

Letter to Harriet Wolfe, President IPA; Heribert Blass, President Elect IPA.

5<sup>th</sup> December 2024

Dear Harriet and Heribert,

First of all, we would like to express our gratitude to you both for joining in person our meetings in Brussels. It was very good to meet with you and to discuss with you the various issues that continue to concern many of us regarding the IPA and in particular the changes to the Procedural Code that were voted on in Miami in July.

We accept, of course, that at this point the Board has made its decision. We understand that Component Societies that wish to do so are now able to use the normal variations in training procedures that were agreed by the IPA Board and some have already begun to do so. We respect the IPA Board's decision to enable them to do this.

However, for those societies, not necessarily only in Europe, who wish to continue to train in accordance with the training requirements of the Procedural Code that existed prior to the Miami decision, i.e., before the extension of the facility for the use of remote training analysis, the decision is deeply problematic. Many of those societies also continue to apply the training requirements that were in place before the Buenos Aires decision to change the specifications of the Eitingon model. They do this because they judge not to do so would be damaging to their tradition of psychoanalysis.

As a number of us noted in our Brussels meeting with you, previous administrations have enabled differences between psychoanalytical approaches to clinical work and training requirements, to be accommodated by creating structures that acknowledge, respect and register these differences. The examples included the British Society's creation of three groups following the acrimonious Controversial Discussion in the 1940s. This enabled the British Society to stay together and with the long-term benefit of continuing discussions and sharing of views which have greatly benefitted our discipline. More recently Daniel Widlöcher, on noting that psychoanalytic theories and technique had developed in ways that might have led to splits in the IPA pioneered the current structure of the three models. This creative solution allowed the IPA to continue as a single entity that could respect, register and hence contain differences.

In a similar fashion we would now like the IPA Board to create a Section for Societies who adhere strictly (although with some limited and carefully monitored exceptions) to the Reference Standard as given in the communication about the current 2024 Procedural Code.

That is to say:

- that their training normally requires in-person attendance for the psychoanalytic sessions candidates both receive and give,

- consists of at least three sessions a week on separate days and fits within an overall theoretical framework consistent with one of the three models (French, Eitingon and Uruguayan).

In effect, we believe that there is now a need for a section which follows the new Reference Standard with only very carefully thought through and monitored exceptions. You will understand that we wish to insist that exceptions, or indeed future innovations, are not to be introduced as normal or “ordinary” variations in this proposed Section. Future changes would follow a gradual accumulation of consensually agreed evidence built up by the different Component Societies’ training organizations and shared and agreed between those in the section. We believe that such a structural recognition of the different trainings that are offered by IPA Societies would enable the project that we all support, namely the scientific study of the different training models and their effectiveness in transmitting psychoanalytic technique and theory to future generations of psychoanalysts.

We also want to register our deep concern about the International New Groups Committee and the Applicant Society Committee. We would like to be assured that, as we had understood had been the rule up until now, when these committees consider applications from new groups in countries where there already exist IPA component organizations, they do not simply consider whether the applicant group meet the IPA’s prevailing minimal standard of training. We insist it is also necessary to give serious consideration to the possible consequences for the existing Societies in terms of their functioning and indeed for the standing and quality control that they have created for psychoanalysis in that country. As we discussed at our meeting, we have grave concerns about this and we wish the IPA Board to give them very careful consideration. Rather than elaborate here, we simply state our concerns knowing that you both noted them in our meeting.

We very much hope for a positive response from you and of course the IPA Board to this letter and then to take the appropriate next steps to flesh out the details of our proposals.

With our best wishes and our thanks again for the care you have taken in hearing our concerns.

Belgian Psychoanalytic Society, (SBP), Marc Hebbrecht, President

British Psychoanalytic Association, (BPA), Ora Dresner, President

British Psychoanalytical Society, (BPS), Vic Sedlak, President

Croatian Psychoanalytical Society, (HPD), Oleg Filipović, President

Czech Psychoanalytic Society, (CPS), Martin Mahler, President, Martin Babik; Vice, President

Danish Psychoanalytic Society. (DPS), Asbjørn Pedersen, President

Dutch Psychoanalytic Society (NPAV), Rick Blom, President

Estonian-Latvian Psychoanalytic Society, Endel Talvik, President

Finnish psychoanalytic Society, Anneli Larmo, President

French Psychoanalytic Association, (APF), Dominique Suchet, President

Hellenic Psychoanalytical Association, (SPH), Ioannis Vartzopoulos, President

Hungarian Psychoanalytical Society, (MPE), Ágoston Schmelowszky, President

Israel Psychoanalytic Society, Viviane Chetrit-Vatine, President

Istanbul Psychoanalytical Association, (IPD), Göver Kazancıoğlu, president

Italian Psychoanalytical Association, (AIPsi), Geni Valle, President, Luigi Maccioni, Vice-President

Italian Psychoanalytical Society, (SPI), Sarantis Thanopoulos, President

Lebanese Association for the Development of Psychoanalysis, (ALDeP), Nayla de Coster, President

Moscow Psychoanalytic Society (MPS) Igor Kadyrov, President

Northern Ireland Psychoanalytic Society, (NIPaS), Hannah Browne, President

Paris Psychoanalytical Society, (SPP), Emmanuelle Chervet, President

Polish Psychoanalytic Society, (PTPA), Piotr Dworczyk, President

Psike Istanbul Psychoanalytic Association, (PSIKE), Nilüfer Erdem, President

Psychoanalytic Society for Research and Training, (SPRF), Jean-Philippe Gueguen, President, Anna Dal Mas, vice President

Psychoanalytical Society of Serbia Tijana Miladinović, President

Romanian Psychoanalytic Society, Bogdan Sebastian Cuc, President

South African Psychoanalytical Association, (SAPA) Mary-Anne Smith, President

Swedish Psychoanalytical Association, (SPA), Alexandra Billinghamurst, President

Swiss Society of Psychoanalysis, (SSPsa), Jean-Marc Chauvin, Berdj Papazian, Presidents

Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, (WPV/VPS), Wolfgang Oswald, President

Vilnius Society of Psychoanalysts, (VPD), Drasute Vaicekonyte Jonaitiene, President