

Case 6, Stage 2: The Double Insulator

The Scenario

The formal announcement of A1 (25M) and B2's (25F) engagement within their Mumbai-based diaspora community acts as an immediate catalyst for the complete dissolution of their conjugal boundaries. Because this union constitutes a consanguineous marriage—a strategic alliance between closely related kin—the standard sociological protocols that govern the integration of a new daughter-in-law into a family are entirely bypassed. Mr. & Mrs. A and Mr. & Mrs. B do not perceive the engagement as the genesis of a sovereign, independent household. Instead, they view it as the ultimate consolidation of an existing multi-generational kinship matrix. Operating under the deeply ingrained cultural assumption that shared blood fundamentally negates the need for systemic boundaries or privacy, both sets of parents assert total, unregulated access to the couple. The customary probationary period of affinity building, which typically allows a newly exogamous couple to negotiate boundaries and establish a distinct spousal subsystem, is erased. Because Mrs. A (the future mother-in-law) is simultaneously B2's paternal aunt, the traditional boundaries of a new marriage are replaced by a pre-existing, heavily enmeshed hierarchy of elder-to-child authority, granting the parental executive committee unquestioned operational oversight over the couple.

This assumption of absolute enmeshment immediately manifests in an aggressive campaign of systemic oversteps and cross-generational micromanagement. Within days of the engagement, the cross-parental coalition begins dictating the logistical framework of the couple's future, viewing the upcoming Mumbai wedding not as a celebration of the couple's union, but as a communal project designed to project kinship solidarity and preserve socio-economic status. The parents unilaterally select vendors based on extended kinship obligations, attempt to secure a post-marital lease within a building heavily populated by extended family to maintain geographical surveillance, and explicitly instruct B2 on her anticipated domestic duties. Crucially, this micromanagement extends deeply into preexisting sibling dynamics; Mrs. A and Mrs. B collaboratively direct B2 on how she must monitor, manage, and caretaker A1's younger brothers, effectively conscripting her into the role of a subordinate caretaker within the joint family rather than acknowledging her as an egalitarian partner. Confronted with the immediate reality of a multi-generational panopticon, A1 and B2 must execute a joint defensive operation to establish an impenetrable boundary around their new conjugal subsystem, proving to each other that their pre-marital pact is structurally sound and capable of withstanding the crushing gravitational pull of their overlapping families.

The Personal POVs (The Internal Reality)

The Parents' POV (A & B)

To comprehend the internal reality of Mr. & Mrs. A and Mr. & Mrs. B, one must synthesize the anthropological mechanisms of endogamy with the clinical framework of Structural Family Therapy (SFT). From a sociological perspective, consanguineous marriage—particularly within the context of the Indian diaspora and specific Dravidian kinship systems—is not an anomalous choice, but a highly rational, historically embedded strategy designed to preserve lineage,

consolidate property, ensure absolute social trust, and reinforce group identity. India possesses one of the highest rates of consanguineous unions globally, with studies indicating that such marriages account for a significant percentage of unions in southern and central demographics, a practice that heavily influences the cultural expectations of diasporic communities residing in urban centers like Mumbai. For the parents, the marriage of A1 and B2 represents the successful culmination of this strategy. By keeping the marriage "in-house," they believe they have successfully insulated their children from the unpredictability, financial extortion, and cultural misalignment often associated with incorporating total strangers (exogamy) into the joint family matrix.

Because the parents view the marriage as an extension of the existing kinship network, they operate under the assumption that blood ties inherently negate the need for boundaries. In the theoretical framework developed by Salvador Minuchin, this family structure is characterized by severe "enmeshment"—a state where boundaries are highly diffuse, individual autonomy is actively suppressed in favor of collective cohesion, and family members become excessively involved in each other's emotional and operational domains. The parents do not view their dictation of wedding logistics, housing arrangements, or sibling management as an intrusion; rather, they perceive this intense micromanagement as the highest expression of loving involvement and parental duty. They cannot conceptually separate their roles as biological elders from their new roles as affinal in-laws. Therefore, the surveillance apparatus that the family uses to police its members is turned entirely inward upon the new couple.

In this hyper-enmeshed reality, the parents view the concept of a sovereign spousal subsystem as not only foreign but actively threatening. Any attempt by A1 and B2 to assert privacy—such as closing a door, making an independent financial decision, or establishing a boundary regarding A1's younger brothers—is interpreted as a catastrophic disruption of family homeostasis. To the parents, differentiation is synonymous with betrayal. They interpret the couple's desire for autonomy as a rejection of their enduring love, authority, and the very kinship safety net that the consanguineous union was designed to provide.

Sociological Driver	Structural Family Therapy Concept	Parental Interpretation of Marital Dynamics
Kinship Solidarity	Diffuse Boundaries / Enmeshment	The marriage is a communal asset; privacy is viewed as secrecy or betrayal of the collective.
Wealth/Status Preservation	Executive Subsystem Dominance	Elders retain absolute veto power over financial, logistical, and domestic decisions.
Information Security	The Consanguineous Panopticon	Continuous cross-generational surveillance is required to maintain systemic homeostasis and cultural continuity.
Role Continuity	Cross-Generational Coalitions	The bride (niece) must seamlessly integrate into a subordinate caretaking role for the groom's siblings.

The Couple's POV (The Syndicate)

The internal reality of A1 and B2 is defined by a hyper-vigilant awareness of the structural

vulnerabilities inherent in their engagement. Raised in a rapidly modernizing, corporate environment in Mumbai, yet tethered to a highly traditional kinship network, the couple operates with a contemporary, egalitarian understanding of a companionate marriage. They view their union not as a submission to the joint family matrix, but as a strategic, mutual-defense pact—a "Syndicate" designed to protect their individual ambitions, egalitarian ideals, and marital autonomy from the relentless gravitational pull of their extended families. They recognize with acute clarity that the very blood ties that facilitated their union (and provided them with pre-existing trust) are now being weaponized against their independence. If they do not immediately execute a synchronized defense to establish their sovereignty, they are acutely aware that they will spend the entirety of their marital lives as perpetually infantilized subordinates within a multi-generational panopticon.

For A1, the psychological distress is rooted in a severe systemic double-bind. He is caught between the mandates of his family of origin—which demands absolute filial piety and adherence to traditional patriarchal structures—and the requirements of his family of creation—which necessitates his primary allegiance to B2's autonomy. From a Bowenian family systems perspective, A1 is experiencing a crisis of "differentiation of self," struggling to balance his need for individual autonomy with his desire for familial connection without succumbing to the emotional reactivity of the system. He understands that his parents' expectation that B2 will seamlessly transition into managing his younger brothers is an archaic imposition that threatens the core fabric of their modern pact. However, directly opposing his parents risks triggering massive emotional reactivity, accusations of abandoning the family unit, and the threat of emotional cutoff.

B2's internal reality is characterized by a deep-seated apprehension regarding structural subordination. She observes the immediate erasure of her boundaries by her aunt (now mother-in-law) and her own parents, recognizing that the lack of an "affinity transition" strips her of the standard diplomatic protections afforded to an outside bride. B2 knows that without an impenetrable boundary, she will be subjected to dual-channel surveillance, scrutinized simultaneously by her in-laws and her biological parents. Her hyper-vigilance is focused on A1's ability to act as a structural shield; she requires immediate proof that he is capable of prioritizing their marital dyad over his filial conditioning. The couple's unified stance is forged in the understanding that their survival as a functioning, companionate dyad requires the immediate and forceful construction of a boundary architecture that visually, operationally, and emotionally signals their absolute separation from the parental executive subsystems.

The Analytical Framework

To successfully navigate the crisis presented by the engagement, it is imperative to deconstruct the underlying sociological and therapeutic mechanisms driving the family dynamics. This requires a rigorous analysis of the Consanguineous Boundary Paradox, the unique authority dynamics of endogamous marriages within the Indian diaspora, and the necessary modification of the standard therapeutic protocols regarding boundary enforcement.

The Consanguineous Boundary Paradox

The fundamental crisis facing A1 and B2 can be analytically defined as the Consanguineous Boundary Paradox. This paradox highlights the structural contradiction wherein the very mechanism that provided the macro-system with information security and cohesion (shared

blood) instantaneously becomes the greatest systemic threat to the micro-system's marital autonomy.

In a standard, exogamous marriage, the introduction of a new spouse into a family system represents the introduction of a "stranger." This stranger originates from a different family system, possessing distinct values, operational rules, and boundaries. Sociologically, the relationship is defined by "affinity" (ties created by marriage) rather than "consanguinity" (ties of blood). Because the new spouse is a biological outsider, the family of origin instinctively affords them a certain degree of structural distance. This distance creates a natural, albeit temporary, boundary. It forces the parents to engage in a process of polite negotiation, observation, and gradual boundary integration. From a therapeutic standpoint, this natural distance provides the newly formed spousal subsystem with the crucial time and space required to solidify their own internal boundaries, establish their operational rules, and form a unified front before fully integrating with the extended family.

In a consanguineous marriage, this normative transition of affinity is structurally obliterated from inception. Because the bride and groom are already deeply embedded within the same biological and social matrix, the "stranger" dynamic does not exist. B2 is not a new daughter-in-law to be cautiously integrated; she is a niece whose behavioral patterns, weaknesses, and subordination to elder authority have been established and reinforced since infancy. Mr. & Mrs. A do not feel the need to politely negotiate with B2 because they already possess a socially sanctioned, pre-existing vector of authority over her.

According to SFT, healthy family functioning requires clear, semi-permeable boundaries that delineate the executive parental subsystem from the spousal subsystem, allowing the couple to resolve conflicts privately and cultivate emotional intimacy without external contamination. However, the consanguineous kinship network relies on high emotional and operational enmeshment to maintain its protective properties against the outside world. Therefore, it views any internal boundary construction as an existential threat. The surveillance apparatus is multi-directional: Mrs. A monitors B2 not just as a daughter-in-law, but as a niece; Mrs. B monitors B2 not just as a daughter, but as a representative of her lineage's reputation within the joint family. The paradox dictates that while the couple is structurally insulated from the external world by their shared bloodline, they are rendered entirely defenseless against their own internal familial architecture.

Boundary Variable	Standard Exogamous Marriage	Consanguineous Endogamous Marriage
Initial Relational Status	Affinity (ties by marriage); requires negotiation.	Consanguinity (ties by blood); pre-existing authority.
Structural Distance	High; allows time for the spousal subsystem to form.	Zero; immediate integration into the joint family matrix.
Parental Oversight	Cautious observation; boundaries are tested gradually.	Absolute entitlement; boundaries are considered non-existent.
Surveillance Vectors	Uni-directional (In-laws observing the new spouse).	Multi-directional (In-laws, biological parents, and extended kin).
Primary Systemic Threat	External misalignment or conflict of values.	Internal enmeshment and suppression of dyadic autonomy.

The Strategy Playbook (The Systemic Moves)

The resolution to this paradox requires a highly specialized modification of standard therapeutic boundary defense. Because the vectors of authority in a consanguineous union are multi-directional and deeply entrenched through biological lineage, traditional conflict resolution models fail. A1 and B2 must transition from theoretical analysis to applied structural family therapy, executing a highly coordinated, three-step actionable strategy designed to dismantle the consanguineous panopticon, neutralize cross-generational coalitions, and forcefully establish the sovereignty of their marital dyad. The tone of execution must remain clinical, strategic, and devoid of emotional reactivity, recognizing that the objective is permanent structural reorganization.

1. The Double Insulator Protocol

In traditional structural and Bowenian family therapy applied to standard exogamous marriages, the biological child of the family of origin acts as the primary boundary enforcer, or the "Sole Insulator," against their own parents. For example, if a husband's parents are overstepping into the marriage, it is the husband's structural responsibility to intercede, set the boundary, and absorb the emotional reactivity of his parents, thereby insulating his wife from direct conflict. This allows the wife to maintain a polite, relatively frictionless affinal relationship with her in-laws while her husband manages the difficult differentiation process.

However, a nuanced understanding of authority dynamics reveals a critical failure point in the traditional Sole Insulator protocol when applied to endogamy. When both spouses share blood relations with the intervening elders, the "Sole Insulator" is structurally bypassed. If A1 attempts to act as the Sole Insulator against his mother (Mrs. A), he finds that his mother possesses an independent, pre-existing vector of authority over his wife, B2, because Mrs. A is also B2's paternal aunt. Mrs. A does not need to bypass A1 to reach B2; she already has direct, socially sanctioned access. If A1 attempts to block Mrs. A, Mrs. A will simply shift her relational axis and assert her authority directly over B2, leveraging decades of aunt-niece conditioning to enforce compliance. Similarly, if Mr. & Mrs. B attempt to dictate the couple's domestic arrangements, B2 cannot simply block them and expect A1 to be insulated, because A1 is also their nephew. Therefore, A1 and B2 must implement the **Double Insulator Protocol**. This requires a synchronized, dual-front defense where the conjugal dyad operates as a completely unified, impenetrable block. Both spouses must simultaneously erect a barrier against both sets of parents, necessitating a strict division of defensive labor to prevent cross-contamination.

Execution Parameters:

- **A1's Vector:** A1 assumes sole responsibility for managing, redirecting, and enforcing boundaries against his biological parents (Mr. & Mrs. A). He must never attempt to enforce boundaries against Mr. & Mrs. B.
- **B2's Vector:** B2 assumes sole responsibility for managing, redirecting, and enforcing boundaries against her biological parents (Mr. & Mrs. B). She must never attempt to enforce boundaries against Mr. & Mrs. A.
- **The Deflective Block:** When a parent attempts to exploit the secondary consanguineous link (e.g., Mrs. A bypassing A1 to issue a directive directly to her niece, B2), the receiving spouse must execute a deflective block. B2 must not engage with Mrs. A's demands, neither agreeing nor arguing, as any engagement validates Mrs. A's assumption of direct authority. B2 must seamlessly deploy the block and immediately route the interaction back

to A1.

Example: Mrs. A calls B2 to dictate that B2 must assume responsibility for tutoring A1's younger brother. B2 utilizes the protocol: *"That is an interesting expectation, Auntie. A1 and I manage our schedule together. A1 will call you this evening to discuss our availability."* B2 then exits the interaction. That evening, A1 (acting as his half of the Double Insulator) delivers the boundary: *"Mom, B2 and I have discussed the tutoring. Our schedules do not permit us to take on that responsibility. We will not be acting as primary caretakers for my brothers."* By rigidly adhering to this division of labor, the couple systematically dismantles the aunt-niece and uncle-nephew channels of authority, forcing all systemic traffic to flow through the external perimeter of the conjugal dyad.

2. The United Front Scripting

The second step requires the couple to preemptively defend against systemic triangulation. In Bowenian family systems theory, triangulation occurs when the anxiety or conflict between a dyad (in this case, the parents attempting to control the couple) is displaced by pulling in a third party to stabilize the system and enforce compliance. In the highly reactive environment of a consanguineous family, parents will inevitably attempt to weaponize one spouse against the other when they encounter the newly erected Double Insulator boundary. The parents will utilize their shared blood history to induce guilt, utilizing cross-generational coalitions to bypass the spousal block.

To survive this, A1 and B2 must utilize exact, rehearsed scripts to neutralize these triangulation attempts. These scripts rely on the Bowenian technique of the "I" position (or in this case, the "We" position) to reduce emotional reactivity while maintaining a rigid boundary. The scripts must be deployed with clinical detachment, proving that the couple cannot be divided by appeals to pre-existing blood loyalties.

Scenario A: The Patriarchal Bypass Attempt Frustrated by his inability to control the logistics of the Mumbai wedding, Mr. A attempts to triangulate A1 against B2. Mr. A leverages his patriarchal authority, expecting his son to enforce the family's will over the bride. *Parental Tactic:* *"A1, you need to control your future wife. Tell B2 she must listen to her aunt regarding the vendor selection. She is disrespecting our family traditions and causing a rift."*

The Deflective Script for A1: A1 must recognize this as an attempt to fracture the Syndicate by pitting his filial duty against his marital loyalty. A1 deploys the script: *"Dad, I understand you are anxious about the wedding logistics. However, B2 and I are making these decisions together as a team. I do not instruct my partner to obey; we reach a consensus. Our decision on the vendors is final, and we will not be changing it."* This script explicitly identifies the couple as a unified decision-making unit and rejects the premise that the husband serves as an enforcer for the extended family.

Scenario B: The Maternal Guilt-Inducing Coalition Mrs. B, attempting to maintain control over the couple's domestic future and ensure her daughter conforms to traditional norms, attempts to triangulate B2 against A1. Mrs. B leverages her maternal bond and consanguineous leverage. *Parental Tactic:* *"B2, you know how A1's brothers are. You have a duty to our bloodline to manage them properly. Do not let A1 distance you from the family; you are our daughter first, and a wife second."*

The Deflective Script for B2: B2 must neutralize the attempt to activate her archaic role as a subordinate niece/daughter. B2 deploys the script: *"Mom, I value our extended family, but my primary allegiance is to A1 and the household we are building together. How A1 and I manage our relationship with his brothers is a private matter between us as a couple. We will not accept*

outside management on our internal domestic structure." This script structurally classifies domestic management as strictly private, enforcing the supremacy of the newly formed affinity boundary.

By consistently deploying these scripts, the couple signals to the extended family system that attempts at triangulation are futile. They refuse to engage in emotional justification, thereby neutralizing the emotional field and forcing the parents to gradually adapt to the new structural reality.

3. The Sovereignty Demonstration

The final step in the Strategy Playbook requires a definitive, tangible action to permanently restructure the systemic hierarchy. While the Double Insulator Protocol and the United Front Scripting establish the perimeter, the couple must execute a "Sovereignty Demonstration" to prove that the boundary possesses structural integrity under pressure. In SFT, this is akin to an "enactment" designed to intentionally disrupt the dysfunctional equilibrium, escalate the systemic stress to a critical threshold, and force the family system to stabilize into a healthier, differentiated pattern.

A1 and B2 must deliberately select a highly visible, yet ultimately low-stakes logistical decision regarding their imminent future to serve as the battleground for their sovereignty. Within the context of their engagement in Mumbai, the optimal vector for this demonstration is finalizing a wedding vendor or securing their post-marital apartment lease.

Assume the cross-parental executive committee has collectively dictated that the couple must utilize a specific catering vendor owned by a distant relative, viewing this as a mandatory exercise in kinship solidarity and economic preservation. Alternatively, the parents may attempt to coerce the couple into signing a lease in a residential building located on the same street as Mr. & Mrs. A, a move designed to maintain the physical architecture of the panopticon and ensure continuous daily surveillance.

A1 and B2 must execute their absolute veto power unequivocally. They must independently research, select, and financially secure an alternative vendor, or sign a lease in a geographically distinct neighborhood, without seeking prior parental approval, consultation, or financial assistance. Once the contract is signed and the deposit is paid, the couple presents the decision to both sets of parents simultaneously as an irreversible, completed fact, not a topic for debate or negotiation.

When the parents inevitably react with intense emotional reactivity—accusing the couple of disrespect, arrogance, and systemic disruption—A1 and B2 must absorb the emotional shockwave without retreating, apologizing, or justifying their choice. They must utilize their United Front scripting to calmly reiterate that they are sovereign adults capable of making independent financial and logistical choices. The crucial therapeutic mechanism here is the refusal to internalize the systemic anxiety.

By successfully executing the Sovereignty Demonstration, A1 and B2 achieve a profound structural victory. They concretely prove to the parental subsystems that their micromanagement is no longer enforceable and that the era of absolute enmeshment has ended. More importantly, they prove to each other that their mutual-defense pact is fundamentally sound, validating the immense psychological risk required to differentiate from a hyper-enmeshed consanguineous matrix. The successful defense of this boundary establishes a critical precedent, serving as the foundational architecture upon which they will construct a stable, autonomous, and deeply companionate marriage.

Works cited

1. Systems of Kinship in India - Plutus IAS,
<https://plutusias.com/elearning/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Systems-of-Kinship-in-India-2.pdf>
2. social kinship system in india - Golden Research Thoughts,
<https://oldgrt.lbp.world/UploadedData/2866.pdf>
3. Structural Approaches to Family Therapy: Techniques and Goals - Psychology Town,
<https://psychology.town/counselling-interventions/structural-family-therapy-techniques-goals/>
4. Case 3: The Companionate Clash | Listening,
<https://www.listening.com/doc/case-3-the-companionate-clash-8VvvxeLimW0r>
5. Consanguineous Marriage in Global Perspective: Anthropological Roots, Genetic Risks, Contemporary Relevance, and the Way Forward - SCIEPublish,
<https://www.sciepublish.com/article/pii/816?utm>
6. A Slow Life History is Related to a Negative Attitude towards Cousin Marriages: A Study in Three Ethnic Groups in Mexico - PMC,
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10480839/>
7. Consanguinity in India: What DNA Reveals About Related Marriages - Helixline, <https://helixline.in/blog/consanguinity-dna-india>
8. Consanguinity and its Effects : The Love That Dare Not Speak Its Surname!,
<https://pimr.org.in/article/consanguinity-and-its-effects-the-love-that-dare-not-speak-its-surname/>
9. Consanguineous marriages: Preconception consultation in primary health care settings,
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3419292/>
10. How to Protect Your Daughters from "Stranger Marriage": Palestinian Families in Germany Betwixt Kinship Endogamy and Intercultural Exogamy | Diaspora - University of Toronto Press,
<https://utppublishing.com/doi/10.3138/diaspora.23.1.2023.03.11>
11. What is Enmeshment? - Simply Psychology, <https://www.simplypsychology.org/what-is-enmeshment.html>
12. Structural Family Therapy | TherapyRoute,
<https://www.therapyroute.com/article/structural-family-therapy-by-therapyroute>
13. Structural Family Therapy: Mapping Techniques, Structural Maps and 3 Best Case Examples for Nurses,
<https://studyingnurse.com/study/structural-family-therapy/>
14. Consanguinity and Affinity: Exploring The Family Relationships! - Testbook,
<https://testbook.com/ias-preparation/consanguinity-and-affinity>
15. When the Marriage Has More Than Two People: In-Law Interference and the Indian Couple,
<https://komelkaur.com/blog/when-the-marriage-has-more-than-two-people>
16. What Is Bowenian Family and Couples Therapy? 5 Techniques - PositivePsychology.com,
<https://positivepsychology.com/bowenian-therapy/>
17. A Process Model of Adolescents' Triangulation into Parents' Marital Conflict: The Role of Emotional Reactivity - PMC,
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2791501/>
18. The effect of interference by affinal relatives on innovation investment in family businesses,
<https://www.emerald.com/jkm/article/30/3/873/1342428/The-effect-of-interference-by-affinal-relatives-on>
19. UNIT 10 KINSHIP* - eGyanKosh,
<https://egyankosh.ac.in/bitstream/123456789/61233/1/Unit10.pdf>
20. Overview of Structural Family Therapy | PDF - Scribd,
<https://www.scribd.com/document/780237050/Structural-Family-Therapy>
21. Structural Family Therapy - Iosco County Psychological Services,
https://www.ioscocoountypsych.com/uploads/3/4/9/8/34986419/gladding__2014__ch_10_structural_family_therapy.pdf
22. Interuniversity Papers in Demography Post-migration survival of traditional marriage patterns: consanguineous marriage among Tu - BRISPO - Vrije Universiteit

Brussel, <https://brispo.research.vub.be/sites/default/files/2024-02/WP-IPD-1998-1.pdf> 23. Triangulation - Detriangulation - Family, Development, Family, and Child - JRank Articles, <https://family.jrank.org/pages/1708/Triangulation-Detriangulation.html> 24. Chromatin Insulator Elements Block Transgene Silencing in Engineered Human Embryonic Stem Cell Lines at a Defined Chromosome 13 Locus - PMC, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3258440/> 25. Chromatin insulators homie and nhomie can interact with distant copies either together or separately, with distinct outcomes for - Research journals - PLOS, <https://journals.plos.org/plosgenetics/article/file?id=10.1371/journal.pgen.1011940&type=printable> 26. Nonstoichiometric Nanolayered Ni/NiO/Al₂O₃/CrAu Metal–Insulator–Metal Infrared Rectenna | ACS Applied Nano Materials - ACS Publications, <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acsanm.0c03012> 27. De-Triangulating a Child from Parental Conflict - Changes Counselling & Psychotherapy, <https://changes.ie/de-triangulating-a-child-from-parental-conflict/> 28. Same Family, Divergent Realities: How Triangulation Preserves Parents' Illusory Harmony while Adolescents Navigate Interparental Conflicts - PMC, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8336947/> 29. Trapped in the Triangle: Reclaiming Your Role in Family Triangulation, <https://www.melinaaldenmft.com/blog/reclaiming-your-role-in-family-triangulation> 30. Triangulation Psychology: Relationship Effects - HopeQure, <https://www.hopequire.com/blogs/what-is-triangulation-psychology> 31. Structural family therapy - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Structural_family_therapy 32. Consanguineous marriages and their effects on pregnancy outcomes in India, <https://www.emerald.com/ijssp/article/33/7-8/437/159693/Consanguineous-marriages-and-their-effects-on> 33. Rajni Palriwala and Patricia Uberoi, <https://www.dumdummotijheelcollege.ac.in/pdf/1588575273.pdf> 34. Development of a Family Therapy Package Based on the Integration of Structural–Systemic and Attachment-Based Therapy - KMAN Publication Inc., <https://journals.kmanpub.com/index.php/aftj/article/download/5041/9129/28191>