

International Review of Psychoanalysis of Couple and Family

N° 2008/1 - *The violence in the family and the society*

FEAR OF FREEDOM AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

*ALBERTO EIGUER**

For 250 years society has worked to make family ties looser, more tolerant, and more egalitarian than in the past. Indeed, the family has been transformed and liberalised. The mentality has changed and women and children are legally protected from conduct which, until recently, limited their autonomy and inflicted harm and hardship. However, violence is still firmly on the increase, overt violence as well as covert, violence which aims to enslave the other. Clinical experience and research both confirm this trend. There is a rise in warnings and convictions for domestic abuse: (ANAES, 2001; A Eguer, 2002; P. Benghozi, 2002.)

In the contemporary family, members feel less secure, parents feel that they are not listened to and that they have lost their authority and that ideals no longer mean anything. I will try to show that these various elements are linked.

We'll start with some bibliographical reminders. In his observations, Freud (1925) remarked that the sight of one's parents making love is, for many children, the first glimpse of adult sexuality. Even if the child has not visually witnessed the scene, which often is the case, he may hear the sounds of the sexual act and how he interprets this will have an impact on him and will give shape to his fantasies. This primitive scene is imagined by the child as a violent act in which the father

takes a sadistic position towards the mother. The child feels excited as well as excluded, humiliated and diminished. For M. Klein (1952) the sexual sadism of the father can be imagined by the child as a fantasy of the father compulsively devouring the mother or in an image of the parents in an embrace where their incomplete bodies become totally entangled (the combined parents). The sadistic impulses attributed to the father are overridden in the end by the oral sadism of the child watching his parents' lovemaking, where he experiences a deep-seated oral wish which is very strong, that is, the desire to devour the breast. Klein's disciple D. Meltzer (1978) draws attention to these sadistic impulses manifesting themselves in parental attacks on their children and yet to be born in the child himself.

According to Freud, the child will go through other experiences which will define how he will understand sexuality: the fear of castration and the moment when he discovers that girls do not have a penis. This seems due to the fact that the young person sees himself as powerless when faced with two aspects of adult sexuality which frighten him: sensual pleasure and domination.

Two important factors are his *prematurity* and his *dependence*, but they are not the only ones. Indeed, my own observations of couples and families have shown that one of the protagonists in a relationship will be the one to « be afraid » and the other to « frighten ». These two feelings and behaviours stimulate each other and we can link these with two others: « to frighten oneself » and « to use the other's fear to dominate him/her. » In light of these observations, the major issue which I will address is whether we as adult or child, man or woman, we are able to accept family ties without constraints.

From liberalisation of gender and generational relationships to the fear of freedom

There are, without a doubt, many misunderstandings nowadays about the consequences of the changes happening within a family. We have seen, in the last few years, the liberalisation of morals and attitudes. Spouses, as well as parents and children, to a larger extent share intimacy, decision making and duties. However, this liberty seems frightening. There is fear of the new sexual freedom, of women's liberation, of children, of the loss of parental authority, in other words, there exists a fear of relinquishing power or losing it. The thoughts of Eric Fromm (1938) and Jean-Paul Sartre (1943) throw light on this

paradox. We fear freedom because we dread to be alone, without the support and warmth of our family, friends and colleagues. Being free implies taking decisions independently, and accepting the consequences of these decisions: success or failure, approval or criticism, praise or shame. The experience of being dependent can occur through these two opposing behaviours.

1. Some people, not knowing anymore how to create a long lasting and fulfilling relationship may try to control and subjugate the other. They do not feel secure and thus fear that if their partner becomes too independent they will not respect and love them and stop treating them as a person.
2. Others adopt the opposite attitude of submission, accepting humiliation without reacting, even if it hurts and even if personal creativity is damaged. The subject may consent to this behaviour, and is very often unaware of the mechanisms of the relationship and the possible consequences on his/her personal integrity.

These two attitudes can coexist within the same person, or be present in turn, depending on the situation. To dominate and be dominated gives shape to an interpersonal whole.

Any attachment to another person certainly implies a kind of dependence, but this can lead to excesses as in the perverted relationship. Domination here is used to deny one's own dependence on the other person and to maintain that it is the other person who depends wholly and exclusively on the one who is dominant. In reality, they are denying their need for each other. However, he knows how to take advantage of the skills and qualities that he finds in his partner and that he himself lacks and of which he is extremely envious, namely emotional intensity, freshness, ingenuity, spontaneity and energy or an ability to generate ideas and to take initiative. Through behavioural manipulation, the dominant partner tries to attain these objectives. Vampirism is a variation of this kind of perverted relationship and its name is aptly chosen.

The subtle nature of this kind of perverse violence at work enables this shift to take place. The benefits to the dominant partner (what we might call the narcissistic advantages) of this vampirism are praised by the agent of the destructive behaviour so that the abused partner may even feel validated by the experience.

We will now discuss family ties. In the family we have one or more interpersonal bonds organised within the structure of a family network with its own laws, positions and functions (A. Eiguer, 1989, 1997). A bond is more than a relationship between two people as a couple influence each other unconsciously building common defences and fantasies.

Sometimes they may forget that they are different and have their own desires. Each person can live as though the other is a part of him/herself. It would be even worse to live as though the other partner were oneself. The drift towards perversion in family relationships may represent an attempt to destroy the other person, in whom individual desire is perceived as leading to criticism, insubordination and autonomy.

It would be useful now to underline that the notion of *freedom* does not rule out the idea of *autonomy*. No matter how authentic the desire for liberty is, it needs to be put into perspective when it comes to family ties, and to any other relationships. We can cut off our dependency on others only by disregarding the fact that we are linked to one another by intense and permanent bonds. It is an individualistic view of the human psyche that maintains that autonomy is the main goal for a human being. Interpersonal relationships imply mutual recognition and a responsibility towards others. This also implies that we can at the same time admit our desire to be different while recognizing the other and remaining essentially dependent on him/her. In order for a child to find his/her way towards emancipation, s/he needs to feel secure in the knowledge that parents want him/her to be free and independent. They will therefore have to equip him/her with the necessary tools to deal with the contingencies of independent life.

If we understand independence to be a synonym of freedom, we are on the wrong track. The notion of *mature dependence* fits the idea of freedom better: it means that we remain free in thoughts and in action while continuing to take others into account (Fairbain, 1952). All the child's mental 'objects' enter into a subconscious dialogue with each other and with the Self (the subject), a dialogue which is often conflicting, and through which the unconscious self feels affirmed in its bid for freedom. Other mental objects are not strongly for or against emancipation. They will suit their position to each case. Parental attitudes which favour the development of the self leave traces on the

child's subconscious, memories more of their acts than their words. The question is: Are we free from others or with others/

As for mutual concern and recognition, I would like to reiterate the fact that the mother's and the father's *concern* is the primary form of the exploration of the needs and wishes of the other, of the infant at the initial stage in life, and later on. Gratitude, which is an act of acknowledgement, represents as well, an important step towards mastering personal freedom. Acknowledgement means putting yourself in the others' shoes, sharing their emotions and identifying with their problems. Freud uses very moving words in *Civilisation and its discontentment*, when he refers to the pain we may feel when a friend is suffering. Living interpersonally means feeling *with* the other person. It is more than empathy. It is identification with the other where we mobilise our internal attitudes and patterns in order to be with the other person (D. Stern, 1985). We also exercise the Superego, one of the major functions of which is the *sense of responsibility* (A. Eiguer, 2008).

Reversal of the trend

Consequently, instances of family violence would seem to be an attempt to reverse the current trend towards more liberty between the generations and genders within a family. It is as though the old masters are trying to get back the power they think they have lost. This is the case in sexual abuse and other perverted behaviour. An incestuous father is a father who needs to impose himself on his child and his partner using the power of his sexuality. By doing this, he disowns his fatherhood and his parental functions and family roles. In less serious situations, fathers or mothers may introduce their child prematurely to the adult world in exchange for tempting gifts of an ambiguous nature: money, presents or seeking their advice as if they were already adults. Indifference, neglect, or punishments can all have the same origin: reasserting power in the face of children who seem ideally strong, and therefore « dangerous ». The consequences of the uncertainties linked to power and sensual pleasure produce other effects which are at the source of other difficulties.

The couple: Physical violence

If we take as example, the man who hits his partner, in most cases the violence is a strong reaction to her wish to leave him or to her saying that she wants to leave. Up until this moment, the couple had established a symbiotic bond which avoided the possibility of any individual expression of originality, as this originality is inappropriately associated with separation and loss. Thus the man fears being abandoned as much as being confronted with the fact that his wife can think, and express herself clearly, is charming and has kept some of her own "je ne sais quoi". These qualities can of course be very attractive to a man; they could be attractive to the husband too. However the opposite is true as femininity makes him « see red ». It is dangerous for him. He cannot tolerate the fact that his wife is able to express her point of view, and can even stand up to him. He considers this a male prerogative. She is supposed to remain submissive and busy herself with the children and with domestic tasks. Fundamentally the eternal battle of the sexes rages on.

Other men, placed in a similar situation and having similar misgivings try other methods using the *psychical power (psychological violence)* in the form of manipulation, persuasion and exploitation.

There are many different interpersonal origins of physical abuse. Sometimes separation and the differentiation of the spouses create a fear of the self disintegrating and the loss of the necessary identifying points for one's own identity. In other cases, there is a fear of losing one's virility in the eyes of others, and that one's *latent bisexuality* would then be visible to all. Many of these spouses say, "You want to leave because you want to make me ashamed". In this case the couple shares many weaknesses as their identity as a couple is scattered and diluted in other peoples' identities.

The following case of a couple seen in therapy is a good example of this. The husband explained the circumstances of their last argument. When he saw a bucket full of water, a mop and a broom in the middle of the sitting-room floor, he « imagined » that his wife had put them there to make him realise that he should do more housework and that he did not do enough around the house and left all the chores to her. This series of assumptions infuriated him and he hit his wife and ended up squeezing her neck and almost strangled her. The wife said that she had put the bucket in the middle of the sitting room with no

ulterior motive. Her husband seemed angered by previous discussions during which his wife had asked him to be more involved in the housework. She acknowledged during the session that she had reproached him on this subject and that they often raised their voices during arguments and this would always end with the husband beating his wife.

With regard to this last example of abuse, I was quite dumbfounded by the interpretation that had triggered the violence. Was this fantasy or delirium? I recall that in many domestic fights, reproaches can be based on projections which are totally unfounded. During the session, the wife could not confirm that her husband could have such projected behaviour outside their arguments. Localised delusion? She does say however, that she has been trying to change her husband, to teach him manners, to care about others and to look after the children and that in fact she has had some success in this endeavour, as he has changed « a bit ». However, the husband seems upset by this : he says his wife puts too much pressure on him that he has had enough. For my part, I cannot see that the results of this education are really beneficial to either partner.

I therefore say to them : «It takes time to change an adult. » I add that both of them seem to want to make the other into somebody « ideal and perfect », perhaps so that they become more attractive to each other and therefore find another reason to love one another. I tell them that it is a very commendable intention, but each should, in this case admit that he is not good enough that he is incomplete. I add that it is hard to recognise your faults and still accept yourself.

Their reaction was interesting. In exasperation, the husband retorts that he has a tendency to be a perfectionist, and that he is proud of it. He cites some examples of how this had made his life easier. When he talks he comes across as being methodical and intellectual in his approach. I am not sure how helpful our conversation was however, though it seemed entirely relevant to me as it addressed the problems in their relationship. However, when I stressed the consequences of trying to change the other person, I was accused of being too didactic.

The husband began to show his annoyance and became domineering, a bit like a rooster. Perhaps his masculinity has been wounded in some way? This is the conclusion that can be drawn from this fight. The wife

then spoke in a defensive way explaining how she « needs to see that her husband is changing ».

What conclusions can we draw from this example? Violence seemed to be part of an attitude of extreme intolerance towards the other person, their gender and their personal style. But since men tend to wrongly link their gender identity with that of the person who is dominant, the husband was trying to assert himself through violence.

Wives can also be domineering and marriage can become a game in which each partner takes turns at being the master. There are also cases of wives who beat or manipulate their husbands and of women who react with deviant defences when faced with a husband who physically abuses them. Amidst all these horrors, there are many possible variations and combinations and it is important to identify the underlying mechanisms.

This case shows that at least one of the causes of physical abuse is the fear of losing the upper hand in a relationship, of no longer having any authority over the other person and concomitantly, the fear that the other will become the master. This fear goes hand in hand with the fear of freedom. These fears respond to the changes in society leading to a new equality between men and women, parents and children. Our hypothesis of contemporary violence is still valid. Evidently, the diversity of styles of violence, abuse and aggressions do not permit us to make generalisations here, but we have taken a first step towards confirming it.

In order to examine some deviations of behaviour, I will look at the following examples: the ambiguity of gifts, the capture of a child into incest, the allocation of roles in incest, the flouting of discretion and intimacy and how revenge and betrayal are legitimised.

When the feeling of obligation goes as far as sacrifice

In families, the source of many of these excesses is to be found in the way that care, giving and generosity are shown. Parents are essential to the formation of a child. Without their presence, love, education and transmission of a subconscious legacy, the child could not survive. The parents give a lot of themselves and they naturally have the right to

claim their due. Normally, to give brings about a counter-gift. The child feels indebted towards his/her parents, as s/he has received life and has been brought up by them. The child is therefore grateful to them but can never make up for what s/he has received. S/he will pay off the debt by giving in turn to his/her own children. This is what is called the « vertical gift».

If the child stays indebted to the parents, this can lead to the development of a crushing feeling of obligation, which leads to self-sacrifice, literally by giving up a part of himself, the possibility of achievements, of a happy marriage, and of children who are well-adjusted. There are perverse processes at work. Over-generous parents can do as much harm as inadequate parents.

I have met this clinical reality in immigrant families or in families where one member (adult or adolescent) has problems such as addiction, self-harm, bulimia or drug taking. In these families we find, hand in hand, over-generosity and a great deal of inadequacy. Sensuality tends to make up for the lack of love, gifts for the lack of security, inappropriate confidences for the lack of interest or understanding of the child's privacy.

“Incestuality” (P.-C. Racamier, 1980) is a term used by P. C. Racamier (1978) to talk about untypical family behaviours where all the elements of the incestuous intimacy are present except for physical contact or sexual penetration. Incestuality, notably between a mother and her child, whether a boy or girl, is made easier by a gift-giving policy in which the child feels that these gifts are exceptional and have taken a great deal of effort. « Since I have made a great sacrifice, you must sacrifice yourself too ». For this to happen, the child cannot think, dream or have his own personal world. The perversion of the mother-child bond is the most frequent and the most dramatic type of female perversion. Even if the child is overvalued, over praised and put on a pedestal, in reality he is made into a fetish and considered as part of the mother, her thing, her tool used for her self-idealisation. (A. Eiguer, 2005).

The perpetrator, the victim and the witness

We will now examine other aspects of perverse bonds in families and contemporary couples. One of the characteristics of perversion is to use the other's resources as lust is very much linked to envy.

The perverse partner may help his victim to get started professionally, playing the role of Pygmalion. In doing this, he will try to prove that his « pupil » or his partner, is far from perfect. This would justify the sacrifices, renunciations and reprimands and at the same time, the pupil has to accept that these are necessary. It is quite common that these arguments serve to prove the validity of the ill-treatment being inflicted. In the abuser-abused relationship, the compromise is mutual. However, it is not true to say that for the pervert, the other person is non-existent; it is in fact important that he should be there so that he can be destroyed.

There is a powerful and mutual interplay between the couple, but other people close to them are usually also involved. In the family, those who watch the situation have feelings ranging from stupefaction to enjoyment, including the fear of also becoming a victim. This clinical observation has revealed that a third party can be involved, that is *the witness*. He is not as such the agent of the perversion or the victim/accomplice, but a different person altogether. He is present in the reality and the fantasy shared by members of the family.

The acts of a perverse exhibitionist aim directly at a victim and indirectly at the witness, the policeman or the judge (G. Bonnet, 1983). He challenges the witness, provokes him, runs away from him by going into hiding and reappearing; he also « lets himself » be caught. An unconscious pact seems to bind these three characters together, in spite of any conscious feelings that the victim and the police may have on the subject. They are drawn into this in a seemingly fortuitous and casual manner and react by appearing offended and revolted by their involvement.

However, the witness is a character whose presence is vital to the whole process. Horrified by what he sees, he calls upon the law, insisting on the need to respect it. Taking as examples some of the unfortunate experiences that can be caused by respecting the law, the criminal will then insist in turn on how « ridiculous » it is to follow the law.

Various family examples illustrate the fact that third parties involved in relationship with perverted individuals and couples suffer at a distance from their behaviours. Their characteristics are similar to that of the witness. What is the role of the prostitute's lover, or of the man who watches while his wife engages in internet sex, and even helps her with his computer skills? What is the role of the rapist's wife, who may often be respected, admired and feared by him although he sexually abuses other women in a horrific manner? He may believe that she is unattainable unreachable, that she does not allow herself to be «psychologically penetrated» by his projections. Is it perhaps because of this mutual avoidance that a couple's relationship ends up becoming unexciting ?

In families where an *incestuous father* holds sway, the other family members are involved to different degrees. In an indirect way, the father is stimulated by the effect of his behaviour on others. His wife, depressed and powerless, seems sometimes to accept silently what is happening behind her back: she is a kind of witness to the incest. The father knows how to use his sexual charisma with their daughter in order to overwhelm and humiliate the mother. He knows how to make the sisters of the victim jealous. A family myth is created, which all members of the family more or less believe in, namely that sexuality is a superior symbol of power and strength. The sexual abuse is presented not as shameful, but as a privilege. In the sexual abuser's family, the idea of the sacrosanct/sacred family spirit can be called upon by the perpetrator to demand that the daughter who has spoken out withdraws her accusation.

Patricia was molested by her father when she was between 7 and 8. She said, « He'd have an argument with my Mum and then come to talk to me about it, saying horrible things about her. He did everything he could to create a bad relationship between her and me. I really never had a mother. I've always behaved as if she didn't exist, I have never known her, and I haven't been able to rely on her to help me. My father wanted to be a "single parent". I wonder if that didn't hurt me more than the sexual abuse.» (A. Eiguer, 2005).

The various pieces of this puzzle and the various family roles are not arbitrary, but are linked together. The fact that one of the members of the family is the *stage director* does not exclude the fact that, from a group point of view, the whole is tragically coherent. To think in this way does not minimise the decisive role of the perpetrator who

instigates the abuse. On the contrary, it enables us to presuppose that sometimes the situation can begin to change only by changing one of the elements, which is something that spontaneously happens for example, when an abused adolescent falls in love. He becomes the third party who helps her to realise the seriousness of the situation and to find, if need be, someone to turn to outside the family circle. The psychological consequences on both the victim and the witness are very serious : stunted development, excitement and agitation and pseudo-maturity.

This is how perverts function within a network; the logic of the sexual symptoms is « to group everyone and to organise the crowd”. It seems that the group point of view is more useful than the one which is centred on the individual, and which emphasises the fact the abused daughter or the marginalised wife may actually enjoy the abuse. The abuser is no less monstrous because he is functioning in a group where all the members are involved.

Other family aspects should be emphasised: heightened sensuality in the relationships, indiscriminate sexual pleasure seems to replace tenderness in the family, lack of rules, using other people as objects, and hateful attacks in the mother-daughter, mother-son or sibling bonds. The spirit of revenge allows betrayal to happen and stirring up ill-feelings and sowing discord among relatives is all part of the game (cf. Patricia’s case study).

The roles of the agent, the victim and the witness are influenced by all the members of the group. Each role is influenced by and influences the other roles within the family. The idea of triumphing over the law and ridiculing the symbolic father is strongly reinforced. "There are many of us so we can keep asserting that we are right." Whether he is close by or far from the family, *the witness* has a significant function in the way he watches the abuser who seems to 'ask' him to function like a mirror, to reflect back his own image, something he himself is unable to do, as he has failed to integrate this ability to see himself from the outside (P. Ricoeur, 1990). Essentially, he has a relationship with the witness which harks back to his bond with his father, made up of challenges and provocations and calling into question the fundamental respect for the Law that the father-figure represents. He claims to have mastery over the father (per-version : *vers le père*, towards the father, attempting to overthrow his functions).

We can imagine these three characters in the abusive situation acting out their roles on stage. A general understanding of their relationship helps us to understand the interplay better. Pichon-Rivière (1978) remarks that both actors of the relationship establish a relationship that is so close and warm that they can actually feel that they are being watched by a third party. This can be simply an impression or there can sometimes be a real third party. In reality, they are seeking this watching figure. The latter « interferes » in the communication between themselves, and creates some kind of *noise*. They have the feeling that this third party is watching them or that he makes it easier for them to understand each other, that he calls them into question or protects them, that he attacks them or make them feel secure. In short he weighs them down. The subjects of the abusive bond are then obliged to establish strategies in response to this « presence », which without doubt draws the regard of the third party Superego. Is this « witness », a variant of the group's third party witness? (Cf. also, T. Ogden, 1994.)

When it comes to *transfer*, it is essential to understand the role of the witness (A. Eiguer, 2007). The notion of interpersonal bonds leads us to think that abuse leads to a scenario in which the analyst is expected to occupy the position of the witness. Why?

Even if he wished to make his analyst his accomplice, the abuser will have difficulty achieving this. So what is the way out for him? The desire to put the analyst in the role of a witness means that he will also have the role of upholder of the law and so the abuser will try to convince him that it would be ridiculous for him to give up the behaviour that the law forbids.

Perverse behaviours would permit the verification of all the advantages derived from breaking the Law. They show up during sessions as requests to break the internal laws of the session, for example. They are like the end product and an exercise of putting theory into practice; the consequences are used as a general proof that to deviate from the straight and narrow has got advantages: perverse sexuality would thus be more exciting and pleasurable. The analyst could also use this position, however, to actively advocate the law.

Why flout conjugal intimacy ?

A few clarifications on perversion in a couple. By treating each other so shamefully, the spouses are reacting to a breach of the unconscious pacts established between them. One of these pacts is the shared rule of *discretion*, and the desire to respect their intimacy, in other words refrain from sharing their secrets with strangers. Intimacy inspires and is inspired by the trust the spouses have in each other and the feeling that s/he will know how to listen when we talk about personal difficulties or some disturbing events in our past. A sense of propriety in a couple involves each person being reassured that they are not too outrageous or immature. It boosts up self-esteem. In another sense, the individual is less ashamed of himself/herself, of what s/he feels, thinks, does or has done in the past.

The destruction of the intimacy of a couple sets off a chain of disappointments: basically, the partner who reveals the shared secrets makes public the weaknesses of the other person and appears to have stopped caring for them or to be laughing at them. It has been said for a long time that betrayal is an exquisite art practised by perverts and offenders. This is part of their evil 'religion'.

In the therapy of Mr and Mrs French this problem occurs regularly. They seek help after the wife finds a series of notes in her husband's diary which seem to hint that he is seeing another woman, something he firmly denies. About ten years ago, he had had a serious accident followed by months spent in a coma. When he woke up, it was considered miraculous but he remained fragile, anxious, bad tempered and partly amnesic. To this day, Mr French has to write everything down for his job. He has also developed MDP (manic depressive psychosis). His wife has helped and « supported » him a great deal. This is why she feels even more betrayed by his suspected infidelity.

Once the therapy under way, she says over and over that he is fragile and that he behaves like a brute, and that all this has been confirmed by his doctors. Mr French presents some « personality problems as an aftermath of the accident which affected his brain ». Though she adds that she must learn how to « forgive him », she humiliates him. Then she puts forward the opinions of their two daughters: « he is nasty », « unbearable », oversensitive to all excesses such as alcohol. Sometimes she insinuates, which is an even more powerful way to create an effect.

As true as these comments are, they appear in the dialogue as a confirmation of the husband's « disabled status ». As for him, he presents himself as a « whipped dog », and reacts to this situation clumsily by getting angry and ends up revealing the living proof of his weaknesses. All his arguments are demolished. In reality the power over the two girls is at stake in this debate. Each parent seeks the love of their daughters in order to appear strong in front of the other. By unconscious agreement, the daughters are appointed as judges and are turned into parents.

I imagine that in front of the girls, the parents are seductive. The principle of authority is abandoned in favour of the equalisation of roles. The husband's infidelity which was presented as the rationale for requesting couple therapy is prefigured. This was in reality a shift in their rivalry with each other in the presence of another woman (women), their daughters.

During therapy, I slowly managed to deconstruct these cruel perverse positions, showing in turn that each wants to use a third party to assert his/her supremacy.

Conclusions

We find in this case that there is devaluation of the bonds of love and trust by running down the other partner using *malicious talk* and even *betrayal*. Perverse violence breaks away from ethical behaviour and disguises itself as sexual pleasure. Physical violence, expressed without restraint can be a coarse and aborted form of perverse violence. This belongs to a logic of fear. The abuser enjoys his supremacy by fear. But murder is the sign of the failure of the will to power in somebody who is overwhelmed by disruptive forces. I am not able to cite all types of aggression, and this may mean that I have not been entirely convincing, but I believe that many violent situations appear as the result of the fear of freedom and the loss of influence over the other partner and of his/her differences and strengths. This is common to all types of deviant behaviour.

The idea that the emancipation of the other is beneficial to everyone must be defended. There is a unique opportunity in our day to do this so that we can understand that the well being of the others can bring fruitfulness and satisfaction to all.

Bibliography

- ANAES (Agence nationale d'accréditation et d'évaluation de santé) (2001), « Psychopathologie et traitements actuels des auteurs des agressions sexuelles » *Pour la recherche*, 31.
- BENGHOZI P. (2002) *Violence et champs social*, Paris, ENSP.
- Bonnet G. (1983) *Les perversions sexuelles*, Paris, PUF, 1993, 2000.
- Eiguer A. (1989) *Le pervers-narcissique et son complice*, Paris, Dunod.
- Eiguer A. (1997) *Petit traité des perversions morales*, Paris, Bayard.
- Eiguer A. (2002) « La progresión vertiginosa de las persiones », *Revista de psicoanálisis*, LIX, 3, 711-724.
- Eiguer A. (2005) *Nouveaux portraits du pervers moral*, Paris, Dunod.
- Eiguer et al. (2007) *La perversion dans l'art et la littérature*, Paris, In Press.
- Eiguer A. (2008) *Jamais moi sans toi*, Paris, Dunod.
- Fairbain R. (1952) *Psychoanalytic Studies of Personality*, London, Tavistock Publications.
- Freud S. (1925) « Quelques conséquences psychiques de la différence des sexes au niveau anatomique », *OC XVII*, Paris, PUF, 189-203.
- Freud S. (1929) *Malaise dans la civilisation*, tr. fr. Paris, PUF, 1971.
- Freud S. (1932) *Nouvelles conférences d'introduction à la psychanalyse*, « La féminité », tr. fr. Paris, Gallimard, 1984.
- Fromm E. (1938) *The Fear of Freedom (La crainte de la liberté)*, Londres, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963, 257 p.
- Ogden Th. (1994) "The analytic third: working in inter-subjective clinical facts", *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 75, 3-119.
- Klein M. et al. (1952) *Développements de la psychanalyse*, tr. fr. Paris, PUF, 1966.
- Meltzer D. (1978) *Le développement kleinien de la psychanalyse*, tr. fr. Toulouse, Privat, 1987.

Pichon-Rivière E. (1978) *La théorie du lien suivi du processus créateur*, tr. fr. Toulouse, Erès, 2004.

Racamier P.-C. (1978) « Les paradoxes du schizophrène », *Revue française de psychanalyse*, 42, 5-6, 877-970.

Racamier P.-C. (1996) *L'inceste et l'incestuel*, Paris, Apsygé.

Ricœur P. (1990) *Soi-même comme un autre*, Paris, Le Seuil.

Sartre J.-P. (1943) *L'être et le néant*, Paris, Gallimard, nouv. éd. 1975.

Stern D. (1985) *Le monde impersonnel du bébé*, tr. fr. Paris, PUF, 1989.

* Psychiatrist and a psychoanalyst, holder of an Habilitation to direct research in psychology (Université Paris V), director of the review *Le divan familial*, President of the International Association of Couple and Family Psychoanalysis.

AIPCF, 154 Rue d'Alésia, 75014 Paris, France