

Freud Profiled: Introduction: A Criminal Investigation

by Eric L. Miller

"This is not a subject for a scientific discussion this is a matter for the police." – Dr. Weygandt (Psychiatrist, Vienna University, On Freud's reputation and theories).

"I was quite prepared to tell them nothing" - Freud, letter to his finance regarding his police investigation, preparatory to being certified as a doctor.

"I must draw an analogy between the criminal and the hysteric. In both we are concerned with a secret, with something hidden. . . In the case of the criminal it is a secret which he knows and hides from you. . . " Freud, "Law and Psychology"

"Thus almost everywhere there can be found striking omissions, disturbing repetitions, palpable contradictions, signs of things the communication of which was never intended. The distortion is not unlike a murder. The difficulty lies not in the execution of the deed, but in the doing away with the traces." Freud, *Moses & Monotheism*

"John Freud (b. 1855 - "untraceable.*)" -- Official comment on John Freud's mysterious disappearance, from the Freud Family Archives; the translated German word given on an imaginary tombstone is "vanished".

Introduction:

The investigation of criminal activities deals with resolving fundamental questions, the answers to which determine the facts of the case: Where did the crime take place? When did the crime take place? Did the suspect have the opportunity to commit the crime? What was the motive for the crime? What is the evidence that the suspect committed the crime? Generally speaking, if any of these issues are unresolved, the prosecution's case is

thereby weakened. And, if too many of the facts of the case cannot be determined, the case may lose entirely its convincibility.

Of course, there are always special situations and circumstances which may play a decisive role in the determination of legal guilt. Such is the case in crimes involving persons who are not technically responsible under the law -- very young persons, or persons with "diminished capacity" or those legally certified as "insane." It is the whole complex of interrelated facts in a criminal investigation which determines the strength of a case against a defendant.

If, for example, ten eye-witnesses observe a man point a gun and shoot someone, and if this event was also photographed, the assailant's fingerprints found on the gun, the autopsy indicated death by a bullet wound, etc., the issue of motive is not critical to determining the fact that a crime had been committed. The fact of the murder speaks loudly enough, whether or not the perpetrator of the crime was technically guilty or not. If, on the other hand, a crime has definitely been committed and it can be proven a particular person had extraordinarily strong motives C even threatened to kill the victim many times before C it is not easy to establish guilt if the suspect has an "air tight alibi" and can be proven to have been in another place at the time of the crime, and there is no evidence linking the crime through an agent or action of the suspect. Obviously, motive itself is not sufficient to determine whether or not a particular person is guilty of a crime.

So, there are different kinds and qualities to evidence. Circumstantial evidence of a crime for which there is no tangible or "hard" evidence is sufficient to convict, however, if a preponderance of facts and circumstances makes it highly probable, if not certain, that a crime did, in fact, occur C and there is a deducible certainty that a particular person committed the crime.

Moreover, sometimes an absence of evidence can serve the prosecutorial purpose if circumstances are compelling that the absence of evidence itself leads to deducible certainties, or reasonably unchallengeable conclusions. Such could be situation in a murder case. If a wife, for example, dies of poison consumed from a glass admittedly served by her husband in their home, but the husband claims he did not know there was poison in the glass,

suspicions are aroused when it is discovered that there was no fingerprint evidence at all at the crime scene. Not only were fingerprints missing from the glass, but from all objects in the entire house C leading to the conclusion that someone systematically wiped away all fingerprints. The absence of evidence in such a situation gives rise to important questions: the circumstances of missing fingerprint evidence, the "motive" for the "absence of evidence," etc.

Further, if it can be proved that the husband lied about when he came home the evening of his wife's death, told in fact five versions of the same story under interrogation (e.g., that he came home before his wife; that he came home after his wife; that he last saw her in the morning; that he last saw her in the evening; and that he was asleep when his wife came home and he put out the glass for her before going to bed), his situation begins to look even more suspicious.

Additionally, when a journal is discovered filled with the suspect's descriptions of unmitigated and ineradicable hatred for his wife C that he wanted her dead, and obsessively dreamed about her death by obscene sexual torture C the case for the prosecution is further strengthened. And when, at last, it is found that someone went to the drugstore where the suspect had, in fact, purchased the same kind of poison used on his wife, and excised the purchase notation for the poison from the accounting records of the suspect, the husband's case for innocence does not look encouraging. This is true even if it can be proven that the suspect could not himself have destroyed the purchase record of the poison because he was out of town at the time. The suspect is also hard pressed to explain why only his, among many purchase order entries were tampered with.

The situation of the husband, described above, is very analogous to Sigmund Freud's position relative to the mysterious disappearance of John, his hated half-brother. In the case of the poisoned wife we may assume her body was discovered. In the case of John Freud, however, his body was never discovered. Indeed, his death or "mysterious disappearance" was never even reported to the authorities—at least the police department in the area was unaware of any. In Freud's situation, as in the example above, we are expected to believe many versions of the single truth, namely that: John disappeared at 18; that he disappeared after 18; that he disappeared sometime between the age of 19 and 60; and that he never disappeared at

all—Freud’s own favorite version (in his “non dixit” dream).

When we come to examine the question of how old Freud was when he last saw John, we shall likewise get many versions of the single truth: at 17, 18, 19, 20. The difference of seeing John last when Freud had just graduated from high school, or after he had already had four years of college.

Also, as in our example, in the case of Freud, too, we have the equivalent of a found "journal." Freud's published writings in the *Interpretation of Dreams* explicitly reveals his quixotic intense hatred for John. The confessions of hatred are directly related to the subject of sexual torture, as well as desire to supplant John, to take his place and to be forever rid of his mortal enemy. Additionally, we have "missing evidence" (like the missing fingerprints) of letters which would critically bear upon the subject or when John really disappeared and when Freud really last saw him. These and many other facts we shall examine, however "circumstantially" conspire to the conclusion that Freud was, in fact, the murderer of his half-brother, John. Let us turn to this evidence.

Evidence: Murder at the Irish Sea

"Repression" and the "Pushing Away" of John's Memory

While deep in the process of analyzing his own "unconscious" mind (how does one do that?), Freud applied his own theory of dream interpretation to the alleged data of his own alleged dreams to allegedly "prove" his own theories. Certainly an historic example of "reasoning in a circle." In these exercises of self-analysis, Freud not only discusses dreams he allegedly had, but also the events in his daily life which he claims gave rise to these dreams. (While at the same time, boasting to his friend, Fliess, that he could change his dreams or have others at will, "I can have "dreams like that any time I want.")

Of course no one can know if Freud really had any of the dreams he reports. Given his documented history of consistent and pervasive fraud in the presentation of his "case histories" we would do well to consider that his reported personal dreams were fabricated for two purposes: Propaganda and Confession/Boasting.

That Freud was avowedly involved in creating propaganda is proved by his statement that his autobiography was specifically created to serve the purpose of propaganda:

I taught others the virtue of confession and have never been able to lay bare my own soul. I wrote a short biography, but more for purposes of propaganda than anything else, and if I ever did make a fragmentary confession, it was in *Traumdeutung* C 'the Divining of Dreams' C Nobody knows or has ever guessed the real secret of my work.

The phrase "if I ever did make a confession" is a revealing remark. He speaks of being unable to ever bare some deep-rooted secret in his own soul which is the "real secret" of his work. And yet, he asserts, that "if" he ever did make a "confession" it was in a "fragmentary" form which nobody has ever figured out. It is clear from Freud's remark that he well *knows* what the secret is that he is keeping from the world. Freud was quite definite in his essay, "Law and Psychology," that the difference between the criminal and the hysteric, is that the hysteric supposedly does not himself know the secret which is the motivating factor behind his actions, but with the criminal he does know the secret, and will not disclose it. Though Freud repeatedly referred to himself as an hysteric, we must assume that, unlike the hysteric Freud does know his own secret—and it is a very criminal one.

Any homicide detective, being told by a suspect that he had never committed a crime or confessed to any, but "if" he did, it was contained in a certain book he wrote, the detective would immediately know where to begin his investigation. Naturally, he would look for a confession to the crime in the indicated book. If there was no evidence in that book, then the detective would probably have the suspect examined by a psychologist. For certainly the suspect's teasing and taunting his interrogators would indicate an unbalanced mind, or a mind with a motive directly related to the crime. Before we turn our search to *The Interpretation of Dreams*, however, a few preliminary remarks are in order.

For those who do not know German, *Traumdeutung*, or the "Divining of Dreams," has been rendered, inappropriately into English, as *The*

Interpretation of Dreams. Freud's choice of words for his title was not accidental. He specifically intended to indicate an association with the occult "sciences" such as astrology and numerology, divination. We have it on the authority of Dr. Bruno Bettelheim, a prominent Freudian analyst who himself grew up in Vienna and breathed the same cultural airs as Freud, that Freud specifically wanted to convey with his title *Traumdeutung* this association with the mystical arts.

That Freud's "divining" the meaning of his own dreams had the same luster of fraud as popular astrologers and numerologists is proved in letters written to a fellow colleague, Dr. Wilhelm Fliess. Fliess served not only as Freud's accomplished surgeon friend in sadistic sexual operations on women—supposedly to cure them of "sexual hysteria," but Fliess also served as Freud's editor and censor for his book, *Die Traumdeutung* "*The Divining of Dreams*" As a voluminous correspondence between the two indicates, Freud shared many details of his personal life with Fliess, details which Fliess knew could not be made public without potential extreme consequences to himself, as well, and of his reputation and even his own freedom to remain at large in the world.

In his letters detailing many of his dreams, or alleged dreams, Freud wrote one confession (or analysis) of a dream which told the whole story. Concerning Freud's "only completely analyzed dream," Fliess not only recommended he not use it in his book, but he forbid him to publish it. He may well have told Freud to destroy the evidence of his confession and that, no doubt is what happened. Freud wrote back that it was no problem if Fliess, fearing a malicious critic would not allow him to use the "only" completely analyzed dream. Why, he says, "I can have dreams like that any time I want."

In another chapter we shall restore this lost confession, as one restores a piece of paper that has been torn in many pieces. And on that piece of paper, in Freud's handwriting we shall read the simple message: "I killed John." It was because the completely analyzed dream was so obvious that Fliess forbid it. Under the influence of acute cocaine addiction, Freud could not see he was telling too much with his discussions of his made-up dreams.

Freud's admission that he can have whatever dreams he wants, any time he wants, is an especially important remark. In Freud's doctrine dreams are the

work of "repression." One represses what is too painful to consciousness. In other words, that which is "repressed" is, by definition, "unconscious" or "subconscious." From the point of view of Freud's own theory it is a mystery how anyone could construct and have any kind of dream one wanted any time one wanted it. And that one would produce these literary gems for If dreams are the results of "unconscious" processes over which the dreamer has no control, or knowledge, then it would not be possible for the dreamer to have whatever kinds of dreams whenever he found it convenient to do so.

More than one scholar, however, has pointed out that even the English word repression is a gross distortion of Freud's actual "teaching." The term translated as "repression," is, in English, a term which indicates a mechanical, automatic, psychic process that happens of itself without the active volition of the subject. *Verdrang* (Freud's term), however, means to "push away," to exert an action to achieve a repelling result. Implicit in the idea of *Verdrang*, then, is a concept involving and requiring the will and psychic participation of the subject. This point is especially important, the correct meaning and use of Freud's own words.

There is no use in discussing Freud's ideas, if we adopt his translators' conceptions, which were not Freud's, and then force these concepts into a critique of Freud's ideas in an effort to either implicate or exculpate him from such a serious issue as a crime. Readers, then, at the outset must be apprised of a simple somewhat devastating fact. The English translation of Freud's work in general and of *Traumdeutung*, in particular is, according to many historians of science, a fraud.

The English speaking peoples have been defrauded by corrupt translators in league with Freud's avowed propaganda strategies. Indeed, Bruno Bettelheim goes so far as to accuse the American translations of Freud's work "traitorous." Now, Bettelheim is himself a native speaker and a devout Freudian, so in his charges documented in *Freud & Man's Soul*, he is not out to serve the purposes of anti-Freudians. He is out to serve the purposes of the "true" Freudians. In another section we will deal at length with these corruptions, but for the moment we here only note the fact that the English translations of Freud's works are woefully corrupt, and intentionally so.

The fact is, the Freudians had to corrupt Freud's works, because without the

corruptions an entirely other portrait of Freud emerges -- the portrait of a self-admitted hysteric who is seeking to distill a "science of the mind" -- actually a science of the "soul" not "mind," as Bettelheim points out—which derives its entire authority from the validity of Freud's own analysis of his own dreams, the essence of which—he will never disclose to anyone!

It needs to be remembered that we are not here involved in any sort of "psychoanalyzing" of Freud's works. We are, rather, engaged in a criminal investigation into Freud's past and the deaths and disappearances of persons intimately connected with Freud -- initially, John Freud. Therefore, we must be careful to follow the thread of facts bearing upon the issues at hand. We must be careful not to obscure the issues with entangling arguments and digressions about psychoanalysis, per se. Psychoanalysis, we contend, from its outset was itself created to serve a propagandistic purpose, not the purpose of science with which it is in no wise connected, except in the minds of the true believers. More on that later.

But let us return to this issue of Freud's confessions contained in his dream accounts and commentaries on those dreams. Freud's assertion that he can produce dreams that he wants for his book, "at will," makes not only highly suspicious, but spurious his claim to the "objective" content of his dreams. Additionally, we shall soon see that Freud has a talent, not only for dreaming what he wants, but in remembering what he wants -- or rather *misremembering* whatever he wants.

From the start Freud shrewdly capitalizes on a critical fact: when it comes to a dream, the dreamer himself is the absolute, "stage manager" of the event, the only creator, arbiter and conductor of the experience. In Thomas Mann's phrase, each person is "the secret theatre manager of his own dreams." There is no machine that can "see" a dream. The dreamer reports his experience, or can claim he had dream experiences he never had, and no one can say him nay.

Freud persistently remarks that dreams are in effect confessions of the "unconscious." And, in discussing his own dreams, he habitually tells his readers that he cannot and will not tell the full truth of their meaning though he says he would give a great deal to be able to do so. The reason he gives for being unable to disclose the truth of his own inner experience is not that, like the hysteric, he *doesn't know*. Freud makes it very clear that he

does know why he can't tell his readers the real meaning of his own dreams. There were, he informs us, "special reasons" which restrained him, and made complete confessions, in his "particular case" impossible. Therefore he often says he has to "break off" the analysis, is "forced" to distort it, and is "obliged the "take the edge off" and "falsify" the text.

In view of the fact that Freud persistently confesses to: being murderous; having an obsessive attraction to the perversely grotesque, (necrophilia, fecal fascinations, gruesome acts of sexual indecency, etc.); having repeated incestuous "cravings" for his mother and his children; desiring the death of his father; being tyrannical and ambitious to the degree of having a pathological condition, and other diseased impulses and obsessions -- it is most interesting that, nonetheless, he is still "taking the edge off of something." What could this something be?

In all of Freud's dreams there is one which is of special interest, and is later discussed at length. This dream is especially important, however, and needs to be mentioned at the outset, at least in passing, because it occurs at the Irish Sea and was based upon an actual memory of his visit to England as a youth. This memory is woven into the reporting of the dream and contains many instances where Freud "pushes away" memories and associations with John. Freud himself tells us that in his effort to "push away" (not "repress") these painful memories he necessarily had to "fragment" and "falsify" the text in which he gave accountings and explanations of his own dreams and his past. One of the reasons for this, he says, is that in his dreams there are things, "the signs of which were never intended for communication." These never-intended-for-communication involved, he said in his writing about Moses, "disturbing repetitions, palpable contradictions and striking omissions" C all the signs which Freud elsewhere indicated involved a situation "not unlike a murder." How does all of this relate to his trip to England?

A further comment regarding these matters is due. The actual thread of discovery was a direct path. Following up the lead that the confession to Freud's secrets, which he could never tell anyone, lay hidden in the pages of *The Interpretation of Dreams*, we turn to the index of that book. If the indicated confession related to a crime involving John, we should expect to see evidence of this fact in Freud's writings on John. Interestingly virtually all comments about John, center on the theme of Freud wanting him dead.

The first mention of his travel to England comes early in the book. It was in England that Freud saw John for the first time since the age of 14, when John visited with his father for a brief stay in Vienna.

Freud's Use of Dreams as a Method of Confession of Real Events

Freud wrote that when visiting England for the first time at the age of 17, he had the opportunity of spending a whole day on the Irish Sea, and was "occupied" with a star-fish, or in German literally a "sea star." Freud reported that a young girl came up to him and asked him if the "sea star" was alive. And, in answering her, the young Austrian, who knew English mostly from letters and self study, responded that yes, the sea star was alive. But, working with a foreign and unfamiliar language he didn't use the indefinite pronoun "it," and used instead the masculine pronoun "he." "Yes," he recalled telling the girl on the beach, "he is alive."

Nearly a quarter of a century later, this memory of being on the Irish Sea returned to Freud when he came to describe a murder dream of his own. Freud's dream, he tells us, involved a conscious desire to inflict terrible and gruesome sexual punishments on a couple who had angered him earlier in the evening, while traveling. Falling asleep on the train where the hostility occurred, he gave himself over to the dream, which researched in dream pictures his homicidal anger and desire to "avenge" himself by sexually torturing his traveling companions.

One of the reasons Freud says he recalled this memory of being on the Irish Sea is that the dream content involved "putting sex where it did not belong." This verbal error (i.e., using "he" instead of "it") Freud says, offered the most "innocent possible example" of "using sex in the wrong place." But this statement is an obvious herring bone. The context of memories in which Freud show-cased this dream is full of comments referring to his anal fascinations, his desire to inflict gross sexual punishments on others, and the relish he experienced contemplating these subjects. Indeed the connection between this memory in England of being on the beach, and the desire to inflict sexual punishment on his traveling companions was, he says "one of the keys to the solution of the dream."

Freud ends his remarks by saying that anyone who knew the origins of the

title of a book (which appeared in his dream concerning the Irish Sea), *Matter and Motion*, would have little if any problem in figuring out his little dream riddle. And, by way of explanation of why this memory on the Irish sea was one of the "keys" to his murder dream, Freud makes reference to a play by *Moliere*, *La Malade Imaginaire*, or the *Sick Imagination*. Now, Freud himself italicized the letters - Ma and Mo, C to emphasize his point. Freud makes one other association which he needs for his point and that is that in the drama by *Moliere*, insane homicidal doctors are constantly delaminating the feces of patients and asking is the *Material*, or feces, okay? ("La *Material* laudable?").

Did some gruesome sexual punishment which Freud inflicted on Mo (i.e., John Freud), occur at the Irish Sea and involve Freud in, not only "making a mistake" in putting "sex where it did not belong," but also his "error" in declaring that "he" (John) was still alive. This is by no means the first or last time Freud makes a mistake about whether John is alive or not. He will make the same mistake in *The Interpretations of Dreams*, not only in his dreams, but in real life, and he will make the same mistake about whether John is alive or not in private letters written to his colleague, as well, in crime, Dr. Wilhelm Fliess.

The connecting links to Freud's confessions to the meaning of his dream involving John required translating German and English words. Freud loved riddles, and uses the term frequently in terms of issues involving the dynamic of human psychology. Indeed, he refers to his entire book as some kind of riddle that had a solution -- a map which could be followed to the secret place, but which no one had ever been able to penetrate. He even likened himself gleefully to Rumpelstiltskin in private letters to Dr. Fliess. He was having a wonderful self-intoxicating time leaving clues all about in his book that he was a murderer, but not really telling the whole story. In fact, he admittedly had to lay false tracks to throw off any new Shylock Holmes. It was a dangerous game, but he loved it.

He knew he was risking a lot. He was willing to gamble that he could tell the truth about his inner nature, and even the specific crimes that he had committed, and still get away with it. All he had to do was be cleverer than his opponents. Every day he went unapprehended, it was another day which testified to his superiority, his right not to be judged. But, in truth, he had to

talk about it. He knew it was only a matter of time before he would be apprehended. So, his emotions ranged from boyish glee over his superior status in the world, and terror that he would be flushed out into the light of day—where his monstrous nature would be judged by the world in which claimed superior status. In common with many other serial killers and even mass murderers, Freud experienced a kind of elation in his murderous lusts, a high that gave him a wonderful feeling of surviving his enemies. In a certain very real sense, Freud's enemies were the living. Since death was the answer to all riddles, the key to the universe, Freud planted his Death Riddle in his book. And, he even tells us that he knows full well that he is at peril of discovery.

But it was the only thing he really had to offer. He knew what it was like to be a murderer and he could tell the world about that, all right. But there is a price -- following the Adriane's thread into the heart of the labyrinth. To follow this threat Freud tells us we need to be able to translate English and German words.

Freud well knew that by connecting his confessions to homicidal impulses with England, and requiring substituting German for English he was putting himself in danger of discovery with this "reckless method." But he could not resist doing so under the power of his compulsion to confess. The "dream-work," as he called it, and all his related commentary was merely a thin disguise for venting his compulsion to confess to his crime of the murder of John. For nearly 100 years Freud got away with his crime because no one investigated what really happened to John Freud.

It is our claim that the murder of John took place at the Irish Sea and is one of the confessions to murder contained in that book, along with two others. Actually, concerning John, Freud seems to have been able to effectively block out his consciousness of John at an early age. There is a note which Freud wrote which still survives. It is the only communication to John that has ever been revealed. John had apparently written Sigi a letter in English, or German, either one, or Sigi wrote back, not to John, to his "brother," Emanuel. "Dear brother, tell John I cannot understand anything he says about anything." Did that really come from a 5 year old boy, or was it dictated by his mother?

Family Background: Amalia Freud, the Mother

What is known about Freud's mother can be summed up quite readily. She came from a well-to-do, if not wealthy family which included businessmen, Rabbis, and writers. No doubt spoiled rotten, she is reported by her granddaughter to have been insensitive, tyrannical, cold, and unjust. Amalia always had to be on center stage. She seemed to care for little but her travels to spas and passing her time in the social set. According to Freud, he had good reason to believe that his mother conceived not only by Jacob, but also two of Jacob's son's, Emanuel and Philipp.

1: Reconstructing The Event: Evidence of The England Experience

That Freud actually spend a day at the Irish Sea shore seems to be proven by a letter, supposedly dated in 1875, and written some two days after his return to Vienna from England. In this letter, dated Sept. 9, 1875, Freud wrote to his childhood friend and confederate, Eduard Silberstein, that "nothing of importance" happened to him in England. He missed all the sightseeing interests and visited none of England's famous cities or monuments. But, he informs his reader, that he did go to seashore at the Irish Sea:

I have seen the sea, the holy Thalesus. I have followed the waves of the high tide as they leapt the land growlingly and I have collected crab's and starfish on the beach.

The issue of collecting starfish on the beach, will take on a more ominous significance when we learn, from other sources supplied by Freud, over 20 years later that the starfish he referred to was actually "holoturns" or "sea slugs" C giving these seemingly innocent words associations with aggressive natural forces, severed sexual parts, as well as scenes of violence and fears of Hell. By mixing a biological term "holoturns" and by injecting the issue of translating from German to English, Freud sought to indicate a link between his desire to sexually torture his traveling companions with his memory of John which involved a "sea slug" C to "slug" in German is *erschlagen*, and with the addition of an suffix, "er," the word becomes *erschlagener* means "murderer." A point which shall be dealt with in another chapter dealing with the "dream" involving Freud's first visit to England.

This scene of collecting starfish at the Irish Sea, then, recorded in an early letter after returning from England, must have been the real occasion which he recalled some twenty-five years in his reported dream and memories of the visit to England and the Irish Sea Shore.

Interestingly, there was apparently another letter, written only a few days after the first, which would have given us other facts about this visit to England. This letter, however, was subsequently claimed to be lost. Probably it was intentionally destroyed. In the missing letter, Freud used a German word (Eirnnnungs-schwelgerei[e]n) in describing his state of mind immediately following his return to Vienna; he was, he said, "wallowing in nostalgia." Silberstein, ever attentive to the precise words Freud used in his letters, took Freud's reference (in the missing letter) to "wallowing in nostalgia" to mean that Freud's was confessing that his memories of England were "mixed up with matters of love." Freud was at pains to quickly inform Silberstein that he was quite "mistaken" in that assumption. Indeed, his assumption that his despair was due to matters of love was, he said, "far from the white" C suggesting some very much more sinister meaning behind his words of "wallowing" in memories of England.

For some reason, Freud ended his letter, in which he responded to Silberstein's mistaken assumption with the words, "Not a Roman Emperor, but a dog at the hospital of Seville." The phrase "a dog at the hospital of Seville" was a customary signature to Freud's to his friend, who belonged, with Freud, to a two-person secret society, the S.S.S C a society dedicated, among other things, to German nationalism as well as Cervantes, from which the phrase derives. That Freud was suddenly "Not a Roman Emperor," however, is a new title added to his customary "signatures." The included in its conclusion, another phrase which Freud wrote in Yiddish, "May God change it for the better. Amen" A curious imprecation for the young avowed atheist.

Freud's handwriting in his letters to Silberstein immediately after his return to Vienna is quite disturbed. Indeed, Freud himself drew attention to this fact. His lines, he told Silberstein, were "all over the map." Freud after returning to Vienna was wallowing in memories of England and he was shaky, his hand writing severely affected.

In a subsequent chapter, details of Freud's murder dream, The Irish

Seashore are carefully examined and related to his hatred for John. But I cannot proceed properly without making a couple of observations on the subject of the "Dream of the Irish Seashore" and the complicated entanglements of sex, murder, and fiendish crimes Freud references to the dream.

"Did Everyone Forget About John?"

It is most interesting that the themes Freud sounds in reference to his relationship to John, all come to a focus in Freud's memory of the scene at the Irish Sea. As the Irish Sea is the only location every mentioned by Freud relative to his visit to England and, as his description of this memory involves all the elements repeatedly emphasized by Freud in reference to his memory of John C an English brother and sister, murder, sexual brutality, riddles whose solutions offer "keys" to understanding his sex-murder mania -- and many other like-issues we shall soon take up, it is reasonable to surmise, at least tentatively, that it was at the Irish Sea where John, or "Mo," "mysteriously disappeared." That is to say it was at the Irish Sea that Freud murdered John and hid the evidence of the crime.

It is most significant that Freud's accounting of the Dream of the Irish Sea, there are two books mentioned in relation to the dream, as well as a conversation Freud has with an English brother and sister, who are in the same room with him. Two of these books were *The Sick Imagination*, by Moliere, and *Matter and Motion*, by James Clerk, but the third book featured in the dream is unstated. It was suggested by Dr. Immanuel Velikovsky, himself an analyst and correspondent with Freud, that, in context, he believed the book must have been Schiller's *The Mission of Moses*. If, as I believe, John's family name was actually Moses C the case for which I propose in an entire chapter C then the last piece of the "puzzle" fits together in an extraordinary way.

The reason this is so, is because in Freud's alleged dream, a conversation takes place in reference to a discussion of books, and who they belonged to. In the reported dream, the English brother turns to his sister and asks her about a book by Schiller "Have you forgotten it?" If the book by Schiller really was correctly guessed by Velikovsky, then the question is equivalent to asking, "What about me, Moses, have I been forgotten?" Was John,

whose family name was Moses, forgotten?

Almost. Ironically, it was the one who killed him who could not forget him, Freud. Because Freud could not forget John, he has survived, not only in Freud's books, but he has survived as a central, incriminating issue in the indictment of Freud as a murderer. "It seemed as though," Freud wrote immediately after the question about whether the "book" had been forgotten, "the books were sometimes mine and sometimes theirs [the English brother and sister]. I felt inclined at that point to intervene in the conversation in a confirmatory or substantiating sense [i.e., yes, he was forgotten]. . . . I work up perspiring all over. . ." Freud had every reason to wake up sweating all over, to wallow even in these dark memories with a shaky hand. Freud's desire to respond in the dream that "Yes, the Mission of Moses was forgotten," was merely wishful thinking, that the fact of John's disappearance would go forever unnoticed.

Evidence, When: The Disappearance of an 18 Year Old

Freud family genealogical records establish that John "mysteriously disappeared at the age of 18." There are three such independent records, asserting this chronology, the records of Harry Freud, Hella Freud, and Fred Hartwig -- all close members in the Freud family. They are all apparently wrong by 2 years, for it was at 20 or just immediately before that John vanished.

Harry Freud: Harry Freud was the son of Sigmund's 10 year younger brother, Alexander (b. 1909). Harry would have been 9 or 10 years old when John disappeared, if, as alleged in one source the year of disappearance was 1918, or 1919, and would surely have remembered if his "cousin" just disappeared one day from the family scene. Harry Freud's genealogical tables of the family history, however, indicate that John "disappeared at 18." This record of Harry Freud's was supplied to me by the wife of Freud's doctor, Max Schur, who intentionally ended Freud's life in London, with injection of drugs.

Max Schur, an official biographer of Freud reportedly had access to all family records and himself replies upon this information when he stated in his essay, "Memories on the Necropolis" that John disappeared at the age of 18. Not knowing, or pretending not to know, John's birth date, he fixes the

disappearance in the year 1872 (when Freud would still have been in High School, age 16 C a very improbable date, and one never mentioned by anyone other than Schur).

Hella Bernays: Hella was the daughter of Freud's wife's brother. Dr. Jeffery Masson, in a private communication, revealed to me that her genealogical table indicated John disappeared at the age of 18. When Dr. Masson was fired from his position as Director of the Freud archives he fled with photocopies of many Freud records, it was these records he quoted to me.

Fred Hartwig: Fred Hartwig was the husband of Pauline Freud, Freud's niece. He deposited notes to genealogical data at the John Rayland's University Library in Manchester, England, stating that John disappeared never to be seen or heard from again "at an early age." There is a reported note, in the Library of Congress, however (according to Swales), that states John "disappeared at 18." If John disappeared in 1918 -as claimed by the Freud Archives, John would have been 63 at the time. Hartwig was born in 1881 and would have been about 30 at the time of Johns disappearance, had he disappeared in 1918. If he married Pauline between the ages of 25 to 30, this disappearance would have been a recent event of which he would certainly have known. "At an early age" then would certainly have referred to a period considerably before this.

Anna Freud's Biography: The biography of Anna Freud, Freud's daughter which discusses Anna's trip to England at the age of 18, (i.e., 1913) nowhere mentions John presence; other members of the family are referred to. Since John was such a close relative C literally, Freud's half-brother, it is highly unlikely that there would be no mention of John. Ernest Jones guided Anna about and had contact with Freud family members. If John had not disappeared in 1914-1919, John would have been there.

Additional Documentary Evidence: Additionally, other evidence points to the fact that John disappeared at an early age. This evidence, in conjunction with family records is persuasive as it does not rely on family "mistakes" or "poor memory."

Census Reports: John is not listed on any census data anywhere after the year 1871, at which time John was 15 and listed as a "shop boy." He is not

listed in the 1881 census data, or any subsequent census. Were he "in existence" such data would be discoverable.

Business Listings: There are rather complete records of business listings for business in Manchester. John is nowhere mentioned in any of these records, though Emanuel, Philipp and Samuel's listings are found. The name of Emanuel Freud's company was changed in 1891 from Freud & Company to Freud and Son C the singular rather than the plural. Emanuel had two sons, John and Emanuel, both worked in the family business. Samuel is listed as the other member of this business.

Death Certificates: John is not listed on any death certificates.

Missing Persons: John's disappearance was never reported to the police in Manchester and there is no record of it C as would be expected.

The "Official" Freudian Version Of John's Disappearance

Faced with the fact that Freud never mentions anywhere that John ever disappeared, and given that there are family genealogical records indicating this, the Freudian organization found it necessary to construct an "official" interpretation of the issue. In order to come up with something that the public would swallow, the Freudian organization makes use of three pieces of known "evidence" to construct its case. Two of these items emanate from Freud himself, so, for the time being, we can dismiss them. No criminal investigation admits as "evidence" assertions of the accused where there is no independent evidence to corroborate his statements. This is especially true when there is considerable independent evidence from unrelated third parties which contradicts the assertions of the accused. According to a communication from a key Freudian organization (Sigmund Freud Archives) an "official" genealogical record has suddenly come into existence in the Freud Archives that asserts that John disappeared "post 1875 or in 1918." What is the basis of this information?

The assertion is based on the researches of Krull who relies on Freud's assertions as well as a letter purportedly written by a Freud family member. his letter is undated and unsigned. It was allegedly written sometime between the years 1914 and 1919. Indeed, I have in my possession, and will

discuss at length elsewhere the fact that Mr. Thomas Roberts, head of Sigmund Freud Copyrights has informed me in writing that *no such letter exists with the claimed information, that the whole matter was due to the "sloppy" writing of Ronald Clark.* The fact is, there are no facts that John Freud *continued to live* after Sigmund's visit to England.

In short, the "construction" of John's disappearance "post 1875 or 1918" demands a complete denial of all other evidence and is based on the most indefensible and undocumented assumptions—all of them proffered by Freudians.

The Issue of Family Correspondence:

Another potential source for new evidence on the issue of John's disappearance is other family correspondence and Freud's own letters to the parties mostly likely to know the truth of when John disappeared. Of particular interest are letters between the time when John is known to have been alive (Census, 1871) and 1914-1919.

Freud was an inveterate letter writer. He literally wrote thousands of letters throughout his career and many hundreds of letters to close relatives. A great many of these are currently being housed in the Library of Congress in the Freud collection. Most all of these letters have been embargoed from examination -- for very obscure and contradictory reasons. Recently there has been a partial lifting of the embargo on some of this correspondence, but the most pertinent letters are still "restricted."

Emanuel Freud & Family:

Emanuel Freud, as I elsewhere document (see Chapter 5) was Freud's real father, and also the father of John. In the catalog of the Library of Congress there are listed numerous letters from Emanuel to Freud and from Freud to Emanuel. These letters are "restricted." This means they are not available to "scholars" or independent investigators. In view of the fact that almost none of these letters have been cited in the official Freud biographies, we may suppose there is a distinct possibility that some of these letters would naturally mention John and other members of his family in England. This is especially true in view of the fact that John worked in his father's business.

If there was mention of John in any of these letters indicating that John was still alive and living in England (or anywhere else) just previous to his alleged disappearance or after the proposed dating of this event (i.e., post 1875 or pre-1919, we can be almost certain this information would have been cited by the Freud organizations and Freud's official biographers. It is highly suspicious that these letters are embargoed. It is noteworthy that some letters which, at one time were listed on the non-restricted listed, suddenly became restricted. Perhaps a critical fact was spotted by a Freudian which required this sudden restriction.

In the Library of Congress Freud files, there are listed some 130 letters from Freud to his half-brother, Samuel. These letters too are embargoed. Samuel, who was born in 1860, would have been 15 when John disappeared at the age of 20. That these letters are not available is likewise very suspicious. There appear no letters to his half sister, Pauline and Bertha. Their ages at the time of John's disappearance would have been 17 and 15 or 16 respectively. They are obviously of the ages when the fact of the disappearance of their brother would not likely have been easily forgotten. As Pauline figures in Freud's memories and phantasies as a victim of a supposed rape by Freud and John C apparently when he made his visit to England C this correspondence would be particularly helpful. This issue will be discussed in a later section. Letters to other family members, namely Emanuel's brother, Philipp and his family likewise are embargoed. Thus, we are precluded from obtaining the potentially most revealing evidence on the subject of the disappearance of John Freud.

All of this gives the appearance of "intentional concealment" of all family records which bear directly upon the facts of the case. A complete absence of mention of John in all "available" family letters, would itself give grounds for suspicion of an intentional concealment and effort to obstruct the discovery of evidence, especially if we are to take Freud's word for it that John remained in Manchester, England was living there up to the age of 45.

The Official Biographers:

There are two authorized biographers of Freud, Ernest Jones, a member of the Secret Committee, and Max Schur, Freud's personal physician, and formally President of the American Psychoanalytic Society. Both Jones and

Schur claim to have had complete access to the Freud files. How do they handle the issue of John's disappearance?

Ernest Jones:

Interestingly, Ernest Jones, in his "monumental" biography of Freud never mentions the fact of John's disappearance, though he makes considerable issue of the fact that John was one of the most important, if not the most important, person in Freud's life. In view of the fact that he was privy to intimate family correspondence, and had in his possession early letters written by Freud from the years 1871-1881, it is most surprising that he never mentions the fact C although he specifically discusses the influence of family "disappearances" in his work. Many of the letters that he quotes from are still embargoed and all that we know of the contents of these letters comes directly from him.

Max Schur:

Schur apparently inherited the mantle of Chief Propagandist for the Freud movement from Jones upon his death. By the time Schur comes to the fore, there was already considerable controversy about the embargoing of Freud's letters and the "construction" put on many aspects of Freud's life by the Freudians. To that end Schur wrote what is still considered the most authoritative biography of Freud, *Freud: Living & Dying*. In his book, Schur repeatedly deals with the subject of John and discusses at length Freud's relationship to John in terms of Freud's psychological make-up. Interestingly, Schur concludes that in addition to having an Oedipus Complex, Freud also suffered from a Cain Complex C or, in good old English, a Brother Murder Complex. With this in mind, Schur's references to John are particularly interesting. Here, however, we will only deal with the issue relating to disappearances and John as it relates the Freud. Elsewhere, in our volume on *Corruption*, we will deal at some length with Schur's work and the linguistic contortions he had to go through to present Freud as a world Hero.

Schur's first reference to John's disappearance occurs in an essay he wrote for a Freudian publication. In "Memories on the Acropolis", Schur makes an important statement: that John "mysteriously disappeared at the age of 18, that would have been in the year 1872." Since we are in possession of

John's birth certificate, we may deduce that this disappearance actually occurred in the year 1873 or 1874. Schur does not reference his information for the year in which John disappeared. Nonetheless, his widow complied with our request for further information on this subject. In a private communication she wrote that in her husband's records was the genealogical data of Harry Freud, previously mentioned. What is remarkable about this piece of evidence is that in his book, *Freud: Living and Dying*, Schur nowhere mentions this critical fact of John's real disappearance, although he has extensive remarks about what he considers the profound importance of "disappearances" on the formation of Freud's psyche. Schur further did not relate Freud's "Cain-Complex" which he himself announced with the fact of John's actual disappearance.

There are 8 references to John in Schur's book, as well as an additional discussion which encompasses an additional 6 pages. Schur is careful in his treatment of the disappearances in Freud's life to suggest that these "disappearances" were disappearances resulting from the mere fact that as a child, when the Freud family moved from the place of Freud's birth to Vienna, the life and people he had known as a child "disappeared."

I have indicted (in Chapter 1 and 4) that the sudden disappearance of people was an important factor during the first years of Freud's life. To recapitulate: the people who "disappeared" were his brother Julius, who died; his nursemaid, who was sent to prison; his playmates John and Pauline; his half brothers Emanuel and Philipp and Emanuel's wife, Maria; the locksmith and his family; and, if Freud knew anything about her existence, his father's second wife, Rebecca. . . That his brother Julius had actually died intensified the linkage between the concepts of disappearances and death.

Elsewhere (Chapter X) I shall establish that Freud had no younger brother Julius, that Julius is a "cover" for John and was invented by the Freud scholars to deflect Freud's murderous hatred of John to an infant fictitious brother. Here I wish to note that Schur attempts to lead the reader into the thought that only brother Julius actually died, or "really" disappeared. That Schur in an earlier work had noted the fact that John mysteriously disappeared at 18, and omits it in his discussion of strange disappearances in

Freud's life invites scrutiny. In a page just previous to the above citation, Schur further remarks that Freud wanted to "kill off" his friend Fliess, and observes that ruptures of a "friendship" can leave such fantasy "traces." And he references this to the theme of the "guilt of the survivor" and John.

One can re-experience the "guilt of the survivor," as Freud pointed out in connection with memories of his childhood fight with his nephew John, if one has "remained in possession of the field" later in life.

This is odd. That Schur should state "if one has 'remained in possession of the field' later in life. When "later in life" did Freud remain in possession of the field so that he should feel guilty about it in reference to John? The question goes unanswered. Schur moves to the topic of "Death in Dreams" and it is in that context he mentions the previously quoted remarks about "disappearances."

In another section where Schur discusses again the theme of murder and "disappearances" he mentions again John's disappearance, and again indicates that "John had 'disappeared' when his family had moved to Manchester, England in 1859." Schur immediately links the event, not with a real disappearance, but only with an apparent one. Again, it is odd that Schur does not mention that John had actually disappeared either at 18 or "in later life." In this same context Schur discusses a central theme linked with John, the subject of Freud's murder dreams. Here he indicates that Freud had "recovered his memory about John in his self-analysis" C as though it took a Herculean effort of memory to "recover" recollection of John who supposedly did not disappear until his 60's and continued to live in Manchester with Freud's other close relatives.

But, this time, while discussing Freud's murder dreams, Schur references Freud's "guilt of the survivor" not to John but to the fictitious "Julius." I shall have a great deal more to say about Schur's "reconstruction," and demonstrate that he willfully corrupted Freud's text to give an illusion that John had not actually disappeared, while at the same time emphasizing the point that Freud was possessed of a Brother Murder Complex C a complex (supposedly) derived from the "disappearance" of his fictitious younger brother who supposedly died when Freud was himself an infant, of less than two. Though, as I shall show Schur himself vacillates between John and

"Julius" in attributing to Freud the heart of his Cain-Complex quilt.

Freud's Four Stories Of When He Last Saw John

Though the "official" version of when Freud went to England for the first time, after graduating from high school, is in the year 1875, the truth is Freud told four versions of this event. In the first edition of *Divining of Dreams* Freud wrote he was 17. In the second edition and all other editions he changed the time in the galleys to 19. In later life in a letter to the great historian and *literature*, H.G. Wells he said he was 18, and in his essay "Notes On A Schoolboy's Experience," he stated that he was 18, when he graduated from high school. Additionally, in a letter written when he was 21 he said he ceased being a "landlubber" at the age of 18. And, in yet another essay, "Screen Memories" he stated that he went to England three years after graduation. Freud graduated from high school according to his school records at the age of 17 which would then have made him 20. So, then, Freud said he went to England and saw John there (for the last time?) at the ages of 17,18,19,20.

In a detailed discussion of the errors he had made in the *Divining of Dreams*, Freud said that all his errors were the results of wanting to "ward off" or "push away" his memory of certain facts because of problems involving his "family complex." He discusses a number of issues, which are later taken up and examined. However, he nowhere discusses this error between stating he was 17 when he went to England and 19. In view of the foregoing facts, this issue of when Freud actually went to England is of critical significance.

The testimony of his sister Anna Freud, for whatever it is worth (many scholars don't trust her at all), is that Freud went to England at the age of 18, immediately after graduating from high school. As stated Freud did not, in fact, graduate at 18, but at 17 as surviving school records indicate. Anna wrote her notes on her brother in old age and is in demonstrable error on some matters, but did she not know if her brother went to England immediately after high school, as she says as a "customary reward" or after two years of college? A lot of children graduated at either 17 or 18, so the number itself could have been wrong but the recollection of going right after graduation could be correct, unless other conclusive evidence establishes

another chronology.

Freud is reported to have had a photographic memory and that he doesn't know when he graduated from high school or when he went to England, whether it was right after graduating from high school or up to three years later is quite suspicious for many reasons. Freud had a keen an abiding interest in, not only genealogies but in dates of significant experiences. Indeed, his interest took the form of an obsession, as noted by many Freud commentators. Later I will also discuss, in detail, the context of Freud's discussion of his age when he went to England, what he experienced there, and the motives for him wanting to "ward off" C it is called now "repressed" these events.

Freud's Destruction of Evidence

It is well known that Freud repeatedly and systematically destroyed records relating to his past. It is an activity that he began to engage in at any early age and which continued into later life. Stanescu, a Freud scholar who came into possession of largest collection of Freud's earliest writings dispelled a previous conjectured that Freud's first desire to destroy early records came in 1885 by producing two of Freud's letters where he first announced these intentions, in 1875 and 1877. Jones had suggested that Freud's motive for destroying early records was to rid himself of his "juvenile literary sins" and obstructing the "psychoanalysis" of his background by his colleagues. Jones remark is especially interesting in that the letter to which he referred was written long before Soul Analysis was a gleam in Father Freud's eye. Jones conjectures that his reason for doing so was to conceal "an important development phase." Schur, in complete contradiction of Freud's own words on the subject suggests this was done because he had small pox at the time. But we rather think it was another kind of disease C the plague of his past.

While the Freudians conjecture over Freud's purpose in the destruction of early records, Freud made no bones about his purpose: to obstruct his "biographers" in their attempt to delineate the truth of his background.

One intention as a matter of fact I have almost finished carrying out, an intention which a number of as yet unborn

and unfortunate people will one day resent. Since you won't guess what kind of people I am referring to, I will tell you at once: my biographers. I have destroyed all my notes of the past 14 years, as well as letters, scientific excerpts, and the manuscripts of my papers. As for letters only those from the family have been spared. Yours, my darling, were never in danger. . . I couldn't have matured or died without worrying about who would get hold of those papers. Everything, moreover, that lies beyond the great turning point in my life, beyond our love, and my choice of profession, died long ago and must not be deprived of a worthy funeral. As for the biographers, let them worry, we have no desire to make it too easy for them. Each of them will be right in his opinion of "The Development of the Hero," and I am already looking forward to seeing them go astray.

Chronologically considered the "past 14 years" indicates that Freud destroyed all his records from 1871. A time period, obviously, which includes the period when he went to England and saw John there C whether it was at age 17,18,19 or 20.

Now, in the above citation from Freud's letters, I have produced it exactly as Schur presented it, including the ellipsis. What did Schur leave out in his lengthy quotation? A most interesting sentence:

All my old friendships and relations presented themselves again and silently took the deadly blow.

John, of course, is repeatedly presented by Freud as the oldest of his friendships and relations, which was the "turning point in his life." Yet, even more pertinently, the great turning point in Freud's life was in England when he last saw this "oldest friendships" and "relations."

The thought of England surges up before me. . . all the ineffaceable impressions of my journey of seven years ago, on that had a decisive influence on my whole life, have been awakened in their full vividness.

This letter, written in 1883, would then place the event of going to England in 1875, *if the letter is not corrupt*. There is ample reason for believing this may be the case as, as I shall later demonstrate, there is documentary evidence of the fact that Freud's editors not only corrupted text in their presentation of Freud's writings, but also dates. The only way this point, and many others, can be resolved is through inspection of the originals but a handwriting expert. But, correctly dated, or not, we return to the primary point. This was obviously the "turning point" in Freud's life to which he had reference when he had a "funeral" for his records and dealt it a "death blow."

It is interesting that Schur refers to an "*auto de fe*" in reference to Freud's destruction of evidence from this chronological period. It was a phrase Freud used on more than one occasion in reference to destruction of records. the term "*auto de fe*" was a term used by the Spanish courts of the inquisition for criminals condemned to die at the stake.

It is also known that at about the time of the letter of 1882 Freud was thinking of immigrating to England.

Whatever the scholars say or do not say about Freud's destruction of records, we have it from Freud himself that his avowed purpose was to rid himself of the past which was "dead" for him and to lead astray future biographers.

Falsification of Evidence: A Family Pattern

In addition to the foregoing "management" of evidence by Freud and his propaganda ministers, we cannot pass by without commenting on the environmental issue. The falsification of significant biographical material, the concealment of critical facts, and the manipulation of the truth to serve a purpose was a world into which Freud was born. And from that point of view, it was as natural for him to lie as it would be for most people to tell the truth. I shall shortly discuss these issues at some length; here I will only present the facts.

Freud's "parents" lied about Sigmund's true birth date
They lied about who his real father was; his supposed father lied in official attestations about how many times he was married; both his mother and his

grandfather themselves adopted false birthdates for themselves, so that they "coincided" with famous personages; Amalia resisted questions about family background relative to genealogical data; made gross exaggerations about details of Freud's early background and the "mysterious disappearance" of a nurse C a subject which some "high ranking" scholars suggest may have been due to the fact that she was murdered. Family genealogical tables omit entirely two daughters of Freud's real father who also "disappeared," making, along with John, three disappearances in one just one branch of the family. Freud's sister makes up totally fabricated "hero" stories about Freud which could not have happened and passes this off as the truth. Anna Freud, Freud's daughter provably systematically corrupted her father's private letters, rewrote entire sentences, "redlined" and excised entire sections and gave the result out as completely reliable. She excised sections dealing with the subject of family incest, omitted telling remarks concerning her father's sexual perversions, and set wanted to set up an organization to "protect" her father's image C even though there was already a well-oiled propaganda machine set up to do just that. Additionally the concealment and destruction of evidence regarding the Freud family was actively aided and abetted by both known and "unknown" persons, who went into the official record house from which the family came and, according to one biographer (Clark) "excised" information from official records. The effect of this act alone, Clark states was to give suspicions that "there were more skeletons in the Freudian cupboard than in a graveyard."

In view of all this, little is really known for certain about the Freud family biography. This is so not only because of the falsifications, concealments, and dissimulations of the Freud family but because the information most widely quoted is from the hand of Freudians (Sajner, Bernfeld, Grinstein, etc.), some of whom hold high positions in the Freudian establishment. In the absence of objective and independent examination of primary documents, performed by specialists, very little of the background of the entire clan can be counted on as certain.

A Preliminary Perspective:

We have confined our initial remarks concerning the investigation of the disappearance John Freud to that data which is "non interpretive." That is to say, we have confronted the issues of who, when, where, the documentary

evidence, and Freud's family background. It was further promised that many details of various pertinent topics will be explored in depth regarding family relations, the systematic corruption of Freud's works to conceal his true nature, etc.

It is believed that a reasonably intelligent reader would agree that the issues raised here cry out for clarification and explanation: why is there so much confusion about simple facts such as John's disappearance and when it occurred, why is it that Freud told so many different versions of when he went to England, why have the Freudian scholars C with their beehives of research centers dedicated to Freud biography C been so remiss in not investigating these fundamental issues, when Freud's personal biography is said to be the basis of the "science" of psychoanalysis, or Soul Analysis, as we prefer to call it more in accord with Freud's original usage.

There probably is no single individual of the entire 20th century who has been written about more than Sigmund Freud, with the exception perhaps of Hitler. And certainly the amount of biographical research on Freud background far exceeds anything written on Hitler. However uncomfortable, or embarrassing it may be to the cultural establishment of the Western world, in a few short pages we have already produced enough questions to stimulate an alert thinker to the question: Is Freudianism one of the most gigantic frauds in history, its leader a murderer with a family background of sexual perversions, and its doctrines utterly false, misleading and fraudulent, in addition to being illogical.

It now remains to fill in the details and confront the issue of motive. We must ask what motive could Freud have had for murdering John, and will the illumination of this motive throw into clear light additional evidence sufficient, in the aggregate, to convict him of murder?