

UNITED WISDOM

Different worldviews in one family

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R33 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Different worldviews in one family

Epigraph

> *…“I will not persecute you”…*

Mary Augusta Ward, *Robert Elsmere*, chapter XXIX, Catherine speaking. A short fragment; in this scene she retains her faith and hope that her husband will return to it. Her promise does not mean that their beliefs coincide.

What this article is about

People sitting at one table may understand life through different foundations. One turns to God, another does not believe, a third considers the question open. The difference concerns more than words: it changes the meaning of upbringing, death, assistance, obligation, and hope. A proposal simply to forget the differences can therefore sound like a request to forget oneself. Yet demanding that the single truth first be demonstrated can make an ordinary conversation about tomorrow impossible.

This article considers an intermediate question: how adults can agree about living together when their beliefs really do differ. A common arrangement should not represent agreement about daily life as a profession of shared faith. The proposed voluntary distinction separates inner belief, an expressed attitude, a particular action, and an accepted commitment. This is an editorial framework, not psychological treatment, a theological ruling, or legal advice. It does not guarantee that a family will remain together. Where threats and coercion are present, joint discussion may be inapplicable; the possibility of stopping and seeking suitable support remains an essential limit.

I. One home does not create one answer to the deepest questions

Imagine Olga and Pavel, adult spouses. Olga is religious; after prolonged reflection Pavel no longer shares her beliefs. They live together, help an older relative, and are accustomed to a shared Sunday breakfast. Olga prays before eating. Pavel used to do the same; now he remains silent. She hears distance in his silence; he sees an expectation of prayer as a demand to pretend. This is a hypothetical scene, not an account of an actual family or evidence of typical behaviour among believers or nonbelievers.

The first difficulty arises before the argument about truth. Each connects several events into one: changed faith, former closeness, a new manner at the table, and a possible future. These

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

may be connected, but the connection needs to be understood rather than declared settled. Pavel really has changed his belief. It does not yet follow that he has stopped caring about Olga. Prayer really matters to Olga. It does not yet follow that she intends to control his every thought. Both possibilities require separate evidence.

The conversation can begin with what is known: previously both said the prayer; now one does not want to say it on his own behalf. That is more specific than judging an entire personality. Next comes what the change means to each. For Olga, praying together was part of closeness; for Pavel, continuing the former words would assert something he no longer considers true. Naming both sides does not mean acknowledging equal truth in their worldviews. It means establishing what the conversation between these people concerns.

Once the subject is distinguished, a limited task becomes visible. They need to decide how breakfast will work, what each may expect from the other, and how to speak about the change outside their home. Resolving these questions does not prove that the disagreement has disappeared. It may remain painful. Pain and an obligation to pronounce another person's profession of faith are nevertheless different things; a family arrangement need not turn the first into the second.

II. Belief, expression, and action have different scopes

Peaceful presence at the table can mean willingness to be together. It does not necessarily mean agreement with the prayer. Silence can mean respect for another person's action, uncertainty, or declining participation. Olga and Pavel would therefore benefit more from defining what their chosen behaviour means than from checking it against a familiar appearance. Pavel can explain that he will stay at the table but will not pronounce the words on his own behalf. Olga can explain that she will continue her own prayer without requiring him to repeat it.

The precision of a promise matters here. If Pavel promised not to interrupt a short prayer, he accepted a rule of behaviour for a particular period. He did not promise to believe again someday. If Olga promised not to ask about his faith in front of guests, she limited a public conversation. She did not commit herself to ceasing to consider faith important. A broader interpretation may suit someone expecting the other person to change, but it makes the agreement unclear. The person becomes indebted for a decision never made.

The same distinction applies to the nonbelieving participant. Asking not to be drawn into prayer gives him no grounds to ridicule Olga's prayer. Personal conviction that another view is mistaken does not establish the acceptability of every way of expressing that conviction. They may discuss arguments if both want the discussion, and may agree on its time and form.

Where there is no agreement to talk now, declining discussion does not make the disputed thought true or false. It establishes the limit of this meeting.

No universal meaning can be assigned to every gesture in advance. Attendance at a ceremony, help with travel, prepared food, or a greeting may be understood differently across families and traditions. Before proposing a form, it is worth establishing what it means to the participants. If one considers an action a profession of faith and another considers it ordinary courtesy, identical movements do not yet create a common agreement. An agreed meaning may be narrower than desired; sometimes a suitable shared form cannot be found at all.

III. Freedom of conscience does not remove the consequences of actions

In the first chapter of *On Liberty*, Mill distinguishes the inner domain of belief from conduct affecting others. His philosophical defence of liberty concerns social pressure as well as state punishment. This raises a question about a family's demand for agreement. The treatise is not a modern family manual, however, and its historical restrictions are not adopted here as a norm. It supplies no permission to disregard the consequences of one's actions.

Suppose Pavel does not want to participate in a religious trip. That is his position on participation. Yet he previously promised to drive a relative who chose the trip herself and is relying on transport. Two questions now arise: his own attendance and an accepted promise to help someone else. He can seek a replacement, reconsider the agreement with the relative, or clarify exactly what he accepted. Declaring every consequence irrelevant merely because his faith changed would be too broad a conclusion.

The reverse situation matters equally. Olga wants to direct some shared money to a project important to her. The project's significance to her conscience does not confirm Pavel's agreement to dispose of their shared funds. They must distinguish personal funds, common expenditure, and the actual way decisions are made. The article establishes no property rights here: actual legal questions require the relevant context. The editorial question is simpler—whose life, time, or resources are changed by an action described as personal?

A boundary thus emerges between inner disagreement and a shared consequence. Relatives need not certify each other's faith, but they do need to see particular actions, promises, and affected interests. This boundary is not always obvious and cannot resolve every dispute. It helps avoid two extremes: declaring every difference a betrayal of the family, or declaring any action personal even when other people pay, work, or bear responsibility for it.

IV. A common minimum does not require identical foundations

Olga and Pavel may both consider humiliating their relative unacceptable. For Olga this is connected to faith; for Pavel it follows from his understanding of dignity. Agreement about an action does not require a common explanation of every reason. They can establish exactly what they promise: not to discuss her credulity in her presence, to ask what she herself wants, and not to use assistance to make her adopt someone else's views. Their grounds can remain different while the observable action is defined.

The common minimum cannot automatically become proof that deep down everyone believes the same thing. That explanation may please an observer, but it assigns participants a belief they have not expressed. Olga may consider faith irreducible to a common ethics. Pavel may reject a religious explanation even when their conduct coincides. Shared practice need not erase the difference. Sometimes declining to announce a hidden unity makes conversation more honest.

Nor should a minimum become a list of attractive words. Respect can be expressed through actions: not publishing another person's disclosure without agreement, not speaking on their behalf, and not making ordinary help conditional on their participation in a dispute. Each rule requires attention to circumstances and does not settle every possible case. The list can be short. Its value lies in participants understanding the scope of what they accepted, rather than in portraying an ideal family.

Sometimes the common minimum reveals an actual obstacle. One person requires the other constantly to conceal a belief; the other cannot accept living together in that form. One expects the other to say a shared prayer as a personal profession; the other refuses. The framework need not manufacture a compromise at any cost. It makes the incompatibility of a particular demand and a particular boundary visible. The next decision may concern changed living arrangements, distance, or ending life together; no universal formula determines it.

V. Care should not become payment for a belief

After a difficult breakfast, Olga wonders why she should make tea for someone who no longer shares what matters most to her. Pavel asks a reverse question: must he help with activities connected to a faith he rejects? These questions may arise from fatigue, loss of a shared meaning, or a need to redistribute work. They should not be explained in advance as malicious intentions. It is useful, however, to distinguish reconsidering available help from requiring a changed belief as the price of receiving help.

If Olga can no longer do her usual work, she can say so separately from the argument about faith. If Pavel does not agree to help with a particular religious action, they can clarify the limits

of assistance and the consequences of a previous promise. A different situation arises when ordinary support is deliberately made conditional on saying the required words. Family life then becomes a means of pressure. This is particularly significant where there is material dependence, limited ability to leave, or a need for care. Joint practice may be insufficient in such circumstances.

No unconditional duty to continue every form of assistance is assigned here. People can limit their available effort, decline actions they do not accept, and discuss ending a relationship. The distinction concerns the grounds and scope of a decision. Saying that a particular form of help is no longer possible is different from promising to restore it only after the other person converts to one's faith. Difficult intermediate cases exist; they require knowledge of actual conditions rather than a ready-made diagnosis.

Care itself does not confirm a worldview's correctness. Olga's kind action does not prove her religion true to Pavel. Pavel's kind action does not prove faith unnecessary to Olga. Turning assistance into an argument about an entire belief system burdens a particular action with something it does not establish. It may show that certain support occurred and help reveal the person's attitude now. A broader conclusion requires separate consideration.

VI. Closeness does not permit speaking on another person's behalf

In Ward's novel Catherine retains her faith when she promises not to persecute her husband. The next chapter leaves their difficulties unresolved by one emotional outburst. This is fiction, not evidence of how all families overcome religious differences. It suggests a limited observation: tenderness and continuing disagreement can occupy the same scene. Continuing the relationship does not certify changed belief.

Olga and Pavel face this distinction when relatives ask whether everything is now as it was. They can answer about living together without answering for another person's inner state. Olga may speak of her own hopes. A claim that deep down Pavel still believes, however, requires grounds that her hope does not create. Pavel may describe his position. A claim that Olga will soon recognise her mistake is likewise not knowledge about her future.

Keeping this boundary is especially difficult around sympathetic people. Olga's friend wants to support her and suggests describing Pavel's temporary error. Pavel's friend wants to support him and suggests treating Olga's faith as a consequence of fear. They may know neither the reasons nor the depth of the other person's position. Supporting one participant should not turn into a settled story about the other's hidden motives. Nor must the spouses supply their circle with material for a collective discussion of family life.

They can agree on a short public answer about facts both are willing to name. Beyond that, each speaks on their own behalf while considering the other's privacy. This is not a prohibition on seeking personal support or a requirement to keep dangerous situations secret. The difference between voluntary privacy and enforced silence matters. A common answer should not deprive someone of the ability to describe what is happening where safe, suitable help is needed.

VII. Traditions have their own foundations for respecting conscience

Romans 14 discusses food and observance of days within a Christian community. It urges participants neither to despise nor judge one another, grounding the argument in relationship to the Lord and accountability to God. It does not declare all religions and nonbelief equivalent and cannot simply become a modern neutral family charter. Within its own foundation, however, attention to another's conscience and the effects of conduct remains visible.

Comparison with Mill does not create a common proof. Their initial questions and grounds differ. Readers need to see these differences; otherwise respect becomes another form of appropriation as we declare every author a supporter of our present formula. This article proposes its own voluntary framework and indicates limited points of conversation with sources. It does not assert that an ancient community, a philosophical treatise, and an English novel anticipated a single method of family communication.

In an actual conversation, this distinction helps avoid requiring someone to abandon their own language. Olga may explain her care through faith; Pavel may explain his participation differently. If one asks for an explanation in words they can understand, that request can be discussed. Translating a meaning should not secretly change its foundation, however. Sometimes a phrase remains only partly understood by the other person. Honestly acknowledged incompleteness is preferable to an invented shared profession of faith.

Common language is needed primarily for a particular decision: who will attend, what is promised, and what remains unagreed. It can stay simple even when explanations of the world are complex. A difference of views does not require constant conversation about them. People may read, argue, remain silent, or choose separate meetings voluntarily. The freedom to discuss and the freedom not to participate now must be considered together; neither guarantees a pleasant outcome for the other.

VIII. Children should not be assigned to resolve an adult dispute

Where a family includes children, daily life cannot be discussed solely as an agreement between two independent adults. Children have their own needs and a changing capacity to understand events; actual questions of upbringing and rights depend on age and circumstances. This article establishes no legal regime of freedom of belief for them. Adults can nevertheless notice separately the danger of turning a child into a witness, ally, or final judge of a worldview dispute.

The earlier article R-12-N04 considers adults giving a child incompatible everyday rules in detail. The subject here differs: adults can retain different explanations of the world without requiring the child to confirm one adult's correctness to the other. Using the child's answer as a victory turns an ordinary question into a test of family loyalty. This does not make every discussion of faith with a child unacceptable. What needs distinguishing is teaching, a freely asked question, and a requirement to take a position against another close person.

Olga and Pavel can discuss in advance how each describes their own belief, which shared activities are offered to the child, and where the adults do not yet agree. They need not say that they think alike. A statement about difference should nevertheless be understandable and should not portray the other adult as dangerous or foolish merely because of their position. Where a dispute concerns particular safety, health, or legal duties, relevant help is needed; a conversational framework cannot replace it.

Nor should the absence of an immediate answer be represented as a child's agreement with one adult. The child may not understand the question, fear upsetting someone close, or simply not want to continue talking. No cause is established by silence alone. An adult can clarify whether an answer is needed now at all and separate ordinary care from testing the words spoken. This is a limited editorial observation, not an assessment of a particular child's development. The possibility of asking questions should not depend on whether the previous answer pleased a parent. Adults retain actual duties of care and protection; their content cannot be deduced from one general principle of agreement. Where the question becomes significant, knowledge of the circumstances and appropriate professional consideration are needed.

IX. Arrangements can be reconsidered; another person's conscience cannot be assigned

After a month, Olga and Pavel find their former breakfast more difficult. Pavel's silence reminds Olga of loss every time; Pavel expects another question every time. Their first agreement proved insufficient. This does not demonstrate that someone broke a promise or that every shared future is impossible. Sometimes a chosen form preserves the formal rule while overlooking the meaning experienced. That meaning can be named without treating a feeling as an obligation for the other to change.

They can reconsider the time for prayer, the duration of breakfast, the presence of guests, and how to answer a repeated question. They can also acknowledge that one does not wish to continue this form. Reconsideration should concern what can actually be accepted: actions and conditions of a meeting. A promise to stop feeling loss or definitely acquire faith is of a different kind. People do not control a future inner state in the same way as a decision to telephone on a particular day.

Not every difference can be accommodated while continuing the former life. A family may change its distance, live differently, or separate. Acknowledging this limit does not urge people to leave in advance or negate possible closeness. It releases consideration from an obligatory happy ending. Clear distinctions help reveal an actual choice and its consequences; they do not produce agreement, love, or safety on demand. No one should tolerate threats to test the proposed practice.

X. A changed position should not become a test of love

Suppose that after some time Pavel himself wants to talk about faith again. Olga may be pleased, but the start of a conversation does not establish its result. A question, interest, doubt, and an accepted belief have different scopes. If each question is immediately celebrated as a return, it becomes harder to explore something not yet understood. Personal inquiry turns into a family event with an expected finale. The same difficulty arises if a nonbelieving relative greets every doubt a believer expresses as a final victory over religion.

The question can be answered as it was asked, while clarifying what the person now wants: an explanation, a comparison of arguments, an account of an experience, or simply to communicate a change. These tasks do not amount to an invitation to debate. Olga need not conceal her own pleasure or hope; Pavel need not promise a convenient conclusion. What matters is that neither names the other's intermediate state as a finally accepted decision. Conversation can be supported without appropriating its outcome.

If a worldview really changes, that does not automatically restore every former living arrangement. The person may have reconsidered faith while retaining a different manner of participation, separate time, or a changed life situation. New closeness does not reinstate old promises without clarification. Previously agreed silence in front of guests may need reconsideration; former actions may need new agreement. The conversation again concerns a particular scope rather than one side's overall victory.

Testing love through belief makes this path especially difficult. Olga can say that difference causes her pain and decide what shared life is possible for her. Pavel cannot reliably prove love by pronouncing words he considers false. Pavel can say that living beside Olga's faith is difficult for him, but her refusal to abandon it does not give complete knowledge of her attitude toward him. The desired relationships may really be incompatible. That is better named specifically than requiring an inner change as an examination of closeness.

A changed belief does not itself violate every family promise. A concealed action, false statement of agreement, or unfulfilled particular obligation nevertheless requires separate consideration. If Pavel long simulated participation to avoid talking, Olga may need to understand which statements were reliable. If Olga told relatives about a decision he supposedly accepted, he may need to correct that public account. Such a question concerns facts and trust in words. A general permission to think differently cannot resolve it alone.

It is useful to leave space for what is not yet known. People need not decide in advance what they will believe in a year, whether a familiar meeting will succeed, or whether feelings will change equally. Honestly defining the present position and nearest accepted action is enough. This does not abandon deep inquiry or require satisfaction with superficial peace. People can continue seeking truth on their own foundations. A family agreement simply should not require an invented outcome of inquiry before it has actually occurred.

What this means in practice

If conversation is possible and voluntary, begin with one recurring event. Write down the belief, action, personal meaning of that action, and accepted promise separately. Clarify who is affected through time, money, care, or a public account. Then propose a limited form for the next meeting and keep clear what remains unagreed. Do not call silence conversion, assistance a profession of faith, or hope knowledge of the other's future.

Olga and Pavel can try one breakfast rather than the whole family at once. Afterwards, ask whether the precise accepted action occurred and whether the form suits both now. Clarification does not guarantee relief. If someone does not want to participate, the meeting can stop; danger calls for a different route to support. Different worldviews may persist. A

common agreement's task is to define actual shared life where it is possible, rather than make people declare themselves identical.

Key quotation

> *…“not solved by a burst of feeling”…*

Mary Augusta Ward, *Robert Elsmere*, opening of chapter XXX. A fragment of the narrator's account of the spouses' problems. One reconciliation does not settle the next stage of life; the quotation assigns no universal outcome to families.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Common question	Essential difference	Limit
Ward and life together	Does difference remain after closeness?	A fictional family scene differs from a present voluntary agreement.	Neither an empirical model of all religious families nor a promise of reconciliation.
Mill and freedom of conscience	Where does a demand for agreement end?	A philosophical question about coercion differs from an individual everyday decision.	Consequences for others remain; historical restrictions are not adopted as a norm.
Romans 14 and another's conscience	How should different practices be approached?	Accountability to God within a Christian community differs from a neutral agreement between adults.	Neither equivalence of all worldviews nor a modern family charter.
Agreement about action and agreement about faith	What has actually been accepted?	Shared action can have different foundations.	It establishes neither inner unity, concealed motives, nor future conversion.

Sources

1. Mary Augusta Ward, *Robert Elsmere*, PG8737, English original. The selected continuous context at web lines 5149–5293, the end of XXIX and beginning of XXX, was read; Catherine's promise and the narrator's limit on emotional reconciliation are used. Embedded biblical and literary passages are not quoted. Neither whole-book reading nor an exact underlying print edition is claimed. Two short fragments appear in the reader roles; PG availability in the US is not declared universal permission.

2. John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, chapter I, PG34901, English original. The selected context at 199–246 on conscience, pressure, and consequences of actions was actually read. This is philosophy; no modern family recommendation is assigned to its author. Historical hierarchical exceptions are not adopted as a present norm. The exact print edition was not established; no direct quotations.

3. Romans, chapter 14, King James Version. The entire chapter, verses 1–23 at web lines 49–87, was read. A limited comparison of practices and conscience retains the Christian foundation. It asserts no equivalence of religions; no direct quotations.

Tags

family, worldview, faith, nonbelief, conscience, conviction, closeness, difference, respect, agreement, daily life, prayer, action, foundation, promise, participation, privacy, care, coercion, freedom, responsibility, consequences, children, conversation, hope, boundaries, Ward, Mill, Romans, life together

About the authors

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

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. She researches and practically tests approaches to unity and mutual understanding among people and cultures. Continue the conversation: **@ilkutki**.