

The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality

In American Psychoanalysis



Dorothy E. Holmes, PhD, Chair
Co-Chairs
Anton Hart, PhD
Dionne R. Powell, MD
Beverly J. Stoute, MD
holmescommission@apsa.org



Nancy J Chodorow, PhD
M. Fakhry Davids, MSc
Ebony Dennis, PsyD
William C. Glover, PhD
Francisco J. Gonzalez, MD
Forrest Hamer, PhD
Rafael Art Javier, PhD
Maureen Katz, MD
Kimberlyn Leary, PhD
Rachel D. Maree, MD
Teresa Méndez, MSW
Michael Moskowitz, PhD
Donald Moss, MD
Usha Tummala-Narra, PhD
Jasmine Ueng-McHale, PhD
Kirkland Vaughans, PhD



The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality (CO-REAP) was established within the American Psychoanalytic Association on recommendation of the Black Psychoanalysts Speak national organization. CO-REAP's purpose is to identify and to find remedies for apparent and implicit manifestations of structural racism that may reside within American psychoanalysis. The Commission's work product will be based on the study of American psychoanalytic institutes, training centers and societies within and across different organizational auspices.

June 19, 2023



To: American Psychoanalytic Organizations and Individual Colleagues
RE: **Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis 2023 – Juneteenth**

Greetings from The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis!

this is a yellow inline note

The Commission's Final Report of our findings and recommendations and the supporting data and other appendices are deliberately released today, Juneteenth 2023, a commemorative and reflective day that puts in focus that racial equality, historically and presently, is in danger. Juneteenth reminds us of the immense work and necessary to continue the quest towards racial equality. The Commission joined that work and engaged in it from August 2020 until now. Our Final Report is our invitation to the entire field of psychoanalysis to join this work of making psychoanalysis equitable regarding race and other identities that are subject to oppression.

We hope our Final Report gives you hope, guidance, and resolve.

The Commission offers our thanks and appreciation to all who completed the Commission's survey and were interviewed, the many who expressed appreciation and hope for the Commission's work, those who offered probing questions, all who have been patient yet eager as we worked, and the American Psychoanalytic Association for sponsoring the Commission.

We encourage you to engage in the work ahead by:

- Sharing the Report far and wide, including both within and outside of your own psychoanalytic institute or other organization,
- Taking time to read and reflect on the Report,
- Talking with others about the Report's findings and recommendations, and the implications for the psychoanalytic communities of which you are a part,
- Forming study groups that allow for dialogic engagement with this material,

- Letting your organizational leaders know what you think about the Report, and letting them know what you believe needs to be done now and going forward,
- Exploring the perspectives of psychoanalysts at various levels of seniority, of current and prospective psychoanalytic candidates, and graduate students, interns, and psychiatry residents by inviting them into conversation, and
- Committing to doing the difficult work of making psychoanalysis as diverse, equitable, inclusive, open, and vibrant as it can be.

The Report puts emphasis on group process to hold the tensions related to the work of achieving racial equality, to create and share rituals to support sustaining effort and best ideas, and to establish the avenues on which collective and individual efforts towards equality can proceed.

We know that help from many sources will be necessary. We recommend establishment of generative cooperatives to hold, encourage, promote, and protect the work towards racial equality and one such coalition, the Consultation-Liaison Network, described in the Chapter 8 of the Report, is being formed.

The Consultation-Liaison Network will be an independent, grassroots organization of psychoanalysts and psychoanalytically interested colleagues from across North America who will connect with each other to work towards a more equitable, rich, inclusive psychoanalysis. Anton Hart (antonhartphd@gmail.com) and Francisco Gonzalez (f.j.g@comcast.net) are coordinating this initiative, and you may email them about it.

The Commission will not formally meet again until September 2023 and sunsets in Fall 2023. Until then, the Commission welcomes comments, which may be sent to: holmescommission@apsa.org. When the Commission meets in September and October, we will process comments and determine how to be of additional help. Going forward, all who have served on the Commission will stay in the struggle for racial equality in psychoanalysis and will contribute to the cause of diversity, equity, and inclusion in the best ways possible.

We wish everyone a good summer and we look forward to rich dialogue and positive change.

Chair: Dorothy E. Holmes and Co-Chairs: Anton Hart, Dionne R. Powell, and Beverly J. Stoute

The chair's signature below attests to the Commission's unanimous ratification of The Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis at its June 17, 2023 meeting.

Yours in hopefulness and gratitude,



Dorothy E. Holmes, PhD, Chair

Anton Hart, PhD, Dionne R. Powell, MD and Beverly J. Stoute, MD, Co-Chairs

Enclosed:

1. **Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis (2023)**
2. **Appendices A-K**

Final Report of

The Holmes Commission on

Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis

2023

holmescommission@apsa.org

Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Juneteenth 2023.....	3
Executive Summary.....	5
Chapter 1. Overview of The Holmes Commission Study Results and Themes.....	21
Chapter 2. Five Themes Cutting Across Data Sets.....	44
Chapter 3. Understanding and Addressing Racism.....	51
Chapter 4. Recruitment, Admissions, Progression and Procedures, and Mentorship and Leadership.....	76
Chapter 5. The Curriculum, Racism as an Analytic Lens, and Supervision.....	113
Chapter 6. The Experience of Race on the Couch.....	129
Chapter 7. Enactments.....	154
Chapter 8. The Consultation-Liaison Network.....	183
Chapter 9. Final Recommendations.....	187

The Holmes Commission Releases its Final Report on

Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis

Juneteenth 2023

Psychoanalysts appreciate that understanding history is a prerequisite to advancing change. History often requires repeated examination to mine its lessons. For example, the Emancipation Proclamation, issued by President Abraham Lincoln on January 1, 1863, was limited in scope, and applied only to states that had seceded. Even after the Civil War ended in April 1865, the enforcement of manumission relied on enforcement by Federal troops, especially at the western edge of the former Confederate states. The history of Juneteenth is a story of justice deferred as emancipation was rough and slow. Union troops arrived in Galveston, Texas, in mid-June 1865. On June 19, 1865, two and a half years after the Emancipation Proclamation, Major General Granger issued General Order No. 3, announcing to the people of Texas that all enslaved people are now free. But slavery did not truly end in all states in the United States until the Thirteenth Amendment was ratified in December 1865, and the people who claimed their freedom continued at risk of murder, torture, and rape.

The commemoration of June 19th started in 1866 as Freedom Day in Texas and became known as Juneteenth in the 1890s. The day was associated with citizenship and liberty as well as the reunion of families. Historian Elizabeth Hayes Turner describes Juneteenth as “a potent life-giving event ... a joyful retort to messages of overt racism ... a public counter-demonstration to displays of Confederate glorification and a counter-memory to the valorization of the Lost

Cause.” Juneteenth has always held meaning, myth, and historical memory. Juneteenth spread from Texas with the Great Migration. Through the advocacy of Ms. Opal Lee, who at the age of 89 walked two-and-a-half miles a day from Fort Worth to Washington, D.C. to encourage recognition of the day, Juneteenth became a Federal holiday in 2021. Juneteenth acknowledges Black family, music, art, prayer, and food. Red food is part of the holiday – barbecue, sweet potato pie, hibiscus tea, Big Red soda, and red velvet cake. There is a culinary connection to the red foods of West Africa, and red is linked to strength, spirituality, and life and death in many West African cultures. Red food, especially red drink, also represents the ancestors and the blood that was shed by enslaved Africans.

As Dorothy Holmes calls to us in her 2021 paper, “‘I Do Not Have a Racist Bone in My Body’: Psychoanalytic Perspectives on What is Lost and Not Mourned in Our Culture’s Persistent Racism”, our job as psychoanalytic psychotherapists includes a process that Hans Loewald (1960) describes as transforming ghosts into ancestors:

Ghosts of the unconscious, imprisoned by defenses but haunting the patient...are allowed to taste blood, are let loose.

On this occasion of Juneteenth 2023, our call is to recognize racism as the ghosts that haunt us, especially as “*these ghosts do their mischief in whites*” (Holmes, p. 238). “Psychoanalytic thinkers and practitioners need to own that disembodied, split-off fragments of (racist) hate, so easily disavowed, are a proper focus for psychoanalysis” (p. 239). This report invites all of us to face that history, in our organizations as well as in ourselves, as part of our core professional value of advancing freedom and liberty.

Final Report of The Holmes Commission on

Racial Equality in

American Psychoanalysis

2023

Executive Summary

We've learned that quiet isn't always peace,
And the norms and notions of what "just is"
Isn't always justice.

— Amanda Gorman
First National Youth Poet Laureate
Biden-Harris Inauguration, 2021

The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis 2023

Commission Members and Authors of The Holmes Commission Final Report

Dorothy E. Holmes, PhD (Chair)

Anton Hart, PhD, Dionne R. Powell, MD, Beverly J. Stoute, MD (Co-Chairs)

Nancy J. Chodorow, PhD, M. Fakhry Davids, MSc, Ebony Dennis, PsyD,
William C. Glover, PhD (Immediate Past President, American Psychoanalytic Association),
Francisco J. Gonzalez, MD, Forrest Hamer, PhD, Rafael Art Javier, PhD, Maureen Katz, MD,
Kimberlyn Leary, PhD (Distinguished Consultant), Rachel D. Maree, MD, Teresa Méndez,
MSW, Michael Moskowitz, PhD, Donald Moss, MD, Kerry Sulkowicz, MD,¹ *ex officio*
(President, American Psychoanalytic Association), Usha Tummala-Narra, PhD, Jasmine Ueng-
McHale, PhD, Kirkland Vaughans, PhD

Methodologist and Author of The Holmes Commission Technical Report (Appendices)

Michael Russell, PhD

Support Personnel

Tina Faison, American Psychoanalytic Association, Executive Assistant to the Commission
Alice Rapkin, Commission Scribe

Guest Editors for The Holmes Commission Final Report

Salman Akhtar, MD, Mark Blechner, PhD, Christopher Lovett, PhD, Susan McNamara, MD,
Stephen Seligman, DMH, and Donnel Stern, PhD

Editor-in-Chief

Susan McNamara, MD

¹ Kerry Sulkowicz was an active member of The Holmes Commission from its inception in August 2020 until September 2022 when he asked to become a non-voting, non-attending *ex officio* member. His *ex officio* membership ended upon his resignation from his office as the President of the American Psychoanalytic Association on April 7, 2023.

The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis 2023

Executive Summary

Opening Statement

The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis (the Commission) was formed in August 2020. The impetus for its formation came from several years of mounting demand that American psychoanalysis express itself on the importance of psychoanalytic understanding of race. The continuing racial atrocities occurring in the United States in 2020 became the immediate catalyst for the then leadership of the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsA) – William Glover, President, and Kerry Sulkowicz, President-Elect – to consult with the co-chairs of Black Psychoanalysts Speak (BPS), Craig Polite and Kathleen Pogue White, on how to address race within APsA. Their discussions led to APsA leadership accepting the BPS recommendation that a high-level body, a commission, be formed for the psychoanalytic study of systemic racism, and Dorothy E. Holmes be named its chair. Once formed, three co-chairs of the Commission were chosen by the chair in collaboration with APsA leadership: Anton Hart, Dionne R. Powell, and Beverly J. Stoute. The chair and co-chairs collaborated to select the full membership of the Commission and the Commission Methodologist, Michael Russell. Selection of Commissioners was made based on their extensive clinical and scholarly experience with and commitment to the understanding of race in psychoanalysis as well as representation of multiple diversities (levels of experience, mental

health disciplines, races and ethnicities other than African American, gender, and sexual orientation) in order that our study of race be informed by broad aspects of intersectionality.²

We held our first monthly meeting of the Commission on October 6, 2020, to establish operational guidelines. We decided that the entire Commission would meet monthly for two and a half hours, and the leadership team would meet weekly for a minimum of an hour, often with the methodologist. We developed the practice of beginning each Commission meeting with a roll call and inspirational music or text message. We discussed how we would engage each other and the range and scope of our work. We recognized the fruitfulness of conducting our meetings as think tanks in which we as Commissioners and consultants would find our way to purpose and methods by sharing our own personal and professional stories about systemic racism. The established meeting schedule and practices continued through June 2023 when the Commission adopted the final report.

Purpose


The purpose of the Commission was to appraise systemic racism in American psychoanalysis and, where found, to offer recommendations and a path forward to reduce its pernicious effects. We studied how well racism is understood; whether, how, and to what degree systemic racism impacts the experience of considering and deciding whether to enter the field of psychoanalysis; how systemic racism affects experience across career development once one enters training; how systemic racism influences teaching and learning in the classroom and

² According to the American Psychological Association, intersectionality is the complex, cumulative way in which the effects of multiple forms of discrimination (such as racism, sexism, and classism) combine, overlap, or intersect especially in the experiences of marginalized individuals or groups to produce and sustain complex inequities. Kimberlé Crenshaw introduced the theory of *intersectionality* in a paper for the *University of Chicago Legal Forum* (Crenshaw, 1989), the idea that when it comes to thinking about how inequalities persist, categories like gender, race, and class are best understood as overlapping and mutually constitutive rather than isolated and distinct (Grzanka et al., 2020).

supervision; to what extent systemic racism is enacted across all domains of psychoanalytic experience; when enacted, how it is processed and to what extent is it resolved; and how race is experienced on the couch.

It is to be noted that we first limited our focus to identifying influences of race within APsA. However, the Commission quickly recognized that our volunteer participants came from a wide array of institutions governed by various bodies, including but not limited to APsA. Thus, we shifted our focus and our title to The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis.

Conceptualizations of Race Used for the Commission Study

The Commission's work recognized several aspects of race. We considered "race" as a social construct invented and perpetuated to support systemic racism. We recognized "racialism" as the exposure of all members of a society to ideas and narratives that influence individual thoughts and perceptions about members of racialized groups. We defined "racist acts" as behaviors performed by individuals or small groups that reflect prejudice, discrimination, stereotyping, or antagonism directed against a person or people on the basis of their membership in a particular racial or ethnic group, particularly a minoritized or otherwise marginalized group. We acknowledged "racial enactments" as how ideas around race and racism unconsciously play out in group processes and interpersonal processes. "Systemic racism" was the main interest of the study, which we understood to be a system that produces advantages for some people in a dominant racial group through the oppression of people in a non-dominant racial group. These structural elements of racism are embedded in individual psyches and institutional practices and can be ubiquitous, operating outside the conscious awareness of the individual or institution carrying or practicing systemic racism. 

The Commission also recognized that how racialized groups are named is controversial and unresolved. Many fields struggle with this issue with the intent to adopt approaches that are not a capitulation to Euro-white normativity. The Commission adopted the convention of using upper case for African American and Black and lower case for white, while recognizing that “white” and “black” are labels for racialized groups. We understood that the matter of racial naming is evolving. In naming Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC), we realized that BIPOC represents a very diverse group of people. However, given the relatively small representation of people of color in the field of psychoanalysis, we reluctantly opted to group all people who were not white into a single group, labeled BIPOC, for data analysis purposes.

Methods of Data Gathering and Analysis and Organization of the Final Report

The Commission’s project was an evaluative study to determine in what ways and to what degree systemic racism is manifest in psychoanalytic institutions and institutional practices, and to recommend ways to limit negative impact of systemic racism on psychoanalytic institutional practices. It was not a research study to prove or disprove systemic racism. A mixed methods design that employed survey instruments and interviews was used to collect data from three groups of participants: faculty, staff, and administrators; candidates associated with training institutes; and people who were psychodynamically-oriented but had not entered a psychoanalytic training program. The surveys were developed over an eight-month period using an iterative design process in which major themes to be explored were identified and items for the survey instruments were co-developed by the lead methodologist in collaboration with members of the Commission. Then, draft instruments were piloted with small sets of potential participants, and revisions were made to improve clarity. The final versions of the survey were administered on-line using Qualtrics survey software. Survey data was collected in four waves

between September 17 and December 12, 2021. The surveys covered five themes: institutes' efforts to understand and address race and racism; issues with race from recruitment through mentoring after graduation, occurrence and response to racial enactments; curriculum, racism as an analytic lens, and supervision; and the experience of race on the couch.

Approximately 7,400 potential participants were invited to participate across the four waves. In total, 2,259 responses were received of which 1,990 were members of the groups of interest. The remaining 269 volunteers who were psychoanalytically identified and wanted to offer information on race but did not fall into one of the three participant groups were offered the opportunity to do so via a post-survey questionnaire, and thereby contributed to our field data noted below. Analyses of survey responses were conducted separately for each group of participants and were examined both collectively for all respondents and separately for people who identify as BIPOC or as white.

Small group interviews were conducted to probe more deeply into specific topics. All interviewers participated in a one-hour training and used a semi-structured protocol to guide interviews. The sample of interview participants was selected based first on a survey item that asked whether the respondent would be willing to participate in an interview. Of the approximately 600 people who expressed willingness to be interviewed, 80 faculty members, 70 candidates, and 20 people who were qualified to but had not entered the field were invited to participate, of which 53, 55, and 18, respectively, were interviewed. To obtain a diverse range of views, when selecting participants first priority was given to people who identified as BIPOC, second priority was given to people who indicated on the survey that they did not believe racism was an issue in their institute, and third priority was given to people who identified as white and indicated some level of concern about racism. All interviews were conducted via Zoom and were

video recorded. Following the completion of the interviews, the interviewers used a report template to provide written summaries of each theme addressed in the interviews. Together, the summary reports and review of the recordings were used to inform an Interview Report (Appendix G).

Please note that in some items in the survey, participants were given space to express their views that racism did not exist within psychoanalysis or did not negatively influence psychoanalysis. We also specifically invited such participants to participate in the small group interviews in which they again were able to express and elaborate their views.

Data from the field was the third source of data. Data from the field included a variety of information provided through personal experiences of the Commissioners, communications on listservs, professional publications, and conference presentations.

A fourth source of data was the Commission process itself in which the Commission engaged for over two years, over which time the study was designed, conducted, analyzed, and reflected upon, including the Commission's own enactments, to inform the main findings and recommendations. Data from all four sources -- the survey, the small group interviews, reports from the field, and the Commission's own process -- comprised the key findings of the study.

Overview of Findings

The principal findings for each theme are given below.

1. Understanding and Addressing Racism

- Many faculty and candidates felt personally inadequate to address issues of race, racism, and white supremacy.

- Many psychoanalytic faculty and candidate members of psychoanalytic institutions experienced an inadequate institutional response to issues of race, racism, and white supremacy when they arose. Candidates experienced this lack more than faculty, and Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) people experienced this paucity the most, including in supervision.
- BIPOC members of psychoanalytic institutions felt the most vulnerable about racial issues in their institutional lives, reporting that white members had advantages in institute life that they did not have and that these advantages were enhanced by higher degree status such as having a medical degree.
- BIPOC people experienced little proactive effort by their institutions to address systemic racism.

2. Recruitment through Mentoring in Psychoanalytic Training

- Currently, recruitment relies too heavily on word of mouth. The lack of vigorous and broad recruitment outreach favors the continuance of a predominantly white membership in psychoanalytic institutions.
- BIPOC applicants experienced the processes of admission as significantly less welcoming than white applicants.
- Even when there are objective criteria and data for progression, those criteria were not reliably used. There was little recognition that subjective assessments are necessarily prejudiced by systemic racism and white supremacy.
- Significantly more white faculty and candidates than BIPOC faculty and candidates reported that their institutions offered mentorship, support, and opportunities for professional connection.

- White candidates and faculty compared to BIPOC candidates and faculty underestimated the negative impact of racial incidents and structural barriers (such as financial costs, rigidities in curricula, and accessibility to training sites) on whether BIPOC candidates were able to complete their training.

3. Curriculum, Racism as an Analytic Lens, and Supervision in Psychoanalytic

Education

- Faculty and candidates irrespective of race agreed that psychoanalytic curricula did not adequately address race and racism, including that BIPOC subjects and supervisors were not adequately represented.
- Candidates were not adequately trained to apply racial awareness to analysis.
- Though freedom to choose supervisors was widely reported, it was acknowledged by a notable minority of candidates that race and ethnicity should be considered in selecting supervisors.
- A majority of candidates and faculty reported inadequate discussion of race and racism in supervision.
- Curricular representation of race was typically token, as in one course, a class, or an optional, secondary offering, creating undue and unmetabolized pressures, sometimes with explosive and destructive results for candidates and instructors in those singular, isolated, and siloed offerings.
- Candidates perceived themselves to be more comfortable than instructors in discussing race. This perception was more pronounced among BIPOC candidates.
- Faculty in APsA institutes reported being less comfortable in discussing race than faculty in independent institutes.

- BIPOC faculty and candidates were more likely to raise issues of race and racism, and with more understanding, than their white counterparts even when adverse reactions may occur such as unworked through enactments.

4. Enactments and Responses

- Racial enactments were reported to be ubiquitous.
- The vast majority of racial enactments happened in public –for example in classrooms, online forums, community events, and committees.
- Despite the thorniness of dealing with racial enactments, a strong desire for change was expressed.
- Fear of retaliation for addressing race was intense and widespread. Both BIPOC and white candidates were wary of being seduced into carrying the lion’s share of the work to be done on race, only to be too often tokenized, pathologized, or problematized in doing so, or conversely, dismissed or erased. White faculty and candidates were fearful of showing racism or ignorance. These strong subjective states among BIPOC and white faculty and candidates can lead to superficial and ineffectual engagement of race and racism, and even stasis.
- The Commission itself experienced, recognized, and processed its own enactments.
- The Commission enactments were inevitable given that all of the Commissioners were born into societies structured around racism, though in radically different and asymmetric ways.
- While carrying various affects and defenses about its enactments, including anger, disappointment, denial, and withdrawal, collectively over time and multiple

instances, the Commission embraced its own racial enactments as rich opportunities for working through by doing in-depth process work. In that work the Commission scattered and then reformed as a generative collective, enabling us to complete our work and to write about and publish a paper on the value of process work for the holding of and reduction in inevitable racial enactments, as reported in the Commission's article in *The American Psychoanalyst* (Winter/Spring 2023), which is included in the Appendix J.

5. The Experience of Race on the Couch

Some of the findings in this section are more inferential and more speculative given the analytic dyad is a private space and because the survey of this study did not address this matter as fully as some other themes. However, what is reported is gathered from field data and clinical examples and reflections from both BIPOC and white scholars on race.

- A majority of faculty (including but not limited to Training or Personal Analysts) reported that they had no preparation to apply racial awareness to psychoanalysis.
- Analysts may tend to reinterpret experiences with racism as something else (such as birth order).
- Some African American graduate analysts may feel that they are not considered by the powers that be to be suitable or desirable Training Analysts.
- There is a persistent view that BIPOC psychoanalytic patients don't exist, even in large racially diverse metropolitan areas.

- Those in powerful positions as psychoanalytic policy setters and educators are perceived as blocking inclusion of topics such as race, racism, and white supremacy in the core curriculum.
- BIPOC analysands sometimes search for similarity of racialized suffering when choosing an analyst, thinking this will facilitate analysis of race. The possibility that the selected analyst may not be prepared for such work based on denial of their own racial heritage was sometimes not recognized.
- Although some institutes reach out to supervisees and analysands in East Asia as a diversity effort, this belies their failure to recognize the centrality of systemic racism within American psychoanalytic institutions and the concurrent lack of American BIPOC candidates and faculty.

Recommendations

In general, American psychoanalysis lacks local or national leaders who acknowledge the presence and deleterious effects of systemic racism in psychoanalytic institutions or who allay the massive resistance to grasping and resolving systemic racism within psychoanalysis. To address these lacks, American psychoanalysis needs:

- Local and national leaders who strongly support meaningful initiatives to address and remediate systemic racism in psychoanalytic institutions.
- Leaders who develop meaningful and comprehensive strategies to combat systemic racism at multiple administrative levels including mission statements, value statements, and policies and procedures, with means for regular monitoring and remediation of expressions of systemic racism at all levels of institutional life. Monitoring should include but not be limited to classes, supervision, curriculum,

committees and boards, educational programming, publications, and the consultation room.

- Local and national leaders who will obtain regular consultation from experts in racial equity and other aspects of intersectionality to increase the likelihood of their success in their efforts to enhance racial and other equities and promote inclusion.
- Leaders who will form and join collective frameworks for support and to solidify their resolve to stay the long course required to achieve racial and other equities.

Finally, this Commission Report is being issued at a time of great upheaval within American psychoanalysis regarding acknowledgement and acceptance that the “social” is deeply embedded in and inseparable from the psyche and is an essential focus for psychoanalytic thought and practice. This broadened, more inclusive, and informed view on what is essentially psychoanalytic is being enthusiastically embraced by many, but is also met with fierce resistance. That resistance has been widely experienced as dismissive and contemptuous, leading to acts by leadership that have been experienced as authoritarian, exclusionary, and destructive.

The current tension about race in American psychoanalysis has important historical precedents. Freud “othered” and then extruded early psychoanalytic pioneers who differed from him. They were considered deviant. American psychoanalysis was built on exclusion by limiting training to physicians until the force of a lawsuit required unencumbered disciplinary inclusion. There was decades-long silence among psychoanalysts about the Holocaust. The persistent silence delayed for much too long exploration and understanding of the fact that the Nazis used racialization of and racism towards Jewish people to support and defend the Holocaust. LGBTQIA+ people were unwelcome and considered unfit for psychoanalytic treatment or

training as analysts. These sad facts of psychoanalytic history harmed many people and diminished the discipline of psychoanalysis. In each instance, positive changes were made and are still being made.

Psychoanalysis can now make another positive change and embrace and build on the growing understanding of the essential importance of racial awareness in psychoanalysis. The Commission found that psychoanalysis is being devitalized by its wide-spread lack of racial awareness or racial inclusion. Will American psychoanalysis seize this moment to use The Holmes Commission findings and recommendations as scaffolding to do hard, long, and fruitful work on race and other aspects of intersectionality? Will American psychoanalysis choose leaders who will uplift and stand behind this work unequivocally to make American psychoanalysis more vital and credible in our increasingly diverse world?

In the United States, beginning in 1964, for the country's sake, a visionary leader rose to the country's need, a leader whose history was drenched in his own personal and systemic racism. Nevertheless, his actions turned the nation forcefully and fruitfully towards wholeness by promoting, encouraging, protecting, and then signing into legislation the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. He withstood withering opposition and was undeterred. That leader was President Lyndon Baines Johnson. President Johnson accepted the wise counsel of Martin Luther King, Jr. who shared with Johnson his view that there were "new white elements," (King, 1998, pp. 242-243) including Johnson himself, whose love of country was stronger than the grip of racism. Will American psychoanalysis do the same on the race questions of today within psychoanalysis by heeding the wisdom of many among us who are eloquently and incisively calling for racial and other equities in psychoanalytic thought and

practice? The Holmes Commission hopes it will, so that American psychoanalysis can claim and celebrate its truer liberatory self.

REFERENCES

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139, pp. 139-167.

<https://philpapers.org/archive/CREDTI.pdf?ncid=txtlnkusaolp00000603>

Grzanka, P. R., Flores, M. J., VanDaalen, R. A., & Velez, G. (2020). Intersectionality in psychology: Translational science for social justice [Editorial]. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science*, 6(4), pp. 304–313. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tps0000276>

Holmes, D. E., Hart, A., Powell, D. R., Stoute, B. J. (2023). The Holmes Commission’s journey toward racial equality in American psychoanalysis: Reflection and hope. *The American Psychoanalyst*, 57(1), pp. 1-7. https://apsa.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/74728_TAP-Winter-2023_web.pdf

King, M. L., Jr. (1998). *The Autobiography of Martin Luther King, Jr.* Warner Books.

Chapter 1

Overview of The Holmes Commission Study Results and Themes

The important thing to remember is this: to be able at any moment to sacrifice what we are for what we could become.³

— Charles Du Bos, *Approximations*

The Holmes Commission, in the words of its mission statement, endeavored “to achieve a thorough psychoanalytic understanding of how racism plays out within our national psychoanalytic organization and component institutes.” To that end, a study was conceived, developed, and conducted by the Commission, in consultation with an expert Commission Methodologist, to bring to light the racism embedded in the structures and practices of American psychoanalytic institutes and organizations. These are obstacles on the American Psychoanalytic Association’s journey toward increased diversity and equity. The Commission hopes that this study of the lived experience of racism will provide a framework for organizational remedies.

The Holmes Commission study was conducted at a transformational moment in our country and in the field of psychoanalysis. The hard reality of structural racism has moved from the margins to the center of public discussions. With that shift, more work is being done to understand structural racism. This social and intellectual ferment affected both our personal awareness and theoretical formulations of otherness, which evolved even as the study progressed. That the demographics of our country have changed provides further context. According to the 2020 United States Census, complex changes in birth rates, death rates, and immigration have led to greater racial and ethnic diversity in our country. In 2020, as a consequence, the under-18 non-Hispanic white population of the United States became a

³ "Premier tressaillement vital; surtout il s'agit à tout moment de sacrifier ce que nous sommes à ce que nous pouvons devenir." This 1922 quotation is often attributed to W.E.B. Du Bois in error.

minority (Frey, 2021). As a result of these patterns, our educational and social institutions face new challenges. The American Psychoanalytic Association (APsA) and its institutes have not been spared from these pressures; nor have our members' practices. The authors of this report here have borne witness, as mental health professionals, as psychoanalysts, as citizens in a divided nation, and as individuals with personal histories of their own, to the collective challenges we all in the field of psychoanalysis face as the gates, of our country, of our field open to these diverse voices.

Historically, our field has not been diverse racially or in other ways. The Holmes Commission was created that we might better clarify and understand the impediments to equity and inclusivity. While many are writing about theoretical limitations and the need to expand the social lens, in this study we examined exactly what occurs on a granular level in the lived experience of psychoanalytic training and education across American psychoanalysis.

The conception in August 2020 and birth in October 2020 of The Holmes Commission occurred during the years of a global pandemic when the threat of annihilation was real, not just intrapsychic. That affected us powerfully. How it factored into our work will only be understood as the work of equity and inclusivity is consolidated. How did the social upheaval in the wake of George Floyd's globally broadcast murder drive us "to do" something? When only 0.0007% of psychoanalysts are African American (Fuller, 1999; Stoute, 2023), psychoanalysis as a theory, as a clinical practice, and as an institution, has failed to meet the challenges of racism or achieve racial equity. Statistics on clinician numbers representative of other ethnic diversities are not even known. Structural racism is one of the most important issues of the day. As you read the Commission's report, we suggest you consider the social context that has contributed to who we were, who we are, and the psychoanalysts we were seeking to become as we navigated the

challenges of this work. With abiding faith and profound commitment, the Chair, the Co-Chairs, the Commissioners, and the Commission Methodologist studied racism while racial division and violence and a global pandemic threatened us all. The urgency was and is pressing.

It will never be possible to convey fully the two-and-a-half-year experience of our work together. We became painfully aware of racial enactments occurring in our group as we worked. No one escaped with a dry eye, without a psychic laceration, without a challenge to foundational beliefs, or without deep personal and historical hurts being activated. As we prepared this final report, amidst a brutal reckoning in the latest racial enactment in the American Psychoanalytic Association, with a sentiment that rings throughout, one Commissioner put it:

I respect the fierce urgency of now that guides the Commission's resolve not to let this moment pass without transformation. I've been challenged to my core on The Holmes Commission and at times resisted, out of a mixture of denial and self-preservation, but confrontation has been leavened by recognition and compassion that have helped me learn and continue in the work. I trust that the Commission can model the openness, self-reflection, and compassion that make bearable the pain and conflict required in the continuing examination of systemic racism.

Yet all of the commissioners remained steadfast to the enduring belief that, as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote in *Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community?* (1967), "racial understanding is not something we find but something we must create" (p. 28). As we studied the problem of racial inequity in our field, we struggled to bear the pain of what we discovered. We survived the pain by bearing it together as a collective. As an African American-centered leadership team, creating a Black-centered space, we brought an African American cultural sensibility and historical perspective to the work integrating inspirational messages and group

rituals as discussed in the Winter/Spring 2023 edition of *The American Psychoanalyst* (see Appendix J) and evolving our group's leadership style to meet the demands of this challenge. We, as a group, while diverse, came together in the Commission as an integrated “thinking mind.”

The mixed method study was designed to include a wide range of psychoanalytic institutes from across North America. Survey participants were invited regardless of membership organization affiliation. Psychoanalytically-oriented mental health professionals in both the APsA and in allied psychoanalytic membership organizations were invited to participate. This allowed representation from psychoanalysts and psychoanalytic trainees from a variety of theoretical perspectives and geographic locales. It also allowed us to explore whether some clinicians chose not to enter APsA-affiliated psychoanalytic institutes for training because of their perceptions and expectations of the way diversity and equity were addressed or not addressed. While study participation included the United States and Canada, we will use “psychoanalysis” to refer to a study of the United States since the predominant respondent participation (>99%) was from psychoanalytic institutes in the United States.

The first phase of the study employed a survey instrument to collect information from a diverse body of study participants. During the second stage, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a sub-set of faculty and candidates who participated in the survey study and expressed interest in participating in the interview portion of the study. The interview study utilized a protocol that was developed collaboratively with this Commission and the Commission Methodologist.

The survey and interview portions of the study were designed to collect information from three groups of people: psychoanalytic faculty, staff, and administrators; candidates affiliated

with training institutes; and professionals who were positioned to enter the psychoanalytic field but had not yet done so or who had chosen to develop expertise as psychoanalytically oriented clinicians outside the formal training system of institutes.⁴ For the survey portion of the study, an invitation to participate was sent to approximately 7,400 potential participants whose email addresses were provided by training institutes and other organizations with which members of the targeted study groups were affiliated. This invitation resulted in 2,259 initial respondents. Of these initial respondents, 1,990 were determined to be members of the study group. In turn, 1,879 members of the study group opted to participate in the survey portion of the study. Following the survey portion of the study, small group interviews were conducted with 53 faculty members, 55 candidates, and 18 people who were potential applicants for training.

Demographic data collected for the study population included racial identity, ethnic identity, gender identity, organizational affiliation, and institutional role. As reported in Appendices E and F, 24.5% of the survey study participants identified themselves as candidates, 44.7% as institute faculty, and 26.8% as psychodynamically trained psychotherapist clinicians. As shown in Table 1, of the 61% of candidates who opted to provide demographic information, 73.3% identified as white and 22.1% identified as a member of one or more groups categorized as BIPOC. Of the 73.7% of faculty who provided demographic information, 85.7% identified as white and 14.6% identified as a member of one or more groups categorized as BIPOC.

⁴ Respondents were routed through the survey to a different series of questions depending on training background and role. Some respondents did not complete all the questions in the survey.

Table 1*Racial and ethnic identity*

With which of the following racial and ethnic identities do you identify? Check all that apply	Faculty (Percent)	Faculty (Number of people)	Candidates Percent (%)	Candidates (Number of people)
Asian, South Asian, Southeast Asian, East Asian, Pacific Islander, Asian American	3.9%	23	11.7%	33
Black, African, African American, Caribbean	4.2%	25	7.5%	21
Latinx, Hispanic, Central American, Latin American, South American	3.9%	23	8.9%	25
Middle Eastern/North African	1.9%	11	0	0
Native American, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian	0.7%	4	0	0
White	85.7%	508	73.3%	206
Not Listed, please describe your identity	8.3%	49	4.6%	13
Total		593		281
Did not respond		212		180

The gender distribution of respondents is represented in Table 2.

Table 2*Gender identity*

With which gender do you most identify?	Faculty (Percent)	Candidates (Percent)
Male	33.6%	27.4%
Female	64.2%	67.6%
Gender variant/non-conforming ⁵	0.7%	1.4%
Not listed, please describe	0.3%	2.1%
Prefer not to answer	1.2%	1.4%
Total number of respondents	592	281
Number of respondents who did not answer the question	213	180

An effort was made to include study participants from psychoanalytic organizations throughout the United States and Canada. In addition to inclusion of psychoanalytic psychotherapy

⁵ Use of “non-conforming” is not intended to imply pathology or diminish one's gender identity. We recognize that advances in language inclusivity have been made since the construction of the survey used in this study. The authors have left this terminology in our final report for the purpose of fidelity with the language of our survey as it was administered. If we were constructing the survey now, we would use other language.

clinicians who did not train at psychoanalytic institutes, psychoanalytic institute affiliation data (Table 3) clearly demonstrated inclusion of organizations outside the American Psychoanalytic Association.

Table 3
Affiliation

Is your institute affiliated with...	Faculty (Percent)	Faculty (Number of respondents)	Candidates (Percent)	Candidates (Number of respondents)
American Psychoanalytic Association	76.7%	428	62.3%	175
International Psychoanalytical Association	54.3 %	303	36.7%	103
Other, please describe	14.2 %	79	10.0%	28
Total		558		281
Did not respond to question		247		180

All survey study participants were offered an opportunity to interview in the second phase of the study. A uniform training procedure for all interviewers for the semi-structured interviews was developed to provide consistency in the data collection as discussed in the Executive Summary. The leadership team and Commissioners, trained according to this uniform training procedure, performed the interviews of respondents. Advanced candidates were trained by the Commission Methodologist to perform candidate interviews.

The Commission met monthly over two and a half years in think tank-style sessions while the Chair and Co-Chairs met weekly. After the data were collected and compiled, we divided into work teams to analyze the data and produce this final report. These smaller writing groups grappled with a stark realization. Struggle as we might, as well intentioned as we consciously try to be as psychoanalysts, our educational institutions and membership organizations were not inclusive. In addition, racial enactments impaired effective functioning on many levels throughout our educational organizations.

As this report was being written, Christina Sharpe’s recently released book, *Ordinary Notes*, came to our attention. Sharpe,⁶ a critically acclaimed author and leading scholar of Black intellectual history and aesthetics, was an invited presenter at the 2019 American Psychoanalytic Association annual meeting at the University Forum Panel on Racism in America.

The popular University Forum was developed to build bridges between academia and psychoanalysis on a wide range of topics, including social issues. The series of panels on racism in America became one of the APsA’s best attended programs. Appearing on the 2019 panel with Christina Sharpe were Saidiya Hartman (Columbia), Carolyn Roberts (Yale), Kirkland Vaughans (psychoanalyst discussant), and Beverly J. Stoute (University Forum Panel Chair and psychoanalyst). In *Ordinary Notes*, Sharpe tells of the audience reactions to her presentation, “Can You Be Black and Stand Here?: Visiting the Legacy Museum⁷ and the National Museum for Peace and Justice in Montgomery, Alabama”:

NOTE 36

*National Memorial for Peace and Justice, December 28, 2018,
Montgomery, Alabama*

In the section of the memorial that is the graveyard, I am undone, thinking about family secrets, and wondering if/worrying that I might see a familial name on a monolith. I am wondering if, worrying that I might find someone I know here...A white woman

⁶ Christina Sharpe is the author of *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*—named by the *Guardian* as one of the best books of 2016—and *Monstrous Intimacies: Making Post-Slavery Subjects*. She is currently Canada Research Chair in Black Studies in the Department of Humanities, at York University, in Toronto.

⁷ The Legacy Museum: From Enslavement to Mass Incarceration is situated on a site in Montgomery where Black people were forced to labor in bondage. The Legacy Museum provides a comprehensive history of the United States with a focus on the legacy of slavery. The National Memorial for Peace and Justice is the nation’s first memorial dedicated to the legacy of enslaved Black people, people terrorized by lynching, African Americans humiliated by racial segregation and Jim Crow, and people of color burdened with contemporary presumptions of guilt and police violence.

approaches me tentatively..."Excuse me," she says..."I just want to say that I'm sorry"—
and she gestures toward where the monoliths are laid out like coffins—

"I'm so sorry about all of this..."

I do not reply.

NOTE 37

New York City, February 8, 2019

We are a first—a panel of five Black people,⁸ two of whom are psychoanalysts, assembled for the third iteration of the Annual Meeting of the American Psychoanalytic Association's series University Forum on Racism in America. In my paper I relate that encounter with the white woman in the graveyard who apologizes...*for all of this*. In the question-and-answer period after our talks, several white women in the audience, which is almost entirely white and primarily analysts, ask me if I can say why I didn't reply to her. They ask me if I will tell them what I would have said if I had replied. I give two answers. My first answer is no, I will not answer this question, because I think that my talk on the work of memorials in general, and on the Legacy Museum and the National Memorial for Peace and Justice in particular, has already explicitly done this work. My second answer is that I will step into my role as a teacher and elaborate. I tell the white psychoanalysts that I do not reply to the woman at the memorial because I am at first unsure that she is speaking to me. And really, she isn't. She is speaking into the space and in the direction of a Black person. But second, and more importantly, I do not reply to her because with her apology,

⁸ While this panel was the first all Black interdisciplinary panel of the University Forum series, the first all Black panel at the American Psychoanalytic Association occurred on February 17, 2018 when five Black psychoanalysts, Dorothy Holmes, Kirkland Vaughans, Anton Hart, Dionne R. Powell, and Beverly J. Stoute spoke on a panel entitled, "African Americans and psychoanalysis: What's been going on (and how can we talk about it)?"

she tries to hand me her sorrow and whatever else she is carrying, to super-add her burden to my own.

It is not mine to bear. I have my own sorrows.

The white psychoanalysts seemed not to understand the dimensions of Sharpe's traumatic experience even after her riveting presentation. They were unable to reflect upon the race fantasies that were enacted in the superficially benign act of the white woman making the overture to the Black woman (Sharpe).

Early conceptualizations that race fantasies about Black people and blackness are culturally and intrapsychically embedded were discussed by Joel Kovel in his 1974 book, *White Racism: A Psychohistory*, a work rarely included in psychoanalytic institute curricula. The idea was further developed extending psychoanalytic theory to posit that race fantasies become cultural propositions that are enacted in group dynamics (Stoute, 2023). Several race fantasies enacted here include: Black suffering is not seen by the white museum visitor or the white psychoanalysts; the needs of the white participants are superordinate and should be attended to by the Black person without attention to the Black person's needs; in group enactments Black people are expected to carry the suffering; and Black people should relegate their suffering to the background to attend to the needs of the white onlookers. At the time of the panel, Kirkland Vaughans replied to the audience that the white woman at the memorial and the white psychoanalysts who criticized Sharpe were expecting Sharpe to be metaphorically their "mammy," enacting a culture stereotype. Nor could the members of the audience recognize that the initial racial trauma was reenacted in the group dynamics of the program discussion when the white psychoanalysts repeatedly criticized Sharpe for not answering the white woman who approached her at the Memorial. The tension in the room was palpable when the panel chair

pointed out the racial context of the injurious remarks during the discussion. That many psychoanalysts were largely unaware that there was a latent racist undertone to the comments or the resultant enactment spoke also to the gaps in our educational and training programs that will be addressed in this report.

That four years later Sharpe chose to note this racial enactment in her book leads one to conclude that her experience with the American psychoanalysts left a psychic scar. The description by a critically acclaimed scholar from outside APsA of a racial enactment she experienced at an APsA meeting makes clear racial dynamics present at many levels in American psychoanalysis despite a conscious desire to be more inclusive and welcoming to diverse practitioners. It ratifies the need for this study.

The study allowed us to examine how race and racism are thought about and addressed in psychoanalytic training and education. We were able to ask if this affected who applied for and who was admitted to our educational programs, including analytic training. The Commission members themselves were diverse with respect to race, ethnicity, gender, age, training, degree status, theoretical orientation, and geographic locale. Most have contributed to the psychoanalytic literature canon and have spent their careers consciously pursuing work on social equity and social justice. While the Commissioners had a range of opinions and experience, which came through in the work, they were all committed to understanding race and diversity on a systems and institutional level, in complement with our day-to-day clinical work with individual psychodynamics.

To ground the reader from the outset, Chapter 2 summarizes the five cross-cutting themes addressed across the data sets in the chapters that follow: the Ubiquity of Systemic and Structural Racism; Education (barriers and advancement); Candidate and Faculty Experiences; Enactments;

and The Personal/Training Analyst. Following this outline, Chapter 3, “Understanding and Addressing Racism,” begins by asking us to reconsider the common tendency to talk about the individual as racist relating to the Other who is the object of racism. We then zoom out to focus on the structures and systems that our study found privileges one racial group and its perspective while marginalizing others. The task, we believe, is not determining why individuals are racist but appreciating how we all, often unknowingly, participate in a system in which racist acts and enactments are embedded, impeding efforts on a broad institutional level to diversify participation.

Many psychoanalysts see racism as an individual phenomenon rather than as a group-level phenomena giving unfortunate primacy to individual reactions based on guilt and shame. This individually oriented perspective is an impediment to flexible problem solving and critical understanding of the systemic manifestations of racism. We recommend that the reader focus on the Commission definitions below, especially the definition of systemic racism for elucidating this systems perspective.

The Commission’s work recognized five views regarding race. *Race* is a social construct invented and perpetuated to support systemic racism. *Racialism* references exposure of all members of a society to ideas and narratives that influence their thoughts and perceptions about members of racialized groups. *Racist acts* are performed by individuals or small groups and reflect prejudice, discrimination, stereotyping, or antagonism directed against a person or people on the basis of their membership in a particular racial or ethnic group, particularly a minoritized or otherwise marginalized group. *Racial enactments* are ideas about how race and racism unconsciously play out in group processes and interpersonal processes. *Systemic racism* is a system that produces advantage for some people in a dominant racial group through the

oppression of people in a non-dominant racial group. Structural elements of the system are so embedded in individual psyches and institutional practices that they are considered to be ubiquitous and to operate outside of the conscious awareness of the individual or institution carrying or practicing them.

In the chapters that follow, the Commissioners, organized in writing groups, summarize the study findings according to the themes explored in the initial study survey on psychoanalytic training and education, drawing on the study data which is referenced in the body of the report and compiled in the Appendices. The study data is analyzed from varying vantage points reflecting the different levels of psychoanalytic education and the varying interpretations that span and reflect the incredible depth of experience and diversity of our Commissioners, who wrote from their individual perspectives while simultaneously working as part of a collective writing team and the Commission collective.

The semi-structured interviews were conducted in the second stage of the study, providing a compendium of qualitative data, and allowing study respondents to reveal in a supportive confidential space details of their lived experience in psychoanalytic institutes of how issues of race and diversity are manifested in training experiences and institute life. The semi-structured interviews covered six main areas of inquiry: Response to Racist Incidents; Attention to Race and Racism in Psychoanalysis; Vision for Racial Equality; Race, Racism, and the Pursuit of Psychoanalytic Training; Race as a Psychoanalytic Topic; and Increasing Inclusivity. In each themed report that follows, qualitative data in the form of anonymously reported quotes from respondents in the interviews are integrated throughout to illustrate the lived experience on the individual level that the survey reports in group aggregate. Both interviewers and interviewees gave permission to use their anonymous quotations.

As discussed in the Executive Summary, the purpose of the Commission was to appraise systemic racism in American psychoanalysis and, where found, to offer recommendations and a path forward to reduce its pernicious effects. We studied how well racism is understood; whether, how, and to what degree systemic racism impacts the experience of considering and deciding whether to enter the field of psychoanalysis; how systemic racism affects experience across career development once one enters training; how systemic racism influences teaching and learning in the classroom and supervision; to what extent systemic racism is enacted across all domains of psychoanalytic experience; when enacted, how it is processed and to what extent is it resolved; and how race is experienced on the couch.

In Chapter 3, “Understanding and Addressing Racism,” the institutional responses to education around race and racism and white supremacy are reviewed and discussed. The three principal findings from the Commission’s survey concerning institutionalized racism are:

- Psychoanalysts, both candidates and faculty, felt that when attention was drawn to issues involving race, racism, or white supremacy arising within institutes they were not adequately dealt with.
- Psychoanalysts, both candidates and faculty, felt inadequately equipped to discuss, teach, or address issues of race, racism, or white supremacy in psychoanalysis.
- Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and white psychoanalysts’ perceptions of the reality of race, racism, and white supremacy, and their experience of these forces, differed significantly.

The chapter authors speak to the nuanced ways that social identity impacts the lived experience of psychoanalytic training and survey respondents’ perspectives on these topics in psychoanalytic education.

In Chapter 4, “Recruitment, Admissions, Progression and Procedures, and Mentorship and Leadership,” there is an in-depth discussion of respondent experiences in recruitment, the admissions process, and mentorship. The chapter reveals how issues of race and bias impact these aspects of psychoanalytic training as well as progression procedures, evaluation procedures, career fostering, and the development of leadership within psychoanalytic institutes. Barriers to accessing and completing training are discussed, how racial identity and experiences of racism influence the perception of inclusion or exclusion, as well as the responses of institute leadership following racial incidents. Study participants also ranked financial resources, family responsibilities, and educational workload, such as frequency of sessions for control cases and training analysis, as common obstacles to training.

Many participants additionally described a lack of sensitivity to these barriers when institute faculty responded to candidates’ needs and feedback as important in the professional cultivation of psychoanalysts. Prejudice towards what is deemed as “psychoanalytic enough” and what is considered “un-analytic” came through as disadvantaging candidates who integrated culturally-grounded techniques in assessment and treatment of their control cases. This surprising finding puts psychoanalytic education at odds with the fields of psychology, psychiatry, and social work that consider culturally informed treatments necessary when treating diverse patient populations. This chapter reviews the study findings in depth of how the respondent experiences on these measures varied according to social identity and location as characterized by age, generational positioning in the institutional hierarchy, social identity including race and gender, and one’s social location with respect to power positioning.

In Chapter 5, “Curriculum, Racism as an Analytic Lens, and Supervision,” the survey findings detail how, “racial issues and people of racially minoritized status are marginalized

across all levels of psychoanalytic education.” The survey results are discussed from multiple perspectives: how respondents felt about addressing race, racism, and white supremacy in psychoanalytic curricula; how aspects of one’s social identity including race/ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, language, religion, and level of training affected the response to these issues; and how and what preparation are necessary for faculty to develop the skill set to teach effectively while being mindful of the potential for conflict and polarization. Candidates and faculty agreed that current curricular offerings in psychoanalytic training did not adequately address matters of race and racism, that BIPOC clinicians were underrepresented as both authors and subjects of required reading, and that the field of psychoanalysis needed to increase focus on race, racism, and white supremacy. Faculty viewed themselves as prepared and comfortable discussing these topics in the classroom while candidates, in their educational experiences, were less likely to see the faculty as prepared for those discussions. These public spaces were the most often cited locale for problematic racial enactments. Recommendations about improving coverage of such issues in the classroom and in the supervisory experience are covered, as is attention to the cultural factors of institutes that impact the development of related educational initiatives. The issue of what it means to teach effectively and what it means to be prepared in this arena of psychoanalytic education is brought to bear with clear and useful recommendations on developing educational directives.

The same data sets⁹ may be quoted from different perspectives throughout the report as the authors examine the representative levels of psychoanalytic education and training. The differential lived experiences for BIPOC people and white-identified people are highlighted and the surprising uniformity of shared priority between the survey subgroups of BIPOC faculty and

⁹ The data sets are included in Appendices A, B, C, D, E, and F.

candidates with white candidates is discussed as contrasted to the differing perspective of the sub-group of white faculty respondents. Despite the lack of understanding of diverse perspectives, variable acquaintance with the psychoanalytic literature on these topics, and reluctance and lack of training in managing group conversations on the issues of diversity especially in the classroom, the majority of respondents across survey groups generally aspired to be more proactive in integrating issues of race, racism, and diversity in growth promoting ways in psychoanalytic education and training.

The experiences of personal/training analysis are explored in Chapter 6, “The Experience of Race on the Couch,” and recommendations for future study are put forth. Generally, BIPOC candidates were less comfortable than white candidates discussing race with their analyst. This was also true for all diversity related topics including sexual orientation, religion, and language differences. Additionally, BIPOC analysands were troubled that their analysts often did not acknowledge the pernicious reality of racism in their lives. In concert with this feeling of candidates, 52% of faculty surveyed reported that they had no preparation for applying racial awareness to analytic work. A discussion of the impact of this on personal/training analysis experience is offered. Personal reflections from the field data from the highly experienced Commissioners were offered and future questions for investigation were posed.

In Chapter 7, “Enactments,” the most powerful and significant findings of The Holmes Commission study are discussed. Narrative reports from the semi-structured interviews are quoted in tandem with survey data. The interviews, a robust and informative source of data, reveal the dynamics and impact of the racial enactments that occur universally in psychoanalytic institutes. It is spelled out that:

The survey instrument largely used the term “action” to describe racist events occurring in psychoanalytic institutions and organizations. In this report, we use the term “enactment” to reflect that these “actions” or events are a form of playing out or – in psychoanalytic parlance – of “acting out” racist dynamics and structures which often are unconscious to individuals, groups, and organizations.

The startling findings, supported by the survey and interview results, reveal that:

- Racial enactments are inevitable ... and constitute a significant part of the racial life of psychoanalytic organizations.
- About two thirds of faculty and candidates have observed, experienced, or heard about an action that was racist.
- Roughly a third of both faculty and candidate responders had the conviction that the racial enactment they observed, experienced, or heard about had caused racial trauma.
- Almost half of respondents ... noted that the racist actions they observed or experienced were multiple, happening at least three times. A significant number of the respondents (candidates 33%; faculty 28%) noted racist actions occurring more than five times
- There was also a general feeling that these matters were dealt with inadequately by institute leadership.

The norm is that racist incidents and racial enactments are poorly handled and most psychoanalytic institutes have no procedure in place for reporting incidents, reviewing complaints, investigating complaints, or interventions for repair. Nonetheless, there is strong desire across the board for change since these enactments are damaging to psychoanalytic communities as a whole.

This sophisticated analysis and discussion of the survey findings lays the groundwork for clear recommendations on the necessity for establishing a collective framework for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) work, for cultivating effective and skilled leadership that understands and recognizes the need for repair work, and the necessity of integrating training resources including specifically group process work as a formal part of psychoanalytic education. A discussion of the Commission's own group process of how the Commissioners came to understand the lived experience of painful enactments through its own enactments, punctuated how difficult the work can be for leadership to provide the holding environment necessary to promote processing and repair when enactments occur. We believe that the uniqueness of having a skilled leadership team rather than an individual leader to head the Commission allowed the Chair and Co-Chairs to work together supporting each other in providing a holding environment for the Commission as a group collective. Formulating our group as a leadership team and functioning as such throughout impacted the group dynamic of the Commission in derivative ways including how we weathered our group racial enactment and the process of how we wrote and have co-authored this report in a collective voice. Artfully discussed is the problematic tendency in psychoanalysis to individualize and privatize reactions to racial enactments which stands at odds with the necessity for group processing and understanding of the anxieties that are stirred up leading to pressure to close down rather than open up discussion in ways that can be reparative.

In interviews, respondents universally shared their negative experiences at their institutes, but they also spoke powerfully of a vision for the field of psychoanalysis with increased representation of diversity among trainees and in leadership from the top down with ongoing preparation throughout curricula, training and education on issues of race, structural racism and

diversity studies. Only one respondent in the entire survey study endorsed the belief that too much attention is paid to race, racism, and white supremacy in psychoanalytic education. Of those interviewed, there was also a shared concern that current leadership in the field demonstrates a resistance to making the structural changes necessary to achieve increased diversity and inclusion at all levels possible. One respondent went so far as to say, “the most viable solution to the generation gap [in perspective on diversity issues] might be to wait for people to fade away and die out.” Another respondent emphasized that “There needs to be an intention at the top with leadership.” Another respondent pointed out that there needs to be an action plan since “a conscious desire for change is not enough.” As this report was being written, there was a general hopefulness in the field for what The Holmes Commission would be able to offer the field in practical and visionary remedies to catalyze change.

In Chapter 8, the formulation of a Consultation-Liaison Network as an organizing matrix for furthering this work in generative enclaves is discussed. A beginning outline for a plan of action for implementation across the field is offered:

The vision for what we have come to call the Consultation-Liaison Network arose organically from our primary task of studying racism in American psychoanalysis. In order to disseminate the initial study instrument as widely as possible, the Commission developed a list of what we then called Ambassadors. These Ambassadors were charged with raising awareness about the study, aiding with distribution, and encouraging participation. When we entered the second stage of the study, the qualitative small group interviews, we recruited a second group: advanced candidates who would be trained to conduct groups with candidates; some of them had also already been Ambassadors. These

two groups comprised a network of individuals who obviously resonated with aims and ideals of the Commission.

The vision of these groups becoming a multidisciplinary network across the field to further diversity work and providing support and solidarity for clinicians is proposed.

Although each chapter makes recommendations, Chapter 9, “Final Recommendations,” offers a broader vision for the field of psychoanalysis. As the organizational structure of Consultation-Liaison Network comes to fruition, it is our hope that psychoanalytic organizations and institutes will make synergistic efforts to develop ongoing study groups and hold community meetings to read this report together. We anticipate that once the meanings of our study findings are digested in this way, a field wide collective effort will be made to formulate organizational and educational initiatives to broadly implement the Commission’s recommendations. Action is needed at all organizational levels, including leadership, to make use of the findings to repair the systemic racism that has devitalized our work and thwarted equity in our field in a multiplicity of ways.

In conclusion, although The Holmes Commission study focused mainly on race as the current marker of diversity in psychoanalytic training and education, we recognize that race is but one marker for stratifying difference. Ethnicity, gender, sexuality, culture, religion, physical ability, and socioeconomic positioning, to name a few, are interrelated at the level of our *lived experience* and worthy of reflection in our psychoanalytic understanding of the many intersecting social locations of otherness (Stoute, 2023).

As a field, we must come to understand that diversity is manifested as inclusiveness of all social identities, socio-cultural positions, points of view, academic beliefs, and personal attitudes.

Understanding the structural impediments to diversity, equity, and inclusion in our minds and in our organizations is a necessary first step if we are to advance as clinicians, as a field, and as a society in a diverse world. The racism and lack of diversity in our field has deleterious consequences and it is doubtful that we fully comprehend how much it has diminished us all as practitioners and as a discipline. As The Holmes Commission has done its work, widespread cross-racial, cross-gender, cross-discipline, and cross-cultural support has emerged throughout the field and uplifted us. We hope the results from this study and the work of this Commission are important next steps towards developing educational and training models that advance psychoanalysis towards equity and unlock the true radical potential for change that psychoanalysis offers the world.

References

- Frey, W.H. (2021, August 13). New 2020 census results show increased diversity countering decade-long declines in America's white and youth populations. The Brookings Institution. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/new-2020-census-results-show-increased-diversity-countering-decade-long-declines-in-americas-white-and-youth-populations/>
- Fuller, R.L., Spurlock, J., Butts, H.F., and Edwards, H. (1999). Chapter 11. Black psychoanalysts. In J. Spurlock (Ed.), *Black psychiatrists and American psychiatry* (pp.163-186). American Psychiatric Association.
- Holmes, D. E., Hart, A., Powell, D. R., Stoute, B. J. (2023). The Holmes Commission's journey toward racial equality in American psychoanalysis: Reflection and hope. *The American Psychoanalyst*, 57(1), pp. 1-7. https://apsa.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/74728_TAP-Winter-2023_web.pdf

King, M. L., Jr. (1967). *Where do we go from here: Chaos or community?* Harper & Row.

Kovel, J. (1970). *White racism: A psychohistory*. Pantheon Books.

Sharpe, Christina (2023). *Ordinary Notes*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Stoute, B.J. (2022). Race and racism in psychoanalytic thought: From fantasy to enactment. Presented on the occasion of being awarded the Haskell Prize for Excellence in Psychoanalysis by the San Francisco Center for Psychoanalysis. April 29, 2022 (publication forthcoming).

Stoute, B.J. (2023). Chapter 2. Race and racism in psychoanalytic thought: The ghosts in our nursery. In B.J. Stoute & M. Slevin (Eds.), *The trauma of racism: Lessons from the therapeutic encounter* (2nd ed., pp. 13-41). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003280002>

Stoute, B.J. (2023). Chapter 26. How our mind becomes racialized: Implications for the therapeutic encounter. In H. Crisp & G.O. Gabbard (Eds.), *Gabbard's Textbook of Psychotherapeutic Treatments* (2nd ed., pp. 653-692). American Psychiatric Association Publishing.

Chapter 2

Five Themes Cutting Across Data Sets

It is time for all of us to tell each other the truth about who and what have brought the Negro to the condition of deprivation against which he struggles today. In human relations the truth is harder to come by, because most groups are deceived about themselves. Rationalization and the incessant search for scapegoats are the psychological cataracts that blind us to our individual and collective sins. But the day has passed for bland euphemisms. *He who lives with untruth lives in spiritual slavery. Freedom is still the bonus we receive for knowing the truth* [emphasis added].

—Martin Luther King, Jr., *Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community?*

Theme 1. Ubiquity of Systemic and Structural Racism

Systemic and structural racism is ubiquitous within psychoanalysis. Racism appears within psychoanalytic institutions including leadership, administration, and faculty, and throughout training. Racism is embedded in teaching, curricula, and supervisory and candidate experiences. Its psychosocial existence is so entrenched and seamless in its representation that it is often only in the presence of a minoritized people or Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) that racism is revealed, often within an enactment.

Simultaneously the poor representation or absence of minoritized people at the institutional and national organizational leadership level is a stark demonstration of the effects of systemic and structural racism. While many more white candidates and faculty are becoming aware of and speaking to these systemic and structural problems, there continues to be an active preservation of the racist status quo.

Theme 2. Education

The presence of systemic and structural racism that has conscious and unconscious components creates pathways for recruitment, admissions, training, and faculty development that

privilege white candidates over BIPOC candidates. This study result illuminates that the sources of potential psychoanalytic candidates, graduate schools and residency programs, are also significantly influenced by systemic and structural racism. Potential BIPOC candidates are adversely affected by systemic and structural racism compared to their white cohort in terms of promoting and sustaining psychoanalytic advancement.

A self-perpetuating cycle of the racist status quo based on cultural affinity remains entrenched in all elements of psychoanalytic training and governance. This includes a Western, Eurocentric model of the mind, the individual, the social, and the group that is resistive to other cultural norms that include but challenge Western perspectives on the psychosocial, development, group phenomena, the psychic role of community, the Oedipus Complex, gender, gender roles, sexualities, and abilities. An essential contributor to the racist status quo is the socioeconomics of analytic training. There are important socioeconomic challenges for minoritized/BIPOC groups in terms of psychoanalytic training that must be understood and addressed. While we recognize that being a psychoanalytic candidate requires an inordinate amount of education, time, and money, many if not most potential BIPOC candidates are entering the field with stratospheric debt. This is regardless of their credentials or the socioeconomic status of their parents. Due to racial disparities in income level, housing, and employment, potential BIPOC candidates have a far worse debt burden than many if not most of their white cohort. This magnifies the financial hardship of analytic training for people who are not in an economically sound position upon entry into training.

Theme 3. Candidate and Faculty Experiences

There were significant differences in the perception of the effects of racial microaggressions on candidates and faculty. BIPOC candidates and faculty experienced racial microaggressions as more impactful and white candidates and faculty experienced racial microaggressions as less impactful. Racial microaggressions adversely affect the educational experience and were cited as a significant contribution to BIPOC candidates dropping out of training and BIPOC faculty being marginalized. Procedures and guidelines to address racial marginalization and aggression are only successful with faculty awareness, participation, and active and ongoing repair. The majority of candidates who participated in The Holmes Commission study had experienced racial microaggressions that were not addressed by their institutes, with the primary response as a type of silencing around the incident directly affecting the morale of the candidates, leading to dropout and a turning away from psychoanalysis as a profession.

The American Psychoanalytic Association (APsA) was started in 1911 by British psychoanalyst Ernest Jones and seven American physicians, all white men. Membership was limited to physicians and psychoanalysis was characterized as a medical treatment in order to gain public acceptance. As the Nazis rose to power in Germany, there was a large backlash in the United States against Jewish refugees and comparatively few were allowed to immigrate to this country. In this context, the analyst refugees fleeing Europe in the 1930s and 1940s were not always welcomed at American psychoanalytic institutes as they were perceived as heretical competition and many were nonphysicians (lay analysts) and/or were women. This led to splitting and schisms as psychoanalytic institutes struggled to accept the progressive ideas that came with diversity. In the 1950s, psychoanalysts who were white men physicians grew very

powerful in organized psychiatry, displacing more biologically oriented psychiatrist leadership and reinforcing the hierarchy of physicians in organized psychoanalysis. In the 1980s, four psychologists sued the American Psychoanalytic Association and two training institutes for violation of federal antitrust laws by restricting the practice of psychoanalysis to psychiatrists. The case was settled in 1988 and the American Psychoanalytic Association agreed to allow other mental health professionals into psychoanalytic training. However, as the field has evolved to include other mental health professionals, women, and minoritized groups, institutional structures and procedures lag in addressing the current obstacles to training a more diverse student body. This lag requires attention to maintaining academic rigor while flexibly including faculty and curricular materials attuned to this diversity. Attention to diversity should include acknowledging “the social” in psychoanalysis in a variety of ways, including providing credit for community and group work during one’s training that aligns with the career aspirations of contemporary psychoanalysts that go beyond the consulting room.

Despite evidence that systemic and structural racism has a negative impact on the training and professional future of BIPOC candidates, the perception of the majority of the white faculty respondents in the study was that they did not perceive these challenges as robustly as BIPOC candidates and faculty. Even if white faculty members acknowledged the negative impact of systemic racism, they still felt they were equipped to address racism in the classroom, in the curricula, and in supervision. Candidates and BIPOC faculty, in contrast, disagreed that white faculty were prepared to address racism, especially when handling classroom discussions on race and systemic racism.

There is persistent blindness about how out of step psychoanalysis is compared to other disciplines regarding race and systemic racism. As mental health professionals, psychoanalysts

are well trained in exploring the sexual and aggressive but remarkably unprepared for and uncomfortable with exploring race, racism, and intersectionality. This lack appeared throughout psychoanalytic faculty and was more pronounced in APsA faculty members compared to non-APsA faculty members. The generational differences in comfort level and preparedness to discuss race and racism -- structurally, intrapsychically, and interpersonally -- have been challenging for faculty members due to the trauma associated with discovering one's own internal racism.

The guilt and shame among white faculty members regarding being the initiator of racist or racialized events with the fear or fantasy of retribution forecloses meaningful dialogue. BIPOC candidates and faculty yearn for deeper understanding and appreciation of these events, not for retribution, but to mitigate the tension and open the possibility of reconciliation with an appreciation of multiple viewpoints and perspectives. The lack of structures and mechanisms to respond to racial incidents keeps the field stagnant and perpetuates a culture of silence and ignorance. As a result psychoanalysis lags behind other disciplines in the understanding of the importance of race and anti-racism. The institutional structure of psychoanalysis prevents white candidates and faculty from learning via getting feedback on their implicit and explicit racism. Thus, all are affected.

Theme 4. Enactments

The occurrence of a racial enactment provokes an immediate reaction for all involved. The reaction to racial enactments depends on where the enactment occurs, whether in group settings (classrooms, scientific meetings, online forums, or meetings with candidates and faculty) or dyadic settings (interviews, supervision, advisers, or personal analysis). Undergirding the individual and institutional response is the hierarchical white power structure that, powerfully

and often unconsciously, impacts the racialized encounter, minimally addressing the minoritized subject of the offense. Due to our collective avoidance of the dynamics of racism in American psychoanalysis, no sufficiently deep engagement about racism can be free of such enactments.

Enactments can also be of great benefit, allowing us to see what was previously unseen and thus making it finally amenable to healing work. The vast majority of racial enactments described by respondents in the study occurred in “public” spaces such as classrooms, online forums, community events, and committee meetings. Both candidates and faculty reported racial enactments in these public spaces as compared to the “private” spaces of individual analysis and supervision. Candidates appeared to be much less comfortable addressing racialized material with instructors and leadership. This correlated with the most frequent occurrence of a racist act being witnessed was in the classroom as reported both by candidates and instructors. The individualist nature of psychoanalytic thinking and practice is not only inadequate to address these group phenomena of enactments but can also cause much more harm. This occurs by locating the problem in individuals and thereby exacerbating already volatile affects, by failing to provide the necessary containment for the group, and by eschewing the working through which might lead to a more healing process.

A climate of fear (typically of retaliation) impedes needed change. The emergence of racism is a painful and inconvenient truth. The intensity of the feelings associated with the unprocessed pain of racism, the noxious realization that it lives within us, and especially its exposure in the public space of a group, can be overwhelming and a highly unwelcome discovery.

Without sufficient consciousness of and procedures to address racial enactments, responses become emotional reactions to personal claims of racism and victimhood foreclosing

meaningful acknowledgment, working through, and repair for all participants. Unaddressed racial enactments have disastrous consequences for the sustainability and growth of psychoanalysis if not addressed on systemic, group, and individual levels that go beyond the shame, guilt, and anxiety that racial encounters (a conflagration of the group, the intrapsychic, interpersonal and social) engender.

Theme 5. The Personal/Training Analyst

Issues of race were seldom brought up by the analyst within one's personal/training analysis, removing race from the psychoanalytic sphere. Race and racism were not addressed as an intrapsychic phenomenon on the same level of influence and significance as sexuality and aggression. The marginalization, if not absence, of race and racism as an intra-psychic, interpersonal and societal factor affected all candidates but particularly BIPOC candidates. The personal/training analyst signals what is significant and needs addressing and what remains outside of exploration and inquiry. To engage with racial encounters in situ within the patient-analyst dyad, the analyst must allow themselves to be uncomfortable with the unknown and the emergent when contemplating a patient's and their own racial subjectivity. Considering the value to the candidate of the training/personal analyst experience, this absence has a negative impact on all our trainees as they themselves potentially model, similar to their analyst, what is privileged and what is silenced or denied.

Chapter 3

Understanding and Addressing Racism

We have not taken the final step of our journey, but the first step on a longer and even more difficult road. For to be free is not merely to cast off one's chains, but to live in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others.

— Nelson Mandela, *Long Walk to Freedom*

The murder of George Floyd was a wake-up call that led to nationwide self-scrutiny, suggesting that something very powerful must be operating that runs counter to and undermines the commitment to equity and diversity that our institutions publicly espouse. These powerful forces have come to be conceptualized as institutional, structural, or systemic racism, indicating that they are embedded deep within the structure of an organization in its group unconscious. Those forces are mobilized to entrench the existing order and its relations of power and privilege. Systemic racism opposes our conscious drive towards greater equity, inclusiveness, and diversity. Once deployed, the forces of institutional racism exert a decisive influence on thought and feeling and impel us to action. As the history of ongoing police brutality and violence against Black, Indigenous, and People of Color¹⁰ (BIPOC) attests, institutional racism is highly resistant to change.

The problem of racial injustice extends responsibility for countering systemic racism and inequity from the individual to the system as a whole. A racist incident, for example, is now seen as signifying the existence of a deeper problem woven into the fabric of the institution, just as a symptom signifies the existence of a more fundamental difficulty in the mind of an individual.

¹⁰ We acknowledge Black, Hispanic, Latinx, Indigenous, Asian, Pacific Islander, Middle Eastern, and all People of Color. We understand that each group is diverse and has varied historical and current experiences with racism and inequality.

Addressing the institutional aspect of the problem requires collective self-scrutiny and action. All members and segments of organizations need to ask: how might the things we do routinely be contributing to racial inequity? What are we unaware of or not noticing? What knowledge base and skill sets do we need in order to change this situation? What have we tried and with what result?

As far as our own profession, psychoanalysis, is concerned, there are at least two observations that suggest we may have a difficulty with institutional racism. First is the fact that despite our conscious attempts at inclusiveness, our profession remains overwhelmingly white. Second, there are consistent reports that mainstream psychoanalysts have difficulty taking seriously and working with BIPOC experiences of systemic racism. Psychoanalysis, which operates within an individualist frame of reference, may be especially ill-equipped to recognize and address the problem of institutional racism. The work of The Holmes Commission represents an attempt to explore any manifestations of institutional racism in American psychoanalysis and, if present, what its dimensions are.

Findings

We report three principal findings from the Commission's survey with regard to understanding and addressing systemic racism:

- Psychoanalytic candidates and faculty felt that when attention is drawn to issues involving race, racism or white supremacy that arise within institutes they were not adequately dealt with.
- Psychoanalytic candidates and faculty felt inadequately equipped to discuss, teach or address issues of race, racism, or white supremacy in psychoanalysis.

- BIPOC¹¹ and white psychoanalytic candidates' perceptions and experiences of the reality of racism and white supremacy in their institutes and their experience differ significantly from faculty's perception of those forces.

We will discuss each of these points separately with reference to the survey and interview data.

Inadequacy of Institutional Response to Issues of Race, Racism and White Supremacy

Psychoanalytic candidates and faculty felt that when attention was drawn to issues involving race, racism or white supremacy arising within institutes they were not adequately dealt with. BIPOC faculty felt more uncomfortable with the prospect of reporting racist incidents within the institute than their white counterparts (Table 1). Similarly, BIPOC candidates felt more uncomfortable than white candidates in raising a racist incident with their instructors, supervisor or analyst (Tables 2, 3, and 4). Interestingly, BIPOC candidates reported feeling more comfortable raising a racist incident with their analyst, followed by their supervisor and least comfortable with their instructors (Tables 2, 3, and 4). Over half BIPOC candidates and about 20% more BIPOC candidates (55%) than white candidates (34%) had raised an issue with an instructor or leader at their institute (Table 5). This suggests a feeling of greater exposure and vulnerability for BIPOC candidates during their training. Confounding this question for candidates is the question of compulsion (as opposed to free choice) as far as one's advisor, supervisor, or analyst is concerned. About 36% of BIPOC candidates were assigned a supervisor as compared to 13% of white candidates (Table 6). BIPOC candidates were also four times more

¹¹ Given the relatively small representation of people of color in the field of psychoanalysis, we reluctantly opted to group all people who were not white into a single group, labeled BIPOC, for data analysis purposes (see Appendices E and F).

likely to be assigned an analyst (Table 7) and two and a half times as likely to have felt uncomfortable with their analyst (Table 8), though the actual numbers of BIPOC candidates involved were small.

Table 1

Faculty raising a racist issue with institute leadership

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with Leadership in your institute?	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable (%)	51.6	40.7
Somewhat Comfortable (%)	31.5	29.6
Somewhat Uncomfortable (%)	13.9	18.5
Very Uncomfortable (%)	3	11.1

Table 2

Candidates raising a racist issue with instructors

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with Instructors?	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable (%)	28.7	25
Somewhat Comfortable (%)	45.9	27.3
Somewhat Uncomfortable (%)	16.6	23.9
Very Uncomfortable (%)	8.8	23.9

Table 3

Candidates raising racist issue with their analyst

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with your analyst?	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable (%)	87.3	64.8
Somewhat Comfortable (%)	8.8	21.6
Somewhat Uncomfortable (%)	3.9	8
Very Uncomfortable (%)	0	5.7

Table 4*Candidates raising racist issue with their supervisor*

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with your supervisor?	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable (%)	69.7	44.9
Somewhat Comfortable (%)	20.2	30.3
Somewhat Uncomfortable (%)	8.4	12.4
Very Uncomfortable (%)	1.7	12.4

Table 5*Candidates raising an issue about race or racism with instructor or institute leader(s)*

Have you raised an issue regarding race or racism with an instructor or leader(s) in your institute?	White	BIPOC
Yes (%)	34.4	54.8
No (%)	65.6	45.2

Table 6*How supervisors are identified for candidates*

Which statement best describes the approach your institute uses to identify a supervisor for each candidate:	White	BIPOC
Candidates select a supervisor approved by the institute (%)	87.4	63.7
Candidates are assigned a supervisor (%)	12.6	36.3

Table 7*How personal/training analysts are identified for candidates*

Which statement best describes the approach your institute uses to identify a personal/training analyst for each candidate:	White	BIPOC
Candidates choose an analyst (%)	97.8	92
Candidates are assigned an analyst (%)	2.2	8

Table 8*Candidates and personal analysis*

With which of the following statements do you agree most:	White	BIPOC
The personal analysis was the most important part of my training (%)	71.8	59.5
The personal analysis was valuable but not the most important part of my training (%)	26.6	35.7
The personal analysis created an uncomfortable relationship between me and my analyst (%)	1.7	4.8

Most white and BIPOC candidates reported feeling comfortable at the prospect of discussing race or racism with their advisor, supervisor, instructors, and fellow candidates (Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12). However, 67% of BIPOC candidates and 55% of white candidates indicated that they never or only once or twice discussed race with their supervisor (Table 13). When we look more closely at those who felt uncomfortable in doing so, two and a half times more BIPOC candidates felt uncomfortable than white candidates, suggesting a different experience for BIPOC and white candidates in relation to these matters (Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12). BIPOC candidates were also more likely to have experienced some form of discrimination at the hands of an advisor, supervisor or instructor (Table 14). In addition, both groups of candidates felt insufficiently prepared to be able to bring racial issues to analysis (Table 15). Neither did they feel they had been helped to develop a framework for thinking about, and hence dealing with, racial matters (Table 16). Both groups of candidates felt that individual institutes, and the field of psychoanalysis as a whole, could benefit from addressing the topic of race and racism in psychoanalysis (Table 17). Across interviews, candidates emphasized that it is “desperately vital” that psychoanalysis attend to race and racism. Others felt that psychoanalysis as a field treats issues of race as a “sidebar,” noting that there is a “persistent blindness to how out of step psychoanalysis is compared to other disciplines regarding race.”

Table 9
Candidates discussing race or racism with their advisor

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with your advisor?	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable (%)	49.7	37.5
Somewhat comfortable (%)	39.4	31.8
Somewhat uncomfortable (%)	7.4	19.3
Very Uncomfortable (%)	3.4	11.4

Table 10*Candidates discussing race or racism with their supervisor*

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with your supervisor?	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable (%)	65.9	48.8
Somewhat comfortable (%)	29.6	31.4
Somewhat uncomfortable (%)	4.5	11.6
Very Uncomfortable (%)	0	8.1

Table 11*Candidates discussing race or racism with their instructor*

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with Instructors?	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable (%)	33.9	25.8
Somewhat comfortable (%)	51.4	37.1
Somewhat uncomfortable (%)	10.9	25.8
Very Uncomfortable (%)	3.8	11.2

Table 12*Candidates discussing race or racism with other candidates*

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with fellow candidates?	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable (%)	51.1	37.1
Somewhat comfortable (%)	39	39.3
Somewhat uncomfortable (%)	7.7	18
Very Uncomfortable (%)	2.2	5.6

Table 13*How often candidates discuss race or racism with supervisor(s)*

How often is race or racism a topic discussed with your supervisor(s)?	White	BIPOC
Never (%)	10.2	14
Once or twice (%)	45.2	53.5
Regularly (%)	36.7	30.2
I don't know (%)	7.9	2.3

Table 14*Candidates' discriminatory experiences*

Did you ever have a discriminatory experience with your advisor, supervisor, or instructor?	White	BIPOC
Yes (%)	21.1	36.6
No (%)	78.9	63.4

Table 15*Candidates and training in racial awareness*

Which statement best describes the preparation you received during your training to apply racial awareness to analysis?	White	BIPOC
I have had no preparation (%)	16.8	27.3
I am underprepared (%)	35.8	38.6
I am moderately well prepared (%)	39.1	28.4
I am well prepared (%)	8.4	5.7

Table 16*Candidates and preparation to use a racial framework*

Which statement best describes the preparation you have received to apply a racial framework during analysis?	White	BIPOC
I have had no preparation (%)	16.4	34.1
I am underprepared (%)	40.1	42
I am moderately well prepared (%)	36.2	19.3
I am well prepared (%)	7.3	4.5

Table 17*Candidates and focus on race, racism, and white supremacy*

For each statement, indicate your level of agreement: The field of psychoanalysis needs to increase focus on race, racism, and white supremacy.	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree (%)	53.5	70.7
Agree (%)	40	22.8
Disagree (%)	4.3	4.3
Strongly Disagree (%)	2.2	2.2

Among faculty who raised an issue regarding race or racism with a leader in their institute, BIPOC faculty (17%) were less likely to feel the matter was addressed adequately than white

faculty (40%) (Table 18). Again, this suggests that BIPOC candidates and faculty in general felt less satisfaction with the institutional response to these matters.

Table 18

Response to faculty raising an issue regarding race/racism with institute leader

Which statement best describes the response you experienced [to raising an issue regarding race/racism with a leader in your institute]?	White	BIPOC
The issue was addressed adequately (%)	39.8	16.7
The issue was addressed to a limited extent, but more should have been done (%)	40.8	54.8
I felt unsupported and/or alienated after raising the issue (%)	11.5	19
The issue was largely ignored (%)	7.9	9.5

Similar disparities emerged in evaluation and progression procedures, with more BIPOC faculty (46%) than white faculty (30%) feeling that those candidates from disadvantaged backgrounds suffer unintentionally (Table 19). Over 80% of BIPOC candidates felt that no efforts in terms of evaluation/progression criteria or procedures were made at the institutional level to increase the number of candidates of color who complete the training program (Table 20).

Table 19

Faculty on procedures that unintentionally disadvantage candidates

Does your institution use any evaluation/progression procedures that may unintentionally disadvantage candidates from disadvantaged backgrounds?	White	BIPOC
Yes (%)	29.7	45.9
No (%)	70.3	54.1

Table 20

Candidates on progression to increase candidates of color who complete the program

Are there any evaluation/progression criteria or procedures your institution considers to increase the number of candidates of color who complete your training program?	White	BIPOC
Yes (%)	35.9	17.5
No (%)	64.1	82.5

Regarding a *critical racial incident* that may have contributed to candidates' premature departure from the training, BIPOC faculty (12%) differed significantly from white faculty (2%) in believing this to be a frequent occurrence (Table 21). Forty-six percent of BIPOC candidates, compared to 29% of white candidates felt this to be the case (Table 22). Again, a significant difference in awareness emerged: BIPOC faculty saw racial factors as importantly present when white faculty did not. Does this suggest a kind of blindness to such issues, consistent with ideas about the institutionalization of racist and discriminatory practices as normative? In the interviews, candidates expressed concern that incidents they experienced or were aware of were not handled adequately, with dismissive attitudes toward and minimization of incidents reported. Candidates expressed a desire for leadership to "take a firm stand" rather than to respond passively or defensively. Regarding the impact of microaggressions on premature departure, the difference between the groups is stark, with approximately 20% of BIPOC faculty compared to 5% of white faculty believing that microaggressions were frequently implicated (Table 23). BIPOC candidates were over twice as likely as white candidates to have felt that racial microaggressions or other discriminatory gestures frequently contributed to candidates leaving the program before completion (Table 24). In interviews, some faculty confirmed that microaggressions had prompted the departure of candidates from their institutes. The survey data also showed that while both groups of faculty felt that graduates of color are not recruited to teach courses (Table 25), publish collaboratively (Table 26), and present at conferences and society meetings (Table 27), BIPOC faculty felt this more acutely.

Table 21*Faculty on critical racial incidents contributing to candidates leaving their program*

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? A critical racial incident occurred.	White	BIPOC
Frequently Contributed (%)	2.2	12.1
Occasionally Contributed (%)	16.4	20.7
Rarely Contributed (%)	40.4	34.5
Never Contributed (%)	40.9	32.8

Table 22*Candidates on critical racial incidents contributing to candidates leaving their program*

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - A critical racial incident occurred.	White	BIPOC
Frequently Contributed (%)	5.8	12.7
Occasionally Contributed (%)	23.3	33.3
Rarely Contributed (%)	35	30.2
Never Contributed (%)	35.9	23.8

Table 23*Faculty on the contribution of racial microaggressions to candidates leaving their program*

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? Racial microaggressions or other discriminatory gestures.	White	BIPOC
Frequently Contributed (%)	4.2	19.3
Occasionally Contributed (%)	24.4	26.3
Rarely Contributed (%)	38.5	36.8
Never Contributed (%)	32.9	17.5

Table 24*Candidates on the contribution of racial microaggressions to candidates leaving their program*

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - Racial microaggressions or other discriminatory gestures.	White	BIPOC
The issue was addressed adequately (%)	39.8	16.7
The issue was addressed to a limited extent, but more should have been done (%)	40.8	54.8
I felt unsupported and/or alienated after raising the issue (%)	11.5	19
The issue was largely ignored (%)	7.9	9.5

Table 25*Faculty on recruitment of graduate to color to teach*

To what extent do you agree with the following statement: My institute makes a concerted effort to recruit graduates of color to teach courses.	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree (%)	16.5	9.9
Agree (%)	42	36.6
Disagree (%)	33.3	39.4
Strongly Disagree (%)	8.3	14.1

Table 26*Faculty on inviting graduates of color to publish collaboratively*

To what extent do you agree the following statement: You and/or your colleagues make a concerted effort to invite graduates of color to publish collaboratively.	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree (%)	7.5	4.3
Agree (%)	28.5	23.2
Disagree (%)	50.1	49.3
Strongly Disagree (%)	13.9	23.2

Table 27*Faculty on inviting graduates to present at conferences and society meetings*

To what extent do you agree with the following statement: You and/or your colleagues invite exemplary graduates to present cases and/or research at conferences and society meetings.	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree (%)	31.3	16.9
Agree (%)	57.6	57.7
Disagree (%)	9	18.3
Strongly Disagree (%)	2.1	7

Inadequacy of Preparation to Address Issues of Race,

Racism and White Supremacy

Psychoanalytic candidates and faculty felt themselves inadequately equipped to discuss, teach or address issues of race, racism, or white supremacy. This confirmed anecdotal reports of such difficulties that have emerged over the years.

Regarding how ethnicity, physical ability/disability, religious affiliation, intersectionality, and socioeconomic status were covered in institute curricula, almost 80% of white and BIPOC faculty agreed that the coverage was insufficient (Tables 28-32). A big difference appeared with respect to ethnicity not being covered “at all” in the curriculum, with BIPOC faculty twice as likely to have felt this than their white counterparts (Table 28). White faculty tended to feel while there is coverage, this is simply not enough. In one faculty interview, interviewees elaborated:

You need to be able to teach about transference, without candidates/trainees feeling that you don't think there's a racial reality. The challenge is, how do you include attention to socio-cultural realities—race, gender, racism—while also paying attention to psychic reality and transference?...How do you introduce the realities of racism and race while also teaching people how to focus on what's in internal reality, transference and resistance?¹²

¹² All quotations are from the Interview Summary, Appendix G. Permission was obtained from all study participants to use their quotations anonymously.

This highlights a difficulty in that, in the eyes of white faculty, the BIPOC person's subjective experience of racism is somehow being seen as not properly located in their inner lived experience - their inner reality.

The above trend was also seen among candidates when discussing race/racism, ethnicity, gender identity, religious affiliation, intersectionality and socioeconomic status. Both white and BIPOC candidates felt these topics are not covered enough or at all (Tables 33-38), with BIPOC candidates being two to four times more likely to have felt that issues of race/racism (Table 33), ethnicity (Table 34), and gender identity (Table 35) were not covered at all in the curriculum than their white counterparts. The inference here is that for white candidates a little bit seems to count as at least something, whereas for many BIPOC faculty and candidates a little bit counts as “not at all.” It seems that “a little bit” is, for many BIPOC faculty and candidates, worse than nothing. This suggests that the threshold of what constitutes an adequate response on the part of institutes was different across the two groups.

Table 28
Faculty on level of curriculum coverage of ethnicity

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum: Ethnicity	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All (%)	13	28.7
Not Covered Enough (%)	66.3	50
Covered Adequately (%)	20.4	21.3
Covered Too Much (%)	0.4	0

Table 29*Faculty on level of curriculum coverage of physical ability/disability*

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum: Physical Ability/Disability	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All (%)	45.7	58.8
Not Covered Enough (%)	46.3	33.8
Covered Adequately (%)	8.1	7.5
Covered Too Much (%)	0	0

Table 30*Faculty on level of curriculum coverage of religious affiliation*

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum: Religious Affiliation	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All (%)	46	60.8
Not Covered Enough (%)	42.1	26.6
Covered Adequately (%)	11.9	12.7
Covered Too Much (%)	0	0

Table 31*Faculty on level of curriculum coverage of intersectionality/intersectional identity*

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum: Intersectionality/Intersectional Identity	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All (%)	32	47.4
Not Covered Enough (%)	52	40.8
Covered Adequately (%)	15.1	10.5
Covered Too Much (%)	0.9	1.3

Table 32*Faculty on level of curriculum coverage of socio-economic status*

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum: Socio-Economic Status	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All (%)	27.2	45.7
Not Covered Enough (%)	60	44.4
Covered Adequately (%)	12.7	9.9
Covered Too Much (%)	0.2	0

Table 33*Candidates on level of curriculum coverage of race or racism*

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum: Race or Racism	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All (%)	11.4	23.1
Not Covered Enough (%)	60.5	58.2
Covered Adequately (%)	27.6	16.5
Covered Too Much (%)	0.5	2.2

Table 34*Candidates on level of curriculum coverage of ethnicity*

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum: Ethnicity	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All (%)	14.1	35.2
Not Covered Enough (%)	59.5	49.5
Covered Adequately (%)	26.5	15.4
Covered Too Much (%)	0	0

Table 35*Candidates on level of curriculum coverage of gender identity*

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum: Gender Identity	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All (%)	4.3	16.7
Not Covered Enough (%)	51.9	50
Covered Adequately (%)	43.8	31.1
Covered Too Much (%)	0	2.2

Table 36*Candidates on level of curriculum coverage of religious affiliation*

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum - Religious Affiliation	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All (%)	37.7	57.1
Not Covered Enough (%)	42.1	35.2
Covered Adequately (%)	18.6	7.7
Covered Too Much (%)	1.6	0

Table 37*Candidates on level of curriculum coverage of intersectionality/intersectional identity*

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum: Intersectionality/Intersectional Identity	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All (%)	26.2	48.4
Not Covered Enough (%)	50.3	38.5
Covered Adequately (%)	22.4	12.1
Covered Too Much (%)	1.1	1.1

Table 38*Candidates on level of curriculum coverage of socio-economic status*

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum: Socio-Economic Status	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All (%)	26.3	46.2
Not Covered Enough (%)	54.3	44
Covered Adequately (%)	19.4	9.9
Covered Too Much (%)	0	0

Among both faculty (Table 39) and candidates (Table 40) the BIPOC group was more than twice as likely as their white counterparts to have felt they had an “advanced level of understanding” of race/racism. This seems self-explanatory but begs the question as to what constitutes “understanding.” Similarly, BIPOC candidates felt that the understanding of race/racism/white supremacy on the part of white candidates was at an emerging level - the lowest level of the three choices offered in the survey instrument (Table 41).

Table 39*Faculty's own understanding of race, racism, and white supremacy*

Which of the following best describes your own level of understanding of race, racism, and white supremacy?	White	BIPOC
Emerging Level of Understanding (%)	23.6	11.1
Moderate Level of Understanding (%)	55.4	37
Advanced Level of Understanding (%)	21	51.9

Table 40*Candidates' own understanding of race, racism, and white supremacy*

Which of the following best describes your own level of understanding of race, racism, and white supremacy?	White	BIPOC
Emerging Level of Understanding (%)	18.8	8.7
Moderate Level of Understanding (%)	62.4	50
Advanced Level of Understanding (%)	18.8	41.3

Table 41*Candidates' assessment of fellow candidates understanding of race/racism/white supremacy*

How would you assess the level of understanding of race/racism/white supremacy of your fellow candidates?	White	BIPOC
Emerging Level of Understanding (%)	32.2	46.6
Moderate Level of Understanding (%)	59.4	50
Advanced Level of Understanding (%)	8.3	3.4

Different Experience and Viewpoints of BIPOC and White Psychoanalysts

Regarding Issues of Race, Racism, and White Supremacy

There were statistically significant differences between BIPOC and white candidate and faculty perceptions of the reality and experience of race, racism, and white supremacy, which inevitably led to little consensus as far as identifying and addressing problems connected with these topics. We think this difference implies that it is BIPOC candidates and faculty who directly feel the impact of our profession's hidden institutional racism as they navigate their way through its psychoanalytic institutes.

BIPOC faculty far outnumbered white faculty in sensing that being white gave prospective candidates undue advantage as far as admission was concerned (Table 42). These disparities extended to socio-economic status (Table 43) and gender (Table 44), where BIPOC

faculty felt that being wealthier and male brought advantages to potential candidates. BIPOC candidates felt that having a degree in medicine was an added advantage (Table 45).

Table 42

Faculty on admission process for white applicants

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who identify as white	White	BIPOC
Advantage (%)	24.9	43
Disadvantage (%)	0.8	1.3
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage (%)	74.2	55.7

Table 43

Faculty on admission process for applicants with higher socio-economic status

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who have higher socio-economic status	White	BIPOC
Advantage (%)	44.2	62.8
Disadvantage (%)	0.8	0
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage (%)	55	37.2

Table 44

Faculty on admission process for applicants who identify as male

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who identify as male	White	BIPOC
Advantage (%)	13.8	31.6
Disadvantage (%)	0.6	0
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage (%)	85.5	68.4

Table 45*Candidates on admission process for applicants with a degree in medicine*

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who have earned a degree in medicine	White	BIPOC
Advantage (%)	45.4	61.4
Disadvantage	2.2	3.4
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage (%)	52.5	35.2

Similar findings emerged regarding invited lectures or symposia on race, with white faculty tending to see these as more effective than BIPOC faculty (Table 46). Twenty-five percent of BIPOC faculty saw either no effect or an ineffective one, while only 10% of white faculty felt this. The two groups appeared to have different thresholds for judging effectiveness of attempts taken to address the problem of racism. BIPOC candidates were also twice as likely as white candidates to disagree that their institutes invite exemplary graduates to teach courses (Table 47) and were less likely to feel the institute makes efforts to recruit graduates of color to teach (Table 48). However, both groups of candidates felt that graduates of color were invited to publish collaboratively (Table 49), but that there was too little inclusion in the curricula of writings by psychoanalysts of color (Table 50).

Table 46*Faculty on effectiveness of invited lecture or symposium on race, racism, and/or white supremacy*

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy? Invited lecture or symposium focused on race, racism, and/or white supremacy	White	BIPOC
Very Effective (%)	30.3	25
Somewhat Effective (%)	59.2	48.4
Somewhat Ineffective (%)	6	15.6
Had No Effect (%)	4.5	10.9

Table 47*Candidates on their institute inviting exemplary graduates to teach courses*

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statement: My institute invites exemplary graduates to teach courses.	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree (%)	37.6	11
Agree (%)	54.4	74
Disagree (%)	5.4	12.3
Strongly Disagree (%)	2.7	2.7

Table 48*Candidates on their institute recruiting graduates of color to teach courses*

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statement: My institute makes a concerted effort to recruit graduates of color to teach courses.	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree (%)	9.2	0
Agree (%)	33.6	25.4
Disagree (%)	41.2	45.1
Strongly Disagree (%)	16	29.6

Table 49*Candidates on exemplary graduates being invited to publish*

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statement: You and/or your colleagues invite exemplary graduates to publish collaboratively.	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree (%)	4.4	1.7
Agree (%)	36.3	25
Disagree (%)	44.2	50
Strongly Disagree (%)	15	23.3

Table 50*Candidates on people of color being represented in readings*

With which statement do you most agree?	White	BIPOC
People of color are represented adequately in the required reading (%)	7	3.2
People of color are overrepresented in the required reading (%)	0.5	0
People of color are underrepresented in the required reading (%)	79.7	84.9
I do not know (%)	12.8	11.8

Regarding the question of whether their institute had taken action with respect to systemic racism, there was similarity in the two groups until they were asked whether that action was “proactive.” When asked, BIPOC respondents were twice as likely to disagree than white respondents. While there appeared to be agreement regarding institutes’ willingness to respond positively to a perceived need in this area, institutes appeared less willing to do so “proactively” in the eyes of the BIPOC group. This group may be more alert on the basis of their own personal experience to the resilience and persistence of the problem of systemic racism and of how it is embedded in apparently innocuous practices that lie hidden within an organization’s ordinary mode of being. Addressing systemic racism requires a proactive, not a reactive, stance, which requires a serious commitment to change.

Recommendations

These findings suggest that psychoanalytic institutions have responded to the momentum created by the Black Lives Matter movement following the murder of George Floyd with concern and introspection. There appeared to be a general trend across institutes toward greater engagement with the topic of race and racism. However, these efforts were mostly seen as “somewhat” or “moderately” effective, with candidates tending towards the former. Candidates seemed more motivated to seek more change, and more immediate change. These findings combine to make the present a moment of opportunity.

We can summarize the data in the following ways. Psychoanalytic candidates and faculty felt that when attention was drawn to issues involving race, racism, or white supremacy within institutes these issues were not adequately dealt with. Psychoanalytic candidates and faculty did not feel adequately equipped to discuss, teach or address issues of race, racism, or white

supremacy. White candidates' and faculty's perception of the reality of race, racism and white supremacy, and their experience of these forces, differed significantly from that of their BIPOC counterparts, who are the objects of racism. These findings are consistent with the idea that systemic racism may be alive in our institutions. However, even the institutes that are taking steps to "do something" about this problem seem to not fully grasp the central point about institutional racism, namely that it exists within the very structure of our organizations. We recommend that psychoanalytic organizations take collective responsibility for identifying and addressing aspects of their institutional life that perpetuate white exclusivity and stand in the way of moving toward greater diversity, equity, and inclusion that is consciously espoused. This will require appropriate authorization, implementation and monitoring.

Authorization

Authorization for addressing systemic problems needs to come from the highest level of an organization, and in membership organizations such as psychoanalytic societies and institutes the ultimate authority resides with the membership. The issues connected with establishing racial and intersectional diversity, equity, and inclusion should therefore be put to the vote in a meeting of the general membership, with the aim of establishing whether there is a collective will to commit to and pursue this goal. This should be established by a free democratic vote, which will then be binding on the organization as a whole, thereby establishing a mandate for change.

Implementation

Once appropriately authorized and mandated, we recommend that the body responsible for running the institute/society formulate a comprehensive strategy for implementing the mandate that will give expression to that particular institute/society's commitment to diversity,

equity, and inclusion. This strategy may require different constituent committees such as those dealing with outreach, recruitment, training, and scientific or professional development activities to formulate detailed policies and procedures. The remainder of this report contains examples of detailed recommendations in each of these areas.

Monitoring

Monitoring Resistance to Change

One of the most important realities about institutional racism is its extraordinary resistance to change. This means that it is inevitable that there will be resistance to the mandated commitment to the goal of diversity, equity, and inclusion, which may attempt to subvert the practices pursuing implementation of this goal. This is likely to be in disguised form (anxieties about “upholding standards”) and it is essential that progress in implementing diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives be regularly reviewed by the board. When obstacles emerge, the responsible entity will need to find ways to address any obstacles with expert consultants, for example. This will allow for learning from experience in that particular society/institute, which may then be compared with initiatives taken elsewhere. The results of these reviews should regularly be placed before the membership, for instance, in the organization’s annual report. Seemingly intractable difficulties should be brought back to the membership.

Proactive Monitoring

Racial enactments usually take place when decisions are made involving a minority group member which on the surface appear to have nothing to do with “race” or minority status. We recommend that every institution appoint a diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) ombudsperson or small committee with expertise in this area, who should be consulted about every decision made in the institution involving a BIPOC or minority individual. This may allow potential

enactments to be identified in advance, thus avoiding ill-advised decisions or actions that may prove catastrophic, causing real and lasting damage to the psychoanalytic institution in its quest for diversity, equity, and inclusion.

A second function of the DEI ombudsperson/committee would be to provide a confidential route for disempowered individuals to raise concerns about race, racist or other diversity, equity, and inclusion issues involving colleagues within the institution, such as candidates raising concerns about faculty.

Explicit protocols, procedures and lines of accountability for the DEI ombudsperson or committee should be established and not only address race, racism, and white supremacy, but also ethnicity, religious belief, national origin, age, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, marital status, veteran status, pregnancy, childbirth, religion, physical ability, socio-economic status, creed, and any other identity markers related to intersectionality.

Chapter 4

Recruitment, Admissions, Progression and Procedures, and Mentorship and Leadership

Now is the accepted time, not tomorrow, not some more convenient season. It is today that our best work can be done.

— W.E.B. Du Bois, *Prayers for Dark People*

You do not have to be me in order for us to fight alongside each other. I do not have to be you to recognize that our wars are the same. What we must do is commit ourselves to some future that can include each other and to work toward that future with the particular strengths of our individual identities. And in order for us to do this, we must allow each other our differences at the same time as we recognize our sameness.

— Audre Lorde, “Learning from the 60s”

Over the years, I’ve been asked why I didn’t hold back as the “model minority” stereotype dictates, to avoid being the nail that sticks out. Here’s why: I’ve always believed that if you can possibly make a positive difference in this world, why wouldn’t any caring person do so? We have the power of our voices. If not now, when?

— Helen Zia, personal communication, June 6, 2023

This chapter of the report focuses on study participants’ responses regarding experiences with recruitment, admissions, progression through analytic training, mentorship, career-building, and leadership. The findings show significant differences in the experience of analytic training for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and white participants, suggesting multiple areas where racial bias is expressed. Candidates as a whole and BIPOC faculty acknowledged the presence of racial and economic privilege and disadvantage at their institutes in similar ways. In contrast to candidates and BIPOC faculty, a smaller percentage of white faculty reported advantages afforded to applicants or candidates who are white, male, or have relatively higher socioeconomic status. Such differences suggest that white faculty may underestimate the negative impact of systemic racism on applicants and candidates of color.

The findings also indicate a universal desire for greater racial and ethnic diversity and inclusion in institute membership and curricula. Several factors hinder progress toward these goals. There is an over-reliance on existing social networks for recruitment and admissions. There was a reported lack of clarity, transparency, and objectivity in evaluation criteria and requirements for progression, which can increase or obscure racial bias. The findings also indicate that after acceptance and during candidacy, there were significant barriers to accessing and completing training programs. These barriers included: racist incidents, including microaggressions; the absence of formal procedures/protocols for responding to racist incidents; high cost of training; lack of sensitivity in the structure of training to work and family responsibilities; objectively and subjectively felt isolation; and a lack of sense of belonging at institutes. These barriers were frequently dismissed by institute leadership. Especially concerning was that white candidates and faculty underestimated the degree to which critical racial incidents contributed to candidates' decisions to leave training.

The Problem of Word-of-Mouth Recruitment

Based on the survey data, recruitment for many psychoanalytic institutes was largely by word of mouth. For many participants, both their decision to pursue analytic training and their choice of institute were encouraged via existing relationships with supervisors, professors, psychotherapists/analysts, and colleagues. Survey results indicated that candidates mostly learned about an institute through people they knew.

In the survey responses, 48% of candidates reported that they learned of their institute through a peer, colleague, or former teacher, and 27% of candidates reported they knew someone who taught or supervised at their institute. This was consistent with faculty responses: 74% of faculty reported their institutes attracted applicants through word of mouth, 17% of faculty

reported their institutes attracted applicants through advertisements in professional journals, and 33% of faculty indicated their institutes attracted applicants through advertisements at conferences. However, very few candidates reported first hearing about an institute through a journal or conference advertisement. In describing their decision to seek training at their institute, candidates wrote that they had a “sense of loyalty from [my] work with the institute’s supervisors during residency,”¹³ and/or that they were individually encouraged. One candidate said, “I got a call from the head of the curriculum committee saying how excited they were to have me, that I was a ‘star.’” Another candidate reported they had “close friends attending the same institute.”

Recruitment occurring primarily through existing social networks rather than through broader outreach methods increases the likelihood that the current demographic of an institute, as well as a sense of particularism rather than universalism, will be reproduced. If institutes wish to attract a diverse student body and develop diverse leadership and faculty, changes in recruitment and outreach will be crucial. Three candidates wrote that they found their institute through their own research. Nineteen candidates specifically wrote that they found their institute through internet research, suggesting that online information and recruitment is an important avenue for reaching a broader and more diverse set of applicants. Online information and recruitment may also help to situate institutes more as a part of the diverse clinical treatment and training world. Based on these findings concerning recruitment, we recommend the following:

- Broaden recruitment strategies beyond word-of-mouth recruitment and monitor and evaluate these strategies on an ongoing basis,

¹³ All statistics in the chapter are from The Holmes Commission Appendices A, B, C, D, E, and F. All quotations in the chapter are from The Holmes Commission Interview Summary Report, Appendix G. Permission was obtained from all study participants to use their quotations anonymously.

- Improve websites and online/social media presence and advertising,
- Expand the network of personal connections to help with recruitment of BIPOC, Latinx, and other diverse applicants, and
- Institute leadership needs to engage in discussions aimed at improving diversity, equity, and inclusivity in the recruitment process, and evaluate the impact of existing and new recruitment processes.

Admissions

In discussions about improving equity and diversity in psychoanalytic organizations, people commonly commented that the younger generation of candidates and psychoanalysts have greater awareness of the experiences of historically marginalized people and systems of oppression, and often express the hope that the youth will be the ones to change things for the better. At first glance, the data from the survey may appear to affirm what seems like a generational difference. A greater percentage of candidates observed advantages for whites, males, and those with higher socio-economic status and greater disadvantage for people of color applying to and progressing in analytic training. Comparing candidate responses to faculty responses there is a consistent difference:

- 40% of candidates, compared to 28% of faculty, reported that a person who identifies as white was advantaged in admissions;
- 31% of candidates, compared to 18% of faculty, reported that a person of color was disadvantaged in admissions;
- 24% of candidates, compared to 17% of faculty, reported that males were advantaged in admissions;

- 66% of candidates, compared to 47% of faculty, reported that applicants who have a higher socio-economic status were advantaged in admissions; and
- 33% of candidates, compared to 18% of faculty, reported that people of color were unintentionally disadvantaged in evaluation and progression procedures.

However, when one disaggregates these data into white or BIPOC respondents, a different, more complex picture emerges. Candidate responses were in line with the responses of BIPOC faculty when it came to perceptions of advantage during admissions for white or male applicants or applicants with high socio-economic status. To emphasize this point, it seems that white faculty were less likely than *both* candidates and BIPOC faculty to notice when there were greater advantages afforded to applicants who were male, white, or who had higher socio-economic status.

Following are two examples of this pattern, in which candidates and BIPOC faculty align, while a difference is seen in white faculty responses regarding admissions:

Survey Question: Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants who identify as white?

- Candidates in total (no significant difference between white and BIPOC candidates): 40% Advantage; 1% Disadvantage; 59% Neither Advantage or Disadvantage;
- BIPOC faculty: 43% Advantage; 1% Disadvantage; 56% Neither Advantage or Disadvantage; and
- White faculty: 25% Advantage; 1% Disadvantage; 74% Neither Advantage or Disadvantage.

Survey Question: Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants who have a higher socio-economic status?

- Candidates in total (no significant difference between white and BIPOC candidates): 66% Advantage; 0% Disadvantage; 35% Neither Advantage or Disadvantage;
- BIPOC faculty: 63% Advantage; 0% Disadvantage; 37% Neither Advantage or Disadvantage; and
- White faculty: 44% Advantage; 1% Disadvantage; 55% Neither Advantage or Disadvantage.

A greater number of candidates perceived disadvantage for applicants of color in admissions compared with faculty responses and a greater number of faculty perceived applicants of color to be advantaged compared with candidate responses. BIPOC faculty responses trended in a similar direction as candidate responses, identifying greater disadvantage for applicants of color. We speculate that some white faculty may view applicants of color as advantaged, because they may have an amplified perception of preference given to applicants of color in the context of the desire of many institutes to diversify their membership; white faculty may have less awareness about how racial bias influences application processes.

Survey Question: Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants who identify as a person of color?

- Faculty in total (no significant difference between white and BIPOC faculty responses): 26% Advantage; 18% Disadvantage; 57% Neither Advantage or Disadvantage;

- Candidates in total (there was no significant difference between white and BIPOC candidate responses): 15% Advantage; 31% Disadvantage; 53% Neither Advantage or Disadvantage;
- BIPOC faculty: 16% Advantage; 22% Disadvantage; 62% Neither Advantage or Disadvantage; and
- White faculty: 28% Advantage; 16% Disadvantage; 56% Neither Advantage or Disadvantage.

Looking more specifically at racial bias in application processes, it seems that racial bias may come up in interviews and in preferences for certain degree holders. In the admissions process, white applicants had a more positive and comfortable experience during interviews as compared to applicants of color. White candidates (63%) were more likely than BIPOC candidates (46%) to report that their admissions interview process was a positive experience. Concerning candidates' experiences of interviews, one faculty participant wrote, "Certain candidates have found the interview process and subsequent interactions with members to be experienced as 'critical' and 'demeaning' rather than supportive and welcoming." A candidate wrote:

The admission interviews are conducted largely by older white people and I imagine there are many people who would benefit from a more diverse group of interviewers. But the people who do those interviews are senior members of the institute, so it seems to be a self-perpetuating cycle of selection based partially on cultural affinity.

In addition to this difference in experiences of the interviews, BIPOC applicants may experience a bias towards medical degree holders to a greater degree than white applicants. A greater percentage of BIPOC candidates (61%) as compared to white candidates (45%) reported

that they observed an advantage for applicants with medical degrees. One candidate reported, “They were not very welcoming to non-MD candidates, and there were very few of us.” Similarly, a faculty participant wrote about the biases in the application process:

We tend to select people from training programs we know and are familiar with. Letters of recommendation from people we already know in the field are highly valued. Prior to COVID we required in-person interviews which required travel, and that is expensive if it involves airplane travel. Unconscious and implicit bias are likely at play in every interview situation. We privilege MD's above PhD's in our selection procedures.

One can again see that the influence of existing social and professional networks described in recruitment procedures is also active in the admissions process, and this increases the likelihood of reproducing current demographics. As institutes work to admit more diverse candidates, having BIPOC and other diverse interviewers may be an important step. It would also be important to address the preference for applicants who already have a connection through current institute networks, as well as the privilege granted towards those who hold medical degrees.

In response to the open-ended responses on the survey, multiple participants described the lack of objective criteria for evaluation in admissions and “a lack of transparency in processes,” procedures, requirements, and costs. For example, one candidate reported, “I was puzzled and irritated by either the lack of organization or, more likely to my mind, the lack of transparency about what was viewed as problematic about my application.” Similarly, another candidate reported:

The first institute I applied to (an APsaA-affiliated institute) rejected me despite my qualifications and demonstrated abilities (strong letters of recommendation, presentation at two APsaA annual meetings, and a book chapter...). Though I will never know what

role racism played in this rejection, as I did have a less-than-perfect application, the malice with which I was met when I inquired about what had led to my rejection was of a magnitude that, I was later told by a senior analyst at that institute, he had not seen projected at an applicant for candidacy.

Another candidate wrote about the requirements and costs of the program, “It was hard to know clearly the costs, the structure, who would be in it, the cost of texts, the amount of time outside of class time, etc.” Similarly, a faculty member wrote:

Our institute has an admissions protocol that is not clearly enough defined. This leaves a great deal of latitude for the individuals involved in screening for candidacy to that individual. As such, there are many individual examples of behaviors on the part of analysts who are participating in the interviews that can be interpreted as exclusive, self-aggrandizing, demeaning or inappropriate, and therefore discourage potential candidates.

Based on these findings concerning admissions, we recommend the following:

- There is a need for BIPOC and diverse interviewers and admission committee members.
- Develop more objective data and transparency in acceptance of applicants.
- There should be transparency and clarity with regard to admissions evaluation criteria in all communications to applicants.

Progression and Evaluation Procedures

The pattern observed in the admissions data was also evidenced in the perception of racism in progression and evaluation procedures in the responses of white faculty compared with all candidates and BIPOC faculty. White faculty were less likely than both candidates and BIPOC faculty to report disadvantages experienced by candidates of color in evaluation and progression procedures.

Survey Question: Does your institution use any evaluation/progression procedures that may unintentionally disadvantage candidates of color?

- BIPOC faculty: 31% yes, 69% no;
- Candidates (no statistical difference between responses from white and BIPOC candidates): 33% yes, 67% no; and
- White faculty: 15% yes, 85% no.

It was also the case that a smaller percentage of white faculty compared to BIPOC faculty observed that candidates from disadvantaged backgrounds may be unintentionally disadvantaged in evaluation/progression procedures.

Survey Question: Does your institution use any evaluation/progression procedures that may unintentionally disadvantage candidates from disadvantaged backgrounds?

- BIPOC faculty: 46% yes, 54% no;
- Candidates: 49% yes, 51% no; and
- White faculty: 30% yes, 70% no.

These notable results suggest that some white faculty members do not grasp that there may be significant inequities in the procedures and policies within their psychoanalytic institutes that disadvantage people of color and those from disadvantaged economic backgrounds. It is good news that a majority (about 68%) of both candidates and BIPOC faculty indicated that they did not observe evaluation/progression procedures that may unintentionally disadvantage candidates of color. At the same time, it is a serious concern that about one third of all candidates and BIPOC faculty reported the presence of procedures that may unintentionally disadvantage candidates of color at their institutes.

One example of the difference in the experience of training was in selecting a supervisor approved by their institute rather than being assigned one: 87% of white candidates selected their supervisor compared to 64% of BIPOC candidates. A possible caveat here is that we also know that institutes differ in the extent to which candidates are assigned or allowed to select their own supervisors. Our data do not tell us if the institutes assigning supervisors are also disproportionately training candidates of color. Yet we conclude that having a choice of supervisor may be important, as many BIPOC supervisees experience racial microaggressions toward them and in comments about their clients. In response to the survey question, “Did you ever have a discriminatory experience with your advisor, supervisor, or instructor?” 22% of white candidates and 37% of BIPOC candidates indicated “yes.” One respondent observed, “Having only ‘unintentionally’ racist white supervisors evaluating candidates of color who struggle at the very least to talk about anything race related” disadvantages candidates of color. Ultimately, this limits training for all candidates.

The perception of evaluation/progression criteria and procedures to increase the number of candidates of color who complete training was different for white and BIPOC candidates. Although the majority of white and BIPOC candidates indicated there were no such procedures in place at their institute, the percentages were quite different between the groups.

Survey Question: Are there any evaluation/progression criteria and procedures your institution considers to increase the number of candidates of color who complete your training program?

- White candidates: 36% yes, 64% no; and
- BIPOC candidates: 18% yes, 83% no.

In response to the question, “To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? Racial microaggressions or other discriminatory gestures,” the perceived frequency of these incidents contributing to candidates leaving varied across white and BIPOC faculty, and similarly across white and BIPOC candidates. Specifically, 4% of white faculty, compared to 19% of BIPOC faculty indicated that candidates frequently left due to racial microaggressions. A greater percentage of white faculty also reported that racial microaggressions never contribute to candidates leaving training: 33% of white faculty, compared to 18% of BIPOC faculty reported that racial microaggressions never contribute to candidates leaving training.

The difference in responses to this question between white and BIPOC candidates’ responses was similar: 12% of white candidates compared to 27% of BIPOC candidates indicated that racial microaggressions frequently contributed to candidates leaving. A greater percentage of white candidates indicated that racial microaggressions never contributed to people leaving: 29% of white candidates compared to 21% BIPOC candidates reported that racial microaggressions never contributed to candidates leaving a program before completion.

A similar difference in perception was observed when participants were asked about critical racial incidents. A smaller percentage of white faculty and white candidates, as compared to BIPOC faculty and candidates, reported that critical racial incidents contributed to candidates leaving analytic training before completion. Nineteen percent of white faculty reported that critical racial incidents frequently or occasionally contributed to candidates leaving compared to 33% of BIPOC faculty. A greater percentage of white faculty as compared to BIPOC faculty indicated that critical racial incidents never contributed to students leaving: 41% of white faculty

compared to 33% BIPOC faculty indicated that critical racial incidents never contributed to candidates leaving training.

The difference in the responses of white and BIPOC candidates was also present, with a smaller percentage of white candidates reporting that critical racial incidents contribute to candidates leaving training: 29% of white candidates compared to 46% of BIPOC candidates reported that critical racial incidents either frequently or occasionally contribute to candidates leaving. A greater percentage of white candidates as compared to BIPOC candidates indicated that a critical racial incident never contributed to a candidate leaving: 36% of white candidates compared to 24% of BIPOC candidates.

These results importantly suggest that while white candidates' reports of the presence of racial discrimination are similar to that of BIPOC faculty and candidates, many white candidates and white faculty do not have an understanding of the negative impact of these incidents on candidates. Whether racial microaggressions or critical racial incidents, white candidates and white faculty may underestimate how these racially discriminatory experiences can be harmful enough to contribute to someone leaving a program. This gap in understanding does appear to be smaller for candidates but persists in that group.

There is an "intergenerational" difference in responses on these items in that candidates were more likely than faculty to acknowledge the contribution of racial microaggressions and critical incidents to candidates leaving training. This was the case for white candidates and white faculty, and notably also for BIPOC candidates and BIPOC faculty. A greater percentage of BIPOC candidates compared to BIPOC faculty indicated that racial incidents and microaggressions contributed to candidates leaving a program. Nineteen percent of BIPOC faculty compared to 27% of BIPOC candidates indicated that candidates frequently left due to

racial microaggressions. Thirty-three percent of BIPOC faculty compared with 46% of BIPOC candidates reported that critical racial incidents frequently or occasionally contributed to candidates leaving a program.

As was seen in admissions procedures, participants described a lack of reliance on objective data and lack of transparency in progression criteria, which may make it more likely for racial bias to play a role. This concern was eloquently stated by one candidate:

Although there are stated procedures for evaluation and progression that have been formulated to protect against biases and systemic exclusions, there is resistance amongst progressions faculty to put into place and adhere to these procedures. Faculty resist the idea of systematizing aspects of evaluation and instead argue for the importance of subjective experience, at times even using this argument as a response to the criticism of systemic racism, i.e. that systematizing competencies could itself be subject to systematic racism, as an attempt to preserve the privileging of the subjective without acknowledging the ways in which subjective assessments are necessarily impacted by white supremacy and other systemic violences.

Given the differences in the experience of psychoanalytic training for white individuals and people who identify as BIPOC evidenced in the study results, establishing clear criteria for evaluation, procedures, costs and requirements will play a centrally important role in developing more equitable psychoanalytic institutions.

Based on these findings concerning progression and evaluation, we recommend the following:

- Create structure and space for faculty and candidates to better understand the experiences of BIPOC candidates, BIPOC analysts, and BIPOC as well as other diverse groups.

- Create standard, publicly articulated procedures for addressing race, systemic racism, white supremacy, and other discrimination occurring at interpersonal and structural levels at institutes/societies.
- Create a process of reflection and discussion within institute leadership when a BIPOC candidate is facing challenges in training and/or decides to leave training. Use the data gathered to make meaningful changes in how systemic racism is addressed in the institute.
- Form progression committees with attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Mentorship and Leadership

In examining experiences of mentorship and career-building support for both candidates and faculty, the percentage of white respondents who observed or experienced mentorship, support, and opportunities for professional connection was greater than the percentage of BIPOC respondents who observed this career support. As one faculty member wrote, “Especially for a person of color there is a lack of mentorship; there is an exclusivity at public meetings.” White and BIPOC candidates differed on their perceptions of the extent to which their institute provided opportunities for connection to professionals in the community. A greater percentage of white candidates (81%) indicated that their institute provided opportunities for candidates to make connections with professionals in the community as compared to BIPOC candidates (66%).

We also found a notable difference between white faculty and BIPOC faculty concerning the extent to which their institute and/or senior colleagues referred patients to recent graduates to help them build their practice. A majority of white faculty agreed that the colleagues at their institute were proactive in referring patients to recent graduates (of white faculty 61% agreed or

strongly agreed and 39% disagreed or strongly disagreed). In contrast, BIPOC faculty were split, with a slight majority of BIPOC faculty disagreeing that the colleagues at their institute were proactive in referring patients to recent graduates (of BIPOC faculty 45% agreed or strongly agreed and 55% disagreed or strongly disagreed).

Overall, a greater percentage of faculty respondents as compared to candidate respondents rated their institutes as providing support through invitations to teach, to present at conferences, or to serve on boards to graduates after completing their program. Invitations to teach courses (41% of candidates and 63% of faculty) and invitations to serve on committees or boards (41% of candidates and 66% of faculty) were the two most frequently identified institute actions to support candidates once they completed the program. The invitation to co-author publications was the least frequently reported item (8% of candidates and 15% of faculty.)

Although the majority of faculty and candidates (white and BIPOC) felt that their institute did invite exemplary graduates to teach courses, white respondents were more likely than BIPOC respondents to be in agreement with the statement: My institute invites exemplary graduates to teach courses:

- White faculty: 94% agreed or strongly agreed;
- BIPOC faculty: 87% agreed or strongly agreed;
- White candidates: 92% agreed or strongly agreed; and
- BIPOC candidates: 85% agreed or strongly agreed.

When asked whether their institute makes a concerted effort to recruit graduates of color to teach courses, candidates and faculty were split when asked the survey question: To what extent do you agree with each of the following statement: My institute makes a concerted effort to recruit graduates of color to teach courses:

- White candidates: 57% disagreed or strongly disagreed and 43% agreed or strongly agreed;
- BIPOC candidates: 75% disagreed or strongly disagreed and 25% agreed;
- White faculty: 42% disagreed or strongly disagreed and 59% agreed or strongly agreed; and
- BIPOC faculty 54% disagreed or strongly disagreed and 47% agreed or strongly agreed.

BIPOC faculty were more likely than white faculty to disagree that there were concerted efforts to recruit graduates of color to teach courses. We see a difference between faculty reports and candidate reports, with white faculty trending in the opposite direction from candidates.

When it comes to another marker of mentoring and career-fostering, invitations to publish, we again find some difference among candidates and between candidates and faculty. For both white and BIPOC candidates, the majority did not feel that their institute invited exemplary graduates to publish collaboratively, however a greater percentage of BIPOC candidates (73% disagreed or strongly disagreed) reported this as compared to white candidates (59% disagreed or strongly disagreed). A majority of both white and BIPOC faculty disagreed that they and their colleagues make an effort to invite graduates of color to publish collaboratively, however a greater percentage of BIPOC faculty (73% disagreed or strongly disagreed) disagreed overall compared to white faculty (64% disagreed or strongly disagreed). Similarly, most candidates did not observe a concerted effort to invite graduates of color to publish collaboratively, however more BIPOC candidates disagreed overall (81% disagreed or strongly disagreed) compared to white candidates (69% disagreed or strongly disagreed).

Case presentation is a universal marker of recognition and advancement in psychoanalysis. Here we note that our survey question combined the common and universal

invitation to present a case with the rarer invitation to present research. Our findings more likely reflect case presentation. Both a majority of white faculty and BIPOC faculty agreed that they and their colleagues invite exemplary graduates to present cases and or research. When asked: To what extent do you agree with the following statement: You and/or your colleagues invite exemplary graduates to present cases and/or research at conferences and society meetings:

- White candidates: 77% agreed or strongly agreed and of these 20% strongly agreed and 23% disagreed or strongly disagreed;
- BIPOC candidates: 50% agreed or strongly agreed and 50% disagreed or strongly disagreed;
- White faculty: 80% strongly agreed or agreed and 11% disagreed or strongly disagreed; and
- BIPOC faculty: 75% strongly agreed or agreed and 25% disagreed or strongly agreed.

When asked whether a concerted effort was made to invite graduates of color to present at conferences and societal meetings, BIPOC respondents were less likely than white respondents to report this effort. There was a slight majority of white candidates (55% agreed or strongly agreed) that colleagues at their institutes made a concerted effort to invite graduates of color to present cases and/or research at conferences and society meetings. In contrast, the majority of BIPOC candidates (67%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. A larger majority of white faculty agreed that they and their colleagues make a concerted effort to invite graduates of color to present cases or research (67% agreed or strongly agreed) compared to BIPOC faculty (55% disagreed or strongly disagreed and 45% agreed or strongly agreed).

Based on these findings concerning mentorship and leadership, we recommend the following:

- Recognize the importance of consistent mentoring that supports BIPOC and diverse students in career development.
- Implement a mentorship program in the structure of training and increase the numbers of BIPOC and diverse mentors.
- Implement assessment procedures where institutes can examine the impact of mentoring on candidates' professional development, equity and inclusion in institute activities, and leadership following graduation.

Multiple Barriers to Accessing and Completing Analytic Training

Institutes may be structuring training with schedules and requirements that are out of step with the reality of the multiple barriers to accessing and completing analytic training faced by candidates. These barriers include experiences of racism and perceptions of inclusivity or exclusion in specific institutions, as well as the response of institutes following racial incidents. Study participants also ranked financial resources, family responsibilities, and workload, such as the frequency of sessions for control cases and training analysis, as common obstacles to training. Many study participants described a lack of sensitivity to these barriers when their institutes responded to candidates' needs and feedback. There are BIPOC candidates who are not affected by barriers such as financial challenges; however, addressing these barriers in analytic training will support both BIPOC and white candidates who face these obstacles.

Greater attention to these barriers is important since there may be a gap between faculty reports of accommodations provided and candidates' experiences of accommodations and support when they face difficulties that threaten their ability to complete their training. White

faculty were more likely than BIPOC faculty and candidates to report that candidates are offered deadline extensions, a new mentor in the field, or assignment of a new supervisor when difficulties threaten their progress in training. A greater percentage of BIPOC faculty compared to candidates indicated these actions are taken to support students, but their ratings were a little closer to the percentages seen in candidate responses. There were no significant differences in responses of white and BIPOC candidates on this question.

Table 1

Supportive actions by institutes

Survey Question: Candidates sometimes experience personal or professional difficulties that interfere with their ability to progress through the psychoanalytic training process. Are you aware of your institute taking any of the actions listed below to support candidates at risk of leaving your program before completion?	White Faculty	BIPOC Faculty	Candidates Total
Deadline Extension	Yes 91% No 9%	Yes 79% No 21%	Yes 70% No 30%
Finding a new mentor in the field	Yes 85% No 15%	Yes 69% No 31%	Yes 60% No 40%
Assigning a new supervisor	Yes 88% No 12%	Yes 76% No 24%	Yes 69% No 31%

The Barrier of Systemic Racism and the Absence of Protocols to Address Racial Incidents

Systemic racism presents significant barriers to completing psychoanalytic training and contributes to candidates' decisions to leave training. Fifty-four percent of BIPOC candidates reported that racial microaggressions or other discriminatory gestures frequently (27%) or occasionally (27%) contributed to candidates leaving their program before completion. Forty-six percent of BIPOC candidates reported that critical racial incidents frequently or occasionally contributed to candidates leaving their program before completion. One faculty member

described discriminatory procedures at their institute as “unintentionally expressed biases, especially what I would call ‘liberal racism,’ on the part of members of evaluation committees.” Such experiences can limit a sense of connection to and full participation in a community. Twenty percent of candidates reported that feeling isolated contributed to candidates leaving a program before completion. Twenty-four percent of candidates reported that a lack of sense of belonging contributed to candidates leaving before completion. This lack of a sense of belonging was exacerbated by a curriculum comprised almost exclusively of white authors, as noted by one interviewee, “We are not educated enough to signal we are prepared to support the learning for everyone. Our reading lists signal we are still white-mainstream.” Participants also described how their institute’s choices to hold events at analysts’ mansions or in expensive/luxury venues was alienating.

It is critical that institutes recognize and reduce racial microaggressions and racial incidents, and that they create and implement standard procedures for responding to them. Given that there was a consistent difference between white and BIPOC responses across candidates and faculty concerning the contribution of racial incidents to candidates’ decisions to leave a program, perhaps the denial of and inattention paid to the toll of racism on candidates contributes to the absence of standardized procedures for responding to racial harm in training. The absence of such standard procedures presents a barrier to training in and of itself, in that the ways in which institutes do respond often cause additional racial harm, through inaction, defensive denial of harm, deflecting responsibility, and pathologizing or “interpreting away” the behavior of the individual who raises concerns. Participants described insufficient institute responses to racial incidents, including the absence of standard procedures or personnel to address them. They also described that in the aftermath, these incidents quickly “disappeared” and there was “silence”

about what had occurred with little or no follow-through in the institute community to address issues raised. A faculty participant wrote, “Students give feedback/evaluation about faculty with no recourse.” Many discussed their wish for a standing independent committee, ombudsperson, or named outside consultant who could lead institute responses to such incidents.

In interviews, candidates, faculty and psychoanalytically-informed practitioners described their experiences of racial incidents, the harm induced by institutes' responses to them, and the absence of standard procedures. Of note, nearly *all* candidates indicated they had either experienced one or more racial enactments or were aware of such enactments having occurred in their institutes, yet *only one* candidate indicated the incident they had in mind was handled adequately. A faculty member shared that their institute lost its first Black candidate because of a racial incident in class. Rather than institutional reflection upon what the offending faculty member had done, the candidate was accused of having “authority issues.” Another faculty interview group similarly reported that an African-American candidate left their program after an incident occurred, was reported, and that report was unaddressed, leaving the candidate feeling unrecognized. At least three interview groups discussed incidents in which a member of an institute used a racial epithet during class discussions, in meetings, or during informal conversations. In all three cases, concerns about the use of the word were raised and the response was unsatisfactory.

Reflecting on the challenges that the field’s history with systemic racism pose for diversity, a faculty participant said:

I’m thinking about this conundrum, that we want to have a more diverse body of people within our field, but in many ways our field is not hospitable to a more diverse group of people right now. I think often people of color and others bear the brunt of a lot of

unmetabolized biases and blind spots and othering, especially when you have... faculty saying there's nothing to reflect on here. That is deeply disturbing.

Speaking to a similar concern, one interviewee reported:

In the first orientation meeting, one of the directors of the [X] program noted that “culture does not matter, and it's all transference.” Hearing that from one of the directors of the program gave me pause to wonder about how he could say that to the group of students that included people of color.

Comments like this affect training for all candidates. Another faculty member wrote:

I think that not understanding that candidates that aren't white, heterosexual, cisgendered, and able-bodied might not feel welcome and understood according to those norms sets the stage for feeling alienated from the beginning. While I don't think that the majority of the white faculty are intentionally un-inviting, they would feel highly criticized and defensive to hear that they are being perceived as unresponsive because they are not willing to be disrupted in their typical views of things.

In another example, an interview participant said:

I wish that there was sort of a group of people that could provide advocacy for people who are being marginalized or racially aggressed against or otherwise harmed by the current structures and [processes of] training. So you know, [a person] could call somebody and be like, this just happened, and there would be some kind of pipeline between that group and the institute to say, “Hey you guys are so out of line and what are you going to do about it?” That there is some kind of collective accountability in place.

Inattention to Realities of Financial Constraints, Work Schedule, What “Counts” as Analysis, and Family Care Needs

Participants described an inattention and “lack of empathy” to the realities of candidates’ life circumstances with “very little flexibility provided to candidates.” Institutes often justify this by touting the necessity for “immersion” in psychoanalytic work. This results in requirements and procedures that may disproportionately hinder BIPOC and those from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds from accessing and progressing in training. As one faculty respondent wrote, there is an “expectation of total immersion to the exclusion of any external circumstances.” Another faculty respondent reported, “some of the candidates have multiple job and/or family responsibilities that can make ‘immersion’ difficult.” Similarly, another faculty participant wrote, “Progression of candidates is partially based on the candidates immersion in clinical practice of psychoanalysis. It is difficult for candidates from financially disadvantaged backgrounds to maintain a sufficient number of cases in analysis, especially when the analysts pay low fees.” Another faculty respondent wrote:

As a rule this is a place filled with members who focus solely on being analysts, and the [criticisms of the] tendency to ignore the realities and limitations of life are not well tolerated...The measure of devotion to psychoanalysis as criteria for one’s work is unacceptable in the current context. No one except those who are supported by others can do this work without also having other jobs.

Faculty members described this inattention to current realities of financial constraints, work schedules, and family care needs as a form of structural racism within the institute, “[A] lack of sensitivity to barriers, difficulties that they may face. There is a sense that ‘everyone is equal’ and should therefore perform at certain levels and according to certain standards that also

unwittingly have embedded racism structurally within.” Financial challenges were the most frequently identified obstacle to completing training, with consensus between candidates (49%) and faculty (41%). However, socio-economic advantage or disadvantage was not as acknowledged by white faculty as compared to faculty of color and candidates. Although financial challenge was the most common obstacle to training, it was not sufficiently addressed in the structures of training or acknowledged as an equity issue hindering the progression of candidates from disadvantaged backgrounds. As one faculty member wrote, “the biggest blind spot in analytic institutes, mine included, is about money.”

Multiple interview groups raised concern related to both the financial burden experienced when seeking training and the cost of psychoanalysis itself. An interviewee recalled the insensitivity in response to their questions about financial support:

I remember asking someone at the psychoanalytic institute if there are any scholarships or a sliding fee scale for a training program, and this man with a suit and tie looked at me and laughed in my face. I won’t forget that moment.

There was a general sense that institutes and the field more broadly need to address this issue if it is to increase its diversity and reach. One candidate expressed:

You can’t talk about racial equity without talking about money. Is there money behind it?

With all we know about class and wealth and race, you really can’t just talk about this.

Where is the money for inclusion, access, consultants? Show me the investment!

Participants reported that when candidates raise concerns about the ways that training is structured, they and their clients of color are often pathologized as exhibiting “resistance,” having “authority issues” or as uncommitted to training and treatment. One faculty member wrote, “There is insufficient recognition of the financial burden on candidates/patients of color in

conducting a treatment (this is often viewed as 'resistance' to be interpreted or 'lack of analytic conviction').” Similarly, another wrote, “People of color may be targeted as rebellious for bringing up issues of racism. People from disadvantaged backgrounds do not have inherited wealth to pay tuition, or excessive analytic or supervisory fees, and may feel ‘othered.’”

Connected to the issue of financial constraints, participants described a lack of acknowledgement that candidates must have paid jobs, sometimes multiple jobs, and many choose work in community mental health agencies. One faculty member wrote, “Our training model requires that participants be private practitioners, which excludes people from participating who may work in agency settings.” Participants also expressed frustration that institute classes and events were scheduled during prime work hours when they needed to be working, as one respondent wrote:

I have always found it astounding that I get these emails from X institute of events, and I’m like, it’s on a Friday afternoon, in the middle of a workday. I can’t do that. But I know traditionally, I know a lot of analysts don’t work on Fridays. So, only a certain kind of person with a certain kind of practice and a certain kind of class can go to that.

Many respondents also described how the number of control cases required, difficulty of finding control cases, the high frequency requirements for sessions, and the often-low fees for control cases all create financial strain and lengthen the time it takes candidates to complete training. One faculty respondent wrote, “Candidates from disadvantaged backgrounds with the need for cases in analysis at high frequency might have a harder time seeing patients who need a reduced fee.” Another faculty respondent wrote, “Progression is dependent on establishing and maintaining long-term cases at high frequency of sessions (3-5x per week). Because this treatment modality is expensive, it is difficult to do unless one has a wealthy practice.” Yet

another faculty participant wrote, “It is expensive, and one is expected to earn less by charging low fees for control cases, making an already disadvantaged person more disadvantaged as the years go by.” Concerning the time required to complete the control cases at low fees, a faculty respondent wrote, “It takes so long. The Institute does have a candidate assistance fund that helps a little, but not enough. There is no financial assistance available for potential patients.” Specifically, about candidates of color working with clients of color, one participant wrote, “Candidates who are of color and want to work with people of color may have trouble finding patients willing or able to meet frequency requirements that candidates must meet.”

Some faculty members did encourage flexibility in control cases. One faculty respondent suggested that institutes “Encourage diversity in the choice of control cases.” Similarly, another suggested institutes “Allow all cases to be female.” Another faculty respondent wrote, “Allow progression to be ascertained by more flexible guidelines. Have community work count as a case. Eliminate the number of hours and immersion as critical criteria and look at a number of other dimensions of process and progress.” One faculty member suggested:

We would increase the number of candidates of color if we were to require 3 times a week frequency for training cases, not 4 to 5. This would make our program more appealing to candidates at **** Institute, with which we are affiliated. The candidates at **** Institute typically practice community psychoanalysis, and their patients often cannot afford the time and money to do 4 times a week treatment.

Many participants expressed how their individual cases and group therapy experiences in community mental health settings were not “counted” towards their analytic training, because they were not deemed to be psychoanalytic enough and noted that this judgment is racially discriminatory. As one faculty member wrote:

The general pool of Supervising Analysts and sitting members of the Progressions Committee, in my opinion, are unaware of the ways in which their theories of clinical work and expectations regarding candidate conduct are products of their white, affluent culture. There are a number of unexamined beliefs about what psychoanalysis 'is' and what it 'isn't,' such that something outside of one's own belief system is disregarded as 'un-analytic' and not qualifying as an analytic case.

Similarly, another faculty respondent wrote, "Considerations of what constitutes acceptable and normative technique may at times disadvantage candidates who use culturally grounded techniques and modes of relating that are seen as less than "properly analytic." A faculty member suggested that institutes "count psychoanalytic work in non-traditional settings as fulfilling the requirements for psychoanalytic hours. De-emphasize cooperativeness as a prized quality in candidates. Have people of color in leadership positions of the Training Committee."

Many faculty respondents also described how the costs for supervision and training analysis were often unclear and "not adequately discussed," and that although some supervisors and training analysts offer some reduced fees, the fees might not be low enough to be affordable for candidates. One faculty participant wrote, "It is difficult for applicants to find supervisors at very low fees. Discounted fees are readily available, but for an applicant of low socioeconomic status, a very low fee may be necessary." There were also restrictions in which analysts and supervisors were approved by institutes, which limit the freedom of choice in training analysts and supervisors who might have experience working with people of color and/or identify as a person of color. They also noted that many sought after supervisors do not offer reduced fees and that it was a barrier "not having training analysts willing to lower fees," creating a division of access for candidates who are wealthy and those who have financial constraints. As one faculty

respondent wrote, “Supervisors each choose their own fees. Therefore, some candidates report that they cannot afford certain supervisors.”

Similarly, participants described how childcare and family responsibilities were not accommodated for and that individuals were “‘docked’ for needing to do childcare” or tending to family responsibilities that conflicted with training activities and events. A faculty member responded, “Expectations for advancement are calibrated to the lives of men with little or no child-raising or family care-giving responsibilities.” Another wrote, “Many years ago, [there was] pejorative conversation about maternity leave and breaks from personal analysis or leave to facilitate breastfeeding.” Participants also reported microaggressions such as:

I was visibly pregnant and two older white men gave a lecture about birth defects which had nothing to do with the clinical material, listing rare conditions and infant mortality rates. It’s hard to describe, but it was intolerable, and I didn’t feel like I could stop them. I had nightmares for weeks after it.

Another candidate reported, “I was told that since I was pregnant and expecting, I should not enroll in analytic training as it would be too challenging in fulfilling my role as a mother.” One faculty member wrote:

Our institute requires full time study now and discourages women who need to take maternity leave. Our institute is primarily white and does not feel like a diverse and safe place for people of color. Many of the individuals at the institute are fairly wealthy, and this can be very alienating for candidates who are struggling to afford training.

Faculty members also described ways their institutes were addressing barriers candidates face. One faculty respondent wrote, “I once advocated for a POC whose financial situation was known only to me. That, along with background, impacted his ability to meet progression

expectations. I involved his advisor, and things turned around.” Another faculty respondent described efforts towards flexible policies at their institute and the challenges that have emerged:

Requirements regarding the number of sessions per week, both for training and for control cases; requirements for the setting (we allow one case of three to be a community case, but the two other cases are fairly traditional); the cohort system prioritizes candidates who can attend full-time. Our efforts to move to an individualized progression system come in conflict with a sentimental attachment to the cohort system. Our efforts to implement a distance learning program have been very helpful in reaching out to candidates of color, but then the problem of credentialing distance training and supervising analysts has undone much of this benefit, because it relies on requirements that are set by the IPA to disadvantage untraditional candidates.

When institutes develop creative and flexible programs with attention to the reality of the barriers candidates navigate, people are drawn to their programs. Candidates wrote the following about factors that influenced their choice of institute:

- My institute offered a scholarship for Black students.
- Offered me a scholarship. Provided online classes to keep me engaged during pandemic. Invited me to events. Offered mentorship.
- Community Psychoanalysis. Commitment to social justice was woven into the fabric of the inception of the institute. Attraction to work around race (INNOVATIVE!). A distance program.
- How I felt in the research process and their flexibility in considering social and political issues.

- I worked with a supervisor I loved and could continue to work with if I attended the institute. My institute offers part-time training at night, which allowed me to work in community mental health while still training psychoanalytically. They also allowed a process where I could advocate to keep my analyst, who was an advanced candidate at her institute at the time and did not meet the official criteria for a training analyst. I felt respected in this decision, and it also had a practical element that I could not have afforded full fee at that time for analysis.
- More contemporary curriculum and orientation, greater selection of supervising and training analysts, class/race/privilege course well established as part of curriculum, intentional aim of non-hierarchical relationship with candidates.
- Flexibility of curriculum, warmth of interviewers.

Summary of Key Findings

Key Finding Number 1 - Recruitment

Based on the survey data, recruitment for many psychoanalytic institutes is largely based on word of mouth. For many participants, both their decision to pursue analytic training and their choice of institute were encouraged by their existing relationships with supervisors, professors, psychotherapists/analysts, and colleagues. Recruitment that occurs primarily through existing social networks rather than through broader outreach methods increases the likelihood that the current demographic, as well as the sense of particularism rather than universalism, will reproduce itself.

Key Finding Number 2 – Admissions Process

In the admissions process, white applicants seem to have a more positive and comfortable experience during interviews compared to applicants of color. White candidates were more likely than BIPOC candidates to report that their admissions interview process was a positive experience. In response to the open-ended responses on the survey, multiple participants described the lack of objective criteria for evaluation in admissions and “a lack of transparency in processes,” procedures, requirements, and costs.

Key Finding Number 3 - Progression

As was seen in admissions procedures, participants described a lack of reliance on objective data and lack of transparency in progression criteria, which may make it more likely for racial bias to play a role. This concern was well stated by one candidate:

Although there are stated procedures for evaluation and progression that have been formulated to protect against biases and systemic exclusions, there is resistance amongst progressions faculty to put into place and adhere to these procedures. Faculty resist the idea of systematizing aspects of evaluation and instead argue for the importance of subjective experience, at times even using this argument as a response to the criticism of systemic racism, i.e., that systematizing competencies could itself be subject to systematic racism, as an attempt to preserve the privileging of the subjective without acknowledging the ways in which subjective assessments are necessarily impacted by white supremacy and other systemic violences.

Key Finding Number 4 – Career-Building

In looking at experiences of mentorship and career-building support, for both candidates and faculty a greater percentage of white respondents compared to BIPOC respondents reported that their institute supports career and leadership building, both for exemplary students in general and for candidates of color in particular. That is, the percentage of white respondents who observed or experienced mentorship, support, and opportunities for professional connection was greater than the percentage of BIPOC respondents who observed this career support.

Key Finding Number 5 – Remove Barriers to Training

Institutes may be structuring training with schedules and requirements that are out of step with the reality of the multiple barriers to accessing and completing analytic training which current candidates face. This includes the barrier of not having a standard procedure for addressing systemic racism. This is important as white candidates and faculty underestimated the negative impact of racial incidences and microaggressions on BIPOC candidates and how these experiences were harmful enough to contribute to BIPOC candidates leaving training.

Key Finding Number 6 - Accountability

In terms of supports that are provided for mentorship and career-building, as well as supports to help candidates when there are obstacles to completion of training, there is a gap between faculty reports of supports provided and what BIPOC candidates experience and a lack of data about BIPOC candidates.

Recommendations for Removing Barriers to Training

We recommend that institutes initiate the following:

- Address the full range of structural barriers (financial, family responsibilities, curriculum, diversity of candidates and clients, frequency of sessions, organizational inflexibility, processes to address systemic racism, consultation) and interpersonal barriers (lack of belonging, engaging with sociocultural perspectives) to accessing and completing analytic training.
- Address financial barriers in analytic training.
- Improve flexibility and organization of training such that candidates can meet their family and other life responsibilities.
- Allow for greater flexibility in choice of supervisors and training/personal analysts.
- Standardize need-based low fees for supervisors and training analysts. All fees for supervision and training analysis, just as for tuition, should be standardized and set in accordance with the income and financial situation of the trainee.
- Broaden diversity of clients which are acceptable as analytic control cases and include children, groups, and community mental health care.
- Decrease the frequency of sessions required for control cases.
- Decrease the frequency of sessions required for training analysis.
- Become more inclusive regarding the curriculum and engagement with issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice.
- Become more attentive to diverse perspectives on development and rethink the normative Oedipal family, recognizing that families have diverse patterns, values, and structures.
- Develop partnerships between institutes where an outside consultant is available to meet with candidates, faculty, and leadership to address systemic racism. One possibility is to

develop a network of volunteer faculty and supportive candidate-siblings at different institutes to whom a candidate might turn.

- Eliminate overburdening BIPOC faculty and provide payment/compensation, especially to instructors not affiliated with institutes.

Recommendations for Institute Accountability in Training

We recommend that institutes initiate the following:

- Develop a plan and timeline with specific projected dates to monitor the progress in implementation of strategies to address systemic racism.
- Collect process and outcome data annually related to implemented strategies.
- Establish a committee that can collect and analyze this data and communicate the findings to all stakeholders in the institute. The committee should include candidates and recent graduates of the institute.
- Use the study findings to develop and implement meaningful change toward improving training for analysts' work with BIPOC clients, reducing racial harm, and supporting BIPOC candidates and other diverse candidates so they can thrive within institute communities.
- Future studies are recommended to specifically investigate the processes in institutes and psychoanalytic organizations that contribute to interpersonal and structural challenges and resistances to engaging effectively with systemic racism.
- Develop and fund a national program with connections to local institutes to increase the number of BIPOC and other diverse analysts who can then teach and support candidates in their regions, supplementing institute activities.

- To decrease the sense of isolation of BIPOC candidates, strive for multiple BIPOC and other diverse candidates of color at participating institutes in these programs.

Summary of Key Recommendations

Recommendation Number 1 - Recruitment

Broaden recruitment strategies beyond word-of-mouth recruitment and monitor and evaluate these strategies on an ongoing basis.

Recommendation Number 2 – Admissions Process

Develop more objective data and transparency in reviewing applicants for admission.

Recommendation Number 3 – Progression

Create standard, publicly articulated procedures for addressing racism occurring at interpersonal and structural levels that interferes with the progression of candidates.

Recommendation Number 4 - Career-Building

Implement a mentorship program in the structure of training and increase numbers of BIPOC and other diverse mentors.

Recommendation Number 5 – Remove Barriers to Training

Address the full range of structural barriers (financial, family responsibilities, curriculum, diversity of candidates and clients, frequency of sessions, organizational inflexibility, processes to address systemic racism, consultation) and interpersonal barriers (lack of belonging, engaging with sociocultural perspectives, negative interactions in response to BIPOC talking about racist experiences) to accessing and completing analytic training.

Recommendation Number 6 - Accountability

Collect process and outcome data related to implemented strategies annually. Establish a committee to collect and analyze this data and communicate the findings to all stakeholders in the institute. The committee should include candidates and recent graduates of the institute. Consider the experiences of candidates and recent graduates and use the findings to develop and implement meaningful change toward improving training for analysts' work with BIPOC and other diverse clients, reducing racial harm, and supporting BIPOC and candidates from a diversity of backgrounds with equity and inclusion so all thrive within institute communities.

Chapter 5

The Curriculum, Racism as an Analytic Lens, and Supervision

If I am not in the world simply to adapt to it, but rather transform it, and if it is not possible to change the world without a certain dream or vision for it, I must make use of every possibility there is not only to speak about my utopia, but also to engage in practices consistent with it.

— Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of Indignation*

Racial issues and racially minoritized people are marginalized across all levels of psychoanalytic education. Faculty and candidates concurred that the field of psychoanalysis needs to increase focus on race, racism, and white supremacy. A majority of faculty and candidates agreed that people of color were underrepresented throughout the curriculum both as authors and as topics of required reading. Faculty tended to see themselves as prepared and comfortable discussing the topic of race or racism; candidates were less likely to see faculty equipped for those discussions. Survey and interview respondents frequently noted how matters of race and racism were addressed only in isolation through courses marginalized from the rest of the curriculum by their rarity, through the frequent designation of matters of social diversity as being questionably psychoanalytic, and through the minimization of racial incidents within the institution as uncomfortably disruptive and personalized.

One interviewee noted, “People coming into psychoanalysis would like to see the field reflect the world that they live in and not the ivory tower that we have built, with analytic identity as something that [is] somehow pristine and unbreachable.”¹⁴ The failure to robustly incorporate the realities of race and systemic racism, or of diversity, equity, and inclusion into psychoanalytic training programs not only impoverishes these programs but is a deterrent to potential candidates. One psychoanalytic psychotherapist who has chosen not to pursue analytic

¹⁴ All quotations in this chapter are from The Holmes Commission Interview Summary Report, Appendix G. Permission was obtained from all study participants to use their quotations anonymously.

training called into question the ethics of training programs that center cis-gender whiteness. “To go through a psychoanalytic training program the way it’s always been taught, which is always about white psychoanalysts and psychoanalytic theory designed to treat the white heterosexual patient is unethical,” stated this clinician. “I want to see a lot of change in the training programs before I do it.” A closer look at relevant results points to the need to address the systemic contexts within which teaching and supervision occur, as well as to consider actions specific to each.

Race and Racism as Topics in Psychoanalytic Education

Attention to Matters of Race and Racism in the Curriculum

Both candidates and faculty agreed that the current curricula offered in psychoanalytic training did not adequately address matters of race, racism, or diversity (Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1

Candidate assessment of topics covered in the curriculum

	Not Covered at All	Not Covered Enough	Covered Adequately	Covered Too Much
Race or Racism (%)	16	55	27	3
Ethnicity (%)	22	52	25	1
Sexual Orientation (%)	7	50	42	1
Gender Identity (%)	10	50	39	1
Physical Ability/ Disability (%)	49	40	11	0
Religious Affiliation (%)	41	40	18	1
Immigration Status (%)	44	42	14	0
Intersectionality (%)	32	45	22	2
Socio-Economic Status (%)	32	51	17	0

Table 2*Faculty assessment of topics covered in the curriculum*

	Not Covered at All	Not Covered Enough	Covered Adequately	Covered Too Much
Race or Racism (%)	12	62	24	2
Ethnicity (%)	16	62	21	1
Sexual Orientation (%)	4	46	48	2
Gender Identity (%)	6	51	41	2
Physical Ability/Disability (%)	47	45	9	0
Religious Affiliation (%)	47	40	13	0
Immigration Status (%)	44	44	13	0
Intersectionality/ Intersectional Identity (%)	34	47	14	2
Socio-Economic Status (%)	30	58	12	0

Candidates (78%) and faculty (70%) also agreed that people of color are underrepresented in required reading.¹⁵ Respondents further agreed that the field of psychoanalysis needs to increase focus on race, racism, and white supremacy (candidates: 59% strongly agree and 33% agree; faculty: 47% strongly agree and 43% agree). Candidates described their preparation during psychoanalytic training to apply racial awareness to analysis as inadequate (no preparation 20% and underprepared 35%). When candidates were asked about preparation received in supervision on how to apply a racial framework during analysis, they stated it was inadequate (no preparation 21% and underprepared 39%).

¹⁵ All study results in this chapter are further detailed in Appendices A, B, C, D, E, and F.

Attention to Matters of Race and Racism in Psychoanalytic Supervision

Most candidates and faculty reported that candidates were free to select their supervisors and that they tended not to select supervisors based on such factors as race and ethnicity.

However, a significant minority of candidates (42%) believed that race and ethnicity should be a consideration in the selection of supervisors for cases. A majority of candidates and faculty reported that race and racism were not regularly discussed in their supervision (Table 3).

Candidates were more likely than faculty to suggest that they perceived their supervisors to be less comfortable and less prepared to discuss these matters than faculty were likely to see themselves. White candidates reported being more comfortable raising race or racism than Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) candidates when these are experienced or witnessed in the supervisory relationship (for all comparisons, $p < .05$).

Table 3

Candidates discussing race or racism with supervisor

How often is race or racism a topic discussed with your supervisor(s)?		
	Percent	Number of responses ¹⁶
Never	12%	37
Once or twice	48%	146
Regularly	34%	104
I don't know	6%	18
Total	66%	305

¹⁶ The number of people who selected a response option. The frequency of responses for a given option divided by the total number of respondents for an item equals the percentage selecting the response.

Addressing matters of race and racism adequately

Respondents suggested that matters of race and racism were not adequately addressed either in the curriculum or in supervision. The respondents suggested various measures to assess this concern, including whether race and racism were addressed in one isolated course or in multiple courses; whether racist incidents experienced or observed in either context were easily discussed; the degree to which assigned readings were authored by BIPOC writers; whether instructors or supervisors themselves were likely to be BIPOC; the ability to apply a racial analysis to analytic material; and the degree of preparation candidates have to apply an analytic lens to the matters of race, racism, and white supremacy.

The omission of race and racism, observed one candidate, is itself an act of racism. Another candidate noted, “It boggles the mind how much literature there is on race and racism yet it never makes it into the classroom.” Another candidate identified the persistent blindness to how out of step psychoanalysis is compared to other disciplines with regard to race.

When race was included in curricula, it was typically through a separate course, a single class, or some other optional offering such as a study group. As one candidate noted, “We have token classes...but it doesn’t feel integrated into theory or technique. If it’s a case conference or a class that’s not specifically about race, you almost never hear race mentioned. And I think there’s something unsatisfying about that. Race is always here, so why is it never mentioned?” Another candidate suggested that if white clinical dyads are presented as a learning case, then whiteness as a racial issue and its operating dynamics must be explored in the clinical discourse.

This split-off approach was viewed by those interviewed as treating race and racism as secondary, rather than as a topic that is essential and thus integrated throughout instruction. A

candidate suggested that faculty seem to falsely polarize the issue and believe that “you either teach psychoanalysis or you teach race.” One unintended consequence of marginalizing discussions of race and racism to a single class rather than integrating them into the curriculum is that it “places considerable pressure on candidates and the instructor in that offering.” It merits noting that one candidate felt institutes are “going overboard” with their response to racism in a manner that is detrimental to the study of psychoanalysis. That candidate stated, “We’ve gone from not talking about race to having it shoved down my throat.” This view was shared by only one of the 55 candidates who participated in the group interviews.

Viewing Racism with an Analytic Lens and Using Racism as an Analytic Lens

Candidates (59% strongly agree and 33% agree) and faculty (47% strongly agree and 43% agree) agreed that the field of psychoanalysis needs to increase its focus on race, racism, and white supremacy (Tables 4 and 5). Responses to the survey also indicated that this focus should include the topic of race and racism as a legitimate subject of analytic inquiry and education within individual psychoanalytic treatments and literature, and include racism as a perspective from which to understand the field of psychoanalysis, its institutions, and its literature.

Table 4*Candidate assessment of attention to race and racism*

For each statement, indicate your level of agreement:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Race, racism, and white supremacy are addressed adequately at my institute as a conceptual framework for analysis. (%)	7	25	48	21	75
Collectively, psychoanalytic writing provides adequate attention to race, racism, and white supremacy as a conceptual framework for analysis. (%)	4	13	56	27	75
The field of psychoanalysis needs to increase focus on race, racism, and white supremacy. (%)	59	33	6	2	75

Table 5*Faculty assessment of attention to race and racism*

For each statement, indicate your level of agreement:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Race, racism, and white supremacy are addressed adequately at my institute as a conceptual framework for analysis. (%)	5	30	51	15	74
Collectively, psychoanalytic writing provides adequate attention to race, racism, and white supremacy as a conceptual framework for analysis. (%)	3	10	61	26	74
The field of psychoanalysis needs to increase focus on race, racism, and white supremacy. (%)	47	43	7	3	75

Comfort With and Preparation for the Discussion of Race and Racism

Faculty, in their roles as instructors, supervisors, and personal analysts, tended to see themselves as comfortable discussing race and racism (Table 6). Candidates were less likely to view their instructors and supervisors as prepared for those discussions (Table 7). BIPOC candidates are even less likely than white candidates to see faculty as comfortable or prepared. Additionally, faculty members from American Psychoanalytic Association (APsA) institutes reported being less comfortable and less prepared to discuss matters of race compared with those surveyed from non-APsA institutes (for comparisons, $p < .05$).

Table 6*Faculty on their level of comfort discussing race or racism*

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... - Your candidates	Percent	Number of responses
Very Comfortable	48%	280
Somewhat comfortable	44%	259
Somewhat uncomfortable	7%	43
Very Uncomfortable	1%	7
Total	73%	589
Missing	27%	216
Total	100%	805

Table 7*Candidates on level of preparation of instructors to discuss race or racism*

How prepared were your instructors to discuss the topic of race or racism?	Percent	Number of responses
Very well prepared	14%	44
Moderately well prepared	49%	148
Poorly prepared	27%	81
Not at all prepared	11%	32
Total	66%	305
Missing	34%	156
Total	100%	461

Multiple candidates identified and elaborated the blind spots they had observed in faculty. One offered: “So many feel like they get it but they don’t. Getting to racial equity would require admitting how much they don’t know and that is something that is surprisingly hard for analysts.”

One group discussed the challenges of exploring issues of race and racism due to senior analysts being unreceptive to learning about topics they do not already know. As an example, a candidate shared the following experience:

In a supervision group an esteemed faculty heard the case of a young Muslim female patient being torn between her cultural values and the wish to be accepted as an American. The supervisor was opposed to talking about this outside of universal themes and experienced her loyalty to her parents as pathological, and her failed negotiation of the Oedipus. [The supervisor was] very rigid and [it was] very hard to consider another developmental point of view.

Another candidate posited that “a fear of eruptions of anger—which is inevitable given the lack of attention previously invested on the topic—dissuade instructors from exploring the topic.”

Another group suggested that resistance to incorporating race and racism within psychoanalysis stemmed, in part, from fear of self-discovery. Discovering that one is engaged in racial enactments is hard to bear. As one interviewee explained, “For faculty, the discovery of one’s own internal racism is traumatic.”

One faculty interviewee, who had been engaged in a year-long study group that explored various aspect of race and racism, described a retreat with other participants who had not engaged in similar work. This study group allowed the interviewee to look:

every week at our own dreams and how [racism] comes up, and incidences of how we are feeling about our own whiteness, how that bumps up against racism, talking about current events, and just steeping ourselves in it rather than avoiding it... I felt a lot of

shame that I hadn't done my own work [earlier] and I didn't even know what it was [to do] my own work.... At the retreat it became clear that the push back came from those who had not done this work. And I think it was actually due to resistance against their own unconscious, against looking at their own racism.

The unconscious is threatening to psychoanalytic practitioners when it comes to matters of race and racism. As one candidate noted, “I think it was actually due to resistance against their own unconscious – against looking at their own racism.” A faculty member further elaborated the “paranoid anxiety” or “fear that something might jump out of their speech which would lead to others seeing them as racist ... and that inhibits some people.”

BIPOC Candidates and Faculty in Comparison to White Candidates and Faculty

BIPOC candidates were more likely to raise issues of race and racism than their white counterparts, despite being less comfortable doing so and less satisfied with the results of such efforts. They were less comfortable raising issues of race or racism with instructors, with their analysts, and with peers, as well as more likely to have felt their instructors were not prepared “at all” to discuss race and racism. Similarly, BIPOC faculty were less comfortable than their white counterparts raising such issues with leadership but were also more likely to have done so. BIPOC faculty members were less likely than white faculty members to feel satisfied with the response of leadership (for all comparisons, $p < .05$). Despite the dangers associated with racial backlash, BIPOC candidates and faculty were more likely than their white counterparts to risk the losses that might be associated with initiating such dialogue.

Both BIPOC candidates and faculty were more likely to report an advanced level of understanding of race, racism, and white supremacy compared to their respective white

counterparts. BIPOC faculty members were also more likely to report talking with candidates about race and racism as instructors, and felt more comfortable and prepared to do so ($p < .05$).

In one interview group, the faculty members seemed unaware of the burden and hardship placed on BIPOC people who experience a racial enactment and are then expected to report or confront the enactor.

Several candidates expressed interest in group discussions as a standard procedure after a racial incident, aimed not at retribution or remedy, but on deepening understanding of the incident and its racist elements. When appropriate, group discussions may lead to resolution. Recognizing that a fuller picture may produce differing viewpoints, these differences should not be used to “negate the validity of minority experience.” “We are going to make mistakes,” said one candidate. What is needed are spaces for candidates to speak openly about issues of race and racism in an exploratory rather than accusatory manner without the need to defend why an incident is problematic. The lack of structures and mechanisms to respond to incidents keeps the field of psychoanalysis stagnant, perpetuates a culture of silence and ignorance, and puts psychoanalysis behind other disciplines in the understanding of the importance of race and antiracism. As one white candidate noted about the defensiveness with which incidents are too often addressed, “The culture also deprives me from getting feedback on how I have been inadvertently racist.” All candidates and faculty suffer in the current configurations.

Recommendations

Elders know psychoanalysis, candidates know race, and never shall the two topics meet and become integrated.

— Survey respondent

The stakes are high for institutional psychoanalysis. One psychoanalytic psychotherapist explained:

If we are not relevant to you, why should you be relevant to us? If you make the claim that you don't have the slightest interest in anybody who is not white or upper middle class or higher, at some point you are not relevant to anybody who is not White or upper middle class or higher.

Despite our training and what we know as psychoanalytic clinicians, the survey and interview data highlight our difficulties using those skills when issues of race and racism enter the classroom. The data point particularly to a difficulty tolerating discomfort and not-knowing, especially in the classroom.

What does it mean to be prepared to discuss the topics of race and racism? When we consider what “being prepared” might look like, we think of increasing attention to enactments and a receptiveness to experiencing, exploring, and formulating them; deconstructing the fear of being uncomfortable when it comes to matters of race and racism; noting the resistances to curiosity and to not knowing; and noting the rush to foreclose racial meanings by addressing them superficially. The study results point to a need to address the systemic contexts within which teaching and supervision occur. Our recommendations for action pertain to the following respective systems.

The Context of Curricula

The study results call for increased attention to the literature on race and racialization, systemic racism, and racial trauma. We would include within this literature an emphasis on the effects of colonialism, migration, and anti-colonial practices. We stress the importance of recognizing that unconsciousness is a property not only of individual psychic functioning, but of relationships, groups, and systems. We recommend:

- including relevant literature from inside and outside the psychoanalytic theoretical and clinical literature, written by racially and otherwise diverse authors as well as by national and international scholars with relevant expertise, in the curriculum of diversity, equity, and inclusion;
- increasing the racial and other diversities among instructors, including the use of faculty from outside of local and national psychoanalytic institutions;
- incorporating matters of race and racism more broadly into the curriculum rather than remaining isolated or marginalized as topics of attention; and
- the formation and ongoing maintenance of a national database available to instructors on the matters of race, racism, and psychoanalysis, including a bibliography, audiovisual materials, and contact information for individual and institutional consultants available to help facilitate the selection of course-relevant literature.

The Context of Supervision

In the service of improving the quality and breadth of discussions within the supervisory relationship, we recommend that supervising analysts be engaged in an ongoing way in developing and enhancing knowledge and skills pertaining to the matters of race and systemic racism in the practice of psychoanalysis. We recommend:

- mandatory faculty development (which may include developing formal CME/CE/CEU requirements) efforts to enhance the comfort, ease, and education for supervisors in recognizing and responding to matters of race and racism in the transference and the countertransference, as well as within analytic situations involving intersectionality of persons, groups or systems of like or differing racial and other backgrounds;
- the use of within-institute and/or cross-institute study groups of training and supervising analysts focused on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) within psychoanalytic thinking and practices;
- the use of relevant national databases (as suggested above) made available to instructors on the matters of race, racism, intersectionality, and psychoanalysis, including a bibliography, audiovisual materials, and contact information for individual and institutional consultants available to help further thinking about race and psychoanalytic supervision;
- increased recruitment and development of BIPOC and other diverse analysts to become supervising and training analysts; and
- ongoing development of supervisors' facility to think about and help teach a broad range of materials related to the social and social context beyond a psychoanalytic lens.

The Context of Institutional Culture

The results from across the survey and interviews point to the need to focus on the culture of institutes as institutions in the psychoanalytic consideration of race and systemic racism. We wish to highlight both formal and informal aspects of institutional culture. Accordingly, we recommend:

- structuring varied venues within the institution such as group meetings, town halls, seminars, and study groups for faculty and candidates to discuss race, racism, diversity, equity, and inclusion in the mind, the consulting room, and the institution in the service of normalizing such discussion, and making such material less disequilibrating in general;
- developing institutional forums for the discussion and management of racist or other discriminatory incidents, within and across institutes;
- developing cross-institutional group discussions for candidates; and
- fostering outreach to and mutual engagement with communities underrepresented in the institutional structure through educational services and programs.

A Context of Cultures and Culture

The other informal culture we want to stress is one wherein the multicultural ethos of the profession, its interests, and its beneficiaries are amplified and celebrated. The value of our broad cultural assets to psychoanalytic education, professional development, community outreach and engagement, and social responsibility is noted. To this end, we recommend:

- developing an atmosphere within psychoanalytic institutions which enhances cross-cultural synergies and across-cultures respect through diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives;
- diversifying leadership groups and committees engaged in decision-making on educational and curricular matters to contribute to the development of such an atmosphere;
- the study of various and particularly non-dominant cultural variations in histories, beliefs, and cultural products (for example, artistic expression) within the curriculum; and

- the inclusion, celebration, and discussion within institutions of multi-cultural presentations and appreciation of culture (film, music, and other arts) as part of psychoanalytic community formation, outreach, and identity.

Chapter 6

The Experience of Race on the Couch

Essentially, one might say, the cure is effected by love.

— Sigmund Freud, *The Freud/Jung Letters*

Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and it never will. Find out just what any people will quietly submit to and you have found out the exact measure of injustice and wrong which will be imposed upon them, and these will continue till they are resisted with either words or blows, or with both. The limits of tyrants are prescribed by the endurance of those whom they oppress.

— Frederick Douglass, *West India Emancipation*

If, how, and in what ways does race get discussed and processed in someone's personal/training analysis? In reviewing the literature and our own experiences, we see that many times analysands are troubled by their analysts' responses to their bringing up issues related to race. Oftentimes, it seems analysts did not acknowledge the pernicious reality of pervasive racism, instead directing their analysands to try to understand their feelings about race as stemming from so-called deeper and more universal fantasies and conflicts. This will be reviewed later in the chapter. Initially, how the participants in this study experienced their analyses will be described.

The survey instrument and interview protocol developed for this study focused on several topics the Commission identified as of interest during the first months of the study. As the study progressed, additional topics of interest that were only touched upon in the survey instrument emerged. One such topic was the ways in which race and racism were "experienced on the couch" during personal/training analysis. This section begins by presenting the limited data collected via the survey instrument specific to the experience of race on the couch. For instance, we do not have data on the experience of BIPOC training/personal analysts work with BIPOC or white candidates, which would provide needed perspective. This lack of data speaks to the

paucity of diversity in this essential aspect of training. Because the data collected through the survey instrument and interviews specific to the experience of race on the couch is limited, this chapter also draws on field data and personal experiences of commission members.

Analysis of the Survey Data

One section of the survey instrument asked participants about the extent to which they felt free to discuss a variety of topics with their analysts. Across these survey items, a higher percentage¹⁷ of BIPOC candidates than white candidates reported that they did not feel free to discuss a variety of topics with their analyst. This was true for every queried topic, not only race, but also sexual orientation, religion, ethnicity, and language differences. Eighty-eight percent of BIPOC candidates felt free to discuss race with their analysts, compared to 97% of white candidates. Ninety-one percent of BIPOC candidates felt free to discuss sexual orientation with their analysts, compared to 97% of white candidates. Eighty-nine percent of BIPOC candidates felt free to discuss religion with their analysts, compared to 97% of white candidates. Eighty-four percent of BIPOC candidates felt free to discuss ethnicity with their analysts, compared to 98% of white candidates. And 89% of BIPOC candidates felt free to discuss language differences with their analysts compared to 97% of white candidates.

Although the findings are consistent and statistically significant, the sample of respondents was small and we need be careful about the conclusions drawn. Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize that the small sample size of BIPOC participants and the aggregate responses of the BIPOC candidates illustrate the challenges of representation in the

¹⁷ All statistics in the chapter are from Appendices A, B, C, D, E, and F. All quotations in the chapter are from Interview Summary Report, Appendix G. Permission was obtained from all study participants to use their quotations anonymously.

psychoanalytic community and need for future work. For example, we can say that 12% of BIPOC candidates did not feel free to discuss a variety of topics with their analyst, but we also can say that 88% of BIPOC candidates did feel free to have those discussions, which is also of note. The Commission study did not study the intersectional differences for white Jewish or white Christian participants.

The finding that BIPOC candidates felt less free than their white peers to discuss a wide variety of topics suggests that discomfort with discussing race affected their analyses across the board. A related finding is that 52% of the faculty surveyed reported they had no preparation to apply racial awareness to analysis. In light of these data, we have a preliminary hypothesis about BIPOC candidates' relative comfort in discussing these issues. The lack of training and discomfort of personal/training analysts in discussing race not only hindered exploration of their analysands' racial identity but likely made BIPOC candidates uncomfortable in deeply discussing other intimate issues. Perhaps not being able to fully bring their racial self into analysis limited the BIPOC candidates' entire experience and may be the reason that they ranked their analysis as not as valuable as white candidates did.

This hypothesis is supported by the data that show that candidates who identified as BIPOC found personal analysis less important than did students who identified as white. In response to the statement, "The personal analysis was the most important part of my training," 71% of the white candidates but only 60% of the BIPOC candidates agreed. We might speculate on the multiple dynamic reasons for these differences. BIPOC candidates are accustomed to microaggressions and macroaggressions in their daily lives and may expect and perhaps tolerate them in their analyses without the expectation of deeper examination. BIPOC candidates may be less prone to positive transference and the idealization of their analysts than white candidates

who may view their analyst as more familiar and safer. This basic trust and establishment of a positive transference as building blocks of the therapeutic alliance isn't as readily available for BIPOC candidates, especially given centuries of slavery, genocide, and systemic discrimination. Therefore, with the scarcity of BIPOC training/personal analysts, the BIPOC candidate may be less revealing of their racial self and along with their analyst's discomfort at bringing up topics of race, racism, or white supremacy, this may foreclose an exploration of this vital aspect of self.

Interestingly, only 55% of the faculty — white and BIPOC but presumably mostly white — agreed that their personal analysis was the most important part of their training, even a smaller percentage than the BIPOC candidates. It may be that with the passing of time, faculty became realistic about their analyses in general, and that BIPOC candidates are more realistic about the realities of racism before their analyses begin. White candidates, in contrast, may idealize their training analyses. Again, these are speculations that deserve further study, and it is important to note that approximately 95% of all those surveyed considered their analyses valuable, even if not the most important part of their training.

In pursuing the hypothesis that BIPOC candidates might be more careful in choosing an analyst and more realistic about what to expect, it might be useful to look more closely at the 12% of the BIPOC cohort that did not feel comfortable talking about a variety of topics with their analysts. Can we say anything about who these candidates are? Though in general for this report we have treated BIPOC candidates as a homogenous-enough group subject to the generality of institutional racism, the relationship of the individual to their analyst is individual and it might be useful to take a closer look at their individual identities. Although the numbers are too small to make any speculative conclusions, we find it important to speak to our experiences with specific BIPOC candidates to emphasize where future attention can be paid.

While it is clear there is a burgeoning literature on the dynamic experiences of BIPOC trainees, there remains the question of how receptive faculty and training/personal analysts are to learning about and addressing these issues. Additionally, all candidates, including white, BIPOC, and recent immigrants may have varying degrees of exposure to racism, white supremacy, and discrimination. This requires sensitivity and the dismantling and restructuring of the faculty and administration in every aspect of the training experience in order to promote antiracism, diversity, equity, and inclusion.

For instance, the literature, discussions, and workshops on anti-Asian and anti-Latinx systemic racism are newer and less well known and apparently have not penetrated the consulting room. Those of us who have taught diversity courses and supervised Asian and Latinx candidates as well as recent white European immigrant candidates have noted that some of these candidates express concern that not enough attention is being paid to anti-Asian and anti-Latinx racism nor to the difficulties that recent immigrants have in adjusting to United States culture. Immigrants sometimes take exception to an emphasis on anti-Black racism and feel not enough attention is paid to the struggles of their groups. We have observed that it is often difficult for immigrants to understand the depth and pervasiveness of American anti-Black racism, its embeddedness in American history and culture, or to appreciate how immigrants who are white have benefited from white privilege even as they struggle with institutions that are not doing enough to help them. Many immigrants from white-colonized nations frequently identify with their colonizers upon their arrival here, projecting their own humiliated “colored” selves outside, which may be an additional source of a lack of empathy towards their African American neighbors. African Americans experience their fight for human and civil rights as being delayed for far too long, and they continue to struggle for inclusion and representation. Health, income,

and housing disparities continue to persistently disadvantage African American and Latinx communities. Therefore, slogans and mission statements from psychoanalytic institutes can appear disingenuous unless accompanied by concerted efforts to mitigate persistent disparities. Surely, more work needs to be done on these complicated issues of privilege and struggle.

Excerpts from the Interview Summary Report with Commentary

In our structured interviews, we did not directly ask the question of how race was addressed in our interviewee's analyses. Nonetheless, a few participants raised this topic during their interviews. What follows are comments that came up in the course of the interviews.

Most poignant was a comment made by an esteemed senior BIPOC analyst:¹⁸ "Whenever I brought up [my experience with racism] in my analysis it was always attributed to my birth order." This struck us as a clear example of an analyst ascribing an analysand's reaction to racism as stemming from so called deeper and more universal fantasies and conflicts. We inquired further, and the Commissioner who conducted the interview replied:

I am glad that you have picked up on the experience of this colleague of ours. The point made by him is the one that Kirkland [Vaughans] makes at the beginning of the Black Psychoanalysts Speak (BPS) film – that the training analyst appeared not "interested" in race and got the patient "off race" and onto a more familiar psychoanalytic topic. The analyst who made these comments at the interview elaborated further that, whenever he raised his experience of racism in his analysis, the analyst's response went straight to his

¹⁸ We quote with permission from the senior analyst and the interviewer from that small group interview of faculty, noting that permission was obtained from all interviewers and interviewees to use their quotations anonymously in this report. See Appendix G.

birth order or sibling rivalry rather than allowing a proper space for the racialized experience to be known and explored in its own right. The core issue concerned, whose substance our colleague does not dispute, involved a conflicted relationship with a sibling.

The training analyst shifted rapidly to a familiar psychoanalytic theme, thereby avoiding potential racial encounters within the patient-analyst dyad that might be uncomfortable for the analyst. The consequence of this was that the patient was left feeling that there was no space for his experience as a Black person or for his racial subjectivity in his analysis. This is a serious enough charge in any analysis but was particularly poignant and painful given the duality of his having both African American and Native American ancestry. He was a member of intersectional marginalized groups and never had the opportunity to explore that in his analysis. Fortunately, the then candidate's rich cultural upbringing in a thriving African American home and community helped him to navigate and survive this unfortunate lack in his analysis and the racism of training. Unfortunately, these experiences in training and with his analyst did have a negative consequence. He never contemplated becoming a training analyst, stating:

I have not pursued beyond graduation to aspire to be a training analyst in part because that path was never made clear or an option for me from any interested party and my anger with my analyst for not addressing something so important to me as racism was unacceptable. I've held older training analysts in particular responsible for this negligence.

In subsequent conversation the Commissioner who conducted the interview shared with the interviewee similar experiences of discouragement and racial "disillusionment" by BIPOC

analytic colleagues in considering applying to become a training psychoanalyst at their societies.

That this Black psychoanalyst did not consider becoming a training analyst deprived the next generation of psychoanalytic candidate analysts of his wisdom and experience. We see him as representative of a group of BIPOC psychoanalysts who completed their training but whose engagement with psychoanalytic organizations was adversely affected by the disavowal of racism in their analysis and training. This analyst, though not a training analyst, did go on to attain positions of authority and leadership at his institute and society. Like other BIPOC faculty, he continued to attempt to bring excellence, inclusion, and representation to psychoanalytic organizations. Other BIPOC graduates and faculty feeling racially marginalized may chose a more limited engagement with their psychoanalytic societies and communities. Much like Black veterans of World War II who were not granted the same opportunities as white veterans to obtain subsidized mortgages, educational stipends, and fair and integrated housing, and thereby gain wealth that could be passed on to future generations, the barriers and obstacles for BIPOC candidates and faculty at psychoanalytic institutes in obtaining positions of power cannot be overstated. Although the majority of BIPOC and white candidates have found their training valuable, the low number of BIPOC candidates reflects the failure to remedy the problem of diversity, equity, and inclusion in psychoanalytic institutions, and the challenges of creating an environment of acceptance and safety for all stakeholders.

There were other comments reflecting the perspective that race was inadequately addressed in personal/training analyses. One analyst expressed what members of this committee heard repeatedly from white colleagues, namely, the stereotypical and false idea that BIPOC patients don't exist, and, if they do, that they cannot afford an analyst's fee despite the analyst

being in major metropolitan areas where many BIPOC individuals have the means to pay. Achieving greater outreach and bringing psychoanalytic service to more diverse communities require a shift in the mindset of some analysts, as reflected in one interviewee's self-reflection and stereotyped belief:

In addition to people of color not wanting to seek out psychoanalytic treatment, we have not and I'm talking about myself seeking to have a private practice office, actually I have not . . . had a black patient in my practice and I want to charge full fee, not take insurance. I don't take insurance. And I'm aware that in the history of psychoanalysis people of color were not thought to be analyzable.

In contrast to this view are the experiences of BIPOC analysts who describe having a diverse patient population that is more reflective of society in general. This includes BIPOC patients and white patients in analysis with BIPOC analysts. Clearly the underlying prejudices and stereotypes among white analysts need to be addressed.

The issue of power was raised multiple times across interviews. As one interviewee stated, "This isn't just about race, it's about power." Historically, psychoanalytic institutes were patriarchal hierarchical oligarchies. Most often power was in the hands of a few white men who opaquely decided who would hold positions of power, who would be training analysts, and who could be analyzed. For example, most institutes retain the position of training analyst and due to the lack of diversity in the faculty body, candidates have quite limited options in which to choose a training analyst if racial or cultural diversity is an important selection criterion for the candidate. Rarely, both white candidates (2.2%) and BIPOC candidates (8%) are assigned analysts (see Chapter 3). Though thankfully much of this has changed, such change is relatively

recent and residues of the typically white heteronormative culture of almost all psychoanalytic institutes remain.

These differences in power are an impediment to reporting and responding to racial enactments. How power impacts an institute and its members cannot be overstated. Power is an impediment to the integration into the curriculum of race, racism, and white supremacy as frames for analysis. Power to decide whether one engages in discussions about race and racism is a challenge to developing and deepening a common understanding of race and systemic racism. One interviewee wondered whether anti-racism training should be mandatory for all rather than optional. Similarly, one interviewer suggested that there was a need to “establish a mechanism to deal with faculty/supervisors who just don’t get it” and that “it is not fair to put that burden on the students of color.” Power also allows analysts to decide which populations they serve and which they do not. Some interviewees felt a lack of exposure to diverse patients limits understanding. This lack of awareness led one interviewee to suggest, “I think people should be required to analyze someone of a different race.” We unequivocally endorse the recommendation that analysts analyze someone of a different race.

Another example of how power differentials within the analytic couple can be enacted is when a BIPOC psychoanalytic candidate attempts to identify a training analyst as a racial/ethnic subject aware of prejudice and discrimination as a perceived minority within the larger white society. Many BIPOC candidates’ choice of analyst is in some ways based on this, with the belief and hope that a Jewish analyst, for instance, could work on this area of self and understand or appreciate the experience of being marginalized. In some instances, this racial/trauma/ethnic commonality can serve as both a bridge and an invitation to discuss differences writ large, including fantasies and transferences, somewhat removed from white privilege and power.

Unfortunately, however, sometimes the training analyst is unresponsive to the candidate need to link their shared experiences, foreclosing the candidate's ability to utilize this aspect of themselves within their analysis. The shutting down of another's subjectivity, especially within the unbalanced situation of a training analysis is an example of an abuse of power that inhibits integration and connection.

Another interviewer noted that a lack of deep understanding of race and racism as a major impediment to moving the field forward, citing one interviewee who had been:

trying for years to get colleagues at their institute, which, in spite of its location, abundant in ethnic and cultural diversity, has had no Black or Brown candidates, to think about racial inclusion. The answer . . . has been to point to their institute's longstanding participation in APsA training and outreach in China and other East Asian Countries. For their colleagues, that is racial inclusion.

We ask if it is an expression of racism when institutes cannot find candidates of color in major metropolitan areas and yet actively pursue candidates from overseas despite all the apparent challenges of doing so.

Several interviewees reflected on the value of study groups that explore issues of race and racism. As one interviewee described:

There needs to be an intention at the top with leadership. In our centre we have a racism study group and we've been meeting monthly for seven years. That has helped the leadership to better understand the depth of the problem and how they themselves are struggling with it. And then from there it trickles down.

Another interview group discussed the need for:

regular meetings, involving the entire institute (town halls) at which the subject of racism can be openly discussed, with plenty of room for free association and other open contributions from the membership, to create space for people to “process their racist thinking” seen as an inevitable consequence of being raised in the US.

Another interviewer described an interview group’s recommendation to “open discussions to make our theories more inclusive and to include meaningful discussions of the role of culture, class, race, etc., and other types of oppressions related to gender discriminations, etc.”

Interviewees recognized that “a conscious desire for change is not enough—real, hard emotional work is needed to bring it about.” In a separate group, an interviewee implored, “I’m pleading that we stretch our boundaries to include things that make us sweat . . . That we commit [to] a process with somebody.” Another interviewee summarized the sentiment of many interviewees, “To achieve racial equity in psychoanalysis, it is worth how hard it is.”

Some Observations from the Psychoanalytic Literature

The psychoanalytic literature on the challenges of addressing race and racism in the clinical encounter has grown exponentially over the past two decades. We will not attempt a review of this exceptionally important work but offer a few powerful examples.

Forrest Hamer described his real experiences in “Guards at the Gate: Race, Resistance, and Psychic Reality” in the *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*:

In the first days of my analysis many years ago, I was walking to my analyst's office when two police cars pulled up to block my path, one of the officers turning me around against the wall while he frisked me. He explained that a tall and bearded black male wearing a gray sweater had just robbed a drugstore, and they wanted me to wait there

until the robbed clerk arrived in another car to tell them if I was the culprit. I doubted silently that the description had been that specific, for it matched me too closely, and I sensed it was important that I not protest. I stood there, shocked, confused, beginning to seethe, and awfully humiliated, for I was just two blocks from the hospital at which I was an intern, and the mother of a child I was evaluating walked by to see her son's prospective therapist detained by the police.

I ended up being some twenty minutes late for my analysis appointment. On the way there, I thought, *Damn, I'll be late. He'll probably think I'm resisting.* I tried to push thoughts about what had just happened out of my mind, for I was also aware I didn't know how this would go between us, him a white man whose own history and comfort with black people I knew little about, whose awareness of certain social realities for black men I questioned, and whose personally reserved style made me uncomfortable. As I did talk to him about it, though, I decided to use the occasion to sort through a range of feelings about it. But aside from wondering aloud if he was familiar with such experiences, I had no thoughts about what else the experience meant between us—how our membership in and identification with different racial groups were already affecting how we experienced each other, what importance these differences would have for what we would discuss and how we would discuss it, and, immediately, how real we would allow this real experience of mine to be. (Hamer, 2002, pp. 1219-1220)

Dorothy Holmes set the scene of her training analysis in “Come Hither, American Psychoanalysis: Our Complex Multicultural America Needs What We Have to Offer” in the *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*:

Psychoanalysis can offer our Black patients avenues for exploration and working through that can free them from the kinds of strictures noted above having to do with race. I remember how my own training analyst helped me get started toward that freedom. In our first consultation, I said to him—a White man born and reared in the South— “I don't know if I can do this [with you]. You're White and you are from the South.” He answered, “I will not seek to dissuade you from anything you may feel on either of those accounts. If you should decide to work with me, we shall see how it all comes out in the wash.” For me, his answer was just what I needed—the validation of my right to know my own mind, including racially. (Holmes, 2016, p. 574)

Kimberlyn Leary explored neutrality, transference, and countertransference in “Race, Self-Disclosure, and ‘Forbidden Talk’: Race and Ethnicity in Contemporary Clinical Practice,” in *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*:

Failing to acknowledge racial difference is not neutral. We might consider, for example, what is conveyed when the clinician does not speak to her/his blackness, or when her/his whiteness is assumed to speak for itself. Clinical silence about race may be perceived—and with some justification—as a commentary on the analyst's effort to stay out of the fray, to opt out of the tension that comes with open talk about race. Ambiguity of this sort can close off the clinical encounter in ways that are at odds with what we ideally wish to offer our patients. Most of the time, my observation that the patient and I have not yet talked about the fact that the patient is white (or Japanese, or Latina, etc.) and I am African-American does not prevent exploration of the patient's racial meanings or obviate fantasy. If anything, I think it facilitates the admission of fantasy to the treatment relationship and sets a tone for the exploration to follow (cf. Greenberg, 1995), as that

which had been excluded from conversation is invited to assume a voice in the consulting room. If the invitation cannot be accepted, understanding the reasons for this over time defines an equally important analytic exploration.

When previously unmentioned racial difference is brought into the treatment relationship, my experience has been that white patients respond nearly universally by saying the difference is “not a problem,” although this is usually then followed by an implicit statement of exactly the problem that the patient expects will complicate the treatment, namely, the fear of saying something that would be perceived as racist or discriminatory. [. . .] It seems inevitable that all of us—patients and analysts—will have racial thoughts and feelings that are libidinally and aggressively tinged. Just as the analyst may become aware of the patient's explicit and subtle immersion in cultural and personally idiosyncratic dialogues about race, it is also quite likely that the patient will, in time, catch the analyst in some unintended racial reflections of his or her own. Speaking to the patient's concerns about racist content and the sociocultural realities of race can become a way of understanding the patient's relationship to ideas, feelings, and behaviours that evoke anxiety and vulnerability. I believe that a parallel process may occur with respect to the analyst's racial countertransference. (Leary, 1997, pp. 166-167)

Michael Moskowitz wrestled with the meaning of his Jewish ethnicity vis-à-vis Blackness in “Our Moral Universe” in *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*:

I remember vividly a dream from my therapy. In this dream, I was denied access to a building by an imposing black doorman. My therapist pointed out that his own name was Schwartz, which I needed him to remind me means black in Yiddish. The associations

and interpretation which followed related to my oedipally viewing him like my father denying me access to my mother's body and not providing me with the key that would give me the power to turn her on. He was my Schwartz-father, my black father of the night. That I portrayed him as a doorman, with its racist stereotypes, was an attempt to diminish his power. Other dreams and fantasies about black men led back to my analyst, and I'd like to say that this in turn led me to further insights into my fear, and envy, of black men. And it did, but not in that analysis. The image stayed with me over the years and was elaborated and further analyzed; I still work on it. I grew up in a rundown, poor white town, in which direct interaction with black people played no part in my early life. Being a Jew was never far from my mind. Being called Christ killer and dirty Jew as I walked to school made it hard to escape. My father's ready explanation was that we were envied; we had a culture, a history, and had survived for millennia. This was not my experience. I did not feel envied. I felt attacked. Seeing the civil rights struggle, I felt more identified with blacks fighting against oppression (Malcolm X, Eldridge Cleaver) than with my father's version of triumphant Jews.

My father would get angry whenever ghetto was used to designate black communities like Harlem. He would say no one stops anyone from walking in or out of Harlem. That's not a ghetto. Jews were locked in at night. What I was not able to see until recently is that by not asking my father about his life, what he knew of oppression, and the ghetto, I was denying his strength and my envy of his knowledge and ability to survive, which I displaced onto blackness.

Maybe I was lucky to have a therapist named Schwartz. I know many men who secretly wished they were black, who were in Kathleen White's (1991) terms black identified white men. (Moskowitz, 1999, pp. 333-340)

Dionne Powell described a challenging moment in her analysis in “From the Sunken Place to the Shitty Place: The Film *Get Out*, Psychic Emancipation and Modern Race Relations from a Psychodynamic Clinical Perspective” in *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*:

...at a moment of unabashed defensiveness, I accused my analyst of “talking like a White woman,” with overt claims that she couldn’t ever understand me due to her Whiteness. She responded with an ounce of humor: “Well I am a White woman.” I came to appreciate that my accusations in the mid-phase of my analysis were easier to tolerate than to confront and work through my rage and destructiveness, and—on a deeper level—to speak of my fears and anxieties, or my dependence and need of her. These were much harder for me to acknowledge and accept, but thankfully, not too uncomfortable to prevent my analyst from leaning into to this moment...and continue to pursue further. This requires cultural humility, the recognition and willingness to embrace the discomfort... the unknown ...even if it removes the analyst from the idealized position that is often defensively turned to in moments of heated racial exchange (Watkins and Hook 2016). And it often requires an ability to play providing necessary psychic space to entertain these overly determined challenging moments. (Powell, 2020, p. 441)

Personal Reflections

The personal reflections of some of our commission members illustrate similar themes captured through the survey and interview data.

Commissioner A wrote:

As a psychoanalyst of color entering white private spaces, as is required in all psychoanalytic treatments, and in some cases entering white public spaces as well, engenders anxieties and fears. An example of this fear being realized occurred in my second analysis with a senior white female who upon exploring my consistent use of the doorman to ring her office upon my arrival suggested that I end the practice and just come to her office at the appointed hour. Following her advice on our next meeting I simply went to her outer office as usual without prior notification, i.e., warning, and she appeared visibly shaken by my unannounced appearance. She recovered after a few seconds and suggested that we return to the initial method of entry. We never discussed this incident, I think due to a need to protect ourselves, each other, and a fear that perhaps it could not be reconciled.

Commissioner B wrote:

Early in my career I worked for a county mental health department and as a college counselor. I saw many Black people on in-patient wards and in brief outpatient treatment. I also saw Black patients in part-time private practice. In each of these settings I would routinely bring up the racial difference at the beginning of treatment and when opportunities presented themselves. My experience was that when a black patient came to see or was assigned to me, a white male therapist, they generally didn't want to discuss race in the dyad. We might discuss race in their life experience but my attempts to bring it into the room usually didn't go far. The treatments would be problem focused and supportive, but it was as though we had an implicit agreement not to tackle race between

us. In retrospect I could have done more but settled for the bargain to work on what we both seemed to feel we could.

When I finished analytic training and went into practice full time, I was more able to work in the transference but saw fewer Black patients. I did stay on an insurance panel to continue seeing students and they are a more diverse group. I've seen several BIPOC students in analytic treatment.

My personal training analyst was a white woman I sought out because of her progressive reputation. The night before beginning on the couch I dreamed of my analyst as an elegant, well-coiffed, intimidating woman, all of which she was, except in my dream she was a black woman. I brought the dream to that first hour, but we never did much with it. It is striking that, in an otherwise deep and meaningful analysis, a white analytic dyad avoided a dream so clearly indicating the significance of race in my life. I'm still working on that dream.

Recently, the crisis leading to the resignations of two esteemed members, one from the association and another as APsaA President, has become a defining moment for APsaA. I respect the fierce urgency of now that guides the Commission's resolve not to let this moment pass without transformation. I've been challenged to my core on the Holmes Commission and at times resisted, out of a mixture of denial and self-preservation, but confrontation has been leavened by recognition and compassion that have helped me learn and continue in the work. I trust that the Commission can model the openness, self-reflection, and compassion that make bearable the pain and conflict required in the continuing examination of systemic racism.

Commissioner C wrote:

After two treatments with African American therapists in dynamic psychotherapy, one having been a training analyst in the past, I, an African American psychoanalyst chose a white analyst that had extensive experience working with and for BIPOC patients and communities. While these facts emerged post analysis, the openness and non-defensiveness in her engagement with me, including the racial and ethnic resulted in an expanding and deepening process where I could bring my full self, especially the racial and cultural into the therapeutic situation. Along with my year-long experience in studying Black psychology in my fourth year of medical school, and my clinical experiences in urban medical centers provided a wealth of diversity where I could apply psychodynamic concepts and its intersection with the biopsychosocial. Finally, my first supervisor, an adult and child analyst allowed a type of flourishing as we worked with three different patients of different races and religions, as I was developing my first case. These professional factors and experiences along with the steady support of family and friends mitigated the damaging effects of being the only one (of color) in my psychoanalytic class and the only African American (faculty or candidate) during my training and for many years afterwards.

Having spoken to a vast array of BIPOC candidates during my 30-year career I am struck by the absence of race and ethnicity being brought up as an exploratory subject within biracial treatments where the analyst is white. The paucity of BIPOC training analysts is why this is the predominant experience of the BIPOC candidate. Where this has occurred there can be a prolonged silence and ultimate enactment around race that can reach an inflection point for exploration, but this is solely dependent on the analyst.

Due to the analyst's minimal or lack of experience with a diverse ethnic clinical practice this area can be ignored, minimized, and neutralized with detrimental results for the BIPOC candidate (considering the differences in BIPOC candidates' survey report about the subjective value of their analysis).

Commissioner D wrote:

The current APsaA crisis has had a profound effect on several of my analysands. Their individual responses have uncannily mirrored the dynamics of the APsaA/Div39 listservs, their feeling differently aggrieved, persecuted, misunderstood. The intensity of their reactions is in part a transference issue which we can discuss. They all know the intensity of my political engagement. But whatever their particular and individual reactions, they are all dismayed by the failure of leadership to offer any pathways towards understanding and reconciliation. I do not think this is only a reflection of my own dismay.

Conclusions and Themes

The Holmes Commission surveys, interviews, field data, and literature, and the over 120 years of professional experience as senior psychoanalysts on this subcommittee confirm that there is a persistent need for increased sensitivity, responsiveness, and knowledge surrounding the impact of racism, racial privilege, systemic bias, and discrimination at psychoanalytic training centers regarding whom we train and treat. Without immediate steps to improve curriculum, supervision, education, and the analysis of all stakeholders, psychoanalytic institutes will lose their relevancy in the larger society that has taken creative steps mitigating these persistent disparities. While our subcommittee's focus has been on the experience of race on the

couch, the training analyst or personal analyst will not be equipped to work in modern society unless systemic racism is addressed with determination and persistence.

The survey and interview data yielded the least data on race on the couch due to the subjective nature of the experience. This limited data was augmented by field data and personal experiences of commission members, to share additional observations and recommend further investigation of this topic. Three themes emerged:

Theme 1: Analysands are often troubled by their analysts' response to their bringing up issues related to race. Many times, it seems that analysts did not acknowledge the pernicious reality of pervasive systemic racism but instead directed their analysands to try to understand their feelings about race as stemming from so-called deeper and more universal fantasies and conflicts.

Theme 2: Across the survey items, a higher percentage of BIPOC candidates than white candidates reported that they did not feel free to discuss a variety of topics with their analyst. This was true for every queried topic, not only race, but also sexual orientation, religion, ethnicity, and language differences.

Theme 3: BIPOC candidates were less likely than white candidates to report that their analysis was the most important part of their training, and it was hypothesized that BIPOC candidates are perhaps more skeptical about what to expect in white-dominated institutions and structures.

Recommendations

Blind spots and unpreparedness were common experiences of race on the couch and cannot be prescriptively addressed. Analysts need to avail themselves of consultation, education, and personal work to gain awareness and the ability to work with racial and other differences on the couch. We have the following recommendations:

- In future research it would be helpful to include surveys that explore how many BIPOC patients a clinician has treated in analysis or psychodynamic psychotherapy, and what their thoughts are about those treatments. In this future work we might also get to more subtle, less conscious issues by asking faculty to describe some of their own dreams that involved race, ethnicity, and diversity, as well as such dreams by patients, and how they worked with those dreams.
- Training cases should also reflect the diversity that is modern society and the urban communities where most institutes are located. This change will increase candidate and faculty experience in working with diverse patient populations and mitigate the stereotypes regarding the un-analyzability of BIPOC people that continues as an active manifestation of structural racism within psychoanalysis, evident in the poor representation of BIPOC trainees and faculty.
- Potential faculty should demonstrate diversity and inclusion in their clinical experience as a prerequisite to becoming a faculty member.
- All training/personal psychoanalysts should regularly participate in experiential workshops on race, ethnicity, whiteness, and difference, and develop study groups at their institutes around these issues. Understanding one's racial, ethnic, class, gender, and other such biases should be viewed as a never-ending, ongoing project of antiracism.
- A clinical work group project on Psychoanalysis and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) could be sponsored by the American Psychoanalytic Association using the International Psychoanalytical Association Working Group model. A core group of principle investigators would identify a series of questions for use in workshops studying individual cases. The paradigmatic question would be “How is this analytic dyad working

with racial difference, or not?" Data from the workshops are reviewed by the core group to refine the questions, collect data, and generate findings for publication. Working Groups have proven to effectively combine clinical research and education in a uniquely analytic format and would augment clinical teaching, supervision/consultation, and experiential process groups in addressing race in psychoanalysis.

We empathically understand that implementing these suggestions is a difficult task. However, the future of our field depends on it. It is from our love of psychoanalysis that we have persisted in this work, some of us for four decades and more. We know the work is hard.

"Nelson Mandela reminds us that it always seems impossible until it is done" (Obama, 2013).

REFERENCES

Hamer, F. M. (2002). Guards at the gate: Race, resistance, and psychic reality. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 50(4), 1219-1236.

Holmes, D. E. (2016). Come hither, American psychoanalysis: Our complex multicultural America needs what we have to offer. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 64(3), 568-586.

Leary, K. (1997). Race, self-disclosure, and "forbidden talk": Race and ethnicity in contemporary clinical practice. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 66(2), 163-189.

Moskowitz, M. (1999). Our moral universe. *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 1(4), 333-340.

National Archives and Records Administration. (2013, December 10). *Remarks by President Obama at Memorial Service for former South African President Nelson Mandela*. National

Archives and Records Administration. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2013/12/10/remarks-president-obama-memorial-service-former-south-african-president->

Powell, D. R. (2020). From the sunken place to the shitty place: The film *Get Out*, psychic emancipation and modern race relations from a psychodynamic clinical perspective. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 89(3), 415-445.

Winograd, B., Reichbart, R., Moskowitz, M., Hart, A. H., Morillo, R., Aspenberg, D., Benbella, A., Cervantes, C., Francis, J., Schorske, C., Crown, T., Adams, C. J., Bennett, J. O., Hart, A. H., Holmes, D. E., Jones, A. L., Morris, D. O., Polite, C. K., Reichbart, R., Thompson, C.,

Vaughans, K., White, C. & White, K. P. (2014). Black Psychoanalysts Speak. PEP Video Grants 1:1 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N8-VIi7tb44>

Chapter 7

Enactments

Guilt is not a response to anger; it is a response to one's own actions or lack of action. If it leads to change then it can be useful, since it is then no longer guilt but the beginning of knowledge. Yet all too often, guilt is just another name for impotence, for defensiveness destructive of communication; it becomes a device to protect ignorance and the continuation of things the way they are, the ultimate protection for changelessness.

— Audre Lorde, The Uses of Anger

The survey instrument largely used the term “action” to describe racist events occurring in psychoanalytic institutions and organizations. In this report, we use the term “enactment” to reflect that these “actions” or events are a form of playing out or – in psychoanalytic parlance – “acting out” racist dynamics and structures which often are unconscious to individuals, groups, and organizations.

Because the deep and difficult emotional work of healing has been unequal to the wound of racism, in our country and in psychoanalysis itself, many of the thoughts, feelings, processes, procedures, and organizational structures that surround and sustain racism have been pushed out of consciousness into the personal unconscious of individuals or the social unconscious of groups and institutions. As analysts we believe, as Freud did, that what resides in unconsciousness constantly pushes up towards awareness, while contravening forces attempt to keep these unpleasant and intolerable contents hidden. Psychoanalysis teaches us that what forms an indelible part of history, but is not able to be brought into consciousness, often breaks out into the open in the form of action. This makes all discussions about racism highly vulnerable to enactment.

We make a distinction between a *racist act* and a *racial enactment*. In the following pages we describe numerous actions and behaviors, some of which are overtly racist (the use of a slur

for example) and some which are much more difficult to characterize (a chilling atmosphere about conversations regarding race, for example). The “actions” documented in the study are analogous to the manifest content of a psychoanalytic session or a dream. As psychoanalysts, we are interested in what subtends these acts, the hidden structures and interpersonal and group dynamics the acts represent in the dyad, group, or organization.

A racial enactment, as we are using this term, connotes the way the original race-related or racist act begins to make manifest and play out these hidden structures and dynamics. At their best, enactments represent opportunities for making these hidden structures and dynamics conscious and amenable to meaningful discovery and working through. In defensive modes, groups move away from this work. The original race-related or racist act is minimized and understood in concrete terms. The symbolic representation of the act of the deeper dynamics are denied. People in the group or organization who were not directly involved in the original racist act may distance themselves from getting involved, pegging the people who were involved as the only perpetrators and victims. This deflection can add fuel to the fire, in effect annulling the experience of the Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) individuals involved, who see in the original act the tip of an iceberg. Individuals who were not directly involved in the original racist act may scapegoat those who were involved, thereby portraying themselves as “outside” of a system that supports oppressive racial dynamics. This level of embroilment—which involves dissociation, negation, denial, and scapegoating—is what we are referring to as a racial enactment.

We believe that as a result of our collective avoidance of the dynamics of racism, no sufficiently deep engagement about racism can be free of such enactments. While often intensely uncomfortable, shame-filled, and at times heartbreakingly painful, enactments can also be of

great benefit, allowing us to see what was previously unseen and thus making it finally amenable to healing work. It is no surprise that in the course of working together so intensely on the question of racism, The Holmes Commission itself became a site of enactment. We will return to a more detailed discussion regarding enactments, including our own, but first we discuss four themes that emerged in the analysis of the quantitative and qualitative portions of the national study.

Four Themes

Theme 1. Racist Actions/Enactments Are a Significant and Necessary Part of the Life of Psychoanalytic Organizations

Enactments happen when we are involved in emotionally evocative work. In fact, we woefully welcome them because enactments generally involve unconscious material — this is where problems lie as “sleeping dogs” (Holmes, 2016, p. 641). Enactments are powerful because our defenses have not held up; what has been hidden painfully and often surprisingly leaps or seeps out. This is the work of psychoanalysis proper. As difficult as enactments are, they teach us about ourselves and each other. Racial enactments are inevitable. As we work on changing structural racism, chipping away at the defenses that keep it invisible, unearthing difficult histories, and challenging the practices that keep it hidden, the emotions connected to racism inevitably surface. Thus, we believe racial enactments constitute a significant part of dealing with the racial life of organizations.

The data bear this out. About two thirds¹⁹ of both faculty and candidates observed, experienced, or heard about an action that was racist. About half of these respondents had the conviction that the racial enactment they observed, experienced, or heard about had caused racial

¹⁹ All study results in this chapter are further detailed in Appendices A, B, C, D, E, and F.

trauma. Almost half the respondents (49% of candidates and 45% of faculty) noted that the racist actions they observed or experienced were multiple, happening at least three times. A significant number of the respondents (33% of candidates and 28% of faculty) noted racist actions occurring more than five times.

Despite the fact that a significant majority of respondents were aware of actions they considered racist, there was also a general feeling (74% of candidates and 64% of faculty) that these matters were not dealt with adequately. About a quarter of respondents (29% of candidates and 21% of faculty) felt unsupported and/or alienated or that racist issues were largely ignored.

The data suggest that because racialized enactments are not adequately processed and worked through, they are doomed to being repeated (as psychoanalytic theory teaches us). Repeated racialized enactments cause significant damage to relationships and perpetuate a status quo that prevents many, especially BIPOC, from feeling included and valued. These repetitions impede the growth of organizations if not sufficiently worked through. For the most part, enactments occurred in group settings such as classrooms, listservs, and committee or organizational meetings. To the extent that we are living in a racist and racializing culture, we enact race and racism in many ways. Examples were provided by respondents of actions that were triggering or constitutive elements of racial enactments depending on how they were processed in group situations. Frequently cited examples included the use of derogatory slurs to refer to people of color with little regard for the effects on the group; the dismissal of racial issues by people in authority, who asserted that racial or cultural matters have no place in psychoanalysis; repeated instances of BIPOC of the same race or ethnic group being routinely confused with one another; and the invalidation or dismissal of BIPOC when they reported experiences of oppression or racism. Both BIPOC candidates and faculty often expressed that

they felt they were either made invisible (through their experiences of racism being minimized or outright disregarded) or hypervisible (by being singled out to speak out and represent all BIPOC). In cases of more egregious racialized enactments (those which rose to the level of triggering administrative investigations of discrimination or a candidate leaving training), most respondents felt that insufficient attention was paid to the matter and the investigation was dropped or there was a lack of closure with all of the affected parties.

Many respondents expressed a need for much greater transparency and follow-through in order to complete the necessary process of working through a racial enactment as a community. This lack of transparency is linked to a second prominent theme: the split between public and private arenas in psychoanalytic societies.

Theme 2. While There Is Relative Comfort in Addressing and Processing Racist Incidents in Private, Significant Racial Enactments Often Occur in Public (That Is, in Groups)

The vast majority of racial enactments described by respondents in the study occurred in what we are calling “public” spaces such as classrooms, online forums, community events, or committee hearings. Many more candidates (96%) and faculty (84%) reported racial enactments in public spaces as compared to the “private” spaces of individual analysis (7% of candidates and 8% faculty) and supervision (25% of candidates and 20% of faculty). When candidates discussed racism, they appeared to be most comfortable in addressing the subject with their analyst (78%), followed by their supervisor (59%), and finally fellow candidates (44%). Candidates appeared to be much less comfortable addressing racialized material with instructors (27%) and leadership (28%). This is particularly interesting because the most frequent occurrence of a racist act being witnessed was in the classroom as reported both by candidates (66%) and instructors (48%).

We conjecture that there are several reasons why there were few reports of racial enactments in the dyadic spaces of analysis and supervision. These private spaces are specifically understood as places where the unconscious is not only likely to emerge, but (ambivalently) welcomed. Both parties are prepared for this and cultivate its emergence. This preparedness may allow a more adroit management of the emergent unconscious material. Additionally, there is a strong emphasis on the relationship itself; emotional connectedness is explicitly fostered in both personal analyses and supervisions. Intimate relationships have been shown to be a protective element when racial trouble strikes, mitigating the trauma of enactments by preserving a sense of the humanity of the parties involved. Thus, when such enactments occur in the analytic dyad, the participants may be better prepared to use the enactments as opportunities for therapeutic work and conscious repair.

Perhaps the most important factor influencing the relative infrequency of racial enactments in private analytic spaces may be the tendency towards ethnic and racial homogeneity of these dyads, due largely to the overwhelming whiteness of psychoanalysis. Things are changing, but currently the most common analytic or supervisory dyad is very likely to be white person with white person. In the dyadic encounters that sit at the heart of analytic training, very few are mixed race. While racial enactments can occur regardless of the racial composition of a dyad or group, it is in the context of racial diversity that racial enactments are more likely to be apparent. When racial enactments happen in the intimate context of supervision or especially within a personal analysis, the psychic impact (feelings of betrayal, erasure, deforming misrecognition, and the internalization of hatreds) can be devastating, precisely because of the cultivated intimacy and trust that these relationships aim to achieve. While the number of BIPOC

respondents in the study was relatively small, BIPOC candidates reported significantly more instances of racial enactments within supervision and personal analysis than white candidates.

With these important caveats in mind, we can celebrate that respondents generally found personal analyses and supervisions to be relatively protected from racial enactments, since these are both privileged sites of psychoanalytic learning and transformation. Yet, when we consider psychoanalytic classrooms, committees, meetings, listservs, boards and institutes as a whole what emerges in the data is a pattern of racist dysfunction.

As described in Appendix G, the Interview Summary Report, both candidates and faculty felt that when racial enactments occurred, they were not dealt with in a satisfactory manner, were too often dismissively brushed under the rug, or were attended to in an incomplete manner that did not close the loop, failed to be sufficiently transparent, or failed to address the structural problems laid bare by the enactments. Working these issues through requires an enormous amount of painful emotional labor on the part of the collective.

It is not easy to learn about intimate parts of yourself in the company of others, including those you may not know well and with whom you may not have a pre-existing relationship of confidence and trust. Individuals who may have felt relatively comfortable experiencing and discussing racial dynamics in the frame of a two-person setting may feel exposed, shameful and shamed, angry and defensive, or shut down, silenced or silencing when they are in a public setting where they don't feel as emotionally safe or contained. Psychoanalytic work is premised on an idea that how we see ourselves is not always who we actually are or how others see us. We are not transparent to ourselves.

When the highly charged emotions that suffuse racism erupt, those emotions are often shocking to those involved. In psychoanalytic "society," the open expression of such raw feeling

is often seen as “inappropriate” or even pathological. The person displaying such emotions is regarded as unregulated, lacking ego strength, and in need of further personal analysis. Rather than offer understanding, containment, and the opportunity to work through those emotions, the group may consciously or unconsciously rally to shut down the emotional process, tagging as its scapegoat someone who will carry the heavy burden of raw emotion, thereby alleviating all others of a need to examine themselves and how they may be implicated in the processes. These cycles of emotional expression, reactivity, and group dysfunction can become explosive, collapsing, and traumatic, too often leading to the disengagement of the individuals and groups most in need of working through and healing from the pain of racism and its consequences. Most tragically, the defense of avoidance may actually strengthen, setting up further cycles of dead-end enactments.

Beyond the pain of dealing with enactments, psychoanalytic organizations face an additional obstacle. As we have noted, racism is, by definition, a group phenomenon, explicitly denoting a class of individuals as inferior (it must be said clearly here that in the United States the epitome of this violence against demeaned groups is anti-BIPOC racism). Psychoanalysis has long had an individualist orientation, both in its clinical practice (the individual analysand) and in much of its pedagogy (the structure of one-to-one supervision). Psychoanalytic practitioners tend to be wary of groups and group dynamics. Racialized enactments take their most forceful forms as group phenomena, on the public stage which involves organizational policies and procedures, classroom dynamics, and community events and programs. The individualist nature of psychoanalytic thinking and practice is not only inadequate to address these group phenomena, it can cause much more harm. Locating the problem in individuals, with attendant

blame, can exacerbate already volatile affects and fail to provide the necessary containment for the group, thereby eschewing working through which might lead to a healing process.

The general picture that emerges from the study is that discussing racial concerns in psychoanalytic organizations and institutes is acceptable — as long as it remains private. It is not too much to say that psychoanalysis *privatizes* emotionality and vulnerability, providing safe enough enclaves for it only in the analytic and supervisory consulting room. When racialized enactments burst open in public, analysts have little means of dealing with them collectively. Too often analytic practitioners resort to doing what they know best - turning to individual subjectivity. This forecloses the process that is most needed - a group and social process.

Theme 3. Despite and Because of the Many Difficulties Facing Psychoanalytic Organizations in Dealing With Racial Enactments There Is a Strong Desire for Change

There was an overwhelming sense among both BIPOC and white respondents that current institute curricula fall short in their coverage of socially relevant issues. This is true among both faculty and candidates, with the general tendency that BIPOC respondents were significantly more likely to feel that matters of race/racism, ethnicity, disability, intersectionality, and socioeconomic status were “not covered at all/enough.” Dissatisfaction was not limited to BIPOC respondents; it was robust for all respondents. Generally, over 80% of respondents said “not covered at all/enough” in most of those categories.

While there was general recognition that institutes and organizations are making efforts to address race and racism, by and large these efforts were felt to fall short of what is actually needed. There were some significant differences between BIPOC and white faculty. The majority (56%) of white faculty agreed with the statement, “My institution has been proactive in taking actions to address race, racism, and/or white supremacy because doing so is viewed as

essential for the future of psychoanalysis,” compared to BIPOC faculty (38%) agreeing with the statement. Forty-eight percent of BIPOC faculty felt that actions taken by their institution took place only in reaction to “events or actions that triggered outrage by members,” compared to white faculty (37%). It is common for psychoanalytic organizations to sponsor invited lectures and symposia focused on race, racism, or white supremacy. The vast majority (89%) of white faculty felt these activities to be “very or somewhat effective,” while only 27% of BIPOC faculty found these activities “somewhat ineffective” or as having no effect.

We take these findings to indicate that there is a great need for change and that respondents to this study, whether candidates or faculty, generally felt that we must do more to address racial enactments and make teaching curricula more racially relevant.

Theme 4. There is a Climate of Fear (Typically Fear of Retaliation) That Impedes Change

There is a general sense that members of psychoanalytic institutions want change. What is being done so far — whether in the realm of instruction and curricula or in the realm of addressing racial enactments — is generally seen as insufficient and inadequate.

What impedes greater and more effective change? One answer that seems to emerge from the study is fear. Many respondents (both BIPOC and white) reported a diffuse but charged atmosphere of anxiety, one that was hard to locate or articulate. Some described a racialized or often outright racist environment which was hard to pin down or which tended to come to light only through an overt racial enactment. It was common to read narrative descriptions giving voice to the chilling effects of this kind of climate. According to both BIPOC and white respondents, fear and anxiety surround and inhibit the matter of bringing forward questions concerning race and racism. The nature of fears expressed by BIPOC and white respondents differed dramatically.

BIPOC faculty and candidates were rightfully wary about bringing issues of racism to the fore. Respondents commonly referred to a double burden regarding ways they are seen:

- Hypervisibility – either being publicly called upon to instruct, give emotional responses on demand, represent whole groups of people, and be the token, or be “pathologized” as problematic, troublemaking, and/or angry. In our own experiences, we have seen this happen repeatedly. Even when the group is genuinely engaged in active efforts to heal the injuries of racism, BIPOC group members can be extraordinarily burdened. Too often BIPOC group members are designated as the representatives of race and race work – as if white people did not carry race or have work to do.
- Invisibility – not heard, not responded to, with complaints and concerns not taken up or dropped. Sometimes this is the result of a perhaps well-intended but misguided stance of “color-blindness” that effectively nullified real racial difference. Such erasures may have their roots in a notion that there is only a “white way” to be an analyst. One must pay the price of giving up ethnic or racial ways of being in order to assimilate and belong to the psychoanalytic community.

White faculty and candidates were fearful of making “mistakes,” speaking in politically incorrect ways, or being perceived as racist. A number of white respondents spoke to their ignorance, to their not knowing or having only insufficient knowledge, or to being early in their process of addressing race and racism. This is borne out by the data. White respondents felt much less confident in their understanding of race, racism, and white supremacy. Fifty-two percent of BIPOC faculty felt their level of understanding was “advanced,” while 79% of white faculty felt

their level of understanding was “emergent or moderate.” Twenty-four percent of white faculty classified their understanding as “emergent,” with only a nascent, beginner’s understanding.

The climate of fear and anxiety leads to stasis. Racial enactments were addressed superficially, if at all, and respondents felt there was not the deeper follow through, transparency, and accountability that might actually lead to *transformation*. Psychoanalysis teaches that significant change only occurs in this kind of sustained attention to moment-to-moment, lived experience. It is in the spirit of real transformation that we turn next to an examination of the enactments occurring during the course of our study, which we feel may serve as examples of the kind of working through we advocate.

The Holmes Commission Internal Enactment

Each Commissioner had been invited to serve on the basis of a demonstrable commitment to addressing racism in psychoanalysis, and there was a clear sense that each of us and all of us collectively had a deep desire to move our field forward in the areas of diversity, equity, and inclusion. While we began our work in the spirit of manifest collaboration, with personal openness, earnestness, and full-throated enthusiasm, there was also a clear-eyed understanding that we were likely to encounter rough waters ahead. In fact, this what happened about a year and a half into our work.

Some of what transpired was previously published in the Winter/Spring 2023 edition of *The American Psychoanalyst* in an article written by The Holmes Commission of Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis (CO-REAP) leadership team (see Appendix J). During one of our regular meetings, after the leaders asked for personal reflections, comments, or concerns, a white member voiced objections to various ways we did things in the group. Most of us – both BIPOC members and white members – had been deeply relieved to have finally found a space to discuss

the “taboo” topic of race and racism. There had in fact been few objections to the leadership team’s ways of conducting the process at this stage in our work. Perhaps the BIPOC members especially felt a strong sense of relief at being in a space that comprised people of color in an overwhelming majority and that centered Black leadership. Perhaps that made it unlikely that most of us would even think to be critical of leadership. We were simply grateful for the opportunity to work under these conditions, so rare in mainstream organizational psychoanalysis. It was shocking to us when our white colleague offered reflections which felt intensely and unfairly critical. There was little sense of context for most of us and we had little we could reference in what had transpired procedurally or relationally between our group members to anchor the harsh critiques. The vehemence of the critique and its lack of context seemed to channel something beyond the collective experience we had shared. There were strong, but respectful, responses from many members of the group.

As we reflected on what happened, we felt the following interpretation is reasonable and necessary, especially given the explicit task of the Commission to study racism in psychoanalysis. We suggest that the sudden angry critique was an example of a racial enactment, in which one member of the group carried and voiced the kind of racist indignation that is inherent in our social order, and which then (necessarily) was manifested in the group. Or to put it another way, the culture of white supremacy (the predominant culture of the status quo) spoke through this member. We want to take pains to say that it was not the critique itself which we considered to have been the problem, but rather the way it was delivered, its vehemence, the way it burst forth, the language that was used. Racial dynamics must have contributed to this. Anxiety about voicing a critique of Black leadership in a white-minority space may have “bottled up” this

member's concerns, which built up over time resulting in an explosion. Or when viewed from another perspective: once the critique burst forth, in this particular space devoted to studying racism, it needed to be understood as unfolding in an environment of racialized dynamics. (An analogy would be transference material emerging in a conventional dyadic analysis.)

Such racist elements express the social and generational deposit contained in everyone born into a structurally racist society, though in radically different and asymmetric ways. We can imagine one form of this deposit in the current enactment - a kind of edict that white leadership with its forms, efficiencies, and procedures is effective leadership, while Black leadership is ineffective. The Commission leadership team is all Black, and three of the four members of it are women, including the Chair. Perhaps the style of leadership embodied in the leadership group – including a roll call at the start of meetings, the use of inspirational readings and music, and a more relaxed way of doing things that prioritized relationship over efficiency – was disorienting. Perhaps the style of leadership dislodged/ manifested that part of the social unconscious steeped in the assumptions of white supremacy culture. The enactment was painful for all – for the white Commission member who manifested it as well as for those Commission members who were injured by the angry words. But it also provided the opportunity for the Commission to explore and process what had happened, to use the enactment towards greater understanding, and to reorder ourselves and our priorities. In addition to upset and hurt, there was also appreciation for the white member's brave attempt to bring out into the open what had been latent in both the member and the group.

This work is extremely difficult. The emergence of racist elements is a painful and inconvenient truth. The intensity of the feelings associated with the unprocessed pain of racism,

the noxious realization that racism lives within us, and racism's exposure in the public space of a group, can be overwhelming and a highly unwelcome discovery. In the aftermath of the enactment, the white member in question had a series of conversations with a number of Commission members including the leadership team, and returned the following meeting with a moving written statement that included an apology. There was a range of authentic responses. Some Commissioners wanted more and questioned the sincerity of the apology, while there were also many kind expressions of support, including from BIPOC members. In a particularly moving moment, two Black women welcomed the member to the fold to share the often unbearable pain of racism, a pain which is lived consciously and on a daily basis by so many BIPOC people, and which deeply, but unconsciously also damages white people. It is in the sharing of this pain, touching it and living it together, that the wounds of racism can begin to heal. But it is very difficult to bear this kind of pain. White people (who can elect to ignore racism), often experience the pain of racism for the first time as adults. It is important to acknowledge what expressing one's racist parts might mean for a white person - to dislike the self, to be disliked, to be seen as incompetent or bad, and/or to be cancelled. In analytic terms – it might mean being annihilated.

We note four factors that we believe make it extremely challenging and, frankly, unappealing, for white people to acknowledge and process racism. These factors are likely heightened for white men, who have long been at the top of the hierarchy of power and privilege for most of the history of psychoanalytic organizations, and who now often feel an enormous, disorienting and painful displacement.

First, whites are privileged with structural safety. A senior Black analyst in a high administrative position in her institute recently relayed a story of trying to convey to white

colleagues the anxiety she experiences when her Black husband drives home alone late at night. She worries that any minor incident such as a fender-bender or an insignificant traffic infraction, could result in her husband getting shot. Her white colleagues expressed surprise. They had never considered that risk and recognized that it was because they didn't have to.

Second, most white people have not needed to develop the defenses required to effectively process racial dynamics because of the privilege structural safety confers. So-called "white fragility" is the result of this lack of experience, though the term minimizes the real (and necessary) experience of pain involved in the recognition that one holds racist thoughts and feelings. BIPOC have spent a lifetime developing thick skins. They have had countless experiences of navigating white space, of not being seen or understood, or conversely of being singled out and hypervisible.

Third, white people have an aversion to being viewed as racist. Particularly in the current national dialogue on race and racism, and in a climate of cancel culture, to admit racism can feel like risking expulsion. We can go far to create the conditions for change by acknowledging that racism is a part of the fabric of the current order, though that does not mean it is the whole cloth. And while white people need support for the pain they encounter in the process, this provision of such support should not be placed on BIPOC.

Finally, while racism touches everyone in our society, it has most powerfully been deposited and stored in the white body. By this we mean that most white people have developed ways of moving through the world, of holding themselves, and of relating to social structures that privileges them. Most white people are unconscious of the very different kinds of experiences that BIPOC have in these domains. Many white people are less likely to be aware of the pernicious impact of racist structures and enactments. White bodies can also carry a

representational value of racism for BIPOC, a correlate of how Black bodies can often carry the representational racist values of denigration, primitivity, and abjection. Thus, if you are white (perhaps especially if you are also a man), you come to these discussions and trainings on racism at risk to your usual psychic and material safety. Even the most well-intentioned of us may find the ensuing emotional pressures too much to bear at particular times or in certain developmental or organizational circumstances.

In this enactment at the Commission, the white member in question chose to leave the group despite multiple outreach attempts to keep them involved. The Commission respects the decisions made and continues to lament the loss of the group member and what this group member challenged the group to work with, even if the member had unconsciously brought up the dynamics. Important material symbolic of organizational dynamics had been brought into the group and needed working through together. We retained the fortitude to continue gathering and conversing in an effort to analyze these group processes in the hopes of better understanding those processes, and in that spirit include them in this report.

We bring this example of our experience to affirm that even under the most favorable circumstances – a group of analysts and candidates with significant expertise and experience in the field of racial work, with a unified sense of purpose and deep commitments to diversity, equity, and inclusion – racial enactments happen that are not sufficiently processed. As analysts we know that to do transformative work, it has to get real; we don't just talk about something "over there," we live it in the here and now. Working through our racist histories is no different. Perhaps we have a better chance at mobilizing and metabolizing the disorientation, shame, and deep pain that inevitably comes to the surface in these processes if we anticipate the work is

going to be evocative, painful, and often requiring toil in the unconscious muck, rather than being shocked by the enactments and the work.

A Racial Enactment at the American Psychoanalytic Association

This report would not be complete without a discussion of the crisis that unfolded within the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsA) in the aftermath of a decision taken by the Executive Committee and the President of the Association in February 2023. The leadership of the organization refused to approve the Program Committee's proposal to extend an invitation to Lara Sheehi to present at a proposed clinical panel at the June 2023 APsA annual meeting. Given the depth of the crisis, The Holmes Commission felt compelled to break with its previous stance of not commenting publicly on organizational matters and issued two communications directly to the membership via the APsA listserv. These communications are presented in full in Appendix K to this report.

We will not attempt to describe the complicated process that ensued and that continues to unfold as this report is published, which includes complex issues of governance, authority, and transparency. We concede that the full picture of the enactment is not yet manifest. Our task is to focus specifically on the question of racism, and more specifically to advance our collective investigation of and creative thinking about what kind of leadership is necessary for promoting greater diversity, equity, and inclusion.

We view the crisis at APsA as a racial enactment, and one that should rightly propel the organization into a period of deep reflection. Attempts to reduce the crisis to a simple matter of governance were part of the enactment to the extent that these attempts disavowed the racialized component of what was unfolding. As a collective body, The Holmes Commission was aware of many BIPOC and white members who felt alienated, angry, hurt, and dismissed by the callous

response of APsA's leadership to their protest and pain. As the crisis unfolded, many on the APsA listserv commented on the divisiveness and the lack of understanding between groups having divergent views of what was transpiring. The fact that people were so divided and struggled to understand the perspective of the "other" sides is indicative of the massive cultural differences conditioning the responses to the situation.

White leadership refused to acknowledge the protest and the pain of groups of BIPOC members, "explaining" that their assessment of the situation was incorrect: there was no racial component to what was happening; that it was only a matter of governance; and that the APsA leadership had the authority to make decrees, disband a committee, and bar a speaker. APsA leadership disavowed the reality of its members. The APsA leadership eventually issued a statement acknowledging some of their mistakes and issued an apology to Lara Sheehi. Among the most egregious of the mistakes made, especially for a psychoanalytic organization, were a refusal to acknowledge the manifestation of structural racism as an essential part of the enactment and the disavowal of the emotional experience of many BIPOC members. The disavowal inflamed the situation, rather than providing opportunity for collective learning and working through. And this is exactly what many BIPOC candidates and faculty reported in the Commission survey. When racial enactments took place, and when BIPOC expressed pain or protest, their concerns were dismissed, the pain disavowed, and organizational defensiveness took the place of receptivity, understanding, and working through.

When Bion spoke of catastrophic change, he meant that the old containers no longer were up to the task of containing. This is a catastrophe in itself, requiring emotional labor and imaginative work for the construction of new containers. However, a much bigger catastrophe is the refusal to recognize the need for new containers and instead double-down on preserving the

inadequate old containers. We are in a period of catastrophic change in organizational psychoanalysis regarding race and racism. It behooves us as a discipline to acknowledge this change and put our energies into the imaginative work of creating new forms that are truly inclusive of a diversity of people and points of view and that welcome the insights and substantial contributions of BIPOC members, even and especially when these perspectives diverge from business as usual.

What kind of leadership is needed to help us achieve these laudable goals? The question itself may be as important as any preliminary answers. We do not fully know, but we can keep learning from our experience. We can start by acknowledging when leadership is not up to the task of helping the group work through enactments of structural racism. Ideally, this acknowledgement starts with the leaders themselves. When people are driven to either resigning from the organization or calling for the resignation of the leadership, we take this as a sign of inadequate containment either jeopardizing the healthy continuation of the existing organization or the beginning of a schism that will lead to a cataclysmic change, including the possible dissolution of the organization. Organizational psychoanalysis is almost exclusively white-led, and the ability to work through racial enactments may be a prerequisite for effective BIPOC leadership. Otherwise BIPOC leadership is left carrying the psychic burdens of structural racism.

We wonder what might have transpired if the APsA President and President-Elect had acknowledged the racial enactment and taken seriously their responsibility to help the organization work through that enactment, beginning with the acknowledgment of the pain of many BIPOC members and the legitimacy of their protest and complaint. For many organizations with white leadership, working through a racial enactment in which white leadership takes responsibility for fostering a healing process, acknowledges the pain of BIPOC

people as a reality, truly listens to BIPOC concerns and critiques, and moves towards remedial action may be steps towards true diversity, equity, and inclusion. Leadership would seize the moment of a racial enactment as a valuable opportunity for growth, instead of a perceived attack. This is the opportunity that was tragically missed in the recent racial enactment at APsA. But it is one we can still learn from if we keep working on racial enactments together.

Four Recommendations

We offer four major recommendations to deal with the ubiquitous problem of enactments. The recommendations are meant as starting points to stimulate further thinking. We focus on how to achieve cultural change in psychoanalytic organizations. Each psychoanalytic organization must innovate interventions adapted to its particular setting and be creative about what works best for the unique configuration of its members. We begin with the broadest, most abstract recommendations and work toward the more specific, but this order is conceptual, not sequential. Like change in clinical psychoanalysis, analytic reflection to promote cultural change in an organization is messy, layered, non-linear, and dynamic. It takes time and perseverance. We know a great deal about these processes from our clinical work. We have a rich collection of useful skills to draw on such as active listening, framing, negative capability, pacing, containment, holding, and repairing. These are incredibly useful if we learn how to adapt them to the level of the group.

Recommendation 1. Establish Vibrant Working Groups and Collective Frameworks for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Work While Fostering a Strong Matrix of Interpersonal Connections

Given the universality of racialized enactments, it is critical to establish a solid framework for the hard work which leads to greater diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). Such a

framework is built on a collectively shared vision that prioritizes DEI aims and acknowledges intersectionality. Many organizations develop a written vision statement specifying collective DEI aims and makes explicit their intent to pursue those aims. The vision statement itself is more than a document. It is a tool to initiate various processes throughout the organization. The crafting of a DEI statement requires discussion and debate throughout the organization by leadership groups, committees, members, and governance bodies, so that by the time the statement is formally adopted there is a wide sense of agreement, acceptance, and support by the organization at large. The process and the ensuing support are desired outcomes as much as the document itself. Part of developing a vision of diversity, equity, and inclusion and the corresponding strategy for how to enact that vision requires in-depth assessment of what has been problematic. We hope The Holmes Commission study results provide a starting point for assessments at the local level. As part of the assessment strategy, we recommend that institutes and organizations host a series of town halls (rather than a single event) to discuss the findings of the Commission report and the applicability of those findings to the local institute or the organization.

The establishment of such a comprehensive framework typically requires consultation. Consultants with sensitivity and expertise in these matters – containment, group process, racism, diversity, equity, and inclusion – should be a cornerstone of the developmental process. It takes time to develop and promote the transformations that will lead to a racially equitable culture in psychoanalysis. It should be expected that consultations will be required over the course of at least several years; the arc required to help heal racism is long. We recognize that personal transformation through psychoanalysis is a long process; we should expect no less for the transformative processes of organizations. Taking the long view helps mitigate demoralization

and contextualize racial enactments as part of a broader picture. We recommend that the American Psychoanalytic Association, in concert with other organizations and networks, develop resource lists of consultants with DEI expertise and experience working with psychoanalytic organizations.

Consultation, assessment, and the development of a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion vision statement are key steps in establishing a framework that recognizes the universality of enactments and begins to develop the skills to work with them more fruitfully. If the group anticipates enactments rather than being shocked by them, it is more likely the group will find ways to use these painful experiences for repair rather than further racial (re)traumatization. The inevitable enactment has the potential to become symbolic, a symptom with meaning, and an opportunity for learning about the group's dynamics and underlying social unconscious. Rather than personalizing the breach or injury and pinning it on an individual, the group can come to understand how racism is a cultural norm. Pernicious normative values are often invisible, so the enactment can be welcomed, with a kind of somber respect, as a manifestation of previously unconscious forces that now are visible and amenable to repair. In order to engage in the repair, we must remember that the data from the study indicate that often we quickly render the enactment invisible again, disappeared, or addressed only superficially.

Perhaps the most significant and time-consuming, but most generative, effort is that of developing a culture that sees enactments as opportunities for learning, growing, and healing. It is a laudable achievement for any organization. It takes considerable time and dedication to bring the organization to this level of collective intentionality and to develop the skills necessary to work at the level of the group. Without this overarching framework, enactments become sites of

(re)traumatization that promote defensiveness and reactivity, inflaming racism rather than moving to heal it.

Organizations that foster a fabric of personal connections among their members are at a considerable advantage. Working through racial trauma and structural racism depends on harnessing the power of difference in a group in a creative and healing way. We occupy different “positionalities,” particular locations in the social order shaped by our histories, including such dimensions as racial identity, ethnicity, regional and national provenance, religion, language, gender, sexuality, physical (dis)abilities, and so forth. Beyond our personal and family histories, we take up a host of roles in an organization and more generally in society. The positions we occupy organize, color, and determine our view of the world and how we perceive and understand events.

When people in an organization have a sense of where others are “coming from,” they have a greater chance of becoming more intelligible to each other, developing deep empathy and radical acceptance, and working collaboratively. Organizational groups that develop this kind of robust working alliance — based on personal connection and understanding, and on a shared intention to work on healing racial trauma — are more able to use the diversity of positions within them as powerful tools for moving beyond the narrow vision of a personal position to the ways that larger group forces are at play.

Structural racism means that the social structures and systems we live within have unconscious histories of racism built into them. This is analogous to the individual plane, in which early attachments to primary objects shape who we become in unconscious ways. But here we are thinking on the level of groups, organizations, and culture. To work through racial enactments requires a group effort, because no one individual can see the totality of the group.

Groups speak through us, and we need each other to help liberate us from the pernicious collective histories of racism which operate unconsciously. Explicitly fostering this kind of culture in an organization is difficult but necessary and fruitful work.

Recommendation 2. Develop and Support Effective Leadership – Working to Heal Racism Requires Ongoing Support and Training for Those Leading the Efforts

Establishing a framework for combating racism and promoting cultural change requires strong and effective leadership. Leadership in psychoanalytic organizations is hard enough as it is, requiring multifaceted skills that extend well beyond what most analysts receive in training. As a discipline, we are now embarking on adding the additional skill of addressing racism, which requires support and training.

Leaders in psychoanalytic organizations must: help provide containment for the difficulty of raced-based work; help develop, communicate, and explain the frames of reference for the work; develop an ethic of responsibility in the group or community, so when there is a racial enactment, accountability can be held in a growth promoting way; and bring investigations of racial enactments to completion. If leaders are to promote a vibrant learning environment, they themselves must be ready to learn. This requires a measure of humility that runs counter to the attitude of being the expert, “already trained,” and established analyst.

Beyond overall consultation to the organization as we noted above (to establish a comprehensive framework for addressing diversity, equity, and inclusion), we recommend specific consultation for leadership. A number of institutes and organizations have established race working groups or diversity committees; we strongly recommend these working groups obtain consultation to develop their leadership skills.

We recommend that the American Psychoanalytic Association, in concert with other psychoanalytic organizations, develop leadership workshops and seminars with established and highly experienced consultants in the psychoanalytic community (for example, Kimberlyn Leary and Kathleen Pogue White). The goal of these workshops – which could be held bi-annually at APsA national meetings — would be to develop leadership capacity by building practical skills as well as intellectual understanding. Such workshops would also develop a network of DEI leaders in psychoanalysis who could turn to each other for support and to share experiences and resources.

DEI leaders should be encouraged to attend group relations conferences and to seek group relations consults to help organizational communities work through the racist effects of hierarchy, power structures, and cultural constraints particular to psychoanalysis. We know of at least one institute which has had a series of Tavistock-style group relations conferences tackling questions of racism. These events have been painful at times, but over the years the community has developed greater openness in speaking about race and racism.

Recommendation 3. Make Group Process a Formal Part of Psychoanalytic Education

The famous Eitingon model of psychoanalytic training is tripartite, comprising personal analysis, supervision of clinical cases, and didactic work. We recommend expanding this to include a fourth component: group process. Because psychoanalytic praxis is so steeped in individualist premises, group dynamics and group process have largely been ignored by psychoanalytic organizations. This is an enormous impediment for doing race work.

Organizations must learn to work in and with groups, recognizing what individual members are holding for the larger group. This allows a deeper understanding of the social unconscious which permeates organizations in general, and racism in particular.

More and more institutes are taking up the importance of group process as part of training. Some require a group process component as part of the curriculum and others offer training experiences for faculty. More information about these efforts could be gathered, assessed, and curated with particular attention to the effect of group work on questions of race and racism. Adding group process as a fourth component of training is a profound investment in cultural change for psychoanalysis. The more candidates are required to have process group experience and to learn about analytic group theory, the more future analysts will have a deeper understanding of the relationship between group life and the individual. We believe such work is crucial for developing a deeper understanding of the social unconscious determinants of racism in collective and organizational life.

Recommendation 4. Provide Resources for Curriculum Revision and Creative Pedagogy

Finally, we recommend a fundamental revision of the curriculum for psychoanalytic training with an emphasis on diversity, equity, inclusion, and intersectionality. Many institutes are already planning how to revise the curriculum in order to meet the needs outlined in this report. The study makes clear that there is wide support among respondents for such revisions. In conjunction with the leadership workshops recommended above, the American Psychoanalytic Association and its affiliates could actively promote and disseminate existing resources, bibliographies, and model curricula. There is no need to duplicate work; a number of excellent resources are already available which could be curated and made accessible on the APsA website.

Curriculum revision is not enough, however. Many faculty members who have enormous experience and expertise in psychoanalytic theory and practice have become intimidated, overwhelmed, or simply reluctant to teach in the current environment in which candidates

demand more emphasis on race, anti-racism, diversity, equity, inclusion, and intersectionality. These faculty members need support. We recommend more trainings on pedagogy at APsA national meetings. Teaching that includes race, anti-racism, diversity, and intersectionality is not simply a matter of content (selecting papers by BIPOC authors for example); it is also a process question. How are faculty to respond when candidates demand certain canonical authors be canceled or when a racial enactment unfolds in the classroom? Workshops that address how to manage these matters allow an exchange of ideas and actual experiences with other faculty.

Summary of Recommendations

The above four recommendations have in common the aim of increasing *capacity* within psychoanalytic organizations to deal with racial enactments more productively. The recommendations are based on psychoanalytic principles: enhancing and making more explicit the necessary framing; developing the benevolent authority that can help construct adequate safety and useful intervention; promoting grounding by educating a new generation of analysts in group work; and charging the learning environment with the vibrancy of analytic curiosity and growth. These are wide-reaching systemic recommendations that, like all analytic work, will need to be brought to life in the here-and-now of unique settings.

REFERENCES

- Holmes, D.E. (2016). Culturally imposed trauma: The sleeping dog has awakened. Will psychoanalysis take heed? *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 26(6), pp. 641-654.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10481885.2016.1235454>
- Holmes, D. E., Hart, A., Powell, D. R., Stoute, B. J. (2023). The Holmes Commission's journey toward racial equality in American psychoanalysis: Reflection and hope. *The American*

Psychoanalyst, 57(1), pp. 1-7. https://apsa.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/74728_TAP-Winter-2023_web.pdf

Chapter 8

The Consultation-Liaison Network

What I know is that an inchoate desire for a future other than the one that seems to be forming our days brings me to a seat around any table to lean forward, to hear, to respond, to await response from any other.

— Claudia Rankine, *Just Us: An American Conversation*

The aims and vision of the Commission extend beyond performing a study with the singular purpose of describing the current picture of racism in psychoanalysis. As important as this is, the Commission also aims to catalyze productive change. Changing the picture of what psychoanalysis looks like now to one of greater equity, diversity, and inclusion will take time, organization, and labor — and that work will need to be done by all of us in psychoanalysis. The Commission seeks to help galvanize that change in a way consistent with the principles and methods of psychoanalysis.

The idea for what we have come to call the Consultation-Liaison Network arose organically from our primary task of studying racism in American psychoanalysis. In order to disseminate the initial study instrument as widely as possible, the Commission developed a list of what we then called Ambassadors. These Ambassadors were charged with raising awareness about the study, aiding with distribution, and encouraging participation. When we entered the second stage of the study, the qualitative small group interviews, we recruited a second group: Advanced Candidates who would be trained to conduct groups with candidates; some of them had also already been Ambassadors. These two groups comprised a network of individuals who obviously resonated with aims and ideals of the Commission.

An idea began to blossom in our discussions about how important it is to support the many individuals who are already doing work on anti-racism in organizational psychoanalysis,

and how powerful it would be to foster a vibrant network of such individuals. The Ambassadors and Advanced Candidates were an obvious beginning of such a network, having demonstrated their interest and commitment to the project of the study. As the study was distributed, interest was generated throughout the field, and some Ambassadors also came to the project to find mutual support and solidarity across organizational boundaries. Now a call will be put out for others to join in.

Thoughtful discussions in the Commission meetings led to a change in the name for the group. Wishing to avoid the nationalistic and potentially proselytizing overtones of the term Ambassador, over time we came to the name Consultation-Liaison Network (C-LN) (see Appendix J). We hoped the network could come to serve an informal consultative function, both between members of the network and across the organization in which we all worked. And we strongly endorsed the idea of liaison work as a linking function that would comprise the working mesh of the Network.

The idea of the C-LN was well received in presentations made at American Psychoanalytic Association (APsA) meetings. An organizing group of interested Commissioners was formed to develop the idea further. The immediate plan of this group is to send out invitations through various channels to recruit members to the network. We hope to organize a preliminary gathering by video chat in Fall 2023, and to convene an in-person meeting at the APsA Winter 2024 national meeting in New York City and/or the Spring Meeting of Division 39 in Washington, D.C. But the wider hope is that C-LN meetings and potentially satellite networks might spring up in all sorts of analytic organizations and gathering spaces. The metaphor of the dandelion is fitting here: we aim first to gather and then widely scatter the seeds of change with

hopes and aspirations for a transformed psychoanalytic landscape. (We are grateful to adrienne maree brown who has used this metaphor in her 2017 work on Emergent Strategy.)

In conversations and discussion by this organizing group, important ideas surfaced about the ethical stance, aims, and organization of the proposed Network. We summarize them here:

- We aim to help create a network of people, the Consultation-Liaison Network, who can generate material and virtual groups and spaces to provide nurturance, support, containment for those involved in Diversity Equity Inclusion Accessibility (DEIA) work.
- We imagine a network with a dual focus: facing both “internally” (to organizational psychoanalysis and institutes) and “externally” to the wider world.
- We imagine the network working in an “interstitial” space — in part linked to various organizations (for example APsA, American Psychological Association-Division 39, Confederation of Independent Psychoanalytic Societies, the Psychoanalytic Consortium) but not bound by them, actively welcoming and inclusive of those who may not have organizational affiliations, operating in the “between” spaces of organizations.
- We see this network as a place of restoration and support: one that would amplify the energies of those doing this work in a synergistic way, rather than becoming overly focused on task and to-do in a way that becomes taxing and depleting: relationships over tasks.
- We envision an autonomous, independent network, not “owned and operated” by APsA or any one psychoanalytic organization — as such, we see the role of the organizing group to help provide the scaffolding and structure that launches this network, not as its overseers or leaders.

- We feel this network should be “counter-cultural” in its process and makeup — we seek the creation of space with strong BIPOC and other diverse presences, a non-white-dominant space, which fosters connection and allows non-conventional ways of working. We are interested in the idea of a democratic space and collective -- one which does not function under dominating hierarchies of traditional power.

REFERENCES

maree, b. a. (2017). Emergent strategy: Shaping change, changing worlds. AK Press.

Chapter 9

Final Recommendations: What to Do Now?

Peace is not the absence of war
It is the absence of the rules of war and
The threats of war and the preparation for war
Peace is not the absence of war

— Gil Scott-Heron, Work for Peace

In this chapter, The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality presents our recommendations for moving American psychoanalysis into a racially equitable future. These recommendations emanate directly from the in-depth study of race and racism in psychoanalysis that we have just reported. These recommendations are based on the findings of our large-scale survey, our extensive small group interviews, our aggregation of field data,²⁰ and the Commission’s own, process-oriented, self-study. First and foremost, our recommendations represent a collection of the calls for change we have heard in response to our asking a diverse array of psychoanalysts and other psychoanalytically interested students, candidates, and practitioners, to tell us what is going on regarding race and racism in psychoanalytic sessions, supervisions, classes, administrative meetings, training settings, and in professional membership organizations, including in their leadership meetings, on the pages of their journals, and on their listservs.

To make these recommendations useful, they are presented as a set of general guidelines, ideas, and strategies, rather than as a specific list of directives. In offering these, we note that all recommendations for fighting against the destructive and oppressive forces of racism, and

²⁰ Field data, defined previously in this report, consists of diverse and various race-related experiences, both qualitative and quantitative, discussed, noted, recorded, and collected by the members of The Holmes Commission.

promoting equality and inclusion in all spheres of the psychoanalytic enterprise will only be of value if they are implemented with awareness of and sensitivity to the *particular contexts* where change is being sought. This means that, at least to a certain extent, previously existing structures and traditions must simultaneously be *respected* and *questioned*. Each aspect of organized and practiced psychoanalysis bears the signs and the scars of what has come before, and much of what is borne is derived from white supremacy, heterosexism, classism, Western hegemony, gender binary-ism, elitism, capitalism, and able-ism.²¹ Arguably, every aspect of the psychoanalysis that we know today bears the marks of racism, oppression, and inequality to one degree or another. We must repeatedly remind ourselves that all aspects of our psychoanalytic culture, including our groups, centers, and larger organizations, are imbued with the social contexts which bore them. This does not mean that we should dispense with all, but it does mean that we must have the courage to boldly committing to revisioning, revising, reorganizing, and reconstructing this alive, ever-evolving body of thought that we call psychoanalysis.

Thus, as an orientation to these recommendations, we might ought to conceive of ourselves as seeking some sort of balance, some sort of dialectical tension, between retaining aspects of our institutions and organizations that are wise and valuable, and revising those that should be dismantled because of their oppressive, inequality-perpetuating tendencies. We must collectively embark on a psychoanalytic journey involving pursuit of both preservation and innovation, conservation and progression, retention and loss, always remembering that psychoanalysis is more fruitfully thought of as a living, evolving, expanding entity than a fully formed set of ideas to be fetishized or worshipped.

²¹ This is, by no means, an exhaustive list of the relevant *-isms* that have influenced and defined psychoanalysis.

Levels of implementation: individual, dyadic, group, institute (or training center), professional organization

The set of recommendations that follows is organized in accordance with the preceding chapters. In each case, where appropriate, we have tried to formulate recommendations to address the various levels of potential intervention: individual, dyadic, group, institute or training center, and professional organization. This way of thinking about our recommendations is predicated on the idea that each of these levels of intervention are interdependent; no single level of intervention is likely to have its fullest impact in isolation. Changes in personal sensibility and practice must manifest themselves in dyadic interaction and in the context of groups, institutes, and psychoanalytic professional organizations. Micro levels matter as much as macro levels. Despite the various structures of psychoanalytic organizational power and hierarchy, psychoanalytic work cannot be vibrant if a compliance-based remedy is sought. And psychoanalysis, a discipline intended to be as necessarily complex as the problems of being human that it is trying to address, will resist being institutionally mandated in an authoritarian manner.

Recommendations: Understanding and Addressing Racism

Making contact, engaging in dialogue, reading (independently and in groups), engaging in research (including case studies), and individual, dyadic, group, and institutional self-study must all increase if psychoanalysis, as a discipline, is to make headway in moving beyond white supremacy and bigotry. Our findings amply demonstrate that most people working in the psychoanalytic domain do not feel adequately prepared to describe, let alone address, issues of

race and racism. This is the case despite the current groundswell of attention to issues of race and racism permeating contemporary professional disciplines.

The first conceptual shift that we all must make is that of recognizing that issues of race and racism are central to what an enriched, self-reflective psychoanalysis would be. Rather than viewing attention to racism as an add-on, psychoanalysts must expand their perspective in the direction of viewing the incorporation of the domain of “the social” as an inherent part of psychoanalytic inquiry. It is not a matter of focusing on the psyche *or* the social. Rather, we must come to accept that the psyche is incomprehensible without being considered in its interpersonal, relational, social context. This is the case, even as we continue to acknowledge what psychoanalysis always has: that being human involves many aspects that are profoundly private, personal, and manifestly innate. The more our psychoanalytic notions of innateness are interrogated though, the more we learn that presumed innateness can be a hiding place for those aspects of the social context that are part of the relational legacy of being human beings, always existing in the context of interpersonal and, more broadly, social relationships. While it is the case that some branches of the psychoanalytic family tree have been more attentive than others to social phenomena as powerful aspects of both conscious and unconscious mental life, the vast majority of contemporary psychoanalytic thinkers view attention to the social in general, and race, in particular, as an enrichment of psychoanalysis rather than a departure from its central tenets. Ultimately, the psyche and the social are inextricably linked, indeed inseparable; we live in our cultures, and our cultures live within us, both consciously and, crucially, unconsciously.

Diversity trainings and workshops *are not enough* to address the kind of ongoing attention to issues of race and racism that is necessary for real, field-wide evolution and change. In the training of candidates, a single race- or diversity-related course is not enough to create a

broader institutional cultural shift. Ongoing, long-term study groups or seminars on race and psychoanalysis are one emergent way that psychoanalytic training centers have begun to tackle these issues, both for students and faculty. Even in the absence of resident experts, psychoanalytic groups and organizations have found that there is much to be learned in the context of settings that allow for both scholarly and personal explorations of issues related to race and racism.

The problem with authority-based legislation of anti-racist change notwithstanding, there is a strong argument to be made for a *top-down prioritization* of issues of race and racism within psychoanalytic settings. If those in positions of leadership and power do not realize the importance of addressing racism in psychoanalysis, it will be difficult for their organizational cultures to prioritize this work and to make movements towards racial equality. Leadership willing to prioritize attention to unconscious aspects of structural racism should be sought, because the leaders have the power to set the tone for the organization.

While a racially (and otherwise) diverse leadership represents one strategy for sensing the presence of discriminatory culture and practice, it is not the only way that such sensitivity and engagement can be pursued. There is no particular racial background that will guarantee the ability to attend to and engage issues of race and racism. Organizations must prioritize leaders willing to attend to these issues and must also substantively support those leaders in their initiatives.

Development of (preferably codified) systems for ensuring accountability of leaders in psychoanalytic organizations is recommended. Given the complex, multifaceted, and conflict-filled nature of working to address structural racism and inequality, everyone involved will likely have their own unconscious *resistances* to the work. Systems designed to track initiatives and

their outcomes are indispensable. It should be emphasized that organizational accountability need not be regarded as punitive in nature. Leaders engaged in fighting racism are likely to be encouraged by the positive contingencies of their organization's accountability tracking systems.

Finally, regarding understanding racism in psychoanalytic organizations, those working to address problems of racial and other inequalities that are likely to arise, need explicit *tools* in the form of strategies, procedures, and designated *roles* in order to handle things optimally. Many centers are using ombudspersons for addressing organizational challenges of all kinds, including those related to racism, that are likely to arise. Other organizations have people or committees dedicated to issues of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI).

Recommendations: Recruitment, Admissions, Progression and Procedures, Mentorship, and Leadership

While the recommendations in this category mostly pertain to the context of psychoanalytic training centers, they also have more general implications for both university settings and mental health care settings. This collection of considerations concerns questions of who is brought into the psychoanalytic “fold,” who is encouraged to progress, and who is mentored and chosen to lead. Each of these considerations is crucial to the evolution of psychoanalytic centers that seek more equitable, vibrant, diversely enriched futures.

Psychoanalytic organizations must be attentive to the direct and indirect *signals* they send out regarding who is welcome and wanted, and who is not. Most recruitment for psychoanalytic training is by “word-of-mouth” and this leads to significant limitations regarding whose “ears” are spoken to. To the extent that such word-of-mouth communication is an inherent tool for those who are potentially interested in pursuing psychoanalytic training, attention must be paid to

reaching beyond the usual spreaders of the word. It is particularly important for institute leadership to recruit BIPOC potential applicants as well as a group of potential applicants with diverse races, genders, sexual orientations, ages, religions, ethnicities, cultures, ability statuses, and socioeconomic status. This may mean not just expanding who spreads the word, but how the word is spread. Websites and social media are becoming increasingly significant in connecting in inviting ways with the next generations of psychoanalytic candidates and psychoanalytic psychotherapy trainees. All efforts must be approached and then evaluated through the lens of prioritizing BIPOC recruitment as well as other diversities, equity, and inclusion.

Regarding evaluation of applicants and admissions, openness and transparency represent key factors in helping those who do not feel as if they are “insiders” to at least gain confidence that their applications will be given fair and attentive evaluation. Whenever possible, BIPOC and other diverse admission and recruitment team members should be developed, and the use of BIPOC and other diverse mentors within the training program should be implemented and drawn on for both recruitment and progression throughout the training process.

Developing and prominently displaying on the institute’s website its policies and procedures on diversity, equity, and inclusion, as is done by other organizations, gives transparency on how racist incidents are addressed. Prospective applicants who see that an institute is trying to be systematically thoughtful about how they handle diversity and equity, including racial incidents, are more likely to feel implicitly welcomed into the institute’s culture.

Institutes and training centers are encouraged to *consider each aspect of their recruitment, progression, and post-graduation structures, with a particular focus on how BIPOC people are affected and potentially hindered by the way things are currently being done.*

Institutes and training centers must also consider how the structures, policies, and procedures

they have in place are actually implemented. To these ends, such centers should create contexts for faculty, administrators, and candidates to focus on and better understand the experience of BIPOC candidates and analysts and the patients with whom they work. The process of reflecting on how things are done and the consequences of policies and procedures should be an ongoing, rather than static, process.

Psychoanalytic training involves relationships that have qualities of mentoring. While often it is the case that mentor-mentee relationships emerge spontaneously, institutes seeking affirmative racial equality must deliberately attend to the matter of mentoring, with particular attention to the development of BIPOC and BIPOC-allied mentors. Mentoring relationships are too important to be left to flourish on their own. Mentors and mentees, especially those from BIPOC backgrounds, must be deliberately encouraged, and their relationships honored and supported.

Socioeconomic factors have impact on who pursues psychoanalytic training and on who can reasonably complete that training. While it is vitally important not to conflate BIPOC status and socioeconomic challenge, it is also the case that, in the context of the legacy of slavery and racial oppression, a disproportionate number of BIPOC people are subject to financial obstacles to pursuing and completing psychoanalytic training. Institute administrators, faculty members, supervisors, mentors, board members, and others in leadership positions should be vigilantly attentive to the ways in which socioeconomic challenges play a role in the lives of all candidates. Institutes must prioritize fundraising activities designed to encourage a socioeconomically and, also, racially diverse student body.

The Holmes Commission observes that there are *differing views* on the extensive training requirements associated with becoming a psychoanalyst and whether or not these requirements

should be reduced or modified in any way in order to make the pursuit of psychoanalytic training more viable for a more diverse array of prospective candidates. Questions related to professional standards are not simple and it is hard to make a unilateral recommendation regarding the modification of standards as a method of increasing diversity and equality in psychoanalysis. Many of these issues are discussed in more detail throughout this Commission report.

One clear recommendation though, regarding the matter of standards and requirements, is that each institution should aim to be as thoughtful as possible regarding the purpose of the requirements that they have, many of which have been passed down across multiple generations of psychoanalytic candidates and faculty. Requirements that have strong elements of being rites of passage are to be particularly scrutinized because they are likely to disproportionately effect those who are not part of the in-group. Rites of passage are less likely to have been transparently and purposefully conceived as useful pedagogical tools for providing the optimal training of thoughtful, diverse, and resourceful psychoanalysts.

Recommendations: Curriculum, Racism as an Analytic Lens, and Supervision

For psychoanalytic practitioners willing to read, think, learn, and revise, the psychoanalytic cannon is perpetually expanding, as the branches of the psychoanalytic family tree continue to sprout and grow. The addition of attention to issues of race and racism, a subset of what has been referred to as “the social,” is to be viewed as an aspect of psychoanalysis’ expansion and growth, rather than as an obligatory add-on forced on “traditional” psychoanalysis by the present socio-historical moment. As mainstream psychoanalysis has tended to marginalize attention to racial issues, institutes and training centers are now called upon to reverse such marginalization. Drawing on literature from both within and outside of psychoanalysis, race and racism, and also other forms of discrimination and oppression, need to occupy a central role in

psychoanalytic curricula, supervision, and organizational self-reflective practice. These issues should be broadly integrated into the psychoanalytic curriculum, and all aspects of psychoanalytic training.

Psychoanalytic faculty, supervisors, and administrators must be encouraged and supported in their efforts to explore and learn about the role of race in all psychoanalytic treatments, not just those involving individuals who tend to be seen as “other.” Supervisors need to be engaged in an ongoing manner with becoming open to and conversant in what are ubiquitous racial matters. Psychoanalytic faculty need be attentive to racial dynamics in their classes and encouraged to develop their abilities to raise discussions of racial issues in the context of their classes’ ever-emergent learning processes.

In the service of increasing receptivity to and facility with discussing issues of race, supervisors and faculty should be given multiple opportunities to process their own racial attitudes and beliefs, and those that are implicit in the cultures and structures of the organization of which they are a part. There should be increased attention to relevant literatures on race and racialization, racism, and racial trauma. A focus on the effects of colonialism and migration, and anti-colonial processes is also desirable.

While the culture and tradition of a psychoanalytic institute is an important part of its identity and cohesion, cultures and traditions are also vehicles for the perpetuation of traditions of white supremacy and exclusionary practice that must be recognized, thoroughly evaluated, and changed. Whenever possible, additive rather than subtractive changes to institute culture are preferred. Yet there are times when institutes may have to consider losing some cultural traditions to which members are attached. Whenever possible, such prospective changes should

be discussed as fully as possible, facilitated by leadership that is committed to equity, inclusion, non-discrimination, and free speech coupled with open listening.

Recommendations: The Experience of Race on the Couch

While there is limited available data from which to draw recommendations regarding the matter of attention to race and racism in the context of training/personal analysis, some basic truths are worth stating. First, there are far too few BIPOC analysts available as choices for both BIPOC and white candidates alike. Accordingly, institutes and training centers, while recognizing that this deficit cannot be corrected overnight, should make every effort to develop and support experienced BIPOC psychoanalysts who can be available to help analyze the next generation of psychoanalysts.

A second observation is that in most analyses race is explicitly discussed too infrequently to the detriment of all involved, including both BIPOC and white analysts-in-training. There is an extensive and expanding literature on the role of race and racism in the psychoanalytic process and how race and systemic racism might be productively explored. All those responsible for psychoanalyzing candidates should be familiar with this literature, whether they personally analyze BIPOC candidates or not.

There is a diversity of views regarding experience requirements of those who would serve as training analysts or personal analysts. Some have persuasively argued that training analysts, regardless of their own racial backgrounds, should have experience analyzing a racially diverse set of analysands. Others have contended that making such a racial diversity of previously treated cases would essentialize race as a variable that one *must* have had experience in in order to be effective. It will have to suffice to say, for now, that analysts should be

encouraged to gain a diversity of analytic experience, including and especially with people of different racial backgrounds than their own, and that they should be willing to make financial sacrifices in order to achieve such experience when necessary.

Recommendations: Enactments

The first recommendation regarding racial enactments is that their ubiquity be realized, and their inevitability be presumed. Having a psychoanalytic perspective means accepting the pervasiveness of unconsciousness, both in oneself, in others, and in groups and organizations. Viewing the basis for such unconsciousness as originating from either *repressive* or *dissociative* defenses matters little in comparison to the realization that being human means never not being subject to vast unconsciousness. Since unconscious racism and a vast array of other discriminatory "isms" are regularly manifest in the form of co-operations that we call enactments, struggling to transcend unconscious racism inherently involves aspiring to a stance of humility, self-reflectiveness, and receptive openness. Such humility and openness are especially needed when grievances and accusations are likely to trigger experiences of shame. It is in such moments that it can be most difficult to be open to the possibility that unconscious and structural racist dynamics are involved.

There are problems associated with individual, groups, and organization *certainties*. Realizing that, to a great extent, we do not know ourselves, individuals, groups, and organizations must repeatedly reach for the unknown aspects of themselves that might be playing out, including those that feel the most ego-dystonic or foreign. All may have good intentions, values, beliefs, and morals. Yet we are subject to the shifts of interpersonal context, including on levels of the dyadic, group, and organizational. Thus, openness to personal unknown-ness is perpetually tested, and repeated renewal of commitment to considering the emergence of

racialized enactment is required. Individuals, groups, and organizations, including the most noble and virtuous, are subject to the same regressive, polarized forces as those individuals, groups, and organizations that are the most destructive, polarized, and oppressive. The difference between such constructive versus destructive individuals, groups, and organizations (with their associated leaders and structures) is the willingness to consider and accept unawareness and psychological blindness as ordinary occurrences that are to be noticed and worked through rather than simply avoided. In no instance is it the case that virtuous qualities make us immune to discovering that we are, in any given instance, unaware, blind, flawed, and mistaken. Certainty about what one is really up to, about one's motivations, or the other's motivations, is almost always a sign of the presence of defensive, anxiety- or trauma-based, dissociative aspects of the psychological position that one is occupying.

The solutions to structural racism require institutional courage and often involve anxieties about destruction and loss, which must be countered by sensitively and thoughtfully conceived attempts at revising structure. This calls for strength and resolve and should be geared toward the specific institution and its culture. Remedies to structural reform that take the form of authoritarian cultural re-education programs are ineffective. Institutions seeking change (even as they still partly seek status quo stability) would best be treated analogously to individuals seeking psychoanalytic treatment. Their individual concerns, traumas, fears, and defenses must be respected throughout the process of considering and implementing change.

There are, certainly though, ambiguities about retaining institutional identity while at the same time moving institutions in the direction of non-discrimination and equity. Some aspects of institutional identity may not be simply, structurally racist in and of themselves, yet institutional identities may be intertwined or intersect with aspects of structural racism that will need to give

way to change. Such ambiguities must be well explored for institutional changes to have the best chance of leading to positive outcomes.

Resistances to such exploration and its associated, necessary dialogue, will rarely be in the service of moving institutions toward morality, social justice, equality, and democracy. Any obstruction of dialogue, including attempts to subvert dialogue in the form of attacking, destructive claims about the other, should be regarded as a common enemy for all involved, even as practitioners of such subversion may see themselves as protecting things that need protection. None of us are immune to becoming involved in enactments. As social beings, we are always prone to slip into ways of being that replicate the very problems we are consciously trying not to replicate, and that we may even be trying to solve. Only if we are prepared to notice or be receptive to the noticing of others, will we be able to learn from our own replications when we are in them and hopefully change course.

The notion of enactment, originating as a conceptual tool for understanding personal behavior and analytic dyadic interaction, has been expanded for use in analyzing a broad range of human interactional phenomena, including group and organizational behavior. Some have argued that the psychoanalytic concept of enactment should be reserved for situations in which significant psychopathology is in play, thus leading to unexpected or erratic distortions of behavior of psychotherapeutic dyads or groups. We of The Holmes Commission, in the course of conducting our studies of race and racism in psychoanalysis, have found that employment of the concept of enactment can aid in the cultivation self-reflection of the participants in an enactment and contribute to enhanced receptivity on the part of all involved in a suspected enactment.

We recommend the *establishment of a collective framework* for addressing enactments in the context of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) work. This will involve setting up structures

which define an institute or training center's vision statement, one that makes explicit the intent to pursue non-discrimination and racial (and other forms of) equality. Members of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality have initiated the formation of the Consultation-Liaison Network (see Chapter 8) for this purpose.

We recommend *developing and supporting effective leadership* since working to fight and to heal racism requires ongoing support, training, and guidance for those leading the efforts. Containment and encouragement for the difficult task of race-based work is expected to be a primary task of leadership in organizations attempting to address issues of race and racism. Leaders must be prepared to explicitly prioritize this work, in both their words and deeds.

Because racial enactments occur in the social domain, and invariably in groups, we recommend *making attention to group process a formal part of psychoanalytic education*. That traditional psychoanalytic education is so very steeped in attending to the individual, it must be recognized that the individualistic focus of psychoanalytic training is a significant impediment to psychoanalytic organizations' challenges in addressing group born racial enactments.

And, finally, in working to enhance the psychoanalytic curriculum's ability to address issues of race and racial equality, *providing resources for curriculum revision and creative pedagogy* will be crucial. Here, the emphasis is not just on added contents, but also on pedagogical *process*. We believe that it is the dialogic, experiential, and process-oriented engagement of racial matters that stands the best chance of transforming our field and ourselves.

Last, with respect to racial enactments, a general complaint focused on the absence of policies and procedure within psychoanalytic organizations for addressing acts and enactments that occur. When institutes had no formal policies or procedures for reporting racist incidents,

there was no accountability or attention to repair. Changes in institutional structure, policies, and procedures are needed, with policies and procedures for reporting incidents, including to whom candidates and faculty report incidents, investigation procedures, policies for review, uniform follow up with those involved, and time requirements and transparency for reporting to the institute community.

A Concluding Credo

In early 2023, a controversy erupted on the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsA) listserv about the racially- and politically- tinged actions of APsA leadership. The then APsA President and President-Elect had directed APsA's Program Committee not to invite a panelist that they had selected for a clinical panel for the upcoming Spring Meeting in June 2023. On April 15th, 2023, Jyoti Rao, a candidate at the San Francisco Center for Psychoanalysis, posted the following comprehensive yet concise plea for what a more equal psychoanalysis could be.²²

Vision for a 21st Century Psychoanalysis

- an **evolving** psychoanalysis that perpetually expands to include a widening range of human experiences within its benevolent and nuanced consideration;
- an **integrated** psychoanalysis that extends a warm embrace to marginalized subjects and subjectivities, making every effort to usher them towards the protection, acceptance, recognition, comprehension, and authority enjoyed by those in the center;

²² This listserv post is reproduced with the permission of Jyoti Rao.

- an **ethical** psychoanalysis within which the work of the Holmes Commission and the Committee on Gender and Sexuality is a solemn commitment internalized by all of us;
- a **generative** psychoanalysis that supports creativity and challenges to existing psychic and material arrangements by receiving and elaborating the fresh insights delivered by unconscious workings;
- a **humane** psychoanalysis that views oppression as a ubiquitous human error borne out of unconscious processes we strive to understand and ameliorate;
- an **honest** psychoanalysis that is accountable for harms that are perpetrated under its aegis and the responsibilities that come with social, professional, and institutional power;
- a **reliable** psychoanalysis that is worthy of the immense trust placed upon us by our analysands and our communities;
- a **relevant** psychoanalysis that is capable of offering meaningful assistance with the increasingly urgent, unconsciously motivated troubles we face - and cause - as individuals and groups;
- a **nurturing** psychoanalysis within which our graduate students, trainees, and early career professionals can see themselves joining, belonging, and flourishing over the course of their careers;
- a **thoughtful** psychoanalysis that comprehends the consequences of actions taken on individual, group, and societal levels, and initiates and facilitates sincere repair when needed;

- an **informed** psychoanalysis that integrates wisdom from multiple disciplines;
- a **self-reflective**, iterative psychoanalysis that takes seriously its definitional relationship to contested knowledge within itself;
- a **liberatory** psychoanalysis whose emancipatory potentials are recognized, encouraged, and realized.

The Holmes Commission believes that this credo reflects the best of what contemporary psychoanalysis has to offer. The principles offered in Jyoti Rao's vision could serve as guideposts for all psychoanalytic practitioners, groups, institutes, and organizations. We urge that codifying, ratifying, implementing and supporting the visions for equality to which psychoanalytic organizations small and large aspire are necessary and vital steps in the direction of overcoming the inertia of anxious resistance to change in the pursuit of true equity.

A psychoanalytic approach to combatting racism, in the form of addressing its individual, interpersonal, group, and organizational practices, should aspire to go beyond proclamation of individual or institutional "antiracism." If psychoanalysis teaches us anything, it is that aggressions and other wrongs cannot be undone by doing their opposite. *Counter-identification* is just as sure a way of replicating the destructiveness of the traumatizing figure as is aligning with the aggressor through *identification*. This is because in each instance, the terms of being are defined by the destructive impulses, ideologies, and practices themselves. Psychoanalysis, in its pursuits of hidden, suppressive, and oppressive forces in all aspects of human experience, is arguably an inherently progressively subversive and emancipatory discipline, and aspires to be as complex as is necessary to

engage the infinite complexity of what it is to be human. Psychoanalysis must be more than just a joiner in the call to be antiracist in its practices and institutions. To live up to its fuller potential, psychoanalysis must imaginatively, thoughtfully, and self-reflectively move beyond the boundaries set by racism and white supremacy. Anything less would represent a shying away from the enormity and complexity of the task of working towards justice and a more diverse, equal, inclusive psychoanalysis, society, and world.

We are now faced with the fact that tomorrow is today.

We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now.

— Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Final Report of
The Holmes Commission on
Racial Equality in
American Psychoanalysis
2023
APPENDICES

When used properly and progressively, science, as a way of thinking and acting, is useful for empowering otherwise oppressed and marginal[ized] people ... in their most humane manifestations, the human sciences are supposed to be liberating and empowering, not oppressive or merely steps in a career.

— John H. Stanfield, II

Appendices

Table of Contents

Appendix A

Technical Report: Descriptive Statistic Tables for Candidate Survey	
Selected Response Items.....	3

Appendix B

Technical Report: Descriptive Statistic Tables for Faculty Survey	
Selected Response Items.....	66

Appendix C

Technical Report: Descriptive Statistics for Items for which Statistically Significant Differences Occurred Between Candidates Categorized as BIPOC or White	107
--	-----

Appendix D

Technical Report: Descriptive Statistics for Items for which Statistically Significant Differences Occurred Between Faculty Categorized as BIPOC or White	127
---	-----

Appendix E

Technical Report: Descriptive Statistic Tables for Candidate Survey Demographic Items.....	145
--	-----

Appendix F

Technical Report: Descriptive Statistic Tables for Faculty Survey Demographic Items.....	149
--	-----

Appendix G

Technical Report: The Holmes Commission Interview Summary Report	154
--	-----

Appendix H

The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis: A Bulletin of Preliminary Findings, January 2023.....	184
--	-----

Appendix I

The Fierce Urgency of Now: An Appeal to Organized Psychoanalysis to Take a Strong Stand on Race. <i>The American Psychoanalyst</i> , Winter/Spring 2017...	191
--	-----

Appendix J

Notes from the Inaugural Meeting of the Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in APsaA. <i>The American Psychoanalyst</i> , Winter/Spring 2021.....	197
--	-----

The Holmes Commission’s Journey Towards Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis: Reflection and Hope. <i>The American Psychoanalyst</i> , Winter/Spring 2023.....	201
--	-----

Appendix K

American Psychoanalytic Association Listserv Emails: March 23, 2023 to April 5, 2023.....	206
--	-----

**2023 Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in
American Psychoanalysis**

Appendix A

**Technical Report: Descriptive Statistic Tables for
Candidate Survey Selected Response Items**

Appendix A

Descriptive Statistic Tables for Candidate Survey Selected Response Items

Table A-1

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. -
Race or Racism

	Percent	Frequency
Not Covered at All	15.7	61
Not Covered Enough	54.9	213
Covered Adequately	26.5	103
Covered Too Much	2.8	11
Total	84.2	388
Missing	15.8	73
Total	100	461

Table A-2

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. -
Ethnicity

	Percent	Frequency
Not Covered at All	22.2	86
Not Covered Enough	52.1	202
Covered Adequately	25	97
Covered Too Much	0.8	3
Total	84.2	388
Missing	15.8	73
Total	100	461

Table A-3

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. -
Sexual Orientation

	Percent	Frequency
Not Covered at All	6.7	26
Not Covered Enough	49.7	193
Covered Adequately	42.3	164
Covered Too Much	1.3	5
Total	84.2	388
Missing	15.8	73
Total	100	461

Table A-4

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Gender Identity

	Percent	Frequency
Not Covered at All	9.8	38
Not Covered Enough	49.7	192
Covered Adequately	39.4	152
Covered Too Much	1	4
Total	83.7	386
Missing	16.3	75
Total	100	461

Table A-5

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Physical Ability/Disability

	Percent	Frequency
Not Covered at All	49.2	191
Not Covered Enough	40.2	156
Covered Adequately	10.6	41
Total	84.2	388
Missing	15.8	73
Total	100	461

Table A-6

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Religious Affiliation

	Percent	Frequency
Not Covered at All	41.3	159
Not Covered Enough	40	154
Covered Adequately	17.9	69
Covered Too Much	0.8	3
Total	83.5	385
Missing	16.5	76
Total	100	461

Table A-7

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. -
Immigration Status

	Percent	Frequency
Not Covered at All	44	171
Not Covered Enough	41.6	162
Covered Adequately	14.4	56
Total	84.4	389
Missing	15.6	72
Total	100	461

Table A-8

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. -
Intersectionality/Intersectional Identity

	Percent	Frequency
Not Covered at All	31.7	122
Not Covered Enough	44.9	173
Covered Adequately	21.8	84
Covered Too Much	1.6	6
Total	83.5	385
Missing	16.5	76
Total	100	461

Table A-9

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. -
Socio-Economic Status

	Percent	Frequency
Not Covered at All	31.5	123
Not Covered Enough	51	199
Covered Adequately	17.4	68
Total	84.6	390
Missing	15.4	71
Total	100	461

Table A-10

Which statement(s) describe how race or racism is addressed in your institute's curriculum.		
	Percent	Frequency
Race or racism is not addressed in any course.	17.6	81
Race or racism is touched on as topic in a single course.	25.4	117
Race or racism is the primary topic covered by a course.	21.9	101
Race or racism is a topic addressed across multiple courses.	29.1	134
Total		461

Table A-11

With which statement do you most agree?		
	Percent	Frequency
People of color are represented adequately in the required reading.	9.1	36
People of color are overrepresented in the required reading.	0.3	1
People of color are underrepresented in the required reading.	77.9	307
I do not know.	12.7	50
Total	85.5	394
Missing	14.5	67
Total	100	461

Table A-12

When in-person learning resumes, will your institute offer remote learning options for candidates?		
	Percent	Frequency
Yes	38.1	150
No	2.8	11
I don't know	59.1	233
Total	85.5	394
Missing	14.5	67
Total	100	461

Table A-13

Does your institute make accommodations to support students experiencing financial or personal challenges?		
	Percent	Frequency
I do not know.	37.1	146
Yes, the institute is very flexible and accommodating.	35.8	141
Yes, in rare or special circumstances.	19.3	76
No, the institute is not sensitive to candidates needs outside the classroom.	7.9	31
Total	85.5	394
Missing	14.5	67
Total	100	461

Table A-14

Which of the following has your institution engaged in during your candidacy.		
	Percent	Frequency
Updated the institution's mission statement to specifically address racial equity	38.4%	177
Professional development workshop focused on race, racism, and/or white supremacy	47.5%	219
Invited lecture or symposium focused on race, racism, and/or white supremacy	59.9%	276
Brought in outside consultants to meet with candidates about race, racism, and/or white supremacy	22.1%	102
Brought in outside consultants to work with faculty about race, racism, and/or white supremacy	20.6%	95
Brought in outside consultants to work with institute leadership about race, racism, and/or white supremacy	21.0%	97
Administered a survey about the health of the institute or center that included questions about race, racism, and/or white supremacy	16.9%	78
Held a reading or discussion group that addressed issues specific to race, racism, and/or white supremacy	49.7%	229
Held discussions among candidates and/or instructors that focused on issues specific to race, racism, and/or white supremacy	44.9%	207
Total		461

Table A-15

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy?

Updated the institution's mission statement to specifically address racial equity		
	Percent	Frequency
Very Effective	9.8	16
Somewhat Effective	47	77
Somewhat Ineffective	18.9	31
Had No Effect	24.4	40
Total	35.6	164
Missing	64.4	297
Total	100	461

Table A-16

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy?

Professional development workshop focused on race, racism, and/or white supremacy	Percent	Frequency
Very Effective	19.8	39
Somewhat Effective	60.9	120
Somewhat Ineffective	13.7	27
Had No Effect	5.6	11
Total	42.7	197
Missing	57.3	264
Total	100	461

Table A-17

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy?

Invited lecture or symposium focused on race, racism, and/or white supremacy	Percent	Frequency
Very Effective	28.3	70
Somewhat Effective	57.9	143
Somewhat Ineffective	8.5	21
Had No Effect	5.3	13
Total	53.6	247
Missing	46.4	214
Total	100	461

Table A-18

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy?

Brought in outside consultants to meet with candidates about race, racism, and/or white supremacy	Percent	Frequency
Very Effective	23	20
Somewhat Effective	50.6	44
Somewhat Ineffective	19.5	17
Had No Effect	6.9	6
Total	18.9	87
Missing	81.1	374
Total	100	461

Table A-19

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy?

Brought in outside consultants to work with faculty about race, racism, and/or white supremacy	Percent	Frequency
Very Effective	13.5	10
Somewhat Effective	51.4	38
Somewhat Ineffective	21.6	16
Had No Effect	13.5	10
Total	16.1	74
Missing	83.9	387
Total	100	461

Table A-20

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy?

Brought in outside consultants to work with institute leadership about race, racism, and/or white supremacy	Percent	Frequency
Very Effective	19.2	15
Somewhat Effective	47.4	37
Somewhat Ineffective	21.8	17
Had No Effect	11.5	9
Total	16.9	78
Missing	83.1	383
Total	100	461

Table A-21

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy?

Administered a survey about the health of the institute or center that included questions about race, racism, and/or white supremacy	Percent	Frequency
Very Effective	10.1	7
Somewhat Effective	53.6	37
Somewhat Ineffective	15.9	11
Had No Effect	20.3	14
Total	15	69
Missing	85	392
Total	100	461

Table A-22

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy?

Held a reading or discussion group that addressed issues specific to race, racism, and/or white supremacy	Percent	Frequency
Very Effective	25.6	50
Somewhat Effective	54.9	107
Somewhat Ineffective	12.3	24
Had No Effect	7.2	14
Total	42.3	195
Missing	57.7	266
Total	100	461

Table A-23

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy?

Held discussions among candidates and/or instructors that focused on issues specific to race, racism, and/or white supremacy	Percent	Frequency
Very Effective	23.1	42
Somewhat Effective	59.9	109
Somewhat Ineffective	11	20
Had No Effect	6	11
Total	39.5	182
Missing	60.5	279
Total	100	461

Table A-24

With which of the following statements do you agree most?	Percent	Frequency
My institution has not taken any specific actions to address race, racism, and/or white supremacy.	18.1	64
My institution has taken actions to address race, racism, and/or white supremacy in response to specific racist events or actions that triggered outrage by members of my institution.	43.1	152
My institution has been proactive in taking actions to address race, racism, and/or white supremacy because doing so is viewed as essential for the future of psychoanalysis.	38.8	137
Total	76.6	353
Missing	23.4	108
Total	100	461

Table A-25

Which of the following best describes your own level of understanding of race, racism, and white supremacy?		
	Percent	Frequency
Emerging Level of Understanding	14.9	55
Moderate Level of Understanding	57.3	211
Advanced Level of Understanding	27.7	102
Total	79.8	368
Missing	20.2	93
Total	100	461

Table A-26

How would you assess the level of understanding of race/racism/white supremacy of - Your fellow candidates

	Percent	Frequency
Emerging	36.3	128
Moderate	55	194
Advanced	8.8	31
Total	76.6	353
Missing	23.4	108
Total	100	461

Table A-27

How would you assess the level of understanding of race/racism/white supremacy of - Instructors in your institute

	Percent	Frequency
Emerging	53.2	189
Moderate	39.4	140
Advanced	7.3	26
Total	77	355
Missing	23	106
Total	100	461

Table A-28

How would you assess the level of understanding of race/racism/white supremacy of -
Administrative leaders in your institute

	Percent	Frequency
Emerging	52.4	184
Moderate	37	130
Advanced	10.5	37
Total	76.1	351
Missing	23.9	110
Total	100	461

Table A-29

Have you observed, experienced or heard about an action within your institute that you would describe as racist?		
	Percent	Frequency
No, I have not observed, experienced or heard about an action that was racist or that produced racial trauma.	33.8%	156
Yes, I have experienced or observed an action that was racist but I am uncertain it produced racial trauma.	17.6%	81
Yes, I have experienced or observed an action that was racist and which produced racial trauma.	15.8%	73
Yes, I have heard about an action that was racist but I am uncertain it produced racial trauma.	12.4%	57
Yes, I have heard about an action that was racist and which produced racial trauma	14.3%	66
Total		461

Table A-30

How often have you observed or experienced an action or comment within your institute that is racist?		
	Percent	Frequency
Only Once	17.2	23
2-3 times	33.6	45
3-5 times	16.4	22
More than 5 times	32.8	44
Total	29.1	134
Missing	13.0%	20
Total	100	154

Table A-31

In which settings have you observed or experienced an action or comment that is racist:		
	Percent	Frequency
Classroom	66.2%	102
Listserv/on-line forum	29.9%	46
Curricular materials	27.3%	42
Interactions with supervisor(s)	24.7%	38
Interactions with your analyst(s)	7.1%	11
Interaction with instructor(s)	46.1%	71
Interaction with administrator(s)	24.7%	38
Total		154

Table A-32

How often have you heard about an action or comment within your institute that is racist?		
	Percent	Frequency
Only Once	29.5	18
2-3 times	45.9	28
3-5 times	14.8	9
More than 5 times	9.8	6
Total	46.9	61
Missing	53.1	69
Total	100	130

Table A-33

In which settings did the action(s) or comment(s) that is racist that you heard about occur:		
	Percent	Frequency
Classroom	25.4	33
Listserv/on-line forum	11.5	15
Curricular materials	8.5	11
Interactions with supervisor(s)	7.7	10
Interaction with instructor(s)	16.2	21
Interaction with administrator(s)	9.2	12
Total		130

Table A-34

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with... - Your fellow candidates		
	Percent	Frequency
Very Comfortable	44.4	155
Somewhat Comfortable	34.7	121
Somewhat Uncomfortable	15.5	54
Very Uncomfortable	5.4	19
Total	75.7	349
Missing	24.3	112
Total	100	461

Table A-35

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with... - Instructors

	Percent	Frequency
Very Comfortable	27	93
Somewhat Comfortable	38.8	134
Somewhat Uncomfortable	20	69
Very Uncomfortable	14.2	49
Total	74.8	345
Missing	25.2	116
Total	100	461

Table A-36

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with... - Your analyst

	Percent	Frequency
Very Comfortable	78	270
Somewhat Comfortable	13.9	48
Somewhat Uncomfortable	6.1	21
Very Uncomfortable	2	7
Total	75.1	346
Missing	24.9	115
Total	100	461

Table A-37

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with... - Your supervisor

	Percent	Frequency
Very Comfortable	58.6	201
Somewhat Comfortable	25.4	87
Somewhat Uncomfortable	10.2	35
Very Uncomfortable	5.8	20
Total	74.4	343
Missing	25.6	118
Total	100	461

Table A-38

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with... - Leadership in your institute

	Percent	Frequency
Very Comfortable	28.3	98
Somewhat Comfortable	32.9	114
Somewhat Uncomfortable	21.4	74
Very Uncomfortable	17.3	60
Total	75.1	346
Missing	24.9	115
Total	100	461

Table A-39

Have you raised an issue regarding race or racism with an instructor or leader(s) in your institute?		
	Percent	Frequency
Yes	41.5	147
No	58.5	207
Total	76.8	354
Missing	23.2	107
Total	100	461

Table A-40

Which statement best describes the response you experienced?		
	Percent	Frequency
The issue was addressed adequately.	26.8	38
The issue was addressed to a limited extent, but more should have been done.	44.4	63
I felt unsupported and/or alienated after raising the issue.	16.9	24
The issue was largely ignored.	12	17
Total	96.6	142
Missing	3.4	5
Total	100	147

Table A-41

For each statement, indicate your level of agreement: - Race, racism, and white supremacy are addressed adequately at my institute as a conceptual framework for analysis.

	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Agree	7	24
Agree	24.6	85
Disagree	47.8	165
Strongly Disagree	20.6	71
Total	74.8	345
Missing	25.2	116
Total	100	461

Table A-42

For each statement, indicate your level of agreement: - Collectively, psychoanalytic writing provides adequate attention to race, racism, and white supremacy as a conceptual framework for analysis.

	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Agree	3.5	12
Agree	13.3	46
Disagree	56.2	195
Strongly Disagree	27.1	94
Total	75.3	347
Missing	24.7	114
Total	100	461

Table A-43

For each statement, indicate your level of agreement: - The field of psychoanalysis needs to increase focus on race, racism, and white supremacy.

	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Agree	59.1	205
Agree	32.9	114
Disagree	5.8	20
Strongly Disagree	2.3	8
Total	75.3	347
Missing	24.7	114
Total	100	461

Table A-44

How did you first hear about your institute before deciding to apply?		
	Percent	Frequency
I learned about it from a peer, colleague, or former teacher.	47.9	221
I know someone who teaches or supervises in the institute.	26.5	122
I saw an advertisement in a professional journal.	1.5	7
I learned about it at a professional conference.	4.8	22
Other, please describe.	16.9	78
Total	97.6	450
Missing	2.4	11
Total	100	461

Table A-45

How long after learning about psychoanalytic training did you apply to the program at your institute?		
	Percent	Frequency
Less than a year	24.4	85
1-2 years	17.8	62
More than 2 years	57.8	201
Total	75.5	348
Missing	24.5	113
Total	100	461

Table A-46

Did you apply to more than one institute?		
	Percent	Frequency
Yes	12.4	43
No	87.6	304
Total	75.3	347
Missing	24.7	114
Total	100	461

Table A-47

After being accepted into your program, did your institute do anything to encourage you to enroll in the program?		
	Percent	Frequency
Yes	52.7	177
No	47.3	159
Total	72.9	336
Missing	27.1	125
Total	100	461

Table A-48

After being accepted into your program, did your institute do anything that discouraged you from or created a concern about enrolling in the program?		
	Percent	Frequency
Yes	15.1	51
No	84.9	286
Total	73.1	337
Missing	26.9	124
Total	100	461

Table A-49

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Identify as White

	Percent	Frequency
Advantage	40.2	130
Disadvantage	0.6	2
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	59.1	191
Total	70.1	323
Missing	29.9	138
Total	100	461

Table A-50

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Identify as a Person of color

	Percent	Frequency
Advantage	15.4	49
Disadvantage	31.4	100
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	53.1	169
Total	69	318
Missing	31	143
Total	100	461

Table A-51

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Identify as Male

	Percent	Frequency
Advantage	23.7	75
Disadvantage	0.6	2
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	75.7	240
Total	68.8	317
Missing	31.2	144
Total	100	461

Table A-52

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Identify as Female

	Percent	Frequency
Advantage	5	16
Disadvantage	7.9	25
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	87.1	276
Total	68.8	317
Missing	31.2	144
Total	100	461

Table A-53

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have higher socio-economic status

	Percent	Frequency
Advantage	65.5	211
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	34.5	111
Total	69.8	322
Missing	30.2	139
Total	100	461

Table A-54

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have earned an advanced degree in psychology

	Percent	Frequency
Advantage	52.3	168
Disadvantage	2.5	8
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	45.2	145
Total	69.6	321
Missing	30.4	140
Total	100	461

Table A-55

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have earned a degree in medicine

	Percent	Frequency
Advantage	48.3	156
Disadvantage	2.5	8
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	49.2	159
Total	70.1	323
Missing	29.9	138
Total	100	461

Table A-56

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have earned a degree in social work

	Percent	Frequency
Advantage	20.3	65
Disadvantage	18.4	59
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	61.3	196
Total	69.4	320
Missing	30.6	141
Total	100	461

Table A-57

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have earned a degree in counseling or marriage/family therapy

	Percent	Frequency
Advantage	15.1	48
Disadvantage	21.7	69
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	63.2	201
Total	69	318
Missing	31	143
Total	100	461

Table A-58

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have earned a non-clinical degree

	Percent	Frequency
Advantage	5.6	18
Disadvantage	40.6	130
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	53.8	172
Total	69.4	320
Missing	30.6	141
Total	100	461

Table A-59

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... -
 Attended a highly ranked undergraduate college/university

	Percent	Frequency
Advantage	38	122
Disadvantage	0.9	3
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	61.1	196
Total	69.6	321
Missing	30.4	140
Total	100	461

Table A-60

When applying to your institute did you feel any aspects of the admission process may have created an advantage for you? - Selected Choice		
	Percent	Frequency
No	51.5	169
Yes, please describe.	48.5	159
Total	71.1	328
Missing	28.9	133
Total	100	461

Table A-61

When applying to your institute did you feel any aspects of the admission process may have created disadvantage for you? - Selected Choice		
	Percent	Frequency
No	75.8	248
Yes, please describe.	24.2	79
Total	70.9	327
Missing	29.1	134
Total	100	461

Table A-62

Does your institution require an interview as part of its admission process?		
	Percent	Frequency
Yes	97.9	328
No	2.1	7
Total	72.7	335
Missing	27.3	126
Total	100	461

Table A-63

Which statement best characterizes the interview process?		
	Percent	Frequency
The interview was a positive and comfortable experience.	58.5	189
The interview was neither a positive nor negative experience.	22.3	72
The interview was a moderately negative and uncomfortable experience.	15.8	51
The interview made me feel very uncomfortable and misunderstood as a person.	3.4	11
Total	98.5	323
Missing	1.5	5
Total	100	328

Table A-64

Which statement best describes the approach your institute uses to identify a supervisor for each candidate:		
	Percent	Frequency
Candidates select a supervisor approved by the institute	78.5	259
Candidates are assigned a supervisor	21.5	71
Total	71.6	330
Missing	28.4	131
Total	100	461

Table A-65

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when assigning you to a supervisor: - Gender identity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	17.5	10
No	82.5	47
Total	80.3	57
Missing	19.7	14
Total	100	71

Table A-66

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when assigning you to a supervisor: - Sexual orientation

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	10.3	6
No	89.7	52
Total	81.7	58
Missing	18.3	13
Total	100	71

Table A-67

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when assigning you to a supervisor: - Race and/or ethnicity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	15.3	9
No	84.7	50
Total	83.1	59
Missing	16.9	12
Total	100	71

Table A-68

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when assigning you to a supervisor: - Religion

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	10.5	6
No	89.5	51
Total	57	57
Missing	14	14
Total	100	71

Table A-69

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when assigning you to a supervisor: - Area of interest aligned with yours

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	28.8	17
No	71.2	42
Total	83.1	59
Missing	16.9	12
Total	100	71

Table A-70

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when assigning you to a supervisor: - Supervisor's ability/openness to communicating in your primary language

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	25.9	15
No	74.1	43
Total	81.7	58
Missing	18.3	13
Total	100	71

Table A-71

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Gender identity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	46.8	29
No	53.2	33
Total	87.3	62
Missing	12.7	9
Total	100	71

Table A-72

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Sexual orientation

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	48.4	30
No	51.6	32
Total	87.3	62
Missing	12.7	9
Total	100	71

Table A-73

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Race and/or ethnicity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	56.5	35
No	43.5	27
Total	87.3	62
Missing	12.7	9
Total	100	71

Table A-74

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Religion

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	44.3	27
No	55.7	34
Total	85.9	61
Missing	14.1	10
Total	100	71

Table A-75

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Area of interest aligned with yours

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	84.1	53
No	15.9	10
Total	88.7	63
Missing	11.3	8
Total	100	71

Table A-76

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Supervisor's ability/openness to communicating in your primary language

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	87.5	56
No	12.5	8
Total	90.1	64
Missing	9.9	7
Total	100	71

Table A-77

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when selecting your supervisor: - Gender identity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	32.5	79
No	67.5	164
Total	93.8	243
Missing	6.2	16
Total	100	259

Table A-78

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when selecting your supervisor: - Sexual orientation

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	15.2	37
No	84.8	207
Total	94.2	244
Missing	5.8	15
Total	100	259

Table A-79

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when selecting your supervisor: - Race and/or ethnicity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	18	44
No	82	200
Total	94.2	244
Missing	5.8	15
Total	100	259

Table A-80

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when selecting your supervisor: - Religion

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	4.6	11
No	95.4	230
Total	93.1	241
Missing	6.9	18
Total	100	259

Table A-81

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when selecting your supervisor: - Area of interest aligned with yours

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	76	187
No	24	59
Total	95.0	246
Missing	5.0	13
Total	100	259

Table A-82

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when selecting your supervisor: - Supervisor's ability/openness to communicating in your primary language

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	38.4	94
No	61.6	151
Total	94.6	245
Missing	5.4	14
Total	100	259

Table A-83

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when selecting a supervisor: -
Gender identity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	39.2	89
No	60.8	138
Total	87.6	227
Missing	12.4	32
Total	100	259

Table A-84

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when selecting a supervisor: -
Sexual orientation

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	34.8	78
No	65.2	146
Total	86.5	224
Missing	13.5	35
Total	100	259

Table A-85

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when selecting a supervisor: -
Race and/or ethnicity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	42.4	95
No	57.6	129
Total	86.5	224
Missing	13.5	35
Total	100	259

Table A-86

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when selecting a supervisor: -
Religion

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	28.4	63
No	71.6	159
Total	85.7	222
Missing	14.3	37
Total	100	259

Table A-87

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when selecting a supervisor: -
Area of interest aligned with yours

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	82.8	188
No	17.2	39
Total	87.6	227
Missing	12.4	32
Total	100	259

Table A-88

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when selecting a supervisor: -
Supervisor's ability/openness to communicating in your primary language

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	83.5	193
No	16.5	38
Total	89.2	231
Missing	10.8	28
Total	100	259

Table A-89

When you were approved to analyze cases during training, were any of the following considered...
- Gender identity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	35.2	96
No	64.8	177
Total	59.2	273
Missing	40.8	188
Total	100	461

Table A-90

When you were approved to analyze cases during training, were any of the following considered...
- Sexual orientation

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	20.2	55
No	79.8	217
Total	59	272
Missing	41	189
Total	100	461

Table A-91

When you were approved to analyze cases during training, were any of the following considered...
- Race

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	19.6	53
No	80.4	218
Total	58.8	271
Missing	41.2	190
Total	100	461

Table A-92

When you were approved to analyze cases during training, were any of the following considered...
- Religion

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	13.1	35
No	86.9	233
Total	58.1	268
Missing	41.9	193
Total	100	461

Table A-93

How often is race or racism a topic discussed with your supervisor(s)?		
	Percent	Frequency
Never	12.1	37
Once or twice	47.9	146
Regularly	34.1	104
I don't know	5.9	18
Total	66.2	305
Missing	33.8	156
Total	100	461

Table A-94

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... - Your advisor

	Percent	Frequency
Very Comfortable	44.8	138
Somewhat comfortable	37	114
Somewhat uncomfortable	12	37
Very Uncomfortable	6.2	19
Total	66.8	308
Missing	33.2	153
Total	100	461

Table A-95

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... - Your supervisor

	Percent	Frequency
Very Comfortable	60.6	186
Somewhat comfortable	29	89
Somewhat uncomfortable	7.2	22
Very Uncomfortable	3.3	10
Total	66.6	307
Missing	33.4	154
Total	100	461

Table A-96

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... - Instructors

	Percent	Frequency
Very Comfortable	31.9	101
Somewhat comfortable	45.1	143
Somewhat uncomfortable	16.4	52
Very Uncomfortable	6.6	21
Total	68.8	317
Missing	31.2	144
Total	100	461

Table A-97

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... - Fellow candidates

	Percent	Frequency
Very Comfortable	46.2	146
Somewhat comfortable	38.6	122
Somewhat uncomfortable	11.4	36
Very Uncomfortable	3.8	12
Total	68.5	316
Missing	31.5	145
Total	100	461

Table A-98

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... - Patients

	Percent	Frequency
Very Comfortable	41.2	128
Somewhat comfortable	43.7	136
Somewhat uncomfortable	13.8	43
Very Uncomfortable	1.3	4
Total	67.5	311
Missing	32.5	150
Total	100	461

Table A-99

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... - People you know outside your institute

	Percent	Frequency
Very Comfortable	44	140
Somewhat comfortable	42.1	134
Somewhat uncomfortable	11.9	38
Very Uncomfortable	1.9	6
Total	69	318
Missing	31	143
Total	100	461

Table A-100

Did your advisor ever raise the topic of race or racism as a topic of discussion?		
	Percent	Frequency
No, race or racism was never raised by my advisor.	59.6	180
Yes, once or twice.	31.1	94
Yes, we discussed race and racism often.	9.3	28
Total	65.5	302
Missing	34.5	159
Total	100	461

Table A-101

Did you ever raise the topic of race or racism as a topic of discussion with your advisor?		
	Percent	Frequency
No, I never raised race or racism with my advisor.	50	150
Yes, when I raised race or racism with my advisor we had an open discussion.	42.3	127
Yes, when I raised race or racism my advisor seemed reluctant or uncomfortable discussing the topic.	7.7	23
Total	65.1	300
Missing	34.9	161
Total	100	461

Table A-102

How prepared were your instructors to discuss the topic of race or racism?		
	Percent	Frequency
Very well prepared	14.4	44
Moderately well prepared	48.5	148
Poorly prepared	26.6	81
Not at all prepared	10.5	32
Total	66.2	305
Missing	33.8	156
Total	100	461

Table A-103

Did you ever have a discriminatory experience with your advisor, supervisor, or instructor?		
	Percent	Frequency
Yes	25.8	83
No	74.2	239
Total	69.8	322
Missing	30.2	139
Total	100	461

Table A-104

After having a discriminatory experience with your advisor, supervisor, or instructor did you... -		
	Percent	Frequency
Request a change to your advisor, supervisor, or instructor	36.1	30
Feel the incident negatively impacted your educational experience	78.3	65
Total		83

Table A-105

Which statement best describes the approach your institute uses to identify a personal/training analyst for each candidate:		
	Percent	Frequency
Candidates chooses an analyst.	94.3	297
Candidates are assigned an analyst.	5.7	18
Total	68.3	315
Missing	31.7	146
Total	100	461

Table A-106

Which statement best reflects your experience selecting an analyst: [select all that apply]		
	Percent	Frequency
I was able to choose a person I wanted to be my analyst without encountering any issues.	48.1	136
I was able to choose the person I wanted to be my analyst but the analyst had to be approved by my institute.	28.3	80
I was provided a select list of potential analysts from which I had to choose.	15.9	45
My institute denied my initial choice and required me to choose someone else from my institute.	2.5	7
I had difficulty finding someone I felt was well matched with my needs.	5.3	15
Total	95.3	283
Missing	4.7	14
Total	100	297

Table A-107

When selecting your analyst, did you consider any of the following:		
	Percent	Frequency
Gender identity	41.8	124
Sexual orientation	13.8	41
Race and/or ethnicity	15.5	46
Religion	10.1	30
Area of interest aligned with yours	38.7	115
Analyst's ability/openness to communicating in your primary language	29.0	86
Total		297

Table A-108

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when assigning an analyst to you: - Gender identity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	6.7	1
No	20	3
I don't know	73.3	11
Total	83.3	15
Missing	16.7	3
Total	100	18

Table A-109

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when assigning an analyst to you: - Sexual orientation

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	0	0
No	20	3
I don't know	80	12
Total	83.3	15
Missing	16.7	3
Total	100	18

Table A-110

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when assigning an analyst to you: - Race and/or ethnicity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	0	0
No	26.7	4
I don't know	73.3	11
Total	83.3	15
Missing	16.7	3
Total	100	18

Table A-111

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when assigning an analyst to you: - Religion

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	0	0
No	20	3
I don't know	80	12
Total	83.3	15
Missing	16.7	3
Total	100	18

Table A-112

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when assigning an analyst to you: - Area of interest aligned with yours

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	0	0
No	26.7	4
I don't know	73.3	11
Total	83.3	15
Missing	16.7	3
Total	100	18

Table A-113

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when assigning an analyst to you: - Analyst's ability/openness to communicating in your primary language

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	0	0
No	33.3	5
I don't know	66.7	10
Total	83.3	15
Missing	16.7	3
Total	100	18

Table A-114

Indicate whether each of the following should be considered when assigning an analyst to you: - Gender identity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	53.3	8
No	46.7	7
Total	83.3	15
Missing	16.7	3
Total	100	18

Table A-115

Indicate whether each of the following should be considered when assigning an analyst to you: - Sexual orientation

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	53.3	8
No	46.7	7
Total	83.3	15
Missing	16.7	3
Total	100	18

Table A-116

Indicate whether each of the following should be considered when assigning an analyst to you: -
Race and/or ethnicity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	66.7	10
No	33.3	5
Total	83.3	15
Missing	16.7	3
Total	100	18

Table A-117

Indicate whether each of the following should be considered when assigning an analyst to you: -
Religion

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	57.1	8
No	42.9	6
Total	77.8	14
Missing	22.2	4
Total	100	18

Table A-118

Indicate whether each of the following should be considered when assigning an analyst to you: -
Area of interest aligned with yours

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	53.3	8
No	46.7	7
Total	83.3	15
Missing	16.7	3
Total	100	18

Table A-119

Indicate whether each of the following should be considered when assigning an analyst to you: -
Analyst's ability/openness to communicating in your primary language

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	93.3	14
No	6.7	1
Total	83.3	15
Missing	16.7	3
Total	100	18

Table A-120

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in the course of analysis: - Sexual orientation

	Percent	Frequency
Very Important	88.3	271
Somewhat Important	4.6	14
Not Important	7.2	22
Total	66.6	307
Missing	33.4	154
Total	100	461

Table A-121

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in the course of analysis: - Gender Identity

	Percent	Frequency
Very Important	87.2	266
Somewhat Important	6.2	19
Not Important	6.6	20
Total	66.2	305
Missing	33.8	156
Total	100	461

Table A-122

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in the course of analysis: - Religion

	Percent	Frequency
Very Important	79.8	245
Somewhat Important	12.4	38
Not Important	7.8	24
Total	66.6	307
Missing	33.4	154
Total	100	461

Table A-123

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in the course of analysis: - Race

	Percent	Frequency
Very Important	90.2	277
Somewhat Important	5.2	16
Not Important	4.6	14
Total	66.6	307
Missing	33.4	154
Total	100	461

Table A-124

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in the course of analysis: - Ethnicity

	Percent	Frequency
Very Important	89.6	275
Somewhat Important	6.2	19
Not Important	4.2	13
Total	66.6	307
Missing	33.4	154
Total	100	461

Table A-125

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in the course of analysis: - Language differences

	Percent	Frequency
Very Important	82	251
Somewhat Important	9.5	29
Not Important	8.5	26
Total	66.4	306
Missing	33.6	155
Total	100	461

Table A-126

During your personal/training analysis, do/did you feel free to discuss: - Sexual orientation

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	95.1	289
No	4.9	15
Total	65.9	304
Missing	34.1	157
Total	100	461

Table A-127

During your personal/training analysis, do/did you feel free to discuss: - Gender Identity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	95.7	290
No	4.3	13
Total	65.7	303
Missing	34.3	158
Total	100	461

Table A-128

During your personal/training analysis, do/did you feel free to discuss: - Religion

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	94.7	287
No	5.3	16
Total	65.7	303
Missing	34.3	158
Total	100	461

Table A-129

During your personal/training analysis, do/did you feel free to discuss: - Race

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	94.1	287
No	5.9	18
Total	66.2	305
Missing	33.8	156
Total	100	461

Table A-130

During your personal/training analysis, do/did you feel free to discuss: - Ethnicity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	93.4	284
No	6.6	20
Total	65.9	304
Missing	34.1	157
Total	100	461

Table A-131

During your personal/training analysis, do/did you feel free to discuss: - Language differences

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	94.3	282
No	5.7	17
Total	64.9	299
Missing	35.1	162
Total	100	461

Table A-132

During your personal/training analysis, does/did your analyst facilitate discussion of: - Gender Identity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	64.7	187
No	35.3	102
Total	62.7	289
Missing	37.3	172
Total	100	461

Table A-133

During your personal/training analysis, does/did your analyst facilitate discussion of: - Religion

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	63.3	183
No	36.7	106
Total	62.7	289
Missing	37.3	172
Total	100	461

Table A-134

During your personal/training analysis, does/did your analyst facilitate discussion of: - Race

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	65.3	190
No	34.7	101
Total	63.1	291
Missing	36.9	170
Total	100	461

Table A-135

During your personal/training analysis, does/did your analyst facilitate discussion of: - Ethnicity

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	66.2	192
No	33.8	98
Total	62.9	290
Missing	37.1	171
Total	100	461

Table A-136

During your personal/training analysis, does/did your analyst facilitate discussion of: - Language differences

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	54.8	155
No	45.2	128
Total	61.4	283
Missing	38.6	178
Total	100	461

Table A-137

With which of the following statements do you agree most:		
	Percent	Frequency
The personal analysis was the most important part of my training.	65.9	195
The personal analysis was valuable but not the most important part of my training.	30.7	91
The personal analysis created an uncomfortable relationship between me and my analyst.	3.4	10
Total	64.2	296
Missing	35.8	165
Total	100	461

Table A-138

Which statement best describes the preparation you received during your training to apply racial awareness to analysis?		
	Percent	Frequency
I have had no preparation.	20.3	61
I am underprepared.	34.9	105
I am moderately well prepared.	36.5	110
I am well prepared.	8.3	25
Total	65.3	301
Missing	34.7	160
Total	100	461

Table A-139

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in analysis: - Sexual orientation

	Percent	Frequency
Very Important	95.4	293
Somewhat Important	3.6	11
Not Important	1	3
Total	66.6	307
Missing	33.4	154
Total	100	461

Table A-140

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in analysis: - Gender Identity

	Percent	Frequency
Very Important	95.8	294
Somewhat Important	3.3	10
Not Important	1	3
Total	66.6	307
Missing	33.4	154
Total	100	461

Table A-141

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in analysis: - Religion

	Percent	Frequency
Very Important	92.2	283
Somewhat Important	7.8	24
Not Important	0	0
Total	66.6	307
Missing	33.4	154
Total	100	461

Table A-142

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in analysis: - Race

	Percent	Frequency
Very Important	97.4	299
Somewhat Important	2.6	8
Not Important	0	0
Total	66.6	307
Missing	33.4	154
Total	100	461

Table A-143

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in analysis: - Ethnicity

	Percent	Frequency
Very Important	97.4	299
Somewhat Important	2.6	8
Not Important	0	0
Total	66.6	307
Missing	33.4	154
Total	100	461

Table A-144

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in analysis: - Language differences

	Percent	Frequency
Very Important	93.8	287
Somewhat Important	4.6	14
Not Important	1.6	5
Total	66.4	306
Missing	33.6	155
Total	100	461

Table A-145

Which statement best describes the preparation you have received to apply a racial framework during analysis?		
	Percent	Frequency
I have had no preparation.	21.2	63
I am underprepared.	39.1	116
I am moderately well prepared.	32.7	97
I am well prepared.	7.1	21
Total	64.4	297
Missing	35.6	164
Total	100	461

Table A-146

Does your institution use any evaluation/progression procedures that may unintentionally disadvantage... - Female Candidates

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	18.4	49
No	81.6	218
Total	57.9	267
Missing	42.1	194
Total	100	461

Table A-147

Does your institution use any evaluation/progression procedures that may unintentionally disadvantage... - Candidates of Color

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	33	88
No	67	179
Total	57.9	267
Missing	42.1	194
Total	100	461

Table A-148

Does your institution use any evaluation/progression procedures that may unintentionally disadvantage... - Candidates from Disadvantaged Backgrounds

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	49.4	134
No	50.6	137
Total	58.8	271
Missing	41.2	190
Total	100	461

Table A-149

Are there any evaluation/progression criteria or procedures your institution considers to increase the number of candidates of color who complete your training program?		
	Percent	Frequency
Yes	30.5	75
No	69.5	171
Total	53.4	246
Missing	46.6	215
Total	100	461

Table A-150

Are there any evaluation/progression criteria or procedures your institution considers that could be altered to increase the number of candidates of color who complete your training program?		
	Percent	Frequency
Yes	59.9	142
No	40.1	95
Total	51.4	237
Missing	48.6	224
Total	100	461

Table A-151

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - Workload

	Percent	Frequency
Frequently Contributed	37.3	79
Occasionally Contributed	43.4	92
Rarely Contributed	14.6	31
Never Contributed	4.7	10
Total	46	212
Missing	54	249
Total	100	461

Table A-152

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - Family obligations

	Percent	Frequency
Frequently Contributed	42.5	91
Occasionally Contributed	47.7	102
Rarely Contributed	7.9	17
Never Contributed	1.9	4
Total	46.4	214
Missing	53.6	247
Total	100	461

Table A-153

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - Feeling isolated

	Percent	Frequency
Frequently Contributed	19.9	38
Occasionally Contributed	37.7	72
Rarely Contributed	30.4	58
Never Contributed	12	23
Total	41.4	191
Missing	58.6	270
Total	100	461

Table A-154

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - Lack of a sense of belonging

	Percent	Frequency
Frequently Contributed	23.8	48
Occasionally Contributed	45	91
Rarely Contributed	19.8	40
Never Contributed	11.4	23
Total	43.8	202
Missing	56.2	259
Total	100	461

Table A-156

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - Dissatisfaction with advisement process

	Percent	Frequency
Frequently Contributed	16.3	30
Occasionally Contributed	37.5	69
Rarely Contributed	29.3	54
Never Contributed	16.8	31
Total	39.9	184
Missing	60.1	277
Total	100	461

Table A-157

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - A critical racial incident occurred

	Percent	Frequency
Frequently Contributed	8	14
Occasionally Contributed	26.1	46
Rarely Contributed	35.2	62
Never Contributed	30.7	54
Total	38.2	176
Missing	61.8	285
Total	100	461

Table A-158

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - Racial microaggressions or other discriminatory gestures

	Percent	Frequency
Frequently Contributed	17.4	31
Occasionally Contributed	27.5	49
Rarely Contributed	29.8	53
Never Contributed	25.3	45
Total	38.6	178
Missing	61.4	283
Total	100	461

Table A-159

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - Diminished interest in psychoanalysis

	Percent	Frequency
Frequently Contributed	12.1	23
Occasionally Contributed	41.6	79
Rarely Contributed	30	57
Never Contributed	16.3	31
Total	41.2	190
Missing	58.8	271
Total	100	461

Table A-160

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - Financial challenges

	Percent	Frequency
Frequently Contributed	49	102
Occasionally Contributed	37.5	78
Rarely Contributed	7.2	15
Never Contributed	6.3	13
Total	45.1	208
Missing	54.9	253
Total	100	461

Table A-161

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - Other

	Percent	Frequency
Frequently Contributed	38.2	13
Occasionally Contributed	29.4	10
Rarely Contributed	2.9	1
Never Contributed	29.4	10
Total	7.4	34
Missing	92.6	427
Total	100	461

Table A-162

Candidates sometimes experience personal or professional difficulties that interfere with their ability to progress through the psychoanalytic training process. Are you aware of your institution taking any of the actions listed below to support candidates at risk of leaving your program before completion?

- Reduced Fees

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	51.9	124
No	48.1	115
Total	51.8	239
Missing	48.2	222
Total	100	461

Table A-163

Candidates sometimes experience personal or professional difficulties that interfere with their ability to progress through the psychoanalytic training process. Are you aware of your institution taking any of the actions listed below to support candidates at risk of leaving your program before completion?

- Deadline Extension

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	69.8	164
No	30.2	71
Total	51	235
Missing	49	226
Total	100	461

Table A-164

Candidates sometimes experience personal or professional difficulties that interfere with their ability to progress through the psychoanalytic training process. Are you aware of your institution taking any of the actions listed below to support candidates at risk of leaving your program before completion?

- Finding a new mentor in the field

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	60.2	136
No	39.8	90
Total	49	226
Missing	51	235
Total	100	461

Table A-165

Candidates sometimes experience personal or professional difficulties that interfere with their ability to progress through the psychoanalytic training process. Are you aware of your institution taking any of the actions listed below to support candidates at risk of leaving your program before completion?

- Assigning a new supervisor

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	69.2	157
No	30.8	70
Total	49.2	227
Missing	50.8	234
Total	100	461

Table A-166

Candidates sometimes experience personal or professional difficulties that interfere with their ability to progress through the psychoanalytic training process. Are you aware of your institution taking any of the actions listed below to support candidates at risk of leaving your program before completion?

- Other, please describe

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	45.2	19
No	54.8	23
Total	9.1	42
Missing	90.9	419
Total	100	461

Table A-167

What actions does your institution take to support candidates once they have completed your program?		
	Percent	Frequency
Assistance building a practice	14.8	68
Invitation to coauthor publications	7.8	36
Invitation to teach courses	40.6	187
Invitation to serve on committees or boards	41.4	191
Encourage applications of psychoanalysis in the community	20.6	95
Total		461

Table A-168

Does your institute provide opportunities for candidates to make connections with professionals in their communities?		
	Percent	Frequency
Yes	76.8	199
No	23.2	60
Total	56.2	259
Missing	43.8	202
Total	100	461

Table A-169

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute is proactive in referring patients to recent graduates in order to help them build a practice.

	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Agree	17.9	41
Agree	40.6	93
Disagree	27.1	62
Strongly Disagree	14.4	33
Total	49.7	229
Missing	50.3	232
Total	100	461

Table A-170

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute works hard to match potential patients with an analyst based on gender.

	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Agree	3.9	8
Agree	34.1	70
Disagree	45.9	94
Strongly Disagree	16.1	33
Total	44.5	205
Missing	55.5	256
Total	100	461

Table A-171

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute works hard to match potential patients with an analyst based on race.

	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Agree	3.5	7
Agree	27.6	55
Disagree	49.7	99
Strongly Disagree	19.1	38
Total	43.2	199
Missing	56.8	262
Total	100	461

Table A-172

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute works hard to match potential patients with an analyst based on religion.

	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Agree	2.6	5
Agree	18.7	36
Disagree	61.1	118
Strongly Disagree	17.6	34
Total	41.9	193
Missing	58.1	268
Total	100	461

Table A-173

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute invites exemplary graduates to teach courses.

	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Agree	28.6	64
Agree	61.2	137
Disagree	7.6	17
Strongly Disagree	2.7	6
Total	48.6	224
Missing	51.4	237
Total	100	461

Table A-174

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute makes a concerted effort to recruit graduates of color to teach courses.

	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Agree	5.7	11
Agree	30.2	58
Disagree	42.7	82
Strongly Disagree	21.4	41
Total	41.6	192
Missing	58.4	269
Total	100	461

Table A-175

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues invite exemplary graduates to publish collaboratively.

	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Agree	3.4	6
Agree	32	56
Disagree	46.9	82
Strongly Disagree	17.7	31
Total	38	175
Missing	62	286
Total	100	461

Table A-176

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues make a concerted effort to invite graduates of color to publish collaboratively.

	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Agree	1.8	3
Agree	25.1	42
Disagree	49.7	83
Strongly Disagree	23.4	39
Total	36.2	167
Missing	63.8	294
Total	100	461

Table A-177

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues invite exemplary graduates to present cases and/or research at conferences and society meetings.

	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Agree	14.2	26
Agree	54.1	99
Disagree	23.5	43
Strongly Disagree	8.2	15
Total	39.7	183
Missing	60.3	278
Total	100	461

Table A-178

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues make a concerted effort to invite graduates of color to present cases and/or research at conferences and society meetings.

	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Agree	9.2	16
Agree	39.1	68
Disagree	36.8	64
Strongly Disagree	14.9	26
Total	37.7	174
Missing	62.3	287
Total	100	461

**2023 Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in
American Psychoanalysis**

Appendix B

**Technical Report: Descriptive Statistic Tables for
Faculty Survey Selected Response Items**

Appendix B

Descriptive Statistic Tables for Faculty Survey Selected Response Items

Table B-1

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Race or Racism

	Frequency	Percent
Not Covered at All	78	11.7
Not Covered Enough	413	61.8
Covered Adequately	163	24.4
Covered Too Much	14	2.1
Total	668	83
Missing	137	17
Total	805	100

Table B-2

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Ethnicity

	Frequency	Percent
Not Covered at All	108	16.2
Not Covered Enough	415	62.2
Covered Adequately	137	20.5
Covered Too Much	7	1
Total	667	82.9
Missing	138	17.1
Total	805	100

Table B-3

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Sexual Orientation

	Frequency	Percent
Not Covered at All	25	3.8
Not Covered Enough	307	46.2
Covered Adequately	321	48.3
Covered Too Much	12	1.8
Total	665	82.6
Missing	140	17.4
Total	805	100

Table B-4

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. -
Gender Identity

	Frequency	Percent
Not Covered at All	42	6.3
Not Covered Enough	338	50.8
Covered Adequately	274	41.2
Covered Too Much	11	1.7
Total	665	82.6
Missing	140	17.4
Total	805	100

Table B-5

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. -
Physical Ability/Disability

	Frequency	Percent
Not Covered at All	312	46.9
Not Covered Enough	296	44.5
Covered Adequately	57	8.6
Covered Too Much	0	0
Total	665	82.6
Missing	140	17.4
Total	805	100

Table B-6

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. -
Religious Affiliation

	Frequency	Percent
Not Covered at All	307	46.6
Not Covered Enough	266	40.4
Covered Adequately	85	12.9
Covered Too Much	1	0.2
Total	659	81.9
Missing	146	18.1
Total	805	100

Table B-7

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. -
Immigration Status

	Frequency	Percent
Not Covered at All	290	43.7
Not Covered Enough	289	43.6
Covered Adequately	84	12.7
Covered Too Much	0	0
Total	663	82.4
Missing	142	17.6
Total	805	100

Table B-8

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. -
Intersectionality/Intersectional Identity

	Frequency	Percent
Not Covered at All	217	33.9
Not Covered Enough	320	49.9
Covered Adequately	91	14.2
Covered Too Much	13	2
Total	641	79.6
Missing	164	20.4
Total	805	100

Table B-9

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. -
Socio-Economic Status

	Frequency	Percent
Not Covered at All	197	29.7
Not Covered Enough	385	58
Covered Adequately	80	12
Covered Too Much	2	0.3
Total	664	82.5
Missing	141	17.5
Total	805	100

Table B-10

Which statement(s) describe how race or racism is addressed in your institute's curriculum.

	Frequency	Percent
Race or racism is not addressed in any course.	74	10.1
Race or racism is touched on as topic in a single course.	170	23.4
Race or racism is the primary topic covered by a course.	180	24.7
Race or racism is a topic addressed across multiple courses.	304	41.8
Total	805	

Table B-11

With which statement do you most agree?

	Frequency	Percent
People of color are represented adequately in the required reading.	56	8.1
People of color are overrepresented in the required reading.	5	0.7
People of color are underrepresented in the required reading.	481	69.3
I do not know.	152	21.9
Total	694	86.2
Missing	111	13.8
Total	805	100

Table B-12

When in-person learning resumes, will your institute offer remote learning options for candidates?

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	39.2	273
No	2.4	17
I don't know	58.4	407
Total	86.6	697
Missing	13.4	108
Total	100	805

Table B-13

Indicate whether your institution has engaged in each activity prior to 2020 and/or since 2020.		
	Frequency	Percent
Updated the institution's mission statement to specifically address racial equity		
Never	102	16.1
Prior to 2020	136	21.5
Since 2020	394	62.3
Professional development workshop focused on race, racism, and/or white supremacy		
Never	100	14.5
Prior to 2020	177	25.6
Since 2020	415	60.0
Invited lecture or symposium focused on race, racism, and/or white supremacy		
Never	49	6.7
Prior to 2020	250	34.4
Since 2020	427	58.8
Brought in outside consultants to meet with candidates about race, racism, and/or white supremacy		
Never	250	40.6
Prior to 2020	97	15.7
Since 2020	269	43.7
Brought in outside consultants to work with faculty about race, racism, and/or white supremacy		
Never	249	40.7
Prior to 2020	102	16.7
Since 2020	261	42.6

Brought in outside consultants to work with institute leadership about race, racism, and/or white supremacy		
Never	273	46.8
Prior to 2020	71	12.2
Since 2020	239	41.0
Administered a survey about the health of the institute or center that included questions about race, racism, and/or white supremacy		
Never	366	63.1
Prior to 2020	47	8.1
Since 2020	167	28.8
Held a reading or discussion group that addressed issues specific to race, racism, and/or white supremacy		
Never	76	10.7
Prior to 2020	223	31.4
Since 2020	412	57.9
Held discussions among candidates and/or instructors that focused on issues specific to race, racism, and/or white supremacy		
Never	74	11.0
Prior to 2020	186	27.6
Since 2020	415	61.5

Table B-14

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy? - Updated the institution's mission statement to specifically address racial equity

	Frequency	Percent
Very Effective	63	14.5
Somewhat Effective	222	51
Somewhat Ineffective	60	13.8
Had No Effect	90	20.7
Total	435	82.1
Missing	95	17.9
Total	530	100

Table B-15

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy? - Professional development workshop focused on race, racism, and/or white supremacy

	Frequency	Percent
Very Effective	95	21.4
Somewhat Effective	260	58.6
Somewhat Ineffective	55	12.4
Had No Effect	34	7.7
Total	444	75.0
Missing	148	25.0
Total	592	100

Table B-16

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy? - Invited lecture or symposium focused on race, racism, and/or white supremacy

	Frequency	Percent
Very Effective	150	29
Somewhat Effective	297	57.4
Somewhat Ineffective	40	7.7
Had No Effect	30	5.8
Total	517	76.4
Missing	160	23.6
Total	677	100

Table B-17

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy? - Brought in outside consultants to meet with candidates about race, racism, and/or white supremacy

	Frequency	Percent
Very Effective	57	21.3
Somewhat Effective	150	56.2
Somewhat Ineffective	34	12.7
Had No Effect	26	9.7
Total	267	73.0
Missing	99	27.0
Total	366	100

Table B-18

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy? - Brought in outside consultants to work with faculty about race, racism, and/or white supremacy

	Frequency	Percent
Very Effective	59	21.2
Somewhat Effective	166	59.7
Somewhat Ineffective	33	11.9
Had No Effect	20	7.2
Total	278	76.6
Missing	85	23.4
Total	363	100

Table B-19

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy? - Brought in outside consultants to work with institute leadership about race, racism, and/or white supremacy

	Frequency	Percent
Very Effective	51	21.2
Somewhat Effective	144	59.8
Somewhat Ineffective	31	12.9
Had No Effect	15	6.2
Total	241	77.7
Missing	69	22.3
Total	310	100

Table B-20

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy? - Administered a survey about the health of the institute or center that included questions about race, racism, and/or white supremacy

	Frequency	Percent
Very Effective	23	13.5
Somewhat Effective	88	51.5
Somewhat Ineffective	34	19.9
Had No Effect	26	15.2
Total	171	79.9
Missing	43	20.1
Total	214	100

Table B-21

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy? - Held a reading or discussion group that addressed issues specific to race, racism, and/or white supremacy

	Frequency	Percent
Very Effective	145	31.4
Somewhat Effective	246	53.2
Somewhat Ineffective	35	7.6
Had No Effect	36	7.8
Total	462	72.8
Missing	173	27.2
Total	635	100

Table B-22

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy? - Held discussions among candidates and/or instructors that focused on issues specific to race, racism, and/or white supremacy

	Frequency	Percent
Very Effective	91	21.4
Somewhat Effective	271	63.6
Somewhat Ineffective	38	8.9
Had No Effect	26	6.1
Total	426	70.9
Missing	175	29.1
Total	601	100

Table B-23

With which of the following statements do you agree most?		
	Frequency	Percent
My institution has not taken any specific actions to address race, racism, and/or white supremacy.	53	8.5
My institution has taken actions to address race, racism, and/or white supremacy in response to specific racist events or actions that triggered outrage by members of my institution.	245	39.5
My institution has been proactive in taking actions to address race, racism, and/or white supremacy because doing so is viewed as essential for the future of psychoanalysis.	323	52
Total	621	77.1
Missing	184	22.9
Total	805	100

Table B-24

Which of the following best describes your own level of understanding of race, racism, and white supremacy?		
	Frequency	Percent
Emerging Level of Understanding	135	21.3
Moderate Level of Understanding	339	53.4
Advanced Level of Understanding	161	25.4
Total	635	78.9
Missing	170	21.1
Total	805	100

Table B-25

How would you assess the level of understanding of race/racism/white supremacy of - Current candidates at your institute		
	Frequency	Percent
Emerging	173	29.5
Moderate	324	55.3
Advanced	89	15.2
Total	586	72.8
Missing	219	27.2
Total	805	100

Table B-26

How would you assess the level of understanding of race/racism/white supremacy of - Fellow instructors in your institute

	Frequency	Percent
Emerging	331	55.6
Moderate	239	40.2
Advanced	25	4.2
Total	595	73.9
Missing	210	26.1
Total	805	100

Table B-27

How would you assess the level of understanding of race/racism/white supremacy of - Administrative leaders in your institute

	Frequency	Percent
Emerging	254	42.8
Moderate	259	43.6
Advanced	81	13.6
Total	594	73.8
Missing	211	26.2
Total	805	100

Table B-28

Have you observed, experienced or heard about an action within your institute that you would describe as racist?		
	Frequency	Percent
No, I have not observed, experienced or heard about an action that was racist or that produced racial trauma.	268	37.2
Yes, I have experienced or observed an action that was racist but I am uncertain it produced racial trauma.	119	16.5
Yes, I have experienced or observed an action that was racist and which produced racial trauma.	102	14.1
Yes, I have heard about an action that was racist but I am uncertain it produced racial trauma.	109	15.1
Yes, I have heard about an action that was racist and which produced racial trauma	123	17.1
Total	721	89.6
Missing	84	10.4
Total	805	

Table B-29

How often have you observed or experienced an action or comment within your institute that is racist?		
	Frequency	Percent
Only Once	36	18.2
2-3 times	72	36.4
3-5 times	35	17.7
More than 5 times	55	27.8
Total	198	89.6
Missing	23	10.4
Total	221	100

Table B-30

In which settings have you observed or experienced an action or comment that is racist:		
	Frequency	Percent
Classroom	106	48.0
Listserv/on-line forum	79	35.7
Curricular materials	47	21.3
Interactions with supervisor(s)	45	20.4
Interactions with your analyst(s)	18	8.1
Interaction with instructor(s)	93	42.1
Interaction with administrator(s)	53	24.0
Total	221	

Table B-31

How often have you heard about an action or comment within your institute that is racist?		
	Frequency	Percent
Only Once	50	34.7
2-3 times	53	36.8
3-5 times	19	13.2
More than 5 times	22	15.3
Total	144	62.1
Missing	88	37.9
Total	232	

Table B-32

In which settings did the action(s) or comment(s) that is racist that you heard about occur:		
	Frequency	Percent
Curricular materials	13	5.6
Listserv/on-line forum	26	11.2
Curricular materials	47	20.3
Interactions with supervisor(s)	42	18.1
Interaction with instructor(s)	58	25.0
Interaction with administrator(s)	29	12.5
Other	17	7.3
Total	232	100

Table B-33

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with... - Candidates in your course or institute

	Frequency	Percent
Very Comfortable	264	43.1
Somewhat Comfortable	242	39.5
Somewhat Uncomfortable	92	15
Very Uncomfortable	15	2.4
Total	613	76.1
Missing	192	23.9
Total	805	100

Table B-34

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with... - Fellow instructors

	Frequency	Percent
Very Comfortable	255	41.3
Somewhat Comfortable	238	38.5
Somewhat Uncomfortable	105	17
Very Uncomfortable	20	3.2
Total	618	76.8
Missing	187	23.2
Total	805	100

Table B-35

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with... - Leadership in your institute

	Frequency	Percent
Very Comfortable	312	49.8
Somewhat Comfortable	191	30.5
Somewhat Uncomfortable	95	15.2
Very Uncomfortable	29	4.6
Total	627	77.9
Missing	178	22.1
Total	805	100

Table B-36

Have you raised an issue regarding race or racism with a leader(s) in your institute?		
	Frequency	Percent
Yes	256	40.4
No	377	59.6
Total	633	78.6
Missing	172	21.4
Total	805	100

Table B-37

Which statement best describes the response you experienced?		
	Frequency	Percent
The issue was addressed adequately.	88	35.5
The issue was addressed to a limited extent, but more should have been done.	109	44
I felt unsupported and/or alienated after raising the issue.	31	12.5
The issue was largely ignored.	20	8.1
Total	248	96.9
Missing	8	3.1
Total	256	100

Table B-38

For each statement, indicate your level of agreement: - Race, racism, and white supremacy are addressed adequately at my institute as a conceptual framework for analysis.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	29	4.9
Agree	176	29.7
Disagree	301	50.8
Strongly Disagree	86	14.5
Total	592	73.5
Missing	213	26.5
Total	805	100

Table B-39

For each statement, indicate your level of agreement: - Collectively, psychoanalytic writing provides adequate attention to race, racism, and white supremacy as a conceptual framework for analysis.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	15	2.5
Agree	62	10.4
Disagree	365	61
Strongly Disagree	156	26.1
Total	598	74.3
Missing	207	25.7
Total	805	100

Table B-40

For each statement, indicate your level of agreement: - The field of psychoanalysis needs to increase focus on race, racism, and white supremacy.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	286	47.1
Agree	262	43.2
Disagree	44	7.2
Strongly Disagree	15	2.5
Total	607	75.4
Missing	198	24.6
Total	805	100

Table B-41

Which of the following tactics does your institute use to attract potential candidates to your program?		
	Frequency	Percent
Word of mouth	595	73.9
Advertisements in professional journals	133	16.5
Advertisements or promotions at a professional conference	264	32.8
Other, please describe	288	35.8
Total	805	

Table B-42

After a candidate is accepted into your program, does your institute do anything to encourage them to enroll in the program?		
	Frequency	Percent
Yes	443	85
No	78	15
Total	521	64.7
Missing	284	35.3
Total	805	100

Table B-43

After a candidate is accepted into your program, does your institute do anything that might unintentionally discouraged them to enroll in the program?		
	Frequency	Percent
Yes	95	18.8
No	410	81.2
Total	505	62.7
Missing	300	37.3
Total	805	100

Table B-44

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Identify as White

	Frequency	Percent
Advantage	161	27.8
Disadvantage	5	0.9
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	413	71.3
Total	579	71.9
Missing	226	28.1
Total	805	100

Table B-45

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Identify as a Person of color

	Frequency	Percent
Advantage	146	25.5
Disadvantage	100	17.5
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	326	57
Total	572	71.1
Missing	233	28.9
Total	805	100

Table B-46

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Identify as Male

	Frequency	Percent
Advantage	94	16.5
Disadvantage	3	0.5
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	474	83
Total	571	70.9
Missing	234	29.1
Total	805	100

Table B-47

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Identify as Female

	Frequency	Percent
Advantage	31	5.4
Disadvantage	22	3.8
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	520	90.8
Total	573	71.2
Missing	232	28.8
Total	805	100

Table B-48

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have higher socio-economic status

	Frequency	Percent
Advantage	269	46.8
Disadvantage	4	0.7
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	302	52.5
Total	575	71.4
Missing	230	28.6
Total	805	100

Table B-49

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have earned an advanced degree in psychology

	Frequency	Percent
Advantage	301	51.7
Disadvantage	9	1.5
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	272	46.7
Total	582	72.3
Missing	223	27.7
Total	805	100

Table B-50

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have earned a degree in medicine

	Frequency	Percent
Advantage	300	51.4
Disadvantage	8	1.4
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	276	47.3
Total	584	72.5
Missing	221	27.5
Total	805	100

Table B-51

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have earned a degree in social work

	Frequency	Percent
Advantage	148	25.6
Disadvantage	78	13.5
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	351	60.8
Total	577	71.7
Missing	228	28.3
Total	805	100

Table B-52

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have earned a degree in counseling or marriage/family therapy

	Frequency	Percent
Advantage	87	15.2
Disadvantage	155	27.1
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	329	57.6
Total	571	70.9
Missing	234	29.1
Total	805	100

Table B-53

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have earned a non-clinical degree

	Frequency	Percent
Advantage	45	7.9
Disadvantage	267	47
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	256	45.1
Total	568	70.6
Missing	237	29.4
Total	805	100

Table B-54

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Attended a highly ranked undergraduate college/university

	Frequency	Percent
Advantage	238	41.2
Disadvantage	8	1.4
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	332	57.4
Total	578	71.8
Missing	227	28.2
Total	805	100

Table B-55

Which statement best describes the approach your institute uses to identify a supervisor for each candidate:		
	Frequency	Percent
Candidates select a supervisor approved by the institute	497	82.8
Candidates are assigned a supervisor	103	17.2
Total	600	74.5
Missing	205	25.5
Total	805	100

Table B-56

Indicate whether any of the following are considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Gender identity

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	22	28.2
No	56	71.8
Total	78	75.7
Missing	25	24.3
Total	103	100

Table B-57

Indicate whether any of the following are considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Sexual orientation

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	20	25.3
No	59	74.7
Total	79	76.7
Missing	24	23.3
Total	103	100

Table B-58

Indicate whether any of the following are considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Race and/or ethnicity

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	24	30.4
No	55	69.6
Total	79	76.7
Missing	24	23.3
Total	103	100

Table B-59

Indicate whether any of the following are considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Religion

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	10	12.7
No	69	87.3
Total	79	76.7
Missing	24	23.3
Total	103	100

Table B-60

Indicate whether any of the following are considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Area of interest aligned with yours

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	45	56.3
No	35	43.8
Total	80	77.7
Missing	23	22.3
Total	103	100

Table B-61

Indicate whether any of the following are considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Supervisor's ability/openness to communicating in your primary language

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	43	56.6
No	33	43.4
Total	76	73.8
Missing	27	26.2
Total	103	100

Table B-62

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Gender identity

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	38	41.8
No	53	58.2
Total	91	18.3
Missing	406	81.7
Total	497	100

Table B-63

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Sexual orientation

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	38	41.8
No	53	58.2
Total	91	18.3
Missing	406	81.7
Total	497	100

Table B-64

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Race and/or ethnicity

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	42	45.7
No	50	54.3
Total	92	18.5
Missing	405	81.5
Total	497	100

Table B-65

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Religion

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	25	27.5
No	66	72.5
Total	91	18.3
Missing	406	81.7
Total	497	100

Table B-66

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Area of interest aligned with yours

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	74	79.6
No	19	20.4
Total	93	18.7
Missing	404	81.3
Total	497	100

Table B-67

Indicate whether you feel each of the following should be considered when assigning a supervisor to a candidate: - Supervisor's ability/openness to communicating in your primary language

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	79	87.8
No	11	12.2
Total	90	18.1
Missing	407	81.9
Total	497	100

Table B-68

When a candidate is approved to analyze cases during training, are any of the following considered... - Gender identity

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	161	29.8
No	380	70.2
Total	541	67.2
Missing	264	32.8
Total	805	100

Table B-69

When a candidate is approved to analyze cases during training, are any of the following considered... - Sexual orientation

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	93	17.3
No	446	82.7
Total	539	67
Missing	266	33
Total	805	100

Table B-70

When a candidate is approved to analyze cases during training, are any of the following considered... - Race

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	86	15.9
No	455	84.1
Total	541	67.2
Missing	264	32.8
Total	805	100

Table B-71

When a candidate is approved to analyze cases during training, are any of the following considered... - Religion

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	57	10.5
No	485	89.5
Total	542	67.3
Missing	263	32.7
Total	805	100

Table B-72

How often is race or racism a topic discussed with your candidates?		
	Frequency	Percent
Never	14	2.4
Once or twice	98	16.5
Regularly	216	36.4
I don't know	266	44.8
Total	594	73.8
Missing	211	26.2
Total	805	100

Table B-73

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... - Your candidates		
	Frequency	Percent
Very Comfortable	280	47.5
Somewhat comfortable	259	44
Somewhat uncomfortable	43	7.3
Very Uncomfortable	7	1.2
Total	589	73.2
Missing	216	26.8
Total	805	100

Table B-74

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... - Instructors in your institute

	Frequency	Percent
Very Comfortable	238	40.4
Somewhat comfortable	288	48.9
Somewhat uncomfortable	53	9
Very Uncomfortable	10	1.7
Total	589	73.2
Missing	216	26.8
Total	805	100

Table B-75

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... - Leaders in your institute

	Frequency	Percent
Very Comfortable	277	46.9
Somewhat comfortable	241	40.8
Somewhat uncomfortable	59	10
Very Uncomfortable	13	2.2
Total	590	73.3
Missing	215	26.7
Total	805	100

Table B-76

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... - People you know outside your institute

	Frequency	Percent
Very Comfortable	277	46.7
Somewhat comfortable	265	44.7
Somewhat uncomfortable	47	7.9
Very Uncomfortable	4	0.7
Total	593	73.7
Missing	212	26.3
Total	805	100

Table B-77

How prepared are you to discuss the topic of race or racism with candidates in your institute?		
	Frequency	Percent
Very well prepared	119	19.7
Moderately well prepared	375	62.2
Poorly prepared	103	17.1
Not at all prepared	6	1.0
Total	603	74.9
Missing	202	25.1
Total	805	100

Table B-78

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in the course of analysis: - Sexual orientation

	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	577	95.5
Somewhat Important	25	4.1
Not Important	2	0.3
Total	604	75
Missing	201	25
Total	805	100

Table B-79

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in the course of analysis: - Gender Identity

	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	574	95.2
Somewhat Important	27	4.5
Not Important	2	0.3
Total	603	74.9
Missing	202	25.1
Total	805	100

Table B-80

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in the course of analysis: - Religion

	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	509	84.6
Somewhat Important	85	14.1
Not Important	8	1.3
Total	602	74.8
Missing	203	25.2
Total	805	100

Table B-81

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in the course of analysis: - Race

	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	572	94.9
Somewhat Important	29	4.8
Not Important	2	0.3
Total	603	74.9
Missing	202	25.1
Total	805	100

Table B-82

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in the course of analysis: - Ethnicity

	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	555	91.9
Somewhat Important	47	7.8
Not Important	2	0.3
Total	604	75
Missing	201	25
Total	805	100

Table B-83

How important is it to be open to the discussion of the following in the course of analysis: - Language differences

	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	549	91.7
Somewhat Important	47	7.8
Not Important	3	0.5
Total	599	74.4
Missing	206	25.6
Total	805	100

Table B-84

Which statement best describes the preparation you received during your training to apply racial awareness to analysis?		
	Frequency	Percent
I have had no preparation.	309	52.1
I am underprepared.	155	26.1
I am moderately well prepared.	106	17.9
I am well prepared.	23	3.9
Total	593	73.7
Missing	212	26.3
Total	805	100

Table B-85

Reflecting on your training to become an analyst, which of the following statements do you agree most:		
	Frequency	Percent
The personal analysis was the most important part of my training.	326	54.5
The personal analysis was valuable but not the most important part of my training.	233	39
The personal analysis created an uncomfortable relationship between me and my analyst.	31	5.2
I did not participate in personal analysis as part of my training program	8	1.3
Total	598	74.3
Missing	207	25.7
Total	805	100

Table B-86

Does your institution use any evaluation/progression procedures that may unintentionally disadvantage... - Female Candidates

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	44	7.9
No	510	92.1
Total	554	68.8
Missing	251	31.2
Total	805	100

Table B-87

Does your institution use any evaluation/progression procedures that may unintentionally disadvantage... - Candidates of Color

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	99	18.1
No	448	81.9
Total	547	68
Missing	258	32
Total	805	100

Table B-88

Does your institution use any evaluation/progression procedures that may unintentionally disadvantage... -
Candidates from Disadvantaged Backgrounds

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	180	32.7
No	371	67.3
Total	551	68.4
Missing	254	31.6
Total	805	100

Table B-89

Are there any evaluation/progression criteria or procedures your institution considers to increase the number of candidates of color who complete your training program?		
	Frequency	Percent
Yes	157	30.7
No	354	69.3
Total	511	63.5
Missing	294	36.5
Total	805	100

Table B-90

Are there any evaluation/progression criteria or procedures your institution considers that could be altered to increase the number of candidates of color who complete your training program?		
	Frequency	Percent
Yes	259	54.8
No	214	45.2
Total	473	58.8
Missing	332	41.2
Total	805	100

Table B-91

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion?
- Workload

	Frequency	Percent
Frequently Contributed	149	30.3
Occasionally Contributed	228	46.4
Rarely Contributed	85	17.3
Never Contributed	29	5.9
Total	491	61
Missing	314	39
Total	805	100

Table B-92

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion?
- Family obligations

	Frequency	Percent
Frequently Contributed	198	39.2
Occasionally Contributed	258	51.1
Rarely Contributed	36	7.1
Never Contributed	13	2.6
Total	505	62.7
Missing	300	37.3
Total	805	100

Table B-93

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion?
- Dissatisfaction with advisement process

	Frequency	Percent
Frequently Contributed	25	5.7
Occasionally Contributed	171	39.1
Rarely Contributed	175	40
Never Contributed	66	15.1
Total	437	54.3
Missing	368	45.7
Total	805	100

Table B-94

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion?
 - A critical racial incident occurred

	Frequency	Percent
Frequently Contributed	15	3.6
Occasionally Contributed	72	17.1
Rarely Contributed	168	39.8
Never Contributed	167	39.6
Total	422	52.4
Missing	383	47.6
Total	805	100

Table B-95

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion?
 - Racial microaggressions or other discriminatory gestures

	Frequency	Percent
Frequently Contributed	27	6.5
Occasionally Contributed	101	24.3
Rarely Contributed	160	38.6
Never Contributed	127	30.6
Total	415	51.6
Missing	390	48.4
Total	805	100

Table B-96

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion?
 - Diminished interest in psychoanalysis

	Frequency	Percent
Frequently Contributed	56	12.1
Occasionally Contributed	223	48.2
Rarely Contributed	130	28.1
Never Contributed	54	11.7
Total	463	57.5
Missing	342	42.5
Total	805	100

Table B-97

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion?
- Financial challenges

	Frequency	Percent
Frequently Contributed	201	41
Occasionally Contributed	242	49.4
Rarely Contributed	37	7.6
Never Contributed	10	2
Total	490	60.9
Missing	315	39.1
Total	805	100

Table B-98

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion?
- Other

	Frequency	Percent
Frequently Contributed	18	28.6
Occasionally Contributed	23	36.5
Rarely Contributed	13	20.6
Never Contributed	9	14.3
Total	63	7.8
Missing	742	92.2
Total	805	100

Table B-99

Candidates sometimes experience personal or professional difficulties that interfere with their ability to progress through the psychoanalytic training process. Are you aware of your institution taking any of the actions listed below to support candidates at risk of leaving your program before completion? - Reduced Fees

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	386	73.5
No	139	26.5
Total	525	65.2
Missing	280	34.8
Total	805	100

Table B-100

Candidates sometimes experience personal or professional difficulties that interfere with their ability to progress through the psychoanalytic training process. Are you aware of your institution taking any of the actions listed below to support candidates at risk of leaving your program before completion? - Deadline Extension

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	463	89.9
No	52	10.1
Total	515	64
Missing	290	36
Total	805	100

Table B-101

Candidates sometimes experience personal or professional difficulties that interfere with their ability to progress through the psychoanalytic training process. Are you aware of your institution taking any of the actions listed below to support candidates at risk of leaving your program before completion? - Finding a new mentor in the field

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	416	82.7
No	87	17.3
Total	503	62.5
Missing	302	37.5
Total	805	100

Table B-102

Candidates sometimes experience personal or professional difficulties that interfere with their ability to progress through the psychoanalytic training process. Are you aware of your institution taking any of the actions listed below to support candidates at risk of leaving your program before completion? - Assigning a new supervisor

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	448	86.8
No	68	13.2
Total	516	64.1
Missing	289	35.9
Total	805	100

Table B-103

What actions does your institution take to support candidates once they have completed your program?		
	Frequency	Percent
Assistance building a practice	186	23.1
Invitation to coauthor publications	118	14.7
Invitation to teach courses	510	63.4
Invitation to serve on committees or boards	528	65.6
Encourage applications of psychoanalysis in the community	246	30.6
Total	805	

Table B-104

Does your institute provide opportunities for candidates to make connections with professionals in their communities?		
	Frequency	Percent
Yes	353	66.6
No	177	33.4
Total	530	65.8
Missing	275	34.2
Total	805	100

Table B-105

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute is proactive in referring patients to recent graduates in order to help them build a practice.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	67	12.4
Agree	249	46
Disagree	173	32
Strongly Disagree	52	9.6
Total	541	67.2
Missing	264	32.8
Total	805	100

Table B-106

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute works hard to match potential patients with an analyst based on gender.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	15	3
Agree	135	27.4
Disagree	275	55.8
Strongly Disagree	68	13.8
Total	493	61.2
Missing	312	38.8
Total	805	100

Table B-107

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute works hard to match potential patients with an analyst based on race.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	10	2.1
Agree	132	27.6
Disagree	267	55.9
Strongly Disagree	69	14.4
Total	478	59.4
Missing	327	40.6
Total	805	100

Table B-108

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute works hard to match potential patients with an analyst based on religion.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	5	1
Agree	60	12.6
Disagree	310	65
Strongly Disagree	102	21.4
Total	477	59.3
Missing	328	40.7
Total	805	100

Table B-109

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute invites exemplary graduates to teach courses.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	257	47.2
Agree	248	45.5
Disagree	29	5.3
Strongly Disagree	11	2
Total	545	67.7
Missing	260	32.3
Total	805	100

Table B-110

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute makes a concerted effort to recruit graduates of color to teach courses.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	77	15.5
Agree	205	41.2
Disagree	171	34.3
Strongly Disagree	45	9
Total	498	61.9
Missing	307	38.1
Total	805	100

Table B-111

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues invite exemplary graduates to publish collaboratively.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	50	10.8
Agree	175	37.7
Disagree	178	38.4
Strongly Disagree	61	13.1
Total	464	57.6
Missing	341	42.4
Total	805	100

Table B-112

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues make a concerted effort to invite graduates of color to publish collaboratively.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	32	7.2
Agree	124	27.7
Disagree	223	49.9
Strongly Disagree	68	15.2
Total	447	55.5
Missing	358	44.5
Total	805	100

Table B-113

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues invite exemplary graduates to present cases and/or research at conferences and society meetings.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	150	29.5
Agree	292	57.5
Disagree	52	10.2
Strongly Disagree	14	2.8
Total	508	63.1
Missing	297	36.9
Total	805	100

Table B-114

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues make a concerted effort to invite graduates of color to present cases and/or research at conferences and society meetings.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	99	20.7
Agree	207	43.3
Disagree	141	29.5
Strongly Disagree	31	6.5
Total	478	59.4
Missing	327	40.6
Total	805	100

**2023 Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in
American Psychoanalysis**

Appendix C

**Technical Report: Descriptive Statistics for Items for which Statistically
Significant Differences Occurred Between Candidates
Categorized as BIPOC or White**

Appendix C

Descriptive Statistics for Items for which Statistically Significant Differences Occurred Between Candidates Categorized as BIPOC or White

Table C-1

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Race or Racism

	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All	11.4	23.1
Not Covered Enough	60.5	58.2
Covered Adequately	27.6	16.5
Covered Too Much	0.5	2.2
n	185	91
Missing	2	2
N	187	93
p-value	0.01	

Table C-2

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Ethnicity

	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All	14.1	35.2
Not Covered Enough	59.5	49.5
Covered Adequately	26.5	15.4
Covered Too Much	0	0
n	185	91
Missing	2	2
N	187	93
p-value	0.01	

Table C-3

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Gender Identity

	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All	4.3	16.7
Not Covered Enough	51.9	50
Covered Adequately	43.8	31.1
Covered Too Much		2.2
n	185	90
Missing	2	3
N	187	93
p-value	0.02	

Table C-4

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Religious Affiliation

	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All	37.7	57.1
Not Covered Enough	42.1	35.2
Covered Adequately	18.6	7.7
Covered Too Much	1.6	0
n	183	91
Missing	4	2
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-5

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Intersectionality/Intersectional Identity

	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All	26.2	48.4
Not Covered Enough	50.3	38.5
Covered Adequately	22.4	12.1
Covered Too Much	1.1	1.1
n	183	91
Missing	4	2
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-6

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Socio-Economic Status

	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All	26.3	46.2
Not Covered Enough	54.3	44
Covered Adequately	19.4	9.9
Covered Too Much	100	0
n	186	91
Missing	1	2
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-7

With which statement do you most agree?

	White	BIPOC
People of color are represented adequately in the required reading.	7	3.2
People of color are overrepresented in the required reading.	0.5	0
People of color are underrepresented in the required reading.	79.7	84.9
I do not know.	12.8	11.8
n	187	93
Missing	0	0
N	187	3
p-value	0.01	

Table C-8

Which of the following best describes your own level of understanding of race, racism, and white supremacy?

	White	BIPOC
Emerging Level of Understanding	18.8	8.7
Moderate Level of Understanding	62.4	50
Advanced Level of Understanding	18.8	41.3
n	186	92
Missing	1	1
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-9

How would you assess the level of understanding of race/racism/white supremacy of - Your fellow candidates

	White	BIPOC
Emerging Level of Understanding	32.2	46.6
Moderate Level of Understanding	59.4	50
Advanced Level of Understanding	8.3	3.4
n	180	88
Missing	7	5
N	187	93
p-value	0.01	

Table C-10

How would you assess the level of understanding of race/racism/white supremacy of - Your fellow candidates

	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable	45.9	39.6
Somewhat Comfortable	39.8	29.7
Somewhat Uncomfortable	11.6	20.9
Very Uncomfortable	2.8	9.9
n	181	91
Missing	6	2
N	187	93
p-value	0.03	

Table C-11

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with... - Instructors

	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable	28.7	25
Somewhat Comfortable	45.9	27.3
Somewhat Uncomfortable	16.6	23.9
Very Uncomfortable	8.8	23.9
n	181	88
Missing	6	5
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-12

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with... - Your analyst

	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable	87.3	64.8
Somewhat Comfortable	8.8	21.6
Somewhat Uncomfortable	3.9	8
Very Uncomfortable	0	5.7
n	181	88
Missing	6	5
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-13

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with... - Your supervisor

	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable	69.7	44.9
Somewhat Comfortable	20.2	30.3
Somewhat Uncomfortable	8.4	12.4
Very Uncomfortable	1.7	12.4
n	178	89
Missing	9	4
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-14

Have you raised an issue regarding race or racism with an instructor or leader(s) in your institute?

	White	BIPOC
Yes	34.4	54.8
No	65.6	45.2
n	186	93
Missing	1	0
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-15

For each statement, indicate your level of agreement: - Race, racism, and white supremacy are addressed adequately at my institute as a conceptual framework for analysis.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	4.3	5.5
Agree	30.4	16.5
Disagree	49.5	44
Strongly Disagree	15.8	34.1
n	184	91
Missing	3	2
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-16

For each statement, indicate your level of agreement: - The field of psychoanalysis needs to increase focus on race, racism, and white supremacy.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	53.5	70.7
Agree	40	22.8
Disagree	4.3	4.3
Strongly Disagree	2.2	2.2
n	185	92
Missing	2	1
N	187	93
p-value	0.01	

Table C-17

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have earned a degree in medicine

	White	BIPOC
Advantage	45.4	61.4
Disadvantage	2.2	3.4
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	52.5	35.2
n	183	88
Missing	4	5
N	187	93
p-value	0.01	

Table C-18

Which statement best characterizes the interview process?

	White	BIPOC
The interview was a positive and comfortable experience.	63.2	47.2
The interview was neither a positive nor negative experience.	18.7	31.5
The interview was a moderately negative and uncomfortable experience.	14.8	15.7
The interview made me feel very uncomfortable and misunderstood as a person.	3.3	5.6
n	182	89
Missing	5	4
N	187	93
p-value	0.03	

Table C-19

Which statement best characterizes the interview process?

	White	BIPOC
Candidates select a supervisor approved by the institute	87.4	63.7
Candidates are assigned a supervisor	12.6	36.3
n	182	91
Missing	5	2
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-20

Indicate whether any of the following were considered when assigning you to a supervisor: - Race and/or ethnicity

	White	BIPOC
Yes	10.5	17.2
No	89.5	82.8
n	19	29
Missing	4	4
N	23	33
p-value	0.01	

Table C-21

How often is race or racism a topic discussed with your supervisor(s)?

	White	BIPOC
Never	10.2	14
Once or twice	45.2	53.5
Regularly	36.7	30.2
I don't know	7.9	2.3
n	177	86
Missing	10	7
N	187	93
p-value	0.04	

Table C-22

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... -
Your advisor

	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable	49.7	37.5
Somewhat comfortable	39.4	31.8
Somewhat uncomfortable	7.4	19.3
Very Uncomfortable	3.4	11.4
n	175	88
Missing	12	5
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-23

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... -
Your supervisor

	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable	65.9	48.8
Somewhat comfortable	29.6	31.4
Somewhat uncomfortable	4.5	11.6
Very Uncomfortable	0	8.1
n	179	86
Missing	8	7
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-24

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... -
Instructors

	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable	33.9	25.8
Somewhat comfortable	51.4	37.1
Somewhat uncomfortable	10.9	25.8
Very Uncomfortable	3.8	11.2
n	183	89
Missing	4	4
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-25

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... -
Fellow candidates

	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable	51.1	37.1
Somewhat comfortable	39	39.3
Somewhat uncomfortable	7.7	18
Very Uncomfortable	2.2	5.6
n	182	89
Missing	5	4
N	187	93
p-value	0.01	

Table C-26

Did you ever raise the topic of race or racism as a topic of discussion with
your advisor?

	White	BIPOC
No, I never raised race or racism with my advisor.	53.3	39.1
Yes, when I raised race or racism with my advisor we had an open discussion.	42.6	46
Yes, when I raised race or racism my advisor seemed reluctant or uncomfortable discussing the topic.	4.1	14.9
n	169	87
Missing	18	6
N	187	93
p-value	0.01	

Table C-27

How prepared were your instructors to discuss the topic of race or racism?

	White	BIPOC
Very well prepared	14.9	11.2
Moderately well prepared	52.3	40.4
Poorly prepared	26.4	29.2
Not at all prepared	6.3	19.1
n	174	89
Missing	13	4
N	187	93
p-value	0.01	

Table C-28

Did you ever have a discriminatory experience with your advisor, supervisor, or instructor?

	White	BIPOC
Yes	21.1	36.6
No	78.9	63.4
n	185	93
Missing	2	0
N	187	93
p-value	0.01	

Table C-29

Which statement best describes the approach your institute uses to identify a personal/training analyst for each candidate:

	White	BIPOC
Candidates chooses an analyst.	97.8	92
Candidates are assigned an analyst.	2.2	8
n	182	87
Missing	5	6
N	187	93
p-value	0.02	

Table C-30

During your personal/training analysis, do/did you feel free to discuss: -
Sexual orientation

	White	BIPOC
Yes	97.3	90.5
No	2.7	9.5
n	184	84
Missing	3	9
N	187	93
p-value	0.02	

Table C-31

During your personal/training analysis, do/did you feel free to discuss: -
Religion

	White	BIPOC
Yes	97.3	89.3
No	2.7	10.7
n	184	84
Missing	3	9
N	187	93
p-value	0.01	

Table C-32

During your personal/training analysis, do/did you feel free to discuss: -
Race

	White	BIPOC
Yes	97.3	88.2
No	2.7	11.8
n	184	85
Missing	3	8
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-33

During your personal/training analysis, do/did you feel free to discuss: -
Ethnicity

	White	BIPOC
Yes	97.8	84.5
No	2.2	15.5
n	184	84
Missing	3	9
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-34

During your personal/training analysis, do/did you feel free to discuss: -
Language differences

	White	BIPOC
Yes	96.7	89.3
No	3.3	10.7
n	180	84
Missing	7	9
N	187	93
p-value	0.02	

Table C-35

With which of the following statements do you agree most:

	White	BIPOC
The personal analysis was the most important part of my training.	71.8	59.5
The personal analysis was valuable but not the most important part of my training.	26.6	35.7
The personal analysis created an uncomfortable relationship between me and my analyst.	1.7	4.8
n	177	84
Missing	10	9
N	187	93
p-value	0.04	

Table C-36

Which statement best describes the preparation you received during your training to apply racial awareness to analysis?

	White	BIPOC
I have had no preparation.	16.8	27.3
I am underprepared.	35.8	38.6
I am moderately well prepared.	39.1	28.4
I am well prepared.	8.4	5.7
n	179	88
Missing	8	5
N	187	93
p-value	0.02	

Table C-37

Which statement best describes the preparation you have received to apply a racial framework during analysis?

	White	BIPOC
I have had no preparation.	16.4	34.1
I am underprepared.	40.1	42
I am moderately well prepared.	36.2	19.3
I am well prepared.	7.3	4.5
n	177	88
Missing	10	5
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-38

Are there any evaluation/progression criteria or procedures your institution considers to increase the number of candidates of color who complete your training program?

	White	BIPOC
Yes	35.9	17.5
No	64.1	82.5
n	145	80
Missing	42	13
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-39

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - A critical racial incident occurred

	White	BIPOC
Frequently Contributed	5.8	12.7
Occasionally Contributed	23.3	33.3
Rarely Contributed	35	30.2
Never Contributed	35.9	23.8
n	103	63
Missing	84	30
N	187	93
p-value	0.02	

Table C-40

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - Racial microaggressions or other discriminatory gestures

	White	BIPOC
Frequently Contributed	11.5	27
Occasionally Contributed	29.8	27
Rarely Contributed	29.8	25.4
Never Contributed	28.8	20.6
n	104	63
Missing	83	30
N	187	93
p-value	0.04	

Table C-41

Does your institute provide opportunities for candidates to make connections with professionals in their communities?

	White	BIPOC
Yes	81.4	65.8
No	18.6	34.2
n	167	79
Missing	20	14
N	187	93
p-value	0.01	

Table C-42

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute invites exemplary graduates to teach courses.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	37.6	11
Agree	54.4	74
Disagree	5.4	12.3
Strongly Disagree	2.7	2.7
n	149	73
Missing	38	20
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-43

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute makes a concerted effort to recruit graduates of color to teach courses.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	9.2	0
Agree	33.6	25.4
Disagree	41.2	45.1
Strongly Disagree	16	29.6
n	119	71
Missing	68	22
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-44

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues invite exemplary graduates to publish collaboratively.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	4.4	1.7
Agree	36.3	25
Disagree	44.2	50
Strongly Disagree	15	23.3
n	113	60
Missing	74	33
N	187	93
p-value	0.04	

Table C-45

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues make a concerted effort to invite graduates of color to publish collaboratively.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	2.8	0
Agree	28	19
Disagree	49.5	50
Strongly Disagree	19.6	31
n	107	58
Missing	80	35
N	187	93
p-value	0.04	

Table C-46

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues invite exemplary graduates to present cases and/or research at conferences and society meetings.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	19.5	3.4
Agree	57.7	46.6
Disagree	17.9	34.5
Strongly Disagree	4.9	15.5
n	123	58
Missing	64	35
N	187	93
p-value	<.01	

Table C-47

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues make a concerted effort to invite graduates of color to present cases and/or research at conferences and society meetings.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	11.4	5.2
Agree	43.9	27.6
Disagree	32.5	46.6
Strongly Disagree	12.3	20.7
n	114	58
Missing	73	35
N	187	93
p-value	0.01	

**2023 Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in
American Psychoanalysis**

Appendix D

**Technical Report: Descriptive Statistics for Items for which Statistically
Significant Differences Occurred Between Faculty Categorized as BIPOC or
White**

Appendix D

Descriptive Statistics for Items for which Statistically Significant Differences Occurred Between Faculty Categorized as BIPOC or White

Table D-1

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage
provided by your institute's curriculum. - Ethnicity

	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All	13	28.7
Not Covered Enough	66.3	50
Covered Adequately	20.4	21.3
Covered Too Much	0.4	0
n	486	80
Missing	26	1
N	512	81
p-value	0.04	

Table D-2

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage
provided by your institute's curriculum. - Physical
Ability/Disability

	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All	45.7	58.8
Not Covered Enough	46.3	33.8
Covered Adequately	8.1	7.5
Covered Too Much	0	0
n	484	80
Missing	28	1
N	512	81
p-value	0.05	

Table D-3

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Religious Affiliation

	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All	46	60.8
Not Covered Enough	42.1	26.6
Covered Adequately	11.9	12.7
Covered Too Much	0	0
n	480	79
Missing	32	2
N	512	81
p-value	0.05	

Table D-4

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Intersectionality/Intersectional Identity

	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All	32	47.4
Not Covered Enough	52	40.8
Covered Adequately	15.1	10.5
Covered Too Much	0.9	1.3
n	465	76
Missing	47	5
N	512	81
p-value	0.02	

Table D-5

For each topic listed below, indicate the level of coverage provided by your institute's curriculum. - Socio-Economic Stat

	White	BIPOC
Not Covered at All	27.2	45.7
Not Covered Enough	60	44.4
Covered Adequately	12.7	9.9
Covered Too Much	0.2	0
n	482	81
Missing	30	0
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-6

When in-person learning resumes, will your institute offer remote learning options for candidates?

	White	BIPOC
Yes	42.4	30.9
No	2.8	1.2
I don't know	54.8	67.9
n	507	81
Missing	5	0
N	512	81
p-value	0.04	

Table D-7

How effective or ineffective was each activity for deepening your understanding of race, racism, and/or white supremacy?

- Invited lecture or symposium focused on race, racism, and/or white supremacy

	White	BIPOC
Very Effective	30.3	25
Somewhat Effective	59.2	48.4
Somewhat Ineffective	6	15.6
Had No Effect	4.5	10.9
n	419	64
Missing	93	17
N	512	81
p-value	0.02	

Table D-8

With which of the following statements do you agree most?

	White	BIPOC
My institution has not taken any specific actions to address race, racism, and/or white supremacy.	7.1	13.9
My institution has taken actions to address race, racism, and/or white supremacy in response to specific racist events or actions that triggered outrage by members of my institution.	37	48.1
My institution has been proactive in taking actions to address race, racism, and/or white supremacy because doing so is viewed as essential for the future of psychoanalysis.	56	38
n	495	79
Missing	17	2
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-9

Which of the following best describes your own level of understanding of race, racism, and white supremacy?

	White	BIPOC
Emerging Level of Understanding	23.6	11.1
Moderate Level of Understanding	55.4	37
Advanced Level of Understanding	21	51.9
n	504	81
Missing	8	0
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-10

If you were to experience or witness an action you considered racist, how comfortable are you raising the issue with... -
Leadership in your institute

	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable	51.6	40.7
Somewhat Comfortable	31.5	29.6
Somewhat Uncomfortable	13.9	18.5
Very Uncomfortable	3	11.1
n	504	81
Missing	8	0
N	512	81
p-value	0.01	

Table D-11

Have you raised an issue regarding race or racism with a leader(s) in your institute?

	White	BIPOC
Yes	38.2	51.9
No	61.8	48.1
n	508	81
Missing	4	0
N	512	81
p-value	0.02	

Table D-12

Which statement best describes the response you experienced?

	White	BIPOC
The issue was addressed adequately.	39.8	16.7
The issue was addressed to a limited extent, but more should have been done.	40.8	54.8
I felt unsupported and/or alienated after raising the issue.	11.5	19
The issue was largely ignored.	7.9	9.5
n	191	42
Missing	3	0
N	194	42
p-value	0.01	

Table D-13

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Identify as White

	White	BIPOC
Advantage	24.9	43
Disadvantage	0.8	1.3
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	74.2	55.7
n	473	79
Missing	39	2
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-14

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Have higher socio-economic status

	White	BIPOC
Advantage	44.2	62.8
Disadvantage	0.8	0
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	55	37.2
n	471	78
Missing	41	3
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-15

Do you believe the criteria used during the admissions process may unintentionally advantage or disadvantage applicants with any of the following background characteristics? Candidates who... - Identify as Male

	White	BIPOC
Advantage	13.8	31.6
Disadvantage	0.6	0
Neither Advantage or Disadvantage	85.5	68.4
n	470	76
Missing	42	5
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-16

Which statement best describes the approach your institute uses to identify a supervisor for each candidate:

	White	BIPOC
Candidates select a supervisor approved by the institute	85.3	71.8
Candidates are assigned a supervisor	14.7	28.2
n	490	78
Missing	22	3
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-17

How often is race or racism a topic discussed with your candidates?

	White	BIPOC
Never	1.6	5.2
Once or twice	14.7	26
Regularly	37.5	29.9
I don't know	46.2	39
n	491	77
Missing	21	4
N	512	81
p-value	0.03	

Table D-18

How often is race or racism a topic discussed with your candidates?

	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable	45.1	59
Somewhat comfortable	45.9	35.9
Somewhat uncomfortable	7.8	3.8
Very Uncomfortable	1.2	1.3
n	488	78
Missing	24	3
N	512	81
p-value	0.02	

Table D-19

How comfortable are you discussing the topic of race or racism with... - People you know outside your institute

	White	BIPOC
Very Comfortable	44.4	60.3
Somewhat comfortable	47.1	30.8
Somewhat uncomfortable	7.9	7.7
Very Uncomfortable	0.6	1.3
n	493	78
Missing	19	3
N	512	81
p-value	0.02	

Table D-20

How prepared are you to discuss the topic of race or racism with candidates in your institute?

	White	BIPOC
Very well prepared	15.9	40
Moderately well prepared	64.9	46.3
Poorly prepared	18.1	13.8
Not at all prepared	1.2	0
n	498	80
Missing	14	1
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-21

Does your institution use any evaluation/progression procedures that may unintentionally disadvantage... -
Candidates of Color

	White	BIPOC
Yes	15	31.1
No	85	68.9
n	454	74
Missing	58	7
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-22

Does your institution use any evaluation/progression procedures that may unintentionally disadvantage... -
Candidates from Disadvantaged Backgrounds

	White	BIPOC
Yes	29.7	45.9
No	70.3	54.1
n	458	74
Missing	54	7
N	512	81
p-value	0.01	

Table D-23

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - A critical racial incident occurred

	White	BIPOC
Frequently Contributed	2.2	12.1
Occasionally Contributed	16.4	20.7
Rarely Contributed	40.4	34.5
Never Contributed	40.9	32.8
n	359	58
Missing	153	23
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-24

To what extent do each of the following contribute to candidates leaving your program before completion? - Racial microaggressions or other discriminatory gestures

	White	BIPOC
Frequently Contributed	4.2	19.3
Occasionally Contributed	24.4	26.3
Rarely Contributed	38.5	36.8
Never Contributed	32.9	17.5
n	353	57
Missing	159	24
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-25

Candidates sometimes experience personal or professional difficulties that interfere with their ability to progress through the psychoanalytic training process. Are you aware of your institution taking any of the actions listed below to support candidates at risk of leaving your program before completion? - Deadline Extension

	White	BIPOC
Yes	91.3	79.1
No	8.7	20.9
n	438	67
Missing	74	14
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-26

Candidates sometimes experience personal or professional difficulties that interfere with their ability to progress through the psychoanalytic training process. Are you aware of your institution taking any of the actions listed below to support candidates at risk of leaving your program before completion? - Finding a new mentor in the field

	White	BIPOC
Yes	84.8	69.2
No	15.2	30.8
n	428	65
Missing	84	16
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-27

Candidates sometimes experience personal or professional difficulties that interfere with their ability to progress through the psychoanalytic training process. Are you aware of your institution taking any of the actions listed below to support candidates at risk of leaving your program before completion? - Assigning a new supervisor

	White	BIPOC
Yes	88.4	75.8
No	11.6	24.2
n	440	66
Missing	72	15
N	512	81
p-value	0.01	

Table D-28

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute is proactive in referring patients to recent graduates in order to help them build a practice.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	13.4	6.8
Agree	47.3	37.8
Disagree	31.5	35.1
Strongly Disagree	7.8	20.3
n	463	74
Missing	49	7
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-29

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute invites exemplary graduates to teach courses.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	49.6	32.4
Agree	44.2	54.1
Disagree	4.5	9.5
Strongly Disagree	1.7	4.1
n	468	74
Missing	44	7
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-30

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - My institute makes a concerted effort to recruit graduates of color to teach courses.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	16.5	9.9
Agree	42	36.6
Disagree	33.3	39.4
Strongly Disagree	8.3	14.1
n	424	71
Missing	88	10
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-31

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues make a concerted effort to invite graduates of color to publish collaboratively.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	7.5	4.3
Agree	28.5	23.2
Disagree	50.1	49.3
Strongly Disagree	13.9	23.2
n	375	69
Missing	137	12
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-32

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues invite exemplary graduates to present cases and/or research at conferences and society meetings.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	31.3	16.9
Agree	57.6	57.7
Disagree	9	18.3
Strongly Disagree	2.1	7
n	434	71
Missing	78	10
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-33

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements: - You and/or your colleagues make a concerted effort to invite graduates of color to present cases and/or research at conferences and society meetings.

	White	BIPOC
Strongly Agree	22.2	11.6
Agree	44.8	33.3
Disagree	27.6	42
Strongly Disagree	5.4	13
n	406	69
Missing	106	12
N	512	81
p-value	<.01	

Table D-34

Racism is no longer a major issue in the United States; regardless of one's race, all people now have similar opportunities for success.

	White	BIPOC
Fully reflects my thinking	0	1.3
Somewhat reflects my thinking	1.8	5
Does not reflect my thinking	98.2	93.8
n	511	80
Missing	1	1
N	512	81
p-value	0.01	

**2023 Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in
American Psychoanalysis**

Appendix E

**Technical Report: Descriptive Statistic Tables for
Candidate Survey Demographic Items**

Appendix E

Descriptive Statistic Tables for Candidate Survey Demographic Items

Table E-1

Which best describes you?

	Percent	Frequency
Candidate (current, recent graduate or previously enrolled) in a psychoanalytic training program	24.5	461
Faculty, administrator, or staff (current and those retired in the past five years) for a psychoanalytic training program	44.7	840
Psychodynamically or psychoanalytically oriented clinician, including but not limited to those who have enrolled in and/or graduated from a psychodynamic or psychotherapy program or had independent training.	26.8	503
None of the above	4.0	75
Total		1879

Table E-2

For how many years have you been affiliated with your institute?

	Percent	Frequency
Less than 1 year	8.4	33
1 year	8.7	34
2 years	8.7	34
3 years	9.2	36
4 years	12.0	47
5 or more years	53.2	209
Total		393
Did not respond		68

Table E-3

With which of the following racial and ethnic identities do you identify? [Check all that apply]

	Percent	Frequency
Asian, South Asian, Southeast Asian, East Asian, Pacific Islander, Asian American	11.7	33
Black, African, African American, Caribbean	7.5	21
Latinx, Hispanic, Central American, Latin American, South American	8.9	25
White	73.3	206
Not Listed, please describe your identity	4.6	13
Total		281
Did not respond		180

Table E-4

Do you identify as White or BIPOC?

	Percent	Frequency
White	66.8	187
BIPOC	33.2	93
Total		280
Did not respond	39.3	181

Table E-5

Do you identify with a religion or faith tradition?

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	44.2	125
No	55.8	158
Total		283
Did not respond	38.6	178

Table E-6

With which gender identity do you most identify? - Selected Choice

	Percent	Frequency
Male	27.4	77
Female	67.6	190
Gender variant/non-conforming	1.4	4
Not listed, please describe	2.1	6
Prefer not to answer	1.4	4
Total		281
Did not respond		180

Table E-7

Is your institute affiliated with...

	Percent	Frequency
APsaA	62.3	175
IPA	36.7	103
Other, please describe	10.0	28
Total		281
Did not respond		180

Table E-8

Please check each of the following that apply to you?

	Percent	Frequency
APsaA member	50.6	124
Member of APsaA governance	1.2	3
Member of one or more APsaA committees	8.6	21
None of the above	49.4	121
Total		245
Did not respond		216

**2023 Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in
American Psychoanalysis**

Appendix F

**Technical Report: Descriptive Statistic Tables for
Faculty Survey Demographic Items**

Appendix F

Descriptive Statistic Tables for Faculty Survey Demographic Items

Table F-1

Which best describes you?

	Percent	Frequency
Candidate (current, recent graduate or previously enrolled) in a psychoanalytic training program	24.5	461
Faculty, administrator, or staff (current and those retired in the past five years) for a psychoanalytic training program	44.7	840
Psychodynamically or psychoanalytically oriented clinician, including but not limited to those who have enrolled in and/or graduated from a psychodynamic or psychotherapy program or had independent training.	26.8	503
None of the above	4.0	75
Total		1879

Table F-2

How many institutes are you affiliated with:

	Percent	Frequency
1	67.5	533
2	24.7	195
3	5.4	43
4	1.8	14
5 or more	0.6	5
Total		790

Table F-3

Which of the following roles have you played in your institute over the past five years:

	Percent	Frequency
Instructor	82.2	662
Advisor for candidate(s)	42.2	340
Supervisor for candidate(s)	50.7	408
Personal or Training Analyst for candidate(s)	37.9	305
Institute Leader	38.6	311
Administrator/Support staff	7.6	61
Total		805

Table F-4

With which of the following racial and ethnic identities do you identify? [Check all that apply]

	Percent	Frequency
Asian, South Asian, Southeast Asian, East Asian, Pacific Islander, Asian American	3.9	23
Black, African, African American, Caribbean	4.2	25
Latinx, Hispanic, Central American, Latin American, South American	3.9	23
Middle Eastern/North African	1.9	11
Native American, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian	0.7	4
White	85.7	508
Not Listed, please describe your identity	8.3	49
Total		593
Did not respond		212

Table F-5

Do you identify as White or BIPOC?

	Percent	Frequency
White	86.3	512
BIPOC	13.7	81
Total		593
Did not respond		212

Table F-6

Do you identify with a religion or faith tradition?

	Percent	Frequency
Yes	59.9	355
No	40.1	238
Total		593
Did not respond		212

Table F-7

With which gender identity do you most identify? - Selected Choice

	Percent	Frequency
Male	33.6	199
Female	64.2	380
Gender variant/non-conforming	0.7	4
Not listed, please describe	0.3	2
Prefer not to answer	1.2	7
Total		592
Did not respond		213

Table F-8

Is your institute affiliated with...

	Percent	Frequency
APsaA	76.7	428
IPA	54.3	303
Other, please describe	14.2	79
Total		558
Did not respond		247

Table F-9

Please check each of the following that apply to you? [Check all that apply]

	Percent	Frequency
APsaA member	76.3	390
Member of APsaA governance	4.7	24
Member of one or more APsaA committees	23.9	122
None of the above	23.7	121
Total		511
Did not respond		294

**2023 Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in
American Psychoanalysis**

Appendix G

**Technical Report: The Holmes Commission
Interview Summary Report**

Appendix G: The Holmes Commission

Interview Summary Report

To complement findings from the survey portion of the study, an interview study was conducted. The interview study was designed to elaborate on a select set of key findings that emerged from preliminary analysis of the survey data.

The interview study was divided into three components, each focused on a different set of participants, namely candidates, faculty/staff, and people who were psychodynamically-oriented but had not entered a psychoanalytic training program. For each component, a semi-structured group interview method was employed. This method entailed the use of a semi-structure interview protocol that focused on three or four topics, depending on the group interviewed. All interviews were conducted in small groups that were intended to range from two to four participants (due to scheduling conflicts, a few interviews were conducted individually). The interviews were designed to be completed within an hour.

Candidate interviews were conducted by four members of The Holmes Commission leadership team and 20 advanced candidates. Faculty/Staff and psychodynamically-oriented interviews were conducted by the 20 members of the Holmes Commission. All people who conducted interviews participated in training session delivered by the methodologist for this study. The training was conducted via Zoom, lasted for approximately one hour, and focused on the purpose of the interview study, the specifics of each protocol, guidance on generating reports, and procedural matters to attend to while conducting interviews (e.g., assuring all participants have an opportunity to speak, managing conflict that might arise during an interview, handling dominating voices, etc.).

All group interviews were recorded (either voice recording or video Zoom recording). Following each interview, the interviewer used a summary report template to produce a report detailing specifics from each interview, recording notable quotes, and commenting on specific aspects of the interview (e.g., dominant voices, level of participation, participants who arrived late, etc.). The reports were submitted to the lead methodologist who then synthesized findings across reports. When clarification regarding a comment or topic mentioned in a report was required, the methodologist reviewed recordings. The summary findings are presented on the pages below. The summary report draws on comments made by interviewees and on the information interviewers provided in their summary reports. To differentiate between statements made by interviewees and statements recorded by interviewers in the summary reports, double quotation marks (“ ”) are used for comments made by interviewees and single quotation marks (‘ ’) are used for statements made by interviewers in their summary reports.

To assure participants felt comfortable discussing issues of race and racism, all participants were presented with the option of participating in a racialized affinity group or in a group containing people of mixed racialized identities. Across all interviews, a small number of participants opted for an affinity group requiring the formation of three affinity groups.

A three-step process was employed to select participants for an interview. First, all people who completed a survey were asked on the survey whether they were interested/willing to participate in a follow-up interview and, if so, to provide a contact email address. From those who responded affirmatively and provided an email address, all volunteers who identified as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) were contacted and invited to participate. Given the under-representation of people who identify as BIPOC in the field of psychoanalysis, we began by extending offers to survey respondents who identified as BIPOC to assure their perspectives were represented in the interview data. We then randomly selected and invited participants from the remaining pool of volunteers until the maximum number of interview participant slots was reached. For the faculty interviews, we also purposefully selected all interview volunteers whose survey responses indicated they did not perceive race and racism as an important concern for the field of psychoanalysis. We took this step to assure that the widest range of perspectives were represented in the interviews and to give voice to those faculty/staff whose views on race and racism differed from that of the Commission.

We aimed to interview 80 candidates, 80 faculty/staff, and 30 psychodynamically-oriented participants. Table 1 shows the number of volunteers for each group, the number of BIPOC participants selected, and the number of participants who identified as White selected. Due to unexpected conflicts that arose for some selected participants, some people who were selected were not able to participate in their assigned interview group. The final row of Table 1 reports the total number of participants that were able to participate in an interview.

Table 1
Interview Recruitment and Participation Numbers

	Candidates	Faculty/Staff	Psychodynamically Oriented
Total Volunteers	171	311	143
BIPOC Selected	48	37	NA
White Selected	32	43	NA
Total Selected	80	80	30
Total Participated	55	53	18

In the sections that follow, summary findings across interviews are presented separately for the candidate, faculty/staff, and psychodynamically oriented groups. The presentation of findings for each group is organized by the main topics explored during the interviews. Each section begins by presenting the prompt all interviews used to begin discussion of each main topic. A synthesis of interviewers' observations recorded in the post-interview summary reports is then presented.

Candidate Interviews Summary Report

Response to Racist Incidents

Prompt: In our survey data a number of people reported incidents that occurred in their institute that they consider racist or to be racial enactments. Many people also indicated that when the incident was reported, the response was not adequate. If you were to experience or observe an incident you consider racist, what response would you like to experience if you were to report the incident?

Nearly all candidates indicated they had either experienced one or more racial enactments or were aware of such enactments having occurred in their institutes. Only one candidate indicated the incident they had in mind was handled adequately. As an example, one candidate recounted a comment by a TA made on a listserv thread about Black Lives Matter that produced offense. The TA was addressed by administration and after making a “surface apology” that indicated a continued lack of understanding of why the comment produced offense, the TA was relieved of their teaching/supervising role.

In the vast majority of cases candidates indicated the incidents they experienced or were aware of were not handled adequately. Across interview groups, the terms dismissive, defensive, passive, and silence were used frequently to characterize responses to racist incidents. Multiple candidates described dismissive attitudes that seemed to disregard or minimize incidents. Several candidates also felt issues were discussed behind closed doors without any public acknowledgment of or response to incidents. Candidates reported that incidents seem to be viewed by institute leaders as isolated. As a result, leaders focus on the single incident absent consideration of the culture or climate in which the incident occurred. In some cases, incidents are reported but not documented. The lack of documentation negates the incident and sends the message that incidents are not considered seriously. In such cases “incidents seem to vaporize.”

In several interview groups, candidates expressed concern about the lack of clarity about to whom and/or how incidents are to be reported. As one candidate described, “If there’s no procedure afterwards [an incident occurs], you’re kind of stuck in this muddle.” Across nearly all interview groups, candidates expressed the need for transparency, both in terms of the reporting of incidents and in terms of how reported incidents are addressed. Candidates want to know who to go to, how reports will be moved forward, public reporting of the resolution, and accountability that the institute is following its process.

Candidates also expressed a strong desire for leaders to take a firm stand against incidents and to acknowledge publicly when incidents occur. Instead, passivity or defensiveness tend to be institutes’ responses. “If the leadership of the institution does not demonstrate humility in these situations [reporting of incidents], we all will be defensive and angry and hurt about this.”

The vast majority of interview groups expressed interest in a clearly defined protocol or process for how an institute responds to incidents and provides people confidence that their concerns are heard. One candidate expressed concern that without a clear process, the onus for the reparative process is placed on the person who has harmed by a racist incident.

Because institutes vary with respect to the work they have done to position themselves to address issues specific to race and racism, several interview groups recognized that some institutes may require “outside help” to establish processes that they can enact in a confident and effective manner. Inquiry that is undertaken with humility, absent pathologizing, and includes all present when the incident occurred—not only the person who spoke up—is important to understand incidents more fully.

As part of standard procedures, several candidates expressed interest in group discussion, not aimed at retribution or remedy, but on deepening understanding of an incident and its racist elements. Where appropriate, group discussions may lead to resolution. Recognizing that a fuller picture may produce differing viewpoints, these differences should not be used to “negate the validity of minority experience.” “We are going to make mistakes.” Given this, what is needed are spaces for candidates to speak openly about issues of race and racism in an exploratory rather than accusatory manner without the need to defend why an incident is problematic. The lack of structures and mechanisms to respond to incidents keeps the field stagnant, perpetuates a culture of silence and ignorance, and places psychoanalysis behind other disciplines in the understanding of the importance of race. As one candidate, who identified as White, noted of the defensiveness with which incidents are too often addressed, “The culture also deprives me from getting feedback on how I have been inadvertently racist.”

As another candidate described: “If an incident happened, I would hope there would be a process of being able to talk about it openly, because...we’re trying to learn, and I would hope that the administration and the faculty would model that, kind of: ‘Ok, here’s - something just happened, we made a mistake, we want to address it and heal from it and learn and move on.’ So that would be ideal.” Instead of openness to acknowledging and discussing incidents, and particularly micro-aggressions, silence dominates. As one candidate described, “I think that the silence, the silence about even the existence of these things happening, is what keeps it at bay and unrecognizable when it does happen. And how the minimizing of what they experienced ... only serves to exacerbate the traumatic experience.”

One group suggested that institutes establish a “mediator” to whom candidates can bring issues they find problematic, and who can then facilitate dialogue about an incident rather than enacting punishment. However, another participant reflected on a similar approach taken at their institute which provoked defensiveness rather than dialogue.

Several candidates expressed a need for a more diverse faculty, with particular focus on increasing faculty who identify as Black.

Attention to Race & Racism in Psychoanalysis

Prompt: *In our survey data we have observed a pattern in which many candidates feel strongly that the field of psychoanalysis needs to increase attention to diversity issues (specifically race, racism and white supremacy) as conceptual frameworks in psychoanalytic thinking. The majority of faculty, however, do not feel increased attention is necessary. What are your thoughts about this pattern and what should be done about this?*

Common responses to the opening prompt were silence, surprise, and calls for humility instead of defensiveness. One candidate described feeling sad and angry that faculty were resistant to increasing attention on race and racism in psychoanalysis. Another observed, “It is disturbing that candidates and faculty have such different feelings.” Another candidate suggested that perhaps faculty falsely polarized the issue by believing that ‘you either teaches psychoanalysis or you teach race.’

Across interviews, candidates noted that attending to race and racism in psychoanalysis is “desperately vital.” In one institute, race and racism is explored in a single diversity course held at the end of the year. Another interviewee noted that a “race and ethnicity study group” was formed, but only those who sought it out participated. These approaches to addressing race and racism were viewed as treating the topic as a secondary issue rather than a topic that is essential and thus integrated throughout instruction.

One candidate suggested that psychoanalysis must descend from its “ivory tower” and supplement the Holocaust as an example of trauma with more modern and racially responsive examples such as police violence and other forms of brutality routinely experienced by people of color. Two other candidates also suggested that the Jewish experience served as the only example of oppression in relation to psychoanalysis. As one candidate observed, the omission of race and racism from the curriculum in itself is an act of racism.

Another candidate posited that ignoring race and racism in theoretical and clinical work created blind-spots to one’s own racial biases. As one older white male candidate noted, despite working with a large number of Latinx and Asian patients, none of his classes or readings addressed working with either population (or with any minoritized groups). This candidate recognized that addressing race and racism requires action by everyone, regardless of their racialized identity or position of power, but also noted the unique role instructors play in shaping this work: “We have to be enlightening each other in our courses and supervision—not just the instructors, but they’re the ones in the position to say I want you to read this article.”

One candidate noted that other fields have focused considerable attention on the topic of race and racism and work in those fields might be useful sources for deepening understanding for those studying and working in the field of psychoanalysis. A separate candidate noted that it “boggles her mind” how much literature there is on race and racism, yet “it never makes it into the classroom.” Another candidate noted that “many [in the field of psychoanalysis] think of the mind and its processes as without color or race, like a surgeon would see a heart. For them issues of race come after, icing on the cake.” Yet another candidate acknowledged that most people in

their institute recognizes racism as a problem, but their thinking seems to be “if a person is well analyzed enough, they wouldn’t be racist.?”

Other candidates recognized that it is essential to unpack internalized racism in the analytic/therapeutic dyad regardless of whether the therapist and patient are of the same or different racialized identity. Several candidates discussed issues of transference and countertransference when working with someone of a different racialized identity, with specific focus on how to navigate this challenge and the issues of privilege that are entwined; ‘imbalance in relationships is a topic of focus, why not explore issues of racialized identity similarly.’ Of particular importance is relocating the subject in psychoanalysis, “we need to start putting things into a social context...When a Black child enters the therapy room, I’m not going to say, ‘What brings you in today.’ No, I am going to say, ‘What happened to you,’ because I know something happened to you.”

A separate candidate described working with an “extremely talented supervisor” who nonetheless interpreted the candidate’s Black patient’s struggles as stemming purely from defensive configurations rather than also from the racism the patient encountered in the real world. In the patient’s utterances, the candidate could “hear the real cry, that ‘Are you going to see, as a white person, are you going to understand me, what is my situation in life?’” Another candidate observed that nearly all of the case studies they read as part of their training were by white analysts and noted how learning becomes trapped in ‘high-minded, poetic renderings of clinical work between white-dyads.’ Being a person of color, this candidate noted “Race has to come into play for me because everyone I meet with, the majority of the people I meet with, is a different race than I am. And I don’t think it would be too difficult to put something like that into the institution [curriculum].” This candidate also noted that if white clinical dyads are presented as a learning case, then whiteness as a racial issue and its operating dynamics must be explored in the clinical discourse.

The lack of attention to racist incidents is linked to the dismissive attitude toward the significance of race and racism in psychoanalysis. As one candidate noted, there is “persistent blindness” to how out of step psychoanalysis is compared to other disciplines regarding race. As a result, “issues of race are treated as a sidebar.” Another candidate contrasted their experience in clinical psychoanalytic education with their training in academic psychoanalytic theory, stating: “The content of psychoanalytic theory in academia that I come across, like in comparative literature, for example, is so rich and so highly developed, often by lots of different kinds of people, lots of people of color, lots of women. I don’t see any of that reflected in my clinical psychoanalytic education.”

One group discussed challenges to exploring issues of race and racism due to senior analysts being insufficiently receptive and resistant to learning about topics they do not already know. As an example, one candidate shared the following experience: “In a supervision group an esteemed faculty heard the case of a young Muslim female patient being torn between her cultural values and the wish to be accepted as an American. The supervisor was opposed to talking about this outside of universal themes and experienced her loyalty to her parents as pathological, and her failed negotiation of the Oedipus. They were very rigid and very hard to consider another developmental point of view.” Another candidate noted that the curriculum is developed for a

white audience and delivered in a white space, “now I have this knowledge and tools that I have to interpret for my clients – I have to do this work on my own.”

To address the lack of attention to race and racism in psychoanalysis, one candidate suggested institutes “cede leadership to the youth” when it comes to the topic of race and racism. This candidate noted that senior members of the psychoanalytic community have demonstrated considerable resistance to and defensiveness about the topic of race and racism. As one interview group observed, ‘elders know psychoanalysis; candidates know race and never shall the two topics meet and become integrated.’ In a separate interview group, a candidate observed that “your average masters students has way more information [about race] than your average faculty member.” Yet another interview group discussed the hierarchical structures that exist within institutes that limit opportunities for candidates to contribute to the (re)shaping of the curriculum and how this in turn limits focus on race, racism, and other topics of emerging relevance and importance.

There were a few candidates that shared positive responses made in their institutes such as the formation of task forces to explore issues of diversity and the subsequent infusion of diversity in coursework. One candidate described a course on Freud that included “black/feminist/queer/Latinx conversations with Freud” which were effective for introducing different perspectives. Another candidate described a Gender and Sexuality course that was recently introduced and praised the openness of the instructor to feedback on the course which led to lengthening of the course. One candidate, however, questioned the impact that addressing these topics in separate distinct courses has, and asked, “Why doesn’t it get weaved into each one of the courses that we take as opposed to having it separate altogether? I think it’s a much more useful way, to make it intrinsic to every course.” In a separate interview group, the need to address these topics was similarly expressed (although in their case these topics are not currently explored in course work): “critical theory, feminist theory, critical race theory, queer theory—all were rarely mentioned in my training and are foundational lenses to really deeply understand, even the history of psychoanalysis.”

In some cases, however, people within an institute who were not active members in addressing diversity perceive the topic as a “side issue.” As one candidate noted, “We have token classes...but it doesn’t feel integrated into theory or technique. If it’s a case conference, or a class that’s not specifically about race, you almost never hear race mentioned. And I think there’s something unsatisfying about that. Race is always here, so why is it never mentioned?”

Another candidate noted that faculty allow conversations about race as long as they remain on the margins of the psychoanalytic thought process; putting race at the center of analysis is seen as displacing core beliefs of psychoanalysis. This candidate stated, “I have been asked not to bring ‘too many’ diversity related speakers by the person leading matters related to race in psychoanalysis.”

It is important to note that one candidate felt institutes are “going overboard” with their response to racism in a manner that is detrimental to their study of psychoanalysis. As one candidate stated, “We’ve gone from not talking about race to having it shoved down my throat.” This view was shared by only one of the 52 candidates who participated in the group interviews.

As one candidate observed, discussions of race are welcomed as long as they don't change the way we do things. Another candidate pointed to the importance of "white folks being willing to do their own work." To aid in this endeavor, one interview group discussed the need for faculty to be required to engage in a "refresh" that focused specifically on issues of race and how to approach and teach these issues in their courses. Another candidate, however, posited that it was 'a fear of eruptions of anger—which is inevitable given the lack of attention previously invested on the topic—that dissuade instructors from exploring the topic.' As a result, race tends to be concentrated in a single institute offering which places considerable pressure on candidates and the instructor in that offering. As one candidate, who recognized the need to address racism, noted, "You can't force it. It has to happen on its own." Given this, the candidate suggested institutes see this work as an evolution that requires honest, authentic, hard work conducted over an extended period of time.

Vision for Racial Equity

Prompt: *What changes are needed to transition the field of psychoanalysis towards racial equity?*

Many/most candidates struggled with this topic. Given the current state of the field and the nation more broadly, it seemed difficult for candidates to envision racial equity. As one group discussed, one needs to see the problem to make change and not enough people in the field seem to “really see it.” Instead, candidates often returned to the previous topics discussed, pointing to the need for open, non-defensive exploration and discussion of race and racism, increased attention on race and racism in the curriculum, and diversifying the field, particularly by attracting a more diverse body of candidates and actively inviting people of color into institutes as instructors and supervisors.

Several groups noted that the difference in diversity between their graduate training and their psychoanalytic training institute. To bring a more diverse body of candidates and instructors to institutes, candidates highlighted the need to assure people of color felt comfortable and welcomed in these settings. In particular, candidates expressed that people of color should not be relied on to deepen awareness and understanding of people who are White. Instead, it is people who are White who must take the initiative to reflect on their own beliefs, deepen understanding, and change. Serious work that increases the curiosity of senior analysts about race and racism was also recognized as a critical need.

One candidate stated the need for “Radical honesty” that takes the form of an “open and honest approach to acknowledging the flaws and pathways forward to create racial equity...[with radical honesty] prospective candidates are aware of the institute’s commitment and dedication to racial equity and are made to feel welcomed and safe.” Racial equity requires ‘anti-racist’ psychotherapy that includes education on systemic racism, including the practices and policies that perpetuate it, and elevating BIPOC analysts to positions of power within institutions. Anti-racist psychoanalysis also requires increasing access and care through a psychoanalytic lens in clinics that serve more diverse communities. As part of this outreach, cost and affordability of psychoanalysis must be examined and addressed to increase the reach of psychoanalysis.

Working toward racial equity in psychoanalysis also requires change to how candidates are prepared. The curricula needs to be modified to include issues of culture, ethnicity, race, and other aspects of diversity. As two candidates expressed, “so many feel like they get it but they don’t. Getting to racial equity would require admitting how much they don’t know and that is something that is surprisingly hard for analysts.”

Some candidates pointed to the importance of tapping readings produced by other disciplines, particularly sociology, political theory, and literary criticism. Attention on these topics must become part of the field’s standards for training and certification. In addition, efforts are needed to increase the diversity of candidates, faculty, and leaders in the field. The field must continually ask itself, “Who is running the show?” The goal, however, should not be limited to increasing representation, but doing so in a way that increases leadership by people who are “competent in racial issues.”

To increase scholarship on race and racism in psychoanalysis, one interview group suggested establishing an award for papers that address this topic. As one candidate expressed, “why would they [clinicians of color] show up when there’s nothing relevant to them going on in the Institute... If somebody were to look through a syllabus, most prospective trainees like look at who is on the faculty, who is at their open houses, what kind of content is presented at the open house, what does the syllabus look like, and what are the readings? I can only speak for my own institute, but when I look at it, I’m like, this is just irrelevant to so many people.” A more radical suggestion focused on creating Black psychoanalytic institutes that develop ideas that draw on African cultures and recognizes ancestors, spirituality, and the family unit such that a person is seen as “a component of the family.” As a candidate of color noted, “The problem is that we are trying to assimilate into something that is racist...we need our own institutes.”

Several candidates spoke of the need for data to both document existing inequity and to monitor progress. As one candidate stated, “We need data, like this [the Commission’s work], to substantiate these conversations as necessary.”

Another theme that arose across multiple interview groups focused on financial resources. This concern related to both the financial burden experienced when seeking training and the cost of psychoanalysis itself. Although no concrete suggestions were offered on how to address costs, there was a general sense that institutes and the field more broadly need to address this issue if it is to increase its diversity and reach. As one candidate expressed it, “you can’t talk about racial equity without talking about money. Is there money behind it? With all we know about class and wealth and race you really can’t just talk about this. Where is the money for inclusion, access, consultants? Show me the investment.”

To address the financial burden, one candidate suggested implementing a program that identifies talented students of color in undergraduate programs and recruits, mentors, and funds them all the way through their psychoanalytic training. Although this suggestion may be based on an assumption that people of color do not have the financial means to support psychoanalytic training, it points to the need for a systematic and sustained approach to diversifying the field. Another candidate suggested that the field establish an expectation that all analysts take on a specified percentage of “low fee” patients. Another candidate pointed to the importance of convincing insurance companies to recognize and reimburse for psychoanalysis.

Some candidates spoke to the need to create a more inviting and warm environment. As one candidate noted, when they first entered their program, the institute felt “so stuffy.” The field’s emphasis on anonymity and neutrality produces a cold and unfeeling environment. Instead, “people need to be ushered into the organization...we need to be maternal too—the function of warmth, welcoming—and making people feel like it’s ok to be here.”

A few interview groups spoke to the need to invite communities that have tended not to engage with psychoanalysis into psychoanalysis. This is a complex endeavor that requires an increase in the diversity of psychoanalysts and outreach efforts. One group suggested conducting studies focused on working with communities that have been out of the psychoanalytic lens. Another candidate spoke to the need for more thoughtful scheduling of courses such that they do not

interfere with services clinicians provide to more diverse clinical populations: “When you teach a class at 5pm, and I'm still in the thick of seeing my patients, and that is my bread and butter, don't tell me that you're accessible. It's a level of awareness where people truly come from and what it is that they need in order for them to be engaged in this very long, intensive process.” This candidate also noted how clinical case presentations or examples provided in class are restricted to a more privileged socioeconomic strata, that not only is it off-putting and exclusionary for clinicians of color, for whom that is not their population of interest, but also serves to send a broader message that dissuades working with more diverse types of patient populations in various other strata of society.

Faculty Interviews Summary

Response to Racist Incidents

Prompt: In our survey data a number of people reported incidents that occurred in their institute that they consider racist or to be racial enactments. Many people also indicated that when the incident was reported, the response was not adequate. If you were to experience or observe an incident you consider racist, what response would you like to experience if you were to report the incident?

Similar to candidates, the vast majority of faculty were not satisfied with the current approaches taken to respond to racial enactments. Faculty regularly spoke of defensiveness, silence, and the need for a clearly defined process for reporting and addressing racial enactments. As one interviewee stated, “There needs to be a faculty protocol in place for handling these kinds of events, even recognizing when they have happened, instead of being niced-over.”

One interview group focused considerable time discussing microaggressions and wondered whether the use of the term itself served to minimize these incidents. A member of this group shared that their institute lost its first Black candidate because of an incident in class. It was unclear, however, whether it was the incident itself or the defensive response of the faculty member confronted with the incident that motivated the student’s departure. Rather than reflect on what the faculty member had done, the candidate was accused of having “authority issues.” Another interview group similarly reported that an African-American candidate left their program after an incident occurred, was reported, and the report was unaddressed, leaving the candidate feeling unrecognized.

Interviewees expressed that it is of vital importance that each racial incident, small and large, is responded to with seriousness and concern, with particular emphasis on helping the victim of the incident feel “joined” rather than marginalized. As another interviewer summarized, responses to racial enactments must be ‘prompt but unhurried.’ Yet another interviewee observed that a main obstacle to a supportive response is that institutes are insufficiently racially diverse. The lack of diversity leads to those in racial minority positions feeling as if they are on their own. People also discussed the anxiety white members of the psychoanalytic community feel about incidents being taken seriously, even as they know that such seriousness is necessary. As one faculty member described, “there is paranoid anxiety...something might jump out of their speech which would lead to others seeing them as racist and that’s the paranoid anxiety, and that inhibits some people.”

The importance of bringing in consultants to help institutes develop procedures and, in some cases, respond to specific incidents was raised by several interview groups. In cases when institutes did bring in outside consultants, faculty indicated this action helped the institute move towards a more productive response that minimized or avoided the production of further harm.

Another interview group suggested that institutes establish an ombudsperson system that is accompanied by a clearly defined and public protocol that details the steps to be taken when an issue is shared with the ombudsperson. As part of this protocol, procedures for advancing issues

to the institution's Board or ethics committee should be included when the issue is not/cannot be resolved at the ombudsperson's level. Having a formal procedure in place was also seen as an effective approach to address power differentials, particularly when a candidate raises concern about a faculty member. To address power differentials, one interview group suggested that the person reporting an incident be provided with an advocate and that the process for exploring issues assures that the reporting person and their advocate receive at least 50% of the attention during discussions. This group seemed to feel that power differentials tended to leave victims of incidents unsupported and often spoken over by the more powerfully positioned who tend to be the enactors. As one member of this group stated, "The person with the least amount of power should get at least 50% of the time to be heard and not be alone; [they] should have an advocate."

Several faculty spoke about the importance of developing an environment in which racial enactments are discussed openly. This openness extends beyond the people involved or immediately impacted by a racial enactment and includes a public reporting of incidents that is designed to help all members of an institute expand their awareness of various forms of enactments. As one faculty member stated, "Racist incidents not only need to be taken seriously, but used as an opportunity to learn and grow." Another candidate recounted a story of how a more open environment that is gradually developing in her institute helped her reflect on a comment she made to see it as racially offensive. Another faculty member noted, "In the meetings I'm part of we're improving slowly in our capacity to confront one another and say 'hey, wait a minute, are you aware that's racist?' And a lot of it is ignorance. It's really what we're trying to make each other aware of." One interview group extended the value openness can have from supporting individual reflection to engaging in institutional reflection. Without openness to the reporting and discussion of racial enactments, there is a 'failure to think in group or organizational terms.' Implied in this lack of thinking is the absence of a focus on how institutional culture may contribute to both the enactment of and responses to racist incidents.

In one interview group, the faculty members seemed unaware of the burden and hardship placed on people of color who experience a racial enactment and are then expected to report or otherwise confront the enactor. Although there is not a clear alternative to relying on those who are harmed to notify others of that harm, the procedures put into place must minimize this burden and avoid further hardship. One member of this group believed that such incidents should be resolved between the people directly involved/impacted and that there is no need for further reporting. This view contrasts sharply with other faculty (and candidates) who believe failure to report, elevate, and record such incidents effectively minimizes incidents and obscures patterns of racial enactments within an institute. As one faculty member in another interview group stated, "There needs to be recognition that people of color often carry an undue burden, which needs to be recognized in advance as they go through the process." Another faculty member similarly described the vulnerable position in which people who report racial enactments are placed: "One of the problems with some of the meetings [about a reported incident] is that it put the candidate in a continued vulnerable place." In this example, an external consultant was brought in to assist with the processing of the incident after which "the candidate felt more considered and listened to" and the process "proceeded very well since that was done."

Discomfort and fear of speaking up about racial enactments was raised in several interview groups. In part, this fear seems to stem from the absence of clearly defined processes for raising and addressing these issues. But, in some cases, the lack of response to prior reports produces a sense that speaking up will only focus attention on the reporter and not on the issue itself. One faculty member reflected on the recent dismissal of the leader in their institute following a racial enactment: “but so much shit had gone on before. Latina analysts had complained. Black analysts had complained...about mistreatment and it went on and it went on and went on. We’ve had had major town halls in the department, but people didn’t feel free to speak.”

At least three interview groups discussed incidents in which a member of an institute used the “n-word” during class discussions, in meetings, or during informal conversations. In all three cases, concerns about the use of the word were raised, but in none was the response satisfactory. In one case, more focus was placed on helping the enactor understand why the use of the word was inappropriate. In the other cases, the response attempted to balance the feelings of those offended by the use of the word with the perspective of the enactor. In all cases, interviewees felt this was a clear example where a firm and definitive statement about the inappropriateness of the use of such language was warranted. Instead, the lack of a strong and clear response admonishing such language produced ambiguity and left those impacted by the use of this language unsupported.

One interview group observed that the leadership in their institute was generally non-responsive to incidents. They noted that without a vigorous response from the top, the incidents do not get attention and instead have a more insidious effect—unrecognized and unspoken about.

One faculty member suspects that racial incidents that have sparked nationwide attention of race and racism will die down. Given that this alarmed focus will eventually pass, there was a sense that some institutes feel they do not need to do anything at this time. Another faculty member felt a “group think phenomenon” is developing around race and is making everything about race: “It is tricky at our institute right now...some people are making it about race, trying to make racial when it is unclear that it has anything to do with race...personality issues turned into race.” Yet another faculty member believes ‘Fights over race [racial enactments] are a diversion, a social defense against engaging in the necessary good trouble of doing reparative work towards racial equity.’ And another faculty member suspects that increasing the diversity of faculty will reduce racial enactments simply due to a larger presence of people who are Black.

Additional Notable Quotes:

‘our institute set up a study group for candidates; why not for faculty?’

“Over the years, I have been absolutely amazed at how people are always interested in inviting people of color in, but not interested in going out into the world of people of color.”

“There is a general lack of interest or apathy or, perhaps fear, among white analysts about taking up questions of race and racism.”

“White ‘experts’ on the subject of racism and white privilege who purport to understand black experience can humiliate white members who are seeking to learn.”

‘We are still trying to figure out the appropriate venues and spaces for these conversations to take place.’

Attention to Race and Racism in Psychoanalysis

Prompt: *In our survey data we have observed a pattern in which many Candidates feel strongly that the field of psychoanalysis needs to increase attention to diversity issues (specifically race, racism and white supremacy) as conceptual frameworks in psychoanalytic thinking. The majority of faculty, however, do not feel increased attention is necessary. Why do you think this pattern is occurring? Why might Candidates feel so different about the need to increase attention to diversity issues (specifically race, racism, and white supremacy) compared to faculty?*

Responses to this pattern in the data ranged from being surprised to not-surprised, as well as finding the pattern depressing and shocking. As one interviewee expressed, “my first thought is that’s kind of depressing. I guess the obvious thought is there is a kind of defensiveness on the part of the faculty about that, or a blind spot. But I’m also struck that in the context of the last several years that faculty would say that in a survey such as this.” Reflecting on then recent listserv posts, another faculty member asked, “Isn’t there an angry speaking out against the Holmes Commission and survey saying there’s no problem? Go away. I think it’s disgusting that the older people say there’s no problem [while] the younger people see there’s a problem.”

Several other interview groups speculated there is a generational issue that accounts for differences in emphasis on race and racism in psychoanalysis. As one interviewee expressed, “My first thought is because the faculty are mostly older privileged white straight people and they’ve never had to think about this before so they’re perfectly happy with how things are as they fit in fine.” One interviewer summarized their group’s discussion in this way: ‘Older members of psychoanalytic communities are seen as not as used to discussing race as an academic or theoretical subject compared to their students. Thus, many senior faculty feel out of their league and threatened by this. Too many senior faculty see themselves at later points in their careers as imparters of knowledge and wisdom rather than as learners along with their students.’ This sentiment was reflected by a separate interviewee who noted “Faculty is average of 78 and tired, stretched, and terribly sad that their way of doing psychoanalysis seems to be fading and they don’t seem to be excited about changing things up.”

In another interview, the interviewer summarized discussion of the generational gap in this way: ‘the older, more established one[s], who have already arrived, and who therefore do not want the kind of disturbance that attention to race and racism would cause. The younger, less established ones, who are on their way and welcome attention race and racism.’ A third interviewer summarized the faculty conversation in this way: ‘Candidates are more visionary; they see that it is possible to expand thinking, to make a shift of assumptions; to keep the subject of race on the table in a deliberative way. [In contrast] faculty are loathe to make changes because they are indoctrinated and more captive to the society at large.’ In a separate interview group, an interviewee noted “I grew up in a black world...and I think most white analysts grew up in white communities. That’s less the case for younger people, they grew up in a post-integration world. They know more people of color. I think people coming into psychoanalysis would like to see the field reflect the world that they live in, and not the ivory tower that we have built with analytic identity as something that was somehow pristine and unbreachable.” A fourth interviewer noted that the discussion within their group similarly began with a focus on differences in age among candidates and faculty, but then shifted ‘to a much more nuanced

understanding that emphasized that progress required a recognition that racism exists in all of us and that as analysts we need to work on this—to examine, acknowledge and get to know it from the surface down to the deepest levels, with feeling.’

Like the candidate groups, one interviewee noted the difference with which the Jewish experience is considered as inbounds for psychoanalysis but race is out of bounds. This interviewee speculated anxiety exists about antisemitism getting overlooked if a focus of race and racism becomes inbounds. The interviewee also postulated that there is a ‘posttraumatic tendency to avoid discussing issues of racial discrimination for the anxieties that such discussions engender.’ This anxiety was reflected in one interviewee’s comment about integrating race, racism, and white supremacy into the curriculum: “The concept of white supremacy turns me off. It makes the assumption all white people are racists.”

Another interview group suggested that resistance to incorporating race and racism in psychoanalysis stemmed, in part, from fear of self-discovery: ‘discovering that one is engaged in racial enactments is hard to bear.’ As one faculty member expressed, “For faculty, the discovery of one’s own internal racism is traumatic. Faculty want to keep things the way they are.” This group also observed that there is a strong tendency to keep race outside of psychoanalysis as a social construct. Members in this group noted that there is literature that can help the field apply a racial lens to psychoanalytic studies, and pointed to recent works by Donald Moss and Dorothy Holmes as examples.

Several interviewees believed that increasing the representation of people of color in institutes, both as candidates and faculty, will help increase focus on race and racism in psychoanalysis. “We’ve got a lot of issues. And, certainly, the issue of people of color is one of them. We need more people of color at our institute.” “There need to be more faculty and candidates of color, and that that will...create kind of more of a critical mass that will shift some of the dialogue.”

One interview group seemed to struggle with understanding resistance to incorporating race and racism as topics considered within psychoanalysis. As one interviewee stated, “Racism and other oppressions are a source of pathology as are psychosexual development and conflict.”

If the field is to add race and racism as topics of study within psychoanalysis, interviewees suggested that “we need to study mechanisms of racism” and not simply address the topic by “just adding a diversity course.”

In some interviews, the focus of discussion shifted from race and racism in psychoanalysis as field to how the inclusion of this topic might impact individual faculty. In one example, a faculty member reflected on their own experience confronting racism within themselves: “In my professional life I run a Group practice and I can think of times when I’ve made such insensitive comments, not just with the language but with white-centeredness, you know, and I’ve unknowingly made people of color uncomfortable. Luckily sometimes they’ve called me on it and I have felt shame. I still hold those instances with me and reflect on them. But a lot of times, because I run the place, I’m sure I’m not being called on it and that’s scarier to me because how do you know that it’s happening, that people are being hurt (in however minor or major ways) and I don’t even know because of the power differential? So, the idea that a faculty member with

authority and privilege and power would say that there's nothing to work on is very upsetting to me.”

In a separate interview group, a faculty member described “a terrible feeling that we acted in a way as a group of psychoanalysts that were not just racist but overtly racist...I think people must be struggling with terrible guilt and shame about that.” In yet another interview group, a faculty member noted “they [their faculty] don’t want to break down and cry for three years. Racism has true trauma...if you are going to talk about the Black experience, you better get ready to bleed.”

Another interviewee focused on challenges a colleague experienced with a similar self-reflection during a workshop on racism conducted within their institute: “If you know anything about awareness of racism these days you know that you just have to figure out what it is. It's not that you don't have these biases.... She’s a white woman who has a lot of white privilege, but she's just unaware of her own white centeredness and what that means in terms of how other people walk in the world, of their marginalisation compared to herself. I don't think she's aware of that – she has no humility.” Another member of this group reflected on resistance several members of their faculty exhibited when asked to reflect on racism during a half-day retreat held within their institute. In this retreat, about one-third of the participants had engaged in a year-long study group that explored various aspect of race and racism, while the other participants had not engaged in similar work. This person reflected, this work allowed them to look “every week at our own dreams and how it [racism] comes up, and incidences of how we are feeling about our own whiteness, how that bumps up against racism, talking about current events, and just steeping ourselves in it rather than avoiding it... I felt a lot of shame that I hadn't done my own work [earlier] and I didn't even know what it was [to do] my own work.... At the retreat it became clear that the push back came from those who had not done this work, and I think it was actually due to resistance against their own unconscious, against looking at their own racism.”

In one interview group, the discussion focused on efforts their institutes have made to introduce race and racism into psychoanalytic training. One interviewee described an initiative in their institute to introduce at least one reading on race into every topic taught in the curriculum. Several fellow faculty members, however, resisted this approach on the ‘grounds that it detracts from learning the business of psychoanalysis [which is] already a complex and difficult undertaking.’ In a separate interview group, a faculty member noted that integration of race and racism into psychoanalysis tends to provoke “the three most powerful words within organizational psychoanalysis...: ‘that’s not psychoanalysis.’” In a separate interview, a faculty member from an institute that has taken steps to include readings about intersectionality, racism, and other forms of oppression noted “some faculty just leave that reading out of their classes, or say ‘that’s not psychoanalysis.’” This sentiment was shared by a faculty member in separate interview group who recounted “one senior analyst said, ‘well, we don’t want to dilute.’” Another faculty member noted that “the older analysts are here to teach psychoanalysis, not culture.” In a separate interview group, an interviewee emphasized the importance of separating the social and the psychic. As the interviewer summarized the discussion, ‘In training, you need to learn how to do analysis, you need to know how to pay attention to the psyche, not the social. Both are important, but as faculty, as analysts, both interviewees agreed: You need to be able to teach about transference, without candidates/trainees feeling that you don’t think there’s a racial reality. The challenge is, how do you include attention to sociocultural realities—race, gender,

racism—while also paying attention to psychic reality and transference?...How do you introduce the realities of racism and race while also teaching people how to focus on what's in internal reality, transference and resistance?'

In one interview group, there seemed to be a lack of understanding of racism itself. As the interviewer summarized, 'Both interviewees did not have a sense of racism except as defined by the absence of non-white trainees and candidates. Both of these sympathetic training analysts said that they had little to say about racism or contact with it in the institute because their institutes had been exclusively or primarily white for most of the time they were involved. They did feel that it was a problem there were not more "minorities" "because it's part of humanity". The prevalent idea was that doing analytic work outside of training and the analysis was the way to deal with the absence of non-whites in analysis—doing community work, short term, different settings that would make it relevant... There was hedging about whether racism had to do with Freuds cultural milieu since it was colonialist, and so contending with race and racism would mean teaching and doing things outside the canon.'

Additional Notable Quotes:

"There is a hidden power dynamic that acts as a block to change."

"I became demonized for saying we are seen as a racist organization."

"What message does it send if you don't have Black instructors? Black candidates?"

"Young people don't know history."

"Focus less on systemic racism in the organization, go instead into the community."

"We have something to offer and they to offer us."

On interviewee strongly recommended that the field move away for reliance on the "white, cisgendered, two parent family" as the model. As this person describes, "I have counted the number of types of families there could be and there are over 35 configurations and we are still talking about one kind of family."

Vision for Racial Equity

Prompt: *What changes are needed to transition the field of psychoanalysis towards racial equity?*

Several interview groups began this discussion by noting the importance of acknowledging that racism exists and operates in many ways in society, within the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsA), in institutions, and in one's own practice. One interviewee responded to the prompt by asking, "Can APsA make it clear we are racist, that it's systemic and we whitewash each other to feel more homogeneous?" Another focused on the theory that undergirds psychoanalysis stating, "Theory [that includes racism]...we are so nascent with regards to this...our theories are so nascent. We need to expand our thinking." Reflecting on an experience in which a faculty member reflected on their own analysis, another interviewee similarly pointed to theory as an impediment to acknowledging the role racism plays in shaping a person, "Whenever I brought up [my experience with racism] in my analysis it was always attributed to my birth order." As a separate interviewee posited, "We need to envision and make new paradigms." Yet another interviewee stated, "We have to have this in our consciousness all the time to lay down new pathways."

To help all in the field recognize racism and to deepen their understanding of the many ways in which racism impacts individual, institutions, and the field, the vast majority of interview groups spoke about the need for assistance in exploring and advancing understanding of race and racism. Several groups pointed to the group format of the interview itself as a useful forum for raising and exploring issues specific to racism and the field. As one interviewer noted, there is a 'request for APsA to help structure formal and informal spaces within psychoanalytic centers and across them for the study of race and racism (for candidates and faculty)... and help members distinguish between individual racist intention and systemic racist practice.' In a separate interview, an interviewee asked, "Could we create more ongoing groups like this one [the group interview format] with familiar folks that develops over time?" This sentiment was echoed in a separate interview group in which the interviewer noted that 'one participant cited our discussion tonight as an example of how to build towards racial equity in psychoanalysis: difficult subject matter with varying views discussed respectfully.' Another interviewee believed that movement towards racial equity begins at the individual level—reshaping individual thinking—and then progresses up through institutions and onto society more broadly: "My vision would be starting at the study group then the institute level then the American level and do that hard work." As in interviewer of a separate group noted, 'The general theme was that racism exists inside of us, that a lack of awareness of this is responsible for resistance against change, and that steps need to be taken to address this if the aspiration of a more diverse discipline is to be realized.'

Interviewees also emphasized the importance of increasing representation of people of color in the field. This begins by attracting and supporting more candidates of color. Some groups focused on making training more affordable, perhaps through scholarships. As one interviewee stated, "I think we need to change the financial structure of training and psychoanalysis itself because that is a significant barrier to many people of color." One interviewee suggested

institutions could improve the clarity with which they inform candidates of the various costs associated with training.

Several groups discussed the importance of diversifying leadership in the field. This was seen as important both to give voice to a more diverse set of perspectives and experiences, and to signal to potential candidates of diverse backgrounds that the field is open to them. One interview group, however, discussed the challenge in diversifying leadership given the field's past history with acknowledging and addressing racism. As one interviewee noted, "the importance of having people of color in leadership positions in training institutes....given what we've talked about I wonder if many analysts of color would want to be in those leadership positions. Is there some way that installing an analyst of color in a leadership position is in some way a set up? I think that person would need a lot of support and a lot of latitude to make structural changes." In a separate interview group, another interviewee similarly reflected on the challenges the field's history with racism produces for diversifying the field: "I'm thinking about this conundrum, that we want to have a more diverse body of people within our field but in many ways our field is not hospitable to a more diverse group of people right now. I think often people of color and other others bear the brunt of a lot of un- metabolised biases and blind spots and othering, especially when you have... Faculty saying there's nothing to reflect on here. That is deeply disturbing."

As a first step to diversifying representation in institutions and the field more broadly, two interview groups discussed the importance of out-reach to communities that have traditionally been underserved by psychoanalysis. As one interviewer summarized, 'There was a general sense of having to do more effortful outreach to BIPOC [potential candidates], but this was challenged by a Black member of the group: rather than outreach, what is needed is analysts getting out into communities, being present there, more than trying to bring BIPOC people into the institute.' As this interviewee stated, "The thing about outreach is that it is often out-preach, and I think it makes more sense to show up and shut up and go and experience other cultures and the ways other people are living lives and thinking about things that matter to them, and then it becomes fairly apparent how we can be helpful and how psychoanalytic ideas are useful. And then people are much more willing to listen if you're not coming to preach or to recruit but to be present." To increase outreach, another interviewee suggested the field expand its conception of analysis from a focus on individual treatment to also embrace community work: "I think we should bring more of an emphasis on community work into the model." Achieving greater outreach and bringing psychoanalytic service to more diverse communities, however, will require a shift in the mindset of some analysts, as reflected in one interviewee's self-reflection and stereotyped belief: "In addition to people of color not wanting to seek out psychoanalytic treatment, we have not and I'm talking about myself seeking to have a private practice office, actually I have not . . . had a black patient in my practice and I want to charge full fee, not take insurance. I don't take insurance. And I'm aware that in the history of psychoanalysis people of color were not thought to be analyzable"

Across interview topics, the issue of power was raised multiple times. As one interviewee stated, "This isn't just about race, it's about power." Difference in power was seen as a potential impediment to the reporting and response to racial enactments. Power was an impediment to the integration of race/racism/white supremacy as frame for analysis into the curriculum. Power to decide whether or not one engages in discussions about race and racism was seen as a challenge

to deepening and developing common understanding of race and racism, leading one interviewee to wonder whether training should be mandatory for all rather than optional. Similarly, one interviewer noted discussion about the need to ‘establish a mechanism to deal with faculty/supervisors “who just don’t get it” and that it is not fair to put that burden on the students of color.’ Power also allows analysts to decide which populations they serve and which they do not. As a result, some interviewees felt this lack of exposure to a diverse body of patients limits understanding of the different experiences patients bring to their analysis. This lack of awareness led one interviewee to suggest “I think people should be required to analyze someone of a different race.” And power, coupled with the hierarchical structure of institutes and the field more broadly were viewed by some as an impediment to increasing diversity and addressing race and racism in the field. As one interviewee suggested, there is a “need to break down various lines so the centers become more democratic.”

A separate theme that emerged in a few interview groups was one of resignation. Resistance by established faculty and leadership to addressing race and racism led one interviewee to speculate ‘the most viable solution to the generation gap might be to wait for people to fade away and die out.’ Another interviewer summarized their session, writing ‘participants were not very confident that things can really change...I didn’t get a sense of urgency and necessity. More a sense that maybe, with time, ‘somehow’ things will change.’ Yet another interviewer noted, “There were elements of being stuck, as in thinking of the social as separate and apart from the psychodynamic, not recognizing racism as trauma, as racial trauma, as psychic trauma.” Another interviewer observed that there was ‘a feeling that psychoanalysis is “endangered” and as such will be increasingly rule-bound to protect its uncertain identity. More confidence, more of a sense of disciplinary security might be necessary to really move toward racial equity.’ A separate interviewer noted that a lack of deep understanding of race and racism was a major impediment to moving the field forward, noting that one ‘interviewee reports trying for years to get colleagues at [their] institute, which, in spite of its location [in a diverse locale], has had no Black or Brown candidates, to think about racial inclusion. The answer...has been to point to her institute’s longstanding participation in APsA training and outreach in China and other East Asian Countries. For her colleagues, that is racial inclusion.’

Despite the frustration and resignation expressed in several interview groups, many interview groups explored addressing race and racism to produce racial equity as requiring multiple integrated approaches. As one interviewer summarized the groups discussion, ‘no single institute initiative would be sufficient for working towards institutional racial equity. Along with facilitated dialogues, workshops on developing syllabi, attention to working with difficult situations that arise in psychoanalytic classrooms, greater recruitment efforts, scholarship offerings, development of mission or vision statements, each would have to be parts of institutes’ efforts.’

Several interviewees reflected on the importance of and value that comes from study groups that explore issues of race and racism. As one interviewee described, “There needs to be an intention at the top with leadership. In our centre we have a racism study group and we’ve been meeting monthly for seven years. That has helped the leadership to better understand the depth of the problem and how they themselves are struggling with it. And then from there it trickles down.” Another interview group discussed the need for ‘regular meetings, involving the entire institute

(e.g., Town Halls), at which the subject of racism can be openly discussed, with plenty of room for free association and other open contributions from the membership, to create space for people to “process their racist thinking” – seen as an inevitable consequence of being raised in the US.’ Another interviewer described an interview group’s recommendation for ‘open the discussions to make our theories more inclusive and to include meaningful discussions on the role of culture, class, race, etc. and other types of oppressions related to gender discriminations, etc.’

A few interview groups returned to the need to revise the current curriculum to include the topic of race and racism. As one interviewer described one step to achieving racial equity requires ‘re-examining the entire curriculum to identify texts that contain implicit bias as well as omissions that feed the blind spots about race/racism.’ Another interview group discussed the need to ‘add into courses across the curriculum readings relevant to working with a more diverse population.’ In another group, an interviewee noted that “We’re holding on to too pure a model of what it means to be a psychoanalyst here, and it’s hard to breathe new life into it.” One interviewer noted a groups discussion of the need to ‘include contents that focus on the role of external realities in psychological function as legitimate issues in psychoanalytic training.’ Another interview group discussed the ‘importance of focusing on discussions on white privilege in psychoanalytic theory and practice.’ As one member of this group stated, it is important “for white people to recognize their own white privilege.” An interviewee in a separate group urged that “issues of race, culture, and class should be in every class and every psychoanalytic publication,” not just delegated to a single course or reading of an assignment paper.

Across most groups, interviewees recognized that working towards racial equity is challenging and hard work. As one interviewer noted, interviewees recognized that ‘a conscious desire for change is not enough—real, hard emotional work is needed to bring it about.’ In a separate group, an interviewee implored, “I’m pleading that we stretch our boundaries to include things that make us sweat....That we commit [to] a process with somebody.” Similarly, another interviewee summarized the sentiment of many interviewees, “To achieve racial equity in psychoanalysis, it is worth how hard it is.”

Psychodynamically Oriented Who Have Not Enrolled in Psychoanalytic Training

Race, Racism, and the Pursuit of Psychoanalytic Training.

Prompt: Some people have indicated that issues related to race and racism have influenced their decision to pursue or not to pursue psychoanalytic training. Have issues of race or racism impacted your decision to pursue (or not pursue) psychoanalytic training?

Interviewees had a mixed response to this topic. Several indicated that race and racism played no role in their decision not to pursue psychoanalytic training. Some expanded the question from a focus on race and racism to other forms of oppression: “I view racism as broader than simply about race. I view it as issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion which span a larger area than simply race.” Others, however, indicated prior experiences with coverage of race and racism in psychoanalysis had a minor to major influence on their decision not to complete psychoanalytic training. For example, one interview described a troubling experience with how race was addressed in a cultural issues in counseling course, which they described as their worst class ever. “there was a day in the class where the professor, white cis-gender woman, used the N-word like at least three times. At one time she asked another student, “Oh Mr. such and such, would you ever tell a black male patient of yours, would you call him a _____. No one in the class, it was all over zoom, we were all like first semester students pretty much, no one said anything or felt comfortable enough to say anything. I tried to say something at my school. And nothing really came of it except that that professor doesn’t teach that class anymore. They made me take another class with her this semester, and I tried to like get a mediation with her, and now they kicked me out of that class and now I can’t graduate on time, so I’m really not, I’m really not feeling motivated to continue psychoanalytic training anymore.”

Another interviewee observed, “They just don’t have an awareness of how to incorporate theories of racialization or social justice or um, you know social justice psychology. They don’t know how to incorporate the theories around this to decolonize the classes, decolonize the syllabi, they don’t know how to talk about this. They have no understanding of intersectionality. I feel like to go through a psychoanalytic training program the way it’s always been taught, which is always about white psychoanalysts and psychoanalytic theory designed to treat the white heterosexual patient is unethical. So that’s why I want to see a lot of change in the training programs before I do it.”

A third interviewee noted that it was more than just limited treatment of race that dissuaded them from pursuing training, “I do think that the work that an institute community has done around identity, integrating of socio-political and social justice concerns with institute life, with institute culture, with theory, technique, that is really important, so race is one piece of that. But if I feel that they haven’t integrated it I don’t see how it would be viable for me to train there. So that has prevented me from stepping, from knowing that after this I’m going into training. If that were a possibility in an institute here, where those things had been integrated, I would likely be headed into training. So it’s not just about race, it’s about an institutional capacity to integrate those things with regards to race, gender, all forms of marginalized identity.”

Another interviewee noted the challenge faculty in training programs encounter addressing issues of race and racism: “Deconstructing the traditional psychoanalytic canon is very decentering. The notion of a cultural shift in the cohorts and the idea of faculty directly called out...that’s really scary especially for faculty who are not prepared to invest that kind of emotional labor. All those topics got lash-back.”

An interviewee who discussed her whiteness and who had experience with multiple institutes noted challenges finding “a place where I could learn and work with other people. All of the environments seemed professionally friendly to me, as an older white woman... But when I opened my mouth and started talking about what I really believe and what I see in terms of systemic oppression and how that impacts all of us, I got a lot of cold-shouldering... I never heard anyone say anything blatantly racist. It was more the exclusion of the concept and the importance of systemic oppression across the board that I just found cold and unacceptable.”

A person of color similarly expressed concern about finding a place in a predominantly white institutional setting, “There’s just walking into a room of 100, 200, 300 people and pretty much everyone is white, and feeling: Who am I joining together with; who am I studying together with.” Similarly, a person who identified as white and works with a diverse body of clients felt training would not prepare her well to work with her BIPOC clients: I didn’t get the sense that doing actual training at an institute would help me serve the people that I work with...I want to be around students and teachers that kind of represent the people that I work with, and I don’t think I’ve found that.”

Finally, one interview recounted, “I remember asking someone at the psychoanalytic institute if there are any scholarships or sliding fee scale for a training program, and this man with a suit and tie looked at me and laughed in my face. I won’t forget that moment.”

Although not all stories shared focused solely on race and racism as a reason for their decision not to pursue or complete psychoanalytic training, the concerns raised reflect limited attention to issues of diversity, both in terms of identity and economic status.

Race as a Psychoanalytic Topic

Prompt: *Do you consider race to be a psychoanalytic topic, both in psychoanalytic practice and in theorizing? Why or why not?*

Interviewees overwhelmingly felt that race is a psychoanalytic topic. As one interviewee stated, “It’s really an important construct, if a patient doesn’t bring it up it’s still present in the room if therapist and patient are similar races or not. I think it’s something we’re all thinking about intentionally or we’re all inadvertently avoiding.” This sentiment was echoed in another interview group: “It’s (race) definitely a psychoanalytic topic...Everything that happens in society is psychoanalytic topic... We have a duty to be informed, whether it is racism, economic disparities, patriarchy, capitalism, and feminism...and they must be a part of psychoanalytic treatment and they must be a part of our education as psychoanalysts... and I think they are not.”

Similarly, another interviewee observed, “It’s the way power has been maintained by a white power structure is using white supremacy to divide the common people along race more than any other single issue, so I don’t think we can work with a patient 1:1 and deal with countertransference and deal with the unconscious without the issue of white supremacy coming up.” Another interviewee also expressed the centrality of race in the formation of a person: “I’ve been thinking about how there are sessions where race doesn’t come up, there are cases where race doesn’t come up, and yet the conventionalization always includes race and identity factors, it always includes that in the formulation. How does this influence who this person has become?...That closes the gap that white people often experience. ‘Oh for me race doesn’t come up.’ For me that kind of closes that gap.”

Yet, reflecting on her own education, another interviewee noted, “I would say that nobody ever mentioned race, ever in any of my fundamental dynamic classes, I don’t think ever once in any of my fundamentals classes or a dynamically oriented class. That was, that was reserved for multicultural counseling. That’s where it showed up and only then....It’s a shame, an enormous hole, error, mistake.” In a separate interview, an interviewee noted the absence of diverse voices in their coursework, stating “Most everything, if not everything we read was by white people and didn’t talk about race. What I read at [institute name] was much more mixed and much more focused on how race plays out in psychoanalysis. I almost feel like I thought that I thought there wasn’t that much written about it because I did two years in which it was all whiteness.”

Another interviewee focused attention on power differentials and what they termed a caste-system within training programs: “As long as the psychoanalytic institutes have a de facto system of castes, it makes it very difficult to examine dynamics of racism... We’ve set up an unspeakable pecking order where it might be difficult for us to look at all the issues of diversity, including racism.” The importance of including the social context as part of analysis was also raised by one interviewee who noted that “Something I struggle with a great deal is just the knee jerk reaction of wanting to locate everything damn thing in the person. I struggle with this in my own analysis because of course I know that we don’t live in vacuums. There is a huge social context, economic context...I would like to see a willingness to not just...locate everything inside a person, because that is simply not true.”

Increasing Inclusivity

Prompt: *From your perspective what changes could be made to make the field more attractive to a more diverse pool of clinicians? Why do you think these changes would make the field more attractive?*

This prompt elicited a wide variety of suggestions that included an interviewee's comment:

I have always found it astounding that I get these emails from X institute of events and I'm like it's on a Friday afternoon, in the middle of a workday. I can't do that, but I know traditionally, I know a lot of analysts don't work on Fridays. So, only a certain kind of person with a certain kind of practice and certain kind of class can go to that.

Several interviewees, however, expressed skepticism that, without major changes, the field will ever be attractive to a diverse body. As one interviewee expressed, "There is an attitude among analysts that doesn't expect people of color to be analysts... I'm thinking of a couple of things that happened with me when I was a candidate, it hit me right away, and I've never ever forgotten it... I was not expected to be a candidate. I was not expected to be in analytic training." Similarly, another interviewee stated, "'I find myself being very cynical. There would have to be such a transformation that I'm not sure we would recognize psychoanalysis as psychoanalysis afterwards. To me it seems like it is a very hierarchical and exclusive field.'" A third interviewee shared, "If we are not relevant to you, why should you be relevant to us? If you make the claim that you don't have the slightest interest in anybody who is not white or upper middle class or higher, at some point you are not relevant to anybody who is not white or upper middle class or higher."

Vison for Racial Equity

Prompt: *What changes are needed to transition the field of psychoanalysis towards racial equity?*

Interviewees again had a broad and diverse range of suggestions for moving the field towards racial equity. One interviewee focused on integrating clinical services within communities that are structurally and economically marginalized. This interviewee suggest that “You got to learn about these communities and cultures, and what can we take from psychoanalytic theory that will help. Having more of a connection to the actual community. Having faculty and candidates work in those clinics and be really there with the actual people.”

Another suggestion focused on increasing the diversity of leadership in institutions and the field more generally. Efforts are needed “To have people in leadership, more diverse staff and faculty that represent different perspectives, non-white perspectives.”

One interviewee pointed to the fields success in increasing gender representation and suggested that tactics employed in that effort might be applicable to working towards racial equity. As this interviewee stated, “we have some examples with what happened to women to achieve gender equity, and that certainly happened very well in psychology and at least here, it’s happened very well in psychoanalysis... You start opening up the training to people of color. You have people of color coming into the field of psychoanalysis. You offer the best training you can and the best support you can to them for developing the issues that are important to them, whatever those issues might be...Give them the support to pursue that.”

Another interviewee noted that the field must accept that addressing racial equity is a political project – one that involves changing opportunities and access for a specific set of people. As this interviewee stated, “I don’t understand what part of the work isn’t political.”

Concern was raised about the seriousness with which institutes take reports provided by external consultants. This interviewee felt that unless instates are serious about change, progress towards racial equity will not occur. “They don’t take them in, they don’t take them seriously. I think if they were taken seriously a lot, most everything would change, but I think those recommendations are very scary. That’s why it’s so performative to me. I can tell you up front that if you ask for recommendations, they’re going to be scary to a lot of the white people. Are we still going to ask for the recommendations knowing they’re going to be scary to us, and can we take them seriously and follow through with them? ...It makes me feel bamboozled.”

Another interviewee in this same group similarly noted, “What I have seen is there would be a recommendation. Then the push back is defensiveness and justification...One was a bunch of POC left. ‘Well, you know, it wasn’t because we didn’t treat them right, those people had problems. There’s other mental health issues is why they left. So, blaming....There’s lots of POC here that feel differently...There’s always an answer...There’s got to be something to learn in it rather than, ‘How can I swat it away?’”

Similar to the ombudsperson recommendation made during the faculty/staff interviews, one interviewee suggested establishing a system that allowed candidates and others in an institute a

trusted mechanism for reporting incidents. “I wish that there was sort of a group of people that could provide advocacy for people who are being marginalized or racially aggressed against or otherwise harmed by the current structures and trainings. So you know, [a person] could call somebody and be like this just happened, and there would be some kind of pipeline between that group and to the institute to say, ‘Hey you guys are so out of line and what are you going to do about it?’ That there is some kind of collective accountability in place.”

A final suggestion focused on establishing programs that specialize in diversity. Although this approach may fragment the field and has potential to isolated a special program from the field’s normative practices, it holds potential to build up the number of analysts who are exposed to a more diverse set of ideas and positioned to support a more diverse clientele. As this interviewee noted, “We can’t expect one program to do it all...What if we had a certificate program that was like, go do NGPI, this national group psychotherapy program which offers you an opportunity to be in a kind of, to have an experience in diverse communities in which diversity, race, difference are addressed head on with facilitators in the moment.”

**2023 Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in
American Psychoanalysis**

Appendix H

**The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis
A Bulletin of Preliminary Findings**

The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis

A Bulletin of Preliminary Findings

Released January 2023

Overview

The American Psychoanalytic Association responded to current and chronic racial injustice by establishing The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality (CO-REAP) in American Psychoanalysis on August 21, 2020. The mission was to investigate systemic racism and its underlying determinants, and to offer remedies for all aspects of identified racism in the field of psychoanalysis. The scope of the inquiry included assessment of national and local psychoanalytic organizations with varied governance structures, and the educational standards and practices within institutes and other psychoanalytically identified groups.

The Commission's Work

The Commission set out to achieve a comprehensive psychoanalytic understanding of how systemic racism and its impacts play out within North American psychoanalysis. The Commission enlisted an expert methodologist to develop a research design to conduct an empirically based analysis of how racism manifested in psychoanalytic institutes. The Commission met frequently in think tank sessions, conducted the study surveys and semi-structured interviews and engaged in integrative smaller work groups to analyze the data and produce a final report of the findings. This Bulletin provides the Commission's preliminary findings. A comprehensive, full report of the Commission's findings and recommendations will be released by the Spring of 2023. The recommendations will include prescriptions for organizational structures, some of which are already in the process of being implemented, and some of which represent proposals for the future, for the purpose of identifying methods to address and significantly reduce systemic racism in the field.

Methodology

Casting a wide net, our data were drawn from four sources: survey instruments, semi-structured interviews, field data (i.e., information provided through diverse, personal experiences of the Commissioners, communications on listservs, professional publications, and conference presentations), and collective self-study of the Commission's group process. Using a mixed method design including quantitative components (i.e., the Surveys) and qualitative components (i.e., open-ended responses in the Surveys and the semi-structured Interviews), data were collected from three groups of participants: a) psychoanalytic faculty, staff, and administrators, b) candidates affiliated with training institutes, and c) professionals who were positioned to enter the psychoanalytic field but had not yet done so or who had chosen to develop expertise as psychoanalytically-oriented clinicians outside the formal training system of Institutes. Across these groups, survey responses were received from 2,259 participants and group interviews were

conducted with 80 faculty members, 70 candidates, and 20 people who were potential applicants for training were invited to participate. A uniform training procedure for all interviewers for the semi-structured interviews was developed to provide consistency in the data collection. To obtain a diverse range of views, when selecting participants, first priority was given to people who identified as Black, Indigenous and people of color (BIPOC), second priority was given to people who indicated on the survey that they did not believe racism was an issue in their institute, and third priority was given to people who identified as White and indicated some level of concern about racism.

Apropos of our fourth source of data (i.e., the Holmes Commission's working group process), racial enactments emerged in the group process among commissioners as they did their work. Even in the collaborative work of the commissioners, all committed to the work of investigating racism within the field of psychoanalysis and whose life works included emphasis on race and/or other aspects of intersectionality, racism and/or other manifestations of hierarchical dynamics, authoritarian functioning still became evident. The Commission found that processing these enactments was essential and crucial to our collective understanding of the challenges that enactments present in developing interventions within institutional structures. This Bulletin has focused on data collected and analyzed from surveys and semi-structured interviews. A report of the Commission's own work on its own group process will appear in the January issue of *The American Psychoanalyst (TAP)*.

Conceptualizations of Racism used for the Commission Study

What conceptualizations of racism guided our methodology and framed our findings? The Commission's work recognized four views regarding race: 1. Racialism which references exposure for all members of a society to ideas and narratives that influence one's thoughts and perceptions about members of racialized groups; 2. Racist acts which are performed by individuals or small groups that reflect prejudice, discrimination, stereotyping, or antagonism directed against a person or people on the basis of their membership in a particular racial or ethnic group, particularly a minoritized or otherwise marginalized group; 3. Racial enactments which included how ideas around race and racism unconsciously play out in group processes and interpersonal processes; 4. Systemic racism as a system that produces advantage for some people in a dominant racial group through the oppression of people in a non-dominant racial group. Structural elements of the system are so embedded in individual psyches and institutional practices that they can be considered to be ubiquitous and to operate outside of the conscious awareness of the individual or institution carrying or practicing them.

Findings

Understanding and Addressing Racism. We found that how racism itself is experienced in psychoanalytic contexts was determined, in large part, by: a) whether one is white or BIPOC, and b) whether one is a faculty member or trainee. While most faculty and candidates indicated that race and racism were neglected topics, the impact of that neglect is experienced more fully by

candidates (be they white or BIPOC) and BIPOC faculty than by white faculty. This had impact on how candidates, both current and prospective, experienced psychoanalytic training. Both white and BIPOC candidates felt that these topics were not covered enough or at all, but BIPOC candidates were 2-4 times more likely to feel this way than white candidates. There was a paucity of attention to race and racism in supervision. To wit, the majority of BIPOC candidates compared to half of all white candidates indicated that they never or only once or twice discussed race with their supervisor.

Psychoanalytic Curriculum and Supervision Through the Lens of Race and Racism. Racial issues and people of racially minoritized status were marginalized across all levels of psychoanalytic education. Both candidates and faculty agreed that the current curricula offered in psychoanalytic training did not adequately address matters of race and racism. A majority of faculty and candidates agreed that people of color were underrepresented as both authors and subjects in required reading. Similarly, both groups agreed that the field of psychoanalysis needs to increase focus on race, racism, and white supremacy. Faculty tended to see themselves as prepared and comfortable discussing the topic of race or racism with candidates, although candidates, in their educational experiences, were less likely to see the faculty as prepared in those discussions.

Candidates and faculty of color were more likely to raise issues of race and racism than their white counterparts, despite being less comfortable doing so and less satisfied with the results of such efforts. Similarly, faculty of color were less comfortable raising such issues with leadership but more likely to have done so, nonetheless. Faculty of color were also less likely than their white counterparts to feel satisfied with the response of leadership. Despite all the dangers associated with racial backlash, BIPOC people were more likely than their white counterparts to risk the losses that might be associated with initiating such dialogue.

Policies and Procedures: Toward Racial Equity (or not). Racial identity and social positioning impacted on several levels the recognition and experience of racism in institute life. White Faculty as a group, in contrast to BIPOC Faculty, and white and BIPOC Candidates, were least likely to see the negative impact of racism. However, white faculty and administrators and white candidates underestimated the traumatic impact of racial incidents and did not recognize racial incidents as a significant reason for BIPOC candidates feeling forced to leave training programs. Recruitment that occurred primarily through existing social networks rather than through broader outreach methods increased the likelihood that the current demographic distribution within institutes would reproduce itself. There were multiple barriers to accessing and completing analytic training, including but not limited to financial resources, conflicting demands of family responsibilities, workload, and access to an institute nearby. A notable barrier was found to be that Institutes do not have any official procedures or personnel (e.g., independent committee or ombudsperson) in place to address incidents of racism. Another barrier to choosing or staying in analytic training had to do with the perception that there is a lack of attention to issues of diversity, race, gender, social class, and intersectionality in typical institute training curricula. Many *potential* BIPOC candidates reported not pursuing psychoanalytic training because of this lack of attention. Additionally, BIPOC and white study participants reported significantly different experiences of psychoanalytic training and institute

life. White faculty differed from candidates and BIPOC-identified faculty in recognizing issues of privilege and disadvantage for historically marginalized groups.

Comparing candidate responses to faculty responses, the following differences became apparent: A significant number of candidates compared to faculty reported that a person who identifies as white is advantaged in admissions. More candidates compared to faculty reported that a person of color was disadvantaged in admissions. More candidates reported believing, when compared to faculty, that people of color were *unintentionally* disadvantaged in evaluation and progression procedures. Interestingly, in this connection, candidate responses, regardless of racial identity, were in line with the responses of BIPOC faculty who endorsed the same belief. On the other hand, it is the white faculty who, as a group, were less likely to observe greater advantages afforded to male applicants in the evaluation and progression procedures. Similarly, a smaller percentage of white faculty, when compared to candidates and BIPOC-identified faculty, believed that applicants and candidates who identified as people of color experienced greater disadvantage. Although financial burden was the most frequently identified barrier to completing training, white faculty were less likely than BIPOC faculty and candidates to indicate that applicants from higher socio-economic backgrounds would be advantaged in admissions and that candidates from lower socio-economic backgrounds would be disadvantaged in progression in their programs.

Racial Enactments. Systemic racism is enacted in public in psychoanalytic institutions, but enactments were not publicly processed leading to the formation of toxic factions instead of generative enclaves within Institute communities. Racist actions and racial enactments were a significant part of the life of psychoanalytic organizations. Because racial enactments are inevitable, they constitute a significant part of the life of psychoanalytic organizations, and the data bears this out. About two thirds of both faculty and candidates have observed, experienced, or heard about an action that was racist. About half of these (roughly a third of both faculty and candidate responders) had the conviction that the racist enactment they observed, experienced, or heard about had caused racial trauma.

Despite the fact that a significant majority of respondents were aware of actions they considered racist, there was a general feeling that these matters were not dealt with fully or sufficiently, as evidenced by the finding that three quarters of respondents reported that responses were insufficient. More concerning was the finding that approximately a quarter of respondents felt that they themselves were unsupported and/or alienated when such incidents occur or that the issues were largely ignored altogether. These data suggested that since racialized enactments were not adequately processed and worked through, they were inevitably doomed to being repeated. While study participants reported that there was relatively greater comfort in addressing and processing racial incidents in private, we do not have data on the extent or efficacy of that processing.

The data revealed conclusively that public enactments persist in the following ways: The vast majority of racial enactments described by respondents in the study occurred in what we are calling “public” spaces (classrooms, online forums, community events, committee hearings). A large majority of candidates and faculty report racial enactments in these public spaces as compared to the “private” spaces of individual analysis and supervision. When

candidates discussed racism, they appeared to be most comfortable in addressing the subject in the following arenas: most comfortable with their analyst, followed by their supervisor, and finally with fellow candidates (less than half). Candidates appeared to be much less comfortable addressing racialized material with instructors and leaders. This is of interest because both candidates and instructors reported that racist acts were most frequently witnessed in the classroom.

Both candidates and faculty felt that when racial enactments occur, they were not dealt with in a satisfactory manner, were often dismissively brushed under the rug, or superficially attended to but in a manner that was incomplete, did not close the loop, failed to be sufficiently transparent, and that failed to address the structural problems laid bare by the enactments. A significant finding was that a climate of fear, typically of retaliation, impeded needed change even though the desire for change was evident across racial lines. Both BIPOC faculty and candidates were wary about bringing racial issues to the fore. Meanwhile, white faculty and white candidates were fearful of making “mistakes,” or speaking in ways that might be regarded as offensive or racist.

Experience of Race and Racism in Training/Personal Analysis. Statistically significant differences between BIPOC and white candidates were found in several domains.

BIPOC candidates felt less free than white candidates to: choose their analyst, discuss sexual orientation, discuss religion, to discuss race and ethnicity, and to discuss language differences. More BIPOC candidates than white candidates reported an “uncomfortable” relationship between themselves and their analyst in their personal/training analysis. Although the numbers for BIPOC candidates were small in this study, a reflection of the low numbers in the field at large, this finding coincides with historical reports of BIPOC clinicians who reported similar experiences-- an example being the famous analysand/analyst dyad of Ellis Toney and his analyst Ralph Greenson. The impact of candidates feeling “uncomfortable” secondarily influences the cohort experience and impacts recruitment of potential applicants. Last, BIPOC Candidates, who usually had non-BIPOC analysts, were also less likely than white candidates to regard their analyses as the most important aspect of their psychoanalytic training.

The above findings drew our attention to the effects of not having a diverse faculty including and especially in the training/personal analysis situation that is an aspect of vulnerability and intimacy, with vastly different positions of power between the training/personal analyst and the candidate analysand. Across interview topics, the negative impacts of differential power were raised multiple times by many respondents regardless of racial identity and these findings will be elaborated in detail in the full report.

Conclusions

This Bulletin represents a preliminary reporting of the findings of the Holmes Commission’s research to date; the full, comprehensive report of the Commission’s findings is expected to be released in the early spring of 2023. That report will include a more detailed rendering of the findings, a discussion of them, along with the Commission’s recommendations for change.

In the intervening time, the Leadership Team of the Holmes Commission invites comments, questions, and responses to be directed to the Commission's email address: holmescommission@apsa.org.

Bulletin Release Date: January 2023

2023 Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis

Appendix I

The Fierce Urgency of Now: An Appeal to Organized Psychoanalysis to Take a Strong Stand on Race

https://apsa.org/wp-content/uploads/apsaa-publications/vol51no1-TOC/html/vol51no1_01.xhtml

SPECIAL SECTION: CONVERSATIONS ON
PSYCHOANALYSIS AND RACE

Michael Slevin and Beverly J. Stoute
Co-Editors

The Fierce Urgency of Now: An Appeal to Organized Psychoanalysis to Take a Strong Stand on Race

Dorothy Evans Holmes

Dorothy Evans Holmes, Ph.D., professor emeritus, former director of clinical training of the Professional Psy.D. Program, George Washington University; training and supervising analyst emeritus, Baltimore Washington Institute for Psychoanalysis; training and supervising analyst, the Psychoanalytic Education Center of the Carolinas.



Dorothy Evans Holmes

The first words of the title of this article were spoken by the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Jr. in his “Letter from the Birmingham Jail” (April 16, 1963), his “I Have a Dream” speech (August 28, 1963), and in his protests of the Vietnam war. His 1967 quote presents his prescient words in a fuller context.

We are now faced with the fact that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history, there *is* such a thing as being too late. This is no time for apathy or complacency. This is a time for vigorous and positive action.

I am calling on national and international psychoanalytic organizations, such as the American Psychoanalytic Association, Division 39 of the American Psychological Association and the International Psychoanalytical Association—guided by our field’s liberating principles and values and as an obligation and duty—to act now by formulating, adopting and promulgating a firm position on “the race issue.” In our Association and in many others, this issue continues to be manifested in racism, in which one racial group claims superiority and targets other racial and ethnic groups as inferior, thereby justifying inhumane treatment of the “othered” races. The inhumane treatment includes ongoing institutional racism and discrimination, mass incarceration of blacks, especially men, and indiscriminate shootings and killings of blacks. This issue and the two preceding *TAP* issues trace the history and institutionalization of racist practices in society and relate how theory, supervision and practice as taught in psychoanalytic educational and training centers are tainted by racism.

Scholarly publications are now frequently published that address the various ways our psyches are damaged by racism, both of the perpetrators and those on the receiving end (e.g., Salman Akhtar, 2012; Katie Gentile, 2013; Pratyusha Tummala-Narra, 2013; and I, 2006, 2016, have addressed this subject). There are also some positive larger institutional efforts to include race in psychoanalytic curricula, such as the new initiative within the American Psychoanalytic Association that awards small grants to psychoanalytic centers to develop required curriculum offerings that address race. Up to now, however, the organizing bodies in psychoanalysis, like the ones mentioned above, have not acted as a whole, in unison, or at the highest levels, to affirm the core importance of the experience of racial injustice to the formation of intrapsychic life and behavior. I believe such an affirmation is imperative, and the time for it is long overdue. I urge us not to be, in King’s words, “too late.”

Why is such an organization-wide statement important? As much of the psychoanalytic literature on race points out, doing the work that can be done on race in the consultation room is very difficult. Psychoanalysts are themselves encumbered by racism, i.e., conflicted; frightened; sometimes identified with and blinded by the privileges associated with racism; sometimes discouraged from acting or criticized for doing so by colleagues, by those who supervise them or by those who may be idealized. A clear stand on race taken by the national and international psychoanalytic organizations that spawned us, to which we belong, and to which we pledge our allegiances, would provide necessary scaffolding to do the work that can be done on race.

Five Vital Policy Recommendations

The psychoanalytic organizational policy on race I am recommending would have five components:

1. The policy on race would speak for the entire organizations adopting the policy.

2. It would publicly denounce the psychologically harmful and traumatizing nature of racism, with explicit recognition that it leads to intrapsychic, characterological and behavioral abnormalities in those who continue to perpetrate it and those on whom it is imposed.
3. It would affirm the necessity of working therapeutically with racial issues in psychoanalytic treatments.
4. It would support ongoing psychoanalytic scholarship and research on race.
5. It would require that education and training in psychoanalysis and training analyses address race in order for practitioners to develop competence to work on race with patients.

What I am calling for is a tall order. The history of psychoanalysis speaking up positively and with one voice against negative cultural trends is not particularly encouraging. That fact has been widely covered of late. In a misguided view of positivist science, Freud eschewed speaking about the damaging effects of the Holocaust on himself and other analysts (Emily Kuriloff, 2014), believing that a focus on the subjectivities of experience with the Holocaust would taint one's necessary objectivity as a psychoanalyst scientist-clinician.

Psychoanalysts also have a history of being blind to their own authoritarian tendencies, to the extent that some psychoanalytic research on the subject has been ignored or relegated to sociology (e.g., Theodor Adorno's psychoanalytic work on the authoritarian personality and my own work, 2016c). Similarly, there is some evidence, that I have also noted, of psychoanalysts' tendencies to "other" those different from themselves, as in the painful era when those other than medical practitioners need not apply for psychoanalytic training. Even darker, Robert Wallerstein, in 2014, and I, in 2016, documented the "long term corrosive effects on organized psychoanalysis in Brazil" of analysts being involved in torture in South America. This history across many generations powerfully suggests a strong influence on psychoanalytic institutional thinking and practices of the worst trends in the cultures in which psychoanalysts have lived.

Thus, what is being proposed, though difficult, is a golden opportunity for organized psychoanalysis to get on the right side of history regarding race. To quote King again: This is a time for vigorous and positive action. Without organized psychoanalysis taking the strong position recommended, there is danger that the good scholarly, clinical and programmatic efforts I cited earlier in this article will not have the widespread effects they deserve. The organizational position I recommend will give structure and encouragement to all to take hold of race with the same steadfastness and courage we have applied to the other core clinical issues of psychoanalysis (internal conflict; disturbances of self; interpersonal conflict; family conflict; characterological problems). They, too, have their scary aspects. We are emboldened and faithful in our efforts to

tackle them because we know we must. We must study the literature in all of these areas; we must learn how to conceptualize them and work with all of them to help our patients, to progress in training and to maintain our competence as practitioners.

Take a Bold Step

The case I am making is that race—that courses through our societal practices, often destructively, and deeply affects us all—deserves the same attention in psychoanalysis as those more familiar factors. It is time for organized psychoanalysis to recognize and ratify these truths. Without providing the policy and values frame around race I am proposing for organized psychoanalysis, the good research and examples of best practices cited in this paper will remain isolated and siloed, and never be optimally effective. We can take the bolder step I am recommending. One recent example of how it can be done was when organizations of physicians, including psychiatrists, social workers and nurses banded together to speak against any practitioner being involved in the degrading and dehumanizing practices of enhanced interrogations. To quote Paul Summergrad and Steven Sharfstein, in 2015, the voice of organized psychiatry, on why it was incumbent on the American Psychiatric Association to speak forcefully for the entire organization and all its members:

First, the American Psychiatric Association must take positions when fundamental issues of science, ethics, or practice are either called into question or need articulation as a matter of public policy.... It is our obligation to speak out as a profession.... Actions on difficult issues for our profession require principled leadership from the highest governance of the organization....

Regarding how race works in our society, with its broad, persistent and deeply damaging effects on us all, it is now time for organized psychoanalysis, at the highest governing levels, to formulate a bold, clear policy regarding race. I hope the specific five-point proposal I made above is a helpful starting point. For all of us who have focused our psychoanalytic scholarship and its clinical applications on race and its all too frequent complement, racism, it is gratifying to see more and more focus on the subject in our psychoanalytic journals and in programming at our meetings.

The one missing piece is the larger organizational embrace of the subject, which is the specific next step I have proposed. The development of a psychoanalytic policy on race that would be widely disseminated is a necessary addition to existing scholarly, programmatic and practice contributions on race. Not only would such a policy support those who do this difficult work, it will encourage the necessary education and training to help others include race in their work. It will contribute significantly to breaking a long, unworthy tradition of silence in psychoanalysis on controversial cultural subjects. Let me emphasize, my appeal is that the highest levels of leadership in organized psychoanalysis articulate policy on race.

For psychoanalytic organizations to remain silent at this time in our culture when racism raises its ugly head once again, so very virulently, would be a betrayal. Failure to act now would betray our deep understandings of the anguish and psychological disturbances racism causes, and would betray those who have dared to address these issues without robust organizational support.

Leaders: the time for you to act is now.

Please, do not be too late.

Editor's Note:

For information on the full references cited in this article, please contact the author at crescent@gwu.edu.

https://apsa.org/wp-content/uploads/apsaa-publications/vol51no1-TOC/html/vol51no1_01.xhtml

**2023 Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in
American Psychoanalysis**

Appendix J

**Notes from the Inaugural Meeting of the Holmes Commission on Racial
Equality in APsaA**

And

**The Holmes Commission's Journey Towards Racial Equality in American
Psychoanalysis: Reflection and Hope**

https://apsa.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/TAP_Vol-55-No-1_Web.pdf

https://apsa.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/74728_TAP-Winter-2023_web.pdf

Notes from the Inaugural Meeting of the Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in APsAA

The Leadership Team

At last, on October 11, 2020, the weekly meetings of the Holmes Commission's leadership team — regularly attended by (the eponymous) Dorothy E. Holmes, Anton Hart, Dionne Powell and Beverly J. Stoute — expanded to all 19 members in our inaugural gathering of the Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in APsAA. It occasioned warm welcomes and introductions, listening to the Stanford Talisman Alumni Virtual Choir's rendition of "Lift Every Voice and Sing," which brought many to tears and the emotionally connected sharing of personal reflections and aspirations as we began our work as a commission.

Commission Chair Dorothy E. Holmes opened the meeting by reading from Freud's 1937 *Analysis Terminable and Interminable*.



Dorothy E. Holmes



Dionne R. Powell



Anton Hart



Beverly J. Stoute

Dorothy E. Holmes

In addressing psychical matters that may or may not require psychoanalytic attention, Freud referred to the patient's latent, instinctual conflict as a "sleeping dog." But, he noted, when such a dog is, in fact, causing disturbances, it is not truly sleeping and should not, thus, be left to lie. Instead, Freud argued:

We seek to bring this conflict to a head to develop it to its highest pitch in order to increase the instinctual force available for its solution. Analytic

experience has taught us that in every phase of the patient's recovery we have to fight against his inertia which is ready to be content with an incomplete solution.

In the reality of our current society and in our organization, the "sleeping dog"—racial conflict and racial inequality—have again been awakened. It is, in fact, repeatedly barking and loudly.

Following Freud's admonition that we must bring such latent conflicts "to a

Continued on page 14

Holmes Commission

Continued from page 13

head," the commission's aim is to bring to a head the conflicts and disturbances around race in APsaA, and to bring them to their highest pitch. This will not be easy.

In the formation of CO-RAP, our acronym for our commission, there is an intellectual recognition of the mental sickness of racism and that we must do something about it, starting in our own analytic home. Given the intransigence and embeddedness of racism in its many expressions, institutionally and individually, and the historical record of high cultural moments about race being repeatedly followed by the basest moments, we need to wage a fight against inertia in our attempts to find solutions to racism within our organization.

Anton Hart, PhD, FABP, FIPA, is a training and supervising analyst and faculty at the William Alanson White Institute, and co-chair of the Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in APsaA.

Dorothy E. Holmes, PhD, psychoanalyst in private practice, Bluffton, SC; teaching, training and supervising psychoanalyst, Psychoanalytic Center of the Carolinas; fellow, IPTAR; PsyD Program director emerita, clinical psychology, The George Washington University. Her current scholarship is focused on "whiteness."

Dionne R. Powell, MD., is a training and supervising psychoanalyst at both the Psychoanalytic Association of New York (PANY) and Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research (CUCPTR), New York.

Beverly J. Stoute, MD, FABP, FAPA is a training and supervising analyst at the Emory Psychoanalytic Institute, and child and supervising analyst at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute, and co-chair of the Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in APsaA.

Systemic racism, wherever it is found, involves powers, the organizational equivalent of instinctual forces that are expressed to create and maintain racial inequality. The formation of this commission is an intentional effort to bring a new powerful voice to meet and transform the old organizational powers that have kept systemic racism in place. Our work will be aimed at helping APsaA redefine and rebuild its structures, operations, and practices, including institute practices, in order to achieve racial equality and to build alliances to do the same with other analytic groups. In such kinships we will also aim to actively work in larger communities—regional, national, and global—to eliminate all forms of oppression.

Just as Freud speaks of necessary suffering, frustration, and damming up of libido as necessary components of the work to be done to liberate oneself, in fostering CO-REAP, APsaA has agreed to the examinations the commission will conduct that will likely involve some organizational frustration. We will persevere to make discoveries and propose changes that will not dam up but transform organizational instincts into constructive developments. Deep disservices of race are as old as our country. They persist and course through all of us. Perhaps racism is interminable, but the commission's commitment is that it is modifiable for the good of all in our Association and beyond. We pledge to be radical in our examination of race in the best psychoanalytic sense. That is, we will upset the status quo for the purpose of progressing toward racial equality.

Remarks by Dionne Powell, Beverly J. Stoute, and Anton Hart of the Holmes Commission's leadership team follow below.

Dionne R. Powell

It is difficult to come up with introductory remarks for such a lifelong battle; including the personal, which I believe is the source of any meaningful change. We are a segregated, invisibly gated community. And while there may not be the snarling white faces and racial epithets of my youth, the message of how "welcoming" APsaA and analytic institutes are is suggested by its lack of diversity, particularly African-Americans, Latin Americans, and Asian-Americans.

The Holmes Commission is an attempt to look at all of this closely or as stated in my recent paper "From the Sunken Place to the Shitty Place: The Film *Get Out*, Psychic Emancipation and Modern Race Relations from a Psychodynamic Clinical Perspective" published in the [2020] *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*:

Our analytic understandings are formed within a racist system that privileges certain people and excludes others. We hide behind maintenance of an "analytic stance" and yet are blinded and mute to how that precludes inclusiveness and diversity. In the end our stance becomes defensive armor that is rarely challenged.

The Holmes Commission is tasked to look at our participation and the maintenance of racist structures and behaviors individually, organizationally, and institutionally, requiring us to dwell in the shitty and unpleasant places, exploring its embeddedness and intransigence, finding new paths to mitigate the effects of racism. This is undoubtedly subversive and uncomfortable as we acknowledge our sordid past and present, while looking at personal, institutional and organizational thoughts, behaviors, and biases that have denied, discriminated, and restricted access to those often identified

Continued on page 15

Holmes Commission

Continued from page 14

as foreign or stranger or the Other. However, if we can struggle with humility and openness, we can reclaim those aspects of the self that have been unacceptable because of our conscious and unconscious attempts to exclude and deny that have our institutions, organizations, and an entire nation psychologically enslaved. To move toward a freedom that is essential for psychoanalysis and our nation, is the reason for my excitement for the commission's and APsA's possibilities.

Anton Hart

My understanding of our convening is to help us think together, to create the mind of our group, and to use this mind in the service of equality and justice, and that is an exciting prospect. I experience this as the beginning of something exciting rather than obligatory, a chance to think together and to be surprised, to be curious, to have humility, and to have courage.

This is not always what it feels like when starting a meeting with a group of psychoanalysts, I dare say. We sometimes succumb to bureaucracy, to some other version of what it is to have a meeting or to get administrative work done. My hope is that we will keep this interesting, stimulating, and surprising. I expect that, in addition, to being imaginative and courageous we'll also have to become uncomfortable with each other and in relation to the organization we're trying to help.

We'll have to expect breakdowns, that things in our dialogic process will break down. Conversations will falter. Sometimes we won't be able to find words to speak to each other. We won't be able to find suitable ways of speaking to our organization. These are inevitable when walking in the territory of race and

racism. In tough moments, our words will fail us. But, as psychoanalysts, we know that breakdowns are opportunities for finding new thoughts and words. When conversations fail, there are possibilities for figuring out how we can start talking again. Let's expect such breakdowns, and let's think of them as opportunities.

My hope for APsA is that we will begin to transform indifference toward racial equality into curiosity and engagement, and that we will help people start to move from positions of holding on to what they preciously cling to, toward positions of recognizing what they could generatively lose.


Beverly J. Stoute

James Baldwin once said, "History is not the past. It is the present. We carry our history with us. We are our history." Every African-American knows this. This is a trans-generational mantra of racial suffering. Every psychoanalyst knows this. It is a fundamental psychoanalytic tenet. James Baldwin believed that the true American identity would be forged by overcoming whiteness and Blackness in favor of a reformulated American nationalism, resolving the split between Black and white within the American psyche. By recognizing that which has been excluded, the identity of Black America, Baldwin believed that the identity of white America would be transformed to reclaim its humanity. This is true of America as a nation. This is true of American psychoanalysis.

I would like to mention the members of this commission who could only be here in spirit today: Solomon Carter Fuller, Ellis Toney, Margaret Morgan Lawrence, Charles Prudhomme, Jeanne Spurlock, Enrico Jones, Ruth Fuller, Hugh

Butts, Henry Edwards, Walter Bradshaw, Samuel Bullock, Jean Christmas, Charles Pinderhughes, Argyle Stoute. They are the Black psychoanalysts who forged the desegregation of psychoanalysis.

The places at this metaphoric table that we each occupy were earned by sacrifice, by painful struggle, by activism, by this generation of freedom fighters — Black psychoanalysts who came before us and carved out paths where there were none. Many shunned membership in APsA because of exclusionary practices, insularity, lack of community engagement, and the intolerable prejudiced teachings about African-Americans espoused in institute curricula. There are times when leadership takes charge and forges a path of social progress, but there are equally important times when leadership recognizes that it must yield to the forces of the historical moment to revive the radical potential of psychoanalysis by internalizing the mobilizing force of Blackness into the American psychoanalytic identity. Blackness represents Black psychoanalysis but also the symbolic Other. Our task is a noble one and a necessary one. Let's commit ourselves to the struggle for racial justice and equality with honor, with dignity, with authoritative humility, in our organization and hopefully reposition psychoanalysis in our work community to reclaim our psychoanalytic soul.

Lastly, Holmes commissioners took turns speaking personally about what had brought them to the present endeavor. Each account was moving and inspiring, reflecting fear and courage, apprehension and commitment. As expectably overcommitted each commissioner is, there was a palpable sense of gratitude for the opportunity to come together and do the important work we have set before us. 

the AMERICAN PSYCHOANALYST

WINTER/SPRING 2023
Volume 57, No. 1

Magazine of the American
Psychoanalytic Association

The Holmes Commission's Journey toward Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis: Reflection and Hope

Dorothy E. Holmes, Anton Hart, Dionne R. Powell,
and Beverly J. Stoute

By the time this article appears in *TAP*, you will have had chances to consider the Holmes Commission project's examination of systemic racism within American psychoanalytic organizations—in, for example, *TAP* 55.1 (Winter/Spring 2021), at various presentations at Division 39 and APsAA meetings, and in earlier written interim reports of the commission's survey and interview studies. Through those studies, the commission documented widespread systemic racism within psychoanalytic institutions and within and across various governing bodies for those institutions. These findings were further illustrated and documented through an intense and lengthy self-examination by the commissioners of our own racial selves.

That self-examining process yielded its own dataset and is the focus of this article. Learning to hold the pain, disagreement, and at times dissension among the commissioners as we reckoned with revelations of our own vestiges of systemic racism offered a model for working with and through systemic racism. This experiential discovery in the room, in the here and now is a hallmark of psychoanalytic work. We held the pain

through facilitated inspirational exercises and rituals including using evocative poetry and music to encourage us to stay in the struggle—for example, R. Masten's 1977 hymn "Let It Be a Dance." May readers find it inspiring as you think about the work toward racial equality in psychoanalysis that lies before you now:

Through the good times and
the bad times, too
Let it be a dance
Morning stars come out at night,
without the dark, there is no light
If nothing's wrong, then
nothing's right
Let it be a dance
Let the sun shine, let it rain,
share the laughter, bear the pain
And round and round we go again
Let it be a dance

Now, to the dance the commission did and
the dancing that all of us are called to do.

Formation and early days

The commission was founded in
August 2020 on a recommendation by

continued on page 4

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

The Lost Daughter:
Psychoanalytic Reflections
Rosemary H. Balsam,
Janice S. Lieberman,
Margarita Cereiñido, and
Anne Adelman

On APsAA-Sponsored Immigration:
Excerpts from *Memories of a
Chaotic World: Growing Up
as the Daughter of*
Annie Reich and Wilhelm Reich
Lore Reich Rubin

About My Favorite Season (*Ma saison
préférée*): A River Runs through It
Eric Essman

Restoring the Psyche to Psychiatry:
A Model of Outreach to the
American Academy of Child and
Adolescent Psychiatry
Rachel Ritvo, Nathaniel Donson,
Timothy Rice, and Stanley Leiken

A Passage from India: "Otherness,"
a Lifelong Process of Analytic Growth
Susmita Thukral

Holmes Commission

continued from page 1

Black Psychoanalysts Speak that the American Psychoanalytic Association (APsaA) form a high-level body to examine systemic racism within psychoanalysis—to wit a commission, not a committee. The recommendation was in concert with APsaA's own intention to study systemic racism within its ranks. In accepting the recommendation, APsaA agreed that a commission be established and named it the Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in the American Psychoanalytic Association, with Dorothy E. Holmes as its eponymous chair. Work of the commission began in earnest with its inaugural meeting in October 2020 after several consultations between the commission chair and the leaders of APsaA who, at the time, were William C. Glover, President, and Kerry J. Sulkowicz, President-Elect. Anton Hart, Dionne R. Powell, and Beverly J. Stoute were appointed by the chair as commission co-chairs—an organic and pre-



Dorothy E. Holmes



Anton Hart



Dionne R. Powell



Beverly J. Stoute

meetings, which became signature elements: one was to start each meeting with something inspirational; the other was an opening grounding ritual. For our first meeting on October 11, 2020, we watched a video performance of the Stanford Talisman Alumni Virtual Choir singing what is known as the Negro National Anthem, "Lift Ev'ry Voice and Sing." All of us listened intently. Many of us swayed, prayed, and sang along. Some cried as we grasped the import and anchor the lyrics gave us for our work. We found motivating truth in singing "a song full of the faith that the dark past has taught us." We committed to

would not have been able to design and conduct the study at the high level that we did.

It is also important to note that APsaA did not have authority over or ownership of the commission's work or its work products. The commission's power came from self-authorization to form itself as a collective with the shared purpose to identify racism within largely English-speaking North American psychoanalysis, to support reducing systemic racism by showing the harm it is doing to psychoanalysis, and to pursue racial equality in psychoanalysis.

Why August 2020?

The need for significant racial inquiry within psychoanalysis had been established when TAP published, in early 2017, Holmes's call for organized psychoanalysis to take a stand publicly on race (issue 51.1). However, the more immediate impetus to act was the 2020 awakening of the sleeping white dog of racism occasioned by the brutal murders of unarmed Blacks by police—Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, and George Floyd—and other public racist acting out that drew national attention, such as the bird watcher/dog walker incident in New York City's Central Park. With these societal atrocities in focus, APsaA acted to form the commission.

The commission's opening meeting was inspirational. At the time we were eighteen strong, plus one distinguished consultant. We recognized the deep psychological disturbance as well as the shameful social reality of systemic racism and that our efforts to understand and reduce its toxicity would best start by examining its presence and deleterious effects in our own field—psychoanalysis—and its institutions. Given that our culture's history of accomplishments regarding race is regularly followed

Learning to hold the pain, disagreement, and at times dissension among the commissioners as we reckoned with revelations of our own vestiges of systemic racism offered a model for working with and through systemic racism.

scient choice given their stellar work on race and other aspects of intersectionality. In addition to the leadership team, the slate of members included the APsaA president and past-president as *ex officio* members, Nancy J. Chodorow, M. Fakhry Davids, Ebony Dennis, Francisco J. Gonzalez, Forrest Hamer, Rafael Art Javier, Maureen Katz, Kimberlyn Leary (distinguished consultant), Rachel D. Maree, Teresa Mendez, Michael Moskowitz, Donald Moss, Usha Tummala-Narra, Jasmine Ueng-McHale, and Kirkland Vaughans.

The commission began work with high hopes and a fierce determination that American psychoanalysis should closely examine systemic racism within its own ranks. All commission meetings were held virtually by secure Zoom conferencing. We developed two ways of beginning our commission

"face the rising sun of our new day begun." The lyrics of the song galvanized us to take up our work with zest and conviction. The grounding element was to call the roll at the beginning of each meeting, the intent of which was to offer all members the opportunity to center themselves for the work and be recognized and validated for that work.

A note of appreciation is important before proceeding further. APsaA provided the direct funding and staff support for the Holmes Commission work and did so generously and unhesitatingly. APsaA also showed gratitude to the commissioners by providing support for them to attend APsaA conferences during the tenure of the commission. The commission is grateful to APsaA for its support, without which we

by serious setbacks and upticks in racist violence, we humbly accepted that our efforts to address systemic racism within psychoanalysis would no doubt have their challenges and setbacks. With such recognition, we set what we thought was a generous timetable—eighteen months—to do the work and produce findings and recommendations. So, we anticipated publishing and promulgating our work by the end of the first quarter of 2022. More in a bit on why it took longer.

Many participated in the study's surveys and interviews, and many added field data by sending vignettes of experiences with and within systemic racism as well as critiques of the study. All these sources of data were essential for the project and deeply appreciated; they play important roles in our findings and recommendations. The commission thanks every participant whole-heartedly. We are also deeply indebted to Michael Russell, our methodologist who designed our study instruments and gave guidance all along the way on data analysis and interpretation. He is a scientific and technical expert at the highest level and was a steady and steadying presence throughout.

Why did it take us longer than we planned?

We worked steadily in monthly two-and-a-half-hour meetings of the whole commission from October 2020 through December 2022 and in weekly one-hour leadership team meetings of the chair, three co-chairs, and most often our methodologist. The main reason for the lengthier-than-anticipated commission work was that it is indeed hard to wake up "sleeping racial dogs" and keep them awake. There is a deep resistance to acknowledging one's participation in a racist system that must be incessantly encountered and processed in order that a national study of systemic racism such as the Holmes Commission study can maintain its cohesion and focus. There is a countervailing tendency toward fragmentation and enactments in which racism is denied or disavowed. That was evident in what was reported to us in the data we collected from the surveys, the

interviews, and the field data. We found a chronic disinclination within psychoanalytic institutions to adequately acknowledge racist aspects. People and institutions tend to cling to white privilege rather than face the pain of recognition. Institutional leadership is inclined to fragment around racial issues, and core psychoanalytic institutional components—such as curricula, supervision, and work on the couch—lack adequate consideration of race in their individual and collective manifestations.

At least as important as the findings from our surveys, interviews, and field data is our recognition that systemic racism—at least in terms of one of its components, namely, identification with white privilege—came to be manifest among the commissioners in our work together. This understanding became a major, time-consuming, and necessary aspect of the commission's work. It led to structural changes in the commission and ultimately to a recognition of a parallel process within the commission that we could use as a paradigm for the field of psychoanalysis in its efforts to move forward on race.

Racial ghosts within our work

Here are some examples of structural change that occurred within the commission as a function of our recognition of the racial ghosts that found their way into our interactions with one another. The following reports are organized in terms of the degree of challenge experienced in recognizing bias and its influences and in moving to positions that were more accountable and more equitable.

1. The commission launched with the name of "The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in the American Psychoanalytic Association." As we worked and recognized the robust participation in all aspects of the study of independent psychoanalytic institutions outside of APsA, our working frame of reference became "The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis." This change acknowledges that the problems with racism in psychoanalysis

cross governance boundaries; thus, solutions need to cross boundaries as well. We also understood that progress will best be achieved by different psychoanalytic governance bodies working together; this requires working through tendencies to be adversarial, exclusive, and hierarchical. With these considerations in mind, we appointed M. Fakhry Davids, a respected clinician and scholar on racism who practices in London and is active in British psychoanalytic organizations. Also, we reached out to the Canadian Psychoanalytic Society to participate in our project.

2. Though we queried ourselves repeatedly and sought counsel of others, we still managed, initially, to not appoint an optimally diverse commission. Once the original commission of eighteen was appointed, we came to recognize that as we celebrated the wide diversity among us and rich array of expertise on racism and other aspects of intersectionality, we had still omitted East Asian representation and representation from the field of social work. Rather than *just* go ahead and add this representation—which we did—we also owned and processed our omissions. The original commission was composed roughly of 45% African American members (including the entire leadership team), 11% Latinx members, 11% South Asian members, and 33% white members. We undertook a reflective process to understand what influences at first made us, a racially-ethnically diverse group, less than optimally inclusive in our choice of commissioners. We benefitted from acknowledging that the marauding ghosts of racism and white privilege resided in us and expressed themselves in exclusionary acts, despite our conscious intentions to the contrary.
3. Another such example manifested itself in the leadership team. For the team to develop its leadership mind to work hopefully, energetically, and effectively, dynamics of friction and exclusion based on authority, age, and

competitiveness had to be processed. We had to reveal ourselves and bear hurt feelings while recognizing that our individual talents as leaders were valuable and we needed to make room for each other.

The chair sought outside consultation, a process revealed to the co-chairs, for support in becoming freer to share the reins of leadership for the benefit of our work. This process was painful, particularly in the awareness that Blacks can identify with white privilege in their use of power. Dorothy, as chair of the commission, examined and owned, as painful as it was, her own vulnerability to this influence as a form of identification with the aggressor. Each member of the leadership team did similar self-examining work around their vulnerabilities, and we shared with one another something about our own styles and histories in order to build scaffolding for good leadership teamwork. Through this process work, the leadership team was able to establish and maintain solidity that made it easier to help other commissioners process potential and actual eruptions of privilege that occurred in the work.

4. To promote robust participation in phase one of our study—the survey—the commission agreed to recruit a body of helpers, members at various levels in the institutions which we wished to survey. We asked them to work with their colleagues and leaders to maximize participation at all levels of membership and in as many capacities as possible. We agreed to call these partners the commission's Ambassador Corps. As the commission met over time, we recognized that we would need more help in promulgating our findings and facilitating consideration and adoption of our recommendations. A white member of the commission expressed concern about the militaristic and exclusionary connotations of the name Ambassador Corps, especially that our findings and recommenda-

tions would thus be less well-received. A lively, engaged process led to considerations of other titles such as emissary. However, we found them wanting insofar as they evoke associations with crusading and evangelistic efforts that historically imply exclusion—us versus them—and sometimes denote violence and colonization. Finally, the group settled on the name Consultation-Liaison Network as consistent with our aspirations to be universalistic, inclusive, and collaborative. One element of this work was further processed when attribution for the term “liaison” was misassigned to a white member of the commission after first being offered by a Black member. Once this error was made, we corrected it, and put in the effort of working through in order to gain more voluntary control over another expression of white privilege.

5. During the commission's work, controversy, even some dissension, occurred about leadership and management of the commission's operations and practices, one of which was our grounding exercise of the roll call. At the beginning of meetings, the chair calls out the name of each commissioner, who in turn confirms that they are present, and absences are acknowledged. For that moment, of course, everyone looks at that individual on their screen. One day, a member of the commission challenged the practice as unnecessary on the grounds that it took up time that could be better used in other ways. We had intentionally adopted it as a grounding ritual for the commission meeting openings, so many of the commission members felt alarmed, hurt, and angry. The comment cast a pall on the meeting. Considering the context and the way in which the challenge was made, several voiced that they experienced it to be enacting a racist attack on the commission's work, including the fact that the commission's leadership team was Black. From a systemic point of view,

such backlashes are to be expected. Some easing of tension occurred when a younger, Black-identified member noted that the roll call was enjoyable and important because, each time, it gave them an experience of being recognized individually, welcomed, and appreciated. The whole commission learned that such experiences are deeply meaningful to Black persons in a white-majority society marked by the echoes of slavery, and which they had not routinely had in the psychoanalytic world. What the younger person shared helped the commission reconstitute and regain perspective. Nonetheless, a small minority voiced concern that the person who questioned the roll call had been unfairly attacked. Extensive additional processing was needed to recognize that rather than an individual manifestation, the disturbance was in fact a *group* phenomenon that found its way into an individual who gave voice to it. We came to understand that *any one of us* could have given expression to such an attack, which is inevitably aroused when processing racism.


The existence of the minority view confronts us with the reality that any group that undertakes work toward racial equality will include people who represent different points in the quest for racial equality and different points of view on how to achieve it. Yet, reckoning with systemic racism must bring into the fold all who come to do the work. Such reckoning includes recognizing and learning from one's own foibles and vulnerabilities to the influence and pull of white privilege dynamics as a resistance to change. Working with this as part of our process has helped the commission hold together and move forward assiduously to complete its task. A part of that task involves showing the field of psychoanalysis at large that wrestling with the grip of systemic racism makes room for constructive change for the many who want psychoanalysis to become a racially equitable profession. This we considered to be *a* but not *the* only valid psychoanalytic way of doing our work.

The method which we offer as a model includes focusing on tasks (e.g., doing the surveys and interviews, interpreting their meanings and implications, and making recommendations), that is, the important *manifest* content. A second component is recognizing and processing *latent* content that includes vestiges of systemic racism and other forms of oppression that have the power to erupt and undo.

pation, and advancement of people of color; and in its failure to include race and racism as core elements in what we teach, how we organize our curricula, how we respond to racist incidents, and how we analyze ourselves and our patients.

There is hope for psychoanalysis if we acknowledge that racism unchecked diminishes us individually and diminishes psychoanalysis as a discipline. There is hope if we

to make work on race—yes, *for the indefinite time the work takes*—an affirmative obligation, an opportunity. In the words of another commissioner, “The process work is just as critical to our progress as is the documented survey and interview data. Racial equality cannot be gained through merely reading articles or by polite discussions but must be *experienced*, then examined and re-examined from an experiential basis that enables us to see the parallels between our group and the world in which we live. So, to my way of thinking and teaching, this approach is a mandate for learning.”

The Holmes Commission offers this article as an invitation to join the mandate to achieve racial equality in American psychoanalysis—as painfully as required and as joyfully as we can make it. As much as possible, let it be a dance we do. 

There is hope for psychoanalysis if we acknowledge that racism unchecked diminishes us individually and diminishes psychoanalysis as a discipline. There is hope if we recognize and use psychoanalysis's potential to identify and heal manifestations of racism in our society.

Why process as well as content?

Processing racial enactments was necessary in order to maintain the power relation established early on so that all members could fully and openly engage in the commission's work. Enactments disrupted that relation. The words of one of the commissioners are informative in this regard: in reflecting on a pre-publication copy of this article, that commissioner said, “You can get a clear sense of racial tension in the report of our process, as well, of course, as in our data. The power of the article resides, I think, in the fact that it not only describes such tension, it brings it. Read the article and you—whoever you are—will likely experience some manifestation of tension, and this, I think, is all to the good. It functions as an alert. Such tension is a requirement, says the article, unapologetically, and in fact, almost enthusiastically.”

What is our hope for psychoanalysis when it comes to systemic racism?

Based on 400-plus years of white dominance and white privilege, systemic racism is a deep, indwelling force in American culture. It affects us all, compelling us into actions that deny the voice and power of othered ones. Our study findings unequivocally show the presence of systemic racism within psychoanalysis in its underrepresentation of people of color in our institutions; in its insufficient effort to increase the presence, full partici-

recognize and use psychoanalysis's potential to identify and heal manifestations of racism in our society. Our data clearly show that institutions that fail to make these efforts are devitalized and tend to lose younger members, including recent graduates of color. When any one of us shows that we are influenced by racism and its corollaries, such as white privilege, there is an opportunity, painful as it surely may be, to increase one's own power and generativity through inclusiveness. It is a long, difficult process, as the commission's work demonstrated, but it is well worth it. We may not be able to eradicate systemic racism, but we can continue to work to acknowledge its pernicious manifestations and thereby free up more energy to enliven and authenticate our work to achieve racial equality. The commission's work emphasizes the need for the development of transformative psychoanalytic collectives, the Consultation-Liaison Network being one such example. We appeal to all who read this article and study the work of the commission to support that initiative *and* to join with others to meet head-on the ceaseless efforts of systemic racism to claim us. The work cannot be rushed and may never end.

We must *not*, as Thich Nhat Hanh says in his 1987 essay “Washing Dishes,” hurry to get the job over with. It is more satisfying to stay with the job in the moment, every moment it takes. Now is the time for psychoanalysis

Dorothy E. Holmes, Ph.D., is in private practice in Bluffton, South Carolina; a teaching, training, and supervising psychoanalyst at the Psychoanalytic Center of the Carolinas; a fellow of IPTAR; and Psy.D. program director emerita of clinical psychology at The George Washington University. Her current scholarship is focused on “whiteness.”

Anton Hart, Ph.D., FABP, FIPA, is a training and supervising analyst and faculty member at the William Alanson White Institute, and co-chair of the Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in APSaA.

Dionne R. Powell, M.D., is a training and supervising psychoanalyst at both the Psychoanalytic Association of New York (PANY) and Columbia University Center for Psychoanalytic Training and Research (CUCPTR) in New York.

Beverly J. Stoute, M.D., FABP, FAPA, is a training and supervising analyst at the Emory Psychoanalytic Institute, a child and supervising analyst at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute, and co-chair of the Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in APSaA.

2023 Final Report of The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis

Appendix K

APsA Listserv Emails from:

The Holmes Commission – Post #1a - March 23, 2023

Beverly J. Stoute – Post #1b - March 24, 2023

The Holmes Commission – Post #2 - March 28, 2023

**The Holmes Commission Follow-up on Commission Invitation to meet
with APsA Executive Team – Post #3 - April 5, 2023**

EMAIL POSTED ON APSA LISTSERV, EMAIL # 1a

[APsaA MEM] : Letter from the Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis

March 24, 2023 at 3:43PM

Members

Letter from the Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis



Mar 24, 2023 3:44 PM

Dorothy E. Holmes

March 24, 2023

A Message from the Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis

Dear psychoanalytic colleagues,

The Holmes Commission Leadership Team writes to you at this time of painful crisis in response to the ruptures that have been reported in the communications from APsA's President, Kerry Sulkowicz, and APsA's Executive Committee, Donald Moss, the purged Chair of the Program Committee, Lara Sheehi the banned prospective speaker who has resigned from APsA, and other members of APsA who have spoken in response to the just-named communications. Over the time of its existence to date, the Holmes Commission has not spoken on listservs about other ruptures around race that have emerged. This was a deliberate decision based on a disciplined effort to study systemic racism, formulate our findings, and make recommendations. We have, as you are likely aware, spoken in a variety of forums in APsA and elsewhere about systemic racism within American psychoanalysis, and we have published three documents, most recently our article in TAP which is a presentation of our psychoanalytic understanding of racial enactments that occurred within the Commission as it did its work.

So, why are we speaking out now? There are several reasons. First, the Commission has completed its work and is in the process of writing its final report and thereby runs less risk of being unduly taken away from its principal work or of being viewed as biased in its work. Second, the current crisis is of such huge national consequence: The President of APsA in concert with the Executive Committee took unprecedented action to dismantle the APsA's Program Committee. Third, almost immediately, very palpable and serious results have

ensued, including: the resignation of a prominent APsA member, Dr. Lara Sheehi, a woman of color from the global south who is asserted to be a "cause" of the crisis; the resignation of all persons of color from the Program Committee before it was dismantled; a call for a vote of no confidence in the APsA leadership. And fourth, we have also noted in the listserv some encouraging constructive contributions that could become elements of healing reformation of what has been torn asunder.

The Holmes Commission Leadership Team offers the following observations of the current crisis. The observations are consistent with the Commission's forthcoming findings. We offer these observations as a beginning attempt to address the current, unfolding crisis in APsA, from the perspective of the Leadership Team, in the context of winding down its work with the Commission as a whole:

1. Preemptive statements that APsA President Kerry Sulkowicz's actions were not an expression of systemic racism can be considered as important conscious content because systemic racism often operates unconsciously, is inchoate, poorly symbolized, or disavowed in the conscious mind and enacted in group processes, and thus cannot be acknowledged in one's conscious mind or intent. We urge one and all to be open to unconscious personal, group and organizational processes as they reckon with the current situation.
2. The fact that all persons of color on the Program Committee resigned based on their experience that systemic racism was in play in the Executive Committee's decision to effectively bar Dr. Sheehi from speaking is not articulated in the President's letter to our community, which only compounds the experience of analysts and prospective analysts of color that their psychoanalytic voices mean little or nothing to those running APsA.
3. The fact that Kerry Sulkowicz and the Executive Committee made such a consequential decision without the participation and concurrence of the APsA Board invites consideration that its actions were authoritarian, and mired in the dynamics of how systemic racism and authoritarianism play out when we may least expect it.
4. The importance of wide participation in organizational decision making in situations in which there are racial elements and voices to be heard from people of color cannot be overestimated (e.g., a prospective speaker of color who is controversial or polarizing; minority or minoritized participants who are deeply concerned that racism was in play in the Executive Committee's handling of the Program Committee's intent to invite Lara Sheehi).
5. The people involved in this crisis—arguably each and every one of us—and their respective sensibilities and (often multiple) roles are inherently complicated. These complexities should not be ignored, obfuscated, or denied. In this regard, we observe that

the Holmes Commission has for the past three years included active members of both the Program Committee and the Executive Committee, even originally, including APsA's current President, Kerry Sulkowicz.

6. We would like to unequivocally acknowledge the important work of the (now disbanded) Program Committee who, in their vital programming for more than three years, have made it amply clear that considerations of the intrapsychic and the social are inherently intertwined. The notion, as expressed in Kerry Sulkowicz's posting of a *return* to clinical matters as involving a stepping back from engagement with social ones perpetuates a corrosive, patently false dichotomy. The Members of the Program Committee have made a major contribution helping APsA's membership address these issues, and we are painfully aware of the painfulness of the backlash they have presently received.

7. Wide participation (e.g., the Executive Committee with the Board and the Program Committee) could potentially become a generative enclave that attempts to contain emergent toxicity and makes it possible to hold multiple, and sometimes disparate views on race and other aspects of intersectional, intra-, and inter-group conflict.

It is the hope and recommendation of the Holmes Commission Leadership Team that all parties in the present crisis seek ways of bringing their psychoanalytic sensibilities to bear, to stand for what is just and right, perhaps to reconvene for further dialogue, and together, lift one another out of the miry clay into which Kerry Sulkowicz's recent actions have sunk them and potentially all of us. Such an effort may be just what it takes to show what all of us as analysts have experienced: ruptures can be healed; there can be survivability and growth, including doing the hard and sustained work of building the scaffolding necessary to hold race, racialization, and racism, and other deeply discomfiting sad and destructive realities of our American and psychic realities and identities.

Should the June meeting be able to be put together at this late date, might it include a significant component, supported by consultants who are expert on systemic racism and its processing, to engage the attending members in a deep processing of systemic racism and misogyny, using the current crisis as its case study?

Best Regards,

/s/ Dorothy E. Holmes, Chair, Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis

Anton Hart, Dionne Powell, and Beverly Stoute*, Co-Chairs

*Owing to the complexity of her dual roles—as a member of the Leadership Team of the Holmes Commission, and as a member of the Executive Committee—Dr. Stoute, a co-signer of this letter, will be issuing a separate, additional posting on these and other issues related to the current Executive Committee/Program Committee matter. (BELOW)

--

Dorothy E. Holmes, PhD
Clinical Psychologist and Psychoanalyst in Private Practice
ABPP (Board Certified in Clinical Psychology)
FABP (Fellow in the Practice of Adult Psychoanalysis, American Board of Psychoanalysis)

Teaching, Training and Supervising Psychoanalyst
Psychoanalytic Center of the Carolinas

Fellow (Training and Supervising Psychoanalyst)
Institute for Psychoanalytic Training and Research (IPTAR)

Professor and Program Director Emerita of Clinical Psychology
Professional Psychology Program
The George Washington University

Teaching, Training and Supervising Psychoanalyst Emerita
Washington Baltimore Center for Psychoanalysis, Inc.

--

EMAIL # 1 b-- ADDITIONAL EMAIL CONNECTED TO EMAIL # 1

Beverly J. Stoute via connect.APSA

March 24, 2023

[Members](#)

Re: Letter from the Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis

Original Message:

Sent: 3/24/2023 3:45:00 PM

From: Beverly J. Stoute

Subject: RE: Letter from the Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis

Dear psychoanalytic colleagues,

I must disclose that I am both a Co-Chair of the Holmes Commission and also a member of the APsA Executive Committee. Throughout my term as a member of the Executive Committee and Director-at-large on the Board of Directors, I have emphasized the importance of leadership being sensitive to the voices and concerns of people of diverse and marginalized identities, while I have also been mindful that I am a nationally elected representative who participates in the leadership decisions of our entire organization. Mindful of my roles, and of my unique border position here, I am reflecting on what has happened, because systemic racism in group dynamics is enacted through us all. I ask, how may we understand this and how do we recover? Therefore, I support and maintain the positions espoused in this Holmes Commission Leadership Team statement for thoughtful review of the processes and impacts on the organization of this painfully shattering decision and the urgent need for reparative action. In so doing let's challenge ourselves to do better and be our better selves.

Best Regards,
Beverly J. Stoute

Co-Chair, Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis
Director-at-large and Executive Committee Member, American Psychoanalytic Association

EMAIL POSTED ON APSA LISTSERV POST # 2
[APsA MEM] : A Second Letter from the Holmes Commission
March 28, 2023; 3:06PM

Members

A Second Letter from the Holmes Commission



Mar 28, 2023 3:06 PM

Dorothy E. Holmes

March 28, 2023

Dear Psychoanalytic Colleagues,

With authorization from the Holmes Commission, we, its Leadership Team, write again to recognize with appreciation the initial steps towards repair taken yesterday by APsA leadership. We join all who feel released from the stalemated and dangerous situation into which the earlier decisions by the Executive Committee put all of us. The Holmes Commission wishes to share the following with all of the APsA membership and its leaders:

We ask the APsA Executive Committee, and the Board, to consider what follows in this communication in the spirit of the Holmes Commission's deep gratitude that in the summer of 2020, APsA, as represented then by William Glover, then our President, and Kerry Sulkowicz, then President-Elect, generously supported establishment of the Commission. It did so by giving it a home at APsA, by funding a high-level methodologist, Michael Russell, PhD, to help us develop, implement, and analyze the results from our study instruments, and also by providing administrative staffing. Tina Faison and Alice Rapkin have served faithfully and admirably as our Executive Assistant and Secretary, respectively. We could not have done our work without this support, and we see it as genuine expressions of commitment to the work of the Commission.

We further appreciate the steps taken yesterday as important *beginning* steps – the apologies and the offers by leadership to rework the relationships between APsA leadership and Lara Sheehi and between APsA leadership and the Program Committee. Because so much work remains to be done, we do not feel relief yet, but do feel committed to continuing the work that is left to do, examples of which follow.

We reach out now to Kerry Sulkowicz (ex-officio member of the Holmes Commission) and Dan Prezant (to whom we have extended an open invitation as President-Elect). Both have been invited and welcome, but they have declined to attend Commission meetings. We ask them to join the Commission in its meeting on April 8 to process work with us on the:

- psychoanalytic limitations of apology and steps needed beyond apology to truly appreciate and gain voluntary control over the influences of race, racialization, systemic racism, and other oppressions, as they play out in our organizational life
 - value of making amends with our whole community, not only people of color
 - need for full recognition that the actions taken *did* cause actual damage and pain, not just that the actions taken *would* cause damage, and also that the damage done requires remediation, not just apology
 - importance that both APsA leadership and the Program Committee be open and receptive to a review of and modification of their practices, and to seeking ongoing, long-term consultation on unconscious, discriminatory and authoritarian processes in their leadership roles
- centrality of the Board as a whole and as a full partner in 1. making the kinds of high impact decisions that were made by the Executive Committee alone; 2. in establishing remediation methods for their respective functions and interactions, with methods to monitor progress when serious missteps have been taken.

The Commission recognizes that one meeting cannot achieve healing, but we are confident that if APsA leadership will accept our invitation, it will be an important step in the direction of dialogue, and hopefully, healing. Our Commission data (surveys, interviews, and our own within Commission work) has shown us that a process orientation to the work of combatting oppressive forces such as racism, antisemitism, classism, sexism, and misogyny works! Again, we refer you to our recent *TAP* article to read or reread as a work product from the Commission that spells out our own encountered enactments and how we processed them. That process work enabled the Commission to find and repeatedly vitalize its center and to establish itself as a working group that could stay focused and constructive even as we, in examining our multiple data streams, had to experience and process the toxicity of many manifestations of systemic racism within the structures and practices of psychoanalytic institutions. In the course of this work, we became aware that the Commission itself was not free of hierarchical, authoritarian, and race-and gender-based influences that we were studying. Therefore, we had to, recurrently, make ourselves the subjects of our own inquiry. So, Kerry and Dan, we ask you – and as many of the Executive Committee as possible – to join us for such work around what has happened in the current crisis, including how you have regarded and related to the Commission itself. Beyond the invitation to Kerry and Dan and the Executive Committee to meet with us on April 8, the Commission reiterates its call from our initial communication on March 24 for a larger scale group process effort to attempt to address and repair the damage we all are facing now in APsA. Specifically, we propose that such an effort be a central offering of the June meeting if the meeting can be put back together. Others have taken up the essence of that suggestion, in a variety of forms, with all recognizing that consultants who are experts on group process, systemic racism and other forms of discrimination including sexism, antisemitism, and classism will be necessary. One of the principal findings of our

Commission work is that systemic racism and other forms of discrimination are very difficult to grasp, own, and take organizational responsibility for, especially where it is needed the most – at top leadership levels, whether that be locally or nationally. Shame can be a major obstacle to doing so. The Commission has found that it takes a deep, immersive effort over time to recognize these oppressive forces within psychoanalysis and ourselves as human beings and psychoanalysts. The Commission has been able to not split apart and to persist in doing constructive work by engaging its own process as openly as we can bear. Our process has kept us from buckling under the pressure and destructive will of systemic racism. Kerry and Dan, and other members of the Executive Committee, we are calling you into the fold. Once more, we ask you to support our effort by joining us on April 8.

All our best,

The Holmes Commission signed by the leadership team,

Dorothy Holmes, Chair

Anton Hart, Dionne Powell and Beverly Stoute, Co-Chairs

--

EMAIL POSTED ON APSA LISTSERV POST # 3

APsaA MEM] : Follow-up on Commission Invitation to meet with APsA Executive Team

Dorothy E. Holmes via connect.APSA

April 5, 2023, 9:00AM

Members

Follow-up on Commission Invitation to meet with APsA Executive Team



Apr 5, 2023 9:00 AM
Dorothy E. Holmes

Dear Fellow Members of APsA:

It is important to share with you again at this fateful time in this country's history, one day past the 55th anniversary of the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (MLK). Yesterday, one of APsA's esteemed members, Dionne Powell, MD, shared a beautiful tribute to MLK, one that was hopefully inspirational and encouraging to all of us as we struggle so painfully in APsA with ruptures and an uncertain path forward, based on multiple unfortunate systemic factors. MLK's wisdom included sage advice on the necessary approach to forward movement in the face of racism and other oppressions.

MLK said, in his Letter from Birmingham Jail, "I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negro's great stumbling block in the stride towards freedom is not the White Citizen's Councilor or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white moderate who is more devoted to order than to justice".

The Holmes Commission reports this morning that we are in communication with APsA leadership in a committed effort to meet with them. Yesterday morning, in response to our two invitations to join us, they declined to join us in our Commission meeting on April 8. They have pledged to work with the Commission to meet in the near future. The Commission will continue to work with APsA leadership to make the promise a reality. We will do so in the spirit of MLK's wisdom that systemic injustices (racism and all oppressions that are of central importance to psychoanalysis) make justice more important than order. May it be so.

Best,

The Holmes Commission on Racial Equality in American Psychoanalysis

--

Dorothy E. Holmes, PhD
