

KATHARINA RUTSCHKY

Erregte Aufklärung

Kindesmißbrauch:

Fakten & Fiktionen

Catherine Rotky
Excited Enlightenment
child abuse:
Facts & Fictions

Katharina Rutschky
Erregte Aufklärung

Kindesmißbrauch:
Fakten & Fiktionen
KleinVerlag

CIP title recording of the German library Slipky,

Katharina: excited

enlightenment: child abuse: facts &
fictions /

Katharinautschky. — 1st

edition — Hamburg: KleinVerlag 1992

ISBN 3-922930-05-0

© 1992 KleinVerlag, Hamburg

Design: Christoph Krämer

Typesetting: Uhl + Massopust,

Aalen Printing and binding: Clausen & Bosse,

Leck 2nd edition

1992 ISBN 3-922930-05-0

elperegrino@rocketmail.com v1.0 FR11 06/21/2015

Contents

1. Tired of breaking taboos

2. Magic with numbers and even more tricks

3. Socialization-theoretical horror romance

4. The normal man and other prejudices 5. How much
sexuality does a child need?

An afterword instead of footnotes

1 . Tired of breaking taboos

You don't have to go to great lengths to come up against a taboo every day when you look at the newspaper, the television screen, yes, even when leafing through the cinema and theater programs, but no one seems to abide by it. Some—and there should not be so few as we have always thought, if we have ever thought of it at all—break it with bad reasons, others with good and praiseworthy ones, namely with the intention of restoring it. Some commit sacrilege and defile what is sacred to all of us, others practice oratory spells to wash it clean again.

This has been going on for a number of years, and yet none of the good guys tire of emphasizing that a taboo must finally be broken, a rule of silence no longer respected, and the truth about a crime brought to light against all odds. »'Psychology today': author Elfriede Czurda (born 1946, Upper Austrian) has tackled a sensitive subject: incest, child abuse in the family, a crime that occurs just as often as it is suppressed and concealed.« That is the topos, who, after years of wandering from science to literature, to art and to the stage, has finally made its way into mass media of all stripes. Anyone who does not recognize a topos as such must get the impression that, years later, the publication of the topic, which concerns everyone, has still not progressed.

A journalist from the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* asked the young director Amelie Niermeyer, who had just staged a play about incest at Munich's Cuvilliestheater: "Why are you interested in the highly taboo subject of sexual abuse of children?"

Publications in by no means esoteric organs such as Brigitte, Spiegel, Stern or at the offer of every bookshop, all of which have been working in a taboo-breaking manner since the 1980s, so that there is no longer any need for action on this point - no, the answer confirms the duty to continue the difficult task, albeit with the modification that one does it better oneself and means it more seriously than others who, for speculative reasons, break taboos.

"I find the question a bit absurd," Amelie Niermeyer replies to the journalist, "because the number of girls and boys who are sexually abused by fathers is so horrendously high that it has to interest us. In addition, this topic is exploited in the press primarily in a voyeuristic manner. This gives it such an exceptional character, while sexual abuse of children is the order of the day in many families.« Niermeyer is, without realizing it, in complete agreement with the view that the crime is an everyday occurrence with the »Bild« newspaper, which was published punctually on the 8th International Congress on Child Abuse and Neglect, held in Hamburg in early September 1990, started a series entitled "Woe you tell Mama - child abuse in Germany". There are also doubts as to whether the play by the Dutch Inez van Dullemen, "Write me in the sand," which was performed in Munich, lives on something other than the voyeuristic exploitation and pandering to human misfortune that the tabloids portray with their case reports operates. The details with which the horror scenarios in »Bild« are equipped in order to grip the reader properly and send pleasant shivers of horror down his spine cannot be missing from the »shattering case study«, which can be taken from life on a one-to-one basis brings to the stage.

The theater critic Wolfgang Höbel also had concerns about the "enlightenment work" - albeit purely aesthetic ones. He has no doubts about the truth of the life that was unceremoniously transported to the boards: »One, like you meanwhile

known from hundreds of media reports about the sexual abuse of children, cruel everyday story: a loving father who stupidly and thoughtlessly uses his 'property' for instinctual gratification; a mother who prefers to look away... and a sister who only understands when it's too late... A horrible play... But does that make it a case for the theatre? The author finds no language for her realistic characters... The real horror is translated one-to-one onto the stage here, and the result is less a drama and more an inherently depressing demonstration: That's how it is in the world outside the theaters.. .

The template adheres very closely to what scientists report about sexual abuse and its psychological and social causes. What does the mother say? She blames herself, defends her father with the ludicrous assertion: ›There are instincts that are stronger.‹ How does the father react? With subterfuges — and with hideous complacency. 'It's quite natural,' says this monster casually, 'a human impulse'... The message is clear, and it has been heard or read in almost all media recently: the perpetrators are among us.«

The fantastic character of the play appears even more clearly in the tightening of the theater criticism than on the stage. Isn't it familiar from myths and fairy tales that girls are sacrificed to the monster and others look on or look away, in their own interest? It is a mistake to believe that the theater must make certain demands on a play that is supposed to be theatrically convincing, but that the truths of life are otherwise lying around loosely and, if not to the naked eye, then to the specially keen eye of science are readily visible. In the end, the critic certified that the director, although not a good play, had managed to put together a "political evening of theatre"; for what was to be seen was the "quite ordinary misery of the real world."

What is supposed to be political or enlightening about it, when, as here and in many other cases, things are presented with Aplomb that we have long agreed on? Incest, i.e. having sex between

Blood relatives is an ancient crime, i.e. forbidden and threatened with punishment in Section 173 of the Criminal Code (StGB). What is disputed among sociobiologists, ethnologists and other researchers is only the meaning and origin of this taboo. The case of abuse on the Munich theater stage also seems to be an application for Section 176 of the Criminal Code (sexual abuse of children under the age of fourteen), presumably also for Section 177 of the Criminal Code (rape) and Section 174 of the Criminal Code (abuse of wards — up to old age of eighteen years) to act.

A year ago a thirty-nine-year-old musician was convicted in Munich of having sexually abused his three daughters, now fifteen, eighteen and twenty-year-olds—two of his children since they were six years old. »The youngest was 13 when her father approached her inappropriately. In order to protect her from further sexual abuse, the middle daughter, who was already separated from the family at the time, turned to the police. The two older girls, like their mother, had said nothing beforehand for fear of abuse... The Hungarian was found guilty of abusing children and having sex between relatives and causing bodily harm.' His sentence was announced thirteen years imprisonment.

The quite ordinary misery of the real world, insofar as it is a matter of sexual abuse of children in the form of incest, does not have to be specifically denounced and branded as a crime in a moral-political-aesthetic act of violence on the stage or anywhere else; because when it comes down to it, going to the police is all you need. The fact that it is not always done or done very late always surprises outsiders and the inexperienced, which we usually are. One cannot really believe that the fear of abuse by the father, as in the present case, is a sufficient explanation.

What abuse surpasses in horror what fathers inflicted on daughters for years? Or how or what?

Be that as it may, the topological way of speaking about breaking a taboo, which must be committed in order for the taboo to regain validity, systematically ignores the fact that we in Central Europe at the end of the twentieth century are no longer dependent on taboos, but rather have laws and penal provisions which are also applied. In addition, it has been shown time and again that there is hardly anything more unanimous than the particular abomination of child abuse and maltreatment. Certainly these laws are broken, and general revulsion doesn't seem to prevail everywhere—but isn't that true of fraud, theft, or murder? It is also proven that this is committed daily, despite the threat of criminal law that one has to spend the rest of his life behind bars if one does not comply with the ban.

When it came to crimes against children and the punishment of child molesters, the voices of the people used to like to use the slogan "Turn off, turnip," and they were glad that the people didn't get their chance without further ado. Not only is the death penalty unworthy of a civilized society, we thought, every enlightened person also knew The police and judiciary can only give the crime a form, they cannot abolish it, despite the halfway accepted objective of rehabilitating the perpetrator. We strive for understanding for all lawbreakers, not only for the sake of justice, but also because the system keeps giving us headaches and relies on control, a function that Gerhard Mauz, for example, performs in an exemplary manner in his court reports.

Didn't we all take sides with a child molester and multiple murderer in the 1970s and finally ascribe the psychiatric treatment of Jürgen Bartsch to ourselves in the appeal proceedings as a victory? In view of the development of a liberal and progressive attitude towards many social circumstances in recent years and decades, one is all the more surprised at the way in which debates and protests in connection with sexually motivated crimes and acts of violence have become all too mild judgments, too

careful and lengthy litigation.

Otherwise, doubts about the lax judiciary are only raised in the context of trials that deal with crimes from the Nazi era. Criminal law is suddenly being insisted upon, and unwillingness and impatience with constitutional procedures are being articulated in places where people actually seem to be campaigning for a further civilizing of society and by no means for the schematic preservation of law and order. In 1988, readers of the alternative daily newspaper, or taz for short, discussed whether it was permissible for a left-wing lawyer to defend a so-called rapist without collaborating with his crimes. If one willingly overlooks the repellent slogans with which some people think they are promoting sexual politics on the walls of buildings, then the advertisements with which a Berlin emergency call facility is trying to create a bad mood are hardly successful; because I cannot see any other meaning in the warning calls and reports repeated daily and weekly. The fact that some make a completely fantastic impression and were obviously not checked for their reality content is no longer of any importance.

Some typical examples from the "taz" for illustration. A comparatively easy problem is a frequently reported exhibitionist or, as is the case today, a sexual harasser: »Warning to all women: At the S-Bhf. Feuerbachstr. in Steglitz a stocky older man (40-50 years) hangs around who sexually molests women. Be vigilant and take care of each other! The emergency women.« The worst thing that this warning can do is to put S-Bahn users in a slightly paranoid state. I can see them in front of me conspicuously — unobtrusively keeping an eye on men who might fit the description from an angle to the rear, and — caution can never be wrong — preferring to wait near another woman for the train.

The processing of the following message poses problems, especially for single women living alone in the specified district of Berlin: »Attention, women! In the area at

Prenzlauer Berg (Dimitroffstr./Greifswalder Str.), a *masked* man breaks into women's apartments in order to rape and rob them. What is striking about him is a black hood with eye slits that reaches down to the shoulders, similar to the KuKluxKlan. He's carrying a knife.' Perhaps that day some will check that windows and doors are secure; but that goes without saying, because thank God Berlin is not a village where the neighbors look out for each other.

Others, hardened like me, for example, read the lines of the ad like a short thriller or a comic: Couldn't the masked man be Batman, who flies through the streets to arrest those bad guys who do things as bad as robbery and rape have said?

The next story sounds completely like a novel, basically like a fairy tale: »In the Böcklerpark in Kreuzberg, a gang of 4-6 Yugoslavs brutally attacks women in the middle of the day. One asks for a light, then the others grab it from behind and drag the woman into the bushes.« There, I add, a trap door opens and the beautiful girl finds herself in a dungeon where eleven other maidens are already waiting for the knight , who puts a stop to the robbers, centaurs on the robbery of women, and redeems them from their captivity. It must be so; because a trivial police operation is out of the question under these circumstances. In addition to two other "guys" who are "massively" a nuisance, a hypnosis therapist from Wilmersdorf is also advertised that day, who rapes women in his practice after they have gained trust in him.

What is the purpose of the emergency call women with the publication of such *cautionary tales*? If I were as innocent as a woman must under no circumstances be, I could assume that they simply want to make themselves and their helpful facilities present and maintained. All well and good, but why with stories that depict the city woman's environment as a playground for deviant sex maniacs against whom nobody and nothing helps but women's solidarity? And another question arises: Where is the good old one?

handbag robber who actually pulled down an old lady on my street, injuring her and stealing from her?

In other words, it is striking what scope and weight the most active women, perhaps just the loudest and, at least in terms of media policy, the most successful, attach to the processing of the sex drive. If I disregard Monika Treut's films and Claudia Gehrke's publishing programs, then it's not my own, but always those of others. Up to now, the forms of expression and satisfaction that are particularly incomprehensible, unsavory, horrible and cruel have been scandalized, but in my opinion they are not only repulsive for women, as is suggested, but also for most men.

So, after a necessary detour, I have now come back to my actual topic, the sexual abuse of children. Apart from the criminal law definition of this crime in our society, which should not be underestimated or even forgotten for a moment, this fact can be summed up in the following formula: sexual abuse of children is abuse plus feminism. Feminism - forgive me for this generalization - offers the only remaining option for further sexualization, which remains in our liberal and enlightened society.

It is, despite all the porn in the cable programs — bed scenes are already obligatory even in television plays of the public broadcasters — regardless of all the frankness with which every specialty is offered and presumably called up on the sex market, reflected in the personal ads in the city magazines, a society that lies in a puritanical deep sleep. There is no better metaphor for her condition than the press photo that shows the long-time head of the Federal Office for Writings Harmful to Young People, Rudolf Stefen, happily together with the porn actress and film producer Teresa Orlowski: two employees at the company party of the sex bureaucracy.

I like the working life of a censor and youth protection officer

imagine little like that of a producer of passable messes.

Whether the compulsive isolation of sexuality under the laws of the bureaucracy with the help of women will be continued and possibly intensified is the question we must deal with at the moment. The debate about male sexual violence in public spaces started years ago. Every woman, so the message went, no matter what age, where she is, no matter how she behaves, is potentially a raped woman. The whistles of construction workers and the posture of some men in the subway have already been criminalized as an expression of this male violence against women. The advertising, but also the cover photos of a liberal magazine that was otherwise part of the enlightenment trend, were exposed as sexist because they allegedly depicted women as sexual objects that were always willing and thus offended every woman's dignity.

However, the failure of the lawsuit against "Stern" did not prevent Alice Schwarzer from initiating an anti-porn campaign at the end of the 1980s, the overly ambitious goal of which was to offer every woman affected a right to sue and claims for compensation, if she was offended by pornography. Since women are even less interested than men in such stimulants, commonly known as "jerking off templates," and as a result they also had no knowledge of them, the magazine "Emma" first had to remedy this lack of education on its pages. This is more than a paradox, born out of the journalistic duty to provide information and clarification and the disgust that one wanted to mobilize and translate into action at the same time. It's not the only one left.

These campaigns had to come to nothing and fail because they set too high a goal and a restoration of the sexual-political conditions and censorship practices of the Adenauer era, no longer under the stuffy aegis of Western value creators, but in the interest of women's emancipation, no longer made plausible to anyone smaller projects have a better chance of success. Yes, the broad coalition that is represented in the media and by all parties meanwhile for measures against sexual harassment

in working life and the increased penalties for forced cohabitation in marriage, where previously only coercion, not rape, was to be punished, could give one the idea that further attempts to keep the women's question present in the public debate using the method of sexualization , can no longer be made.

Apart from that, however, the ever more subtle juridification of all areas of life is probably nowhere more unsuitable as a means of choice for reform than in the area of sexuality, especially if one wants to hold on to the idea that fundamental human possibilities of expression and happiness lie here, that only individuals can realize or miss.

Even if tax justice can hardly be enforced, the apparently envisaged goal of establishing justice in life and love relationships is wrong from the outset.

Experiences from the Scandinavian countries, which have had laws of the desired kind for a long time, show that if the number of advertisements remains the same, only the number of convictions increases or has increased up to now. A victory for the women's cause or a change of mood in the avenging judiciary?

The following dpa report about a German court case is hopefully not a harbinger of future legal decisions in cases that the courts should not actually deal with:

"A 50-year-old food wholesaler has been sentenced to eight years in prison in Frankfurt for raping his partner's daughter several hundred times between 1979 and 1987. After several weeks of taking evidence, the Frankfurt Regional Court came to the conclusion that the victim's testimony was credible. Only out of consideration for her mother did she remain silent for years. The defendant had vehemently denied the allegation in court. The now 29-year-old agreed to the sexual contact, they had a 'completely normal love affair'. « Men seldom have a »normal« relationship so close to their main

relationship as here, where mother and daughter are involved

are. Nevertheless, one cannot believe that the report correctly reproduced the entire facts on which the verdict was based. Is it possible to rape a woman who is initially seventeen and finally twenty-five years old for eight years without having to think of any relationship between the perpetrator and the victim, which can be qualified in any way? That the daughter, under the given circumstances, was struggling with the most severe feelings of guilt and could only be kept in the relationship by her mother's boyfriend with difficulty and probably some pressure—so far, so ugly. In any case, eight years in prison for rape is not made plausible to me.

When the court believed that the witness had remained silent for so long for the mother's sake, it took the side not of the victim but of maintaining the status quo in gender relations. If it is true that the robust male sex drive all too readily and all too easily overrides resistance from the female opposite side, then we must fairly criticize an equally disastrous tendency on the part of women to renounce self-determination, to be submissive, conform and irresponsible. The conviction that physical and, once again, sexual integrity is of great value would have led in the present case—if I had been a judge—to a stern warning to the young woman that she had definitely taken her consideration for her mother too far. ..

Always assuming that dpa informed the newspaper reader correctly.

Without the themes of past feminist campaigns disappearing completely from the media and the discussion, a cooling off and wear and tear effect could probably not have been avoided if, at the beginning of the 1980s, a new group of victims had not appeared alongside the women, who felt almost even better when this itself was suitable for the continuation and intensification of the sexually centered emancipation and reform discussions: those were the children. With a delay of ten years, which is the same as with which the problem of abused children was imported from the USA in the 1970s, this has now been discovered in our country too

sexually abused child. The formula with which the topic then prevailed here also applies to the United States: Child abuse plus feminism equals sexual child abuse.

In other words, since Henry Kempe formulated the "Battered Child Syndrome" in 1962 and thus gave a name to social conditions, a small scientific industry had emerged in the USA that investigated the phenomenon of violent parents in all directions and created appropriate institutions to remedy it, therapy models tried and tested, in short, very impressively knew how to mobilize public interest and public money for a social illness.

Feminist women were the first to discover that false sexuality is also a component, if not the most important, then the worst of this social disease. At a conference in New York, an elderly social worker, Florence Rush, gave the talk that would become her book *The Best Kept Secret*. That was on April 17, 1971, and since then the topic has spread, worked forward, ever further and further, until not only »Bild«, but also radio, television, serious and less serious journalism, and film every day and the book market in any case, were affected by the type and extent of sexually-related child suffering in our society.

Since 1982, women from Berlin founded a counseling center for raped women and girls under the name "Wildwasser", the publicity of the topic has also been used elsewhere for the installation of offers of help. In further training seminars for the relevant social professions, one catches up on what was previously neglected and practices identifying sexually abused children - the younger they are, the more the psychologist or the kindergarten teacher is dependent on their own observation. Since it has been found that many drug-addicted women and a high percentage of prostitutes have been sexually abused in childhood, the importance of early detection of abuse is clear. In the five new

In the federal states, the need to catch up on information and practical offers of help is of course still particularly great. In general, one must never lose sight of the fact that new and hitherto criminally neglected problems of considerable social significance require more qualified personnel, more permanent positions in existing institutions, in short: a lot more money that has to come from somewhere...

Young people have recently joined the girls and women as victims, albeit still very hesitantly. Their share seems to be higher than the feminist dogma of male violence against women initially allowed us to see. Yes, there are also women, mothers, who train a son or daughter to be a sexual partner.

The topic will be rounded off with other discoveries in the future - but no more sensations are to be expected now. Breaking taboos as a method has had its day, if it ever was a method and not the content itself.

For a long time I have no longer doubted that a modern and liberal society could still be enlightened by breaking taboos and brought to more care and humanity in dealing with hitherto neglected members. Breaking a taboo is a gesture, a pathetic attitude at best, otherwise it's the daily bread of the media society, where people fight hard for speaking time and attention. So the resounding success of such a nightmarish subject as child abuse is not at all surprising; because the strategy of sexualization that women have adopted in order to keep their emancipation deficits present, to articulate dissatisfaction, has always been a means of choice there, for other reasons.

2 . About magic with numbers and even more tricks

The all-too-successful liaison between child abuse education and the media subscribed to sex and crime as a favorite way to break taboos has raised concerns even among those who believe the campaign itself is necessary and helpful. The displacement movement of the good from those who are merely
But to abuse the abuse is difficult to accomplish, in fact quite impossible. You can only blame others for trivializing scandals of individual cases or speculating on voyeurism if you do it better yourself — and that never happened.

From the beginning, the campaign lived on the coming out of child victimized women at gatherings not unlike religious revival meetings —except that it was not awakened sinners who stood up to confess and surrender to the grace of God, but vice versa, as martyrs of male violence, to inspire successor wishes among us who have hitherto been unsuspecting. Those who show their wounds gain a superiority that disables sense and reason. Whether that is the enlightenment about an allegedly everyday evil like that

sexual abuse of children in families or just encourages the formation of sects, I have no doubt. Let's let the experience report of the "Brigitte" editor-in-chief from the year 1983 have an effect on us:

»In the fully occupied meeting room there is not a sound for several minutes. The silence became so agonizing that it takes a long time before I dare to turn to the woman who spoke last. In the middle of a sentence, her voice stopped obeying her and drowned in desperate sobs. Her father sexually abused her for years when she was a child.

She couldn't confide in anyone, couldn't talk to anyone about what she felt... In the crowd of nearly 150 women in Berlin's Mehringhof, I finally make out the pale face of the young woman, who for the first time publicly spoke about the misery of her Father ruined life has spoken. Nobody hugs her, comforts her.

Even looking around, I realize why: there are too many other women sitting in their chairs, paralyzed at the recognition of their own sad childhood... Many faces are streaming tears. As the silence gradually breaks and one woman after another takes the floor, it becomes clear: the crying wasn't just about bitterness and ancient anger. It was also a relief to finally no longer have to remain silent, finally no longer to have to feel rejected and abnormal...' There is no need to doubt that a real victim has come forward here and made an accusation, and rightly so hopes for our sympathy and our encouragement, so as not to notice the theatrical nature of the event, including the cathartic side effects, and find it rather strange. I believe that the stillness of the listeners after the appearance of one in their midst had nothing to do with the recognition of "one's own sad childhood", as the observer puts it, but quite the opposite, with immersion in the belief that the improbable and unthinkable is real and true. Precisely because sexual violence against children and even incest in families are not everyday events, it is necessary to bear witness, to speak and finally - to believe.

The mission with martyrs, who today are of course called victims, needs adult women. In their monotony, their stories resemble litanies in which the same thing is always said. Whether this is in the nature of things or in the compulsion to fulfill the feminist requirements, to do justice to the scheme of perpetrator/victim, power/powerlessness, guilt/innocence, speech/silence and so on and immediately, is an open question. Men,

Those who were sexually abused as boys talk about their memories noticeably more personally, more nuanced, and often noticeably ambivalent about the sexual experiences. The melodramatic title »Lost Childhood«, which Nele Glöer and Irmgard Schmiedeskamp gave their interviews with affected males in 1990, does not take this realistic inconsistency into account.

In cases where personal testimonies are not available, the method of empathetic voyeurism is used to spread appropriate terror and fear. One can almost only distinguish oneself from the tabloid press by the sign, the somehow contextually provided or imagined proof of the right attitude - hardly by the thing itself. "While you start reading now" - this is how "Bild" turned its readers into witnesses - 'a man is attacking a child. Somewhere behind a door he takes it off and then exposes himself. He's about to abuse it. The child will turn its head away and whimper, 'Dad, don't, you're hurting me.' And the man will say, 'What's the matter? I won't hurt you. I'm your father'. The child will apathetically hold out the body and the man will say: 'Now be nice, otherwise it'll be something.'"

The ticklish congruence of reading time with event time in this sickening case is arguably at the expense of speculative voyeurism, but is the elsewhere implied suggestion of checking the clock every three minutes because another girl is being abused more enlightening and pertinent? The two commentators for the "taz" have recognized the dilemma that conscientious journalists have to live with:

“Reporting sexual abuse is a balancing act. A report in which the deeds are only described with the term abuse plays down reality. An unvarnished description of the facts forces one to look.

Because very few can imagine what happens in families every day. However, the presentation of such facts can also be misused as a jerk model.' That could be

one risk as politically completely irrelevant; because no one is responsible for the selection of such models anyway, they are purely private—on the other hand, the effect that an "unvarnished description of the facts" aims for in such cases is significant: that is partiality, identification with the victim, a child .

On the one hand, that seems morally correct, on the other hand, it is simple and self-evident, so that it will be worth asking again later. Here it is only important to recognize the function that the empathetic voyeurism of reporting has in these cases. The credibility deficit against which the new state of emergency has to fight is to be covered with the detailed description, not of the cases in general, but in excerpts and in isolation of the act of sexual violence. This goal is reached when the emotional avalanche that has been unleashed by the reader or the reader comes to a standstill with the decision: That can't be true!

Usually this is the hour of simple answers, simple solutions and activism.

Where there are no scenic descriptions, excerpts from autopsy reports cause shocks and that unbearable helplessness in us that makes some people so vulnerable and downright grateful for external guidance. The following vignette of the sexual abuse of girls, which has been in circulation since 1970, shows that such forays into forensic medicine and other expert worlds are rhetorical devices and not intended to convey important information. Speaking to an American government commission tasked with investigating the effects of pornography, an unnamed doctor described its consequences from his point of view as follows:

“I've been working in obstetrics and gynecology lately. What is happening there is extremely frightening. The wards and sickrooms are full of young girls... They're tattered inside. The repair work we do defies description. These girls have been subjected to all kinds of sexual abuse. Doctors used to treat prostitutes who were beaten up like this, but now we have to

treating young girls from the best families...' This is exactly how Florence Rush, in her book ten years later, tells us the conditions again, as if it were not a question of a subjective impression but of facts that speak for themselves. In 1988 Barbara Kavemann warmed up the doctor's opinion so impressively that the visitor to her advanced training seminar wrote down the quote almost verbatim, evidently convinced that it was a topical report from the American scene, which always gave us a certain foretaste later on events that occur to us promises. A vignette doesn't inform, it doesn't have to be true—it has to fit its place. That is why the minute taker of the "Süddeutsche Zeitung" replaces the "young girls" in the original with the "little ones": "We used to treat prostitutes, today mainly little girls from the best families." just the zeitgeist that has brought us the paradigm shift from violence to violent sexuality in family relationships since 1970. In addition, the example teaches us that, from the specialist's point of view, the world is no better or more correct than any other frog's perspective when it comes to questions of life.

Counting and arithmetic is another way in which child abuse has been made into a somewhat recognized societal problem. What was ever counted is a mystery; The fact that each number is underlaid with an equally enigmatic dark digit and thus again inaccurate, but on the other hand also higher and more threatening, shows this method as magical. Numbers are used for magic. Anyone who assumes that the sudden rise in interest first in child abuse and then in child sexual abuse is due to the statistically demonstrable and worrying increase in these crimes is profoundly mistaken.

At first glance, it might even appear as if the opposite had been the case: From 1973 to 1984, the number of violations of Section 176 of the Criminal Code recorded by the police has increased

(sexual abuse of children under the age of fourteen) has steadily decreased from 15,566 to 10,589. I can hardly speculate about the reasons, but I am very surprised that nobody noticed this development and nobody thought about it. Has the abuse been transferred abroad - keyword: child prostitution in the 3rd world or sex tourism there? Have sex drives been transformed by the media and found their way into porn shops and video stores? Or what?

Michael S. Honig has correctly pointed out the strange fact that feminist campaigns against male violence also emerged at the moment when a new family law had removed the remnants of patriarchal power of disposal. Of course, the fact that norms are legally fixed does not mean that they are valid in life, let alone their 100% fulfillment - but I would have expected some effects on the formulation of emancipation goals under the changed conditions. Instead, a moral panic is stirred up by suggesting that women and children have always been and still are without rights and helpless, and are ultimately fair game for unscrupulous, power- and sex-addicted men. At some point, however, the abolition of all guardianship regulations in favor of gender equality simply no longer allows anyone to legitimize demands on the women's side with guilty verdicts on the men's side.

Inevitably, the historical point in time comes when only self-exploration or even self-criticism can help.

An example constructed by Kavemann & Lohstöter in their book "Fathers as Perpetrators" and destroyed by me may show what options are at stake here for women. With a look at the provisions of the penal code, they warn: »Since the provisions look complicated and varied, it is easy to get the impression that the protection granted to girls against sexual violence is complete. On closer inspection, however, this protection turns out to be incomplete: For example, with today's extreme youth unemployment and the lack of

places, regardless of whether she is 15, 17 or 19 years old, is increasingly exposed to the teacher's authority and dependent on his goodwill. With the existing legal situation, the teacher who forces the sexual intercourse with the threat of losing his job remains unpunished in any case if the trainee is 19 years old. If she is only 17, the teacher remains unpunished if the threat was not verbatim, but only resonated in certain behaviors. Complete protection of girls and women can only be guaranteed if all sexual acts are made a punishable offence, without differentiation or exceptions, as soon as they occur against the will and in the presence of a dependent relationship. « Which image of women are the authors basing their example on? A, to put it mildly, quite archaic. It begins with the blurring

of the distinction between criminal law provisions and the protective guarantees that belong to feudal and patriarchal systems of rule. The nineteen-year-old apprentice who is striving for regular employment and therefore allows himself to be blackmailed into having sex, lacks many things, but not the opportunity for self-determination in sexual terms.

That he doesn't perceive them or perceives them differently than we imagine a person of moral integrity to be, is another matter. No modern society spares its adult members such and similar decisions, why should women who historically became politically capable of acting late be exempted from this?

That is why it is also absurd to fundamentally place all adult women in "dependency", i.e. almost all employment relationships today, under special care again. With a view to collective agreements and labor law, this is not only alien to life, but also fails to recognize that wards and not individuals thrive in "complete protection", which is always assumed with such beautiful legal constructions as "sexual self-determination".

But the law is not only deficient, above all it is ineffective and meaningless, as a look at the numbers and the situation seems to show. Where do the numbers come from and why are they so effective in forming opinions? The basis of most estimates in the old Federal Republic is the research by Michael C. Baurmann, carried out in 1983 on behalf of the Federal Criminal Police Office in Wiesbaden. Without offering any readings on my part, I state here that all those who refer to him come to slightly different conclusions or have changed their conclusions after some time, true to the old adage: Don't believe any statistics that you haven't falsified yourself.

The latest published figure comes from the German Child Protection Association and is completely out of the ordinary. He gives an estimated 80,000 children in Germany who were likely to be sexually harassed or coerced by parents, acquaintances, friends or strangers in 1991. To give such a low number is almost self-defeating when one considers that the size of an organization is measured by the size of its task. In addition, others have been offering higher figures for years, and even the federal government, under pressure from the campaign or new insights that are yet to come, has backed away from its more conservative 1985 estimates and revised them in a show of goodwill and commitment has.

Back then, in 1985, she was responding to a major inquiry from the Greens the previous year. There are a number of things that emerge from the answer that are worth noting against the agitated zeitgeist in the matter of sexual abuse of children. The police statistics provide no information on violations of Article 173 of the Penal Code (incest), Article 174 of the Penal Code (abuse of those under protection) and Article 179 of the Penal Code (abuse of persons unable to resist). Apparently the ad volume here is too low. I have already pointed out the puzzling drop in violations of Section 176 of the Criminal Code from 1973 to 1984.

As with all misdemeanors and crimes, of course, there are unreported cases against sexual self-determination

to reckon with. In 1985, the Federal Government assumed a bright/dark field ratio of one to eight to one to fifteen, referring to the numerous available research studies. Assuming such a range of fluctuations is probably the elegant form of expressing ignorance and uncertainty in clear numbers, without frightening us and acknowledging the incompetence of the authorities in the face of any problem. In 1987, at least for the Federal Ministry of Health, it was not the number of victims recorded statistically, but the bright/dark field ratio that was not only clarified, but also increased, to one in twenty.

This brought the figure to 210,000. But there were still 90,000 missing, with the help of which the federal authorities and ministries were able to catch up with a number that has finally dominated the scene since 1988. This number applies completely independently of the police statistics and the number of unreported cases. The number 300,000 has become a metaphor for sexual abuse, just as the eleven thousand virgins who accompanied Saint Ursula on her way to marriage with a pagan and were said to have been slaughtered outside Cologne also stand for something with this pseudo-precision number and not literally want to be taken.

“Sexual abuse is increasing. Bonn (dpa) - The number of cases of sexual abuse of children registered by the police rose in 1988 by 13.1% to more than 13,000. But the actual number is estimated at up to 300,000 a year, according to the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs in Bonn....« The fact that the number of abused children has increased by 13.1 percent could worry some. But the decimal place signals to him that everything is under control in higher places. No one remembers that in 1973 the police statistics even recorded 15,566 child victims under Section 176 of the Penal Code.

The figure of 300,000 abused children appears for the first time in Kavemann & Lohstöter. How did you come up with that? They also refer to Baurmann, but also to unnamed representative studies in which adult women were asked about sexual assaults in their childhood and youth.

They confuse the picture from the start because they are not talking about children (up to fourteen) but girls (up to eighteen).

»The number of unreported cases was calculated as 1:18 to 1:20, which means that out of 18 to 20 acts of sexual violence against girls, only one is reported to the police... If we now look at the official number of cases reported in 1980 or 1981, respectively Child abuse and rape and sexual assault of girls under 18 multiplied by the calculated number of unreported cases gives an estimated 300,000 children sexually abused every year. Of these, at least 250,000 are girls — about one every three minutes. Studies in the USA came to the conclusion that one in four women was affected by sexual violence as a child.« Children or girls, sexual assaults or acts of sexual violence - who can still see through these arts of thought and arithmetic? Assuming the number 300,000 is realistic, what does it mean? Who knows the total number of children/girls up to the age of eighteen?

And who knows what can be hidden behind a case?

Violations of Section 176 of the Criminal Code include acts of exhibitionism as well as rape; one-off assaults on a child like chronic abuse in an incestuous family. It is doubtful that mixing the most diverse offenses and age groups together makes any sense, except for the one of making the sexual danger overwhelming and ubiquitous. The layman is not informed and enlightened about the facts with seemingly reliable numbers, but manipulated. It doesn't matter whether it's out of naivety or for tactical reasons, because the higher purpose of the campaign justifies the means. All numbers are fictions and their pseudo-rationality makes us vulnerable to a totally fantastical world where sexuality is the number one enemy in children's (and women's) lives.

Although the tricks with time, numbers and experts or the appeals to the imagination of the reader are not fundamentally different, the tabloid press naturally masters them better from long practice, so that in their surpassing the fairytale-mythological twist of this

so-called enlightenment about an everyday evil becomes unmistakable. This is how »Bild« calculated on August 28, 1990: »The silent, terrible drama from next door. 300,000 of our 10 million children are constantly sexually abused.

(Figures for the GDR are not available.) Some experts estimate that the number of unreported cases is at least four times as high. 1.2 million — every eighth child. That's 1 million affected girls and 200,000 boys.

If they were all running through your nightmares — one of the molested little girls was looking at you every 30 seconds. One every thirty seconds. Day and night. And every two minutes an additional boy. More than half of these children are abused for years, many several times a week...' Only at first glance do these high numbers appear to be

speculative, lurid reasons, but on closer inspection they turn out to be a logical extrapolation from all the information provided can already be found at Kavemann & Lohstöter. In the case of these, the number of 300,000 victims a year is already taken into account, so that one might believe that "Bild" arbitrarily further increased an already dubious figure - but that is not the case. As you will remember, the Berlin experts end their figures with reference to American studies, according to which every fourth woman is said to have been affected by sexual violence as a child. In doing so, they not only devalue their halfway transparent considerations on police statistics and the light/dark field relationship by changing the reference value, but also suggest »Bild« to generate a much higher number of victims by including this new information. However, it is not just a matter of the high number of victims, but also of linking all the numbers involved and of fully developing the pseudo-rationality of the calculation. »Image« differs from so-called experts not in its willingness to manipulate, let alone lie, but in its determination to engage in computational excess where others elegantly insinuate.

Nevertheless, »Bild« also reaches the figure of 1.2 million children

Sacrifices only because here and there one just lets five be. But decimal fractions and other pedantries are ultimately a matter for those responsible in offices and authorities, not for those who want to bring a social emergency into the conversation in the first place. For this you need not only high but also round numbers, ones that you can remember. This is probably why Kavemann & Lohstöter preferred the number three to others: 300,000 victims, a girl every three minutes... The number three comes like the seven in "Sieben Zwerge", "Sieben Todsünde", "Sieben Wonders of the World« a fairytale-like, mythical truth that one is reluctant to give up. In the fairy tale one is granted three wishes, the hero has to solve three tasks, the trinity and trinity cannot be understood and are accepted in the mode of faith. So I did the math to see if it was true that a girl was killed every three minutes — and I found that — assuming the restless perpetrators weren't allowed nocturnal rest breaks — the two-minute cycle was closer to the truth. Again, assuming that 250,000 girls under the age of eighteen are the correctly estimated victims... However, the fairytale-mythical truth of the number three deserves preference over the arithmetical accuracy.

Back to the continuation of the expert work by »image«. Thorough reflection revealed the mystery of the 1.2 million victims there: »Bild« assumes ten million German children. Experience has shown that around half of these are girls; the ratio of female to male victims is set at five to one; on the other hand, every fourth woman is said to have been abused as a child, and the number 300,000 is a topos of the subject to which the reader is entitled. The reasonable compromise that »Bild« finds here is the quadrupling of the number 300,000, whereby the girls are duly considered, the reader's expectations are fulfilled and the even more catastrophic number of 1.5 million German children to be assumed by calculation as victims of their »fathers, grandfathers, stepfathers, uncles, neighbors and brothers« is undercut.

It is not enough to be fundamentally skeptical about such feats of numbers; because even more serious ones, if they existed, would not spare us the task of checking the standard on which the whole counting is based. It makes no sense, especially when you think of children's interests, to lump together all the scenes in which children are confronted with adult sexuality. The nature of the act and the relationship to the perpetrator result in such a variety of sexual incidents that only sheer dogmatism can subsume them under the pseudo-objective heading of "sexual abuse." Looking at criminal law doesn't really help here; because it contains standards, but these can only really measure if the victim or his/her guardian accepts them and also wants to give criminal prosecution priority over other regulations.

This is true in general, but even more so when one's own intimate sphere is touched and it is about sexuality, a terrain on which no one can ever move safely and confidently, no matter how enlightened they may be. Child protectors of the past drowned out this insecurity with a rigorous morality, feminist enlighteners with the decision to adopt Manichaeism. Except for non-controversial cases that everyone can quickly agree on, we don't know what sexual abuse really is. In other words, in the often-cited dark field that worries us so much, there are not only cases that need to be rescued from the Qadi, but also those who have a lot to tell, but then wonder about them that it was the prose of sexual violence that flowed so naturally from their lips.

Every fourth American woman was a victim of sexual violence as a child - this calculation has often been mentioned. It goes back to Florence Rush, who in turn draws on Kinsey and David Finkelhor, a younger researcher specializing in child abuse. Kinsey's study is more important because it is given a certain representativeness that Finkelhor and others after him do not with their surveys

own.

Kinsey's findings were published in the 1953 Kinsey Report on "Women's Sexual Behavior," and anyone can easily read the relevant chapter on "Prepubescent Sexual Experiences with Adult Males" in the 1970 German edition. In fact, Kinsey found that a quarter of women before the age of thirteen have had a sexual experience with a man who is at least eighteen. As a pioneer of sex research, he wisely speaks of "experience," not of abuse like those who refer to him. Of this quarter, eighty percent had such an "experience" only once, another twelve percent twice, three percent three to six times, and five percent nine times or more. Kinsey then not only gives a differentiated picture of the individual incidents according to the type of action and status of the perpetrator, but also tries to paint an accurate picture of the children's reactions. The spectrum is wide, ranging from curiosity and interest to sheer horror. Eighty percent of the children were emotionally disturbed and frightened by the contact, but for the vast majority only temporarily. However, as befits a critical sex researcher, none of his data are revelations to him, but instead offer occasions to ask further questions.

The concluding reflections show the chasms that separate Kinsey from those who want to base their fantastic constructions on his solid research. "If the child were not culturally shaped," it says, "it is doubtful whether it would be disturbed at all by the sexual advances. It is difficult to see why a child should be disturbed by having their genitals touched, or by seeing other people's genitals, or even by specifically sexual acts, unless it is because of cultural conditioning ... Some experienced adolescent researchers have come to believe that the emotional reactions of parents, police officers, and other adults who discover the case are more psychologically damaging to the child than the sexual acts themselves are. The

constant hysteria about sexual offenses may very well have serious repercussions on the later sexual adaptability of many of these children.”

Nothing remains today of Kinsey's hopeful trust in the ultimately good nature of human sexuality, even when it comes to criminally sanctioned and culturally taboo contacts between children and adults. In what catastrophes, one is tempted to ask, did it actually go under? Or is it the fault of women's fresh self-confidence, which is currently having to vent itself in wild accusations, as if it were necessary, almost at a later date, to make up for yesterday's involuntary goodwill? More often than not, the tone of voice and the way of thinking convey oneself

into an archaic-looking world, a human stone age, which doesn't fit at all with the conditions in which one moves on a daily basis.

At least I and the theater critic Höbel, who was quoted at the beginning, only knows about incest from hundreds of media reports and can no longer avoid considering the whole thing to be a social emergency... "Children will continue to be sexually abused for so long," write the commentators the »taz«, »how men can exercise power over and violence against women and families«.

The undifferentiated talk of "sexual abuse" as an objectified evil, a recognized social disease, drives up the number of victims on the one hand, but on the other hand does not prevent the public consciousness from increasingly equating sexual abuse with incest or the rape of small children becomes. So at the same time there is a delimitation of the problems and an enormous dramatization, and these are extremely poor conditions for providing help where it is really needed.

The dissolution of limits on sexual abuse in one way or another is by no means limited to feminist circles, but has long been common practice elsewhere. Did Finkelhor and others who adult women after their sexual experiences

asked when children were careful to separate childish reactions, adult evaluations and today's somewhat conventional codes? Or did they deny their subjects the right to judge their experiences and to evaluate them in the context of their biography from the outset?

The trend is towards objectifying the facts and the bar is being lowered and lowered. A 1985 British survey classified as "abused" all women who had experienced anything as children that satisfied the following definition: "Abuse occurs when a child under the age of 16 is exposed to an action by a sexually mature person who that person expects to sexually arouse the child.' Despite this really generous definition, only 12 percent of the 1,049 women surveyed could be counted as 'sexually abused'.

So that not only every fifth, fourth, third, yes, every second woman is considered as a victim, but also as raw material for statistics, research projects and therapeutic institutions, one must go further, up to where the madness begins and also saying goodbye to the last remnant of common sense and wisdom. A journalist who attended a specialist seminar with Barbara Kavemann sums up what she learned as follows: Abuse »basically starts with all behavior that tells the girl that men can freely dispose of her, for example lecherous looks, slapping her butt or that Touching and examining physical curves. But even the presence of a sexually aroused adult can be violent under certain circumstances, even if he does not touch the child..."

It is no wonder that the psychohistorian Lloyd de Mause concludes that "more than half of all American women were sexually abused in their childhood." Why not all? And why not say right away that any sexuality, any allusion, any joke should be avoided in the presence of children, who must be protected from the gods at all costs? In a strange reversal, in this farsightedness, men are to be placed under guardianship as they are in Islam

Women. Shrouded and with downcast eyes, they have to prove their reputation as decent people, as non-abusers, every day. Only they are responsible for the mischief that sexuality causes if it is not strictly monitored. From us, the women.

3 . Socialization theor e ti s chilling romance

One can explain the world from one point, and if that point is the salvation of children, their proper care and education, then one finds more willing listeners than with other panaceas for life and social reform. For years, Alice Miller had benefited from this specific crippling of critical faculty with her books before American feminists spiced up their specialty, the unfortunate child, with sexual traumatization. The leading figure of this horror romanticism based on socialization theory is the small child abandoned in the nuclear family, or, to put it bluntly, the girl who cannot escape the ogre because the creepy-romantic constellation only allows escape as an escape into the trap. This means, for example, that the therapist does not believe the patient who is seeking help, or, even worse, perpetuates the abuse himself. An example from one of Miller's more recent books that shows the punchlines of such narratives and the insights they don't:

“A forty-year-old woman witnessed her husband sexually abusing her twelve-year-old daughter. Concerned about the psychological consequences, she sends her child to her analyst, who has been treating her for eight years. After the first meeting, the daughter comes home in tears and says, 'I never want to see that woman again. She said it wasn't a bad thing that I fantasized about such things... but I had to find out with her why I wanted to make trouble for Papa. I'm afraid of her.' How will mother and daughter free themselves from the entanglements of the conspirators? Will innocence finally triumph? With every other demand you blew up the genre here. What did the mother see? What could make the analyst doubt? And finally: Should one twelve-year-old girls

send it prophylactically to an analyst like to the dentist, without first putting dad through the wringer and waiting to see whether the child would like to seek help from others?

Oddly enough, however, respect for the victims' privacy is not a matter of course for those who loudly accuse them of being destroyed by the abuser. Anyone who cannot remember having been sexually abused could just have repressed particularly bad experiences particularly deeply.

A psychologist explained to me that anyone who remembers a lot, but downplayed all incidents with a good deal of intellectual effort, has just split off his feelings and put them away — a suspicion of my intelligence as cold and heartless, which I have been hearing from different people since my surprising first successes in elementary school pages have heard over and over again. The fact is that one shouldn't really argue about children and children's misfortune, its extent, its causes, and how to combat it. Here, as with no other topic in our society, non-partisan and non-denominational concern is required, as active as possible - insertion in the television talk show "Inzestoffer" - but at least passive, which manifests itself in long-suffering and the refusal to ask questions. After a public discussion, I received a letter that perfectly combined the remote ignition of my inner life with a plea for children and for the good in this world in general: "You overestimate yourself quite a bit if you think you have anything good to say about the complex problem contributed. Her own repressed childhood stood in the way! So you portrayed a cool strong (would like to be strong)

woman who is fundamentally very confused...

Dangerously, anyone who talks about children's kitsch has not yet looked at their own story, and it was obvious that you were an unloved child, that you were mentally abused (like almost all of us)... You and the social worker Reinhart Wolff did not understand what the roots of (all?!) problems are. I'm not a psychologist, if that puts your mind at ease. But I've retained my sensitivity and don't block myself against anything emotional..."

Are these the episodes of Alice Miller, whose books the writer still recommends to me? I don't think that cold reason will triumph over sensitivity and emotions anywhere. What I dread are the fantasies that inundate us with experts who use their influence, tools and knowledge to serve a delusion. Don't worry, I'll maintain a sense of proportion and admit that sexual abuse beliefs can't get anywhere near as fatal as other well-known delusional systems in history, from witchcraft to anti-Semitism.

Virginia Woolf is dead and she no longer has to defend herself against the crashing stretcher that the American literary scholar Louise DeSalvo set up for her. You quickly think differently about their downright abysmal naivety and hopeless sloppiness in dealing with the texts when you read the report by a psychologist, who is also an expert on the subject, about a case of abuse in her own family. There are living little girls who are frightened, questioned, examined and taken away from their father, a real father who faces serious charges in court. The same delusion is acted out on the dead as on the living object, where assumption follows assumption and confirms one another until there is no escape.

The inquiry into the impact of sexual abuse on Virginia Woolf's life and work has not been uncritically received. As far as I can see, however, no one has disputed the claim that something worthy of the name took place in her childhood and girlhood. One did not want to follow Louise DeSalvo in the somewhat exaggerated search for clues in her literary work. One would like to concede a bit of autonomy to Woolf, despite the overwhelming evidence of her instability, her breakdowns and finally her suicide in 1940 in the waters of the Ouse, which speak for a disturbance in need of explanation.

I have to spoil everyone's fun, or better said, the satisfaction that

want to present a Virginia already canonized as a feminist saint as an exemplary abused girl.

The kid, or little monkey, as they were nicknamed, was not a victim of Victorian libertines. Had it been so, she would certainly have told us; for the intellectual bohemian of Bloomsbury, ever since Lytton Strachey had found the redeeming word, loved talking about sex, about everything. 'He pointed to a stain on Vanessa's white dress. he cried. Can you really say that? I thought and we burst out laughing. With that one word all barriers of restraint and reserve fell. A torrent of sanctified outpourings seemed to overwhelm us. Sex dominated the conversation. The word homosexual was constantly on the tip of our tongues. We discussed intercourse with the same enthusiasm and frankness with which we had discussed the nature of good.' Bloomsbury included the

translators of Freud, Alix and James Strachey, and the work edition appeared in Leonard Woolf's Hogarth Press, where Virginia hot off the press could read. With so much heightened attention and sophistication on the part of the victim, an interpreter would have to have something on hand to infuse the narratives and self-analysis with an ulterior motive, as if Virginia Woolf was too stupid, too shy, and too sick to to recognize and write down the whole truth; as if she had therefore peppered all her works, letters and diary entries with hints such as calls for help and cries of pain, which we can finally hear and decipher today - in my opinion one should not incapacitate a person and an author without reason.

Laura, Leslie Stephen's daughter by his first marriage, was, as Virginia candidly explains, an idiot. No, DeSalvo claims, she was a "maladjusted" child who was made the family scapegoat and used as a warning to Stella, the half-sister from her mother's first marriage, and Vanessa about what might happen to them too if they weren't well behaved . From the fact that the unfortunate father clung as long as possible to the illusion that his child was peculiar, "perverted" and capable of special

educational measures are improved, quite in accordance with the views of the time, by the way - before he then removed the adolescent from the family and finally placed him in a nursing home - from this fact DeSalvo creates a sadistic orgy, a crime of the father.

But they also share responsibility for the loss of this child with Gerald and George Duckworth, the older half-brothers, who we already know sexually abused Virginia and Vanessa; the deterioration of Laura's condition after the Stephen/Duckworth households were merged suggests that they also found gratification for their unbridled animal instincts here... DeSalvo's indications are generally such that anyone else who is not sexual everywhere and every time Unrat smells like the pig smells the truffle, finds other explanations closer and more plausible; often enough clues are invented in the zeal of proof, but also with the best of intentions.

After George Duckworth's death, Virginia writes to her sister that Leonard thinks "we" could have spared Laura. The obvious interpretation that the death should not have been reported to the patient may be uncertain; DeSalvo's construction that Leonard meant to say that there were ways at least to protect Laura from George is ludicrous. Why Laura if Vanessa and Virginia hadn't been protected? And to whom is the accusation in Leonard's remark addressed, for example to the two women who were allegedly helpless victims themselves and therefore could not be able to support their much older half-sister? The questions become superfluous when one pulls the central stone out of DeSalvo's construct that the secret of Virginia Woolf's unstable psyche lies in the sexual abuse at the hands of her half-brothers.

For obvious reasons, the attitude towards the two twelve and fourteen years older than them was extraordinarily ambivalent. You were wealthy on your father's side. George had a thousand pounds a year at his disposal—Virginia had fifty, and how well she understood the connection between money, independence and intellectual greatness

was always in mind, as her reflections in the famous essay "A Room for Herself" prove. Besides, these brothers were thoroughly conventional Victorians. One could envy her safety in society—but one could despise her just as well; namely when, like Stephen's children, following the example of their intellectual father, one had other goals in life than being invited to tea with a duchess.

George, who is charged by both brothers as the chief offender, was, to make matters worse, handsome, and even extremely generous in the way of gifts, outings, and the financing of trips. Gerald, another thing that shouldn't be overlooked like DeSalvo, published Virginia's first book through his publishing house. George was also—Gerald is much less often mentioned—absolutely stupid, says Virginia. The lack of equipment in his brain was in stark contrast to the dimensions of his emotional world. "It was something very familiar," Virginia writes in one of her autobiographical sketches, "to come into the drawing room and find George there on his knees, arms outstretched and expressions of ardent love talking to my mother, who might just be add up the weekly expenses.

He might have spent the weekend with the Chamberlains. But he was so profuse of caresses, caresses, reassurances, and hugs, as if he had finally returned, after forty years in the Australian bush, to the home of his youth and found an old mother still alive to greet him." Her too In the following pages, Virginia Woolf, in this lecture to the Bloomsbury Memory Club, refers to George, who had become

head of the family after the death of his mother; for Sir Leslie, who should have been the part, was deaf, eccentric and self-absorbed. The two adolescent sisters, of breathtaking beauty, the "abnormally stupid" George intended to use in his rise into aristocratic society. Beautiful, young and motherless

Both would have graced every banquet if only Vanessa hadn't always been thinking about her painting and Virginia hadn't been intellectually brilliant at the most inopportune moments.

At the end of the lecture, after an exciting evening at the theater and in company, Virginia lets George sneak into her bedroom. "Who is it?" I yelled. "Don't be afraid," whispered George. 'And turn on no light - oh, beloved! Beloved —' and he threw himself on my bed and took me in his arms. Well, it never occurred to the old ladies of Kensington and Belgravia that George Duckworth was not only father and mother, brother and sister to the poor Stephen girls, but also their lover.' A clear scene and a clear word out of his mouth the victim? First and foremost, a well-done punchline, served at the expense of George and the Victorian upper class, who repelled and at the same time fascinated Virginia throughout her life.

To what extent George's behavior justified the title of a lover of the two sisters in the modern sense, we cannot know with the best will in the world; in any case, Virginia gives not a syllable that what happened happened to Vanessa or to her as helpless victims of a deranged ogre. On the contrary, I got the impression that young Virginia was very impressed by the beautiful, generous and hysterically exalted George. The stupidity of a long-grown adult may not have been as evident to a child and young girl as Virginia later portrayed it; neither does its conventionality. Those wanting to unravel mysteries might start pondering here—but not where Woolf himself told us what to say.

The second sacrifice made to the male sex drive was Stella, the sister of Gerald and George, who after some hesitation married Jack Hills and died a few months later in the months of pregnancy center appendicitis. Anyone who places sexual abuse at the of gender relations has one too

certain theory of the workings of the phallus. DeSalvo reveals to us what she looks like. Stella got shagged sick by Jack, let's put it like it's really meant. Jack is a tireless lover, according to Violet Dickinson, Virginia's spinster friend, from an unnamed nanny, and that's why Stella had to die.

One is tempted to tell DeSalvo, who takes over this story, the old medical joke: "Miss, don't promise yourself too much from marriage . . ." strangest explanations and, above all, accusations of blame; but a hundred years later such fantasies should no longer be sold at face value. But the distortion of male sexuality into the monstrous and violent is so much part of the term "sexual abuse" that DeSalvo cannot do without the horrific vision of the phallus as a murder weapon. Again, she totally disregards the account of events and characters that Woolf himself gave.

Far from blaming Jack Hills, she gratefully remembers the fresh and humorous way in which he taught her, a few years later, the role of sex even in the lives of respectable gentlemen. Woolf has precisely diagnosed the condition of the shocked young man, who had to come to terms with the death of his beloved, his loneliness and his desires that suddenly ran out of steam just a few weeks after marrying.

Why does DeSalvo have to cast these sympathetic communications about Hills into the image of a prototypical sexual barbarian? Her argument reversely moves back to the Victorianism from which Virginia and Vanessa left for Bloomsbury.

While the apostrophe of George as the 'lover' of the Stephen sisters is ambiguous, the infamous scene in which Gerald lifts the little girl onto a ledge and, despite her resistance, slips his hand under her dress remains seemingly unambiguous. "His hand felt my privates too. I

remember that it angered and repelled me—what is the right word for such a dull and confused feeling? It must have been strong as I still remember it. This seems to prove how instinctive it must be to feel certain parts of the body not to be touched, and how wrong it is to let them be touched."

The ghosts are divided again. At worst, I consider the incident to be what Alfred Kinsey impartially bills as "a sexual experience with prepubescent men." Whether the perhaps eighteen-year-old Gerald can be described as a "man" is doubtful, despite the difference in age with Virginia, who must have been six; because he must have followed his curiosity less than his instincts: What does the female genitalia look like?

Anyone who remembers the interest in stamp-sized reproductions of Rubens paintings aroused in children in the 1950s will not find my assumption for 1888 quite as far-fetched as it would be today. She said what Woolf wanted to say about the incident, and I refer anyone who wants to find out more about her "mirror shame," the shame about her body, to the "Reminiscences," which began in 1939. What she thought of "Duckworth, Gerald" anyone can easily find out by looking at the indexes to her letters and diaries. It's just DeSalvo's bad luck that every crumb of her material is available in print and every Woolfian metaphor she misuses as a telltale association, as an idea in need of interpretation, can be put back into context and — understood. This is instructive for understanding the whole campaign, because at least one example shows the rampant delusion and the associated danger of a complete loss of reality.

The discovery of the sexual abuse of children as a widespread crime went hand in hand with fierce accusations against Freud, who in a second attempt had dropped the so-called theory of seduction in favor of the drive theory in favor of the origin of the neuroses. The seduction theory starts from a real event, a trauma

for the child out; the drive theory of a conflict between ego and drive, without thereby excluding the fundamental possibility of traumatization. Freud had come to the conclusion that it was impossible for children to be seduced by their parents as regularly as neuroses had appeared.

Secondly, and this is easily overlooked for obvious reasons, Freud was dissatisfied with the healing success achieved by the therapeutic procedure based on the theory of seduction.

The cure consisted of reviving the traumatic event and freeing the affect that was jammed at the time, removing the emotional congestion. The idea is obvious, but the successes are short-term at best. It is clear that the return to the theory of seduction must be accompanied by a repetition of Freud's therapeutic errors and failures. The miracles that are expected today from public and private confessions, confessions and accusations, the breaking of silence and the experience of "anger and sadness" in self-awareness groups stand in amazing contrast to the size and severity of the damage that the children endure has been subjected to sexual abuse. Or should be. Or how or what?

The realism of the theory of seduction - in Alice Miller there are no more drives, certainly not in children, only bad parents who, on the other hand, had bad parents themselves and so on ad infinitum - this unpsychological bias for the "truth of the facts" (Miller) leads in DeSalvo to the philologically based delusion of relationships that has elsewhere led to the blurring of concepts and the baseless multiplication of victims, to the point where all women and girls could somehow define themselves as potentially abused. The difference between an actual victim and a potential one is not all-encompassing, but contingent. If you then start digging through your memories, you will eventually find something that does not completely contradict the theory and can at least be counted as sexual violence by helpful interpreters. That's how it grows

Delusion and finally leads to the confrontation of those who share it with the others who defy the "facts" and do not know their true feelings.

What remains of Virginia as the main victim in the chain of incestuous crimes when notorious criminals George and Gerald Duckworth have to be acquitted for lack of evidence? Should I, as a layman, write something on her chart, then maternal deprivation could be a condition of her instability. Julia Stephen fought her chronic depression with such restless work and travel that everyone is convinced that she died prematurely and exhausted at the age of forty-nine.

Virginia's "mirror shame" points to an impediment to normal body exhibitionism. Throughout her life she struggled with being photographed, which is hard to imagine now that her portraits of Gisèle Freund have become almost iconic. Something unsettled her relationship to her body, something didn't seem right with him, so that she had to be ashamed of him. Your lack of interest in (hetero)sexuality is well known; what she regretted was her childlessness.

DeSalvo goes so far as to interpret her childish need to lean on mostly older and tall women as a positive lesbian processing of her experiences with men and abuse. As naive as this sexual ^{evil} psychology of feminist goodwill towards one's own sex, DeSalvo, a scientist designated as a Woolf editor, has crocheted her chains of circumstantial evidence, where one daring guess supports the next misunderstanding, just as negligently. "A finger seemed to have rested on our lips," is how Woolf would describe years later the wordless grief after the sudden death of his mother in 1895. Fresh and frank, DeSalvo interprets this sentence as a clear reference to the sisters' "forced silence" about George's sexual ones assaults. From here, DeSalvo continues to associate, via a 1908 law criminalizing incest, to a Virginia diary entry

Woolf 21 January 1918.

DeSalvo sums it up coherently for her argument, but otherwise factually incorrectly: "And she began to deal with the problem of incest and wanted to join the British Sex Society in 1918, which dealt above all with 'incest between parents and children'. ' I am translating this passage from Woolf's diary to give, first, a sample of Bloomsbury's sociable climate of conversation, in which everything was talked about, but 'modern' subjects such as sexuality were particularly popular; secondly, to rid Woolf of the stigma of being a woman of self-discovery; thirdly, to show that the British Sex Society was not primarily concerned with incest and certainly not with what concerns DeSalvo, but fourthly with Freud's theory about it at best:

'Lytton came to tea; stayed to eat, and by about ten o'clock in the evening we both had dry lips and a feeling of wasted life. That comes from talking for hours. But Lytton was extremely pleasant and entertaining. Among other things, he gave us an amazing report on the British Sex Society, which meets in Hampstead. That sounds like a third species of man, and it seems that the gathering looked like one too. Still, they were surprisingly open; fifty people of both sexes and ages discussed without shame such issues as Dean Swift's deformed penis; do cats go to the toilet; masturbation; Incest — between parents and children, of which both are unaware, was the main theme, following Freud.

I think I'll become a member. It's a pity that civilization always enlightens the dwarves, cripples and sexless people first. And they can be found in Hampstead. Lytton blurted out the word PENIS at various points. That was his contribution to the frankness of the debate.« Judge for yourself whether the connection between tentative self-discovery, incest and the British Sex Society is given, which DeSalvo insinuates here and elsewhere with other cornerstones.

The temptation is great to refute and correct her book page by page, but when is delusion ever a more reasonable speech

given way? In 1936, Virginia and Leonard once again visited Gerald Duckworth at his home. "It was like visiting an alligator, a fat and retarded alligator lying half in and half out of the water like our turtles do." Letter. DeSalvo, of course, with the abuse evidence firmly and unflinchingly in mind, has no idea of Woolf's relationship with animals. To make it short: nothing hysterical, which makes the alligator per se a terrifying disgust. Let's hear DeSalvo's interpretation: "I still don't think I was fully aware of the early memory of Gerald Duckworth molesting her. But something troubled her about this reunion. Her picture of him as an alligator in a tank where she herself was trapped (not written here, but there is the picture of soulful George and crushed Virginia as a whale and minnow in a tank elsewhere, KR) shows, that she thought he was dangerous." The exact opposite is the case: Virginia feels bored with Gerald's speeches, she looks down on him, and she suspects that he too feels the roles have been reversed: now it's her, the poor little sister who swims in open water with Leonard. Thus, in

the diary, Virginia takes up the image of the alligator in the pool again: the outsiders move in life; the once superior Gerald has failed across the board and is no longer interested in anything. It is perhaps no exaggeration to say that DeSalvo's interpretation of the alligator Gerald reverses what Woolf has said clearly.

On the surface, DeSalvo's book treats Virginia as a victim who needs belated justice and whose own crime-solving efforts should be recognized. In truth, however, the allegation that Woolf was sexually abused by several members of the family between 1888 and 1904, but that she no longer knows it and is only suffering from the consequences, justifies completely incapacitating the victim and manipulating her at will. Luckily only with the means of philology. But this bailout

did not deserve the writer Woolf, although I gladly admit that her childhood and youth before the turn of the century did not correspond to the regulations according to which social-educational model institutions are supposed to be run today...

The counterpart to Woolf's reluctant rescue by a girl scout, who guides her across the street anyway, is given by the pursuing innocence. If it remains unclear what drove a literary scholar insane, at least one understands the benefit Katharina Lappessen derives from blaming her ex-husband for abusing her daughter Anna. On the one hand, this saves her the grief over the failure of a seven-year relationship; On the other hand, the relationship with the man continues for a long time through the active gratification of desires for hatred and revenge, and this—this is important—in a morally irreproachable manner.

The ideology of sexual abuse allows the mother to present herself as the selfless protector of her children and to write a book about all the events, including a preliminary investigation against the father, with a clear conscience. At first only for self-therapeutic reasons: "I sat down and wrote my feelings on paper so as not to choke on the terrible things I felt inside me." Later came the intention to help others who were equally affected. The book was printed "to tell other mothers about our experiences, to encourage them to also protect their children from abusers, although this is so difficult and the environment does not react in a supportive way, but with doubts and a lot of fear, about the abusers even contemplating the existence of sexual abuse."

To anticipate the result of my reading: The book is not a lesson on sexual abuse and the difficulties Children possibly with the help of the youth welfare office, the family court or even the police and criminal authorities, but depressing evidence of how poorly developed the ability to test reality is and how quickly the existing one is developed

can also be lost if the circumstances are correspondingly unfavorable. What the mother achieves by accusing the divorced man of abuse is the destruction of the good relationship that two little girls had with their father and father with them.

A modern divorce law that gets by without assigning blame and therefore no longer deprives children of their father or mother because one has committed adultery - in other words, all new attempts to grant children their own rights and to separate the (failed) marital relationship from the relationship with the children in Separating their interests is all for naught if the question of guilt can be re-introduced via the allegation of abuse and with very dramatic consequences. The fact that the mother in the present case is a psychologist and also works as a professional in the field of abuse therapy and education makes this story an all too realistic gothic novel without any prospect of a happy ending: Because that the father at the end of the The fact that the indictment is cleared has reassured me about the possibilities of the judiciary to put a stop to the worst delusion, but there are two little girls and a father who are to be lamented and who are now no longer allowed to see each other. Regardless of the father's innocence, the further exercise of visitation rights under the circumstances brought about by the mother exposed the children to such ordeal that the foreseeable damage seemed too significant to the family court. The children's biographies will one day show how much porcelain the determined mother smashed in the course of the many months of surveys at home and with other experts who tested, questioned and assessed her daughters.

Unfortunately, you can't choose your parents like you usually do with friends and enemies in life...

Now what made me, in this so instructive and broadly detailed case of paternal abuse of a five-year-old girl, put it under delusion and not under reality? Because of course I know that there is sexual abuse of children, a

A crime that really and truly deserves the name - although I doubt that the current campaign has in mind this realism, which in itself is also very ill-suited to a moral awakening of broad lay circles. With DeSalvo, one only had to go back from the wildly accumulated and combined references to the texts and contexts to reject their interpretation. Finally, Woolf herself could be heard as a witness who has interpreted her life so artfully that it is actually unacceptable to treat her utterances as if they were the ideas of an analysand lying on the couch.

There is no original text to go back to the story of Anna's abuse by her father, his discovery and persecution by her mother, only some counter-arguments from the father in the form of letters from his lawyer and finally the court's decision, the main hearing due to deficiency not to be opened due to sufficient suspicion. The judiciary is thus increasing the number of "culprits" who are so often criticized and who get away with it, as if the number of investigations being discontinued or acquittals per se shows the blindness of the judiciary and does not primarily prove that we live in a constitutional state whose supreme principle is dubious pro reo reads.

Or should there be crimes for which this principle should no longer apply? What else did Kavemann & Lohstöter think of their judicial scolding? "A comparison of the crime statistics and the number of people convicted makes it clear that only every fifth reported sexual abuse is tried before a criminal court, although two perpetrators out of three are identified." in addition, the difference between reporting, investigation and criminal proceedings is still obscured, a valuable legal procedure which, in the case of Anna's father, has not prevented everything, but has prevented the worst. In the future, too, let's hope that someone who has reported someone has not yet been convicted.

That Anna's abuse is due to her mother's delusions and not to the reality of an unscrupulous father is something everyone who has the patience to listen to her story from beginning to end must be convinced. This effort is also worthwhile because there are so few real-life examples that show the dangerous traps that the new child protection ideology still unnoticed. The word delusion, which I used with DeSalvo and now apply to Anna's mother, may sound too sharp in some people's ears. However, the possibility of developing delusions is already inherent in the propagated concept of the sexual abuse of children; because on the one hand very few people know about this crime from their own experience, on the other hand we are supposed to be led to believe that it happens en masse. The number of unreported cases has long since turned from a criminal statistical tool into a metaphor for the unspeakable horror that is hidden behind the facade of normal everyday life.

Child abuse is also a crime that leaves no trace and has no witnesses; because bodily harm is not the rule and children, even if they are old enough and can speak, remain silent and must be listened to according to all the rules of the art of testing if there is a suspicion. So Anna's mother doesn't have to ask herself whether she's about to go crazy when suddenly, after the first thought, the second unavoidable thought comes to her that her father hasn't just abused his daughter now, after the separation, but has been doing so for years. A recurring nightmare of the child is easily explained by this fact, which the mother has overlooked for just as many years, although as an expert she should have listened more carefully than normal mothers.

Other obvious explanations are systematically avoided. Stomach pains in both girls and a severe upset in the older Anna whenever they return to their mother from visits to their father, lead me to suspect that the children are suffering from a conflict at the expense of their mother's contradictory behavior. As part of a generous visitation plan, the children are allowed to spend a lot of time with their father — with the

They are then confronted with their denied but crassly acted out hatred of their father. Anna's fate as a victim of abuse is sealed when a Danish friend of her mother, maid of honor at her upcoming remarriage, notices the unhappy behavior of her now six-year-old daughter.

As the devil would have it, this friend is also an expert, even a multi-year experienced and well-versed in the field of sexual abuse. You can read her report on Anna's symptoms, the father's personality structure and the incestuous basic structure of the (ex) family.

Apparently no one thought of finding Anna's behavior understandable and normal: the wedding finally made it clear to her that all her hopes of seeing her father and mother together again were in vain. It's of little use if the new "father" and the two new siblings are nice and likeable. Not only when reading Anna's story do I ask myself whether all the excitement about sexual abuse of children is instigated because of the children, or whether other adult women, like Anna's mother here, want to cook up completely different soups on the subject. How else can you be so insensitive to a child?

I don't want to fundamentally exclude men from misbehavior, it's just that up to now they have hardly made any public appearances. Hasn't the pursuit of immorality been a tried and tested means of checkmating one's enemy since time immemorial? With

the liberalization of laws and changed forms of behavior between the sexes, it is also easy to overlook the fact that the general progress in the field of sexual drives is subject to very narrow limits and that resignation, not hysterical outcry, is often demanded of us as a civilizational virtue. To give an example: it is worthwhile to keep improving public safety, it is not worth trying to do the same for private circumstances. If elsewhere police, law and diplomacy are the norm, here, in romantic and other close relationships, we are always confronted with outbursts of affect and other deviations from so-called normal behavior

calculate and — have to put up with it. Anyone who calls for the state and new laws to further raise the level of civilization in interpersonal relationships is only driving out the devil with Beelzebub. So nothing changes — except the ad traffic.

If her outbursts of anger and the pent-up bitterness about her ex-husband remain private, Anna's mother can also count on our forbearance and patience. But she reacts publicly and with missionary intentions. Why? It is probably about more than the good conscience that innocence pursuing in all innocence needs. Yes, the monotony with which Anna's mother paints the world in black and white in lyrical therapeutic prose (only an apparent contradiction) and portrays herself as a suffering, self-sacrificing and finally completely enlightened angel shows that this is not at all easy for her.

The delusion on which she relies is eventually favored by others who are not divorced. What other, less random, desires does it gratify in women that it almost never satisfies in men? It resembles a dream in which the dreamer stands unchallenged in the center, undisturbed by any critical objection, no reality. Because child abuse is seen as an invisible crime that has yet to be revealed in a backworld to which our everyday lives cling like a facade, anyone who is affected is chosen to provide information.

The expert concerned is completely sacrosanct. Anna's mother was raped once. We are not given any further details, except that the event happened years ago. As a psychologist and victim, she is invited to a panel discussion on the subject of »sexual violence«. "I'm happy to agree, I'm happy to be able to contribute to making this topic public again." Months later, after the youth welfare office had long been informed about the case in her own family, she was invited to a panel discussion about the sexual abuse of children. The head of the youth welfare office has concerns and advises against their participation. Could she separate the specialist from the affected mother? And what do you want to do if

the suspected father shows up at the event? Anna's mother has no qualms. This is how she describes the event and the puzzling journalistic reaction to it:

»The other participants on the podium present their topics. All performances are important, but impatience is slowly spreading in the audience. There is a discussion as to whether the remaining contributions - mine would be one of them - should be left out to make room for questions from the audience. I propose to bring the contributions anyway... This proposal is accepted. Another participant speaks... Then I speak, offer to interrupt if everything should be known, and describe the psychological consequences of sexual abuse... It becomes quiet in the hall, a tense silence spreads, even the walls seem to absorb what i say, i am so sure, calmly answer any question, am sovereign and independent...

I am factual and yet emotionally involved, calm and yet strong, no one reaches me with attacks. My own experience with the topic gives me strength and security, leaves no question unanswered... Most of the questions are put to me... The other podium participants also get involved, but I feel that I am actually the feelings of the people in the room achieved that it is no longer theory but truth that children are sexually abused... The quiet social worker thanks me as I am about to leave after the event... Many others report back to me the impression that it wasn't until something happened to people that I started speaking. They were impressed, it did them good. But neither in the references to the panel discussion nor in the subsequent report about it in the newspaper is my name mentioned. The director was too scared...' So the most important narcissistic gratification to which Anna's mother was entitled after her glorious public appearance did not materialize. Has their self-perception misled them about their role, or is it again the officials' fear of the truth that is

to blame? Anna's mother chooses the second answer. Of course I say, that's the delusion that

utterly unwavering. It seems there are plenty of women whose souls thirst for public appearances of unbridled bossiness and roaring applause. If sexual abuse is a man's privilege, then complaining about it is a woman's business: a clean division of labour. But one should not believe that enlightenment is taking place here. One takes a look at archaic emotional and imaginary worlds that are only very superficially civilized.

A look at the antediluvian stocks in the relationship between the sexes also makes the meaningful silence of the men, individually or collectively so grossly insulted, understandable. It signals neither agreement nor lack of understanding or even a sense of guilt. What they show is perfectly normal male behavior, as anyone who knows the canine world knows. Nothing but a long-term sexual goal in mind, the male has to put up with anything, really anything from the ladies, who snap and bite more often than he's graciously accepting.

4 . *The normal man and other prejudices*

women, girls and children live dangerously; because in their immediate vicinity a dangerous species of human beings cavorts on a daily and uninterrupted basis: the man in the various varieties of father, brother, uncle, boss, colleague, neighbor or friend. It has been found that in 70 percent of sexual offenses the perpetrator is more or less known to the victim and only 6.2 percent are committed by complete strangers.

Since Michael Baurmann discovered this relationship between known and unknown perpetrators, why is it so important? It seems to prove emphatically that our everyday life is riddled with perpetrators, while we have always believed that evil is an outside import.

Kavemann & Lohstöter take this argument even further by combining the statistics with a qualitative statement of the nature of the crime, thus giving the impression that one is less protected and safe in the near world than captive and is being served up bite-sized to the male tormentors : »The study mentioned above shows that the danger for girls and women is highest in the social area, because the intensity of the abuse, the duration of the abusive relationship and also the degree of violence used increase with increasing degrees of acquaintance and relatives.« According to this Logically, women and girls should be advised to constantly change their environment and, if possible, to take up jobs like that of travelers if they are not immediately able to organize the local area free of men.

Baurmann's research on the perpetrator-victim relationship in the case of sexual offenses can probably support panic-stricken arguments, but the results are not surprising, rather trivial and tautological. Just as traffic accidents require traffic, so set

Relationship accidents or, for that matter, relationship catastrophes precede the network of relationships in everyday life in which we live. Because sexuality requires more relationship between perpetrator and victim than, for example, theft, the high degree of acquaintance is not surprising, on the contrary it is what one should expect. In any case, it is completely wrong to create another horror effect from this fact; because Kavemann & Lohstöter also know that most sexual murders are committed by perpetrators from the group of 6.2 percent unknown.

However, they soften this date with the outrageous suggestion that the abusive fathers do not need such blatant methods to cover up their crimes, since they have other means of pressure at their disposal to keep the victims silent. Only in the interest of an all too simple conceptualization of sexually motivated violence in men, which to a certain extent depicts its basic structure before it becomes civilized and beyond control, can one consider the pedophile, the blackmailing brother, the incest father who writes childish love letters to his daughter and, for example, Jürgen Bartsch on a continuum or within a calculated game of ruthless instinctual gratification and punishment avoidance.

However, anyone who wants to gain social recognition for the topic of sexual abuse as an epidemic must neither concern themselves with the perpetrators, their intentions and actions, nor with their precise relationship to their victims. This becomes very clear in the wording that Kavemann & Lohstöter made for the title of their well-known book. Are fathers perpetrators? They exist, but are they so common and regular to justify the title? Baurmann already made the crucial mistake in his investigation of simply adding fathers, stepfathers and other men using the same apartment to one group of perpetrators. With this method of calculation, it includes an impressive quarter of all perpetrators. Although the proportion of abusers from the immediate area, outside the family and the home, is even higher at a good third - but this is the case with this numerically more important group

insinuated effect of the capital sexual crime against children: incest.

At the center of the moral nightmare that our society seems to be dreaming must be the father making his own flesh and blood, his daughter, his child, sexually pliable. The primacy of this image among those who want to educate about sexual abuse is by no means due to knowledge of the spread of this crime, or the insight into its specific importance in the etiology of severe neurotic or psychotic illnesses on the part of the victims, but solely the horrific ones fascination that emanates from him. Every story of incest contains moments of the scary movie that makes you scared. The protector per se, the father, turns out to be the persecutor; the proportions of size and power make resistance almost impossible for the persecuted; where to flee they do not know; they are trapped and must be overwhelmed.

Of course, this has little to do with the multifaceted reality of father-daughter incest, but perhaps more to do with the warded-off wishful fantasies of childhood than Freud's feminist critics would like. What little girl isn't torn between wanting to marry her father and being terrified of the huge body and male genitals? The title »Fathers as Perpetrators« advertises, so to speak, in a sociological way, which the book cannot redeem with its view of reality.

Elsewhere, the sentimental ambiguity inadvertently reverts to the incestuous fantasies we've all had to engage with at one point or another. "Kiss Daddy Goodnight" is also the German title of Louise Armstrong's collection of case histories of incest victims. There is hardly a better way for unaffected readers to get in the mood for the spicy topic than by remembering the tender bedtime ritual with which reluctant children are then excluded from the world of adults.

A Cologne initiative to combat sexual abuse innocently gave itself the name "delicate bitter" because it was delicate

Something bitter is inflicted on children with the abuse. As a Freudian, I see the blunder in the clumsiness of the name design: bittersweet is not just a flavor of chocolate, so that child abuse is associated with enjoyment, the double attribute is also reminiscent of something else, contradictory in itself, with which otherwise sentimental love stories without tragedy, but also without a happy ending: bitter sweet. In short, if I didn't know better, I wouldn't have thought of "Zart-Bitter" in terms of child protection, but rather of a pedophile interest group; Because whoever is fixated on children in his choice of love, along with the happiness of love feelings, also regularly experiences the disappointment of the child, whom she cannot reciprocate, indeed, can hardly understand, precisely because it is a child whose callousness and objective cruelty cannot be felt once can make a reproach and so ad infinitum.

Unraveling why the Berlin pioneers called their initiative "wild water" requires more psychoanalytic effort and more speculation than the readers are willing to tolerate. My guesses revolve around the knowledge that whitewater is untamed water; In connection with sexuality, one should then also think of urethral eroticism, whose aggressiveness is regressively cast by the disappointed penisless child — in short, this name is also chosen more meaningfully than fortunately and fits with the dogmatic hostility to men that the help and enlightenment offer of »Wildwasser e . V.« is based.

Are fathers perpetrators? They are, but far less often than one might actually expect, pardon: ought to be, if certain hypotheses about male sexuality and violence weren't completely unfounded. Why don't Baurmann and his successors Kavemann & Lohstöter give the exact percentage of fathers, i.e. real incest offenders? Quite simply because it is ineffective for the public and cannot be pushed to impressive heights even with the most daring multiplication of unreported cases. For this reason, the police

Criminal statistics do not specifically include the offenses under Sections 173 of the Criminal Code (incest), 174 of the Criminal Code (abuse of those over sixteen and under eighteen) and 179 of the Criminal Code (abuse of the defenseless). Do I have to emphasize that for me, too, the statistical irrelevance is on a different level than the punishability of these offenses and the sympathy for the victims who need help?

So the title "Fathers as Perpetrators" is grossly misleading. More correct would be "stepfathers as perpetrators" or "maternal partner as perpetrators" - but that would eliminate incest and we would come closer to the more trivial problem of mothers, stepfathers and pubescent daughters. The hardline feminists don't need to explain how incest occurs, but why it is not as widespread as expectations about male sexual behavior would suggest. For men, according to this doctrine, women and those who are close to them are sexual objects that they can dispose of as they wish, simply because they have the power.

Susanne Padberg, the reviewer of Josephine Rijnaarts' well-known book "Lot's Daughters — About Father-Daughter Incest" approves of her criticism of the family-dynamic interpretation of incest. It is not a question of a tacit agreement between two needy adults at the expense of a child who wants to guarantee the family cohesion, no, it would »minimize incestuous behavior into an occasional derailment and a social fringe phenomenon, which the general spread of incest in our Western cultures are misunderstood.« One comes closer to reality, believes the Dutch author, and the reviewer of »Psychologie heute« agrees with her, if one views incest as part of male violence against women in terms of power theory. However, one would then have to explain why it does not statistically represent the normal state. In a complete reversal of the facts, the criticism raises the question 'why only some fathers sexually abuse their daughters while others never dream of it. Rijnaarts can only very much

engage in speculative reflections". Fathers, do your evil duty!

The standard repertoire of arguments also includes the emphatic and repeated statement that the child abuser, and of course the abusive father, is a "completely normal man" who should by no means be marginalized as a psychopath. It is therefore assumed that sexuality with children of all ages and sexes, including one's own, is one of the possibilities for every man to gratify his instincts, even if, as a rule, he does not realize such possibilities out of fear, decency or insight. Anyone who considers even the slightest hint how puzzling not only the love choices but also the sexual preferences are in individual cases can hardly believe that the "completely normal man" is the sexual omnivore that he is led to believe. Actually, the social workers, therapists and psychologists of both sexes, who, along with the feminists, also favor the "normal man" as the perpetrator, should also say so to themselves. They don't because the argument is very useful in two ways.

The bourgeois middle class, in its more moral factions, to which the above-mentioned experts undoubtedly belong, has a guilty conscience, which, however, does not express itself in self-accusation and self-sacrifice, but in making excuses for others. There is no perpetrator whom one cannot understand, feel sorry for and, in turn, understand as a victim of another authority that is as anonymous and impersonal as possible; because basically the perpetrator is always a more or less extreme version of myself. When a forty-seven-year-old early retiree is on trial in Berlin-Moabit for having recruited and paid young boys for pornography recordings out of passion and business interests, the radio reporter does not realize how disgusting it is the deeds and the man who belonged to them are, or vice versa, how surprisingly likeable a man with such repulsive habits and inclinations can be, no, he resorts to the stereotype of the "completely normal man" who is on trial here.

This strategy of embracing is of no use to the perpetrator, nor does it help to clarify the facts; it serves solely to dispose of the chronic feelings of guilt on the part of the missionary social critics free of charge. Anyone who normalizes the anomaly also values themselves with the perpetrator, especially if they deal with him professionally. The psychologist is by no means concerned with a hopelessly neglected person, a pervert or a sexual offender who is almost hopeless to help, but with a significant social problem that manifests itself more or less by chance in the offender.

Political authorities can only be mobilized and public funds won for facilities and support staff if the problem can be brought to the fore from the fringes and fringe groups of society, where it actually takes place.

In 1984, Barbara Nelson described how this works under American conditions in a solid political science study, which unfortunately is not available in translation, but has not received the attention it deserves in expert circles, where English-language specialist literature is otherwise taken note of. The reasons will quickly become apparent to the reader of *Making an Issue of Child Abuse — Political Agenda Setting for Social Problems*. Nelson's example is not child sexual abuse, but what has been popularized in German as child abuse or violence against children and in families in the 1970s and first half of the 1980s. Child abuse, a social disease with a high number of unreported cases, arrived here as an import from the United States with a delay of about ten years, as did sexual abuse, about which almost nothing had been heard until then.

Let's take Alice Miller, for example, who since her first book has repeatedly made herself an advocate for children who are overwhelmed and neglected in their real developmental needs. Apparently she is neither in her long practice as a psychoanalyst nor in her biographical research

sexual abuse—until Florence Rush's book opened her eyes to the horrifying physical reality of the abuse, which until then she had understood more psychologically. Only this reality made it possible to finally disavow Freudian psychoanalysis and to expose the assumption that children are also instinctual beings with sexual desires and fantasies as a mere lie, good enough to cover up the silence about the child's misfortune, with all the foreseeable consequences for the child desolate state of the world we live in...

The rest is well known: Alice Miller won »Brigitte« for the subject, and from her reading audience came those eighty-one women who, relieved, broke the silence about something that they were only now entitled to understand as the root and cause of their unhappiness in life . Some cases raise doubts as to whether, even with a broad definition of "child sexual abuse," anything worthy of the label associated with the dramatic biographical consequences took place. When a twenty-two-year-old student allows herself to be seduced by her father, to whom she suddenly (and finally) appears as a desirable woman, then that is certainly unusual and not the desirable end of a father-child relationship. Nor will one be persuaded that our understanding of the events headed 'He called it love—and broke me' could be gained by assigning the roles of perpetrator and victim. Other reports, despite their fragmentary character and focus on the scandal in question, gave a view of conditions that were anything but average orderly, so that certain prejudices about the occurrence of incestuous acts in chaos families, under the influence of alcohol and with family dynamics that are also specific to the underclass be confirmed than disproved.

Criticism of the depiction and presentation of the cases does not deprive anyone of sympathy for the injustice suffered, a terrible childhood and unsatisfactory living conditions in which

many are stuck without much hope for change. The question is why this misfortune was formulated and popularized by experts and the media alike, first as child abuse and then, under feminist influence, as sexual abuse. Based on Barbara Nelson's thorough research into developments in the United States, some answers can also be formulated for local conditions.

The norm of protected childhood is an invention of the bourgeois middle class, which they also carry into living conditions in which all the material and personal prerequisites for fulfilling this norm are missing, apart from cultural differences. This is a problem that has accompanied public welfare and child protection from its inception. As an example from the coverage of the "Spiegel" may show, it was not resolved by 1990. Even more common than physical abuse, it is claimed, is child neglect, which can result in infant deaths, as in the case of a twenty-two-year-old mother whose fifth child was found dead in his bed one morning: the man is unemployed and beats her, the family is in debt and lives in a one and a half room apartment without a washing machine. During the fifth pregnancy, the mother attempts suicide but is saved and gives birth to the child.

It doesn't thrive, but she doesn't dare to go to the doctor because she fears reproaches. She herself is losing weight and is becoming more and more apathetic. Then the child is dead.

"Vera Körner can't believe it. 'I didn't let him starve. He ate until the last day. I loved him as much as any other child.'" One sociologist sees the core problem in the inability of neglectful parents to ask for or even demand help. A social worker adds and deepens that »the parents would never have learned to take good care of themselves and therefore also failed in the attempt to develop care for their children. They end up doing to their children what was done to them before."

According to these interpretations, we are also dealing here with completely normal parents, fathers and mothers, who unfortunately only show certain deficits in their behavior towards their fundamentally and dutifully loved children, a failure that one cannot even blame them for, because they themselves have not learned what caring is. So it all boils down to emotional learning and experiential deficits that are passed from parent to child until a compassionate social worker, therapist, or other helpful agency cuts the chain of misfortune. Holy simplicity, one would like to exclaim, if the interests of the experts did not come into play at the same time as analytical philanthropy; because the degree of understanding for everything and everyone is synonymous with the competence of one's own profession, which promises help and rescue. But can anyone seriously believe that misery of the dimension just mentioned can be explained in terms of socialization theory and psychology and can be remedied with the methods and means of even the most advanced social work?

When a twenty-two-year-old woman becomes a mother for the fifth time under the conditions described, then she is obviously quite neglected and also completely stupid. What frightened me most was the story of how the woman, under pressure to explain her child's death and presumably influenced by the questions of an all-too-wise interviewer, used her motherly love for all children, even the dead, as a final, irrefutable argument for her leads innocence. In doing so, she fully ties in with a bourgeois perspective in which there are only individuals who fail, often through no fault of their own, like this normal but needy mother. No one who wants to formulate child abuse or neglect as a solvable social problem that can be dealt with perfectly in the hands of pedagogues and psychologists should admit that the misery here is quite different from that of a disorganized family, a misery that cannot be remedied at all is lifted.

A social problem, Barbara Nelson exaggerates this attitude, is caused individually and can therefore be localized

disease described and cured with a few doses of therapeutic conversation. Despite occasional references to unemployment and the material hardship it causes, to bad housing and a violent milieu, attempts have always been made in the USA and here to stop not only the epidemic spread of abuse and neglect, but also their occurrence regardless of class and proof of class affiliation. With even more emphasis and perhaps more chance of success, the myth of the classlessness of a crime is also preached for sexual abuse, yes, here it seems to go even further and to assume that the perpetrators from better circles predominate.

Why is there so much emphasis on classlessness? The arguments that seem to speak for them are always the same: Perpetrators and victims from higher social classes are only so rarely discovered because there are better opportunities up there to evade social control by the police, youth welfare office and doctors; everything can be settled with money and connections... That's how it is, but these social advantages of space are used differently from the start than the puritanical critics of the dissolute upper class and bourgeois partisans of the common human imagine. A boss can not only conceal his need for power and control, yes his perversions to a large extent, but organize them in a way that is impeccable under criminal law. His radius of action is not limited to his small family.

The classlessness argument against all reason is essential for two reasons. No one can make money from simple poverty and aid programs. The civilizing impetus of the helpers does not come into play, but is downgraded to garbage worker status if it is only a matter of cleaning up and correcting tasks in social fringe groups to which the helpers do not belong and from which they can derive no prestige. One remembers the school and education reforms in the 1960s, with the pronounced emphasis on

Class antagonisms and the proletarian backlog of school and university degrees in order to gauge the difference to moral reform today. Indeed, the discovery of a new clientele for the high school and the universities has coincided with the expansion of these institutions and a rather unprecedented proliferation of public service jobs. Socially thinking or even class-struggle-motivated teaching staff was able to combine their educational mission with their own professional security and career. An expansion of social services, which would have corresponded to that of the public and freely accessible education system, has not happened so far for a number of reasons.

Firstly, schools and vocational training are traditionally organized or controlled publicly, soul education is not. Second: Furthermore, family life and raising children is a private matter — until criminally relevant evidence to the contrary is found or shortly before. Third, there is no general interest in moral reform outside of groups that work professionally or want to work in the field. It can only be awakened when the danger appears general and immense. What did not succeed with the issue of child abuse, the generation of moral panic, seems to work better with sexual abuse. Sex is not class specific, has nothing to do with poverty and other social deprivations it seems.

Across all classes, the "normal man" sins against the child, who is sacrificed to his instincts, even if he survives.

5 . How much sexuality does a child need?

The puritanism of modern societies no longer manifests itself in the police, censorship authorities and public prosecutors intervening when a naked breast appears on the screen, but in the compulsion to repeatedly occupy the freedom spaces opened up by reason with panic fear and to indulge in wild catastrophe fantasies . Groups that used to be without rights, such as women and children, who were once the most severely affected by immobility and moral repression, suddenly appear, in a complete misjudgment of the emancipation processes that have taken place, as victims of a liberal social order in which they can be ruthlessly exploited, disregarded and - abused.

Because there is a chronic conflict of interest between motorists and pedestrians, which includes children, and this must be negotiated on a case-by-case basis; or because the consumption possibilities of families are more limited than for people without children, one cannot justify the statement that a characteristic of our society is its "phobia towards children". That makes a mockery of all historical facts. Those slogans with which the women's question is pressed into archaic patterns of thought also lead us past the real problems. While it is true that women have a specific security risk that they must take into account; as the crime statistics teach, it is not higher than that of other people. Finally, considering that women have been able to increase their life expectancy by almost ten years over that of men over the past hundred or two hundred years, the conclusion that men live dangerously would be more plausible than the reverse...

Benevolent viewers of morality campaigns, whether they deal with misogynistic advertising, youth video viewing, violence, pornography, sexual harassment at work, or whatever

dealing with child abuse could put their peculiar rigorism into perspective with the experience that nothing is eaten as hot as it was cooked. Exaggerations aside, committed feminists have the merit of fearlessly putting these taboo subjects on the table. This is how Mathias Hirsch argues in his well-read book on »Real Incest«, where the psychotherapist presents patients and cases from his own long-term practice that take into account the biographical situation of such relationships in contrast to the ghastly romantic horror stories elsewhere.

Benevolence is badly placed; because issues and problems that owe their public acceptance to a moral hangover (Freud spoke of the "discomfort in culture," the guilt of morally correct people) are formulated incorrectly and solved incorrectly. There are historically chilling precedents for such distortions, in which nurturing and progress have combined with fatal regressions and fixations. The bourgeois discovery of the child in the eighteenth century and the development of pedagogy as a strategy for its careful nurturing and education went hand in hand with the most absurd moral terror against the child. How much paper—and if only it had been paper—has been wasted on the discussion of masturbation, by educators famous and not! As if sexuality was the basis of all the resistance that a childish individual could offer to the good intentions of the adult teachers who wished it to be a tabula rasa.

Until Freud appeared, the child was visible at the price of its so-called innocence, its ideal exclusion from life, into which it was introduced in didactic portions. Under the heading of constitutional weakness, seduction through wrong reading, feather beds, bad friends, sumptuous food and lack of supervision, every sexual impulse in a child could be discriminated against as unnatural and combated—if one could get hold of it: combating masturbation has something in common with research into child sexual abuse that the children find out about that

Vices are usually kept quiet, so that both the educator then and the therapist today depend on a checklist, on rehearsals and tests, to make sure whether the suspicion is justified.

Puppet shows, Rorschach tests, behavioral observations and the interpretation of drawings can hardly be better methods of early detection today than the search for clues of conscientious educators in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, who attributed the position of the hands during sleep, the pale complexion, the irritable or depressed nature of a child were looking for. Parallels can also be seen where the alleged harm to the child must be compared with that which the investigation of the offense is certain to cause.

The philanthropic educator Peter Villaume wants to catch the child in flagrante delicto and therefore advises hiring a spy, actually an agent provocateur: a friend, whom the pedagogue takes into his confidence, may sleep in the same bed with the suspected child. »In bed, shame and distrust easily disappear.

At least it won't be for long that the little ones don't give themselves away through words or actions." When American parents hand over their two daughters to a therapist today because the children are said to have been genitally manipulated twice by a babysitter, then no one knows whether the Cure no worse than the evil is. It's not at all clear whether children aren't doing a great deal of injustice if they are investigated and questioned without their consent and will, because one thinks this can prevent later damage.

Children who tell their parents about an experience do not therefore define themselves as abused and in need of help. What they need is not a therapeutic conversation with a stranger, who may take their unwillingness to cooperate as a bad sign, but an objective interpretation of the incident in which the sexual motives of the abuser are just as little concealed as the child's right and duty to to evade such advances - if that is the opinion of the parents. The willingness to indiscretion through the involvement of

Thirdly, the general lack of respect for the child's privacy, which one believes one can invade at any time and rule there, does not differ in its effects from the strange strategies that pedagogues of past times - even with the very best intentions for the child - used a lot have caused mischief.

Also to be considered is the foreseeable harm that a general climate of distrust and fear of sexual depravity will bring. A recent guide to the treatment of sexually abused children and their families from the United States gives a fair indication of how quickly the initially intended protection of children from adult and/or violent sexuality expands to the pursuit of any sexual initiative even among children of any age group. While no one has ever worried about a child's lack of desirable sexually erotic activity, checklists are created in which conspicuous, inappropriate, basically just indecent and naughty behaviors are collected to tick.

I haven't found anything that I didn't already know from my own childhood or that others wouldn't have known about later. Now, of course, those who draw up such lists always point out that the rest of a child's behavior must also be taken into account. It seems that a child is never just sexually disturbed, but always at the same time disturbed in other areas of his behavior and development. Why not, then, leave the child's sexuality to itself and attend to the areas where clearer views of right and wrong can guide pedagogical-therapeutic interventions?

The case of a young woman who was sexually abused by her stepfather twice a week between the ages of twelve and fifteen while her unsuspecting mother was away is instructive in this regard. In any case, the court came to this conclusion and sentenced the denying stepfather to seven years in prison. After adding a

Psychologist specializing in abuse cases, it considered the credibility of the victim, who, as is often the case in such cases, the only witness, to be proven. This satisfies criminal law.

Nevertheless, the case offers two views. On the one hand there is a twenty-one-year-old woman whose unhappiness in life was prepared well in advance, long before her stepfather came into her life and did not comply with the provisions of the penal code. Manuela, as she is called in Gisela Friedrichsen's "Spiegel" report, was born out of wedlock. In 1970, that would no longer have to be a catastrophe, but in this case it is already rudimentary. The child grows up in baby homes, foster homes and childminders before the mother takes it home to her and her stepfather. The report does not say when that was.

"She learned to speak with difficulty, she ate badly, she had to be forced into everything. She didn't connect at school... She was teased a lot, put up with a lot... At 12, 13 she vomited a lot. She started stealing from other children, from department stores... The average performance at school dropped noticeably.« Again and again this difficult child and adolescent girl is examined psychiatrically and is, as one can tell from the hints of the »Spiegel«, almost constantly in psychotherapeutic treatment. Nevertheless, the problems escalate to such an extent that Manuela, on the advice of a psychologist, but nominally of her own accord, is placed in a home at the age of fifteen. She stays there until she is eighteen and therefore of legal age.

It was in this home that she appears to have spoken to another psychologist for the first time about her stepfather's sexual abuse. The mother finally finds out what happened, and in 1987 she files a complaint against her stepfather, with whom she is now divorced. About the further life of her daughter it says in the "Spiegel": "Manuela left the home at eighteen. She ended up with men who took advantage of her. She should go buy. She did it at times.« Who is surprised at that

Prehistory? Gisela Friedrichsen quotes an expert from the Federal Criminal Police Office as saying that 70 percent of all prostitutes were sexually abused as children. Drug addiction, too, as one can read elsewhere, has a causal connection with this crime against children.

In other words, the stepfather is also to blame for this deplorable development of Manuela. He denies or denies to this day what he was charged with. What else do we learn about him and his motives? He is forty-six, an "operator" by trade, so was thirty-seven or thirty-eight at the time the abuse occurred. As a child he suffered from parents whose performance requirements he could not meet. He married a turn "dominant" woman, Manuela's mother, who in controls him, but in the form of a difficult, unwanted child also provides him with a human being whom he can feel superior to and control.

Why he must give his power over the child a sexual expression remains obscure; unless one interpolates the all-too-simple notion, which is common after long debates about rape and abuse, that men normally do not know the difference between sexuality and power and violence. Then in this case, too, the perpetrator would be an uncivilized sexual animal that has given in to its urges and lived it out wildly. I took something else from the hints about carrots, massage sticks, partner swapping and porn videos, namely the desperation of an impotent man, driven by the severest fear of castration, who fled with another woman as soon as he could find satisfaction with her in the "normal" way, even one that didn't get him in trouble with the law. The judge's advice to the convict, who faces seven years in prison, that he should now also think about "how he wants to deal with his sexuality in the future," addresses the problem that the sex drive poses to this man and in another form to everyone, cynically naive just over.

However, the court and the reporter for Der Spiegel recognize that the perpetrator was also once a victim. But hasn't this understanding long since become the rhetoric of an enlightened public that wants to preserve its own ignorance and conceal its powerlessness with the guilty verdict? In the spirit of Alice Miller, the second "Spiegel" report on the appeal hearing, in which the victim's credibility check was made up for, closes with the following words from the judge about the perpetrator: "He, too, was once a damaged child." That's no Sentence of the Enlightenment, but a larmoyant endless loop, which, depending on our temperament, makes us resign before fate, or puts us in aimless excitement from which much, but nothing sensible, can be done.

If understanding is free for the perpetrator, who was also a victim in the past - and so ad infinitum, we quickly return to the concept of original sin, then one must ask exactly the same question, whether the victim Manuela is doing any good if he is given carte blanche, because as a child and growing girl she had to endure the sexuality of a grown man. "If a child was abused," says the report, "its subsequent behavior is usually the result of the abuse." That's probably why not a single word about the relationship with the stepfather falls before or alongside the abuse files that have been identified, which look like sterile vignettes of absolute horror spread all the more terror.

In this case, the technology may also be a function of the legal codification of the acts of abuse, but the effect on the normal audience who hears and reads such vignettes goes far beyond that.

Designations such as "oral" or "anal sex," for example, are clouded with the plague of the perverse and monstrous, so that in the background the suspicion emerges that "protected intercourse," after written agreements in front of witnesses with their limbs in order, is probably the only thing decent people can do remains at all. Because in this story and this trial, as elsewhere, everything is talked about, everything is described, everything is counted, precisely for that reason

the topic of sexuality is avoided and missed. What spreads is not understanding and insight, but disgust, displeasure, depression.

Of course, this is not the intention of those who have accepted the sexual abuse of children as a taboo subject in our society. They want to enlighten, protect, treat, familiarize us with the signs of crime and its terrible consequences. "Every fourth child?" is the question asked in Spiegel, but has long been assumed elsewhere. "The children are sending out a plethora of distress signals. Manuela did that too. You don't have to be very knowledgeable to see how desperately and unsuccessfully she pleaded for help." Has she? Nothing speaks for it - and if she

could, who would have been able to help her? Do we only lack institutions, specially trained staff, therapy centers and comprehensive education? I have no doubts about the stepfather's guilt, about the reality of the acts for which he was convicted; I do not insinuate complicity on the part of the victim, nor am I arguing for a revision of the criminal code that prohibits sexual acts between children and adults: Every pedophile knows that he has to seduce and bribe children because they want everything from adults but never get into fall in love with someone, even desire him sexually, as is the reverse in the really tragic case. After this declaration of my good will and my conviction, I hope that my application from Manuela's story will still attract attention.

For many years, probably her entire life, Manuela was in the sights of educational, medical, and psychotherapeutic authorities. Many warmed their soup on this case, nobody helped her if it had been possible. For three years her stepfather made her sexually compliant; but the girl was in a home for just as long, where each place costs several thousand marks a month, but isn't worth it.

Apparently no one can require that there basic mental

intellectual repair services are provided by professional helpers.

But did Manuela at least graduate from school in this home and start vocational training? If she goes on the prowl after the home, then we'd rather not blame the stepfather, who hasn't studied the spoiling of young girls like others have studied the socio-educational rescue of underprivileged, difficult or even disturbed children.

If today the sexual abuse of children is claimed with so much verve as a new field of activity for the relevant social professions and institutions, then we must first ask ourselves soberly whether they were at all able to solve simpler homework after previous experiences. As the school has in its comparatively long history, welfare institutions and measures provide further examples, the possibilities of optimizing the child's well-being in general and in detail with their resources are very small.

Those who are sure to benefit from investments in such sensitive areas are the operators of such facilities. In short, the teaching profession was more successful with the school than the students for whom it was actually intended. In recent years - so my hypothesis - more and more graduates have been looking for a job in the social sector; because the education market is known to be dense. A new need must therefore be created, which can then be responded to with funds, permanent posts, counseling facilities and further training measures.

Because of the human commitment in the foreground of the abuse debate, one usually overlooks the fact that the production and sale of socio-pedagogical-therapeutic know-how is subject to the same laws that also prevail in other areas of economic life. With one important difference: the failure of a company is reflected in the red figures it may have to write, while there are no comparable success controls in social services in the welfare state.

We respect the philanthropic intentions and ideas and like to believe that enough can never be done in this area and unfortunately too little is always done for lack of money.

The idea that there are also superfluous, environmentally harmful products here is completely alien to us, as is the suspicion that scientifically proven experts may also be rude prospects and competitors in a competitive market.

The Manuela case could teach us otherwise. After much effort, all the children's friends and child protectors involved have succeeded in finding nothing but a drawer for this difficult child and this peculiar young woman in which to put her; because she did not crawl in of her own accord or even voluntarily. The label is "sexually abused," and of course it makes the job easier that the underage girl has actually been involved in a sexual relationship by her stepfather.

It has already been mentioned that the child had been examined and treated repeatedly for practically his whole life before a psychologist in the children's home could identify him as a victim of abuse for the first time. The scandal isn't that this expert talked Manuela into something that didn't happen, it's that she investigated her, drove her to confession and confession about events that the girl wanted to keep quiet about with all her might.

But the accused has to admit that if she refuses, she will be tortured, and then she will talk. Of course, Manuela is not accused, but the destructive procedure by which she is made the innocent victim of others and for others, not for herself, is the same.

The "Spiegel" reports repeatedly mention how difficult it was to break the victim's silence, how much skill and patience it took for her to "slowly open up" to the psychologist, how long it took until she "finally began to reveal herself to her mother." This even in writing, so that the judge can later ask her to read out what her stepfather did to her. 'She can't get a sound out.

She sits petrified. She didn't move during the whole interrogation.'
Not

for a moment, from 1985 to the court hearing in 1991, did anyone think that the silence of a human being - a child is a human being, by the way - should be respected, and that in the case of Manuela lacked this respect from the start. On the contrary, everyone systematically misunderstands her silence, her denial, her resistance to new assessments and examinations over the years as a clear consequence and eloquent expression of the horrible crime to which she fell victim. Once again the gods of sexuality are invoked, as was the case with the philanthropists, who did not hesitate to take the children to task, to eavesdrop on them, to spy on them, even to bring them to the terminal stages of syphilis so that they would know what might be threatening them .

Who benefits from the labeling of Manuela as a victim of abuse? Certainly not Manuela herself; because the extorted confession is not therapy, not even the beginning of it—if the young woman ever wanted to have one. Why couldn't she have escaped her stepfather? Or later the wishes of men who sent them out on the streets? Presumably, in these relationships - as hard as we like to bear this idea is - she experienced something that pleased her, that did her good, more than anything investigative social work has ever given her, more than anything we can *offer* her have.

In the case of Manuela, good society had its chance from the start — and couldn't use it. Let's not make the point that an alarmingly large number of "normal" men are bastards and that child abuse is a taboo subject, a trivial offense that we are covering up and that finally belongs on the agenda. If only it were that easy! What we absolutely do not want to admit: Life is unfair and unhappiness is commonplace, and anyone who wants to change that today must also be able to do without the last vestige of messianism or socially critical-feminist wishy-washy.

Instead of footnote en e in afterword

I got the suggestion to deal with the topic of this little book from Reinhart Wolff. As President of the 8th At the 1990 International Congress on Child Abuse and Neglect, held in Hamburg, he invited me to give a lecture on "Symbolic Crusades - Modern Child Protection Ideology." My earlier confrontation with do-gooders, who wanted to make properly groomed children the guarantors of a bright future, seemed to him a good basis for critically analyzing the current obsession with violence and sexual abuse. Not everyone who speaks for children is willing and able to advocate for their interests.

Here I am addressing ordinary people, not experts and professionals in the field of social work, but people who are introduced to the subject in the newspaper, on television, or in their local chapter and daycare. First and foremost, I used and atmospherically interpreted reports and messages, analyzes and comments that are accessible to anyone who has subscribed to one or more daily newspapers, reads the customary national magazines and weekly newspapers and does not fundamentally reject a television. Evidence from sources seemed superfluous to me because tendencies and tricks are the same everywhere; more so than with other topics, it doesn't matter whether one consults »image« or »mirror«. Yes, apart from very few exceptions, scientific literature, researchers and experts are no smarter than journalists, but bear the same prejudices.

But I would like to thank those whose work has helped me to clear my head. Just as the topic is imported from Anglo-Saxon countries in general, so are most of them

Research written in English and not translated. For the great historical context, I cite *Elizabeth Pieck: Domestic Tyranny. The Making of American Social Policy against Family Violence from Colonial Times to the Present, Oxford 1987.*

The ambiguity of feminist engagement is treated by *M. P. Ryan: Stuff and Strength. An early lesson on the ambivalence of female moralizing campaigns.* To be found in the anthology by *Claudia Honegger and Bettina Heintz : Listen der Unmacht, Frankfurt 1981.* *Anthony Platt* deals with the connection between social discrimination and progressive youth politics : *The Child Savers — The Invention of Delinquency, Chicago 1977.* There is also a German-language equivalent here : *Detlev JK Peukert: Limits of social disciplining. Rise and crisis of German youth welfare.*

1878—1932, Cologne 1982.

The subject of family violence, which was the taboo subject of the 1970s and early 1980s, is also exemplary for sexual abuse: *Michael S. Honig: Domestic violence - social conflict, scientific constructs, everyday knowledge, action situations, Frankfurt 1986.* Sharpness and courage characterize the book by the author, who unfortunately died by suicide very early: *Barbara J. Nelson: Making an Issue of Child Abuse. Political Agenda Setting for Social Problems, Chicago 1984.* The following important article is translated: *Leroy H. Pelton: Child abuse and neglect: The myth of class and stratum independence. In: Familiendynamik 4, 1979.* Voices that resist the restorative setback in matters of children and sexuality are rare and therefore all the more valuable in this country.

Recommended is *Katharina Gröning: Sexuality with children. Of changing a discussion. In: Neue Praxis 19, 1989.*

Reinhart Lempp was involved in the reform of sexual criminal law and therefore has to justify himself today: *Remarks on aggressiveness and sexuality using the example of the sexual abuse of children. In: Journal for Sex Research 3, 1990.* Informative regarding the therapeutic measures that are worse than the traumatic event: *William N. Friedrich: Psychotherapy of*

Sexually Abused Children and Their Families, Norton 1990.

I recommend the following titles on the subject to those who want to investigate the connection between feminism, sexuality, masochism and dogmatism:

Sigmund Freud: A child is beaten. In: Ges. Werke, Volume 12 (first 1919); Anna Freud: Beat fantasy and daydream, writings volume 1 (first 1922); Dorothy Burlingham: Urgency to communicate and forced confession. In: Imago 20, 1934. Also recently for the classification of authentic concern the anthology by *Alois Hahn and Volker Kapp: Self-thematization and self-testimony, confession and confession, Frankfurt 1987.*

For the progressive idealization of sexual relationships between adults and children, read *Martin Dannecker: On the criminal treatment of pedosexuality. In: The Drama of Sexuality, Frankfurt 1983.* No horror stories from full-time victims, but true stories from real people who have experienced incest in some form can be found in the book by the Düsseldorf psychotherapist *Mathias Hirsch: Realer Incest, Berlin 1987.*

Books that one finds bad and perceives as the opposite of enlightening, namely misleading and prejudiced, should not be mentioned at all and thus brought to the attention of others.

Here, however, it cannot be avoided, because the authors I have so decisively criticized and rejected dominate the subject with their books. I have also quoted and attacked them directly. *Barbara Kavemann/Ingrid Lohstöter* belong to the classic basic inventory : *Fathers as perpetrators. Sexual violence against girls, Reinbek 1984 and above; Angelika Gardiner Sirtl, ed.: Abused as a child. Women break the silence, Munich 1983; Florence Rush: The Best Kept Secret. Sexual abuse of children, Berlin 1982.*

If *Rush* had an intro, then *Louise Armstrong* had an intro, where *Alice Miller* threw herself into it: *Kiss Daddy Goodnight, Frankfurt 1985.* Through advertisements in two daily newspapers, *Nele Glöer and Irmgard Schmiedeskamp-Böhler* made contact with men who had been abused as children: *Lost childhood - boys as victims of sexual violence, Munich 1990.* In *Armstrong* and in

There are, however, cases in this book where the abuse is not invoked as the godsend of a botched childhood. *Josephine Rijnaarts: Lot's Daughters* deals with the theory of Freud and Lévi Strauss on incest and its refutation by the circumstances as they are supposed to be. *About the father-daughter incest, Düsseldorf 1988*. Paradigmatically I chopped up *Louise De Salvo: Virginia Woolf - The effects of sexual abuse on her life and work, Munich 1990*. Also eat *Katharina Lapp: What about Anna? Munich 1991*.

There was no more time to sift through the counseling literature on the subject: *Rosemarie Steinhage: Sexual Abuse of Girls, Reinbek 1989*. This handbook for counseling and therapy is an example of the fact that Leninism-Stalinism was not limited to the CPSU.

If women don't stick together, that is, if mother and daughter abuse the latter without protection, then something must be made clear to the mother. While the introduction of children into the world of love, eroticism and sexuality has long been a thing of the past, people do it all the more when it comes to protecting them from sexual abuse: *Beate Beste: Sexual abuse and how to protect children from it protects, Munich 1991*. And *Michelle Elliott: How do I protect my child - from sexual abuse, violence and drugs, Stuttgart 1991*. Nothing against self-confidence training for children - but could this be limited to pedagogically undesirable indecent offers, as the authors think?

In his new essay, sex researcher Martin Dannecker analyzes the results of his AIDS study. »Documentary sobriety is probably the most sensible remedy against demonization.

That is enlightenment in the best sense.« *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*

»Here Martin Dannecker does not simply take stock of his extensive study

»Homosexual Men and Aids«. His new book examines existing prevention

and coping strategies.« *magnus* »Using the example of the development of

feelings of guilt due to sexual desire, Dannecker can show that problems with

homosexuality are a magnifying mirror of our problems with sexuality in

general.« *Listen*

Martin Dannecker

The homosexual man in the
sign of AIDS

KleinVerlag

108 bound

pages

ISBN 3-922930-02-6

In his new book, Eberhard Schorsch describes a trial about a sex murderer from the perspective of the expert witness.

"Schorsch made it clear that even the most horrible act is committed 'by one of us'." *Der Spiegel* "It's not a lesson, it's a masterpiece and at the same time the best introduction to forensic psychiatry there is." *Law and Psychiatry* 'Can murder be understood? Anyone looking for an answer to the tricky question should read the multi-faceted description of the process at their leisure. " That can only be in the interest of the matter." *Monthly journal for criminology*

Eberhard Schorsch

Short process?

A sex offender in court KleinVerlag

118 bound

pages

ISBN 3-922930-04-2