


UNITED WISDOM

# The Ethics of Food: Discussing Values Without Moral Superiority

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-20-N05 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# The Ethics of Food: Discussing Values Without Moral Superiority

## Epigraph

*Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not;*

Romans 14:3, King James Version, a short literal fragment. The original concerns a Christian community, faith and relationships, rather than contemporary nutrition.

## What this article is about

Nadya attends a family dinner and chooses dishes without meat. For her, this expresses care for animals. Her aunt, who has cooked all day, hears the refusal as a judgement on her work. Her brother jokes that everyone at the table will now be tested for moral purity. Nadya answers more sharply than intended: if they thought seriously about suffering, they would not joke. The conversation already concerns more than food. Conviction, hospitality, habit, tiredness and the wish not to appear a bad person before loved ones have become entangled.

This hypothetical scene establishes no suitable diet for anyone and compares no products' environmental properties. It poses another question: can we discuss food's values seriously while remaining clear about our choices and respectful towards people who choose differently? Merely banning arguments is insufficient. Silence can hide a significant boundary; moral pressure can prevent it being heard.

Distinguish a personal commitment, an argument about consequences and arrangements for a shared meal. These connect but require different decisions. We can explain, ask, propose and decline participation in a particular action. Yet another person's plate should not become a brief, definitive account of their entire life.

## I. One Dish Can Carry Several Meanings

For Nadya, declining meat means trying to align everyday action with care for animals. For her aunt, the prepared dish means time, family memory and a desire to welcome guests. These meanings do not automatically cancel each other. Noticing only one leads the conversation to attribute intentions people did not express. Nadya supposedly arrived to humiliate the host; the host supposedly demands that she abandon her conviction. Between these assumptions, the actual refusal and actual work disappear from discussion.



@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Food's meaning can include religious observance, access, familiar cooking methods, attachment to a place or a personal decision. We need not consider every reason sufficient for every action. Yet before objecting, understand which reason is being offered. An argument about animals cannot be answered solely with a joke about taste; a question about additional cooking cannot be answered solely with general language about compassion. In each case, the subject changes while the original question remains unexamined.

The person choosing may not immediately explain their reason clearly either. Nadya says this is right for me because she does not yet want a long argument. Her aunt hears everyone else is acting wrongly. Nadya can clarify: I am explaining my boundary, rather than evaluating everything you did. This does not empty her choice of moral significance. It identifies the claim's scope. A broader argument can be discussed later if time and willingness to listen are available.

A shared meal need not make every meaning coincide. It needs sufficiently clear conditions for participation without unexpected coercion. Sometimes this means clarifying ingredients and an available dish; sometimes it means agreeing beforehand that someone will bring their own contribution. The task is not to dissolve conviction through politeness. It is to avoid making one answer simultaneously settle worldview, menu, work distribution and mutual recognition. Distinctions help each question receive the appropriate conversation.

## II. A Conviction Need Not Certify One's Own Purity

Nadya may decline food contrary to her considered choice. Refusal does not require the whole family's permission and need not wait until she becomes consistent in every other aspect of life. Otherwise, any conviction could be halted by listing human imperfections. Yet refusing also does not certify complete moral faultlessness. It concerns a particular action. Retaining that scope helps both the person choosing and those hearing their explanation.

Arguments often become searches for inconsistency. Someone reminds Nadya of another purchase; someone asks why she has not changed everything at once. Such observations can raise an important question about a principle's limits, or serve to avoid considering the present argument. Distinguish the two. If the question concerns the explanation, it can be answered or its incompleteness acknowledged. If it demands perfection before someone may decline a dish, the demand does not help the decision.

Nadya can also notice the temptation to treat her refusal as authority to speak from above. I am acting more attentively can quietly become I understand life better in general. This transition needs separate grounds that a food choice does not provide. Even justified criticism of an action does not establish complete knowledge of another person's motives, opportunities or

other deeds. Moral seriousness is not diminished by declining to claim such knowledge. It becomes more accurate about its subject.

In the selected sections of The Enchiridion, Epictetus distinguishes external advantages from the person, cautions against judging without understanding an action's basis and proposes showing philosophy through conduct. This is Stoic work on one's behaviour, rather than a contemporary theory of food ethics. For our scene, it helps retain a narrow question: what does my choice actually allow me to assert? An answer can be firm about personal participation and modest about another person's whole character. Those qualities are compatible.

## III. Care for Animals Deserves an Argument Rather Than Ridicule

Seeking to avoid unnecessary animal suffering is a substantive moral reason. It cannot be dismissed simply because conversation began at a table or refusal inconveniences the host. Yet the existence of this reason does not produce a complete answer about all production and nutrition. Explain which action is considered, which harm matters and where the speaker's knowledge ends. A personal refusal can be maintained without pretending to know every chain, but a general claim's limits must be identified.

In selected passages from Of Cruelty, Montaigne reflects on his aversion to suffering and attention to animals while retaining the complexity of his experience of hunting and pleasure. This is historical philosophical testimony, rather than contemporary research on animal behaviour. We do not adopt his generalisations linking cruelty to animals with human vices as a proven law. Something else is useful: moral attention can arise within an imperfect life, without waiting for the author to portray himself as completely consistent.

Nadya can explain that her refusal connects with this attention. She need not attribute delight in cruelty to relatives to explain her choice. Her aunt can disagree with the conclusion while taking the reason seriously. A question about available changes or disputed parts of the argument may follow. Such conversation does not guarantee agreement. It preserves the subject of moral consideration instead of replacing it either with an accusation against the whole family or with a joke making compassion ridiculous in advance.

Respect for people does not require declaring every treatment of animals equivalent. A specific action, production practice or justification can be criticised when appropriate grounds exist. Yet criticism must fit what is known. If a general conviction is being discussed, a relative's plate should not become evidence of a specific production history without information. If established conditions are being considered, they cannot be dismissed by demanding respect for every preference. Moral distinctions and accurate knowledge work together when each retains its own scope.

## IV. A Shared Meal Requires Agreement Rather Than Mind Reading

Nadya could have explained her choice before dinner, and her aunt could have clarified what was already prepared and what help she could accept. If that conversation did not happen, blame need not be assigned immediately. Establish what is possible now and what needs discussion next time. A host need not anticipate every guest's restriction. A guest need not eat unsuitable food to prove gratitude. An area for practical agreement remains between these boundaries.

Explaining a personal choice must be clear enough for organisation without necessarily containing a moral lecture. Someone can say which dishes they do not eat, ask about available alternatives and offer agreed help. If they bring something, clarify necessary conditions for storage, preparation and use of the shared kitchen. Good intentions do not make additional work already accepted. Offering to bring a dish can help, but should not become an unexpected instruction about somebody else's space.

Hosts can honestly identify their limits. They may not be ready to change the whole menu today, but can explain existing ingredients; another day they may discuss a different arrangement. Such answers do not necessarily refuse respect to a guest. Yet hospitality must not conceal pressure to try something despite a clear refusal. Attention to the shared table includes the possibility of declining a particular action. A meal becomes no more communal by requiring identical plates as confirmation of family belonging.

In section 36 of The Enchiridion, Epictetus attends both to food as bodily desire and to one's relationship with the person hosting the meal. We do not derive a duty to eat everything offered. The comparison is narrower: eating occurs within relationships, and these deserve attention alongside personal choice. Work can be respected through words, help within agreed limits and attention to conditions. None of these requires cancelling a significant personal boundary.

## V. Health and Environmental Effects Need More Than Values

In family conversation, a moral choice readily acquires promises: this is healthier for everyone; it is certainly better for nature. Such conclusions require information different from a philosophical reason. This article identifies no suitable diet, assesses no individual needs and compares no products across their life cycles. If Nadya speaks about care for animals, that argument should be discussed. A medical or environmental assertion needs its own grounds; the speaker's worthy purpose does not make it true.

The reverse also matters. Lacking a ready calculation does not cancel every moral question. Someone can acknowledge limits of knowledge while choosing not to participate in a particular action. Yet general advice to others must consider their actual conditions and the necessary expertise. Dietary change cannot be assigned through certainty about one's virtue. Where health is involved, qualified advice is appropriate, rather than making the family table a place for an unprepared decision. Respect for conviction cannot replace relevant knowledge.

When discussing products, ask which exact claim the offered information concerns. One person's experience does not prove identical opportunities and outcomes for everyone. A packaging label does not explain a product's whole history. A general product category does not always describe specific conditions. Every possible unknown need not be listed. What matters is not claiming more than is established and separating a need for information from attempts to devalue someone else's moral reason.

For Nadya, this permits simpler wording: my present choice follows this conviction; I am not claiming to have established the best diet for everyone. Her aunt can answer equally precisely: I understand the boundary, but do not know how to provide that option at our next meeting. These statements do not settle every disagreement. They reduce unsupported assertions and open a practical question. Once the subject is clearer, arguments about values cease to substitute for specialist knowledge that may be absent at the table.

## VI. Access Belongs in Moral Consideration

Food is not chosen solely from a list of ideal possibilities. Money, time, a kitchen, familiar skills, shared living arrangements and other circumstances affect choice. This is not a universal justification for every action. It describes which changes are actually available. If an initiator skips this part, they may offer an image of a correct life rather than a possible action. Advice becomes particularly inaccurate when personal resources are silently presumed available to every listener.

Nadya may know a simple way to prepare her chosen dish and offer it to her aunt. The proposal helps when the necessary ingredients, time and work are visible alongside it. It helps less when accompanied by a conclusion that nobody has grounds to choose differently. What suits Nadya may not suit another family. Clarifying access gives conversation a basis, rather than necessarily accepting every constraint forever. Some obstacles can be reduced; others remain real at present.

A person need not disclose detailed health, income or domestic relationships for their refusal of a proposal to deserve respect. A shared dinner often requires only a necessary condition: this option is currently unavailable to me, or I am not ready to accept this work. In a voluntary conversation, appropriate help can be explored. If no answer is offered, retain the discussion's

limit. Moral interest does not authorise access to every private detail, even when we hope to use it for a good decision.

In section 47 of The Enchiridion, the selected reflection on modest consumption draws attention to people for whom hardship is not a conspicuous voluntary practice. Historical Stoic discipline does not provide a contemporary account of poverty. It helps notice the distinction between a chosen restriction and a compelled condition. Nadya can value her consistency without turning somebody else's limited opportunity into a character defect. Participation in food ethics begins with actual choice, rather than identical outward results.

## VII. Refusing Contempt Does Not Mean Abandoning Distinctions

Romans 14 considers differences in eating and observing days within Christians' relationships with God and each other. The chapter includes both rejection of contempt and attention to one's action's effect on another person. It is not a contemporary manifesto declaring every diet morally equivalent. Its religious reasons and understanding of faith remain explicit. For this article, the text opens a limited question: can we discuss differences without turning a person into an object of contempt?

Nadya can consider her refusal justified while recognising her relatives' dignity. This does not require saying that animals do not matter. Her aunt can consider her habits acceptable while stopping jokes that humiliate the guest's choice. This does not require immediately adopting Nadya's whole worldview. Mutual respect concerns the manner of discussion, rather than deciding the argument's content in advance. An appeal to respect should therefore neither prohibit reasons nor become a reward offered only for agreement.

Distinctions remain within specific criticism. One can say this argument does not address suffering, or this demand transfers unaccepted work to me. That differs from you are heartless or you are arrogant. In the first case, the subject of response remains visible and the position can be clarified. In the second, someone must defend their entire character, often before understanding the original question. We do not promise that precise language prevents conflict. We notice that it at least retains the action being discussed.

Serious conversation exists between politely evading a subject and humiliating certainty. It can end in disagreement while producing clearer knowledge of participation's limits. For a shared meal, that knowledge is sometimes enough. People can choose another time for a deeper question and continue discussion. Respect need not reconcile every reason immediately. It preserves the possibility of listening and answering without appointing one person the final moral judge of everyone else's life.

## VIII. The Conversation's Timing Affects Its Subject

At a festive table, people may be ready to socialise without being ready for a lengthy argument about production and moral choice. Nadya can explain her refusal briefly and propose a separate broader discussion. This need not evade her principle. It distinguishes situations: participation's conditions need clarification now; the argument can be considered later. Yet postponement should not become an everlasting promise to avoid inconvenient subjects. If relatives genuinely want to discuss the value, find an appropriate moment and subject.

Ask what someone wants to know now. Are they interested in a dish's ingredients, Nadya's boundary or a general argument? Answers differ in length and substance. Someone clarifying how to host her does not necessarily invite a debate about every basis of eating. Someone asking about compassion is not necessarily mocking it. Presuming intent can make us answer our own defensive version of the conversation. Clarification preserves genuine curiosity and avoids expanding an organisational question into a struggle for recognition.

Consent to discuss does not mean consent to be persuaded. Nadya can give a reason, hear an objection and acknowledge that it needs further consideration. Her brother can abandon the jokes while retaining a different position. An adult conversation can withstand that outcome. If every refusal to agree is declared a moral defeat, an invitation to talk becomes a concealed demand to accept the conclusion. Conviction's seriousness also appears in accurately identifying what a listener accepted and what they still reject.

The right to stop a discussion matters when it becomes humiliating or incompatible with the meeting's conditions. One can say the personal refusal remains, but the conversation should not continue in this tone. This does not erase the possibility of returning differently. Nor does a pause prove personal correctness. It protects limits of participation in a conversation. Afterwards, distinguish the disputed assertion, the damaged manner of communication and the practical food decision that still needs to be made.

## IX. Shared Arrangements Can Change Without Assigning Blame

The next dinner allows future conditions to be discussed instead of a past moral failure. Several understandable options can be chosen beforehand, ingredients clarified and help agreed. Nobody must prepare a separate menu without an accepted duty. Nobody should have to justify a personal boundary to every joke. Real subjects emerge: time, dishes, access and work. Moral reasons remain significant, but cannot replace an answer to who will perform the necessary action.

Nadya can offer an agreed dish and undertake a known share of preparation. If her aunt prefers to cook herself, clarify what that means and which conditions are available. Agreement

should not rely on one side being required to accept every gift and the other to eat everything offered. Each retains the ability to state a limit. A shared table emerges where their opportunities intersect, rather than from demands for complete coincidence. Sometimes the intersection is smaller than the initial wish, but still permits meeting.

Not every conflict can be solved by a menu. If relatives continue humiliating Nadya's refusal or she continues evaluating everyone by their plate, relationships themselves are involved. Name that directly rather than hiding it within an endless discussion of products. Practical agreement may not remove this conflict, and the article does not promise otherwise. Distinguishing questions clarifies which change is needed: a dish, fair distribution of work or a boundary on acceptable treatment. Each requires its own response.

Shared arrangements can be checked against the accepted promise: was an understandable dish available, did the host receive agreed help and was the boundary respected? This checks a particular meeting rather than proving the best food ethic. If something failed, describe why without immediately assigning someone's moral inferiority. The correction can be small. People can learn to arrange things together without pretending that one conversation settled animals, health, nature and human dignity.

## X. Firm Choices Can Coexist With Open Conversation

By dinner's end, Nadya may retain her refusal, thank her aunt for the invitation and propose discussing next time beforehand. Her aunt may recognise that the refusal did not evaluate all her work. Her brother may understand that a joke does not replace an argument. This is a possible, rather than guaranteed, outcome of the hypothetical scene. Its value lies in clarity: nobody must surrender their reason for immediate peace, yet nobody gains permission to humiliate another person to defend it.

Openness does not mean being ready to violate every boundary after the first objection. It means listening to relevant information and reasons, clarifying one's claim and recognising limits of knowledge. Nadya can alter her wording without changing her current choice. She can discover a new practical contribution or remain unconvinced. In every case, actual consideration must differ from a performance of humility that demands abandoning conviction simply to avoid appearing self-confident.

Nor does moral superiority disappear through a soft voice. It can hide in the assumption that another person has simply not reached our understanding and their reason deserves no answer. Attention therefore concerns both tone and the structure of conversation: can the other person object, clarify and state a limit of participation? If so, a firm choice need not close relationships. If not, even polite words can make the meal a test whose content one side alone determines.

Food ethics remains serious when it considers actions, conditions and relationships together. It has room for care for animals, attention to other people's work, personal boundaries and honest requests for knowledge. These aspects need not be declared one value or equally strong in every situation. They should remain visible. Conversation can then stop measuring people by one plate and begin discussing what we choose, why and how to live alongside difference.

## What this means in practice

Before your next shared meal, state a personal boundary in one clear sentence and identify its moral reason separately. Do not include unsupported health or environmental advice. Communicate organisational needs beforehand, ask about an available option and offer help within a scope you can actually accept. Do not treat the hosts' additional work as already agreed.

If conversation becomes an argument, clarify its subject. Is it a dish's composition, your personal participation or a general reason? Answer that question while preserving limits of knowledge. Try replacing a judgement of the whole person with a precise objection to an action or assertion. This does not require declaring every action equivalent or abandoning a significant conviction. Disagreement can remain, with deeper conversation moved to an appropriate time.

Afterwards, check only what was agreed: access, help and the manner of treatment. If change is needed, propose a concrete next step without assigning blame through someone's plate. This is an original practice with no asserted research-based efficacy. It prescribes no diet and does not replace qualified help with health questions; its subject is clear moral conversation and agreed participation in a shared meal.

## Key quotation

> *don't talk how persons ought to eat, but eat as you ought.*

Epictetus, The Enchiridion, 46, Elizabeth Carter's translation; a short literal fragment. The comparison concerns demonstrating conviction through action, rather than prohibiting discussion of food ethics.

## Connections between traditions

| Source or perspective | What it helps us notice | Limit of comparison |
|---|---|---|
| Romans 14 | Differences in eating need not produce contempt | The Christian context does not declare all contemporary diets equivalent |
| Epictetus, The Enchiridion, 36, 44–47 | Personal action, reasons for judgement and relationships at a table | Stoic discipline cannot replace nutritional knowledge |
| Montaigne, Of Cruelty, selected passages | Compassion deserves consideration within an imperfect life | Historical generalisations are not adopted as behavioural laws |
| United Wisdom | Personal boundaries, arguments and shared arrangements need different answers | Original practice without scientific guarantees |

## Sources and notes

1. Romans, King James Version, Chapter 14, verses 1–23 read continuously in full, displayed lines 789–828; epigraph from the first part of 14:3. Religious reasons concerning acceptance, faith and relationships remain explicit. Contemporary dietary advice and environmental effects are not derived from it.

2. Epictetus, The Enchiridion, Elizabeth Carter's translation, Internet Classics Archive: section 36 read in full, lines 115–116; sections 44–47 read continuously in full, lines 125–131. Key fragment at 46. Questions about personal practice, hasty judgement and conspicuous modesty are used; Stoic rules do not become medical advice.

3. Michel de Montaigne, Essays, Book II, Chapter XI, Of Cruelty; Charles Cotton, edited by William Carew Hazlitt, 1877, Project Gutenberg 3600. Two selected continuous passages were actually read: displayed lines 5863–5868 and 5916–5938. They concern personal imperfection, aversion to cruelty, animals, religious attention and the beginning of a discussion of transmigration. The whole chapter is not claimed as read; historical hypotheses and generalisations are not adopted as scientific facts.

Reading checked on 10 October 2026. Russian quotations are our translations of the specified English versions. Worldwide rights for specific versions have not been established; brief quotations, links and limited paraphrase are used without full import or source vectorisation.

The scene, distinctions and practice are original. This article is not a nutritional guide and establishes no efficacy for the proposed conversation.

## Tags

food ethics, moral conversation, personal choice, care for animals, shared meals, hospitality, respect, consent, personal boundaries, conviction, compassion, moral superiority, eating habits, accessibility, other people's work, distribution of work, family conversation, disagreement, accurate knowledge, limits of advice, refusal, gratitude, shared table, human dignity, practical ethics, Romans, Epictetus, Montaigne, United Wisdom, food values

## About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.