



ETHOS UNIVERSE LAB • CONCEPT ESSAY 003 • PART II

TWO LIVES. TWO CENTERS.

GROWTH INTIMACY IN CONVERSATION WITH THE
FIELD

Companion and Parallel Theories of Autonomous Relational Life

KYZETHX • THEORY & INTEGRATION • 2026

DEDICATION

For the thinkers who taught us that closeness can be studied without reducing love to sentiment, and that autonomy can be protected without reducing relationship to distance.

For anyone trying to remain fully themselves while allowing another person to matter deeply.

KyZethX

ABSTRACT

IN CONVERSATION WITH THE FIELD

Growth Intimacy proposes that meaningful closeness can develop between people who remain recognizably themselves: autonomous without becoming detached, attached without becoming possessed, secure without requiring certainty, reciprocal without becoming transactional, and capable of change without treating every change as relational disappearance.

These ideas do not emerge into an empty intellectual landscape. Relationship science, family-systems theory, attachment theory, self-determination theory, relational-cultural theory, interpersonal models of intimacy, self-expansion research, interdependence theory, risk-regulation theory, relational dialectics, and philosophical accounts of encounter have each examined important parts of the same human problem.

This essay places Growth Intimacy in conversation with those traditions.

Its purpose is not to claim that autonomy, responsiveness, differentiation, secure attachment, self-expansion, mutuality, or repair are new discoveries. They are not. The developing contribution of Growth Intimacy lies instead in a particular integration: a philosophy of autonomous relational life in which two centers create a voluntarily renewed relational space protected by truth and self-respect, sustained through reciprocity, made secure through continuity, and evaluated partly by whether both lives remain capable of becoming.

The question is not whether Growth Intimacy replaces existing theories.

What becomes visible when their strongest insights are brought into the same relational architecture?

THE FIELD WAS ALREADY ASKING THE QUESTION

The central question of Growth Intimacy is:

How can two people become deeply important to one another without either person having to become smaller?

Part I answered this through a six-layer architecture involving Self-Growth Intimacy, self-respect, boundaries, freedom, autonomy, security, reciprocal intimacy, the Reciprocity Window, Growth Defense, repair, Secure Continuity, Mutual Expansion, Jeju, and the Ethos Compass.

Yet psychology and philosophy have been approaching pieces of this problem for decades.

Security How does attachment create enough safety for exploration?	Selfhood How do I remain myself while emotionally connected?
Intimacy What makes disclosure become genuine closeness?	Growth How can another person help me become more?

Other traditions ask how autonomy and relatedness coexist; how relationships negotiate contradictory needs; and how people risk dependence without losing self-protection.

Growth Intimacy enters the field not by denying those answers but by asking whether they can be placed inside one larger system.

II

ATTACHMENT THEORY - SECURITY THAT MAKES EXPLORATION POSSIBLE

One of the closest scientific ancestors of Growth Intimacy is attachment theory's concept of the secure base.

Attachment is often misunderstood as simply the need to remain close. But secure-base theory contains something more developmental: security should make exploration more possible.

Brooke Feeney's work on adult intimate relationships found that responsive, nonintrusive support of a partner's exploration and goal striving was associated with outcomes including greater happiness, self-esteem, and perceived likelihood of goal attainment. Feeney and Nancy Collins later developed a broader model of *thriving through relationships*, arguing that close relationships can help people not merely survive adversity but pursue opportunities for growth and development.

Security should make more life possible, not less.

The overlap with Growth Intimacy is substantial. But Growth Intimacy pushes the question further.

Secure-base research largely asks how supportive relationships facilitate exploration. Growth Intimacy additionally asks:

What happens after exploration?

The Ethos cycle introduces release, independent life, voluntary return, sharing, responsiveness, repair or updating, and renewed continuity.

The significant relational act is therefore not simply leaving from a secure base. It may also be returning by choice.

III

BOWEN AND DIFFERENTIATION - REMAINING A SELF WHILE CONNECTED

If attachment theory helps explain security, Bowen Family Systems Theory may provide the closest established parallel to Two Lives. Two Centers.

Bowen's concept of differentiation of self concerns the capacity to preserve a coherent self while remaining emotionally connected within important relationships.

A major scoping review examining 295 studies found substantial evidence associating greater differentiation with psychological health and marital quality, while also noting important limitations in longitudinal and causal research.

Growth Intimacy refuses to choose between selfhood and attachment.

I need enough security to attach.

I need enough selfhood to remain myself while attached.

This is where Self-Growth Intimacy enters. Growth Intimacy does not merely ask whether the self is differentiated. It asks whether I maintain an active relationship with myself: my values, boundaries, histories, fears, needs, contradictions, aspirations, and becoming.

I know myself well enough that loving you does not require losing access to myself.

Bowen helps explain the center. Attachment helps explain the bond. Growth Intimacy asks how both can remain alive simultaneously.

IV

SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY - AUTONOMY IS NOT DETACHMENT

Self-Determination Theory provides perhaps the strongest empirical neighbor for Growth Intimacy's distinction between Freedom and Autonomy.

Within this tradition, autonomy does not mean isolation. It means acting with volition and self-endorsement.

Research by Knee, Lonsbary, Canevello, and Patrick found that greater autonomous motivation within romantic relationships was associated with less defensive and more understanding responses during conflict, along with better post-conflict satisfaction.

Growth Intimacy adopts that compatibility between autonomy and relatedness while drawing a useful distinction:

Freedom

The relational space in which independent choice is permitted without being converted into evidence of rejection.

Autonomy

The person's internal capacity to act from values and volition while remaining emotionally connected.

Freedom is the relational space. Autonomy is the capacity to inhabit it.

A relationship may technically permit independent action while emotionally punishing it. Likewise, a highly autonomous person may possess enormous independence while participating very little in relational life.

I can belong to myself and belong meaningfully with you.

Autonomy is not the absence of relationship. It is the continued presence of agency inside relationship.

V

REIS, SHAVER, AND RESPONSIVENESS - HOW KNOWING BECOMES INTIMACY

Another major intellectual neighbor is the interpersonal process model of intimacy associated with Harry Reis and Phillip Shaver and empirically examined by Laurenceau, Barrett, and Pietromonaco.

Their research found that self-disclosure and partner disclosure contributed to experienced intimacy and that perceived partner responsiveness - feeling understood, validated, and cared for - played a central mediating role. Emotional disclosure was especially important.

Growth Intimacy strongly inherits this logic.

Open Heart

Reveal

Respond

Safety

But Growth Intimacy asks what happens once intimacy already exists.

Can people release one another? Can they live? Can they experience things the other person does not witness? Can they return voluntarily? Can the listener receive those experiences without competition or control? Can contradictory information enter the relationship? Can rupture produce repair rather than collapse?

The interpersonal-process model helps explain how intimacy emerges inside an encounter. Growth Intimacy attempts to model how intimacy remains developmental across encounters, absences, returns, disruptions, and change.

VI

RELATIONAL-CULTURAL THEORY - GROWTH THROUGH CONNECTION

Relational-Cultural Theory may be Growth Intimacy's closest philosophical sister within psychology.

Emerging from the work of Jean Baker Miller, Judith Jordan, and others, RCT challenged models of development that treated increasing separateness and independence as the primary markers of maturity. It instead emphasized growth through connection, mutual empathy, authenticity, mutual empowerment, and relationships in which both people can be affected and enlarged by one another.

This resonates profoundly with Mutual Expansion.

Growth Intimacy similarly rejects the idea that psychological maturity requires becoming invulnerable to relationship. We are changed by one another. We need one another. Connection can develop capacities unavailable in isolation.

But Growth Intimacy adds a deliberate counterweight:

Connection must not require disappearance of the center.

RCT strongly corrects excessive individualism. Growth Intimacy attempts to hold that correction together with autonomy.

Not independence instead of relationship.

Not relationship instead of selfhood.

Autonomous relational life.

Two centers capable of mutual influence without requiring mutual absorption.

VII

SELF-EXPANSION AND THE MICHELANGELO PHENOMENON - BECOMING THROUGH ANOTHER

Arthur Aron and colleagues' self-expansion model examines how close relationships can enlarge the self through new resources, perspectives, identities, activities, and capacities.

Rusbult, Finkel, and Kumashiro's Michelangelo phenomenon adds another important mechanism: close partners can affirm or inhibit movement toward one another's ideal selves. Partner affirmation can contribute to both personal and relational benefits.

Growth Intimacy's Mutual Expansion clearly lives near this tradition.

But it introduces an ethical qualification:

Helping you become is not the same thing as sculpting you into who I want you to be.

Growth must remain compatible with autonomy. A person should not become "better" only according to the desires of the relationship.

Growth Intimacy asks

Does knowing me help you become more fully yourself?

It does not ask

Does knowing me help you become more useful to me?

That distinction matters.

VIII

RELATIONAL DIALECTICS - THE TENSIONS DO NOT DISAPPEAR

Leslie Baxter’s work on relational dialectics offers another powerful parallel.

Research on relationship development identified recurring tensions such as autonomy versus connection, openness versus closedness, and predictability versus novelty. These contradictions did not appear merely when relationships failed. They appeared throughout relationship development.

This matters because Growth Intimacy should never promise that healthy development eliminates relational contradiction.

We may want Closeness and space.	We may want Truth and privacy.
We may want Stability and novelty.	We may want Security and freedom.

Growth Intimacy differs primarily in what it attempts to do with those tensions.

Relational dialectics describes contradiction as intrinsic to relational life. Growth Intimacy adds a navigation architecture.

NAVIGATION ARCHITECTURE

Jeju [⌢]Open Eyes [⌢]Reciprocity Window [⌢]Growth Defense [⌢]Compass

Jeju governs temporal uncertainty. Open Eyes disciplines interpretation. The Reciprocity Window distinguishes pulses from patterns. Growth Defense protects developmental conditions. The Compass orients action.

The goal is not to remove the dialectic. It is to become more capable of living inside it.

IX

RISK REGULATION - WHY SECURITY MATTERS BEFORE WE RISK CONNECTION

Sandra Murray, John Holmes, and colleagues have examined the tension between seeking connectedness and protecting oneself from rejection.

Risk-regulation models propose that interpersonal risk activates both connection-seeking and self-protective goals; confidence in another person's positive regard influences whether someone risks greater dependence and closeness.

This provides a strong scientific neighbor for Growth Intimacy's distinction between Internal Security and Relational Security.

Security changes what vulnerability costs.

But Growth Intimacy's emerging contribution may be Secure Continuity.

Secure Continuity is not unchanging availability. It is confidence that relational coherence can survive altered rhythms, separation, independent experiences, mistakes, and asymmetry because truth, return, responsiveness, reciprocity, and repair continue to recur.

Continuity is not constancy.

Attachment research helps us understand security. Risk regulation explains how perceived safety influences relational risk. Secure Continuity asks another question:

Can I experience change without automatically interpreting change as disappearance?

X

SELF-RESPECT, FORGIVENESS, AND GROWTH DEFENSE

Growth Intimacy should not become a philosophy that teaches people to tolerate everything gracefully.

Research on self-respect provides an important safeguard. Kumashiro, Finkel, and Rusbult found that self-respect was positively associated with constructive pro-relationship behaviors such as accommodation, forgiveness, and conciliation. Self-respect therefore need not be the enemy of relational generosity.

But work by Luchies, Finkel, McNulty, and Kumashiro identified an important qualification: forgiveness may support self-respect when the offending person demonstrates that the injured partner will be safe and valued, whereas forgiveness without such signals may erode self-respect and self-concept clarity.

This is extraordinarily relevant to Growth Defense.

GROWTH DEFENSE

Do not protect the relationship by destroying the conditions under which healthy relationship is possible.

Growth Defense protects truth, dignity, boundaries, agency, safety, reciprocity, accountability, and the possibility of repair.

Growth Defense therefore sits between two extremes:

Extreme One

Preserve the relationship no matter what.

Extreme Two

Leave whenever relationship becomes difficult.

Is this difficulty participating in growth - or systematically eroding the conditions growth requires?

XI

GROWTH BELIEFS - RELATIONSHIP AS SOMETHING CULTIVATED

Research on implicit relationship theories has distinguished destiny beliefs, which emphasize compatibility as something largely discovered, from growth beliefs, which emphasize relationships as capable of development through effort.

Recent longitudinal research has associated stronger growth beliefs with a slower decline in relationship satisfaction over time, while also showing that the relations among beliefs and satisfaction are more complicated than a simple one-way causal claim.

Growth Intimacy shares the developmental intuition but rejects one possible misunderstanding.

Growth does not mean every relationship should be saved through sufficient effort.

Sometimes growth reveals incompatibility. Sometimes growth requires a boundary. Sometimes repair alters the relationship's form. Sometimes the most developmental outcome is release.

Growth Intimacy is committed to becoming - not preservation at all costs.

XII

BUBER - THE OTHER PERSON MUST REMAIN AN OTHER

Martin Buber offers a philosophical ancestor for the ethics beneath the framework.

His distinction between I-Thou and I-It describes a fundamental difference between encountering another being as a genuine presence and reducing the other to something categorized, managed, possessed, or used.

Buber's philosophy gives special importance to the between - the relational encounter arising between distinct centers rather than through annihilation of distinction.

Two lives.

Two centers.

One relational space.

Growth Intimacy's non-possession ethic can therefore be understood as partly dialogical:

You must remain sufficiently other for my encounter with you to remain real.

If I turn you entirely into an extension of myself, I may preserve proximity while destroying encounter.

XIII

ESTHER PEREL - SECURITY AND FREEDOM

Contemporary relational writing has also repeatedly returned to the tension between security and freedom.

Esther Perel describes human relational life as involving simultaneous needs for belonging and freedom and argues against treating these as permanently solvable opposites. Her writing on long-term relationships similarly emphasizes the tension between togetherness and separateness and warns that fusion can diminish autonomy and desire.

Growth Intimacy shares the tension but broadens the question beyond erotic partnership.

How can security and freedom coexist in any meaningful bond?

Friendship. Chosen family. Long-distance relationships. Romantic relationships. Sibling relationships. Mentorship. Collaborative partnership.

Growth Intimacy treats security and freedom not merely as competing needs but as capacities that can potentially reinforce one another.

Security

Enough security makes freedom less threatening.

Freedom

Enough freedom makes continued connection more genuinely chosen.

XIV

THE INTELLECTUAL CROSSWALK

EXISTING TRADITION	CENTRAL CONTRIBUTION	GROWTH INTIMACY COUNTERPART
Attachment /secure base	Security supports exploration.	Relational Security; Release; Exploration
Bowen differentiation	Remain a self while connected.	Two Centers; Self-Growth Intimacy
Self-Determination Theory	Autonomy and relatedness can coexist.	Freedom + Autonomy
Interpersonal Process Model	Disclosure + responsiveness create intimacy.	Open Heart; Responsiveness
Relational-Cultural Theory	Growth occurs through mutual connection.	Reciprocal Intimacy; Mutual Expansion
Self-Expansion	Relationship can enlarge the self.	Mutual Expansion
Michelangelo phenomenon	Partners can affirm ideal-self development.	Support for Becoming
Relational Dialectics	Connection contains enduring contradictions.	Jeju; Compass; Reciprocity Window
Risk Regulation	Security influences willingness to risk closeness.	Internal / Relational Security
Interdependence & self-respect	Generosity must coexist with self-regard.	Self-Respect; Boundaries
Forgiveness research	Repair without safety/accountability may damage self-regard.	Growth Defense
Growth-belief research	Relationships can be cultivated.	Repair; Update; Becoming
Buber	Genuine encounter preserves otherness.	Non-Possession; Relational Space
Perel	Security and freedom remain simultaneous needs.	Autonomous Relational Life

Growth Intimacy does not have to defeat these theories to matter. Its potential contribution lies in connecting them.

XV

WHAT GROWTH INTIMACY MAY ADD

The existing field gives us many of the mechanisms. Growth Intimacy may contribute a particular architecture.

Attachment Security.	Differentiation Selfhood.
Self-Determination Autonomy.	Responsiveness research Being known and received.
Relational-Cultural Theory Growth through mutuality.	Self-expansion Enlargement.
Risk regulation Vulnerability and protection.	Relational dialectics Contradiction.

Growth Intimacy brings them into a single proposition:

INTEGRATIVE PROPOSITION

Two autonomous centers can create a relational space that becomes developmentally meaningful precisely because neither person owns the other and both continue choosing how to participate.

From that integration emerge several Ethos concepts that deserve empirical investigation rather than assumption: Voluntary Return, Secure Continuity, the Reciprocity Window, Growth Defense, Jeju, the Ethos Compass, and the developmental criterion of whether the relational space helps both people become more capable of life.

XVI

A THEORY OF THE SPACE BETWEEN

Perhaps the most distinctive possibility is that Growth Intimacy changes the unit of attention.

There is me.

There is you.

And there is something created between us.

The relational space is not identical to either person's internal world. Neither person owns it. Neither person can maintain it entirely alone. It exists through participation.

My life belongs to me.

Your life belongs to you.

The relational space depends upon what we mutually create.

Freedom protects the first two. Reciprocity protects the third. Self-respect prevents participation from requiring self-betrayal. Truth prevents the shared space from becoming fictional. Repair allows the space to incorporate reality. Secure Continuity allows it to change without requiring it to disappear. Growth Defense protects the conditions under which the space remains capable of producing life.

XVII

TOWARD AN EMPIRICAL GROWTH INTIMACY MODEL

The responsible next question is not:

How do we prove Growth Intimacy is correct?

Science rarely advances that way.

The better question is:

Which propositions are distinct, measurable, and falsifiable?

Future work could examine whether autonomy support combined with reciprocity predicts security beyond attachment style alone; whether Secure Continuity predicts lower catastrophic interpretation of temporary communication changes; whether perceived Voluntary Return following independent experience predicts closeness; whether Growth Defense helps explain when accommodation supports versus undermines self-respect; whether a Reciprocity Window intervention reduces overinterpretation of isolated digital cues; and whether Mutual Expansion predicts eudaimonic well-being beyond relationship satisfaction.

These hypotheses would allow Growth Intimacy to meet the field on scientific rather than merely rhetorical terms.

METHODOLOGICAL COMMITMENT

Open Eyes must apply to the theory itself.

If Secure Continuity proves indistinguishable from existing attachment-security measures, the framework should say so. If Growth Defense collapses empirically into boundaries or self-respect, its status should be revised. If Voluntary Return offers no predictive value beyond responsiveness and investment, it should not be retained simply because the phrase is beautiful.

XVIII

THE INTEGRATION

The field has taught us that people need security.

It has taught us that they also need autonomy.

It has shown that disclosure matters - but responsiveness determines whether disclosure becomes intimacy.

It has shown that close relationships can facilitate exploration, resilience, growth, and movement toward ideal selves.

It has shown that selfhood and connection are not necessarily opposites.

It has shown that relationships contain contradictions that cannot simply be solved once and eliminated.

It has shown that love does not excuse the disappearance of self-respect.

Growth Intimacy receives all of this.

Can we build an architecture in which these findings stop appearing as separate truths and begin functioning as one relational philosophy?

AUTONOMOUS RELATIONAL LIFE

Not fusion. Not isolation. Not possession. Not indifference.

Two lives. Two centers. One voluntarily chosen relational space. Secure enough for vulnerability. Free enough for autonomy. Reciprocal enough to be mutual. Truthful enough to remain real. Defended enough to preserve dignity. Flexible enough to survive change. And developmental enough that both people remain capable of becoming.

RESEARCH BOUNDARY

WHAT THIS ESSAY DOES - AND DOES NOT - CLAIM

Growth Intimacy is presented here as a developing integrative conceptual framework, not as a validated psychological theory, diagnosis, attachment classification, clinical intervention, or psychometric instrument.

The companion theories summarized in this article support individual mechanisms and tensions relevant to the framework. They do not establish the integrated Ethos model as empirically valid.

Responsible Claim

Growth Intimacy integrates established and emerging ideas around autonomy, responsiveness, selfhood, reciprocity, repair, security, growth, and non-possession into a distinct conceptual architecture.

Claim to Avoid

Existing relationship science has proven Growth Intimacy, Secure Continuity, Growth Defense, the Reciprocity Window, Jeju, or the Compass.

The next stage is empirical: operational definitions, discriminant validity, measurement development, longitudinal research, cultural testing, and comparison against established constructs.

SELECTED REFERENCES

COMPANION AND PARALLEL WORK

1. Aron, A., Aron, E. N., Tudor, M., & Nelson, G. (1991). Close relationships as including other in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(2), 241-253.
2. Baxter, L. A. (1990). Dialectical contradictions in relationship development. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7(1), 69-88.
3. Bowen, M. (1978). *Family Therapy in Clinical Practice*. Jason Aronson.
4. Buber, M. (1970/1923). *I and Thou* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). Scribner.
5. Feeney, B. C. (2004). A secure base: Responsive support of goal strivings and exploration in adult intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(5), 631-648. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.87.5.631
6. Feeney, B. C. (2007). The dependency paradox in close relationships: Accepting dependence promotes independence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(2), 268-285.
7. Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. (2015). Thriving through relationships. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 1, 22-28. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2014.11.001
8. Jordan, J. V. (2017). *Relational-Cultural Therapy*. American Psychological Association.
9. Knee, C. R., Lonsbary, C., Canevello, A., & Patrick, H. (2005). Self-determination and conflict in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(6), 997-1009. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.89.6.997
10. Kumashiro, M., Finkel, E. J., & Rusbult, C. E. (2002). Self-respect and pro-relationship behavior in marital relationships. *Journal of Personality*, 70(6), 1009-1050.
11. Laurenceau, J.-P., Barrett, L. F., & Pietromonaco, P. R. (1998). Intimacy as an interpersonal process: The importance of self-disclosure, partner disclosure, and perceived partner responsiveness in interpersonal exchanges. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(5), 1238-1251. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1238
12. Luchies, L. B., Finkel, E. J., McNulty, J. K., & Kumashiro, M. (2010). The doormat effect: When forgiving erodes self-respect and self-concept clarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(5), 734-749.
13. Miller, J. B. (1976). *Toward a New Psychology of Women*. Beacon Press.
14. Murray, S. L., Holmes, J. G., & Collins, N. L. (2006). Optimizing assurance: The risk regulation system in relationships. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(5), 641-666.
15. Perel, E. (2006). *Mating in Captivity: Unlocking Erotic Intelligence*. Harper.
16. Reis, H. T., & Shaver, P. (1988). Intimacy as an interpersonal process. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of Personal Relationships*.
17. Rusbult, C. E., Finkel, E. J., & Kumashiro, M. (2009). The Michelangelo phenomenon. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18(6), 305-309. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01657.x
18. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-Determination Theory: Basic Psychological Needs in Motivation, Development, and Wellness*. Guilford Press.

Editorial note: This reference list is intentionally selective. It identifies major intellectual neighbors rather than claiming exhaustive review of the literatures discussed.

CODA

THE FIELD AND THE SPACE BETWEEN

Growth Intimacy does not begin by claiming that relationship science has missed intimacy.

It has not.

The field has given us remarkably sophisticated accounts of attachment, autonomy, responsiveness, dependence, differentiation, support, mutuality, self-expansion, conflict, repair, and growth.

The question is whether those insights can be arranged around another image of relationship.

Not two halves becoming one.

Not two independent individuals refusing dependence.

Two centers.

Meeting.

Revealing.

Responding.

Separating.

Living.

Returning.

Repairing.

Changing.

Meeting again.

The strongest relationship may not be the one that makes separation impossible. It may be the one in which both people remain sufficiently secure to attach, sufficiently autonomous to live, sufficiently reciprocal to return, sufficiently truthful to repair, and sufficiently free to continue becoming.

And perhaps that is what autonomous relational life ultimately means: neither person becomes less themselves because the other matters, and the space between them remains meaningful precisely because neither person has to disappear in order for it to exist.



KYZETHX HOUSE

I do not become less myself because you matter.

You do not become less yourself because I matter.

*And the space between us becomes meaningful because neither of us has to
disappear in order for it to exist.*

STORY • SCENT • SOUND • MEMORY