


UNITED WISDOM

# Forgiveness, reconciliation, and rebuilding trust

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R27 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# Forgiveness, reconciliation, and rebuilding trust

## Epigraph

> *I freely forgive you now*

Nathaniel Hawthorne, The Scarlet Letter, chapter XVII; Dimmesdale’s words in a scene of pressure, not a model of voluntary agreement.

## What this article is about

In this fictional story, Lada and Roman have been friends for years. At a gathering he mocks her unsuccessful attempt to speak before an audience. Later he acknowledges being cruel and asks forgiveness. Lada hears the acknowledgment but does not want the old friendship back. An acquaintance sees a contradiction: if she really forgave him, why decline a meeting? Lada herself is uncertain. She no longer wants to humiliate Roman in return, yet the painful memory remains and she is unready to share vulnerable plans with him. Different questions need asking; one attractive word cannot settle them all.

We distinguish forgiveness, reconciliation, and trust as three directions of decision. This is an editorial practical map, not a definition binding on every religious or philosophical tradition. Changing one’s relation to the past, resuming a relationship, and relying on a particular future action may happen at different times, or not happen. The article requires no forgiveness, promises no disappearance of pain, and proposes no new closeness to test someone dangerous. Readers may keep distance, decline a conversation, and seek necessary support separately. The aim is to recognize an available choice without a concealed duty to reopen every former door.

## I. One word does not settle three decisions

When Lada says she forgave, listeners may hear very different things. One means giving up revenge, another the complete disappearance of hurt, another friendship renewed. Ambiguity becomes a demand when somebody else’s definition is declared the only correct one. Clarifying meaning helps a conversation without testing anyone’s virtue. What does Lada herself call forgiveness? Which action has she chosen, and which has she never promised? She may stop retaliatory humiliation while remaining hurt. She may avoid the word altogether while responding more calmly. A term helps when it does not conceal separate boundaries and actual decisions.



@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

In our map, forgiveness concerns one’s relation to what happened: a person may freely stop seeing the other solely as the person who caused harm, or give up revenge. These possibilities are no compulsory set of signs and do not authorize judging an inner process. Reconciliation concerns the relationship: people agree whether and how to continue contact. Trust concerns an expectation about particular behavior involving a particular risk. It asks what exactly we intend to rely on. The three directions connect, but none automatically proves the others.

Lada can stop wanting to humiliate Roman without agreeing to renewed friendship. He can reliably complete a small shared organizational task while her hurt remains unchanged. They can also meet out of courtesy without substantial reconciliation. Each case shows the limits of an outward sign. A calm voice proves no forgiveness, a meeting no trust, and one completed task no restored closeness. The distinctions are not reasons to distrust everything. They keep conclusions sufficiently narrow: this action happened, this contact was agreed, while an inner or broader outcome remains unknown.

Distinguishing these directions must not become a demand to sort every feeling into three boxes immediately. Lada may not know what to call her state. She can name only an available decision: no meeting today, no discussion of a personal plan, no continued public argument. That suffices for a concrete contact boundary. More complex understanding may emerge later or remain open. The map serves the person; the person owes no service to the map. If precise terminology adds pressure, begin with what next action is or is not wanted.

## II. Forgiveness does not rewrite the event

A changed relationship to the past need not declare harm good or necessary. Lada may understand Roman wanted to entertain the group and still consider the humiliation unacceptable. An understandable motive does not make the action agreed. Giving up revenge creates no duty to retell the event as a useful lesson gifted by a friend. She can recognize her own growth, if it occurred, without giving someone credit for causing harm. A memory keeps its factual basis even when a person chooses a different continuation and stops retaliatory humiliation.

Nor can the disappearance of an unpleasant feeling be assigned as a deadline for completed forgiveness. Someone may choose an action and later feel anger at the memory. We make no diagnosis and do not test forgiveness by the absence of every reaction. Our practical distinction concerns feeling and available choice. Lada notices a wish to respond harshly and decides against a humiliating post about Roman. She need not immediately become calm or affectionate. A responsible choice can be real amid a difficult inner state that this article promises no quick change in.

Some people do not wish to call their decision forgiveness at all. They choose distance, end an argument, or attend to other matters. Do not declare that a lower stage because the word matters to your own faith. Another person may understand it differently or experience the demand itself as pressure. We leave that question open. Religious or philosophical ideas can be explored in one’s own life without claiming authority over another’s maturity. Ways of describing the past need not match for contact boundaries and the unacceptability of renewed humiliation to be clear.

Forgiveness does not cancel necessary consequences. A false fact in a public statement may still need correcting. Shared matters need workable arrangements independently of inner feelings. Seeking protection or other help where needed does not prove a failure to forgive. This discussion determines no legal obligations and replaces no professional support. In Lada’s scene, giving up revenge can coexist with asking for the gathering’s recording to be removed, where appropriate. Demanding she forget everything for an attractive ending again substitutes someone else’s idea of a proper story for her concrete interests.

## III. Reconciliation needs two free decisions

Roman wants a meeting, but his wish alone cannot reconcile them. Lada may not want it or may find contact too difficult now. He may propose a conversation where this respects an existing boundary and must allow refusal. After an explicit request for no messages, even another request can intrude. Reconciliation cannot be performed on someone as relationship improvement. The form, time, and purpose of contact need agreement. Mutual willingness does not guarantee success; it makes an attempt possible where each can actually decline without punishment.

Agreement to a half-hour meeting is not agreement to restore the old friendship. It may clarify one event or close a shared task. Do not silently expand its meaning. Roman may hope for more, but his hope becomes no promise from Lada. Naming a limited purpose and permission to end the exchange can help beforehand. This is an editorial suggestion for safe, voluntary contact, not a mandatory procedure. A written exchange may suffice, a neutral intermediary may help, or contact may be unnecessary. The actual task determines the form.

Reconciliation can change a relationship rather than restore its previous form. Lada allows occasional group contact without discussing her performances. Roman can accept that boundary or honestly decline the format without humiliating her for refusing greater closeness. Both have choices. Limited continuation need not be failure; it may fit what is now known. Nor must reduced contact become a compulsory compromise. Someone can choose to end a friendship even when the other offers a courteous form and sincerely regrets what happened.

Threats, coercion, or recurring dangerous conduct place a different limit on a joint conversation. A kindly tone makes no meeting safe, and the word reconciliation creates no attendance obligation. Keep distance and seek needed support without a personal confrontation. We offer neither diagnosis of another person nor instructions for a specific dangerous situation. The principle is simpler: safety and freedom to leave matter more than a completed scene. Where refusal brings threats or punishment, contact cannot count as free merely because someone formally called it voluntary beforehand.

## IV. Trust always concerns something

Trust becomes clearer when the risk is named. Lada may rely on Roman to pass on a meeting time without sharing a new performance plan. That need not be hypocrisy or punishment. The two actions require different grounds. Reliable organization proves no care with vulnerability, and courtesy proves no respect for a personal boundary. Assess an area without stamping a whole character. Limited trust does not make Roman entirely bad, but good qualities elsewhere do not cancel what Lada observed in this particular action.

Not every absence of trust needs immediate repair. If Lada no longer intends collaboration in a vulnerable area, she may need no test of Roman. He can change his conduct independently of her participation. Demanding another chance can place new risk on the person already affected. Our map grants no right to probationary access to another life. A person’s capacity to change and another’s duty to test it personally are different claims. The first can remain possible without accepting the second. Declining a test need not condemn every future action Roman may take.

Where a limited shared task is actually wanted, trust can draw on available conduct. Roman asks permission before discussing the topic, respects refusal, and stops repeating the jokes in company. These are observations in our fictional scene, not a scientifically measured reliability scale. Lada can consider them gradually while keeping conclusions narrow. One successful event should not automatically increase risk. A small agreement promises no next level of closeness. Observation helps a decision where it is available without turning life into continuous supervision.

Trust needs no absolute certainty, but a person may decline uncertainty they consider too great. Roman’s entire future cannot be proven; some actions and informational limits can be known. Lada can choose small contact, accept a particular risk, or not continue. Someone else’s judgment of generosity does not measure that choice. Keep uncertainty, possible harm, and who bears consequences visible. Where risk affects others, a personal wish to trust is also insufficient. Shared responsibilities and necessary protection need separate consideration from an inner feeling of forgiveness.

## V. When the decisions happen in different orders

A familiar expectation resembles a ladder: forgive first, then meet, then fully trust. We prescribe no such sequence. Lada can close a shared organizational matter before changing her relation to the past. She can give up revenge and never meet again, or recognize reliability in one action while keeping difficult feelings. These examples prove no universally correct path; they show questions can be independent. Without a compulsory ladder, someone can choose today’s relevant task. Settling the entire relationship is unnecessary for deciding the form of one meeting or declining it.

Another case checks the distinction. Two colleagues continue using a shared schedule after an unpleasant conflict: entries remain accurate and responsibilities are fulfilled. They have not forgiven each other and want no friendship. Cooperation may rest on clear roles and limited checking rather than closeness. Personal feelings need not be reconciled. This example cannot simply transfer to unsafe participation or a situation without free choice. Work necessity makes no contact automatically acceptable. The counterexample shows only that a specific expectation of dependability can exist without full inner acceptance of a past event.

Conversely, Lada may feel goodwill toward Roman while knowing he still crosses the relevant boundary. Warmth need not authorize discussing her performances. Compassion for his difficulties does not replace information about his future treatment of vulnerability. Wishing someone well can coexist with declining a shared task. That need not conceal anger; it may account for known behavior. Yet the article diagnoses no motive on the reader’s behalf. Leave the inner state open and describe an available boundary without having to justify it through perfectly pure feelings.

One decision may help another. A free conversation can provide information, and respect for a boundary may make a meeting more desirable. This is a possibility, not a promised result. Do not turn the connection into a hidden bargain: meeting means Lada must now forgive; Roman’s courtesy means she must share personal matters. A step remains a step. People may discuss continuation and mutually revise an agreement while retaining refusal. The relationship then develops through renewed consent rather than a debt for an earlier gesture or a need to vindicate a previous choice.

## VI. A literary scene and an ethical limit

In Hawthorne’s The Scarlet Letter, words of free forgiveness appear in a difficult scene: Hester holds Dimmesdale as he tries to free himself and repeatedly demands a response. The epigraph therefore offers no ready reconciliation instruction. The novel reveals tension between spoken words and the meeting’s conditions. We use that limited contrast without applying the characters’ religious judgments to readers or treating fiction as psychological research. Our question is whether the person could refuse and leave. An attractive word about freedom cannot answer in place of observed respect for a boundary.

In his sixth sermon on compassion, Joseph Butler discusses stopping further revenge while explicitly considering the safety of stopping. This belongs to his Christian account of human nature, not a modern relationship protocol. We retain a limited distinction: ending retaliatory harm differs from restoring someone’s access. No duty to meet, trust, or endure danger follows here. Butler and Hawthorne address different questions in different genres. Comparing them helps notice a boundary; it does not prove every tradition defines forgiveness identically or prescribes one sequence of decisions.

Reading requires retaining inconvenient details. Remove the holding from Hawthorne’s scene and the speech appears different. Forget Butler’s safety condition and a different practical demand may emerge. Our map is not assembled from matching attractive words. It compares a passage, context, and limit. Questions about voluntary contact and specific trust remain editorial analysis. The sources prove no outcome Lada must choose and grant no authority to test her feelings against a fictional character or religious ideal.

Readers may explore their own tradition more deeply if it matters to them. An idea’s personal value does not make another participant its obligated follower. Roman cannot assign Lada a religious duty to obtain a meeting. Acquaintances should not decide calmness proves complete healing or distance moral failure. We assess no faith and promise no therapeutic result. The limited work describes decisions clearly: what relation to the past someone chooses, which contact they want, and what particular action they are willing to rely on today.

## VII. A boundary without proof of hostility

Lada may find it hard to choose distance without presenting the whole humiliation again. She fears a calm refusal seems insufficiently justified. A future contact boundary does not always require retrying every past motive. Name the chosen form and limit: a group gathering is acceptable; personal discussion of performances is currently unwanted. Responsibility for the event remains. The task shifts from endless proof of harm toward understandable future interaction. Roman’s disagreement about the past creates no right to disregard a clearly stated absence of consent to renewed closeness.

Roman also retains a boundary. He can acknowledge his action without accepting continual public humiliation in return. Declining a disproportionate demand proves no absence of regret, just as Lada's refusal to meet proves no absence of forgiveness. A personal boundary should not conceal denial of what was acknowledged. Both distinguish available responsibility from unacceptable contact. The scene need not make one permanently guilty and the other obliged to accept any compensation. Each answers for their next action; refusal belongs to neither side exclusively after a test of moral perfection.

A shared task may need a brief organizational exchange without reconciliation. Lada and Roman decide who collects materials for a gathering without discussing friendship. Limit content, choose an appropriate channel, and avoid presenting task completion as new closeness. More complex circumstances or legal obligations require separately verified grounds. Our example grants no universal right to end every obligation with a relationship. It distinguishes subjects: closing an available shared matter, relating inwardly to the past, and voluntarily continuing personal contact can be considered separately even when events connect.

A boundary may change without making an earlier refusal false. Months later Lada may want to discuss a performance, or decide against any meeting. The new choice concerns present agreement and circumstances. Possible change cannot justify disregarding a current boundary. Nor must consistency become proof of sincerity. Someone may revise available contact without promising complete trust. Communicate the new limit clearly where appropriate and safe, and avoid turning a changed mind into a duty to continue beyond what the person now actually chooses.

## VIII. An open outcome without a compulsory ladder

At the end of our fictional story, Lada posts no retaliatory humiliation, allows occasional group contact, and does not trust Roman with new performance plans. She may call the first choice part of forgiveness or avoid the term. The second is a limited contact agreement; the third keeps a separate area of trust closed. No single verdict on friendship must absorb these decisions. Roman can work on his behavior without promised future closeness. The story remains open, allowing both to act without a bargain in which one appropriate gesture earns everything else.

In United Wisdom's map, this topic connects with A03 and B12 as directions concerning responsibility and changed action. Links indicate subjects, not readiness of related materials. R26 examines apology and repair; R28 grounds for dependability after a broken promise. R27 asks a different question: which decisions have silently been fused when we speak of forgiveness or restored relations? Separating them guides further reading. Contact can be

considered without an entire apology procedure, and an expectation about one action can be examined without scheduling inner forgiveness or promising the former friendship back.

Keep a conclusion proportionate to observation. A meeting tells us about a meeting, not complete trust. Giving up revenge tells us about an action, not the disappearance of every feeling. A completed task tells us about performance in particular conditions, not an entire character. This is no skepticism for its own sake. Accurate conclusions protect people from premature demands and give small actual changes value of their own. They recognize what happened without announcing healing and retain uncertainty where no one has grounds to decide for someone else.

The distinction leaves room for compassion and autonomy. See another's difficulties without giving them control of your closeness. Regret a mistake without demanding immediate forgiveness. Value reconciliation while recognizing both have not chosen it today. None guarantees ease. They clarify the subject: inner relation, agreed contact, or a particular risk. Naming it reduces the temptation to turn refusal into moral condemnation or agreement into endless obligation. The next step becomes small enough to be freely chosen and stopped when needed.

## What this means in practice

For voluntary reflection, choose a situation safe enough to consider now. Contacting the other person is unnecessary. Write three separate questions: how do I want to relate to what happened; which contact do I want or decline; which particular action am I willing to rely on? Answer only one if needed and leave the others open. Do not test yourself by the disappearance of difficult feelings or accept risk to prove kindness. If the situation is too painful or unsafe, stop and seek needed support separately. The distinction requires no immediate decision or explanation to someone who crosses your boundary.

If both choose safe contact, name a small purpose and limit. Agreement to discuss one fact promises neither friendship, forgiveness, nor complete trust. Afterwards, check only what occurred: did the agreed exchange happen, was the boundary respected, and what information emerged? Each may end the conversation and decline continuation. If you apologized, work on your behavior remains yours independently of the response. If you received an apology, closeness remains a separate decision. The practice seeks clarity with an open outcome, not compulsory reconciliation or proof of a final inner transformation.

## Key quotation

> *He would have released himself*

Nathaniel Hawthorne, The Scarlet Letter, chapter XVII; the narrator describes Dimmesdale’s attempt to free himself.

## Connections between traditions

| Source | Limited comparison | Limit |
|---|---|---|
| Hawthorne, chapter XVII | Words of forgiveness differ from meeting conditions | Holding occurs; no model of free agreement |
| Butler, Sermon VI | Stopping revenge includes a safety condition | Christian ethics, no duty to resume closeness |
| This article’s proposal | Relation to the past, contact, particular trust | Editorial map; traditions’ definitions are not declared identical |

## Sources

1. Nathaniel Hawthorne — The Scarlet Letter. Project Gutenberg digital English edition of the 1850 novel. Chapter XVII, The Pastor and His Parishioner. Fictional dialogue and narration, including pressure; not a model of consent, empirical psychology, or a modern forgiveness protocol.

2. Joseph Butler — Human Nature and Other Sermons. Project Gutenberg English sermon compilation; underlying Fifteen Sermons. Sermon VI, Upon Compassion, primary web text line 158. Christian moral theology; no obligation of contact or trust inferred.

## Tags

forgiveness, reconciliation, trust, boundaries, consent, safety, refusal, contact, past, memory, revenge, compassion, responsibility, apology, closeness, friendship, risk, observation, freedom, choice, uncertainty, change, Hawthorne, Butler, literature, Christian ethics, United Wisdom, A03, B12, R26, R28

## 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 coauthor 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 everyday relationships between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.