

FREUDIAN LIES
CONTEXTUALIZING AND TRANSLATING THE ROLE OF TRANSLATION IN THE FABRICATION OF
PSYCHOANALYSIS

A thesis submitted to the
Kent State University Honors College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for General Honors

by

Danielle N. Martin

May, 2014

Thesis written by
Danielle N. Martin

Approved by

_____, **Advisor**

_____, **Chair, Department of Modern and Classical Language Studies**

Accepted by

_____, **Dean, Honors College**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
A Brief Note on History.....	3
Purposes for and Challenges of the Translation.....	7
II EXCERPT ONE.....	17
III EXCERPT TWO.....	35
IV EXCERPT THREE.....	61
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	71
SOURCE TEXT (APPENDIX).....	72

Acknowledgements

I am first and foremost indebted to the Kent State Honors College for offering such an opportunity for growth as the honors thesis project provides.

I would also like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Maryann De Julio, with all sincerity and humility, as she exhibited a level of patience with me that I didn't even believe was possible.

My committee members deserve many thanks as well. Professor Christina McVay, Dr. Sharon Bell, and Dr. Jocelyn Folk: I am delighted that you are the individuals on my defense committee. Some of you I have worked with extensively, and others I barely know. But I know that each of you is a hardworking and accomplished professional in your respective field, and I am honored to know you.

Part of what made my experience with this project unique was my correspondence with the author of the source text, who generously answered my questions with both friendliness and professionalism. He also deserves praise for producing such a well-written and accessible text in the first place, and for his relentless search for the truth along with his colleagues. Therefore, I would like to thank Dr. Jacques Benesteau as well.

In the interest of brevity I end my list here, but not without mentioning that many other people deserve, and have, my gratitude. I am confident that you all know who you are.

CHAPTER ONE

“Le monde scientifique ne considère plus la psychanalyse que comme un charlatanisme d’un autre âge mais dangereux, pour ceux qui en ont été victimes, comme pour la science psychologique dans son ensemble. A l’opposé le grand public est désinformé.”

– Philippe Gouillou (Gouillou, 1)

*“The scientific world no longer considers psychoanalysis to be anything but a quackery from another time, but dangerous, for those who were victims of it as it is for psychological science as a whole. On the opposite side the general public is disinformed.”**

– Philippe Gouillou

Introduction

Mensonges freudiens: Histoire d'une désinformation séculaire, or, *Freudian Lies: A 100-Year History of Disinformation* was written by Dr. Jacques Bénesteau, who is a clinical psychologist and member of the neuropsychological team at the *Université de Toulouse* in France. From 1974 to 2010 he was a professor at the *Institut de Formation en Psychomotricité, Faculté de Médecine Toulouse-Rangueil* (Bénesteau, Back Cover). *Mensonges freudiens* was published in 2002 by the Belgian publisher Mardaga. Dr. Bénesteau has also written and contributed to articles such as “Quelques mots de synthèse d'un siècle de travaux sur l'hérabilité de l'intelligence” [“A Few Summarizing Words on a Century's Research on the Heritability of Intelligence”] and “Motor impairment in dyslexia: The influence of attention disorders.” *Mensonges freudiens* is written as much from the perspective of a historian as that of a psychologist.

The importance of his work stems from two factors. The first of these is cultural: France is one of the most psychoanalytic countries in the world, according to Bénesteau. He even notes, quoting one of his ardent opponents, “En France nous savons que ‘Freud a valeur de patrimoine

national!” [in France we know that ‘Freud is a valuable part of our national legacy!'] (Bénesteau, 1). Second, there is the educational perspective. Every Introduction to Psychology class in the United States, in reviewing the history of Psychology, takes note of Freud and furthermore treats him as a veritable scientist with legitimate contributions to human knowledge – apart from popularization of ideas such as the unconscious.

Dr. Bénesteau has earned a reputation for brilliance in his controversial attempt to correct this perception of Freud and his theories. Before Mardaga agreed to publish his book, he was rejected by at least fourteen publishers (Bénesteau, 1). Generally, however, experts have welcomed and raved about *Mensonges freudiens*. The evolutionary psychologist and translator Philippe Gouillou, for example, said the following:

“Le livre de Bénesteau est essentiel. Parce que la simple diffusion continue des recherches modernes, qui détruisent toute prétention scientifique de la psychanalyse, ne suffira pas : nous sommes en présence d'une religion, et il faut montrer le Gourou nu, pour que les fidèles aient une chance d'un jour ouvrir les yeux” [Bénesteau's book is a “must read.” Modern research indicating that psychoanalysis is, in fact, a pseudo-science continues to proliferate. This is not enough, however. Psychoanalysis is a religion, and its Prophet must be rendered transparent, so that his followers may one day open their eyes] (Gouillou, 2).

Only one year after his book was published, Dr. Bénesteau was recognized with the annual prize from the *Société française d'histoire de la médecine*. Unfortunately, however, the book has yet to be translated into any other language, at least to my knowledge. Dr. Bénesteau has participated in two interviews that I could find, but these are in French as well.

The western world in particular has an affinity for psychology, which is understandable, considering that the study thereof is a way for humans to understand their own nature. In fact,

according to the *Princeton Review* (“Top 10 College Majors”), psychology is the second most popular undergraduate major in the United States. How, then, have ten years gone by since this revolutionary historical analysis was published without its being translated? Information is only useful insofar as it is accessible, and this text deserves a wider audience. The text’s importance stems not only from its revealing the truth about Freudian fraud¹ but also its treatment of translator complicity in maintaining these lies across nations’ borders and natural boundaries, whether through omission or mistranslation. The author’s own multilingual capabilities allowed him to compare texts side-by-side himself without a middleman, allowing him to fill the whistleblower role. *Mensonges freudiens* is primarily an account of Freudian disinformation, but it is secondarily a work that highlights translator accountability for and collusion with disinformation.

A Brief Note on History

In the latter half of the nineteenth century and first part of the twentieth, Europe was undergoing significant changes in all spheres of life. Political tensions were high, with developing alliances and enemies, Austria-Hungary’s growth as an Empire, European colonialism in Africa formalized via the Berlin Conference in the 1880s, and the spread of Marxist ideas.

Scientific knowledge and attitudes towards it were in flux as well, as a renewed respect for and interest in science emerged alongside research that almost demanded this by its merit. For example, Charles Darwin’s (1809-1882) groundbreaking work *The Origin of Species* was

¹ Others in the Anglophone world have done so already, such as Dr. Todd Dufresne, the author of *Killing Freud*.

published in the late 1850s. Biology and its importance in determining humans' behaviors and subjective experiences were increasingly recognized, even to the extreme of determinism.¹¹

Neuropathology was a rapidly developing field – “the cutting edge,” if you will. And hysteria was a popular research topic during this time, although it had been identified (as vague as its definition was) several centuries even before Jean-Martin Charcot (1825-1893). In fact, hysteria is broadly defined as “a psychoneurosis marked by emotional excitability and disturbances of the psychic, sensory, vasomotor, and visceral functions” in the online Merriam-Webster Dictionary.

Charcot and a few other notable figures in neuropathology and hysteria are discussed below. Note that while originally many of these figures and more were going to be discussed in a glossary, resource constraints prevented this, as I could not find acceptable sources of biographical information for many of them. Besides, their work is more important for the purpose of my work than their biographies, and so the most relevant aspects of their work as it relates to Freud are discussed.

Pierre Briquet (1796-1881) was a French physician, and Charcot's predecessor. He is “generally acknowledged as the first to have conducted a truly objective and systematic study of hysteria in general” (Libbrecht and Quackelbeen, 371). Charcot was a French neuropathologist at the Salpêtrière. He was, in the most literal of senses, a physician, who focused on the physical and objective, especially visual given his artistic talents and inclinations, when examining diseases such as epilepsy and hysteria (de Marneffe, 71-76). His efforts to be objective were extreme in the sense that he frequently failed to consider patients' subjective experiences. On the other hand such efforts lacked when aesthetic concerns predominated and Charcot had

¹¹ Deterministic ideas were strengthened with the Russian psychologist Ivan Pavlov's work on “classical conditioning” in the same time period.

photographs altered with paint (de Marneffe, 84). Nonetheless he was one of the founders of modern neurology. Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) was one of his students. Note that Freud was particularly influenced by Charcot's work with male hysterics and hypnosis (Libbrecht and Quackelbeen, 375). Freud studied under others as well, such as Theodor Meynert (1833-1892) (Libbrecht and Quackelbeen, 375), although perhaps he was most influenced by Charcot.

One other person, Wilhelm Fliess (1858-1928), must be discussed although his research primarily concerned infantile sexuality. He is important in that while his work was in actuality a basis for many of Freud's ideas, they were frequently overshadowed by the latter's. In fact, according to Frank J. Sulloway, who has written extensively about Freud's shaky theoretical bases and whom Bénesteau cited in his own research, Fliess "was documenting periodic erections in his infant son a year before Freud supposedly 'discovered' infantile sexuality during his famous self-analysis" (Sulloway, 250). While a full translation of *Freudian Lies* would be necessary for a more complete understanding of Freud's lack of originality, at least the discussion above can set the stage.

While Freud eventually achieved the renown he wished for, criticism is growing in the present time. However, Bénesteau commented in an interview with François Aubral, "Je vois ensuite une dissociation entre d'un côté l'omniprésence et l'arrogance des freudiens en France, puis d'un autre leur disparition dans le monde." [I see then a disconnect between the omnipresence and arrogance of Freudians in France, on the one hand, then on the other, their disappearance in the rest of the world] (INFC, 1).

Despite this climate in his home country, Bénesteau observes, "La psychanalyse est sans avenir et se conjugue aujourd'hui à l'imparfait" [Psychoanalysis has no future and today is conjugated in the past tense] (Bénesteau, 10).

Mensonges freudiens is a 400-page text that essentially exposes psychoanalysis not only as a pseudoscience, as has been fairly well established in the field of psychology, but also as a movement and belief system within the above context (however, much of it is implicit). From Freud's own superstitions to the lack of data and, in many cases, forgery thereof backing psychoanalytic claims about the etiology and treatment of mental illnesses, *Mensonges freudiens* brings together information from sources in French, German, and English. It covers Freud's career from his beginning aspirations to his legacy and followers, taking care to note those who influenced Freud greatly, notably Jean-Martin Charcot.

Within *Mensonges freudiens* Freud's work is contextualized not in the fantasy psychoanalysts created before institutional review boards and other such safeguards, but within the disturbing political reality known as fact. However, a reevaluation of psychoanalysis as presented to the public since its inception does not constitute defamation – and that is not what Bénesteau's writing (or my translation of it) centers around. Eliezer S. Yudkowsky, a research fellow with the Machine Intelligence Research Institute, has an article on his website entitled "Twelve Virtues of Rationality." In this he quotes P.C. Hodgell, who said, "That which can be destroyed by the truth should be." I see this as one of Bénesteau's guiding strengths: he recognizes Freud as an imperfect human being and is more concerned with his false professional legacy than attacking him as a person. *Mensonges freudiens* discusses Freud's personal life and beliefs only to the extent that they are relevant to understanding his "theories" and (mis)conduct in the professional sphere.

Freud and his transgressions cannot be understood in isolation, nor should this be the case. So Bénesteau discusses his education, rise to professorship, and professional relationships (although Freud himself blurred boundaries) with figures such as Wilhelm Fleiss and Carl G.

Jung. Nonetheless, the sociopolitical environment in which Freud lived is scarcely commented upon, except for the author's refutations of "anti-Semitic" accusations against critics of psychoanalysis, who in many cases were themselves Jewish. Bénesteau cites Hirschmüller: En fait, ils « furent de plus en plus nombreux à parvenir à des fonctions de maître de conférences et de professeur dans les facultés profanes de l'Université, de médecins- chefs dans les hôpitaux, ainsi qu'à des postes de hauts et de très hauts fonctionnaires » car « dans l'élite intellectuelle, les attitudes antisémites ne jouaient pour ainsi dire aucun rôle » [“In fact, they were more and more numerous achieving positions such as lecturer and professor in the secular departments of universities, Head Doctors in hospitals, as well as government officials” because “among the intellectual elite anti-Semitic prejudices played, so to speak, no role”] (Bénesteau, 190).

It is probably becoming clear that psychoanalysis has a strong foundation of dishonesty. What was the role of translation in it, though?

Purposes for and Challenges of the Translation

My personal translation philosophy may be summed up in the following way: as translators our primary duty is to make information accessible with as little distortion as possible. In several senses, it is this thought that drove my interest to work with *Mensonges freudiens*, or *Freudian Lies*. Within the world of Freudianism we find dishonesty in research to be sure, but in translation as well, such as in the case of James Strachey, one primary translator of Freud's works, who was in contact with Ernest Jones and deliberately followed his lead in lying about Freud's writings on Leonardo da Vinci, as is discussed at length in the second excerpt (beginning on page 32) in the translation section of my thesis (Bénesteau, 208). Before discussing features of *Mensonges freudiens* as a whole text, along with my own challenges and successes in

translating the chosen excerpts, I would like to discuss Freud, and his treatment of Leonardo da Vinci particularly, as related to language and translation as tools of deception.

Even psychoanalysts, perhaps in an effort to make themselves seem more credible, have now come to admit the many scandals surrounding their founder: “In failing to distinguish between fact and theory and between conceptual disagreement and personal betrayal, Freud inadvertently contributed to creating a culture within psychoanalysis in which the clash of orthodoxy and apostasy became endemic” (Levine, 47). Yet, they continue to rave about Freud’s intelligence and supposed contributions to science, which Bénestean demonstrates are, on the whole, falsehoods. I would like to briefly introduce the case of Freud and Leonardo da Vinci before discussing my translation strategies.

First of all, Freud’s “case study” was in actuality speculation about an individual’s life 400 years removed from the author’s. Second, despite access to multiple texts (in Italian *and* German) Freud intentionally mistranslated in order to support his “theory” that in actuality is a series of disjointed ideas about Egyptian mythology, incestuous desires, and repressed homosexuality. Furthermore, James Strachey and Ernest Jones, a translator of Freud’s works and Freud’s biographer respectively, not only failed to correct the mistranslation despite being aware of it, but even actively tried to place blame on the translator of the German text that Freud relied upon. Essentially then, this project became one of translating corrections of a mistranslation with an agenda.

In “Translation and Science,” Sundar Sarukkai, the author, contemplates the absence of translation discourse in scientific discourse, which is inherently immersed in translation, especially intersemiotic, from the world around us into our respective language symbols. Sarukkai observes, “In theoretical texts, as in quantum and relativity theories, it is presumed that

the ‘essential’ content of the text is contained in the mathematical sub-text” (Sarukkai, 650).

Translation of essentially Freudian texts, I would argue, poses particular challenges because of its lacking a truly objective sub-text with quantifiable values. Psychoanalysis was a political agenda with an overactive imagination, with verification issues present even before translation. Add multiple languages into the equation, and the possibilities for “disinforming” greatly expands. This is particularly true when the translator himself is a close associate with no foundation of, or motivation for, objectivity or fact checking, which frequently becomes an additional bullet point in translators’ job descriptions.

So what about Benesteau’s text as such, and its translation? For those unfamiliar with translation vocabulary, I will make a point to explicate. The source text is the one to be translated. In this case the source text is in French and has as its goal shedding light on psychoanalysis’s history and multifaceted dishonesty that is evident, for example, in the case above. Dr. Bénesteau kindly indicated his target readership to me via personal correspondence: “Ce livre est destiné à l’honnête homme intelligent et cultivé, capable de lire le *New York Times*, ou John Irving, ou Bloody Miami [sic] de Tom Wolfe” [This book was written for the honest, intelligent, and cultivated man, capable of reading the *New York Times*, or John Irving, or Bloody Miami by Tom Wolfe]. So as we would usually indicate in a translation log (documenting the translator’s experience) in a translation course, his target audience is the educated public. Here an interesting predicament arose. When I read through I imagined the target text, the product of translation, would have a readership primarily comprising professionals in the field of psychology and historians with an interest in social sciences’ development over time. However, his correction of this idea led me to wonder whether or not there might be some differences between the French educated public and the American

counterpart, even if only in terms of whom we discuss and study because of cultural biases (i.e., contributors to the field from our own respective cultures receiving more attention). Given these factors, my strategy has been to translate with an educated public in mind to the extent that even if the target audience has no knowledge about a given institution, for instance the Salpêtrière, it is a safe assumption that a brief footnote or personal research would compensate for this. In other words, for the most part, I haven't explained anything that Bénesteau did not deem necessary to explain, unless *cultural* factors would significantly obscure the readers' understanding. So then, the majority of the target audience will likely be above the age of 20, and most will have at least a Bachelor's degree or be well read. Note that adolescents and even younger individuals are not included in the estimated age range because of their likely lack of background knowledge necessary for fully grasping the text in the context of history, as well as the implications of Freudian fraud. Originally I considered that generational differences might influence the target audience above a certain age; but, given that there is no (or I found no) evidence to support this suspicion, I revised my estimate. I am not of the opinion that other demographic factors such as race, ethnicity, sex, or sexual orientation will be indicators of interest. Religion could, conversely, have an effect on the anticipated readership in that propriety might prohibit religious individuals from engaging with subject matter that is sexual in nature. Nonetheless, I imagine religious and non-religious individuals alike would be drawn to Dr. Bénesteau's work as long as they have some interest in psychology.

Mensonges freudiens is characterized by literary techniques usually reserved for fiction (rich imagery, etc.). The text is both informative and expressive, as the author makes a point of providing every fact available and its source, but also offers facetious commentary. The author addresses the reader, albeit sparingly, making the personal modality important in some sections

more so than in others. The text's tone is marked by sarcasm and curiosity on the author's part. This source text has a register (measure of the formality and "correctness" of speech) that is neutral. While some specialized psychology vocabulary is present, the book is, on the whole, accessible to non-experts as well. The text type is more difficult to find a single word for, but can be described as a non-fiction analysis of the Freudian Movement's history.

I would like my target text to have as many of the same features as possible and have made every effort to ensure this result. Note, for example, that Bénesteau tends to organize by chronology within each section. This model makes sense to me as an individual, to be sure, but the information's organization makes perfect sense for Anglophones more generally (I am referring primarily to Americans, although most native Anglophones are included) given the emphasis on time in western, and particularly monochronic, cultures. Thus in this case no significant restructuring of the text was necessary. A smaller, detail-oriented example of this may be encountered on the very first page of the first excerpt. One of my goals in translating was to not only channel Bénesteau's voice, but also to render his imagery as accurately as possible. I found that in my original drafts I very frequently normalized or muted his imagery, for fear of exaggerating any of his messages. With my advisor's guidance and continued studying of the source text I came to realize the strength of the author's presence in the text and decided that if anything, failing to capture the literary richness of the work would do much more harm than overemphasizing it. I was especially concerned about using the word "creator" vs. "founder" when referring to Freud. The source text reads "créateur" in the chapter's first heading – a cognate no less (Bénesteau, 13). Founder, to me, elicited images of cultism that were ideal given the politics of Freudianism. However, "creator" indicates much more creativity and grandiosity,

and God himself is called “the creator” of all things. So then, given Freud’s rather large ego, and the author’s relation to it, I decided to preserve Bénesteau’s language.

One of the joys and challenges of working between languages is the problem of equivalency. Frequently a word in the source language does not exist in the target language, is broader than the target language counterpart, is narrower than the target language counterpart, or any number of other conflicts. To demonstrate, allow me to share an example of stronger restrictions for expressing a given concept in one language, and more leniency in the other. In French, “songer” is strictly “to daydream (about),” whereas “rêver” refers to dreaming only in a state of sleep. In English, we can make this distinction with our words: ex. She’s not paying attention – she’s probably daydreaming about...” or leave it to context by saying, “She’s not paying attention – she’s probably dreaming about....” Another example of this is the false cognate “éditer,” meaning “to publish” rather than “to edit,” which is expressed by the word “rédiger.” Far from making similar languages easier, such false cognates force language learners to double check everything that seems familiar, and novice translators to question their work.

Other differences, such as tense usage, not only became apparent but also problematic. For instance, Bénesteau frequently used the present tense when describing case studies, as though to set the scene and take the reader back in time. However, doing this in English made the text clumsy and disagreeable from a reader’s perspective. Furthermore, tense changes are less tolerated in English, from what I have observed, and so for the sake of the target text’s cohesion I chose to use the past tense consistently, as per English conventions, rather than switching between the present and past. Use of the present tense was not the only “tense” challenge, however. Frequently when translating from French into English we find that the French future tense becomes the English conditional.

One of Bénesteau's choices that I chose to incorporate in the target text, however, was his tendency to leave titles of Freud's and other significant figures' works in their original language (footnotes provided for first appearances). This is, to me at least, a strong message about the multilingualism of the Freudian Movement, giving some indication of how widespread Freud's influence was and how complicated it remains. It also indicates that the author's sources come from several languages. To verify the English titles for footnotes, etc. I made sure to check sources such as the Freud Museum website (freud-museum.at). At this website I was specifically able to verify the English title for a paper given by Anna Freud in 1922 called "Beating Fantasies and Daydreams."

Speaking in strictly grammatical terms, usually if capitalization appears marked or unusual, such as capitalization of the word "Hero" when referencing Freud, it is carried over from the source text because of its deliberate nature and implications. So in the aforementioned example this capitalization appears in the English text to emphasize Freud's grandiosity, as was the case in the French text.

Also, part of the grammatical transformation that takes place from French to English is that strings of "*de*" or "*of*" become compound noun phrases in English. Each construction is considered bulky if used in the other language.

Continuing on the theme of grammar and markedness, I would like to mention that Bénesteau did not seem to observe conventions of spelling numbers ten and below, while numerically expressing numbers 11 and above. I decided that it would be important, according to English conventions, to follow this guideline consistently, and so this is one, somewhat notable, change found between the texts. However, there is an exception to my consistency, and that is in the context of quotes. I did not change how numbers were formatted within them.

I have focused a great deal on challenges and difficulties in rendering the text into English. However, there were a few factors that made this process a bit easier than it would have been with other texts. For one thing, many of the quotes found in the book are from sources originally in English. Therefore, instead of reinventing the wheel by translating these quotes myself, or using a back-translation, which tends towards increased corruption of the original utterance, I was able to “reinsert” the quote in *its* source language! In this way, both the source and target text each have both non-translated and translated sources. Quotes translated by me are marked with a single asterisk following the quote. Only quotes originally in English or for which I found exceptionally worded translations are rendered by somebody else. For example, one quote from Frank J. Sulloway’s article “Reassessing Freud’s Case Histories,” “Each one of them will be right in his ‘The Development of the Hero,’ and I am already looking forward to seeing them go astray,” is not marked and therefore readers know that it is the original English. Another example is the quote from Peter Medawar (target text page 61). For this quote I followed Bénesteau’s trail (footnotes) and was able to access the original English text in the *New York Review of Books* online. So this reinsertion is also not accompanied by an asterisk.

Explication played an important role in translating this text, as it is a very frequently used translation strategy. On that note, in the target text on page two you will find the following: “He then removed the work from his *épreuve de titre* [much like a C.V. in the present-day United States], the document he hoped....” The parenthetical addition is to acquaint readers with this historical document type that is not a part of our own background. The original French “*épreuve de titre*” is carried into the target text because of its contextual specificity. In another instance of explication I included both the original and revised name (Sulloway, 266) for

Freud's Wednesday Society, whereas only one was mentioned in the French: "*la société psychanalytique du mercredi*."

Sometimes the nature of a statement as either positive or negative changes as well.

"...Each new edition would make matters worse by increasing the weight of initial errors with the addition of notes that never changed direction" from page 20 of the target text is a "negative" statement in that it uses "never" rather than "always" as the source text does: "...Chaque nouvelle édition va l'enfermer, en augmentant le poids des erreurs initiales par l'adjonction de notes allant toujours dans la même direction" (Bénestean, 202). The message has the goal of expressing a "lack of change" that is nonetheless conveyed in both renditions.

While for the most part vocabulary was straightforward there was one term, expressed in French as "peintures-devinettes" (Benestean, 217), with a meaning approximate to "painting riddle." I found, however, in the article "Freud and the Vulture" by Hans Israëls, that in English it was expressed as "Vexierbild," which seems to have been borrowed from German (Israëls, 584). I decided to use this expression as well, based on its concision and contribution to a largely multilingual text.

It is also worth noting the use of "disinformation" rather than "misinformation" on the first page. A developing trend in American English is the use of "misinformation" to indicate accidental transmission of inaccurate information, and "disinformation" for deliberate propagation of falsehood. The French use of "*désinformer*" is parallel in the context of Bénestean's work, and for this reason I felt its use was justified.

Like Sundar Sarukkai's, part of the purpose of my work has been to "draw attention to the close conceptual links between the concerns of translation and of science," namely, access to or corruption of the truth. The sections below provide exactly the basis necessary for such a

discussion. This is true partially because for ideas and technology to spread they must transcend time and place which is only possible via translation, and also because it is a concrete example of deliberate mistranslation with evidence supporting the author's (Freud's) dishonest intent. There are many cases we may not know about simply because of a lack of oversight in translation (certainly, most of our clients in this field have no way to check our work apart from hiring other translators). The comments above are mostly true of the second excerpt. The first and third were included because of their ability to situate the reader in Bénesteau's work, and also to learn more about Freudian lies in contexts other than translation (information suppression, etc.). It is my hope that in time psychoanalysis will be seen for what it is both popularly and in the academic realm, and that progress will follow from transparency.

CHAPTER TWO

Excerpt One

Chapter 1

The Archive Embargo

“The lie, this dream taken literally...”*

Louis Ferdinand Céline (1932)⁶

“Reality will always remain ‘unknowable.’”*

Sigmund Freud (1938)⁷

The Creator’s Good Examples

A letter from Freud to his fiancée Martha Bernays, dated April 1884, informs us that Freud was already pondering his heroic destiny. He was only 27 years old at the time. Despite having been tormented since childhood by visions of grandeur and persistent fear of anonymity and mediocrity, he nonetheless, in a tremendous rhetoric of denial, asserted the contrary to his betrothed: “I’m hardly the ambitious type. I don’t need the recognition of others to know that I am somebody.”⁸ Notwithstanding his fear that no one would remember his name due to his having “done nothing remarkable up to this point,”⁹ he informed Martha one year later that although his short career had as of yet produced nothing meriting worldwide recognition, he was already thinking of his biographers. Having just destroyed all of his notes, letters, abstracts and

⁶ (4) Céline: 1932, *Voyage au bout de la nuit* [*Journey to the End of the Night*].

⁷ (5) Freud, S, 1938 : *Abrégé de Psychanalyse* [*An Outline of Psychoanalysis*]: 73.

⁸ (6) Cited by Schur, 1972: 51.

⁹ (7) *ibid.*

manuscripts *dating back 14 years* – half of his young life as he was 28 at the time – he had effectively pulled the rug out from under them. He went on to say, “Each one of them will be right in his ‘The Development of the Hero,’ and I am already looking forward to seeing them go astray.”¹⁰ As it would happen, his biographers would indeed make an astounding number of mistakes, but above all would, with full knowledge, contribute to the disinformation campaign for which their legendary leader had set the best examples.

In 1897 Freud destroyed his offprints from a litigious lecture written in March 1885 on the subject of cocaine. He then removed the work from his *épreuve de titre* (much like a C.V. in the present-day United States), the document he hoped would support his request for professorship in his department.¹¹ But this article, which would compromise his glorious image, was already in print, and history could not be altered.

The posthumous publication of “*Entwurf einer Psychologie*”¹² consisted only of the two manuscripts sent to Wilhelm Fliess on October 8, 1895. The third notebook, which contained the answers to historical controversies and enigmas, had disappeared half a century ago – no doubt Freud destroyed it, too.¹³ Freud’s letters to Charcot have not survived either. However, a brief correspondence between Charcot and Freud, written between 1888 and 1892, was recovered among the latter’s documents. Within the exchange one finds, among other things, Charcot’s denial of being offended by Freud, who had accused him of being wounded by the latter’s nonchalance. Freud was also under the impression that his numerous personal comments and criticisms, in footnotes (not to mention added into his translations of the Salpêtrière neurologist’s *Leçons [Tuesday Lessons]* without asking for his input) had affronted Charcot. In reality,

¹⁰ (8) S. Freud, Lettre du 28/04-1885, in Schur, 1972: 53-55 (& in Correspondance [Correspondence] 1873-1939).

¹¹ (9) La conférence évacuée [The eliminated lecture]: Freud 1885, *Über die Allgemeinwirkung des Cocains*. L’épreuve de titre [Curriculum Vitae]: Freud 1897, *Inhaltsangaben der Wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten*.... On this disinformation see the chapter entitled: “La Potion Magique” [“The Magic Potion”].

¹² (10) in S. Freud, 1895: *La naissance de la psychanalyse [The Birth of Psychoanalysis]*. P.U.F. 1969: 307-396.

¹³ (11) According to Sulloway (Frank), 1979: 114; & Letter from Freud to Fliess, 10/08/1895.

Charcot's letters were enthusiastic and very kindly applauded Freud's initiatives.¹⁴ The correspondence had not been published, though, because one must not contradict the "untruths" propagated by Freud.

In 1907 and March 1908 Freud set fire to many more papers, including the exchanges between himself and Wilhelm Fleiss, which Freud would later claim to have lost or so ingeniously stashed away that, despite his best efforts, he could not find them. In 1915 Freud had few patients and so had the luxury of drafting 12 dense articles in addition to the first lectures from *Introduction à la Psychanalyse* which would be published the following year.¹⁵ Of the 12 aforementioned articles, six would be burned in 1917. These were in all likelihood his "metapsychological" writings. A seventh¹⁶ paper would not be published until its discovery 70 years later in London in 1983. It was found in an old suitcase with a collection of files that Sandor Ferenczi had bequeathed to Michael Balint. Finally, shortly before leaving Vienna in 1938, he once more destroyed numerous documents.

Thus, on at least seven different occasions – in 1885 (on April 28 and on August 31 when he left Vienna General Hospital), 1897, 1907, 1908, 1917, and 1938, then at other times, Freud deliberately destroyed his notes, correspondence, manuscripts, and clinical journals, which to some extent is legitimate because they belonged to him. But what is interesting about this undertaking of systematic destruction is the nature of the information from which Freud distanced himself, and the tracks that he could not fully cover.

The Unsettling Oddities of the Freud Archives

¹⁴ (12) Cf. Masson's note in Complete Letters Freud-Fliess: 19-20 n. & for the correspondence with Charcot: Gelfand, 1988. Freud's false remarks are found in Freud, 1901, *Zur Psychopathologie des Alltagslebens*. (Psychopathologie de la vie quotidienne [The Psychopathology of Everyday Life]: 171-172, end of chap. 7).

¹⁵ (13) Cf. Jones, vol 2: 197-199

¹⁶ (14) Freud, 1915, *Übersicht der Übertragungsneurose*.

A considerable number of historical documents, spanning the hero's youth to his death, are scattered across more than 20 locations worldwide, principally in university libraries in Jerusalem, New York, Washington, Stanford, Yale, Columbia, London, Manchester, Colchester, Vienna, Zurich, Basel, Geneva, Munich, and Tübingen, and elsewhere. Some of these documents may be found in the Freud Museum in London. The Library of Congress, however, houses the most impressive collection of them all in its Manuscript Division. The Freud Collection, the jackpot, comprises over 80,000 documents, including 45,000 manuscripts and 20,000-30,000 letters, not counting iconography or relics.¹⁷

The fact that publications from Freud's own pen are now controlled by his grandchildren, heirs to the author's rights, should not bother anyone because it is simply the provisions of the will in practice.... With the exception that the Freud Copyrights (in Wivenhoe, near Colchester, England), in addition to regular management can also exercise control over content in texts *about* Freud to accompany it before granting publishing rights to an author for an iconography. This practice alone forces publishers to take precautions in citing Freud.

Paul Roazen, who recalls¹⁸ these oddities and others, notes that Freud nevertheless had a habit of giving his patients and visitors photos of himself without being asked for them. The original edition of Roazen's book (1993) contained a rich and rare photographic documentation, which strangely disappeared from the French translation¹⁹ (which gives no indication of this fact as if its historical importance and relevance to the text were in question and especially the mysterious fate of a picture of Freud). Moreover, it takes a skillful eye accustomed to reasonable suspicion to realize that Roazen had already had the rights to truncated translations of his books.

¹⁷ (15) Cf. Jeffrey Masson, 1984 (The Assault on Truth): xxii; & "Freud, sa correspondance et ses correspondants" ["Freud, his correspondence, and his correspondees"], in *Revue Internationale d'Histoire de la Psychanalyse* [*The International Review of the History of Psychoanalysis*], 1989 n°2. Cf. Library of Congress, 101 Independence Avenue. S.E. Washington D.C. 20 540, USA (site Internet: www.loc.gov).

¹⁸ (16) Roazen 1993, *Meeting Freud's Family*: 103.

¹⁹ (17) Roazen, *ibid.* 1993, *Mes rencontres avec la famille de Freud* [*Meeting Freud's Family*], Éditions du Seuil [Published by du Seuil] 1996.

Thus, “*Comment Freud analysait*” [Freud As A Therapist]²⁰ comprised only 54 out of 600 pages of *Freud and His Followers*, written by the same author in 1975 and without the iconography. The three imposing volumes of Freud’s biography by Ernest Jones also are missing the photographic documentation in the French version. The publisher does not indicate this loss. The original iconography found in *La Vie de Freud*, which Irving Stone fictionalized in 1971, as well as the one found in Frank Sulloway’s superb 1979 book, also disappeared in the French translations, both in 1998.²¹

But the measures taken by the psychoanalytic institution’s cerbera to prevent access to documentation are much more surprising. Numerous essential works have been made inaccessible to the curious, historians, and scholars, in some cases *until the twenty-second century!* Historians regret this decision because Freudians have condemned them to ignorance, as they will all be dead having had no chance to view their sources. Besides, one might wonder how it will serve psychoanalysis when, for example, a letter from Sigmund Freud to Josef Breuer will be freed from this interdiction in 2102 – 177 years after the death of the addressee, to whom it belonged. What secrets could be hidden in these documents, famously inaccessible for years until 2102, first of all, and then suddenly declassified and explicitly forbidden again until... 2113?!²²

Esti Freud’s (Ernestine Drucker, death in 1980) copious interviews, recorded by Kurt Eissler, will not be accessible until 2053, only for the eyes or ears of the Freudian elite’s survivors, undoubtedly because of the turbulent relations that she, the black sheep of the family, maintained with her father-in-law Sigmund who openly called her a *messhugga*, that is to say, an

²⁰ (18) Trans. fr. Navarin 1989. Another part of *Freud and his followers* (Paul Roazen, 1975) was published under the title “la Saga freudienne” [“The Freudian Saga”] in 1986 by Presses Universitaires de France [University Presses of France].

²¹ (19) Irving Stone 1971 (trans. fr. *La Vie de Freud* [The Life of Freud], Pygmalion/Gérard Watelet 1998.) & Sulloway 1979 (trans. fr. *Freud, Biologiste de l’Esprit* [Freud, Biologist of the Mind], 2nd edition, published by Fayard 1998).

²² (20) Crews, 1995: 132.

idiot in Yiddish²³ and with Martin Freud, her Don Juan of a husband, who died in 1967. Besides, the correspondence between Sigmund Freud and his oldest son Martin was hidden from the eyes of the living until 2013 for one part, 2032 for the other. Some interviews with another of his sons (Oliver, who died in 1969) will be detained until 2057.²⁴ Access to Eissler's interviews with Carl Jung from September 1953, concerning Freud and Jung's correspondence, is blocked until 2010.²⁵ Kurt Eissler's interviews with Albert Hirst, the nephew of the tragic Emma Eckstein, have suffered the same fate and are inaccessible, along with 14 letters from Sigmund Freud to Emma in the Library of Congress in the famous "Container Z" which will not be opened until 2100. On the same note, an interview between Freud and Julius Lieberman will not be consultable until 2007. Were these date choices dictated by a magical numerology? What must they then conceal?

These affairs are pure marvels, completely ridiculous. To my knowledge, nowhere in the world, in no other civilized nation, have such restrictions, so ample and long-standing, been imposed, aside from Stalinist Soviet state secrets, rather porous, and perhaps the Vatican Secret Archive, in which ordinary, hazy, secrets are guarded for only 60 years.

Many myths have been fabricated about Albert Einstein's²⁶ character and his personal life because, once he was recognized as a likeable genius, he had to become heroic. His private life seems to have been erased, and then replaced by that of another's, the fiction being more conventional and without any discord. Albert's childhood had been revised, and he himself contributed. It is thus inaccurate to say that he suffered from a delay in language development, or that he was a poor student, according to the model of the dunce overcoming the challenge only

²³ (21) Roazen 1993: 163.

²⁴ (22) Cf. Roazen 1993, passim, and p.71, 118, 136; also see Sulloway, 1991: 248-249.

²⁵ (23) Publisher's introduction to the Correspondence between Freud and Jung (page 17).

²⁶ (24) Cf. Denis Brian 1996, *Einstein. A Life*.

by the strength of his character, without the intelligence that would appear, alone or in spite of him, much later. He was a rebel, to be sure, but because he was a genius.

As Anna Freud did for her father's archives, Helen Dukas, Einstein's secretary, who, during his lifetime was his cerberus, hoarded documents, extinguished private correspondence, and eliminated his drafts, except those which she had discretely recuperated from the scientist's trash, like Marie Bonaparte from Sigmund Freud's. After Albert Einstein's death in 1955, his friend and executor Otto Nathan founded the Einstein Archives, whose goal was to bury biographical documentation until the twenty-first century, preventing historians from revealing aspects harmful to the hero's public image. More than 400 books have thus been published on Einstein that could expose but a small part of the truth. That is, until some time before Otto Nathan's death in 1987, when lawsuits pried from his hands precious information that he had unjustly hidden. Then tens of thousands of documents, the originals of which are in Jerusalem, became freely accessible 30 years after the scientist's death, even though certain materials remain inaccessible for some years.

But while it is true that the facts were hidden or distorted to preserve the heroic montage of Albert as a character, his physics remain – *i.e.*, an objective, scientific structure independent of his person, and not a tall tale forged by manipulation. In the Freudian camp, the Hero character *and* his work are artificial, and disinformation has served this double fabrication.

In the domain of ideological and scientific history, the restrictions on the Freud Archives are in any case unheard of and inconceivable. But that's not all.

In effect, this absurd censorship – concerning the personal archives of deceased individuals – is a posthumous decision. Nowhere in his last wishes does Freud mention this obligation for his own family, at least, not in writing. For good measure, Sigmund Freud's will

itself is locked away in the Library of Congress until the year 2007, because of the explicit orders of Kurt Eissler, a former Freud Archives official, and the will appears in the Freud Collection catalogue. Now, the conditions of Freud's will, which forbid nothing, have been deemed public since their registration in London in 1939, which allowed Paul Roazen to publish them in 1990.²⁷

The Cerberi and The Plumb Line

Since 1939, Anna Freud masterfully controlled an abundant quantity of her late father Sigmund's private archives in his final residence in London, in the family home that became the Freud Museum, which opened to the public in July 1986. With 14,000 visitors per year, the Freud Museum at 20 Maresfield Gardens, London NW3, Finchley Road station is today in the Hampstead quarter where Anna Freud also founded her "clinic," a place of pilgrimage more important than the Sigmund Freud-Gesellschaft at 1090 Wien, Berggasse 19, Österreich, or even the hometown of our hero in *Freiberg – Pribor* in Moravia in the present-day Czech Republic, to the north of the Carpathian Mountains – where the main square is now called *Freudova Naměstí* after having been named for Stalin (*Stalinova Naměstí*).²⁸ In September 1996 the statue of Lenin in Prague was replaced by another giant statue of the other false idol of the virtual world: Michael Jackson. *Sic transit gloria mundi*.... An Austrian banknote had been decorated with Freud's portrait, and Bertha Pappenheim's image was featured on a stamp—but the recognition of Bertha, alias Anna O., was only to celebrate her involvement with psychoanalysis.

In 1951, at the time of the first publication of Freud's letters to Fliess and l'*Esquisse* from 1895, Kurt Eissler would found the Sigmund Freud Archives in the United States, which would

²⁷ (25) Cf. Freud, 1939: Last Will; and Roazen, 1990 for his comments. "Le testament de Freud" (1939: Last Will) was published again in Roazen, 2001, chap.65.

²⁸ (26) It is now possible to visit the "Freud Museum" on the Internet, in Vienna: <http://www.freud-museum.at/>; and London: <http://www.freud.org.uk/>

receive masses of photocopied documents from London, enriched with numerous donations and loans from Freud's correspondents and collaborators, then some evidence to which they would add films and tape recordings, of which 400 were interviews from Eissler himself. Curiously, a great part of the original financing for the foundation in London came from the Jungian camp. These Archives were to be entirely at specialists' disposal to facilitate historical studies on the founder and pioneers of psychoanalysis, even according to terms of the nonprofit's articles. But figuring that "historians have enough geniuses like Darwin or Newton at their disposal to leave Freud alone,"* Kurt Eissler would hurry to restrict access. Thus, this considerable fund would be deposited at the Library of Congress in Washington, and this official status as donor would allow Eissler and Anna Freud to require the library administration to restrict access to private archives held at a public place financed by public funds, much like the American "Classified - Defense" documents that can also be found there. The rule is applied in a draconian fashion: even today *not one* initiate, including the movement's elite, aside from Anna Freud herself, has been able to read certain troublesome materials that are completely prohibited.

In the 1960s in London, the Canadian Paul Roazen was nevertheless able to approach hidden files, the publication of which would cause a large scandal because of the nature of the content. They were only about the Tausk affair and Anna Freud's analysis, performed by her own father. Immediately, the people we might call the organization's "cerberi" would severely worsen censorship, move even more documents from the London archives to the Freud Collection coffers in Washington, and by diplomatic briefcase, no less!²⁹ But certain choice works would never arrive at their destination, and, in all likelihood, the most bothersome of them were physically destroyed, since the authorized individuals would never find them again. It was a lockdown.

²⁹ (27) Roazen, 1993: 60. Cf. also Janet Malcolm, 1984.

Some passionate truth-seekers – and Peter Swales is one of the most famous, if not the strangest – stemming from their observation of information elimination and the multiplication of lies, have been forced, under these conditions, to transform themselves into detectives specialized in historiographical research to verify everything, reestablish the missing data from surviving witnesses or inherited documents and traces relocated on every continent, for example, in the municipal archives or hotel registries from the Austro-Hungarian Empire. These “revisionists” and “shit rakers”³⁰ earned only denigration and pillory from the Freudian movement with every publication of their troubling findings.³⁰

Neither Anna Freud’s death in October 1982, nor Kurt Eissler’s forced resignation during the torment of the Masson affair around the same time,³¹ really changed the rigorous application of this censorship, practiced for more than 40 years because their successors pursued this somber work started by the vigilant prevaricators of historical documents. To meet Ms. Freud it was a good idea to start by presenting one’s passport.³² Then she made herself available, if necessary, for “only fifty minutes, the duration of an analysis,”³³* but she refused to cough up one bit of information concerning her father, referring the curious to what was already published. Whereas “the father of psychoanalysis and his daughter, who had both made the communication of the most secret information about the base of their science and therapy were not themselves, while living, in any way disposed to letting others examine their personalities.”³⁴* Unfortunately, when Anna Freud (who never allowed anyone to record her testimony about anything) herself died, a capital resource on the history of psychoanalysis died as well.

³⁰ (28) Cf. John Forrester, 1994 & Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, 1994.

³¹ (29) Cf. Masson, 1984: *The Assault on Truth*; Janet Malcolm, 1984; & Young-Bruehl, 1988: 409 sq.. After having been turned away from the Archives, Jeffrey Masson sued and won a fair sum.

³² (30) Berthelsen, 1989: 9.

³³ (31) *ibid.*

³⁴ (32) *ibid.*

It seems that since the early 1990s we have been witnessing a partial lifting of limitations and the beginning of a very relative and constrained liberalization: readers certainly have access to new elements, but after the suppression of a very large number of compromising passages.³⁵ It is necessary to understand, in all fairness, that after having been ousted from the Archives in 1985, the pure and orthodox Kurt Eissler –who, until his death in New York in February 1999, above all had the defect of loyally but blindly respecting his covenant vis-à-vis Freudianism in general and Anna Freud in particular – had created the Freud Literary Heritage Foundation with the goal of amassing the funding to publish Freud’s unabridged correspondence, which we are still waiting for fifty years later.

Because the correspondence has been truncated and expurgated in more than 80% of the cases, to the point where the majority of them are either uninteresting, or devoid of historical significance for specialists without independent sources to reference, or who are not a part of the privileged group authorized to consult the documentation reserved for the movement’s elite. This would therefore indicate, once again, that as only a vampire can create another vampire, only initiated psychoanalysts, or even only individuals judged to be favorable to their dogma by the organization’s censors, would be qualified to apprehend Freudianism’s history! For an authoritative view on Stalinism: consult the First Secretary of the Communist Party. Bizarre?

There are several things to note here. Fifteen thousand to 20,000 letters from the hand of psychoanalysis’s founder have been indexed – 35,000 in fact, according to the last evaluation from the historiographer Paul Roazen³⁶ – and it is estimated that between 5,000 and 10,000 have simply disappeared. Of the remaining 10,000 letters, a little over 4,000 have been partially published, and 3,650 remain inaccessible at the beginning of the year 2000. A fractional part of

³⁵ (33) Lynn & Vaillant, 1998: 163.

³⁶ (34) Roazen, 2001: 125.

this information has been published, but what has been was also subjected to cuts and extraction, both significant and without any indication. Mail received by Sigmund Freud had been destroyed by him, so that no one could reconstruct the correspondents' messages except by reading their drafts. Frequently the correspondence was not so much exchanges as they were mail fragments from Freud's hand received by addressees who saved them, and which someone then selected to reveal only crumbs of the original content. Those who lent their documents to the Freud Archives couldn't later recover them. So when Helene Deutsch wanted to borrow her own in 1978, it was impossible even for her to consult them at the time when her future biographer Paul Roazen, who then had become *persona non grata* thanks to his previous publications, sought to reclaim her documentation. Anna Freud and Kurt Eissler did everything in their power to impede access to the information.

Let us take a look at a few examples.

The abundant correspondence between Freud and Otto Rank—which Tola Rank (his widow, nicknamed Beata) possessed in its entirety before her death in 1967—still has not been published.³⁷ That with Franz Alexander, and with Sandor Rado (although briefer), is also unpublished.³⁸ Furthermore, the latter's memoirs, currently being held in Columbia University in the United States, are still unpublished—because Rado was “*a traitor*” to the cause. Of 30 years of letters to Oscar Pfister, from 1909 to 1939, the most interesting have disappeared, following Anna Freud's merciless choice in 1962, and those from Pfister to Freud were destroyed. The last French edition of this correspondence, in 1991, is identical to the original from 1963, and—as the cover note, humbly signed J.B.P., says, “Once psychoanalysis intends to profess a moral or a

³⁷ (35) Roazen, 2001: 211.

³⁸ (36) Roazen, 1975: 510.

religion, even its own, it makes an entrance into the field of illusion.”³⁹* Moreover, the break between the end of 1913 and 1918, confirmed by the editors, is denied by Freud himself in 1915 (“Pfister still writes from time to time, but each of his letters irritates me”*) in a letter to Binswanger and in another addressed to Ferenczi in 1916.⁴⁰ The epistolary exchange with *Arnold* Zweig from 1927 to 1939 is also severely expurgated, with total suppression of 25 letters and cuts without any indication. On the other hand, the publication of correspondence between Freud and *Stefan* Zweig is complete, although a part of it had been lost.⁴¹

The first publication of the 500-letter correspondence between Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham, between 1907 and 1926, although savagely amputated, shocked the British translator Eric Mosbacher to such an extent that he hid behind the pseudonym “Bernard Marsch”!⁴² The “lively and voluminous”⁴³ correspondence between Freud and Eugen Bleuler, essential considering the stature and scientific status of the latter, was very critical towards psychoanalysis—because Bleuler, the founder of modern psychiatry, was rightfully convinced that Freudianism was more political than scientific—remained forbidden aside from a few fragments; so that the reader only knows the Freudian version of their opposition.⁴⁴

The mail exchanged between 1903 and 1915, and from 1931 to 1932, between Freud and Baron (*Freiherr*) Christian von Ehrenfels, one of the creators of “Gestalt Theory,” an opponent of the now incorrect idea of eugenic selection, and who gave several valued lectures at Freud’s Psychological Wednesday Evenings, later known as the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, seems to have been erased. Ehrenfels’s widow wrote to Freud on May 12, 1935 to reclaim her husband’s

³⁹ (37) Freud, *Correspondence with Pastor Pfister, 1909-1939* Gallimard 1991 (Tel collection).

⁴⁰ (38) Letter from Sigmund Freud to L. Binswanger, 01/10/1915; Freud to Ferenczi, 04/29/1916.

⁴¹ (39) Arnold Zweig (1887-1968) and Stefan Zweig (1881-1942), were not alike. These writers corresponded with Freud. Arnold had been analysed in Berlin and was, at the end of his days, notorious in Eastern Germany, and Stefan committed suicide with his wife in 1942.

⁴² (40) Roazen, 2001: 157. A new edition of the correspondence between Freud and Abraham presumed to be complete.

⁴³ (41) S. Freud to L. Binswanger, 10/24/1910. There are 50 letters from Bleuler and 7 from Freud.

⁴⁴ (42) Excerpts of the correspondence are in Alexander & Selesnick: *Archives of General Psychiatry*, January 1965: 1-9. Cf. Cioffi, 1998: 168.

letters. He had died in 1932, but nobody knows what became of that correspondence.⁴⁵ The damned psychoanalyst Wilhelm Reich died in 1957 in an American penitentiary where, having been deeply disturbed for years and having commercialized accumulators of cosmic sexual energy, he served a sentence for fraud. Kurt Eissler recorded his conversations with him in 1952. Mary Higgins later published these interviews⁴⁶ in 1967, but denied any association with the enlightening letters from Freud to Reich, which would soon be locked away in containers in the Archives.

Sandor Ferenczi's formidable Clinical Diary (*Journal Clinique*) from 1932 had been stifled for more than 50 years, which makes sense when read, if for no other reason than because of the psychological portrayal the author makes of his master, who according to him had neither the compassion nor the humility indispensable to healing patients, is realistic and uncompromising.⁴⁷ His historic lecture at the Psychoanalysis Congress in Wiesbaden in 1932 was lucky to be suppressed for only 17 years.⁴⁸ Naturally, censorship carried into the immense correspondence between Ferenczi and Freud, which Anna Freud first tried to cull, then obstruct when her nephews (heirs to the documents) wanted to publish it.⁴⁹ The publication of 1,236 letters out of the 2,500 counted by Michael Balint had finally begun 60 years after Sandor Ferenczi's death in 1933.⁵⁰ Anna Freud spared no effort to stop all of these exchanges between her father and the Hungarian from being published because, she wrote, "If it were up to me we simply wouldn't publish the letters."⁵¹

⁴⁵ (43) Molnar's annotation in Freud, 1939 *Kürzeste Chronik*: 131-132.

⁴⁶ (44) *Reich parle de Freud [Reich Speaks of Freud]*; Paris, published by Payot, 1970.

⁴⁷ (45) Ferenczi, *Journal clinique [Clinical Journal]*; janvier-octobre [January to October] 1932. (J. Dupont Edit.) Payot 1985.

⁴⁸ (46) Cf. Masson, 1984, *The Assault on Truth*: 145-188 (This book by Masson contains Ferenczi's lecture, 1932: pp 291 sq.)

⁴⁹ (47) Roazen, 1993 chap. 3.

⁵⁰ (48) Another unpublished document appeared the same year in 1992: *Kürzeste Chronik* by S. Freud. It consists simply of notes from some 20 pages written from 1929 to 1939, which were laconic and trivial. Its uninteresting nature is the principal reason for its late publication. On the other hand, Michael Molnar's day-to-day annotations and historical references newly drawn from the Freud Archives make it a precious work.

⁵¹ (49) Cited by Young-Bruehl, 1988: 278; on Anna Freud's maneuvers to suppress information cf. also *ibid.*: 277 sq., 333 sq., & 409 sq..

Anna Freud had also put the correspondence from her father to Edoardo Weiss, who founded the Psychoanalytic Society in Italy in 1925, under lock and key in England. This is because the reader would have found therein confirmation, during Anna Freud's lifetime, of what she had always denied, namely that she had been analyzed for a long time (of course with all of the necessary benign neutrality) by her father from the summer of 1918 until 1922, then from the spring of 1924 until 1929, that is to say for at least nine years, at five to six hours per week. "Her analysis is coming along well,"* her father wrote to Sandor Ferenczi on October 20, 1918. The evidence is copious and indisputable, despite the suppression and nervous denial in analytic circles that lasted almost 80 years.⁵²

It must be said that Freud wasn't the only first-generation psychoanalyst to practice "familial" psycholanalysis, kindly treating children, husbands, wives, mistresses, lovers, friends, or neighbors. Carl Jung, Ernest Jones, Sandor Ferenczi, Karl Abraham, Wilhelm Reich, Erich Fromm, and Melanie Klein all pulled this stunt. One also calls to mind Max Graf who "psychoanalysed" his son under the very persuasive orders of his teacher Sigmund Freud, then his own wife Olga Hoenig (the mother of their son Herbert, also known as "Little Hans"), after her first psychoanalysis at 19 Berggasse, just before divorcing her.⁵³

Melanie Klein, who invented the "good mother-bad mother" concept, psychoanalysed three of her children: Erich, a.k.a. "Fritz," Hans, a.k.a. "Felix," and Melitta, a.k.a. "Lisa," about whom she published demonstrative clinical publications.⁵⁴ The psychoanalyst Melitta Schmideberg, who became a doctor, which her mother was not, was analysed again four times by other specialists, and maintained with her mother, who seems to have persecuted her, openly

⁵² (50) Cf. on the Young-Bruehl problem, 1988 chap. 3; Grosskurth, 1991: 68, 72-73; Roazen, 1993 chap.7; Webster, 1995 chap. 20; and Lynn & Vaillant, 1998.

⁵³ (51) Letter from Freud to Jung, 02/02/1910. On the Herbert/Hans imposture cf. here the chapter "Substance Clinique" ["Clinical Substance"].

⁵⁴ (52) Grosskurth, 1986: chap.5.

hostile relations for years. In 1936 Melitta felt the need to inform British Psychoanalytic authorities that a work by M. Klein, et al. (“On the Bringing Up of Children”) was plagiarized.⁵⁵ Old habit.

Anna Freud, Melanie Klein’s inherited enemy, and her psychoanalyst father’s “real pride and joy,”* in 1922, at 26 years old, had made her first official presentation at the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society on the case of a child supposedly troubled by masochistic and masturbatory fantasies, without noting, of course, that it was autobiographical – she was talking about her own fantasies. At least, she could believe it. One of the audience members, an apparently naïve psychoanalyst from the Vienna society, publicly remarked that the patient about whom Anna spoke was “a completely abnormal individual whose incompetence and inferiority would necessarily manifest themselves in his social life!”*

Sigmund, the father who was still analyzing his daughter at the time and of whom he was especially proud, felt obligated, in the face of Anna’s emotional upset, to forcefully defend her without betraying anything in front of his followers.⁵⁶ Tight rope to walk.

Sigmund Freud for his part, nonetheless, recirculated, for instructional purposes, the “clinical material”* taken from his daughter Anna’s psychoanalysis — “material” presented, together with his own fantasies, as independent evidence —, while she was already active in the profession and these private details were of an origin easy to recognize by the regulars who heard them. Anna’s “sexual” secrets had been decoded and published by her father since 1919.⁵⁷ One finds in the two texts, Sigmund’s from 1919 (“A Child Is Being Beaten”) and his daughter’s presentation in 1922 (“Beating Fantasies and Daydreams”), the same fantasies, in the same terms — without taking into account the strange similarities with “The Case of Dora,” written by Freud

⁵⁵ (53) Cf. Rodrigué, 1996 vol. 2: 283.

⁵⁶ (54) Cf. Young-Bruehl, 1988: 97sq. & Webster, 1995: 410 sq.

⁵⁷ (55) Freud 1919, “*Ein Kind wird geschlagen*”.

in 1901 when Anna had just turned five. The common denominator is Sigmund the father, he alone, who had obtained a complete “confession” from his daughter on the couch. Anna’s fantasies, which she attributed to a so-called girl of 15, are those of her father, who maneuvered her as he had previously manipulated Emma Eckstein, Ida Bauer (the case of Dora) and Herbert Graf (the case of Little Hans).

Now one may better understand Freud’s sharp reaction to the attack of which Anna, his creation and his double, was the victim at the time of this meeting in 1922, which evidently doesn’t figure into the collection of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society minutes. One understands, too, why Freud entrusted nobody else with his daughter’s psychoanalysis, in formal contradiction to all of his own edicts, not to mention that he didn’t agree to submit himself to the analysis that he demanded of his disciples before practicing the profession that he had invented.

The some 300 letters between Anna Freud and her father are not published, nor is Anna’s correspondence with her good friend Dorothy Burlingham, nor are the letters that she exchanged without discontinuation with Ernest Jones,⁵⁸ her suitor for a time who was quickly disappointed and curbed by Sigmund, the father. The correspondence between Anna Freud and Eva Rosenfeld — the singer Yvette Guilbert’s niece and a friend of the family for a while — has equally been excluded from publishing.⁵⁹ And the exchanges, from 1912 to 1936, between Lou Andréas-Salomé and Sigmund Freud won’t tell us much more, either about Sigmund’s psychoanalysis of Anna, about which Lou, the seductive muse, was in the know, like several trusted individuals, or about the Viktor Tausk affair in which she had been the mistress, or about the other stories, since all of the essential letters had been excluded or redacted by Anna Freud in 1966.

When Paul Roazen tried, as he edited his 1975 book *Freud and His Followers*, to

⁵⁸ (56) Cf. Letter from Jones to Sigmund Freud, 02/27/1936, for example.

⁵⁹ (57) Peter Heller, Anna’s former patient, published this truncated correspondence in 1992 (Roazen, 2001: 133-134).

interview a former analyst, simply asking him *when* he had joined the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, the latter dryly replied that it was none of his business, and then that he wouldn't possess any of "our secrets."⁶⁰

That is precisely what Frank Sulloway calls the Freudians' "paranoid secrecy."⁶¹ The paranoid man is feeble, with a furrowed brow. And secrets, dangerous for those who lose them, become instruments of power for him who keeps them.

⁶⁰ (58) Paul Roazen 1975: p xxxiii. Cf. also Roazen, 2001: 41.

⁶¹ (59) Sulloway, 1991: 250.

CHAPTER THREE

Excerpt Two

Chapter Ten

Leonardo and The Bird Mix-up

“Children who are not breastfed by their mothers
have a risk 1,000 times greater than others of
becoming homosexuals.”*

Ayatollah Montazeri, Tehran Sermon, March 1985.

Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of his Childhood is a real gem.⁵⁹ One work, just one, deliberately invented and untranslated by its author, serves as the key to the vault of a 150-page long phantasmagoria bubbling up from the kingdom of the dead. *Leonardo* is one of these numerous pieces of analysis forged *post mortem, et sine materia*, which were a habit for Sigmund Freud. These pedagogical “pathographies”⁶⁰ are considered archetypes justifying Freudian pretensions of being a science that, by its method alone, discovers that which no other rival method could. His psychotherapy, irreducible to any other, already supplanted everything that psychiatry could generate before. But it wasn’t enough, and these pathographical reconstructions would prove Freudian superiority over the archeologist and historian.

The interpretive edifice is supposed to be evidence of Freudian techniques’ formidable power to access historical truth — here an artist’s childhood, there a patient’s, elsewhere

⁵⁹ (629) Freud, 1910, *Eine Kindheitserinnerung des Leonardo da Vinci* (hereafter shortened to *Leonardo* [*Léonard*]).

⁶⁰ (630) The term is used by Freud himself, in *Léonard* [*Leonardo*] specifically. On Freud’s *Leonardo*, see primarily Jones vol 2: 367-370, Ellenberger 1970: 530-531, & Gay vol 1: 422-431. Stannard (1980, in Crews, 1998: 200-211; and Eysenck, 1985, chap.7) offer good reviews. But the best study is Han Israëls’s 1993 “Freud and the Vulture.”

prehistorical man — from distant artifacts obtained years, centuries, or millennia later. And, *Saxa Loquuntur*, it even made stone speak.⁶¹ A word, a dream, a mental association, a symptom, a literary or artistic oeuvre, an archeological vestige, a myth erected as a real event, or a legend taken literally carries hidden information about the individual's or species's past, still nestled inside the present that it governs.

Psychoanalysis invented the time machine. Not only did it unveil historical, ontological, and paleontological truths unknown to the best experts, but also the reason for the facts, meaning the unconscious motives of prehistoric man embedded in the child embedded in the adult. The good news: prehistoric man had an unconscious, a living fossil and reservoir of myths, transmitted from generation to generation by inheritance of acquired characteristics. Only psychoanalysis of current symbols from an immemorial past could give them their *real meanings*, and attain *the* understanding. It possesses the only, but universal, key to all secrets: *interpretation* surrenders to psychoanalysis the ultimate knowledge of unconscious meaning, and thus knowledge about the true engines of human phenomena, since, according to its postulate, the meaning determines behavior. No meaning exists without psychoanalysis (Freudian of course, for a Freudian), and no one else outside of it, be he Jungian, could understand that this meaning is always sexual.

Finally, it informs miscreants about the neurotic motivations of historians who wouldn't be psychoanalyzed and teaches them the profound nature of worldly affairs about which they were ignorant from the origin of the human race until the invention of the only *psychology of profundity*: psychoanalysis. On that account *Leonardo* was a lesson, but from an author who

⁶¹ (631) One of Michaelangelo's statues in 1914, for example. The expression *Saxa Loquuntur* is in Freud's 1896 *Zur Ätiologie der Hysterie* (trans. Fr. 84).

never took one, because psychoanalysis never remembered the one on history. And psychoanalysis doesn't apply to psychoanalysts. *Quod licet Jovi, non licet Bovi* – what God is allowed, cattle are not. Anyway, Carl Jung noted, in regards to the marvelous *Leonardo*, “It is but a cruel pleasure to be ahead of the cow by God knows how many decades.”^{62*} In fact, Sigmund Freud's power of persuasion demands respect much more for the writer's talents than for his readers' wisdom.

Abracadabra, The Vulture is Gone...

Sigmund Freud became interested in Leonardo da Vinci's life in 1906 after reading his romanticized biography in 1902 by Dmitry Merezhkovsky.⁶³ In October 1909, following his return from the United States,⁶⁴ he collected some documents and, the next December 1, offered the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society the account of his bewitching speculations.⁶⁵ However the lecture that Wednesday reserved for devotees comprised, as we will see, a revealing peculiarity when one compares the original to *la vulgate* that we know. The official model, with an identical framework but intended for the public, was then written in several weeks at the beginning of the year 1910 and would appear at the end of May.

Then the author would add a number of notes, modify the vocabulary, or even clarify the reading of new finds, but the text wouldn't undergo any substantial revision despite several editions. There wouldn't be any reshaping addressing the stock objections Freud was aware of from the start of his study that already reduced it to triviality. Moreover, each new edition would make matters worse by increasing the weight of initial errors with the addition of notes that never

⁶² (632) Letter to Freud, 08/11/1910.

⁶³ (633) In 1906, in a survey about the best books (1907, *Antwort auf eine Rundfrage* “Vom Lesen und von guten Büchern”), he put Merezhkovsky's novel among his top ten.

⁶⁴ (634) Letter to Jung, 10/17/1909.

⁶⁵ (635) Cf. Nunberg & Federn, *Minutes* from the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society (vol 2) on this date.

changed direction.

We have known for a long time that *Leonardo*, one of Freud's favorite works, or even "the only beautiful thing"^{66*} that he had ever written (but each important publication was his favorite work, and each clinical case was his best case), was a hoax. He constructed a tale with the intent of increasing previous illusions' social penetration — principally the cases of Little Hans and the Rat Man published several months earlier — and these themselves montages of the seduction narrative meant to inspire the thought that Psychoanalytic theory could find any therapeutic evidence. It was equally important to put a stop to the vain disputes, like the one that took place with Albert Moll, and make them impossible.

Peter Gay remarked, by the way, that he "saw in his work something like a reconnaissance towards a massive invasion of the cultural domain, an invasion that he prepared, with psychoanalytic weapons in hand."^{67*} That year the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA) was founded at the Congress in Nuremberg. But initially Freud's intention was less to form his own independent group than it was to use organizations with political clout already in existence.⁶⁸ To this end, he had asked Alfred Adler, who was very close to leftist activists, to prepare a report to determine whether or not psychoanalysts should join the Social Democratic Party. And it was during the writing of *Leonardo* that he envisaged a specific organization (the IPA), all while thinking that his internal discipline needed to be stricter than in a scientific society.⁶⁹ It was political. Freud's speech at this Congress in Nuremberg was militant:

⁶⁶ (636) Letter from Freud to Ferenczi, 02/13/1919 (in Jones vol 2: 369) or even from Freud to Lou Andreas-Salomé, 02/09/1919 (in Gay vol 1: 424).

⁶⁷ (637) Gay vol 1: 422-423. And Peter Gay strangely placed *Léonard* [*Leonardo*] in his chapter, "Thérapie et Technique" ["Therapy and Technique"].

⁶⁸ (638) As John Kerr notes, 1994: 280-281.

⁶⁹ (639) Cf. His Letter to Ferenczi 01/01/1910. Cf. *Minutes*, vol 2: 03/10/1909 for Adler's intervention on Marxism in front of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society.

it indisputably had everything to do with penetrating cultures via psychoanalysis.⁷⁰ *Leonardo* was destined to colonize culture via psychoanalysis. Freud had the firm conviction that “Mythology would have to be entirely conquered by us”⁷¹* and that the “the biographical domain must also become our own.”⁷¹*

It’s the fact of a single man, who, facing his giant sheets of paper with pen in hand, possessed no clinical information justifying his account. He disposed of them. The paleontologist of course deduces the entire dinosaur from a fossilized claw. But the claw exists. But Leonardo da Vinci was in no state to confirm or refute by the “free association” technique, or to guide the author in his clever deductions via a “transferential relationship”: he died 400 years before his “analysis.” There was no patient. So where are the facts? How did Freud obtain them? Apart from Merezkovsky’s novel and an Italian biography from 1550 by Vasari that was well-known at the time, Freud procured two principle sources: a study by Smiraglia Scognamiglio dating from 1900, and above all a work by Marie Herzfeld from 1906. Thus he possessed two versions, in Italian and in German, of autobiographical notebooks (or *Codex Atlanticus*) that Leonardo wrote with his left hand in specular handwriting, with extraordinary, visionary drawings.⁷²

At the beginning of the twentieth century, almost nothing was known about the artist’s early infancy, as Freud notes in his own text.⁷³

Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) was the biological child of Caterina and de Ser Piero da Vinci, the latter of whom married the year of Leonardo’s birth a woman other than Leonardo’s mother (Donna Albiera Amadori). In 1457 Leonardo was officially recorded as a member of his father’s family. And that is about all, apart from rumors. What was a conjecture at the time,

⁷⁰ (640) Freud, 1910 *Die zukünftigen Chancen der psychoanalytischen Therapie*.

⁷¹ (641) Letter from Freud to Jung, 10/17/1909.

⁷² (642) The *Codex* is available on CD-ROM. The original of Leicester’s *Codex* was acquired in 1997 by Bill Gates for the modest sum of 30 Million US-Dollars.

⁷³ (643) End of Chap.1 of *Léonard* [*Leonardo*].

lacking evidence, appeared to Freud as an indisputable historical certainty: Leonardo was a homosexual. Even if it “seems to be ruled out that he was sexually active,”* one must “Consider him a repressed homosexual, or as *someone who is only homosexual in thought!*”⁷⁴* Twenty-five years later he would once again see in Leonardo da Vinci “An *ideal* homosexual, meaning that he was probably one by nature, but not by behavior.”⁷⁵*

By virtue of his conjectural doctrine, homosexuality was by definition caused by a young boy being raised by a castrating mother and a father deprived of his virility, or even without a father, by his single mother with whom he “identified” during a period of time seen as crucial to his sexual orientation. By postulate Leonardo *was* a pederast. It *follows* then that Leonardo *must* have been raised by his mother before once again living at his father’s in 1457. And all of this played out in five or six years; such is the dogma: “in the three or four first years of life impressions are formed about, and reaction modes are established in relation to the outside world, that no event at a later point in time could strip of their influence.”⁷⁶* It is the irreversibility of premature influences that makes it difficult to discern psychotherapy’s attempts to work with adults. Aside from the paradox, we observe that it’s once again a myth: one learns and changes at every age – except for psychoanalysts.

Despite the paucity of information, Freud possessed unshakeable convictions — incidentally making the rest of his interpretation perfectly superfluous —, and solutions well anterior to documentation: “There is so little information about Leonardo that I am at a loss as to how to demonstrate, in a manner accessible to others, that of which I am justifiably

⁷⁴ (644) Freud, December 1, 1909, Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, *Minutes* vol 2: 334 (my italics).

⁷⁵ (645) Freud to Joseph Wortis 01/18/1935 (Wortis 1954, *Psychoanalysis in Vienne [Psychoanalysis in Vienna]*, 1934. “Notes sur mon analyse avec Freud” [“Notes on My Analysis with Freud”]: 164).

⁷⁶ (646) *Léonard [Leonardo]*: 63.

convinced.”⁷⁷* His rhetoric would prove them *a priori*, without facts, and serve also as a demonstration of the abilities of psychoanalysis to decode the first years of an individual’s life, endowed with an inversion “of thought” that Freud had always deemed pathological, filling in biographical gaps only by the force of his interpretation. For his readers he reversed the logical order, which for him went from theoretical presuppositions to interpretations, and began with the interpretation, 400 years later, of a single fantasy pulled from a single memory from Leonardo’s childhood of which he would be reminded in 1505 in his 50s.

Da Vinci would remember, then, at the time when he was an infant in his crib, a vulture flew over and hit him several times between his lips with its tail. That’s what Freud claimed to have read in the notebook, which is an affirmation on his part and not a fact. The notebook said this: “*Questo scriver si distintamente del nibbio par che sia mio destino, perchè nella mia prima ricordatione della mia infantia e’ mi pareva che essendo io in culla, che un nibbio venissi a me e mi aprissi la bocca colla sua coda e molte volte mi percuotesse con tal coda dentro alle labbra.*” The quote is extracted from Scognamiglio by Freud,⁷⁸ who translated *nibbio* as *Geier* in German, meaning, in English, a *vulture*.

The Freudian interpretation begins and treats the supposed memory like the “obvious contents” of a dream, concealing its “latent content.” The memory fragment in fact revealed fantasies and unconscious desires which, wrongly rejected during infancy, surfaced later in Leonardo’s life, appearing to him in his adult years in the form of a memory. The fantasy was overdetermined: a vulture’s tail is a bodily appendage that calls to mind — since it is a *tail* (“*mi aprissi la bocca colla sua coda*”)! — a virile member, *thereby* indicating within da Vinci a fellatio fantasy that is much like those of women and *passive* homosexuals, and is reminiscent of

⁷⁷ (647) Letter to Jung, 10/17/1909.

⁷⁸ (648) *Léonard [Leonardo]*: chap. 2 note 1 (Freud citing the *Codex Atlanticus* F.65 v., pulled from Scognamiglio’s text, 1900). At the time *nibbio* was still spelled *nibio*.

suckling the maternal breast for which he unconsciously had nostalgia.⁷⁹ Excellent news once again: females have fantasies about fellatio. Passive homosexuals have them as well. *But* what about heterosexual males and *active* homosexuals?

The *vulture*, he maintained, is “identified” (by whom?) as the mother and, when it strikes the infant between the lips, the image translates as the child’s desire to “have its lips crushed by innumerable impassioned kisses,”⁸⁰* *thus* evidence for the intensity of an *erotic* connection between Leonardo da Vinci and his single mother.

Now, the *vulture* is a symbolically female animal. Why? Well, the Egyptians had a divinity with a vulture head, named Mut, of a female nature, impregnated by the wind,⁸¹ and *so*, all vultures were female, *without fathers*. In Ancient Egypt Mut was the symbol of maternity, which would be found elsewhere in the sound of the German *die Mutter*, the mother, Freud affirmed — here associating consonances that could only be his own, and not Leonardo’s, to appropriate readers’ gullibility himself.

But how could a female creature offer herself, with feathers, to be fellated? Well, said the Professor, who had a response to everything, the Egyptians *often* depicted Mut with breasts *and* an erect penis, much like children who imagine — at least in Freud’s mind — that all individuals, male or female, were endowed with a phallus. And “Leonardo may very well have known the scientific fable (*sic*) in which the vulture had to have been chosen by the Egyptians as

⁷⁹ (649) *Léonard [Leonardo]*: 54.

⁸⁰ (650) *ibid*: 97.

⁸¹ (651) During the discussion about Freud’s exposé on *Léonard [Leonardo]*, December 1, 1909, Viktor Tausk taught the devotees that Croats also believed that illegitimate children were born from fertilization by the wind, because they have an expression for them that goes, “she had the child of broken wind” (*Minutes*, vol 2: 344). His admirers were satisfied. S. Freud later gave his expert advice: “J’ai remarqué, en analysant plusieurs musiciens, un intérêt particulier, et qui remonte jusqu’à leur enfance, pour les bruits que l’on produit avec les intestins. [...] Une forte composante anale dans cette passion pour le monde sonore ? Je laisse la question en suspens” [“I’ve noticed, in analyzing several musicians, a peculiar interest, stemming from their childhood, for sounds that one produces with his intestines {...} A strong anal component in this passion for the world of sound? I leave this question unanswered”]. It was indeed the founder of psychoanalysis who wrote this (Letter to Stefan Zweig, 06/25/1931).

the symbol of the mother.”^{82*} Freud does not tell us at the beginning of his argument that Leonardo *must* have noticed this similarity, but that he *could* have. It seems logical to say that he *might not have*, because he could have been unaware — lacking understanding about Egyptology, created three centuries later — that the ancient Egyptians had a goddess with a vulture head.

But a rhetorical magic trick transforms a simple discursive possibility into total conviction. The other jumps about in his syntax from the conditional to the categorical imperative. He claimed, first of all, that Leonardo *could* have learned by reading about the myth among the Fathers of the Church, who turned to this to explain how Jesus was born to a virgin, and then that he had certainly done so. Then Freud, having surreptitiously slipped from a narrative estimation to factual evidence, was magically authorized to write that Leonardo certainly imagined the vulture as a female animal born without a father, even when he wouldn’t have known about Ancient Egyptian beliefs. At that point, “we stumble upon a piece of information that elevates from probability to certainty that Leonardo knew the vulture tale.”^{83*}

The only certain historical fact, Freud said, suddenly forgetting the artist’s supposed repressed “homosexuality,” is that he had been *registered*, in 1457, living in his paternal home. As to what happened before, we wouldn’t know anything without psychoanalysis. Thanks to it — without counting a complete psychological portrait of the character about whom Freud had, from the beginning, no solid evidence — we know that from then on that he lived with his single mother for “at least three, maybe five, years.”^{84*}

The logic is as follows: 1. Leonardo was a homosexual, *therefore* he liked fellatio, 2. his

⁸² (652) *Léonard [Leonardo]*: 58. The “fable scientifique” [scientific fable] (*das Wissenschaftliche Märchen*) here is a textual repetition of a terrible critique by von Krafft-Ebing during the lecture rigged by Freud on April 21, 1896 (*Zur Ätiologie der Hysterie*). Cf. here chapter 12.

⁸³ (653) *Léonard [Leonardo]*: 59 (my emphasis).

⁸⁴ (654) *Léonard [Leonardo]*: 61.

fantasy shows a restless vulture's tail-penis between his lips, 3. Ancient Egyptians considered the vulture to be a fatherless and invariably female animal, 4. "If we try to insert this into the fantasy," the memory "would signify that the *mother* bent over him, put her penis in his mouth and shifted it from back and forth several times."⁸⁵* So it was in fact the symbol of his mother. So then one leaps from the symbol to the historical reality of his mother, who raised him. The psychoanalysis of fantasies embedded in a childhood memory demonstrated *thus* that Leonardo had no father around to compensate for the deficit in masculinity at such a sensitive age, and that is why he became a homosexual. *His vulture fantasy symbolizes an unconscious identification with a female individual by a child raised without a father.*

So he moved in with his father Ser Piero, when he was about five years old.

But the die had been cast and Leonardo Da Vinci, identifying himself with his single mother to whom he could no longer be disloyal, remained a homosexual until the end of his days, dedicating himself to studying *flying* machines and, surrounded by adonises, painting Madonnas with such beautiful *smiles*. What began as pure, empty speculation then became a "*fact* that the vulture fantasy corroborates."⁸⁶*

All of the disciples were thunderstruck by the revelation. The fascinating *Leonardo* reconstituted the artist's life better than the specialists and, admirers proclaimed, contained the grand, final explanation about the origins of homosexuality.

The painter's works were the object of the most psychoanalytic attention, and they found there what had escaped every art critic. Suddenly the Swiss Pastor Oscar Pfister understood everything. In da Vinci's painting entitled The Virgin and Child with Saint Anne (1510), the reverend saw, in 1910, there on the Madonna's lap, the perfect contours of a vulture. It's

⁸⁵ (655) Freud, December 1, 1909, Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, *Minutes* vol 2: 336 (my italics).

⁸⁶ (656) *Léonard [Leonardo]*: 63 (my italics).

glaringly obvious and no one had noticed for four centuries! In 1913 Oscar Pfister distributed a work dedicated to this superb confirmation of his master's genius, and, he said, "Almost none of the people to whom I revealed my little discovery could resist the evidence of this painting's riddle."⁸⁷* Naturally Carl Jung, another protestant informed by precedent about what would be agreeable to observe also found one, but somewhere else...⁸⁸ to which Freud replied that his vulture wasn't at all as clean as Pastor Pfister's.⁸⁹ Sandor Ferenczi, for his part, noticed it, "at first glance — it is truly astounding."⁹⁰*

The author elevated his sheep, whom he generously quoted in his subsequent editions as external verification, with the goal of reinforcing his magical *Leonardo*'s persuasion. And nevertheless Sigmund Freud knew perfectly well that his *vulture*, which everyone was persuaded to contemplate in all of its intricate details, *had never existed*.

The Flight of the Kite

Leonardo is interesting because, save his "clinical cases," it concentrated the entirety of Sigmund Freud's talents in information manipulation. It continues to teach us also about his admirers' child-like credulity up to the present time. Psychoanalytic milieus, evidently very much bothered by their own incoherences, and to save the hero with their favorite ideology when the incoherences started becoming public despite the devotees, got in the habit of reducing the incoherences to a sole "translation error." But the regrettable mistranslation was already sufficient in itself to demolish the Freudian construction, and it was not at all an error.

Let's begin by remarking upon Freud's very vague respect for historical documentation.

⁸⁷ (657) O. Pfister 1913, cited by Freud in the 1919 edition of *Léonard [Leonardo]* (chap. 4 note 18).

⁸⁸ (658) Jung to Freud, 06/17/1910.

⁸⁹ (659) Freud to Jung, 06/19/1910.

⁹⁰ (660) Letter from Ferenczi to Freud, 06/12/1910.

Already in 1892 Gabriel Séailles's biographical essay⁹¹, which the Viennese had read, had firmly put Leonardo da Vinci's homosexuality into question, deeming this affirmation, founded on gossip, "monstrous." On April 8, 1476 Leonardo da Vinci had been implicated in a lawsuit in Florence, along with others, for "active sodomy," following an anonymous and libellous accusation actually aimed at another individual from the illustrious Medici family. Da Vinci was exonerated that same year, on June 16.⁹² This is the only historical evidence we possess. The rest is pure speculation and the artist's homosexuality is still discussed today. But for Freud, it was an absolute certainty well before 1910. Where did this idea come from? Sigmund Freud — revealing here his poor understanding of homosexual behavior— had to make Leonardo a singly passive homosexual of a feminine kind, because it was the postulate for the rest of his reasoning.

The *second serious anomaly* is that at the moment when Freud prepared his account for the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, then in 1910 when he wrote it for the public, affirming in the two cases that the child was, *by definition*, raised only by his mother, he didn't take into account one French author's study, that he had read and conscientiously annotated, which indicated nevertheless that Leonardo only lived with his mother Caterina Ser Piero's marriage, the same year as his birth in 1452.⁹³ Thus, Leonardo was raised by his father. In any case, Caterina was not alone: she married Antonio Buti, called *Accattabriga* (a belligerent person), in 1453, or 1454 at the latest. At five years old, in 1457, when Leonardo da Vinci was recorded in the fiscal declaration registers, he had lived, since he was weaned, in a normally constituted family. His father, the notary Ser Piero, of a solid and very virile temperament, got involved with at least five women, married four, and died in 1504 in his 78th year of life, leaving behind 12 living children.

⁹¹ (661) Séailles (G.), 1892: *Léonard de Vinci, l'artiste et le savant* [*Leonardo da Vinci, The Artist and Savant*]. Essai de biographie psychologique [Essay on Biographical Psychology]. Paris, Perrin.

⁹² (662) Cf. Bromly, 1988: 139 sq.

⁹³ (663) Jack Spector, 1972 (The Aesthetics of Freud: a Study in the Psychoanalysis of Art), mentioned without reference by Gay vol 1: 431, which Rodrigué reproduced without reference, 1996, vol 1.: 532.

The second child wasn't born until 1476, so Leonardo remained the only son raised by Ser Piero and his first two wives — pampered in comfort and not like the bastard invented by Freud — until his independence.

The *third serious anomaly* consists of numerous, unsettling revivals.

In January 1923, the year the third edition was published, the scholar and art historian Eric Maclagan, in the *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* which had published in its previous issue a long account of Freud's *Leonardo*, drew attention to the fact that Leonardo da Vinci had in reality written *nibbio*, meaning kite, and certainly not vulture, which is called *avoltoio*.⁹⁴ But in the Italian text that Sigmund Freud used for the memory quoted above, one clearly reads *nibbio*, which he translated as *Geier* (vulture) and not as *Hühnergeier* (kite).

Certainly, as Han Israëls points out,⁹⁵ Merezhkovsky's Russian couldn't distinguish the kite from the vulture because there is but a single word (*korshun*) for the two birds, so that its German translation — by Carl von Gütschow in 1903 —, who didn't return to the original text, would render *korshun* as *Geier*, or vulture. But Freud said himself that Merezhkovsky was “carried away by his imagination”^{96*} and knew to distinguish his novel from a historical document, used both, and translated the Italian himself. The sources of the memory cited by Freud were Scognamiglio, in Italian⁹⁷ and its German translation by Marie Herzfeld, and not Merezhkovsky. No Italian-German dictionary would allow translating *nibbio* as *Geier*. Let's note that *Herr Professor* Sigmund Freud mastered German, English, Italian, read Greek, Latin, Spanish, French, a bit of Hebrew, and, having learned Czech as a second language until three years old, knew Yiddish well which his always present mother used daily. He sufficiently

⁹⁴ (664) Eric Maclagan: Leonardo in the consulting room. *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, 1923 vol. 42: 54-57.

⁹⁵ (665) Israëls 1993, “Freud and the Vulture”: 580.

⁹⁶ (666) *Minutes*, vol 2: 338.

⁹⁷ (667) *Léonard [Leonardo]*, chap. 2 note 1 (see above).

mastered conversational Italian to use it during his frequent travels to Latin-European countries. From 1898 on, he could say that in Ragusa, in Sicily, he had “constantly spoken in Italian, meaning that I got used to translating from German into Italian in my head.”^{98*} In his minor literary work, he also referred to the biography in Italian by Giorgio Vasari (*Vita di Leonardo da Vinci*, 1550),⁹⁹ and quoted, with the Latin and Greek, the number of extracts from different texts, including the *Codex Atlanticus*, in Italian.

In other parts of the *Codex Atlanticus*, which frequently figured in Smiraglia Scognamiglio’s book that Sigmund Freud had under his nose, Leonardo da Vinci did actually mention the vulture (*avoltoio*) as a voracious scavenger who followed the army on their campaigns, but at no time does he mistake it for the kite (*nibbio*) from the supposed memory. The artist, fascinated by birds, was well informed about the radical differences between the two predators, and Freud, who knew at least rudimentary Zoology, had no reason to make a translation error of such breadth.

Vultures are not found in Tuscany, and it is highly improbable that little Leonardo could have been touched by this volatile bird in northern Italy. Kites, on the other hand, are as common in Italy as vultures in Egypt. Nevertheless, the ancient Egyptians didn’t believe that they were invariably female and impregnated by the wind. And the Fathers of the Church didn’t use the myth of an invariably female kite impregnated by the wind to wiggle out of the affair with Baby Jesus and the Virgin’s Immaculate Conception. Given his competency in foreign languages, language itself, rhetoric, and the cardinal role that he conferred to the memory fragment in his theory, Professeur Freud is inexcusable.

Han Israëls clearly demonstrated in 1993, with supporting historical documentation, that

⁹⁸ (668) Freud, 1898: *Zum psychischen Mechanismus der Vergesslichkeit*: 103.

⁹⁹ (669) G. Vasari, 1550: *La vie des meilleurs peintres, sculpteurs et architects* [*The Lives of the Best Painters, Sculpturists, and Architects*].

it was not at all an error on Freud's part but a dupery: the author *knew very well* what he was doing in deliberately translating *nibbio* as vulture (*Geier*), since 1909. He was even better informed about the correct German translation of *nibbio* given that he used the 1906 work by Marie Herzfeld, who, when she translated the memory, correctly used the word *Hühnergeier*, or kite, and boldly underlined the corresponding passages in red pencil in her personal copy.¹⁰⁰ But there's more.

Han Israëls tracked down another oddity in the *German edition* of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society Minutes, the loyal retranscription of what was recorded from the meeting on December 1, 1909. Indeed, when Freud delivered his talk on Leonardo da Vinci in front of the stunned society members that Wednesday, he used the word kite (*Hühnergeier*), when discussing his own translation of the memory, but used "vulture" (*Geier*) during his interpretation talk! And his translation of the memory, then, was indisputably a textual reproduction of Marie Herzfeld's work. Han Israëls published the facsimiles from Herzfeld's translation (1906) and Freud's (1909) side by side,¹⁰¹ and the latter could be a copy. The two texts employ *Hühnergeier* (kite).

A few weeks later the vulture recovered his great wings in Leonardo's crib in the complete work destined for the masses, and the kite flew away. The inventor of psychoanalysis knew about the impossibilities and historical incongruities from the beginning, since the Autumn 1909 drafts, since his talk in December, since the May 1910 publication, since the subsequent 1919 or 1923 editions, when he was reminded of them, and changed absolutely nothing, in fact the opposite: the body of footnotes got thicker with successive layers of intransigent dogmatism, always ignoring history's objections, scorning the experts and their documentation when it wasn't in agreement with his theory.

¹⁰⁰ (670) Israëls, 1993 "Freud and the Vulture": 583.

¹⁰¹ (671) Israëls, 1993 *ibid.*: 581 fig. 4.

Sigmund Freud knew the review in *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, in which Eric Maclagan critiqued his work. Ernest Jones had sent him a copy from April 1921, where an article by Mitchell providing him material and ideas increasing the plausibility of another pathographical-fantasmatic interpretation, and valid enough to merit, in 1927, an appendix in his 1914 *The Moses of Michelangelo*.¹⁰² But his *Leonardo* didn't have the right to such fair treatment.

In July 1910 “a kind review”* of his book by Havelock Ellis in the *Journal of Mental Science* already indicated that Leonardo's bird “could well have not been a vulture” (“*kein Geier gewesen zu sein*”), to which Freud replied in a 1919 postscript that Da Vinci had “promoted” (“*ernannten*”) the animal to the vulture's rank....¹⁰³

The Devotees are Embarrassed

Freud's interpretive system is devastated: Leonardo da Vinci was raised by his father, there was never a vulture, and *Herr Professor* knew it from the beginning. And nonetheless the devotees aided in its publication, marked by an obvious untruth, visual in the ether, but Freud still refused, up until his death, to alter his *Leonardo*. As to the artist's homosexuality, the starting point for his commentary, it is pure speculation.

On Monday, May 26, 1952 James Strachey, who translated Sigmund Freud's complete works into English, wrote to Ernest Jones — who for his part gathered the elements for his biography of the great man, then in the process of fabrication — that he was surprised by a very bothersome affair. Indeed *nibbio*, transformed by Freud into a “vulture”(imagine that!) was nothing but a common kite! And in the source that Freud had — Strachey insisted — Marie

¹⁰² (672) Freud 1914, *Der Moses des Michelangelo*; & Freud 1927, *Nachtrag zur Arbeit über den Moses des Michelangelo*. Cf. *Lettres de Jones à Freud [Letters from Jones to Freud]*, 05/11/1921, & from Freud to Jones, 03/03/1927.

¹⁰³ (673) “*Der grosse Vogel brauchte ja gerade kein Geier gewesen zu sein.*” And “*wie es von Leonardo mit dem zum Geier ernannten Vogel...*” (*Léonard [Leonardo]*, Chap.2 n2).

Herzfeld correctly translated *nibbio* as the German word *Hühnergeier* (a kite), underlined in red, and not *Geier* (a vulture), as he had written in his book. Jones, troubled, quickly responded to his pen pal about what needed to be corrected: “I don’t see how we can tamper with the Holy Scripture, or even the *Vexierbild*, but of course there will have to be a footnote.”¹⁰⁴

A year and a half of reflection was necessary for Jones to find the solution, which he revealed in a letter to Strachey on January 11, 1954. This is the explanation provided in his biography: Sigmund Freud must have read in Herzfeld only the second part of the word *Hühnergeier*, making it *Geier*, which would clearly be *vulture*.¹⁰⁵

This would have readers believing that Freud made a mistake in reading “*Hühnergeier*” contained in the memory correctly translated by Herzfeld, and Jones, pretending to be unaware of the Italian text by Scognamiglio, that his master was supposed to have translated himself. He had to find something else: it didn’t hold. The matter was quickly put to rest in 1955 in the second volume of the Great Work by Doctor Jones, who had another trick up his sleeve. There you have it, Jones wrote: “In the German books on Leonardo it is correctly given as *Hühnergeier*, but in Herzfeld’s translation of Leonardo on which Freud mainly relied, it is given as simply *Geier* (vulture).”

That is the string of obvious, pathetic lies trying to hide Freud’s editing, that Jones had passing for an error on Marie Herzfeld’s part. And he even added foolishness to insincerity because, in the end, if what Jones had written was true: 1. Freud didn’t know how to read Italian, which he cited and translated, 2. He only took into account Herzfeld’s text but not any other German texts where *nibbio* was correctly translated. But the reader’s intelligence is of little importance, while he’s left in ignorance about information useful to his understanding. Herzfeld

¹⁰⁴ (674) The exchange is found in Israëls, 1993 “Freud and the Vulture” (583-584). “L’Ecriture Sainte” (Holy Scripture) is evidently Freud’s, and the “image-devinette” (*Vexierbild*) is the canvas recognized by Pfister and Jung as containing the vulture.

¹⁰⁵ (675) Jones vol 2: 370.

was thus made into the only responsible party, once again with the disciples' full knowledge. Jones's dishonesty towards Marie Herzfeld and readers is clear. But he didn't stop there. First of all, the translation problem was a "non-essential part of Freud's argumentation!"* Then, to distinguish the Hero, never culpable, who couldn't make a mistake or falsify, from all the naïve ones, Jones persisted and found convenient, expiatory victims: the two Swiss, Oscar Pfister and Carl Jung. Indeed, "The two birds' appearances [I'll clarify for him: the vulture and the kite] are different enough to diminish the importance of the Swiss' observations."¹⁰⁶* And that's how the cattle became the scapegoats. Self-excepting fallacy: that which is true for them wasn't for Freud, but these two halfwits, on their own, thought to see the vulture on the Madonna's lap.

James Strachey got the message, and in the *Standard Edition* volume containing the *Holy Leonardo*, which was published in 1957, he attributed the blame, like Jones, despite what he had previously written, to Marie Herzfeld. And then he added that the information had only come to light "very recently."¹⁰⁷ "Recently," because Strachey concealed himself behind the appearance, the previous year, of another devastating critique of *Leonardo* by Meyer Shapiro.¹⁰⁸ This author, again a scholar, again addressed the problem of the *nibbio* translation, and also the fact that Leonardo's "memory" *very simply wasn't a memory*, but rather, as they did in folklore during Leonardo's time, a presentiment presented in the form of a reminiscence. But in April 1956, Shapiro extensively quoted Eric Maclagan, of whom the psychoanalysts had pretended to be unaware since January 1923. Furthermore, doubt had been raised since 1910 (in the "kind" review by Ellis cited by Freud himself), and it is clear from his letter to Jones referred to above, that Strachey had had access to Freud's sources, proving that the translation was deliberately

¹⁰⁶ (676) Jones vol 2: 370.

¹⁰⁷ (677) Introduction to *Souvenir d'enfance de L. de Vinci [Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of his Childhood]* (*SE 11: 59-62, principally 60-61)

¹⁰⁸ (678) *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 1956; vol 17 n°2: 147-148.

false *from the beginning*.

Ernest Jones and James Strachey, like their teacher, very simply tricked readers: the two accomplices knew well that their justifications were inaccurate, but they had to protect the Holy Scripture, their prophet, his theory on homosexuality, and their own identity.

In 1967, the *English edition* of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society minutes continues the epic. The meeting on December 1, 1909 where Freud at first used “kite” in his translation of the memory, and then “vulture” for his interpretation, is corrected. Indeed, one reads the orator using “vulture” in both cases, and not “kite” (*Hühnergeier*), then “vulture” (*Geier*), contrary to the original German text. In a note, the translator Margarethe Nunberg and the publishers Hermann Nunberg and Ernst Federn — loyal psychoanalysts from the innermost circle,¹⁰⁹ of Austrian origin, and who nonetheless had the German text in their hands —, after having reviewed the discrepancy making Freud’s interpretation definitely absurd, determined that distinguishing between the vulture and kite, both being birds, in any case, wasn’t important.

But that’s not all. Because there was a *French edition* of the Viennese minutes! It used the two preceding texts. The publisher’s note indicates to us that his product is a translation of the original German, but “of course” adjusted “to benefit from the work already completed by the American translator”^{110*} in 1967. One might expect that the honest French edition would respect the meticulous recording of Freud’s scholarly Society minutes and would dutifully align itself with the German transcription, then insert an explanatory note, let’s say, a euphemistic distraction, or an “interpretation error” from the American text. That’s nonetheless not what happened: the English text (vulture in every case, not kite then vulture) was deemed politically

¹⁰⁹ (679) Paul Federn, who attended this meeting on December 1, 1909, was for a long time in charge of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society minutes after Otto Rank. He committed suicide in 1950 and then his son Ernst succeeded him. Margarethe (Oscar Rie’s oldest daughter) was analysed by Freud himself, her husband Hermann Nunberg by Paul Federn, and Ernst Federn by... Hermann Nunberg! A family affair once again!

¹¹⁰ (680) J. B. Pontalis, warning to Nunberg & Federn (Eds.) *Minutes*, vol 1: 6.

preferable to the original, including the note affirming that kite and vulture, being two birds, makes using one for the other unimportant....¹¹¹ Indeed. Why not, in that case, a parakeet, a heron, or a chaffinch? An ostrich? Or why not an eagle, as Erwin Christensen wrote in 1944 in the *Psychoanalytic Review*, instead of the embarrassing vulture?¹¹²

In other words, even the movement's internal historical sources were altered so that they conformed not to the truth, but to the propaganda content destined for the public, composed of potential patients, naïve individuals, "laypeople," and future psychoanalysts.

In 1994 another French work was published, called, *Léonard de Vinci. Mythologie ou théologie ?* [*Leonardo da Vinci: Mythology or Theology?*] adapted from a doctoral thesis by Jean-Pierre Maïdani Gérard, that once again parroted, in the most loyal Freudian tradition, the cliché idea that the kite's transfiguration into a vulture was nothing but a banal translation error that didn't alter the central concept, despite the definitive article by Han Israëls published the year before, which left behind only a pile of rubble. It is comical that having dedicated numerous pages to the supposed translation error, and assuring that the "mistranslation" couldn't destroy the argument's foundation, the author made a fascinating slip of his own that one might qualify as cosmetic, again translating Marie Herzfeld's *Hühnergeier* as the indispensable "vulture," in a paragraph where he corrects Herzfeld's interpretation errors.¹¹³

"*The Childhood Memory*" was, he added, for Freud both the sole source and the complete "validation" of his "etiological" theory of homosexuality, as the excessive connection to the mother is the cause of the inversion. And Maïdani Gérard insisted on the opinion that the axiological theory of homosexuality was described *entirely* by Freud in his *Leonardo*: "It could

¹¹¹ (681) The text of Freud's exposé from December 1, 1909 is in *Minutes*, vol 2: 333 sq, and the "Notes" page 335.

¹¹² (682) Cited by Israëls, 1993 "Freud and the Vulture": 579.

¹¹³ (683) Maïdani Gérard, 1994: 36.

only be so clearly formulated and firmly articulated thanks to the Leonardo case study.”^{114*}

Rightly so, *since it was never anything but a fantasy*.

In short, *Leonardo* was fertile by necessity and “psychoanalysis lost nothing there.”¹¹⁵

One can always manipulate words, as one can numbers. There you have a falsification transformed into unconscious error, and yet again a fiasco transformed into victory. Following Bouvard and Pécuchet’s example, and that of his predecessors Pfister and Jung, Maïdani Gérard saw in the finger frequently erected towards the sky in Leonardo’s *Vexierbild*: a phallus, “This phallus that nobody ‘had,’ apart from perhaps the Father, who is invisible ‘in the Heavens’; this phallus that no one would need to fear losing, imagining it was theirs...,”* etc.¹¹⁶ Freud did not make this penetrating discovery.

For the psychoanalyst, it is always a matter of modifying the founder’s interpretations to insert “meaning” into them. In this way Jacques Lacan engaged in a new, second-generation hermeneutical analysis of the “Little Hans” case in his “seminar” from 1956-1957 (*Object Relations and Freudian Structures*) and had “revealed” in the Lacanien sense *in text and not a patient*. Who will psychoanalyze Lacan’s text? Even so it took five years of relentless labor for Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok to produce a “cryptonymic” reinterpretation of Freud’s “Wolf Man” case.¹¹⁷ What perhaps is secondarily delightful is that a pathographical analysis gives way to a second analysis, then a third, etc., according to an inexhaustible process that I will call *the Ripolin method*.

The Vulture in the Cuckoo’s Nest

The vulture never existed, and Freud deliberately injected this thought into a textual

¹¹⁴ (684) *ibid*: 223.

¹¹⁵ (685) *ibid*: 12.

¹¹⁶ (686) *ibid*: 256 (original syntax).

¹¹⁷ (687) N. Abraham & M. Torok (1976), *Cryptonymie: le verbier de l’Homme aux loups*. Paris Aubier. (Cf. also Mahony, *les hurlements de l’homme aux loups* [*Cries of the Wolfman*]: 48 sq.)

reality that did not contain it, in the same way that Pfister and Jung projected a perception into a painting by Leonardo da Vinci.

In short, text and artwork resemble these supposed “projective tests” that are not tests, have no value in most cases, and inform us much more about the interpreters’ manias than about the psychological characteristics of the person who produced this imaginary output.¹¹⁸ Of course, no one among Freud’s admirers was preoccupied by finding out if they could perceive the outline of a vulture in whatever work by whichever artist, or even in a cloud, or even those of a bat languidly stretched across the Madonna’s lap. Before their master indicated what they should see and the mysterious key was extracted from the interpretation of a false memory from the crib of Mona Lisa’s painter, not one among them had yet imagined that one could — *more than 450 years later, no less!* — distinguish such a predator’s outline in this precise spot (or another, for Jungians). Even when the vulture had actually figured in the *Codex Atlanticus*, Leonardo couldn’t have been imbued with the conviction of a female animal born without a father, because it was a Freudian fantasy, not ancient Egyptian.

As he had no facts, either historical or clinical, Freud invented a fantasy, or rather recuperated one from his own set to smuggle into a four-century-old “memory” reconstructed by a 50-year-old adult, and then fabricated his interpretation which hid the stowaway while driving out the kite.

How is it that Sigmund Freud decided to refer to Ancient Egypt and not to the popular beliefs closer to the Tuscans’ from the fifteenth century, if not because the latter could not provide any credible material for his thought system? How is it also that he chose only Mut from the range of multiple dieties from the Egyptian pantheon?

¹¹⁸ (688) One final point on these processes is given in a study by Lilienfeld & al.: 2000. It may be obtained online: http://www.psychologicalscience.org/newsresearch/publications/journals/pspi/pspi1_2.pdf

The composite Ancient Egyptian dieties — hybrids blending animals, plants, and different materials — were anthropomorphological representations, varying according to provinces, time period, or their transformations.¹¹⁹ Mut was most often represented as a female creature armed with lion claws, and sometimes adorned with the imperial crown, a “*pschent*” with a vulture’s head. But she *had no penis* disguised either as a tail or as plumage. If it was sometimes the case — in her periodic representations, at certain times or in some provinces — that she was endowed with an erect penis, this feature was not permanent, as in mythology she always remained the God Amun’s *heterosexual wife*. Amun, in one of his incarnations, was Min, a very virile and erectile divinity. Amun, the national “father-God,” the symbol of masculinity, and Mut, the national “mother-Goddess” and the symbol of motherhood, lived happily ever after and had a son who was not born of the wind: Khonsu, the child-god.

Several divinities were equipped with the body or the *head of a hawk*: Khonsu himself (oftentimes crowned by a moon), Montu (the Falcon God, the God of War, Thebes province), Ash (God of the desert), Harakhte and Aten (sun Gods), Nemty (the wandering God), Seker (God of artisans), and then, above all, Horus, the national God, the composite of different falcon Gods. In addition, it is in the form of a kite that Isis, Horus’s mother, hovering over her husband Osiris’s corpse, gave birth to him. Why didn’t Freud prefer these hierarkocephallic leaders who were morphologically closer to the kite than the vulture? And why did he choose Mut rather than Nekhbet, precisely the God who was completely a vulture? Or again, since it would hold, why not grab a firm hold of Min’s priapism, as he was the only truly ithyphallic God, the Lord of procreation?

From where did he get these ideas that weren’t Leonardo’s, that couldn’t be? The vulture image did not come from Leonardo da Vinci. Needless to say, it is tempting to interpret the

¹¹⁹ (689) Cf. Hornung, 1971, and the website: <http://www.dieuxegyptiens.com/index.html>

narrative as Sigmund Freud's fantasies and nothing else — some, such as Eysenck in 1985, would consider his entire oeuvre as autobiographical. Different commentators, for example Ernest Jones or Peter Gay (who had “no doubt that he figured into the subject”^{120*}), noted Freud's heroic identification with Leonardo, which is a way to say that he assigned his own tendencies to his character, which he then described as objective fact without realizing — looking out a window to watch himself walk down the street — that he was in fact looking in a mirror. Besides, his *Leonardo* is historically the first appearance, in the absence of any patient, of the Freudian concept of narcissism.

The Viennese's interpretation was a concatenation of Sigmund Freud's mental associations, all governed by the analogical or agglutinative argument. A distant consonance (*Mut-Mutter*) — arbitrary phonetic similarity between two foreign languages by Freud and Freud alone¹²¹ — an approximate spatial contiguity and a vague resemblance of bodily appendages' forms between zoologically distinct species (*coda* = the bird's tail = the man's penis), a forced coincidence of function (breastfeeding-fellatio), or even an objectively fortuitous historical correspondence (Leonardo's predator – Ancient Egyptian mythological creature), act as pieces of evidence that then are imposed on readers in rhetorical manipulation, as relationships of causal determination, while neither this information nor these analogies are present in the supposed “memory.”

The only Egyptian aspect of this fiasco is a pyramid, but inverted, point to the ground, that doesn't hold. Like bags that fold upon themselves when empty, Freud's endeavor collapsed upon itself.

¹²⁰ (690) Gay, vol 1: 430.

¹²¹ (691) One may also find in “*Mut*” resonance much like that of the German word *Mut*, which has several meanings, including courage, but Freud has nonetheless decided upon mother (*die Mutter*). Analysis makes numbers, like sounds, whatever it wants.

The fantasy of Leonardo's childhood memory clearly came from Sigmund Freud himself. In October 1865, aged nine years, not long after his maternal grandfather, Jacob Nathansohn's death, whom he saw in agony, little Sigismund Freud had an intense nightmare that awoke him, screaming. He claimed he remembered more than 30 years later, in his dear, largely autobiographical *Traumdeutung*, "He was extremely clean and showed *me my dear mother, asleep, with an especially tranquil facial expression, carried into her bedroom and laid out on the bed by two (or three) characters equipped with birds' beaks*. I awoke crying and screaming, and I roused my parents from sleep. These stretched out characters, strangely clothed and with bird beaks, I had borrowed from the *Philippson Bible*. I believe it was these Gods with sparrowhawk heads who were taking part in a low relief Egyptian funeral."^{122*}

To my knowledge no sparrowhawk exists in the Egyptian pantheon.¹²³ But curiously, Freud's interpretation of his "anxiety dream"* was not cut from the same cloth as the one of Leonardo's memory. This one, concerning himself, is more normative, very secondarily sexual: here the bird (*Vogel*) evoked for him, Freud, a play on words (*vögel**n*, vulgarly: sexual intercourse), a perfectly standard occurrence, and the reader must be unaware of the object of his lust. He wouldn't know either if Amalia Nathansohn-Freud, his Goddess-mother, had the Mona Lisa smile; but characters had already, under his pen, impossible sparrowhawk heads (*Sperber*), not those of a hawk, nor a vulture, nor a kite.

Ten years after his key to dreams Freud knew that "dreams about flight still originally meant: I can make love [*vögel**n*], I am a bird...."^{124*} etc., the old refrain from his own childhood memory from 1865 interpreted in 1899 and reinjected into his informal talk from December 1, 1909 would be a trial run to test his stunning ideas on his suggestible society members. In 1910,

¹²² (692) 1900, *L'Interprétation des Rêves*: 495 (Italics belong to Freud, who knew the Bible in detail since age seven).

¹²³ (693) Cf. Hornung, 1971.

¹²⁴ (694) Minutes, vol 2: 335.

finally, having decided that Leonardo was a homosexual fellatio amateur — but “*someone who [was] only homosexual in thought*” — and that only psychoanalysis could reveal his platonic “inversion,” Freud once again put the 1865 nightmare in circulation, changed the heads, expelled the sparrowhawk, scorned the hawk, placed the travesty of the ithyphallic vulture fitted with a long neck and fabricated for the occasion in the kite’s nest, then the Cuckoo of his own analogical fantasies in the great artist’s cradle.

CHAPTER FOUR

Excerpt Three

Chapter 16

VERDICTS

“Only Freud, as obstinate, sly, and cynical, as he was ambitious, was susceptible to transforming failure into victory in the service of self-promotion on such a large scale.”*

Frederick Crews, 1998¹²⁵

Having estimated, “in weighing my words” he said, that “Freud set Psychiatry back more than fifty years,”¹²⁶ Hans J. Eysenck admitted to finding the situation so strange, “in the sense that psychoanalysis is largely accepted by laypeople and those lacking any notion of what Psychology is, while it is rejected by those who have serious knowledge about the matter.”^{127*} In fact, the total difference between Freudianism’s place in culture, on the one hand, and the evolution of knowledge, on the other, is indeed curious.

Factual criticisms and those on the epistemological organization of psychoanalysis are not recent. They have always existed and were immediately relevant for the most part. But also from the beginning, psychoanalysts have ignored them and ignored everyone except themselves, definitely paralyzed in a stagnant dogmatism, closed off the outside world. Fifty years before

¹²⁵ (1090) Crews 1998, *Unauthorized Freud* Doubters confront a Legend: xxxi.

¹²⁶ (1091) Eysenck, 1973, *Le déclin et la chute... [The Decline and Fall...]*: 71.

¹²⁷ (1092) Eysenck, 1973 *ibid*: 59.

Eysenck, Adolf Wohlgemuth's¹²⁸ criticism was radical but received no reply from the deaf and blind Freudian movement. Like all of those who preceded and followed him, Wohlgemuth had no impact on a hermetic, sterile ideology that never took any major or minor refutation into account in a century, and lived for itself in virtual and juvenile self-sufficiency of collective illusion. A publication by Colby and Stoller in 1988 is another surprising demonstration of this dissociation.¹²⁹ Colby estimates, given the evidence, that psychoanalysis is devoid of all fact, apart from the unconscious, which it neither invented nor reliably explored. It is also a waste of time for modern psychology, which must dispense of it definitively. But Stoller, for his part having recognized the former's arguments and considered that they are true, imperturbably affirmed continuing to believe and practice a treatment that, deservedly so, one can no longer discern from an act of faith, if it wasn't fundamentally, from a consumer's perspective, a fraud.

There is no reason to accord this doctrine, which is not a sacred object, special protection in critical examination any more than to any other branch of ideological history. Informed scholars' judgements are negative. Peter Medawar, winner of the Nobel Prize in 1960, wrote in 1975 that "psychoanalysts will continue to perpetrate the most ghastly blunders just so long as they persevere in their impudent and intellectually disabling belief that they enjoy a 'privileged access to the truth.' The opinion is gaining ground that doctrinaire psychoanalytic theory is the most stupendous intellectual confidence trick of the twentieth century and a terminal product as well—something akin to a dinosaur or zeppelin in the history of ideas, a vast structure of radically unsound design and with no posterity."¹³⁰ Friedrich August Von Hayek, winner of the Nobel Prize in 1974, added that "in the future, men examining the past will see our time as an era

¹²⁸ (1093) Wohlgemuth, A. 1923: *A Critical Examination of Psychoanalysis*, Allen & Unwin (cité par Wolpe & Rachman, 1960) ; cf. also Wohlgemuth, A., "The Refutation of Psychoanalysis." *J. Mental Science*, July 1924; & Robert Woodworth: "Some Criticisms of Freudian Psychology". *J. Abnormal Psychol.* 1917: 174-194.

¹²⁹ (1094) Colby & Stoller, 1988: *Cognitive Science and Psychoanalysis*.

¹³⁰ (1095) Medawar, 1975: 17.

of superstition, fundamentally associated with the names Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud.”¹³¹* More than 20 years ago, Hans J. Eysenck already possessed several sufficiently solid pieces of evidence on its epistemological shortcomings to firmly reject psychoanalysis, as much for its theoretical apparatus as for its therapeutic failures about which systematic evaluation had occupied him since the end of the Second World War. His verdict was harsh: The most well-founded Freudian ideas, which were the rarest, were borrowed from its predecessors or came from common sense; the most original ideas, strictly psychoanalytic, were without grounds and essentially absurd.¹³² When Eysenck, having already weighed his words in 1973 to announce that “Freud set Psychiatry back by more than 50 years,” once again contemplated, in 1985, Freud’s place in history, and he could affirm without a shadow of a doubt that he was “a genius, not of the scientific sort but with propaganda, not of rigorous proof but of persuasion, not in the organization of experience but the art of literature. His place is not, as he called for, alongside Copernicus and Darwin, but with Hans Christian Andersen and the Brothers Grimm, fairy tale narrators.”¹³³* A more recent account of Freudian distortions by Allen Esterson concluded with the observation that “The ascension of psychoanalysis to its dominant position in the twentieth century will probably be seen as one of the most extraordinary aberrations in the history of occidental thought.”¹³⁴*

After having examined in 500 pages the historical distortions and gross internal incoherences of the Freudian system, and before tackling external refutations of it, the Australian Malcolm Macmillan concluded that its “supposed discoveries depend upon methods of inquiry and interpretation that are so defective that even trained practitioners are incapable of producing

¹³¹ (1096) Von Hayek 1978, cited by Gellner, 1985: 230.

¹³² (1097) Eysenck & Wilson 1973.

¹³³ (1098) Eysenck, 1985: 208.

¹³⁴ (1099) Esterson, 1993: 254. Cf. aussi Webster, 1995: 438.

vaguely consistent conclusions,”* then that after a century “psychoanalysts must start all over again,”* but unfortunately “the psychoanalytic method is not capable of discovering clinical facts on which we can agree.”* And so “psychoanalysis is not a bad theory, but rather a theory looking for a few facts.”¹³⁵*

The psychoanalytic theory and therapeutic model are a fiasco (Grunbaum, 1984 to 1996, Erwin, 1996), intellectual bankruptcy that is fraudulent, if not dangerous (Wilcocks 1994, Frederick Crews 1993 to 1999, Max Scharnberg 1993 and 1996, Esterson 1993 and 1998). And while Freudianism enters its second century, we are still at the same point: the beginning.

Let’s be clear, at the beginning of this century, because, for one hundred years, not one study could provide acceptable evidence for the etiopathogenic role of a repressed sexual conflict from childhood responsible for unhealthiness later in life. Not one study to this day has been able to demonstrate that standard psychoanalytic treatment is more effective than simple suggestion. No research permits us to accept the pretensions of psychoanalysis to describe and explain normal or pathological development in its theoretical edifice. Not a single one of its intrinsically psychoanalytical predictions has been confirmed in any dimension because they were all contradicted. In the end Sigmund Freud, who claimed originality and revolutionary innovation, invoked biological foundations that had already been surpassed and rejected by the science of his time, at the exact moment when he published his reflections, and never integrated new knowledge independent of psychoanalysis.¹³⁶

All of this evidence is public and accessible to the watchful reader in the world literature deliberately silenced and scorned by Freudians. Psychoanalysis is unique in that there is nothing original in anything it got right— the unconscious, although today science gives it a very

¹³⁵ (1100) Malcolm Macmillan 1991: 505-506 & 548.

¹³⁶ (1101) Sulloway, 1979; Macmillan, 1991.

different place than accorded it by numerous authors well before the birth of Sigismund S. Freud in 1856, or even the psychological processes described 150 to 200 years before him —, and all its originality is in what it got wrong.

Karl Popper's critique, in 1953, was ultimately not completely one.¹³⁷ To say that psychoanalysis is irrefutable, beyond the line of epistemological demarcation and outside the domain of science, thus in the territory of belief, did no harm to its expansion, in fact to the contrary, as the course of history has shown. Psychoanalysis had been strengthened, and was immunized against such dispute. Before Popper, Karl Kraus, as early as 1908, then Albert Moll in 1912, Havelock Ellis in 1919, had already observed anyway, in vain, Freudianism's epistemological fault of irrefutability: Freudian interpretation is always correct because it is impossible to demonstrate that even one of its claims is false.¹³⁸ A belief is undoubtedly a proposition that one can neither prove nor disprove. Nevertheless, apart from the idea that he at first agreed to prove that Freudianism was irrefutable..., which Popper could neither achieve nor conceive, Adolf Grunbaum (1984, 1996) had noted that astrology, marxism, and psychoanalysis are testable but refuted by experience and history. These are not beliefs, but false paradigms. The assaults of philosophy of science and contemporary epistemology, especially since 1984 with Adolf Grunbaum, have not — any more than demonstration, repeated these past few decades, Sigmund Freud's false fabrications and his catechumens — reached the efidice as they would have been fatal to any other candidate to science. Besides, psychoanalysts ignore them and have not responded to a single crucial argument. In reality the question is no longer whether or not psychoanalysis is a science, even a very soft one, *because it never had fact or method*.

¹³⁷ (1102) "La Science: Conjectures et Réfutations" ["Science: Conjectures and Refutations"], lecture given by Popper at Cambridge in 1953 starting from ideas that he was formulating since the '30s, published in Popper's collection, 1962: *Conjectures et réfutations [Conjectures and Refutations]* (Chap. 1).

¹³⁸ (1103) K. Kraus, *Die Fackel*, 15/01-1908: 31, in Szasz, 1976: 29. Albert Moll 1912 in Sulloway, 1979: 470-471. Havelock Ellis had returned to this challenge in 1919 ("pile je gagne, face tu perds" [heads I win – tails you lose]), and Freud had tried to respond in an article (1920, "Zur Vorgeschichte der analytischen Technik") published under the cover of anonymity.

Psychoanalysis evades reality and fundamentally has nothing to do with science: it's a fantasy that claims that science is only a fantasy.¹³⁹ It's a chimera having bifurcated a century ago and taken its evolutionary course irremediably foreign to fact. Concerning the science of which Freud always availed himself, psychoanalysis is not dead: it very simply was never born.

Specialists opening archive files, historians' inquiries (Ellenberger, Sulloway, Macmillan, Hirschmuller, etc.) into the documents that the movement's authorities actively removed, locked up, and redacted by methods worthy of the K.G.B., then the overlap of evidence, would cause discrepancies to emerge, such that in reality Freudianism's history and its celebrities have a reputation today that is far removed from the fiction drawn up by the hagiographers and exegetes (Jones, Fine, Schur, Gay, Rodrigue, etc.). Psychoanalysis fabricated its history, which is not truth but mysitification with its legends and heroes. The works of rational textual expertise (H. Israels, M. Scharnberg, etc...), texts on hand that everyone had under their noses since their publication, combined with others that are accessible to any serious person, demonstrate that psychoanalytic writings, beginning with Freud's, were subject to distortions, deliberate forgeries, and obvious inventions. All of Freud's known cases were therapeutic failures erected in universal triumph. In any other domain in the history of ideas, it would be an imposture; and for any other thaumaturgist, it would be fraud.

And so "step by step we learn that Freud had been the most overvalued character in the history of science and medicine — as he caused immense damage by propagating false etiologies, diagnostic errors, unproductive research methods."^{140*}

For a century Freudianism has been a fantastic machine destined first to strengthen the psychoanalysts' fantasies; second, to extract patients from their realities, and to suggest to them

¹³⁹ (1104) "L'important est que la science n'est qu'un fantasme" [The important thing is that science is only a fantasy] (J. Lacan, *Ornicar*, 1977, *Ouverture de la session clinique*, p.9) [Opening of the clinical session, p.9].

¹⁴⁰ (1105) Crews, 1995: 295.

that they belong in another; third, to persuade psychotherapists in training and the public that Freudian interpretation is always truer than the facts. Psychoanalysis is lastly a formidable rhetoric of falsehood intended for readers and a permanent alteration of shared evidence inside the therapeutic relationship, all the while assuring that there was no manipulation of information.

It's there without a doubt that arrogant Freudianism had been truly effective and exposed its true talent: dissimulating its factual, clinical, and therapeutic paucity.¹⁴¹ Freudian rhetoric counterfeited the gathering and description of its initial clinical data, falsified the justifications for its interpretations generalized to all of humanity including its prehistoric vestiges, misrepresented the efficacy of its treatment, lied about etiological roots, and finally distorted its own history with extraordinary mass propaganda that continues, seeking to make people believe that it never disinformated, possessed the secret of original sin, and was immunized against all criticisms of the normal world. The more the movement was valued in medias and cultures, the more persuasion was easy, and the less they resorted to evidence.

In one last avatar, always believing itself removed from criticisms and requirements of reason, in relation to which it imagined itself protected by nature and exclusive privilege, psychoanalysis baptized itself "truth narrative" in the end. The determinism of normal or pathological human behavior thus escapes all pragmatic appreciation since the concrete reality of biographical events would have no importance in the organization of a personality or its problems, any more than it would hold weight in the psychotherapies. Freudianism self proclaims its territory defined by private rules that reduce it to a kind of verbal material, an atmospheric vibration gaining meaning from its repetition, simultaneously persuading the psychoanalyst and the psychoanalyzed, welded one to the other by an intersubjective truth, but foreign to the laws of scientific objectivity and sensory knowledge.

¹⁴¹ (1106) Cf. Wilcocks, 1994, Sulloway, 1979 & 1991, Esterson, 1993, and Webster, 1995.

Thus, during analysis, gradually “the associations and interpretations are *inserted* into the developing discourse, *they become true by becoming familiar* and give meaning to disjointed parts of the patient’s biography.”^{142*} In fact, it was of little importance whether the interpretations are true, false, or deliberately fabricated. They were “inserted” by the analyst’s manipulation and “*became true*”... if they weren’t. Such is the magic of the word that shapes reality like clay. But then what were *the facts* described by the “truth narrative”? Where, then, was the administration of proof of its existence outside of psychoanalysts’ discourse? Finally, where is the evidence of the therapeutic effects that one could obtain from it and that would be inaccessible to objectivity?

Persuading oneself that psychoanalysis existed was necessary. But the expulsion of facts is at the very origin of psychoanalysis. The virtualization of its thought narrative was consubstantial and congenital for it, because the incapacity to take reality into account appeared *ab initio* in Sigmund Freud, which the loyal successors ratified at a gathering of worshipers of emptiness, and that the hagiographs regarded as sacred. This inability to be objective is in fact the definition of their identity, and that which by tropism absorbs them into the movement. In the factual universe psychoanalysis doesn’t exist, not in ours, not in yours, not in the patients’; it has no substance and never did. Breaking away from the clinical first, from biology of the time next, and lastly from its own history that would be falsified, it couldn’t reintegrate into the evolution of science from which it was detached *ab ovo*. The unconscious was an interior swindle which Freud commandeered a century ago. And its machievellian ruse, Ernest Gellner remarked, “The habit of tampering with the facts is not something that one adds more or less surreptitiously to the theory when it gets muddled or when it encounters difficulty. *It has always been there*, in all

¹⁴² (1107) Donald Spence, 1982 (my italics), cited by Borch-Jacobsen, 1995: 19. Also see the special no. from the 75th anniversary of the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 1994.

sincerity. Subterfuge isn't introduced to save the theory: *it is* the theory itself."¹⁴³* Freud hoped his creation, definitive and imperfectible, would stand the test of time and, like a statue surviving the artist, would attain eternity in all of its immaculate purity. Therefore, Freudianism is a system entirely constructed in a manner to dodge any refutation and attain universality. But this dream of immortality failed.

Today, in all parts of the world that it permeated with its imperious ideology, Freudianism still protects itself in its mythology. "Narrative truth" embedded in consciousnesses, it penetrated democracies ensuring a fictitious conquest in a virtual world, but it ends in France where it all began: surrealism. Territories have been conquered or annexed without great resistance. But this colossal investment in the culture and uncontrollable stream of soldiers in The Army of Phallus are but a grand illusion in an empty fortress.

"The Immutable School of Nothing"¹⁴⁴* that wanted to be the science of fantasy and the soul, is in fact a fantasy, not a science, and it has no soul. It certainly had plenty of students, which couldn't guarantee any victory against Nothing in the living world. The truth doesn't divide and doesn't multiply. The soldiers' loyalty to their dogmas and rituals does not make them valid. The crusaders could also assemble in support of the doctrine of Christ's resurrection, but their democratic agreement does not significantly increase the chances of the Savior's resurrection, prevented by natural laws, as they are, against which the combatants of the "good fight," regardless of their number and the force of their vociferating conviction, could not escape.

¹⁴³ (1108) Gellner, 1985: 172 (author's italics).

¹⁴⁴ (1109) To borrow a phrase from Jules Michelet, *Histoire de France, Introduction au Tome IX* [*The History of France, Introduction to Tome IX*].

Bibliography

- Bénesteau, Jacques, and Jacques Corraze. *Mensonges freudiens: Histoire d'une désinformation séculaire*. Liège: Mardaga, 2002. Print.
- Bénesteau, Jacques. "La Berlue et la Récurrence des Invectives." *Psychiatrie-und-ethik.de*. September, Réseau International des Critiques du Freudisme, Sept. 2009. Web. 05 Dec. 2013.
- Bénesteau, Jacques. Personal correspondence. September 6, 2013. E-mail.
- de Marneffe, D. "Looking And Listening: The Construction Of Clinical Knowledge In Charcot And Freud." *Signs: Journal Of Women In Culture & Society* 17.1 (1991): 71. *Humanities International Complete*. Web. 12 Mar. 2014.
- "Entretien de François Aubral avec Jacques Bénesteau." Interview by François Aubral. *Psychiatrie-und-ethik.de*. Réseau International des Critiques du Freudisme, n.d. Web. 07 Mar. 2013. < <http://www.psychiatrie-und-ethik.de/wpinfofr/123/> >.
- Gouillou, Philippe. "L'Escroquerie du siècle ?" *Psychiatrie-und-ethik.de*. International Network of Freud Critics, 03 May 2002. Web. 13 Feb. 2014.
- "Hysteria." *Merriam-Webster*. 2014. Web. 1 May 2014.
- Israëls, Han. "Freud and the Vulture". *History of Psychiatry* 4.16 (1993): 577-86. Sagepub.com. Sage Publications. Web. 19 Feb. 2014.
- Levine, Howard B. "The Sins of the Fathers: Freud, Narcissistic Boundary Violations, and Their Effects on the Politics of Psychoanalysis". *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*. 19.1 (2010): 43-50. *EBSCO*. Web 20 Mar. 2014.

- Libbrecht, Katrien, and Julien Quackelbeen. "On The Early History Of Male Hysteria And Psychic Trauma." *Journal Of The History Of The Behavioral Sciences* 31.4 (1995): 370-384. Academic Search Complete. Web. 17 Mar. 2014.
- Medawar, Peter B. "Victims of Psychiatry." Rev. of *The Victim Is Always The Same*. *The New York Review of Books* (January 23, 1975): n. pag. NYBooks.com. The New York Review of Books. Web. 25 Mar. 2014
- Sarukkai, Sundar. "Translation and Science." *Meta: Journal des traducteurs* 46.4 (2001): 646-63. *Erudit.org*. Erudit. Web. 02 Dec. 2013.
- Yudkowsky, Eliezer. "Twelve Virtues of Rationality." *Yudkowsky.net*. Eliezer Yudkowsky, n.d. Web. 27 Mar. 2014.