

Peter Caspari · Helga Dill
Cornelia Caspari
Gerhard Hackenschmied

At some point there has to be peace and quiet!

Institutional struggle to working
through the past of sexual violence
and abuse of power at an institute
for analytical child and adolescent
psychotherapy

At some point there has to be peace
and quiet!

Peter Caspari • Helga Dill
Cornelia Caspari • Gerhard
Hackenschmied

At some point there has to be peace and quiet!

Institutional struggle to working
through the past of sexual violence
and abuse of power at an institute
for analytical child and adolescent
psychotherapy



Springer

Peter Caspari
Institute of Practice Research and Project
Consulting (IPP)
Munich, Germany

Cornelia Caspari
Psychological Psychotherapist
Munich, Germany

Helga Dill
Institute of Practice Research and Project
Consulting (IPP)
Munich, Germany

Gerhard Hackenschmied
Institute of Practice Research and Project
Consulting (IPP)
Munich, Germany

ISBN 978-3-658-39784-5 ISBN 978-3-658-39785-2 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-39785-2>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH, part of Springer Nature 2023

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH, part of Springer Nature.

The registered company address is: Abraham-Lincoln-Str. 46, 65189 Wiesbaden, Germany

Foreword

How do social developments arise? How can one explain that there are always changes in social consciousness, that suddenly abusive relationships can be seen and named, over which a cloak of silence had previously been spread for decades? In the 1960s, the paediatrician Henry Kempe (Kempe et al., 1962) “discovered” a “new” clinical picture in the USA: The battered child syndrome, i.e. the typical consequences of child abuse, which had been overlooked by paediatricians until then; after its publication, the number of reported cases increased by leaps and bounds and exponentially: Awareness of the existence of child abuse had been awakened, so to speak. For family sexual abuse, there was such a change of consciousness in Europe in the mid-1980s (cf. Hirsch, 1987/1999); suddenly the media, the judiciary, and finally also the psychotherapeutic and psychoanalytic professionals and their organizations were able to name the true circumstances. In 1999, the *Frankfurter Rundschau* published a full-page article reporting on the numerous cases of sexual abuse of students of the well-known reform pedagogical Odenwald School by its director, as well as on the culture of abuse at this school. And the reaction of society? The article was not taken note of in any way, not by any media, not by local and national politics, not even by law enforcement agencies. In the same way, it was impossible to perceive and name the horrendous abuse conditions in the churches, especially in the Catholic Church, until 2010, when the Jesuit priest Klaus Mertes, due to the demands of those affected, could not help but initiate the disclosure of sexual abuse in the Canisius College in Berlin, thus giving the impetus for a broad public confrontation with the mass sexual abuse of wards in religious institutions. As a result, society could no longer close its eyes to the conditions in the well-known reform pedagogical school; the so-called Me Too movement can be understood as another area of this development.

And now some psychoanalytic training institutes are also drawing attention to themselves in the same way. These are by no means unaffected by social tendencies and developments. Even if sexuality is (was?) the genuine core of Freudian psychoanalysis, the topic of love in analysis (the title of the 1996 conference of the German Society for Psychoanalysis and Depth Psychology, DGPT) was rather disregarded. In the 1980s, there was an accumulation of international publications on this subject, in Germany the DGPT conference mentioned above, at which the psychoanalyst Günter Bittner wanted to explicitly legitimize sexual relationships between analyst and analysand or patient (cf. Hirsch, 1998), incidentally with exactly the same arguments that the protagonist of the present study used: the relationship of two adults was nobody's business. The conflict over this provocation led to a symposium of the DGPT in 1998, where the question of abstinence and the problem of sexualized abuse of power were thoroughly discussed. In this sense, the events at the AKJP Institute in Heidelberg were able to remain without consequences for many years, also due to the ignorance in society and specialist public that prevailed until the 1990s.

Psychoanalysis arose – not to be forgotten – from Freud's discovery of the pathogenic relevance of child sexual abuse in the family. (However, Freud abandoned this seduction theory in 1897 in favour of an – oedipal – drive psychology.) Freud developed his theories on the basis of his experiences with his female patients; he himself called the corresponding publications "Novellen" (Novellas), they were case stories whose reception in subsequent generations of psychoanalysts led to ever new theoretical ideas. The most impressive, harrowing news of sexualized, narcissistic abuse of power in analyses and psychotherapies has come to us through the accounts of those affected: Anonyma (1988), Joëlle Augerolles (1989/1990), Christa v. Petersdorff (2003), Margarete Akoluth (2004). The present volume, however, is not a case story, but rather the result of a socio-psychological investigation which, using scientific methods of social psychology and organizational dynamics, thoroughly examines the scandalous, decades-long abuse in a psychoanalytic training institute (for analytical child and adolescent psychotherapy) on the basis of a contemporary psychoanalytic understanding.

How could a perpetrator of abuse go on almost unnoticed for so long? Individual, group- and organizational dynamic factors came together. The perpetrator came from the outside as the saviour of an almost failed institute and was therefore already idolized and idealized, he uncontrollably united in his person a manifold formal and psychological abundance of power, he established a network of nepotism of dependents. Typical fears and resistances arose to recognize, name and

expose the increasingly obvious abuse, fears that were to be overcome with the help of denial, cover-up, rationalization, trivialization and forgetting; the primary goal was to preserve the reputation and ultimately the existence of the institute. We know this from abusive families, from pedagogical and religious institutions: the whole is protected, the victim sacrificed once again. The central means for this was a “functional pragmatism”, as the authors call it, which is based on an identification with the (powerful) aggressor; accordingly, empathy and identification with the victims were missing throughout, just as in the aforementioned organizations. The almost tragic pseudo-paradox is that it is precisely the denial and cover-up that can lead to the institution’s demise, i.e. that what is feared is brought about by the very behaviour that should prevent it.

Typically, the exposure of the culture of abuse in institutions causes a group-dynamic split into a part that continues to idealize the perpetrator, upholds his merits and trivializes his deeds, and another part that strives to clarify and acknowledge the reality. If an integration of these divided subgroups through (of course fierce emotional) confrontation (also through external help) does not succeed, the institute cannot survive, as was the case with the Odenwald School as well as with the Munich-based psychoanalytic institute. The fact that in the present case only a few victims were willing to participate in working through the past suggests continuing loyalties and identifications, also particular fears of losing (professional) group membership. This circumstance plays a minor role for victims of power abuse in religious and educational institutions.

Nowadays, there are ethical guidelines everywhere in psychoanalytic institutes, and professional associations, ethics committees, ombudsmen, and chambers of physicians and psychotherapists have greater awareness. However, the authors of this book rightly demand that not only formal norms of behaviour and institutions to monitor them are necessary, but in the sense of real prevention a change of consciousness in psychoanalytic and other institutions, a change of organizational and group culture is also essential. In the first place, in training, it should be natural to talk about love and dependence in training relationships, as well as about power and narcissistic and sexualized abuse of power. What can be talked about does not have to be acted out.

The evolution of social consciousness has made the commission of this study possible, and the book will in turn contribute to a further shift in consciousness.

Heiligengrabe-Jabel (Brandenburg), Germany

Mathias Hirsch

References

- Akoluth, M. (2004). *Unordnung und spätes Leid*. Königshausen & Neumann.
- Anonyma. (1988). *Verführung auf der Couch*. Kore.
- Augerolles, J. (1990). *Mein Analytiker und ich. Tagebuch einer verhängnisvollen Beziehung*. Fischer (Erstveröffentlichung 1989).
- Hirsch, M. (1998). Überlegungen zum Wesen der Analyse, zum analytischen Raum und zur Überschreitung seiner Grenzen. Eine Erwiderung auf „Liebe in der Analyse – ein Fall für den Staatsanwalt?“ von Günther Bittner. *Forum der Psychoanalyse*, 14, 312–318.
- Hirsch, M. (1999). *Realer Inzest. Psychodynamik des sexuellen Missbrauchs in der Familie* (3., überarbeitete Aufl.). Unveränd. Neuaufl. Psychosozial-Verlag (Erstveröffentlichung 1987).
- Kempe, C. H., Solveman, F. N., Steele, B. F., Droegemueller, W., Silver, H. K. (1962). The battered child syndrome. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 181, 17–24.
- Petersdorff, C. V. (2003). *Anonyma: Verführung auf der Couch. Eine Niederschrift*. Psychosozial-Verlag (Erstveröffentlichung 1988).

Preliminary Note

But nothing is probably more urgent than the application of psychoanalytic insights to one's own group as well. One may be certain that an initial dishonesty through stubborn cover-up and concealment will eventually be passed on to the following generation as a distressing legacy. (Annemarie Dührssen, 1994)

This quotation by Annemarie Dührssen refers to the National Socialist past of German psychoanalysis and some of its representatives. Nevertheless, it can be extended to the handling of the transgression of boundaries – abstinence violations – that have taken place or are taking place in the context of psychotherapy.

In the following, we discuss the boundary violations, the sexual violence, which were committed in the AKJP-Heidelberg (Institut für analytische Kinder- und Jugendpsychotherapie) (Institute for Analytical Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy) in the years from 1975 to 1993 by the medical director and chairman at that time H. M.¹ and which are casting a shadow on the institute for nearly 30 years.

When the rumors became unmistakable, when victims turned to the management of the Institute for Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy Heidelberg-Mannheim e.V. (IPP-Heidelberg-Mannheim),² when the former patient was pregnant for the second time by H. M. and was married, there were first attempts of disclosure and clarification. From then on, a disturbed institute tried again and again to unleash initiatives to clarify H. M.'s boundary violations. And again and again, the attempts reached deadlock. Some were able to hide behind a persistent secrecy of the

¹ Out of consideration for H. M.'s family, we do not mention his name in this report, but anonymize him as well as the names of all participants and interview partners.

² H. M. was also involved in various positions in the IPP-Heidelberg-Mannheim, see Sect. 1.2.

victims, others worried about the institute, so that the initiatives of enlightenment, which flared up again and again over the years, ultimately petered out and the extent of his boundary violations remained speculation.

H. M. left the AKJP-Heidelberg Institute in 1993, later also the association, but was able to continue practicing and working as an expert witness without being bothered. In 2017, H. M. was sentenced to probation for multiple sexual abuse of his granddaughter. In the context of this trial and on the occasion of an article in the *ZEIT* on the “Causa H. M.,” the general meeting of the AKJP-Heidelberg association decided to have the incidents investigated externally. With this decision, the AKJP-Heidelberg took a courageous path of working through the past. Sexual violence and sexual exploitation occur again and again in psychotherapeutic settings. However, the affected institutions very rarely dare to take the step of an external inquiry, especially without pressure from the victims, which in other contexts, such as the religious institutions, first led to projects of working through the past of sexual violence.

The now available report documents for the first time all verifiable boundary violations of H. M. during his time as medical director of the AKJP-Heidelberg and is able to release them from the aggregate condition of rumor.

This work would not have been possible without the willingness of many people to provide information, especially former and current training candidates and members of the AKJP-Heidelberg and the IPP-Heidelberg-Mannheim, the victims who managed to talk about their experiences and the contemporary witnesses, and experts who answered our questions. We would like to thank them very much. We would also like to express our gratitude for the support of the AKJP-Heidelberg, who accompanied our study in the Advisory Group, supported it, and actively helped us to find interview partners. Our respect and gratitude also go to the family of H. M., especially to his widow, who provided us with important and insightful information and documents.

Sexual violence in psychotherapy is still a topic that is scarcely discussed in public discourse. It is difficult for the victims to find contact points. Often the hurdles are so high that the already vulnerable patients shy away from reporting or legal proceedings. With this report we hope not only to clear the fog in front of the history of the AKJP-Heidelberg but also give an impulse to the social discussion about the victims of sexual violence in psychotherapeutic relationships.

Munich, Germany

Munich, Germany

Munich, Germany

Munich, Germany

March 2021

Peter Caspari

Helga Dill

Cornelia Caspari

Gerhard Hackenschmied

Contents

- 1 The Context. 1**
 - 1.1 The AKJP-Heidelberg. 1
 - 1.2 Who Was H. M.?. 3
- 2 The Study 5**
 - 2.1 How the Commissioning Came About 5
 - 2.2 Advisory Structure 6
- 3 Methodology 7**
 - 3.1 Access to the Research Field, Data Collection. 7
 - 3.2 Interleaving of Data Collection and Data Analysis 10
 - 3.2.1 Theoretical Research Framework 10
 - 3.2.2 Qualitative Interviews 12
 - 3.2.3 Hermeneutic Approach 14
 - 3.2.4 Validation of Interview Data: The Narrative Approach. 17
- 4 Descriptive Findings as a Frame of Reference. 23**
 - 4.1 Assaults, Boundary Violations, Sexual Violence: Findings on the Crimes of H. M. 23
 - 4.2 Potentials for Disclosure and Attempts of Inquiry 31
 - 4.3 Potential for Disclosure: Initiatives and Omissions in Relation to Possible Disclosures 32
 - 4.4 Attempts of Inquiry. 44

5	Conceptual Framework for the Classification of Events	51
5.1	Normality	51
5.1.1	Morally Based Normality	52
5.1.2	Criminal Normality	53
5.1.3	Health-Related Normality	54
5.1.4	Statistical Normality	56
5.2	Professional Ethics: Organizational Ethics	57
5.3	Abstinence	61
5.3.1	Narcissistic Love	66
5.3.2	The Line Between Fantasy and Realization	67
5.3.3	The Ego Limits of Female Patients	68
5.4	Sexual Violence	72
6	(Sexual) Boundary Violations in Psychotherapeutic Relationships: An Inventory	77
7	System Dynamics	89
7.1	History and Structural Integration of the Institute	92
7.2	The AKJP Institute Heidelberg as an Economically, Scientifically and Therapeutically Oriented System	94
7.3	Professional Identity/Organizational Identity	102
7.4	Power, Dependencies	109
7.5	Contexts of Abuse of Power	112
7.6	Nature of the Exercise of Power	117
7.7	Organizational Power	121
7.8	Victimizations	122
7.9	Forms of Defence	130
7.9.1	Defence of Responsibility	130
7.9.2	Forgetting, Denying, Repressing, Not Knowing, Silence	134
7.10	Groups and Conflicts	148
7.11	Exemplary Case Reconstructions	154
8	Theoretical Models: Individual and Institutional Victimization of Sexual Violence	167
8.1	Abuse System – Disclosure System – Help System	167
8.2	Latent Processes and Manifest Index Events	174
8.3	Knowledge Base in Different Systems	186
8.4	Traumatized Institutions	196

9	Background and Functioning of Structural Prevention	201
10	Recommendations	207
10.1	Internal Procedures and Structures	207
10.2	Qualification	208
10.3	External Cooperation	210
	References	213



The Context

1

1.1 The AKJP-Heidelberg

The AKJP-Heidelberg is a training institute for child and adolescent psychotherapy based on analytic and depth psychology. The institute is supported by the association “Institut für Analytische Kinder- und Jugendlichen-Psychotherapie Heidelberg e. V.” (Institute for Analytical Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy Heidelberg), which was founded in 1949. The association currently has 110 members. The Institute includes a psychotherapeutic outpatient clinic and a educational counseling center at three locations in and around Heidelberg. In addition, the Institute has been involved in research projects in cooperation with the University of Heidelberg, among others, for many years. Numerous publications are available on this subject (see AKJP, n.d.).

The AKJP-Heidelberg is a successor institution of the Institute for Psychagogy founded by Annemarie Sänger after the war, a educational counselling center with depth psychological parent counselling and child psychotherapy. At that time, child psychotherapy was still practiced by psychagogues.

The (re)introduction of psychagogy in Germany began in Berlin at the then Institute of the DPG (Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft, German Psychoanalytic Society). Harald Schultz-Hencke and Felix Böhm, among others, were instrumental in this.

Psychagogy was conceptually pragmatically oriented. “It is interesting to see that the psychoanalytic tradition of the old Berlin Institute from the 1920s was not taken up here; rather, a more practice-oriented profession oriented towards social therapy was created, the model for which was the work of the social workers at the Child Guidance Clinics in the USA and England, which are roughly comparable to

our present-day educational counselling centres” (Böhm 1952; quoted after Diepold, 1994).

Psychagogues had a basic pedagogical qualification and, building on this, completed a psychotherapeutic training with teaching analysis, theoretical specialist training and practical guidance. The training was long and demanding, yet the finished psychagogues were not allowed to treat alone. Psychagogy was rather understood as a medical assisting profession. “... the psychagogues, on the other hand, with an hourly limit of 35 h, were supposed to take care of the milder disorders, not treat them, mind you (...) Psychagogues were trained for something they were ultimately not allowed to practice.” (Diepold, 1994). Moreover, in these early years, training was entirely in the hands of adult analysts. Both the theoretical training and the teaching analysis were offered exclusively by adult analysts. In Heidelberg, the Institute for Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis Heidelberg-Mannheim (IPP-Heidelberg-Mannheim) took over this role.¹

Barbara Diepold sees in this history of origins the roots for the fact that psychagogues had to struggle with a low social prestige, which even their successor, analytical child and youth therapy, has not overcome.

In 1975 the professional title was changed: the psychagogues became analytical child and adolescent psychotherapists (cf. Diepold, p. 7).

This development led to the Institute for Psychagogy Heidelberg changing its name to the Institute for Analytical Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy. However, the dependence on medicine still remained. From 1971, the psychotherapeutic treatment of children and adolescents was recognized as a health insurance benefit under certain conditions. This meant, however, that psychoanalytically trained physicians were necessary for the management of a training institute and for practical training.

H. M. held this position in the AKJP-Heidelberg from 1975 to 1993.

¹The IPP-Heidelberg-Mannheim was founded in 1969 as a psychoanalytic training institute in the tradition of Erich Fromm, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann and Viktor v. Weizsäcker, among others. In the post-war period, the “Heidelberg School” emerged, which focused on the interfaces between psychosomatic medicine and psychoanalysis. Alexander Mitscherlich played a prominent role in this discourse. From the beginning, the IPP-Heidelberg-Mannheim saw itself as emancipatory, even subversive in its rejection of dogmatic concepts. Rather, it propagated a diversity of concepts and attitudes in psychoanalysis. (<https://ipp-heidelberg.de/ueber-uns/selbstverstaendnis/>)

1.2 Who Was H. M.?

H. M., born in Munich in 1932, studied medicine in Tübingen, Munich and Berlin and eventually became a specialist in paediatrics. In 1966 he moved from the children's clinic/child psychiatry in Kiel to Berlin. There he began psychotherapeutic training at the Institut für Psychotherapie e. V. Koserstraße (Institute for Psychotherapy) and at the same time completed the practical year in psychiatry. This was followed by a position at the AOK Institute, which was then headed by Annemarie Dührssen. In 1970 he became head of the children's department of the Institute for Psychogenic Diseases of the AOK. In 1971 he passed – together with J. S. – the exam to become a psychoanalyst.

In his unpublished memoirs, H. M. writes self-critically and probably with apologetic intent about his analytical training:

By the time of the 1971 exam – you had to have treated 6 cases – I had treated 4 child cases and only 2 adult cases. We were not told about the problems in treating adults, for example transference love and its counterpart, countertransference love especially in men treating young women. Moreover, Mrs. Dührssen transferred her pronounced narcissism to her students as well. If one was employed by her at the institute, or if she had controlled most of the treatments, she liked to overestimate the abilities of her students and then, of course, they overestimated themselves. Although as a pediatrician I had an advantage in treating children, because I already had some command of the language of children in the various age groups, it was a disadvantage for me as a psychoanalyst that I had treated only two adults under control by the time of my exams. I later became a teaching analyst in Heidelberg in 1975 without having had sufficient experience in treating adults.

In 1975 H. M. moved to Heidelberg, where he took over the direction of the Institute for Psychagogy – as successor to Annemarie Sänger and Karl Tornow. The initiative for this change came from Prof. M. P., the full professor for child psychiatry in Heidelberg.

The institute – today the Institute for Analytical Child and Adolescent Therapy Heidelberg e. V. – consisted at that time of an educational counselling center and a training institute where teachers, social workers and social pedagogues were trained to become psychagogues in 4–5 years while simultaneously working.

As described above, psychagogy was initially more of a medical assistant profession. Until 1993, the *Delegationsverfahren* – a delegation procedure – applied, according to which a doctor had to examine the children and then delegate them to the therapists for treatment. Therefore, at that time it was absolutely necessary for the Institute to have a medical director. According to the statutes, the director was

also the chairperson of the association. Thus, this position was associated with a considerable amount of power.

Furthermore, H. M. was also a member of the adult institute, the IPP-Heidelberg-Mannheim. He was a lecturer, teaching analyst and later also chairman of the training committee there.

In 1993, H. M. was dismissed from his leadership function during a general meeting of the AKJP-Heidelberg, after there had been accusations and rumours in connection with abstinence violations in the form of sexual boundary violations/sexual violence and a sexual relationship with a former patient could be proven. Due to this, H. M. had already resigned as a member of the IPP-Heidelberg-Mannheim. In 1999, H. M. terminated his membership in the AKJP-Heidelberg. Before that there were considerations to exclude him from his membership because of abstinence violations. The accusations and rumours referred to training candidates, patients as well as children and adolescents, girls and boys, who had experienced borderline violations by H. M. in the context of second sight (i.e. assessing the child in order to verify the diagnosis assigned by the training candidate) or the examinations in the context of the delegation procedure.

In 2017, H. M. was sentenced to probation for sexually abusing his granddaughter.

The case of H. M. has occupied the AKJP-Heidelberg since the 1990s again and again and in various forms. While H. M. had supporters for a long time who relativized his boundary violations and sexual violence, there were at the same time various attempts to working through them. Nevertheless, the rumors kept the upper hand, were passed down through the various generations of trainees and the facts about H. M. were not taken note of.

“Thus the case of H. M. remained like an abscess, which had encapsulated itself under the skin, was isolated there, but could break open at any time to threaten the whole organism”.² A professional confrontation, e.g. with the help of external group supervision and a systematic inquiry (with the help of external experts) was nevertheless avoided over the decades.

²From a motion to the June 1998 General Membership Meeting to the members of the Board of Directors.

2.1 How the Commissioning Came About

In connection with the trial in 2017, the case of H. M. became virulent again for the AKJP-Heidelberg. Once again, a working group of enlightened people was formed, which sought answers to the following two guiding questions: (1) “How can the H. M. period and the attempts to overcome it be told, when the history of the institute is told? (2) How can this period be integrated into the history of the Institute?”

At the general meeting of the AKJP-Heidelberg in June 2018, it was decided to scientifically work through the “Causa H. M.” or “Era H. M.”. Subsequently, the then ethics officer of the institute contacted the IPP Munich.

At a meeting on 6 September 2018 with representatives of the IPP Munich and the working group “Causa H. M.” as well as the board of AKJP-Heidelberg, the research question was specified. In April 2019, the IPP Munich started its work.

The focus of the study is the period from 1975 to 1993, i.e. the era of H. M. For a comprehensive working through of the subject of sexualised violence within the AKJP-Heidelberg, however, possible further indications of other cases of sexualised violence within the AKJP-Heidelberg should also be investigated.

The following questions guided the scientific analysis:

- What extent of sexualised violence by H.M. within the AKJP-Heidelberg can be proven?
- What structures within the Institute have encouraged this violence and hindered its detection?
- How is the handling of known and suspected cases of sexualised violence by the people in charge belonging to AKJP-Heidelberg to be assessed?

- How was H. M.'s membership in AKJP-Heidelberg terminated?
- What network structures existed within the Institute and between the analytical institutes in Heidelberg that prevented the boundary violations from being uncovered for a long time?
- What was the influence of H. M. as a training director on the development of the psychoanalytic identity of the trainees at that time?
- What were the effects of the sexual violence and the work of H. M. at the AKJP-Heidelberg on the Institute and on the psychoanalytic training at the Institute ?
- What were the effects of the sexual violence on the individual groups affected (patients [female and male children and adolescents], training candidates, teaching analysts, staff)?
- What measures have been taken so far to support victims and to prevent further sexual assaults within AKJP-Heidelberg?
- Are there any further indications of cases of sexual violence within AKJP-Heidelberg?

2.2 Advisory Structure

The research was supported by an advisory group, which included representatives of the AKJP-Heidelberg (who work there in various functions) as well as a survivor. The advisory group met four times during the research period. Significant support for the research was provided primarily by the AKJP-Heidelberg office and the ethics officers. For example, they sent the letters with the calls for interview participation to the (former) training candidates, made documentary material accessible and were available at any time for questions or temporal classifications.

The Advisory Group also played an essential role in the planning and implementation of the public calls for participation and the press events organized for this purpose.

3.1 Access to the Research Field, Data Collection

The main intention of the research working through the H. M. case is a multi-perspective reconstruction of historical facts. Multi-perspective approaches are in a position to reveal contexts of emergence and concealment in relation to institutional violence and to provide explanations as to why cases of sexualised violence in particular remained uncovered for a long time or did not lead to effective institutional reactions that would have ensured the sustainable protection of children and young people and other affected groups.

The study was designed qualitatively. Semi-structured, qualitative interviews and a file and documentary analysis formed the methodological core, supplemented by a literature review.

The file and documentary material came from various sources: On the one hand, archive material of the AKJP-Heidelberg was available to us. This was partly incomplete; for example, minutes of general meetings or letters from professional associations, which were referred to in existing sources, were missing.

On the other hand, we were able to access material that individual members or functionaries of the AKJP-Heidelberg had collected on their own initiative. This includes, among other things, memory protocols and personal records.

Another important source of data are the diaries and memoirs of H. M., which we were able to consult thanks to the permission of his widow. This made many facts from the perpetrator's perspective accessible. The diaries replace an interview with H. M. that was planned but never came about. H. M. died in March 2019.

We were able to benefit from the preparatory work carried out at the Heidelberg University Hospital, Institute for Psychosocial Prevention, when viewing this biographical material. There, H. M.'s autobiographical bequest was digitized and put into chronological order in preparation for a possible research project.

Due to research ethics and data protection, only those interview partners could be asked directly who are persons of public interest, i.e. who, for example, hold positions in the AKJP-Heidelberg that make it necessary to mention their name publicly (for example, on the homepage) or who were directly connected with commissioning the research project to the IPP Munich. This also applies to experts who are known by name through their publications or their participation in public discourse.

Other key stakeholders and contemporary witnesses were partly approached by the current functionaries of the AKJP-Heidelberg and asked to get in touch with the IPP Munich. The different cohorts of the training candidates of the AKJP-Heidelberg and the IPP-Heidelberg-Mannheim were contacted in three waves by the office of the AKJP-Heidelberg:

- Call 1a: Training candidates of the AKJP-Heidelberg (training years 1975–1995), 60 letters were sent in June 2019,
- Call 1b: Training candidates of the AKJP-Heidelberg (training years 1996–2019), 53 letters were sent in December 2019.
- Call 2: Training candidates of the IPP-Heidelberg-Mannheim (born 1975–1993), about 170 letters were sent in April 2020.

Apart from a few exceptions (scheduling problems, cancellations at short notice), all persons who had responded to the calls were interviewed. Initially, the interviews took place in person, usually in the respective practice rooms of the interviewees or in AKJP-Heidelberg. From spring 2020 onwards, the interviews were conducted by telephone or video, due to the Coronavirus pandemic.

The interviews were semi-structured and problem-centered. The explicit aim was to generate narratives from the interviewees, with corresponding follow-up questions based on the guide. On the one hand, the interviews aimed to provide material for the historical reconstruction of the events in the era of H. M. era, but also to trace the atmosphere in the institute and to give space to personal memories with all their subjective colorations. This allowed for making visible the conditions that made the events possible, as well as the contexts of concealment and disclosure (see Sect. 3.2).

The perspective of the victims is central to the scientific working through the history of sexual boundary violations/sexual violence. A special feature of the events at the AKJP-Heidelberg emerged from the very beginning that those affected were not visible there, that they did not come out publicly as affected

persons, except to the contact person at the IPP-Heidelberg-Mannheim at the time. This was initially true for the affected trainees, but also for most of the (former) patients and even more so for children and adolescents who experienced boundary violations by H. M. in the context of second sights or delegation examinations.¹

In order to be able to reach this group as well, a public call for participation was launched within the framework of a press campaign. For this purpose, two press releases were produced, one by the IPP Munich and one by the AKJP-Heidelberg. The production of the latter and the step towards the public made clear which tense dynamic the Causa H. M. still unfolds in the Institute today when it comes to positioning oneself in relation to its past. This dynamic was discussed and reflected upon in the context of an extraordinary accompanying group meeting moderated by IPP Munich.

The press campaign was ultimately successful. Two articles about the case of H. M. and the scientific inquiry appeared in the regional press:

- “Heidelberg institute wants to reveal family secret” in the *Mannheimer Morgen* on 02.06.2020 and
- “Institute works through its leader’s abuse of power after decades” in *Rhein Neckar Zeitung* on 10.06.2020.

On the basis of these articles, seven people contacted IPP Munich, including three victims.

However, there were no (former) training candidates among the victims. However, patients from the therapy with H. M. himself or from second sights or examinations in the context of the delegation procedures with him could be interviewed. These interviews finally disproved the long-held narrative that H. M. had never “abused” children or adolescents or that it was only a matter of harmless “playfulness”.

A total of 47 interviews were conducted (Table 3.1). Of these, 45 were in-depth, semi-structured interviews (duration 90–120 min); in addition, there were two short telephone interviews. Some interview partners also provided us with written material.

Under key stakeholders we subsumed those interview partners who had taken on central functions in AKJP-Heidelberg or IPP-Heidelberg-Mannheim or in the Heidelberg “scene”, e.g. as a board member, in another leading position or as a lecturer/supervisor. In this group there is a partial overlap with the group of training

¹However, until the calls for participation in the context of this study, there had been no active and systematic search for victims.

Table 3.1 Number of interviews by groups. (Own representation)

Group	Number of interviews
Training candidates	25
Experts	3
Key stakeholders	14
Victims	4
Total	46

candidates, both from the AKJP-Heidelberg and from the IPP-Heidelberg-Mannheim.

The interviews were recorded, transcribed and analysed using the MAXQDA analysis software. Data collection and data analysis are discussed in detail in the following sections.

3.2 Interleaving of Data Collection and Data Analysis

3.2.1 Theoretical Research Framework

In the context of the research project presented here, a clear differentiation must be made between two different types of results, each based on different research approaches:

1. Results that refer to the proof of facts, namely to the acts of H. M. and the events of unveiling and woking through them. These results, which are based on the study of files, protocols and H. M.'s diary and were supplemented and substantiated by evidence from the interviews, are presented as descriptive findings in Chap. 4.
2. Results that serve to understand the psychological, social and communicative processes underlying the descriptive data collected. Here, above all, the interviews conducted within the framework of the research project function as data sources.

While the results described under (1) primarily required a systematic collection, sorting, contextualizing and relating of information, the generation of the findings characterized under (2) requires a qualitative evaluation strategy, which is described