



## Daniel Jeremy Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and  
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

### **MS-4850: Daniel Jeremy Silver Papers, 1972-1993.**

Series III: The Temple Tifereth-Israel, 1946-1993, undated.

Sub-series B: Sermons, 1950-1989, undated.

---

Reel  
45

Box  
14

Folder  
721

Books that Shape Our Destiny: Sigmund Freud, A General  
Introduction to Psychoanalysis, 1960.



**BOOKS THAT SHAPE OUR DESTINY****A Series**

**Sigmund Freud, "A General Introduction  
to Psychoanalysis"**

**The Temple  
January 31, 1960**

**Rabbi Daniel Jeremy Silver**

Sigmund Freud wrote the "An Outline of Psychoanalysis" in 1938, just one year before his death at the age of eighty-three. In a real sense this short book, "An Outline of Psychoanalysis", is a valedictory, a farewell and a summation of seven decades of incredibly fertile creative activity. That this brief resume was written at all is a measure of the stature of Sigmund Freud. He began it when he was already an octogenarian and an invalid, suffering a malignancy of the throat which was soon to prove fatal. His hand was weak, his days were numbered, and his days were anything but serene. The Vermacht was poised on Austria's border. Chancellor Schuschnigg was vainly trying to turn aside the Nazi wrath. There were daily anti-Semitic outbreaks on the streets of Vienna. So this book was written in an atmosphere of panic, packing cases, and hasty planning for escape and fleeing for safety, and it was completed in the safety of a London refuge shortly before Freud died.

Turning its pages, we can sense the truth of an autobiographical description Freud left us of himself some five decades before. He had written then, "A man such as myself needs a hobby horse - a compelling passion. I have such a tyrant, and in her service I know no leisure." Freud's tyrant, his compelling passion was the study of the human mind and of human emotion. Twenty-five hundred years or so before Freud's day, the Psalmist had asked in



our Bible, "O Lord, what is man?" The Psalmist had answered that man is part clay and part God-like, part dust and part divine, part brute and part saint. Now, Freud did not disagree with this poetic imagery, but he was a physician, not a poet. He needed to prescribe, not only to describe. He needed to heal and to cure. And so he required a more substantial knowledge of the human psyche, of the human body, and it was to the uncovering of this more substantial knowledge that Freud dedicated his life.

The most general answer, the most prevailing answer to the question "What is man?" in Freud's day was simply this: that man is a reasoning animal; that alone of all the animals man has the power of conceptual thinking, and it is this power which has enabled man to rear towering cities and great cultures and civilizations. Man sees, and he thinks. He judges. He wills. He acts. And if it was objected, what of the men who are <sup>obviously</sup> irrational, who act unreasonably, the men and women whom we would describe today as mentally ill, the answer was simply given that either those parts of the brain which control reason had deteriorated or been physically damaged or else, less scientifically, that these were people possessed, prisoners of some outside power over which they had no control; in any case the average person, the normal person, remained a reasonable human being. He judged. He willed. He acted.

Now Freud was a very keen student of human activity, and especially was he intrigued by the idiosyncrasies, the vagaries, the unpredictabilities in human action, and he knew that this description did not fit the human beast. There is much conversation between human beings but not always a great deal of communication. We seemed at times to erect emotional blocks which preclude our accepting what is obviously reasonable, logical and true. All of us have been inordinately enraged at some manifestly innocuous statement. All of us know that we have at times set aside judgment, good counsel, and acted on what we call an urge, an impulse, instinct, compulsion. Knowing this, Freud set out to describe the human



body and the human mind a little more fully, and this led him to what has been called "depth psychology", the recognition that no man can fully explain the motives of any one action, because there exists in every man, below the level of our consciousness, a seething area of activity, wish, impulse, and desire which intrudes itself from time to time upon our bodies and our minds and colors - sometimes controls and determines - the decisions which we make and the actions which we take. A soldier escapes months of battle unharmed, without a wound. He returns home tired, but easily and quickly resumes the routine of his daily life. His family plans a picnic, a reunion with some of his wartime buddies. It is the Fourth of July - a very happy occasion, until, unexpectedly, near by a fire cracker is exploded, and the soldier becomes rigid and tense. Sweat pours out of his body, and his mouth begins to mumble incomprehensible sounds. Somehow this chance explosion of a harmless firecracker had opened up the channels of the unconscious mind, and the seething tensions and fears which were suppressed or repressed there come to the fore and bring with them uncontrollable, irrational action. But we need not be as dramatic in our examples. All of us know of times when we have rejected the advice of friends and parents - advice which we knew to be correct, to be proper and to our best interests - and when we have on impulse, impulse which we could not explain even to our self in the quiet of our rooms, that we have on impulse taken an act which was rash and unnecessary<sup>and</sup>/could not redound to our credit or to our advantage.

Well, Freud began to study these acts - these irrational acts of man. He was not the first to describe them. Poets and philosophers and playwrights had known of the irrational nature of man since time immemorial. After all, our Bible describes Adam and Eve as knowing that they ought not to take of the apple of the tree of knowledge, but, on impulse, taking it nevertheless. But Freud was the first man in history to give a valid description, a generalized explanation of this activity. He was the first man to explain the mechanics by which the



conscious and the unconscious mind act and react on one another. Freud told us that the answer to the question "O Lord, what is man?" is this: that man is a creature of instinct and of reason, and that if we would heal the ills of man, if we were to cure the society of man, then we had better take into our thinking both his instincts and his reason, for unless we do, we cannot cure his mental illnesses nor improve our social fabric.

Of what manner of man was this discoverer of the unconscious? Sigmund Freud was born in the little Moravian town of Freiburg in the year of 1856. When he was only four years of age, his father moved the whole family to Vienna. A railway had been laid through this particular Moravian province and it had bypassed the little town of Freiburg, and Jacob Freud ~~had~~ read the handwriting of economic decline written large on the wall. Vienna was to be Sigmund Freud's home, his workshop, his study, his library, his lecture hall until the penultimate year of his life. The move to Vienna meant many things in the life of the Freuds. In Freiburg the center of cultural activity had been the synagogue. In Vienna there were great universities and medical schools, lecture and concert halls and fine libraries. And, as with so many of the politically emancipated families of the day, the Freud family began to move out of a world which was centered on uniquely Jewish interests and Jewish values, into a more secular world which was centered upon the universities and the libraries and the concert halls and the like. So we might say that the chance decision of some railroad engineer in Austria a century ago deprived Judaism of a potentially brilliant rabbi and teacher and scholar. The Freud family, in Vienna, never affiliated with a synagogue. Their world was largely a humanistic secular world, but nevertheless many of the Jewish cultural values remained with them, and we can understand Freud's upbringing only as we understand it as having been the upbringing of a Jewish home. Learning was Israel's most prideful accomplishment, and no blessing was more welcome in any Jewish home than that of a precocious, intellectually



gifted son who, through years of application in the Yeshivas, would gain scholarly Talmudic competence and, through his fame and his knowledge, establish the fortune and the fame of his family. In Vienna Talmudic scholarship became not the only end of the precocious Jewish boy, but it remained true in Vienna what was true in Vilna - that this precocious child was the letter of credential by which a family moved out into the larger world. "My son, the doctor" - "My son, the lawyer" - these were the passports of middle class acceptability, and the precocious son was intellectually force-fed. He was pampered and mollycoddled and given every advantage which the family could possibly afford. For Sigmund Freud was the chosen one of his family. Their living quarters were small - quite modest. Everyone shared bedrooms with brother or sister. Freud had a room of his own. Freud had a study of his own. Dinner was prompt. No excuse was accepted for tardiness. No one was to interrupt Sigmund at his work. It was never too much for his mother to fix him a tray. Sigmund Freud's youth reminds one of the youth of Joseph in our Bible, the specially favored, the specially pampered. A sister of his, it is told, showed particular promise at the piano. Jacob Freud, the father, worked for many months to save enough money to purchase a piano for her to practice. The piano was bought. The piano was brought home. Freud complained that her practicing interfered with his concentration. The piano was returned. Undoubtedly this pampering, this manifest favoritism left scars on Freud's personality throughout his adult life. He was often accused of being high-handed and overbearing. But it is equally true that this hothouse of the intellect managed to breed a rare orchid indeed. Now, Freud's religious education was meager. About all we know about it is that he had, at one time or another in his youth, read through some parts of the Bible. Certainly, he never understood the heart, the essential spirit, the basic dimensions of Jewish life. We have only to read such a volume of his late maturity as "Moses and Monotheism" to see this manifest. Here is a purely fanciful reconstruction of Jewish history. Moses is



made out to be not a Jew, but an Egyptian. God is not the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and not the God of Sinai, but an idea borrowed by Moses from Egyptian contemporary culture. Moses seeks to impose this Egyptian god upon the Jews. The Jews are rebellious, they are contemptuous, they refuse, they rise up in tumult, and they murder Moses, according to Freud, and they are so filled with a sense of guilt and of shame that this guilt for the first time compels them to accept the worship of the one God, and somehow an inherited sense of guilt, passed on from generation to generation, a guilt in which you and I supposedly share, is what still binds us to our faith. Now there is not one tissue, one scrap of historical fact to substantiate any of these wild claims by Sigmund Freud. They are woven out of the whole cloth of an extremely able and fanciful imagination. They are woven with an express purpose. Freud had certain preconceived ideas about the function of religion in human life, and he was determined that the round body of Judaism should fit into this personally constructed square hole. It did not, so he reconstructed Judaism to fit his needs. Now I do not recite this misconception of Jewish life to denigrate any of Freud's psychiatric constructs. Rather, I do so to place before you this truth: that Freud's teachings are the product of nineteenth century philosophy and nineteenth century science, and that they do not spring out of any essentially Jewish milieu. Psychoanalysis has sometimes been called a "Jewish" science, largely because an inordinate number of its early practitioners were Jews. Well, it is not Jewish in origin. It is not Jewish in conception. It must stand or fall on its intrinsic objective merit and truth and success. It does not spring out of the heart of our faith,<sup>and</sup> It is not necessarily responsive to the values and to the traditions of Judaism. In Freud's family, then, Judaism was more of a label than a love, more of an historical memory than of a mandate. And yet it is to the credit of Freud, as an evidence of the strength of his character and the fierce <sup>essential</sup> pride of person which was always part of his ~~personality~~ nature, that he never



rejected Judaism. He never accepted the easy way of convenient conversion which was so popular among many of the middle class in Vienna in his day. Nor was he of that type of Jew who abhors all Jewish society and who spends his days and his years trying to cultivate the society of his non-Jewish neighbors, not because they are worthier, but simply because they are not Jewish.

In an autobiography edited in 1925, Freud said simply, "My parents were Jews and I see no reason not to remain a Jew." And somewhat later, before the Vienna B'nai B'rith, on the occasion of the only speech which Freud ever gave before a Jewish organization, he enlarged on this idea, and I quote:

What bound me to Judaism was, I must confess, not belief and not national pride, for I have always been an unbeliever and have been reared without religion, but not without respect for those requirements of human culture called 'ethical'. Whatever national pride I have I endeavored to suppress, considering it disastrous and unjust, frightened and warned as I am by the example of what national pride has brought to the nations among whom we Jews live.

But there were other considerations which made the attractiveness of Judaism and Jews irresistible--many obscure forces and emotions, all the more powerful the less they were to be defined in words; and also the clear consciousness of an inner identity in common with yours, of a common construction of the soul. And soon there was added to this the knowledge that only to my Jewish nature did I owe the two qualities which had become indispensable to me on my hard road. Because I was a Jew I found myself free from many prejudices which limited others in the use of their intellect, and, being a Jew, I was prepared to enter opposition and to renounce agreement with the 'compact majority'.

Freud was a man whose strength of intellect was happily blended with ~~his~~ a strength of character. His chosen profession -- medicine. But from his early days at medical school the clinical sides of medicine, symptomatic medicine failed to appeal to Freud. He was interested in the whole man and especially the mind of man and the emotions of man. As a medical student and as a young resident he engaged primarily in the study and the treatment of the central nervous system and neurology. But he found this practice extremely frustrating, for it was believed in Freud's day that all mental illness was organic in origin, came from some physical cause, and it was patently evident to Dr. Freud that no



organic treatment could reach and treat and cure most of these symptoms.

The year 1885 marks the turning point in Freud's life. A young medical physician of promise, he was granted a traveling fellowship and he spent his stipend traveling to Paris, there to study with the famous neuro-pathologist, Dr. Jean Martin Charcot. Now, Dr. Charcot was working primarily with hysterical patients, and his studies had taken an unexpected turn. In the first place, hysteria was believed to be an illness which affected only women. It was believed to be associated with some damage to the woman's reproductive organs, but Charcot had discovered that all the symptoms of hysteria were present in men as well as in women. Secondly, he had discovered that with suggestion, under hypnosis, he could induce in some of his patients all the symptoms of an hysterical attack. Obviously, the mind in some way could afflict the body with poison and with illness, and here was a scientific demonstration of what Freud had long since believed. But how do you treat the mind? Not with surgery, certainly. Drugs seemed to be useless. How do you treat the mind? The key to this puzzle was afforded to Freud on his return to Vienna by a confidence related to him by a very famous Viennese physician, Dr. Joseph <sup>Brewer</sup> ~~Brewer~~. A young girl, some twenty-one years of age, able and talented, had come to Dr. Brewer suffering from a series of what we would call neurotic symptoms. She had been treating for the last several years an ailing father. She had been his constant nursemaid and attendant, and his end was now rapidly drawing nigh. And the young girl was suffering from double vision, from hallucinations which involved primarily skulls and skeletons, from occasional paralysis of the right side. <sup>Brewer</sup> ~~Brewer~~ tried all of the acceptable organic treatments of the day and all were utterly unable to bring relief. In desperation, he attempted hypnosis, and under hypnosis he suggested to this young girl, who is known in medical history as "Anna O." -- he suggested to Anna O. that she speak out whatever ideas come into her mind concerning her symptoms. This "talking out", this catharsis, somehow brought relief, for when



she was brought out of the hypnosis the tensions and symptoms were mitigated, and some, in fact, had utterly disappeared. Now Bruer was much mystified as to this strange, unexpected turn of events. Why should the simple discharge of a few words bring relief to the body? But Freud was already prepared to accept this truth, indeed, he seized upon it as a key to his teachings. He saw that this young girl was suffering from a deep, pent-up emotions in her unconscious; that, as the death of her father drew near, as that traumatic experience came, all the thoughts which she had repressed, half-wishes that her father might speedily die that she might be freed of the yoke of this burden of nursing -- which all these wishes ~~that~~ she had driven out of her consciousness, into her unconscious mind, welled up again, for she was no longer able to control them, to censor them, and they brought with them illness. And speaking them out quieted these pressures. The cock was taken off of this pressure-cooker. Quieted down, the bubbling cauldron ceased to seeth, and she was given relief.

Freud dedicated his life to the continuing, unceasing charting of the geography of the unconscious. Largely, in his day, men were unwilling to accept the idea that our conscious actions and decisions can be affected by unconscious impulses and wishes. But gradually, the evidence which Freud accumulated became overwhelming. He found, for instance, that slips of the tongue, blunders of speech, the reason why we occasionally see an old friend and simply cannot remember that person's name, that all these relate to the tensions between the conscious and the unconscious world. He found that in sleep the censors of our mind relax and the symbols of our unconscious desires well up into our dreams, albeit in symbolic and bizarre ways, and an analyst who can correctly interpret these symbols can trace back into the darkness of the unconscious many of the ideas of which we are utterly unaware. And if we are disturbed and distraught and ill sometimes our ability to see these unconscious urges enables us to come to grips with them and to control them and brings healing. He found, moreover,



that in psychoanalytic treatment it was possible for an analyst to sit behind the couch of a patient and suggest to the patient that he simply talk out by a process of free association any ideas concerning his illness and his problems which came into his mind. Now, one would think that these conversations would be utterly rambling and pointless, but Freud soon discovered that inevitably, inexorably, this kind of free association led back to early experiences in an individual's life, to the repression of certain wishes and desires, and, uncovering these suppressed desires, he was often able to bring relief and healing.

Now Freud has effected a revolution in our medicine and in our whole outlook on life. Medicine can no longer treat only the organic man, only the symptoms of illness, for often <sup>these</sup> ~~the~~ symptoms are psychic in origin. Medicine must reach the whole man. Freud's psychoanalytic treatment has brought healing to many who ~~never~~ previously could be offered no relief. And finally, Freud's thinking has made all of us recognize that our snap judgments about human behavior are often utterly false and incorrect. A child has a reading problem. The reading problem persists. We call the child obstreperous. That failing, we say the child is scholastically incapable. We throw up our hands. Yet Freud has made us realize that this reading block may be nothing more than the external evidence of some severe emotional block, that if we can uncover that block we can release the latent potential of the child and enable that child to grow and to develop. We see the explosion of antisocial behavior in an adolescent. We cry out, "Let him be punished", and often he needs to be punished. But as often we have here a child who is suffering from some inner tensions which he cannot control, and, lacking the censors of the adult person, he has simply exploded, as indication to the world that here is a child who needs treatment and needs help. Our educational systems, our systems of counseling, our systems of penology, our systems of medicine -- all the areas of human relationships -- have been immeasurably enriched by the knowledge which Freud brought forth.



Now, many men have denied this or that principle in Freud's psychoanalytic constructs. Much further investigation has shown that his ideas need to be modified or changed or refined. But it was he who pioneered this world, and like Columbus, who discovered America believing that he had discovered the Indies, so we cannot take away from Freud the first-ness, the fact that he was the discoverer, the pilot, the man who first interpreted for us and made us aware in conscious of the unconscious world.

But unfortunately, Freud became, especially in his later life, not only physician but philosopher, not only doctor but dogmatist. Freud had an unusually creative mind. It was a free-wheeling mind, a mind which loved to think over the whole expanse of human knowledge, a mind which loved to explore the relevance of psychoanalytic constructs for every area of human life. He wrote on art, he wrote on literature, he wrote on society, he wrote on politics, he wrote on economics, he wrote on anthropology, he wrote on sociology. No area of human thought was beyond him, and unfortunately, much of what he wrote was misleading, misguided, and invalid. Freud thought of religion largely in these terms. Freud had seen, in his psychoanalytic treatment of neurotic patients, that the patient often turned to religion to supply a love for his loneliness, security for his insecurity, an assurance of immortality and salvation to undermine the morbid sense and fear of death which was present so often. Often the patient created a religion of his own/<sup>when</sup> He felt that his particular faith could not supply these needs. And furthermore, Freud found in his treatment that the fanatic belief of a person was often in direct proportion to his mental illness. And so Freud argued that religion was created by man as a supportative agency. Religion was created by man to supply man with warmth against the coldness of the world, with a sense of belonging against the loneliness of the world, with a sense of security against the insecurities of the world, with a promise of permanence ~~as~~ to counteract the impermanence of life. Indeed, he said, as he attempted to interpret the



origin of religions, men had created religion by remembering that the great security symbols of their childhood were their fathers, and they had projected on the cosmic canvas a giant father image, and they had pushed onto this father image all the attributes which they wanted him to have -- compassion, warmth, love, mercy, care -- and this was the origin of religions. Now, Freud was right to this extent: men do turn to religion, have always, in all ages, turned to religion for comfort, encouragement, consolation, and all religions have been conscious that there are those who are righteous overmuch, whose religious loyalties are neurotic in their origin and have to be treated as such. But is that all that there is to religion? and does this behavior of certain of our mentally ill individuals explain the origin of religion? Freud forgot entirely that religion not only comforts but it commands, that religion not only promises peace of mind but demands that the individual religion must establish peace among men, that religion not only protects but it prophesies, that God commanded not "Return unto Me and I will protect thee" but told Abraham "Get thee out, get thee out of thy father's house", and this is the mandate which every religionist -- every healthy religionist has attempted to fulfill in his life. Religion is much more than Freud knew it to be. Indeed, it is much more than any scientist will ever discover who works simply in our terrestrial world only with man. For neither the microscope nor the telescope nor the psychoanalyst's note-book will ever reveal the full extent of religion because religion comes from above, from God. It is not a creation simply of human beings in need. That it fulfills human beings' needs -- of that we can be grateful. That does not explain its origin or its purpose, nor does it undermine its truths.

Unfortunately, many who have been adept in psychoanalysis have loved to psychoanalyse the venerated seers and prophets and social critics and teachers of our, and of every, tradition. They have, in a sense, sneered at the sanctified heroism of mankind. They have said, after all it is true that every man acts out



of unconscious impulses, and reading the texts of an Isaiah or of a Jesus or of a Buddha they have said that this man was motivated by a need for self-immolation or by an Oedipus complex or by an Electra complex, whatever it be. They have forgotten that the truth of a man's message is independent of his personality and must be judged as such -- that though Isaiah may have been neurasthenic, I doubt that he was, that though he may have been that, it is still true what he said: "Wash yourself, make yourselves clean. Put away the evil of your doings. Act in the way that is right before the Lord. Unfortunately, there has been a disparagement of religious teaching based on this analysing of religious teachers, and this is a process which we must guard ourselves against.

Now, Freud did not take a sanguine view of the future of mankind. More than any other man in his day he was fully aware that anger, hate, fear, and the need to express oneself aggressively lies but thinly veiled beneath our conscious minds. He destroyed much of the heady optimism of the nineteenth century, an optimism which was born with Darwin, which grew with Marx, an optimism which looked ahead to a better society of peace-loving individuals once, genetically and economically, that society had been improved.

Freud said, "Be careful. Man is still a beast. Each of us has within ourselves the seething cauldron of wishes and primitive instincts which we can but control but with difficulty." But I wonder if we are not the better off - far better off - for having understood this about ourselves. It may have tempered our optimism, but a false optimism is folly. And recognizing our limitations, recognizing the truth of what Freud taught, perhaps soberly, realistically men will be able to set about establishing the organizations in society which will reach the whole man and improve the whole man, not just the genetic man or the economic man, and in so doing bring us closer to that world of peace, of justice and of friendship for which we all dream and hope.



Sigmund Freud wrote An Outline of Psychoanalysis in 1938 - only one year before he died at the age of 83. As a result some of the short volumes is a mini dictionary - a glossary & a summation of 7 decades of psychoanalytical creation & theory.

That the book even under such adverse conditions, some charged with the  
 strength of French personality, the first and perhaps proper for the understanding  
 whether we are already on a the penetration and an involved - complex group  
 year of attained realization, which seems now to prove fatal. This book was  
 meant, but it was never finished and it was never completed and finished  
 The Walden book was never finished. Chancellor Schuyler was trying  
hardly to be sure the margin books. With some other books found out  
throughout the book, French was in the middle of Paris and  
Paris was not the only place of the book or the way to  
London and Paris. Chancellor of Paris was not the only place of the book or the way to  
found unusually of French books but equally as in the middle of Paris  
to be the only place of the book or the way to London and Paris.  
 Turning to the Paris and Paris was not the only place of the book or the way to  
 half a century before, "A man like me would be interested in a healthy house -  
 in a university place ... and in the middle of Paris and in the middle of Paris  
 no other place.

Franklin Pierce - after death of son and another.

25 Centuries, but the standard was not to be lost. The result of the war was a blending of East and West - not East and West.

French parameter which is calculated in more subtle manner of course.  
He did not neglect the influence of the Parameter emerging - but he had  
to go beyond it <sup>prescribe</sup> as a physician his purpose was not simply  
to describe but to heal and save

to describe but to reason. Before French's day the most widely accepted answer to the question was to say simply "man is a reasoning animal". Man's mind has the capacity to think conceptually, we reason. We do this by the use of our power of reason (and will and understanding).

have come into being  
if it were objected, that these are people who are not sufficiently  
informed as to the value of the property. The answer is simply  
that these objections are not to the point. The members of the  
suffrage committee have been damaged by the existing  
on the subject of the suffrage and the property of the  
individuals. The committee is a committee of men. the  
the judge - the lawyer, the writer, the etc.



















Prison was collapsed and a little ingenuity to be given first found  
arranging for the Prison had to be made. The  
The guide was not near in hand. At night the  
was lost. The ground to be made in some cases. Some of the  
the same - and the same - and the same - and the same.

On a scale of 1 to 10, how much do you agree with the statement that the following are the most important factors in determining the success of a business? (1 = Not at all, 10 = Completely)

Friends meet in the hall on property of the hall - and well, Anna's  
 illness was due to some illness and she must have regretted -  
 covered - on the way to the hall - reminded of the hall - and  
 he insisted Anna was her father's daughter - and she was  
 Anna's daughter - she was sister of her in the same way - and  
 had been forgotten Anna's and Anna's, but she was not - They  
 collected quite naturally the subject and in the same way - Anna's  
 her mother's mother's daughter - and she was Anna's daughter - and  
 Anna's mother's mother's daughter - and she was Anna's daughter -

[illegible][illegible]











[illegible][illegible]

Third, especially those who are interested in religion, Trustees do not only sit,  
 French found that many of his people turned to religion on a defense  
 against a world which was too much for them. They were not  
 anything - the great world - the great world - the great world - the great world  
 was a promise of a confidence in the <sup>world</sup> not otherwise felt.

[illegible]

But French seems to be one matter of religion - the French the religious ~~community~~  
as well as community - that religious nation with that different not  
quite. more moral than even the ~~French~~ <sup>to</sup> ~~French~~ <sup>French</sup> only at  
first of first; French community with of that ~~community~~ that  
in ~~French~~. The French is in French ~~French~~ - French  
and ~~French~~ in ~~French~~ ~~French~~ ~~French~~

[illegible]







"What bound me to Judaism was, I must confess, not belief and not national pride, for I have always been an unbeliever and have been reared without religion, but not without respect for those requirements of human culture called 'ethical'. Whatever national pride I have I endeavored to suppress, considering it disastrous and unjust, frightened and warned as I am by the example of what national pride has brought to the nations among whom we Jews live.

"But there were other considerations which made the attractiveness of Judaism and Jews irresistible--many obscure forces and emotions, all the more powerful the less they were to be defined in words; and also the clear consciousness of an inner identity in common with yours, of a common construction of the soul. And soon there was added to this, the knowledge that only to my Jewish nature did I owe the two qualities which had become indispensable to me on my hard road. Because I was a Jew I found myself free from many prejudices which limited others in the use of their intellect, and, being a Jew, I was prepared to enter opposition and to renounce agreement with the 'compact majority'."



From a letter to the author, dated 1911, in which the author states that he had been compelled to leave his religion for some personal reason but that he had never been able to do so and that he was now a Jew. He also states that he was a Jew and that he was a Jew.