

Dear Paul.

Just finished a quick read of the "Deadly Dr. Freud", which I enjoyed. I appreciate your acknowledgment of my work. No doubt, I would take exception to a number of your remarks concerning my work, and what I did or did not say. But, I mention this only in the spirit of dialog rather than criticism. All in all, however, my guess is there is not much that really divides us in our common view of Freud. .

Naturally, much of what I read was familiar ground crossed either in "Passion for Murder" or in the intervening decade of continued research. So, none of it was really a shock to me, though there were a number of new items I did not know about before. What was most new to me, and which I credit a lot is your expose of Jones. Some of the things, of course, were known to those of us who have generally studied the whole field. But a lot of your material was new to me. And what I did know I did not know in such detail. You certainly have added an elucidating character sketch of one of Freud's top dogs, -- a portrait, by the way, which is highly consonant with what one might expect of the head propagandist of "die Sache".

There was much interesting information in your book. I had not known the reference to Sadger's "administrative murder." Brrrr!! And you've added Jung, I believe, to the list of Freud's enemies fit for conversion into a "revenant"? As with his other dear friends, they all ultimately became fit fodder for the fire. Your proliferation of evidence contributes to recognition of Freud's profile as a serial killer -- the subject of my latest work on Freud.

You were certainly right warning me I'd find you occasionally indulging in "Freudian" perspectives and techniques. .

Incidentally, as you know, in my book it is quite clear that Monika Zajac could not have been the culprit everyone wants her to be. Certainly, no one has a right to accuse her on Freud's "word", he being a psychopathic liar himself and there being little to no documentary evidence that she was even on the scene when the scholars claim.

I hope you will take it in good spirit and won't fault me for telling you, nonetheless, I thought it a bit odd to find you so frequently referring to Freud as "the master." At times it seems a bit disconcerting to be discussing a famous individual as a homicidal maniac and in the same breath referring to him as "the master." You did explain to the reader that you came from the discipline of clinical psychology and, were therefore pre-conditioned to reject the idea of Freud being a murderer, but isn't this going from one extreme to another? However, even my good friend, Dr. Velikovsky, as I have recently noticed, occasionally lapsed into using the term, "the master." Indeed, at a time in his life when one would have thought him long removed from such former fascinations. Reading your book, I presume you, too, would not make much of it, and would rather explain your use of the term as a "force-of-habit," rather than a confession of faith. Or am I wrong in this?

As to the subject of Emanuel Freud, I never identified him in print as one of Freud's victims. I certainly had the same suspicions you have, but my researcher in England could not find sufficient evidence for me

to try to stake that ground. I wish you good luck in your endeavor, however. Whether or not Freud killed him or had him killed, I do not know. But I emphatically believe Freud was capable of killing just about anyone, at any time, for any reason, or no reason at all.

As to the subject of John Freud. History will have to determine that. For my part I believe that Freud killed John in 1873 (at 17) or in 1875 (at 19). Of course it could have been in 1874 (at 18), as Freud also claims that date for the time he "first went to England." Ironically, Freud told H.G. Wells himself (shortly before Freud died) that he first went to England as a youth of 18. It does appear, on the surface of it (i.e., the Silberstein letters), that he really did go to England first in 1875 (at 19). Unfortunately, there are also indications of possible forgery with several of the letters, so this is by no means certain. What seems conclusive, however, is there is no evidence of John's continued existence as you imagine into 1919. I believe it is fair to say, not one shred of evidence exists for that proposition except the fraud letter that you quote from "a Freud relative." The reason is simple, Freud killed John and he was no longer around after 1875. Incidentally, we can be reasonably confident that John was killed shortly after his 20th birthday (August 13, 1855). There are a number of issues involved in this. But what does it matter, really? The important thing is the clarification that Freud was a murderer, that this is the secret behind his work, and his diseased perspectives ought to be rooted out of our culture. More important for the future is probably how did it ever come to it that a serial killer, with the mentality of an obvious maniac, ever achieved such renown in the Western civilization.

You will perhaps have gotten a copy of the "Freud/Silberstein Correspondence" (1991), which I mentioned to you. There you will see strong evidence of our thesis that Freud was a murderer "type" from the beginning. Certainly, in his letters to Silberstein we have sure evidence of Freud's severely disturbed psyche and strong signs of the serial killer syndrome. I am looking for the page number in my book where I predict that the Silberstein letters will contain unmistakable evidence of Freud's murder mania. My prediction is proved by the Silberstein correspondence as my book, Sigmund Freud: Serial Killer will establish. I expect I shall have it completed within the next couple of months. I shall be sure to share with you a manuscript copy.

Well, there is much more that we could discuss. But perhaps its better to let the year trail out before we turn to it.

Thanks for your kind words and the warm news of your family activities in the offing. The best of the season greetings to you and all of yours.

I've spent a couple days now going through your book and will certainly have things to say later. For now, congratulations for your efforts and for producing such a lovely, readable, and important book. Looking forward to sharing new information, perspectives, and materials, I remain,

Yours,
Eric Miller