

2014
JAN

FREUD, PROFILED: SERIAL KILLER

(TYPE: ROMAN EMPEROR)

[Sigmund Freud, the Father of Psychoanalysis, is profiled and typed, based upon the murders he committed, his “fit” with other Serial Killers in terms of personality type, family background, confessions of his innermost passions and habitual obsession with murder and established “profile” criterion of Serial Killer Characteristics developed by leading experts in the field and the F.B.I. Behavior Science Section]

©ERIC MILLER, JANUARY, 2014



SIGMUND FREUD PROFILED: SERIAL KILLER

Copyright, Eric L. Miller
New Directions Publishing
San Diego, CA



TYPE: ROMAN EMPEROR

"In sadistic persons who subject others to torture, we see most vividly the quest for omnipotent control. As Kernberg (1967) has shown, this is a feature common to many borderline persons as well. In the case of the sadist, however, it is an omnipotent control carried to the furthest possible extreme, where (often enough) a brutish non-entity suddenly takes on the trappings of a Nero or a Caligula. The quest in the sadistic killer is for something even beyond the omnipotent control: the quest is instead for the complete subjugation and the slow and painful destruction of other human beings. This has led Wilson and Seaman (1992) to refer to the psychopathy of such killers, aptly, as the "Roman Emperor syndrome."

"Sadistic Personality in Murderers"

Michael H. Stone, in *Psychopathy: antisocial, criminal, and violent behavior*, 1998, The Guilford Press, New York, NY

CHAPTER ONE

In 1991 the hideous deeds of a young man in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Jeffery Dohmer, became public and horrified the world. A Serial Killer, Dohmer's apartment was filled with body parts of scores of victims. In his refrigerator he kept hunks of human meat upon which he dined. In his room, numerous human skulls were found which had been cleaned and even painted in bright colors. A terrible stench of rotting human flesh hung in the air in and about his apartment. But no one investigated the strange odor. The tragic horror of the situation was intensified when it was later learned that a young Asian boy of 14 had, shortly before discovery of the gruesome situation, run out of Dohmer's apartment naked and bleeding. Stopped by the police, the young Asian, drugged and nearly unconscious, was returned to his tormentor when Dohmer came out and assured the police they were lovers. It was only a lover's spat.

There is reason to believe the police didn't want to know the truth of the situation. No honest investigation was made. Attempts by neighbors to get help for the boy were rebuffed by the police. The situation was "taken care of." The boy, who by Western standards looked more like 11 or 12, had been wandering the streets, naked, bleeding profusely from the anus, drugged and unable to talk. Despite the boy's desperate condition, the police *returned* him to Dohmer. It is hard to believe Dohmer himself presented a normal appearance before the police that night. In any case, within minutes after the police left, Dohmer slit the boy's throat. Another name was added to the list -- apparently with complete confidence the police would never follow-up on the status of the boy. Sixteen of Dohmer's victims have already been accounted for, more yet may be discovered.

Had the police attempted to look into the situation, they would have discovered that Dohmer had a police record and had previously been convicted and imprisoned for sex crimes.

The case of Dohmer stimulated, once again, the public's fascination with the Serial Killer and the strange drama of human depravity involved. Serial killing, a uniquely human phenomenon is also paradoxically an *inhuman* activity -- the work of moral monsters. Serial Killers do not kill for food, unless they have already acquired the taste for human flesh. They do not kill out of fear of their own lives, or to further a political cause, or even for specific acts of revenge. They appear to kill primarily for the pleasure experienced in the act of murder. It energizes them, lifts their spirits, and quiets their nerves. A successful killing is like a good meal after a great hunger, or special fun after a period of terrible boredom. It leaves a pleasant after-glow. On a recent TV show featuring live interview with Serial Killers from prison, most of them talked about the good feeling the killer got from murdering. The murder was "exciting," "enjoyable," it was like a "terrible burden being lifted."

As to the fate of the victim and their cruel sufferings the Serial Killer is stone-cold, unfeeling, without pity or remorse.

Obviously all Serial Killers are not the same though they have much in common. Some are cannibalistic and have sex with the murdered corpses, like Dohmer. Some disfigure their victims, some merely suffocate them; some do it with a knife, hypodermic needle, gun, or other means. For some, the murder itself is enough, without the need of brutalizing or chewing on the bones. But we must not think that cannibalistic and necrophiliac tendencies stir only in the worst cases of the Serial Killer. Such impulses are to be found, in varying degrees, in many Serial Killer types -- including Sigmund Freud.

However much Serial Killer's are differentiated in the individual case, all of them have much in common. What they have in common is called by forensic science their "profile." To

forensic science the Serial Killer is different from the mass murderer who, in a single act, may take the lives of many persons. He is different from killers who open fire at a mall, set fire to a nightclub, or places a bomb in an airplane. It is not a single episode or situation which makes a person a Serial Killer. It is a continuing state of mind, a criminal state of mind of the worst kind imaginable.

Serial Killer Types

Famous names of Serial Killers readily come to mind: Jack the Ripper (believed by many to have been a doctor, because of his surgical techniques in hacking up his victims - 23 victims; the Boston Strangler (strangled mostly women - 10 victims; the Zodiac Killer (chose his victims with astrology) - 20 victims; the Manson Family (butchered and disemboweled victims) - 3 victims; Cardoza (mostly homosexual murders with necrophilia - 30 victims); Son of Sam (shot women - 7 victims). Many more, unfortunately, could be mentioned.

Almost daily, it sometimes seems, many recent names of Serial Killers are quickly being added to the list, most recently Gary Ng, a Marine Sergeant, indicted for 17 murders but still at large. Not only is the population of Serial Killers increasing but the numbers of their victims as well. Here are a few of the more recent examples, along with a case, of particular interest to this investigation, from the 1940's.:

The Good Nurse, Liza Mills, was an LVN. She is believed to have murdered perhaps as many as 40 infants by giving them lethal injections in hospital and doctor office settings. She enjoyed the thrill and excitement generated around the death scene, in which she was in attendance as a nurse -- having herself caused their mortal condition. Apparently her spree started first by bringing the infants to near death then "saving" them so she could be hailed as a

heroine. Later, she found it more exciting to just be done with it and kill them. Instead of near lethal doses, she administered lethal doses. Did she *decide* to kill again or find herself "unconsciously" motivated? Whatever the case for her "unconscious" motivations she was extremely crafty and cunning -- requiring considerable mental alertness -- in both the killing and covering her tracks.

An epidemic of infant deaths ceased when she left the hospital at which they were occurring. The hospital reportedly covered up the murders out of fear of massive legal suits against them.

The Good Nurse, herself had two children, which she appears to have treated well. Always ready to help others, she was considered an exemplary nurse. In fact, she was a conniver all her life. At 32 she tricked a 19 years old man into marrying her by claiming she was pregnant. Her tubes, in fact, had been cut long before. The doctor who employed her confronted her with her crimes. The Good Nurse, knowing she had been found out, suddenly assumed her real form. The doctor testified she felt her sudden "coldness" and knew she was facing "a very evil person."

The Good Doctor Dr. Periot was a doctor in France who active as a Serial Killer during and right after World War II. When he was away from his house, a glut of dead and half burned bodies was accidently found in the Good Doctor's basement furnace. 17 bodies could be distinguished, but there was another large mound of ashes also containing the remains of corpses. Dr. Periot separated, apparently with great care, the flesh from his victim's bones like Dohmer. Whole rib cages were skinned and found scattered on the floor along with hands, arms, and other body parts.

Dr. Periot's whole life showed a pattern of criminality. He had been diagnosed as "neurasthenic" - the same condition Freud diagnosed in himself. Dr. Periot was an outrageous liar and claimed he could cure everything from the common cold to rare diseases. He was as brutal of a killer one can imagine, yet

hundreds of his patients swore by him. Dr. Periot would travel far distances in the middle of the night to help his patients. Often he would forget to even charge them. His patients were in shocked disbelief when they discovered he was a homicidal maniac, a Serial Killer. As Dr. Periot was a doctor and had many personality traits in common with Freud, we shall have occasion to return to him.

The Good Psychoanalyst Dr. John Rozen, a Freudian psychoanalyst, subjected his therapy patients to cruel and inhuman treatment. Some patients were locked in small rooms, bolted with two by fours, and containing only a pot for a toilet. He sexually and physically assaulted some patients. He beat patients with his fists and murdered others. Recent disclosures of this case have met with stony silence from the professional psychiatrists and psychoanalysts. Here was one of their own. Dr. John Rozen was a prominent Freudian psychoanalyst; in fact he was referred to as one of psychoanalysis's leading "stars." **SALLY ZINMAN**

The Prophet & The Cult: In a recent book, *The Prophet of Death* (1991), the case of another Serial Killer, Jeffery Ludson, is explored. This Jeffery fancied himself an instrument of God and ritually executed all members of a family of five, one at a time, beginning with the oldest and ending with a beautiful little girl of 6 years old. The victim sacrifices were bound and taped, leaving only space for their eyes to see. Jeffery had his victims put in a pit, and so the horrified victim could witness their own execution, he put a bullet in their heads, one at a time. Jeffery was absolutely pitiless and had no remorse at all for the deaths he caused. To this day he professes his right to "obey" God, despite mortal laws.

Jeffery was a cult leader of an off-shoot group of Mormons. We will have cause to return to him as his profile has much in common with Freud, who also fancied himself a death messiah. It would be hard to "cure" a Serial Killer who refuses to admit he did

anything wrong. But it appears he can be stopped, Jeffery Ludson was given the death sentence and now resides on death row.

The Prophet's Wife: Jeffery Ludson's collaborators in the murders included his wife. She now claims she was suffering at the time from the "battered wife syndrome." She took part in the murders and had known her husband was a crook, a liar, and a thief for years before he proclaimed his new lie of being God's prophet. Yet, she claims she believed he really was a new messiah. Now she is on the bandwagon of the "woman's rights" issue and loudly claims, from prison, that if her situation is not properly understood, "millions of women will suffer" because of it. Other witnesses, who well knew her, refute her words that she was abused and without "free will." She was an active member of all her husband's criminal activities. She herself was a criminal of the same kind and manifests the same characteristics.

All of the above Serial Killers put themselves in a position of dominance and control over the lives of others. Absolutely indifferent to the rights and pleas for mercy from their victims, they loudly scream over the criminal justice system violating their rights.

Beyond Good & Evil: Human Beings With Inhuman Souls.

General Schwartzkropf, when asked to comment on Sadamm Husein's behavior in the recent war observed that, so far as he was concerned, anyone who would set fire to a whole country after being defeated, out of mere perversity, was not only a criminal but "sub-human." Schwartzkropf's diagnosis of Sadamm would probably make many a psychiatrist and psychotherapist shudder. For if there were really a class of people recognized as

sub-humans, what need would we have of highly expensive psychoanalysts when it comes to dealing with them? Instead of pondering theories of the mind, we might simply adopt the biblical "diagnosis:" "By their deeds ye shall know them."

By designating someone as "sub-human" there is perhaps an implication that they are disposable, and like a social poison or disease should be eradicated. No doubt that was exactly what Schwartzkropf had in mind. Sadamm is a vicious and inhumane enemy a man who was, and is, prepared to kill anybody and everybody if it serves his purposes. One suspects Schwartzkropf, and most of the world for that matter, would have greeted news of Sadamm's death, as the news of Hitter's death was greeted -- with a sigh of relief. It is not Schwartzkropf's "psyche" that needs to be examined, nor do we need to examine Sadamm's psyche either. Schwartzkropf showed himself to be an extremely humane person, who's purpose was to defeat the enemy and cause as little destruction of life and property as possible. The opposite of Sadamm. Examining Sadamm's psyche will not change who he is.

Should we hold dear the life of all, even a sub-human, if by holding that life dear we expose innocent human life to the insane cruelty of the sub-human? Sub-human or not, the Serial Killer, whether "sick" or "insane" is a *criminal* and *morally*, if not legally or medically, diseased. Any psychological diagnosis of the Serial Killer failing to embody that fact as a primary element of the diagnosis is a diagnosis in league with the criminal. Let us be clear about one thing. A Freudian diagnosis of the Serial Killer, or in fact any murderer, primarily serves the interests of exculpating the criminal from his actions. The reason for this is simple. Freud, himself a Serial Killer, created a psychology intended for purposes of the "defense." As we learn more about Sigmund Freud, it will become quite clear why Freud curiously initially called his psychology "The Defense." The implicit assumption of Freudian psychoanalysis is non-responsibility due to uncontrollable

unconscious forces. A force Freud called the “Es” (in German) or the “*It*” in English . It was the *It* that made him do it!

The Serial Killer is the most depraved of all criminals. A creature of the dark, he lies in wait upon his next victim, sometimes with great patience. It may be a six month old infant in the crib, a prostitute roaming the streets, a child on the playground, an office worker at their desk. Any defenseless person caught in an unsafe place, made unsafe by virtue of the presence of the Serial Killer, may be a target. Anyone vulnerable, upon whom he can work his dirty deeds, is a prospect for "acquisition" or "sacrifice" -- if he believes he can get away with it and the prey is worth the having. He stalks his victims with a ruthlessness seen in no other creature on this planet. No other known creature kills primarily for the pleasure of killing and killing of its own kind.

The Serial Killer salivates over the idea of completely dominating the life of a helpless human being as the victim's life is bled away. Gleefully, he contemplates the death-dates of his victims. The Serial Killer does not so much "give in" to committing horrible deeds, he simply can't resist the pleasure experienced by the murder. He believes he has an inalienable *right* to indulge himself in whatever he wants to do. In Freud's own words he can permit himself doing a "small wrong." After all, the Serial Killer believes himself to be one of the truly Superior Ones, those to whom murder is permitted and whose permission they require from none but themselves. .

The Serial Killer is an alert and successful criminal who time after time gets away with it. That is why he is called a Serial Killer. The Serial Killer takes pride in his unique place among the most terrible of criminals. He is in a class by himself. Nobody seems smart enough to catch him up. And with success comes carelessness, boldness, going too far, attracting attention sorely desired but highly dangerous. The Serial Killer desperately fantasizes being a Super Human because he knows himself to be a Sub Human.

The Serial Killer appears to have a near physical hunger for killing. He thrills in the sensation of the power of life and death over others, his ability to take precious human life and turn it into dead meat. In the act of murder, the terrible void at the center of his being is somehow empowered, enhanced, re-energized, the Serial Killer is reborn. After the death meal, the Serial Killer often confesses to feeling "normal." Serial Killers can make a sandwich after a murder, go to the movies, visit with friends, put the milk out for the cat, or help an old lady across the street. Curiously, the Serial Killer can be more dangerous when he is in his most rational state of mind. It requires an alert state of mind to plan and execute a premeditated murder without getting discovered. The craving for normalcy that the Serial Killer most wants satisfied, however, can only be temporarily achieved through evil deeds.

The Serial Killer is most often described as a kind of addict. Murder is his addiction, the thrill achieved in murder his "kick." This addiction requires a maintenance "fix." At first, the experience is wonderfully exhilarating, later the fix is needed to just feel normal again. It is a hard habit to break, the hungering sensation to consume another life returns. Between murders, they often play back video or sound recordings or look at photos made of their previous murders. This voyeurism provides a surrogate death-meal until their next feeding.

How many Serial Killers, if any, give up their monstrous habits is unknown. Whether, after a few murders, they can cease altogether their killing, or whether they may be subject to a renewed "outbreak," has not been determined. Perhaps it never can be determined. It is not unusual that serial killings will stop abruptly. The police never know if the killer has left the area, died, quit killing, is in jail on some other offence, or is just keeping a low profile. Perhaps the truth is "once a Serial Killer always a Serial Killer." To my knowledge no serial killer has ever been "cured." How could one even decide such a question? Does the Serial Killer *choose* to kill or is he under the influences of "unconscious" forces,

over which he has no control? Does the Serial Killer kill because his mind is diseased, or is his mind diseased because he is a killer and his "human side" revolts against the inhumane hybrid inside of him?

Not many months ago and man who raped and cut off the arms of a young girl about 10 years old was released from prison. He was a repeat offender and was obviously capable of the most hideous of crimes. How many victims he actually had no one knows. It would be a mistake to think we know all about the man's history. The community in which the man was to be released protested vehemently, but he was released anyway, into another community where the public would not know him. Did the psychoanalyst's give him a clean bill of health? Were the probation officers merely doing their unavoidable duty? I do not know enough of the details of this case to venture an opinion. But, if the probation officers and psychiatrists were sure that he was "cured" it might not be a bad idea of releasing him directly into a community with a high population of psychiatrists and related legal professionals -- specifically, if possible, where the ones involved in the case lived. Of course, no one would wish that on anyone. In any case, who would trust their unprotected life, or the unprotected lives of their loved ones, to someone who "used to be" a Serial Killer, or who "used to" cut off the arms of children after sexually brutalizing them? Is there not some point at which we must all cry, "Stop." Whoever you are or whatever you think you know, "Stop."

The Right to Kill the Right to Lie

The life of the Serial Killer is dominated by lies. He feeds upon lies, uses them to weave his death-traps, to hide the leprosy of his moral condition. The Serial Killer, like any one, may shake hands with his neighbors, wish them good day with a smile, bid his fellow workers good-night in a pleasant voice and play sweetly with his children at home. The Serial Killer may be a Sunday

school teacher, a professor, a nurse, policeman, a psychiatrist, politician, a general laborer or anybody. On the surface he or she usually appears as normal as anyone, sometimes even especially nice, courteous, and helpful.

But it is all a lie. The Serial Killer is far from being a normal person and well knows it. His life, like Mephistopheles, is completely dominated by the "spirit of lying," death and denial. In public, before the eyes of the world, the Serial Killer takes great pains to pass himself off as normal, even better than normal. The Serial Killer must constantly lie to prevent the truth of his inner nature from becoming known. He is especially alert and constantly on guard for making a mistake -- a slip here, a slip there. . . something written down. . . a stray piece of evidence. . . -- any thing at all may bring suspicion to him.

The Serial Killer reportedly often comes from a family background of incest and childhood rape. Raised to never betray horrible "family secrets" a deep inner need possesses him to tell on the offending father, mother, or close relative. As he himself was once a helpless victim, so others will be his helpless victims. Taking the American poet Auden's perception, "Those to whom evil is done, do evil in return." But the Serial Killer goes one further. He gives better than he gets, he inflicts damage greater than he ever received. Sometimes he is prepared to murder, as Shakespeare said, "even for an egg shell." But there is no cause behind his slogan, though to lessen his responsibility he will often claim he was serving a "higher cause." The ultimate cause, however, seems to be the lust to kill itself. That is the sole defining factor between the Serial Killer and the vast, overwhelming majority of mankind.

All speculations about the motivations of the Serial Killer somehow miss the mark. Some of the most ridiculous comments on the Serial Killer come from the psychiatric profession itself. In Dohmer's case, for example, a court approved psychiatrist diagnosed him as "lonely." The psychiatrist believed Dohmer

became a Serial Killer because "his mother left him at home as a child and he killed people so that they wouldn't leave him."

The psychiatrist probably got his idea from Freudian theory and the fact Dohmer kept grisly body parts in his apartment and played with the remains of his victims, their murdered bones were as toys. Certainly something is lacking in this psychiatric evaluation. The analysis claims to find an "explanation" of Dohmer's deed in the fact of his parent's fault. The analysis misses a key fact, which must have been known to the psychiatrist. Dohmer was a pedophile before he turned to murder, necrophilia, and sadistic mayhem. Was it "loneliness" which inspired him to sexually assault children? No doubt the psychiatrist would have reference to Freudianism to explain this complication of Dohmer's "Oedipal complex" -- Freud's own complex which he would have the world believe was a genetic desire to have sex with one's mother and to murder the father. Sham "soul-doctors" schooled in Freud's insane theories pass the theory on as though it were inspired by Holy Writ.

It is claimed that Dohmer, in keeping with the Serial Killer profile, was sexually molested as a child. But was Dohmer really molested? Who says he was, Dohmer? The psychiatrist who begins with the assumption based on theory? There's probably hardly a criminal in the whole criminal system, going for a plea of "insanity" who doesn't know what the psychiatrists want to hear. When a Freudian analyst gets "confirmation" from a patient-inmate of a basic assumption of his theories, he has a "fact" in hand. For this reason many a criminal has conned a psychoanalyst into becoming his "advocate" in criminal hearings. Of course, testifying for the defense, the psychiatrist is *paid* to come to mitigating circumstances; testifying for the prosecution, he is *paid* to arrive at conclusions adverse to the prosecutorial interest. For the defendant, his first goal is to be released, if not at once, then as soon as possible. The issue of what the patient was thinking or not thinking at the time of the crime, whether he could distinguish

"good" from "evil," like a dream, only the dreamer will ever really know what he was dreaming-- no matter how many psychiatrists and Freudian psychoanalyst come upon the scene for *pay*.

One outstanding expert in the field, Dr. Stanton E. Samenow, comments on this issue of the killer knowing how to manipulate the psychiatrists for his own purpose.

When a person commits a particularly sordid crime, his sanity may be questioned. Three men pick up two girls who are thumbing a lift. A joyride turns into a nightmare when the teenagers are driven to a desolate mountainous area where they are bound and repeatedly raped. Two of their tormentors dig a hole and tell them to say their prayers. However, the men decide to prolong the torture and spirit the girls off to an apartment and brutalize them again. The girls are saved by a suspicious neighbor who calls the police. Eventually the court considers the rapists to be "mentally disordered sex offenders" and sends them to a psychiatric hospital, where they spend less than one-third of the time they would have served in prison.

Criminals learn to fool the psychiatrists and the courts in order to serve "easy time" in a hospital with the prospect of getting out more quickly than they would from a prison. From other criminals *and from their attorneys* [emphasis added], even unsophisticated street criminals learn the ploy of insanity. The game is for the criminal to convince others that he is sick so that he can beat the charge. After he is admitted to the hospital, he plays the psychiatric game of mouthing insights and behaving

properly so that he can convince the staff that he is recovering and deserves to be released.

In the field of psychiatry and psychoanalysis, it is not enough to say a person is simply evil or repeatedly gives way to evil impulses. No, they look for explanations of behavior, upon which they can hang one of the tags of their profession, to give an illusion that it is a medical matter for which their services are indispensable, for *pay*. Some primarily search for biochemical explanations, others, like the Freudians, for events and circumstances in the early life of the criminal which "caused" the criminal's condition. Still others find explanations of behavior in the criminal's pattern of free choices, his conscious decision to commit criminal deeds, the criminal state of mind. He knows like everyone else the difference between right and wrong, but chooses to commit the wrong if he thinks he can get away with it.

Not unexpectedly, most psychiatrists would say they give proper attention to both physicochemical and psychological factors. In all cases, however, the good doctors are presuming a physical-psychological determinism -- that somehow the criminal was "forced" into his crime or was not responsible on grounds of insanity. The legal basis for a claim of insanity is based upon three legal tests:

Does he know right from wrong (the McNaughton rule)? Is the crime a product of mental disease or defect (Durham rule)? Does the defendant lack substantial capacity to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of the law (American Law Institute Model Penal Code)?

I dare say, regardless of how heinous the crime, regardless of the circumstances of the crime, defense attorneys have no

problem at all finding psychiatrists to testify, for a pretty penny, that the criminal was "insane." The psychiatric profession, in collusion with the courts and defense attorneys, cede to the psychiatric hospital's staff the determination of whether the criminal is now "cured" or not. Hence, in effect, they preside over the legal system's authority to meet out "justice."

What's In A Name: A Serial Killer By Another Other Name Would Smell As Rank

With the Serial Killer, it seems particularly difficult to come to conclusions about their condition. It just might be this is so because we don't have a category for the "sub-human." We can all understand if not condone, someone killing in the so-called "state of passion" under certain conditions. We can even understand someone "losing it all" and killing everyone in sight, as has happened a number of times in recent months. Examples of these kinds of things abound in our daily newspapers. But, the actions of a Serial Killer, time after time, plotting, planning, preparing to murder innocent people, that is something else. How do we explain it to ourselves?

It is difficult for most to imagine that the sweet face of a new born infant masks a demon from birth. Most probably believe terrible things must have happened in the life of a Serial Killer which greatly influenced, if not determined, his twisted life. Yet, no one has shown, and science can not show, that evil is not the primary ingredient in the make-up of the Serial Killer, whatever else may or may not be true.

I think it would be fair to say there is a liberal presumption that the new-born child is "innocent" at birth, and there is a fundamentalist presumption that we are all "born sinners." Those who believe, or want to believe, all are innocent at birth, even they are often not prepared to accept a simplistic Freudian "cause" and "effect" paradigm where the parents are *always* the primal cause of

the child's problems. Likewise, many a fundamentalist is not prepared to conclude that because we are all "born sinners" we do not have responsibility for our acts. From this point of view, it might be argued because we are born sinners we are completely responsible for our deeds. In any case, in dealing with the Serial Killer, we are going to have to stretch all our concepts to try to describe the indescribable.

In the U.S. alone, millions of American children are reportedly sexually assaulted by their parents or others close to the family each year. But we do not have millions of Serial Killers. Far from it. The discovery of even one of them creates a national sensation and local horror in the afflicted community. Yet, many of these incest-abuse victims (the numbers exaggerated or not) were left alone and not paid proper attention to, like Dohmer. They, too, were "lonely." Dohmer's psychiatric evaluation, it seems to me, is not only worthless but misleading, dangerous and incompetent. The ordinary person almost involuntarily believes the Serial Killer like Dohmer is sick and insane. But is this necessarily the case? Again, Dr. Samenow challenges this point of view:

When a criminal commits a shocking crime, as did Berkowitz and the Tylenol killer, a gut reaction on the part of the average citizen is to say that he must be crazy. But this reveals only something about public perceptions, nothing about the mind of the criminal.

Berkowitz, the reader may remember, was "Son of Sam." It is almost inconceivable that anyone could murder seven women and be thought anything other than insane. Berkowitz at first claimed the Devil was talking to him through his dog and issuing commands to kill. Later he said he had lied. "There were no real demons, no talking dogs, no satanic henchmen. I made it all up via my wild imagination so as to find some form of justification for my

criminal acts against society." Berkowitz said it was simply an "urge to kill" that led him to his brutal murders. But it was not an urge to do a distasteful thing; rather it was an urge to indulge in a wildly exciting pleasure. But does such an appetite for the murder of another human being necessarily mean the person is "insane," or psychotic? That is to say, the criminal could not distinguish, nor had the capacity to distinguish, right from wrong. Is it at all possible that the criminal chooses to be a criminal, opts to commit evil deeds, of the most horrible nature, out of defiance and hatred of the world and all its standards for civilized behavior? Is there even one such person on this planet? And does the possibility exist that it was not his mother or his father or his friends or his social position that made him do it, not a brain tumor or a physiochemical imbalance, but rather himself, of his or her own free evil will?

Diagnosis or Description

It matters little what we call the "condition" of the Serial Killer. Whether it is called "Paranoid Schizophrenic Homicidal Mania," "bad seed," the "sins of the father visited upon the child," or simply "evil," each reader will decide on their own. One thing we do know for certain is that the actions of the Serial Killer is *criminal*, however right or wrong the "diagnosis" of motivation.

However Serial Killers are described or "explained," they have much in common between themselves. They are first and foremost liars; their whole lives are ensnared in a tangle of lies. This point is worth keeping foremost in mind, particularly since the psychiatrist's examination of the criminal's past is based on what he is told by the Serial Killer himself. We can be sure, without fear of contradiction, that Serial Killers are not reliable witnesses of what experiences and thought processes they had as a child if a certain version of it will get them off or a less severe punishment via the "insanity plea." But we can know them by what they do, if we cannot really know them by what they think.

Serial Killers indulge in the most gruesome of crimes often including necrophilia (copulation with corpses) and even cannibalism. They generally have a history of sadism in their background and delighted in torturing defenseless victims such as animals or people. They often come from family backgrounds where crime and incest are prominent. They seldom express remorse for their sick deeds and seem to pride themselves on their indifference to the sufferings of their victims. Moreover, they often possess an insatiable hunger for fame, for being recognized as special, superior to others, better than the next guy. They are ruled by a personal code: "if you cross me you'll pay," and "If you get in my way I'll destroy you." These are typical statements made by Freud in his personal correspondences.

The Serial Killer believes he has a right to murder, believes he is not bound to the laws of morality which bind other mortals. He permits to himself the impermissible. He is at once, in his own imagination a Superman yet he knows himself to be a miserably powerless creature. The Serial Killer can be unbelievably bold and daring and yet, in the center of his being, his craven cowardice seeks victims based on their helplessness. Once caught, they blame their crimes on the influence of others or the "injustice" of their background. Before they are caught they take pride in their crimes. Their victims are often chosen ritualistically, by means of numerology, magic, by orders from "God" or the "Devil."

The victim may have a name, body type, or color of hair in common with a hated figure in their lives; he may be known or unknown to the Serial Killer. The Serial Killer has no problem justifying to himself his *right* to murder. In many cases the Serial Killer merely identifies his victims as The Enemy or a "disposable" person who can serve his purposes. All of them are candidates for Freud's own confession, that he noticed others who got in one way could be gotten rid of "if one desires it." Further, they would subscribe to Freud's observation that the problem is not the deed but covering up the deed.

Even when the Serial Killer is telling the truth, even when he is confessing, he is lying. He may confess to crimes he did not commit and, at the same time hide others from the authorities. He tells the truth about himself only in a context of lies, in order to subvert an understanding of the truth. If the whole truth were to flood the scene, the Serial Killer would be seen for what he is, something less than human, a monster hiding in human form, regardless of the forces that may have contributed to his condition. The nature of the Serial Killer is characterized as a flight from truth and humanity -- the truth of who he really is and the anti-human instrument he has become. While still at large, he is forced into the Underground, he tries to keep up appearances lest he be discovered.

It is supremely ironic that the most famous psychoanalyst of all, Dr. Sigmund Freud, the man who provided much of the language-concepts used to "diagnose" the Serial Killer, was himself one of them. It is likewise tragically ironic that the American legal system gives preferential treatment to those convicted of the most monstrous crimes, and appeal to Freud's theory of the murdering mind of mankind.

* * * * *

In *The Murdering Mind* (1973), Dr. Abrahamsen, a prominent psychiatrist specializing in murderers, presented a detailed psychological profile of the murderer. A nationally recognized top expert on the psychology of the murderer, Dr. Abrahamsen has examined hundreds of murderers over a period of some thirty years. He has provided expert testimony to Senate Hearings on Crime and has participated in some of the most notable criminal trials in the country. An unabashed Freudian, Dr. Abrahamsen sees murder through the lens of Freud's own confessional theories. Though an expert psychoanalytic psychiatrist, specializing in murder, his eye was not keen enough to

see that his own profile, "Predominant Characteristics of the Murderer" fits Freud's own life to a tee. The fact is he shows no knowledge or awareness of Freud's own personal life—as is true of many a Freudian psychoanalyst.

Were we to take Abrahamsen's word for it, he did not come to his knowledge of the murderer by reading Freud, but primarily from his own professional experience. It is strange, then, that everything we know about Freud precisely fits Dr. Abrahamsen's profile. Yet, in Abrahamson's dedication he tells his indebtedness to Freud, "This book follows the fundamental views of Sigmund Freud, without whose indomitable research into the working of the human mind it could not have been written."

I would ask the reader to remember that these supposedly "indomitable" researches were primarily derived from Freud's analysis of *his own mind*, not the mind of mankind. Far from it. Freud makes the case that murder is a natural state of mind whereas, in fact, it is rare. This is especially true when we do not deviate from our focus of the Serial Killer. "Only rarely," Dr. Abrahamson observes, "is the human mind obsessed with the total impulse to murder." The Serial Killer would come closest of all to a mind totally obsessed with murder.

In keeping with Freud's theories (confessions of Freud's own background), Dr. Abrahamson believes that it is from childhood experiences that the Serial Killer emerges. "As a student of Freud, I strongly believe that the mind of the murderer is charged with a turbulence of emotions stored from early childhood. When these often repressed emotions are tantalized, made hot, stirred up or activated, the mind, particularly when aroused or frustrated, becomes violent. And so it is that a person who may appear quite normal and well-adjusted on the surface becomes possessed by a mind that murders."

Before turning to Dr. Abrahamson's profile of the murderer, another point needs to be made, sketchily here, and later detailed in another chapter. The following facts are critical in forming a

perspective on the relationship of the profile of the murderer, Freud's theory, and Freud's personal life.

1. Freud first based his psychological theory on the premise that all persons suffering from severe "repressed" childhood experiences, which charged their emotions with murderous turbulence, had been sexually abused as children. He claimed to a "certain knowledge" about this matter based, in part, upon his own family situation and the fact that his father was a sex pervert who raped Freud's own siblings and, no doubt, himself as well.

2. Freud could not openly admit this "certain knowledge," so he changed his theory. Instead of explaining repression as the result of *actual* experiences he introduced the "Oedipus complex." The theory of repression, then, originated not in deeds done to a child, but conflicts inborn within the child himself. A biologically determined "death drive" acquired at birth supplanted the reality of incestuous assaults in *Freud's own family*.

3. Freud claimed that when he discovered the so-called Oedipus complex he had discovered that the deepest motivation in his own mind was a desire to murder his father and have sex with his mother. Of course, he could not hold himself up as an exception in this matter so he announced his idea was a universal truth. Hence, Freud tried to dissolve the terrible uniqueness of his own serial killer nature into an anonymous generality that applied to all people.

4. The most convincing specific case history evidence Freud ever gave of a mind haunted by a passion to murder was his own. He admitted his own turbulent emotions often turned into a rage and a desire to inflict gruesome punishments on others, even strangers. He also confessed that this attraction for the gruesome and his murderous rages were more extreme than in most people.

Specifically Freud claimed his own rage vented itself in a desire to murder many people, including a younger brother, a slightly older nephew, his father, a sister, various friends and associates and opponents of his work. In his analysis of himself he compared his own situation to that of a homicidal maniac and said he had "wanted to confess to something analogous." Freud's own personal doctor, Dr. Max Schur, in his biography of Freud admitted that Freud had an omnivorous appetite to murder people, including his family members. Dr. Max Schur was a former President of the American Psychoanalytical Society and the truth of what I am saying can be easily found in his book, *Freud Living and Dying* and in my own work outing Freud as a Serial Killer.

5. The prototypical killer Freud had in mind was himself. That is the reason Freud's own profile fits so exactly the "classical Freudian profile" of the so-called Oedipal complex at the heart of motivation of the murdering mind.

Dr. Abrahamsen's profile is here quoted in full in italics. Below the italic are specific biographical correlations from Freud's personal life, which I have added. The details of these biographical correlating entries will be dealt with throughout this book, with appropriate references.

1. Extreme feelings of revenge and fantasies of grandiose accomplishments which may result in the acting out of hateful impulses. A deep seated feeling of revenge is the prominent characteristic of Freud's personality. The theme of revenge reverberates throughout his writings. He himself confessed that the feeling of revenge was much stronger in him than normal people. His favorite quotes comes from writings of a German poet, Heine, who said that if God wanted to really do something for him, then he would line the streets with the hanged bodies of his enemies. On hearing certain words, reminding him of the names of his past

victims he would be re-stimulated to murderous feelings of revenge, as though he could still not forgive them, for whatever triggered their murders.

2. Loneliness, withdrawal, feelings of distrust, helplessness, fears, insignificance, loss of self-esteem, caused by early (pre-Oedipal) childhood experiences. This description precisely follows Freud's own version of his biography. This includes these characteristics having been "caused" by early (pre-Oedipal) childhood experiences between the ages of 1 and 2 years. It is remarkable in itself that Dr. Abrahamsen was able to obtain reliable "case histories" of murderers between the ages of 1 and 2. His analytical skills must have approached Freud's and his ability to corroborate his 1 to 2 year old biographies uncanny. Of course, Abrahamsen is full of hog-wash, like his "master" Freud. Freud wrote "I have long known my companions in crime between the ages of one and two. . ." It is claimed it was in Freud's own pre-Oedipal period when he first had murderous rages for a little brother allegedly about a year younger and a half-brother, who was only a little more than 6 months older.

From early teens on Freud confessed to an unfathomable loneliness. He repeatedly asserted his feeling of isolation. At fifteen he compared himself to the forlorn Hamlet, lamented he had no friends, no one could understand him. He had enemies by the dozens, he said. He pictured himself as the great lonely genius and promoted this self-image in his propaganda. Frequently, he complained of an incredibly helpless state of mind, he is overcome by forces (he claims) over which he had no control. His fears for his own life were so frequent as to drive him into near suicidal rages. He constantly tried to find out when he would die, feared he would die on specific dates and constantly wished for the deaths of others.

A sudden loss of self-esteem is another pattern in his personality, his life is "worthless," "haunted," condemned to failure. More than once he confessed that people found him an "alien," "strange." In one paragraph he could and often did range from self-intoxication where he was like a god to abysmal worthlessness where he was like a worm. The sudden inflation and deflation of self-esteem is one of the most remarkable and obvious elements in Freud's psychopathic writings.

The so-called "cause" of loneliness, revenge, etc. as included in Abrahamson's description is purely Freudian and does not belong in an "objective" description, not of causes, but personality disorders.

3. *Sexually over-stimulating family situation because of primal-scene experiences.* Again, Abrahamson's description has reference to ideology rather than description, per se. He is a Freudian cult member. Of course, this is Freud's precise personal situation. Indeed, the term "primal-scene" is Freud's own and represents a concept Freud supposedly *proved* by giving examples from his own childhood! Even if we accept the legitimacy of the term "primal-scene" we are nonetheless already talking about *Freud's specific background*. In the Freudian cannon the concept "primal-scene" directly derived from stories Freud told about his own background and his passionate desire to murder his half-brother.

Freud's earliest recollections of events he supposedly repressed centered on being exposed to a "sexually overstimulating family situation." That's where Freud got the idea of the so-called incestuous urges for his mother in the first place. He discovered it in himself and found the root of it in his own reenactment of the "primal scene." He spent the night with her, his mother, he said, became sexually stimulated and fell in love with her. Freud claims he was first sexually aroused by his mother when he was still three years old, but was first sexually assaulted by a nursemaid when he was two years old (elsewhere he identifies his "nursemaid" as

really his mother. It was Freud's theory (and his alleged experience) that he became over-stimulated because of the "primal-scene" experiences -- experiences which, Freud would have us believe, happen to everyone.

Freud's primal-scene, involved the instinctual need to murder and have sex with his mother. He later extended this idea to the origins of the primal tribe of human beings and their ape-like harem struggles. By the age of 7, Freud was having dreams resulting from his sexual "cravings" for his mother and images of sex with his mother in a grave. Freud exalted Death to a biological "urge" and placed this urge at the center of his own psychology and that of the entire human race. The Serial Killer, Son of Sam, likewise confessed to an "urge" for death. Whether he got this explanation from Freud or his own psychopathological criminal experiences is unknown.

4. Errors of spelling or speech related to emotional disturbances in early (pre-Oedipal) childhood experiences. One of the most interesting phenomenon on which prominent Freud scholars invariably comment is Freud's misspelled words and use of his own "invented" or "coined" language. Dr. Abrahamsen observes in his discussion of this issue, that the murderer by creating his own words, is seeking to impose his own inner world upon the world at large. He does not want to be part of the real world. Freud frequently made up his own words, not just technical terms but words used in everyday language. These errors in spelling frequently relate to personal issues involving family or basic emotions about things. Also, he was noted for his errors in speech and he comments on and analyzes these things extensively—deriving his subject matter often from himself. Indeed, there are massive misspellings and new word creations in Freud's use of Spanish, a language in which he frequently wrote long passages and even whole letters.

5. *Tendency toward transforming identification. Blurred self-image; suggestible, impressionable.* Freud's "blurred self-image" is one of the most prominent characteristics of his psychological biography. From teenage years throughout adulthood he frequently confused his identity with some great mythical figure, such as the Devil in Faust, Oedipus, Moses from the Bible and even contemporaries. Freud wrote an analysis about his "confusion of identity" and again gave an example from his own life to make his point, "Acropolis." Freudian "scholars" have written hundreds, if not thousands, of articles on Freud's confusion of identity as this characteristic of his figures so dominantly in his personal and professional writings.

Freud's extreme suggestibility and impressionableness is another major curiosity of his life and, again, a frequent subject of Freud scholars. Freud, for example, hailed his demented lover doctor friend, Wilhelm Fliess, as a "Messiah," a "new Copernicus," someone who had literally gone God himself one better. Fliess's garbage numerology, with which he calculated death-dates, was greeted by Freud as divine truth. Freud was also very superstitious. He loved to calculate people's anticipated death-dates and totally "bought into" Fliess's insane numerological theories. .

Incidentally, additional evidence of Freud's identity problem emerged with publication of his earliest letters, in 1991. These letters show he signed his name, Sigisimund, Sigmund, Cipion, and Berganza and Berganzia. Sigisimund was his birth name, which he changed to Sigmund, then back to Sigisimund. The names Cipion and Berganza were alter ego's of characters in *Don Quixote*, by Cervantes.

6. *Inability to withstand frustration and to find sufficient gratification for expressing hostile aggressive feelings through constructive outlets.* When Freud was really frustrated he wanted to murder, individuals and whole groups of people. He could be frustrated by trifles. The idea that a criminal can find sufficient

gratification for his violent hostilities through constructive outlets is a presumption of Freudianism, not a description of personality traits. Though Freud habitually let fly his completely bitter venom against the world, including his best friends, he could not release enough of it. At the age of 28 he wrote that his desire for revenge was a seething poison that existed at the very core of his being. In his 50's and 60's he could suddenly lash out at an "enemy" and condemn them as "trash." For his worst enemies, he longed for their deaths. The only "constructive outlet" for Freud was writing phony case histories about dreams of the death of his enemies and his analysis of how his death wishes kept cropping up everywhere he turned. This constructive outlet was in fact psychoanalysis, Freud's self-declared maniacal obsession.

7. Inability to change persistent egocentricity, self-centeredness (primitive narcissism) into elements of healthy ideals and conscience (ego ideals and superego elements), resulting in dependency on and contempt for authority. The entire "description" is loaded with Freud theory. But this, too, is pertinent, as it is Freud himself who is being described. Cutting through the jargon, the description says that the killer is both dependent on and contemptuous of key persons or authority figures in his life. Also, that the killer cannot change his extreme egotism into healthy ideals and conscience. Freud lived at home, never worked, and relied on others to take care of him until he was close to thirty years old. His dependency was frequently and terribly complained of by him. He mooched off ever friend he ever had and those who were most generous to him were those whom he most wanted to murder.

The passionate swings in Freud's life from complete submissiveness (to a sexual male partner) and violent need to dominate and destroy all authority except his own is the distinctive feature of his criminal mind. Mirroring his own life, Freud wrote a "case history" of a patient, a homicidal maniac, whom he likened to

himself. Freud also confessed that his extreme feelings of submission and dominance was ruled by a desire to destroy, kill, and torture.

8. *Suicidal tendencies, with depression.* Freud's private letters are filled with horrible depressions, periods when he was depressed enough to realize he was more than half-mad. His depressions were so acute, they left him with feelings of being literally a monster, inhuman. Because of his suicidal and homicidal tendencies he was ordered to stay off cocaine and cigars by his doctor, to lock himself in his room and remain aloof of all company. Freud's personal letters to his fiancé frequently cry out for a desire for suicide. Much as Freud claimed he wanted to commit suicide, he was himself terrified of death and in deep depressions mournfully tried to calculate when he would die or be subject to another attack. That was something for his victims, not himself. Freud's suicidal confessions are really more homicidal. He clung to life tenaciously, under any and all circumstances. Serial Killers who so easily kill others are usually terrified of it happening to them. But there are exceptions. Some, like Dr. Periot faced his own execution with remarkable composure, he even had to be awakened for his execution.

9. *Seeing the victim as the composite picture of murderer's self-image.* This description again fits Freud to a tee and, in fact, is derived from Freud's own experience. Freud often confessed to hiding behind the composite picture of his victims. In Freud's many phony case histories (some partially based on real people, others entirely fabricated) he often introduced elements from his own biography into the fraudulent biography of supposed patients. Freud specifically stated he identified with the name Joseph, who was himself a "composite image" of Freud himself. Freud tells us he identified with "Joseph" because the name Joseph evoked in his mind "crime." The reason for this association of "Joseph" and

"criminal," Freud said, was simply due to the fact that his uncle Joseph was, in fact, a criminal who served some 10 years in prison. Freud specifically stated, in his interpretation of his own dreams, he "hid behind the name of Joseph." In discussions of his identification with his criminal uncle, he specifically discussed that he, Freud, was the "composite image" of this uncle and other of his victims, or would-be victims. More than once Freud related this self-image of being Joseph with dreams and associations involving his desires to murder. Freud also identified with "Moses," Moses I conclude was the Jewish name of Freud's "primal murder victim" and also Moses of the Bible was a murderer. Freud specifically refers to himself as a new "Moses."

10. History of previous antisocial or criminal act associated with threatening or committing murder. Freud had a history of threatening the lives of others, some known to him, others not. He threatened he was going to kill a stranger, a fellow traveler over trifle frustrations. He also threatened to kill his fiancé Martha, who later became his wife. If they parted he told her he would kill her and himself. He frequently played with the idea of killing playmates and fantasized their deaths. At the age of 17 Freud joined a group of political assassins who had regicide as their aim. Freud belonged to a political group which was disbanded by the police for sedition. Freud murdered many people, as I document in other writings.

Abrahamsen is quick to point out that some of these characteristics may be present in the emotionally disturbed who do not commit murder. Nonetheless they are *always* there in the case of the murderer.

* * * * *

Abrahamsen has little to say regarding the mass murderer or the Serial Killer, per se. His work is mostly geared to the thesis that the victim of murderers is really a *co-conspirator* in their own murder, albeit "unconsciously." The Serial Killer is a category which destroys his thesis of intimate psychological interplay between the Murderer and his Victim, which Dr. Abrahamsen thinks is so crucial in murder and which relieves the murderer of much of his responsibility for the crime—in good old Freudian fashion. He does offer, however, a few more details on the profile of the murderer in his more extreme forms.

The profile of the murderer, Dr. Abrahamsen tells us, is to be distinguished from those who are mentally ill. What differentiates them is an "enlarged constellation and marked intensity" of a feeling of "revenge," "search for power," as well as "a lack of self-esteem," and "fear."

Interestingly, it is to Freud's own personal background that Abrahamsen appeals in asserting it is the Oedipal complex problem which is most typical of the repeat-murderer. Specifically, Abrahamsen says, he means the time when the child wanted to murder his father in order to sexually possess his mother (as Freud did, that's where the concept came from, Freud's analysis of his own background). "This extreme form of vengefulness we most often find in the murderer who is capable of killing more than once." The characteristic of "extreme vengefulness" is the very condition to which Freud repeatedly confessed and to which virtually every page of his biography readily attests. Freud wanted to "revenge" himself on everybody, for just about anything. He wanted to revenge himself on a housekeeper because she objected to him spitting on the floor, he wanted to revenge himself on his patients, he wanted to revenge himself on his friends (whom he suspected were trying to poison him), he wanted to revenge himself on his father because he was not noble, on his class-mate because he didn't listen to him. A morbid desire for revenge is the single key characteristic of Freud's deepest emotions. And it is Freud

himself who paints himself in exactly that language in describing his relations with others.

Abrahamson gives a remarkably accurate portrait of Freud in his description of the revengeful murderer.

The prime marks of the murderer are a sense of helplessness, impotence and nagging revenge carried over from early childhood. Intertwined with this core of emotions which color and distort his view of life and all his actions are his irrational hatred for others, his suspiciousness and his hypersensitivity to injustices or rejection. Hand in hand with these go his self-centeredness and his inability to deal with frustration. Overpowered by frequent uncontrollable emotional outbursts, he has a need to retaliate, to destroy, to tear down and kill.

This desire to vent a colossal revenge, "uncontrollable" emotional outbursts fired to retaliate, tear down, and kill is the chief characteristic of the Serial Killer. But are these states, as the Freudians would have it, really uncontrollable?. Or does the Serial Killer prefer and lust for the state of mind of killing?. Does the Serial Killer simply have a preference for Evil?

One of the issues that immediately emerge in a description of the killer's state of mind involves that of "free will." Was the criminal really unable to control himself or did he chose to not control himself? Abrahamson adopts Freud's idea that we all secretly murderers at heart. The public, Abrahamson says "admires" the murderer and his "courage" to do what they are too cowardly to perform. Abrahamson accounts for the public's interest in murder novels and movies as a direct desire to commit murder themselves. He even goes so far as to assert that if the world's murder wishes were accomplished there would be no one alive. Of course, Abrahamson forgets that only one homicidal

maniac's wish for the destruction of the world, would itself be sufficient given his premise. But that the majority of human beings, including those who like horror movies, actually would like to murder someone has much in common with the murderer who actually does murder, is itself nearly an insane proposition. One wonder's does Abrahamsen include himself in the long list of would-be murderers. We certainly, given his premise, cannot exclude him. The definition of the murderer, I would remind him, is someone who really wants to murder someone enough to do it. Would Dr. Abrahamsen charge, under his formula, every mother who ever said in a moment of exasperation, "Those kids are such brats today, I could just kill them."? Or a parent transported with affection, who said, "That baby was so sweet today, I could have just squeezed him to death."

Of course, Abrahamson merely mouths the words of his master, Freud, for whom murder was permissible and justified on the basis that it was an "unconscious act" and everybody has an unconscious desire to murder anyway.

Freud is the only person in history credited with "penetrating" his own "unconscious mind" and revealing the discovery to mankind that we are all murderers and, like him, have sexual cravings for our mothers and want to murder our fathers. If we read carefully Freud's words we hear in them the defense of the killer, who would exculpate himself on the grounds that 1) everybody is a killer anyway, even if only "unconsciously," 2) everyone is strongly motivated by controllable and uncontrollable incest cravings, 3) the killer is basically not really responsible for his deeds, even if he is not technically insane and, 4) a psychoanalyst, armed with his own theory, is needed to explain it all to the world.

Abrahamson's assessment of the murderer is that his accomplice in the crime is his victim; the victim collaborates in creating the condition resulting in murder. Abrahamson also believes most cases of rape are the fault of the woman who is

raped, She seduces the man into raping her with "unconscious" signals. "Girl's complaints that they have been raped are sometimes true, but more often than not they are rooted in their own uncomfortable guilt feelings about having been a willing partner." This would be news to the feminist groups. That over 50% of all girls' rape complaints are not valid and only intended to cover up their own guilt feelings. The victim becomes, once again, the guilty party. The criminal is innocent, or at least partly innocent. It is the intention of Freudian psychoanalysis to leave no body innocent, least of all the victim. Why, the perpetrator of the crime is more likely to be the innocent party after a Freudian analysis is completed! Is this because so many of the Freudian psychoanalysts are themselves sick human beings—and gravitate to the cult due to *their own* illness? Certainly the mother and the father is guilty. It was because of them that the child became a rapist or Serial Killer in the first place. It is amazing that Abrahamson's twisted view of murder was ever allowed into any court. And that he is an "expert witness." One wonders if he also testifies at rape trails for the Defense.

The F.B.I's Working Hypothesis: The Homicide Triangle

F.B.I. Agent, John Douglas, is (was) head of Behavioral Science Unit at the F.B.I. task force responsible for analyzing serial killings and deducing the "type" they are dealing with in a particular case. The Unit is called the Psycho Squad or the Mind Trackers. Agent Douglas in a nationally televised program characterized the Serial Killer as "the worst form of humanity." It is not to psychoanalysis or psychiatry, per se, that the task force turns for needed answers, we are told. Their work is practical, to apprehend the criminal. While a few members of the task force have some limited background in psychology, they primarily do their work as "investigators." It is to the details of the crime that

they turn for hints about what type of murderer they are looking for.

The F.B.I. task force operation is a far cry from a Freudian psychoanalyst, yet, curiously, they seem to take their cue from the Freudians. In Agent Douglas' view, the Serial Killer is a product of his environment, "manufactured by his parents." The childhood of the Serial Killer forms into what they call the "Homicidal Triangle."

The triangle consists of three pronounced characteristics of the Serial Killer: 1) a background of arson (setting fires), 2) a bed-wetting history - enuresis - in later childhood, 3) and a background of child-abuse. Two of these three elements are present, Douglas claims in all cases of Serial Killers. The primary motivation of the criminal is his desire to be an important person, at least to their victim, and to hold the power of life and death over others. "They love to talk about their crimes, but hardly anyone asks them about the details." It is Detective Smith's view that the only way to get inside the mind of these criminals is to talk to them. He has spent numerous hours interviewing such killers as Charles Manson, Son of Sam, and others to "get in their minds."

In a nationally televised interview of a Serial Killer, Agents Tony Daniels and Douglas, provided excerpts from a six hours questioning session with Gary Heidnik, a sex torturer slayer. Heidnik showed little, if any, remorse for his sex torture slayings. Proclaiming that he was fully conscious at all times, Thomas described all the practical steps he had to take to avert detection. And, typically, he had an awareness of the law and was fully conscious that whatever he said would reflect on the issue of his state of mind at the time, from a legal viewpoint. He described how he chained his victims in the basement, raped and brutalized them, how he would turn the radio on full blast so that their screams would not be heard and how he had a hard time deciding what to do with the body. Ultimately he dismembered his victim and cooked the flesh.

As killer Heidnik described the sordid details of his crimes, he could as well been discussing a baseball game. When Agent Douglas asked him if, by torturing his victims, he had wanted to "hurt them" Thomas lit up for a moment, eager to answer the question—apparently surprised at the question's naiveté. "Well, I hope so," he quickly replied. Then, sensing, he might have gone too far in his confessions, he added, "that is, I wanted to shut them up." It was only when it came to discussing his ultimate act, that of chopping up the bodies into pieces and frying some on the stove, that he exhibited an obvious childish delight in what he had done.

A sick smile came to his lips and for a moment he seemed engaged with the thought of his deeds, "I just chop, chop, chop." It seemed apparent he enjoyed more chopping up their dead bodied than just torturing them. In other words he appeared to take great pleasure in repeating the crime in his imagination. This, too, Detective Smith says is a characteristic of the Serial Killer. That is why they make videos or tapes of their murdered victims, between fresh killings.

The idea that the Serial Killer was sexually abused as a child, that he was "manufactured" by his parents or that he was a bed-wetter as a child, or set fires, or enjoyed torturing of animals, is certainly open to challenge. How do they know if the criminal wet the bed as a child? By whose evidence is this "fact" concluded? What is the evidence the Serial Killer was manufactured by his parents and was abused as a child? Are we to rely upon the claims of the "Defense," psychoanalyst, or the word of the Serial Killer, who knows his sentence will be mitigated if these elements are "proved"? What evidence is presented to prove the Serial Killer had a pre-disposition to setting fires, or torturing animals as a child? Without specific factual evidence, which cannot be had in the majority of cases, such statements are mere suppositions.

It is true, however, that most all authorities in the field agree about the fundamental profile of the Serial Killer. That is to

say they agree on the personality type and manifest personality traits, even when there is little or no agreement as to the "cause."

Indeed, the F.B.I.'s view of the matter is not really novel and follows the old patterns. Even before the era of Freudianism an "early psychiatric description of the psychopathic personality listed four childhood symptoms characteristic of that disorder: somnambulism, enuresis, cruelty to animals (particularly decapitation) and arson. The only element not used in the "homicide triangle" is somnambulism, or sleep-walking. Interestingly, Freud found this condition in himself and in a homicidal maniac he was treating and with whom he compared his own situation.

The Criminal Mind

Another leading authority on murder and the criminal mind takes issue with the entire Freudian point of view, whether contained in the views of the psychoanalysts and psychiatrists or the F.B.I. investigators. Dr. Stanton E. Samenow, a clinical psychologist, in a "groundbreaking" book, *Inside The Criminal Mind*, totally challenges the Freudian description of the "etiology" of the criminal killer. While Samenow, and most other authorities, would agree with much of Abrahamson's or the F.B.I.'s personality description of the criminal, as well as the earlier description of the psychopathic personality, still he does not accept the claim as to the "cause" or motivation of the criminal's deeds.

In 1915 Freud stated that we all experience guilt, which is a remnant from the time in our lives when we had erotic feelings toward the parent of the opposite sex (the oedipal period). He contended that children often misbehave in order to be punished, which then relieves that guilt. In "The Ego and the Id," Freud wrote, "It was a surprise to find that an

increase in this unconscious sense of guilt can turn people into criminals." Freud and his disciples extrapolated from findings on neurotics and applied them to criminals, even though they rarely treated criminals as patients. Present-day psychiatrist and psychologists do the same. Instead of seeing the offender as a person who is overconfident, they read into his motivation that he wanted to get caught or may even go a step further and claim that his behavior represented a cry for help.

Dr. Samenow underscores an aspect of the killer that Dr. Abrahamson's discussion hardly covers. The criminal **thinks** differently from other people, he has a criminal mind. He uses that criminal mind to deceive everyone he can for his own purposes. He is an habitual liar, a thief, a finagler, a manipulator of people, places and things. According to Samenow, in most cases the criminal has been engaged in various criminal activities most of, if not all his life. The crimes of the criminal are a result of decisions to commit crimes.

Samenow asserts that there are many myths about the murderer, myths about "passions of crime," the responsibility of other's such as the parents, schools, social conditions, which shape the murderer. In Samenow's view the criminal shapes the world more than the world shapes the criminal. Samenow would completely challenge the F.I.B. agent's assertion that the Serial Killer is "manufactured by the parents." Even in obvious crimes of passion, unpremeditated events are often misunderstood according to Samenow. Samenow says most murderers have a history of violent emotions, abusing others verbally and physically, manipulating their environments for selfish purposes, lying to achieve their goals, and even threatening the lives of others. The so called "crime of passion" is nothing more than another chapter in a history of criminal activities, whether they were caught before or

not. These acts are not the fault of the influence of others, but to the criminal's decision to commit crime. Even if Samenow's case may be overstated, it seems a proper corrective for the permissive Freud defense of murderers.

Freud's Profile As A Serial Killer

Throughout his life, Freud demonstrated many characteristics in common with the Serial Killer. His life was dominated by a morbid preoccupation with death from the earliest we know about him. His twisted mind was well apparent even in his middle to late teens and well into old age. Interestingly, Freud's background itself had all three legs of the Homicide Triangle: he had a history of bed-wetting, torturing of animals, and pyromaniacal urges. These details will be discussed at the appropriate section.

Freud confessed to a growing up in a family of rampant incest. While many Serial Killer's will claim they were sexually abused, as criminals, they do not do so until apprehended. In Freud's case, he was never apprehended and his confessions were not under the pressure of getting a "light sentence."

It is a well known fact he had intense desires to kill the "old man," his supposed father, and other family members -- issues constantly discussed in psychoanalytic literature. He admitted a desire to drink wine from the skulls of his enemies and had recurring "fantasies" where he inflicted "gruesome sexual punishments" on innocent victims. He tortured animals out of boredom and was elated and gleeful over the deaths of enemies. Freud saw enemies everywhere, even in his own family. He constantly mused on people's death-dates and numerologically calculated when they would die. His dreams were almost totally dominated by desires for murder and sexual obscenities. He had numerous bouts of psychosis and was a severe cocaine addict during the period he was writing his theories of psychoanalysis. He

fabricated medical case histories, routinely committed fraud to further his reputations. One of his fraudulent case histories led to the deaths of an untold number of people—when he claimed to have cured morphine addiction and recommended unlimited use of cocaine for cures of it. Hundreds, maybe thousands died due to his false medical claims of a cure.

He had a self-confessed "pathological desire" for fame and compulsion for sexual dominance over his enemies. By his own admission he was ready to kill to advance his cause. He was an irrepressible liar about his true past, from his birth date to the identity of his real father. He was a sadist and professed sexual cravings for his mother well into adulthood. He confessed to desires to copulate with corpses, had a hatred for all religions and openly claimed he was doing the Devil's work. He believed in Fascism and could not bring himself to blame Hitler even though he was committing genocide against his own people. He was an anti-Semite and informed on colleagues *because* they were Jews. His children he called "worms," his patients, "niggers," "victims," and "trash." He appointed himself Commander-in-Chief of psychoanalysis and called his "science" a new "religion," a "scientific Calvary," the "Cause." He named his own children after his victims, to memorialize his crimes.

Certainly, it will be difficult for many to reconcile any of this with the received portrait of a man universally regarded as one of the most important intellectual forces of the 20th century—a man to whom the whole world has paid reverential homage. True, Freud's works have come under fire, again, recently, and it is true that Freud has been revealed in recent disclosures to have had "feet of clay." But the psychoanalytic "critics" are themselves obviously dupes, cultists, or simply stupid not to see the deeper truth.

One scandal after another has come upon Freud's reputation in recent days and has been blared to the national and international press. Recent researchers have charged Freud with embezzling money from patients, exercising authority over psychoanalysis with

the iron fist of a tyrant, with having an "incest" relationship with his live-in sister-in-law, Minna Bernays. He has even been accused by one leading writer (Peter Swales) to have hatched a plan to murder his best friend, Wilhelm Fleiss. All of it is tepid stuff compared to the truth of Freud's serial killer career.

Most devastatingly, are the revelations of a renowned historian of science, E.M. Thornton. Ms.Thornton has documented with private letters and official publications that Freud was, in fact, a sever cocaine addict given to attacks of psychosis. He was just well enough to continue faking it for the public. Thornton also proved that Freud was under the effects of psychosis induced by cocaine when he created his famous theories. Additional confirmation of her claims came, after publication of her book, *Freud & Cocaine*, when a number of Freud's letters, previously unknown, further confirmed her thesis.

Further, it has been abundantly documented, by a number of prominent historians, that Freud repeatedly created phony case histories to make his argument. Despite all this, it is still claimed by many, inside and outside of the Freud camp, that Freud's place in history is secure. A history in which Freud's place is secure is a phony history and those who promote it are themselves frauds, propagandists, incompetents and, in some cases as I shall establish, criminal co-conspirators.

To Be Continued. . .

Freud's Profile As A Serial Killer

Throughout his life, Freud demonstrated many characteristics in common with the Serial Killer. His life was dominated by a morbid preoccupation with death from the earliest we know about him. His twisted mind was well apparent even in his middle to late teens and well into old age. Interestingly, Freud's background itself had all three legs of the Homicide Triangle: he had a history of bed-wetting, torturing of animals, and pyromaniacal urges. These details will be discussed at the appropriate section.

Freud confessed to a growing up in a family of rampant incest. While many Serial Killer's will claim they were sexually abused as criminals, they do not do so until apprehended. In Freud's case, he was never apprehended and his confessions were not under the pressure of getting a "light sentence."

It is a well known fact he had intense desires to kill the "old man," his supposed father, and other family members -- issues constantly discussed in psychoanalytic literature. He admitted a desire to drink wine from the skulls of his enemies and had recurring "fantasies" where he inflicted "gruesome sexual punishments" on innocent victims. He tortured animals out of boredom and was elated and gleeful over the deaths of enemies. Freud saw enemies everywhere, even in his own family. He constantly mused on people's death-dates and numerologically calculated when they would die. His dreams were almost totally dominated by desires for murder and sexual obscenities. He had numerous bouts of psychosis and was a severe cocaine addict during the period he was writing his theories of psychoanalysis. He fabricated medical case histories, routinely committed fraud to further his reputations. One of his fraudulent case histories led to the deaths of an untold number of people. He had a self-confessed "pathological desire" for fame and compulsion for sexual dominance over his enemies. By his own admission he was ready to kill to advance his cause. He was an irrepressible liar about his

true past, from his birth date to the identity of his real father. He was a sadist and professed sexual cravings for his mother well into adulthood. He confessed to desires to copulate with corpses, had a hatred for all religions and openly claimed he was doing the Devil's work. He believed in Fascism and could not bring himself to blame Hitler even though he was committing genocide against his own people. He was an antiemetic and informed on colleagues because they were Jews. His children he called "worms," his patients, "niggers," "victims," and "trash." He appointed himself Commander-in-Chief of psychoanalysis and called his "science" a new "religion," a "scientific calvary," the "Cause." He named his own children after his victims, to memorialize his crimes.

Certainly, it will be difficult for many to reconcile any of this with the received portrait of a man universally regarded as one of the most important intellectual forces of the 20th century. A man to whom the whole world has paid reverential homage. True, Freud's works have come under fire, again, recently, and it is true that Freud has been revealed in recent disclosures to have had "feet of clay."

One scandal after another has come upon Freud's reputation in recent days and has been blared to the national and international press. Recent researchers have charged Freud with embezzling money from patients, exercising authority over psychoanalysis with the iron fist of a tyrant, with having an "incest" relationship with his live-in sister-in-law, Minna Bernays. He has even been accused by one leading writer to have hatched a plan to murder his best friend, Wilhelm Fleiss.

Most devastatingly, is the revelations of a renowned historian of science, E.M. Thornton. Ms Thornton has documented with private letters and official publications that Freud was, in fact, a sever cocaine addict given to attacks of psychosis. He was just well enough to continue faking it for the public. Thornton also proved that Freud was under the effects of psychosis induced by cocaine when he created his famous theories. Additional

confirmation of her claims came, after publication of her book, *Freud & Cocaine*, when a number of Freud's letters, previously unknown, further confirmed her thesis.

Further, it has been abundantly documented, by a number of prominent historians, that Freud repeatedly created phony case histories to make his argument. Despite all this, it is still claimed by many, inside and outside of the Freud camp, that Freud's place in history is secure. A history in which Freud's place is secure is a phony history and those who promote it are themselves frauds, propagandists, incompetents and, in some cases as I shall establish, criminal co-conspirators.

CHAPTER TWO

Phony Case Histories: A Pattern of Fraud

Freud's life-work and the "legend" of his biography, is based on the promotion of the Big Lie. It starts with his birth and ends with his death and marks most every important event in his life -- his birth date, who his parents were, who his siblings were, when the

graduated from high school, how old he was when he went to England and other matters. Freud had to lie about all these things. He had to lie about who his real father was, when he was born, that his parents were once rich, that he went on a trip abroad in a year different from what he claimed. He had to lie about curing patients, about making great discoveries, about his plagerism and his fraudulent case histories. And, of course, he had to lie about what happened to his victims.

Freud had a talent for bringing under his control talented but highly disturbed (if not sick) collaborators to work in the interests of psychoanalysis, or the "Cause," as Freud called. Through them he created an international organization to promote his theories and the propaganda of the "biography of a genius" Freud's case histories were claimed to be "classics." He was promoted as the greatest Seer in to human soul of all time. Without the active and relentless promotion of Freud's transcendent importance, by legions of so-called "Freud scholars" and intellectuals, interest in Freudianism would have died out long ago. But it survived and became known to the public, interestingly enough, as the movement of the "Headshrinkers." Like the high priest of Atomic physics, with the inner secrets of nuclear destruction, the Headshrinkers were the self-appointed high priests of the powers of destruction in the center of the human soul. They knew, as their Master taught them, that in the center of the human soul resided the forces of "Lucifer-Amour" -- murder and incest.

Dr. Frank Sulloway, a prominent historian of science and medicine (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), recently "went public." In February, 1991, he revealed that certain of Freud's famous case histories were, in fact, frauds. Commenting on an upcoming meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Sulloway said that at the AAAS meeting research papers, highly critical of Freud would be discussed. One of these papers

involved six patients Freud allegedly treated and cured. Of the six case histories, Sulloway reported "one involved a patient who fled therapy in disgust, two actually were not treated by Freud and another involved no real therapy." Two were not even treated by Freud and another did not even involve therapy? Why that sounds very much as though Freud was writing phony case histories. Indeed, he was in those cited cases and many, many more.

Less than two months before Sulloway's pronouncement, I supplied to him a manuscript written by me in 1981 with abundant proof of many of Freud's fraudulent case histories, as well as evidence of murders. Indeed, I had stated that Freud's work was riddled with massive fraud, virtually all his case histories. Though Sulloway said he found my work very interesting and requested I send him my new works on Freud, he was chary of communicating and amazingly had no questions about my documentation. Ronald Clark, likewise, was very interested in getting information from me, but after being presented with my evidence he declared there was nothing I had to say that had any value whatsoever. Another historian, E.M. Thornton, likewise expresses interest in my work, and even declared it brilliantly written, but she, too, strangely had no questions. Though she herself has asserted Freud was homicidal and psychotic, she shrinks from accepting that he was a murderer. That Freud was a Serial Killer is too disturbing. Scholars whose life work is to seek out the truth suddenly don't want to know the truth. Could it be the royal tail of the intellectual establishment is afraid of being stepped on?

Sulloway, in keeping with the guild convention, even now downplays the whole matter. In his interview he merely stated: "Freud's logical inferences and conclusions about his research and empirical evidence are simply not justified." One would think Freud was actually working from "empirical evidence" and had just made improper "logical inferences and conclusions." Freud was

completely incompetent to conduct "research" and his "empirical data" was of his own selective invention. In the words of American feminists, Sulloway still "just doesn't get it."

Sulloway further observed that Freud had acted like a high priest and that his work was "a step backward. . . based on authority and secrecy that was typical of alchemy." Is Sulloway insinuating that Freud was really a cultist? It seems so, though he doesn't want to say it directly. Cults have high priests, are based on authority and secrecy and are a step backward? Actually, Freudianism is not typical of alchemy at all, but it is typical of cultism and fraud. Alchemy is not a criminal offense, but fraud is. Even Freud's critics seem somewhat like the Aparachii investigating its own corruption in the Party. By "voting" Freud out, they may well be sealing the doom of their own careers in the intellectual establishment.

Plight of the Scholars

Sulloway, along with his colleagues -- historians, psychoanalyst, and writers alike -- has, it seems, little to gain with revelations of Freud's criminal career. Disclosure of Freud's homicidal mania, his career as a Serial Killer, will shed new light on the work of virtually all the Freud "experts." The situation must undoubtedly be a huge embarrassment to them. Obviously they all "faked" it to a great degree. They were incapable of comprehending the true nature of Freud's work as a confession of his own serial killings.

In truth, the "new research," revealed at the AAAS meeting is the proverbial case of too little too late. It is not only Freud who has lost credibility, but the legion of Freud scholars as well. It has been long known to scholars in the field that Freud was a fraud. But, the scholars were Freudians, Freudian Revisionist, or even Anti-

Freudians -- all of whom have a vested interest in keeping at least part of the mythology of Freud alive. Otherwise, what good is their alleged expertise? The truth is historians, psychoanalyst, biographers, the medical profession, professors all over this country whose calling card is their expertise in Freud -- all these groups and others have little incentive for a complete revelation of the truth of the situation. Yet, they must appear to be leading the pack in search of the truth. So now, the "scientists" at the AAAS meeting are having a belated "insiders" meeting to discuss the problems and issues of Freud being a fraud. But they will not use the appropriate word. They will talk about erroneous inferences and inadequate theoretical basis and other such tongue-chewing phrases -- anything to escape the simple truth -- a criminal fraud. What the Freud "experts," along with the entire scientific community is faced with a massive problem of "damage control."

It is hardly likely "objective science" will want a full investigation of the matter or will honestly examine a scandal of such tremendous importance to whole industries in America -- universities, publishers, reviewers, Freud lecturers, the Freudian psychoanalytic school of the American Medical Association, training programs in Freud theory, government funding of Freud research programs, etc. The facts of Freud's gruesome nature and the murders he committed and the pervasive fraud of his work may very well destroy the multi-million dollar Freud industry. That Freud was, in fact, one of the worst of the Serial Killers should have a chilling effect upon, for example, the number of university courses requiring reading of Freud's fraudulent case histories, for example.

Are we to really believe that *only now*, nearly a hundred years after Freud began his campaign of lies, that "science" has now discovered that Freud's "science" was a fraud. One begins to wonder about the credentials of these scientists who took a century

to discover an obvious out and out fraud. And it is astounding that "science" is now discovering what most every person on the street long sensed, Freud was some kind of maniac -- that any one who taught the human infant is motivated to murder the father and have sex with the mother must have been some kind of nut. To the embarrassment of the intellectual establishment, the general public was correct in its assessment of Freud. It is the educational system in America, with all its divergent vested interests, which has permitted Freud's murder-incest cult to prosper and flourish in our country.

Freud's First Discovered Psychoanalytic Case History Fraud: An Autobiographical Confession

Discovery of Freud's first scientific fraud came early, in 1938. Dr. Siegfried Bernfeld, a psychoanalyst, discovered among Freud's manuscripts a uniquely interesting case history. The case history purported to be the story of a young man, 38 years old, who was suffering from neurosis. The story about the origin of the man's neurosis and its roots in his early experiences served as the basis for his psychoanalysis, conducted by an unnamed doctor. The case history, "False Memories" was written in 1899, just prior to publication of Freud's famous confessional dream book, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, in which Freud's concept of False Memories is also discussed.

The case history was remarkable because it was obvious to anyone with a basic knowledge of Freud's biography (or alleged biography) that the supposed patient in the case history was none other than Freud himself. The anonymous doctor who prepared the case history was also none other than Freud.

Dr. Bernfeld is credited with being especially brilliant in his detective work which unmasked the case history as one of Freud's

own. The fiction is announced and promoted that Bernfeld made a great and permanent contribution to the history of science by his discovery. This is all balderdash. Freud specifically mentions the essay "False Memories" in his private letters. Indeed, he said "False Memories" was "the most important discovery I have ever made." Even if Bernfeld did not have access to these letters, one would have to be stupid not to recognize Freud's own biography in the phony case history. Almost identical autobiographical details in "False Memory" are also contained in *The Interpretation of Dream*.

The "patient" in "False Memories" is called Mr. Y. His biography, though considerably enlarged upon in his dream book, was identical to Freud's own, except in the most trifling ways. For instance, Freud said Mr Y., was 38 years of age instead of Freud's real age at the time, which was 43. His two infant playmates, called nephew and niece in *The Interpretation of Dreams* become cousin's instead. Otherwise the story is the same. His "brother's" became his "uncles." The disguise was so embarrassingly thin that the hoax was obvious. In the phony case history Freud himself could be seen clearly at work in his primary occupation, fabricating fraudulent medical case histories to provide "evidence" of the validity of his theories. But there was something more than mere fraud contained in Freud's case history. Virtually all of Freud's case histories were fraudulent, from the beginning of his career to the end. What makes "False Memories" of particular importance is that it was an amazing personal confession, one which he dared not claim, but which he could not resist writing.

"False Memories" tells about a "catastrophe" which occurred to Freud in his youth, about a scar on his chin, a planned incest wedding between himself and his sister, about rape "scene" also involving his sister, and many other critical biographical details of Freud's life. These will be examined in the appropriate place.

Among the scientist scholars, the fraudulent case history, instead of being branded a felony, a criminal violation of professional ethics, it acquired a special sanctity and reverence in the canons of Freud's psychoanalytic writings. The fraud has long been euphemistically referred to as Freud's "disguised autobiographical case history." Of course a "disguised" biography is a phony biography. The biographical scholars of Freud still feed upon "False Memories," as if honey. Even Freud's critics and revisionists like Sulloway do not point out Freud's "slip." Did Freud here, too, merely make incorrect inferences from his research and empirical data? No, he simply rigged the whole thing.

Though "False Memories" is a blatant fake, it provides valuable information and evidence about Freud's background and the inner workings of his diseased mind. For this reason, Freud had to write it in secret, without getting found out. Why would Freud have to hide his most "important discovery"? The answer to this will soon be obvious when we turn to his roots of family incest and murder.

Interestingly, Freud titled his case history of himself, "False Memories." The title itself was actually the term he gave for one of his psychological theories. In German, the title was *Errinrungstrung*. The roots of the word are derived by *Errin*, which literally means "wrong," "erring" hence a synonym of "false" and *runstrung* which means "memories." So the term suggests that it is the concept of false Memories that is referred to as opposed to real or true memories. The translators of Freud, however, didn't like the connotations suggested by Freud's term, so they merely changed it -- as they often do when what Freud actually wrote is too revealing. They it the name "Screen Memories," instead of the more revealing and accurate title "False Memories."

Freud's idea in both his phony case history and in his dream book was that patients suffering from neurotic or psychotic conditions "invent" memories of events that never happened to hide painful events that occurred at another time and in another place. In the essay "False Memories," Freud used his analysis of his own background as a case in point to promote his concept of false memories. In that context he reveals that a "catastrophe" happened to him in his teenage years which forced him to build up "false memories" to hide the real events at the root of the his psychoneurotic (actually psychotic) condition.

We will soon examine in detail "False Memories," as it serves as primary evidence concerning at least one of Freud's murders. At this point, however, I primarily want to register on the reader, the verifiable fact that Freud's career was based upon fraud and required fraud to perpetuate it.

Additional Examples of Fraud: Freud's "Classics"

Only a couple more of Freud's many phony case histories will be cited here. At this point, I only want to register I am not "accusing" Freud of fraud, I am only making known to the general public the fact that Freud was habitually guilty of fraud in his writings. Indeed, among historians (Sulloway U.S.A, Berfeld, Germany, E.M. Thornton, U.K., Balamary, France, etc.) it is a widely accept fact Freud created phony case histories and rigged "evidence" to promote his image as an analytical genius -- a crime which reveals but one side of his outlaw activities.

Another major discovery of a fraudulent case history involved the "Case of Anna O." The "Case of Anna O" has been hailed for decades as one of the "great classics" of psychoanalytic literature.

In 1961, Dr. Ellenberger established, as fact, that Freud's claims of curing the patient Anna O, contained in the case history, was a daring and outrageous lie. Hospital records and other documents were produced by Ellenberger which proved Freud lied when he stated his patient had been cured by "the talking method," -- the method adopted by Freud for psychoanalysis. Freud lied about so many details of this case history, here is not the place to discuss then in detail. A couple of points however need to be made.

Ellenberger, on the basis of documentary evidence, concluded: "the famed 'prototype of a cathartic cure' was neither a cure nor a catharsis." He did not say, straight out, that Freud was a liar and the so-called classical case history was medical fraud, but that is exactly what it was. Ellenberger as a member of the psychoanalytic guild could not go so far. That would have been to ill-mannered. It is considered bad manners to professional insiders, to call a spade a spade, when it involves issues affecting the guild. Nonetheless Ellenberger's evidence conclusively established the facts that: Freud lied about curing the patient; Freud lied when he stated the patient had a catharsis; he lied about the place of her alleged hospital confinement; he lied about the patient's biographical facts, including the patient's life style; he lied about her diagnosis upon confinement in the hospital, etc. This was not a mere slip of the pen. It was a carefully structured fraudulent case history to maximize its impact on the reader as a work of creative fiction. A work of fiction in which, of course, Freud casts himself in the role of the Messiah Genius Doctor of the Soul.

Otto Marx, the German historian of medicine and science has appropriately faulted Ellenberger's lack of courage in speaking the direct honest truth about the discovery of Freud's medical fraud. without beating around the bush, commented to me in a personal communication: "Ellenberger knew he was a liar but wouldn't state it straight out." Actually, Freud showed with his case history on

Dora that he was more than a liar, he was a criminal. Medical fraud is a very serious matter. Criminal though it is, it does not necessarily kill people. In Freud's case phony case history he was directly responsible for a massive numbers of death and launched the greatest epidemic of our era, cocaine addiction.

Additional Cases Of Medical Fraud

In 1985, E.M. Thornton, a distinguished historian and medical science, with the Royal Academy of Science in England, established the fact that Freud's first claim to being a Great Curer, came when he wrote a case history of a patient suffering from morphine addiction. Freud claimed to cure him of morphine addiction with the use of cocaine injections. This claim, too, was medical fraud. Freud had not only not cured his case history, but had was responsible for hastening his death -- a fact Freud himself acknowledged brought to him severe reproaches from the medical community. It was only luck and the effectiveness of a coverup which kept him out of prison. When I take up this issue in a latter chapter, it will also be established that Freud confessed to desires not only to kill this patient but to copulate with his corpse.

E.M. Thornton's work is especially important as she quite correctly concluded that Freud was psychotic and had homicidal tendencies, in addition to having psychopathic interests in sexual perversions. Despite her acknowledgment that Freud was a fraud, homicidal, and possessed with abnormal interests in sexual perversion, she shrinks from accepting that Freud was, in fact, a murderer, as my communications with her indicate.

In the course of examining the evidence of murder against Freud, we will reveal, incidently, numerous other of Freud's famous case histories to be frauds, including two other of Freud's "classical" case histories, "Dream of Irma's Injection," "The Wolf Man," and

others. Indeed, I challenge that *any* of Freud's case histories were anything other than fraudulent propaganda.

Freud could not resist writing these phony case histories. It was in Freud's recording of his dreams and phony case histories that he planted the clues for his real murders. Each written clue, each specially crafted dream he used to analyze, each memory which touched on the real situation of his crime was precious, a memorial to his victims. It was through them that he became famous and hailed as one of the greatest scientific geniuses of the twentieth century. In that, due to the total failure of the scientific community, and its inability to objectively examine the issue, Freud, for a time, succeeded.

Freud got the world to believe his phony case histories and cures were real with the complicity for other "disciples" -- as Freud called them -- who allowed themselves to be used for Freud's propaganda and directly participated in the fraud. Some of those directly involved in this work includes some of the biggest names in psychoanalysis such as Dr. Ernest Jones, Dr. Max Schur, Dr. Anna Freud, Dr. Adler, and others. Thus, with collaboration of co-conspirators in his movement, his work was accepted by many as valid or, in the least case, tolerable as a medical specialty. Whether any part of his work is accepted as valid or not, Freud unquestionably had a profound effect on western civilization. This includes literature, films, biography, psychology, penology, sociology, jurisprudence, and other arts and disciplines. Over the decades millions of American college students have been forced to purchase and study Freud's works. Every major university has its Freud "expert" and Freudian perspectives are everywhere evident in adjudicating criminal conduct.

The discovery of Freud's pervasive fraud is, and should be, a great embarrassment to the intellectual establishment. It represents

probably the most shameful chapters in the history of science. Other scientific frauds have rocked the world of science before, but none have had such a profound influence on the intellectual values of the western world. Most embarrassing of all, no doubt, is that Freud was also a Serial Killer. Even Freud's severest critics want to hide from that fact.

Though Freud founded his self-declared "Empire" of psychoanalysis on the Big Lie, that does not mean he was incapable of confessing to the truth of his crimes. Indeed, he derived perverse delight in telling many details of specific crimes. He also revealed the truth of many of the gruesome aspects of his inner life both in his published works and in private letters. Freud loved to live on the edge and hoodwink the great scholars of the day. Time and again, he risked discovery by planting his clues and riddles concerning his murders in his writings. Time and again, in personal letters, he asserted that he was generations ahead of everyone and no one was smart enough to catch him up. When writing one of his greatest confessionals, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, he worried over being caught, arrested, and hung for his crimes. Still, he could not resist planting clues and fragments of confessions. And when he went to far and his best friend forbid him to say too much, Freud confessed to "mourning" for the "murdering" of the dream which said too much and had to be cut out.

Because Freud used "evidence" from his own daily life, his alleged dreams and childhood remembrances to "prove" his theories, a track of valuable information survived. This information was needed to establish the record of his criminal activities. In Freud's early books and private letters, in particular, he constantly expounded his theories and even revealed dangerously daring facts concerning the intimate gruesome secrets of his life. Though it has been 20 years since I deduced, from then available record, Freud

was a homicidal maniac, much needed data was unavailable. Original copies of known censored and corruptly translated letters were kept from all independent researchers and even prominent Freudians. Because of Freud's work was embargoed by the Freud estate, and because it is widely known many of Freud's writings were intentionally corrupted, it was difficult to get key pieces of evidence -- times, dates, places, names. The information was needed to charge Freud with specific acts of murder.

New Disclosures: Primary Evidence

Within the last few years much new information concerning Freud's private life has come into the public domain. This information provides critical evidence previously kept secret. Unpublished, if not unknown private letters were suddenly released in 1985 when Harvard University Press issued Freud's famous correspondence to a close colleague, Dr. Wilhelm Fliess (*Freud Letters to Fliess*). The Harvard edition, translated and edited by a highly placed Freudian, announced itself complete and unabridged. But this is not so. Nonetheless considerable progress was made in getting more of the truth of Freud's background into the open. By correlating new letters with old ones, comparing dates, the new translations with the old, and by comparing and correlating corrupted passages with those claiming to be uncorrupted, new facts of great significance emerged. All of it corroborated and strengthened the previous accumulated evidence and here and there through new light on previous assumptions.

Then in 1991 another volume of letters written by Freud came to light, the Silberstein correspondence. These letters were written

when Freud was between the ages of 15 and 28 -- the very period in which it had been deduced Freud killed his first victim. These letters then were critical and allowed for cross correlations of dates and times, the results of which clearly implicate him in murder. And, too, with publication of this early correspondence, an entirely new and unknown victim was unearthed -- the young wife of his early loved and hated friend to whom he had sent his imitate letters, letters persistently haunted with an abnormal obsession with death.

Based on these new public disclosures of Freud's private letters, along with an accumulation of other evidence from various and independent sources, it can now be established that Freud was not only a murder, but had a passion for murder. Freud's psychological profile and the number of victims who succumbed to his murder mania justifies classifying him as a Serial Killer.

Phony Case Histories: A Pattern of Fraud

Freud's life-work, including the "legend" of his biography, is based on the promotion of the Big Lie, getting others to believe it and, creation of an international organization to perpetuate it. Without the active and relentless promotion of Freud as a great genius of the human psyche by legions of Freud scholars and intellectuals his work and memory would have died out long ago.

Regarding the Big Lie of his life-work, Dr. Frank Sulloway, a prominent historian of science and medicine (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), recently "went public." In February, 1991, in an interview with journalists, he announced that certain of Freud's famous case histories were frauds. Commenting on an upcoming meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Sulloway said the meeting would feature research papers highly critical of Freud. One of these papers dealt with one of Freud's major works involving six patients allegedly

treated and cured by him. Of the six case histories, Sulloway said "one involved a patient who fled therapy in disgust, two actually were not treated by Freud and another involved no real therapy." Sulloway then seemed to imply that of the six three were frauds or one sort or another. But are we justified in thinking the other three were bone fide case histories? Not at all.

Less than two months before Sulloway's interview with the press, I supplied him with proof that many of Freud's case histories were frauds. I also presented evidence of Freud's murder. Indeed, I stated that all virtually all of Freud's case histories were frauds. Sulloway has been reluctant to comment or communicate with me on any of these issues, while at the same time professing a great interest in getting the latest results of my research and commentary on Freud's criminal activities. Ronald Clark, the renowned biographer of Freud took the same track, as did E.M. Thornton and others -- even those most critical of Freud.

In keeping with the gild convention, Sulloway, too, does not want to face the facts. In his interview, he merely stated that "Freud's logical inferences and conclusions about his research and empirical evidence are simply not justified." From what Sulloway stated one would think Freud actually had "empirical evidence" but he only made wrong inferences from it. The point rather is that Freud was incapable of either securing or analyzing empirical data. One's own dreams and imagined case histories are not empirical data.

Sulloway did assert correctly that Freud acted like a high priest and that his work was "a step backward. . . based on authority and secrecy that was typical of alchemy." Actually, Sulloway is wrong. Freud's work is not typical of alchemy. Alchemy is not a crime, fraud is a felony.

Sulloway is a major commentator on Freud. He has written a compendious volume, *Freud: The Biology of the Mind* (1960), long considered one of the best works on Freud. Despite his "revisionism," Sulloway, long been part of the intellectual establishment and a leading spokesman on issues regarding Freud, is routinely quoted in the national press every time a mini-scandal on Freud emerges, which is often. He writes reviews and lectures on Freud. As he is one of the more honest among writers on Freud, his own situation is instructive relative to the question how so many have been misled so long and how the new revelations may affect his own reputation.

Sulloway's own reputation, as with the reputations of all the Freud "experts" may have much to lose with disclosure of Freud's criminal career. How is it that all these intellectual "experts" could not see the trees for the forest. The fact is disclosure of Freud's career as a murderer and a liar will be, and should be, a huge embarrassment to all of them. Indeed, it is an embarrassment to our entire culture.

The truth is, the "new research," referenced by Sulloway's is too little and too late to redeem the scholars. That Freud's work was and still is a fraud is old news. The only thing that may be new is that the scholars are waking up to the fact that they better face up to it publically, screw their courage to the "sticking place" -- as Shakespeare has it -- and figure out how they will handle the torrent of criticism that will confront them.

It has long been known to scholars in the field that Freud was a fraud. But the scholars were Freudians, Freudian Revisionists or even Anti-Freudians -- those who, one and all, capitalized and continue to capitalize on. They have a weak incentive to tell the honest truth about the Freud phenomenon. And they are in a dilemma. That is why they would now have us believe that "science" is just beginning to discover that Freud's "science" was

illigitamate. Why is it that science couldn't distinguish a cult group from a science? Why didn't Sulloway know Freud was a fraud years and years ago? And why didn't he say so. How would the career of Sulloway progressed at MIT had he announced in no uncertain terms that Freud was a complete fraud? Would the national press rush to quote his words on Freud had he been forthright? Not likely, not likely at all. We have to thank the American intelligensia for the continuing plague of Freudianism -- a proto-Nazi ideology created by predominantly neurotic and psychotic German Jews who emigrated to America to escape their ideological competitors and root themselves into the inner circles of the American intelligensia.

I am not suggesting Sulloway is a villain in this drama, he is one of the best of them. Like the patriosky members of the intellectual establishment in the U.S. are not unlike the communist party in the USSR. They has position and prestige in the old order. A revolution of truth in the halls of learning concerning Freud will probably not serve his professional interests or the interests of any other members of the intellectual establishment. None of them are likely to receive Nobel Prizes for their work on Freud in light of discovery of Freud's homicidal mania. Nor are they likely to be honored for exposing the illogical foundations of his theories. We must not forget it is in America that Freudianism found its native roots.

I think rather than awarding the scholars honors for their "new discoveries" the American public will look at them much as they are now looking at members of Congress. With a profound unease in their hearts and minds, the American public will more likely be asking themselves "What the hell is going on here?" There was a reason, which we will later discuss, why a Director fo the Freud Archives, a key insider, recently accused the psychoanalytic fraternity as a mafia type organization, itself capable of murder.

Are we to take Dohmer's word for it what his childhood was really like? The fact is, no one can know what Dohmer's inner life was like as a child. Probably even Dohmer doesn't know. But when a psychiatrist examines and concludes from the self-interested testimony of the Serial Killer everyone is prepared to receive the great detective-work of the psychiatrist or psychoanalyst as a fact. At least *here* is an explanation, some reason for all this insanity.

The criminal justice system in America uses the psychological explanation of the murderer as given by a murderer, Sigmund Freud, to judge the issue of criminal responsibility under the law relating to murder.

To be continued...