

I interviewed Dr. Filet to better understand why the Dutch Psychoanalytic Institutes decided to merge to become one Dutch psychoanalytic institute.

Dr. Filet said, “you should understand a little of what went on before the split - All these things have long term effects. First of all, and this is my personal opinion, because the controversies were so deep and wide and long term, there will be many people who think differently than I do.

He then outlined the history of the Dutch Psychoanalytic Society.

This year, actually, we are celebrating the hundredth year of the Dutch psychoanalytic society. It was established in 1917 — the same year as the British psychoanalytic society. Both were early societies. The first society was in Vienna and after that the Berlin psychoanalytic society.

There were many revisions - especially in Germany after WWII. At that time new ones were established, and the Dutch Psychoanalytic Society was revised. One hundred years ago, it wasn't yet a society, but more a group of interested physicians. For training they went to Vienna (to be analyzed by Freud) and take courses. Later they went to Berlin where Carl Abraham was the founder and leading teacher. Abraham analyzed Melanie Klein. Anna Freud was analyzed by her father —god forbid.

In Holland there was no regular training program - only scientific meetings. The Dutch only really started to have a regular training program (in the model that most societies have -i.e. courses, training analysis, supervisions and final case presentation) after WW2. Before WW2, Dutch analysts went to Berlin or Vienna to train. For example, the Dutch analyst, Mrs. Lampel de Groot, trained in Vienna and married another person training there at the time.

When Austria was taken by Hitler, many analysts went to Amsterdam. [As an aside, Dr. filet mentioned that he reviewed a book on letters between Freud and Lampl de Groot. It has not been published yet.

When Lampl de Groot set up a practice, she and others also set up a training program which adhered to the model set up by the Congress before WWII. This model included 5X a week analysis, courses on theory and technique, and supervision. It used to be customary for a trainee's analyst to give permission (without revealing any content) for a person to continue training. This practice was observed in Holland as well — and became the beginning of the establishment of the Dutch psychoanalytic society - after WW2.

The Nazis were against psychoanalysis, and many of the people wanting training were Jewish and trained in Holland after 1946. Non-medical people were accepted on an exceptional basis. That changed only in the early 70s, and only if they demonstrated special talents. Usually they were in analysis with members of the society. They were afraid they would lose state recognition if they weren't physicians.

To be clear, in Holland state recognition was necessary since most clinical institutions were financed by the state. Even people in private practice could be prosecuted. This has loosened up

gradually since the 90's. Still, you cannot call yourself a psychotherapist unless you meet the requirements of the state, e.g. are trained in an officially admitted organization. There is still no designation of psychoanalyst by the government.

In Holland, requirements to become a psychoanalyst are designated by the society. The ratio between starting trainees and finishing ones is not open information."

Dr. Filet started PA training in 1972. Before that he had been doing psychotherapy. In 1972, a very large number applied (10 or 11) for psychoanalytic training. About half finished.

There are in Holland at the moment 2 psychoanalytic training societies. Previously there were 3 societies. This year 2 of the societies merged — the oldest one (Dutch Psychoanalytic Society) merged with the dissenting group [artly because the old society had become very rigid.

What was then established was the Society of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy. ( Dr. Filet had been a member of the old group; he left it during the split (15 years ago) and went along with the new group But he is still a "silent member" of the old group.because the new group stuck to many of the old requirements it reformed itself, including merging with the psychoanalytic psychotherapy society. The merger didn't work because the quality of the training decreased.

Then what happened: the group, including myself, disagreed with the lowering of standards. Around the year 2000, we from the old dinosaur which was too rigid. One of the people - the head of the training program in the old structure (Prof Verhag) was accused of being anti-semitic. But according to Dr. Filet (or Bien??), he wasn't

That became the reason that was used to get the old society to merge with the psychotherapy society — the last test to become a psychoanalyst.

It is noteworthy that Dr. Filet belies this allegation was a diversion from the real reason for merging. "It's ridiculous — not allowing for a criticism or second thought about a particular person who happens to be Jewish, and labeling it as anti-semitism. critical remark about a Jewish person by the head of the psychoanalytic society doesn't make him an anti-semite.

The institute and staff are paid by the government. Candidates are sometimes paid by the governments — although that needed to be bargained as the only way that would allow you to do treatment of people in the institute.

By 2000, all societies deteriorated. The membership speeches deteriorated. To become a member, it was more political. If you agreed with the lessening of standards. The difference between psychoanalysis and psychotherapy became unclear. That was one of the reason why the Dutch Psychoanalytic left. The old society deteriorated. More respected people demanded discussion of higher standards. They left. They were called reactionary and anti-semitic because they supported the man who was called antisemitic (presumably because in a newspaper article he said something unpleasant about a Jewish man - questioning the man's reasoning. People were accused of being anti-semitic without knowing what it is.

Holland was a pillared society - split by religion. e.g. Catholic workers joined the Catholic workers union, Protestant workers joined the Protestant workers union and went to Protestant schools. There were, of course, also public schools.

So back to psychoanalysis.....What happened was that all societies got less and less candidates because the conflicts among the 3 societies were publicly known - especially among potential candidates.

Dr. Filet emphasized that it is important to discriminate what you keep and what you get rid of when your aim is to keep the society psychoanalytic. For example, at the end of the 90's people didn't write about dreams — the unconscious became taboo. Object relations was emphasized vs unconscious dynamics. I'm aware that happened in the United States also — emphasizing containment and likeability at the price of interpreting regression or focusing on negative transference. It became more touchy feely.

All analytic societies in Holland had less candidates - in part because of arguments between them. Both were threatened by extinction. Dr. Filet believes that it is also happening in the US at the NY Pschoanalytic Institute.

In Holland there were then 2 psychoanalytic societies. They merged into one, called The Dutch Society for Psychoanalysis. There is still a struggle to find common ground.

In the old society, people who hadn't done psychoanalysis for years could still be training analysts. Dr. Filet is not in favor of the merger because of the threat of lowering standards. The decision was made democratically - by majority rule.

In the whole decision -the split was related to the issue of anti-semitism. He believes they falsified notes leading to turning over the classical society to the reformed society with lower standards, including members who had not been analyzed and had not done analysis. They split 15 years ago. The name of the old society is The Netherland Society of Psychoanalysis. The dissenting group called The Netherlands Psychoanalytic Group, got more candidates. They merged in 2017 because both of them got too few candidates. The Group got less people interested in holding an office (president, etc.). In the Society, only 12 or 15 people who trained in the classical way wanted to hold office.

The original society had more members. The new group was smaller with less applicants. But over the years, people discovered the better quality of the new one. Dr. Filet is a member of both. The old one was celebrating the 100th anniversary of psychoanalysis. They borrowed some of Freud's antiquities to celebrate.

Reasons the two institutes are considering merging are:

- a) Celebrations about the 100th anniversary of psychoanalysis
- b) lack of candidates
- c) lack of people willing to become officers in each institute
- d) tremendous dissension among the Board of the old society which had "gone into decadence" and members had to resign because the growing portion of the membership of the old society grew unhappy about this. Ten years after the group who critiqued the lowered standards of the old society formed a new one. Through several years of negotiating, they decided to merge.

Bargaining that included the content of courses is still going on. According to Dr. Filet, they are now leaning more toward the basic tenants of psychoanalysis: i.e. drives for one. This is still not resolved. In the old society, very little of Freud was studied.

2) Supervision: The supervisor is required to evaluate each candidate every half year. In the old organization the function of training analyst was taken away because they didn't approve of the psychotherapy group having the same rights as the psychoanalytic group.

Dr. Filet no longer was accepted as a training analyst in the old society. The reformed old society changed and became more realaxe in standards (e.g. had no analytic work for years) to become training analysts.

As a sign of the hatred of the dissenters - in Rio - last August, the Group was voted to become a member of IPA. Dr. Filet thanked them for being accepted. The Board of the reform society were booing Dr. filet during his acceptance speech. The Freudian Society was appalled at this.

The old society denounced Dr. Filet as a traitor for joining the New Group. He is interested in the model of how evaluations of psychoanalytic training can evolve or dissolve.

What was underlying was the collaboration between the Institute (a place you could go for analysis - evaluation could take 8 months). The whole mental health world was stressed by the battles and strict rules of the old psychoanalytic society. Physician referrals were lessened to the psychoanalytic society because of the complicated messy intake procedures.

Not only the trainers were not qualified, but the candidates for psychoanalysis had very stringent rules. They wanted to prove how strict they were in who they accepted for patients for training analysts.

They merged because:

1)The group had no support from the government

2 The original institute got more from mental health financing from the government because they were a mental health organization

The new group, the dissenters are The Dutch Psychoanalytic Group

They did not want government financing because psychoanalysis is not an officially accepted treatment.