

# 10

---

## THE NETHERLANDS

### The Dutch psychoanalytic movement and the IPA

*Eddy de Klerk & Harry Stroeken*

#### Early beginnings

The Dutch Psychoanalytical Society was founded on 24 March 1917, as the seventh member Society of the International Psychoanalytical Association (Groen-Prakken & De Nobel, 1992, p. 225; Stroeken, 1997, pp. 26–27). Freud sent his congratulations and best wishes for fruitful endeavours. How to characterize the founding members of the Society? They were 13 in number, all men, all medical doctors, most of them specialists in psychiatry. Socially, the psychoanalysts belonged to the upper reaches of society. They stood for social change, but within limits. Strong roots in the medical profession were a valuable asset in the struggle to attract income and clients.

The birth of the Society was not a sudden development. It had been preceded by several events, notably the first International Congress on Psychiatry and Neurology, Psychology and the Nursing of the Insane, held in Amsterdam in September 1907. At this congress Jung read an extensive paper on Freudian theory and practice, which received a great deal of publicity and caused a huge stir among psychiatrists and laymen alike. In fact, some books and articles by Freud had already been translated into Dutch.<sup>1</sup> Then in 1914 G. Jelgersma [1859–1942], a professor of psychiatry, gave his

famous rectorial address for the *Dies Natalis* of the University of Leiden, which spoke about the unconscious and Freud's theory of dreams. For many people in the Netherlands, this was the first time they had heard of Freud. Freud was quite pleased with this (Bulhof, 1981, 1982, 1983).

Starting in 1913, a number of Dutch psychoanalysts in contact with Freud held informal gatherings at the home of A. Van der Chijs [1874–1926] in Amsterdam. In “On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement” (1914d), Freud mentions J. E. G. van Emden [1868–1950], J. M. van Ophuijsen [1882–1950], A. W. van Renterghem [1845–1939], A. Stärcke [1880–1954], and J. Stärcke [1882–1917]. Van Emden underwent an analysis with Freud, comprised of a total of 245 sessions spread over several periods (May, 2008).

The first paper presented to the newly founded Dutch Psychoanalytical Society was by J. H. van der Hoop [1887–1950] and published in the *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde* [Dutch Review of Medicine]. It gave rise to considerable debate inside and outside the Society. The members considered the paper to be too Jungian, and Jung's disagreements with Freud split the membership. Only six of the thirteen founding members had undergone a training analysis, and five of them had done so with Jung. Two of the five—Van Ophuijsen and Van der Hoop (perhaps S. J. R. de Monchy [1893–1969] as well, in 1936)—later did some more personal training in Freudian circles in Berlin and Vienna. Van der Hoop would never shake off his Jungian stigma: because of it, he remained suspect all his life.

### Developments and conflicts in the first thirty years

Very early in its history the Society experienced a high point: in September 1920, the 6th IPA Congress was held in The Hague, which was then the centre of psychoanalytic life in the Netherlands. As the Netherlands had been neutral during the First World War, former enemies could meet there; and it was prosperous enough to stage the event. Both Jelgersma and August Stärcke read papers: Jelgersma on “The theory of emotions” [*des Gefühls*] and Stärcke on “The Castration Complex” and on “The Relations between Neurosis and Psychosis” (Anonymous, 1920). It was the only time that Jelgersma met Freud; he wanted to safeguard his independence. The main

organizer was Johan van Ophuijsen; his wife received Freud, Anna Freud, and a number of others in their house for dinner.

The Society's membership grew slowly during its first thirty years. In 1931 the Society had 21 members and five extraordinary members; by the end of the Second World War in 1946 there were 33 members and six associate members. Following the war, there was a steady and increasing growth in the Society's membership.

From its founding, two subjects caused conflict within the Society. The first was the issue of lay analysis. The majority wished to keep psychoanalysis within the framework of psychiatry. They also opposed the obligatory training analysis: this was the second issue of controversy. Jelgersma thought that it would only attract psychopaths, that people would become too attached to their training analyst, and that it would form a barrier to the membership of valuable but non-analysed psychiatrists. There were widely divergent opinions on what the Society ought to be: an organization for well-trained and practising psychoanalysts, according to a minority, or a Society of psychiatrists with an interest in psychoanalysis, according to the majority. The requirements of the IPA prescribed lay analysis and training analysis in 1925.

The arrival in the Netherlands after Hitler took power in January 1933 of four German Jewish psychoanalysts—Th. Reik [1888–1969], K. Landauer [1887–1945], who died in Bergen Belsen, L. Levy-Sühl, who died in September 1947, and A. Waterman, who died in a German concentration camp—aggravated these smouldering conflicts and made them acute. Should these men become full members of the Dutch Society? Reik was not a medical doctor, and Dutch law did not recognize the other three as doctors either. These difficulties had a financial dimension, due to the fact that the world was in the midst of an economic crisis: some feared that if immigrants were to start practising in the Netherlands, it would take patients away from their Dutch colleagues.

Van Ophuijsen—who held an executive function in the IPA for almost ten years—saw a great opportunity in the arrival of the German colleagues: he wanted to revitalize his analytic institute in The Hague, which had fallen into decline, by making it the exclusive training centre. Karl Landauer seemed particularly well suited as a training analyst. Van Ophuijsen, president of the Society, tried to force the issue, against the advice of Ernest Jones. A majority of the Society signed a motion of no confidence against him in September

1933; in response, Van Ophuijsen left the Society and founded a new one: the Society of Psychoanalysts in the Netherlands. This tiny newly established Society pursued the course set out by the IPA and was immediately recognized by it. Apparently there was no objective professional reason for this split: it was personal tensions that played a major part. A committee was appointed to bring about reunification, and unity was restored in 1938. But there were significant losses in the intervening period. Van Ophuijsen left the country for the United States in 1934 (Stroeken, 2009). Westerman Holstijn [1891–1980]—one of the main opponents of van Ophuijsen as well as his former analysand—left the Society altogether, fed up with all the fighting, even though he had been an active participant.

#### German occupation and the founding of the Dutch Psychoanalytical Association

During the war the Amsterdam Psychoanalytic Working Group—the Amsterdam chapter of the Society—was more important than the Society as a whole. Until then, the Society had mainly been concentrated around The Hague and Leiden. During and after the war the centre shifted towards Amsterdam. Officially this working group had dissolved itself when the German occupying forces demanded that the Jewish members leave the Society, but in practice it continued to work very hard. Jeanne Lampl-de Groot [1889–1987] and her husband Hans Lampl [1889–1958] had settled in the Netherlands in 1938, following the *Anschluss* of Austria. The Amsterdam Psychoanalytic Working Group set up the field of psychoanalysis in accordance with the regulations of the IPA, just as a few had wanted in the 1930s. The measures necessary for this were adopted on 19 April 1943 at a meeting of the working group held in the Lampls' home. On the same occasion it was decided to have only two training analysts, Lampl-de Groot and R. Le Coultre [1897–1987]. After the war, the Working Group took over the Society completely, and the requirements of the IPA came to apply to the Society as a whole.

Not everyone was pleased with the actions of the Amsterdam Working Group. J. H. van der Hoop was deeply aggrieved by his exclusion as a training analyst. He was a well-known Dutch psychiatrist who held important positions in the world of mental health, among them assistant professor at the University of Amsterdam,

where he lectured on psychoanalysis. A founding father of the Society in 1917, he had been doing training analyses for decades and was suddenly no longer allowed to do so. He lodged a protest, in vain, against the decision of the working group.

A. J. Westerman Holstijn had left the Society a few years before the German occupation. He was opposed to the “moguls” who headed the Society. Van der Hoop and Westerman Holstijn—together very different personalities—started their own psychoanalytic training. Their attempt to work together with the Society was unsuccessful, and their group developed into the Dutch Psychoanalytical Association. Although officially founded on 1 January 1947, its activities can be traced back to 1945.

#### After the Second World War

After the war the Dutch Psychoanalytical Society enjoyed several decades of great prosperity. The Dutch Psychoanalytical Association did well too, although it needed many years to establish itself. The relationship between the Society and the Association was very troubled for years. The Association was blamed for everything that had gone wrong during the 1930s. The Society regarded itself as the continuation of everything that had gone right, even though most of its members had originally been against lay analysis and training analysis and had not viewed the inclusion of the German immigrants as a thing to be taken for granted.

In 1946 the Society founded the Psycho-Analytic Institute in Amsterdam. In 1947 Jeanne Lampl-de Groot, P. J. Van der Leeuw [1909–1985], an analysand of Jeanne Lampl-de Groot, and H. G. van der Waals<sup>2</sup> [1894–1974] organized a conference of European psychoanalysts in Amsterdam. Ernest Jones presided over this European conference, which was an attempt at reconciliation and cooperation, drawing more than 100 participants from 11 countries. He said, and afterwards wrote, that the Dutch Society was very likely the most active one on the continent. Van der Leeuw helped to organize the *Mitteleuropäische Arbeitstagung* [Central European Working Group] in 1958,<sup>3</sup> which became a bi-annual event for German-speaking countries. In 1986, a new journal—*Zeitschrift für psychanalytische Theorie und Praxis* [Journal of psychoanalytic theory and practice]—resulted from these encounters. Dutch analysts helped to revive psychoanal-

ysis in Germany.<sup>4</sup> Van der Leeuw also helped the Swiss Raymond de Saussure to found the European Psychoanalytical Federation (EPF) in 1966.

By far the most influential Dutch psychoanalyst after the Second World War was Jeanne Lampl-de Groot. She had been in analysis with Freud and became an intimate friend of the Freud family, especially of Anna. She served as vice-president of the IPA in 1947, and was honorary vice-president from 1965 till her death in 1987. Shortly after the war, she supported the admission of the new *Deutsche Psychoanalytische Verein* to the IPA and the rejection of the old *Deutsche Psychoanalytische Gesellschaft*. In 1953, as a member of an IPA enquiring committee, she was against the recognition of the newly founded *Société Française de Psychoanalyse*, of which Lagache and Lacan were the principal leaders. It was the beginning of a ten-year process that finally led to Lacan's expulsion.<sup>5</sup>

Jeanne Lampl-de Groot and her circle presided over what some have called "The Golden Age of Dutch Psychoanalysis", from 1960 to 1980. The Society grew rapidly, and there was a great deal of international exchange. Many analysts held professorships in psychiatry, psychology, psychotherapy, and sexology, resulting in frequent publications. But in the long run, her lifelong influence on the Society, supported by her IPA status, formed a limitation to the development of psychoanalytic thought in the Society. Because of her close ties to Anna Freud and the Hampstead Clinic, the atmosphere was definitely anti-Kleinian; Lacan was unknown. In contrast, many psychoanalysts within the Association were familiar with Klein and Lacan. However, the Association was not recognized by the IPA, because the rules then in force demanded the assent of the Society, which it refused in the late 1970s. Only after the IPA had abolished this rule did recognition become possible—in 2001, more than 50 years after the Association's founding.

Going back in time, the 17th IPA Congress in 1951, the second to be held in the Netherlands, took place in Amsterdam, which had replaced The Hague as the centre of psychoanalysis. In 1965 the IPA held a third Congress, its 24th, in the Netherlands, in Amsterdam again. There, Van der Leeuw was elected president of the IPA (1965 to 1969) and M. M. Montessori [1921–1993] its secretary; after his term Montessori became vice-president (1969 to 1975).

In 1966 the first training in child analysis was set up in Leiden by S. Teuns; in the same year the Department for Children and Adoles-

cents of the Psycho-Analytic Institute in Amsterdam was opened. The Hampstead Clinic in London lent its support by sending instructors for teaching, technical seminars, and supervision. Jeanne Lampl-de Groot, who had worked together with Anna Freud and others in Vienna at a centre for destitute children, stimulated this endeavour. Elisabeth Frijling-Schreuder [1908–2003], another analysand of Jeanne Lampl-de Groot, had been director of a child guidance clinic and became the first professor of child psychiatry in Amsterdam (1965). She was a great source of inspiration for the child analytic movement in the Netherlands. In 1969 the Dutch Society asked the IPA to recognize child analysis as a regular form of analysis; at the same time the Society supported Anna Freud in her fight for recognition of the Hampstead Training Clinic. This proposal was rejected after an emotional discussion in the IPA business meeting (Groen-Prakken & De Nobel, 1992, p. 225). Frijling-Schreuder attributed this rejection to the fact that many child analysts were psychologists, and the Americans did not want lay analysts (Stroeken, 1997, p. 157).

### Recent developments

Even before the fall of the Iron Curtain, Han Groen-Prakken [1927–2003], then president of the EPF (from 1987 to 1991), had become active in Eastern Europe. Many members of the Society joined her. In 1999 Groen-Prakken started the “Amsterdam School of Psychoanalysis”, a training programme that allowed Eastern Europeans to become direct members of the IPA. It continued for ten years, and during this time many Dutch psychoanalysts provided training, shuttle analysis, and hospitality to their East European colleagues. In a way, the work done in Germany after the Second World War was repeated. The Psychoanalytic Institute for Eastern Europe (PIEE) was named the Han Groen-Prakken Institute.

In 1993 the IPA held its Congress, the 38th, in the Netherlands for the fourth time, once again a high point in the existence of the Dutch Society.

With the increasing interest in biological psychiatry, the rise of alternative forms of therapy, and cuts in governmental financial support to psychoanalytic treatment, a lively discussion began in the 1990s about the place and the financing of psychoanalysis. The

number of candidates who sought psychoanalytic training, either in the Society or in the Association, dwindled. The financial base became fragile. Because the very survival of psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic training was at stake, the Society and the Association sought to work together, with the Dutch Society of Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy as a third partner. The latter Society had been established in 1979 as a joint effort between the Society and the Association. The plan was to pool financial and teaching resources for part of the theoretical curriculum. However, at about the same time a conflict erupted within the Dutch Psychoanalytical Society in connection with a remark by a training analyst in the *Mededelingenblad* [Bulletin] of the Society, which was deemed by many members to be anti-Semitic and in need of retraction, by other members much less so. At the same time, the position of training analyst was separated from that of supervising analyst, and the functions of the training committee were redefined. A small group in the Society, comprising a relatively large proportion of training analysts, dissented and sharply criticized the new joint training programme. Rumours began to reach the IPA board, which thereupon threatened the Society with suspension of the training programme. A visiting IPA committee led by A.-M. Sandler came to the Netherlands (2005) but failed to heal the looming split. This was not surprising since this committee could not be perceived as neutral—not by the Society, because it was under pressure by the IPA's threat to end its training programme, and not by the dissenting minority, which felt encouraged by the stalemate. Following the visit, in 2005 the minority—about one-tenth of the Society—organized itself into the Dutch Psycho-Analytic Group. After the split, a second IPA committee, consisting of I. Szecsódy and R. Lander, visited the Society (2006) and found its new regulations and training programme perfectly in line with existing IPA standards, with the exception of a few details, which were readily resolved. The Dutch Psycho-Analytic Group was recognized by the IPA in 2007. In retrospect, we might wonder whether the split could have been avoided if the IPA and the Society had first ironed out their apparent differences of opinion.

Meanwhile, the Association, only recently (2001) recognized by the IPA, had watched the conflict within the Society and the reaction of the IPA board with growing concern. Shortly thereafter the Association withdrew from the three-way cooperation; it feared that the IPA would disapprove of the joint training. But ambivalence towards



the Society, which had for decades opposed the Association's admission to the IPA, may also have played a role in its withdrawal.

The result of these events was ironic: at the beginning of the attempt to work together, two organizations existed in the Netherlands that provided training in psychoanalysis. Now there are three, all of them recognized by the IPA. All three organizations have to date only a handful of new candidates each year, for a total of around ten—sometimes more, sometimes less. Together, the Society, the Association, and the Group have 406 members, including associate members, candidates, and extraordinary members.

Dutch psychoanalysts continue to be active internationally. For instance, Duveken Engels has served two terms as treasurer of the EPF, and in that capacity was liaison officer for the Psychoanalytic Institute of Eastern Europe (PIEE), which is sponsored by both the EPF and the IPA. Henk Jan Dalewijk was vice-president of the EPF, its treasurer, and EPF representative to the board of the IPA; he currently (2010) serves as IPA treasurer.

Members of the three organizations continue to work together under the umbrella of the Netherlands Psychoanalytic Institute, a merger of the Psycho-Analytic Institute in Amsterdam and the one founded in 1983 by the Association. Unlike similar institutes in other countries, it is incorporated in the government-regulated and financed field of mental health care. In addition to offering patient care, the Institute has devoted its energies to research into the effectiveness of long-term therapy (i.e. psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy). The government and health insurance companies will only continue their financing if the effectiveness of long-term psychoanalytic treatment is proved beyond doubt. Another area of productive cooperation since 1995 has been the journal *Tijdschrift voor Psychoanalyse*, which is supported by seven psychoanalytic societies in the Netherlands and Belgium. Cooperation exists also in groups such as *Psychoanalyse en Cultuur* and *Psychoanalyse en Film* and the website [www.psychoanalytischwoordenboek.nl](http://www.psychoanalytischwoordenboek.nl)

Evidence of the fact that Freud's thinking continues to be important in the Netherlands is the publication of his complete works in a new Dutch translation entitled *Werken* (Boom, Amsterdam) which appeared on the occasion of Freud's 150th birthday in 2006. This edition—the translation as well as all the accompanying registers—compares favourably with the existing German and English editions.

In summary, the history of the psychoanalytic movement in the

Netherlands in relation to the IPA can be characterized in three ways: impassioned internal controversies reflecting international ones, practical cooperation whenever necessary and possible, and some hard work in the international arena, both in professional and in administrative functions.

### Notes

1. A complete survey of the Freud translations and editions in the Netherlands is given by E. Greven (2006), and a summary in the German language is available in Greven (2009) (see also: H. Stroeken, 1993; 1997, chap. 1).

2. H. G. van der Waals emigrated to the United States and joined the Menninger Foundation in Topeka, Kansas, in 1956; there, Kernberg was one of his supervisees.

3. Together with W. Solms from Vienna, Alexander Mitscherlich from Germany, and the Swiss Psychoanalytical Society.

4. J. Bastiaans, W. H. Goudsmit, P. Kuiper, J. Lampl-de Groot, P. J. van der Leeuw, D. van der Sterren, S. Teuns (Brecht, Friedrich, Hermanns, Kaminer, & Juelich, 1985, p. 210)

5. For this controversial topic, see A. de Mijolla (2001) and E. Roudinesco (1986, pp. 328–368).

### Bibliography

- Anonymous (1920). Bericht über den VI. Internationalen Psychoanalytischen Kongress im Haag, 8 bis 11 September 1920. *Korrespondenzblatt der Psychoanalytischen Vereinigung*, 4: 376–402.
- Brecht, K., Friedrich, V., Hermanns, L. M., Kaminer, I. J., & Juelich, D. H. (Eds.) (1985). *“Hier geht das Leben auf eine sehr merkwürdige Weise weiter . . .”. Zur Geschichte der Psychoanalyse in Deutschland [“Here Life Goes on in a Most Peculiar Way. . .” Psychoanalysis Before and After 1933: English edition prepared by H. Ehlers]*. London/Hamburg: Goethe Institute/Kellner Verlag, 1993
- Bulhof, I. (1981). From Psychotherapy to Psychoanalysis; Frederik van Eeden and Albert Willem van Renterghem, *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 17: 209–221.
- Bulhof, I. (1982). Psychoanalysis in the Netherlands. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 24 (4): 572–588.
- Bulhof, I. (1983). *Freud en Nederland. De interpretatie en invloed van zijn ideeën*. Baarn: Ambo.

- Freud, S. (1914d). On the history of the psycho-analytic movement. *Standard Edition*, 14.
- Greven, E. (2006). *Freud uitgeven*. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Greven, E. (2009). Hundert Jahre Freud-Ausgaben in den Niederlanden. *Luzifer-Amor*, 22 (44): 54–70.
- Groen-Prakken, H., & De Nobel, L. (1992). The Netherlands. In: P. Kutter (Ed.), *Psychoanalysis International: A Guide to Psychoanalysis throughout the World, Vol. I: Europe*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstadt: Frommann-Holzboog.
- May, U. (2008). Nineteen patients in analysis with Freud (1910–1920). *American Imago*, 65: 41–105.
- Mijolla, A. de (2001). Splits in the French psychoanalytic movement, between 1953 and 1964. In: R. Steiner & J. Johns (Eds.), *Within Time and Beyond Time: A Festschrift for Pearl King*. London: Karnac.
- Roudinesco, E. (1986). *La bataille de cent ans. Histoire de la psychoanalyse en France, 2; 1925–1985*. Paris: Seuil.
- Roudinesco, E. (1990). *Jacques Lacan & Co. A History of Psychoanalysis in France, 1925–1985*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stroeken, H. (1993). The reception of psychoanalysis in the Netherlands. In: H. Groen-Prakken & A. Ladan (Eds.), *The Dutch Annual of Psychoanalysis 1993*. Amsterdam/Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Stroeken, H. (1997). *Freud in Nederland. Een eeuw psychoanalyse*. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Stroeken, H. (2003). Psychoanalysis in the Netherlands during World War II. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, 12: 130–135.
- Stroeken, H. (2009). Johan van Ophuijsen, Padang/Indonesien 1882—New York, 1950. *Luzifer-Amor*, 22 (44): 7–44. [An English version is in preparation.]