

Translated extract from

Michael Hagner
Der Hauslehrer
Die Geschichte eines Kriminalfalls
Suhrkamp Verlag
Berlin 2010
ISBN 978-3-518-42204-5

pp. 7-15 / 228-233

Michael Hagner
The Private Tutor

Translated by Rodney Livingstone

CONTENTS

A boy dies

Criminal investigation

The trial in Bayreuth

The scandal and the media

The uses and disadvantages of the humanities

Epilogue: life goes on

Postscript

Notes

Literature

A boy dies

In June 1902 Rudolf Koch, a banker, and his wife Rosalie Koch, advertised for a private tutor for their two youngest sons. Heinz Koch, who was thirteen years old, had recently been expelled from Haubinda, his boarding school in Thuringia. Joachim, his brother, who was two years younger, was not making any real progress in secondary school despite extra coaching. While their parents had no great expectations of brilliant scholastic achievements on the part of their sons, they felt disturbed and ashamed that their efforts hitherto had resulted in so little success. Their children now stood indicted of laziness, absence of motivation, idleness, unreliability and intellectual torpor.

The development of one's children looked very different to the proud, self-confident members of the German middle classes at the beginning of the new century. In banking circles, life plans were more or less fixed in advance and following a grammar school education, male descendants were meant to seek a career in business, the civil service or the military, while girls were supposed to prepare themselves for a suitable marriage. They had no prospects at all of attending a grammar school, to say nothing of a university, in order to join a more ambitious profession. The Kochs' older children had followed this path as had their parents themselves.

Rudolf Koch had been born in Brunswick in 1847 as the son of a respected Protestant public prosecutor. His career had been exemplary for Germany's swift rise to global power. He had decided against studying at a university in order to learn about banking from the bottom up. He obtained a post as manager in the Deutsche Bank in Berlin shortly after its foundation in 1870 and worked there as the right-hand man of Georg Siemens, the founder of the bank. He was promoted to the board of the bank as early as 1878. At that time he was already married to Maria Seele, who was four years younger than him, a middle-class girl also from Brunswick and she bore the ambitious banker five children before suddenly dying in 1886. A year later Koch married Maria's younger sister Rosalie, who had been born in 1854. Rosalie had become divorced from Max Schüller, the well-known Berlin professor of surgery, by whom she had a daughter.¹ The two marriages resulted in the birth of six children. When the parents decided to find a tutor for Heinz and Joachim most of their other children had already left home. Karl and Friedrich, Koch's sons from his first marriage, were both living abroad. One was serving in the army; he had a post at the German Embassy in Constantinople; the other was studying law in Oxford. The two elder daughters had made suitable marriages and lived in Wannsee and Quedlinburg, respectively. Only the youngest daughter, Therese Rosalie, was still living at home. Rosalie Koch's daughter from her first

¹ See Koerner 1910, pp. 325-328.

marriage had married Ferdinand Bugge, a municipal councillor in Steglitz, a man considerably her senior.

The Kochs were among the wealthiest and most respected families in Berlin. Rudolf Koch was an influential representative of Berlin high finance, in other words, the circles he moved in controlled the organization of the economy and the financial affairs of the German Empire. From 1901 he even acted as director and chairman of the board of the Deutsche Bank.² A brilliant career, and yet, despite over thirty years' activity in positions of central importance, little is known about Koch's personality and his role in what was even at that time Germany's most important bank. He was responsible for the internal running of the bank and the expansion of its branch network as well as for its domestic credit and savings functions. This may help to explain why he is mentioned only in passing in the histories of the Deutsche Bank.³ Apart from the setting up of Deutsche's Overseas Bank, Koch had little involvement in the international side of the bank, some of whose activities were of political significance – in stark contrast to his charismatic predecessor and patron, Georg Siemens, and his successor, Arthur von Gwinner.

Then as now, a banker's reputation among his colleagues depends on his business sense and not his talent for organization. In consequence, Koch did not stand very high in the estimation of other bankers.⁴ He stayed in the background and there was little that could be said about him apart from his great leadership and organizational skills, his clear-headed and down-to-earth intelligence, as well as his loyalty to the Deutsche Bank, which the *Berliner Börsen Courier* emphasized in articles about him on his birthday and also in his obituary.⁵ At any rate, he appears only at the margins of the relevant memoirs, biographies and autobiographies of the most prominent Berlin bankers of the day. Hermann Walich and Gwinner, colleagues of Koch's for decades, had but few words for him in their autobiographies. Carl Fürstenberg, a highly reputable banker and a partner in the Bleichröder banking house had nothing to say about him apart from a reference to the family tragedy we are concerned with in these pages.⁶

The Koch family lived in a villa in Tiergarten St, a popular address among bankers, not too far distant from the Brandenburger Tor. They spent their weekends on the Wannsee, frequently also in the Ziegenberg house, an estate belonging to the family and run by a

² Helfferich 1921, p. 229; Schmidt 1957, p. 96; Achterberg 1965, p. 115.

³ See Seidenzahl 1970; Gall inter alia 1995.

⁴ Reitmayer 1999, p. 131.

⁵ See BBC, 23. 11. 1917; BBC 24. 11. 1922; BBC 21. 3. 1923. My thanks are due to Dr. Bernd Kulla of the Historisches Institut der Deutschen Bank in Frankfurt as well as Prof. Dr. Volkhard Huth of the Institut für Personengeschichte in Bensheim for their information on these points.

⁶ See Wallich 1978; Gwinner 1975; Fürstenberg 1931, p. 211.

number of employees in Ballenstedt in the Harz Mountains.⁷ The bourgeois household maintained a strict hierarchy and division of tasks. The head of the household was fully occupied with his professional and social duties and therefore did not concern himself with the children's education. Indeed, they only rarely caught a glimpse of their father. It was the lady of the family who was responsible for the education and the transmission of such bourgeois values as culture, discipline and the carrying out of their duties and at the same time she was in charge of the organization of the household, maintained a social life, performed various representative functions and was frequently involved also in charitable activities.⁸ That was how the roles were divided up in the Koch family and we find this reflected in the reactions of the parents and in the measures that were taken when the two sons failed to develop as their parents had envisaged.

Rudolf Koch was clear in his own mind about how to deal with the problem. The difficulties created by his sons were entirely his wife's responsibility and it was her duty to propose remedies with which to improve the situation. For her part, Rosalie Koch approached the problem with a mixture of helplessness, anxiety and indignation. Searching for the causes of her sons' failure at school, she overwhelmed them both with reproaches and threatened to withdraw her affection for them if they should fail to improve quickly. That was exactly how she reacted when it became obvious that her favourite son Heinz would have to be withdrawn from Haubinda.

Haubinda, the National Boarding School in Thuringia, was one of the earliest of the new wave of progressive schools and it owed its existence to Hermann Lietz. He had founded the first boarding school of this kind in Ilsenburg in the Harz Mountains in 1898 and Heinz Koch had been a pupil there since 1900. A year later the entire school, pupils and teachers, moved into the newly established Haubinda. These boarding schools were intentionally set up at some distance from the larger cities in order to keep the boys away from the allegedly decadent temptations of the towns and to instil in them the advantages of the simple life in the spirit of Rousseau. Lietz's child-centred educational reforms sought to motivate its pupils with a combination of intellectual, artistic and physical activities, above all in agriculture, and it set out to oppose the mechanical drill characteristic of the German grammar school with its emphasis on the disciplining of mind and memory. At the same time, the cultivation of the emotional and creative faculties, together with the stress on the body and the closeness to nature were coloured by patriotic ambitions. Lietz was interested in the education of 'young Germans... strong and healthy in mind and body, able to think clearly and incisively, capable of warm feelings and eager to become brave and strong.'⁹ Moreover, these progressive educational establishments set out to train their pupils to be inquisitive and actively involved

⁷ On the property relations, see Martin 1912, pp. 474-475.

⁸ See Reitmayer 1999, pp. 236-244.

⁹ Lietz 1997, p. 45. On Haubinda see also Lietz 1935, pp. 100-120.

and they consciously rejected strict discipline and corporal punishment. Instead, they emphasized the close emotional bonds between teacher and pupil derived from Plato's idea of Eros in education and hoped to recreate something like the atmosphere of ancient Athens.¹⁰

By taking Heinz Koch as an example, we can gain some sense of the relationship between progressive intentions and everyday school routine. It was taken for granted that no one could survive in Haubinda without enthusiasm and a willingness to play an active part. That had forced the school to insist on strict criteria for admissions. Theodor Lessing was a teacher at Haubinda between 1902 and 1904 before Lietz's anti-Semitic attitudes forced him out, a fact he bitterly resented. He has left a proud and candid account of the practices in force at the time. 'Any intellectual or moral inferiority unable to satisfy the relatively high standards set by the school is ruthlessly eliminated without the slightest regard to material considerations.'¹¹ This amounts to saying that if the pupils failed to fit into the pattern of work and the way of life of the school they would be forced to leave, regardless of whether they came from rich or poor homes. That was precisely Heinz Koch's situation. Lietz thought he was amiable and good-tempered but thought little of his mental capacities and he described him as an idle, spoiled boy. His school performance was evidently inadequate but this was perhaps not the only factor in his being forced to leave Haubinda in April 1902. Given Heinz's laziness and indolence, Lietz may have had fundamental doubts about his ability to grow up into an adult notable for both modesty and inner strength of character.

We do not know whether Rosalie Koch was particularly attached to educational reform or whether she had simply hoped that having failed in a traditional school, her poorly motivated son would pass his school-leaving examination at boarding school. At any rate, this was not the first time that Heinz Koch had been compelled to leave a school prematurely. His mother did not take kindly to this new setback. She cancelled the planned Easter holiday on the Ziegenberg estate with the family and constructed a threatening scenario which would show her son just how bleak his prospects were. 'Your two worst vices are laziness and lack of seriousness; unless you take these two vices seriously and constantly work hard at remedying them, they will gradually take over your life. Your tendency to seek out pleasure and an easy life are likely to ruin you entirely.' Her announcement that 'henceforth only strict discipline will save you' was linked to an appeal to her son's conscience. 'I very much hope that by being severe with you I can rely on your good heart, for you know how much the need to punish you makes me suffer and so I hope that you will pull yourself together and will strive to do your duty as a favour to me.'¹²

Joachim, their youngest son, who was likewise the source of great worry to his parents, did make some effort to correct his behaviour. He was thought to be not just lazy

¹⁰ ,Autobiographical Sketch', p. 3.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 2.

¹² The history of the discourse about onanism has been brilliantly reconstructed. See, e.g. Lütkehaus 1992; Braun 1995; Eder 2002, pp. 91-127; Laqueur 2003.

and inattentive but also dreamy and stubborn, in contrast to his affable and outgoing brother. In addition, he had also had to have an operation on his ear which had resulted in partial deafness and required prolonged hygienic aftercare. Despite his illness, his Easter school report had been positive, as his mother hastened to inform his older brother by way of a rebuke. Joachim's appreciation of the importance of learning was said to have been fostered by the 'unyielding severity' of his coach Johannes Benser, a law student who would occasionally resort to corporal punishment. Since the liberal approach in the spirit of the educational reformers had failed to have any effect on Heinz, severity seemed to offer the only solution.

Rosalie Koch actively involved her son, whom she addressed as 'my dear Heinzchen', in her twofold sufferings – the pain caused by his vices and also by the punishments she felt compelled to inflict on him and she tried energetically to arouse his conscience. But she did not adopt this line with any consistency. Perhaps without noticing what she was doing, she would remind him of the pleasant, luxurious side of life. She reported, for example, that in Ziegenberg where she was staying there had been an 'entertaining hunt' of two wild boars that had wrought havoc in the garden and announced that she was about to spend the holidays in Italy with her stepdaughter (who was also her niece) and her husband and daughter.¹³ Heinz Koch responded to the sanctions imposed on him by writing, evidently by return of post, with a letter of lamentation that at once caused his mother to soften her attitude. He was still forbidden to join them in the family house in the Harz, but she promised to spend two days with him in Haubinda and to discuss his future with Lietz, the Headmaster.¹⁴ This was all to no avail. Heinz had to leave the school and Joachim's performance also resumed its downward curve in June.

Rosalie Koch found herself under considerable pressure at the time when she and her husband put an advertisement for a new private tutor in the Protestant *Kreuzzeitung*. Her attempts to bring about improvements in her children had failed and time was getting short. Heinz had now reached puberty and Joachim was not far behind. Their parents now put their hopes in a strict and enthusiastic teacher who would dedicate himself to his task wholeheartedly. It was not easy to find anyone who would fit the bill, even if only for a few months, for students with the right qualifications also had other things to do. The Kochs had already had one disappointment with Benser who had had some initial success but who then fell into disfavour with Rosalie Koch because he had failed in her view to take a sufficient interest in Joachim. So there was no small risk attached to employing a new student.

Andreas Dippold entered upon his new duties on 1 July 1902. At that point he had completed four semesters of law studies, two at what was then the Friedrich Wilhelm University in Berlin (the present Humboldt University) and before that, two semesters at Würzburg University. As to his origins and background, these could scarcely have been more

¹³ Salzmann 1799, p. 185.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 200 ff.

different from that of the Kochs. He was born in 1879 as one of the nine children of a Catholic farmer in the Franconian village of Drosendorf near Bamberg. Such a background was an unlikely starting point for an academic career. Initially, at least, he was supposed to acquire just as much learning as was needed for work on his father's farm. Nevertheless, in 1891 he obtained a place in the grammar school in Bamberg. When it became obvious that the world of books meant more to him than his father's fields, he began to study for a theological career and in 1896 he transferred to the episcopal seminary for boys in Bamberg, where, however, he did not stay long. Four years later, he passed his leaving examination at the grammar school in Münnerstadt. His teachers attested to his diligence, ambition and his good grasp of the subject matter so that nothing stood in the way of more advanced studies. Dippold decided in favour of studying law at Würzburg University, perhaps so as to remain relatively close to his family, even though he had really taken his leave of the world they inhabited. He was forced to finance his studies at least in part by tutoring grammar-school pupils, but notwithstanding this he found time to attend lectures on economics, religion and geology, in addition to his legal studies.¹⁵ From the autumn of 1901 he continued his studies in Berlin. He was inquisitive, took the idea of wide-ranging study, *studium generale*, seriously, was ambitious and was unclear about whether he should take his doctorate in Law and then become a journalist or whether he should take up teaching as a profession.

Dippold could demonstrate his experience as a coach and his manner was evidently persuasive at interview. He showed that he was interested in basic questions of education and that he was conversant with pedagogical classics from Rousseau to Salzman and Herbart. In short, he generally gave the impression of a man prepared to take the profession of educator with the appropriate seriousness. Nevertheless, Rosalie Koch proceeded with caution. She sought out a university professor and a businessman in Würzburg whose sons Dippold had coached and inquired into his abilities as a teacher. Only when they confirmed that he had done excellent work did she single him out from the forty applicants and offer him the post of family tutor. The family and Dippold spent the first few days of July in Berlin but Dippold soon made it clear that the metropolis contained too many opportunities for variety and distraction and these were frustrating his pedagogical efforts. Concentrated work with the boys in an atmosphere of peace and seclusion would be preferable. This suited the family since they wished anyway to spend the rest of the vacation in Ziegenberg in the Harz. The family therefore moved there at the beginning of August 1902. Rosalie Koch's hopes that she had found someone who would devote himself entirely to her sons seemed to have been granted. At the same time, she would be able in those first weeks to form her own impressions of the new tutor, his methods and the progress made by her sons.

Scarcely had Dippold familiarized himself with his new environment than he made the decision to give up his studies at the country's most important university and to devote himself entirely to his position as tutor. What could have motivated a twenty-three-year-old, ambitious law student to spend at the very least a few months on a secluded estate in the Harz

¹⁵ 'Autobiographical Sketch', pp. 11-12.

together with two spoiled and educationally backward boys? Was it not rather in his best interests to complete his studies as soon as possible and move on to establish his own future on a secure financial foundation? It was after all with this in mind that he had made his original move from Würzburg to Berlin in October 1901. In the event, he experienced a major setback after only a few months. At Christmas 1900, while he was still a student in Würzburg, Dippold had become engaged to Josepha Margarete Vorndran, the daughter of a young teacher from Mittelstreu, a village in Northern Franconia where he also worked as a tutor. He quickly established good relations with her father, Ferdinand Vorndran, and addressed him as 'Herr Papa' in letters in which he begged him to lend him money so that he could concentrate entirely on his studies. As late as February 1902, when he was already in Berlin, he wrote thanking Vorndran for the money with which to finance his studies in the approaching summer semester. But then in May Vorndran wrote to his would-be son-in-law, breaking off the engagement to his daughter. At a stroke, Dippold had lost his fiancée and his means of support, and it may have been this fact above all that induced him to respond to the Kochs' advertisement in the first place.

The momentum with which the sexologists of the early twentieth century opened up the discursive field of the young discipline for the first time was such that it was quite impossible to obtain a proper hearing for Albert Moll's sober scepticism or Magnus Hirschfeld's warning about a self-fulfilling prophecy. The case was associated with the promise to make use of science to render harmless a complicated affair that had unleashed a major scandal in society and had triggered controversies in various branches of knowledge. And yet no fundamentally new theoretical insights were needed. In this respect the case was cleared up relatively quickly. Nor was there any overwhelming reason to go beyond the information that had come into the public domain at the time of the scandal. Scientific analysis did not make the case any more complex. 'Rendering the case harmless' meant laying bare the nature of a sadistic type of person whose behaviour and motivation supplied a model for our understanding of such characteristics. An 'object lesson' was the term used for it by Erich Wulffen, who made a thorough study of the case. This exacted a certain price since the story was now tailored with increasing vigour until it finally fitted into the costume of an 'object lesson'.

Iwan Bloch had assumed the reader's familiarity with the case. Merzbach devoted just two pages to paraphrasing the story; in his account it reads like a Reader's Digest version of the various newspaper reports. Then came Wulffen. As a state prosecutor, he was of course not a sexologist in the narrower sense of the word and his two popular books on crime, *Psychologie des Verbrechers* ['The Psychology of the Criminal'] and *Der Sexualverbrecher* ['The Sex Offender'] of 1908 and 1910, are far from being models of methodological and critical reliability in their treatment of their sources. Nevertheless, they have their place here because writers such as Hirschfeld, Forel, Liszt, Näcke or Max Marcuse showered him with praise. He was credited with a profound insight into the 'criminal mind' with the result that his books are always referred to as standard works of reference in the literature on sexology.

Simply by altering the beginning and the underlying reason for Dippold's employment by the Koch family, Wulffen ends up telling a different story. He begins with the bald declaration: 'Commercial Councillor Koch had entrusted his two sons of fourteen and ten to Dippold for the duration of a journey to Italy in the spring of 1903. The employment of Dippold had been arranged by Mrs Koch.'¹⁶ That sounds as though the caring parents had just needed someone to look after their sons' education for a few weeks to allow them to undertake an extended vacation. The uninitiated reader gains the impression that Dippold had been put in charge of two highly motivated and well-brought-up children and then subjected them to a sadistic regimen of beatings. This freely invented story would of course fit better with the persona of a criminal sadist than would the essentially more complex course of events. It does away with the nuances which the court had in fact taken

¹⁶ Wulffen 1908, p. 77.

into consideration. There is no trace of the doubts that had been raised about whether this really was ‘psychologically a highly interesting case of sadism’. Wulffen’s account does in fact record page after page of the testimony of witnesses and experts as these had been reported in the newspapers in October 1903. The offender himself no longer has a voice in the proceedings; instead, he is dismissed in a brief concluding description that makes sadists out to be a species of perverts. Dippold was said to be ‘completely inaccessible, even to his parents and siblings living in the same place. As a scholar he was outstandingly competent.’¹⁷

Thus the transformation took place in two stages. In the first stage, the case became the model of a syndrome in sexual pathology (‘educator sadism’ or ‘Dippoldism’), with a definite sadistic type. In the second stage, the reverse takes place: the case is tailored to fit an ideal type. Both processes were instigated by media attention at the height of the scandal immediately following the trial and culminate in the scholarly debate, without ever resulting in a monograph worthy of mention. The transition is more or less seamless. Significantly, ‘Dippold’ is to be found both in Max Marcuse’s *Handwörterbuch der Sexualwissenschaft* [‘Handbook of Sexology’]¹⁸ (albeit not under its own headword) and also in the literature which apparently has scholarly ambitions but whose style and visual appearance seem to address the sensation-seeking reader. In the studies of corporal punishment in education of 1932 by Heinrich Wörenkamp, and Gertrude Perkauf, the tutor’s story is recounted at length and presented as the ‘standard example’. Moreover, the version given is that of Wulffen which was no longer seriously disputed by anyone.¹⁹ A condensed version of it can be found in Hirschfeld, who should have known better and in a later edition of Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia sexualis*.

Krafft-Ebing had died in December 1902, in other words, before there was such a thing as a Dippold Case. The subsequent editions of the books contain no mention of the affair to begin with, and that is easily explicable. Albert Fuchs, the first to be entrusted with a revision, made only minimal changes and in the chapter on ‘Child beaters’, he kept closely to the wording of the last edition prepared by Krafft-Ebing. The next editor, Albert Moll, doubled the size of the book, but did not regard the Dippold Case as forming part of *Psychopathia sexualis*. Only in 1937 when Alexander Hartwich, a Viennese doctor who had not hitherto made any contribution to sexology, was sufficiently inconsiderate as to produce a new edition of *Psychopathia sexualis* without even mentioning his predecessors, did the case of the tutor obtain an entry in the book – Moll lived until 1939 but as a Jew in National-Socialist Germany he had almost no outlets for publishing anything. Hartwich even considered the story ‘particularly illuminating and valuable as evidence’ of sadistic acts in

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 81.

¹⁸ Kronfeld 1926.

¹⁹ Wörenkamp/Perkauf 1932, pp. 86-89. This book also contains a repulsive photograph ‘in the possession of a train driver condemned for child abuse’ which shows a man naked to the waist caning a completely naked boy who is tied up. It bears the title ‘Dippold lives on’ (Ibid., p. 98).

which defenceless individuals are singled out for treatment as sexual objects.²⁰ The characteristics he thought especially telling as indicators of Dippoldism included: physical abuse, particularly at night; false accusations of masturbation (typical of Dippoldists because fictional accounts of onanism heighten their own lust); indecent physical contact; complete nudity during play; threatening behaviour with a knife; humiliating someone by forcing them to make false confessions about their own obscene behaviour.

The case received similar treatment from Magnus Hirschfeld who in 1903 had expressed the justified fear that the great publicity the case had aroused might encourage copycats. A quarter of a century later, in his monumental *Geschlechtskunde* [‘The Science of Sex’], he and his colleagues had to confess that Dippoldists – the pathological group of educators who derived sexual pleasure from inflicting pain on others – were much more common than was generally supposed. He then took as examples a number of cases from his own experience as a sexologist and medical expert.²¹ His last book was *Geschlechtsanomalien und Perversionen* [‘Sexual Anomalies and Perversions’] which appeared posthumously in England in 1936 and in it Hirschfeld returned to the question of Dippold, using more or less the same words as Hartwich.²² Both men had copied straight from Wulffen. Even if we credit Hartwich and Hirschfeld with calling for a comprehensive abolition of caning and even more severe punishments in cases of child abuse, this does not compensate for their superficiality and for the credulity which led them to retain Dippold in the canon of sexual pathology. As we noted in the case of the other writers we have reviewed here, neither man reported even a single piece of information that had not been contained in the press in October 1903. Since the archives were closed to them, this does not come as a surprise, but we do not need to ask fundamental questions about the way these scientists dealt with phenomena, with the existing state of knowledge and with their sources, given the failure of sexology, of educational theory, criminology and psychiatry to grapple with the blatant inconsistencies and contradictions that had been pointed out by individual commentators. Given all these difficulties would it not have been better simple to remain silent?

In this context, we should perhaps say a few words about the crucial branch of science at the time: psychoanalysis. In 1905 Freud published his *Three Essays on Sexuality*. Neither here nor in his later writings is there any mention of Dippold. It is inconceivable that the case could have escaped the attention of Freud, an avid reader of the Viennese daily papers and a keen observer of current events. He might have read about it in Löwenfeld’s *Sexualleben und Nervenleiden* [‘Sexual Life and Nervous Illness’], particularly since he had contributed his essay ‘Sexuality in the Aetiology of the Neuroses’ to that volume.²³ Other

²⁰ Krafft-Ebing 1918, pp. 94-96; Krafft-Ebing 1924, pp. 164-179; Krafft-Ebing 1937, pp. 205-206.

²¹ Hirschfeld 1926, pp. 175-178.

²² Hirschfeld n.d., p. 362.

²³ Löwenfeld 1906, p. 330. Freud’s essay appears there on pp. 242-251.

psychoanalysts have likewise either said nothing about the Dippold case in their relevant publications or merely mentioned it in passing.²⁴ Even Alfred Adler, who had found that the ‘terrors of their own childhood’ are the sadistic triggers, which explain why ‘many pedagogues can’t stop using the cane’, failed to give any examples of this.²⁵ Freud too had refrained from commenting on other prominent cases of sexual pathology, and without wishing to overstate the importance of his silence on this point, psychoanalysis should be congratulated for two reasons. First, psychoanalysis simply refused to join in the discourse about decadence, degraded psychopathologies and sexual bestiality common among both psychiatrists and sexologists. Had psychoanalysts wished to join these debates and discuss the case from their own point of view, they would have needed far more information about Dippold than was available to them or indeed anyone. Second, the scientific discourse about the private tutor was evidently influenced by facts as they percolated out through the media. That was incompatible with a proper psychoanalytical procedure. Looked at in this way, the silence of psychoanalysis may be regarded as an act of scientific prudence. Unlike the sexologists the psychoanalysts resisted the temptation to seize on such a prominent case as an opportunity to advertise their own science.

All the other disciplines treated here made their voices heard and, as we have seen, they had good reason to do so. The lawyers quarrelled with the explanation of the appropriate punishment; the educationalists about the potentially perverted nature of their educational methods; the psychiatrists about the difficulties thrown up by their system of classification, and the sexologists for the first time undertook to survey the apparently vast distance between the sex drive and cruelty. For the latter group Dippold was the *ideal sadist* because in effect he introduced a new category, that of teacher sadism, and made it the focus of debate. Thus everything hinged on the relation of sex to education, of sadism and flogging. This caused as much concern to the mandarins of science as to the journalists who wrote for the daily press. Other questions arose around this centre of gravity – child sexuality, the education of children in the family, the responsibility of fathers and mothers, the doctors’ duty of care, the biological and sociological causes of crime, prison as severe punishment or as mere incarceration. At times these questions were at the centre of attention, while at others they receded more into the background. We cannot really think of the debate as involving Foucault’s multiple discourses. It is rather a recombination because the unprecedented event and the resulting scandal changed the direction of the discourse about sexuality and upbringing. Regarded in this light, social structures appear to be plastic rather than inert. They undoubtedly help to mould modes of action, manners and the interpretations of events, but only up to a point. For, the event also contains a surplus that is conducted further and enters into systems of knowledge and institutions. That is the lesson to be drawn from the Dippold case.

²⁴ See e.g. Asnaourow 1913; Sadger 1921; Stekel (1925, p. 327) mentions the case briefly in a footnote.

²⁵ Adler 1925, p. 49.

