

UNITED WISDOM

When preserving a relationship at any cost is too much

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R30 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

When preserving a relationship at any cost is too much

Epigraph

“Here our reception was wholly different.”

— Josephine Butler, Personal Reminiscences of a Great Crusade, chapter II, p. 17, new edition, 1910; English original. She is describing working communities’ response to a public campaign after limited support from influential recipients.

What this article is about

In an imagined story, Lena has several times prepared to tell her partner that she no longer wants to live together. Each time, she remembers their good years, his help during her illness, and relatives saying that family life requires patience. All of that is true for her. But another thing is true as well: before meeting him, she checks whether she looks calm enough to avoid another humiliation. Asked what she wants now, Lena describes how much she has already invested. The future seems obliged to repay the past, even as the present cost grows heavier.

This article does not make Lena’s decision, or the reader’s. It helps examine the cost of preserving a connection and distinguish difficulties that people can work on together from conditions in which support beyond a conversation with the partner needs to come first. Love, gratitude, shared responsibilities and a wish to reconcile matter. They do not remove questions about freedom, dignity and specific risks. An adult may choose the pace of a decision, receive help, change an initial plan and refrain from presenting others with exhaustive proof that things are bad enough.

I. What exactly are we trying to preserve?

Preserving a relationship sometimes combines several different wishes. A person may want closeness with someone particular, a familiar routine, a home, children’s contact with both parents, their family’s respect, or reassurance that past years were not wasted. Those wishes may diverge. Living under the same roof does not always preserve trust. Ending shared living does not always destroy gratitude for earlier help. The more precisely we name what matters, the less likely one expression is to quietly require acceptance of any price.

In the imagined story, Lena is most afraid of losing her sense of family. Asked how that feeling works today, she would describe familiar Sunday breakfasts, photographs together and

occasional evenings without tension. Alongside them is the need to stay silent about her plans so that the evening will not be spoiled. The question is not whether the good memories are real. They are real for Lena. The question is what conditions she needs for a living connection now, and who besides her is helping create them.

It helps to distinguish the form of a commitment from its substance. A promise to care for someone may include attention to their difficulties, honesty and fulfilment of specific agreements. It does not give them unlimited authority over the promiser’s body, time, contacts or earnings. This is an editorial ethical distinction, not an interpretation of a contract or religious rule. Commitments have their own context within each tradition and legal system. Here the concern is that fidelity should not make someone’s refusal an automatic moral offence.

A connection has a history, but it also has a present. Someone may acknowledge everything valuable that happened and still recognise that the available way of living together no longer suits them. This recognition often hurts precisely because the past is not being devalued. A person does not first have to declare the other wholly bad in order to consider their own limits. They can retain the memory of good without making it a signed promise to accept any future treatment. Mutual gratitude should not depend on indefinitely surrendering one’s will.

II. A difficult conflict and the loss of freedom to talk

Conflict can involve harsh words, different demands and uncomfortable facts. An argument alone does not explain how a relationship works. What matters is what follows disagreement: is it still possible to return to the issue, acknowledge a mistake, postpone discussion and choose without punishment? Sometimes both people struggle to negotiate but are willing to notice the consequences of their actions. Something different happens when discussion is allowed only until one person refuses to comply. A conversation then exists outwardly while the right to give one’s own answer gradually disappears.

Consider an imagined everyday incident to see the difference. Partners argue about visiting relatives. One becomes angry, then agrees to discuss another day; the other can say they are tired. In another version, refusal is followed by taking away travel money, threats of eviction and several days of mockery in front of the children. The same subject of argument does not make these situations equivalent. The cost of disagreement changes the meaning of an invitation to talk. Attention to facts and conditions matters here, rather than judging temperament from a single phrase.

NHS guidance describes humiliation, isolation, threats and financial control among signs of domestic abuse; physical violence is not its only possible expression. This is contemporary information from the United Kingdom’s health service, not a means of diagnosing someone

through an article. It helps avoid measuring seriousness only by visible injury. An isolated unpleasant remark and repeated restrictions on freedom need different consideration. Assessing a particular situation may involve frequency, how events develop, dependence on housing and money, threats, and available support.

When refusal becomes dangerous or practically unavailable, a suggestion to explain oneself better may be insufficient. A person may already have explained their position many times, with clarity not being the problem. They are not obliged to find a perfect formulation guaranteed to change the other person. No conversation can be promised safe for everyone. When threats or fear of consequences are present, considering available help and the constraints of the setting may be more useful than testing the relationship through a still more candid confrontation. Seeking support does not require first succeeding in persuading a partner.

III. Patience with a subject and a limit

Patience can mean taking part in a difficult period: illness, unemployment, exhaustion or changed circumstances. In that case, it is possible to ask what specifically must be endured, how the burden is shared and when to reassess the situation. A definite subject makes patience a recognisable action. Without it, a request to be patient can stretch into an indefinite future. Each time, someone waits a little longer while the conditions they are waiting for remain unnamed. Not every delay is mistaken, but its reasons deserve a voice of their own.

If a hurtful incident is followed by a promise to change, it matters less to debate how sincere the words sound than to consider observable behaviour. Have specific actions stopped recurring? Can someone mention the agreement without facing another threat? Does the person making the promise take responsibility without requiring the hurt person to become easier to accommodate first? These questions are not a checklist guaranteeing an outcome. They bring attention from solemn statements back to the life between statements. One warm evening is insufficient to establish how someone will be treated afterward.

Hope does not have to disappear at the first doubt. Someone can want change without giving a promise unlimited credit. They may distinguish privately between a wish and a condition for continuing: I would like closeness restored; for living together, I need certain actions to stop. Conditions can be discussed together when that is safe and appropriate. If doing so creates risk, they do not have to be announced to the partner. Acknowledging one’s limits privately should not automatically become a public ultimatum or an examination for the other person.

Patience becomes a difficult trap when its only measure is someone’s ability to endure more. Exhaustion is then read as insufficient love, fear as weakness and seeking help as betrayal. This measure misses actual costs: lost sleep, access to work, ordinary contacts and the right

to feel at ease at home. The article does not establish how many incidents someone must experience before being permitted to leave. There is no universal counter of sufficient suffering. Limits belong to the person and their circumstances; help may be needed long before a final decision.

IV. Past investment does not choose the future

Years together carry weight. They may contain care, work, important events and shared losses. But the question of the next year cannot be answered only by counting previous ones. If continuing demands ever greater surrender of freedom, earlier investment does not reduce that cost. We suggest looking backward and forward together: what deserves recognition in the past, and what conditions are actually available now? This keeps memory from becoming an opponent of a decision. A good chapter may remain good even when someone does not want to write the next one in the same form.

It is especially hard when one partner once helped the other through a difficult time. Gratitude may be deep and entirely justified. It can be expressed through words, support within one’s means, fulfilling an agreement or discussing shared matters fairly. But a debt of gratitude is not an obligation to maintain closeness without consent. When earlier help is presented as grounds for demanding present obedience, its current function changes. Someone need not deny the good they received to notice that it is now being used to restrict their choice.

In the imagined story, Lena returns to the time of her illness, when her partner truly did a great deal. She does not want to rewrite that time as deception. Her new question is different: can I acknowledge that help while refusing present humiliation? Within this article’s ethical position, the answer is yes, but that does not determine how to act in practice. Money, shared housing, care for relatives and children may need separate decisions. These tasks deserve concrete consideration, without requiring earlier care to be repaid by continuing an unwanted shared life.

Years invested may explain why a decision takes time. They do not prove what the decision must be. From outside, it is easy to call slowness indecision or demand separation as a display of self-respect. But respect includes attention to someone’s available options, not only a striking gesture. They can take small steps toward understanding, revise a plan, seek information and still lack a final answer. That movement is not devalued because other people want a clear ending by the time the conversation finishes.

V. Shared responsibilities without a demand for sacrifice

Children, older relatives, shared resources and work can connect people regardless of whether they want to remain a couple. These are real circumstances, not something to dismiss by invoking the attractive word freedom. But the need to address shared tasks does not mean that only one person must abandon their limits. It helps to separate questions: how can specific care be provided, what options exist, and does each person want to continue the intimate relationship? This separation promises no easy exit. It keeps different responsibilities from disappearing inside one demand to preserve the family.

Care for children should not turn them into witnesses, judges or intermediaries in an adult decision. They should not be required to choose sides, carry secret messages or defend an adult against threats. The Hotline’s contemporary guidance on preparing to leave emphasises that a child’s task in a crisis concerns their own safety. Practical measures depend on age, place and circumstances; this article does not replace specialist support. The important limit here concerns responsibility: a child should not be assigned the role of saving the relationship or protecting a parent.

Housing, property, maintenance and care may have legal aspects that differ between countries. This article does not establish a reader’s rights or offer a procedure for exercising them. If a decision depends on these matters, information from a competent local service or professional may help, accessed with attention to risk and privacy. General reflection on dignity does not replace checking specific conditions. Someone’s right to consider ending a connection and the availability of a convenient practical route are different things; difficulty finding a route does not invalidate the need for change.

Even while living together continues, someone can stop privately agreeing with the demand to endure everything for a shared cause. This is not equivalent to a hidden plan to leave and does not require immediate announcement. A starting point may be recognising that care for others includes limits on one’s own strength and safety. Where decisions are gradual, a temporary way of coping should not be mistaken for free consent to everything happening. People may have restricted options; respecting them begins by acknowledging those restrictions without accusing them of insufficient courage.

VI. Reconciliation, forgiveness and continuing a connection

These words often appear together although they describe different things. Forgiveness may concern how someone experiences the past. Reconciliation involves some restoration of a relationship between people. Continuing to live together requires conditions in the present. None automatically obliges someone to fulfil the other two. A person can reject revenge and still not want to return. They may hope for reconciliation while choosing distance for now. This is an ethical distinction proposed here, not a universal definition covering every religious and philosophical tradition.

When spiritual language is used to demand endurance of humiliation, it helps to ask whose will gains authority through that demand. Saying that someone close must become a teacher does not make all their treatment worthy of acceptance. A history can teach recognition of limits, seeking help and acknowledging the complexity of choice. Such meaning does not require treating harm as a necessary good. An adult may decline the interpretation of their life offered to them. The article’s authors have no grounds to define another person’s suffering as a compulsory path of development.

The historical Christian reformer Josephine Butler describes seeking public support for a campaign against coercive treatment of women in her reminiscences. At the start of chapter II, she recounts how, after a weak response from influential recipients, participants turned to working communities. This is a specific history of public action, not an instruction about ending a family relationship. It can be compared with the question of where to find a listener when familiar authorities do not hear. The comparison cannot establish a single Christian teaching on every marriage or a contemporary safety prediction.

Forgiveness need not be a condition for receiving help either. Someone may need food, somewhere to stay, conversation and information before they can even consider their relationship to the past. A supporter should not turn these needs into a test of correct spirituality. The chance to gradually understand feelings has value of its own. A changed attitude toward the past does not establish that a specific risk has gone away. Decisions about contact deserve consideration on their own grounds, even when someone is no longer angry or still feels love.

VII. Support that does not take over the decision

Receiving support can be difficult when someone expects an immediate verdict: return, or leave today. A helpful listener can keep the complexity in view: hear the description, ask what help is needed, avoid demanding proof and refrain from promising to solve everything for the person. The Hotline's materials for supporters emphasise respecting the decisions of someone experiencing abuse. The practical meaning for this topic is simple: help should not depend on whether someone's pace matches a friend's expectations. Available options sometimes matter more than someone else's final conclusion.

In the imagined story, Lena's friend offers to consider together what help would be useful this week. Lena says she wants, for now, to find out whom she can ask about housing. Her friend does not declare this proof of readiness to end the relationship or call the partner to discover the truth. She asks how to continue communicating more safely and explains what she can actually offer. This scene guarantees no favourable outcome. It shows support in which the other person's knowledge of their own conditions remains significant.

Information and records also have a cost in privacy. If a partner controls devices, a shared account or correspondence, a saved note about intentions may become available to them. The Hotline warns that internet use can be monitored. An exercise in clarity therefore should not automatically demand journalling, photographing evidence or sending a candid message. How to seek help deserves consideration in light of the setting, with competent support where possible. The article offers no technical procedure that promises to conceal actions or remove the risk of discovery.

A supporter has limits. They may lack spare accommodation, money or expertise for a particular question. Naming what is available honestly is better than promising complete rescue and disappearing after a difficult turn. Suitable local services can be sought together without publishing someone's private circumstances or disclosing their location without consent. An adult receiving help is not obliged to tell everything in order to deserve care. A small, agreed form of support can be useful even when the larger picture remains unknown to the listener.

VIII. Deciding to leave and the conditions for acting

Understanding that one does not want to continue a connection and being able to end it immediately are different stages. Housing, access to documents, health, money, children and fear of retaliation may stand between them. These circumstances are not reducible to psychological readiness. Where threats or abuse occur, The Hotline describes preparing to leave as a process requiring attention to possible risk and individual planning. This does not instruct every reader to leave. It is grounds for avoiding promises that a decisive conversation or announced date will by itself make what follows safe.

Leaving need not become proof of one’s worth. Someone may continue living nearby, limit contact or only consider options for now. Sometimes a new circumstance changes a decision. We cannot assess all available choices from outside and should not call returning proof of agreement with harm. In immediate danger to life or safety, seeking available emergency help where one is matters, if doing so is safely possible. This article gives no single number for every country and promises no uniform capabilities from local services.

Planning does not always mean extensive secret preparation. It can begin with one question to a competent service: what is possible in my situation if I have not yet decided? Seeking information need not culminate in a particular action. Someone can ask about the help, confidentiality and limits of a specific service. They should not assume that any organisation can provide housing or money. The Hotline, for example, says it connects people with local resources but does not itself provide direct financial assistance. Proposed support needs to be verifiable.

Complex actions are best considered separately from the moral right to decide. Even if someone cannot take a chosen step now, they retain the right to recognise that the conditions do not suit them. Such clarity can sometimes help stop returning all responsibility to their own supposed failure to persuade. But clarity need not arrive immediately either. A reader may leave some questions open, postpone the practice and seek support without a finished account with a correct beginning and ending. A decision should not become another source of pressure on someone already under pressure.

IX. Preservation is possible with participation from both people

Sometimes people truly want to change how they live together and have conditions for conversation. It then makes sense to discuss specific actions, sharing burdens, the right to refuse and how to return to disputed questions. Wanting to continue a connection can be free and responsible. The article does not make separation the sole sign of maturity. But reciprocity cannot be achieved by one person’s effort alone. If one person has the right to determine every condition while the other must endlessly preserve calm, together describes an aspiration rather than how the work actually operates.

Acknowledging one’s contribution to a conflict matters where it does not become a demand to assume responsibility for another person’s treatment. Someone can answer for a harsh tone without answering for a threat made against them. They can change a habit of avoiding conversation without promising to agree to every demand. These distinctions protect responsibility from becoming endless self-blame. Understanding a shared difficulty requires freedom to see each person’s actions. Someone does not first have to prove faultlessness to deserve respectful treatment and access to support.

Neither a calm tone nor outward politeness establishes reciprocity. Restriction can be presented very gently: you will lose money if you do not obey; nobody will support you; your disagreement will upset the children. Attention should therefore cover not only the form of speech but also the availability of another answer. Conversely, strong emotion does not automatically make someone dangerous or incapable of relationships. The article contains no personality test for a good partner. It attends to repeated actions, conditions of choice and responsibility for consequences.

If a connection continues, its value does not need the motto at any cost. Respect for limits can help people choose each other again rather than remain through fear of losing resources or the right to belong. This is a possibility, not a promised result of the practice. Where necessary conditions are absent, refusing endless preservation need not destroy the capacity to love. It may acknowledge reality: I cannot create alone what requires two people’s participation. Such recognition deserves attention without a demand for an immediate, impressive action.

X. Returning to one’s own question

At the end of the imagined story, Lena receives no ready resolution. She stops answering a question about the future only by listing earlier merits. Now she has several separate questions: what do I want to preserve, at what cost is that happening, what actions recur, and what help is available to me? The answers may be incomplete. But distinguishing them shows that love and fear of loss are not the only grounds for a decision. The possibility of her own refusal matters too, along with actual life between occasional moments of reconciliation.

A reader may find that their difficulty is closer to an ordinary painful disagreement in which both people can speak and choose. Time, specificity and careful discussion may then help. Another reader may see that conversation itself has become a setting for threats. Seeking support with attention to risk may then take priority over perfecting an argument. The article does not decide which situation someone is in, and these possibilities do not exhaust every circumstance. They help show how the same advice to preserve closeness can carry entirely different costs.

Refusing a limitless price does not require hatred. Someone can regret, feel grateful, miss the other, doubt and still recognise their own will. They may not know how life will work after a change. These feelings neither invalidate a decision nor oblige them to choose its opposite. Dignity is not measured by emotional certainty. It includes the chance to receive help and consider choices even when words are confused, the account is inconsistent and a final answer is still forming. Another person’s impatience should not become a new measure of correct behaviour.

Preserving a relationship makes sense when space is preserved for the people, not only for the connection’s name. This is United Wisdom’s editorial ethical position, open to discussion and not presented as a proven law of human life. Its practical question is more modest than a sweeping verdict: do I still have an available way to participate in this connection? An answer deserves to be sought in actions, resources and conditions, respecting complexity. Someone may refuse to pay for a relationship’s outward continuity by losing the right to notice what happens and ask for help.

What this means in practice

If things are calm enough now and doing so creates no risk, you may spend a few minutes with one question: what exactly am I trying to preserve? It is enough to name privately one valuable thing and one condition without which continuing becomes too difficult for you. Writing answers down is optional. Do not use a shared device or a note others can access if you have reason to fear monitoring. The practice is voluntary; you can skip it, stop or return later. It is not a test of courage or readiness to leave.

Then consider one recent incident rather than the whole history at once. What did you suggest or refuse to do? What followed? Was a pause, another answer or help outside the couple available? You need not diagnose yourself or your partner. Naming an emotion may help, but the specific action and its cost matter more here. If remembering becomes too difficult, you can stop and notice your present surroundings. The exercise does not require reliving an event to make it convincing and does not promise relief for everyone.

As a third step, if appropriate, name one form of support you need: a calm conversation with someone trusted, information about an available local service, or help with an ordinary task. Choose and seek it with attention to privacy and risk; you need not disclose details or tell your partner about intentions. Where threats occur, competent support concerning the particular situation may help. In immediate danger, seek available local emergency help if safely possible. Do not conduct a conversation about leaving or a confrontation as a test of this practice's result.

Finally, retain the right not to decide everything today. These minutes may lead to a more precise question or an understanding of needed help, rather than an announcement of separation. If a safe conversation is genuinely available to both people, a specific condition can be discussed; otherwise, it may remain a private reference point for now. The practice does not treat the effects of abuse, guarantee safety or replace local specialists. Its purpose is a small area of clarity in which someone's needs do not disappear behind a demand to preserve the connection at any cost.

Key quotation

> *"Great principles cannot be modified"*

— Josephine Butler, Personal Reminiscences of a Great Crusade, chapter II, p. 19, new edition, 1910; the opening of a sentence, English original. The continuation concerns an assembly considering the matter. Butler defends the principles of her public campaign; the excerpt supplies no ready decision about intimate relationships and does not remove the need to discuss specific circumstances.

Connections between traditions

This comparison concerns particular texts and contemporary guidance, not agreement among entire traditions. The historical authors addressed other institutions and tasks; their arguments do not replace assessing present risks.

Source and context	Connection with the topic	Limit of the comparison
Josephine Butler, Christian reforming activity, chapter II of her reminiscences	Seeking support beyond familiar influential recipients	A public campaign against coercive regulation, not guidance on intimate relationships; her moral language is not presented as common to all Christianity

Source and context	Connection with the topic	Limit of the comparison
Mary Astell, Christian philosophy and women's education, part I of her proposal	How guidance treats a person and their judgement	Her historical model of a religious community retains hierarchy; it is not equivalent to contemporary autonomy
Olive Schreiner, social criticism of labour and dependence, opening of the book	Material conditions matter for available choices	An early twentieth-century argument about women's work supplies no individual prediction and does not describe every modern family
NHS and The Hotline, contemporary information on abuse and support	Considering control, threats, resources and the person's own decision	Practical information concerns services in the UK and US; help and rights elsewhere require separate local checking

Sources

1. Josephine Elizabeth Grey Butler. Personal Reminiscences of a Great Crusade. Horace Marshall & Son, new edition, 1910. Title information and selected passages of chapter II, pages 17–19, were read; the context of an embedded account later in the book was checked separately. English original; the whole volume was not read.

2. Mary Astell. A Serious Proposal to the Ladies, in Two Parts. Richard Wilkin, London, 1697. Part I, pages 68–70, and nearby context were selected. English original; historical discipline is not imported as a contemporary norm.

3. Olive Schreiner. Woman and Labour. English original, 1911; Project Gutenberg's electronic edition was updated on 29 October 2024. The opening of chapter I concerning work and preparation was read; the whole book was not read.

4. NHS. Domestic violence and abuse. Sections on signs, seeking help and supporting another person were read; checked on 6 October 2026. UK context.

5. The National Domestic Violence Hotline. Preparing to Leave. The main preparation section and information on the limits of assistance were read; checked on 6 October 2026. US context.

6. The National Domestic Violence Hotline. Ways to Support a Domestic Violence Survivor. Emotional and material support sections, respect for decisions, and the warning about digital monitoring were read; checked on 6 October 2026. US context.

Tags

relationships, preserving relationships, freedom of choice, personal boundaries, dignity, patience, gratitude, reconciliation, forgiveness, responsibility, reciprocity, consent, refusal, support, pressure, threats, humiliation, control, financial dependence, safety, privacy, family responsibilities, care for children, supporting someone, historical sources, Josephine Butler, Mary Astell, Olive Schreiner, United Wisdom, adult choice

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.