

ETHOS UNIVERSE LAB

# CLOSENESS WITHOUT CAPTIVITY

*Understanding Growth Intimacy Through Disorganized Attachment,  
Autonomy, and Self-Expansion*

---

GROWTH INTIMACY RESEARCH SERIES

Conceptual Working Paper - First Draft - September 2026

*How can another person become important to me without becoming responsible for me - and how can I become deeply connected without disappearing inside the connection?*

CORE PROPOSITION

**Growth Intimacy = Closeness without possession.**

A relationship can support the development of security without becoming responsible for creating it.

## RESEARCH NOTE

# How to Read This Paper

A synthesis of established relationship science and an emerging Growth Intimacy framework.

---

This is a conceptual working paper for Ethos Universe Lab. It brings together established research in attachment theory, belongingness, secure-base functioning, autonomy, self-determination, and self-expansion. The complete Growth Intimacy framework and the Security-Autonomy-Expansion Cycle are proposed syntheses, not established diagnostic or clinical models.

The term "disorganized attachment" is used carefully. Popular discussions often equate adult disorganized attachment with fearful-avoidant attachment, but academic definitions and measures are not fully interchangeable. This paper therefore emphasizes dynamic patterns of attachment anxiety, avoidance, approach-avoidance conflict, and relationship-specific security rather than treating any single label as a fixed identity.

This article is educational and philosophical. It is not a diagnosis and does not replace individualized mental-health assessment or treatment.

## Abstract

What happens when the human need for connection collides with the fear of connection itself? Attachment theory begins with a relatively simple proposition: human beings are relational organisms. From infancy onward, proximity to responsive others helps create safety, regulate distress, and make exploration possible. Research on belonging similarly argues that forming and maintaining stable interpersonal bonds is a fundamental human motivation, while Social Baseline Theory proposes that the human brain operates as though access to familiar, predictable others is part of its expected environment.

But this creates a profound difficulty for people whose attachment systems have learned contradictory lessons about closeness. What if I want connection and fear it? What if distance hurts me, but intimacy can also overwhelm me? What if I can become intensely attached to someone and later feel an equally powerful need to withdraw?

This paper explores those questions through the emerging concept of Growth Intimacy: a form of closeness in which people become increasingly known, trusted, and emotionally connected while preserving sufficient autonomy, honesty, boundaries, and psychological safety for each person to continue becoming themselves. Viewed through attachment theory, Self-Determination Theory, secure-base research, and Self-Expansion Theory, Growth Intimacy attempts to resolve a central tension of intimate life: how can another person become important to me without becoming responsible for me, and how can I become deeply connected without disappearing inside the connection?

## PART I

# The Relational Paradox

## 1. THE PARADOX THAT BEGAN THIS INQUIRY

A discussion of disorganized attachment can be arresting not because every description necessarily applies to the listener, and not because a video can diagnose an attachment pattern, but because it may give language to something previously difficult to understand: how can the same person become deeply attached, feel secure at times, become anxious at others, and at still other moments emotionally detach or retreat into radical independence?

Adult attachment research offers a more useful approach than placing people into four permanent personality boxes. Much contemporary research conceptualizes adult attachment particularly along two dimensions: attachment anxiety - concern about abandonment, rejection, insufficient love, or another person's availability - and attachment avoidance - discomfort with intimacy, dependence, vulnerability, or reliance on others, often accompanied by greater emotional distance and self-reliance.

The popular term fearful-avoidant attachment generally describes high levels of both tendencies: a powerful desire for connection accompanied by powerful strategies for protecting oneself from it. The relationship between fearful attachment and what developmental researchers call disorganized attachment is more complicated. They overlap conceptually, particularly in approach-avoidance patterns, but researchers continue to debate whether adult fearful attachment and attachment disorganization should be treated as equivalent constructs.

*Under what relational conditions does my attachment system move toward security, anxiety, or avoidance?*

That question changes the inquiry. It replaces identity with observation. It replaces "This is what I am" with "This is what happens inside me under certain conditions." And once a pattern becomes observable, it also becomes possible to work with.

## 2. WE ARE RELATIONAL BEINGS - BUT RELATIONSHIP IS NOT SIMPLE

The claim that humans are fundamentally relational has substantial psychological support. Baumeister and Leary's belongingness hypothesis argued that human beings possess a pervasive motivation to establish and maintain lasting interpersonal bonds characterized by repeated positive interaction and relational continuity. Social Baseline Theory goes further, proposing that the human brain expects access to social resources and that familiar, predictable others can reduce perceived risk and the energetic burden of regulation.

Attachment theory offers the developmental version of this story. Human beings do not merely seek other people for companionship. Under threat, the attachment system motivates us toward particular people who can potentially provide protection, reassurance, responsiveness, and regulation. Through repeated relational experience, people develop expectations about

themselves and others: whether they are worthy of care, whether others will be available, whether dependence is safe, and what happens when vulnerability is exposed.

For someone with relatively secure attachment, the proposition "humans need relationships" may feel reassuring. For someone who experiences a strong approach-avoidance conflict, it can feel more complicated. The dilemma becomes: what happens when the thing I am motivated to seek is also something I have learned to fear? Connection can activate longing. Connection can also activate protection. Distance may produce loneliness. Closeness may produce alarm.

*The attachment paradox of Growth Intimacy: I need enough connection to feel relationally alive, but enough autonomy to remain psychologically safe.*

The answer cannot simply be "find the right person." Nor can it be "learn not to need anyone." Growth requires something more sophisticated.

### **3. ATTACHMENT DOES NOT REQUIRE THE ELIMINATION OF AUTONOMY**

This is where autonomy theory becomes essential. In ordinary language, autonomy is often confused with independence. They are not the same. Within Self-Determination Theory, autonomy refers primarily to experiencing one's behavior and choices as self-directed and authentically endorsed rather than controlled or coerced. Healthy autonomy therefore does not require isolation. A person can voluntarily depend upon, cooperate with, love, and remain deeply committed to another person while still functioning autonomously.

This distinction may be particularly important for someone who protects themselves through avoidance. Independence can say, "I do not need you." Autonomy says, "I can need you without surrendering myself." Detachment can say, "I remain safe by making myself unreachable." Autonomy says, "I remain myself even while allowing myself to be known." Dependency can say, "Without you, I cannot regulate myself." Interdependence says, "Sometimes I regulate myself. Sometimes you help me. Sometimes I help you. Neither of us becomes the other's entire emotional infrastructure."

*The opposite of unhealthy dependency is not isolation. It is differentiated connection.*

## **PART II**

# **From Security to Expansion**

The secure base, safe haven, self-expansion, and the conditions that make growth possible.

---

## 4. THE SECURE BASE: WHY HEALTHY LOVE CAN INCREASE INDEPENDENCE

Attachment theory contains an apparent paradox that may be central to Growth Intimacy: the more confidently people believe that appropriate support is available when needed, the more freely they may be able to explore away from the relationship. This is the secure-base function.

In adult relationships, secure-base support has been described in terms of availability, encouragement, and non-interference. Responsive support of a partner's goals and exploration has been associated with greater confidence, goal pursuit, and exploration. This creates a dependency paradox: being able to depend on someone appropriately can make greater autonomy possible.

*Security is not permanent proximity. Security is confidence in the relationship's ability to survive movement.*

Movement toward. Movement away. Exploration. Return. Individual goals. Shared goals. Silence. Conversation. Vulnerability. Boundaries. The secure relationship is not motionless. It is resilient enough to tolerate motion.

## 5. SAFE HAVEN AND SECURE BASE

Attachment research distinguishes two complementary relational functions. A safe haven is where I can move toward someone during distress and experience responsiveness, comfort, reassurance, or assistance. A secure base is what allows me to move outward - to explore, learn, work, take risks, develop capacities, pursue purpose, and become increasingly capable - while knowing that connection remains available.

Feeney and Collins extended these ideas into a model of thriving through relationships. Their concept of relational catalyst support describes partners who encourage exploration, notice possibilities, help prepare for challenges, celebrate accomplishments, and remain available without unnecessarily interfering.

This is remarkably close to what Growth Intimacy is trying to describe. But Growth Intimacy adds an explicit ethical requirement: support should ultimately increase the supported person's capacity rather than increase their unnecessary dependence upon the supporter.

A loving partner may provide reassurance. But if reassurance becomes the only way I can tolerate uncertainty, it can accidentally maintain dependence. A partner may help me regulate. But if I surrender responsibility for learning self-regulation, the relationship may become responsible for psychological functions that I also need to strengthen within myself. A partner can become a secure base. They should not have to become my entire ground.

## 6. THE QUESTION BEHIND THE PATTERN

Instead of asking only, "What is my attachment style?" Growth Intimacy proposes a more dynamic inquiry: under what relational conditions does my attachment system move toward security, anxiety, or avoidance? This question should be examined without immediately blaming either oneself or the other person. An attachment response emerges through an interaction among at least three things: my internal working models, the actual behavior of the other person, and the present relational context.

Research shows that attachment security has meaningful within-person variation. People can experience different attachment dynamics with different people, and relationship-specific security can fluctuate across time. The task is therefore not simply to discover a permanent category. The task is to discover one's attachment conditions.

### Conditions That May Move Me Toward Security

- When do I feel able to remain close without monitoring the relationship?
- What happens when someone is consistent over time?
- Can I express a need without being mocked, punished, ignored, or made to feel excessive?
- Can the other person disagree with me without threatening the relationship?
- Can I say no? Can they say no?
- Can we spend time apart without converting distance into rejection?
- Can we repair misunderstandings without one person having to win?
- Can I reveal something vulnerable while maintaining choice over how much I reveal?
- Does the person's behavior generally match their words?
- Can I pursue goals that do not include them?
- Do they celebrate my development even when it makes me more independent?
- Do I feel more capable through knowing this person - or increasingly unable to function without them?

### Conditions That May Move Me Toward Anxiety

- What happens inside me when communication becomes inconsistent?
- What happens when closeness suddenly decreases?
- What stories do I construct when I do not know what another person is thinking?
- Do I begin scanning for evidence of abandonment?
- Do I seek increasing amounts of reassurance?
- Do neutral changes become evidence that the relationship is ending?
- Do I abandon my own boundaries or priorities to restore closeness?
- Can I distinguish actual relational inconsistency from an attachment alarm generated by uncertainty?

This last distinction is critical. Not every anxious response is irrational. Sometimes another person truly is inconsistent, unavailable, deceptive, or unpredictable. Growth does not require teaching myself to tolerate unhealthy relational conditions. Security includes learning to distinguish "My past has been activated" from "Something unhealthy is actually happening here."

### **Conditions That May Move Me Toward Avoidance**

- What happens when someone wants more emotional access to me?
- When does care begin to feel like obligation?
- When does closeness begin to feel like surveillance?
- When does vulnerability begin to feel like loss of control?
- Do I distance myself when another person becomes highly important?
- Do I suddenly focus on their imperfections when intimacy increases?
- Does needing someone evoke shame?
- Do I confuse accepting help with weakness?
- Do I interpret another person's desire for connection as an attempt to control me?
- Do I disappear emotionally before another person has the possibility of hurting me?
- Is my withdrawal a historical defense - or is someone actually violating my autonomy?

## **7. THE GROWTH INTIMACY ATTACHMENT MAP**

A practical way to answer the central question is to stop recording only what happened and begin recording the entire sequence. For important attachment moments, Growth Intimacy can use a seven-part Attachment Map:

### **1. THE EVENT**

What actually happened - not what I feared happened?

### **2. THE BODY**

What happened physiologically: tightness, urgency, numbness, agitation, shutdown, or a compulsion to text, call, leave, isolate, explain, or disappear?

### **3. THE MEANING**

What interpretation did I immediately create: "They are leaving," "I am becoming trapped," "I do not matter," "They want too much from me," "I should not need this," or "I am going to lose myself"?

### **4. THE ATTACHMENT STRATEGY**

Did I move toward hyperactivation - pursuing, monitoring, reassurance seeking, catastrophizing distance - or toward deactivation - withdrawal, numbing, rationalizing away feelings, extreme self-reliance, sudden detachment?

### **5. THE NEED BENEATH THE DEFENSE**

What did I actually need: reassurance, clarity, space, consistency, rest, choice, affection, a boundary, information, or time to regulate before responding?

## 6. THE SECURE RESPONSE

What would I do if neither abandonment nor engulfment were controlling the decision?

## 7. THE OUTCOME

After choosing the more secure response, what happened?

Over time, this creates something more valuable than an attachment label. It creates an attachment map: these conditions activate anxiety in me; these activate avoidance; these allow security; these people reliably respect my autonomy; these behaviors genuinely violate it; these reactions belong primarily to the present; these reactions appear to carry something older into the present. That is psychological agency.

## 8. SELF-EXPANSION: LOVE SHOULD MAKE THE SELF LARGER, NOT SMALLER

Attachment explains why we seek security. Autonomy explains why we need to remain authors of our own lives. Growth Intimacy requires a third theory: Self-Expansion Theory. Developed by Arthur Aron and Elaine Aron and studied over decades, Self-Expansion Theory proposes that people are motivated to increase their resources, perspectives, capabilities, identities, and efficacy - and that close relationships can become important pathways for this expansion of the self.

Through another person, I may encounter new experiences, ideas, abilities, communities, possibilities, ways of seeing myself, and versions of the person I might become. The healthiest interpretation of self-expansion is not "I absorb you until we become psychologically indistinguishable." It is "Knowing you introduces possibilities that allow my own self to grow."

This distinction is essential because self-expansion without autonomy can become fusion. Attachment without autonomy can become dependency. Autonomy without attachment can become defensive isolation. Exploration without security can become restless escape. Security without exploration can become stagnation. Growth Intimacy therefore requires these processes to coexist rather than compete.

### PART III

## The Backbone of Growth Intimacy

An integrative framework: belonging, security, autonomy, exploration, expansion, mutual development, and self-ownership.

---

## 9. THE PROPOSED BACKBONE OF GROWTH INTIMACY

### I. BELONGING

**I am a relational being.**

Human beings possess profound motivations toward sustained relational connection. Pretending that we need nobody is not necessarily psychological freedom; sometimes it can be protection disguised as independence.

## II. SECURITY

### **I can move toward you.**

Healthy intimacy permits comfort, responsiveness, appropriate dependence, vulnerability, and support. Safe Haven: when life becomes difficult, connection is available.

## III. AUTONOMY

### **I can remain myself beside you.**

Connection does not revoke self-direction. I retain boundaries, choice, identity, purpose, other relationships, private thought, individual development, and the right to say no.

## IV. EXPLORATION

### **I can move away from you without losing you.**

The relationship becomes a secure base rather than an enclosure. Our connection gives me confidence to enter the world rather than a reason to retreat from it.

## V. SELF-EXPANSION

### **Knowing you enlarges what becomes possible for me.**

Love introduces new capacities, perspectives, experiences, and possibilities without requiring either person to surrender authorship of the self.

## VI. MUTUAL DEVELOPMENT

### **We participate in one another's becoming.**

Each person can encourage the other's goals, celebrate growth, support experimentation, challenge limiting narratives, and provide responsive assistance without taking control.

## VII. SELF-OWNERSHIP

### **My attachment system remains my responsibility.**

I can tell you what helps me, ask for reassurance or space, explain my triggers, and invite understanding. But I cannot make you responsible for preventing every activation of my attachment system, and you cannot demand access to me in the name of helping me heal.

*Growth Intimacy requires mutual support without mutual ownership.*

## THE SECURITY - AUTONOMY - EXPANSION CYCLE

| SECURITY                     | AUTONOMY             | EXPLORATION                | SELF-<br>EXPANSION     | RETURN                        | DEEPER<br>SECURITY              |
|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| I am safe enough to connect. | I can remain myself. | I can move into the world. | I become more capable. | I come back as a larger self. | Growth is welcomed, not feared. |

Security -> Autonomy -> Exploration -> Self-Expansion -> Return -> Deeper Security

### 10. DOES HEALING REQUIRE THE "RIGHT PARTNER"?

This is one of the most difficult questions. A person experiencing fearful or disorganized attachment dynamics may hear, "You heal through relationships," but then confront a painful practical problem: how am I supposed to find someone who understands all of this, remains consistent when my defenses appear, gives me enough closeness without overwhelming me, gives me enough space without disappearing, and remains committed to my growth?

That is an enormous demand to place upon partner selection. It may even become another reason to avoid relationships entirely: "Until I find someone psychologically sophisticated enough to handle me, I should remain alone." Growth Intimacy offers a different proposition.

A healthy partner matters. Partner behavior matters. Responsiveness matters. Consistency matters. Respect for autonomy matters. Relationship-specific experiences can influence attachment security, and attachment can show meaningful change rather than functioning as an unchangeable destiny. But the research does not justify the fantasy that the correct romantic partner will automatically convert insecurity into permanent security.

*The partner is not the treatment. The relationship is one possible developmental environment.*

### 11. THE PARTNER AS COMPANION, NOT CURE

A Growth Intimacy partner does not need to be a therapist. They need to be capable of relationship: consistency, truthfulness, emotional availability, respect for boundaries, capacity for repair, curiosity rather than judgment, willingness to communicate, support for autonomy, and willingness to grow themselves.

They do not need to understand every psychological mechanism before loving someone. And they should not be asked to absorb unlimited dysregulation simply because the behavior has an attachment explanation. Understanding explains behavior. It does not automatically excuse behavior. Likewise, attachment insecurity does not mean surrendering relational standards.

Someone working toward security is still entitled to expect honesty, boundaries, reciprocity, respect, and consistency from another person.

*I take responsibility for the attachment system I bring into the relationship. You take responsibility for the relational environment you help create.*

Neither person carries everything. Neither person carries nothing. That is interdependence.

## 12. PERSONAL WORK BECOMES PART OF INTIMACY

If relational security depended entirely on finding the perfect partner, psychological development would remain externally controlled. Growth Intimacy instead proposes that secure functioning can become something I practice before, during, and outside romantic attachment. The deeper work is learning to create an internal pause between activation and action.

- What am I protecting?
- What am I afraid will happen?
- What evidence belongs to the present?
- What part of this expectation may have been learned elsewhere?
- What do I actually need?
- Can I communicate that need without controlling the other person?
- Can I tolerate their answer if it is not exactly what I hoped for?
- Can I remain connected to myself while remaining connected to them?

That is where attachment work becomes Growth Intimacy.

## 13. FROM CO-REGULATION TO SELF-REGULATION TO FLEXIBLE INTERDEPENDENCE

Perhaps the goal should not be radical self-sufficiency. Human beings co-regulate. Relationships can reduce stress, increase confidence, provide perspective, and make difficult things easier. Social Baseline Theory suggests that use of relational resources is not necessarily pathological; it may be part of ordinary human functioning.

So healing should not mean, "I will eventually need nobody." Nor should love mean, "You must regulate everything with me." Growth Intimacy proposes movement toward flexible interdependence: I can regulate myself. I can sometimes let you help regulate me. I can help regulate you. I can function while you are temporarily unavailable. I can ask without demanding. I can receive without becoming helpless. I can give without becoming responsible for your entire stability. I can move close. I can move away. I can return.

### PART IV

# The Developmental Cycle

How security, autonomy, exploration, and expansion may reinforce one another over time.

## 14. THE SECURITY-AUTONOMY-EXPANSION CYCLE

This leads to a proposed central mechanism of Growth Intimacy:

### SECURITY

**I experience sufficient relational safety.**

I do not have to devote as much energy to preventing abandonment or protecting myself from engulfment.

### AUTONOMY

**Because I feel safer, I can remain differentiated.**

I can choose rather than merely react. I can maintain boundaries and identity.

### EXPLORATION

**Because I do not have to constantly defend the relationship or myself from it, I can explore.**

I can pursue work, friendships, purpose, creativity, learning, travel, contribution, and individual goals.

### SELF-EXPANSION

**Exploration increases my capacities and sense of self.**

I become more capable, experienced, confident, and differentiated.

### RETURN

**I return to the relationship as a larger person rather than a more dependent one.**

If the relationship can welcome that growth instead of experiencing it as a threat, security deepens.

*Security -> Autonomy -> Exploration -> Self-Expansion -> Return -> Deeper Security*

This is the proposed developmental engine of Growth Intimacy. It is not yet an established psychological model. It is a theoretical synthesis built upon established bodies of research, and that distinction should remain explicit as Growth Intimacy develops academically.

## 15. DISORGANIZED ATTACHMENT THROUGH THE GROWTH INTIMACY LENS

### ANXIETY

**Protective logic:** If I explore too far, connection may disappear.

**Growth Intimacy response:** Connection does not require constant proximity.

**AVOIDANCE**

**Protective logic:** If I depend on you, I may lose myself.

**Growth Intimacy response:** Appropriate dependence does not require surrendering autonomy.

**DISORGANIZATION / APPROACH-AVOIDANCE**

**Protective logic:** I want what I am also trying to escape.

**Growth Intimacy response:** We can slow the movement between closeness and distance enough to understand what each direction is protecting.

**ISOLATION**

**Protective logic:** If nobody gets close enough, nobody can activate the wound.

**Growth Intimacy response:** Protection from all vulnerability also protects us from intimacy, belonging, co-regulation, and relational expansion.

**FUSION**

**Protective logic:** If we become close enough, perhaps I will never lose you.

**Growth Intimacy response:** Erasing separateness does not create security. It removes the autonomy that makes freely chosen love possible.

**16. THE GOAL IS NOT PERFECT SECURITY**

There is another trap hidden inside attachment discourse. Once people learn attachment terminology, they can begin pursuing "secure attachment" like a personality achievement. Then every anxious moment becomes failure, every desire for reassurance becomes pathology, every need for distance becomes avoidance, and every attachment activation becomes evidence that healing is incomplete.

That would misunderstand the human attachment system. Security does not mean never experiencing fear. It does not mean never wanting reassurance. It does not mean never needing space. It does not mean emotional invulnerability. It means developing greater flexibility in what happens after activation.

- Can I recognize what is occurring?
- Can I communicate?
- Can I maintain perspective?
- Can I tolerate uncertainty without immediately converting it into catastrophe?
- Can I set a boundary without emotionally erasing the other person?
- Can I seek connection without abandoning myself?
- Can I repair after I react poorly?
- Can I learn from the episode?

*Perhaps part of becoming more secure is increasing our ability to remain authors of our behavior while attachment is activated.*

## 17. GROWTH INTIMACY IS NOT ABOUT FINDING SOMEONE WHO WILL NEVER TRIGGER YOU

A relationship in which attachment is never activated might not necessarily represent healing. It may simply represent low vulnerability. If somebody never matters enough to lose, the attachment system may remain quiet. The deeper question is what happens when someone does matter.

- Can significance coexist with freedom?
- Can love exist without possession?
- Can uncertainty exist without immediate panic?
- Can intimacy exist without engulfment?
- Can conflict exist without abandonment?
- Can distance exist without emotional disappearance?
- Can another person's independence exist without being interpreted as a referendum on my worth?
- Can I become increasingly attached while also becoming increasingly capable?

That is where Growth Intimacy lives.

## 18. A NEW DEFINITION

Through the combined lenses of attachment, autonomy, secure-base functioning, and self-expansion, Growth Intimacy can now be defined more precisely:

*Growth Intimacy is a form of relational closeness in which people become increasingly known, trusted, and emotionally significant to one another while preserving sufficient autonomy, honesty, psychological safety, and differentiation for each person to continue developing as an individual. It allows relationship to function as both a safe haven during vulnerability and a secure base for exploration, while maintaining the principle that support should strengthen capacity rather than create unnecessary dependency. Through this balance, intimacy becomes not the surrender of self, but a context in which the self can safely expand.*

Its shortest expression remains:

**CLOSENESS WITHOUT POSSESSION.**

*Belonging without captivity.*  
*Dependence without helplessness.*  
*Autonomy without isolation.*  
*Vulnerability without self-abandonment.*  
*Support without rescue.*  
*Distance without automatic abandonment.*  
*Growth without relational threat.*  
*Love without the shrinking of either self.*

### **Conclusion: The Relationship Is Not the Destination**

The insight that human beings are fundamentally relational does not mean that every person requires a romantic relationship to become psychologically complete. Nor does disorganized attachment imply that someone is incapable of intimacy. The more compelling possibility is that people who have learned contradictory lessons about connection may need to develop a different relationship with relationship itself.

Not: "I must find someone who finally makes me secure." And not: "I am safest when nobody matters enough to hurt me." But: "I want to become capable of experiencing significant connection without giving another person ownership of my stability - and capable of experiencing autonomy without automatically converting it into isolation."

A good relationship may help. A responsive partner may matter enormously. A therapist, friend, family member, mentor, community, and other secure relational experiences may matter too. But ultimately Growth Intimacy asks something of the individual as well: can I learn my own attachment system well enough that fear no longer gets to make every relational decision for me?

And then something equally important of the relationship: can we create a form of closeness in which neither of us must become smaller to make the other feel safe?

*Perhaps that is the deepest promise of Growth Intimacy: connection and autonomy no longer have to be enemies.*

I can come toward you. I can remain myself. I can leave to explore. I can return. You can do the same. And instead of measuring love by how impossible it becomes to function apart, we can begin measuring something different: how much more capable of living, choosing, loving, exploring, and becoming did each of us become because this relationship existed?

## RESEARCH FOUNDATION

# Selected Sources

Core bodies of research informing this conceptual synthesis.

---

**Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995).**

The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529. [Source](#)

**Coan, J. A., & Sbarra, D. A. (2015).**

Social Baseline Theory: The social regulation of risk and effort. [Source](#)

**Feeney, B. C. (2004).**

A secure base: Responsive support of goal strivings and exploration in adult intimate relationships. [Source](#)

**Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. (2015).**

A new look at social support: A theoretical perspective on thriving through relationships. [Source](#)

**Adult attachment variation and relationship-specific security.**

Research on within-person variability in adult attachment across relationships and time. [Source](#)

**Autonomy in relatedness / Self-Determination Theory.**

Research distinguishing autonomy from detachment and examining autonomy while remaining relationally connected. [Source](#)

**Adult disorganized attachment measurement review.**

Systematic discussion of the conceptual and measurement overlap between fearful attachment and adult attachment disorganization. [Source](#)

**Self-Expansion Theory review.**

Contemporary review of self-expansion processes in close relationships. [Source](#)

**Earned security and attachment change.**

Research examining pathways through which people with insecure attachment histories may develop greater security. [Source](#)

**Longitudinal attachment change in established couples (2025).**

Dyadic evidence on the degree and predictors of adult attachment change across time. [Source](#)

**Ethos Universe Lab Conceptual Contribution**

The terms Growth Intimacy, the Growth Intimacy Attachment Map, the seven-part Growth Intimacy backbone, and the proposed Security-Autonomy-Expansion Cycle are presented here as original conceptual syntheses for further theoretical development and empirical testing. They should not be represented as established psychological instruments or validated clinical models unless future research supports those claims.

# GROWTH INTIMACY

---

*Closeness without possession.*

**The deepest forms of love do not make another person smaller in order to keep them close. They create enough security for closeness and freedom to exist at the same time.**

ETHOS UNIVERSE LAB | CONCEPTUAL WORKING PAPER | 2026