



The International Journal of Psychoanalysis

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ripa20>

The 'community turn': Relational citizenship in the Psychoanalytic Community Collaboratory®

Jane A. Hassinger & Billie A. Pivnick

To cite this article: Jane A. Hassinger & Billie A. Pivnick (2022) The 'community turn': Relational citizenship in the Psychoanalytic Community Collaboratory®, The International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 103:1, 120-143, DOI: [10.1080/00207578.2021.2017780](https://doi.org/10.1080/00207578.2021.2017780)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207578.2021.2017780>



Published online: 16 Feb 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 123



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



The ‘community turn’: Relational citizenship in the Psychoanalytic Community Collaboratory®

Jane A. Hassinger^a and Billie A. Pivnick^b

^aPsychoanalytic Institute of California, San Francisco; ^bWilliam Alanson White Institute, New York

ABSTRACT

Drawn from five years of experience in the web-based Psychoanalytic Community Collaboratory, this paper explores implications of the ‘community turn’ in psychoanalysis for roles, methods, clinical theory, and training. With participants from many parts of the world, the Collaboratory has become a creative generator of projects including documentary films, community memorial initiatives, and mental health interventions in highly stressed communities. The Collaboratory’s unique pedagogy offers valuable experiential learning about the complex intersubjective dynamics common to group and community life. Through reflection on the interpersonal dynamics of three critical incidents, we illustrate the interplay of intra-psychic and political aspects of identity—what we have termed ‘relational citizenship’, an intersubjective self-state in which the individual and the sociopolitical are psychically linked and where the challenges of identifying with and belonging to one or more collectivities are recognized and negotiated.

I would have you be a conscious citizen of this terrible, beautiful world.

Coates, T. N. (2015, 108).

We live in an era of unprecedented political polarization. Catastrophic anxiety has penetrated our minds and bodies in ways that threaten psychic, community and global equilibrium. Throughout the world, we find widespread fear and mistrust, cult-like fealty to white supremacist, authoritarian leaders, violent insurrection, dangerous erosion of our democratic institutions (Lifton 2019), global climate change, pandemic and dislocation of millions. In addition to social unrest and political conflict, these conditions trigger intrapsychic and interpersonal instability often revealed as enactments in our communities and in our consulting rooms. Although these domains have been historically considered to lie outside the canonical frame, our patients persist in bringing their political concerns and their experiences in community life to our consulting rooms (Samuels 2016). How can we hope to adequately respond without a theory of how politics and world events are represented internally? Moreover, how do experiences in community groups large and small play critical developmental roles in post-adolescent and adult development?

Contemporary political and economic realities challenge psychoanalysts to expand our scope of practice into community-focused, interdisciplinary work in which practitioners

shift from experts to collaborating citizens. Psychoanalytic scholars such as Layton (2019), McLaughlin (2019), Alpert and Goren (2017), Altman (2013, 2015) and Frosh (2001) are engaged with theorizing a social psychoanalysis that repairs the rupture between the psychic and the sociopolitical in psychoanalysis. Based on five years of experience in the web-based Psychoanalytic Community Collaboratory®, in this paper we contribute our perspective on what the practice of a community psychoanalysis might encompass and how practitioners can best prepare themselves for “the community turn”.

Twemlow and Parens (2006) and Gonzalez and Peltz (2021) have been committed to making psychoanalysis “more relevant in addressing the urgent issues that press upon us today as individuals and collectives” (410). They and Danto (2005) have pointed out that, as far back as 1919, with Freud’s call for a “psychoanalysis for the people”, psychoanalytic practitioners have turned their attention to the mental health needs of communities. Since then, much work has been done to articulate and address troubles in the community and, taking different points of entry, psychoanalytic scholars have identified several approaches to community practice. Gourguechon (2011) calls one approach “psychoanalysis in the community”, and another “psychoanalysis of the community”. Twemlow (2013) focuses on three different yet overlapping psychoanalytic frameworks: the “Type I therapeutic mind”, referring to the analyst within the consulting room; the Type II therapeutic mind, for the analyst who works in the community with individuals; and the Type III social/therapeutic mind within this for analysts who work within an affected community demonstrating powerful and symptomatic group unconscious forces. In each framework, the analyst remains in the expert role and intervenes independently. Our conception of the analyst for the group compared with the analyst in the group sets forth a different perspective on community psychoanalytic work. In addition to the roles outlined by Gourguechon and Twemlow, we view the analyst as a resource for the community, a fellow citizen and a collaborator with other citizens.

Furthermore, we argue that psychoanalysis should consider what it means psychologically to be a community member and a citizen. How is being a citizen represented in the intrapsychic register? How is citizenship represented in the interpersonal register for members of groups? How can psychoanalysts contribute to the nurturing of generative relationships and solutions for persistent toxic problems in our communities? How do we account for the links between the consulting room and community settings where psychoanalytic practitioners are also *citizens*, *collaborators* and *consultants*.

The Psychoanalytic Community Collaboratory® was founded in 2014 by US psychoanalytic practitioners Jane Hassinger and Billie Pivnick. The Collaboratory is a web-based seminar, project incubator and experiential laboratory in which participants share stories from their work, develop new projects and explore relevant scholarship. Through five iterations, it has become a generator of such creative collaborations as documentary films, community memorial projects and mental health interventions in highly stressed communities. The Collaboratory has also offered a site and methodology for studying complex intersubjective dynamics as they play out in group and community life.

In this paper we will present three critical incidents that illustrate the dynamic interplay of intrapsychic and political aspects of identity – what we have termed *relational citizenship*, an intersubjective self-state in which the individual and the sociopolitical are dynamically linked and where the challenges of identifying with and belonging to one or more collectivities are recognized and negotiated.

The development of the *relational citizen*

American psychoanalysis has historically conceived of the individual mind as universal and evolving apart from the social/political world (Cushman 2015). However, there have been a few important voices in the field who have argued that character development takes place in a social context. In the early years, such thinkers as Erich Fromm (1958), Erik Erikson (1963), Karen Horney (1994), Harry Stack Sullivan ([1953] 1968) and Fromm-Reichmann (1960), viewed interpersonal relations as inseparable from psychic development. In more recent times, the work of Vamik Volkan (2013), Selma Fraiberg (Fraiberg, Adelson, and Shapiro 1975), Judith Kestenberg (1990) and Henry Krystal (1968) demonstrated the effects of intergenerational social trauma on personality. Of those figures, Fromm and Erikson theorized how the realms of culture and politics could be viewed psychoanalytically, and laid the groundwork for thinking about how the influences of the intergenerational transmission of trauma, the social/political surround and the individual's direct participation in the social world contributes to the construction of subjectivity and identity development.

More recently, Layton (2013) has considered the effect of neoliberal economic values and policies on normalizing defences against narcissistic wounding, characterized by denial, splitting, projection of vulnerability and dependency, expressed through sadomasochistic repetition compulsion, reversals and retaliation. With the advent of neoliberal economic values and policies, she notes a corresponding decline in social altruism, emboldening decivilizing attitudes and stigmatizing empathy. The sense of a containing community has devolved into what Banfield (1967) calls "amoral familism" with little or no accountability to "the other" (Layton 2019) and a devitalized understanding of what it means to be a citizen.

And yet, we know that the development of the "citizen-subject" is as integral to mental health as is working well and loving well (Samuels 2004). When citizenship is stripped of the dimension of mutual aid and accountability, the individual citizen is left feeling uncared for *and* uncaring. To address this crisis of empathy and to reforge a broken social-historical link, psychoanalysts need to attend to patients as members of communities and to their development as citizens with an acceptance of their implication in the suffering of others (Davoine and Gaudilliere 2005; Frie 2017; Layton 2019; Rothberg 2019). We believe that a robust community psychoanalysis must be premised on an ethic of inextricable interdependency, mutuality and social responsibility (Butler 2020; Fromm 1958; Layton 2019; Rothberg 2019). Developments in the social-political sphere, including the grass-roots emergence of Black Lives Matter, Me Too and pandemic-related mutual aid networks, are recent affirmations of the need for this correction in course.

Relational citizenship is an expression, at both intrapsychic and interpersonal levels, of maturing capacities for intersubjective perspective taking *and* group relations outside the family (Shapiro and Carr 1991, 2017; Tubert-Oklander 2014). This psychological work produces increased self-authorization and the capacity for managing multiple group identifications necessary for mature participation as a citizen in community life. These multiple group identifications complement the multiplicity of other internalized object relations (Bromberg 1998, 2011). *Relational citizenship is the intersubjective experience of oneself as a generative citizen among citizens.*

Our formulation of relational citizenship builds on Eng and Han's (2000) exploration of the psychic challenges associated with assimilation desires and conflicting identifications for Asian American citizens, which include, for example, the distortions of self and self-value that result from being viewed/stereotyped as model minorities. Referencing Klein's (1935) concept of the melancholic identification, Eng and Han view *psychic citizenship* as the resolution of a continuous intrapsychic struggle with contradictory and competing identifications in which the painful toll of racial and cultural marginalization is reduced by mourning the loss of good internal objects (mother, mother tongue) and identifying with communities associated with those good objects. As community psychoanalysts, we have linked the intrapsychic "psychic citizen" to the psychosocial realm and the domain of group and community dynamics. In this move, we imagined an interpersonal, intersubjective realm for relational citizenship nested in one's developmental experiences in voluntary, intentional groups.

The 1991 collaboration of Edward Shapiro and A. Wesley Carr was essential to our elaboration of relational citizenship as the outcome of an adult developmental task. They discuss the significance of acquiring an "interpretive stance" – a capacity for "integrating an evaluation of the individual's experience and interpretation of that experience from the perspective of their institutional role" (Shapiro and Carr 1991, 76). An interpretive stance organizes the psychological management of multiple group roles and is a product of experiences in groups tasked with reflection on their process within an organizational context. Similar to our conception of relational citizenship, Shapiro and Carr (2017) also later turned his attention to the realm of adult development, linking his "psychological citizenship" to taking up citizen roles in work groups. He further proposed that the interpretive stance is an individual developmental outcome of experiences in such work groups, because it reflects the person's attachment to, and responsibility for, the group.

Typically, membership in a group puts pressure on the individual, who can come to feel that their autonomy must be sacrificed to the project of becoming a cooperative member of the group. Psychoanalytic theorists of groups, including Bion (1961), Rice (1965/2018) and the British Group Analysis school (Dalal 1998; Foulkes 1964), have described how this pressure on individual identities often stimulates member regression to dependency on the leader and a de-differentiation of roles in the group. Managing the conflict between autonomy and dependency without resort to regression entails an acknowledgment and acceptance of interdependency, which is only possible if leaders have emotional maturity, are capable of critical evaluation of people, and have the ability to stand up to criticism (Kernberg 2020) and channelling them constructively, while maintaining clear boundaries, clarifying tasks and roles, and adding structure, conflict resolution, respect and support. Leadership styles vary from the directive (often effective for short-term decision-making) to the democratic, which emphasizes support, inclusion and engagement of all members (Rudden, Twemlow, and Ackerman 2008). Notably, and fitting to the needs of the Collaboratory, leaders who assume a democratic style engender greater long-term commitment. Additionally, intrapsychic management of multiple group identifications (represented internally as *groups-in-the-mind*) leads to a strengthened capacity for negotiating authority relations, differences and power (Bion 1961; Burka, Sarnat, and John 2007; Rudden, Twemlow, and Ackerman 2008).

Our thinking about relational citizenship has also been enriched by the work of Tubert-Oklander (2014) whose integration of relational psychoanalysis and group analysis builds on Matte-Blanco's (1988) recognition of the interchangeability of individual and group in the "symmetrical logic" of the unconscious. A person is part of a group and this group is also part of the person, represented internally in one's "groups in the mind". An individual may thus speak both from themselves and for the groups to which they belong (Losso, de Setton, and Scharff 2017).

Development of the self and the groups in which one participates evolve dialectically and are mutually constitutive. Participation in groups in which one collaborates with others to achieve goals and solve problems contributes to both individual and group identity. When leadership is strong and external boundaries are secure, the experience of persons working together on shared objectives can produce a state of mind (self-state) and mode of relating characterized by a synchrony and a sense of being part of something bigger than the self (Tubert-Oklander 2014). Consider, for instance, the situation of the jazz ensemble, composed of distinct players/instruments joining and cooperating together to create original music, reliant on the individual's technical prowess and creativity while also transcending them. The jazz ensemble, working within a frame (the key and the changes, the tempo, collective improvisation built in relation to a basic melodic line, and moving the solo among the members) functions as both container and site for innovation and experimentation. Musicians not uncommonly refer to being "in the groove". It is in this mode of experience that a "group state of being" emerges in which members' individual contributions combine to create something new and bigger than the sum of the parts. We view this relational pattern as a *Collaborative Third* (Aron 1999; Benjamin 1988, 2004, 2017) and consider it an explicitly group-situated relational experience and an important part of the psychological toolkit of the relational citizen. Insofar as the groups' collaborative stance helps resolve power struggles, it is related to the Moral Third and founded in values including acceptance of uncertainty, humility and compassion that form the basis of a democratic, egalitarian view of psychoanalytic process.

Participation in democratic, humanistic groups (Glassman 2008) is supported by group norms and values that recognize and protect the distinctive voices of each participant while discouraging toxic processes such as scapegoating and marginalization. These groups can stimulate growth in members' capacities for holding multiple identifications and tolerating differences with empathy, mutuality and accountability. Simultaneously, the group further evolves its own containing/holding functions, thus becoming a vehicle for personal growth as well as creative problem-solving. With an explicit mission to collaborate on developing new projects (the task), the group provides a container for the multiple "groups-in-the-minds" of its members (ethnicities, cultural histories, citizenships, professions, etc.) and a Collaborative Third emerges to hold, manage and utilize these identifications, which could otherwise be incompatible.

This imaginative construction of a Collaborative Third indicates that members feel adequately secure and identify with the "group-as-a-whole" and thus move from defensive uses of splitting and/or projection (paranoid position) to a recognition of and concern for others (depressive position) and identification with the group's task and mission. These outcomes enhance, rather than disrupt, self-definition and interpersonal competence. At the same time, as individuals take on constructive group roles and leadership

functions on behalf of the whole group's mission, they contribute to the group's resilience, creativity and productivity.

Shapiro, following Fromm (1958), argues that an ability to negotiate complexity of this sort also represents a significant adult developmental achievement:

Though formal authorization as a citizen comes with birth or naturalization, effective citizenship is an interdependent experience. The capacity to link personal experience in role in relation to a task - with the support of increasingly socially linked, self-reflective institutions and leaders - may ultimately increase the possibility for each of us to find a place to stand. (Shapiro and Carr 2017, 166)

Growing this capacity is a distinctly relational experience insofar as it joins internal and external realities within an intersubjective context. One's ability to engage in building a Collaborative Third is a prerequisite for developing intrapsychically and interpersonally as a relational citizen. Relational citizenship is the intersubjective experience of oneself as a generative citizen among citizens. Since community life demands that we understand the influence of both external and internalized groups on individuals, our work as community psychoanalysts requires an expansion of our developmental theories as well as praxis to reflect the interdependence between these important aspects of self and community life. To further elaborate the concept of relational citizenship, we next provide clinical illustrations of both adult and group development from the Psychoanalytic Community Collaboratory®.

Psychoanalytic Community Collaboratory®

When the authors met at a conference in 2011, we recognized each other as kindred spirits. For years, each had been working collaboratively in non-conventional projects in community settings with colleagues from many disciplines. Our projects spanned the worlds of the arts, museums, health care, schools and policy-making. Pivnick started a school, developed a dance therapy department in a hospital, and later became a programme development consultant. Her multi-year consultation to the designers of the National September 11 Memorial and Museum and the National Pulse Memorial and Museum emphasized the significance of memorialization in the wake of mass trauma (Pivnick 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017, 2018, 2021; Pivnick and Hennes 2014). Hassinger has for many years collaborated with artists, activists and social scientists to address the economic and health impacts of marginalization, abuse, the HIV/AIDS epidemic in post-apartheid South Africa, the widespread community trauma of gender-based violence in the Democratic Republic of Congo, the effects of the sexual abuse of US women prisoners, and the stigmatization of abortion and reproductive healthcare providers around the world (Anderson et al. 2014; Berman and Hassinger 2012; Harris et al. 2011).

We found in each other a much-needed alliance and sounding board for our experiences bringing psychoanalytic theories into community-based practice. Hoping to create a supportive community of like-minded colleagues, in 2015 we launched the Psychoanalytic Community Collaboratory® – a web-based seminar and learning community that offers support and education for clinicians who want to bring a psychoanalytic framework to community-based interventions. The Collaboratory's objectives are to: bring psychoanalysts, psychotherapists and other practitioners into creative collaboration on persistent social problems; create a theoretical/methodological framework for working

in groups and interdisciplinary teams; and develop resources and curricula that reflect new scholarship, reports from the field and toolkits for practice.

The Collaboratory has become an exciting online international laboratory for innovative community-based interventions. Functioning as both a seminar and a facilitated group experience, in which foundational readings support the development and implementation of innovative projects, the Collaboratory is designed to address significant gaps in professional psychoanalytic education. We chose an interactive webinar model based on our belief in the importance of engaging with others from outside their own communities and the psychoanalytic institute training culture and structures. Commonly, participants have explored challenges related to adopting new collegial roles in interdisciplinary teams, interpreting and navigating team dynamics, and project implementation in target communities. We have also urged participants to consider issues of professional membership in the psychoanalytic community.

The Collaboratory utilizes a “here and now” reflective approach to understanding group dynamics and the impacts of the cultural and political contexts on the group. Each participant typically presents a project proposal. Project modalities have included community-based participatory action research, film-making, place-making and collaborations with visual artists, actors, musicians and dancers. Discussions often delve into the nuts and bolts of the work itself, ranging from, for example, the management of shifting one’s sense of professional self to negotiating agreements with various community stakeholders. Members also explore challenges faced in the transition from “expert” to collaborating citizen; the differences between being a “psychoanalyst for the group” and “psychoanalyst in the group”; interpreting unconscious processes in teams; and more (Foulkes [1964] 1984).

Each year, a new cohort of professionals from the USA and various countries around the world gathers (including senior psychoanalysts, private practice psychologists and social workers, creative arts therapists, chaplains, university professors, community mental health workers, social justice activists, architects, educators, graduate students, artists, writers and film-makers). The Collaboratory syllabus combines psychoanalytic, sociological, historical and aesthetic scholarship and materials. Sessions begin with a brief presentation from facilitators on themes relevant to planning and implementing projects, for example programme formulation and design, becoming a team member, phases of project development, racialization and racism, and intergenerational historical and cultural trauma. Over time, members take on leadership and teaching roles related to their interest and expertise. All contribute to an evolving set of practice principles and bibliographic resources. And all come to have a stake in each other’s success.

As work in the community involves working with and within groups, attention is devoted to reflecting on the group’s dynamics and development. Other than in social work education, few postgraduate and psychoanalytic training programmes offer courses on theories of group dynamics and methods of leadership. Because of the complex mix of experience, backgrounds and social demographics of the Collaboratory members, we anticipated that these groups would produce variants of the challenges, dynamics and “crises” that typically arise in community group settings. Like all groups, each Collaboratory produces distinctive recurrent themes, processes, group member roles and critical incidents that reflect the particular psychologies and interests of

members, unconscious dynamics as well as the influences of major events in the world (Tubert-Oklander 2014).

Our aim has been to use the group as a site for experiential learning, grounded in a democratic, humanistic framework (Glassman 2008) and guided by psychoanalytically informed theories about authority relations, anxieties related to inclusion/exclusion, intimacy, conflict and destructiveness (Bion 1961; Foulkes 1964; Kernberg 2020; Menzies 1960; Rudden and Twemlow 2013; Rudden, Twemlow, and Ackerman 2008). Indeed, each Collaboratory has produced a dramatic and unfolding narrative arc with distinctive themes, member roles, emotional tones, phases and critical incidents that reflect the psychological histories of members, regressive pulls in the group and events in the outside world.

Bion identified unconscious regressive responses (the “basic assumptions”) to anxieties stirred intrapsychically in groups. The emergence of basic assumption-motivated behavior patterns – dependency, fight/flight and pairing – can disrupt the ability of a group to accomplish its tasks. Applying this model to describe the distorted communication patterns in traumatized groups, Earl Hopper (2003, 2009) proposed a fourth pattern, “incohesion”, which includes two forms – “aggregating” (or becoming disconnected) and “massifying”(or regressed massing together and loss of differentiation). Indeed, several scholars have recognized how traumatized communities evidence narrative memory disturbances brought about by a collapse of the capacity for symbolization following unresolved bereavement and dissociation (Davoine and Gaudilliere 2005; Pivnick 2015; Volkan 2013). Transgenerational traumas – the “wounds of history” – can also be revived, pressing for a repair and reconnection of broken relational links (Apprey 2004; Holmes 2016; Salberg and Grand 2017; Vaughans 2017).

In the Collaboratory, members’ commitment to maintaining an “interpretive stance” regarding events in the group and its “holding environment” (Shapiro and Carr 1991) ensures rich opportunities for learning about how to respond to challenges encountered in projects in the field. Group dynamics theories posit that after an early positive identification with the facilitators and participants is established (the basis of a working alliance), a normative crisis often erupts. This normative crisis includes a shift in authority relations that, if successfully resolved, leads to decreasing vertical, projection-based relations and increasing horizontal, peer-to-peer relations. Going forward, various critical incidents, or what may be understood psychoanalytically as enactments, usually develop. We view critical incidents as symbolic crystallizations of group defences mobilized against anxiety and threats to the cohesion of the group, often also in response to counterpart events outside the group. These threats are revealed through changes in the quality of interaction among members, absences, dreams and parapraxes (Menzies 1960; Foulkes 1964; Glassman 2008). In the next section we will describe a critical incident from each of the first three Collaboratories to illustrate the influences of traumatic community events on the experiences of participants, manifestations of the Collaborative Third and *relational citizenship* in the evolution of each group.

Critical Incidents in the Collaboratory

When society fails to act responsibly to contain the suffering of individuals and groups, traumatic levels of hopelessness often emerge (Hernandez-Tubert 2011). In these instances, the

entire unconscious *group matrix* – dyad, group, family, institution – of communication and relationships can be affected, which in turn influences the organization of the individual psyche (Foulkes 1964; Tubert-Oklander 2014). Remarkably, each Collaboratory has coincided with one or more catastrophic political/cultural events – the 2016 election of Donald Trump, the 2017 Parkland School shooting, the 2018–19 explosion into national awareness of the immigration and family separation crises at the USA/Mexico border, the 2020 eruption of the COVID-19 pandemic during which the killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis galvanized a re-emergence of the Black Lives Matter movement, and the 2021 insurrection at the US Capitol and murders of six Asian American women in Atlanta.

Emerging themes in each group reflected the psychological reverberations of these crises for individual participants and the group as a whole. As hoped, the exploration of enactments in the group became an important pedagogical tool in the first Collaboratory. This form of experiential learning brought theory to life and facilitated participants' movement from dependency on the leaders and hierarchy in the group toward increasing self-authorization and productivity. As in community life, cross-cultural and intergenerational interactions were invaluable sources of experience from which we could generate practice principles for community work.

First Critical Incident

In the 2016–17 Collaboratory, the use of new web technology involved a steep learning curve for both facilitators and members, and we expected missteps. But we did not anticipate the intensity of emotion and disorientation – particularly related to race – that ensued. Vexing challenges with our (pre-Zoom) video platforms included breakdowns in connectivity and serious distortions in video and/or audio transmissions. In the process of mastering this new technology, over time the “gaps and glitches” took on many dynamic meanings.

The first Critical Incident occurred in the second session, the day after the 2016 election. Members arrived in states of agitation, shock, grief and fear. A few expressed a sense of deep peril and others gratitude that “we were all in this together”. Several described feeling dumbstruck, others shame over not anticipating this outcome, and still others expressed anger at our collective failure to take seriously the possibility of a Trump victory and fears of marginalization in the new regime. The shock of Trump's election disrupted white participants' sense of security associated with unreflective identifications with US democracy – a system now outwardly linked to whiteness and white supremacy. All four members of colour spoke about feeling endangered (“we are the people at the border”), but all said that they had “seen this coming”.

It was not long before the defensive stance – “we're in this together” – began to come apart. White members talked about their horror about the uncontained displays of misogyny and racism during the campaign and their pain about the erosion of a democracy, once thought to be secure, and betrayal by a country once felt to be a “good place”. One participant acknowledged dread over being “the losers”. Deeply identified with this “good place”, they had believed it would shelter “good citizens” (like “us”) and not like the “others” (Trump voters) whom they viewed as ignorant, racist and misogynistic. Anticipating repressive measures and a spoiling of civil society, both white individuals

and people of colour expressed insecurity about their places in the social hierarchy. For white members, the heightened sense of vulnerability and danger led to a self-consciousness of the (white) privilege and influence they had formerly taken for granted. Members of colour reminded the others that their marginalization had long been firmly established.

Over the remaining sessions, unconscious anxieties manifested in technology failures, dreams and absences. One member, a white woman, never appeared at all on video transmissions, only eerily registering as a disembodied voice. Another, a mixed race woman, frequently arrived late, appearing only in shadowy profile. Feelings of frustration, disorientation and disconnection were palpable. One white European woman left the group, finding she could not orient to US time zones. Two others, one a person of colour and another a white immigrant, dropped out of the group without explanation. Struggling with technology themselves, the leaders endeavoured to hold to the Collaboratory curriculum and focus on members' projects. During this period, one facilitator fell ill with pneumonia and, although quite ill, continued to attend meetings. The other facilitator had the following dream:

I am driving an old rickety bus on a muddy mountain road with poor visibility and steep drop-offs. The passengers, among them a few Collaboratory members, are frightened and some are very ill. An African American woman, an old friend and former colleague of mine, is moving in and out of consciousness. I feel a gripping responsibility for everyone's safety and an urgency about getting my friend to a hospital. Suddenly, one of the wheels comes off its axle and the bus falls on its side, near the edge of a cliff. I crawl out, check the damage, and with effort pull myself back into the bus. My friend is conscious and screaming for help.

Before the next session, the facilitators talked about the dream that so vividly reflected the destabilizing events both around and within the group, including the loss of the two members. External events characterized by the early Black Lives Matter protests, racialized police violence and an uprising of vigilantism contributed to an atmosphere of anxiety and dread in the group. They shared the dream with Collaboratory members. Some responded protectively by expressing gratitude for the leaders' efforts to keep the group from "falling off the mountain's edge". One South Asian American woman suggested that the critically ill and endangered Black woman in the dream represented a defensive use by facilitators and others in the group of "the other" to avoid their collective terror and anxiety. Another white member pointed to a heightened sense of (white) fragility – both in the country and in the facilitator – over being left in the 'driver's seat' when the other facilitator fell ill. Another observed: "The rickety bus of democracy does indeed seem to be falling apart." Racialized tensions moved into the centre of our discussions.

In the next phase, with somewhat greater capacity for naming and tolerating the race-related anxieties in the group, discussions increasingly focused on the dynamics of structural racism (Dalal 1998, 2002), the enduring impacts of colonialization (Fanon 1967), the developmental roots of racism (Davids 2011), and intergenerational cultural historical trauma (Apprey 2004; Holmes 2016). In the process, we also began to acknowledge and talk about our own personal histories and racialized identities. The second facilitator attended a reunion of her suburban private school outside of Detroit. As a Jewish girl who travelled by bus from beyond the eponymous Eight Mile Road to get to school, she felt misrecognized and treated with contempt by her wealthy Episcopalian classmates. In

the Collaboratory, she shared the following experience from her reunion to illustrate Davids' (2011) concept of the "internal racist pathological organization" (characterized by projection, reversal, racialization and guilt):

I am seated at a table with the spouse of a classmate who identifies himself as a Trump supporter. His hostility, so reminiscent of my experiences in high school, was evident in several remarks (e.g. "Ah, you are from Brooklyn! You must be 'A Liberal.'" "Oh, I guess your military son must be a Trump supporter"). Feeling proud of my son's close multiethnic "Band of Brothers" and my family's similarly diverse composition – formed by adoption – I pushed back by pointing out that my family is a microcosm of the US. While chivalrously offering me a piece of cake, this guy countered sarcastically with: "I'm quite certain that your family is no microcosm of the US." I was briefly knocked off centre. My value had been misrecognized – as I had so often felt in high school. I was furious for leaving myself open to his attack, all for a piece of cake.

In the ensuing discussion, she theorized that this man's white vulnerability had been projected (into her), reversed (so that she became a loser and he the winner), racialized ("you're no microcosm") and managed with guilt (for example, his demeaning comments came with dessert). That night, she had a dream from which she remembered only a fragment: "I was standing at an old-fashioned screen door saying: 'Oh, I get it! The group is enacting erasure.'" Thinking of events in the group in which members seemed to appear and disappear, she suggested: "othering can take place via erasure as well as through ejection or scapegoating".

Both dreams indicate the dawning awareness of racialized anxieties and concerns about scapegoating, exploitation and annihilation circulating in the group. The technological gaps and glitches and lost members began to make sense as racialized enactments and attacks on linking in response to these anxieties (Bion 2013; Dalal 2002; Pivnick 2017). One Collaboratory member, wondering about her own silence in the group, connected our difficulties (technological and otherwise) to DiAngelo's (2011) observation that communication coherence often breaks down when a white person is confronted with the reality of their complicity in racism. As white guilt and grief surfaced, we realized the white members had attempted to disavow their distress by projecting it onto Black members. Another member proposed that we focus on whiteness, white fragility and white racism, a new direction that in turn led to deepened intimacy, enhanced clarity of thinking and a renewed sense of purpose.

Reflections on critical incident 1

Holmes (2016) has pointed out that seemingly small or positive changes in the group's environment can trigger the return of dissociated affective experiences of traumatic historical-cultural trauma. Even the introduction of new technologies (e.g. Zoom) can produce disorientation, disconnection and disorganization. This observation offers a useful perspective on the disruptions in community-based projects when new participants enter, for example the introduction of a community psychoanalyst or other new participants in community projects.

A recognition of the interplay of the intrapsychic and political enables us to link elusive phenomena such as "whiteness" to psychoanalytic concepts such as Winnicott's (1960) *false self*. Psychoanalyst and economist David Levine (2017) understood the Winnicottian mother to be communicating normative values and behavioural

patterns of adaptation along with her adoring gaze. Her forms of adaptation and compliance can seriously compromise her capacity for mediating certain social impingements for the infant, thus forming the basis for a false self. This false self is organized defensively to protect the vestiges of what is experienced as authentic but unacceptable to family and society. It can be made up of internalized cultural and social norms as well as idiosyncratic familial relational structures (Hernandez-Tubert 2011). Layton (2019) has expanded on these ideas in her concept of the normative unconscious, the repository of attitudes, values and norms that normalize and consolidate socially determined “right” kinds of identities and behaviors. In a later discussion of a clinical vignette, we will offer an example of how this phenomenon is enacted in groups.

Political changes, such as the election of Donald Trump, inevitably generate strong feelings of fear, rage, shame, longing and guilt (Protevi 2019; Layton 2018). Attending to the impacts of these disruptions and group phenomena can prompt heightened awareness of the ways we have disowned and enacted devalued, contradictory or dissociated internal representations of self-as-citizen and a need to develop a more nuanced, dynamic experience of status and agency in the sociopolitical arena. We view these enactments as evidence of working toward *relational citizenship*.

Second Critical Incident

Participants in the 2018 Collaboratory struggled with internal conflicting loyalties and identifications, negotiated differences and resisted pulls toward conflict avoidance and scapegoating. Participants explored their own experiences of racialization and racism as these same issues were violently erupting in US society, with an eye toward the implications for the work of the community analyst. Managing one’s responses to difference can require a dis-identification from the constraints of earlier identifications, for example with a traditional analytic role and frame (Layton 2019). In this role transition, one’s sense of self and role reconfigures as one becomes aware of oneself as a member of the community and a citizen in the political sphere. The psychic work required to manage complex identities forms the basis of what we call relational citizenship.

Collaboratory 2.0 participants came from all over the USA and worked in settings that included Native American reservations, migrant camps, schools, graduate student field placements and neighborhood associations. They engaged in journalism, film-making, asylum and human rights evaluations, work with chronically mentally ill and low socioeconomic status-income patients, and undocumented immigrants. Participants’ ranged from very senior training analysts to graduate students and included three Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC) practitioners. Unsurprisingly, straddling multiple identities and border/boundary crossings were predominant themes.

Again, on the day before our second meeting, a catastrophe – the Parkland School shooting in Florida – dominated the news. Horror, grief and anger hung in the air. Several of our participants worked with highly stressed kids, in schools, in preschools and in community programmes. Violetta, a psychoanalyst and person of colour who worked in private practice very near to Parkland, mentioned how her analytic training had left her with a sense of inferiority about her previous work in a community mental health centre. Now, as she revealed feelings of confusion and powerlessness about

how to help her community, we were puzzled by what appeared to be this senior analyst's deep sense of shame and paralysis.

Over several sessions, Ricardo, a graduate student of colour and a writer/poet, was often an evanescent presence. With limited technological resources, he usually joined by phone. When he could be seen, he appeared in faint outline; other times we could see him but not hear him. On this occasion, we neither saw nor heard him for almost an entire session during which discussion proceeded without reference to him at all. Suddenly at the end of the meeting, a rapid-fire explosion of chat messages appeared on the screen. He spoke from the margins, in pain and anger. In these messages, Ricardo, our "Greek Chorus", voiced the group's disorientation, anxieties and unmetabolized grief. Participants were thunderstruck. One facilitator said that we had silenced Ricardo, and the other observed that we had been enacting erasure. Deeply shaken, participants expressed sorrow and apology. Gradually, all shared pain and guilt about the explosion of gun violence and our implication in society's failure to recognize and empathize with victims, many of whom were people of colour. As guardedness relaxed, members reached out to Violetta to express concern for her and their interest in helping her find ways to engage with young people in her community. Violetta realized she was not alone. The participants began to reflect on inhibitions and prejudices associated with earlier professional training. The group had become a Collaborative Third, animated by empathy and purpose.

A few weeks later, Ricardo presented his project – a documentary film, shot in the field with a hand-held camera, telling the stories of a group of migrant workers who, for generations, had travelled from Mexico to Colorado and back. One young man movingly described his ancestral community's cultural claim to the land, where boundaries/borders had for hundreds of years been constructed by land-owners and politicians, foot soldiers for settler colonialism in the Americas. The film brought everyone to tears.

In the previous enactment, our unconscious privileging of the white voices had pushed Ricardo into the margins. Both his chat messages and his film presentation helped all break free of the unconsciously constructed boundaries that had ensured his invisibility and silence in the group and shifted the group toward greater inclusion and depth. At the end of this session, Violetta shared that she had volunteered to be part of a mental health team available to kids and families from Parkland. She said she felt more able to act in alignment with her social conscience.

Reflections on critical incident 2

Throughout life, we become members of many groups. Effective community participation is enhanced by an understanding that membership in groups is an essential means of identity formation. Adult psychological development is fostered in the crucible of these membership experiences (Erikson 1963; Shapiro and Carr 2017; Tubert-Oklander 2014). Our actions in groups and organizations reflect emotion-laden identifications, subgroup memberships, loyalties and ideological commitments. To quote Shapiro and Carr (2017, 149–150):

To take full charge of our lives and find a place to stand as a citizen requires an effort to make sense of these connections and their impact on us. This begins with our engagement in organizations. Taking up a role in an organization connects each of us with a mission: the links, both explicit and hidden, that each organization must make to the needs of the larger society. Through our organizational roles – the place where the person and the

context meet – we can begin to have a public voice on behalf of others ... But as we enter the larger society, we meet powerful irrational pressures.

Shapiro goes on to say that, in response to what are often chaotic impingements, “we attempt to organize our experience both internally and externally, a more-or-less stable sense of self”. This happens in both personal and political ways:

The personal is the development of a psychological “skin” so as to relate to others while holding onto oneself ... The political is the attempt to simplify the world by imagining oneself in some kind of group that links to and involves others ... (150)

Although becoming members of groups enhances our differentiation as individuals, it also blurs some of the distinctions of each individual’s complexity and always involves some regression. For example, in order to develop a common purpose and a dynamic of mutuality/reciprocity, individuals must temporarily surrender the illusion of autonomy – “I am in charge of myself” becomes “I need their support” (Glassman 2008). This move requires both a sturdy psychological “skin” and a strong commitment to a mission.

Bringing these often unconscious attitudes into awareness allows for insight into the impact or lack of impact of our membership on the group-as-a-whole and its central projects. As members begin to identify with their community group such that they feel it belongs to them and they belong to it, their contributions to the vitality and effectiveness of the group feel necessary and significant. These developments are invariably complicated by racial, ethnic and other differences. Mutual aid, recognition of the other and dynamic processes of negotiation for role and power, as well as commitment to the group’s goals, are valued features of group membership and central to the maintenance of the group itself (Glassman 2008). Members begin to experience themselves as beneficiaries of, and as capable stewards for, the group to which they come to feel loyal. In some ways, parallel to the processes involved in exercising one’s political citizenship, members begin to experience themselves as “citizens of the group” with benefits and responsibilities, and form identities as both individuals and group members.

However, members may also feel mistrustful or ambivalent about their experience in the group due to their histories of marginalization and because of experiences of erasure and silencing in the group. For instance, consider Ricardo’s contribution to the group: by signalling his feelings of having been silenced, his intervention in the group illustrated his agency and responsibility, which mobilized reciprocal concerns from members. Although he might reasonably have chosen to leave the group, his intervention illustrated both a protection of his cultural/racial identity and his loyalty to the group. It is by means of one’s internal process of identification with the group and interdependency with other members that one exercises one’s relational citizenship.

Third Critical Incident

Discussions in the 2019 Collaboratory emphasized the theme of relational citizenship: members were concerned with the protections and constraints of being citizens in the psychoanalytic community while recognizing the importance of owning multiple (competing) identities in oneself and others. Again, shifting role identifications and processes of inclusion/exclusion were evident. In a variation on these themes, we saw how certain attempts to ally around race and ethnicity could also disguise authority struggles. In this

case, group cohesion was achieved after two members chose to leave the group, one after an unsuccessful attempt to unseat the authorities (the authors) and the other after being recruited in this attempt. The authors will come back to this dynamic later in the paper.

The original composition of Collaboratory 3.0, which met around the lunch hour, included three BIPOC (two of whom dropped out before the group began) and five European American members who worked in a range of public sector settings in the USA – including child care centres, community mental health centres, youth programmes and psychoanalytic institutes, with roles as diverse as educator, researcher, chaplain, director of a national/international professional association, film-maker/author and political activist. Early conversations focused on these questions: If we work in communities, are we really psychoanalytic? And, if we don't bring our psychoanalytic perspectives to community work, are we "good-enough" public citizens? Most participants had struggled to integrate psychoanalytic theories with social justice endeavours for many years. All were psychodynamic therapists except for Sean, a political activist/writer, well read in psychoanalysis.

As we have already mentioned, membership in groups begins early in life and continues throughout, contributing to both personal and political identities (Shapiro and Carr 2017). As such, membership always involves tensions associated with the surrender of aspects of one's personal identity and prerogatives in order to become part of a collectivity that itself offers an identity, albeit one that involves others. In this group, these tensions evolved into a "fight/flight" challenge to the group leaders and their agenda.

Sean often dominated conversations. After the second meeting, in an email to the members, he suggested continuing discussions via email between sessions. The facilitators understood his acting outside the boundaries to be a challenge to group norms, structure and leadership. Members expressed ambivalence about the proposal, and, in the interest of maintaining the frame, both facilitators discouraged it. Next, Sean communicated a concern to the facilitators and to Alia (an American woman of Middle Eastern birth who had in her application informed us that she would need to miss a few sessions) that she was being marginalized. Alia denied that she felt marginalized and reminded the group of her pre-existing schedule conflicts. In spite of her objections and our urging Sean to bring his concerns more fully into the groups' discussion, he persisted in communicating via email with her. Shortly after, she decided to leave the group, offering the job responsibilities as explanation. In the subsequent meeting, Sean told the group that he believed Alia left because she was being marginalized due to her singular status as a person of colour. We reached out to Alia to explore her reasons for leaving. She reassured us that her reasons for leaving had entirely to do with professional obligations and emphatically rejected Sean's interpretation.

Another way of understanding this episode is that Sean, himself an outlier, had attempted to recruit another member to join him in his challenge to the group's leadership, thus making her a container for his own feelings of marginalization (Gatzambide 2019; Hopper 2001; Shapiro and Carr 2017). Without support, Sean's attempt failed and he left the group, offering the explanation that the group had not met his expectations. Members expressed missing Alia as well as relief over Sean's departure, some suggesting that he had been distracting the group from its work. Indeed, the members returned to discussions about their projects and readings. We believe that

both the leaders and members resisted the attempt to unseat the leaders and their agenda in order to protect the group's coherence and purpose. We conjectured that Sean's anxiety about his analytic competence and fear of marginalization (projected onto the woman of colour) motivated his challenges. With his departure, the crisis over authority appeared to be resolved, interactions among members increased and a task orientation was restored. But in the process, it appeared that a member of colour had been sacrificed.

It is axiomatic among group leaders that one should avoid composing a group with a single member of colour/ethnic group/gender. Unfortunately, two other BIPOC members decided not to participate in the Collaboratory before the group began. Thus, it was not lost on us that Alia's departure (as well as that of the other two BIPOC members) may have reflected their resolution of a conflict of split identifications. In fairness, Sean was indeed attempting to point this out. But it is also the case that leaders are advised not to emphasize racial differences in the circumstance of a singular person of colour, which would implicitly place the burden of representation, and as noted above, make that member overly vulnerable to the projections of other members (McRae and Dias 2014). Nonetheless, we are left wondering about what we might have done to better protect Alia and others in what was an overwhelmingly white group. It seems imperative that, in future groups, we take up our whiteness in the earliest stages of group formation.

The remaining members turned from the earlier focus on the leaders and their exercise of authority to a lively interest in one another and where they each fitted (or did not) in the psychoanalytic community. Discussions highlighted how each had managed potential conflicts between adherence to conventional psychoanalytic practices (which emphasize abstinence, neutrality and a distant expert) and their interest in community-based practices (which emphasize democratic humanistic values of equality, participation and negotiation of conflict). For example, Jack described his ambivalence about referring to himself as a psychoanalyst and pointed to his strong identification with the community in which he had worked for decades – an ethnically diverse, low-resourced community in a large urban centre. Jack felt that his analytic identity was a liability in this setting. A talented musician, Jack almost sheepishly talked about his decision to bring his guitar and keyboard to work. But subsequently, otherwise reticent kids began to bring their own music to the centre, where they shared in spontaneous rap sessions, music-making and dancing. Jerry, a former chaplain and a faculty member at an analytic institute, surprised us by bringing in examples of artwork produced by community participants in a rural Colombian school. He told us of his interest in theorizing about the connections between community work and clinical practice, and spoke movingly about the spirit, creativity and mutual aid generated in this project. Jack agreed, recalling an occasion when he had brought his guitar to a psychoanalytic gathering – for him a sort of “coming out”. In jamming with other psychoanalysts, he found a “place to stand” among colleagues (Shapiro and Carr 2017). Other members, including the authors, added their own stories about bringing their artistic sensibilities and experience to their clinical work with patients. Jack and Jerry agreed that our professional community work and clinical practice mutually influence one another for the better. These examples are emblematic of the ways participants struggle with managing conflicting identifications, aspirations and their commitment to push the field of psychoanalysis to

become more flexible, responsive and inclusive. They also demonstrate the ways that the group vitalizes individuals' efforts and individuals add vitality to the group.

Reflections on critical incident 3

Collaboratory 3.0 began during the immigration crisis at the US/Mexican border. From the beginning, tensions associated with inclusion/exclusion, asylum/citizenship for "illegals" and managing conflicting identifications were palpable. While in the real world people fought over who would be accepted as (possible) citizens, in the Collaboratory struggles over inclusion and exclusion led to the departure of two members. Afterwards, conflict about what constituted "good-enough" psychoanalytic identities took centre stage, offering another illustration of the dynamics of relational citizenship. The group endorsed Jack's efforts to contend with binary identifications (psychoanalyst or musician) and an interest in making room for his own and others' complex and often competing loyalties inside psychoanalytic organizations. His struggles reflect the ways relational citizenship holds interacting registers of individual, group and community experience.

We can also see in the example above the intersections of race and relational citizenship. As noted earlier, Eng and Han's (2000) concept of *psychic citizenship* grew from their attempts to understand the psychic challenges of Asian Americans' need to continually wrestle with contradictory identifications at the intrapsychic level. For Eng and Han, psychic citizenship refers to a process of both mourning and recommitment to one's clustered good internal objects in a hostile racialized environment. Our elaboration of Eng and Han's psychic citizenship concept reimagines it as *relational citizenship* – a *relational, intersubjective process* – and extends it to all citizens insofar as we all hold multiple loyalties and identifications within, and in relation to, society (Hopper 2000; Tubert-Oklander 2014). This extension of Eng and Han's concept allows us to: (a) include the dimension of self-as-member of multiple groups; (b) reveal the link between the intrapsychic and social/political registers; and (c) transform "psychic citizen" to "*relational citizenship*" – a relational, interactive self-state through which one enacts one's citizenship/membership with other citizens in ways that convey agency, mutual aid and responsibility.

Awareness of this self-state becomes possible under circumstances in groups that evoke conflict between various identifications as well as with external institutions and power structures (Shapiro and Carr 2017; Tubert-Oklander 2014). Because managing multiple states and registers of experience requires the capacity to accept and negotiate among "like me" and "not me" features of oneself and of others, exercising one's relational citizenship involves activating internalized relational patterns (Tubert-Oklander 2014) or enacting "ways of being" (Benjamin 1988; Bromberg 1998; Stern 1995) that are imbricated by race, ethnicity and cultural histories (Dimen 2012). In the social/political register, our subjective experience of political freedoms and constraints on the exercise of power shape these transactions, and therefore, the qualities of one's experience of being a citizen among citizens. Taking on citizenship roles in the group can animate corresponding roles in a democratic society as well as facilitate the development of group-member competencies or, as Foulkes (1964) describes it, "ego training in action" (Hopper 2000; Tubert-Oklander 2014).

Politically, citizenship results from transactions between the state and the individual as mediated by the affinity groups, neighbourhoods and communities to which we belong. Psychologically, we are born into the citizenship status and the roles taken on and

enacted by our parents and community members that provide instruction for how to “be-in-community” (Shapiro and Carr 2017). At an unconscious level, these *ways-of-being-in-community* are features of the internalized social norms described by Hernandez-Tubert (2011) and what Layton (2006) has called *normative unconscious processes*. Reflecting the social/political conditions, attitudes, values and strictures of the time and place, these processes organize how one behaves as a gendered, raced or ethnic person, for example, and as a citizen in society (Layton 2019).

Established through interactive repetitions of affect, behaviour and cognitive patterns, the normative unconscious communicates and reinforces social conventions and roles. Normative unconscious processes obscure awareness of the universalizing, binary-thinking and unequal power relations on which they are based. They normalize and consolidate socially determined “right” kinds of identities over time with regard to such distinctions as class, race, sex and gender. Because the risk of contesting them is loss of love and social approval, they are potent social forces. Normative unconscious attitudes are evoked and enacted in relationships among community members. Since all identities are relational and situated, and not individual possessions, “who I am” is generally determined by and reflects “where I belong” (Dalal 2002, 18).

Layton (2019) has observed that coercive normative unconscious processes as well as counternormative unconscious processes (such as “de-identification”) express themselves through preferencing the past over the future through repetition compulsions. The identity categories, the power-inflected relations of sameness and difference they both describe and prescribe, and social histories of oppression, are not add-ons to the psyche nor defenses against something deeper, but rather are found at the very deepest layers of psychic life.

Our concept of relational citizenship as intrinsic to psychic life relies on these foundational ideas. In the Collaboratory, interactions among participants provided opportunities for challenging normative assumptions about psychoanalysis, psychoanalytic practice and psychoanalysts themselves – for example the dominance of certain psychoanalytic core concepts and practices, including the “frame,” neutrality and the internalist bias of psychoanalysis (Dalal 2002) – part of the necessary “disillusionment” called for by Layton (2019).

Conclusion

The Collaboratory has facilitated generative connections among practitioners from a variety of disciplines and practice settings. Its design provides opportunities for bringing psychoanalytic scholarship and methods to interventions outside the consulting room, for reflective self and group study, and for working collaboratively on innovative community projects. Our experience with this unique pedagogy demonstrates how these sorts of conversations, group experiences and community engagements act as correctives to the splitting of the psychic and social in our field in hopes of working toward what Davoine and Gaudilliere (2005) call the repair of the social link.

In looking back, we were impressed by the extent to which historical trauma, normative unconscious relational processes and surrounding political events shaped interactions in the groups. Dynamics of exclusion, erasure and othering associated with racial/ethnic differences were prominent in each. In Collaboratory 1.0, sociocultural differences among participants manifested first in unconscious enactments of difficulties with

the use of technological platforms and tools (or what we came to call “gaps and glitches”) but were eventually incorporated into the group’s conversation. In Collaboratory 2.0, responses to Ricardo’s differentness and marginality reflected complicity with his silent erasure and illustrated how normative unconscious processes “reproduce[d] inequality precisely where the link between the psychic and social has been disavowed” (Layton 2019, 269). We believe that these moments of disorganization (both technological and psychological) signal an inability to put racialized experience into words, perhaps a reflection of what has been observed as a taboo against talking about race in individual psychoanalysis (Leary 2006). In Collaboratory 3.0, enactments of inclusion/exclusion themes helped to reveal the faultlines between subgroups and within individuals that complicated the experiences of relational citizenship. As these enactments were explored, albeit with some difficulty, participants talked about their divided loyalties to the various racial/ethnic and sociopolitical groups to which they belonged.

Our concept of relational citizenship not only helps us track individual growth, but also enriches our understanding of the complexity of interactions among Collaboratory members. These mirror the sorts of interactions that take place in communities that can break down when individuals come into conflict either directly or indirectly. Sometimes, as in Collaboratory 3.0, conflicting identifications within members manifest as group splits and an eventual loss of members. A relational citizenship perspective allows one to see that the problem exists both at what Shapiro and Carr (2017) term the personal (“skin”) level and the political (“us”) level. Thus, while an individual analyst might be concerned with adaptation, a community psychoanalyst might focus on the “us” level and how individuals are managing their multiple identifications (or their “groups-in-the-mind”) in ways that fosters the group’s (and the community’s) work and well-being.

Given that managing political identifications may require disidentifying from one or more groups in the mind – at least for a time – this process often requires mourning. For instance, in Collaboratory 2.0, Violetta’s engagement with others like her – both psychoanalysts and members of minority groups – facilitated a recognition that her paralysis was based in the disavowal of her pre-psychoanalyst identity, one profoundly determined by her ethnic identity. This process freed her from the anxiety and inhibition associated with her introjected psychoanalytic mentors and supervisors, thus reanimating an identification with the Latin American citizens and victims in Parkland and her capacity to join in community action to support them. By the end of the group, having felt recognized, her identification with her analytic institute had been supplemented by an identification with the more relational and interdisciplinary culture of the Collaboratory, opening a place for Violetta to stand and a pathway toward becoming a responsible relational citizen.

We have coined the term *relational citizenship* to describe the intersubjective experience of holding in mind one’s membership in multiple groups and communities, including (but not limited to) engaging with the obligations, benefits, losses and exclusions of political citizenship. This dynamic phenomenon includes feelings of belonging, commitment and responsiveness to the needs of others and the responsibilities of (group) citizenship, as well as anxiety and guilt about potential identity loss and conflicts among roles. We view this constellation of experiences as constituting a self-state *and* a developmental achievement in which the development of the individual is inextricably connected to the strength of their community (Shapiro and Carr 2017).

For instance, in Collaboratory 3.0, it was necessary for participants to temporarily de-identify from their institute-trained psychoanalyst self-state in order to identify with and join the group and its goals to help them find greater flexibility and self-authorization to do work in their communities. For Jack, this meant reclaiming his jettisoned psychoanalytic identity in order to most effectively utilize his broad knowledge in his work with troubled and low-resourced adolescents. The participants' sincere excitement about the beauty and meaningfulness of Jerry's earlier work in Latin America revitalized his wish to integrate psychic, social and political dimensions in his theorizing of psychoanalytic practice.

Being a citizen is not a reified identity or single state but a constantly shifting dynamic process in which our internal worlds interact with the external world in a way that reveals the psychological complexity of group memberships. The Collaboratory has offered a site and methodology for studying these complex intersubjective dynamics as they play out in group and community life. Indeed, our experiences in the Collaboratory have enriched our understanding of the dynamic links between the internal (the psyche) and the external (the sociocultural). They have also highlighted the ways history enters our consciousness in the present. Through these three iterations of the Collaboratory we encountered new ways to think about the effects of history on psychoanalytic processes and theory, not just in the present, but as applied to the language, theory and methods of psychoanalysis. The Psychoanalytic Community Collaboratory® represents one attempt to find a novel approach for training psychoanalytic practitioners to work creatively and effectively in community settings. What our experience has shown us is a glimpse of the emerging future of community psychoanalysis.

Translations of summary

Issu de cinq années d'expérience au sein du Psychoanalytic Community Collaboratory sur Internet, cet article explore les répercussions du « tournant communautaire » en psychanalyse, sur les fonctions, les méthodes, la théorie clinique et la formation. Avec des participants originaires de nombreux pays du monde, le Collaboratory est devenu le moteur de projets innovants, tels que films documentaires, interventions autour de la mémoire communautaire et de la santé mentale dans des communautés sous tension. La pédagogie singulière du Collaboratory offre un apprentissage par l'expérience, de grande valeur, de la complexité de la dynamique intersubjective partagée par le groupe et la communauté. A travers la réflexion sur la dynamique interpersonnelle inhérente à trois événements critiques, les auteures de cet article illustrent l'interaction entre les aspects intrapsychiques et politiques de l'identité – ce qu'elles nomment « citoyenneté relationnelle », un état intersubjectif du self où l'individu et le sociopolitique sont psychiquement liés et où les challenges de l'identification et de l'appartenance à une ou plusieurs collectivités sont à la fois reconnus et négociés.

Mithilfe einer fünfjährigen Erfahrung in dem webbasierten psychoanalytischen *Community Collaboratory* untersucht dieser Beitrag die Auswirkungen, die der «Community Turn» in der Psychoanalyse auf Rollen, Methoden, klinische Theorie und Ausbildung hat. Mit Teilnehmenden aus vielen Teilen der Welt hat sich das *Collaboratory* zu einem Kreativlabor für Projekte entwickelt, wo unter anderem Dokumentarfilme, Initiativen gemeinschaftlichen Gedenkens und Interventionen im Bereich psychische Gesundheit in stark belasteten Gemeinschaften entstehen. Der vom *Collaboratory* verfolgte einzigartige pädagogische Ansatz ermöglicht wertvolles Erfahrungslernen über die komplexen intersubjektiven Dynamiken, die im Zusammenleben von Gruppen und in Gemeinwesen häufig anzutreffen sind. Durch eine Reflexion der zwischenmenschlichen Dynamiken dreier wesentlicher Ereignisse veranschaulichen wir das Wechselspiel intrapsychischer und politischer Aspekte der Identität – das, was wir als «relationale Staatsbürgerschaft» bezeichnet haben. Dabei handelt es sich um einen intersubjektiven Selbstzustand, bei dem das Individuum und das

soziopolitische Umfeld psychisch miteinander verbunden sind und wo die Herausforderungen der Identifikation mit und der Zugehörigkeit zu einer Kollektivität oder mehreren Kollektivitäten erkannt und verhandelt werden.

Basandosi su cinque anni di esperienza con la risorsa digitale del Collaboratorio Psicoanalitico di Comunità, l'articolo prende in esame le implicazioni che la "svolta di comunità" in psicoanalisi ha avuto per i ruoli, i metodi, la teoria clinica e il training. Il Collaboratorio, che conta membri provenienti da molte parti del mondo, è diventato un generatore creativo di progetti che spaziano dalla produzione di documentari a iniziative legate alla memoria della comunità, fino all'organizzazione di interventi per la salute mentale a favore di comunità provate da eventi fortemente stressanti. Il particolare approccio pedagogico del Collaboratorio consente di apprendere dall'esperienza le complesse dinamiche intersoggettive che regolano la vita di gruppo così come quella di comunità. Riflettendo sulle dinamiche interpersonali che hanno caratterizzato tre episodi critici, mostreremo qui l'interazione tra aspetti intrapsichici e aspetti politici dell'identità – un'interazione a cui abbiamo dato il nome di "cittadinanza relazionale", ossia uno stato intersoggettivo del Sé in cui sfera individuale e sfera sociopolitica sono psicologicamente legate tra loro, e in cui le varie sfide poste dall'identificazione e dall'appartenenza a una o più collettività vengono riconosciute e negoziate.

Este artículo explora las repercusiones del "giro comunitario" en el psicoanálisis respecto a roles, métodos, teoría clínica y formación, basado en cinco años de experiencia del Psychoanalytic Community Collaboratory [Colaboratorio de la Comunidad Psicoanalítica] en la web. El colaboratorio, con participantes de muchos lugares del mundo, se ha convertido en un generador creativo de proyectos como filmes documentales, iniciativas de memorias comunitarias e intervenciones de salud mental en comunidades con altos niveles de estrés. La singular pedagogía del colaboratorio ofrece un aprendizaje experiencial valioso acerca de las complejas dinámicas intersubjetivas, comunes en la vida de grupos y comunidades. Mediante la reflexión sobre la dinámica interpersonal de tres incidentes críticos, se ilustra la interacción de los aspectos intrapsíquicos y políticos de la identidad, lo que los autores denominan "ciudadanía relacional": un estado del self intersubjetivo en el que lo individual y lo sociopolítico están vinculados psíquicamente y donde los desafíos de la identificación con una o más colectividades, y la pertenencia a ellas, son reconocidas y negociadas.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

- Alpert, J., and E. Goren, eds. 2017. *Psychoanalysis, Trauma, and Community: History and Contemporary Appraisals*. NY: Routledge.
- Apprey, M. 2004. "From the Events of History to a Sense of History: Aspects of Transgenerational Trauma and Brutality in the African-American Experience." In *Analysts in the Trenches: Streets, Schools, War Zones*, edited by B. Sklarew, S. W. Twemlow, and S. M. Wilkinson, 45–55. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.
- Altman, N. 2013. "Psychoanalysis In and Out of the Office." *Psychoanalysis, Culture, and Society* 18 (2): 128–139.
- Altman, N. 2015. *Psychoanalysis in an age of Accelerating Cultural Change: Spiritual Globalization*. NY: Routledge.
- Anderson, F. J., P. Donkor, R. DeVries, E. Appiah-Denkyira, G. Dakpallah, J. Hassinger, A. Luo, et al. 2014. "Creating a Charter of Collaboration for University Partnerships: The Elmina Declaration for Human Resources for Health." *Academic Medicine* 89 (8): 1125–1132.
- Aron, L. 1999. "Clinical Choices and the Relational Matrix." *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 9: 1–29.
- Banfield, E. 1967. *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*. NY: Free Press.
- Benjamin, J. 1988. *Bonds of Love*. NY: Pantheon.

- Benjamin, J. 2004. "Beyond Doer and Done to: An Intersubjective View of Thirdness." *The Psychoanal Quarterly* 73 (1): 5–46.
- Benjamin, J. 2017. *Beyond Doer-Done To: Recognition Theory, Intersubjectivity and the Third*. NY: Routledge.
- Berman, K., and J. Hassinger. 2012. *Women On Purpose: The Resilience and Creativity of the Founding Women of Phumani Paper*. Johannesburg, South Africa: DeskLink Publishing.
- Bion, W. R. 1961. "Experiences in Groups And Other Papers." In *Experiences in Groups And Other Papers*, 1–191. London: Tavistock.
- Bion, W. R. 2013. "Attacks on Linking." *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 82 (2): 285–300.
- Bromberg, P. 1998. *Standing in the Spaces*. NY: Psychology Press.
- Bromberg, P. 2011. *The Shadow of the Tsunami*. NY: Routledge.
- Burka, J. B., J. E. Sarnat, and C. S. John. 2007. "Learning from Experience in Case Conference: A Bionian Approach in Teaching and Consulting." *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 88: 981–1000.
- Butler, J. 2020. *The Force of Nonviolence*. London: Verso.
- Coates, T. 2015. *Between the World and Me*. NY: Spiegel & Grau.
- Cushman, P. 2015. "Relational Psychoanalysis as Political Resistance." *Contemporary Psychoanalysis* 51 (3): 423–459.
- Dalal, F. 1998. *Taking the Group Seriously*. London: Jessica Kingsley Press.
- Dalal, F. 2002. *Race, Colour, and the Processes of Racialization: New Perspectives from Group Analysis*. New York: Routledge.
- Danto, E. A. 2005. *Freud's Free Clinics: Psychoanalysis and Social Justice: 1918-1938*. NY: Columbia University Press.
- Davids, F. 2011. *Internal Racism: A Psychoanalytic Approach to Race and Difference*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Davoine, F., and J. M. Gaudilliere. 2005. *History Beyond Trauma: Whereof One Cannot Speak, Thereof one Cannot Stay Silent*. NY: Other Press.
- DiAngelo, R. 2011. "White Racism." *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy* 3 (3): 54–70.
- Dimen, M. 2012. *With Culture in Mind: Psychoanalytic Stories*. NY: Routledge.
- Eng, D., and S. Han. 2000. "A Dialogue on Racial Melancholia." *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 10 (4): 667–700.
- Erikson, E. 1963. *Childhood and Society*. 2nd ed.. NY: W.W. Norton.
- Fanon, F. 1967. *Black Skin, White Masks*. NY: Grove Press.
- Foulkes, S. H. 1964. *Therapeutic Group Analysis*. London: Karnac. 1984 [Original publication, London: Allen & Unwin].
- Fraiberg, S., E. Adelson, and V. Shapiro. 1975. "Ghosts in the Nursery: A Psychoanalytic Approach to the Problem of Impaired Infant-Mother Relationships." *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry* 14 (3): 387–421.
- Frie, R. 2017. "History Flows Through Us: Psychoanalysis, and Historical Understanding." *Psychoanalysis, Self, and Context* 12 (3): 221–229.
- Fromm-Reichmann, F. 1960. *Principles of Intensive Psychotherapy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fromm, E. 1958. "The Revolutionary Character." In *The Dogma of Christ and Other Essays*, 147–168. NY: Holt. 1992.
- Frosh, S. 2001. "Psychoanalysis Identity, and Citizenship." In *Culture and Citizenship*, edited by N. Stevenson. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gatzambide, D. 2019. *A People's History of Psychoanalysis: From Freud to Liberation Psychology*. NY: Lexington Books.
- Glassman, U. 2008. *Group Work: A Humanistic and Skills-Building Approach*, 2nd ed. LA: Sage Publications.
- Gonzalez, F., and R. Peltz. 2021. "Community Psychoanalysis: Collaborative Practice as Intervention." *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 31 (4): 409–427.
- Gourguechon, P. 2011. "Citizen Psychoanalyst: Psychoanalytic Advocacy and Social Commentary." *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 59 (3): 445–470.

- Harris, L. H., M. Debbink, L. Martin, and J. Hassinger. 2011. "Dynamics of Stigma in Abortion Work: Findings from a Pilot Study of the Providers Share Workshop." *Social Science & Medicine* 73 (7): 1062–1070.
- Hernandez-Tubert, R. 2011. "The Politics of Despair: From Despair to Dialogue and Hope." *Group Analysis* 44: 27–39.
- Holmes, D. 2016. "Culturally-imposed Trauma: The Sleeping dog has Awakened: Will Psychoanalysis Take Heed?" *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 26 (6): 641–654.
- Hopper, E. 2000. "From Objects and Subjects to Citizens: Group Analysis and the Study of Maturity." *Group Analysis* 33: 29–34.
- Hopper, E. 2001. "Difficult Patients in Group Analysis: The Personification of (ba) I: A/M." *Group* 25 (3): 139–171.
- Hopper, E. 2003. *Traumatic Experience in the Unconscious Life of Groups*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Hopper, E. 2009. "The Theory of the Basic Assumption of Incohesion: Aggregation/Massification OR (BA)I: A/M." *British Journal of Psychotherapy* 25 (2): 214–229.
- Horney, K. 1994. *The Neurotic Personality of our Time, Revised Edition*. NY: Norton.
- Kernberg, O. F. 2020. "Malignant Narcissism and Large Group Regression." *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 89 (1): 1–24.
- Kestenberg, J. 1990. "A Metaphysical Assessment Based on an Analysis of a Survivor's Child." In *Generations of the Holocaust*, edited by M. S. Bergmann, and M. E. Jucovy, 137–158. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Klein, M. 1935. "On the Psychogenesis of Manic-Depressive States." In *Love, Guilt and Reparation and Other Works*, 145–174. London: Hogarth.
- Krystal, H., ed. 1968. *Massive Psychic Trauma*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Layton, L. 2006. "Racial Identities, Racial Enactments, and Normative Unconscious Processes." *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 75: 237–269.
- Layton, L. 2013. "Psychoanalysis And Politics: Historicising Subjectivity." *Mens Sana Monograph* 11 (1): 68–81.
- Layton, L. 2018. "On Lying and Disillusionment." *Psychoanalytic Perspectives* 15: 12–24.
- Layton, L. 2019. *Toward a Social Psychoanalysis: Culture, Character, And Normative Unconscious Processes*. NY: Routledge.
- Leary, K. 2006. "In the Eye of the Storm." *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*. LXXV 75: 345–363.
- Levine, D. 2017. *Psychoanalysis, Society, and the Inner World: Embedded Meaning in Politics and Social Conflict*. NY: Routledge.
- Lifton, R. J. 2019. *Losing Reality: On Cults, Cultism, and the Mindset of Political Zealotry*. NY: The New Press.
- Losso, R., L. de Setton, and D. Scharff, eds. 2017. *The Linked Self in Psychoanalysis: The Pioneering Work of Enrique Pichon Riviere*. NY: Routledge.
- Matte-Blanco, I. 1988. *Thinking, Feeling, and Being: Critical Reflections on the Fundamental Antimony of Human Beings and the World*. London: Routledge.
- McLaughlin, N. 2019. "The Coming Triumph of the Psychosocial Perspective: Lessons from the Rise, Fall, and Revival of Erich Fromm." *Journal of Psychosocial Studies* 12 (1): 9–22. (Link).
- McRae, M. B., and S. I. Dias. 2014. "In the Boardroom/Out of the Loop: Group and Organizational Dynamics." In *Handbook of Race-Ethnicity and Gender in Psychology*, edited by M. L. Miville, and A. D. Ferguson, 295–306. NY: Springer.
- Menzies, I. E. P. 1960. "A Case Study in the Functioning of Social Systems as a Defense Against Anxiety." *Human Relations* 13: 95–121.
- Pivnick, B. A. 2011, September. "Enacting Remembrance: Turning Toward Memorializing September 11th." *Journal of Religion and Health* 50 (3): 499–515.
- Pivnick, B. A. 2013. "What the Living Did: September 11th and its Aftermath." In *The Therapist in Mourning: From the Faraway Nearby*, edited by A. Adelman and K. Malawista. NY: Columbia University Press.
- Pivnick, B. A. 2015. Spaces to Stand in: Applying Clinical Psychoanalysis to the Relational Design of the National September 11 Memorial Museum. (Winner of the APA Division 39 Section Five Schillinger Memorial Essay Award.) *Division/Review* 13: 19–24.

- Pivnick, B. A. 2017. "Transforming Collapse: Applying Clinical Psychoanalysis to the Relational Design of the National September 11 Memorial Museum." *International Forum of Psychoanalysis: Violence, Terror and Terrorism Today: Psychoanalytic Perspectives, Part II* 26 (4): 248–257.
- Pivnick, B. A. 2018. "Behind the Lines: Toward an Aesthetic Framework for Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 74: 218–232.
- Pivnick, B. A. 2021. "Recollecting the Vanishing Forms of 9/11: Twenty Years of Ruptures, Ripples, and Reflections." *Psychoanalytic Perspectives* 18 (3): 279–295. doi:10.1080/1551806X.2021.1953874.
- Pivnick, B. A., and T. Hennes. 2014. "Managing Collapse: Memorializing September 11th through the Co-Creation of a Memorial Museum." In *The Ethics of Remembering and the Consequences of Forgetting: Essays on Trauma, History and Memory*, edited by M. O'Loughlin. NY: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Protevi, J. 2019. *Edges of the State*. Minneapolis: U Minnesota Press.
- Rice, A. K. 1965/2018. *Learning for Leadership: Interpersonal and Intergroup Relations*. NY: Routledge.
- Rothberg, M. 2019. *The Implicated Subject: Beyond Victims and Perpetrators*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rudden, M., and S. Twemlow. 2013. "A Beginning Theory of Action for Community Analysts Based on Group Observation, Theories of the Unconscious, and Evolutionary Psychology." *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies* 10 (3): 199–209.
- Rudden, M., S. Twemlow, and S. Ackerman. 2008. "Leadership and Regressive Group Processes: A Pilot Study." *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 89 (5): 993–1010.
- Salberg, J., and S. Grand. 2017. *Wounds of History: Repair and Resilience in the Trans-Generational Transmission of Trauma*. NY: Routledge.
- Samuels, A. 2004. "Politics on the Couch? Psychotherapy and Society – Possibilities and Some Limitations." *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 14 (6): 817–834.
- Samuels, A. 2016. *The Political Psyche*. London: Routledge.
- Shapiro, E. R., and A. W. Carr. 1991. *Lost in Familiar Places: Creating new Connections Between the Individual and Society*. New Haven, CT: Yale U Press.
- Shapiro, E. R., and A. W. Carr. 2017, Autumn. "Citizenship as Development." *Organisational and Social Dynamics* 17 (2): 278–288.
- Stern, D. 1995. *The Motherhood Constellation*. NY: Basic Books.
- Sullivan, H. S. 1953/1968. *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry*. NY: Norton.
- Tubert-Oklander, J. 2014. *The one and the Many: Relational Psychoanalysis and Group Analysis*. NY: Routledge.
- Twemlow, S. W. 2013. "Broadening the Vision: Community Based Psychoanalysis in the Context of Usual Practice." *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 61: 662–690.
- Twemlow, S., and H. Parens. 2006. "Might Freud's Legacy Lie Beyond the Couch?" *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 23: 430–451.
- Vaughans, K. 2017. "To Unchain Haunting Blood Memories." In *Wounds of History. Repair and Resilience in the Transgenerational Transmission of Trauma*, edited by J. Salberg, and S. Grand, 226–239. NY: Routledge.
- Volkan, D. 2013. "Large-group-psychology in its own Right: Large-Group Identity and Peace Making." *International J of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies* 10 (3): 210–246.
- Winnicott, D. W. 1960. "The Theory of Parent-Infant Relationship." *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 41: 585–595.