

This article was downloaded by: [Macquarie University]

On: 22 January 2014, At: 17:19

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Women's History Review

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rwhr20>

The continuum of sexual violence in occupied germany, 1945-49

Hsu-Ming Teo ^a

^a University of Sydney , Australia

Published online: 20 Dec 2006.

To cite this article: Hsu-Ming Teo (1996) The continuum of sexual violence in occupied germany, 1945-49, Women's History Review, 5:2, 191-218

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09612029600200111>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

The Continuum of Sexual Violence in Occupied Germany, 1945-49

HSU-MING TEO

University of Sydney, Australia

ABSTRACT This article explores male sexual violence against German women in Occupied Germany, 1945-49. Drawing upon the feminist sociological concept of a 'continuum of sexual violence', it argues that German women's experience of rape and prostitution must be seen in relation to other aspects of male sexual violence such as murder, verbal, visual and physical abuse, and sexual harassment. It seeks a historical explanation for this violence through an examination of twentieth-century Western hegemonic masculinity, arguing that National Socialist or Fascist masculinity is merely the extreme end of a right-wing, militaristic masculinity constructed around violence against and domination over women and perceived 'others' in society. Through the course of World War II this strand of masculinity became dominant and facilitated the continuation of 'war' against German women throughout the period of Occupation.

During the 1945 Battle for Berlin and in the immediate postwar period, approximately one in three Berlin women were raped by Allied troops – mostly from the Red Army – while 10,000 women in Berlin died from sexual assault.[1] Many women committed suicide after rape, some forced to do so by their fathers because of their 'dishonour'[2], while others were shot and killed by their husbands for consenting to sexual relations with Allied soldiers.[3] Many German women were verbally abused by German soldiers on the streets or in their homes for being 'Allied whores', many received threatening letters from German men, and in at least one extreme case, a German woman had her head shaved by a returning POW for consorting with Allied troops.[4] Rather than facing the threat of multiple rapes by unknown soldiers each day, many women found themselves 'protectors' who supplied them with food and other basic necessities as well as luxury items in return for sex. Even after the threat of multiple rape was over, many women – both from the petit-bourgeoisie as well as the upper middleclass – continued this form of sexual relations, especially with US and British

HSU-MING TEO

soldiers.[5] At the end of the war there were approximately 50,000 professional and semi-professional prostitutes in Berlin, but the number tripled by the end of 1946, and this did not include the huge, unquantifiable mass of amateur prostitutes and sex workers.[6] It is very clear that while the Second World War might have ended for European men on 8 May 1945, the war against German women continued long after through the period of Allied Occupation.

This article examines the war against German women in Occupied Germany, 1945-49, which took the form of rape, prostitution, murder, suicide, verbal, visual and physical abuses, and sexual harassment in the workplace and in public spaces. In the first section I address methodological concerns which affect my analysis: namely, theoretical frameworks drawn from feminist sociology which inform my account of German women's experiences of sexual violence. In particular, I explore the usefulness of the concept of a continuum of sexual violence. The next section deals with concrete examples of sexual violence while the third section examines the way in which the sociological concept of 'hegemonic masculinity' may help to explain the extent of this violence. In the concluding section I discuss briefly the relevance of my research for German history.

I

Undoubtedly one of the main difficulties in dealing with the subject of the rape and prostitution of women in Occupied Germany is the problem of how this topic should be analysed. Traditional historians separate rape and prostitution, perceiving the former as an act of sexual violence forced upon women, whereas prostitution is perceived as a choice – albeit a constrained one – deliberately made by women for “food and luxury items”.^[7] Feminist historians such as Ute Frevert and other social historians sympathetic to the plight of German women, such as Douglas Botting, also separate the categories of rape and prostitution. However, Frevert and Botting locate the cause of women's prostitution not in a desire for luxury items such as nylons and chocolates, but in dire socio-economic circumstances whereby they – and often their families – were on the brink of starvation.^[8]

In my view there is overwhelming evidence to support Frevert's and Botting's position; nevertheless I do not believe that a historical analysis of German women's experiences during Occupation should treat rape and prostitution as separate categories. Recent feminist theorisation of male violence attempts to construct a framework of analysis which encompasses the various forms of male violence linked to continuing struggles by (mainly white) men to maintain their position as the dominant group over women (and other ethnic groups) in society.^[9] Rather than separating categories of violence against women, contemporary feminist theories of male sexual violence connect all crimes against women, viewing them along a continuum,

SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

and parallels are made between the sexual abuse/exploitation of women and sexual harassment of women in the workplace. As Anne Edwards observes: "In both situations men are able to use their superior power position to treat women as objects, and primarily as sex objects, rather than as human beings".[10] While acknowledging that sexual violence is used as a means of control over women, contemporary feminist scholarship escapes accusations of ahistoricity and biological essentialism since male violence is recognised as being "a socially-produced and often socially-legitimated cultural phenomenon" rather than being the result of biological drives inherent in men.[11]

The concept of a continuum of sexual violence is useful for a study of German women's experiences in Zero Hour for the following reasons. Firstly, it can be used to conceptualise German women's sexual experiences, ranging from "consensual sex (equally desired by woman and man), to altruistic sex (women do it because they feel sorry for the man or guilty about saying no), to compliant sex (the consequences of not doing it are worse than the consequences of doing it), to rape".[12] The continuum of male sexual violence is also useful in examining the ways in which men interpret their own behaviour, ranging from those who acknowledge their sex act as rape and those who attempt to avoid viewing it as rape.[13] In Occupied Germany there were soldiers who tried to turn their acts of rape into prostitution on the part of women whereby, according to the notions of traditional historians, sexual relations are consensual. However, it is a mistake to assume that all sexual intercourse which is not defined as rape is therefore consensual. The boundary between rape and prostitution was often blurred because many women turned to prostitution to avoid rape. Furthermore, an exploration of women's alternatives to prostitution reveals that much of the type of work available to women during Occupation often involved systematic sexual harassment and the reduction of women's bodies to sexual objects to feed male fantasies. The notion of a continuum enables fluid movement between otherwise rigid categories of analysis. This model also allows the range of sexual violence to be extended to include forms of behaviour such as sexual harassment, which is often laughed off by men as 'jokes' or 'a bit of fun', but which women often find threatening.[14] It was only within a structure of male sexual violence that soldiers at the time could have made the frequently heard sexual proposition, 'May I offer you a little abuse?' and have perceived it as a very funny joke.[15]

It may be objected that such a model treats women as victims. Certainly the utility of the notion of a continuum of sexual violence also needs to be considered in relation to questions of agency and victimisation. Such issues have been particularly debated by feminist historians of Nazi Germany who have discussed the extent to which German women who lived through the Third Reich could be viewed as 'perpetrators' or 'victims' of Nazism, and who have insisted on the necessity for German women to

HSU-MING TEO

confront their roles in the Nazi state; in the last few years this debate has focused especially on Claudia Koonz's *Mothers in the Fatherland: women, the family and Nazi politics*[16] and Gisela Bock's vituperative reaction to Koonz's analysis in *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*. [17] It is evident that German women were not merely victims but did exert agency in that they made attempts to resist or avoid rape, collectively overcame their trauma by mutual support, and utilised their relations with Allied men to ensure that they and their families survived. However, there is no doubt that they were also victims in a very real way, and that their agency was severely constrained during this period by the structures of Allied military occupation, increasing loss of economic independence, and the ever-present threat of male sexual violence. In such circumstances it is difficult to see how increased sexual activity among young women constitutes sexual emancipation, as Annemarie Tröger argues.[18] It is equally difficult to see how German women could have had the same freedom to exercise agency during Occupation as before Germany's defeat. Arguments for women's agency must never blur the fact that German women *were* victims of male sexual violence during World War II and the Occupation. To argue otherwise sets very problematic precedents for women of other countries (such as those in the former Yugoslavia during the last few years, especially in 1992-94) who experience male sexual violence in war.

Finally, some mention must be made about the nature of the sources upon which I have drawn. In the initial period after the mass rapes, women freely exchanged their own stories of rape and, in the process of doing so, collectively overcame the trauma and horror of their experiences.[19] After the first few months of occupation, rape stories became scarcer, probably for three major reasons. Firstly, women's concerns were directed towards physical survival in the context of the food, clothing, and coal shortages in the aftermath of defeat. Secondly, German men and Allied soldiers had no wish to hear of German women's rape experiences. Thirdly, official sources are unsatisfactory because of the arbitrary nature with which rape was dealt with as a crime. In the Soviet zone, for example, accusations of rape were sometimes laughed off, and sometimes offenders were shot on the spot.[20] Official statistics of these rapes are therefore difficult to come by, although Atina Grossman managed to obtain the rough estimates quoted at the beginning of this paper by looking at affidavits of women seeking abortions because they had become pregnant through rape.[21]

By the early 1950s, however, German women's stories of Russian rape began to circulate again and were this time given a more positive reception by publishers in England and the USA. In the context of the Cold War, stories of Russian atrocities against German women made good propaganda. These stories began to appear not only in women's diaries and autobiographies but also in German and Allied men's texts, and by the 1960s Cornelius Ryan and Eric Kuby had begun collecting oral histories of German

SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

women's rape experiences.[22] These sources can be problematic because published accounts were deeply imbricated in Cold War politics from the start, constructing German women as victims of communist Russian violence, and enabling German women to view themselves as perpetual victims – first of National Socialism, then of the war, of mass Russian rape, and of defeat and the ensuing material shortages.[23] The 1970s and 1980s saw a considerable growth in published autobiographies of German women, and these made it clear that sexual violence was perpetrated not only by the Soviets but also by French, British, and American soldiers; rape and prostitution were constructed as part of women's general experience of war. These are the sources upon which I have drawn for this paper, and taken together they give a comprehensive picture of German women's experiences of Allied occupation.

II

Even before the Red Army crossed the border into East Prussia, discourses of male sexual violence against women were employed as propaganda to terrify the German civilian population and to incite greater sacrifice on the parts of both civilians and soldiers. As the Red Army fought its way across Eastern Europe in 1945 and approached eastern Germany, frightening stories of Soviet brutality, murder, looting and rape became commonplace.[24] Thus when the Soviets crossed the border into East Prussia hordes of panicking refugees streamed westwards. For those who remained, the stories of Soviet violence were soon confirmed.

Renate Hoffman was the wife of a German Luftwaffe officer who was living at Greifswald Air Base near Peenemünde. When the Soviets came in March 1945 she decided to head for Greifswald with a female friend and their children. When they passed a house on the way:

Suddenly three Russian soldiers ... pointed their guns at us and forced us into the house. We realised right away that we had walked into a trap. And we knew what they had in store for us.

We were separated. They put guns to our heads. Any attempt to defend ourselves meant certain death. The only thing you could do was to pretend you were a rock or dead. I don't want to talk about what happened next ...[25]

After raping her and her friend the three Soviet soldiers left the house and the women managed to make their way to Greifswald. To her knowledge four out of every 10 women in Greifswald had been raped, including women over 50 years old.[26]

Because the rape of German women initially occurred in conditions of battle, sexual relations and male sexual excitement came to be connected intimately with death and violence. As a well-known drill sergeant's ditty put it:

HSU-MING TEO

This is my rifle, this is my gun
This is for business, this is for fun.

However, the reasons why these men forced women to have sex at gun point go beyond simplistic explanations of sexual release after the tension of battle. Nancy Hartsock believes that to the extent that a society's image of sexual relations is governed by a dynamic of dominance/submission, other societal structures will also follow the same pattern. She identifies at least two possible modes of sexuality: hostility and domination versus intimacy and physical pleasure.[27] In Western culture sexuality has been socially constructed so that, "putting aside the obvious effects that result from direct stimulation of erotic bodily parts, it is hostility - the desire, overt or hidden, to harm another person - that generates sexual excitement".[28]

Sexual excitement in Western society has also been constructed on the fetishisation, dehumanisation and objectification of the sexual object, which is "stripped of its humanity; the focus is on breasts, buttocks, legs, and penises, not on faces".[29] This fetishisation and reduction of women to their female genitalia is obvious in the following account by Hans von Lehndorff, a senior surgeon in a Königsberg hospital. Königsberg fell to the Red Army on 9 April 1945. On entering the hospital Soviet soldiers immediately began looting the premises, destroying many valuable drugs and much equipment. Attempts to complain to Soviet officers were unavailing. Von Lehndorff wrote that to the Soviets, he was "only a tall stand with pockets, they see me only from the shoulders downward"[30], and his account makes it clear that far from stopping their men, Soviet officers condoned the rape of German women. The following acts of intercourse with nurses reinforced their dehumanisation and reduction to receptacles for penises:

A couple of nurses who got in their way were seized and outraged from behind, and then released again, thoroughly dishevelled, before they realized what was happening. The older ones could hardly believe their senses, they went wandering aimlessly about the corridors. There was nowhere to hide, and fresh tormentors kept falling on them.[31]

Further evidence of the role that the fetishisation of women's genitalia played in male sexual violence is the fact that the age or physical condition of the victim apparently did not matter to Soviet soldiers. Von Lehndorff reported that "Eighty-year-old women were no safer than unconscious ones. (At one time a patient of mine with head injuries ... had been raped over and over again without knowing anything about it)".[32] The women raped were not necessarily German either.

Although many stories of Soviet atrocities reached Berlin there was a tendency to view such rumours as Nazi propaganda, which to a certain extent they were.[33] Sometimes the behaviour of the Red Army on first arriving in a neighbourhood was unexceptionable, lulling women into a false

SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

sense of security.[34] Therefore, despite the ample warnings that Berlin women had received in news broadcasts and from east German refugees, they were unprepared for the sexual assaults of the Red Army. Atina Grossmann places the occurrences of most of the rapes between 24 April and 5 May 1945, while Erich Kuby agrees that about 80% of all the rapes in Berlin occurred between 24 April and 3 May.[35]

The anonymous author of *A Woman in Berlin* (hereafter referred to as A.) recorded that in her sector of Berlin the rapes began on the evening of Friday 27 April. Because she understood Russian, A. was thrust into a conspicuous position as the interpreter/mediator between the Germans and the Soviets. She was given the task of asking a Soviet officer for protection – which he gave reluctantly – when two soldiers attempted to rape one of the women in the cellar where she and others from her apartment block were hiding:

Several times I heard the expression: ‘*Ukas Stalina*’ – by the order of Stalin. This order seems to mean that ‘these things’ must not happen. Needless to say they happen just the same, as the officer tries to convey to me with a shrug of his shoulders. One of the two reprimanded men contradicts. His face is distorted with anger: ‘So what? What did the Germans do with our women? My own sister,’ he yells, ‘they ...’ And so on. I don’t understand the words, but the meaning.[36]

This exchange demonstrates that vengeance was an excuse given by Soviet soldiers for the rapes. Women were to discover repeatedly that they were being punished for German men’s crimes in the USSR. On 5 May A. visited Frau Lehrmann and Fräulein Behn, who were entertaining Russians. A 17 year-old Russian asked A. to translate “a story about how, in his native village, German soldiers had stabbed some children and seized others by their feet, smashing their skulls against a wall. Before translating this I ask him: ‘Did you hear this or see it yourself?’ He, grimly, to himself, ‘Saw it myself – twice’”.[37]

Frau Lehrmann could not believe that “our men” and “my husband” could do such things, but A. and others already considered their rapes as part of the ‘bill’. In the water queues women were already saying, “Well, I don’t suppose our men behaved much better over there”.[38] In fact, A. told C. W. Ceram, who wrote the introduction to *A Woman in Berlin*: “None of the victims will be able to wear their suffering like a crown of thorns. I for one am convinced that what happened to me balanced an account”.[39] Ceram admired her for her implacable sense of justice amidst the inhumanity of the Second World War and the occupation of Germany, but it was a justice in which German women were punished for the crimes of German men.

A.’s attitude was remarkable in light of the fact that although she often went out of her way to prevent the rape of other women, her ‘cellar family’ gave her no support at all. During the first evening when A. was raped, she

HSU-MING TEO

screamed for help but all she heard was the cellar door closing “with a soft thud” as her ‘cellar family’ locked her outside with her two rapists.[40] The Soviet Commandant’s response was to scoff at her. “That hasn’t done you any harm. Our men are all healthy”.[41]

In her diary A. also recorded what her friends had undergone between 27 April, when the Russians first entered her neighbourhood, and 8 May, when they left. A widow was raped twice: once by an adolescent boy and later by a Ukrainian who threatened A. and the widow’s lodger, Herr Pauli, with violence unless the widow had sex with him. The janitor’s daughter was raped by “two rowdy, dead-drunk Ivans”. A distiller told A. how Soviet troops had depleted his alcohol supplies at his factory, then found him and two female employees hiding. The narrative was then taken over by his wife because, like so many other German men, the distiller left the room at this time, unable to continue with the account of rape:

‘They queued up,’ whispers his wife, while Elvira just sits there speechless. ‘They waited for one another to finish’ She thinks there were at least twenty, but of this she isn’t sure

I stare at Elvira. Her swollen tongue hangs from her deathly pale face like a blue plum. ‘Just let them see’, says the distiller’s wife. And without a word Elvira unbuttons her blouse, opens her chemise, and reveals breasts covered with bruises and the marks of teeth At the memory of it I feel like retching again and again and can hardly write. We left her the rest of the vaseline. There’s nothing one can say – and we didn’t try. But she herself started talking. We could hardly understand a word, her lips are so swollen. ‘I prayed all the time,’ she muttered. ‘I prayed: Dear God, I thank You for making me drunk ...’ For even before queuing up as well as after, the Ivans had forced liquor down the women’s throat.[42]

Although Ruth Andreas-Friedrich was not herself raped due to the intervention of ‘Andrik’, a fellow ‘Uncle Emil’ resistance fighter and senior conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra[43], she knew many women who had been raped. Her daughter’s friend and classmate, Hannelore Thiele, was raped consecutively by seven Soviets. Inge Zaun, who lived in Lein-Machnow, was raped “over and over again, sixty times”. She explains:

‘How can you defend yourself?’ she says impassively, almost indifferently. ‘When they pound at the door and fire their guns senselessly. Each night new ones, each night others. The first time when they took me and forced my father to watch, I thought I would die Since their captain has taken me as his mistress, it is fortunately only one. He listens to me too and helps make sure they leave the girls [her sisters] alone.’[44]

Julianne Hartmann was 19 years old in 1945 and she was the first girl raped on her street when the Russians entered her neighbourhood on 14 April. A

SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

Russian forced her at gunpoint into one of her bedrooms in her house and raped her there. The only thing she had been told was 'Don't try to defend yourself', because her family and friends had already heard horror stories about the Red Army. The experience was especially terrifying for her because as "an upper middle-class child, I had never been told about the facts of life".[45]

After 3 May 1945 there were fewer rapes in Berlin. Most measures taken to prevent rapes were initiated by women.[46] In one case a woman doctor hid young girls in an air-raid shelter hospital which she pretended contained typhoid cases.[47] Women who hid in the upper storeys of big apartment blocks were generally safer because Soviet soldiers seldom ventured up the stairs of Berlin's 'skyscrapers'.[48] A's friend Gisela escaped by painting wrinkles on her face and covering her hair with a scarf. In A's neighbourhood young girls became scarcer after 30 April because "the hours at which Russians go on their hunt for women are now generally known" so the girls were locked into "safe" flats and hidden away.[49]

One of the worst consequences of the mass rapes in Berlin was suicide. To place suicide within the continuum of male violence is certainly problematic because many women undoubtedly chose of their own will to commit suicide. However, it cannot be denied that in many cases German men were partly responsible for the deaths of many women. The unpublished diary of 'Frau K.' records that on the night of 28 April 1945, "a couple was found dead in their beds. He had shot her before putting a bullet into himself". Upon burial, the sexton reported that "they were the seventeenth and eighteenth suicides since the place was first occupied".[50] Andreas-Friedrich notes that after 6 May, when the Soviets entered her neighbourhood, German men were lamenting the rape of their daughters and wives:

Suicide is in the air

'Honor lost, all lost', a bewildered father says and hands a rope to his daughter who has been raped twelve times. Obediently she goes and hangs herself from the nearest window sash.

'If you get raped nothing is left to you but death,' a teacher declares to a class of girls two days before the final collapse. More than half the students came to the anticipated conclusion, as expected of them, and drowned themselves and their lost honor in the nearest body of water. Honor lost, all lost. Poison or bullet, rope or knife. They are killing themselves by the hundreds.[51]

For the majority of women, however, survival was the main priority. Many opted to prostitute themselves in order to stay alive. The boundary between rape and prostitution in the immediate postwar period was extremely fluid, and the relation between the two can be better understood when viewed along a continuum of male sexual violence, where 'altruistic' sex, compliant

HSU-MING TEO

sex, and possibly consensual sex shaded into each other, and into the very palpable threat of rape during the Occupation.

For A. there was no doubt that she was deliberately prostituting herself, but any sense of agency she might have experienced was countered by the fact that her only choices were either rape or prostitution, and she saw herself as a victim of “all men and their male desires”.[52] She first entered into a regular sexual relationship with a Soviet captain in order to avoid multiple rapes by other Soviet soldiers. Anatole provided A. with food as well as protecting her. When he was transferred, she was given to a Soviet major. Her sense of ‘agency’ was further constrained by the fact that she was treated as a piece of property – merely a female body – to be handed on from one male officer to another. In her relationship with the major, A.’s situation changed not only to prostitution but also from what we might call ‘compliant sex’ to ‘altruistic sex’ (see the above definitions) since she also felt sorry for the disability he suffered as a result of the war. Although this relationship was complicated by her genuine liking and respect for him, and by the fact that she had turned to him for comfort at their first meeting, allowing herself to cry for the first time since the rapes, I have chosen not to categorise this as consensual sex since A. makes it perfectly clear that, given the choice, she would have preferred not to have sex with any man during that period of time.

German complicity in the continuum of sexual violence against women is demonstrated by the fact that the widow and Herr Pauli placed pressure on A. to continue in prostitution. After the major was transferred out of Berlin, Herr Pauli showed his antagonism towards A., grudging her the space she took up in the widow’s apartment (her own had been bombed) and the food she was consuming, although much of it had been provided by the major in payment for her sexual services. His attitude towards A. changed when she met a potential ‘client’, Nikolai. Even the widow advised A. not to “let that one get away” on the pretence that they would at last have “an educated man from a good family, someone we can talk to!” A. was not deceived:

In her mind’s eye the widow is already seeing the supplies rolling in; she’s convinced that Nikolai has access to food stores, that he’ll do something for me and indirectly for the three of us. I’m not so keen I’m not in the mood for one more man, I still enjoy lying alone between clean sheets.[53]

A.’s acute awareness of her body as an object for barter was emphasised by the fact that as long as Nikolai appeared to be a potential customer, she was allowed to share the group’s food without objections from Herr Pauli, but “since Nikolai ... dissolved into thin air and there’s no new provider on the horizon, my stock has sunk very low”.[54] Once A.’s sexual use as a woman was over, Herr Pauli forced the widow to evict A., although he knew that as

a single, unemployed woman she would draw the 'Death Card' for food rations.

A. was atypical of most Berlin women because throughout her prostitution she was constantly aware of her degradation and humiliation. Unlike other women she did not seem to possess mechanisms - such as cloaking her activities in 'romance' - which helped her to cope with prostitution. It was necessary at the time and she benefited by it, nevertheless:

It goes against my nature, offends my self-respect, undermines my pride. What's more, it shatters me physically ... I'll get out of this 'profession' ... with the greatest relief as soon as I can provide for myself in a manner more pleasurable and more fitting to my pride.[55]

However, alternative work to prostitution was hard to come by, especially in the western zones. The situation in occupied Berlin was such that "Baronesses thought themselves lucky to get jobs as waitresses, company directors as lavatory assistants, colonels as gardeners or waiters".[56] Moreover, the jobs which single women could get often entailed some form of sexual exploitation or harassment - further aspects of the continuum of male sexual violence.

Marianne MacKinnon managed to get work as an interpreter, but she was viewed as a potential prostitute by the Allied officers who employed her. When Americans took over her office, the first question asked about her was: "Do you think she's an easy lay?"[57] When the Soviets moved into Tangermünde, the sexually aggressive behaviour of the officers made it clear that they expected to inherit Marianne's sexual services along with the office in which they worked.[58] When she worked as an English-speaking switchboard operator in an officers' leave centre, the English manager tried to coerce her into having sex with him. When she refused, her employment was terminated and "No reason for my dismissal was given".[59]

Other German women who were unskilled and who did not wish to engage in prostitution nevertheless found that the only jobs available to them again involved the degrading use of their bodies as sexual objects for the male gaze. Drawing on his experiences as a US officer in occupied Berlin, James McGovern described the limited work opportunities for middle-class German women in his novel *Fräulein*, where lack of alternative employment forced the heroine Erika to work as a mud-wrestler, striptease and nude dancer in the numerous nightclubs and cabaret-shows which sprang up in occupied Berlin.[60]

Considering that so many of the occupations available to German women in the immediate postwar period involved the fetishisation of their bodies in explicitly sexual terms anyway, the fact that many women chose to engage directly in prostitution is not surprising. Many women coped with prostitution and made it more palatable by dressing their sexual relations in an aura of romance, and many hoped to escape the conditions of defeated

HSU-MING TEO

and occupied Germany through marriage to an American or British soldier.[61] Fiction from the Occupation period contains many references to German women's desire to reach the 'Golden West' through marriage.[62]

To what extent were some of these sexual relations consensual? Certainly in the first few weeks after Germany's defeat it is difficult to see how sexual relations could be termed consensual when the actuality or memory of mass rapes were ever-present. Later, as social relations stabilised, the possibility of consensual sex emerged, but not without its difficulties. On the one hand, within the framework of extreme inequality in power relations and the threat of rape during Occupation the notion of consensual sex is problematic, to say the least. Gender relations during the Occupation served to throw into glaring relief the power inequalities in heterosexual relations in 'normal' society. On the other hand, if consensual sex is simply defined as sexual relations 'equally desired by woman and man', then women *did* choose to enter into consensual sexual relations with Allied men based on mutual liking, need, desire, and the romance of escape. Can these women then be called prostitutes, and if so, how does the historian categorise these women – as professional, semi-professional, or amateur prostitutes? Allied Military Government (AMG) rules often defined non-AMG women as prostitutes if they were caught with Allied personnel, but it is virtually impossible to quantify these categories which shade into one another. Again I find the idea of a continuum useful here because it takes into account the complexities involved in any kind of sexual relation and allows for the notion that even an ongoing consensual sexual relation may sometimes have elements of altruistic and compliant sex, and conversely, what sometimes begins as altruistic sex may evolve into consensual sex.

One thing, however, was certain. Women who fraternised with Allied men were caught in a double bind. They were often the ones who most desperately needed the food and other essential supplies such as coal and clothing which could be gained by sex, but they were also the ones who most wanted to escape Germany through marriage to an Allied soldier. These women were least likely to succeed because the double standards of Western hegemonic masculinity still branded them as 'prostitutes' and therefore unfit for marriage, and many of the soldiers were married anyway. A married English private recalled his affair with an 18 year-old German girl:

I felt a bit sick at times about the power I had over that girl. If I gave her a three-penny bar of chocolate she nearly went crazy. She was just like my slave. She darned my socks and mended things for me. There was no question of marriage. She knew that was not possible.[63]

III

Thus far, I have examined evidence of the continuum of male sexual violence from rape to compliant, altruistic and consensual sex, and sexual harassment

SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

in Occupied Germany. What I have not done is to analyse in detail *why* this outbreak of male sexual violence occurred in the aftermath of the Second World War. Male observers at the time, such as William Shirer, and traditional masculinist historians writing in the 1960s, such as John Gimbel, Ralph Willet, or Harold Zink, have never addressed this question, merely assuming that such behaviour is a regrettable but inevitable concomitance of war. Susan Brownmiller similarly offers an ahistorical explanation for the mass rapes:

War provides men with the perfect psychologic backdrop to give vent to their contempt for women. The very maleness of the military – the brute power of weaponry exclusive to their hands, the spiritual bonding of men at arms, the manly discipline of orders given and orders obeyed, the simple logic of the hierarchical command – confirms for men what they have long suspected, that women are peripheral, irrelevant to the world that counts, passive spectators to the action in the centre ring.[64]

I find this radical feminist analysis of an innate male hatred for women unconvincing, but Brownmiller's observation is useful if we take the mental and emotional attitudes she describes to be specific to the dominant or hegemonic masculinity of postwar Europe. Only if we recognise the specific nature of this particular image of Western masculinity can we begin to understand the continuum of male sexual violence and its relation to other socio-economic and political structures in society.

Bob Connell observes that 'masculinity' is not a homogeneous phenomenon. In any society at a particular moment, there are different, competing forms of masculinity, some of which are hegemonic, others subordinated or marginalised.[65] Hegemonic masculinity is a particular model of masculinity which gains dominance in a particular society because the majority of men benefit from it, since "hegemonic masculinity is centrally connected with the institutionalisation of men's dominance over women".[66] This is the case even though the actual lives and identities of most men do not correspond to the image of hegemonic masculinity.

Hegemonic masculinity is continuously constructed against other forms of masculinities by the prevalent economic, political and gender relations in society.[67] Although aspects of the hegemonic image shift, Western culture has long associated hegemonic masculinity with the "murderous hero" – the aggressive male whose use of violence to achieve "good" goals is viewed positively.[68] Theodore Roszak points out that twentieth-century Western masculine culture glorifies violence and "toughness" in:

the cult of the bullfight and prize ring, of battlefield heroics and barroom brawling and good red wine. At a more vulgar level, it flourishes in the sadistic fantasies of Mickey Spillane and Ian Fleming –

HSU-MING TEO

but especially in myriad he-man pulps where endless fascination with the atrocities of war and Nazism prevails.[69]

Of course, the latter part of Roszak's observation applies to postwar Western culture. But when and how did this development in hegemonic masculinity occur? One of the sources of twentieth-century hegemonic masculinity is indubitably the legacy of European imperialism in the nineteenth century and European men's presumption of their right of sexual access to non-European and working-class women.[70] Another significant source stems from fascist masculinity of the 1920s and 1930s, described by Klaus Theweleit in *Male Fantasies*. Theweleit explores the images of masculinity glorified and propagated by the *Freikorps*, who viewed working-class women (virtually synonymous with 'communist' and 'promiscuous') as aggressive 'castrating' whores who must be violently destroyed before they emasculated men. The *Freikorps* were misogynistic; deeply hostile to and contemptuous of women who did not conform to the rigidly defined 'good woman' images of 'mother' and 'sister'.[71] This model was not only available to fascist men; it was and is a model consistently propagated by right-wing, military masculinity.

Jessica Benjamin points out that masculine identity can often only be achieved through differentiation, since those with whom men identify or to whom they relate do not provide adequate 'otherness' against which their individual selves can be defined. This is potentially problematic in masculine erotic relations because:

In order to prove his own existence, the erotic master must dominate the other, and this must be the unwilling domination that physical violence expresses, in which the other, subject-to-become-object, is dragged, kicking and screaming, into domination. This is most often borne out heterosexually as the 'male-master', 'female-victim' system, within pornographic literature and materials.[72]

These patterns of masculine erotics are evident especially in war, where the structure of military life denies individual men affirmation of their personal identities (armies want 'soldiers', not individuals), while simultaneously, homosocial bondings in the military "operate largely by exclusion or permit great cruelty to those who lie outside the borders of the group".[73] In the case of Western society, a historically-specific strand of fascist or right-wing, military masculinity became hegemonic during the six years of the Second World War, and the onset of the Cold War at the end of the 1940s – with its attendant social angst and continual state of military awareness – merely strengthened its hegemonic position.

When we examine pulp fiction written by Western men during the Occupation and in the Cold War era, the similarities between twentieth-century 'heroes' and *Freikorps* 'heroes' become clear. Over the course of the twentieth-century, hegemonic masculinity has become fiercely

SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

heterosexual, associated with a violent response to perceived threat – whether this comes from women, other races, homosexuals, or any groups of the ‘other’ – and based, to a large extent, on (violent/sexual) power over women.

During and after the Second World War, there was a widespread belief among female literary writers that women were being victimised by men on their own side. Susan Gubar notes that throughout the 1940s many English and American women writers such as Dorothy Parker, Kay Boyle, and Carson McCullers wrote about:

the vulnerability of war brides, women war workers, and female civilians who are threatened less by the enemy than by their so-called defenders, while Elizabeth Bowen composed several works about heroines who fear that ... '[t]he First War had opened a few doors but ... the Second slammed many of them shut again.' [74]

This belief was borne out in reality by the number of pornographic pictures of women warriors and war workers in barracks, the ‘joking’ male translation of WAAF (Woman’s Auxiliary Air Force) as ‘Women All Fuck’, and by the number of dangerous ‘practical jokes’ played on WASP airplanes.[75] Clearly, male sexual violence was directed against women who had availed themselves of the limited opportunities achieved by first-wave feminism, thus making the public sphere a threatening place for women. On the other hand, women who remained in traditional docile roles which were non-threatening to men’s position were rewarded with marriage – both in reality and in the pulp fiction of the time. The perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity was motivated by men’s need to keep women out of the economic and political spheres, and to reassert separate spheres and domestic ideology, whereby women attended solely to their husbands’ comfort at home. This is evident in Occupation novels by American GIs, such as Hans Habe’s *Aftermath*, or in articles in American periodicals.

Victor Dallaire, a former correspondent of the US Army newspaper *The Stars and Stripes*, wrote an article for the *New York Times Magazine* in 1946, attacking American women.[76] According to Dallaire, it took only some WACs (Women’s Army Corps) and a few days back in the USA to convince him of European women’s superiority to American women. His idealised image of European femininity complemented the hegemonic masculinity in which he had a vested interest, whereas American women’s assertiveness was clearly threatening to him:

Some of us used to sit in a cabaret in the Rue Washington of Paris last summer and compare the French girls and the American WACs who visited the place. The American girls would insist on a loud and full share of the conversation with their escorts while the French girls would let the men do most of the talking, adding only a word or two now and then to show their interest. Or they would go into the

HSU-MING TEO

appreciative peals of laughter at the right moment. The over-all impression we gathered was that the Americans looked on their boyfriends as competitors while the Parisiennes seemed to be there for the sole purpose of being pleasant to the men.[77]

Western hegemonic masculinity is characterised by domination over and competition against perceived 'others', including women. The Other could be tolerated as long as she remains in subjection, inferior and on the periphery of male spaces. However, even tentative steps towards equality provoked hostile masculine reactions and resentment against women as 'competitors'.

The language used by men – both Allied and German – during this time is extremely revealing of the aggressive ideal of masculinity and the chauvinistic attitudes towards women, and it explains how women's *bodies* were viewed as booty won in combat, the 'just' reward for men who had risked their own bodies in war. In fictional and non-fictional texts written by men during this period, linguistic references to men, specifically soldiers, are positive and emphasise qualities such as machismo, heroism, and glorified aggression – for example, Alexander Solzhenitsyn's use of the words "warrior" and "honest, openhearted soldiers" to describe three Soviet rapists.[78] However, linguistic references to women are generally derogatory, reducing them to the level of sexual objects who were the property of some man. Thus, in Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago*, Polish women could be "chased naked around the garden and slapped on the behind" as an amusement, while German women are reduced to "two raunchy broads", one of whom was the "property" of the army Chief of Counterintelligence.[79] In *A Woman in Berlin*, A.'s rape experiences and her encounter with two Russians in a park made it very clear that to Russian men, German women existed only as receptacles for penises: "one of the soldiers turned to me and, in the friendliest of tones, said in Russian: "What's it matter who sleeps with you? One cock's as good as another!"[80] Richard Brett-Smith reduced the rape of German women to the "one great mistake" made by the Soviets, which "did them incalculable harm politically".[81] Again, the assumption that women are men's property is demonstrated in the rhetorical device of parallelism between "body", "valuable" and "home" in Brett-Smith's following remark, while the parallelism with "story" firmly places all these on a fictive plane of mythology, or downright lies: "Of course, if one believed *every story* one heard one could only conclude that *every female body* in the city had been raped several times over, *every valuable* looted, *every home* desecrated".[82]

Many men on both sides believed that rape was not a serious crime against women since they should be sexually accessible to men anyway. The issue had to do with male right of access rather than with the violation of women's bodies. A. records that when Herr Pauli realised that a lesbian in their house had thus far escaped rape because she dressed in a man's grey

SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

suit with a man's hat over her face, he "cracks jokes at the girl's expense, hopes for her conversion and insists that it would come close to a good deed to send her some hefty Ivans - the strapping Petka, for instance, with his lumberjack's paws".[83] Interestingly enough, this comment underlines the specifically heterosexual nature of hegemonic masculinity.

Both Allied and Axis soldiers shared in common an attitude towards women entirely consonant with hundreds of years of Western patriarchal domination, the most modern form of which is grounded in a social contract from which women are excluded. As Carole Pateman observes:

the common law doctrine of coverture laid down that wives were the property of their husbands and men still eagerly press for the enforcement of the law of male sex-right, and demand that women's bodies, in flesh and in representation, should be publicly available to them.[84]

The sale of (white) wives is no longer an acceptable practice in Western societies, but the trade in women's bodies continues with prostitution. In the late nineteenth and throughout the twentieth centuries, prostitution became increasingly professionalised and influenced by the ideology of capitalism.[85] Pateman argues cogently that the body of a prostitute cannot be simplistically paralleled with that of a (male) worker, but the main point for us here is that *men* believe that it can be, and that the prostitution industry can be organised along capitalist guidelines, whereby it is part of a male-controlled:

international sex industry that includes mass-marketing of pornographic books and films, widespread supply of strip-clubs, peep-shows and the like and marketing of sex-tours for men to poor Third World countries. The general display of women's bodies and sexual parts, either in representation or as live bodies, is central to the sex industry and continually reminds men - and women - that men exercise the law of male sex-right, that they have patriarchal right of access to women's bodies.[86]

The pervasive ideology of capitalism in twentieth-century hegemonic masculinity is demonstrated by Allied men's bragging about the bargain prices at which they had their 'frat' with German women. A popular 'frat' song began:

Underneath the bushes
You take your piece of frat.
You first take off your gas-cape
And then remove your hat ...

continuing through half a dozen verses and finally concluding:

HSU-MING TEO

... And to your chums relate
The total cost of all of it
Just one chocolate date.[87]

Clearly, this is a male-centred view which perceives the 'cost' in purely capitalistic terms (high returns for low investment?), whereas the emotional and physical costs for women must surely be far greater. Such behaviour was consonant with the wholesale looting done by Allied troops after the war, where valuable German heirlooms and *objets d'art* were bought from starving Germans for ridiculously cheap prices on the black market and sent back to the USA and Britain.[88]

Twentieth-century hegemonic masculinity, then, is the common denominator in the continuum of sexual violence in Occupied Germany. I do not wish to suggest that the British and Americans committed rape and other atrocities on the same scale as the Red Army, for clearly they did not. Nor do I wish to suggest that anything the Allies did was comparable in scale to what the Germans did when they overran Eastern Europe. The point is that without the structure of Western hegemonic masculinity these particular atrocities might not have occurred or been excused, on whatever scale of violence or numbers. Much has been written about the National Socialists' glorification of aggressive Aryan manhood as personified by the image of SS-men during the Second World War[89], but ideas and images do not arise from a vacuum. 'Fascist masculinity' or 'Nazi masculinity' should be viewed as the extreme end of Western right-wing, military masculinity, which is constructed around violence and domination. Only within such a paradigm does the general reaction of German men to the rape of German women make sense.

There are a few accounts of German men taking steps to prevent women from being raped. Ruth Andreas-Friedrich and her female cellar-mates were saved from rape by their male fellow-members of 'Uncle Emil', a socialist, anti-Nazi resistance group.[90] When Marianne MacKinnon was captured by Soviet troops on her way to Berlin she was protected from rape by a fellow prisoner, Herr Busse, who disguised her as a man.[91] Erich Kuby records that Dr Heinrich Grüber, a pastor in Berlin, was able to prevent the rape of several women by sheltering them in the church.[92] Frederick Luft prevented the rape of women in his household by pretending they were dead.[93] Berlin diarist A. gave only one account of male resistance to the Russians: when a bookseller (who was in hiding because he was a member of the NSDAP (National-sozialistische Deutsche Arbeiter partei; ie Nazi party) attacked a Russian who was molesting his wife.[94]

These cases are the exception rather than the rule; most German men did nothing at all while women were raped. German men's inaction has traditionally been imputed to fear and cowardice. However, there may be other contributing factors. For over a decade, German males' identity as 'men' had been intertwined with images of aggression and victory. The end

SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

of the war could not but produce a crisis in this concept of masculinity. Their sheer inability to respond with effective violence to the threat of the invading Soviets during the Battle for Berlin, their subsequent defeat, and their disarmament meant that other roles which accompanied this specific masculine identity – such as the protection of wives, mothers and sisters – collapsed also. Significantly, A. noted that German men assumed culturally recognised forms of masculine behaviour only when they were authorised to collect firearms for the Soviet authorities:

This is the first time in weeks that I've heard German men talking in loud voices, seen them move with any sign of energy. They strike me as almost 'masculine', or at least like something we used to call masculine. I'm afraid we'll now have to think up a new and better word for this quality.[95]

In addition to having to cope with the trauma of rape and of their male compatriot's inaction, German women also had to cope with German men's violent reactions to their rape. Although Marianne MacKinnon was fortunate enough to escape rape, her fellow-prisoners were all raped on the first night of their imprisonment. On the second night, the Soviets bribed the women with soup and bread in exchange for sex. When some women agreed to compliant sex (the consequences of not engaging in sex were worse than engaging in it) the German male prisoners abused them as 'Whores! Bitches!' despite the fact that those who did not 'prostitute' themselves were subsequently raped brutally.[96] When Gerd – A.'s fiancé for whom she wrote the diary – returned to the house, she found that there was "continuous friction between him and me".[97] When she described what she and her cellar community had been through:

then the real trouble began. Gerd: 'You've turned into shameless bitches – every one of you in this house!' And he made a grimace. 'I can't bear to listen to these stories. You've lost your standards, the whole lot of you!'[98]

Other women faced more overt violence from German men. A female neighbour of A.'s who had been forced into compliant sex with a Russian was shot and killed by her husband, who later killed himself also.[99] Returning German prisoners of war (POWs) often threatened their wives with violence, beat them, or shaved their heads for 'collaborating' with the Allies. Posters viciously attacking women appeared in public places, one reading (in English): "What German women do makes a man weep. One bar of chocolate or one piece of gum gives her the name of German whore. How many soldiers gave their lives for these women!"[100] In 1946, a German woman received an abusive, anonymous letter telling her:

You are a very filthy creature, an American whore. Don't flatter yourself by thinking you are pretty. When one looks at your rouged-up puss one

HSU-MING TEO

thinks they are seeing a worn-out cow. Just like you the following girls are hated.[101]

There followed underneath the names of seven other German women. In an extreme case, a German POW publicly shaved a German woman's head with a pair of nail-clippers to express outrage at her "whoring".[102] These incidents taught German women that both the public and private spheres were fraught with the danger of male violence when women stepped outside the role hegemonic masculinity prescribed for them. It is hardly surprising that German women retreated into traditional roles within the private sphere in the 1950s, and it perhaps explains why these women had a vested interest in restoring hegemonic masculinity, with its implicit protection of 'good' women.

Most men, whether Allied or German, did not wish to hear of German women's experiences. William L. Shirer, a correspondent for the *New York Herald Tribune* who visited Berlin in November 1945, flatly disbelieved the majority of rape stories he heard because "I remarked how many German women sported stylish fur coats"![103] Less than 4 months after the worst mass rapes, Shirer complained that on the whole, German women looked "pretty well, though I am not implying, God knows, that they were ever a beautiful race".[104] He observed that:

There is always rape when an army overruns a land ... when you consider what the Germans did to the Russian population when they overran half of European Russia - and that the Red Army soldier may have remarked this - and taking into account that Soviet troops had been in the field constantly fighting for two to three years and that capturing Berlin was a costly operation and that some of the Russian divisions were made up of very inferior sort of material not to mention a weird assortment of Asiatic troops, then the amount of raping by Russian troops here apparently was not above the average to be expected.[105]

Shirer thus excuses the behaviour of Soviet troops as "inevitable revenge" and reinforces both the racist myth that it was the barbaric, less evolved Mongolian hordes who did the raping, and the hegemonic masculinist view (famously espoused by Havelock Ellis) that men needed regular sexual release, especially after the tensions of battle. What is not explained is the fact that in many cases, there was a significant delay between the end of battle and the beginning of the rapes.

Shirer's attitude was typical of Allied forces stationed in Germany. When George Clare's 'frat', Anita, tried to tell him about her rape experiences, he silenced her quickly, perceiving such stories as examples of the Germans' excessive and unjustified self-pity.[106] Although he did not doubt the veracity of Anita's account of the behaviour of Soviet troops,

SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

Clare adds that he “nevertheless resented her saying it. The Germans had brought it upon themselves. What right had they to complain!”[107]

Western Allied soldiers also had no desire to hear German women’s complaints because, after all, they were reaping the rewards of the Soviets’ raping sprees. The Red Army rapes established the pattern of power relations in Occupied Germany in terms of aggressive male dominance politically, economically, and sexually. German women were forced into compliant sex with the Soviets to protect themselves from rape, and this relationship was enthusiastically continued by British, French and American troops. After the immediate postwar months, sexual relations modulated from compliant, through altruistic, to consensual sex as relations were complicated by desire and by many German women’s genuine liking of their Allied partners. However, the very nature of hegemonic masculinity made male sexual violence an underlying possibility in these relations and also constrained German women’s behaviour and attitudes, for women were only granted ‘affection’ and ‘protection’ as long as they conformed to the requisite femininity demanded by hegemonic masculinity: passive servants of male desires – both sexual and nurturant. To step out of this role was to provoke violent male recriminations.

IV

To the present day, little has been written about sexual violence in war, let alone the rape of German women in the last days of the Second World War and during the Allied occupation of Germany. This paper has insisted that not only German history but Western history of the postwar era cannot be evaluated without taking into account the continuum of sexual violence in Occupied Germany because of the deeply disturbing patterns of gender relations and hegemonic masculinity which were established during this period, and most significantly because German women’s experiences of sexual violence have had largely unexplored lasting repercussions in subsequent German history.

Gender relations constitute one of the principal dynamics in all societies, and by its very extremity, sexual violence in war throws into sharp relief the nature of gender relations in ‘normal’ societies. Clearly, much more research is needed into this topic, especially in view of the systematic raping of women which accompanied the break-up of the former Yugoslavia from 1992 onwards, which suggests that a new phase has emerged in masculine hostility towards women, especially in connection with militarised masculinity.

Women’s experiences of the continuum of sexual violence need to be treated seriously. To do otherwise is to affirm to a patriarchal tradition of male sex-right and the notion of men as women’s sexual masters, and to succumb to the myth propagated by hegemonic masculinity that women’s

HSU-MING TEO

bodies are property to be disposed of by men. These assumptions have prevented serious analyses of German women's experiences of rape and prostitution by male historians in the past, although the material is not sparse.

Furthermore, German women's memories of Germany's defeat and occupation have had serious consequences for postwar German society. According to Alexander & Margarete Mitscherlich's 1967 Freudian study, *The Inability to Mourn*, postwar German society has not been able to come to terms with the full enormity of the crimes committed in the name of the fatherland nor to mourn the victims of Nazism because the German people effectively established defence mechanisms to avoid confrontation with the past.[108] This refusal to mourn the past and face Germans' collective guilt for the horrors of World War II is what West German intellectuals call the *unbewältigte Vergangenheit*, the "undigested" or "unmastered" past, the consequences of which have been extensively documented by the Mitscherlichs and others.[109] Among the defence mechanisms established to avoid confrontation with the past and responsibility as the guilty perpetrators of war and the Holocaust is an identification with the innocent victims. The Mitscherlichs argue that:

To the conscious mind the past then appears as follows. We made many sacrifices, suffered the war, and were discriminated against for a long time afterward, yet we were innocent, since everything that is now held against us we did under orders. This strengthens the feeling of being oneself the victim of evil forces, first the evil Jews, then the evil Nazis, and finally the evil Russians. In each instance the evil is externalized.[110]

German women have played a crucial role in establishing these defence mechanisms - a role which has been either omitted or made invisible in the Mitscherlich's account because women have been omitted from their analysis. It was extremely easy for German women to identify with the victims of war. For the first time in history, civilian populations lived amidst the massive devastation of World War II and faced death daily as bombing raids were conducted by both sides. Even before the war's end, German women, together with other European women, had to struggle for survival, living in cellars and queuing for rations. With the defeat of Germany, living conditions deteriorated, and it was easy to blame both the war and the outcome on the 'evil Nazis'. In addition to the privations experienced during Occupation, many German women justifiably felt victimised by the Soviet rapes. Ironically, prostitution and fraternisation with British and US troops also aided in the construction of defence mechanisms because they enabled many German women to shift their loyalty from Hitler to the democratic allies[111], and this undoubtedly explains the desire of many women to leave Germany and escape to Britain or the USA through marriage. The return of German soldiers and POWs to their families probably strengthened women's

SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

identification as victims, since German men often reacted with violence to German women's sexual relations with the Allies. Moreover, German men, struggling through the trauma of defeat and expending enormous psychological and emotional energy in warding off mourning and melancholy themselves[112], made living conditions much more difficult for many women. Women were exhausted by the struggle to ensure their families' survival, yet many men who returned home were unwilling to help either with the housework or by getting a low-paid job, adding to women's burdens by demanding women's support emotionally, psychologically, and financially.[113] These, then, were the memories which German women carried into the postwar years and possibly handed down to postwar generations. It is quite possible that memories of male sexual violence left the deepest scars, although all these memories contributed to women's - and subsequent generations' - identity as victims.

Finally, although much has been made of Germany's unmastered past in terms of Nazi atrocities and the Holocaust, little ink has been spilt over Allied men's unmastered past in terms of the sexual violence they unleashed on German women during the Occupation. Peter Merkl points out:

A criminal who feels guilty about an act of violence is just as likely to commit his crime again as he is to repent and to sin no more ... The tormentor or murderer is the tortured wretch who commits his crime because of feelings of unworthiness and self-hatred which he projects, of course, onto the victim. Once he has committed his crime, this outlet for his self-hatred may become fixed, and so he goes on committing his deed, or hardening his conscience by reaffirming and rationalising it in his mind Only through rehabilitation can the corroding effect of hatred and self-hatred be ended, the feeling of unworthiness alleviated, and a halt called to the endless chain of mutual revenge and retribution which allows hatred to continue to proliferate and blight ever more lives.[114]

Merkl was writing about Germany's refusal to confront the crimes of Nazism, but the same insight can be applied to twentieth-century Western hegemonic masculinity and its relation to women. As long as hegemonic masculinity continues to endorse male aggression, violence, hostility to and domination over women and 'others', and as long as military training in boot camps continues to repress individual male identities and to construct homosocial bonds at the expense of women's dignity as human beings, degrading women's sexuality and reducing them to sexual objects, there is every likelihood that rape will accompany war - although men purportedly fight to protect women.

Acknowledgement

I am greatly indebted to Carole Elizabeth Adams, under whose supervision I wrote the BA(Hons) thesis at the University of Sydney in 1993 that has served as the basis for this article.

Notes

- [1] Atina Grossmann (1993) *Rape and the German Occupation* (Poughkeepsie, New York: conference paper at the Ninth Berkshire Conference on the History of Women, Vassar College).
- [2] Ruth Andrea-Friedrich (1990) *Battleground Berlin. Diaries 1945-1948*, tr. Anna Boerresen, pp. 16-17 (New York: Paragon House).
- [3] Anonymous (1955) *A Woman in Berlin*, tr. James Stern, p. 218 (London: Secker & Warburg).
- [4] Douglas Botting (1985) *In The Ruins of the Reich*, p. 194 (London: Allen & Unwin).
- [5] Annemarie Tröger (1986) Between rape and prostitution: survival strategies and chances of emancipation for Berlin women after World War II, tr. Joan Reutersham, in J. Friedlander, B. Wiesen Cook, A. Kessler-Harris & C. Smith-Rosenberg (Eds) *Women in Culture and Politics: a century of change*, p. 98 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).
- [6] Richard Brett Smith (1966) *Berlin '45: the grey city*, pp. 101-102 (London: Macmillan).
- [7] See for example, Harold Zink (1974) *The United States in Germany, 1944-1945*, pp. 137-138 (Westport: Greenwood Press).
- [8] Ute Frevert (1989) *Women in German History: from bourgeois emancipation to sexual liberation*, tr. Stuart McKinnon-Evans in association with Terry Bond & Barbara Norden, p. 258 (Oxford: Berg); and Douglas Botting, *In the Ruins of the Reich*, pp. 190-191.
- [9] Anne Edwards (1987) Male violence in feminist theory: an analysis of the changing conceptions of sex/gender violence and male dominance, in Jalna Hanmer & Mary Maynard (Eds) (1987) *Women, Violence and Social Control*, p. 24 (Basingstoke: Macmillan).
- [10] *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25. Edwards also argues that pornography is another area where images of (hetero)sexuality reflect and reinforce male dominance and a hegemonic masculinity which emphasises male aggression in terms of capitalism and sexuality, and the “depersonalisation, objectification and degradation of women”.
- [11] *Ibid.*, p. 26.
- [12] Liz Kelly, The continuum of sexual violence, in Hanmer & Maynard *Women, Violence and Social Control*, p. 55.

SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

- [13] Ibid., p. 50.
- [14] Ibid., p. 49.
- [15] Tröger, 'Between rape and prostitution', p. 112.
- [16] Claudia Koonz (1987) *Mothers in the Fatherland: women, the family and Nazi politics* (New York: St Martin's Press).
- [17] Gisela Bock (1989) Die Frauen und der Nationalsozialismus: Bemerkungen zu einem Buch von Claudia Koonz, *Geschichte und Gesellschaft. Zeitschrift für Historische Sozialwissenschaft*, 15, pp. 563-579.
- [18] Tröger, 'Between rape and prostitution'.
- [19] *A Woman in Berlin*.
- [20] Erich Kuby (1968) *The Russians and Berlin, 1945*, tr. Arnold J. Pomerans (London: Heinemann).
- [21] Grossmann, 'Rape and the German Occupation'.
- [22] For a summary of Cornelius Ryan's research see Susan Brownmiller (1975) *Against Our Will: men, women and rape*, pp. 66-69 (New York: Simon & Schuster, London: Secker & Warburg); Kuby, *The Russians and Berlin, 1945*, pp. 260-288.
- [23] Eric Santner (1990) *Stranded Objects: mourning, memory and film in postwar Germany*, pp. 1-5 (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press).
- [24] Jay W. Baird (1974) *The Mythical World of Nazi Propaganda, 1939-1945*, p. 246 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).
- [25] Johannes Steinhoff, Peter Pechel & Dennis Showalter (Eds) (1991) *Voices from the Third Reich: an oral history*, p. 331 (London: Grafton).
- [26] Ibid., p. 334.
- [27] Nancy M. Hartsock (1983) *Money and Power: toward a feminist historical materialism*, pp. 155-157 (New York: Longman).
- [28] Robert Stoller, cited in Hartsock, *Money, Sex and Power*, p. 157.
- [29] Ibid., p. 157.
- [30] Hans von Lehndorff (1963) *East Prussian Diary: a journal of faith, 1945-1947*, tr. Violet M. Macdonald, p. 53 (London: Oswald Wolff).
- [31] Ibid., p. 53.
- [32] Ibid., p. 68.
- [33] Baird, *The Mythical World of Nazi Propaganda*, p. 273. See also Brunhilde Pomsel's account in Steinhoff et al, *Voices from the Third Reich*, p. 320.
- [34] See the account of George Clare's German girlfriend, Anita, in George Clare (1990) *Berlin Days, 1946-47*, p. 59 (London: Pan).
- [35] Grossmann, 'Rape and the German Occupation'; Kuby, *The Russians and Berlin, 1945*, p. 275.
- [36] *A Woman in Berlin*, p. 66.
- [37] Ibid., p. 153.

HSU-MING TEO

- [38] Ibid., p. 153.
- [39] C. W. Ceram, Introduction to *A Woman in Berlin*.
- [40] *A Woman in Berlin*, p. 66.
- [41] Ibid., p. 68.
- [42] Ibid., pp. 147, 156-157.
- [43] Brett-Smith's *Berlin '45*, p. 122 gives an account of conductor Leo Borchard's death which tallies with that of Andreas-Friedrich's "Andrik".
- [44] Ibid., p. 16.
- [45] Steinhoff et al, *Voices from the Third Reich*, p. 338.
- [46] Kuby, *The Russians and Berlin, 1945*, p. 275.
- [47] *A Woman in Berlin*, p. 187.
- [48] Kuby, *The Russians and Berlin, 1945*, p. 267.
- [49] *A Woman in Berlin*, pp. 112, 187.
- [50] Cited in Kuby, *The Russians and Berlin, 1945*, p. 238.
- [51] Andrea-Friedrich, *Battleground Berlin*, pp. 16-17.
- [52] *A Woman in Berlin*, p. 134.
- [53] Ibid., p. 212.
- [54] Ibid., p. 212.
- [55] Ibid., p. 136.
- [56] Brett-Smith, *Berlin '45*, p. 103.
- [57] Marianne MacKinnon (1987) *The Naked Years: growing up in Nazi Germany*, p. 240 (London: Chatto & Windus).
- [58] Ibid., p. 251.
- [59] Ibid., p. 296.
- [60] James McGovern (1957) *Fräulein. A Novel* (London: John Calder).
- [61] Gordon Schaffer (1947) *Russian Zone*, p. 149 (London: Allen & Unwin).
- [62] See for example: McGovern, *Fräulein*, pp. 222-223; Kay Boyle (1952) *The Smoking Mountain: stories of postwar Germany* (London: Faber & Faber).
- [63] Cited in Botting, *In the Ruins of the Reich*, pp. 190-191.
- [64] Brownmiller, *Against Our Will*, pp. 24-25.
- [65] Bob Connell (1985) Masculinity, violence and war, in Paul Patton & Ross Poole (Eds)(1987) *War Masculinity*, pp. 5-7 (Sydney: Intervention Publications).
- [66] Tim Carrigan, Bob Connell & John Lee (c. 1987) Toward a new sociology of masculinity, in Harry Brod (Ed.) *The Making of Masculinities*, pp. 86-92 (London: Allen & Unwin).
- [67] Ibid., pp. 88-89.
- [68] Connell, 'Masculinity, violence and war', p. 6.
- [69] Theodore Roszak (1969) The hard and the soft: the force of feminism in modern times, in Betty Roszak & Theodore Roszak (Eds)(1969)

SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

Masculine/Feminine: readings in sexual mythology and the liberation of women, p. 93 (New York: Harper & Row).

- [70] Ronald Hyam (1990) *Empire and Sexuality: the British experience* (Manchester: Manchester University Press) is an especially useful source with regard to this point since Hyam reproduces exactly the attitudes of imperial masculinity in his sympathetic reading of the sexual adventures of British male imperialists.
- [71] Klaus Theweleit (1987) *Male Fantasies I: women, floods, bodies, histories*, tr. Stephen Conway in collaboration with Erica Carter & Chris Turner (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- [72] Cited in Jo-Ann Pilardi (1990) On the war path and beyond: Hegel, Freud and feminist theory, in Azizah Y. Al-Hibri & Margaret Simons (Eds) *Hypatia Reborn: essays in feminist philosophy*, p. 13 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).
- [73] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- [74] Susan Gubar (c. 1987) 'This is my rifle, this is my gun': World War II and the blitz on women, in M. Higonnet, J. Jenson, S. Michel & M. Weitz (Eds) *Behind the Lines: gender and the two world wars*, p. 228 (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- [75] *Ibid.*, pp. 231-255.
- [76] Victor Dallaré (1946) The American Woman? Not for this GI, *The New York Times Magazine*, 10 March 1946, pp. 15, 51.
- [77] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- [78] Aleksander Solzhenitsyn (1985) *The Gulag Archipelago, 1918-1956. An experiment in literary investigation*, tr. Thomas P. Whitey & Harry Willetts, p. 21 (London: Collins Harvill).
- [79] *Ibid.*, p. 21.
- [80] *A Woman in Berlin*, p. 188.
- [81] Brett-Smith, *Berlin '45*, p. 158.
- [82] *Ibid.*, p. 158. My emphasis.
- [83] *A Woman in Berlin*, p. 140.
- [84] Carole Pateman (1988) *The Sexual Contract*, p. 14 (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- [85] *Ibid.*, pp. 195-197.
- [86] *Ibid.*, pp. 199-209.
- [87] Cited in Botting, *In the Ruins of the Reich*, pp. 189-190. My emphasis.
- [88] Brett-Smith, *Berlin '45*, p. 95.
- [89] *Ibid.*, p. 6; see also Theweleit, *Male Fantasies*.
- [90] Andreas-Friedrich, *Battleground Berlin*, p. 8.
- [91] MacKinnon, *The Naked Years*, p. 8.
- [92] Kuby, *The Russians and Berlin, 1945*, p. 276.
- [93] *Ibid.*, p. 276.

HSU-MING TEO

- [94] *A Woman in Berlin*, p. 176.
- [95] *Ibid.*, p. 73.
- [96] MacKinnon, *The Naked Years*, pp. 14-15.
- [97] *A Woman in Berlin*, p. 281.
- [98] *Ibid.*, p. 281.
- [99] *Ibid.*, p. 218.
- [100] Botting, *In the Ruins of the Reich*, p. 194.
- [101] *Ibid.*, p. 194.
- [102] *Ibid.*, p. 194.
- [103] William L. Shirer (1947) *End of a Berlin Diary*, p. 148 (London: Hamish Hamilton).
- [104] *Ibid.*, pp. 148-149.
- [105] *Ibid.*, p. 148.
- [106] Clare, *Berlin Days*, p. 18.
- [107] *Ibid.*, p. 59.
- [108] Santner, *Stranded Objects*, pp. 1-4.
- [109] Peter Merkl (1965) *Germany: yesterday and tomorrow* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- [110] Cited in Santner, *Stranded Objects*, p. 6.
- [111] *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- [112] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
- [113] Frevert, *Women in German History*, pp. 262-263.
- [114] Merkl, *Germany: yesterday and tomorrow*, p. 8.

HSU-MING TEO is a postgraduate student at the Department of History, University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales 2006, Australia. She is currently working on her doctoral thesis: 'An interdisciplinary study of the discursive construction of identities in English women's travel writing, 1918-1939'.