

Relational Positions in Volunteer Aid: A Preliminary Psychoanalytic Formalization

Wanhong HUANG
huangwanhong@serendip.ngo

Abstract

This paper develops a preliminary psychoanalytic formalization of relational positioning in volunteer, aid, and support relations within Generative Relational Theory (GR). It studies how participants may encounter concrete historical subjects through expectation-laden positions that organize functions, anticipated continuations, confirmation conditions, frustration conditions, and revision routes. Papers I–III already provide the historical-relational substrate: tracked subjects, support roles, self-reconstruction, recognition, path dependence, provenance, and subject co-formation. Paper IV adds a separate claim-grade architecture for increasingly theory-dependent interpretation. It distinguishes manifest aid events, participant reconstructions, relational-position inferences, source-specific psychoanalytic structural hypotheses, dynamic-contribution attributions, and comparatively demanding attributions of unconscious contribution. The framework separates support-relevant need from relational address, desire hypotheses from ordinary requests, relational tension from psychoanalytic lack, recurrence from psychoanalytic repetition, and the concrete other from the function assigned within a relational position. Disconfirmation events—including refusal, independent success, transfer, altered need, and loss of expected recognition—provide comparative evidence about position revision, position-restorative pressure, and the incremental explanatory contribution of stronger hypotheses. Freudian, Lacanian, relational, intersubjective, and object-relational resources enter as source-specific interpretive interfaces under ontological suspension and competing-explanation discipline. The resulting architecture supports analysis of helper identification, rescue configurations, recognition mismatch, separation, alterity tolerance, coupled positioning, institutional reinforcement, rupture, and later reorganization while preserving material, institutional, normative, interpersonal, and historical explanations as independently typed contributors.

Keywords: volunteer aid; psychoanalysis; relational position; desire; alterity

Discussion Note

This paper is an exploratory theoretical manuscript within the Generative Relational Theory (GR) volunteer, aid, and support research programme. Its psychoanalytic vocabulary is used as a family of interpretive resources rather than as an established ontology of volunteer motivation. The manuscript distinguishes observed relational patterns, participant reconstructions, relational-position inferences, psychoanalytic structural hypotheses, dynamic-contribution attributions, and stronger claims about unconscious contribution. The current revision preserves those distinctions through an explicit claim-grade architecture and plural provenance discipline.

The paper also distinguishes a concrete other from a position that a subject may be expected to occupy within another subject's relational organization. The distinction is analytical and supports non-accusatory interpretation. A supporter can care genuinely about another subject while also receiving identity, recognition, continuity, or desire-related investment from the relation. Mixed relational investment therefore remains compatible with care unless an independent normative argument establishes otherwise.

Responsible Use and Rights Reservation

The author encourages good-faith discussion, criticism, independent inquiry, and responsible use of the material in this work. Separately from the licence's terms, the author asks users to consider foreseeable harms when adapting or applying the proposed framework. This ethical request leaves the licence's permissions and legally authorized uses unchanged.

The author retains the rights preserved under CC BY-NC 4.0 and may pursue remedies to which the author is legally entitled for breach of the licence or violation of the author's independently applicable rights. Reuse remains independent from authorial endorsement. Third-party rights require authorization from their respective holders where applicable. Copyright exceptions and limitations remain fully available.

Notices

Status. This discussion paper is a working manuscript in the GR volunteer-relations programme. The current checkpoint contains the complete 25-section architecture after three integrated whole-manuscript revision passes and release-level semantic synchronization. The psychoanalytic constructions remain provisional and require empirical testing, competing-explanation analysis, and claim-specific literature expansion where additional sources are genuinely needed. Circulation at this stage does not constitute clinical validation, empirical confirmation, psychoanalytic diagnosis of volunteers or supportees, normative judgment, or a claim about ultimate subject ontology.

Licence. Except where otherwise indicated, copyright 2026 Wanhong Huang. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

Statement on the use of language models. The exploratory discussions and preparation of this paper involved OpenAI’s ChatGPT. ChatGPT supported exploratory dialogue, formal reconstruction, argumentative criticism, drafting in $\text{\LaTeX}$, source-verification workflow, and compilation and consistency checks. External scholarly references inserted into the manuscript were verified from online bibliographic or publisher records before citation and recorded in the project verification ledger. The author selected the research questions, directed and approved the theoretical commitments and epistemic status of the claims, and bears sole responsibility for the manuscript, including its definitions, formal constructions, arguments, conclusions, and errors. Authorship credit remains with the human author.

1 Introduction

Volunteer, aid, and support relations are organized through more than visible role occupancy. A person can offer assistance to a concrete, historically particular other while also encountering that other through expectations about need, reliability, gratitude, improvement, dependence, refusal, recognition, or separation. The supportee can likewise encounter the supporter through expectations concerning availability, judgment, protection, authority, abandonment, or transfer. These structures can shape the relation even when the manifest aid task is straightforward.

Paper IV develops a preliminary Generative Relational Theory (GR) architecture for studying this layer through selected psychoanalytic resources. The analytical question is when a volunteer or aid history warrants a representation in terms of relational positions, subjective investment, fantasy, desire, identification, or psychoanalytic repetition, and what additional evidence each interpretation requires. Psychoanalytic traditions are historically heterogeneous: relational psychoanalysis incorporates several relational-model lineages [7], while classical and Lacanian vocabularies assign technical and changing meanings to concepts such as fantasy, identification, desire, repetition, and lack [6]. The present framework therefore treats psychoanalysis as a family of source-specific interpretive resources whose use must remain explicit and revisable.

The paper begins from the historical-relational architecture developed in Papers I–III. Those papers already permit analysis of history-bearing subjects, public roles, self-reconstruction, recognition, practical horizons, path dependence, provenance, subject co-formation, exit friction, and reopening. Paper IV adds a distinct attribution burden. The same retained history can support a strong role-sedimentation claim while supporting only a weak or indeterminate psychoanalytic hypothesis. The distinction protects both the earlier GR results and the stronger interpretive vocabulary introduced here.

The central intermediate object is the *relational position*. It records the functions, anticipated continuations, confirmation conditions, frustration conditions, and revision routes through which one tracked subject encounters another within a declared history. The object is pre-psychoanalytic: it supports historical reconstruction at grade g_2 independently of any stronger attribution. A supporter may organize a

relation partly around effectiveness, indispensability, protection, repair, recognition, or successful separation; a supportee may organize the same relation around reliability, rescue, nonjudgment, institutional access, autonomy, or protection from abandonment. Stronger interpretation depends on source-specific theory, longitudinal evidence, informative disconfirmation, and comparison with live alternatives.

The *concrete other* is the tracked counterpart whose history exceeds the function assigned within the focal position. Mismatch becomes especially informative when the other refuses, succeeds independently, transfers support, changes goals, no longer needs the original form of assistance, or reconstructs the relation differently. Benjamin's intersubjective account of recognition and tolerance of difference provides one resource for interpreting such moments [1]; Winnicott's discussion of object use and externality provides another [8]. Paper IV uses these traditions as adjacent interpretive interfaces while keeping the GR position profile and alterity-tolerance diagnostic programme-specific.

Repetition illustrates the graded architecture. Recurrent volunteering, routinization, path dependence, and role sedimentation belong first to the historical record. Freud's repetition-compulsion hypothesis and Lacan's treatment of repetition introduce stronger, source-specific interpretations [3, 4]. Paper IV therefore identifies the recurrent configuration, asks whether later conduct tends to restore it after disconfirmation, compares that account with ordinary historical persistence, and states observations that would weaken the psychoanalytic hypothesis.

Desire and lack enter through the same sequence. The framework first records practical need, relational address, and historically evidenced tension. Lacanian resources concerning demand, desire, and the Other can then support a source-specific hypothesis where they add explanatory discrimination [5]. Material absence, inaccessible resources, and institutional exclusion remain separately typed contributors within the same history.

The paper's contribution is a typed architecture of psychoanalytic attribution in volunteer aid. It distinguishes manifest events, participant reconstructions, relational-position inferences, source-specific psychoanalytic structural hypotheses, dynamic-contribution attributions, and comparatively demanding attributions of unconscious contribution. These claim types are connected to position profiles, disconfirmation, competing explanations, plural provenance, institutional reinforcement, rupture, separation, and later revision. The architecture accommodates mixed histories in which genuine care, explicit moral commitment, subjective benefit, institutional constraint, and psychoanalytic investment coexist within a plural explanatory record.

The manuscript proceeds in five stages. Sections 2–6 establish scope, inherited architecture, claim grades, position profiles, and the distinctions among need, address, desire, and relational tension. Sections 7–16 develop helper identification, supportee positioning, fantasy, rescue configurations, gratitude, recurrence, refusal, successful separation, alterity tolerance, and coupled positioning. Sections 17–20 add institutional reinforcement, differential dependency and investment, rupture and reorganization, and plural provenance. Sections 21–22 provide finite diagnostic illustrations and verification limits. Sections 23–25 develop philosophical interpretation, programme interfaces, and synthesis. Throughout, ultimate subject ontology remains suspended, psychoanalytic claims remain model-relative, and normative evaluation remains an independent burden.

2 Analytical Scope of Psychoanalytic Positioning

This section specifies the analytical objects and inference boundaries of Paper IV. Its role is to separate lower-grade descriptions of aid history from theory-dependent psychoanalytic interpretation so that the same empirical record can support different conclusions at different levels. The method is reconstructive and comparative: each stronger claim must identify what it adds to the relational history already represented by Papers I–III.

2.1 Five Analytical Objects

The paper distinguishes five objects that ordinary descriptions of helping can conflate.

1. **Support-relevant condition.** A material, practical, relational, institutional, or manifested condition that provides a reason for possible support.
2. **Manifest aid action.** An offer, refusal, request, transfer, accompaniment, intervention, withdrawal, or other observable event within the aid history.
3. **Relational role organization.** Historically stabilized positions such as volunteer, supportee, mediator, expert, witness, coordinator, or beneficiary, represented through the earlier GR architecture.
4. **Relational position organization.** The expectation-laden structure through which one subject encounters another as occupying a function within the first subject's relational world.
5. **Psychoanalytic interpretation.** A theory-dependent hypothesis involving identification, fantasy, desire, lack, repetition, defense, unconscious investment, or another source-specific psychoanalytic construct.

The ordering is analytical rather than causal. Evidence can establish one object while leaving another unresolved. Stable helper-role occupancy can coexist with weak evidence for helper identification; gratitude can occur without functioning as a confirmation requirement; refusal can frustrate an intervention while leaving the supporter's broader subject organization intact. Paper IV therefore treats movement among these objects as an inferential task.

2.2 Relational Position as a Programme Term

The expression *relational position* is a GR programme term. It denotes an application-relative configuration of expectations, functions, anticipated continuations, confirmation conditions, frustration conditions, and revision routes through which one tracked subject encounters another within a relation. It is an intermediate analytical object distinct from technical uses of "position" in Kleinian, Lacanian, object-relational, interpersonal, or relational psychoanalytic traditions.

This programme-level object is analytically sufficient at grade g_2 . Stronger psychoanalytic attribution is a separate inferential step. Different psychoanalytic traditions can then interpret the same position history differently, while metapsychological commitments remain outside the definition of the relational position itself.

2.3 Interpretive Pluralism

Psychoanalytic vocabulary is historically heterogeneous. Laplanche and Pontalis organize psychoanalytic concepts through their development and internal relations rather than presenting a fixed terminological system [6]. Mitchell likewise develops relational psychoanalysis through several relational-model traditions [7]. Paper IV consequently records theoretical provenance for every stronger interpretive claim.

Three constraints govern this pluralism. First, a borrowed concept retains enough of its source-specific meaning to remain discriminating. Second, its translation into the GR architecture is stated explicitly. Third, theoretical disagreement remains visible when different traditions would organize the same history differently. A Lacanian desire hypothesis, a Freudian repetition hypothesis, a Winnicottian account of externality, and an intersubjective recognition account can therefore overlap without being declared equivalent.

2.4 Compositional Structure of Volunteer Motivation

Paper IV represents volunteer motivation compositionally. Material concern, affection, explicit moral commitment, role identity, reputation, institutional duty, subjective satisfaction, guilt, identification, fantasy, and other contributors can coexist in one history. Supporter-side psychological benefit is therefore compatible with genuine concern for the supportee, while altruistic self-description remains compatible with additional supported motives or investments.

The same compositional discipline applies to the supportee. B can resist, negotiate, reinterpret, strategically inhabit, or transform an attributed position. B can also sustain a complementary position for reasons different from A's. Reciprocal positioning therefore does not imply equal power, awareness, benefit, or causal contribution. These variables remain separately typed throughout the paper.

2.5 Normative Independence

Psychoanalytic description and normative evaluation address different questions. Fantasy, subjective investment, helper identification, dependency, or recurrent rescue can receive different normative evaluations depending on consent, harm, responsibility, distribution, contestability, power, and other standards supplied by later papers. Legal, material, or institutional mechanisms can likewise ground judgments of injustice, coercion, or harm through premises independent of psychoanalytic interpretation.

Paper IV therefore contributes descriptive and interpretive distinctions whose normative significance remains open. This separation is especially important where institutional constraints involving housing, immigration status, disability infrastructure, funding, legal status, or organizational hierarchy already explain part of the relation.

2.6 Clinical Analogy across Volunteer Settings

Many psychoanalytic concepts were developed within clinical settings that have distinctive frames, interpretive practices, confidentiality arrangements, session structures, and professional responsibilities. Volunteer relations usually differ on each of these dimensions. Paper IV therefore uses psychoanalytic theory as a source of structural hypotheses whose portability must be argued at the level of the specific construct and case.

A transferable hypothesis should discriminate among relational histories, remain answerable to competing explanations, and generate evidence-sensitive expectations about confirmation, frustration, recurrence, or revision. Claims that depend essentially on clinical mechanisms unavailable in the focal volunteer setting should retain that limitation. The resulting discipline treats psychoanalytic interpretation as a fallible explanatory proposal whose admissibility depends on theoretical fit, historical evidence, comparison, and explicit uncertainty.

3 Inherited Subject, Role, Recognition, and Historical Architecture

Paper IV begins from the formal and historical infrastructure of Papers I–III. Its role is to identify which objects already describe the volunteer relation before any psychoanalytic attribution is introduced and to mark the exact points at which Paper IV adds new theory. The method is conservative inheritance: inherited objects retain their established type and interpretation, while any extension is stated explicitly.

3.1 Tracked Subjects and Relational Histories

Let $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_t$ denote tracked subjects at stage t under relational context κ . The history-bearing carrier $\mathcal{K}_{i,t}^\kappa$ is inherited from Paper III's subject-tracking architecture. Paper IV preserves the separation between subject tracking and subject interpretation: a psychoanalytic hypothesis can concern a tracked subject while leaving ultimate subject ontology suspended.

For the focal aid inquiry, Paper IV assembles the ordered history stated in Equation 1.

$$\mathcal{H}_{ij,I}^\kappa = ((\mathcal{K}_{i,t_r}^\kappa, \mathcal{K}_{j,t_r}^\kappa, R_{ij,t_r}^\kappa))_{r=0}^n, \quad (1)$$

where $I = (t_0, \dots, t_n)$ is the declared observation interval and R_{ij,t_r}^κ is the relation record admitted by the local study. Equation 1 is a Paper IV assembly over inherited carriers. It can retain offers, refusals, requests, transfers, recognitional events, role changes, institutional decisions, and self-reconstructions before any event is assigned psychoanalytic significance.

3.2 Role Position and Relational Position

Paper III reuses and conservatively extends the subject-to-role relation inherited from Paper I. Paper IV adopts the Paper III version at the same type and interpretation, stated in Equation 2.

$$\mathcal{Q}_t^\kappa \subseteq \mathcal{I}_t \times \mathcal{P}_t^\kappa, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_t^\kappa$ contains application-relative role positions. This relation records historically situated role occupancy without identifying role with subject.

Paper IV introduces a different object: an expectation-laden relational position that can cut across public roles. A volunteer can publicly occupy a helper role while organizing the encounter around effectiveness, indispensability, protection, repair, recognition, or successful separation. A supportee can publicly occupy a recipient role while organizing the relation around reliability, rescue, autonomy, testing, or institutional access. These possibilities are hypotheses about relational organization rather than meanings built into the public role labels.

3.3 Self-Reconstruction and First-Person Evidence

Paper III's self-reconstruction profile supplies historically variable first-person descriptions, memories, commitments, retrospective interpretations, and projected self-understandings. Paper IV treats these records as distinctive evidence. A participant can give a truthful explicit reason for helping while a wider history supports additional contributors to the action or relation.

Three relations between first-person reconstruction and a psychoanalytic hypothesis are especially useful: concordance, supplementation, and conflict. Concordance occurs when the participant's reconstruction already recognizes the relevant investment. Supplementation occurs when the hypothesis adds a supported dimension while preserving the explicit reason. Conflict occurs when the hypothesis attributes a central process that the participant rejects or represents differently. The evidential burden rises sharply in the conflict case, especially for claims concerning dynamic or unconscious contribution.

3.4 Recognition, Reputation, and Confirmation

Paper III separates directed recognition, public recognition, reputation, standing, and revision. Paper IV retains these objects because recognitional events can enter the confirmation conditions of a relational position. Gratitude, praise, institutional commendation, public narratives of sacrifice, and repeated requests can therefore be modeled first as historical events with social effects.

The psychoanalytic question concerns the subject's patterned relation to those signals. Evidence becomes more discriminating when recognition changes, disappears, conflicts with the participant's expectations, or is replaced by refusal or independent success. The resulting response history can support a relational-position inference and, with additional warrants, a stronger psychoanalytic hypothesis.

3.5 Path Dependence, Reopening, and Repetition

Paper III already represents path dependence, recursive stabilization, delayed effects, role sedimentation, exit friction, and reopening. These historical objects explain many forms of persistence without further psychoanalytic machinery. Institutional routine, reputational lock-in, scarce alternatives, material dependency, acquired competence, and explicit commitment can each generate recurrence.

A psychoanalytic repetition hypothesis therefore adds a separate interpretive burden. Freud's account of repetition compulsion and Lacan's treatment of repetition provide one source family for such analysis [3, 4]. Paper IV uses repetition in this stronger sense only when the analysis identifies the recurring configuration, the evidence for its dynamic contribution, the relevant source-specific concept, and the lower-grade explanations that remain live.

Table 1: Epistemic grades for psychoanalytic attribution in volunteer aid.

Grade	Analytical object	Typical warrant
g_0	manifest event or recurrent pattern	documented action, sequence, refusal, request, recurrence, role occupancy, recognition event
g_1	participant reconstruction	self-report, remembered motive, explicit identification, articulated expectation, retrospective interpretation
g_2	relational-position inference	cross-event evidence that an expectation-laden position organizes interaction beyond one isolated event
g_3	psychoanalytic structural hypothesis	a source-specific construct fits the position history and adds discrimination beyond the lower-grade description
g_4	dynamic psychoanalytic contribution	evidence supports the hypothesized structure as one contributor to later action, recurrence, confirmation seeking, refusal response, or position maintenance
g_5	unconscious-contribution attribution	evidence supports a comparatively demanding claim that the process remains operative as a contributor despite incomplete, displaced, or conflicting explicit representation by the subject

3.6 Provenance Discipline

Paper IV inherits two provenance interfaces with different domains. Paper I’s action-provenance architecture can represent contributors to a particular aid action α . Paper III’s subject-change provenance relation $\Pi_{i,t' \leftarrow t}^{\kappa, \delta}$ is narrower: it records typed participation of admissible provenance bearers in diagnosed constitutive changes under diagnostic δ . Paper IV preserves this distinction and does not use the Paper III symbol as a generic latent-cause variable.

A supported psychoanalytic hypothesis can enter either interface only at the level warranted by the focal explanandum. If the explanandum is a later aid action, the hypothesis can be retained as one possible contributor within the action-provenance analysis. If the explanandum is a diagnosed constitutive change q , the hypothesis can be admitted to the Paper III provenance-bearer class and, where evidence warrants, appear in a tuple $(b, q, \rho) \in \Pi_{i,t' \leftarrow t}^{\kappa, \delta}$. Neither use supplies causal magnitude, exclusivity, responsibility, or normative valence.

This plural architecture keeps material need, explicit commitment, social norm, institutional duty, affection, reputation, prior history, practical convenience, and psychoanalytic investment simultaneously available. The next section specifies the claim grades through which a study can move from the inherited historical substrate toward increasingly theory-dependent interpretations.

4 Epistemic Grades of Psychoanalytic Attribution

This section provides the claim-status architecture for Paper IV. Its objective is to prevent manifest patterns, participant interpretations, relational-position inferences, and psychoanalytic hypotheses from entering the manuscript at the same evidential level. The grades organize inferential burden; they do not rank persons, cases, theories, or metaphysical depth.

Let $E_{ij,I}^{\kappa}$ denote the declared evidence base for the focal aid history $\mathcal{H}_{ij,I}^{\kappa}$. Paper IV uses the claim-grade family $\mathcal{G}_{PA} = \{g_0, g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4, g_5\}$, interpreted in Table 1.

The grades preserve lower-grade conclusions when a stronger attribution remains underdetermined. They also need not be traversed mechanically: different psychoanalytic traditions may formulate their constructs differently, and some applications can remain at g_2 or g_3 throughout. A grade records the strength and type of the claim actually being made.

4.1 Claim Records

Let h be a psychoanalytic claim concerning subject i , subject j , or their coupled relation. The claim record is stated in Equation 3.

$$\mathfrak{C}_{\text{PA}}(h) = (h, g(h), \Theta(h), E(h), \mathcal{A}(h), \mathcal{U}(h)), \quad (3)$$

where $g(h) \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{PA}}$ is the attribution grade, $\Theta(h)$ is the declared psychoanalytic tradition or conceptual source, $E(h) \subseteq E_{ij,I}^{\kappa}$ is the supporting evidence subset, $\mathcal{A}(h)$ is the set of live alternative explanations, and $\mathcal{U}(h)$ records unresolved uncertainty.

Equation 3 makes theoretical provenance and uncertainty part of the object being reported. A label such as “rescue fantasy” is therefore analytically incomplete until the study states the meaning of fantasy being used, the pattern that motivates it, the attribution grade, and the alternative explanations retained by the analysis.

4.2 Admissibility and Comparative Support

Paper IV uses a partial comparative relation rather than pseudo-precise probabilities for psychoanalytic hypotheses. For two hypotheses h_1 and h_2 concerning the same declared history, Equation 4 records local comparative support.

$$h_1 \succeq_{E,\kappa}^{\text{PA}} h_2 \quad (4)$$

when the local study judges h_1 at least as well supported as h_2 under the stated evidence, conceptual vocabulary, and comparison criteria. The relation can be incomplete because hypotheses may explain different features or the available evidence may fail to discriminate them.

Comparative support should be tied to a declared explanandum. Relevant questions include whether the hypothesis explains a recurrent pattern left open by lower-grade descriptions, survives informative disconfirmation, generates historically checkable expectations, and remains distinguishable from material, institutional, normative, reputational, interpersonal, or ordinary psychological explanations.

4.3 Disconfirmation Events

Psychoanalytic claims gain analytical content when the study specifies evidence that would weaken them. Equation 5 defines the declared disconfirmation family.

$$\text{Disconf}(h) \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{ij,I}^{\kappa}. \quad (5)$$

Membership identifies events whose occurrence would weaken, revise, or defeat hypothesis h under the local design. For an indispensability-oriented helper-position hypothesis, relevant observations can include stable support for B’s independence, comfortable role transfer, reduced recognition without restoration attempts, or continued care after the helper function becomes unnecessary.

This requirement is especially important outside clinical settings. An interpretation that can re-describe every outcome as confirmation has little discriminating value. Paper IV therefore treats disconfirmation, competing explanations, and later revision as parts of the hypothesis architecture itself.

4.4 First-Person Disagreement

A participant’s rejection of a psychoanalytic attribution enters the evidence record as substantive disagreement. The rejection can challenge the hypothesis without mechanically deciding it, and it cannot be redescribed as confirmation merely by invoking resistance. For g_4 – g_5 claims, the research record should preserve the participant’s reconstruction, the external interpretive basis, the independent evidence, the live alternatives, and the residual uncertainty.

The claim-grade architecture thereby limits interpretive authority. It permits stronger hypotheses where the history supports them while preserving the participant’s account and lower-grade conclusions when the stronger interpretation remains unresolved. Section 5 now defines the intermediate relational-position object on which many g_2 and later claims depend.

5 Relational Position Profiles in Volunteer Aid

This section defines the central intermediate object of Paper IV. A relational-position profile represents how one subject is situated within another subject's expectation-laden organization of an aid relation. It is richer than public role occupancy and remains available before any psychoanalytic attribution is accepted.

For ordered subjects i and j , the application-relative position profile is stated in Equation 6.

$$\mathfrak{P}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}^{\kappa, \delta} = (\mathcal{F}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}, \mathcal{E}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}, \mathcal{C}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}, \mathcal{X}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}, \mathcal{R}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t})^{\kappa, \delta}, \quad (6)$$

where δ is the declared diagnostic and the five components represent expected functions, anticipated continuations, confirmation conditions, frustration or disconfirmation conditions, and revision routes. Equation 6 describes relational organization and carries no presumption of unconsciousness or pathology.

5.1 Expected Functions

$\mathcal{F}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}$ records functions that subject j is expected to perform within i 's organization of the relation. In volunteer aid, these can include accepting guidance, expressing trust, confirming effectiveness, allowing protection, offering gratitude, remaining reachable, displaying improvement, or eventually becoming independent. The last possibility matters because a strongly organized helper position can be oriented toward successful separation.

Expected function also differs from prediction. A may predict refusal while still organizing the relation around hoped-for acceptance. The position profile records the function through which the relation is organized; later psychoanalytic analysis asks which subjective stakes, if any, attach to that function.

5.2 Anticipated Continuations

$\mathcal{E}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}$ records anticipated continuations that give the position temporal form. A helper can anticipate repeated contact, progressive improvement, crisis and intervention, gratitude and closure, durable dependency, institutional referral, or transfer of competence. A supportee can anticipate reliable availability, judgment, withdrawal, surveillance, rescue, or abandonment. At grade g_2 , such continuations can be inferred from recurrent interaction patterns when the evidential basis is stated.

The temporal component distinguishes a relational position from a one-event expectation. Position organization becomes more informative through recurrent confirmation, mismatch, revision, and later conduct.

5.3 Confirmation and Frustration Conditions

$\mathcal{C}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}$ contains events that stabilize or confirm the current profile, while $\mathcal{X}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}$ contains events that frustrate, contradict, or destabilize it. Gratitude, compliance, renewed requests, visible improvement, praise, public recognition, or successful crisis resolution can carry different meanings across histories. Improvement can confirm an effectiveness-oriented helper position while destabilizing an indispensability-oriented one.

Mismatch events are often especially discriminating. Refusal, independent success, changed goals, preference for another supporter, disappearance of need, or absent gratitude can reveal which features of the relation carried importance. Flexible adjustment, escalation, resentment, withdrawal, or restoration attempts remain observations to be explained; none is itself a proof of unconscious fantasy.

5.4 Revision Routes

$\mathcal{R}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}$ records historically available ways to revise the position when the concrete other changes. Revision can include renegotiating the aid goal, accepting refusal, transferring responsibility, reducing contact, recognizing new competence, allowing another helper to enter, revising expectations of gratitude, or reconstructing the supporter's own identity outside the focal relation.

Revision routes are analytically central because stable positioning and revisability can coexist. A position becomes more constraining when the history repeatedly absorbs disconfirmation by restoring the other to an established function. Later sections analyze that pattern as *position-restorative pressure* and examine its relation to fantasy, recurrence, dependency, and separation.

5.5 Position Fit and Concrete Alterity

Let $\text{Fit}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}^{\kappa, \delta}$ denote the application-relative relation of fit between the current position profile and the manifested or reconstructed organization of subject j . Paper IV leaves Fit non-scalar by default because its dimensions can diverge. B can continue to need material assistance while rejecting an expected gratitude script; B can remain institutionally dependent while becoming more practically autonomous; B can accept help while contesting A's interpretation of its meaning.

Reduced fit can therefore mark the visibility of concrete alterity rather than simple relational failure. Benjamin's account of recognition and tolerance of difference provides one intersubjective resource for interpreting this possibility [1]; Winnicott's account of object use and externality provides another [8]. Their relation to the GR position profile remains interpretive rather than identity-based.

5.6 Relational-Position Stability at the Pre-Psychoanalytic Grade

Stable position profiles can arise through ordinary coordination. Medical volunteers, disaster-response teams, tutors, mentors, or peer supporters can rely on durable expectations and divisions of labor. Such organization remains at the relational-position grade when the evidence concerns coordination, role continuity, predictable response, or explicit commitment.

A stronger psychoanalytic question becomes available when the position persists or is actively restored after its practical basis changes, when confirmation and frustration patterns organize conduct beyond the explicit task, or when the position becomes tightly linked to self-reconstruction and repeated relational selection. Section 6 develops the vocabulary for that transition while preserving the lower-grade description.

6 Need, Address, Desire, and Relational Tension

This section separates four objects that can become conflated in aid analysis: support-relevant need, relational address, desire hypothesis, and relational tension. Its role is to preserve practical and communicative descriptions before a source-specific psychoanalytic concept is introduced. The method moves from lower-grade conditions toward stronger hypotheses only when additional explanatory work is demonstrated.

6.1 Support-Relevant Need

Let $\mathcal{N}_{j, t}^{\kappa}$ denote the application-relative set of support-relevant conditions concerning subject j at stage t . Membership can be based on self-report, professional assessment, institutional criteria, manifested impairment, environmental barriers, jointly negotiated goals, or another declared evidential route. The set leaves open the normative and institutional questions of whether support should be provided, by whom, and in what form.

Need and request can diverge. A need can remain unrequested; a request can be contested under the evaluator's criterion; and several evaluators can disagree. These distinctions matter because psychoanalytic positioning can organize the gap among perceived need, expressed request, and the intervention preferred by another participant.

6.2 Relational Address

The address relation is typed in Equation 7.

$$\text{Addr}_{i \rightarrow j, t}^{\kappa} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{i, t}^{\kappa} \times \mathcal{M}_{j, t}^{\kappa}, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{i, t}^{\kappa}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{j, t}^{\kappa}$ are application-relative manifestation records. An address can be an explicit request, offer, appeal, invitation, refusal, instruction, reassurance, complaint, or another communicative act oriented toward the other. The programme term *address* avoids identifying an ordinary request directly with Lacan's technical concept of demand.

Addresses situate need within a relation. B can communicate a narrowly specified request while A interprets a broader invitation to protect, advocate, or remain continuously available. A can offer assistance that B receives as care, surveillance, judgment, debt, or an expectation of gratitude. The position profile records how the address enters a longer relational history.

6.3 Desire Hypotheses

Lacan's treatment of demand, desire, and the Other provides one influential vocabulary for distinguishing articulated request from a wider organization of desire [5]. Paper IV treats desire as a source-specific hypothesis recorded through $\mathfrak{C}_{\text{PA}}(h)$ rather than as a universal GR variable.

A desire-related hypothesis can propose that A's subjective investment concerns being needed, that repeated rescue preserves a particular self-other configuration, or that recognition from B contributes to maintaining a helper position. Such a hypothesis earns standing when it adds discrimination beyond the need, role, address, and position-profile descriptions already available and when the live alternatives remain explicit.

6.4 Relational Tension

Let $\mathcal{T}_{ij, t}^{\text{rel}, \kappa, \delta}$ denote the application-relative carrier of unresolved tensions in the coupled relation under diagnostic δ . A tension can concern uncertain recognition, unstable role complementarity, unresolved dependency, incompatible expectations, uncompleted separation, recurrent guilt, resentment, ambiguous responsibility, or another historically supported mismatch.

The tension carrier is descriptive. A psychoanalytic model can interpret selected elements through lack, fantasy, defense, transference-like processes, repetition, or another source-specific construct only through a separately warranted claim record. Practical deficits and relational tensions therefore retain independent analytical standing.

6.5 Subject-Specific and Coupled Tension

Some histories benefit from a three-part distinction among $\mathcal{T}_{A, t}^{\text{rel}}$, $\mathcal{T}_{B, t}^{\text{rel}}$, and $\mathcal{T}_{AB, t}^{\text{rel}}$, with κ and δ suppressed for readability. The first two record tensions whose best-supported manifestation is organized around A's or B's history. The coupled carrier records mismatches whose structure is inadequately represented as two independent private states.

The coupled case is important for GR because an unstable complementarity can arise through interaction. A can be invested in being needed while B depends on reliable access to assistance; the resulting configuration can persist through the interaction of those histories even when neither subject is described as possessing one self-contained deficiency. Responsibility, benefit, and normative status remain separate questions.

6.6 Psychoanalytic Interpretation of Lack

The term *lack* enters Paper IV only through an explicit source-specific interpretation. Lacanian theory develops a structured relation among lack, desire, demand, and the Other [5]. An application can use

that vocabulary when it explains features of the history that remain unresolved by the descriptive tension record and when the translation from the source concept is stated.

This rule preserves the distinction between psychoanalytic lack and ordinary absence. Hunger, inaccessible transport, missing information, housing barriers, or absent institutional standing are practical deficits with their own causal significance. A desire-related position can also persist after the relevant practical deficit changes or disappears. That temporal separation becomes important in the later analysis of rescue configurations and successful support.

6.7 Genesis Patterns

The paper retains three heuristic genesis patterns from the programme's preliminary discussions. In a supportee-centered pattern, B's manifested condition and articulated needs dominate the immediate genesis of action. In a supporter-centered pattern, A's prior history, role investment, tension, or desire-related organization contributes strongly. In a coupled pattern, the action emerges through interaction and distributed provenance.

These patterns organize inquiry rather than exhaust possible genesis. The focal question concerns how explicit need, relational address, position structure, subjective investment, and historical tension enter the provenance of the aid action or later reorganization. Sections 7–16 develop the position dynamics through which those contributions can become historically stable.

7 Helper Identification within Subjective Investment

This section distinguishes recurrent helper-role occupancy from stronger claims about the place of helping within a subject's organization of self. The analysis moves from explicit self-description to historically supported position investment and then, where separately warranted, to source-specific psychoanalytic identification. This ordering allows durable helper commitments to be studied without treating generosity, competence, vocational continuity, or repeated service as latent pathology.

7.1 Role Occupancy and Self-Reconstruction

A subject can repeatedly occupy a helper role for practical and publicly intelligible reasons, including training, contractual responsibility, moral commitment, friendship, institutional membership, and accumulated competence. Paper III's role and self-reconstruction records already represent such histories. Paper IV asks a narrower question when helping also appears to organize continuity, worth, efficacy, attachment, or relation to others.

The first evidential distinction separates a role statement from a self-organizing statement. "I volunteer every week" reports recurrent role occupancy. "Being the person others can rely on is central to who I am" supplies stronger first-person evidence that helping participates in self-reconstruction. The latter remains a grade- g_1 reconstruction until a wider history supports a relational-position inference or a source-specific psychoanalytic hypothesis. Explicitly valuing a helper identity therefore carries less evidential burden than attributing unconscious or dynamically rigid identification.

Paper IV reserves *helper identification* for a declared psychoanalytic use in which helping or the helper position is hypothesized to participate in a durable organization of self-other relations. Psychoanalytic uses of identification have a differentiated conceptual history, so an application must state the theoretical source and local meaning of the term [6].

7.2 Subjective Stakes in a Helper Position

A relational position can matter to a supporter through several non-exclusive stakes. It can support continuity of self-understanding, confirm efficacy, sustain belonging, organize responsibility, provide

recognition, mediate guilt or reparative aspiration, stabilize authority, preserve closeness, or shape a preferred relation to dependency and autonomy. These possibilities are diagnostic prompts whose relevance depends on the declared history and evidence.

Paper IV represents heterogeneous support for such stakes through the application-relative investment record

$$\mathcal{J}_{A \rightsquigarrow B, t}^{\kappa, \delta} = (\mathcal{S}_{A, t}, \mathcal{L}_{A \rightsquigarrow B, t}, \mathcal{W}_{A \rightsquigarrow B, t})^{\kappa, \delta}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{A, t}$ contains historically supported subjective stakes, $\mathcal{L}_{A \rightsquigarrow B, t}$ records which components of the relational-position profile in Equation 6 carry those stakes, and $\mathcal{W}_{A \rightsquigarrow B, t}$ records the evidence and attribution grade supporting each linkage. Equation 8 is a heterogeneous evidence record rather than a scalar measure of desire or unconscious force.

The same manifest helper role can therefore carry different organizations. One supporter can invest primarily in effective task completion and welcome transfer when another helper is better placed. Another can value continuity of contact. A third can place unusual weight on recognition. A fourth can explicitly understand volunteering as reparative in relation to earlier life history. These differences matter before a technical psychoanalytic claim is introduced.

7.3 Identification Hypotheses and Disconfirmation

A helper-identification hypothesis proposes that some element of the helper position contributes to the organization through which subject A sustains or reconstructs self-relation. The hypothesis should enter the claim architecture of Equation 3 at grade g_3 or above when identification is used technically.

Potential support includes cross-context recurrence of similar helper positions, marked destabilization when the position becomes unavailable, repeated selection of relations that preserve a recognizable self-other configuration, difficulty tolerating role transfer, or recurring attempts to restore a helper position after its practical basis changes. Each pattern remains compatible with alternatives such as vocational commitment, grief, reputational dependence, institutional continuity, or scarce replacement routes. Comparative support under Equation 4 therefore remains part of the attribution burden.

Disconfirmation is equally important. A strongly invested helper position can remain flexible: a supporter may value being useful while welcoming B's increasing independence because successful separation itself fits the supporter's organization of care. Evidence of sustained revision can weaken hypotheses that depend on indispensable centrality or rigid position maintenance. A grade- g_5 attribution of unconscious helper identification requires the additional conflict and disagreement discipline of Section 4; participant disagreement remains evidence to be explained alongside the hypothesis, not a self-validating sign of resistance.

Subjective investment also carries no fixed normative valence. Identity continuity, satisfaction, recognition, attachment, or reparative meaning can coexist with responsive and beneficial support. Ethical judgment requires additional premises concerning consent, harm, domination, manipulation, distributive effects, or other relevant standards. The psychoanalytic task here is diagnostic: to identify how a relational organization is sustained and how it responds when the concrete other changes.

8 Concrete Alterity in Supportee Positioning

This section extends relational-position analysis to the supportee side of aid. Subject B can organize expectations around supporters, institutions, and recurring assistance while remaining a concrete historical subject whose projects, preferences, and interpretations exceed any position allocated within the relation. The analysis therefore treats supportee positioning, dependency, reliability expectations, and disagreement as independent evidential objects.

8.1 Supportee-Side Position Profiles

Equation 6 is ordered. The profile $\mathfrak{P}_{B \rightsquigarrow A, t}^{\kappa, \delta}$ records how A is situated within B's expectation-laden organization of the relation. Expected functions can include reliable presence, practical competence, advocacy, confidentiality, rescue, institutional access, emotional availability, nonjudgment, boundary maintenance, or eventual withdrawal. Anticipated continuations can include repeated availability, progressive transfer of competence, crisis response, abandonment, surveillance, or replacement by another helper.

These expectations can arise from the focal relation, prior support histories, institutional experience, family histories, public narratives, or explicit service design. Predictability can be a rational response to vulnerability, uncertainty, scarce services, or previous abandonment. A higher-grade psychoanalytic attribution becomes relevant only when the position organizes affective or relational responses in a way that contributes explanatory discrimination beyond those contextual accounts.

8.2 Concrete Other and Assigned Position

The concrete supporter A possesses projects, limits, obligations, vulnerabilities, preferences, and relations that exceed B's position profile; the same holds in the reverse direction. Paper IV treats this excess as analytically basic. Benjamin's account of recognition foregrounds the difficulty of sustaining another subject as an independent center of experience, while Winnicott's account of object use gives conceptual importance to externality beyond subjective relating [1, 8]. Paper IV uses these traditions for a narrower diagnostic question: how does a relation respond when the concrete other ceases to fit an inherited position?

Mismatch can concern availability, competence, gratitude, authority, emotional tone, goals, dependency, or preferred forms of contact. The historical response can include revision, negotiated closure, or efforts to restore the earlier position. These responses provide more information about position organization than the mismatch alone.

8.3 Supportee Agency within Dependency

Material or institutional dependency and supportee agency can coexist. A subject may depend strongly on transport, translation, legal advocacy, personal assistance, financial aid, or emergency support while negotiating timing, refusing particular interventions, preferring one helper, reinterpreting the relation, and pursuing projects that diverge from the supporter's expectations. Dependency conditions therefore require separate description from position compliance.

This separation matters for later analysis of coupling and recognition. Acceptance under scarce alternatives supplies evidence of participation in an aid arrangement, yet it may provide weak evidence that B endorses A's preferred relational meaning. Gratitude can likewise be sincere while shaped by prudential concerns, institutional norms, fear of withdrawal, or culturally organized expectations. These contextual routes remain active competitors to stronger psychoanalytic interpretations.

8.4 Reliability Expectations and Repeated Address

Some histories contain repeated requests, renewed contact after withdrawal, checking whether promises are kept, or escalating demands during uncertainty. The manifest pattern can be described without deciding whether it constitutes a psychological "test." At grade g_0 , the record concerns repeated checking or address; at g_1 , a participant can reconstruct the sequence through fear of abandonment or concern about reliability; at g_2 , a cross-event inference can identify A as occupying a position whose reliability repeatedly requires confirmation. Source-specific hypotheses involving repetition, transference-like organization, fantasy, or unconscious expectation require the additional burdens of g_3 – g_5 .

Unstable service environments can generate the same manifest sequences. Cross-context recurrence, response to improved reliability, and behavior when alternative support routes become available therefore help discriminate environmental and subject-side explanations.

The resulting supportee-side analysis supplies the counterpart to Section 7. Section 9 next asks when two or more position elements can be assembled into a higher-grade psychoanalytic scene hypothesis.

9 Fantasy Structures in Aid Relations

This section introduces fantasy as a higher-grade interpretive object that organizes relational positions into a scene. The analysis first identifies recurrent scene structure at grades g_0 – g_2 , then specifies the additional burden for a psychoanalytic fantasy hypothesis. Because psychoanalytic uses of fantasy are historically differentiated, each application must state the theoretical source and local meaning of the term [6].

9.1 Relational Scene Patterns

A relational scene pattern records a recurrent organization of subjects, functions, anticipated events, and responses across a history. One aid history can repeatedly involve difficulty, intervention, visible improvement, and acknowledgment or separation. Another can involve crisis, urgent contact, temporary stabilization, and renewed crisis. A third can involve guidance, progressive competence, transfer of responsibility, and closure.

Such patterns remain pre-psychoanalytic at grades g_0 – g_2 . A psychoanalytic fantasy hypothesis adds a source-specific account of why a scene is invested, defended, restored, or recurrently selected across changing practical conditions. The distinction prevents narrative regularity alone from functioning as evidence of fantasy.

9.2 Fantasy-Configuration Hypotheses

For a declared history and diagnostic, Paper IV represents a fantasy-configuration hypothesis by

$$\mathfrak{F}_{ij,t}^{\text{PA},\kappa,\delta} = (\Pi_{ij,t}, \Sigma_{ij,t}, Q_{ij,t}, \mathcal{R}_{ij,t})^{\kappa,\delta}, \quad (9)$$

where $\Pi_{ij,t}$ records positions allocated within the hypothesized scene, $\Sigma_{ij,t}$ its recurrent or anticipated organization, $Q_{ij,t}$ events interpreted as confirmation or completion, and $\mathcal{R}_{ij,t}$ routes through which the scene is restored, revised, or relinquished after disruption. Equation 9 is an interpretive hypothesis object and belongs in the claim record of Equation 3 at grade g_3 or above.

The object is relational and can include A, B, institutions, witnesses, absent third parties, or imagined future subjects. Its contents can also be partly conscious. The analytical burden concerns the scene's role in organizing desire-related investment and recurrent selection, rather than an assumption that fantasy is defined by unawareness.

9.3 Fantasy Fit and Explanatory Discrimination

A useful fantasy hypothesis should discriminate among histories that ordinary role description leaves similar. Two supporters can provide equally intensive assistance while responding differently when B becomes independent. One can treat reduced need and successful transfer as appropriate completion. Another can repeatedly redefine problems, experience separation as personal rejection, or restore intervention after B has expressed a preference for autonomy. The manifest role is similar; the position history differs.

The second history becomes evidence for a fantasy hypothesis only relative to live alternatives. Genuine risk, professional responsibility, uncertainty about capability, institutional liability, cultural expectations, or previous failed transitions can justify continued intervention. Comparative support increases when a fantasy hypothesis explains patterned responses to disconfirmation that these alternatives leave unresolved.

The hypothesis must also expose itself to weakening evidence. Stable acceptance of independence, successful role transfer, and a positive relation after the helper function ends would weaken a hypothesis organized around indispensable rescue. A formulation that survives every possible history unchanged fails the disconfirmation discipline of Section 4.3.

9.4 Fantasy, Alterity, and Revision

Fantasy organization can coexist with substantial responsiveness to the concrete other. The relevant question is therefore how scene stability responds to alterity. When another participant changes, a fantasy configuration can revise allocated positions and anticipated completion, tolerate unresolved difference, or contribute to conduct that restores the established scene. These alternatives connect the fantasy record to the revision routes in $\mathfrak{P}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}^{\kappa, \delta}$.

Fantasy attribution also remains subject-specific. A can organize the relation through a rescue scene that B does not share; B can position A as a rescuing figure while A treats the relation as bounded practical assistance. Claims about mutually sustaining fantasy require separately warranted hypotheses for both sides plus evidence of cross-profile dependence. Section 16 develops that stronger architecture after the paper has examined rescue, recognition, repetition, and disconfirmation.

Section 10 first examines a particularly salient family of scene structures in aid relations: rescue configurations organized around crisis, intervention, and anticipated completion.

10 Rescue Configurations with Anticipated Completion

Rescue can be an appropriate form of aid in emergencies, crisis accompaniment, medical intervention, legal protection, evacuation, and immediate material assistance. This section defines a rescue configuration as a longitudinal relational-position object and specifies the additional evidential burden for a psychoanalytic rescue-fantasy hypothesis. The analysis centers on how crisis, intervention, and completion are organized across changing conditions.

10.1 Rescue as a Relational Configuration

A *rescue configuration* contains three salient elements: a crisis or vulnerability position assigned to B, an intervention-capable position assigned to A, and an anticipated completion condition through which the episode becomes intelligible. The configuration can be entirely practical; a lifeguard responding to immediate danger requires no psychoanalytic explanation.

Longitudinal significance arises when the same allocation persists as conditions change. B can remain positioned primarily through vulnerability after competence increases, or A through intervention after direct intervention becomes unnecessary. A revisable history can instead move from emergency response to accompaniment, competence transfer, ordinary relationship, referral, or closure. The pattern of revision therefore carries more diagnostic information than the initial rescue scene.

10.2 Anticipated Completion Conditions

Completion can mean immediate safety, restored access, stabilization, successful referral, regained autonomy, resolution of a legal or material barrier, or another declared endpoint. The confirmation and revision components of the position profile already represent these conditions, so Paper IV introduces no separate completion variable.

Three heuristic patterns organize the historical comparison. A *terminal* pattern treats resolution as an appropriate end or transformation of the helper position. A *renewable* pattern allows repeated episodes because new practical needs arise independently. A *deferred* pattern repeatedly postpones or redefines completion so that the same allocation remains active. Deferred completion can be justified by recurrent risk, chronic conditions, unstable institutions, or long-term care. A psychoanalytic interpretation requires additional evidence that persistence also serves an invested position or fantasy configuration.

10.3 Rescue-Fantasy Hypotheses

A rescue-fantasy hypothesis specializes Equation 9 to a crisis-intervention-completion scene whose subjective investment is proposed to contribute to later conduct. The hypothesis can concern the helper, the supportee, or a coupled relation. It can address, for example, repeated dependence of self-organization on effective rescue, recurrent expectation that safety arrives through a rescuing figure, or a coupled history in which crisis and intervention stabilize both sides of the relation.

The claim normally enters at grade g_3 . Grade g_4 requires evidence that the hypothesized organization contributes to later choices, confirmation seeking, responses to refusal, or maintenance of the relation. Grade g_5 additionally requires the conflict, disagreement, and alternative-explanation discipline established in Section 4.

10.4 Success, Separation, and Position Stability

Successful aid can confirm one rescue organization and destabilize another. A position oriented toward effective temporary support can treat B's growing independence as completion; a position organized around indispensability can lose a central confirming function. The response to successful reduction of need can therefore discriminate among position structures more clearly than the fact of helping itself.

Sadness, uncertainty, grief, or concern after separation remain compatible with ordinary attachment and realistic risk assessment. A stronger position-restorative interpretation gains support when a history includes repeated redefinition of need, devaluation of demonstrated autonomy, monopolization of access, or reinterpretation of independence in ways that restore the rescuing function. The same discipline applies to supportee-side anxiety where scarce services or unreliable institutions can explain continued reliance.

10.5 Rescue, Control, and Beneficial Intervention

Material outcome, procedural legitimacy, normative evaluation, and psychoanalytic organization are distinct analytical dimensions. A materially beneficial rescue configuration can contain constraining position dynamics, while controlling conduct can arise through institutional or normative mechanisms that require no psychoanalytic account.

This separation matters in high-stakes aid. Immediate danger, legal duty, or professional responsibility can temporarily narrow choice. The psychoanalytic question concerns the later position history: whether emergency logic remains active after its justificatory conditions change and whether the relational organization revises around restored or newly expressed agency.

Rescue histories often generate confirmation signals such as relief, gratitude, renewed requests, visible improvement, institutional praise, or public narratives of sacrifice. Section 11 examines when such signals merely mark an aid episode and when they become consequential for position stability.

11 Gratitude, Recognition, and Position Confirmation

Gratitude and recognition can register appreciation, mark successful assistance, sustain ordinary reciprocity, satisfy institutional conventions, or confirm a relational position. This section distinguishes these functions by asking what a recognition event does within a declared history and how the relation responds when the expected signal changes or disappears.

11.1 Gratitude as Affect, Expression, Convention, and Relational Event

Everyday language can compress several objects into *gratitude*. A participant may experience appreciative affect without expressing it, express thanks because a convention calls for it, acknowledge assistance publicly for institutional reasons, or use gratitude to communicate recognition of another person's effort and significance. These forms can coincide, but their evidential meanings differ.

The position profile in Equation 6 records expected functions and confirmation conditions; private affect enters only when independently evidenced. If A expects B to express thanks, the historical question is whether gratitude operates as one confirmation signal among many or becomes central to A's position stability. B's expression can confirm receipt of help while leaving B's wider position toward A open.

Absence of gratitude is equally underdetermined. Silence can reflect exhaustion, cultural style, embarrassment, concern about indebtedness, dissatisfaction, limited communication capacity, or a wish to reduce asymmetry. The more informative evidence lies in the subsequent relational response to the mismatch.

11.2 Recognition and Position Confirmation

Paper III treated recognition as one possible dimension of subject co-formation. Paper IV asks whether recognition events stabilize a relational position. Benjamin's intersubjective account makes mutual recognition and another subjectivity analytically salient while leaving the interpretation of particular aid histories open [1]. The present framework uses recognition in this narrower historical sense.

Recognition can stabilize different positions. B's acknowledgment that A was reliable can confirm an effectiveness-oriented helper position; public praise can confirm an exemplary-helper position; A's acknowledgment of B's competence can confirm a relation organized around capability development. The relevant inference depends on which component of $\mathfrak{P}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}^{\kappa, \delta}$ is affected and how the position responds when the signal later changes.

Recognizing an action also differs from confirming a broader position. B can acknowledge that A's intervention was beneficial while declining A's continued centrality. A can recognize B's vulnerability during crisis and later recognize B's competence. Position confirmation becomes more consequential when recognition enters expected function, anticipated continuation, or self-reconstruction.

11.3 Recognition Mismatch as an Evidential Event

A mismatch occurs when received recognition differs from what a participant's position profile anticipates in content, source, intensity, timing, or public visibility. A may receive private gratitude while expecting public acknowledgment; B may receive praise for compliance while seeking recognition of independent judgment; a successful referral may receive organizational praise while the focal supportee reduces direct contact.

Mismatch separates practical outcome from position confirmation. Satisfaction with successful support despite diminished recognition weakens a recognition-dependence or indispensability hypothesis. Repeated attempts to restore praise, centrality, or exclusive acknowledgment after practical goals have been met provide stronger evidence that recognition participates in position stability. The same logic applies to supportee-side expectations of recognition by A.

The claim grades locate the inference. A documented mismatch is g_0 ; stated disappointment or relief is g_1 ; recurrent organization of contact around recognition can support g_2 ; source-specific claims about narcissistic confirmation, identification, fantasy, or unconscious dependence require the additional burdens of g_3 – g_5 .

11.4 Gratitude, Indebtedness, and Supportee Agency

Gratitude can coexist with a wish to reduce indebtedness. A supportee may value assistance while declining further contact, refusing public narration, rejecting a proposed reciprocal obligation, or choosing another source of support. Such responses can express agency and boundary setting even when they frustrate a helper position.

A helper may reasonably value appreciation, and a supportee may reasonably wish to express it. The dynamic becomes more analytically significant when gratitude is repeatedly recruited as a condition for maintaining a subordinate, dependent, admiring, or otherwise confirming position. Ethical evaluation remains a later task; Paper IV first records the organization and its response to change.

Recognition can also be supplied by organizations, audiences, families, or other third positions. When external routes materially shape position stability, the dyadic record should identify their source and function; Section 17 develops that institutional architecture. Section 12 now extends the analysis temporally by distinguishing recurrence from position restoration and stronger psychoanalytic repetition hypotheses.

12 Repetition and Relational Recurrence

Repeated helping, crisis, contact, or selection of similar relational partners can arise through many mechanisms. This section separates observable recurrence, position-restorative recurrence, and source-specific psychoanalytic repetition hypotheses. The analytical sequence preserves the historical significance of recurrence while requiring additional evidence before repetition is assigned a psychoanalytic role.

12.1 Recurrence as a Historical Pattern

A recurrence claim begins at grade g_0 . It records events that recur under a declared similarity relation. Aid episodes rarely repeat exactly, so the comparison must specify whether events share a practical need, helper-supportee allocation, confirmation sequence, rupture-repair pattern, or another defined feature.

Ordinary mechanisms can generate stable recurrence. Chronic illness, unstable housing, recurring legal barriers, disaster exposure, long-term disability, continuing care responsibilities, organizational routines, and institutional fragmentation can reproduce similar episodes and roles. The first inferential task is therefore structural: identify what recurs, under which conditions, and across which comparison set.

12.2 Position-Restorative Recurrence

Recurrence becomes more discriminating when disconfirmation is followed by conduct that tends to restore an earlier position profile. B may become more independent, refuse an intervention, shift goals, or transfer support; A may then identify a new emergency, redefine completion, intensify checking, or create another route through which the former helper function becomes central. Paper IV calls such a sequence *position-restorative recurrence* when the historical comparison supports the restoration relation.

The same organization can occur from the supportee side. B may repeatedly re-establish A as the uniquely reliable helper after viable alternatives become available. Rational judgments about reliability, institutional scarcity, attachment, habit, or strategic choice remain live explanations. Position-restorative recurrence therefore names the pattern and leaves its mechanism open.

Available alternatives increase the pattern's evidential resolution. Recurrence under severe constraint supplies relatively weak evidence about subjective investment; repeated return to the same allocation across viable alternative routes supplies stronger grounds for a subject-side inquiry.

12.3 Psychoanalytic Repetition as a Source-Specific Hypothesis

Freud's account of repetition in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* gives repetition compulsion a technical psychoanalytic history that extends beyond behavioral recurrence [3]. Lacan likewise treats repetition as a fundamental concept within a wider account of subject, Other, transference, and drive [4]. Paper IV therefore uses *psychoanalytic repetition* only through a declared source-specific hypothesis that adds explanatory discrimination to the recurrence record.

A grade- g_3 hypothesis should identify the proposed recurrent structure, its theoretical provenance, and evidence that differentiates it from habit, rational adaptation, institutional reproduction, and stable preference. Grade g_4 requires a supported contribution to later conduct. Grade g_5 adds the conflict, disagreement, and alternative-explanation burdens specified in Section 4. Each hypothesis should also identify histories that would weaken it, including sustained revision or disappearance of the pattern after contextual change.

12.4 Functional Similarity and Cross-Context Comparison

A repetition hypothesis can concern relational function even when surface behavior changes. A helper can move from material aid to advice, advocacy, crisis management, or public representation while preserving a similar position of indispensability; a supportee can change helpers while preserving a recurrent expectation of rescue or abandonment. Broader functional equivalence increases both analytical reach and the risk of overfitting, so the equivalence relation should be grounded independently in the declared position profile, fantasy configuration, or confirmation/frustration pattern.

Cross-context comparison can improve discrimination. A pattern restricted to one structurally demanding volunteer setting leaves institutional explanation comparatively strong. A similar position-restorative sequence across unrelated settings and partners can increase support for a subject-side hypothesis while remaining underdetermined. The unit of analysis is the temporally bounded position dynamic, which can contain recurrence and revision simultaneously.

Refusal, frustration, independent success, and separation provide especially useful perturbations of anticipated continuation. Section 13 begins with refusal because it creates a direct observable mismatch between another subject's agency and an inherited position profile.

13 Refusal, Frustration, and Threatened Position Stability

Refusal separates the availability of support from a participant's willingness to accept a particular action, interpretation, or relational arrangement. This section treats refusal as a disconfirmation event and locates its evidential value in the subsequent sequence: clarification, revision, closure, persistence, or restoration. The same framework applies when the helper refuses an assigned role or request.

13.1 Forms of Refusal

A supportee can refuse an offered action while accepting the helper, reject the helper's interpretation while accepting material assistance, decline public narration while retaining private support, refuse exclusivity, reject gratitude expectations, or terminate the relation. A helper can decline a request, set a boundary, refuse an assigned rescuing position, or transfer responsibility.

These distinctions identify which component of the position profile has been frustrated. A refusal of one expected function in $\mathcal{F}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}$ can leave the remaining profile intact; another can challenge the anticipated continuation of the entire relation. The evidence record should state the affected component and the practical context of refusal.

13.2 Frustration and Subsequent Response

When an event enters the frustration/disconfirmation component $\mathcal{X}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}$, the subsequent history can include revised expectations, clarification, negotiated alternatives, pause, respectful closure, continued availability, intensified persuasion, third-party recruitment, withdrawal of recognition, guilt induction, renewed crisis framing, or structural control over access. These responses are first described at their manifest grade.

Comparison with the revision routes in $\mathcal{R}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}$ adds context. Repeated return to one frustrated position despite viable alternatives differs from persistence under acute risk, explicit requests for repeated outreach, legal duty, or scarce alternatives. Persistence and withdrawal therefore receive meaning from their declared material, institutional, legal, and ethical setting.

13.3 Position-Restorative Pressure

Paper IV uses *position-restorative pressure* for a recurrent history in which conduct after disconfirmation tends to make the concrete other resume a previously assigned function. Pressure can operate through repeated persuasion, moral appeal, selective recognition, withdrawal, reinterpretation of competence,

renewed crisis framing, or control over access to resources. The concept records a relational sequence; coercion, conscious intent, and psychoanalytic motivation require separate warrants.

A single repair attempt or instance of persuasion provides weak support for this label. The evidential core is recurrent organization around restoration after meaningful evidence that the other is attempting to revise the position. At g_2 , this can support a relational-position inference. At g_3 or above, fantasy, identification, anxiety about separation, or another source-specific construct may be considered if it improves explanatory discrimination.

13.4 Refusal of Interpretation and First-Person Disagreement

Participants can also reject the researcher's interpretation: they may deny that gratitude is important, dispute an indispensability hypothesis, reject a rescue-fantasy account, or explain repeated contact through practical considerations. Section 4.4 requires this disagreement to remain part of the evidence record.

This constraint is especially important for psychoanalytic attribution because an interpretation that treats every objection as resistance becomes difficult to disconfirm and reproduces an asymmetry of interpretive authority. A higher-grade hypothesis may coexist with participant disagreement, but its support must come from evidence independent of the disagreement itself.

Refusal therefore functions as a stress test of the position profile. The subsequent history shows whether the relation can revise, close, or continues to organize conduct around restoration. Section 14 applies the same logic to another high-information event: success that reduces the practical basis of the helper position.

14 Successful Support, Separation, and Helper-Position Destabilization

Successful support can alter the conditions that made a helper position intelligible: a crisis resolves, competence grows, institutional access stabilizes, another support network forms, or the supportee no longer needs the same intervention. This section treats success as a diagnostic transition by distinguishing practical completion, relational continuation, ordinary loss, and historical evidence of position restoration.

14.1 Practical Completion and Relational Continuation

Completion of an aid task leaves the relation's future open. Former participants can become friends, colleagues, peers, occasional contacts, or strangers. A volunteer can remain available under a different position profile, and a supportee can value the relationship after the original need has ended. The analytical object is therefore transformation of the position profile rather than contact continuation alone.

Continued contact can coexist with flexibility, while abrupt separation can reflect appropriate closure, practical circumstance, or unresolved conflict. Functions, expectations, confirmation conditions, and revision routes provide the stronger evidence for position change.

14.2 Success as a Disconfirmation Event

Success becomes a disconfirmation event when it removes or substantially changes an expected function that had stabilized the helper position. B may no longer need protection, advice, advocacy, transport, crisis intervention, or repeated reassurance. The same practical success can confirm an effectiveness-oriented position, destabilize an indispensability-oriented position, or permit transformation into a non-aid relation.

Supportee-side positions can also change with success. B may lose a familiar source of safety, recognition, institutional translation, or emotional containment. Separation anxiety can therefore arise even as practical capability increases, especially where alternative institutions remain unreliable. A psychoanalytic interpretation requires evidence that position organization contributes beyond these environmental conditions.

14.3 Loss, Grief, and Historical Reorganization

Meaningful aid relations can end with sadness, grief, uncertainty, or temporary disturbance of self-understanding. These responses are compatible with successful support and provide limited information about the organization of the relation by themselves.

The stronger question concerns action and reconstruction after loss of function. A can integrate completion into a broader self-understanding, preserve care for B outside the helper role, select new volunteer work for ordinary reasons, or recurrently recreate conditions in which a similar indispensable position is restored. B can miss a trusted helper while gradually reorganizing expectations around alternative supports, or preserve the earlier position across later relations. These longitudinal differences supply the relevant evidence.

14.4 Position Restoration after Success

Repeated redefinition of completion after stated goals are met, discouragement of transfer to competent alternatives, minimization of demonstrated capability, unnecessary monitoring, unsupported reinterpretation of reduced contact as deterioration, or continual shifting of the aid objective can increase support for a position-restorative interpretation. Each indicator remains context-sensitive: risk can recur, apparent success can be fragile, transfer can reduce quality, and monitoring can be appropriate.

The inference therefore compares practical success with subsequent position maintenance under live alternatives. A relation that permits closure, transfer, reduced contact, or a differently organized continuing relationship supplies evidence of position revision. Section 15 names and systematizes this capacity through the programme concept of alterity tolerance.

15 Alterity Tolerance and Position Revision

Gratitude mismatch, recurrence, refusal, and successful separation share one diagnostic question: how does a relational position respond when the concrete other exceeds its expected function? Paper IV uses *alterity tolerance* for the application-relative capacity of a relational organization to revise around such difference. The concept organizes the preceding disconfirmation analyses and prepares the transition to coupled and institutional positioning.

15.1 Alterity Tolerance as a Property of Relational Organization

A relation displays greater alterity tolerance when projects, preferences, capacities, interpretations, or boundaries that depart from an inherited position can produce revision or respectful closure. The concept is historical and relation-specific. It does not require unrestricted acceptance of conduct: safety constraints, legal duties, professional boundaries, and justified refusal remain compatible with recognition of the other as a distinct subject.

This formulation extends the concrete-other distinction of Section 8. The relevant evidence lies in what the relation does with sustained mismatch, including whether difference changes the position profile or recurrently generates restoration pressure.

15.2 Revision through the Existing Position Profile

The formal architecture already contains the needed object. $\mathcal{R}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}$ in Equation 6 records available revision routes. The historical questions are which routes were available, which were attempted, and whether they changed expected functions, anticipated continuations, confirmation conditions, or frustration conditions in response to the other's manifested or reconstructed organization.

Revision can move direct rescue toward consultation, exclusive support toward distributed support, intervention toward availability, or aid toward ordinary relationship. Supportee-side revision can move

expected rescue toward bounded assistance, constant availability toward negotiated reliability, or dependence on one person toward a broader support network. Respectful closure belongs to the same architecture where no mutually acceptable continuation is available.

15.3 Revision, Closure, and Restoration

Three heuristic response families summarize position mismatch. *Revision* changes the profile so that the relation accommodates new information. *Respectful closure* accepts that the prior relation lacks a viable continuation. *Position restoration* acts to re-establish the prior expected function. Their evaluative meaning remains context-dependent: restoration can support a mutually endorsed care arrangement, closure can be irresponsible, and revision can be blocked by material conditions.

Repeated restoration despite viable revision or closure routes can increase support for a higher-grade hypothesis about subjective investment. Sustained revision despite loss of confirmation can weaken hypotheses that depend on rigid position maintenance. The diagnostic therefore produces informative negative evidence as well as support for stronger claims.

15.4 Recognition, Externality, and the Concrete Other

Benjamin's account of mutual recognition emphasizes encounter with another subjectivity and tolerance of difference [1]. Winnicott's account of object use gives conceptual importance to externality beyond subjective relating [8]. Paper IV draws a limited interface from these traditions: sustained evidence that the concrete other exceeds an assigned position creates a test of whether the relational organization can revise.

The position profile and alterity-tolerance diagnostic remain programme-specific constructions. Benjamin and Winnicott provide adjacent interpretive resources for difference, externality, and survival of disconfirmation; clinical developmental attribution would require a separate evidential framework.

15.5 Alterity Tolerance under Asymmetry and Coupling

Resource, expertise, institutional access, mobility, legal status, health, and safety can remain strongly asymmetric while a relation revises around the supportee's agency. A comparatively symmetric relation can also remain positionally rigid. Material asymmetry and position revisability therefore require separate evidence, a distinction developed further in Section 18.

Aid histories can also contain two position profiles whose confirmation and restoration conditions interact. Mutual fit can be practically constructive or constraining and remains below the evidential threshold for shared psychoanalytic fantasy by itself. Section 16 formalizes this cross-profile organization.

16 Coupled Positioning and Mutually Sustaining Fantasy

Section 15 treated relational revision through one ordered position profile at a time. Aid histories can also contain two position profiles whose confirmation and restoration conditions become historically interdependent. This section calls that organization *coupled positioning*. Its purpose is to represent reciprocal positional fit while leaving symmetry, shared intention, equal dependence, and common unconscious fantasy as separate empirical questions.

16.1 Coupling between Ordered Position Profiles

Let $\mathfrak{P}_{A \rightsquigarrow B, t}^{\kappa, \delta}$ and $\mathfrak{P}_{B \rightsquigarrow A, t}^{\kappa, \delta}$ be the ordered position profiles defined in Equation 6. A coupled-position record is

$$\mathfrak{R}_{AB, t}^{\kappa, \delta} = \left(\mathfrak{P}_{A \rightsquigarrow B, t}^{\kappa, \delta}, \mathfrak{P}_{B \rightsquigarrow A, t}^{\kappa, \delta}, \Lambda_{AB, t}^{\kappa, \delta}, \mathcal{R}_{AB, t}^{\text{cpl}, \kappa, \delta} \right), \quad (10)$$

where $\Lambda_{AB,t}^{\kappa,\delta}$ records the historically supported cross-profile dependence between confirmation, frustration, or restoration conditions, and $\mathcal{R}_{AB,t}^{\text{cpl},\kappa,\delta}$ records revision routes available to the coupled organization. Λ is relation-valued. It can be sparse, directional, intermittent, and domain-specific.

Coupling exists when a component of one subject's position organization recurrently enters the confirmation or restoration conditions of the other. A's expectation of being needed can fit B's expectation of reliable availability. B's wish for nonjudgmental presence can fit A's investment in being uniquely trustworthy. A's anticipated completion through B's increasing competence can fit B's wish to demonstrate growing independence. Each example can be practically constructive, constraining, mixed, or historically unstable.

The coupled record therefore describes reciprocal organization. Motive remains a separate attribution. A can be more invested than B, B can be more materially dependent than A, and one side can revise while the other seeks restoration. Section 18 develops those asymmetries directly.

16.2 Mutual Confirmation and Cross-Profile Restoration

Coupling becomes especially visible at moments when one participant changes. Suppose B gains competence and requests less help. This event can disconfirm an indispensability-oriented component of $\mathfrak{P}_{A \rightsquigarrow B}$ while confirming an independence-oriented component. The same event can also alter $\mathfrak{P}_{B \rightsquigarrow A}$ if B had organized the relation around A's constant availability. The resulting history can include mutual revision, unilateral revision, reciprocal restoration, or exit.

A cross-profile restoration process occurs when conduct by either subject tends to re-establish conditions that confirm both position profiles. Recurrent crisis and rescue can provide one pattern. So can cycles of withdrawal and reassurance, failure and renewed guidance, or public praise followed by intensified availability. The analytical burden is to show the cross-profile sequence historically. A repeated event pair alone does not establish coupled restoration.

Disconfirmation remains especially informative. If one subject can tolerate the other's revision while the second subject repeatedly reconstructs the former arrangement, the history supports asymmetric coupling; a jointly maintained pattern requires evidence of participation on both sides. If both profiles revise after sustained mismatch, the coupled organization can remain durable while its content changes.

16.3 Shared Scene Patterns and Mutually Sustaining Fantasy

A recurrent coupled scene can be described at grades g_0 – g_2 as a pre-psychoanalytic relational pattern. A stronger claim of *mutually sustaining fantasy* requires separately warranted fantasy hypotheses for both sides. Each hypothesis should satisfy Equation 9. The evidence must also show that the two configurations enter one another's confirmation or restoration conditions.

The phrase *mutually sustaining* therefore concerns structural contribution and can apply when the two fantasy contents differ. A can organize the relation around rescue and indispensable effectiveness while B organizes it around reliable return after feared abandonment. The two configurations can sustain one another because each produces conditions that stabilize the other, even though their subjective meanings differ.

Paper IV also permits one-sided fantasy within a coupled position history. A's fantasy organization can recruit ordinary behavior by B even when the evidence supports no corresponding psychoanalytic structure for B. Conversely, B can position A in a highly invested way while A maintains a comparatively flexible helper position. These cases preserve the subject distinction established in Paper III and prevent coupled analysis from collapsing into a single relational psyche.

16.4 Coupling, Alterity, and Revision

Coupled organization can increase stability because each profile supplies confirmation for the other. The same structure can increase revision difficulty when changing one position destabilizes both. A supporter's new autonomy can require the helper to revise an identity-relevant position while the supportee

simultaneously revises expectations of availability, recognition, or rescue. The practical transition can therefore be difficult even when both participants endorse the new arrangement.

Alterity tolerance in a coupled relation concerns whether each profile can revise when the other exceeds the inherited function. The relevant evidence includes responses to independent success, refusal, new attachments, transfer of support, changes in public recognition, and the entry of new institutional or interpersonal routes. These events prepare the move to Section 17, where a third position can stabilize, contest, or redistribute coupled organization.

17 Third Positions, Institutions, and Public Reinforcement

Coupled positioning can be sustained or disrupted by actors and structures outside the focal dyad. This section extends the analysis to third positions, institutions, and public recognition while preserving the typed triadic architecture of Paper II. The purpose is to identify how external functions can enter a psychoanalytic position history while institutions remain typed as external functional structures.

17.1 Inheritance from the Typed Third-Position Architecture

Paper II represents a third-position function relative to a focal pair through the typed record $\mathfrak{F}_{Z|XY,t}^{\kappa,\phi}$, retaining its domain, codomain, operative transformation, provenance, and standing. Paper IV inherits that record unchanged at the carrier level. It adds a narrower question: whether the realized third-position function changes the confirmation, frustration, revision, or public-recognition conditions of a relational position profile.

A supervisor can validate a volunteer's effectiveness, a service organization can designate one participant as responsible helper, a family can repeatedly contact the same supporter, and an online audience can reward visible rescue. Each process can stabilize a position profile through ordinary institutional or reputational mechanisms. Psychoanalytic attribution requires a further evidential step concerning how the external reinforcement enters subjective investment or fantasy organization.

This distinction permits institutional explanation to remain sufficient when it is sufficient. Repeated availability can follow scheduling rules, professional obligation, funding structures, or scarce alternatives. Public gratitude can follow protocol. A position may persist because the institution keeps recreating it even when neither participant is strongly invested in the arrangement.

17.2 Third-Position Reinforcement Channels

For a realized third-position function $\mathfrak{F}_{Z|AB,t}^{\kappa,\phi}$, define a position-reinforcement relation

$$\mathfrak{F}_{Z|AB,t}^{\kappa,\phi} \text{ Reinf}_\delta \mathfrak{P}_{i \rightsquigarrow j,t}^{\kappa,\delta} \quad (11)$$

when the retained effect of the function enters at least one confirmation, frustration, anticipated continuation, or revision component of the declared position profile. Equation 11 records typed historical reinforcement. Psychological causation requires a separate claim.

Reinforcement can operate through authorization, publicity, witnessing, brokerage, translation, resource allocation, exclusion, or routinized classification. A public award can strengthen a helper identity; institutional referral can make A the default supporter; a witness can validate B's account and weaken A's prior interpretive authority; brokerage can distribute support across several actors and thereby reduce exclusivity. The same third position can reinforce one profile while destabilizing another.

The relation can also be negative in practical effect while the question of deliberate opposition remains open. An institution may repeatedly classify B as dependent, narrow available exit routes, or make A's recognition contingent on visible need. Such structures can make a coupled pattern more durable through external reproduction even when the dyad itself contains substantial revision efforts.

17.3 Public Recognition and Position Confirmation

Section 11 distinguished gratitude from position confirmation within the focal relation. Public recognition adds another layer. A can receive prestige, praise, moral standing, organizational trust, or reputational capital from audiences who observe only selected manifestations of the relation. B can receive public classification as vulnerable, resilient, grateful, difficult, exemplary, dependent, or recovered.

These public manifestations can feed back into later interaction. A volunteer may become increasingly selected for rescue tasks because of a reputation for reliability. A supportee may find refusal harder because third parties interpret assistance as obviously beneficial. Conversely, public recognition of B's competence can widen practical alternatives and weaken an inherited supportee position.

Paper IV treats such feedback first as social and institutional history. A psychoanalytic claim requires evidence that the public confirmation has become subjectively invested, dynamically consequential, or incorporated into a fantasy configuration. This sequencing keeps reputational incentives, organizational routines, and unconscious contribution analytically separable.

17.4 Institutional Position Ecologies

An institution can sustain several position profiles simultaneously. Volunteer organizations allocate helper roles, define need categories, authorize interventions, create recognition systems, impose reporting practices, and determine exit routes. These arrangements form a *position ecology*: a structured environment in which some relational organizations are easy to reproduce and others are comparatively costly.

The ecology can scaffold healthy revision. Rotating responsibility, supervision, referral procedures, time limits, independent complaint channels, and distributed recognition can reduce exclusivity and create alternatives when a focal position becomes rigid. The same kinds of devices can also be used poorly or become merely formal. Their relevance lies in changing the continuation and revision conditions of the relation; outcome evaluation requires separate evidence.

The institutional perspective prepares the next section's treatment of asymmetry. Resources, legal standing, mobility, expertise, public credibility, and organizational authorization can be distributed unevenly. Position investment must therefore be analyzed alongside material and institutional dependency and established through its own evidence.

18 Asymmetric Dependency and Differential Position Investment

Aid relations can distribute resources, institutional access, expertise, mobility, authorization, local knowledge, experiential expertise, and decision rights unevenly. This section separates such dependency structures from position investment and examines cases in which practical dependency and subjective stakes diverge across participants.

18.1 Dependency and Investment as Distinct Analytical Axes

Material or institutional dependency concerns what one subject requires from another or from a route controlled by another. Position investment concerns the subjective stakes carried by a relational-position profile and, at higher grades, by a psychoanalytic configuration. The two can covary, diverge, or reverse across time.

A highly dependent supportee can remain flexible about who supplies assistance, while a materially nondependent helper can be strongly invested in remaining the person who supplies it. A helper can also have little identity investment while a supportee places substantial subjective weight on that particular helper's availability. Dependency therefore supplies context for the psychoanalytic analysis, while investment requires its own evidence.

This separation also protects later responsibility analysis. Greater resources or institutional authority can generate practical responsibilities independently of which participant carries stronger position investment. Ethics, justice, and power analyses therefore require their own premises.

18.2 Typed Differential-Investment Comparison

The investment records $\mathcal{I}_{A \rightsquigarrow B, t}^{\kappa, \delta}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{B \rightsquigarrow A, t}^{\kappa, \delta}$ from Equation 8 can be compared only over a declared domain D and common evidential standard. A local comparison may show stronger support for A's stake in recognition while showing stronger support for B's stake in continuity of availability. Other dimensions can remain incomparable.

Paper IV therefore treats differential investment as a partial typed comparison in prose rather than a global scalar ordering. The comparison concerns evidential support for declared subjective stakes; suffering, need, moral worth, responsibility, and institutional power require separate comparisons. Opposite material and positional asymmetries can consequently coexist.

18.3 Asymmetric Coupling

The coupled record $\mathcal{R}_{AB, t}^{\kappa, \delta}$ from Equation 10 permits directional and component-specific cross-profile dependence. A's confirmation can depend strongly on B's gratitude while B's position remains comparatively independent of A's recognition. B's security expectations can depend strongly on A's availability while A's helper position remains transferable to another relation.

This distinction becomes especially informative at rupture. The participant whose profile depends more heavily on the focal relation can face greater subjective disruption even when materially more powerful; the participant with fewer practical alternatives can face greater exit cost even when position investment is modest. The two burdens should be reported separately.

18.4 Differential Revision and Responsibility

Revision can likewise be asymmetric. One participant can accept transfer, separation, or a new role while the other continues to seek restoration. Repeated contact, guilt induction, avoidance, institutional escalation, rapid disengagement, or negotiated restructuring can follow, with their interpretation depending on context.

A useful case report therefore records at least two axes: material, institutional, and practical dependencies; and the supported distribution of position investment and revision difficulty. Later normative analysis can then ask what duties, permissions, vulnerabilities, or power differentials follow. Section 19 uses this separation to distinguish the practical fact of exit from the subjective reorganization of a position.

19 Rupture, Exit, Working-Through, and Reorganization

Rupture can expose a relational position with unusual clarity, while later reorganization requires its own historical evidence. This section distinguishes manifest rupture, practical exit, position persistence, relational reorganization, and a source-specific working-through hypothesis. The analysis preserves retained effects of the relation while allowing later revision to change their efficacy.

19.1 Rupture and Practical Exit

A rupture is a marked discontinuity in interaction, trust, expected continuation, or recognized standing within the focal history. Exit changes the participation route: a volunteer leaves an organization, a sup-portee ends contact, responsibility transfers, or a previously central relation ceases to organize practical support. Rupture and exit can coincide or vary independently.

Position effects can persist after either event. A may leave while organizing later relations around a familiar indispensable-helper position; B may end contact while anticipating abandonment from later supporters. Such inferences require evidence from the later history. Paper III's reopening architecture is relevant because a later formation can weaken, displace, reroute, or recompose the retained efficacy of an earlier one. Paper IV adds the narrower question of whether the relational-position or psychoanalytic organization itself changes.

19.2 Position Reorganization after Rupture

The revision component $\mathcal{R}_{i \rightsquigarrow j, t}$ in Equation 6 already represents routes for changing the position profile. After rupture, reorganization can alter expected functions, relinquish exclusivity, revise confirmation conditions, reinterpret earlier events, distribute support across new relations, or allow a former position to lose practical relevance.

Cessation and reorganization therefore differ historically. Cessation records that a behavior or contact pattern ended. Reorganization requires evidence that the position's retained effects changed in later interaction or self-reconstruction. Components can change at different rates: explicit beliefs may revise while affective responses remain strong, or behavior may change while the relation is still reconstructed through the earlier position.

19.3 Source-Specific Working-Through Hypotheses

Freud's 1914 discussion of remembering, repetition, and working-through introduced the term within psychoanalytic technique in relation to repetition and resistance [2]. Paper IV therefore treats *working-through* as a source-specific psychoanalytic construct whose transfer to volunteer relations requires an explicit portability argument.

A working-through hypothesis in the present framework is a grade- g_3 or higher claim that repeated encounter with a previously stabilized relational configuration contributes to its later reorganization. The evidential record should identify the recurrent configuration, occasions of re-encounter, changes in position or investment across time, and competing nonpsychoanalytic explanations. Reflection, apology, insight, grief, learning, renegotiation, or behavioral cessation remain adequate lower-grade descriptions when they fit the evidence.

Volunteer relations occur outside the analytic setting. A study that uses working-through should therefore state which features of the construct are being transferred and what evidence would distinguish the claim from ordinary reflective or relational change. Stronger causal attribution belongs at higher grades only when the comparative-support burden is met.

19.4 Historical Retention after Reorganization

Reorganization can leave substantial historical retention. Skills, memories, reputations, attachments, concepts, and institutional pathways can remain after an indispensable-helper position or rescue expectation has been revised. The later organization can therefore become less positionally rigid while remaining historically marked by the prior relation.

This structure parallels Paper III's distinction between terminal similarity and historical equivalence. Paper IV assesses position change through retained effects, later selections, responses to disconfirmation, and revision patterns; disappearance of explicit position language supplies only one part of the record.

19.5 Evidential Opportunities Created by Rupture

Rupture can increase evidential resolution because practical and subjective structures that previously moved together can separate. Loss of contact can test the role of recognition; transfer can test person-specificity; independent success can test whether continued need is required; institutional exit can test whether recurrence generalizes to new settings.

Distress after rupture remains compatible with grief, practical loss, injustice, fear, financial insecurity, moral injury, and ordinary attachment. Section 20 therefore consolidates provenance and competing-explanation requirements before the finite diagnostic illustrations.

20 Psychoanalytic Provenance and Competing Explanations

This section consolidates the evidential discipline governing the stronger interpretations developed in Sections 7–19. Its role is to connect psychoanalytic hypotheses to the programme’s plural provenance architecture while preserving alternative explanations and the exact domain of inherited provenance symbols.

20.1 Psychoanalytic Hypotheses inside Relational Provenance

Paper IV uses two inherited provenance interfaces. For a particular aid action α , Paper I’s action-provenance architecture can retain psychoanalytic and non-psychoanalytic contributors when the evidence warrants. For a diagnosed constitutive change, Paper III’s relation $\Pi_{\alpha, t' \leftarrow t}^{\kappa, \delta}$ records typed participation of admissible bearers in changed constitutive dimensions. Paper IV preserves these domains rather than treating one symbol as a generic causal record.

A psychoanalytic hypothesis h can enter either interface only through the claim record $\mathfrak{C}_{\text{PA}}(h)$ from Equation 3. If repeated intervention after refusal is the explanandum, the record first preserves the manifest recurrence and relational-position evidence. A rescue-fantasy hypothesis adds its source, grade, evidence, alternatives, uncertainty, and disconfirmation conditions. If the study later claims that this supported hypothesis participated in a Paper III constitutive change q , it can be admitted as a provenance bearer b and appear in a warranted tuple $(b, q, \rho) \in \Pi_{\alpha, t' \leftarrow t}^{\kappa, \delta}$.

This architecture retains multi-causation. Institutional duty, affection, professional identity, public recognition, scarcity of alternatives, guilt, fantasy, and explicit moral conviction can contribute to the same history, with their relative importance incompletely ordered.

20.2 Families of Competing Explanations

For practical use, Paper IV recommends retaining several explanatory families when relevant. Material explanations concern resources, safety, health, housing, money, transport, and practical constraint. Institutional explanations concern rules, authorization, staffing, reporting, incentives, and organizational continuity. Normative explanations concern duties, commitments, moral convictions, legal obligations, and role ethics. Interpersonal explanations concern affection, trust, conflict, friendship, loyalty, grief, and ordinary attachment. Cognitive-behavioral explanations concern habits, learned expectations, reinforcement, skill, and planning. Psychoanalytic explanations concern the source-specific position, fantasy, desire, identification, repetition, and unconscious-investment hypotheses developed in this paper.

The list is open and overlapping. Its analytical function is to prevent the psychoanalytic vocabulary from absorbing phenomena already well described elsewhere. A strong application can therefore retain a relational-position description while concluding that the additional psychoanalytic hypothesis contributes little explanatory value.

20.3 Comparative Explanatory Burden

The partial support relation $\succeq_{E, \kappa}^{\text{PA}}$ in Equation 4 applies within the psychoanalytic hypothesis family. Cross-family comparison requires a declared explanandum because different hypotheses can explain different features of one history. A staffing rule can explain why A was present, a recognition history can explain why praise stabilized a helper identity, and a fantasy hypothesis can address recurrent restoration after the practical function changes.

For target phenomenon y , let $\mathcal{A}_y$ denote the live alternatives recorded in the relevant claim record. A psychoanalytic hypothesis gains explanatory standing when it adds discrimination or explanatory reach

beyond the strongest live lower-grade accounts for the declared explanandum. The comparison can remain partial: different families may explain different components of the same history. Plural causation remains available, and disconfirming history can lower the standing of an initially plausible interpretation.

20.4 First-Person Reconstruction and Interpretive Conflict

First-person reconstruction provides distinctive evidence concerning remembered motive, fear, resentment, hope, guilt, explicit identification, articulated desire, and later reinterpretation. Such material supports g_1 claims and can contribute to stronger hypotheses when combined with longitudinal evidence. It can also contest an external interpretation, and the conflict itself becomes part of the evidential record.

When a participant rejects a g_4 or g_5 attribution, the conflict protocol of Section 4.4 applies. The record should preserve the participant's account, the external interpretation, the evidence used for each, and the unresolved uncertainty. This requirement is particularly important in aid settings because clinicians, researchers, institutions, or higher-status helpers can possess greater authority to circulate interpretations of another person's conduct.

20.5 Provenance Audit before Diagnostic Illustration

Before assigning a psychoanalytic explanation to a finite case, the analysis should identify the declared explanandum, the established lower-grade facts, the supported relational-position inference, the proposed psychoanalytic construct and source, the live alternatives, and the evidence that would weaken or defeat the stronger hypothesis.

The evidence base $E_{ij,I}^\kappa$, attribution grade $g(h)$, theoretical provenance $\Theta(h)$, alternatives $\mathcal{A}(h)$, uncertainty $\mathcal{U}(h)$, and disconfirmation family $\text{Disconf}(h)$ together regulate the interpretive claim. Historical provenance is then attached through the inherited interface appropriate to the explanandum: action provenance for an aid action and $\Pi_{a,t' \leftarrow t}^{\kappa,\delta}$ for a diagnosed constitutive change. Section 21 applies this discipline to finite stylized histories.

21 Finite Diagnostic Illustrations

The preceding sections define a layered language for relational positions, subjective investment, fantasy hypotheses, recurrence, disconfirmation, separation, institutional reinforcement, and reorganization. This section stress-tests that language on finite stylized histories. The cases are diagnostic constructions rather than empirical demonstrations. Their role is to show how different evidential configurations alter the admissible conclusion while the visible aid sequence remains superficially similar.

Each illustration therefore begins with a limited manifest record and then asks which additional inferences are warranted. The analysis preserves the six-grade architecture of Section 4, the claim-record discipline of Equation 3, and the competing-explanation burden of Section 20.

21.1 Case I: Repeated Help with Flexible Transfer

A repeatedly assists B during a period of housing instability. B expresses gratitude, later develops a stable alternative support network, and begins relying on another organization. A reports mixed feelings about the transition, helps transfer practical information, accepts the reduced contact, and later engages in unrelated volunteer work without attempting to restore B's dependence.

At the manifest level, the history contains repeated aid, gratitude, role continuity, and later separation. A relational-position inference may also be warranted if A had come to anticipate being a reliable helper and B had come to anticipate A's availability. The later transfer, however, supplies a strong disconfirmation event. A's conduct shows a revision route: the expected helper function can lose centrality while the concrete other remains recognized as an independent subject.

This case can support a history of ordinary helper identification when A explicitly understands the role as personally meaningful. It supplies weaker support for an indispensability fantasy. The absence of restoration attempts after transfer, the acceptance of B's alternative support, and the availability of ordinary explanations such as commitment, affection, competence, and institutional continuity remain important defeaters. The case therefore illustrates a central rule of Paper IV: repeated aid and subjective importance can coexist with substantial alterity tolerance.

21.2 Case II: Recognition Mismatch and Position Restoration

A provides intensive support during a crisis. B later becomes more autonomous, expresses general appreciation, and declines several further offers of help. A increasingly emphasizes prior sacrifices, interprets the declining contact as ingratitude, repeatedly reintroduces support proposals that B has refused, and seeks public acknowledgment from the organization for having been central to B's recovery.

The visible sequence supports more than recurrence. The critical evidence concerns the response to disconfirmation. The helper position appears to contain confirmation conditions tied to continued need, recognized centrality, or both. B's growing independence weakens those conditions. A's later conduct can then be analyzed as position-restorative pressure when it tends to return B to a function that reconfirms A's earlier relational standing.

Several explanations remain available. A may be responding to perceived unfairness, unresolved conflict, reputational incentives, institutional ambiguity, grief over relationship change, or a genuine concern that B remains at risk. A psychoanalytic rescue or indispensability hypothesis becomes more plausible only if the longitudinal record shows that these lower-grade explanations leave important features unexplained and that similar restoration patterns recur across contexts. The case therefore demonstrates why refusal and independent success are often more discriminating than gratitude or praise.

21.3 Case III: Material Dependency with Low Position Investment

B depends heavily on A for transport to medical appointments because no accessible alternative is available. The dependency is practically severe. Both participants describe the arrangement instrumentally, B routinely negotiates times and providers, A welcomes substitution when another driver becomes available, and the relation does not display person-specific confirmation demands or restoration attempts.

Paper IV classifies the practical asymmetry as substantial while leaving subjective position investment comparatively low. The case is therefore important precisely because visible dependency can be large without supporting a correspondingly strong psychoanalytic interpretation. Institutional scarcity explains much of the structure. A relational-position profile may still exist, because each participant has expectations about functions and continuation, but its revision routes remain open and its confirmation conditions are weakly person-specific.

The case disciplines any tendency to infer desire from need or investment from dependency. It also demonstrates why the differential-investment comparison of Section 18 remains typed and partial: practical dependence and subjective positional investment answer different questions.

21.4 Case IV: Coupled Position Fit with Asymmetric Investment

A prefers to be experienced as highly reliable and repeatedly takes responsibility beyond formal requirements. B prefers a stable, familiar supporter and frequently turns to A even when other resources exist. The arrangement functions smoothly for a time. When A becomes unavailable, B adapts after a short transition; A, however, experiences the reduced centrality as a major disruption and repeatedly seeks routes back into the prior support configuration.

The history can support coupled positioning because each subject's conduct helped confirm part of the other's expected relational scene. Yet the later divergence shows that mutual fit does not imply symmetric investment. B's adaptation provides evidence that the prior arrangement was useful without

being strongly person-exclusive. A's restoration attempts may support a stronger investment hypothesis concerning the helper position.

A shared unconscious fantasy remains a further claim. The evidence may justify an asymmetric coupled-position record while leaving only one side of a psychoanalytic fantasy hypothesis well supported. This case therefore separates mutual relational reinforcement from common motive, equal dependence, and shared unconscious organization.

21.5 Case V: Institutional Reinforcement and Public Helper Identity

An organization repeatedly assigns A the most visible support tasks, features A in public communications, rewards rapid intervention, and informally treats continuity with particular supportees as evidence of dedication. A develops a strong public helper identity. B later requests a different supporter. The organization formally accepts the transfer while continuing to celebrate A's earlier centrality.

The case contains at least three analytically distinct layers. First, the institution functions as a third position that changes confirmation and anticipated-continuation conditions. Second, A may become subjectively invested in the helper position. Third, the institutional ecology can preserve that position even after the original dyad changes. A's later distress may therefore arise from interpersonal loss, threatened public identity, institutional recognition structures, psychoanalytic investment, or some combination.

The case shows why institutional reinforcement should remain visible in provenance analysis. A psychoanalytic account that ignores public incentives and organizational authorization would overstate its explanatory contribution. Conversely, institutional explanation alone may remain incomplete when A continues restoration attempts after the public rewards disappear. The finite history therefore supports plural provenance rather than a single-cause diagnosis.

21.6 Case VI: Rupture with Historical Reorganization

A support relation ends after conflict. In the immediate aftermath, A repeatedly reconstructs the episode around failure and indispensability, while B anticipates similar overreach from later supporters. Over time, each participant enters different relations, revises prior expectations, and responds differently to situations that previously reproduced the same pattern. A later accepts limited roles without seeking centrality. B later permits support while preserving stronger boundaries and without assuming inevitable intrusion.

The later history supplies evidence for more than cessation. Earlier position effects appear to lose or change their retained efficacy. Paper III's reopening language can describe this historical transformation, while Paper IV asks the narrower question of whether the relational-position organization itself has been revised. A source-specific working-through hypothesis may become relevant if the evidence supports repeated engagement with the earlier configuration and a later change in its organizing force. Ordinary learning, reflection, grief, and contextual change remain live alternatives.

This final case demonstrates the temporal burden of psychoanalytic interpretation. A rupture can expose a position, but reorganization requires later evidence. The framework therefore evaluates histories across time rather than reading the meaning of the relation from one dramatic event.

21.7 Cross-Case Diagnostic Implications

The six cases produce several recurring discriminators. Flexible transfer weakens exclusivity and indispensability hypotheses. Persistent restoration after refusal strengthens some position-investment hypotheses while leaving motive open. Material dependency can remain high when subjective investment is low. Coupled positioning can be asymmetric. Institutional reinforcement can stabilize a position beyond the dyad. Rupture can reveal a relational organization, while later reorganization requires independent evidence of changed retained effects.

These discriminators are more useful than assigning a psychoanalytic label to a visible behavior class. The same act of helping can participate in ordinary care, role ethics, organizational duty, friendship, iden-

tity maintenance, fantasy restoration, or several of these at once. The framework earns analytical value only when it preserves those differences and allows evidence to change the admissible interpretation.

22 Verification, Clinical Analogy, and Empirical Limits

This section specifies the empirical burden created by applying psychoanalytic concepts to volunteer and aid relations outside a treatment frame. Its role is to match evidence design to claim grade, preserve the setting difference between clinical and volunteer relations, and define conditions under which stronger interpretations should be weakened or withdrawn. The framework organizes hypotheses about relational histories; diagnosis and public person-level attribution require separate justification beyond formal resemblance.

22.1 Units of Evidence and Temporal Coverage

The evidential unit should match the claim grade. Manifest-event claims can use records of conduct, communication, assignment, transfer, refusal, or institutional action. Participant-reconstruction claims require first-person material or comparable evidence concerning how a participant understood the relation. Relational-position inferences require longitudinal evidence linking expected functions, anticipated continuation, confirmation conditions, frustration conditions, and revision routes. Stronger psychoanalytic claims require the additional source-specific and comparative burdens encoded in $\mathcal{C}_{PA}(h)$.

Temporal coverage matters because several central constructs concern response to change. A single supportive act can establish neither position stability nor recurrent restoration. Evidence is more informative when the history includes confirmation, mismatch, transfer, altered need, refusal, institutional change, or later reinterpretation. The relevant interval should therefore be chosen in relation to the mechanism being tested.

22.2 Multi-Source Triangulation and Interpretive Conflict

Higher-grade claims benefit from triangulation across interaction records, participant reconstructions, institutional documents, third-party observations, temporal comparisons, and other admissible sources. Agreement across sources can strengthen a hypothesis, while disagreement can reveal distinct manifestations or competing interpretations. Triangulation is therefore a way to map evidential structure rather than a simple vote-counting rule.

First-person disagreement remains especially important. A participant's account can be incomplete, retrospective, strategic, or uncertain, yet those possibilities also apply to external interpretation. The framework consequently preserves disagreement as evidence and requires additional support before a conflictual g_4 or g_5 claim receives substantial standing.

22.3 Clinical Analogy and Setting Difference

Clinical psychoanalysis contains an interpretive frame, repeated sessions, professional training, confidentiality structures, and role-specific responsibilities that usually differ from volunteer aid. These differences affect what can be observed, what can be inferred, and how interpretations can be tested. A construct developed within treatment therefore requires an explicit portability argument when used in another institutional setting.

Paper IV uses clinical theory primarily as a source of structural hypotheses. The strongest applications will show how a source concept maps onto the volunteer relation, which parts of the clinical mechanism are retained, which are absent, and how the changed setting affects the evidential burden.

22.4 Diagnosis, Pathology, and Public Attribution

The Paper IV architecture is an interpretive research framework. Rescue behavior, recurrent volunteering, discomfort with refusal, gratitude seeking, rupture, or helper identification can arise through many ordinary and institutionally intelligible pathways. Clinical diagnosis has a separate evidential, professional, and institutional basis that lies outside the present formalism.

Public person-level interpretation creates a separate publication-ethics burden. Contested higher-grade claims can alter reputation and standing. Paper IV flags that burden without deriving a complete publication ethic from the psychoanalytic formalism. Any person-level publication therefore requires separate justification concerning identifiability, disclosure detail, uncertainty communication, and the decision to publish the attribution.

22.5 Identifiability of Psychoanalytic Contribution

A psychoanalytic hypothesis becomes empirically useful when its incremental contribution can be distinguished from live alternatives to a reasonable degree. The requirement is compatible with qualitative and mixed-method designs: it asks for a declared explanandum, explicit alternatives, and a reasoned account of the additional discrimination or explanatory reach supplied by the psychoanalytic hypothesis beyond the lower-grade descriptions already available.

Potentially informative observations include recurrence across contexts with different institutional incentives, restoration attempts after the original practical need changes, person-specific confirmation demands that survive role transfer, patterned responses to refusal or independence, and later reorganization that tracks changes in the hypothesized relational position. Each observation remains defeasible and must be interpreted within the full history.

22.6 Empirical Designs Compatible with the Framework

The framework can interface with several methods. Longitudinal qualitative interviewing can trace participant reconstruction and later reinterpretation. Ethnographic observation can identify institutional reinforcement and recurring position allocation. Process tracing can reconstruct sequences linking confirmation, disconfirmation, restoration, and revision. Comparative case analysis can test whether similar manifest aid sequences diverge under different relational or institutional conditions. Structured coding can operationalize lower-grade profile components while keeping stronger psychoanalytic interpretation in a separate analytical stage.

Method choice follows the local question. Quantification can be useful for recurrence, network position, or institutional allocation, while first-person and interpretive material may be necessary for subjective investment. Methodological pluralism is therefore part of the verification architecture.

22.7 Verification Checklist for Applied Use

Before accepting a psychoanalytic interpretation, an application should identify the tracked subjects and interval; the manifest event record; the relevant relational-position profile; the attribution grade; the theoretical source; the evidence supporting the stronger construct; the principal alternatives; the disconfirming evidence; the participant's own reconstruction where available; the institutional context; and the observations that would lead the analyst to weaken or withdraw the claim.

An application can remain at a lower grade when these burdens are unmet. A conclusion limited to role history, recognition dynamics, recurrence, relational-position organization, or institutional reinforcement is analytically complete when that is what the evidence supports.

23 Philosophical Interpretation of Relational Desire and Otherness

This section develops a limited philosophical interpretation of the formal architecture. Its role is to clarify what relational positioning, desire hypotheses, recognition, separation, and alterity make visible within the present model while maintaining ontological suspension and theoretical pluralism. The claims are interpretive consequences of the framework rather than proofs about ultimate subjectivity.

23.1 Relational Position as a Condition of Encounter

In many volunteer and aid settings, participants approach one another through roles, expectations, categories, histories, institutions, memories, and anticipated continuations. The relational-position profile formalizes one part of this mediation. It represents how another subject becomes intelligible through expected functions and how that intelligibility can organize future interaction.

Such mediation is ordinary. Volunteers can expect communication about need; supportees can expect reliability or boundary maintenance; professionals can rely on role-specific coordination. Philosophical significance increases when the concrete other exceeds the established position and the relation must respond to that mismatch.

23.2 Otherness as Excess over Assigned Function

Within Paper IV, *otherness* is approached operationally through mismatch between the concrete other—the tracked counterpart in the focal position—and the functions allocated to that subject within the position profile. The claim concerns the analytical model: an assigned function does not exhaust the tracked history. Refusal, reinterpretation, exit, changed goals, reliance on another person, altered desire, and disappearance of expected confirmation can each manifest this excess relative to the profile.

The programme term *alterity tolerance* then describes the revisability of the relational organization in the presence of such mismatch. Its application asks whether expected functions, confirmation conditions, and continuation routes can change while the other remains represented as a subject with a trajectory exceeding the focal position.

23.3 Desire as a Hypothesis about Relational Organization

Paper IV treats desire as a theoretically mediated hypothesis concerning how a subject's relation to another, to recognition, to lack, or to a position may organize conduct over time. This usage differs from ordinary preference and explicit request. A participant can sincerely endorse B's independence while also carrying a subjective investment in the helper position through which the relation has organized A's own continuity.

Explicit commitment and less articulated investment can coexist, reinforce one another, or enter conflict. A warranted psychoanalytic interpretation therefore adds one layer to a plural account of the relation; it supplies no automatic verdict concerning sincerity or moral value.

23.4 Recognition and Functional Capture

Recognition can make another person's agency, need, contribution, or standing socially legible. Recognition can also become selective when the surrounding relation most readily registers the other through one established function. A helper can recognize B primarily as recipient; B can recognize A primarily as continuously available; an institution can classify both through standardized categories.

Paper IV uses *functional capture* as a programme term for a persistent tendency to interpret the concrete other through the function that confirms the surrounding relational organization. The claim is graded rather than total. Evidence for functional capture increases when repeated manifestations that exceed the assigned function fail to produce corresponding revision in the position profile.

23.5 Separation as a Test of Relational Generativity

Some aid relations aim locally to alter the conditions that generated the original support need. In those cases, successful support can create a transition in which the relation contributes to trajectories that require a different form of relation or less support of the original kind. Section 14 showed that this transition can also destabilize a helper position.

Within the present GR interpretation, such separation can serve as one application-specific indicator of relational generativity. The indicator is satisfied when the relation helps sustain viable trajectories that exceed the earlier position configuration and the relevant local aims support that transition. Long-term interdependence and continuing support can instantiate other generative forms, so independence carries no privileged status in the formalism.

23.6 Ontological Suspension and Psychoanalytic Pluralism

Paper IV's psychoanalytic constructions remain model-relative under ontological suspension. A fantasy configuration represents a theoretically interpreted relational organization. A lack hypothesis represents one source-specific reading of selected tensions. Identification and repetition likewise retain the meaning supplied by the declared tradition and evidence base.

This restraint permits genuine theoretical pluralism. Different traditions can offer competing accounts of desire, recognition, object relation, intersubjectivity, repetition, or unconscious investment. The GR interface can compare their domains and consequences while preserving failed translation, theoretical remainder, and unresolved disagreement as legitimate results.

24 Programme Interfaces with Aesthetics, Justice, Ethics, Power, and Historical Dynamics

Paper IV supplies a psychoanalytic layer within a wider research programme. Its constructs become normatively and politically consequential only through additional premises. This section identifies the principal interfaces while preserving disciplinary remainder and avoiding automatic translation from psychic organization to ethical or legal judgment.

24.1 Aesthetic Philosophy of Supporting

The programme's planned aesthetic paper asks how supporting can be experienced and judged as a form of relation, including questions of distance, restraint, timing, presence, excess, disappearance, and the shape of successful withdrawal. Paper IV contributes a vocabulary for distinguishing aesthetic appreciation of support from investment in a preferred helper position.

A supporter can value quiet, non-dominating assistance while still seeking recognition; a highly visible intervention can be aesthetically compelling while constraining the supportee's position; separation can be experienced as loss while also marking a successful transformation of the relation. The aesthetic analysis therefore inherits relational-position history without treating beauty, grace, or fittingness as psychoanalytic effects.

24.2 Justice and Recognition

Justice questions arise when relational positioning affects standing, voice, distribution, participation, or the capacity to contest how one is represented. Paper IV can identify a persistent recipient position, public helper centrality, or interpretive authority. A justice analysis must additionally specify the relevant normative standard and institutional conditions.

This distinction matters because psychoanalytic explanation can itself become a source of asymmetry. An institution that labels resistance as unconscious dependency can weaken the supportee's ability to

contest the relation. A later justice paper can therefore examine both the underlying aid structure and the authority to impose interpretations upon it.

24.3 Ethics of Aid and Responsibility

Ethical evaluation requires a separate account of responsibility, care, consent, foreseeable harm, role obligation, and the treatment of vulnerable subjects. A helper's subjective investment can accompany responsible, irresponsible, or mixed forms of support. Desire, fantasy, and identification become ethically relevant only through additional premises linking them to conduct, consequences, duties, consent, vulnerability, or institutional conditions.

Paper IV contributes diagnostic questions that can sharpen ethical analysis: Does the helper revise after refusal? Are alternatives concealed to preserve a position? Does the supportee retain meaningful routes of contestation and exit? Are institutional rewards amplifying a configuration that harms either party? Ethical conclusions require the additional normative premises supplied by the relevant ethics paper.

24.4 Power and Interpretive Authority

Power enters Paper IV through resource dependency, institutional authorization, public recognition, classification, and interpretive authority. These factors can shape which relational positions become available and whose account of the relation receives institutional standing. The power programme can formalize these constraints more fully through differential capacities to define, enforce, reward, or reopen relational structures.

The interface is especially important for psychoanalytic interpretation. A high-status professional can describe another person's refusal as defensive or unconscious while the other person lacks an equivalent capacity to circulate a competing interpretation. The psychoanalytic hypothesis may still be worth examining, but its social force depends partly on the power field through which the interpretation travels.

24.5 Historical Dynamics and Path Dependence

Paper III supplies the main architecture for provenance, path dependence, reopening, and retained efficacy. Paper IV adds a candidate psychoanalytic contribution to those histories. Position confirmation can accumulate, institutional reinforcement can stabilize a configuration, and repeated restoration can increase the practical probability that later events are interpreted through the same relational scene.

The historical programme can investigate different timescales. Rapid changes in interaction may co-exist with slow changes in self-reconstruction or institutional classification. A rupture can alter manifest conduct immediately while subjective investment persists. Reorganization can therefore involve fast and slow components whose relation must be established empirically rather than presumed from the formal vocabulary.

24.6 Interfaces with Law, Governance, and Heterogeneous Subjects

Later jurisprudence and governance papers can ask when relational positioning becomes legally relevant: coercive dependency, fiduciary obligation, undue influence, consent, professional boundaries, discrimination, or institutional responsibility may each provide a distinct legal interface. Legal analysis therefore retains its own elements and evidential requirements alongside any psychoanalytic interpretation.

The wider programme also extends aid theory beyond ordinary human-human relations. Human–AI, AI–AI, human–animal, and other heterogeneous configurations raise questions about whether concepts such as desire, fantasy, recognition, or unconscious investment remain applicable. Paper IV leaves that extension open. Its typed architecture makes the dependency explicit: the analyst must first justify which subject-level constructs can meaningfully be attributed to the entities in the focal relation.

24.7 Selective Inheritance by Later Papers

Later papers should inherit Paper IV selectively. A paper on aesthetic supporting may use position revision and separation. A justice paper may use institutional reinforcement and interpretive authority. A power paper may use differential investment where it changes susceptibility to control or the distribution of interpretive leverage. A historical paper may use recurrence and reorganization while remaining agnostic among psychoanalytic theories.

This selective inheritance preserves modularity. Paper IV offers a library of typed distinctions whose use depends on the downstream question. Programme coherence comes from explicit interfaces and declared dependencies, while each later paper retains its own disciplinary premises and evidential burdens.

25 Foundational Synthesis of Psychoanalytic Positioning

Paper IV has developed a preliminary architecture for studying psychoanalytic positioning in volunteer, aid, and support relations within Generative Relational Theory. Its contribution is a disciplined interface between historical-relational description and source-specific psychoanalytic interpretation. Manifest events, participant reconstructions, relational-position inferences, psychoanalytic structural hypotheses, dynamic-contribution attributions, and unconscious-contribution attributions remain separately graded throughout the analysis.

25.1 Core Architecture

The central pre-psychoanalytic object is the relational-position profile of Section 5. It records expected functions, anticipated continuations, confirmation conditions, frustration conditions, and revision routes. The claim-grade architecture of Section 4 then regulates stronger interpretations through theoretical provenance, evidence, live alternatives, uncertainty, and disconfirmation.

Subjective-investment records connect personally consequential stakes to position components. Fantasy hypotheses organize positions into source-specific relational scenes. Repetition hypotheses interpret recurrent organization under a declared psychoanalytic account. Working-through is a still more specific, setting-sensitive hypothesis about repeated encounter and later reorganization. Each construction adds an identifiable inferential burden to the lower-grade history and remains defeasible through the claim record.

25.2 Principal Distinctions

The framework distinguishes support-relevant need from relational address; material dependency from subjective investment; gratitude from position confirmation; recurrence from psychoanalytic repetition; role occupancy from helper identification; rescue action from rescue fantasy; rupture from practical exit and later position reorganization; coupled positioning from shared fantasy; institutional reinforcement from subject-level psychoanalytic contribution; and the concrete other from the function allocated within a relational position.

These distinctions support mixed cases. Genuine concern can coexist with recognition investment. Material dependency can coexist with strong resistance to the assigned supportee position. Institutions can reinforce helper centrality without any participant intending that result. Effective and caring support can still contain position dynamics that later require revision.

25.3 Disconfirmation and Revisability

Disconfirmation provides a central source of comparative evidence. Praise, gratitude, success, or repeated requests can fit several different organizations; refusal, independent success, transfer, altered need, loss of public recognition, or disagreement about the relation can discriminate more sharply among them by changing the anticipated continuation.

Alterity tolerance describes one application-relative property of that response. Greater revisability is evidenced when sustained mismatch modifies expected functions, confirmation conditions, or continuation routes. Position-restorative recurrence and position-restorative pressure identify, respectively, recurrent historical return and conduct tending to re-establish the earlier configuration after disconfirmation. These patterns inform higher-grade hypotheses while leaving motive and normative evaluation separately open.

25.4 Plural Provenance and Competing Explanation

Psychoanalytic interpretation remains embedded in plural provenance. Material scarcity, organizational rules, explicit commitments, friendship, habit, public recognition, learned expectation, grief, and psychoanalytic dynamics can contribute to the same history. Paper IV therefore asks what additional discrimination or explanatory reach a psychoanalytic hypothesis contributes for a declared explanandum.

The provenance interface is also domain-specific. Paper I's action-provenance architecture applies to particular aid actions, while Paper III's $\Pi_{i,t' \leftarrow t}^{\kappa, \delta}$ applies to diagnosed constitutive change. A supported psychoanalytic hypothesis can enter either architecture as one warranted contributor without becoming a complete causal model or responsibility allocation.

25.5 Empirical and Ethical Restraint

The formalism is an interpretive research architecture. Higher-grade claims require longitudinal evidence, participant reconstruction where available, theoretical provenance, competing-explanation analysis, and explicit uncertainty. Clinical diagnosis and public person-level attribution introduce separate professional, evidential, and publication-ethics burdens beyond the formalism itself.

Normative evaluation also remains independent. Desire, identification, fantasy, repetition, subjective investment, and position-restorative pressure can matter to later ethics, justice, power, law, and governance analyses, but those papers must supply the relevant standards of responsibility, consent, harm, domination, legitimacy, or institutional design.

25.6 Contribution to the GR Volunteer and Aid Programme

Paper I established the minimal dyadic architecture of volunteer support. Paper II extended that architecture to triadic and multiparty structures. Paper III developed subject co-formation, constitutive-change provenance, path dependence, and reopening. Paper IV adds a distinct interpretive layer concerning how participants can become invested in positions through which aid relations are organized and how those positions respond to recognition, refusal, separation, institutional reinforcement, rupture, and later reorganization.

The contribution is intentionally scoped: a revisable interface between GR's historical-relational architecture and selected psychoanalytic resources. Its formal objects make stronger interpretations more accountable to evidence while preserving lower-grade relational descriptions as complete analytical endpoints when the stronger attribution remains underdetermined.

25.7 Open Research Burdens

Several research burdens remain. Empirical work should test the reliable reconstruction of relational-position components across settings and examine whether disconfirmation responses discriminate among competing hypotheses. Cross-cultural studies should examine the portability of helper, recipient, gratitude, dependency, and separation vocabularies. Comparative theoretical work should retain differences among psychoanalytic traditions. Heterogeneous-subject research must separately justify the extension of subject-level constructs to human-AI, AI-AI, human-animal, or other configurations.

The wider programme should also examine interpretive power. Psychoanalytic language can illuminate a relation while also shaping how another participant is publicly represented. A generative use of

the framework therefore requires revisability on the analyst's side: interpretations remain answerable to evidence, contestation, competing explanations, and later history.

Within these limits, Paper IV provides a foundation for studying relational positions whose formation, confirmation, disruption, and revision can matter alongside the material work of aid itself. The framework preserves the concrete other beyond the assigned function and treats psychoanalytic interpretation as one accountable, revisable mode of access to that history.

DRAFT

References

- [1] Jessica Benjamin. “An Outline of Intersubjectivity: The Development of Recognition”. In: *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 7.Suppl. (1990), pp. 33–46. DOI: 10.1037/h0085258.
- [2] Sigmund Freud. “Remembering, Repeating and Working-Through (Further Recommendations on the Technique of Psycho-Analysis II)”. In: *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XII (1911–1913): The Case of Schreber, Papers on Technique and Other Works*. Ed. and trans. by James Strachey. Original work published 1914. London: The Hogarth Press, 1958, pp. 145–156.
- [3] Sigmund Freud. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. Ed. by Todd Dufresne. Trans. by Gregory C. Richter. Originally published in 1920. Broadview Press, 2011.
- [4] Jacques Lacan. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Ed. by Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. by Alan Sheridan. New York: W. W. Norton, 1998. ISBN: 9780393317756.
- [5] Jacques Lacan. *The Formations of the Unconscious: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book V*. Ed. by Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. by Russell Grigg. Polity Press, 2017. ISBN: 9780745660370.
- [6] Jean Laplanche and J.-B. Pontalis. *The Language of Psycho-Analysis*. Trans. by Donald Nicholson-Smith. New York: W. W. Norton, 1974. ISBN: 9780393011050.
- [7] Stephen A. Mitchell. *Relational Concepts in Psychoanalysis: An Integration*. Harvard University Press, 1988. ISBN: 9780674754119. DOI: 10.2307/j.ctvk12rmv.
- [8] D. W. Winnicott. “The Use of an Object and Relating Through Identifications”. In: *The Collected Works of D. W. Winnicott, Volume 8: 1967–1968*. Ed. by Lesley Caldwell and Helen Taylor Robinson. Originally published as “The Use of an Object” in 1969. Oxford University Press, 2016, pp. 355–364. DOI: 10.1093/med:psych/9780190271404.003.0066.