

Freud's Family Incest History, History of a Serial Killer

by Eric L. Miller © 2014

Freudian Fraud & Freud's Family Incest Religion

Nothing more clearly indicates the conspiratorial nature of the Freudian hierarchy than the fact that, for many decades now, they have been virtually silent on the fact that Freud's nominal father, Jacob Freud, was a repeat infant/child sexual offender. Jacob, according to Freud himself, subjected their family (seven children, five girls and two boys—Sigmund and Alexander) to sexual “relations.” As Jacob had a previous family of two sons, Emanuel (Sigmund's real father) and Phillip, it is virtually predictable that they, too, were assaulted (or “seduced”, as the Freudians would have it) as young children. Indeed, it is the position of this research that Freud came from a Jewish Incest Cult, which may even have been also a murder cult. That matter will be dealt with at great length elsewhere. Here, the focus is on the whole unholy business of Freud, and his criminal “gang” (to use Dr. Thomas Szasz's descriptive term for them)—and their efforts to “front” for Freud's crimes and conceal the family truth behind Freud's incest/murder theory of the Oedipus-Complex.

Dr. Jeffery Masson, former *Director of the Freud Archives*, some decades past, attempted to lead the world into believing Masson himself was “the great one” by declaring he had discovered the *real* great truths and discoveries only claimed by Freud. In short, his claim was that Freud was an intellectual coward, a coward who was afraid to admit the truth of the prevalence of childhood sexual trauma. Well, that would seem like the Freudian organization was, at last, about to tell the truth for the first time, doesn't it? Or was this just another cold dish of Freudian propagandabalderdash—itself a scheme of deception? Isn't it strange, on first impressions, that Masson, a Director of the Freud Archives, approved by Anna Freud herself, should have such “duties” as “outing Freud”?

In 1984, just previous to publication of the allegedly unexpurgated Harvard University Press edition of the *Freud/Fliess correspondence*, Masson wrote a book, ironically entitled, *Assault On Truth: Freud's Suppression of the Seduction Theory*. “Seduction Theory” is Masson's attempt to soften the

harsh tones of the term “Sexual Assault” and pretend that childhood sexual assault was really like adults, *with the children actively involved in enticing the assault against themselves*, in Masson’s strange world (like Freud) this is called a *seduction*” –naturally causing suspicion as to the sexual inclinations of people who use language like that—*both* Masson and Freud. We shall return to that.

Masson’s so-called "seduction" theory is actually better subtitled, we suggest would have been:

*Freud's Rejection of His Own Childhood Incest
Rape by his Father and His Frantic Effort to Hide
This Fact In A Universal Theory of Family Sex &
Family Murder*

In his remarkably double-tongued book, *Assault On Truth*, Masson posed as a friend and critic of Freud. He took Freud to task for showing "intellectual cowardice" by rejecting his own research—research that allegedly “led” to, or should have led to, his theory of various psychological disorders resulting from sexual assaults experienced in childhood--*committed by the father*. It is difficult to know Masson’s motives, it is strongly suspected they were and just as varied, hidden and (to this writer’s view) ignoble—as Masson’s own accounting of his biography would suggest. Was Masson just “buying into” the “language of ‘seduction’” to describe child sexual assault (as many Freudian do)? Or, is he, too, “titled” with problems of his own in that regard? In any case, it’s far more than a bit fatuous, as we shall see, for Freud to pretend he needed all his so-called “research” when he knew he thought what he did because of his own criminal incest cult family—which we shall herein document.

It is important at the outset to learn about Freud, the Serial Killer, to realize that he does have, strongly, one of those leading frequent “markers” of serial killers—they were victims of childhood sexual assault. And, indeed, other markers of the Serial Killer, which are numerous, also have a correlation with childhood experiences making the point particularly important.

When Masson’s book was published, leading Freudians, one by one, marched to the podium of the national and international press to register their attack on Masson's book. The book and the attacks were themselves, we believe, calculated frauds. Masson's book dealt with the theme that Freud

had a failure of courage when he capitulated to pressures from the medical community to change his theories and deny the research upon which they were based. Actually, Freud's evidence and his theory are as crazy today as they were when he wrote them. But Masson insists that *Freud was right the first time!* All of which only goes to show, the Master is always right even when he is wrong. He only got it wrong when he *contradicted* himself. This is the line of all "True Believers" as well as the Mafia and their Godfathers.

Masson "Rats" On Freud, "A Little" But Only To Gain Fame !

Masson asserts that Freud had actually been right in his original "correct" view that hysteria was the result of sexual attacks by fathers upon their own children. According to Masson, instead of adhering to this supposed "correct" view, Freud adopted the "mythology" of the "Oedipus complex" to supplant his earlier view of *actual* sexual molestation. Hence, Freud substituted a *fictional* "innate" "Oedipal complex" to account for psychological disorders caused by *actual* trauma. Yet, in his entire book Masson never took up the fact that Freud admitted, in private letters, that his own father was a sex pervert who repeatedly molested the Freud family, almost certainly including himself. In other words, he, Masson, dared not discuss *that*, i.e., Freud-family incest as the ruling factor in development of Freud's own personality and his psychoanalytical "theories" -- a fact which Masson, as translator and editor of Freud's most revealing letters, well knew!

How can we explain such a dramatic avoidance of biographical evidence of Freud's own family incest history? This issue is nothing short of astounding. The censorship of Freud's incestuous background has tremendous implications for everything regarding Freud, Freudianism and its influence on the psychoanalytic movement in the United States and abroad—then and now! The question arises: what is the real political agenda of the Freudian movement, with the likes of Masson? The question seems particularly pertinent when it is to Masson the wheel of the ship is given to steer—people who, like Masson, will even pose as a *severe critics of Freud only to praise him all the louder*, as we shall see.

Perhaps Masson's own Jewish heritage, and Freud's status as an acknowledged Jewish icon, one of the very top, "a very important Jew" of the 20th Century—perhaps this restrained Masson himself from telling the "truth,

the whole truth, and nothing but the truth”? Perhaps it was fear of prosecution? The point here is that the Masson’s obvious charade should have been maintained—indeed, up until the very publication by Harvard University Press of *The Complete Letters of Fliess/Freud*.

Since then, it appears, Masson has learned to keep his mouth shut.

Jones Leaks Freud's Admission: His Father Was An Incest Sex Pervert

Earliest indications of Freud’s confession of family incest practices were reported by Dr. Ernest Jones. Dr. Jones was Freud’s first *official* biographer and a long-time intimate of Freud’s inner-circle—both before and after Freud’s passing. Jones, earlier in his career, had himself been repeatedly brought to the attention of the police for his own acts of alleged child molestation. The facts surrounding Jones own situation, a separate subject, should be further thoroughly investigated and brought to public awareness—as evidence of the “types” Freud had in his inner circle. Not surprising to this writer, is the fact that Jones, was also suspected of murdering his wife.

In any case, it is Jones who first leaked the issue of sexual perversion in the Freud family. A particularly important passage, relating to the fact, had been completely excised by Anna Freud and bowdlerized and corrupted in an early publication of Freud’s Fliess letters (1960). Of course, Anna committed fraud by doing so. She did not indicate, with proper editorial marks, the fact of her excisions, and purposefully gave the false impression no incriminating disclosure existed in the original letters. Falsifying Freud’s letters for propaganda purposes seems to have been the major duty of daughter, Anna, in the Freudian criminal enterprise. She is said to have ruled the “inner-sanctum” of Freud secrets with an iron knuckled fist.

To Jones discredit, however, he attempted to divert attention from *that* reality of this crucial disclosure by illicitly manipulating the English language to rob Freud’s disclosures of their central importance in the letter. Despite many shocking revelations contained in his official biography, Jones was an “out and out” Freudian propagandist whose *primary purpose was to deceive the American public as to the truth of Freud's background and intentions*. Actually, Jones was an unconscionable liar and frequently practiced fraud in his presentation of crucial data concerning Freud's background. He could

have, and should have, been sentenced to prison for his crimes of mortal turpitude on numerous fronts. [Freud's granddaughter, Sophie, confided to this writer that she most resented the fact that her beloved aunt, Anna, had made Jones Freud's official biographer.]

In Jones' authorized book on Freud, *Sigmund Freud: Life & Work*, chapter "Self-Analysis," he wrote concerning Freud's confession that his moninal father, Jacob, was a sex pervert, and that:

He inferred from the existence of some hysterical symptoms in his brother and several sisters (not himself: *nota bene*) that even his own father had to be thus incriminated (February 11, 1897); though he immediately added that frequency of such occurrences often raised his suspicions. Towards the end of this period doubts began to crowd his mind, but they were repeatedly rebutted by some fresh evidence. When, finally, he had a dream about his American niece, Hella [herself a child] which he had to interpret as covering a sexual wish toward his eldest daughter he felt he had first hand evidence of the correctness of his theory.

Four months after this, however, Freud had discovered the truth of the matter: that irrespective of incest wishes of parents what he had to concern himself with was the general occurrence of incest wishes of children towards their parents, characteristically towards the opposite sex.

Jones goes on to state that, Freud, commenting on his own dreams, also admitted to having sexual desires for his eldest daughter, who was Mathilda. Freud "had to interpret it as a sexual wish toward his eldest daughter." Of course, Freud found this incestuous "evidence," Jones said, as corroborating "the correctness of his theory." Jones refers to Freud's sexual "wish." He means, of course, Freud sexual "desire" for his own daughter. Two years later, June 27, 1899, Freud was dreaming again of sex with his daughter, only this time it was Anna who was his "sex" child. The little girl had made a remark on the occasion of her aunt's birthday: "On birthdays I am mostly a little bit good." This remark stimulated Freud's incest dream. Concerning it

he concluded to his beloved “friend” Wilhelm Fliess, himself a pedophile who apparently repeatedly raped his own little boy, Robert, that:

The only possible solution: Anneral is my *sexta* child! Brr. . . "

What if anything more came after the ellipsis will not be known until the actual letter is examined. [still, this has not been seen] Masson certainly cannot be trusted with such matters. I have correspondence from the Chief of Manuscript Division at the Library of Congress, that Masson attempted to disguise the real names of people in Freud’s letters by not only blacking-out the names but in giving “false initials” to them to mislead investigators of the truth. Be that as it may.

In any case, the Harvard University Press edition of the Freud/Fliess correspondence (none of Fliess’ letters survived, supposedly) contains no letter of February 11, 1897. Investigating further, the passage, not quoted by Jones, is found in a letter dated February 8, 1897. The passage begins as a new paragraph, with no previous mention of Freud's father in any preceding paragraphs:

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. The frequency of this circumstance makes me wonder.

Freud’s youngest sibling is his brother, mentioned here, is Alexander, who is 10 years younger than Freud. In any case, in Jones brief passage (in 1950) about the incest confession, there are three lies.

Freud does not go on to say anywhere in this letter anything about Mathilda, his eldest daughter. Freud's admitted sexual desires for Mathilda is contained in another letter. In this letter, of February 11, 1897, Freud only referred to his youngest daughter, Anna. Anna is mentioned in relationship to an experiment Freud had in mind of force-feeding her *feces* to test her reactions for a theory of his on perversions. Incidentally, the reader might be glad to know, he stated the women folk wouldn't go along with it — implying, as a consequence, that the force-feeding of his baby Anna did not happen. But we do not know this. Secondly, Freud does not state that the

"frequency of such occurrences often raised his suspicions." Rather he said he was filled with "wonder" over the "frequency of this circumstance." Wonder is not "suspicion."

Additionally, Freud nowhere indicated that he "inferred" Jacob's sex perversion from symptoms of his brother and several of his sisters. Jones made that up entirely. Again, the words are: "My father *was one* of those perverts and *is* responsible. . . ." There is nothing inferential in Freud's statement at all. It is a simple declarative statement of fact, not a supposition or a suspicion. Thirdly, Freud did not state he was not one of his father's victims – another corrupt fiction Jones wanted to impress on the reader's mind, as though fact. Jones is at particular pains to tell his readers to *note well* ["*note bene*"] that Jacob was not charged by Freud with molesting him. But Freud said no such thing; therefore, we can only *well note* Jones's despicable lack of integrity—once *again* in evidence.

It seems highly improbable that Freud escaped Jacob's perverse assaults. (or that Jacob Freud's other sons Emanuel and Philipp escaped them either. All the symptoms which Freud delineates for victims of early sexual assault by fathers are, as to be expected, those from which he himself suffered from his father forcing him to engage in anal and/or oral copulation, *in extremis*. Indeed, in all Freud's researches, it was really himself whom he was studying, as he well knew—as anyone really intimate with his biography will know. He said it, for instance, in a letter to Fliess, his chief confessor:

The chief patient I am concerned with is myself.

This matter will soon be explored in greater depth.

Actually, the letter in which Freud reveals his father was a sex pervert immediately follows another letter in which Freud concluded that hysterical headaches were the result of pressure being applied to the head. These headaches were "characteristic of the scenes where the head is held still for the purposes of actions of the mouth." Obviously, Freud who himself suffered by hysterical headaches was explaining his own case. In other words, Freud believed such hysterical headaches resulted from remembered pressure on the head during the act of forced fellatio, or mouth/penis copulation.

In another letter, written just two weeks before Freud gave further

information about his own orientation toward perverse sex with children, Freud *reveals himself* again. Read carefully what Freud says, the quality, tone and choice of words he used to describe incestuous family relations with the father.

One more detail. In hysteria I recognize the *pater* [father] in the high demands made in love, in the humility in relation to the lover, or in the inability to marry because of unfulfilled ideals. The reason for this is, of course, the height from which the father lowers himself to the child. Compare with this, in paranoia [another condition to which Freud frequently confessed] and fictions of an alienation in parentage [to which he also confessed].

Freud's words are particularly significant as he frequently identified himself as an "hysteric," a "paranoiac," and the theme of "alienation in parentage" is an especially dominant theme of his own elaborate "self-analysis"—most of it actually intended to reveal his murder mania and his "confessions of victims" which is a kind of catechism in Freud's murder messiah mind. As we shall see, decades later, Freud is still insisting that sex with one's mother and sister, is a pleasure that should not be resisted, and that, if one does not give into it, they will *never reach the heights of fulfillment*. We shall soon come to this.

Note that, in the above indented quotation, Freud uses Latin to refer to the father. Why was it not just given as "father." In *The New Cassell's German Dictionary*, "pater" is given as the second definition of "father," with the note that it is R.C., or Roman Catholic version of it in German. Roman Catholics, Freud tells us, are far more his enemies than the Nazis. Strange that Freud would refer to his own *vater* as Roman Catholic version of the German, "pater"! Nonetheless, Masson doesn't want to write "father" either. His entire translation or non-translation of German words is entirely arbitrary. Sometimes he gives a "foreign" usage, when he wants to disguise something, other times he simply translates the foreign words, rather than giving the original language used by Freud. Let me be frank, a lot of American's seeing the word *pater* really don't know what it means. Masson wants to capitalize on this lack of familiarity with foreign languages or divert attention. He is not trying to communicate, but hide the fact. If he did not have a plan for selective language manipulation, why doesn't he employ a consistent method

of handling foreign phrases?

More importantly, consider the language Freud used in the quoted passage to describe incest. He cannot do so in objective terms because of his own family conditioning. It is in Freud's use of language to describe incest that he consistently betrays his own personal involvement with the subject. He refers, for example, to the "high demands made in love." It is incest he is talking about as a "high demand" made upon the child. It's the language of a sex-pervert. The "love" that he refers to is an act of incest and child rape. Freud refers to the "humility" in relation to the "lover." The "lover", of course, is the father inflicting incest upon his child—no doubt inflicting great trauma upon the poor infant. Freud's reference to the "humility" of the child, is really the "humiliation" of the child, but to a very young child, an infant, even, the word "humiliation" hardly captures the true extent of the criminal sexual act upon another defenseless human being. Nor does Masson's adopting of the same lingo make it any the less palatable to a normal human being, I dare say.

Freud stated that the "inability to marry" was based upon an "unfulfilled ideal" emanating from the child's confused sexuality caused by the father's forced incest. This tragic situation becomes the "ideal" condition of "love" which interferes, Freud would have us believe, with a normal heterosexual marriage.

Freud is using the language of the confused victim and identifying with him in his own choice of words to describe the horrible situation. I would suggest that a normal perception of this situation, in every major culture in the world, among the vast majority of people would more accurately characterize the true, clear, meaning of Freud's description in the following *rewritten* words.

One more detail. In hysteria I recognize the influence of the perverted father in the debased demands made upon the child-victim in incestuous assault, in the debasement of the child in relation to the father and the child's later inability to marry because of trauma. The reason for this is the dregs into which the father lowers himself and criminally violates his own child. Compare this in paranoia and the alienation of parentage.

This is the more proper statement of what Freud's already perverted mind cannot articulate because the condition has been formative for him and he himself is identifying with the father pervert—as he admits is true in his own letters.

There is explicit evidence that Freud did in fact identify himself as a pervert, as his father before him in relation to his own children. And, even, as a young teenager, as his early letters to Silberstein reveal. It is no wonder Freud was, as all the Freudian “scholars” agree, “patricidal.” Or simply he wanted to murder his father. I could here, and later will, provide many such perversions of language in which Freud describes incest in just such terms as he does in the quoted passage above.

Freud's Confession to a Sexual Situation with His Father And His Desire to Murder Him

The question must be asked directly. Besides Freud's assertion that Jacob assaulted his brother and several sisters is there any evidence that Freud, too, had a sexual “situation” with his father?

Some seven months after the confession of February 11, 1897 Freud wrote to Fliess that he had a “great secret.” The great secret had four parts to it. 1) The first secret was that he no longer believed in his own theories; 2) He admitted he had not really brought “a single case” to a real conclusion. This assertion in his private letter was at odds with his published writings where he claimed numerous cures. This was the first group of secrets, Freud continues his remarks with:

Then, the surprise that in all cases the *father*, not excluding my own, had to be accused of being perverse. [underline added]

In this context, too, Freud was discussing incest.

While he knew his father was a pervert and responsible for the hysteria of his brother and several of his sisters, the issue is clearly not whether Jacob was a pervert, but also himself, *father* Sigmund Freud. Freud only doubted, he wrote, whether he was justified in believing that “all” cases of hysteria could

be attributed to incest assault—such as was the case with his immediate family. He continues his letter by saying that such "wide spread perversions against children are not very probable." He did, however, have one certainty, one absolutely amazing certainty: "that there are no indications of reality in the unconscious." Here Freud is so confused he can't be followed. There are no indications of real experience in the unconscious mind, one asks in amazement? Why that was the entire cornerstone of psychoanalysis—that early traumatic experiences of youth were decisive in the development of psychological disorders.

As Jones would have his readers believe, Freud did disavow his disclosure that his *own father was a pervert*. Indeed, he merely stated that it was only in cases where there was "an accumulation of events" that hysteria resulted.. Simply, hysteria only occurred where the father *repeatedly* forced his children into incestuous acts. Single acts of incest rape in early childhood were not responsible for psychological disorders, in Freud's view, it was only when the assaults were repeatedly inflicted on the child that incest rape figured into determining later problems. Certainly, nonetheless, in an incest-family cult, such "an accumulation of events" was inevitable—it was a culture and a way of life!

In the assertion, once again charging his father with sex perversion ("not excluding my own"), Freud stated that he feared he would have to give up the "certain knowledge" of neurosis originating in the "etiology of childhood" in every case. That is say, he was afraid he would have to give up the universal generalization of his concept because he couldn't prove it happened in "all" cases. Freud is obviously crazy, in any case.

And, in any case, it is highly improbable that Freud would assert that his father was "unfortunately" a pervert and was responsible for the psychological disorders of several of his sisters and his brother if it were not true. Let us look at the facts of the matter.

Freud's younger brother, Alexander, was 10 younger than himself. Freud elsewhere stated incestuous assaults on children usually occurred at the age of 6 [*sexta*] months and around the age of three or five (when Freud says the child reaches his "sexual peak"). Taking this as the time frame for Freud's only family situation, then Freud would have been between the ages of between 10 and 15 when his father (i.e., Jacob) was forcing his youngest son, Alexander, into acts of sodomy and oral copulation. The statement that

"several of his sisters" were also attack would seem to leave open the question of whether any of the Freud own children escaped sexual rape. Freud's way of describing things is just way of disguising the whole truth, *that all the children in the family were so abused*. There is a clear suggestion in Freud's Silberstein letters that Freud himself had sexual relations with his own sister(s) as a teenager. (The matter is discussed in a new book of the author's). Had Freud said "all" of his younger sisters, who would imagine that Freud himself was the only exception? That he was left alone is hardly credible given the nature of the disease and the fact of Jacob's appetites in this direction—for both male and female infants/children.

Indeed, the fact is, Freud admitted that he not only had a "sexual situation" with Jacob, but also that he wanted to murder him because of it. In the *Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud confessed in public print his own problem with his father. In his discussion of his dreams in the chapter "Intellectual Activity In Dreams," Freud called to attention one of his patients, a homicidal maniac, with whom he was also identifying.

I knew that the root of his illness had been hostile impulses against his father, dating from his childhood and involving a sexual situation. In so far, therefore, as I was identifying myself with him, I was seeking to confess to something analogous.

Could anything be clearer? Freud not only identified with the homicidal maniac in his murderous impulses for his father, but he connected his murderous feeling with a desire to inflict gruesome sexual tortures on his victim(s). [Many serial killers have a "primal victim" in their minds, and each victim is but a re-killing of the original victim].

Freud had nothing to gain by confessing that his father was a sex pervert and that incest haunted the Freud family. It could hardly have helped the public case for his "theory." Public admission that he himself came from such a family, would certainly have thrown into doubt (if more doubt was needed) Freud's claim that *everyone* who had a psychological disorder had a incestuous family history, just as he did—and he gloried in the fact.

Freud's Mother as Sex Pervert

Freud's mother, Amalia, was doubtfully not unaware of the incestuous assaults happening in her house. Indeed, she may well have been the primary or first offender in Freud's life. It is strange that Freud blamed the father in "all" cases, whereas he well knew, and himself documented, instances where the mother was the sex pervert. The idea of the mother's participation in sexual assaults is all but banished from Freud's overt accusations. And yet, in his own published case (not his personal letters), *he laid the primary cause of his own psychological disorders upon the woman, not the father.*

Though Freud was reluctant to directly admit to Fliess that he had sex with his mother, he came very close to it. In a letter of October 3, 1897, a little more than a month after Freud claimed the father had to be blamed in "all" cases, he specifically disavowed that Jacob played a role in his own case and charged instead the woman as playing a decisive role. Freud's denial that the father played a direct active role in his own life is in direct contradiction to his confession in the *Interpretation of Dreams* as just quoted above. In another letter to Fliess of October 3, 1897 Freud stated, "I can only indicate that the old man [Jacob] plays no active part in my case."

One must know Freud's theory to understand this statement clearly. It was his view that the father did not play an "active role" in traumatizing the child *if* he did not commit *repeated* acts of assault which caused the "active" condition. Early experiences, which were not perpetuated over time, had, in his view, no influence on the development of psychological disorders. The alleged reason for this was that the child *forgot these experiences because they were not reinforced through repetition*—but what about repression?

Freud Takes View of Sex Pervert

Freud takes the view of the sex pervert who justifies his acts with the idea that children *don't remember* these early experiences *if* they are infrequent enough. In other words, the pervert can permit himself (or herself) the luxury of the forbidden act of incest, so long as it's not done too often—so often that it reinforces the trauma upon the psyche of the child and provides tracks of memory. Discussing the subject of Periodicity in his book *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, Freud stated:

There is no justification for the fear that trends
which set in with the greatest violence in childhood

will permanently dominate the adult character; it is just as likely that they will disappear and make way for an opposite tendency ("Harsh rulers have short reigns). (page 146)

It was not the "old man," who played, then, this "active role" it was the "old woman." Nonetheless, in one of Freud's dream he discusses the "glee" he experienced when, in the dream, his father put his urinating penis in his "receptacle." They had to hide when this was being done. In the letter of October 3, Freud also stated he drew an "inference by analogy from myself onto him," "him" being his father. The meaning of this statement was that *Freud was himself a pervert to his own children, as Jacob was to his*. But there must be another letter missing where Freud had confessed that his father had molested him, otherwise why did he feel the necessity for informing Fliess that he was then using his father as an analogy of his own situation. Besides his father Freud also used his mother as an "analogy" of himself and projected onto himself the identity of his mother the "prime originator" of his own mother-son incest.

In the letter of October 3, after stating that he was analogizing from himself to his father, he next made the statement that, in his own case of sexual molestation, a "prime authoress" [translated "prime originator"] was to blame. Of course it is the mother who is the primary authoress or originator of the child.

The Freudians have concocted a theory whereby they pretend to identify this prime originator as a nurse of Freud's molester. The so-called evidence they produce attempts to frame a nursemaid in the Freud household in Freud's infant years. A thorough analysis and check of documents upon which this charge is made, however, only proves the negative case. The very documents adduced to prove the identity of this woman, proves instead, only that there was no such woman. Jacob Freud never had a nursemaid. It was required by law that nursemaids had to be registered with the state. The state records, which still exist, indicate there was no such housemaid as claimed by the Freudians.

It is easy to see, then, why Freud, in his very next comment on this matter, brings up the subject of his *sexual excitement for his mother*. He states that between the ages of two and two and a half his sex was aroused for his *matrem* [mother] during a journey with her and "that later - between the ages of two and two and a half years -- my libido toward *matrem* was awakened. .

.). Here Freud is fudging again. He stated that "we must have spent the night together and there must have been an opportunity of seeing her *nudem* [naked]." Freud can't even bring himself to say "mother" and "naked" in the same breath, that he is admitting to being sexually aroused by his mother. As we have seen before, Freud resorted, in the language of his confession, to use of a foreign language to convey his secrets which ought not be said straight out. I will quote this passage from the letter of October 3 so the reader may see Freud's exact words:

To put it in writing is more difficult than anything else for me; it also would take me too far afield. I can only indicate the old man plays no active part in my case, but that no doubt I drew an inference by analogy from myself onto him; that in my case the "prime authoress" was an ugly elderly woman, who told me a great deal about God Almighty and hell and who instilled in me a high opinion of my own capacities; that later between two and two and a half years) my libido toward *matrem* was awakened, namely on the occasion of a journey with her from Leipzig to Vienna, during which we must have spent the night together and there must have been the opportunity of seeing her *nudem*. . .

And Freud immediately after goes on to mention that Fliess himself had pointed out the importance of such an event *with his own son* [Fliess, was also a sex pervert. Then Freud turns to the subject of the death of a young brother. But who was this ugly old woman of whom Freud spoke above? The Freudians want it to be *someone other than Freud's mother*, anyone. In a postscript to this letter Freud continues that he had a dream which produced "under the strangest disguises" the following:

she was my teacher in sexual matters, and complained because I was clumsy and unable to do anything."

After another sentence stating that neurotic impotence comes from such experiences (Freud was self-declared impotent at the time), Freud turns again to the subject of death, a "skull."

In the letter of October 3, Freud had to continue with the story about the

nurse and makes a correction. He states he made a mistake in saying that the "old woman" (mentioned above) made him steal money, in fact she [the "old woman"] had stolen some money and small toys.

The whole story is sheer bunk. Even Schur couldn't resist commenting on the ridiculousness of Freud's description of his being with his mother at the age of two and being sexually aroused by seeing his mother naked in Freud's statement: "we must have spent the night together and there must have been an opportunity of seeing her naked." Freud's avoidance of speaking of his mother by name and that he could not speak directly of her nakedness and his conditional statement that they "must have spent the night together" and he must have had the "opportunity" of seeing her naked, certainly sounds as if this two year old had more shameful and secretive things in mind than any ordinary child, ever. The fact is, Freud was not an infant at the time, he was, most probably, in late puberty or early teens.

In a letter of October 15th, less than two weeks later, Freud continued with the theme of Freud family incest. "I have found in my own case too, being in love with my mother and jealous of my father."

Before making this statement Freud was obviously struggling with himself again as he had in the letter of October 3. He said that "It was by no means easy" for him to be "totally honest" with himself. But, he continued, with his revelations by telling Fliess that he had "A single idea of general interest" which had "dawned" on him. It is at this point that he confesses to "being in love with" his mother. Now "love" in this context is the same as that Freud mentioned in reference to the "love" of the sex pervert father in the act of sexual assault. It is sexual "love" that Freud is referring to. He now considered he concluded that "being in love" with the mother is a "universal event."

Think about it. Who needs to be told children "love" their mothers? Why all the mystery, as though this simple fact, known to everyone in the world, required a "momentous" effort of Freud's to "psychoanalyze" himself to discover? What Freud refers to was his sexual cravings for his mother, which is what he "found." It is this letter of October 3, which is credited by Freudians with constituting Freud's "breakthrough" discovery the Oedipus complex.

This "event," Freud acknowledged to Fliess, came at a "later" time. How much later? We do know that at the age of 44 Freud discussed a dream he

had of his mother in a tomb. Freud asserts that the dream was one that he had a young boy of about 7 or 8 and which he analyzed some 30 years later. The dream he said represented his sexual "craving" for his mother and he pointed out that in the dream there were tall bird-headed figures. The German word for "bird" was remarkably similar to the common word for sexual intercourse, "fuck." The tall erect bird represented, then, Freud's admitted desire to "fuck" his mother, he would have us believe. He said that he learned of the word "fuck" which he specifically related to his mother from a young friend who was named Philipp and that it was in the *Philippson Bible* that he had seen the picture of the falcon headed birds. Later, we shall see Freud stated he had good reason to believe his half-brother Philipp was having sex with his mother, along with Jacob and both his sons Emanuel, and Philipp.

It may be shocking to the reader to read such confessions in such street language, but it is Freud's language and the sensation he wanted to create for his German readers. He referred to the dream as containing infantile content, but Freud was no infant at 7 or 8, nor at the age of 38 when he interpreted the dream to mean he had a "sexual craving" for his mother. The word "sexual craving" is not appropriate to an infant in any case, not even I dare say in Freud's own theory! It was, so he informed the reader, an "appropriate" description of what he was feeling not at 7 or 8 but in his adult life. Freud reported that he woke up from this dream in a state of anxiety. The anxiety had nothing to do, he assured his readers, with the death-like appearance of his mother's face in the grave, which was copied from his "grandfather." The anxiety he said related to his sexual craving, it was that which made him anxious.

Another reference to his mother is found in his discussion of another dream. This is not a dream which he had at 7 or 8, either but a dream he had in his early 40's. He had the dream after returning home tired and hungry from a journey. The dream was about his sexual relations with his mother. In the dream he went into the kitchen. Later in the book he specifically stated that dreams involving going into a kitchen are clearly sexual dreams. His own dream is no different, as Freud himself makes clear. Bear in mind this is not a dream from childhood, not an analysis 30 years after the alleged fact. It was clearly his dream in the present when he wrote about it; and, again, he was not an infant, he was in his early 40's.

Freud went into the kitchen to satisfy his "hunger." This hunger we discover

was a craving for sexual sensations from his mother -- a situation that "often happened." When he went into the kitchen to get some from his mother she was making some food and told him she wasn't ready. He would have to wait. Angered, he went into the other room to put on a condom. A "stranger," who is described as having a long face and a short pointed beard (Jacob had just such a face) tried to prevent this from happening and claimed the condom, which was too big for Freud, as his own. A struggle threatened to ensue, but "then everything was alright."

Freud states that when he was *sexta* or 6 years of age, he received his first "lessons" from his mother about life death and sex. Freud reflecting on the dream confessed that sexual cravings for his mother were "plaguing" him in his dream. In connection with these associations, Freud made mention of the fact that his mother nursed him as an infant and he, like a friend of his, regretted not taking more advantage of the "opportunity." One of the thoughts he had while musing on his craving for his mother was that "One should never neglect an opportunity, but always take what one can even when it involves doing a small wrong. One should never neglect an opportunity, since life is short and death inevitable."

That this interpretation is not taken out of context, as is surely to be charged by Freudians is shown by Freud himself. He makes it quite clear that he was talking about "sex with his mother"—that's what her "lessons" about, in her role as the old nursemaid, who was his "instructress." (In another dream Freud identifies his early "nursemaid" as his mother!).

Because this lesson of *carpe diem* had among other meanings a sexual one, and because the desire it expressed did not stop short of doing wrong, it had reason to dread the censorship and was obliged to conceal itself behind a dream.

The "it" in the above passage, is "I." This is a favorite trick of Freud's, to throw the reader off. Why, one almost starts believing that the dream had a life independent of the dreamer, an "it" life. The passage should read:

Because this lesson of *carpe diem* had among other meanings a sexual one, and because the desire I expressed did not stop short of doing wrong, I had reason to dread the censorship and was obliged to

conceal my mother's "lessons" behind a dream.

The dream also related, Freud announced, to "restraining thoughts of every kind and even threats of the most revolting sexual punishments."

In short, Freud related his adult dream and its meaning to his sexual craving for his mother and his desire to suckle her breasts. Adult images are invoked of using a condom, his father's condom, to which the father objected. He admitted he was committing a "small wrong." But this "small wrong" was sufficiently important enough for him to "dread" censorship and to conceal the real meaning of the dream—so we are told. Twice Freud informed the reader that he had to conceal the real meaning of the dream, even though he was obviously not concealing it at all with his overt references to his sexual craving for his mother. By stating that he was concealing the meaning of the dream, the reader gets the idea that the meaning really is concealed. "I might pursue the intricate trains of thought further along these lines and explain fully the part of the dream which I have not analyzed; but I must desist at this point because the personal sacrifice demanded would be too great." One again the refrain, Freud would sacrifice too much with his shocking confession of his sexual relations with his mother if he to continued!

Freud's fear of telling the truth of his sexual relationship with his mother in adolescence and in adult life is further evidenced in Freud's most important dream. The one he says which represented his "self-analysis." In this dream Freud had been set a task of dissecting himself, cutting off his body, the pelvis and legs. It all had to do with a book named *She*. "She" was the guide, who in the dream had carried Freud. The woman who "carried" Freud's "belongings" was his mother. A mother carries the child. In the dream a woman Louise N. (Nathanson, Amelia's maiden name?) was admonishing him about what he would reveal. Sarcastically, she challenged him to give his "ultimate" explanations:

At that point I saw that someone else was admonishing me through her mouth and I was silent. I reflected on the amount of self-discipline it was costing me to offer the public even my book upon dreams -- I should have to give away so much of my character in it. 'The best of what you know cannot be told to boys.

The further thoughts stimulated by Louise N. Freud said "went too deep to become conscious." These deeper thoughts were diverted, Freud said, to references to the book *She* which describes an adventure "scarcely even been trodden before." This "perilous journey" with his "guide" *She* summoned up fears of perishing in "subterranean fires." Freud stated it directly, "A fear of that kind was unmistakably active in the dream thoughts." Not only in his dream thoughts but in his waking thoughts when he analyzed the dream giving him that conclusion.

This is not the only time that Freud associated the fires of hell with memories of sexual excitation for his mother. In the previously mentioned case, where Freud spoke about being sexually aroused by his mother during the train trip, Freud introduced the story by saying that the lamp lights at the station gave him an hallucination of "souls burning in hell." The "old woman" who sexually molested him taught him about God and Hell. And in the discussion of his dream when he was 7 or 8, the subject of death was prominent, as well his adult dream of going to the kitchen to get some from his mother, who told him she wasn't ready and he had to get a condom. One of the "lessons" taught him by his mother in the kitchen was that "he owed Nature a death."

It would appear that Freud began having active sex with his mother sometime around the age of 13. And, in his adult dream he is wondering "how long will my legs carry me." Or, how long can I continue with this activity.

The letter of October 15 where Freud confesses to being "in love" with his mother continues:

Our feelings rise against any arbitrary individual compulsion, such as is presupposed in *Die Ahnfrau* [*The Ancestress*] and the like. . . Everyone in the audience was once a budding Oedipus in fantasy and each recoils in horror from the dream fulfillment (here transplanted into reality) with the full quality of repression which separates his infantile state from his present one.

What does Freud mean, "here transplanted into reality"? Freud is not one of those who recoils in horror. As just mentioned he freely and openly announced being in love with his mother. In his case there is no "full quality of repression which separates his infantile state from his present one."

The play, *The Ancestress*, which Freud mentions is a play that "concerns brother-sister incest and parricide." On the issue of brother-sister incest and parricide we are on the Freud family ground. The Freud-incest-family, as will soon be proved also sanctioned brother-sister incest.

Something Forbidden Is Aloof

Ernest Jones, Freud's official biographer, observes that "something" of a profound nature did occur to Freud in his adolescence. He links this change with "forbidden" matters and a mysterious problem that Freud had:

But what is significant is the extraordinary change that must have set in at about the age of 16 or 17. . . . What a demoniac intuition must have been at work. Perhaps we are nearing a clue to the mysterious problem of how it was that just this man was destined to discover psycho-analysis and reveal the unconscious mind of man.

Jones could not resist commenting further on this issue regarding Freud's alleged self-analysis:

But it must also have been accomplished by some profound sense of forbiddenness. . . . it is as if he devised all along that the path he was treading would sooner or later lead to terrible secrets, the revealing of which he dreaded but on which he was nevertheless as determined as Oedipus himself.

It must be remembered that the "secret" of Oedipus was two-fold (as Freud casts it, that is), that he had sexual relations with his own mother and that he

was a murderer. But the "forbidden secret" in Freud's own life has, in fact, nothing to do with Oedipus. Oedipus did not grow up with his father or mother. When he killed his father he did not know it was his father and when he had sex with his mother, he did not know it was his mother. With Freud it was otherwise, he did know and it was not an "event" that he "experienced" in his unremembered infancy, but rather in his own real adolescence. It wasn't Freud's problem to "discover" the terrible secret, but how to reveal it in such a manner that he didn't give "too much" of his personal life away.

Freud's great struggle was not a "heroic" effort to remember his sexual lusts of infancy, but a profound struggle associated with "telling on" his parents. The taboo in an incest family, is not incest, but telling anyone about it. He told on Jacob directly, without mincing words. But somehow it was much more terrible to tell on his mother. What would the world think of him and his family if he told the whole truth? No, that was not quite possible.

The truth is, Freud believed himself to be a "Superman," the German *Übermensch* which Nietzsche "prophetically" announced to the world was "beyond good and evil." Four months before the letters of October, 1897 which I have quoted Freud wrote the following:

Definition of "Holy"

Holy" is something based on the fact that human beings, for the benefit of the larger community, have sacrificed a portion of their sexual liberty to indulge in perversions. The horror of incest (something that is impious) is based on the fact that, as a result of communal sexual life (even in childhood), the members of the family remain together permanently and become incapable of joining with strangers. Thus incest is antisocial -- civilization consists in this progressive renunciation. Contrariwise, the "superman."

Do not think that the word "perversions" is a negative word to Freud. Freud

believed, or would have the world believe, that perversion is so universal that "No healthy person, it appears, can fail to make some addition that might be called perverse to the normal sexual aim; and the universality of this finding is in itself enough to show how inappropriate it is to use the word perversion as a term of reproach." (3 *Theories*, p.51)

That which is "Holy" according to Freud is merely a sacrifice of the sexual liberty for the whole family to indulge in sexual perversions. The horror of the "Unholy" is based on the fact that incest families are antisocial and don't join with strangers. So, to all you people who do not practice incest and have to renounce your perversion to get a sense of the "Holy" go ahead, Freud tells you. It is *different for the Freudian Supermen*, for those who are beyond Good and Evil. Freud specifically often identified himself as just such a one, an *Übermensch*. But what about the rest of his family?

Incest: A Family Tradition

When I investigated the trail of evidence for family incest in the Freud clan, numerous facts arose which indicate incest was a family tradition. From Freud's confessions in *The Interpretation of Dream* we learn that Freud's mother was hardly a conventional woman. Freud stated that he had "good reason to believe" that Amalia had children not only by Freud's supposed half-brother, Emmanuel, but by his uncle, Phillip as well as by Jacob. The reader should register, before we spoke of Freud's mother having sex with Jacob's other sons, now we are speaking of *having children by*.

According to Peter Swales, who investigated the records where Freud's mother, Amalia, used to journey to her spa, she carried on affairs with more than her incest relatives. Swales claims there is suggestive evidence that Freud's mother was carrying on an affair or affairs at her favorite spa to which she habitually went. His research also concluded that Freud had an on-going affair with his sister-in-law, Minna Bernays. Minna lived in the Freud household most of her adult life and Freud had first wanted her rather than his wife, Martha. According to Swales, Freud not only had a sexual relationship with Minna but he impregnated her and arranged an abortion. An indisputable fact, borne out by the Fliess correspondence, is that Freud frequently traveled with Minna to various foreign parts and left Martha at home. Freud referred to her as the "second" mother, his wife being the first mother. In Mosaic law, sexual relations with in-laws is incest.

Additionally, turning to official records, we find that Emanuel Freud's (i.e., Freud's father) mother, Sally Kanner, had the same last name as his wife's mother, both of whom came from Russia. Freud's sister, Rosa, also married her first cousin, Moritz Freud.

As stated, Freud's grandfather, Jacob, and his father Emanuel had planned to marry Freud to his half-sister Pauline. In the autobiographical case history where Freud disclosed this information, "Screen Memories," Freud also overtly suggested that he and his half-brother John had "raped" Pauline Freud supposedly in infancy, but obviously the event, in context, most probably occurred when Freud was between the ages of 16 and 19. Freud used suggestive language to describe the "deflowering" of Pauline, *Pfucksingen*. Freud delighted in suggesting hidden things with "double meanings" in the words he used, especially English words. Pauline and her family lived in England.

The Effects of Incest on the Freud Family and the "Hereditary Taint."

The effects of incest on the Freud family are also shrouded in secrecy. One might well expect that the psychological ravages of incest would show itself in the members of Freud's family, his sisters and brothers as well as his mother and his father. And that is just the case.

There were four sisters and one ten-year younger brother in Freud's immediate family. Of the "several sisters and younger brother" that Jacob raped, there is evidence of serious psychological problems with two of the sisters, and serious problems with the youngest brother, Alexander—to say nothing of our serial killer Sigmund himself. Information on the other two daughters is missing, as Freud did not discuss any problems they had. One of the sisters, Adolphine, never married and apparently lived with her father and mother until they died. All of Freud's four sisters perished in Nazi concentration camps. Freud did not take them with him when he fled Vienna, citing as his reason they were too old. All of them were younger than him.

Alexander, Freud's 10 year younger brother was said by Freud to be "very

strange." This remark, coming from Freud, who did not easily consider severe psycho-neurotics and even psychotics "strange," would seem to indicate a rather serious condition. In the Fliess letters, Freud also referred to Alexander as a "miserable rascal." He had serious problems with his head. What those serious problems were was not detailed in the letters. Probably severe headaches or some kind of nasal problems, problems which Freud shared. Possibly Fliess had operated on him for hysteria, as he had on Freud and other members of his family. "He is still complaining, as far as *antipodisch* is concerned." The term, made up by Freud, apparently plays off the words "anti" ("against") and "popo" (colloquial for "behind," "bottom" or "backside") and the English colloquial for "father" (Pop). Recalling that Freud stated he had been raped by Jacob, and that his symptoms were the result of this rape, Freud's remark that Alexander "is still complaining" is most revealing. Probably it refers to some kind of anal problems Alexander habitually experienced.

Alexander was declared by Freud to be a "very tortured neurasthenic." Neurasthenia is, according to Freud, a condition related to a "hereditary taint." Freud worried a lot about Alexander and his condition and had "fears for his future." Enigmatically Freud exclaimed of him "if only none of his former infections is slumbering in the womb of time." What Freud meant by these "former infections" is not spelled out by him, but it is reasonable to assume they related, in Freud's mind, to developmental phases resulting in part from premature sexual development brought on by sexual assault. At least that was Freud's theory of infections which he and Fliess were hatching about the time of the remark.

Marie Freud, Freud's sister, married her cousin Moriz Freud who Freud suspected of being a sex pervert. Marie herself was always "isolated and rather peculiar," and was "pathological" in her parsimony, or spend thriftiness. All three of her children were hysterical and the youngest and most talented "severely so." Freud stated what he thought referring to his cousin who married his sister, "I doubt the father is innocent in this case either." Freud stated the father, Moriz Freud, himself suffered from "pseudologica fantastica" -- a term of Freud's own indicating he was given the man was given to irrational fantasies. Though Freud presumed he, too, had incest with his children, he was "otherwise good to his family."

Sophie: Sophia was a gentle child who in later years changed greatly. She developed "alarming toxic manifestations." She, too, like Freud had a septic

problem and also like Freud experienced "enormous acceleration of pulse, cardia dyspnea, arrhythmias, and septic confusion." She also became subject to "a kind of toxic mania."

Rose: Rose was declared by Freud to be neurasthenic.

Freud, claimed to have raped or fantasizing raping his half-sister, Pauline, (nominally Freud's half-niece) with the assistance and participation of John, to whom Pauline was a full sister. Freud also suggests he had sexual relations with John himself and also found the same incestuous impulses in himself for two of his own daughters, Mathilda and Anna -- the latter of whom later herself became a famous psychoanalyst.

Freud's father's mother had the same last name as his wife; Freud's sister married her cousin, and it was planned that Freud would marry his half-sister, Pauline.

Further, there is a suggestion in the record that Freud carried on sexual liaisons with his sister-in-law, Minna Bernays, who lived with Freud's family. Sexual relations with a sister-in-law is incest in a Jewish family. Freud's own sister, Anna, married his wife's brother, Eli Bernays. Alexander, Freud's brother, lived in the Bernays' home even before Freud and Martha became engaged. Martha's mother, Pauline, also lived for a time in the Freud household. Despite these obviously close relations, Freud had to keep the "terrible secret" of their engagement from Martha's mother, who opposed the alliance. Freud was *very jealous* of his betrothed Martha's relationship with her own brother Eli and, at one point, threatened to "inform" on him to his employer. Whatever Freud had on him, Eli who was feuding with Freud was forced to capitulate to his demands. Ernest Jones says of this situation that *he could not talk about it*. Freud forbid Martha to live with her brother before they got married! Freud's expression of jealousy has all the earmarks of sexual jealousy.

Amalia, Freud's mother, probably had children, as Freud suspected, with Jacob *and* both of his son's (or her sons-in-law) Emmanuel and Philipp. Freud's true father being, we contend, Emanuel, his supposed half-brother. Why should Freud not have sex with his mother, everyone else seems to be doing so?

Examining the family of Freud's father (Emanuel), he had three children,

Samuel, Pauline, and Bertha. Pauline went insane, and neither Pauline nor Bertha ever married, and lived at home with their father their whole lives. Samuel also never married. Two other children by Emanuel were completely hidden and were not even known to have existed prior to my research which discovered their birth certificates but no death certificates. By 1875 they were no longer in existence. At least they are not mentioned in Freud's letters from Manchester, England back to Vienna when Freud was visiting there in the summer of 1875. These children were named Elizabeth and Mathilda and were born in 1863 and 1865 respectively.

Concerning Jacob Freud's background, he had five brothers. One of them was put in prison for 10 years, presumably for financial fraud or counterfeiting. The true charges against him are not known. One of Jacob's brothers' gave birth to five children. Of these five children, one was an encephalitic, one went insane and one committed suicide. The other brother's background is completely obliterated from the record. He may have been Mortiz, whom Freud suspected of being a sex pervert who had incest with his children. Freud, recounting this family background in a letter to his fiancé, Martha, ended with the statement, "As you can see my family suffers from a genetic taint." But this may have all been the result of incest. The issue should be examined more closely and when the "sealed" records of family letters are opened I confidently predict other "surprises" from the Freud family will emerge. [The predictions contained here, made over 20 years ago, have come true, with publication of the *Freud's Silberstein Correspondence* where early evidence of incest comments, suggesting Freud was having sex with his sisters].

Martha Bernays & Freud

Did Martha Bernays also come from the same Jewish cult background of crime and incest. Her father, as also the case with Freud's uncle, Joseph, was sentenced to prison for a number of years for fraud (its believed to be 10 years, the number of years needs to be verified). He died a couple years after being released. The police records are being investigated. Martha also had a brother who died at seventeen. His death certificate is being searched for in order to determine if there was a relationship between the father's imprisonment and his son's death. To date the matter is unresolved.

When Martha married Freud she was well aware he was brutal, a tyrant, and

meant to control her life and have her submit to his will in all things. She knew he was obsessed with ambition at any cost, that he was murderous, and that his family had a "genetic taint." Her brother, Eli, made it quite clear that he thought Freud was "brutal." Martha's mother said Freud was "pathological" and acted like a "cry-baby" when he didn't get his way. "The Greatest Jew, The Greatest Person, of the Modern World" a "cry-baby" well into his 30's!

Freud had threatened to kill Martha and himself if ever she were to leave him. She knew Freud had threatened to "inform" on her brother, and he demanded she renounce her relationship with her mother and her brother. She knew from letters written to her that he liked to torture animals, and that he took a perverse delight in the death of other people. He had described his desire for her as "gigantic," and even "monstrous." A normal young lady, from a healthy family would not likely have had a thing to do with him. Last, but not least, she saw in Freud the very image of her own father (the one imprisoned for 10 years). It was not such a strange world into which she was entering with her marriage to Freud. Indeed, they had lived in each other's worlds for some time.

So, to repeat Jones question as to why just this man to bring to the world the theory of universal incest and murder -- Freud's own family history, seems to answer, quite nicely, the question. But incest was only one of the "terrible secret" which he felt would one day come out. There is more. The other half of the Oedipus complex, besides incest, is murder. Is there a history of murder, too, in the Freud family? Many Freud scholars seem to think so. Martha seems never to have objected to her sister being Freud's second "mother" on his extended travels with her. They traveled as a couple. From earliest years, Freud made it clear that he and Minna were much alike, both passionate and wild, shared the same kinds of interests. Minna for her part, when informed of Freud's early courting of Martha, responded that she was happy he was taking "such an interest in us."

Minna herself, according to the Freud children, was a tyrant, cold, and a severe taskmaster—very much, in fact, like Freud's own mother, Amalia, according to her children.

Jacob's Murder Secret

Jacob Freud's history is a history of shadows and hidden things. Two problems immediately come to the fore. What happened to his first wife, Sally Kanner, the mother of Emmanuel and Philipp? No one knows. She has mysteriously disappeared from the records. Not one word about her remains. She is never referred to by Freud.

In 1852, Emanuel, then 19 and Philipp, then 17 suddenly arrived upon the scene in Freiberg, the place of Freud's birth. They were in the company of a woman who was listed as Jacob's wife, one Rebekka, herself 34 years old at the time. Ronald Clark points out that she could not have been Emanuel's or Philipp's mother as she would have been 11 years old at the time of giving birth to Emanuel. Actually, no one would have assumed her to be the mother, as Emmanuel's mother's name is listed on various surviving official documents, as Sally Kanner. Sally Kanner's mysterious disappearance has been speculated on by the scholars. What intrigued Clark, however, is not so much what happened to Sally as what happened to Rebekka.

In official attestations, preparatory to marrying Freud's mother, Amalia, Jacob Freud, falsely stated he had had only one previous wife, Sally Kanner. Official records indicate otherwise, creating a mystery over why Jacob would lie about how many wives he had. Still more mysterious, is the fact that, as Clark relates, someone went into the official record house in Freiberg and "excised" the name of Rebekka from all official records.

Clark does not enlighten the readers as to the details, but says it was in the early 1960's and that this was well known to the scholars. I have read scores of books and articles on Freud by the scholars and have not found a trace of what Clark stated. He gave no reference for the assertion. Nonetheless, Clark was especially interested in this mystery in the Freud family background. In a private communication he related to this writer that all traces of Rebekka have been obliterated and he had to give up his search of the records in Freiberg and environs. He further informed me that one must view any documents from Czechoslovakia "with extreme caution" and expressed the opinion they were not reliable. When queried what evidence he had for the claim of corrupt records he said he didn't have any. One wonders what was going on with this?

A number of Freud scholars have taken up the issue. French psychoanalyst, Marie Ballamy, after a detailed examination of the Freud's works, concluded in her book, *Psychoanalyzing Psychoanalysis*, that Jacob

was probably a murderer and killed Rebecca. She examines what she appropriately calls Freud's "religion of murder," and sees in the influence of Jacob the motive forces of Freud's theoretical ideas.

When a detailed examination is made into who Jacob was, little is learned. He was a dealer in animal fat and skins. Documents indicate he was fined for not reporting for compulsory military service. In other records, as indicated, he lied about his previous marriages and had no visible means of income. More personally, he was described by Freud as a kind of Mackintosh. "Frequently grouchy," he was also one of the "greatest optimists" in the family. Like many perverts he appeared normal and his sadistic inner life (and outer life as well) was kept secret. Much may be learned when the Library of Congress is forced to release many letters which he wrote, but which are sealed from inspection. It will serve little purpose to speculate on Jacob's nature and personality at this point. Those who have done so, to date, are generally Jewish racial (and/or religious) Freudians who seek to make the sex pervert serial killer a saintly man, indeed—indeed, a Talmudic scholar, as part of their propaganda program for their Idol, The Golden Sigi (the name given him by his mother).

elm

(**Note:** we will report further on Freud's Jewish incest cult family in an upcoming review of a *very* chauvinistic Jewish view of Freud published in *Australasian Psychiatry*, an article "Soaring on the Wings of the Wind: Freud, Jews and Judaism" by Robert Kaplan (2009)—which provides further details of Freud Family Jewish Incest Cultism. Of course its author tries to make a "silk purse out of a sow's ear"—to be extraordinarily charitable in describing it. Kaplan's conclusion gives a sense of the whole "varnish" job. His conclusion states:

Freud, despite a deliberate attempt to play down his Jewish origins to deflect anti-Semitic attacks, is the most representative Jew of his time and his thinking and work represents the finest manifestation of the Litvak mentality.

Of course, for the Jewish Freud-Believers they don't want anyone to "play down" Freud's Jewishness but to proclaim and exalt it, as he does in his article. Obviously, anyone who says anything negative about the "sacred

one” must be a deranged anti-Semite. This, of course, would include all the very many Jews who have assisted this writer in helping to bring the truth of Freud to the world. Hopefully, all those Freud-intoxicated Jewish scholars will themselves cease slandering the Jewish race and the Jewish religion and Jewish culture with their unholy advocacy of their Modern Murder Messiah: Sigmund Freud as one of the Jewish nation’s “finest” manifestations.)

Eric L. Miller, 2014