

# A Relationship That Is Fair to Both of Us

Power, care, and the clinical work of sharing a life

Brian Kennedy, MA, LMFT  
2026

“If you tell me what needs doing, I’ll do it,” Peter says.

Mina looks at him for a moment. “I want not to be the person who has to tell you.”

They have been discussing his father’s next appointment. Peter drove him last time and is willing to drive again. Mina knew the follow-up was due, called the clinic, found a time that fitted three schedules, and remembered the question his father wanted to ask. Peter counts a journey they shared. Mina is trying to describe the work that made the journey possible.

This is a fictional encounter, developed from the educational situation in the Fairness pathway. Peter has worked a long week and hears that his effort does not count. Mina had hoped to use an evening for something of her own. She spent it arranging the visit, then felt ungenerous for resenting care she also wants to give. Neither has yet said all of this. What reaches the room is an offer to help and a reply that sounds as though help has been rejected.

The therapist may want to soften the exchange: help Mina ask more directly, help Peter acknowledge the strain, find a task he can take. Before choosing, we need to understand what has already become hers. If we ask Mina to become better at delegating, we may leave her in charge of noticing, deciding, and returning to see whether the work was done. A well-intended intervention can preserve the arrangement that brought the couple here.

We also need room for Peter’s account. He may be willing to carry more and unsure what the responsibility includes. He may be defending an arrangement that suits him. His work conditions may limit what he can offer. These possibilities call for different responses. The invitation is to become more accurate about the shared life, including what each person feels, what each actually carries, and who has the opportunity to change it.

My client article, *A Fair Relationship With Room for Both of Us*, explores these questions through personal reflection and an everyday experiment. Here I turn toward the therapist’s judgment. How can we understand an adaptation without asking someone to adapt indefinitely? How can we help a person retain a voice while becoming answerable for a real obligation? What would make care more dependable after the conversation ends?

A relationship can be loving and contain an unfair arrangement. It can also become fairer while its members remain tired, disappointed, or uncertain. I want to keep emotional meaning and the organization of responsibility available to each other throughout the work.

## **Secure functioning gives care an everyday form**

Stan Tatkin describes secure functioning through mutuality, collaboration, justice, fairness, and sensitivity. His PACT approach asks partners to build a relationship that serves both people rather than requiring one to organize around the other. The standard concerns what they do, including under pressure, rather than how securely attached or emotionally calm each person appears <sup>[1], [2]</sup>.

This is a demanding and useful guide. Understanding a partner's history does not complete the work if decisions still proceed without their participation. Feeling close after a conversation does not settle an arrangement that leaves one person exhausted. A shared commitment becomes more credible when it changes how attention, time, authority, and care are distributed.

My practical translation begins with equal standing. Both people can raise a concern, influence an important decision, and expect that their welfare matters. Neither person becomes the default authority because they earn more, speak more confidently, know more therapeutic language, or become more distressed. Contributions may differ; personhood does not.

It includes sensitivity: learning how something affects this particular person instead of deciding how they should feel. It includes dependable responsibility: noticing, doing, returning, and following through. And it includes repair: when an agreement or action causes harm, the response addresses the impact and what needs to change.

Putting the relationship first must not mean preserving the bond at the expense of either person's bodily autonomy, safety, identity, or access to other people. A partnership is also part of a larger world of children, friends, elders, work, and community. A shared commitment should help people meet those responsibilities, not become a closed system that makes outside ties suspect.

## **Equal standing does not require identical contributions**

One person may be ill, recovering from childbirth, providing care for an aging parent, or temporarily working longer hours. They may have different capacities, preferences, and resources. Insisting on an identical division in every moment can ignore these realities. But an uneven contribution needs to remain visible, discussable, and open to revision.

A fair arrangement asks about the whole burden. What does each person carry, including work that is difficult to see? What does it cost in time, sleep, health, attention, opportunity,

and freedom? Who has access to rest? Who can change the arrangement? An apparently equal number of tasks may conceal very different demands.

Fairness also includes the conditions under which agreement is possible. Someone may say yes because they freely prefer a role. They may also say yes because they have no income, nowhere to go, or a reasonable fear of the response to refusal. The same words can describe very different degrees of choice. Consent to an arrangement deserves more attention than the absence of an argument.

We need not treat every difference as evidence of exploitation. People make real sacrifices for one another. Care during illness can be deeply chosen and temporarily unequal. The question is whether the person doing more remains a person with needs, support, influence, and a future, rather than becoming an endlessly renewable resource.

## **The work that becomes visible only when it stops**

Cooking a meal is one task. Remembering what is running out, deciding what can be prepared, accommodating a dietary need, and noticing that somebody has not eaten are other forms of work. A household can divide the visible activity while leaving its planning with one person.

Daminger's study makes it possible to ask a question that a completed chore can leave unanswered: who remained responsible for noticing, planning and checking? In interviews with 35 couples, women generally carried more of that cognitive work, with more equal participation in decision-making <sup>[3]</sup>. The finding does not describe every household. It directs this conversation toward responsibility for the task as a whole, including the work that continues after someone says they have helped.

Pew's 2023 analysis likewise found that similar earnings in opposite-sex marriages did not necessarily mean similar allocations of caregiving, housework, and leisure <sup>[4]</sup>. These are population findings, not a description of every couple. They invite us to examine the actual arrangement rather than assume that paid income or modern beliefs have already made it equal.

Taking responsibility for a task can mean carrying it from recognition through completion, not waiting to be managed. If one person must remind, explain, delegate, check, and repair, their partner's help may reduce the physical work while preserving the underlying management burden.

The manager may have work to do as well. They may find it difficult to relinquish a particular standard or permit a different competent approach. That concern deserves examination, provided it does not erase an actual imbalance. A preference about how a task is done is different from a medical requirement, a safety issue, or the expectation that agreed work will be completed.

With Mina and Peter, we can ask for the sequence before interpreting the relationship. Who noticed that another visit was needed? Who knew how to contact the clinic? Who checked the time, arranged transport, and remained available if something changed? Peter's driving belongs in the account. So does the evening Mina lost to arranging it. The inquiry may disclose work neither had fully recognized.

Mina adds, "I don't mind taking him. I like being with him. I mind that everything before and after becomes mine." That distinction protects something she values. Redistributing responsibility need not mean withdrawing care or proving that she never wanted the role. The next question concerns which parts she would choose, given a real opportunity to choose.

## **Why family therapy needed a feminist correction**

Systems thinking helps us recognize how responses influence one another. One person presses, another withdraws, and each makes the next response more likely. But a description of the cycle can become misleading when it ignores who controls resources, who carries the care, and whose refusal has consequences.

Rachel Hare-Mustin's feminist critique asked family therapists to examine how their own work could reinforce traditional sex roles. Virginia Goldner connected familiar family patterns with historical divisions between work and home, rather than treating them only as private dysfunction <sup>[5], [6]</sup>. These contributions change what we need to notice before recommending better communication.

Consider a partner repeatedly asking for more involvement with children. Calling them demanding while describing the other partner as overwhelmed may be accurate about their emotional states and still obscure the distribution of responsibility. Helping the first person become less urgent does not make the arrangement fairer if the second person remains free to postpone participation.

The reverse matters too. The person raising an important concern can use accusation, contempt, or intimidation. A legitimate grievance does not justify those actions. We can recognize an unequal burden and ask the overburdened person to speak without humiliation, while asking the other person to take more responsibility. Accountability need not become symmetrical to remain accurate.

The feminist correction is therefore a question about whose reality the explanation protects. Who is asked to adapt? Whose exhaustion becomes a symptom? Whose convenience remains a fact of life? A relationship can look peaceful because one person has stopped expecting their experience to matter.

These questions also apply to the treatment contract. Are we asking Mina to bring a complete list so Peter can choose from it? Does the person carrying less preparation receive

praise for participating while the person carrying more is asked to become less resentful? We may need a temporary account of the work. We should examine who is expected to produce that account and whether the assessment itself becomes another assignment for the more burdened partner.

## **We inherit a culture as well as a family**

Monica McGoldrick's work places families within cultural, historical, racial, economic, and generational contexts. Her attention to genograms and the stories around them widens the inquiry beyond an individual's defenses <sup>[7]</sup>. We can ask what a family taught about duty, money, gender, authority, belonging, and the right to differ.

In one family, care may mean making yourself available whenever somebody needs you. In another, respect may mean not asking too much. A religious community may offer strong support while prescribing different roles for men and women. Migration may make loyalty and mutual assistance essential, while leaving little room to discuss their costs. These possibilities need to be learned from the person, not assigned from their background.

Culture can hold wisdom, beauty, protection, and forms of interdependence that an individualistic account of freedom misses. It can also protect arrangements that silence some members. Understanding a tradition does not require deciding that everything inherited must remain unchanged. Questioning it need not mean rejecting the people who carried it.

A chosen division of roles can be meaningful. Its fairness depends on whether both people have real voice, access to resources, protection, and the ability to reconsider. A caregiving role should not make someone economically invisible. A provider role should not prohibit tenderness or dependence. The arrangement needs to remain responsive to the lives of the people within it.

This applies in same-sex relationships, relationships involving transgender or nonbinary people, and relationships outside a conventional marriage form. Power does not disappear when the old gender pairing changes. Differences in income, age, immigration status, disability, social acceptance, or familiarity with institutions can still shape whose needs are easiest to accommodate.

## **A history of marriage is not a template for every marriage**

Stephanie Coontz's historical work helps distinguish the persistence of an institution from the fairness of its arrangements. In her interview on feminism and marriage, she describes movement toward expecting women to be providers and men to be nurturers, while work structures often continue to assume an employee has someone else managing care <sup>[8]</sup>. Private negotiation occurs within those public conditions.

This helps explain why nostalgia can miss a cost. A marriage may have remained intact because people were devoted, because their roles fitted, because their community supported them, or because leaving was financially or socially impossible. Longevity alone does not tell us which. Nor does the ability to leave guarantee a satisfying relationship.

Some couples are trying to build a more mutual arrangement while lacking affordable care, reliable schedules, or sufficient income. Their difficulty is not necessarily that they have failed to communicate sensitively. The available choices may be inadequate. A fairer conversation can identify that shared constraint and seek support instead of assigning all the strain to one another.

The question becomes what we can change between us, what we need from outside, and what remains hard despite good faith. Equality at home and economic security are related concerns, but one does not automatically produce the other. Two exhausted people may need a different agreement and a less punishing environment.

Peter says that leaving work during the day could cost income they need. We take that constraint seriously and ask what remains possible around it. He might contact the clinic during an available break, handle transport planning outside work, or arrange another source of help. Mina's evening is also time with a cost. If the available hours cannot meet the actual care need, the formulation must include that shortage. Asking either partner for greater generosity cannot create hours neither has.

## **Men can carry real burdens without inequality becoming a myth**

Gloria Steinem's discussion of men as feminist allies emphasizes that restrictive gender roles can constrain men too <sup>[9]</sup>. The possibility is larger than one group granting kindness to another. More room for women's authority can coexist with more room for men's care, vulnerability, and participation in family life.

Warren Farrell, the author of *The Myth of Male Power*, asks us to attend to the costs of expectations that men provide, protect, and accept disposability <sup>[10]</sup>. That is a valuable question to bring into relationship. His broader argument that male power is a myth is a contested interpretation, not something the existence of men's suffering establishes.

A man may have less freedom to reduce paid work without shame and still have more influence over a household's money. A woman may depend economically on a partner and still exercise important emotional or relational influence. Burden and power need to be examined separately. Finding one does not tell us the whole distribution of the other.

If a man feels valued only for what he earns, that experience deserves care. If a woman feels that everything she does at home is assumed rather than recognized, that experience

deserves care. Neither has to become less real for the other to be heard. The next question is how the arrangement can change, and who has the capacity and authority to help change it.

Robert Bly's conversations with Bill Moyers invite attention to men's grief, fathers, and the need for emotional company<sup>[11]</sup>. I take from that work an invitation to make room for feeling and mentorship, rather than a rule about an essential masculine nature. No gender owns tenderness, courage, or grief, and no partner should become the sole place where another adult can have an emotional life.

Pew's 2025 report found similar levels of reported loneliness among men and women, while men were less likely to turn to a wider network for support<sup>[12]</sup>. The findings complicate a simple story of uniquely male loneliness. They also suggest a practical question: can friendship, community, and professional support share some of the load currently placed on a partnership?

In the room, this means listening for what provision has required of Peter without allowing his fatigue to settle whose time is available. We can ask whether being needed financially has also become the only place he feels competent or valued. If that fits his experience, it opens an emotional inquiry. It still leaves the appointment to be arranged. If it does not fit, his correction helps us return to the difficulty he actually reports.

## **Responsiveness matters and redistribution matters too**

Sue Johnson's attachment-oriented work places emotional accessibility and responsiveness at the center of connection<sup>[13]</sup>. The question beneath a practical disagreement may be whether a partner is available when it matters. Will you respond to my fear, my exhaustion, or my need for company? Can I reach you without becoming desperate?

That question can deepen a conversation. The argument about a task may also concern the experience of being alone in the shared life. Recognizing the loneliness can make an agreement more human. Yet an attachment explanation should not absorb the practical issue. A person may need responsive company and a partner who takes responsibility for the appointment.

Warmth can otherwise become a substitute for change. Someone listens tenderly, both feel close, and the same person resumes carrying the work. The reassurance is meaningful, but the arrangement remains. Conversely, a task can be redistributed while the giver conveys contempt, leaving the recipient feeling that their need is illegitimate.

Tatkin's emphasis on dependable shared functioning and Johnson's emphasis on responsiveness can therefore ask different questions of the same encounter. Does the care reach the person? Does the agreement make their life more workable? Neither question should disappear inside the other, and one theory need not settle which comes first in every situation.

The distinction can guide the next intervention. If Mina is trying to say that she feels alone and Peter can remain available, we may help him hear that experience before negotiating. If he understands and the work repeatedly returns to her, another account of her loneliness may add little. We need to examine the unfinished responsibility. If he lacks information or capacity, the next step may be learning or practical support. If he declines participation, the couple needs an honest account of that refusal and its consequences. These are clinical discriminations to test with them, not a universal order of treatment.

In *You Can Help Me Without Taking Charge of Me*, I explore support that preserves both people's agency. Here that support also needs a material form: time, effort, resources, decisions, and reliable return.

## **Desire and equality do not have to compete**

Esther Perel's writing challenges cultural scripts that make men and women simpler than they are <sup>[14]</sup>. Those scripts can tell a man that he should always want sex, a woman that desire must be secondary to care, or either partner that a particular role defines whether they are attractive. A person may feel deficient when their experience does not fit.

A more equal relationship does not require identical desires, styles, or preferred erotic roles. People can enjoy differences while retaining equal standing. A freely chosen sexual dynamic is different from a household arrangement in which one person cannot refuse, influence decisions, or change the terms.

Fairness must never become a claim on another person's body. Doing more chores, earning income, offering care, or feeling lonely does not purchase sexual access. At the same time, differences in desire can be discussed with seriousness and compassion. Neither the desire nor the refusal needs to be shamed for the conversation to remain honest.

Dependability can make room for play. Sharing responsibility may protect time and attention for pleasure, while a relationship still needs curiosity about what each person actually enjoys. We should not promise that a fairer division of labor will create desire. It can remove a burden without deciding the whole meaning of intimacy.

## **When politics enters the household**

The words equality, merit, freedom, tradition, and inclusion now carry strongly polarized meanings in U.S. political life. Arguments about progressive workplace culture and diversity, equity, and inclusion can become arguments about who is entitled to opportunity, whose effort is recognized, and whether noticing unequal conditions is fair or unfair.

The Trump administration's January 21, 2025 executive action explicitly framed its opposition to certain DEI practices in terms of discrimination and merit <sup>[15]</sup>. That document establishes the administration's political framing and actions at that date; it does not

establish that every diversity initiative is discriminatory. Programs differ, and their design and effects deserve specific examination.

A Pew report published in March 2026, using late-2025 surveys, found that 40% of Republicans and Republican-leaning adults considered promoting racial and ethnic diversity in workplaces important, compared with 87% of Democrats and Democratic-leaning adults [16]. This question concerns workplace diversity, not endorsement of every DEI program. It shows a substantial partisan division without telling us how a particular couple treats one another.

Here is where that public dispute may enter a private relationship. One person hears an equity argument as the claim that their hard work does not count. Another hears opposition to it as indifference to the barriers they have experienced. Each may begin defending an identity before understanding the particular concern. This is a possible relational interpretation, not a causal finding from the survey.

A criticism of a particular hiring or training policy does not by itself establish hostility to another group. Nor does professing progressive values establish that someone practices fairness at home. A conservative partner may share care reliably and respect difference. A progressive partner may speak fluently about oppression while expecting somebody else to manage the household. Political language and everyday conduct both need examination.

We can ask what each person means, which claim they are making, what evidence would matter, and what the disagreement changes in the shared life. Sometimes the issue concerns policy design. Sometimes it concerns a relative's dignity, a child's identity, discrimination at work, or whether a partner believes the other's account of mistreatment. These are different conversations and may have different stakes.

Respectful discussion does not require treating another person's basic humanity as an open bargaining question. You can examine a disputed policy without humiliating a group, threatening a partner, or dismissing their right to safety. A person need not stay in a degrading conversation to demonstrate tolerance.

Nor should political disagreement automatically become a clinical diagnosis. People arrive at beliefs through family, faith, experience, economic insecurity, community, and information sources. Understanding those contexts can improve the conversation without requiring agreement. Some differences can be lived with; others reveal incompatible commitments. The task is to discover which, rather than promise that better listening can resolve every conflict.

## **Generations inherit different questions and contain different answers**

A person whose family organized love around provision and endurance may hear a request for explicit negotiation as distrust. Someone who learned that fairness includes naming emotional work may hear unquestioned duty as an invitation to disappear. Each may be using the language in which care first became recognizable.

Baby Boomers, Generation X, Millennials, and Generation Z have encountered different public conversations about marriage, work, gender, sexuality, and mental health. But these labels cannot tell us what an individual believes. Class, race, religion, region, family structure, and personal experience intersect with age, and many older people have long challenged unequal roles while many younger people value traditional ones.

The younger pattern is particularly worth keeping open. Pew's 2025 report on a fall-2024 survey found that 57% of teens thought children with two parents were just as well off when both had jobs, while 43% preferred one parent focusing on the family. Within that latter group, a majority preferred the mother to be the parent at home <sup>[17]</sup>. These are opinions, not findings about child outcomes or a description of all young adults.

Generational change is therefore not a straight march toward one model. A younger person may welcome shared authority and still expect a man to carry financial provision. They may speak readily about boundaries and feel unsure about durable obligations. An older person may struggle with new terminology while offering dependable care and a genuine willingness to learn. The contradictions deserve inquiry rather than caricature.

Pew's methodological work distinguishes effects of age, historical period, and birth cohort <sup>[18]</sup>. That matters in relationships too. What appears to be a generational belief may partly reflect having children, providing elder care, facing retirement, or entering an uncertain labor market. The useful question is how this person's expectations were formed and whether those expectations still fit the present arrangement.

An intergenerational conversation might ask what endurance made possible for a parent and what it cost them. A younger adult might explain what naming a boundary protects and what responsibilities they still accept. Both can learn without having to rank an entire generation as either wiser or more enlightened.

## **The arrangement can feel old even when the problem is current**

The therapist wonders whether Mina has learned that asking makes her troublesome. It is a plausible hypothesis, and it is easy to move toward the history before discovering whether the hypothesis fits. We might ask, "What do you expect would happen if you asked Peter to carry this?"

“I do ask,” Mina replies. “I’m not afraid to ask. I’m tired of having to know everything before I can ask.”

Her correction changes the formulation. The immediate difficulty concerns responsibility for knowing, rather than a prohibited need. There may still be a history of becoming the reliable person, but it has not been established by this exchange. We can answer, “I was moving toward what makes asking difficult. You’re telling me that asking is already work you have been doing. Let’s stay with that.” The return matters because the practical concern can otherwise disappear inside an interpretation that sounds empathic.

Later, Mina may remember being valued for anticipating everyone’s needs, or Peter may recognize a family rule that provision excused other forms of care. Either account can deepen understanding if it belongs to the person’s experience. Neither is required before the present arrangement can change.

Winnicott’s account of accommodation and spontaneous expression offers a further question about the room available within a valued role <sup>[19]</sup>. With Mina, that could mean discovering whether she can enjoy caring for Peter’s father while expressing a limit on the planning. With Peter, it could mean making room for uncertainty within a role organized around competence and provision. These are possible applications of the theory, to be explored with them. Neither person’s care becomes false because it has also constrained them.

IFS offers an optional way to hear competing concerns <sup>[20]</sup>. Mina might want to hand over the arrangements and want to check them. Peter might want to contribute and resent being instructed. We can ask what each response is trying to prevent, while allowing simpler language or a different explanation. The aim is a considered action the person can own. Naming a protective concern cannot transfer responsibility for the action to a part.

Bowen’s differentiation framework adds the capacity to hold a position while remaining connected and open to influence <sup>[21]</sup>. Peter can retain his account of a difficult working week and revise his assumption that Mina’s evening was available. Mina can accept that his schedule limits one proposal without abandoning the need for a different division. Dependence and a thoughtful position can coexist. Opposition alone gives us little information about either person’s capacity to participate.

In *The Echo Within*, I explore how preserving connection can become a gradual loss of room for oneself. In *When Someone Else’s Pain Becomes Your Assignment*, I distinguish responsive care from becoming wholly responsible for another person’s inner life. Fairness needs both distinctions, along with an honest account of the responsibilities we really do share.

## The therapist's place in deciding what is fair

Fairness invites us into a position of authority. One partner may look toward us after every disputed detail, hoping we will finally establish what counts. We may share their wish, especially when an invisible burden resembles work we have carried. Or we may identify with the partner who feels that no effort is enough. Our response can organize the assessment before we have recognized its personal meaning.

Aponte and Kissil's Person-of-the-Therapist model emphasizes purposeful use of the therapist's personal themes in contact with clients <sup>[28]</sup>. Here, supervision might ask why we keep translating Mina's complaint into a more acceptable request, or why Peter's account has become difficult for us to hear. The question is how our participation affects whose experience can influence the work.

Suppose Mina asks, "Can you just tell him this isn't fair?" We can acknowledge the burden already described and remain specific about what is known. Peter's disagreement does not erase that work. Nor does our alliance with Mina establish every claim she makes. We need enough authority to name an unequal arrangement and enough openness to revise our account.

We can also become the household's new manager: assigning tasks, reminding Peter, and inviting Mina to report back. That may produce temporary compliance while leaving responsibility attached to someone else's supervision. The clinical question is what support enables ownership, and how we will recognize whether that ownership continues beyond our involvement. Consultation helps us examine the pull to adjudicate without making the couple responsible for reassuring us.

## Feeling powerless and understanding power

When Peter says the planning questions feel controlling, we begin by asking what he experiences and which conduct he means. Does he feel watched while learning a task? Is Mina checking a requirement that has previously been missed? Has she made his every choice subject to approval? Feeling, agreement, and enforcement need separate descriptions. We ask who can influence the decision, who has access to information and resources, and what happens when either person disagrees.

Earlier relationships may affect what a present request means. Andersen and Chen's account of the relational self offers a framework for considering how significant-other representations can become active in later encounters <sup>[27]</sup>. We can ask whether Peter is answering Mina's current question or an expectation that accepting one request will lead to unlimited supervision. We also ask what Mina has actually required. The hypothesis becomes useful through that comparison, not through the intensity of his reaction.

The influence can also run in the other direction. An arrangement may feel normal because unequal authority has always been familiar. A person may minimize financial restriction or repeated humiliation rather than recognize its significance. Someone accustomed to making every decision may experience shared authority as a loss of freedom. That discomfort is real, but it does not by itself establish that being asked to share decisions is oppressive. Present unfairness, historical expectation, and the strain of changing an arrangement can coexist.

Differentiation helps the inquiry remain open. In Bowen's account, a thoughtful position can include realistic dependence and responsiveness to other people <sup>[21]</sup>. Applied here, Peter might say, "I want to choose how I arrange the transport, and I accept that the medical requirement needs to be met." Mina might reply, "I can leave the route to you. I still need to know that the requirement has been included." Whether either has crossed into unnecessary supervision depends on the terms and conduct, not on who speaks more confidently.

This matters when protective responses pull in opposite directions. One response may insist that keeping love requires compliance; another may insist that any obligation threatens freedom. Neither response has to become the whole person's position. There may be room to acknowledge both the fear of disappearing and the responsibility to participate in a shared life. A limit can be clear and still considerate. Accepting help can be a thoughtful choice. Accountability can coexist with self-respect.

**Fictional illustration:** A partner asks that purchases from shared savings be discussed first. The other feels a sudden loss of autonomy. They examine the agreement: both have access to the account, the rule applies equally, each retains personal spending money, and either can propose changes. The feeling may connect with earlier experiences of having every choice supervised. Recognizing that possibility helps the person explain the fear and negotiate an agreement rather than treating the feeling alone as proof of domination. The request still needs evaluation: its scope, their resources, and how it is enforced all matter.

Now imagine a different arrangement: one partner conceals accounts, permits only their own spending, and threatens consequences when questioned. A calm explanation of the arrangement does not make it fair. Asking the other person to become more differentiated would not supply the missing access or remove the retaliation. Confidential support and practical options may be needed before a shared conversation is possible.

Differentiation should remain an invitation to examine our own participation, rather than a label we use to discredit someone else. Telling a partner that their concern is simply their trauma can repeat the experience of not being heard. Equally, understanding why a request feels threatening does not erase the impact of refusing every shared responsibility. The work is to become more accurate about both the inner experience and the present relationship.

## **Sensitivity to feeling does not require surrendering judgment**

We may notice a tightened voice, abrupt explanation, or sudden wish to end the conversation. Damasio's somatic-marker hypothesis and Schore's developmental synthesis make embodied experience relevant to understanding how a decision becomes charged [22], [23]. They cannot identify the motive or fairness of an action from its bodily accompaniment. We ask the person what became difficult and what would help them stay able to consider the issue.

Siegel's integrative work similarly keeps mind and relationship in conversation, while Panksepp's affective neuroscience gives feeling a broader evolutionary context [24], [25]. Their place here is to resist treating emotion as an irrelevant obstacle. They do not establish a neural explanation of a particular household conflict or make a soothing exercise a measurement of secure functioning.

We can slow the encounter without making calm a condition for being heard. If Mina is tearful, we can ask whether she wants a pause, company with the feeling, or help keeping the work in view. If Peter becomes quiet, we need to discover whether he is thinking, withdrawing, or unable to take in the exchange. A usable pace helps each retain access to judgment. It does not settle the dispute.

The principle in *Meet Me Before You Move Me* helps here. Recognition can make a conversation less lonely, while leaving room for correction and another perspective. It need not require either partner to accept the other's interpretation as the whole truth.

## **A different agreement may bring grief as well as relief**

Changing a role can mean losing something it provided. The person who has been indispensable may feel less valued when responsibility is shared. The person who has controlled decisions may feel exposed when another person gains influence. Someone may feel sadness about how long their own needs remained secondary. These responses deserve company while the arrangement changes.

A fairer arrangement can unsettle the place each person has known how to occupy. One may miss being indispensable; another may feel exposed by having to ask rather than decide. We can give these experiences a place without making the return of the old arrangement their remedy. The useful question is what support would help each person participate in the new agreement.

There can be something tender in discovering that another person is willing to carry work one had assumed was theirs alone. There can also be mistrust: will they follow through? Fosha and Thoma's clinical account of metatherapeutic processing invites attention to the experience of helpful change [26]. With Mina, we might ask what felt different when Peter contacted the clinic himself, if she wants to reflect on it. Relief, sadness, suspicion, or no

discernible emotional shift can each be explored without deciding in advance what care should produce.

The reflection remains attached to conduct. A welcome action may disclose how long someone has waited for it. We can accompany that sadness while recognizing the current contribution. If Peter hears the sadness as evidence that nothing helps, we can distinguish appreciation for what occurred from grief about what preceded it. If the promised action does not occur, the next task is to revisit the agreement and its conditions. An invitation to receive cannot supply missing care.

## **A manageable experiment in shared responsibility**

With Mina and Peter, the first experiment may be making the appointment work visible rather than immediately transferring it. They each describe what they know and have done. Where their accounts differ, we keep the uncertainty available. The aim is enough shared understanding to choose a feasible change, rather than a complete history of who has contributed more.

If they want to proceed, Peter proposes taking the next scheduling and transport responsibility. We ask what that includes, what information he needs, and what the clinic permits him to arrange. His father's preferences, privacy, and required care remain part of the plan. Peter's work schedule may require a different call time or practical assistance. Essential checks remain in place; we do not put another person's care at risk to discover whether a partner will follow through.

Mina says she will write everything down. Peter says he can ask the clinic for the information he needs. We distinguish information only Mina has from work Peter can reasonably take up himself. A short handover may be necessary. If she must research and prepare every decision, the proposed transfer is incomplete. If she holds a preference about the route, that can remain different from a required medical instruction. We help them identify what must be met and where Peter can choose a competent method.

Before they try the agreement, each names a prediction. Mina expects to feel drawn to check and hopes to have an evening that is genuinely available. Peter expects uncertainty and hopes to manage without repeated prompting. They specify when arrangements need to be confirmed, how an obstacle will be communicated, and when they want to review the attempt. They can decline, narrow the task, rehearse privately, or seek other support. Threats, retaliation, or fear would change the clinical task toward confidential assessment and practical protection; they are not conditions for a joint test of trust.

In the later fictional review, Peter has contacted the clinic, arranged transport, and attended the visit with his father. Mina checked once. She says, "I didn't have to carry that part. I still had to tell your sister what was happening and work out what came next." Peter says he had thought the task was finished when they returned home.

There is a real contribution and an incomplete transfer. We ask about both. Mina's checking could reflect caution after earlier disappointments, missing information in this agreement, a preferred standard, or a combination. It is worth examining without turning it into the explanation for every task she still carries. Peter's follow-through provides evidence about this attempt. It does not establish the whole division of labor as fair.

The result revises the agreement: communicating with relatives and tracking follow-up had remained outside Peter's understanding of the task. They can now decide who will carry those stages and whether his schedule allows it. Mina may choose to remain involved in a part she values. Choosing it requires an answerable alternative, rather than discovering that it returns to her whenever nobody else acts. Peter may need to learn more, change the scope, or say honestly what he cannot undertake.

If the appointment had remained unarranged, we would need a different review. Was an obstacle communicated? Was information missing? Was the scope unrealistic? Did Peter agree in the room and then avoid the responsibility? An explanation informs the response but does not make the unfinished work disappear. If he is unwilling to carry it, Mina needs that fact for her own decisions; another practice in asking more gently cannot guarantee participation.

We also distinguish a task still pending from a broken agreement, private rehearsal from an actual exchange, and a freely declined experiment from failed treatment. An accurate review may lead to continuing the arrangement, revising it, seeking outside help, or recognizing a limit the couple cannot currently resolve. The learning lies in what the result permits them to understand and decide.

## **Bringing the five modules into clinical work**

The Power, Fairness, and Shared Responsibility pathway offers places to continue these inquiries between sessions. Its five modules support noticing, understanding, experiment, practice, and reflection. They do not prescribe the order of a couple's readiness or replace assessment of the relationship in which the practice will occur.

What Is Fair in Our Shared Life? makes the full responsibility visible, alongside costs, capacities, and influence. With Mina and Peter, naming scheduling as work comes before deciding who will do it. The observation can correct "nothing is shared" as well as "we already share it equally."

The Rules We Learned About Love and Responsibility considers a prediction about asking, giving, or autonomy. Mina's correction—asking is already work she does—keeps an assumed history from organizing the next step. A memory may deepen the inquiry; current conduct remains relevant whether a memory appears or not.

Feeling Controlled and Understanding Actual Power separates the experience of pressure from the terms of a request, access to resources, and the consequences of refusal. A jointly chosen purchase threshold may need updating. Concealed accounts and retaliation require a different response. Neither the worksheet nor a calm discussion establishes safety.

Staying Yourself While Sharing Responsibility connects a position with something the person can honor. Peter may be unable to host overnight and able to arrange a ride. A real contribution can coexist with disappointment about a separate need. Mina need not become pleased before he acts; his limit does not require her to stop needing help.

Agreements That Become Reliable Care returns to what actually happened. The visit occurred; coordination with relatives remained with Mina. That result makes the next agreement more specific. The review includes helpful, unchanged, mixed, harder, pending, rehearsed, declined, and untried outcomes. Private notes remain theirs to share or keep. A changed questionnaire response cannot settle how much influence, rest, or responsibility has changed in their lives.

## **Fairness becomes believable through repetition**

When Mina and Peter next discuss a visit, the useful change may be quiet. Peter notices a follow-up is due and asks his father about arranging it. Mina has an evening available and decides how to use it. She may still feel an impulse to check. He may still want recognition for an unfamiliar effort. Those responses can be understood while the responsibility remains where they agreed to place it.

A future difficulty will ask whether the arrangement can be revised without making one person's need an accusation or the other's limit a disappearance. The work has made a difference if both have more real opportunity to influence that revision and a clearer account of what they will carry. Continued affection, relief, or equal approval of the therapist cannot substitute for those observations.

Our histories, cultures, politics, and generations help shape what we recognize as care. They do not have to write every agreement that follows. We can retain loyalty, tradition, desire, and meaningful responsibility while reconsidering who carries their costs. We can take men's pain seriously without dismissing women's inequality, and recognize structural inequality without making a particular person only an example of it.

The relationship we are trying to build has room for two realities, accurate responsibility, and a shared life that neither person must disappear to sustain. Its fairness is not settled by a declaration of love or a political identity. It becomes visible in what we are willing to notice, hear, carry, change, and keep doing when the conversation is over.

## Sources and further reading

Clinical frameworks, historical scholarship, feminist argument, cultural interpretation, surveys, and neuroscience contribute different kinds of understanding. The clinical sequencing and practical criteria are my integrative proposals, not a validated treatment algorithm. Mina and Peter are fictional; their encounter extends the educational appointment example. Selected originals, official accounts, interviews and abstracts were consulted, with reading limits recorded separately. These sources do not establish BKL's effectiveness as a treatment.

1. Tatkin, S. Interview with Ruth Wetherford. Stan Tatkin on Psychobiological Couples Therapy. Clinical account of secure functioning and a mutually protective contract. Interview.
2. PACT Institute (8 April 2026). What Successful Couples Do Differently When Navigating Conflict. Official explanation of collaboration, mutuality, and fair agreements. Article.
3. Daminger, A. (2019). The cognitive dimension of household labor. *American Sociological Review*, 84, 609–633. Qualitative study of 35 couples. Original abstract.
4. Fry, R., Aragão, C., Hurst, K., & Parker, K. (13 April 2023). In a Growing Share of U.S. Marriages, Husbands and Wives Earn About the Same. Population analysis of opposite-sex marriages and time use. Pew report.
5. Hare-Mustin, R. T. (1978). A feminist approach to family therapy. *Family Process*, 17, 181–194. Feminist clinical critique. Abstract.
6. Goldner, V. (1985). Feminism and family therapy. *Family Process*, 24, 31–47. Power, history, and the work-family division. Abstract.
7. Amorin-Woods, D. (2024). Genograms, culture, love and sisterhood: A conversation with Monica McGoldrick. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*. Cultural and gender context; interview. Publisher article.
8. Coontz, S. Why Feminism Was Good for Marriage. Author-hosted historical interview. Interview. See also *The New Instability* for the distinction between changing gender relations and economic inequality. Essay.
9. Steinem, G. Interview with Marianne Schnall (5 December 2006). Gender roles and men as feminist allies; political and ethical argument. Feminist.com interview.
10. Farrell, W. (1993). The Myth of Male Power. Provider and protector burdens; a contested interpretive argument. Author's book account.
11. Bly, R., with Bill Moyers (8 January 1990). A Gathering of Men. Grief, fatherhood, and emotional company; cultural and poetic perspective. Broadcast transcript.
12. Goddard, I., & Parker, K. (16 January 2025). Men, Women and Social Connections. Survey conducted September 2024; support networks and reported loneliness. Pew report.
13. Johnson, S. Science with Sue, Episodes 1 and 2. Accessibility, responsiveness, and emotional patterns; official descriptions of clinical teaching. Episode overview.

14. Perel, E. Breaking Free from Gender Expectations. Author essay on cultural scripts and individual variation. Essay.
15. The White House (21 January 2025). Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity. Primary policy document, cited for its stated framing and actions at that date. Executive action.
16. Hurst, K. (25 March 2026). How Americans View Racial Diversity Ahead of the Country's 250th Anniversary. Late-2025 surveys; political differences in workplace-diversity attitudes. Pew report.
17. Hatfield, J. (30 April 2025). Are Children Better Off When One Parent Has a Job or When Both Do. Teen attitudes from a fall-2024 survey; questions concern two-parent families. Pew report.
18. Lau, A., & Kennedy, C. (22 May 2023). Assessing the Effects of Generation Using Age-Period-Cohort Analysis. Methodological account. Pew analysis.
19. Winnicott, D. W. (1960; published 1965). Ego Distortion in Terms of True and False Self. Accommodation and spontaneous expression; psychoanalytic theory. Collected Works record and abstract.
20. IFS Institute. The Internal Family Systems Model Outline. Optional language for protective concerns; clinical model. Official outline.
21. The Bowen Center for the Study of the Family. Differentiation of Self. Connected self-definition and openness to influence; clinical theory. Official account.
22. Damasio, A. R. (1996). The somatic marker hypothesis and the possible functions of the prefrontal cortex. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 351, 1413–1420. Decision-making hypothesis. Abstract.
23. Schore, A. N. (2000). Attachment and the regulation of the right brain. *Attachment & Human Development*, 2, 23–47. Developmental synthesis. Abstract.
24. Siegel, D. J. (2020). *The Developing Mind*, third edition. Integrative background on mind and relationship. Publisher overview.
25. Panksepp, J. (2010). Affective neuroscience of the emotional BrainMind: Evolutionary perspectives and implications for understanding depression. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*, 12, 533–545. Cross-species emotion framework. Abstract.
26. Fosha, D., & Thoma, N. (2020). Metatherapeutic processing supports the emergence of flourishing in psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy*, 57, 323–339. Clinical primer with case illustrations. Abstract.
27. Andersen, S. M., & Chen, S. (2002). The relational self: An interpersonal social-cognitive theory. *Psychological Review*, 109, 619–645. Framework for significant-other representations and interpersonal transference. Abstract.
28. Aponte, H. J., & Kissil, K. (2014). "If I can grapple with this I can truly be of use in the therapy room": Using the therapist's own emotional struggles to facilitate effective therapy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 40(2), 152–164. Person-of-the-Therapist model; publisher abstract consulted. Original record and abstract.