

When Love Does Not Make Us Alike

Differentiation, otherness, and the grief of a relationship with someone real

Brian Kennedy, MA, LMFT · Therapist companion to **Living With Difference** · 2026

“She understands why it matters,” a client says. “That’s what I don’t understand. If she really gets it, why doesn’t she want to come?”

His partner has listened. She knows that Sunday dinners with his family mean continuity, belonging, and the pleasure of bringing the people he loves together. She also wants some Sundays at home. They have discussed schedules, exhaustion, and compromise. Yet her continuing preference seems to undo the understanding he thought they had reached.

For her, another conversation brings a different fear: that being understood will eventually require wanting what he wants. She can describe his longing sympathetically and still feel herself disappearing beneath the expectation that sympathy should produce agreement.

This fictional couple brings us to a tender difficulty in intimate life. We may welcome another person’s difference until it touches something we hoped love would settle. Then the person whose distinctness once attracted us becomes someone whose distinctness hurts. We want to be freely chosen, yet begin organizing the encounter so that only one answer can count as love.

The client article, [If You Loved Me, Wouldn’t You See It My Way?](#), and the five modules of *Living With Difference* examine what happens here. This therapist companion considers how we accompany the longing beneath the demand, make room for two minds, and help understanding become conduct. Some differences grow more workable. Others become clearer in their consequence. Both require clinical seriousness.

The hope carried by agreement

Agreement can do more than settle an issue. It may assure a person that their experience is credible, their wish is reasonable, or their place in the relationship remains secure. Disagreement then threatens several things at once. A declined invitation can become evidence of being unwanted; another interpretation can feel like expulsion from a shared reality.

We need to discover the particular meaning. “What would it give you if she wanted to come?” may bring a different answer from “Why is this dinner so important?” The client might say, “I want to feel that joining my life is a pleasure for her.” Now the practical request and the relational wish can be heard distinctly.

His partner also has a wish: “I want my tiredness to matter before I have to defend it.” Her preference carries a concern about whether she can be loved without continual availability. We should resist arranging their accounts into an elegant symmetry before examining how each actually behaves. One person may already have accommodated repeatedly. One may have broken a commitment. Their wishes deserve recognition; their contributions require separate assessment.

There is often a developmental question alongside the present one. What happened when someone important did not share the client’s experience? Was difference bearable, interesting, punishable, or evidence that someone had ceased to care? We ask without supplying a history. Present relationships can also teach accurate apprehension. A client who expects dismissal may have been dismissed yesterday.

A self that can remain open

Bowen’s differentiation framework concerns functioning thoughtfully within the emotional pressures of important relationships. His institutional account includes realistic dependence, considered generosity, and the capacity to maintain a position without forcing conformity. Automatic accommodation and automatic opposition can both remain governed by the other person.[1]

Schnarch’s formulation of a solid, flexible self sharpens the clinical question. Can someone retain a sense of worth and direction when approval is absent, while remaining able to reconsider? Flexibility is integral to his account: a person can discover that they are wrong without collapsing or compelling someone else to restore them.[2]

These contributions matter when a client’s position becomes increasingly clear and increasingly impervious. “I know what I want” may represent hard-won authorship. We still need to ask whether any response from the partner can enter the decision. A position protected from all influence is different from one that survives thoughtful examination.

Conversely, changing a position can express genuine development. The partner who initially wanted quiet may learn that this dinner marks an important anniversary and choose to attend. The relevant distinction lies in whether new meaning affected her judgment or whether she capitulated because his disappointment had become intolerable. The same outward yes can contain different forms of participation.

The therapist’s stance matters. If we praise firmness too quickly, a client may learn to perform independence for us. If we reward accommodation as empathy, they may again disappear to preserve connection. We are interested in the person’s access to thought, feeling, responsibility, and choice throughout the encounter.

When difference is felt before it is understood

Knowing that a partner is entitled to a preference does not necessarily make that preference emotionally bearable. A client can explain differentiation fluently and still experience a sinking certainty that the relationship is slipping away. The body has already entered the conversation that reflection is trying to join.

Damasio's somatic marker hypothesis proposes that body-related signals participate in reasoning and the evaluation of possible outcomes, sometimes outside conscious awareness. His account challenges an exclusively cognitive explanation of decision-making; it does not make a bodily feeling an infallible guide.[3]

Applied clinically, we can take the sinking feeling seriously while examining what it seems to predict. "As you imagine going without her, what feels as if it will happen?" The client says, "I will be there, explaining why she didn't want us." His partner's absence has already acquired an intention. A little space may open when the experience and its conclusion become distinguishable.

We do not need to persuade him that the feeling is irrational. We can acknowledge the loneliness he anticipates, ask what evidence supports his account, and remain interested in what her refusal actually means. Historical resonance and present information can then be considered together.

Schore's clinical synthesis directs attention to implicit affective communication through voice, expression, timing, and responsiveness.[4] A technically sound question asked with impatience may intensify the client's effort to be understood. A pause that leaves him feeling accompanied may allow a less defended answer. Neither response tells us which neural circuit is operating. It tells us something about the encounter we can check with him.

Siegel's IPNB formulation describes integration as linking differentiated elements; in relationships, distinct persons remain connected through empathic communication.[5] This gives us a useful organizing question: does the conversation permit distinctness and contact together? In this essay's application, warmth purchased through disappearance and self-definition maintained through withdrawal each restrict the relationship's possibilities.

The relationship we are also shaping

Terry Real brings a necessary challenge to the idea that maturity consists chiefly in holding onto oneself. In his account, the person is participating in a relational system whose conditions their conduct helps create. He distinguishes an adaptive child response from the cultivated capacity of the wise adult to engage in repair.[6]

The usefulness of this distinction depends on how it is offered. Calling a client childish can reproduce humiliation. The clinical invitation is to recognize a familiar protective response and consider whether it serves the relationship the person now wants. Real also acknowledges adaptations to ongoing oppression that cannot adequately be reduced to

childhood history.[6]

For our fictional client, the question becomes concrete: “When you continue asking after she has answered, what happens between you?” Perhaps he discovers that his pursuit of a freely offered yes has become pressure. For his partner, the question may concern withdrawal: “When you stop speaking, what is left for him to understand about whether you will return?” The answers concern particular conduct. We do not assign equal responsibility by describing a cycle.

Real and Schnarch illuminate different clinical risks. A person may rely excessively on external approval; they may also use self-sufficiency to avoid their effect on others. We need judgment about which task is becoming urgent here. Someone may need accompaniment before they can hold a position, a direct challenge to how they impose it, or help recognizing a responsibility they have left unaddressed.

“You are allowed to want this,” and “Your partner is allowed to answer differently,” can belong beside “The way you respond to that answer matters.” Warmth becomes more substantial when it can hold all three.

The person beyond our description of them

Perel and Miller’s discussion of otherness asks us to notice a partner beyond the roles they occupy in our lives. Their account of the tension between familiarity and desire suggests that closeness need not depend on exhaustive knowledge or the disappearance of distance.[7]

This can widen our formulation beyond tolerance of disagreement. A partner has interests, perceptions, and sources of vitality that do not originate in the relationship. Their absorption elsewhere may awaken insecurity; it may also invite renewed interest. The fact that someone remains partly unknown can be an opening in intimacy.

For the therapist, curiosity might begin where an established description seems sufficient. “She is avoidant.” “He is controlling.” What experience has the label made harder to notice? Does the quiet partner enjoy conversation elsewhere? Does the insistent partner become receptive when a practical concern is addressed? Such questions complicate a formulation without erasing harmful conduct or meaningful patterns.

Our fictional client might begin to hear what a quiet Sunday offers his partner: an unhurried morning, time with a book, recovery from a week of being available to others. He may feel touched by learning this and still wish she wanted the dinner. Understanding has given the difference more human substance. It has not made the cost disappear.

We also ask whether her separate life is supported by work he reliably carries, or whether her freedom repeatedly depends on his labor. Appreciating otherness does not settle the distribution of responsibility. Another person can be a mystery and still owe a clear answer about an agreement.

Jung and the partner asked to complete the picture

Jung's essay on marriage considers the difficulty of distinguishing a partner from unconscious images and motivations brought into the relationship. He also describes discontent that is located in the partner while a conflict within oneself remains unrecognized. His movement toward a more conscious relationship offers a depth perspective on disillusionment.[8]

This opens a question: what has the person asked the relationship to carry on their behalf? A partner's enthusiasm may have become necessary proof that a family, a creative life, or a spiritual commitment is worth loving. The client may be seeking recognition and also requiring the other person to inhabit the same meaning.

Jung's historical formulations include gender essentialism and hierarchies of development that we should not reproduce. The useful inquiry here concerns projection and greater self-knowledge; it does not require his account of masculine and feminine psychology, a ranking of partners, or an assumption that suffering advances development.[8]

In this essay's clinical application, we might ask our client what he can claim as his own even when his partner does not share it. Can family remain important without her equal enthusiasm? Can he want her company without making her answer establish the value of his life?

His partner has an equivalent inward task only if her experience supports it. Perhaps she has located all pressure in him while forbidding herself to disappoint anyone. Perhaps she is responding to actual pressure that must change. Projection is a possibility to examine, never a ready explanation for the person whose complaint troubles us.

There can be grief in withdrawing an expectation that someone else will confirm or complete us. There may also be a recovery of participation in our own life. An interest can be pursued, a friendship renewed, a family bond maintained. The partner becomes less responsible for authorizing the whole of what matters.

Understanding without possession

Buber's distinction between I-It and I-Thou concerns different ways of relating. In an I-It orientation, the other is approached as an object of experience and description. The I-Thou encounter brings us into relation with someone whose presence exceeds the qualities we can inventory.[9]

His philosophy asks something exacting of clinical attention. We need descriptions and formulations, yet we can become so occupied with explaining someone that we cease addressing them. The partner is reduced to a defense, an attachment pattern, or the missing ingredient in another person's healing.

The therapist can participate in this reduction through a particularly elegant interpretation. "You withdraw because closeness frightened you as a child" may be plausible and still leave

little room for the person who says, “I withdraw because he asks the same question for two hours.” We need to receive the answer before deciding what else it means.

Understanding should make the other person more available to encounter. It can also reveal how much remains unknown. Neither intimacy nor clinical expertise grants complete access to another mind. People retain privacy, the right to correct our account, and the right to say that they do not yet understand themselves.

Porter and Schumann’s research links intellectual humility with openness to opposing views in imagined disagreements and political contexts.[10] It offers a modest empirical foothold for considering the limits of one’s knowledge. It does not demonstrate a couple intervention. In the room, the more demanding question is whether we can learn something unwelcome without requiring the speaker to soften it into reassurance.

Whose difference changes the arrangement?

A conversation can sound balanced while distributing freedom unevenly. One partner articulates a preference; the other reorganizes childcare, manages disappointment in the extended family, and makes the plan happen. We may admire the first person’s clarity while overlooking the work that permits it.

Knudson-Martin’s account of power directs attention to shared relational responsibility, vulnerability, attunement, and influence. It challenges the assumption that partners enter therapy with equal power.[11] We therefore ask whose concern has consequences, who initiates repair, and who can decline without losing access to essential resources.

Culture and family obligations need an equally careful hearing. Shared family time may express a valued identity and a genuine duty. Solitude may preserve health or capacity. Neither an individualist preference nor a communal commitment has automatic moral priority. We examine the specific obligations, resources, freedoms, and costs involved.

We also distinguish an ordinary difference from a breached agreement, a disputed factual claim, or coercion. Whether someone paid a bill or sent a threatening message cannot be settled by affirming two subjective realities. The meaning of an event may be contested while aspects of the event remain open to evidence. Where disagreement brings intimidation or retaliation, confidential support and protection take precedence over joint vulnerability.

Overall and McNulty’s review emphasizes that the effects of conflict communication depend on context, including the seriousness and changeability of the problem.[12] Gentleness can preserve contact while leaving an important issue untouched. Directness can clarify a needed change. We need to judge the substance and consequences of the exchange alongside its emotional tone.

The grief after being understood

Sometimes the client says, “I believe she understands. I am still sad.” This can be an important transition. The sadness no longer has to prove that the listener failed. It can concern something wanted that remains unavailable.

We should stay interested in whether the understanding was substantial. Accurate words without follow-through may offer little. But when recognition has occurred, another explanation may become visible: the client is encountering the limits of what this person can share. A wish has been received and remains a wish.

Fosha’s experiential formulation emphasizes accompaniment with difficult affect and reflection on newly available experience.[13] Here, we can help someone encounter disappointment without immediately converting it into persuasion, self-reproach, or a decision. We can also notice what it is like to be heard while something remains unresolved.

“Could we make room for the sadness without asking it to tell us everything about the relationship?” may be a useful invitation. The person might want quiet company, words, or a change of focus. The feeling can inform judgment without being required to disappear before a responsible next step is possible.

A practical accommodation may then be chosen more honestly. He attends some dinners alone; she joins selected occasions. Perhaps this is workable. Perhaps, even with fair arrangements and genuine respect, he discovers that a partner who wants frequent family life is important to him. A kinder conversation can reveal an incompatibility. Therapy needs room for that discovery too.

What the therapist may want the couple to become

Our preference for a particular relationship ideal enters this work. We may admire autonomy and subtly mistrust dependence. We may value repair so strongly that a client feels pressed to keep trying. We may identify with the person pursuing understanding or the person exhausted by its pursuit.

These investments can organize what we hear. The client whose argument resembles our own may receive more generous interpretations; the quieter partner may be mistaken for the more regulated one. We need supervision and personal reflection that help us notice who is becoming less visible under our account.

The couple also needs room to disagree with us. Imagine the therapist suggests that she join one dinner a month. She answers, “You have decided the number before asking what I want.” We might feel caught in the very criticism we were trying to resolve. Her correction nevertheless provides information about our participation.

We can acknowledge the premature arrangement and return to inquiry. The task is to help them find what each can actually choose, alongside what they already owe. Our willingness to

revise demonstrates a form of influence that does not require humiliation. The client need not protect our competence for the session to continue.

The five modules as a developing encounter

The pathway follows one disagreement through increasing clarity. The modules provide opportunities to notice, formulate, correct, experiment, and review. They should remain answerable to what the learner discovers, including no improvement or a decision to stop.

Why Difference Can Feel Like Rejection separates the observable difference from the meaning it carries. Our fictional client identifies the declined invitation, the anticipated loneliness, and the belief that his family has been rejected. His partner can correct that account. A corrected interpretation may leave the wish for company intact.

Disagreement Without Disconnection gives each stated position a recognizable place. They describe what they want, reflect what they understand, and name the unresolved issue. We review whether both remained present or whether apparent peace required one person's disappearance. A pause includes whatever practical responsibility cannot wait.

Curiosity Without Surrendering Your Position invites a question whose answer could genuinely change the account. "What is difficult about these Sundays?" might reveal exhaustion, an unwelcome family interaction, or a preference already explained. The question needs an ending; repeating it until a different answer appears would turn inquiry into pressure.

What Cannot Be Resolved considers the practical issue after a misunderstanding or unfair burden has been addressed. They might redistribute preparation and try a limited arrangement. Their different wishes about family time can remain. We examine the actual cost of the trial before interpreting persistence as failed communication.

Acceptance, Accommodation, and Choice brings understanding into a proportionate next step. They may keep the arrangement, revise it, seek support, or leave a larger decision open. Acceptance acknowledges present reality. Whether to continue a relationship involves values, resources, responsibilities, and experience beyond a worksheet.

At review, suppose the client reports, "I went alone. I missed her. We had a good evening when I came home." The partner adds, "I rested, and I didn't spend the whole afternoon preparing for him to be hurt." There is useful information here: sadness remained, contact continued, and the anticipated consequence did not unfold in the same way.

We can help them notice what supported that encounter without promising the next Sunday will be easy. If resentment accumulated, an agreement was broken, or essential work fell unfairly, those observations would require revision. Learning becomes credible when the actual result can change the explanation and the next choice.

A person to meet again

In his letter of May 14, 1904, Rilke imagines a love in which distinct beings “protect one another, border upon one another and greet one another.”[14] The image offers a literary possibility: proximity that preserves someone to approach. It is no measure of clinical outcome, and difficulty alone does not make a relationship worth enduring.

For our couple, the possibility may first appear in a modest sentence: “I want you there, and I am beginning to understand that you can love me while wanting something different.” The partner may answer with affection, uncertainty, or a continuing limit. There is still someone present to answer.

Living with difference asks us to bear the grief of limits and the surprise of an encounter we cannot wholly direct. We can become more knowable without becoming identical. We can receive influence, make commitments, and discover that some differences ask for another choice.

The work serves a relationship in which each person has enough room to become real to the other—and enough responsibility to care about what happens between them.

References

1. The Bowen Center for the Study of the Family. (n.d.). Differentiation of self. Institutional account of Murray Bowen’s theory.
2. Schnarch, D. (2011, January 17). The Crucible 4 Points of Balance. Crucible Institute.
3. Damasio, A. R. (1996). The somatic marker hypothesis and the possible functions of the prefrontal cortex. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 351(1346), 1413–1420. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1996.0125>
4. Schore, A. N. (2022). Right brain-to-right brain psychotherapy: Recent scientific and clinical advances. *Annals of General Psychiatry*, 21, 46. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12991-022-00420-3>
5. Siegel, D. J. (n.d.). An introduction to interpersonal neurobiology. Author’s account of the framework.
6. Real, T. (n.d.). Getting real with relationship expert and author Terry Real [Interview with Elisabeth LaMotte, transcript, episode 120]. *Social Work Talks*. National Association of Social Workers. See also Real, T. (2023, August 11), The myth of the individual, an author-hosted excerpt from *Us* (2022).
7. Perel, E., & Miller, M. A. (2022, February 8). Letters from Esther: Appreciating otherness in relationships. Esther Perel.
8. Jung, C. G. (1925). Marriage as a psychological relationship. Reprinted in *The development of personality, Collected Works*, Vol. 17, paragraphs 324–345. Transcribed essay consulted. Historical clinical theory; selected formulations critically considered here.
9. Buber, M. (1923). *I and Thou*. Selected original passages, with separately marked editorial comments. ICANN archival reproduction. The discussion here draws on Buber’s passages, not the annotations.
10. Porter, T., & Schumann, K. (2018). Intellectual humility and openness to the opposing view. *Self and Identity*, 17(2), 139–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2017.1361861>

11. Knudson-Martin, C. (2013). Why power matters: Creating a foundation of mutual support in couple relationships. *Family Process*, 52(1), 5-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12011>
12. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.03.002>
13. Fosha, D. (n.d.). Wired for healing: Thirteen ways of looking at AEDP. *Transformance: The AEDP Journal*.
14. Rilke, R. M. (1904, May 14). Letter seven, to Franz Xaver Kappus (K. W. Maurer, Trans.). In *Letters to a Young Poet*. Rainer Maria Rilke Archive reproduction.

Clinical illustrations are fictional. This essay develops an integrative clinical argument, drawing on research, clinical theory, philosophy, and literary reflection in their different roles. Selected passages, institutional accounts, and abstracts informed the draft; full-book reading is not claimed. Evidence for informing constructs or therapies does not establish outcomes for BKL's educational practices.