

If You Loved Me, Wouldn't You See It My Way?

How to Make Room for Another Person Without Giving Up Your Own Experience

Brian Kennedy, MA, LMFT

You want to spend Sunday with family. Your partner wants an afternoon at home. At first, this is a disagreement about plans. Then something shifts. Their reluctance begins to feel like a judgment about what matters to you. Your insistence begins to feel, to them, like a refusal to recognize how exhausted they are. Soon you are discussing whether either of you cares, although the question that started the conversation was where to spend an afternoon.

The argument may carry an unspoken hope: if you loved me, you would understand this as I do. Agreement would make the relationship feel secure again. But your partner may be hoping for the same thing. Each person waits for the other to change position so that closeness can return, and difference becomes something neither can afford to leave unresolved.

Love does involve responsiveness. We need relationships in which our concerns have consequences, our needs receive consideration, and commitments mean something. We also need room for the person we love to have a mind we cannot fully predict or control. Learning to live with difference involves both: allowing another person's experience to exist and deciding responsibly what the actual difference requires.

When Disagreement Becomes Personal

A disagreement can touch something larger than its subject. A different opinion may bring a familiar feeling of being dismissed, corrected, or left alone. The chest tightens; an explanation becomes urgent; a small disappointment begins to carry the weight of many others. We may hear "I do not agree" as "Your experience does not matter."

Attachment theory offers one way to understand why conflict can become entangled with questions about availability and connection. Mikulincer and Shaver's account of adult attachment examines how expectations about ourselves and others shape emotion regulation and couple relationships (2016). In everyday clinical work, this can help us ask whether we are responding only to the present disagreement or also to what we fear it says about the bond.

History is one possibility, not a complete explanation. A person who has repeatedly been ignored may be responding accurately to another dismissal. Sleep deprivation, illness, financial pressure, or an unfair division of work can make an ordinary disagreement harder to bear. Before deciding that someone is overly sensitive, we need to know what has happened, what keeps happening, and what practical burden they are carrying.

It can help to separate the event from its meaning. “You declined the visit” describes a choice. “My family means nothing to you” describes an interpretation. The interpretation may contain an important concern, but checking it gives us more information than treating it as settled. We can ask about the family relationship while still addressing the immediate plan.

The Hope That Love Will Make Us Alike

Early closeness often comes with the pleasure of apparent similarity. We finish each other’s sentences, discover shared tastes, and feel relieved that someone understands. Differences may seem small or even charming. Later, a different pace, religious conviction, sexual preference, or approach to money becomes harder to overlook because a shared life gives it consequences.

Sometimes we discover that what looked like agreement was accommodation. One person preferred the other’s happiness to another discussion. Sometimes both people changed. Sometimes they understood the same promise differently. These possibilities deserve examination before either person concludes that the relationship was false or that the other has become unreasonable.

There can also be grief in discovering the limits of being known. A partner may understand why something matters and still be unable to want it. That does not make the wish unimportant. It does mean we may need to express disappointment, seek other sources of participation, or face a consequential incompatibility. More explanation cannot guarantee a shared desire.

Understanding Is Different From Agreement

Consider a familiar exchange: “I understand why you were hurt, but that is not what I meant.” Depending on what follows, this can be an opening or an escape. If the speaker remains interested in the effect of their conduct, intention and impact can both be examined. If the sentence ends the discussion, the acknowledgment may offer very little.

Understanding involves making an honest effort to grasp another person’s experience. Agreement involves accepting a particular interpretation, claim, or proposed action. We can understand why a comment hurt without agreeing that it was intended to humiliate. We can disagree about intention while taking responsibility for careless words. We can acknowledge someone’s fear while declining the restrictions they want that fear to justify.

Jessica Benjamin’s work on mutual recognition asks how two people can remain subjects with experiences of their own (1988). Applied to disagreement, the challenge is to allow another person’s reality to affect us without requiring either person to disappear. Recognition becomes more substantial when it changes how we listen, what we acknowledge, or what we do.

This distinction needs care. “That is your reality” can become a way to avoid facts or responsibility. Whether a bill was paid, an agreement was kept, or a threatening message was sent cannot be settled solely by affirming two perspectives. Experience deserves respect; factual claims still require evidence, and conduct still requires accountability.

Curiosity That Can Actually Learn Something

A question can sound open while carrying a preferred answer. “Why can’t you see how selfish this is?” invites a defense more than a discovery. Even “Help me understand” can become a demand for the explanation that will finally satisfy us. Genuine curiosity leaves room for information we did not anticipate and may not enjoy.

John Stuart Mill wrote, “He who knows only his own side of the case, knows little of that” (1859, chapter 2). His subject was freedom of thought and discussion, rather than couples therapy. Yet the invitation is useful here: learning another position may clarify the limits and strengths of our own.

Porter and Schumann found that intellectual humility was associated with greater openness to opposing views in studies of imagined disagreements and political perspectives (2018). These studies do not establish a method for resolving couple conflict. They offer a reason to value the ability to consider that our knowledge is incomplete, even when we have a firmly held position.

An everyday question might be, “What am I missing about why this matters to you?” After listening, we can check what we understood and state our continuing view. We may change our mind, discover a practical constraint, or understand more while remaining opposed. Curiosity does not require a particular outcome, and another person need not disclose private history to earn the right to disagree.

When We Need Our Explanation to Be Right

It is easier to notice a partner’s selective reasoning than our own. We remember the examples that confirm they never listen and lose track of occasions when they did. We may also minimize a repeated problem because acknowledging it would require a painful decision. The conclusion we want can shape what we look for.

Ziva Kunda’s review of motivated reasoning describes how desired conclusions can influence the way people access and evaluate information, within the limits of explanations they can find plausible (1990). This is a broad account of reasoning, not a diagnosis of either partner. It invites an uncomfortable question: what evidence would I find harder to notice because of what it would ask me to reconsider?

The answer may concern either hope or blame. Perhaps I need my partner to be the entire problem so I do not have to acknowledge my contribution. Perhaps I need the conflict to be entirely my fault so I can preserve the belief that changing myself will solve it. A more useful account makes room for evidence that complicates both stories.

Remaining Connected While Holding a Position

Bowen’s differentiation framework concerns maintaining a self within important relationships (1978). It includes dependence and participation, as well as the ability to think and choose under relationship pressure. In disagreement, it offers a way to consider whether we can remain involved without making another person’s approval the condition for having a view.

This can sound ordinary: “I understand why you want to go. I am too tired to join this time, and I want us to make a workable plan.” Or, “I hear that you prefer to leave it alone. I still need us to address the unpaid bill.” A position becomes clearer when it names the issue, the relevant responsibility, and what the person is actually willing to do.

There is a different danger in using independence to avoid influence. “I am allowed my opinion” may be true while leaving shared consequences unaddressed. A partner’s concern may reveal a blind spot, an unfair arrangement, or a responsibility we have neglected. Remaining ourselves includes being able to reconsider, apologize, and make a commitment.

A pause can help when the conversation has become repetitive or overwhelming. Its usefulness depends partly on what happens afterward. Leaving necessary care unsupported or repeatedly postponing an important concern creates another problem. Where a return is possible, naming a realistic time and a specific issue gives the pause a purpose.

What Kind of Difference Are We Facing?

Some differences concern preferences that can coexist. One person likes crowds; the other prefers quiet. Separate outings may work well. Other differences involve limited resources or shared duties: who rests, who takes the children, how money is spent, and whose work is interrupted. These require an arrangement that accounts for the actual costs.

A broken commitment raises a different question. If someone agreed to provide care and did not, the discussion needs to include what was promised and how the consequences will be addressed. Describing this as a difference in personality may obscure responsibility. Likewise, a disagreement about whether to have children cannot necessarily be solved by dividing time more evenly.

Overall and McNulty’s review of conflict communication emphasizes the importance of context, including the seriousness of a problem and whether change is possible (2017). Warmth can support connection, but warmth alone may leave a substantial problem untouched. A direct discussion can clarify what must change, while unnecessary harshness can make a manageable difference more damaging.

The practical question is therefore specific: are we trying to coordinate preferences, meet a need, repair an agreement, establish facts, or consider incompatible commitments? Sometimes several are present. Naming them separately helps us avoid trying to solve every difficulty through reassurance or every disappointment through confrontation.

Acceptance That Still Leaves Room for Change

Integrative Behavioral Couple Therapy brings acceptance strategies together with work toward change, attending to the partners and the context of their interaction (Christensen & Doss, 2017). This offers a useful counterweight to the expectation that a relationship becomes workable only when one person finally stops being different.

Acceptance may begin with acknowledging a fact: my partner has a different pace; this discussion has not changed their wish; our current arrangement is exhausting one of us. Acknowledgment permits a more realistic decision. It does not require approval, forgiveness, continued contact, or a conclusion that nothing can change.

Accommodation can be generous and freely chosen. We may attend an event we would not choose ourselves because participation matters to someone we love. We may also need to adjust an arrangement that repeatedly asks one person to absorb the inconvenience. The question is whether the choice remains workable, open to revision, and responsive to both people's circumstances.

An experiment can be modest. Try separate plans for one afternoon, clarify who will carry a shared task, or rehearse a request privately before making it. Decide what would show whether the arrangement helped, when to review it, and what would make it necessary to stop. A calm conversation is encouraging; the actual follow-through tells us whether the plan works.

Whose Difference Is Allowed to Matter?

Advice about tolerating disagreement can sound evenhanded while overlooking power. One person may control the money, housing, or access to transportation. One may be expected to anticipate everyone's feelings while the other is praised for stating a preference. An agreement reached under those conditions needs closer examination than the words "we both chose it" provide.

Knudson-Martin's account of power in couple relationships emphasizes shared relational responsibility, vulnerability, attunement, and influence, while warning against assuming partners are already equal (2013). This directs attention toward whose concerns change the arrangement and who is expected to do the work of maintaining connection.

Gender, culture, religion, class, disability, and family obligations can all shape what each person feels entitled to ask or refuse. These influences do not establish a person's motives or make every duty oppressive. They help us ask whether a valued commitment is shared, whether options are materially available, and whether one person's freedom depends on another person's unrecognized labor.

Coercion, intimidation, violence, and fear of retaliation require attention in their own right. A threatening response to disagreement is not simply an enduring difference to accommodate. Joint reflection may increase risk under those conditions; confidential individual support and attention to immediate safety take priority. Mutual influence does not make responsibility for harmful conduct equal.

Making Room for the Difference That Remains

Some conversations end with greater understanding and a remaining disappointment. We may know more about why a partner cannot offer something and still feel its absence. Allowing that grief can reduce the pressure to force agreement, but it does not determine what we should choose. There may be a livable arrangement, a need for further support, or a limit that remains important.

Return to the Sunday disagreement. Perhaps one person visits family alone while the other rests, and both feel considered. Perhaps the plan reveals that one partner is always expected to give up family time. Perhaps a promised return to the discussion never happens. Each result changes what can responsibly be concluded; the original explanation should remain open to revision.

There may be a second learning after the practical review. Having been heard might feel unfamiliar, welcome or insufficient. Naming a remaining limit might bring grief, or relief that you no longer have to pretend. Give that response enough attention to know what the conversation changed for you. It need not become another task for your partner to complete. You can appreciate an accurate understanding and still ask for a concrete change, or discover that the better understanding has made a consequential difference clearer. The next step should follow those observations rather than the expectation that a thoughtful conversation must end with closeness.

The Living With Difference pathway follows one such encounter through noticing its meaning, maintaining contact, asking a genuine question, considering the practical issue, and reviewing a choice. You can use a manageable disagreement, a fictional example, or private reflection. The work does not require a major relationship decision or a conversation you do not want to have.

Over time, difference may become less automatically a verdict on love and more something we can examine. We can seek reassurance, receive influence, hold a position, and acknowledge a limit. A relationship has more room to breathe when disagreement does not erase care, and care does not erase the substance of the disagreement.

Clinical Foundations and Further Reading

This article draws on attachment research, family systems theory, relational psychoanalysis, conflict communication research, and acceptance-based couple therapy. Research on intellectual humility and motivated reasoning provides broader context; Mill's contribution is philosophical. The examples and suggested practices are educational interpretations. Evidence for the approaches informing this article does not establish the effectiveness of BKL's Living With Difference pathway.

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2016). *Attachment in Adulthood: Structure, Dynamics, and Change* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Bowen, M. (1978). *Family Therapy in Clinical Practice*. Jason Aronson.

Benjamin, J. (1988). *The Bonds of Love: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and the Problem of Domination*. Pantheon Books.

Mill, J. S. (1859). *On Liberty*. John W. Parker and Son.

Porter, T., & Schumann, K. (2018). Intellectual humility and openness to the opposing view. *Self and Identity*, 17(2), 139-162.

Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3), 480-498.

Overall, N. C., & McNulty, J. K. (2017). What type of communication during conflict is beneficial for intimate relationships? *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 13, 1-5.

Christensen, A., & Doss, B. D. (2017). Integrative behavioral couple therapy. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 13, 111-114.

Knudson-Martin, C. (2013). Why power matters: Creating a foundation of mutual support in couple relationships. *Family Process*, 52(1), 5-18.