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“This [Freud’s views] is not a topic for discussion at a scientific meeting, it is a matter for the police.”

Professor Wilhelm Weygandt (psychiatrist), at a congress of German neurologists and psychiatrists in Hamburg, Germany, 1910 (Ronald Clark, p. 285. *Freud*)

“In 1910, Professor Wilhelm Weygandt, who wrote an unflattering review of *The Interpretation of Dreams* in 1901, declared to the Hamburg Congress of Neurologists and Psychiatrists that Freud’s theories were not for scientific debate but "for the police." pg. 33

*Freud: A to Z*, by Sharon Heller, Ph.D.
John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New Jersey, 2005

“There were many other examples where Ernest Jones either ignored or even falsified the positive. For example, he suggested that one psychiatrist, Wilhelm Weygandt, had refused to discuss some of Freud’s shocking ideas, saying such notions were “a matter for the police.” In fact, Weygandt had written a glowing review of Freud’s *The Interpretation of dreams.*”


Underline added above to show one says “unflattering” the other, a Freudian, “glowing review.” Cohen offers no source for his comment this reader could find.
NOTE: Dr. Weygandt was correct as to what was the needed response to Freud. Two years after Professor Weygandt’s warning about Freud’s danger to the public, Freud published in 1912, “On the Universal Tendency to Debasement in the Sphere of Love”, in which he admonishes mankind that in order to have the most complete and happy life mankind must learn to accept the fact that incest with one’s mother and sisters was the height of human pleasure and satisfaction.

“It has an ugly sound, and it is also paradoxical, but nevertheless it must be said, that whoever is to be really free and happy in love must have overcome his deference for women and come to terms with the idea of incest with mother or sister.”

Freud, “On the Universal Tendency to Debasement in the Sphere of Love” (1912)

You want to be happy, gentle reader? You better get used to it, the only way to that Royal Road of Happiness is through Incest. If you can’t grasp that, you’ll never be really happy—that is Freud’s clearly stated view—AND IT IS A MATTER FOR THE POLICE, IT WAS THEN AND IT IS NOW.

(Here we must also add the caveat that Freud elsewhere expresses the conviction that the most supreme act of joy and elation is murder, which is, for Freud, the “primal act”. Apparently, in Freud’s world, after the “first deed” of murder, comes the orgasmic pleasure—that’s probably, from
Freud’s personal preferences the best time for sex with mother or sister).

In any case, and yet, David Cohen, an obvious Freud idolizer, would have us believe the opposite—that Dr. Weygandt wrote a “glowing review” for Freud’s *Interpretation of Dreams*.

**What is true?** In any case, it doesn’t matter and Cohen’s books is full of Jewish Pro-Freud racism. For, simply, Dr. Weygandt could well easily have “got it” (Freud’s real nature) and found good reasons for a “police” investigation in most any of Freud’s works published *after* reading *The Interpretation of Dreams* and Prof. Weygandt’s reported comment that the cops should be on the tail of Freud. To remind the reader what books of Freud that he published “after” 1900 and 1910 see below:

1900 *The Interpretation of Dreams*
1901 *On Dreams* (abridged version of *The Interpretation of Dreams*)
1904 *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*
1905 *Jokes and their Relation to the Unconscious*
1905 *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*
1907 *Delusions and Dreams in Jensen's Gradiva*
1910 *Five Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*
1910 *Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of his Childhood*

1913 *Totem and Taboo: Resemblances between the Psychic Lives of Savages and Neurotics*
One can see Freud’s most insane book of all (unless it be *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, *Totem and Taboo*, was published only 3 years after Professor Weygandt’s remark suggesting Freud’s criminality.

In any case, in his book (*Escape of Sigmund Freud* by David Cohen, 2009, 20012) he further writes:

***************

Quoted Material Below in bold is from: *Escape of Sigmund Freud* by David Cohen, 2009, 20012). This writer’s remarks are all in bracketed

[Text in Bold is copied, no page numbers available]

“Biographies and Restricted Archives

The Library of Congress houses 153 boxes of correspondence among Freud and his family, friends, and patients, as well as clinical notes and other papers, but not all of these can be read, Nineteen boxes cannot be opened until 2020, 2050, or 2057; eight are closed in perpetuity. One box contains an envelope marked TOP SECRET.

It is natural that Freud should wish to protect the confidences of his patients, even for fifty years after they died. The restrictions go well beyond this, however, and it is far from clear that all of the closed items deal with confidential medical matters. In contrast, Carl Rogers, the
founder of humanist psychotherapy, gave the Library of Congress all of his papers with no restrictions. Appendix @ contained a detailed list of materials in the Freud Archives that are restricted, but some need to be highlighted from the start.

Not to be opened until 2050 or 2057 are the following folders:

Till 2050, correspondence between Freud and his nephew Harry Freud, the man who had Sauerwald arrested. No other correspondence with a nephew or niece is restricted.

Till 2956, correspondence relating to the Bernays family, with whom Freud became doubly linked by marriage. He married Martha Bernays, while his sister Anna married Martha’s brother, Eli. One of Martha and Eli’s sisters, Minna, lived with the Freud family from 1892 after her fiancé died. Freud and his sister-in-law traveled together to Rome in 1913. Freud historian Peter Swales claims Sigmund Freud and Minna Bernays were lovers and that she had to have an abortion after she became pregnant by him.

The papers relating to Minna Bernays are restricted in perpetuity. If she and Freud had a sexual relationship, that would not be surprising.

The papers relating to Anna Freud, Freud’s daughter, are also restricted in perpetuity. Freud called her “Anna Antigone,” because of her devotion to him. Antigone was the daughter of Oedipus in Greek mythology. Her friends denied Anna was a lesbian, though she had a fifty-year-long intimate friendship with Dorothy Burlingham . . .
[Author Cohen then notes. . . “’An American psychoanalyst, Leslie Adams” who was preparing a biography on Freud and who wrote:]

“It will guide you somewhat that the Freud family are morbidly reticent about the family history and any work which must be done in this direction must be in spite of their cooperation. This indicates that behind this history is some disillusioning truth.”

[Also, see text which says, below, that Freud’s sister was almost married to Freud’s uncle! There are a lot of incest issues in the Freud family.]

“The uncle was smitten with Anna and took her to see William Tell at the opera. Amalie had to come as well, to act as chaperone. The uncle showered young Anna with chocolate and sweet talk, preludes to a proposal of marriage. Her would-be husband can’t have really been an uncle, as that would make the marriage incestuous, but he was clearly a close relative. Stepfamily issues again! “

[Says who, “stepfamily”? Other examples of incest exist. This is just another one I didn’t know about or just forgot it, seemed trivial considering the horrors of Sigmund Freud Serial Killer, FSK.]

As to the matter, Anna reported: “Sigmund was less than delighted,” Anna recalled, “and explained to mother and me what was involved when a man of fifty-nine wanted to marry a girl of sixteen.” the writer continues, “Freud won
the argument and the cradle-snatching “uncle” was sent back to Odessa in disgrace.”

[Obviously, Freud was not concerned about the incest issue; it was only the age and this when Freud was just a teenager. As we shall see elsewhere at this site, Freud also almost married his half-sister, Pauline. Freud grew up in a Jewish incest family; it is that simple—as to that matter].

But that is just a tip of the iceberg with Freud:

Issues Needed To Be Explored As Appropriate “Matters for the Police” TODAY, include, beginning with the LOC:

The reader will recall, the first quoted passage above from David Cohen’s book states:

The Library of Congress houses 153 boxes of correspondence among Freud and his family, friends, and patients, as well as clinical notes and other papers, but not all of these can be read, Nineteen boxes cannot be opened until 2020, 2050, or 2057; eight are closed in perpetuity. One box contains an envelope marked TOP SECRET.

A statement that shocks the imagination, if true! Is the LOC playing the “Freud Game”?

Below, is a passage to me from a personal letter to me from Chief of Manuscript Division, James H. Hutson. The information given above by Cohen, would seem to refute the
information given to me by the former Chief of the Manuscript Department himself, Mr. Hutson.

July 17, 1985

Dear Mr. Miller,

This is a reply to your letter of June 26 to Ronald S. Wilkinson.

Dr. Wilkinson did not tell you that there was no formal agreement governing Anna Freud’s gift of Freud’s letters to Fliess. These letters were part of a large gift of her father’s papers which she made in 1970 (the present Series A of the Freud Collection). She stipulated that until the year 200, when the gift would be unrestricted, only those persons having her written permission could have access to the materials. By her direction, since her death Dr. Eissler has decided on applications for access. We know nothing more about the history of the Freud-Fliess letters than we have read in Masson’s introduction.

We’ll not here go into these matters as to what Mr. Wilkinson did or did not tell me—what is very significant is the apparent *change* in the original conditions. In any case, this is a good place to begin an investigation of LOC on the matter. As an opener, I am sure to address the below issues, however phrased for LOC’s or the Department of Justice’s requirements.
Some Opening Issues For LOC

1. Is the Library of Congress subject to Freedom of Information requests regarding release of information pertaining to:

a: documents attesting to the LOC’s first acquisition (what, where, when, by whom, for what, by whose authority) of any property or properties on behalf of LOC which constituted then (and/or now) LOC’s so-called “Series A of the Freud Collection” and or/any such collection under any other name since the first acquisition.

2. Is it true that public disclosure (Freedom Of Information) laws do not apply to the agreements made with the Freud family (or whomever represented themselves to be rightful owners or caretakers of such property in possession of LOC) as claimed by David Cohen (Escape of Sigmund Freud)

3. What is the budget of the Freud Archives, who are its officers and administrative employees—and do they have any racial or ideological identities or involvement with “psychoanalysis” or its representatives in common?

4. Does the U.S. Government, through the LOC, or any other known entity, provide financial grants or other forms of subsidies to any “psychoanalytical” or “Freud” organizations for research, or any other activities that are sponsored by or ever participated in by employees in the “Freud Archives” section?
5. Are there any letters or portions of letters missing from the Freud Collection inventory which were once in the inventory under control of LOC?

6. Other than the Freud/Fliess correspondence, what are the donor sources for Freud family correspondence—and are there gifts and conditions placed upon them of them to LOC available under the Freedom of Information Act?

7. What Freud family members have donated Freudiana to LOC other than Anna Freud?

Before long, we will address these and other issues to LOC and report back on their replies. As it happens, I other original correspondence with the head of the Feud section going back 30 years and so have representations made then to compare with representations being made now, or to be made in the future. Always an interesting exercise.

elm

For David Cohen’s book, see below:

See book:
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