

UNITED WISDOM

Adult children and parents: how the right to decide changes

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R31 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Adult children and parents: how the right to decide changes

Epigraph

> *sometimes I let him go alone*

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile*, Book V; the voice of the narrator and tutor, translated by Barbara Foxley. A selected fragment within a historical educational model, rather than a contemporary rule of family law.

What this article is about

A train timetable lies on the kitchen table. A daughter is planning to move; her mother looks at it as though a family emergency has occurred. The daughter has already chosen her job and accommodation, yet she still begins by explaining why she should be allowed to leave. Her mother has not explicitly asked for that explanation. Both nevertheless know the old arrangement: one must persuade, the other must permit. Their ages have changed; the arrangement of the conversation has stayed the same.

This scene does not tell us that the mother is bad or the daughter insufficiently adult. It raises a separate question: who decides this particular matter, and which real interests of others does it affect? Respect for parents need not mean giving them the final word. An adult child's independence need not mean that parental needs disappear. Between these two statements lies difficult work: changing a role without declaring a person unnecessary or turning affection into authority.

Here, the right to decide means an ethical distinction within relationships, rather than a legal conclusion. This article does not determine decision-making capacity, property rights, maintenance obligations or consent to medical procedures. It considers the connection between adult family members: personal decisions, shared matters, help, refusal and continuing care. All the following scenes involving Marina, Vera and Nikolai are fictional. They serve the discussion, rather than providing research cases or a promise of a successful outcome.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Adult age does not yet change the form of conversation

Marina is thirty-four. She works, rents a flat and pays for her own travel. Vera, her mother, habitually asks about each weekend as she once asked about a school excursion. Marina gives a detailed report, then becomes angry with her own submission. Vera notices the anger and demands a more respectful tone. The conversation returns to manners, although its subject is a role that changed long ago: reporting as a condition of permission no longer fits the life Marina has organised.

One might try to win this conversation through age: remind the mother how old her daughter is, list her earnings, present independence like a diploma. But the examination before her mother continues if each decision still requires proof of adulthood. The evidence changes while the final word remains with the former examiner. It is therefore useful to notice the form itself: is the daughter announcing a decision, asking for advice, negotiating a shared matter or requesting someone else’s resources? These are different conversations, even at the same kitchen table.

Vera could also describe what is happening differently. Her involvement need not end when her power to permit ends. She can learn what matters to her daughter, express her own anxiety, offer help or decline involvement beyond her capacity. None of this requires her to consider the choice correct. The difficulty is retaining her opinion without turning it into a compulsory pass for action. An independent decision does not make the parent a silent ornament; it changes the meaning of the parent’s answer.

This change does not happen through one ceremonial conversation. If Marina calmly announces a trip today and starts justifying every detail tomorrow, that does not mean everything has been lost. She can notice one particular return to the old form. There is no need to judge her entire character or her mother’s whole life again. The adult role becomes clearer in particular matters: who chooses, whose involvement is requested, what is already known and what still needs agreement.

II. A personal choice and a shared consequence

Marina’s move concerns her work and where she lives. However, she has also bought groceries for her father, Nikolai, twice a week. That help does not disappear from discussion merely because moving is a personal decision. Nikolai’s need remains; the way Marina can participate changes. There is no need to turn her father’s need into a prohibition on leaving. Yet declaring freedom does not, by itself, answer what will happen to a particular task she previously undertook.

If the family discusses only permission to move, the practical matter gets lost. Vera lists the dangers of the new job, Marina defends her right to live separately, and Nikolai hears an argument about himself without a chance to say what help he actually needs. Separating the questions may be modest: the job decision belongs to Marina; grocery shopping requires separate clarification. This does not guarantee agreement, but it does not present an everyday task as proof of who should control the daughter's whole life.

A shared consequence does not equal a shared right to cancel a choice. At the same time, calling something personal cannot automatically close discussion of a decision that uses another person's flat, time or money. If Marina wants Vera to stay with her for a week and help with the move, that is now a request to Vera. The parent is not a service resource. Her refusal may be unwelcome and still remain another adult's refusal, rather than a betrayal of the parental calling.

It is enough to examine a small matter instead of immediately drafting a family constitution. What exactly am I choosing? What will change for the other person? What involvement have I actually promised? What am I assuming without a conversation? The answers may be incomplete. Uncertainty gives no one authority to decide everything for everyone. It identifies what further clarification is needed, if possible and appropriate. Legal questions meanwhile require separate consideration of the particular situation, outside this article.

III. Advice does not become an order through the strength of a feeling

Vera is certain that Marina is making a mistake about the job. She knows her daughter well and remembers a previous unsuccessful trip. Such experience may matter; the daughter need not belittle it to make her own decision. But knowing a person does not turn every prediction into a fact. One can accept an observation about a tendency to overestimate one's strength and still assess the present circumstances differently. Gratitude for useful advice does not require agreement with the adviser's entire conclusion.

Sometimes the argument shifts unnoticed: what is being discussed is no longer the job but the intensity of the mother's distress. If Vera is very anxious, her daughter must give up the plan; if the daughter does not, she does not love enough. In this arrangement, feeling becomes a lever of authority. Yet one can acknowledge a feeling as real without granting a right to direct another person's decision through it. This does not forbid anxiety. It marks the boundary between a person's experience and a demand made on that basis.

The abstract of Kira Birditt and colleagues' 2009 study describes self-reports from adult children and parents in 158 families. Relationship tensions were associated with lower affective solidarity and greater ambivalence. This limited observation establishes neither causality nor

the usefulness of the practice proposed here. It reminds us that the relationship's arrangement, rather than only an individual decision, may be a subject of disagreement. The full paper was not used here.

Marina might therefore hear two different messages: her mother fears the new job; her mother finds it hard to lose her former place in her daughter's choices. There is no need to declare the second an established motive of Vera's. It is a question for careful consideration, rather than a diagnosis used to win an argument. They can discuss what has explicitly been said and their own involvement while leaving the other's inner reasons uncertain. The parent, in turn, need not explain every fear to state an actual request or a limit to her strength.

IV. Support does not buy control

Suppose Vera offered to pay for moving Marina's possessions. Marina accepted the help and later heard a demand to choose a different flat. A difficult question arises: which conditions were stated, and what did each side understand? This article does not settle the financial dispute or determine either party's rights. Ethically, however, it matters not to pretend that help was unconditional if conditions really existed, or to turn an unspoken expectation into consent supposedly already given by its recipient.

If a condition is clear and Marina can decline the offer, she has an opportunity to assess that particular exchange, including its unwelcome cost. If refusal is difficult in practice, the word voluntary alone is not enough to describe the situation. One cannot demand immediate independence while overlooking housing, money and available support. Material dependence affects real possibilities. Under this article, it does not become proof that a dependent person must surrender every personal decision to someone else.

The parent may also limit her own help in the ethical sense of this discussion. Vera may decline to pay for what she is unwilling to fund; Nikolai may decline to lend his car for a trip. Such limits should not automatically be called cruelty. The distinction concerns the particular matter: deciding how to use one's own resource and deciding another person's whole life are different actions. The boundary is sometimes contested, and this article lacks sufficient information to determine confidently which action is taking place in a particular family.

One possible step for Marina is to separate help already received from a future offer and not promise a decision she does not intend to make. One possible step for Vera is to state conditions before agreement rather than afterwards. These steps may leave the conflict open. Sometimes an honest result is precisely that the parties no longer pretend to share the same understanding. Clarity does not mean a dependent person has suddenly acquired money, housing or a safe way out.

V. Caring for a parent does not cancel the parent’s own voice

Several months later, Nikolai asks for help with everyday tasks. Marina and Vera quickly make a plan, argue about the schedule and forget to ask which actions Nikolai wants to do himself. He becomes irritated; his daughter interprets that as ingratitude. Yet care may reproduce the earlier arrangement: the person helping considers herself the principal decision-maker. Only now the adult child occupies the parental position, while the father becomes the object of a carefully designed organisation.

Age, difficulty or a request for help does not, by itself, allow this article to establish an inability to choose. Particular questions about health, understanding or safety require appropriate professionals and applicable rules. A family conversation does not replace such an assessment. In an accessible everyday matter, one can start with a simpler distinction: did Nikolai ask for groceries, ask to discuss options or delegate a decision? These meanings should not be replaced by the single general word help.

Marina can explain her own capacity: bring groceries once a week, help find another available option or decline a task she does not know how to perform. Nikolai may prefer an option that his daughter finds inconvenient. Not every disagreement requires an immediate correction of his life. At the same time, respecting his choice does not oblige Marina to promise to carry out any plan he chooses. His voice remains alongside her limit, rather than replacing it.

There is no attractive symmetry here, as though the generations always had equal strength and equal dependence. Their money, health, housing and access to support may differ. That is precisely why respect cannot be reduced to the same phrase for everyone. What matters is not erasing the person within the organisation of their needs. Sometimes participation really must become broader; sometimes an independent professional assessment is needed. Neither extending help nor declining part of it automatically explains a family’s whole moral worth.

VI. A parental role can remain without the final word

Vera remembers accompanying her daughter on her first day at school. Responsibility then required actions the child could not yet undertake. The same gesture can now mean something different: an offer of company, checking a chosen route or demanding a constant report. The gesture’s history does not determine its present meaning. What was care at one age and in one circumstance receives no lifelong infallibility. Nor does care that was once necessary become false in retrospect.

In Book V of Rousseau’s *Emile*, the tutor sometimes lets his pupil go alone. Yet in the nearby context he continues to manage visits and sets private rules. This is a historically constructed model with patriarchal assumptions, rather than an example of an equal adult family. Its

limitation raises a useful question: is letting someone take a separate trip enough if the tutor retains the entire arrangement of permissions? Benevolent language does not remove that substitution.

For Vera, a new role might consist in a presence that need not be paid for each time through obedience. Her daughter can seek advice after an independent decision, share success or admit a mistake. If an admission immediately becomes grounds for restoring constant control, the cost of openness increases. This is not a prediction of all children's behaviour. It is a conditional examination of what a family promise to listen means: receiving a particular difficulty or using it as evidence of an adult's complete incompetence.

The parental role need not become endless availability. Vera may also tire of requests, decline to discuss a particular subject or pursue her own life. She need not prove unconditional love by fulfilling every expectation her daughter has. Both may suffer as familiar closeness changes. That pain deserves attention, but it supplies no ready answer about which decision the other must cancel. Preserving a connection is a possible goal, rather than an obligation to achieve it at any price.

VII. Respect allows disagreement rather than demanding a performance of agreement

At a family dinner, Vera asks whether Marina is happy with the move. Her daughter could say everything is perfect to avoid hearing the old reproach. But the fictional scene permits another answer: she likes the job; loneliness has proved harder than expected. This is neither a request to reverse her choice nor proof that her entire independent life is mistaken. Vera can hear the difficulty while retaining her disagreement with the move. Recognising adulthood does not oblige her to declare her own view wrong.

Respect in such a conversation appears in the way disagreement does not cancel a person's standing. A parent does not lose dignity through outdated advice; an adult child does not become a schoolchild again through a mistake. The consequences of an action can be discussed without sentencing its participant to a role for ever. This is the article's ethical position, rather than a proven technique for reducing conflict. It leaves room for responsibility without a compulsory scene of humiliation intended to confirm another's power.

There is also a counterexample: Marina declares every observation interference, although she promised to tell her parents about a change in their shared trip and failed to do so. Invoking adulthood does not settle that matter. She can acknowledge her own unfulfilled promise without giving her mother the right to choose her job and friends. Adult responsibility distinguishes a particular mistake from general surrender. Otherwise admission becomes

dangerous: every small fault is used to capture all later decisions or to reject any criticism entirely.

Not every disagreement should be discussed now. Under threats, coercion or control, there is no need to prove adulthood through an open joint conversation. The British NHS page on domestic abuse describes support and control; it certifies neither a particular family’s safety nor that of a communication channel. Immediate danger requires local emergency help in the person’s actual location. Without that help, this article proposes no family experiment as a substitute for protection. Particular services and their availability have not been checked here.

VIII. Two people instead of a family examination

Suppose Marina now announces her next trip without a lengthy justification. Vera says she still dislikes the chosen city. That is not yet a failure. If the daughter expected an immediate blessing, she may have quietly replaced the old examination with a new one: her mother must confirm that her independence is correct. The new form instead allows two adults to retain different assessments. One can stop requesting permission without demanding compulsory approval as its replacement.

The daughter may also decline to discuss details of her personal life. Such a limit is not the same as saying her mother means nothing. But Vera need not guess that distinction from silence. If an explanation is possible, Marina can speak about the value of their connection separately from the closed subject. She need not reveal more to make her boundary convincing. Her mother can also state a request for contact without turning the absence of details into evidence of a hidden catastrophe.

Sometimes an adult child wants closeness only on her own terms, leaving the parent no space to respond. The family hierarchy then simply changes direction. Vera may not want a conversation at the proposed time; Nikolai may disagree with a role as permanent helper. Their own lives are not an appendix to their daughter’s independence. Distinguishing decisions concerns every participant, although the actual degree of dependence varies and requires attentive, particular consideration rather than mechanical sameness.

The new arrangement may remain incomplete. A family has no obligation to create perfect closeness immediately. Sometimes grocery shopping can be agreed but travel cannot; sometimes conversations become shorter without becoming warmer. Such limits should not be hidden beneath a promise that the right words will necessarily restore trust. A more modest result is that participants see more clearly where a personal choice lies, where a shared task lies, where another’s request lies and where uncertainty remains. Living with that distinction can also be difficult.

IX. Family history need not be an admission pass to one’s own life

Vera’s family traditionally spends every holiday together. For the first time, Marina wants to spend one with friends. Her mother speaks not about a particular evening but about her daughter rejecting the family. This may sincerely describe the mother’s pain, yet it does not exhaust the choice’s meaning. One different evening does not automatically communicate separation, contempt or the entire future frequency of meetings. The event deserves its own scale, even when it arouses strong feelings.

Marina might also rush: call the family custom meaningless and demand that her parents stop valuing it. Independence then becomes a demand to rewrite another’s memory. Vera has reasons to love these holidays, remember earlier years and feel sad about change. Her daughter can decline one custom without acquiring authority to invalidate its meaning for everyone else. She need not share all her mother’s feelings to avoid ridiculing them or turning memory into material for an accusation.

Two separate questions can be considered: what participation Marina chooses now, and what she wants to preserve in their connection. The second answer should not become compulsory payment for the first. The daughter can propose another day to meet, but need not immediately fill every loss with it. Her mother can accept the proposal or say it does not replace the holiday. Neither response requires pretending that the parties experience change identically. A proposed alternative is a possibility, rather than proof that refusal has already stopped hurting.

Belonging to a family becomes particularly difficult when every choice is tested for loyalty to its entire history. A person then defends not a trip or evening but the right to count as one of the family. This article does not promise that such an arrangement is easy to change. It suggests not reinforcing it through one’s own judgment: not declaring a relative wholly alien through disagreement, and not promising participation that will later require deception. Sometimes acknowledging a limited possibility of meeting is more honest than confirming an attractive picture nobody can live out.

X. A request to decide for me has its own subject and limit

Marina may tire of choosing and ask Vera to find a convenient train. This is no automatic return to childhood. An adult can draw on another person’s experience and temporarily delegate a particular task, if that is what she actually wants. What matters is precisely what was entrusted: comparing timetables, suggesting an option, buying an agreed ticket or taking over the whole travel plan. The less clear the request, the easier it is for both to hear in it the old relationship arrangement that neither has explicitly discussed.

Vera may conclude that she has regained the right to approve all her daughter’s journeys. Marina may conclude that her mother must choose perfectly and answer for every inconvenience. Both mistakes expand a small matter. A request for help proves no complete incapacity on the requester’s part, and agreeing to help promises no absence of mistakes. Clarifying the task avoids turning one ticket into evidence of who generally manages life better. This concerns an ethical understanding of a request, rather than the creation of legal authority.

If Marina later wants to choose the train herself, she need not declare the earlier help harmful. She can acknowledge its value and change further involvement. If Vera no longer wants to deal with timetables, she likewise need not prove that her daughter is now sufficiently adult. Her own refusal has a particular subject. Keeping it limited helps preserve the value of help received without turning gratitude into a lifelong continuation of a role. It does not establish how already agreed actions or the consequences of spending can be cancelled; those facts require separate clarification.

Finally, the right to decide does not mean a duty to choose alone every time. One can seek advice, hesitate, need help and change one’s mind. An adult connection differs not through a prohibition on dependence but through attention to how involvement arises and whether it fits the actual request and available capacity. Even a small shared decision can be honest. Even an apparently independent decision can conceal an attempt to make everyone else submit. Age and an attractive name for a role do not replace consideration of what happens between particular people.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one small family matter that poses no danger. Do not begin with a decision about your whole life or invite someone to a test of their love. Three distinctions are enough for a private note: what I choose myself; what actual involvement of another is affected; where I am merely assuming their agreement. Writing establishes no rights and does not make your understanding shared. You may keep it private, postpone it or not do it at all.

If a conversation is possible and wanted, try one matter rather than a general demonstration of adulthood. You can announce a decision, separately request help and leave the other person free to answer the request. There is no need to promise matching feelings or gratitude. Afterwards, consider whether you turned another's anxiety into a compulsory order or their resource into something already available. This practice is an editorial suggestion for reflection, rather than a tested way to repair relationships.

A related but different question is available to a parent: where am I offering a view, and where do I consider it binding? Another is available to an adult child helping an ageing parent: what involvement was requested, and where did I silently take the decision-maker's place? Do not turn these questions into a diagnosis. A joint conversation is not prescribed under a present threat; a private note is not a safety measure either. You may seek appropriate separate support without making compulsory reconciliation its goal.

Key quotation

> *must not be treated as a child*

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile*, Book V; a selected predicate from the narrator and tutor's statement about his maturing pupil, translated by Barbara Foxley. The context retains the tutor's authority and establishes no contemporary general right.

Connections between traditions

In *Emile*, adulthood is considered within an educational project and the tutor's continuing authority. This cannot become proof that Rousseau had already formulated the adult family connection proposed here. The comparison is limited to a question: does only a particular permission change, or does the decision-maker's role itself change?

In the selected passages of the *Analects*, reverence is not reduced to material support, and gentle remonstrance sits alongside hierarchical requirements. This is a historical ethic of filial piety, including limits this article does not propose as contemporary norms. It raises a question about the quality of respect but does not confirm independent decision-making in our sense.

Ephesians 6:1–4 combines an exhortation to children about obedience with an appeal to fathers about upbringing without provoking children. Its household and religious context is not equivalent to contemporary relationships between adult generations. What matters here is preserving both sides of the exhortation and their different grounds, rather than deriving compulsory adult obedience from a single verse.

In the first section of Epictetus's *Enchiridion*, translated by Elizabeth Carter, one's own action is distinguished from what is beyond one's control. For this topic, that provides a limited question

about one's advice and another's choice. The Stoic position cancels neither dependence, need for help nor protection, and establishes no allocation of family duties.

These connections do not produce a unified historical agreement on the right to decide. Birditt and colleagues' study concerns self-reports and associations between experiences; the philosophical and religious texts have other grounds. Through this comparison, the fictional scenes and practice acquire no proven effectiveness, legal force or universal rule for every family.

Sources

1. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile*, Book V, translated by Barbara Foxley. Gutenberg 5427, updated 15 September 2019; exact printed basis not established. A selected context of the narrator and tutor was read, not the entire work.

2. Kira S. Birditt, Laura M. Miller, Karen L. Fingerman, Eva S. Lefkowitz, *Tensions in the parent and adult child relationship: Links to solidarity and ambivalence*. *Psychology and Aging*, 2009, 24(2), 287–295; DOI 10.1037/a0015196. Complete abstract and bibliographic record read. The full paper was not read: the attempted PMC access stopped at a browser check.

3. *The Analects*, Internet Classics Archive. Selected passages II.7 and IV.18–19 with context; the translator and exact printed basis are not identified on the page read. A historical record of sayings associated with Confucius, rather than a contemporary legal norm.

4. *Ephesians*, chapter 6, Updated World English Bible. Whole chapter and publisher's notice read; 6:1–4 used, 66-book version.

5. Epictetus, *The Enchiridion*, translated by Elizabeth Carter. The first section, nearby context and translation attribution were read in this batch; a philosophical distinction rather than a contemporary family study.

6. NHS, *Domestic violence and abuse*. Reviewed 23 June 2026. Selected sections on control and support read in this batch; British context, linked material and local availability not checked.

Tags

adult children, parents, independence, decision, family connection, generations, respect, advice, consent, disagreement, help, dependence, resources, care, boundaries, request, refusal, responsibility, moving, adulthood, parental role, voice, uncertainty, dignity, safety, Rousseau, Confucius, Epictetus, Ephesians, family tension, United Wisdom

About the authors

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

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside 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.