

Conceptions
of
Postwar
German Masculinity

Edited by

Roy Jerome

with an Afterword by
Michael Kimmel

State University of New York Press

Cover Painting: *Trauriger Europäer*, 1977, Rudolf
Hausner (1914–1995)

Published by
State University of New York Press, Albany

© 2001 State University of New York

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner
whatsoever without written permission. No part of this book may be
stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any
means including electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical,
photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission in
writing of the publisher.

For information, address State University of New York Press,
90 State Street, Suite 700, Albany, N.Y. 12207

Production by Michael Haggett
Marketing by Patrick Durocher

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Conceptions of postwar German masculinity / edited by Roy Jerome.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-7914-4937-8 (alk. paper) — ISBN 0-7914-4938-6
(pbk.: alk. paper)

1. Masculinity — German — History — 20th century.

I. Jerome, Roy, 1964–

BF692.5 .C66 2001

155.3'32'094309045 — dc21 00-053151

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

For Julian

Masculinity and Sexual Abuse in Postwar German Society

Klaus-Jürgen Bruder

I. INTRODUCTION

Sexual abuse, or rather the discussion of it, affects our image of masculinity. In 94.7 percent of all cases of sexual abuse, the sexually abused interviewee names a man as the violator.¹ This is a fact that males must confront. How do they do this?

Discussion of sexual abuse in the public media invites men over and over again to negotiate this confrontation through the defense mechanism of splitting: the violator is excluded from male society by being declared a "monster." The media reports instances of sexual abuse almost every day, and in these reports, the violating man appears almost invariably as a stranger, someone unknown to the victim whom he treacherously attacks, a "sex gangster," a "beast." This propensity toward splitting is likewise expressed by demands voiced in the media for the castration of the perpetrator, if not for the death penalty itself.

The defense mechanism of splitting is becoming less convincing, however. More and more often, the press must report cases of child sexual abuse by fathers or other family members: the extensive trials of Flachslanden and Worms, Germany, in which entire family clans (including the grandmother!) have been accused, are examples. At the trial of Worms, which began on November 24, 1994, in the district court of Mainz, the parents of five children and a sixty-four-year-old grandmother were accused of orally, anally, and vaginally raping their children and two more children not their own, over a period of eight months. The children ranged in age from six months to eight years. The parents were further accused of lending their children to strangers for a fee. Trials against other alleged violators, including uncles and aunts, were

held separately. At Worms, in June 1997, the accused were acquitted. (In the charge of child abuse, the prosecutors had focused on the "sex ring" that could never be proved, while the actual abuse within the family never became a subject of the charge). At Flachslanden, in October 1994, the ten accused—mother, father, uncle, and friends of the family—were sentenced from three and a half to ten years for the abuse of nine children, the youngest two years old, over a period of more than one and a half years. In both cases, the accused were part of the lower middle class.

Ascribing sexual abuse to the lower classes, a popular way of splitting societal outrages, flagrantly denies its actual occurrence in all social classes. In the above case, however, the media's splitting of the violator from the violation was attempted by questioning the status of the father: "Can he still be called a father?" asked *Bild*, one of Germany's most popular boulevard newspapers.² Thus sexual abuse by the father was vehemently presented to the public, while sexual abuse by other family members, above all, by the mothers, sisters, aunts, and other adults outside of the extended family, remained underexposed.

The feminist answer to the question of whether the abuser can still be called a father is that he can. *Väter als Täter* (Fathers as perpetrators) is the title of a book by Barbara Kavemann and Ingrid Lohstöter, two who have considerably influenced the discussion of sexual abuse in the Federal Republic of Germany.³ Kavemann and Lohstöter take as their point of departure the belief that in the majority of cases it is the father who sexually abuses his children, and consequently, being a father and being an abuser do not rule each other out.

In Peter Wetzel's first representative interviews with victims in Germany, the image of the father or stranger as sole perpetrator is substantially corrected, however. In only 27 percent of all cases were family members identified as the violators. Sixty-nine percent of the offenders were known to the child. In addition to the 27 percent of violators who were family members, 42 percent were acquaintances from outside the immediate family circle. The number of offenders unknown to the victim, that is, strangers, was around 25 percent. It can be concluded, therefore, that the two images most often invoked in public discussion—the unknown monster and the father as violator—are untenable, the invention of fantasies. What is true is the fact that in an overwhelming majority of cases, the violator can be found among the child's acquaintances, and almost all of the violators are men. But if the questions are addressed differently, that is, not in the form of questionnaires intended for representative sections of the population, but if the actual victims themselves are asked, and if, furthermore, the most severely in-

jured and/or traumatized victims are selected, then we find a significantly higher percentage of victims sexually abused by family members, a higher percentage of women as violators, and a higher percentage of male victims.⁴

What is the reason for this discrepancy? Wetzels, coauthor of the questionnaire, notes that in order to properly evaluate such representative questionnaires, the following must be taken into consideration: (1) specific groups often appear underrepresented in a representative sample survey, especially those in which a certain prevalence of victims may be assumed, such as drug addicts, prostitutes, prison inmates, and institutionalized individuals; and (2) incidents occurring before the victim has reached age three are vulnerable to childhood amnesia and consequently do not appear on retrospective questionnaires. Furthermore, it is essential to add that representative questionnaires do not take into consideration those processes that specifically aid the victim in assimilating the experience of abuse, which in turn lead the victim to stop talking about experienced violations: these processes are first and foremost repression and splitting. As a result, studies relying upon questionnaires have only limited validity with respect to their representation of the actual extent of sexual abuse, as well as to the percentages of family and other groups as violators. Moreover, it can be assumed that the actual extent of sexual abuse, the percentage of violators from the immediate family, the percentage of abused men, and the percentage of female violators are higher than representative questionnaire studies suggest. This has consequences for the discussion of (1) sexual abuse as an expression of masculine violence and (2) the relationship between sexual abuse and masculinity.

When we are compelled to realize that boys also are the victims of sexual abuse and that women also are capable of sexually abusing children, we will no longer be able to characterize sexual abuse as an expression of masculine violence against females. We will instead be obliged to admit that children of both sexes are sexually abused by adults of both sexes; that sexual abuse is, as such, a behavior not exclusive to men, and not directed solely toward girls; and that sexual abuse is an expression of violence emanating from adults (or adolescents) and directed toward children. We have only recently recognized the existence of the sexual abuse of boys, and only very lately realized that women—mothers, aunts, sisters, and female educators—may also sexually abuse (their) children. These facts are slowly entering the public consciousness, which shows that these well-kept secrets contradict socially acceptable ideas and images of motherhood and challenge images of the father, who, as a "man," is more readily placed in the category of "violation."

II. SEXUALIZATION OF THE MOTHER-SON RELATIONSHIP

We know nothing of the actual statistical extent of sexual abuse by women in Germany. Published figures speak only for the extent to which we are aware of the abuse, and here, the numbers are on the rise. In a study conducted by the psychologist Craig Allen, two interesting results were found, however. Generally, women—whether they are abusive or not—have a higher threshold of perception concerning abuse than men. That is, there are things women do not recognize as abuse, but men do. In addition, women who have sexually abused their children are much less likely than men to admit to their abusive actions (30 percent of abusive women, compared to 47 percent of abusive men).⁵ Could it be that the preponderance of male sexual offenders is an artifact of the greater denial of women?

A study by Gerhard Amendt sheds light on this very question.⁶ In the spring of 1992, Amendt surveyed 903 women on their attitudes toward both their sons' bodily hygiene and their sons' sexuality in relation to shame and abuse. Amendt did not pose questions about sexual abuse as such, but rather about possible boundary violations that could immediately precede the actual abuse. The question of why sexual abuse by women of their sons is rarely spoken about was answered by 4.1 percent of those surveyed with, "Mothers do not abuse their sons," whereas 64.5 percent said, "They do it much less often," and 35 percent stated that, "Mothers do it differently." "When women are asked to describe the difference between paternal and maternal boundary violations," he writes, "they give violence and pain great importance."⁷ This understanding, however, does not take into consideration "the emotional effect that sexual stimulation has on the child, who is unable to cope with it."⁸ In the mother's imagination, the absence of violence "becomes proof of mutual desire."⁹ Males, on the other hand, cannot reconcile the experience of being seduced with their sense of self-worth. They therefore deny such experiences. Feelings of shame, awakened within them by women who violated boundaries with them, "make it difficult for them to remember."¹⁰ They would much rather "believe they provoked the mother's desire themselves."¹¹

Further, when the boy is too "small" for his mother's wishes, he will be continually wounded. Shame results from his desire to be "big" when he is in fact too "small." He senses that he is too small for the mother's expectations and desires, yet he is unable to see that this skewed perspective comes from the mother. How do women perceive the son's smallness

and his attempts to be bigger than he can? First, women underestimate the son's abilities and overlook the son's desire for independence. Second, women overestimate the son's capabilities, and they burden the son with expectations and wishes that the son would like to fulfill, but by which he is overwhelmed.¹²

Amendt has concluded that, "Women make their sons ashamed; and they are unable to recognize it."¹³ It is a very painful experience for the son to have his feelings of shame overlooked. He experiences this as powerlessness and as an inability to exist independently from his mother. How often do women overlook the son's expressed feelings of shame? To the question, "When your son is ashamed, do you overlook it?" 26.1 percent answered with "quite possibly." If this number is compared to the mere 14.5 percent who answered affirmatively the question, "Do you think it is possible that your son will at some point regard as seduction what you only did in meaning well?" then the discrepancy between the mother's self-perception and her perception of the son's feelings becomes obvious. Amendt interprets this disparity as an indication of the mother's self-deception; the mother idealizes the relationship with the son:

What causes shame in the son creates closeness in the mother, one that she has the power to determine. By denying her son's shame, the woman allows herself a vast array of well-meant care. She creates for herself the opportunity to practice sexual incursions "shamelessly." She can assert her own needs under the cover of nurture without being aware of the sexual content of her actions.¹⁴

He continues, "Most inappropriate relationships with children exist under the veil of modern parenting as (nonviolent) encroachments on the children's intimacy."¹⁵ There exists a "wide range of 'inappropriate' care, training in cleanliness, as well as moments of playing and cuddling."¹⁶ Through this, the mother views the son's penis as an "early object of endless motherly care."¹⁷ Amendt learned that many of the mothers were still washing the genitals of twelve-year-old sons.¹⁸

Compared to 58.9 percent of the mothers who are so concerned with the son's penis, the interest mothers have in the daughter's genitals seems strikingly smaller (21.8 percent). One of the mothers' preoccupations with the penis is the "narrowing of the foreskin," the normal state in which a boy is born.¹⁹ In spite of this, more than a few mothers resort to preventative measures (against the feared medical operation, circumcision); in some cases, these measures, which Amendt compares to the

widening of the girl's labia, persist until the son is twelve years old.²⁰ In addition, only 57.3 percent of the women who were concerned had actually consulted a doctor.²¹ "If one further considers that only 20.3 percent of the women consult their male partners, it becomes clear that women are concerned with the fantasy world of the son's penis as well as their own possibly exclusive occupation with it."²² Moreover, "The 'disease' phimosis permits certain actions to become acceptable; ones which women could otherwise not justify."²³ That is, the manipulation of the penis through this conduct (phimosis) is explained as an action of careful nursing.

"There are mothers who have difficulties with touching the son's penis," the survey continued. "What are or were your experiences concerning this?" "Touching his penis is feeling-neutral," answered 62.2 percent of the women. In the process of neutralizing feelings through playfulness, however, repressed feelings become barely perceivable. As Amendt observes: "In the group that insisted on the normality of touching the penis, some of the violence that women do to themselves and their sons when they deny their feelings becomes evident."²⁴ The mothers maintain that touching the son's penis is "feeling-neutral." By doing so, they commit violence toward themselves through the denial of feelings and perpetrate in the same moment violence toward the son, for whom touching is just as unlikely to be neutral. One can assume that the son perceives such treatment as sexual stimulation. Likewise, there is just as little ground for saying that women also would be unaffected by such sexual stimulation. When feelings are subjugated, there exists a likelihood that the relationship itself will be sexualized. What appears as genuine concern is, in essence, an inappropriate relationship, one that leads to the sexualization of the relationship between the woman and the son in small, barely perceptible steps. On the level of emotion, this is an action of secret mutual arousal and at the same time an external, rigid denial of this arousal.²⁵ As such, an incestuous element can gradually be introduced into the relationship. This is not a sudden injection of the incestuous into the mother-son relationship but rather a slow and gradual insertion. There is no line at which one action suddenly takes on a different emotional quality.²⁶ The denial of the double-sidedness of feelings, as well as the fiction of being able to dissolve those feelings through neutrality, offers no security against seductive actions. Splitting offers no protection for the woman or the son; it merely makes the explosive element invisible.²⁷ Further, the longer the stimulation of the genitals occurs, the more the son will become an actively participating partner, which will in turn lead to feelings of shame and guilt.²⁸

The mother's actions toward the son, camouflaged as motherly care, may manifest themselves in the adult male as a disturbance in male sexual identity and may eventually lead to an inability to enter into relationships.²⁹ Cultural disinterest in the inappropriate actions of the mother must be paralyzing for the boy. The boy finds no understanding for his situation, no recognition, and no language in which he may express himself and be understood. An "inability to cry and to show feelings" may have its basis in this.³⁰

III. MALE BOUNDARY VIOLATIONS AND DENIAL OF CONTROL AND RESPONSIBILITY

Men do not possess the same self-understood contact with the child that women do. For this reason, men often cannot integrate their abuse into their care for the child. Rather, they must justify their care for the child, as they must likewise justify their unmediated access to the child. Men must make excuses for what remains open to women without question: unmediated access to the child, physical contact, caring for intimate parts of the child's body, and so on. Consequently, men transgress a boundary with the child before each abuse. They approach the child from without; this is their unique situation, and the conspicuousness of the abusive element is grounded in this distinction.

Women are able to integrate and conceal their sexual abuse in their actions of care; for men, this is not as easily accomplished. Physical closeness to the child is not as self-evident for men, and they are therefore threatened with appearing to have committed a boundary violation, which they then must justify. Male (abusive) boundary violation is much more obvious, which explains the special precautions men take to preserve secrecy and, as a consequence, the justifications themselves. Through their excuses, one sees the specifically male element of sexual abuse: men justify their abuse with arguments that fall back upon masculine possibilities grounded in the division of roles within the family, and for this reason their arguments even emphasize that which is not self-evident. Men justify their abuse: (1) as "sex education," as an aspect of fatherly care; (2) as a special "love" relationship; (3) with the fact that their partner rejected them; and (4) by stating that they were so intoxicated that they no longer knew what they were doing.

Men deny too—women have always known this. It is not through denial, however, that they distinguish themselves from women, but rather through the difference in their denial. As a first step, both men

and women deny the boundary violation and the abuse. But men deny it by playing down abuse as an expression of their special relationship with the child, whereas women see "nothing special" in the fact that they disregard the son's (shame) boundaries. Men deny the deed, while women deny its sexual character. In addition to the denial of the fact, "the denial of responsibility" also plays a central role in sexual abuse.³¹ We are inclined to view this denial of responsibility as a typical male behavior. Yet the demand to take responsibility, the need to be the author—even of events that he did not cause—and the need to be in control of the situation, are all central to the image of the male in our society, and therefore also central to male socialization. Control belongs to the concept of "masculinity." To have lost control contradicts our image of masculinity. Denying this injurious loss of control—unacceptable to the man and to patriarchal society—is the most important strategy for protecting a threatened masculinity. Further, arguments denying responsibility for the abuse of a child (one's own) contain different metaphors of masculinity and show that the attempt to preserve masculinity simultaneously places this very masculinity in question. The enigmatic task of (upholding) masculinity—"Loss of control through alcohol" as a socially acceptable expression of masculinity; "sex education" as an affirmation of the male's monopoly on violence in patriarchal society; the "partner's fault," though it reveals an ambivalence of subjectivity. On the one hand, it confirms the patriarch's right to choose as he desires among "his" women. On the other hand, his power to have his partner at his disposal is at once placed in question, revealing the defeat of not being desired. The metaphor of the "love relationship" with the abused child also affirms the masculinity of the "lover"; it is at the same time the "truest" argument and the most remote from reality because it interprets the search for love as actually fulfilled.

It is striking that three of these arguments (the alcohol, the partner, and a love relationship) deny and negate the barrier between generations more than they do sexuality itself. That is, these arguments affirm characteristics of "masculinity" that collapse upon themselves only when we bring the difference in generations into play—the question of power (of parents over children), the question of power abused by the parents, by elders, all stronger individuals in comparison to younger and weaker children. It is only by bringing the differences in generations into focus that a failure in masculinity—a disgrace—emerges. It is a debatable affirmation of power to use this power over dependents; it is ridiculous to conquer the child (one's own) as an object of love. Behind male denial hides not only the disgrace of having been caught doing what was for-

bidden—like a caught sinner who is not worthy of love and is dirty—but the disgrace to one's masculinity as well.³² This is why denying the difference in generations is so important. The rejection of responsibility, like the denial of the act itself, concerns itself with rejecting the shame, the disgrace of having been caught. Yet the denial of responsibility is the denial of the subject-character: I prefer to be the object of the other's influence rather than to be responsible. This again contradicts the male role, the need to be the subject. If all that is left to me is the denial of responsibility, then I have already been substantially driven back in the defense of my masculinity. This is most evident in the love metaphor that enables me to say, "I did nothing that she did not want. I did not use force." This is certainly not the little girl's view. It is an attempt by the abusive male to claim and maintain his masculinity by contesting that which is held up for and to him as a man: the image of the violent one (*Gewalttäter*). He knows that he does not become a man by employing violence but rather through the possibility of employing violence and his control of this possibility. The concept of (self-)control belongs to the (self-)image of the man, and, with that, responsibility. His doubt in his ability to control himself, to remain in control of the situation, places his masculinity in question.

The decisive factor in the sexual abuse of children is not whether or not the man used force, however—as we have seen with Amendt, women also differentiate between violent and nonviolent acts—but rather that he disregarded and crossed the barrier between the generations. He denies this fact when he makes his daughter his lover, when he fantasizes his daughter to be his lover. (The same is true for pedophilic abuse of boys; here, as well, the abused boy is stylized as a friend or a lover.) Negating the barrier between the generations simultaneously means making the child an adult, construing oneself as a child—creating a level of equality, an equality of means and possibilities. This also may be interpreted as a deficit in the perception of reality and of (self-)criticism. The attempt to claim and maintain the doubted masculinity is the result of an inability to initiate and form relationships with actual equals, with male and female partners, and, of course, with children. This inability is denied during the abusive act itself, and not only in the subsequent justification. In an abusive relationship that lasts several years (as is most likely the case within the family), each single abusive act is denied immediately after it occurs.

During the process of boundary violation—which is denied every time—the boundary itself is simultaneously displaced. It is an invisible process to which the abusive adult surrenders. The abuser's perception

adjusts to the newly created boundary. If originally the boundary of affection was marked by the taboo of touching the genitals, then this boundary will be continually pushed further during the process of abuse, until the genitals are included within the boundary for the first time. The *quality* of the touch itself will now mark the new boundary, and will be considered the point where the realm of what is forbidden begins. The touch will be short and timid at first, but as soon as this newly defined boundary has been assimilated, more arousing stroking and so on will mark the new boundary. Through a series of small steps, the boundary will again and again be pushed further. Here, too, we find the "sexualization of the relationship in small steps," the "slow appearance of the incestuous element in the relationship" that Amendt encountered with the mothers.

The boundary displacement is not only accompanied by an adjustment of perception to the newly acquired boundary line—through which it is made invisible—but rather is at the same time protected through the construction of systems of rationalization. The abusive adult male takes these rationalizations from a variety of spheres: (1) from the pedagogical: he tells himself that he shows the child something important for the child's development; he tells himself that he introduces the child to sexuality; (2) from the area of health and hygiene: he tells himself that he sees to the child's cleanliness and looks after the child's physical development; (3) from discursive elements on "free" sexuality: he gives the reason that today everyone runs around naked in the house, that there are no boundaries of shame within the family, that one is unable to turn off the television when one watches pornographic films even if children come into the room, that one can show and explain to children everything about sexuality, not through picture books, but rather with one's own body and with the bodies of the children, even with touch that arouses the genitals, and so on. Naturally, he simultaneously protests against the contention that he is doing this for his "own arousal and satisfaction." He maintains that this is all "self-understood" and that to assert the opposite would be outmoded, prudish, dishonest, and hypocritical. It is in this way that the male violator reinterprets the abuse. He is involved in a steady, continuous process of reinterpreting his abusive behavior by adapting it to the ideal image he maintains in regard to his behavior: the image of the "good father," the image of the one person who really loves the children, the only one who understands them.

As with men, we also have seen the mothers' rationalizations of boundary violation, if not of overt abusive behavior: their concern about the development of the son's penis, combined with a denial of his sexu-

ality, a denial of arousal. These strategies of denying the reality of sexual abuse function at the same time to protect the self-image (of the loving father, of the caring mother), as well as to keep fears and feelings of guilt at a distance.³³ In contrast to women, however, men are not concerned with denying the other's embarrassment; they instead deny their own embarrassment, defend against threatening, shameful memories of their own experiences (of humiliation), deny their own history of abuse, and the reasons for this abuse. The career of the abusive man is most often a career of denials: denials of deficits, of humiliation, and of injuries to his masculinity. Denying such humiliation offers him the possibility of rescuing the (self-)image of masculinity. This is because humiliation is an experience that cannot be integrated with the self-image of masculinity. The denial of humiliation makes it possible for him to conquer the experience of humiliation—which would otherwise be very difficult to integrate—and to preserve a feeling of control. His aim here is to deny the experience of victimization.³⁴

IV. THE REPETITION OF DENIAL AND ABUSE

Denial also can be seen in the abused boy, as Amendt has pointed out. It is well recognized that boys deny the experience of having been beaten.³⁵ Further, boys appear more inclined to employ compensation strategies that enable them to deny their victimization—for instance, hyper-masculine and aggressive behaviors toward others. Boys who attribute the cause of their sexual assaults to their own female or supposedly homosexual characteristics most often employ compensation strategies. The adaptive function of these modes of behavior is grounded in the experience of renewed feelings of control and security, which in turn condition a reorganization of cognitive constructs (self- and object-images) with respect to a positive self-image and a relative invulnerability.

Further, the experience of victimization changes the cognitive and emotional orientation of the child and has a traumatic effect by destroying the child's fundamental cognitive constructs of himself and the world. It obliterates his perception of his own invulnerability, as well as the meaning (*Sinnhaftigkeit*) of his world and his self-worth. This is accompanied by intense feelings of fear and helplessness. The affected boy no longer feels safe and secure in his world. His self-image, or more specifically, his self-concept, is placed in question by his experience of victimization. Above all, his perception of powerlessness and helplessness

caused by his experienced loss of control leads to a reevaluation of the self in the sense of a loss of self-worth and self-respect.

The most important opportunity to overcome the experience of victimization lies in reevaluating the events in a way that assimilates them with previous schemes without fundamentally changing those schemes. In this way, the threat to cognitive constructs (images of self and the world, object-images) and the ensuing consequences are reduced to a minimum. Thus one may explain the positive valuation of the experience of sexual abuse by boys and men: they reorganize their experiences in accordance with traditional sex roles that do not accommodate the role of the victim. The abused boy's desire to regain the feeling of being in control during a situation of utter helplessness also could be a decisive motive for appropriating the role of the violator. The role of the violator seems to be a genuine "processing form" of the role of the victim.³⁶ Gail Ryan, Sandy Lane, and others speak of processes of "cyclical victimization" that lead to abusive sexual behavior by adolescents.³⁷ Further, the classic masculine role demands that the boy/man be able to protect and defend himself (gender-specific socialization). In accordance with this demand, the boy interprets victimization as a sign of his own weakness or failure, or as a consequence of his own behavior. It is unlikely that he will seek help. Instead, he introjects the guilt for the abuse and cannot process his feelings of helplessness and rage. During puberty, with its ongoing development of masculine identity, a sexually abused boy runs the risk of attempting to conquer his feelings of confusion and helplessness by creating extreme experiences of control. He may even, under certain conditions, repeat his own victimization—this time in the role of the violator. Through this, he assures himself of his power as a man. As tension is repeatedly built up and then discharged, sexual behaviors have the tendency to reinforce themselves. The same is true for abusive behaviors. Here reinforcement arises from the thrill of secrecy, the thrill of what is forbidden: while anticipating the abusive action in fantasies during the planning phase, while approaching the victim, during "habituation" and its resulting need to look for newer and more intense experiences. On a behavioral, or more specifically, a physiological level, reinforcement comes through sexual arousal and ejaculation, both during anticipatory fantasies and during the abuse itself. The experienced feelings of power and control combine with physical satisfaction and outweigh all possible negative consequences. A cycle of abuse thus comes into existence, which has a course comparable to addiction. One must add that "only" approximately 20 percent of abusive boys were themselves the victims of sexual abuse. Conversely, only an insignificantly larger percentage of abused boys become abusers themselves. This

indicates that other causes in the development of the male into an offender, as well as a wide spectrum of alternative methods for processing the experience of sexual abuse, must be taken into consideration.³⁸ In spite of this, the experience of sexual abuse remains the most common cause.

The following excerpts are taken from a therapy session with M., a twenty-eight-year-old man who abused his four-year-old daughter by pressing himself against her and masturbating in front of her.

M. would like to talk about his "compulsion" to "stare" at women's breasts. The more he fights it, the stronger this compulsion becomes. It arises whenever he meets a woman superior to him, such as his boss, or a woman toward whom he feels aggression. He forces himself to look into her eyes, but—"pow"—his glance abruptly slips downward! He interprets his behavior as an expression of his desire to devalue women, of his wish to humiliate them. As an adolescent, he thought the way other boys glanced at girls was dirty; he did not do it himself. His mother described all men as "pigs," even his father: "Don't become like him!" and "Thank God, you're not like him!" The young M. assimilated this. By doing so, he could please his mother, cut out his hated father, and take over his father's place in his mother's heart. Now he is forced, through his compulsion, to "realize" that he is nothing more than a "pig" himself.

It is, however, through his mother's evil expression that he sees himself. He takes this in when he perceives his glance slipping "downward." This glance is not initially lustful, but rather a look of humility, a lowering of his eyes before the eyes of his mother. Thus the poor boy finds himself looking at her breasts, which was precisely where he was not allowed to look. "Look me in the eyes," she had demanded.

In M.'s case, we see how he reinterprets his gesture of humility as an aggressive, "misogynist" one. By doing this, he denies his humiliation. This denial of humiliation also forms the nucleus of the denial of the abusive man; it is a fight for his doubted masculinity. In his eyes, humiliation negates his "masculinity." In order to maintain his masculinity, he must negate humiliation. I do not contend that the denial of humiliation compulsively leads to abuse, but rather the opposite: through deprecation, the damaged masculinity—a masculinity called into question—may be affirmed. Abuse and the denial of humiliation are aimed at the same objective, that of winning a lost masculinity. The abusive man does not want to face the fact that he abuses his child because of his incapability, his weakness. Not only is the deed denied, but so is the deficit itself, the nucleus of masculinity—to maintain control over the

situation. This deficit points to a deficient socialization. In general, one could say he had a failed, destructive history (socialization)—one that destroyed his feelings of self-worth—during which the resources and educational requirements necessary for his successful personality formation were withheld from him. His was a childhood in which he was not allowed to develop independently. In turn, he now inhibits his child from developing on her own. This may be fully interpreted as a compulsion to repeat, a repetition compulsion. He was not allowed to accept his needs and to fight for their gratification. His needs were poisoned as insubordinate, impertinent, “dirty.” To his shame, the possibility of fighting to satisfy his needs was taken from him. Nonetheless, those needs did not simply disappear. He was forced to make himself small, to look for his satisfactions behind other people’s backs. He accustomed himself to obtaining gratification in secret, against social norms and in avoidance of the public. A life in a forbidden realm.

And herein lies the reason for the secrecy with which the adult man veils his abuse. Secrecy, which binds both violator and victim, occupies an important place in acts of abuse—in their maintenance and in their screening from the environment. It occupies an important place in the psychodynamics of the violator and the victim as well. The abused children guard the secret: consider the reluctance of abused children to speak about what they have experienced. Reviving the memory and the affect associated with the memory are resisted, above all, because children do not like to be reminded of the unbearable relationship with the bad object. Fairbairn emphasizes the importance of the shame that is connected to the experience of the relationship with a bad object. Because identification plays an important role with respect to children’s feelings about themselves, children believe themselves evil when they experience the parents as evil or humiliating. Hence children must repress both the parents and the bad relationship with them in order to protect their egos from being persecuted by them.³⁹

V. THE CORE OF SEXUAL TRAUMATIZATION: SEXUALIZATION AND ITS DENIAL

The sexualization of (power) relations and the simultaneous denial of sexualization, more specifically, of power itself, or even more precisely, the denial of the abuse of this power—this is the core of a child’s traumatization through sexual abuse. The possibility of traumatization is immensely greater *within* a close, (life-)sustaining, emotional *relationship*

between the child and adults—one that the child cannot or does not want to do without, a relationship that the child depends upon, a relationship of dependence that the child cannot leave behind—than outside of such a relationship, with a stranger. In studies conducted by Peters, Rosenfeld, Landis and Rosenfeld, and others, sexual assault by a *stranger* also appears less traumatic for the child than assault by someone within the family because: (1) an assault by a stranger is often a singular event; (2) the relationship between the child and the family is more often such that the child is better able to obtain help; and (3) the child does not have the feeling of having been betrayed in trust.⁴⁰

Thus it is not the sexual assault alone that is traumatizing but also its embeddedness within a relationship that is important for the child. The pathogenic effects have their etiology not only in overstimulation and fear but also in a confusion of perception and in a weakening of reality proofing and primary trust. Abuse from within the *family* cannot be isolated from existing relationships: “The climate within the family in which the incest happens is traumatic even before the event itself occurs.”⁴¹ Still, it remains relevant whether the “actual” incest occurs. Even within the family, the consequences differ depending on how much the nonabusive parent is able to protect the child, to get help from outside, to leave the abusive partner. Additionally, the *duration* of sexual abuse within such a relationship is of importance. Sexual abuse within the family is almost never a singular or an “accidental” event. It often takes place over a period of years. Each day is filled with fear, and each time it occurs, the abuse goes qualitatively (and quantitatively) further; it is not uncommon for the abuse to reach a stage where penetration occurs. Moreover, incest is more harmful the earlier it begins.⁴² Incest develops over many years through a series of boundary violations, denials, compulsions to secrecy, repetitions, and ritualizations, during which the “consequences” of sexual abuse are produced daily and gradually.

The family, or in more general terms, the emotionally important relationship (between the child and the adult), would therefore be the decisive precondition for the destructive consequences of sexual abuse: the incestuous relationship within the family, the sexualization of this relationship, and the simultaneous denial of this sexualization.

We have seen that denial plays a role for both the male and the female violator, as well as for the victim. Both types of denial, as well as the possibilities for sexualizing the (power) relationship, are gender-specific. Both sexes return concurrently to images of masculinity and femininity that are related to each other in a polarized form. These images make denial easier or, for their part, more difficult as they con-

tribute to whether or not the abuse will be perceived. Consequently, denial is the destructive element for abused children. Before Amendt's study, Sandor Ferenczi greatly emphasized the denial of the abuse on the part of the adult.⁴³ It is because of this that the children are left alone with the unbearable contradiction that the trauma comes from those individuals who are most important to them. Abused children must deal with extreme pain, fear, humiliation, and not least of all, anger; the only people these children can turn to for help are the torturers themselves, if they are the parents. Therefore, the only possibility left to the children is to deny the abuse itself, that is, to split off the experience; this comes at the price of ego splitting, however.

VI. MASCULINITY, SEXUALIZATION, AND DENIAL THROUGH THE PERSPECTIVE OF MODERNITY

If we believe the traumatizing element of child sexual abuse to be the sexualization of the relationship and the simultaneous denial of this sexualization, then we can immediately see that this is not specifically male, not simply the expression of masculine sexual violence, but rather that it is a possibility for both sexes. Both men and women can sexualize the relationship with (their) children, albeit in different ways. Amendt sees this sexualization as a result of the denial of feelings, as well as the inability to communicate feelings and desires to others in a different manner. This structure already determines the relationship between the partners before the child even appears as a substitute partner. The partners bring the propensity to create such a structure into the relationship: both enter the relationship with desires that they simultaneously deny, or more specifically, that they project onto the child. Both the father and the mother transfer onto their daughter those needs that are intended for the mother.⁴⁴ Thus they overwhelm their relationship, and they overwhelm the child. Both parents have fled into this relationship and need it "in order to create for themselves a certain sense of security that they are unable to get anywhere else," as Anthony Giddens makes clear.⁴⁵ With this indication, sexual abuse may be situated within the overall relationship structure of "co-dependency." I am not only interested, however, in how one may order sexual abuse, but more importantly, I am drawn to Giddens's observations of how "co-dependency"—boundaries, boundary violations, and the acceptance of boundaries—is thematized in therapeutic work itself. The boundaries damaged through

sexual abuse are, at first sight, those of the other as subject. Yet in the violation of these boundaries, the abusive adult simultaneously negates his or her own boundedness, negates the impossibility of making the other into an "object."⁴⁶

Giddens has examined many therapeutic case studies and has found that the first goal of many therapy programs is a reflexive one: the creation of a reflexive attentiveness. Reflexive attentiveness encourages the understanding that one has a choice, which in turn implies an acceptance of boundaries and compulsions to which one is subject. This is seen as a path toward learning to gauge possibilities.⁴⁷ One could say that the project of the "reflexive self"—the prerequisite for acceptance of one's own boundaries—is required for respecting the boundaries of the other. With this, sexual abuse would be ordered within a broader cultural frame as an answer to the deficiency of a "reflexive self." Some term this reflexive element a "talk with the self," or a direct reflection on the nature of the self.⁴⁸ Choice not only implies external or marginal aspects of individual attitudes but also defines who the individual "is." The project of the "reflexive self," the reflexive history of the self; the idea of an individual life story that can and must be constantly (re)written; and the development of a narrative self referred to as "biographical accounting" in which the self feels emotionally well.⁴⁹

The project of the reflexive self is a historical one. Giddens views its creation as bound to the fact that "in a society in which traditions have been erased more thoroughly than ever before, and in which many parts of personal life are no longer determined by preset patterns and customs, the individual must try to find security within the self, through the individual's own 'style of living.'"⁵⁰ The opportunity to choose a style of living is, however, constitutive for the reflexive history of the self.⁵¹ The individual is constantly compelled to renegotiate the possibilities of a style of living, to work through the history of the self, and to make those applied styles of living commensurate with the self if the individual wants to harmonize personal autonomy with feelings of ontological security.⁵² The project of the reflexive self is part of a set of new ideas, interpretation models, and orientations that appeared in the second half of the eighteenth century. Klaus Wahl calls these the "promises of modernity": (1) the promise of a new image of humanity, tending toward the universal (an autonomous, self-conscious, humane subject possessing human dignity); (2) the promise of universal progress in science, technology, economy, law, and society; and (3) the promise of a new family model (individualized marriage based on love, familial happiness, and autonomy).⁵³

It soon became clear, after these promises had grown to be an aspect of social reality, that social changes that simultaneously began with these cultural innovations by no means happened without conflict. Dissonance appeared between the promises of modernity and the experience of daily social reality, which led to disappointment, subjective suffering, and "private" unhappiness. Above all, the triangular relationship between individual, family, and society proved to be the source of momentous conflicts. For instance, the individual interests of women, men, and children in autonomous play within the family are hardly *a priori* congruent, but rather are laid down through possible conflicts. The same can be seen with the orientation toward family and with individualism, which have spread parallel to each other since the eighteenth century. In addition, the family did not appear as a universal instance that compensated for missing self-affirmation and recognition.

If self-consciousness, as a focusing on one's own person and worth, belongs to the nucleus of the modern image of man, if individuals have adopted the education and demands of their own self-consciousness and self-esteem—even if only unconsciously—as a maxim, then this claim suggests much danger.⁵⁴ The danger lies in the fact that the individual no longer, or now only in a limited fashion, holds the right of disposal over the cultural and societal conditions governing the fulfillment or realization of this project of self-consciousness. Certainly there are many paths leading to an individual's self-respect, which is necessary for survival.⁵⁵ However, "where there is no longer the guarantee of minimal economic success, . . . self-consciousness, self-respect, and individuality will be undermined because they are firmly based on the success of such material criteria."⁵⁶ Individuals then run the risk of becoming trapped between internalized promises of self-conscious autonomy, family happiness, and social progress on the one hand, and their real experiences of denied respect, disregarded human dignity, and damaged self-confidence on the other hand. This trap—between the triangle of promises and the discovery that they cannot be carried out in the reality of modernity—is subjectively experienced as suffering. The individual suffers from not being what or as he should, from not being able to be what he should. He experiences this as a failure, a not-getting-enough (*Zu-kurz (ge)kommen-Sein*), a being discriminated against, an inferiority. He experiences this inability, this not-(being)-right, as shaming. The individual takes the promises seriously and ascribes their nonfulfillment to his own fault, to his failure, to the failure of his parents; he does not place the promises themselves in question, however. The trap between the myth and the reality of modernity is not without consequences for individual behavior.⁵⁷

Some long for recognition in the form of different demonstrations of power toward weaker individuals; others are bound by neurotic strategies that compensate for the defects of their own self-images. Disappointment leads to aggression.⁵⁸

Feelings of guilt are replaced by mechanisms of shame, the feeling of being worthless, the feeling that life is empty and that the body is not an adequate vessel of the self—all results of the diffusion of the self-referential systems of modernity.⁵⁹ In this situation, sexuality takes on the task of filling the "emptiness." Sexual activity tends to be drawn to this emptiness, this search for fulfillment so difficult to obtain, which influences each gender differently.⁶⁰

In his extensive project on sex and how it is made discursive, Michel Foucault characterizes the historical development of sexualization as thus: "In the space of a few centuries, a certain inclination has led us to direct the question of what we are, to sex."⁶¹ Moreover, "between each of us and our sex, the West has placed a never-ending demand for truth: it is up to us to extract the truth of sex, since this truth is beyond its grasp; it is up to sex to tell us our truth, since sex is what holds it in darkness."⁶² Sex is a history that, according to Foucault, began in the eighteenth century with the establishment of the hegemony of the bourgeois class.

And this was far from being a matter of the class which in the eighteenth century became hegemonic believing itself obliged to amputate from its body a sex that was useless, expensive, and dangerous as soon as it was no longer given over exclusively to reproduction; we can assert on the contrary that it provided itself with a body to be cared for, protected, cultivated, and preserved from the many dangers and contacts, to be isolated from others.⁶³

As far as the bourgeois classes were concerned, sex had nothing to do with "asceticism, in any case not a renunciation of pleasure or a disqualification of the flesh, but on the contrary an intensification of the body, a problematization of health and its operational terms."⁶⁴ Moreover,

[t]he bourgeoisie made this element identical with its body, or at least subordinated the latter to the former by attributing to it a mysterious and undefined power; it staked its life and its death on sex by making it responsible for its future welfare; it placed its hopes for the future in sex by imagining it to have ineluct-

able effects on generations to come; it subordinated its soul to sex by conceiving of it as what constituted the soul's most secret and determinant part.⁶⁵

All of these strategies "went by way of a family which must be viewed, not as a powerful agency of prohibition, but as a major factor of sexualization."⁶⁶ Further, the discourse of sexuality was masculine, was conducted by men who turned their masculine gaze toward women, making women the object of masculine sexuality.

For women today, however, sexuality contains the promise of intimacy.⁶⁷ It is a "means of establishing relationships with others based on intimacy."⁶⁸ Masculine sexuality, on the other hand, remains untouched by this; it remains "episodic." Giddens characterizes masculine sexuality as often compulsive and interprets it as an "obsessive acting out of routines devoid of their former context," precisely because it denies the emotional dependence that it arouses.⁶⁹ Its compulsive character becomes more pronounced the more women insist on an ethic of love based on partnership. This in turn places pressure on masculine sexuality, "which fluctuates between self-confident sexual dominance that includes violence and constant fears about one's potency."⁷⁰ Masculine sexual violence in modern societies results more from insecurity or inadequacy than from a smooth continuity of patriarchal dominance. It is a "destructive reaction to the decay of female complicity."⁷¹

The more the life of the individual concentrates on itself, and the more "identity" is understood as a reflexively organized project, the more sexuality becomes the property of the individual.⁷² Sexuality was split off or privatized as part of that process in which motherhood was invented and declared to be a fundamental component of the female realm; it is the result of social rather than psychological repression. What was involved was the restriction or denial of an expressly feminine sexuality and an acceptance of the general assumption that masculine sexuality was unproblematic. These developments renewed the emphasis on the difference between the sexes.⁷³

Women were burdened with the changes in intimacy that modernity had effected. For women, the problem of having to constitute love as a medium of communication and development of the self emerged, both in relationship to children and in relationship to men. The demand for female sexual desire made up a major part of the reconstitution of intimacy, and this emancipation was as important as all others fought for in the public arena.

For men, sexual activity remained compulsive to the extent that it remained untouched by these concealed changes.

The man connects primary trust with domination and control—including self-control—which stem from his suppressed emotional dependence on women. The need to neutralize these suppressed desires or to destroy their object collides with the desire for love. What men seek to suppress is not the ability to love, but the emotional autonomy necessary to endure intimacy. Intimacy is more dependent on communication than on the need to express emotions as such (communicative competence as compared to instrumental competence of the boys).⁷⁴

"Above all," Giddens writes, "intimacy is a question of emotional communication with others, with the self, and thus, within the context of interpersonal equality."⁷⁵ This presupposes that "the other is understood as an independent being, that personal boundaries are defined and maintained, that the boundaries of the other are accepted."⁷⁶ Such boundaries are disregarded whenever one person uses another to implement old psychological formations.⁷⁷ Sexual abuse belongs to this category. Men and women differ in how they use (their) children by such means. These differences reflect the differences in the meaning of sexuality for both sexes, as well as the construction of the history of the self.

VII. CONCLUSION: FASCISM AND SEXUAL ABUSE

Fascism as a specifically German phenomenon cannot be purged from history. Consequently, we must consider, along with the question of sexual abuse, the effects of fascism on sexual abuse in Germany. I take as my point of departure the family as the place of sexual abuse and concentrate on the meaning that sexual abuse occupies within the family. I also take as my starting point the destruction of relationships between the abusive adults and the abused children, as well as within the family as a whole. Fascism itself brought about a destruction of families and pressured families to open up intimate spheres—above all, through children and youth—to the controlling organs of the fascist state. Youth were exposed to a tension of loyalty that forced them out of the family and instilled mistrust in them, mistrust that was subsequently brought

back into the family. Silence and concealment became a "principle of survival," even within the family itself. Foremost was the parents' silence; they were forced to conceal their differences with the fascistic system. They did not speak about what they saw outside, what they experienced, what they went along with or took part in, the reasons they were compelled, or the ways in which they bowed to pressure. Likewise, they remained silent about the discrepancies between their actions and their ideas of a moral and just life, ideas that they perpetually had to violate. They remained silent about the horrors and atrocities that they knew, half-knew, or suspected. To escape unscathed, they tried to look away. These attempts created a mental climate of untruthfulness, concealment, and secrecy that ripped deep wounds in their self-consciousness. With this damaged self-consciousness, with strategies of conformity such as looking away and concealing, the Germans experienced the defeat of fascism and stood intimidated, laden with feelings of guilt, vulnerable to what would come at them. Only a few experienced this period as a liberation. One spoke of "collapse," yielded oneself to "reconstruction," desired most of all to erase history.

We must place lying at the center of the relationship between National Socialism and sexual abuse. Lying is the specific aspect of National Socialism that intrudes into the intimate relationships between people. Inside the lie, the murder of Jews—which distinguishes National Socialism from other dictatorships—was brought into the family. Lying was the people's "survival strategy" in the face of horror. No one "knew" of the murder of the Jews—although everyone could see how the Jews "disappeared" from their field of vision, from their midst. The looking away, the concealment, the lying, became endemic in National Socialism; it colored everyday life, thought, speech, and the actions of the Germans (even those who were outside of the sphere of influence of National Socialism). Never was there so much lying.⁷⁸

The lying that poisoned relationships between people did not stop at those intimate relationships. Lying, the concealment of knowledge, is at the center of sexual abuse. Lying, the opportunity for the subject to say something different from what he thinks or knows—to be different from that which he is (Lacan)—is certainly a "weapon of the weak." It destroys, however, the most important and fragile instrument of human coexistence: speech, the breath of the soul.

Lying did not stop with the defeat of National Socialism. On the contrary, one could in fact say that it actually began to flourish for the first time and on a large scale, as if in a hothouse. The millions of members of the National Socialist Workers Party (NSDAP), who swore

they had had nothing to do with the Nazi system ("denazification"), that they knew nothing, continued and informed the nascent phase of the Federal Republic—always severely shaken by the discovery, the unmasking, that extended into the ranks of the political classes.

The fathers concealed from the children what they knew, what they had known before, what they had experienced, what they had seen. They lied to the children, while the mothers remained silent. This climate of concealment—"Silence is reactionary" (Sartre)—determined the developmental period of the postwar Federal Republic. In this silence, relationships atrophied. Diversion lay in an ecstasy of consuming. Silence, speechlessness, lying—all are part of the climate in which sexual abuse also prospers. Putting an end to the silence is certainly the first step in the liberation of the destructive imprisonment of the victim, and in the liberation of the perpetrator from the relationship of abuse.

NOTES

1. See Peter Wetzels, *Gewalterfahrungen in der Kindheit. Sexueller Mißbrauch, körperliche Mißhandlung und deren langfristige Konsequenzen. Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zur kriminologischen Forschung*, vol. 8 (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1997).
2. "Daughter raped two thousand times. Can he still be called a father? The word 'father' implies protection, kindness, love. This man, however, was a torturer, cold and boundlessly cruel" (*Bild*). In this excerpt, *Bild* attempts to reconstruct the image of the undamaged family in which sexual abuse does not take place.
3. Barbara Kavemann and Ingrid Lohstöter, *Väter als Täter* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1984).
4. M. Metcalfe, R. Oppenheimer, A. Dignon, and R. L. Palmer, "Childhood Sexual Experiences Reported by Male Psychiatric Patients," *Psychological Medicine* 20 (1990): 925–929; R. L. Palmer, D. A. Chaloner, and R. Oppenheimer, "Childhood Sexual Experiences with Adults Reported by Female Psychiatric Patients," *British Journal of Psychiatry* 160 (1992): 261–265; A. Jacobson and C. Herald, "The Relevance of Childhood Sexual Abuse to Adult Psychiatric Inpatient Care," *Hospital Community Psychiatry* 41 (1990): 154–158; J. Kinzl, W. Biebl, and H. Hinterhuber, "Die Bedeutung von Inzesterlebnissen für die Entstehung psychiatrischer und psychosomatischer Erkrankungen," *Nervenarzt* 62 (1991): 565–569; J. Surrey, C. Swett, Jr., A. Michaels, and S. Levin, "Reported History of Physical and Sexual Abuse and Severity of Symptomatology in Women Psychiatric Outpatients," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 60 (1990): 412–417; G. M. Margo and E. M. McLees, "Further Evidence for the Significance of Childhood Abuse History in Psychiatric Inpatients," *Comparative Psychiatry* 32 (1991): 362–366.
5. Craig Allen, "Socio-Demographics, Family Satisfaction, and Child Sexual Abuse Experiences of Women and Men Who Sexually Abuse Children," Address, Ninth International Congress on Child Abuse and Neglect, Chicago, September 1992.

6. See Gerhard Amendt, *Wie Mütter ihre Söhne sehen* (Bremen: Ikaru, 1993).
7. Ibid., 41.
8. Ibid., 43.
9. Ibid., 45.
10. Ibid., 38.
11. Ibid., 26.
12. Ibid., 49–50.
13. Ibid., 48.
14. Ibid., 50.
15. Ibid., 13.
16. Ibid., 35.
17. Ibid., 59.
18. Ibid., 55.
19. Ibid., 72.
20. Ibid., 63, 72. These precautions obviously do not reach their goal of preventing circumcision: more circumcisions have been reported in the new *Bundesländer* (17.1 percent compared to a previous 10 percent), although the number and duration of preventative measures is higher there than in the old *Bundesländer*: D5, D6, D7.
21. Ibid., 68–69.
22. Ibid., 63.
23. Ibid., 77. Here Amendt also compares these motherly measures of prevention to the roughness of doctors toward female patients.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid., 63.
27. Ibid., 70.
28. Ibid., 83.
29. Ibid., 63.
30. Ibid., 74.
31. T. S. Trepper and M. J. Barret, *Inzest und Therapie: Ein (system)therapeutisches Handbuch* (Dortmund: Verlag modernes Lernen, 1989), 152.
32. Compare Klaus-Jürgen Bruder, "Die Scham des Mißbrauchers und die Probleme der Therapie," *Psychoanalytische Blätter* 4 (1996): 104–119.
33. C. Marquit, "Der Täter, Persönlichkeitsstruktur und Behandlung," *Sexueller Mißbrauch von Kindern in Familien*, L. Backe and N. Leick, eds. (Köln: Deutscher Ärzte Verlag, 1983), 128.
34. See Ronnie Janoff-Bulman, "The Aftermath of Victimization: Rebuilding Shattered Assumptions," *Trauma and Its Wake: The Study and Treatment of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder*, Charles R. Figley, ed. (New York: Brunner Mazel, 1985).

35. See H. Petri, *Erziehungsgewalt* (Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1989).
36. W. R. D. Fairbairn, "The Repression and the Return of Bad Objects," *Psychoanalytic Studies of the Personality* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952), 19.
37. G. Ryan, S. Lane, J. Davis, and C. Isaac, "Juvenile Sex Offenders: Development and Correction," *Child Abuse and Neglect* 11 (1987): 385–395.
38. C. Cooper, W. Murphy, and M. Haynes, "Characteristics of Abused and Nonabused Adolescent Sexual Offenders," *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment* 8 (1996): 105–119.
39. Fairbairn, 65. The children's symptoms are predominantly attributed to a failure of defense mechanisms through which bad objects would be kept repressed.
40. J. J. Peters, "Children Who Are Victims of Sexual Assault and the Psychology of Offenders," *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 30 (1976): 398–421; A. Rosenfeld, "Incidence of a History of Incest among Eighteen Female Psychiatric Patients," *American Journal of Psychiatry* (1979) 136: 791–795; A. Rosenfeld et al., "Incest and Sexual Abuse of Children," *Journal of American Academic Child Psychiatry* 16 (1977): 327–339; J. T. Landis, "Experiences of Five Hundred Children with Adult Sexual Deviation," *Psychiatric Quarterly* (Supplement) 30 (1956): 91–109.
41. B. F. Steele and H. Alexander, "Long-Term Effects of Sexual Abuse in Childhood," *Sexually Abused Children and Their Families*, P. B. Mrazek and C. H. Kempe, eds. (New York: Pergamon, 1981), 224.
42. See R. S. Kempe and C. H. Kempe, *Kindesmißhandlung* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1980); L. L. Shengold, "Child Abuse and Deprivation: Soul Murder," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytical Association* 27 (1979): 533–559. See also B. F. Steele and H. Alexander, "Long-Term Effects of Sexual Abuse in Childhood," op. cit.
43. Sandor Ferenczi, "Die Leidenschaften der Erwachsenen und deren Einfluß auf Charakter und Sexualentwicklung des Kindes: Sprachverwirrung zwischen den Erwachsenen und dem Kind," *Schriften zur Psychoanalyse*, vol. 2 (1932): 303–313.
44. See M. Hirsch, *Realer Inzest. Psychodynamik des sexuellen Mißbrauchs in der Familie* (Berlin: Springer, 1978), 126 ff.
45. Anthony Giddens, *Wandel der Intimität. Sexualität, Liebe und Erotik in modernen Gesellschaften* (Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer Zeitschriften, 1993), 100. Published in English as *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1992).
46. Ibid.
47. Ibid., 103.
48. Ibid., 103, 105.
49. Ibid., 87.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid., 87 f.
53. Klaus Wahl, *Die Modernisierungsfalle* (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1989), 181 f.
54. Ibid., 162.

55. Ibid., 79.

56. Ibid., 97.

57. Ibid., 161.

58. Ibid., 163.

59. Ibid., 190.

60. Ibid., 46.

61. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, Volume 1*, Robert Hurley, trans. (New York: Vintage, 1978), 97. This and subsequent citations are from Robert Hurley's translation.

62. Ibid.

63. Ibid., 147.

64. Ibid.

65. Ibid., 149.

66. Ibid., 137.

67. Giddens, 91.

68. Ibid., 190.

69. Ibid., 144.

70. Ibid., 132.

71. Ibid., 137.

72. Ibid., 189 f.

73. Ibid., 192 f.

74. Ibid., 168 f.

75. Ibid., 145.

76. Ibid., 106.

77. Ibid., 204.

78. Alexander Koyre, "Betrachtungen über die Lüge (1943)," *Freibeuter*, vol. 72 (Berlin: Wagenbach, 1997).