups is not new to those who have scrutinized the literature concerning Sigi's youth. Yet, none of them have commented on the ominous nature of Sigi's political passions nor sought to throw light on this extreme phase of his early youth. Certainly in view of the fact that Freud scholars have turned out a mountain of studies on

virtually every aspect of their Messiah's life, this is a very significant intentional or unintentional oversight.

To make credible the clear features of Freud's crime line we must then, at the outset, examine the basis for the claim that Freud's crime line began with this fateful association -- conspiracy to commit political murder.

To establish the link between the facts and Sigi's confession I must ask the readers indulgence on one point only. That is, I ask the reader to accept as fact, that, in later life, Freud wrote one fraudulent case history after another. In a number of these phony cases he incorporated, with great care, biographical details of his own life which he longed to confess and boast about. But, as the nature of these confessions had to do with criminal matters, he could only do so under the disguise of a "colleague," "patient," or "healthy informant."

These phony case histories, by which means Freud made daring confessions about his background, are easy to identify because for the most part, Freud's remarks are transparently autobiographical. Indeed, childishly so. Peter Swales, generally considered one of the more informed breed of Freudian sleuths, remarked on Freud's deceptive practice of Freud's as follows:

It is easy to spot these pretenses, they are transparently biographical and deal with unmistakable details in Freud's own life.

Numerous scholars of highest reputation and credentials have acknowledged (in professional publications) as fact that Sigi used just such a method of hiding personal details of his life behind fictitious case histories. It is not an exaggeration to state that virtually the entire world of Freud "scholarship" acknowledges the importance of these clandestine confessions in determining Freud's true past.

In another work, I have added to the discoveries of other researchers—i.e., numerous additional examples of phony case histories in drawing the true portrait of the man whom Swales characterizes as "extremely deceptive." See my book *Passion for Murder: The Homicidal Deeds of Dr. Sigmund Freud* (1984) for additional examples. [My own examples of Freud's fraudulent

case histories, however, only cause the “known” pile of Freud’s fraud to swell.]. The pile is already there, and is so acknowledged by the world of Freud scholarship.

I now ask the reader to go only a short step further with me. I ask that you accept also that Sigi used, not only "dreamed up" case histories purported to originate from his own patients, but that he drafted other psychoanalysts from his inner circle to perpetuate his fraud. In other words, members of Freud's inner circle of Freudian analysts allowed themselves to front for Freud's confessions. Later they would assist in corrupting the historical record of Freud's true activities in an effort to exalt their leader to the status of a world renowned "Scientist." Who they are and how they accomplished their nefarious activities will be fully discussed later.

I trust the reader might grant that, if indeed it is a fact, as represented, that Freud used phony case history material for his own autobiographical confessions, it is reasonable to entertain the possibility that there are other examples of the same method. If the goose lays three eggs, we cannot discount the possibility that it can lay another

Let us turn then to a case history supposedly garnered from a case history of Dr. Adler—another Jewish Freudian fanatic. That is to say, let us turn to the story of the "informant" who confessed to participating in a political murder conspiracy at the age of 17. This informant, as we shall see, is none other than Freud himself.

2467: Mistakes in *the Interpretation of Dreams*

In the *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, Freud introduces an informant of “Adler’s” to highlight his own theory of repression in relation to the subject of seemingly arbitrary mental operations such as unthinkingly conjuring up a number, any number. Freud’s purpose in these supposed analytical exercises is to demonstrate his thesis that there is nothing arbitrary in any mental operation. Even arbitrary acts, such as imagining a particular number are, in fact, Freud claims, psychically determined events. When the secrets of these supposedly repressed associations are discussed by Freud we are faced with Freud’s own biographical confessions concerning very intimate matters.

Freud would have us believe it is only with the aid of his own self-invented “science” that these secret associations can be brought into the light of consciousness. To that end, he offers numerous examples of allegedly successful psychoanalysis of seemingly meaningless mental acts.

The first example offered by Freud confirming his new discovery that “nothing in the mind is arbitrary or undetermined” is admittedly taken from his own experience. His first example appeared in a letter of August 27, 1899 to a colleague of his, Dr. Wilhelm Fliess. Freud hassled with the writer’s labor of seemingly endless textual corrections of the book he was then working on, *ID*, Freud casually commented that he was not going to work on it any more “even if it contained 2467 errors.” This first example then is of particular importance in tracing the link of his personal example with others which he claimed derived from the experience of others.

Background to Freud’s Confession

Prior to writing his letter to Fliess concerning the seemingly arbitrary selection of numbers, Freud had discussed with his wife a notice that had appeared in the newspaper—the career end of a certain General called “E.M.” Remarking that he had long taken an interest in this particular General whom he had met in his youth he relates that he set down to calculate how long it had taken for the general to arrive at this career dead-end.

For some inexplicable reason, upon reading the retirement notice, Freud said down and calculated from the time when he first met the General to the present (1899) when the notice appeared. After making his calculation he communicated his result to his wife—that the General had taken 17 years to come to his end. Upon learning this, Freud’s wife, responded, “Oughten you to be on the retired list too, then?” Freud immediately responded, “Heaven forbid!”

Freud later explained (*The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*) that what he wished to indicate by his unthinkingly picking an arbitrary number was merely “**a bold arbitrary estimate of the number of errors that will be found in the dream book.**” The post script of Freud’s letter to Dr. Fliess which contained his commentary on this number (2467) has been lost, or more

probably destroyed. The letter itself survives, but the post script is curiously missing so there is no way to actually compare the comments in the letter with those that appeared in his discussion of the matter in *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*. Interestingly, however, in the same letter as Freud mentions this number of 2467, he expresses his fears that the publication of *The Interpretation of Dreams* may cause him to be "locked up, lynched, or boycotted."

In another letter September 24, 1900, Freud asked Fliess to send him back the letter. "Am slowly writing *The Psychopathology of Everyday life* (to be in error - madness)."

We are informed by the authorized editor of Freud's letters that Freud's phrase ("to be in error - madness") meant to associate the German word "error" (*irren*) with the word "madness" (*irre*). Obviously Freud was making the point that to commit errors was a form of madness. It is in Freud's next sentence that he requests the letter back -- "the one that contains the analysis of a number chosen at random." !

In any case, Freud incorporated his pseudo-analytical discussion of this number 2467 in his next book, *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*. There Freud discloses what he purportedly wrote in the post script. "What I meant," he continued in explanation of the number, "was some very big number; but that particular one emerged. However, nothing in the mind is arbitrary or undetermined." Freud then proceeds to apply his highly personal and subjective method of analyzing the meaning of a number we have only his say-so that came to him "accidentally." This is science. No!

A central feature of Freud's own analysis of the number 2467 involves the subject of Freud confusing his age when he was in a military prison (on his birthday) when he achieved his majority. When Freud computed his age when he first met the General he calculated that this took place 17 years ago. But when he recalculated the number he found it was not 17 years ago, but rather 19 years ago. He knew this, he tells us, for certain because he recalled he was actually 24 when he was in prison (May 1880 - not 1882, as he first calculated).

Strangely enough, Freud confesses to having had a curious reaction to the General's career coming to an end -- he was exultant.

While calculating the General's end he was also "celebrating a kind of triumph over his [the General's] career coming to an end, while I still have everything in front of me." With this comment Freud strikes, once again, his most enduring theme about his own psychology: that he delighted in the death of others and his own survival. The thought of others dying while he survives was as a drug to Freud. In all of his voluminous writings nothing so elates his spirit and gives him a triumphant feeling. Later, we shall have opportunity to provide copious examples of this psychopathology, a psychopathology routinely commented on by Freud scholars.

Freud's explanation of this presumably arbitrary number of 2467 was explained and "proved" by the number associated with his prison sentence at the age of 24. Here, too, we witness The other part of the number represented, Freud says, his present age at the time of this event, which was 43 in combination with his desire to live another 24 years. Here, too, we witness Freud's own life being augmented by the death of another. The number 24 and 43, then, supplies the explanation of 67—so Freud tells us.

What is interesting, however, is that Freud's explanation for the arbitrary number of errors in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, had reference to his being in prison, as well as celebrating a triumph of the "end" of a superior's career and a confusion between the numbers 17 and 19. But this was not the first time Freud confused the numbers 17 and 19. **Indeed, in *The Interpretation of Dreams* itself he makes the same mistake.** He wrote, for instance, that he first had his memorable trip abroad when he was 17, but later also and recalculated that number and changed it to 19 in all subsequent editions from the first (1900). Interestingly, Freud nowhere discusses the reason for **this biographical error** -- an error, as we shall later see, has a profound implication to Freud's crime line.

Nonetheless, one might think this is an innocent intellectual exercise in which he merely confused 17 with 19 and there was nothing particularly important or ominous concerning these key dates in Freud's biography. Certainly, to make his point, Freud did not need the *proof* of having been in prison on his "coming of age." He could as easily have made his point by just mentioning

the time when he met the General he was a medical- officer cadet. Confessing to having been in prison seems not to have been a problem for him.

The reader will recall that Freud's wife, on being informed that it had taken 17 years before the General came to his career end, suggested that perhaps her husband, too, should retire. The remark's significance cannot be guessed without more intimate knowledge of Freud's life and times. Why would she suggest that it might be time for Freud to "retire"? Her suggestion got an immediate rejection from Freud.

Freud, at the time, was in dire economic straits. He was still young (43) and had a large growing family. And, even more importantly, Freud was experiencing periodic states of psychosis. While it is not my purpose here to fully detail Freud's insanity (see Chapter 10) still it is important to be aware of this situation in specific regard to the issues raised regarding the number 2467. A couple comments in this regard, however, seems appropriate.

In the same year (1899) that Freud wrote his "discovery" that nothing in the mind is arbitrary he was going through repeated mental breakdowns. Earlier in the year (Feb.6) he referred to his life as a "cancer."

I have turned completely in a cancer. The cancer likes to drink wine in its latest stages of development. Today I am supposed to go to the theater, but this is ridiculous -- like trying to graft on top of the cancer. Nothing can adhere to it, and from now on the duration of my life is that of a cancer.

On October 4th he speaks of his very painful feelings over the publication of *The Interpretation of dreams* and tells Fliess that he will keep him posted on his health: "I shall let you know the date of my next breakdown for your calculations."

He was always alone, having" been ostracized by his medical colleagues" (for moral turpitude and incompetence). Indeed, one of his closest former colleagues and medical supervisor, the renowned Dr. Breuer, considered him (or would consider him) to have, according to Freud himself, "Moral

Insanity”.

He misdated letters (or so we are told), apparently sometimes by months (so we are told). By March 23, 1900, of the next year he was simultaneously speaking of being “fifteen to twenty years ahead of my time” and in the same breath he confessed to a personal “catastrophic collapse.”

“You know,” he wrote in this same letter, I have been going through a deep inner crisis.” In this letter Freud makes an important reference which we shall soon encounter in another of Freud's phony case histories.

There are still other, inner reasons, an accumulation of imponderables which weigh heavily on me (from the natural habitat of madness, you will perhaps say). Inwardly I am deeply impoverished; I have had to demolish all my castles in the air.

Freud continues with talk about his catastrophic collapse, his trying to conquer his depression and continues:

No one can help me in the least with what oppresses me; it is my cross, I must bear it; and God knows that in adapting to it, my back is noticeably bent.

During the summer or fall, no later, I shall see you, talk with you, and explain all the riddles of Count Oerindur to you. You will be able to convince yourself that the matter is merely complicated, not at all crazy -- although the abominable work with all its demands would excuse some of that too. Then we shall discuss the pros and cons of nasal therapy, preferably right on the object.

The object was Freud's nose, which he masochistically submitted to his beloved Fliess' sadistic surgery - a subject we shall later take up.

But the mention to Count Oerindur is most important. What are the riddles of Count Oerindur? Count Oerindur is the protagonist of a play by Adolphus Müllner, *Guilt; or the Gipsy's Prophecy, a Tragedy*. A condensed version of one of the stanza's from the play had become, by Freud's time, an idiomatic expression to convey the most extreme conflicting emotions for the same person—emotions of wanting to love and murder, at the same time:

Explain to me, Oerindur, this contradiction of nature.

The following lines in this stanza, however, gives the real context of the phrase's meaning:

One moment I want his life to disappear in blood. The next moment to forgive him.

These lines are accepted by Freud scholars to refer to Freud's contradictory feelings of hatred and love for Fliess and his desire to want to murder him in the first case, and “forgive” him in the other.

Strong words to tell a friend! Explicit words of murderous feelings in the least case. The point is that when Freud was discussing his air.¹ number a 2467, what he was wanting desperately was to add 24 years to his 43 years, which would give him until the age of 67, before he, too, would be put on the list -- the death list.

But why 24 years stead of another number? And what did this have to do with him being in prison? There is no ready answer to the question. Faust's pack with the Devil was for 24 years—and as we shall see a pack with the devil was at the heart, not only of Freud's joining a murder group, but of memories a prison and his desperate desire for longer life. The reader will recall that Freud wrote in the same letter that he requested back his letter dealing with the 2467 commentary that he was worried about being “lynched, boycotted, or locked up”).

Certainly these thoughts were on the surface of his mind. Being “lynched, boycotted, or locked up” is a typical fear for the serial killer.

But is this number exercise really only an isolated example? Not at all. There is abundant data to confirm Freud had a numerological fixation on when he would die for the greater part of his life. Freud's doctor, Max Schur, offers that he could not have had this preoccupation without a substantial feeling of personal guilt for a "primal crime." Given this, we can readily see that all Freud's examples, his "death dates" whether avowedly his own or that of his phony informants, deal with the same complex of numbers. There is a reason for it. The truth is, Freud repeated his "number" experiment that explained significant numbers in his life many times and in all cases he had, as he said, special reasons for keeping the deeper meaning of those number associations secret:

Since this first example [i.e., 2467] in which an apparently arbitrarily chosen number was explained I have often repeated the same experiment, and with the same result; but the content of the majority of cases is so intimate that they cannot be reported.

To those who are very familiar with all of Freud's works, it seems strange that Freud, who frequently confessed to being homicidal, "delighting in the deaths of others, who declared himself a frequent victim of sadistic and gruesome preoccupations, would find this subject *verboten*. The words of the renowned Freud scholar, Bernfeld, well make the point:

Freud, in all his confessions so generously dispersed throughout many of his writings -- has censored with great consequence any reference to love. He has presented himself as a villain, as patricidal [desire to murder his father], ambitious, petty, willful, but never as a lover ... this is a warning to biographers of Freud not to assume that his autobiographical statements are random samples. Quite to the contrary, they are rigidly censored and follow criteria that are not obvious.

Well, Bernfeld is wrong there. Freud confessed his overt "love" for Fliess

repeatedly and other of his boyfriends. Bernfeld just didn't want to tell the truth.

The reader should pause and carefully consider these words, especially the fact that Freud readily confessed to being murderous, vengeful and ambitious. But even the above quotation gives no indication of the total depth of what is meant. Freud was vengefully murderous especially when it served his ambition. And Freud's confessions to being murderously revengeful are not random samples. Indeed, it is the most dominant aspect of his entire personality. Bernfeld, I would note in passing, was himself a member of the Board of Directors of the key Freud organization, Freud Archives. He is hardly a critic of Freud's, but rather one of his believers.

One further note is needed before we continue to the specific text of Freud's confession to belonging to a secret murder society. I have noted that there was an ominous significance in Freud's numerological associations and produced as evidence of this that the themes struck by Freud included his being in prison, the coming to the end of the career of the General, and the numbers 17,19, and 24. Freud actually ended his commentary on the number 2467 with a passage which was later excised. That passage is particularly important and, for this reason I will quote it in full. The reader should bear in mind that this passage was included in the original publication of *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* to throw light on his whole discussion of number associations. Freud's passage is as follows:

In analysis of this kind which I conduct on myself I find two things particularly striking: firstly, the positive somnambulistic certainty with which I set off for my unknown goal [i.e., discovery of the meaning of his specific numerological fixations] and plunge into an arithmetical train of thought which arrives all at once at the desired number, and the speed with which the entire subsequent work is completed; and secondly, the fact that the numbers are so freely at the disposal of my unconscious thinking, whereas I am a bad reckoner and have the greatest difficulty

consciously noting dates, house numbers and such things. Moreover in these unconscious thought-operations with numbers I find I have a tendency to superstition, whose origin is still unknown to me myself.

But all this is artifice. If Freud knows himself to be murderous, as indeed he could not but know, then it did not really require "analytic insight" for him to trace these murder associations with his own biographical facts; he well knew them. Freud pretends to be surprised by his own analysis, whereas in fact, he begins by knowing the truth and merely creates a pseudo mystery out of the specific data, which he knows but which the reader does not. The paragraph, cited above, continues without interruption:

I generally come upon speculations about the duration of my own life and the lives of those dear to me; and the fact that my friend in B[erlin] has made period of human life the subject of his calculations, which are based on biological units must have acted as a determinant of this unconscious juggling. I am not now in agreement with one of the premises from which this work of his proceeds; from highly egoistic motives I should be very glad to carry my point against him, and yet I appear to be imitating his calculations in my own way.

The editors of Freud's authorized text of ID here informs the reader in a footnote that the friend was Dr. Fliess and the "egoistic motive" Freud had for disagreeing with Fliess "was no doubt that which predicted his death at the age of 51—the year in which the passage was canceled."

Freud's colleague, Fliess, who probably knew more about him than anyone, developed the idea that Freud would because of biologically determined elements neurotic and himself addicted to the mystical in youth, Freud was terrified by Fliess's "prediction" and for that reason yearned for 24 more

years of life. Again, , Max Schur, Freud's doctor in his renowned book on Freud, *Freud Living and Dying* suggests Freud secretly believed he yearned for 24 more years of life as he did not think he was deserving of it. Expressed directly Freud needed more time because he believed it was not due him because of his "primal crime."

Schur, to be sure, goes out of his way to identify this primal crime as masturbation. But Schur's truer thoughts come out when he suggests that it was the "crime of Cain" that was really the determining factor in Freud's psychological associations.

What do we learn from the above quoted passage in Freud's book that was deleted? We learn that his specific number leaped out at Freud, that they represent a "tendency to superstition," that Freud is given to speculating on the death dates of those , and that all of this is somehow related to biological units involving the number 17 and 19 and the beginnings and ends of life.

It is here necessary to disclose to the reader that the life-death periods of Freud's own life involved a multiple of the number 17, $3 \times 17 = 51$. Could Freud's obsessive number fixations relate to something that happened to him at the age of 17. Freud claimed in the 1901 edition of *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* that he did not know the origin of his "superstition" involving numbers. By the time of the second edition, however, he dropped this pretence with the statement that these associations "whose origins long remained unknown to me." In *The Interpretation of Dreams*, however, Freud repeatedly states that he very well knows the secret associations behind his own psychopathology, and finds himself unable to disclose them to the public as he is "restrained by special considerations."

In 1907 Freud added text to his chapter, "Chance and Determinism," which features his "new" understanding of superstitions which underlie obsessive states of mind. His apparently new understanding was that superstition is the result of suppressed hostile and cruel impulses." In his interleaved copy of the 1904 edition of *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, Freud made a telling remark in the margins of his edition about himself in reference to superstition:

Rage, anger and consequentially a murderous impulse is the source of superstition in obsessional neurotics. . . my own superstition has its roots in suppressed ambition and in my case takes the place of that .anxiety about death ...

But what kind of "suppressed ambition" is it that makes Freud superstitious? Simply, and unequivocally, it is a *murderous ambition*.

So, what Freud professed not to know earlier -- the source of his own superstition concerning his personal number fixation, -- *he* discovered to be rage, anger and murderous impulses. The very emotions express- in the play *Guilt* by Müllner. Can we find these same elements in the specific pathology of Adler's "informant"?

As we shall now see the "Informant" fits Freud to a tee.

The Confession: Conspiracy to Murder

Let us now return to the subject of Freud's confession of belonging to a secret murder society at the age of 17. Freud added this disguised confession of his "youthful follies" in 1907, six years after the first publication of his book on the psychopathology of his everyday life.

As Freud had special reasons for concealing his "problem" with the numbers 24, 17,19, he found it necessary to confess the meanings of these numbers in the case histories of others, in order to disguise the specific autobiographical significance of these too "intimate associations which could not be openly reported. Indeed, in the first edition of *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, Freud left off a] together a discussion of other allegedly confirming case histories. Again, his reason was that his own personal examples would be too revealing.

"For that reason," he says, "I will take the opportunity of adding here ~ very interesting analysis of a 'numerical association,' which Dr. Adler (1905) of

Vienna obtained from a 'perfectly healthy' informant." Late] we will discuss the fact that Adler himself was a pervert type am himself seriously psychotic. Here we are interested in Adler's one time "Master," Freud himself.

The statement that Freud's second example that proves his theory comes from an "informant" of Adler's does not, of course, preclude the fact that it is Freud himself who is the "informant." Indeed, in this same year (1899), Freud wrote another fraudulent case history, "Screen Memories" wherein he also claims that he got his information from a "perfectly healthy" informant. There, too, he also pretends an analysis of the informant's specific psychological problems proves his theories with information exactly paralleling Freud's own biography. This case is now universally acknowledged by Freud scholars to be a fraud. But they do not use the term "fraud" -- that would be too demeaning to their master. It is referred to as "Freud's disguised autobiographical case history." The "disguise" was the fraud and it is dissimulation to call it otherwise. But let us continue with what we learn from "Adler's informant," relative to Freud's personal confessions.

This "perfectly healthy" informant, who is Freud, states the following:

I got down to *The Psychopathologic of Everyday Life*, and would have read the whole book straight away if I had not been prevented by a remarkable incident. For what happened was that, when I read that every number which we summon seemingly arbitrarily into consciousness has a definite meaning, I dedicate to make an experiment.

With these words, readily identifiable as being in Freud's own style, we are told that the informant was interrupted in his straight away reading of the whole book by a "remarkable incident." Of course this "remarkable incident" was nothing other than the informant decision to interrupted his reading to test Freud's theories. The "experiment" that was launched was merely letting a number come unthinkingly into the mind of the informant. The number was 1743:

There came into my mind the number 1734. The following ideas then rapidly occurred to me: 1734 divided by 17 = 6. I then divided the number 17 and 34. I am 34 years old. I believe I once told you that 34 is the last year of youth, and for that reason I felt very miserable on my last birthday. The end of the 17th year was the beginning of a very pleasant and interesting period in my development. I divide my life into portions of 17 years. What do the divisions mean?

This is the very pertinent question, but one which Freud unfortunately does not directly answer.

In thinking of 102 it occurred to me that No. 102 in the Reclam Universal Library is Kotzebue's play *Menchenhass und Reue* [*Misanthropy and Remorse*]

But why did the informant divide the number three times by number 17? Was it because it was a lucky number? If that was the case, there is no mystery at all why he would have selected 17 in the first place, and since he was supposedly 34 years old, could we simply say that he chose 1734 because it represented his favorite number and his age. But that would be too simple, and there would be no mystery, no confession, no marvel to Freud's psychoanalysis.

It appears more than a chance coincidence that the informant would divide the number three times by 17, without having an idea in mind about how things should come out. The number, arbitrary, or not, is, as with Freud's own examples, then consciously manipulated for a specific result. Freud *consciously chooses to divide the number 3 times*. Of course, the issue, whether the number 1734 was arbitrarily selected or not has nothing to do with Freud's discussion. It was what he wants to convey in his confession, the number then was selected for the purpose of confessing to something. What is it?

The number 34, we are told, represents not only the “informant’s” age, but his depression over being 34—the end of his youth, coming “to the end” of something, just like in the example of the General. When Freud, for some inexplicable reason, divides the number 1734 by 17 he arrived at 102, which number represented misanthropy (hatred of humanity) and remorse. Hatred and remorse are themes which totally dominate Freud's biography. Still, we do not know why he divided by 17, what does the division mean?

Dividing by 17

Freud says because the end of his seventeenth year saw the "beginning" of a very pleasant and interesting period in his life, he divides his life into "portions of 17." Who divides their lives into portions? Interesting in itself.

Actually, Freud himself divided his life into portions of 17 and for a specific reason that had nothing to do with the beginning of a happy period in his life. The truth is Freud had a fear of dying at age 51 because his friend Fliess had, on the basis of an insane periodic theory, predicted Freud would die at that age. Fliess was a numerologist who believed he could comprehend all things, especially the beginning and end of a person’s life. He based these ideas, as did Freud himself, on factors involving dates of conception, and biological periods. Indeed, Fliess's whole theory was based upon period recurrences in Freud's case the age at which he was "destined" to die was based on a multiple of 17 ($3 \times 17 = 51$). This multiply factor was itself determined by "critical periods" in a person's life. The critical dates were determined by biological changes which forced a "breakthrough" in behavior and was ruled by sexual forces and biochemical responses.

Traditionally, Freud death fear at 51 is supposedly linked to Fliess's formula 23 male cycle and a 28 day female cycle, which, of course, yields 51. But this is far too simplistic, and of course would not account for Freud's attacks of neurotic death fears also at 51-52,60-61, and 67-68.

It is not our purpose here to fully explicate Freud's death date fears with a detailed examination of Freud's own theories, the theories of Fliess, and the theories that they share relative to biological psychological "units." In any

case it is sheer madness and has no intellectual or medical value, and no one, it appears, not even a die heart fanatical Freudian believes it. What is of interest for our purposes, however, is that if Freud really did multiply his life into portions of 17, then that number in terms of age would appear. It will be noticed that there was always a one year factor of error in their numerological collocations. With that in mind, this passage from Freud's doctor, Max Schur, is particularly important:

While it might be merely hypothetical for me to link Freud's complex calculations pointing to the retirement [read death] at the age of 67 with his fatalistic attitude when he actually reached the age of 67, we have an authoritative interpretation from Freud himself (in a letter written in 1909) in which he linked, by means of a similar type of calculation, the age at which he might die with this obviously fateful year of 1899 [the year he completed *The Interpretation of Dreams*.

It is interesting that Schur does not cite his source for this letter of 1909. Presumably, the letter is the very one translated in full in his own book. In this letter Freud states:

A few years ago I discovered in myself the conviction that I would die between the ages of 61 and 62, which at that time seemed a long way off. (Now there are 8 more years)

Of course, since the letter was written in 1908, then Freud was specifically afraid he would die in 1917 or 1918. Of course Freud didn't want to advertise the 17 in the 1917 so he refers to the numbers 61 and 62, his age, rather than the year in which he would die. Actually, if he died in 1917, he would be 61 or 62; if he died before his birthday March or May 6th, he would be 61; if he died after his birth date he would be 62. This easily indicates that the reason he referred to 61 or 62 (ordinarily an imprecise phobia). In other words he

could die anytime after the year turned to 1917, or in the first few months of 1918.

It would be interesting to know what Freud himself said was the explanation of his fear of dying from a primal guilt. The situation, Freud says can be explained by two factors.

The first is the enormously heightened alertness on the part of the Unconscious which sees Helen in every woman. The second is the undeniable existence of a "compliance of chance," which plays the same role in the formation of delusions as somatic compliance in hysterical symptoms and linguistic compliance in puns.

An involved answer to be sure. But it involves an "enormously" alert psyche - (like a criminal fearing capture?) which sees a death reflection

(Helen) everywhere he looks. When the year 1917 came, the number 17 would be unavoidable. The "compliance of chance", the chance that he would die in a year of the century when he himself should have died for his crimes? But what is linguistic compliance in puns? One answer presents itself -- but I must come back to this in a later chapter.

Other Evidence of Preoccupation With the Number 17

Given all this, is there additional evidence that Freud himself divided life and death cycles into 17 or "portions of 17." I now refer the reader to four documents contained in Freud's private correspondence with Fliess, two documents contained in a letter of May 30, 1896, and another two documents contained in a letter of December 6, 1896. These documents conclusively establish that Freud specified the phases of development culminate at the age 17.

Freud's Critical Period, 17

I ask the readers indulgence, once again, to bear with me in explicating this issue of the number 17, being the exact period which Freud determined to be crucial for psychic development, and crucial Freud would have us believe in determining his "death dates."

In the letter of May 30, 1896, Freud begins his letter with the following remarks:

As the fruit of some tormenting reflections, I send you the following solution to the etiology of the psychoneurosis, which still awaits confirmation from individual analysis.

In this letter Freud states that 4 stages are to be distinguished. "A and B (from 8 to 10 and 13 to 17) at the transitional periods, during which repression for the most part occurs.

Freud's charts on the matter speak for themselves. The point is that Freud was developing a maniacal theory of psychoneurosis based upon numerological associations which terminated at 17, on his own, not in imitation of Fliess's work. These "periods" can produce "poisons" in the system which result in "breakthroughs" and mental collapses. In the letters encompassing this period, Freud specifically refers to his death fears: "I would like so much to hold out until that famous age limit of approximately 51, but I had one day that made me feel it was unlikely." And again (Dec. 4, 1896): "What I am lacking completely are high spirits and pleasure in living, instead I am busily nothing the occasion when I have to occupy myself with the state of affairs after my death. Indeed we learn that one of Freud "critical dates," during which dangerous events could happen was the 24th, a number which appeared prominently in Freud's admittedly biographical example (2467).

A Miserable Birthday

Freud or the "informant" tells us he divided 102 by 17, yielding 6. He notes that he is 34, which represented, he tells us, the "last year of my youth, and for that reason I felt very miserable on my last birthday [Freud was born on March 6th] Well knowing the childish operation of Freud's "intellectual" games, it is to be noted that 34 is a mere transposition of Freud's avowed age, 43, in his first example. Knowing that in the same year that he was writing *The Interpretation of Dream* Freud also wrote the phony case history, "Screen Memories" wherein the "informant was 38, though Freud was 44 at the time, we shall have no problem in accepting that Freud is here, once again, merely juggling his age for effect.

Concerning our informant's despondency on his birthday, we may we: ask ourselves was Freud despondent on his birthday in the year 190~ the date of the second publication of *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*? The answer is simple, even without specific knowledge of the year. The reason is, Freud was, as he said, an "avowed enemies of a] birthdays and celebrations." And, indeed, when one checks the: historical record of letters written on or near his birthday it appears an enduring phenomenon. Fortunately, we do have a letter written to Freud on his birthday in the year of the publication of the 1900, edition of *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*. In the letter Freud thanks him for a present. Writing on his birthday he states:

I had asked that the wretched in-between number of my birthdays be overlooked. I am too young for a jubilee and much too old to be a birthday child ... I am at present correcting the first pages of "Everyday Life," which turned out to be a hefty 60 pages. I *dislike* it tremendously and hope others will do so even more. The essay is entirely without structure and contains all sorts of forbidden things.

Certainly Freud was in a depressive state on his birthday, just like the informant. The time of his birthday is called "wretched," he emphasizes a

tremendous dislike of his own book, and characteristically and twistedly hopes that others will dislike it even more than he does. Certainly these are the comments of a despondent man.

Depression and Murder Guilt

The informant continues his analysis of the number 1734. It will be recalled that the informant divided 1734 by 17 and arrived at the number 102, which he then also divided by 17 to get the number 6 (*Sexta* in German, and incidentally the number of Freud's birth date, May 6). Freud continues in the guise of the informant:

My present psychical state is one of misanthropy and remorse. No.6 in the U.L. (I know a whole quantity by heart) is Müllner's *Guilt*. The thought plagues me constantly that the guilt is mine for failure to become what I could have been with my abilities.

This theme of being tormented by not getting on in life is the central theme of Freud's confessions in "Screen Memory," written just five years before 1904. Indeed, it is no exaggeration that this theme of being constantly plagued with a sense of guilt for not being famous is a major refrain in Freud's letters and also in his autobiographical remarks in his famous confessional, *The Interpretation of Dreams*. This depression over his success is the capstone of "Screen Memories."

Because Freud's megalomania cannot restrain him, he dangerously pushes on, tempting discovery. His very next comments pickup with the statement that he was reminded of the fact that 34 (his supposed age) reminds him of another book, number 34 in the Reclam Universal Library, entitled *Der Kaliber*. Freud then, in an effort, to balance his morbid associations (i.e., guilt, depression, etc.), wants to appear to the reader as a good guy. Therefore he tells a domestic story concerning his child who is 6 (*sexta*) years old. The story is hardly worth repeating and is intended to demonstrate his cleverness in dividing words to get the meaning he wants. So, Freud divides Kaliber into *Ka* and *liber*. *Ka* in German means "not" and *liber* means sweet,

"not sweet." Freud then gives us the background for this world division and association and recounts an event with his young son with whom Freud was playing a game of rhymes (an event that took place numerous times in Freud's household). What is worth mentioning is that the child's name of the "perfectly health informant" is "*Ali*."

Freud's son Oliver, was nicknamed "*Oli*." In 1899, when Freud was 43 Oli was 8 years old.

With all this in mind, let us now turn directly to Freud's murder confession. The unbiased reader will, I think, agree that we indeed have Freud himself in our sights and not a "healthy informant." The "informant" continues:

I then asked myself what is No. 17 in the U.L?
but I could not bring it to mind. But I quite
certainly knew it earlier, so I assumed I
wanted to forget that number. All reflection
was in vain. I wanted to go on reading, but I
only read mechanically, without
understanding a word, as the number 17 was
tormenting me.

Freud turns the light out and in the dark tries to remember the book with the number 17. It dawns on him that it must be one of Shakespeare's plays and he thinks of *Hero and Leander* - "clearly a stupid attempt to lead me astray."

Finally I got up and looked in the catalog of
the V.L. No. 17 is *Macbeth*. To my
bewilderment I was forced to realize that I
knew almost nothing at all of the play,
although I had given it as much attention as
other plays of Shakespeare's. I only thought
of murderer ...

And he goes on to associate Lady MacBeth, "fair is foul" and that,

at one time I had found Schiller's version of

MacBeth very fine. There is no doubt that I wished to forget the play. The further thought occurred to me that 17 [Freud's age whose end brought him to good times] and 34 [Freud's age on his birthday when he was miserable] gives the result of 1 and 2. Numbers 1 and 2 in the *UL*. are Goethe's *Faust*. I found very much of myself of Faust in myself.

Freud doesn't want to remember Johann Schiller's *Macbeth*. There "was no doubt about that." And he found much of himself in Johann Goethe's *Faust*.

Here then is another direct route to Freud's own biography, not wanting to remember the name *Macbeth*. In another chapter (see Chapter 10) we will deal with one of Freud's dreams, of which one of Freud's avowed themes was just this point, he desired to not want to remember the name of *Macbeth*, because of very intimate persons associations. And in that discussion, strangely enough, the number 1 and 19 are of especial importance. There, too, as well Freud leads u into a discussion of books and their names and his not wanting t remember specific titles, but one of them was from Schiller, the author of a play called *Macbeth*.

Now it has been widely acknowledged by Freud scholars that Freud had a profound self-identification with the figure of Faust. H habitually quotes from Johann Goethe's *Faust*, "sometimes without even any apparent relationship to what he is discussing." Faust is the most frequently quoted writer throughout Freud's voluminous writings. Freud was, in fact, personally obsessed with the figure of Faust and in his most intimate commentaries about the meaning of his dreams, which he habitually says he cannot share with the reader, he quotes Faust as his spokesman, particularly to the effect that "the best that you know cannot be told to boys ... "

Freud further informs us that when he thought of *Macbeth*, he "was: forced to realize" that he knew almost nothing at all of the play. The first thing that came into his mind, however was:

I only thought of murderer, witches,"fair is foul," and at one time I had found Schiller's version of *Macbeth* very fine."

Freud then goes on to assert that the informant did not synthesis his remarks and that the whole story wouldn't be worth repeating unless:

. . . something had emerged during their continuation which gave us a key to understanding the number 1734 and the whole series of associations.

And then Freud continues to discuss the issue which provided the key to the understanding. It is important to note what Freud says:

This morning indeed I had an experience that strongly supports the correctness of the Freudian view. My wife, whom I had woken up when I got out of bed the night before, asked me why I wanted the U.L. Catalog. I told her the story. She thought it was all hair-splitting, only - a very interesting point -- she accepted *Macbeth*, which I had resisted so forcibly.

What does this mean, she accepted *Macbeth* "which I had resisted so forcibly"? Freud says:

It can only mean that his wife could easily understand why he would resist the association with *Macbeth* in regards to the number 17 and his "wish to forget the play."

What did his wife know, that was not told us the readers? She must have known the intimate relationship between the number 17 and "murderer." Otherwise why would she have no problem "accepting" the problem that lay concealed beneath the number? His wife then merely said that "nothing

came into her mind when she thought of a number." Freud then wanted to "test" her. "She gave the number 117."

Freud further states that his wife "understood very well what complex her husband's number was derived from, and chose her number from the same complex." In her choosing of a number (117) she also chose a number having to do with age ("for in both cases it concerned the relative ages). And Freud further adds that the man got rid of his wife a year later. A footnote brings us to the real issue, the key to understanding the number:

The explanation of *MacBeth*, No. 17 in the U.L. Adler informs me is that in his 17th year this man joined a society of anarchists with regicide as its aim. This was no doubt why the content of *Macbeth* was forgotten. At that time, too, he had invented a code in which letters were replaced by numbers.

So, the charade is over. The man didn't think of 17 because of the happy period that came to him at the end of his 17th year, but because the number was related to his age when he joined a murder organization. That was why he divided his life in portions of 17 because the age of 17 marked his career as a murderer or would-be-murderer. The fiction of his "happy association is disclosed," Freud says, the woman's number 117 took the 17 from his own story.

I'll be damned!

Of course, one can only speculate as to the deeper meaning of this number 117. Might it be because 117 was Freud's address when he lived in Freiberg as a child? In which case, Freud's assertion that he has trouble remembering dates and "addresses" might have a more significant meaning?

But there is yet another very important point in cross referencing Freud's biography with the information supplied about the "informant Freud wrote that in addition to belonging to a murder society, the man was also "at that time" was involved in creating a number code. We must then ask, did Freud

invent a special number code when he was 17? The answer is yes.

In a letter to his political friend, E. Silberstein, Freud wrote at 17.

I earnestly pondered the possibility of creating a system of numbers, having observed that everything in the real world has its equal, or equivalent, in the world of numbers. Numbers are born and die, marry, and destroy one another like men. Their estates comprise noble, soldiers, genealogical tables, just as happens with the estates of mortal man. Numbers even have a mythology and gods! I know how astonished you must feel over this discovery, but when I have finished the work and presented it to you, you will have to concede that it is a marvelous proof of human perspicacity in general and of that of your friend, in particular.

Q.E.D.

I will not here indicate the numerous references which establish Freud's fixation on the number 17, murder, MacBeth, Schiller, murderous political passions, the U.L. series of authors, and Freud's mythological number systems system where he replaces letters with numbers. Such associations abound throughout his entire life.

If we are correct in our assumption and accept the coincidental improbability that Freud had all these specific feature in his own biography and was not the "informer" then there exists confirming evidence of Freud's participation in a conspiracy to murder.

To strengthen the supposition that Freud actually confessed to being in a murder conspiracy, we should need to establish: that Freud was murderous, the he had murderous political passions, that he belonged to secret political organizations, and that he had a secret number code for letters.

Before leaving off this discussion, one more point needs to be registered. In

Freud's very next example "proving" his theory, another informant comes to the fore. This one involved a man:

who admitted having a special preference for the numbers 17 and 19 ... that at the age of 17 he had gone to the university and so attained the academic freedom he had long desired, and that at 19 he had taken his first long journey and soon after had made his first scientific discovery.

The man, like Freud was a scientist; like Freud he graduated at 17, and like Freud at age 19 took his first journey abroad; like Freud not long after he made his first scientific discovery (Freud had worked on a paper involving a discovery of his concerning the eel. This is a family association example and in the story someone's life is "cut short"

Did Freud Belong to Political Organizations

1. What did they believe?
2. what literature ?
3. what theories?
4. aims?

I have resisted, as much as possible, exploring areas of Freud's murder mania except as it relates to his murder of John. On a number of occasions I have made reference to Freud's phony case histories and the fact that it is pathetic that the Freudians think they can continue to rely upon Freud's "epochal" penetrations into the human mind based upon his "objective" examinations of "case histories" of patients, who are, overwhelmingly Freud himself, dressed up and disguised as other people. What we really have is a massive documentation of Freud's own psychopathology and how it relates to the human mind is primarily important as an example of the workings of a diseased mind.

Freud presents many "chronological dreams" in *The Interpretation of Dreams* which "play about with numbers." These numbers are, in fact, references to

events virtually all of which relate to his murder of John. Again, to avoid the criticism that I am employing Freudian techniques to analyze Freud, I hasten to emphasize this is not true. It is what Freud himself says about himself, from a prosecutorial point of view, that I discuss his confessions. In the *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, we have another unique opportunity to examine the subject of his confessions to murder in reference to his age at the time of the event, 17, John's age at the time of his death, 18, and related family matters. I now examine "case histories" which purportedly examine others, but which are used by Freud to confess his crime. These examples were first examined in my book, *Passion for Murder*, but I take up these subjects again in specific and exclusive reference to his murder of John.

Note:

The Reclam Universal Library was an old-established and very comprehensive series of paper-bound reprints. Kotzebue (1761-1819) [author of *Misanthrope and Remorse*] is still known in England for another of his plays, *Lovers' Vows*, which was *not* performed at *Mansfield Park*.] - [italic in origin] Interesting, this reference to England and a play that was *not* performed at Mansfield Park. Who said it was? Was something cut out of Freud's comments, regarding England and a performance of this play, which the editors failed to cover their tracks by leaving in this footnote? There is no mention anywhere in the text, either about England, or a play's performance. We could as well say it was *not* performed at an infinity of theaters other than those at which it was performed. What is the meaning of this? Why this reference to England. Is Freud referring to an English publication? This is the way the Freudians constantly give themselves away with stupidly careless corruptions.

Note:

There thus runs through my thoughts a continuous current of "personal reference" of which I generally have no inkling, but which betrays itself by such instances of my forgetting names. It is as if I were obliged to compare everything I hear about other people with myself, as if my personal complexes were put on the alert whenever

another person is brought to my notice.

This applies, obviously, to much more than just the forgetting of names and confirms Fliess' diagnosis of Freud that he was a "thought reader" – i.e., a person who reads into other person's thoughts his own. This characteristic is and has been universally recognized as "Projection." The simple truth is, Freud "projected" his murder mania religion into the Universe and claimed it was the universal nature of mankind to have a murder mania and a sexual craving for his mother, and desire, of course, to murder his father.

Additional commentary on the Biblical Meaning of 17 *

In the Bible the number 17 signifies "vanquishing the enemy" and "complete victory in Christ." During the days of Noah, God vanquished rebellious mankind by the flood which He began on the 17th day of 2nd month. The ark came to rest on the 17th day of the 7th month. Jesus was victorious over death when God raised Him from the dead on the 17th day of the first month.