

UNITED WISDOM

A child as a distinct person: care that leaves room for participation

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R34 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A child as a distinct person: care that leaves room for participation

Epigraph

> *Please let me speak!*

Kate Douglas Wiggin, *Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm*, chapter I. Rebecca addresses the driver from an uncomfortable place in the coach. Short remark in the English original; the historical journey is not a contemporary instruction on child safety.

What this article is about

Lidia has entered her son Misha in an exhibition of drawings. She arranged a place, prepared a folder, and already told his grandmother which beautiful landscape he would show. Misha brings out a different drawing: an imaginary city with impossible bridges. His mother is about to explain that the landscape looks more serious when she notices something odd: the exhibition will show the child's work, yet almost every decision about it has been made without him. Meanwhile, organising the journey and a safe return really does remain her concern. This small scene raises a question answered neither by complete adult authority nor by declaring the child completely independent.

The article considers the moral meaning of a child's distinct personhood: a perspective, preferences, and participation in their own life, while an adult remains responsible for necessary care and protection. It is an overview of relationships, rather than an age-based developmental timetable, legal advice, or a parenting method with demonstrated effectiveness. The Convention on the Rights of the Child supplies a normative basis; Rebecca's literary voice helps raise the question. Particular medical, educational, and risky decisions need appropriate verification. We will follow how participation changes an ordinary decision, where an adult's duty remains, and why respect does not oblige a child continually to confirm an attractive parental story.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Distinct personhood begins before full independence

Recognising a child as a distinct person does not mean assuming they can already provide for themselves or assess every risk equally well. Distinct personhood concerns whose life is being lived: a drawing, fatigue, interest in activities, feelings about invited people. Dependence on an adult does not make this experience the adult's property. Misha can need transport, food, and an explanation of exhibition conditions while having his own choice of work. These positions are compatible. The mistake arises when necessary assistance becomes permission to assign the meaning of everything happening and describe the child in advance in terms they can only accept.

Lidia need not stop being a mother to hear her son. She needs to distinguish areas of decision. The place and time of a meeting with the organiser, transport, and available spending concern her actual commitments and means. The drawing's subject concerns Misha's authorship, although exhibition conditions also need checking. The question is not simply who is in charge overall. One shared situation contains different subjects, each with potentially different grounds. This consideration does not promise ease: a child may want something unavailable; an adult may discover their own haste. But the distinction offers a more precise conversation than an overall argument about obedience.

A limit also runs the other way. An adult cannot justify withholding necessary protection by claiming respect for someone else's distinct personhood. Asking a child to take responsibility for an unverified journey, serious risk, or arranging care differs from allowing a choice of drawing. This concerns responsibility within the scene, rather than legal allocation of duties in every country. Decisions requiring specialist information cannot be deduced from a philosophical principle. A child's distinct personhood calls for attention to what happens to them; it does not turn inadequate adult preparation into their personal task or remove the need to seek reliable help.

II. Participation must concern the actual subject

A child can be asked many questions while still being kept outside a decision. Lidia offers a choice of folder colour and sticker position, but has already sent the landscape's photograph to the organiser. Formally, Misha participated; the question important to him remained closed. A small choice is not bad in itself: sometimes that is precisely what is available. The problem concerns how it is presented. If an adult calls the organisation collaborative after settling its central decision beforehand, a child is left to accept a ready-made description of their participation. It is more honest to name what can actually still change, what has already been done, and why.

In our scene, the mother can check whether an image may be replaced, which requirements concern format, and who chooses content. Only then does an offer become concrete. If replacement is possible, the choice of work really is open. If the deadline has passed, that limitation should be named along with her own premature action. An unchangeable result should not be portrayed as her son’s mature agreement. Participation does not require every wish to be fulfilled, but it does require distinguishing a wish, discussion, and a settled decision. The opportunity to explain a choice can also matter when external conditions limit the outcome, although it does not automatically compensate for a lost opportunity.

Article 12 of the Convention connects expressing a perspective with giving it due consideration; article 5 retains direction and guidance consistent with evolving capacities. The normative compatibility of participation and care matters here, rather than a ready-made household algorithm. The text cannot establish that any child should make any decision independently or that discussion will always succeed. Our application is limited: a heard perspective does not become decoration, and adult guidance gains no universal justification from dependence alone. Particular action still requires understanding conditions and an available ability to participate; the Convention’s provision does not replace that assessment.

III. A child’s interest differs from an adult’s story about it

The mother sees the exhibition as a chance for her son to feel proud. This may be a good intention, but it remains her expectation for now. Misha wants to show the city because he imagined how people could meet above a river. The invention itself interests him, rather than proof that he draws better than a neighbour’s child. If Lidia hears only future success, she may miss an existing interest. An adult story makes an activity intelligible to relatives but does not exhaust what it means to its participant. In the fictional scene, the distinction emerges through the child’s explanation, rather than a diagnosis of hidden needs.

Wiggin gives Rebecca her own perspective on names and the visible world. In the first chapter read, the same home signifies more to her than a location, and an uncomfortable seat calls for a response although the adult is already doing his job. This is a literary observation about different perspectives, rather than evidence of a developmental pattern. We do not transfer old travelling arrangements, children’s allocation of duties, or historical prejudices into a contemporary family. The episode’s limited use lies in a question: does an adult know what happens for the child, or merely assume it from their own comfortable position?

Lidia can ask about the city without promising necessarily to admire it. Misha may explain the idea poorly, change his mind, or prefer not to speak to visitors. His distinct personhood does not require constant eloquence. Participation should not depend on persuading an adult through attractive speech. In an everyday situation, a subject can be clarified, an accessible way of answering offered, and unknowns acknowledged. We establish no universal

communication format for every age or condition. Where participation needs particular accommodations, those should be found appropriately; an unfamiliar response, or its absence, does not itself authorise declaring that no perspective exists.

IV. Safety and adult convenience need different grounds

Lidia also prefers the landscape because she would not have to explain the strange bridges. That is convenience, rather than established danger. Convenience exists too: the mother has limited time, energy, and other responsibilities. It can be considered openly without calling every inconvenient feature of a child a threat. When reasons are mixed, an adult's request becomes untestable: any disagreement supposedly proves that the child does not understand their own good. Distinguishing reasons helps name a real limit. The mother may be unable to spend long preparing additional materials, but that does not necessarily justify replacing the drawing itself with one more pleasing to her audience.

A genuine safety question arises separately. The building's meeting procedure may be unclear, an organiser may propose leaving the child without verified supervision, or the journey may require information not yet available. This article does not resolve such conditions through a general permission for independence. Particular information and appropriate local rules are needed. An adult can postpone or cancel participation if necessary protection is unavailable without requiring a child to share confidence in a good result. Verified reasons, assumptions, and absent information still need distinguishing. Unknowns should not be decorated with a promise of safety; they should be acknowledged and considered separately.

The Convention connects a child's interests, care, and protection from violence; it does not permit every adult to declare all personal preferences the child's best interests. A normative document does not assess our exhibition or guarantee local services. Within our own scene, we retain a more modest question: does a limit concern actual protection or a wish for a convenient answer? Sometimes both grounds coexist. A necessary limit can then remain while a humiliating explanation changes. Protection does not require blaming a child for adult anxiety, and discussing interests does not cancel action where danger is real.

V. Increasing independence is not one ladder

Misha may choose his drawing's content independently while needing help with the application. Explaining an idea does not establish readiness for an unaccompanied journey; difficulty with an application form does not cancel authorship. Here, independence is considered by subject and conditions, rather than one overall mark awarded to a personality. This is an editorial way of distinguishing decisions, rather than a scientific developmental model. We set no age by which a child should master a particular step. Age-related, educational, or medical recommendations need separate specialist verification and cannot be replaced by a persuasive family scene.

Participation can expand through a changed particular role, rather than transferring a whole task. Today, the mother sends the application after her son checks the description of his drawing; elsewhere, a child may prepare an accessible part while an adult verifies necessary information. The action should concern an actual subject without making a child responsible for what remained outside their participation. Failed adult organisation does not become evidence of the son's immaturity. This example prescribes no universal sequence. It illustrates discussing who does what now while leaving room to reconsider in light of actual conditions.

Available participation may be smaller today than before: a child is tired, occupied elsewhere, or does not want this particular exhibition. Refusing an event does not necessarily mean rejecting all independence. Every opportunity need not become an examination of continuous growth. An adult can notice a change and determine its subject without deriving a medical cause or personality from one scene. A significant concern about a child's condition needs appropriate separate attention. Moral distinct personhood remains where more assistance is needed; it cannot be awarded only as a reward for convenient progress along a parental plan.

VI. A perspective of one's own does not remove shared life

The choice of drawing concerns Misha, but the exhibition uses family time and travel money. His mother can name available resources and what she cannot organise. A child's distinct personhood does not oblige an adult to fulfil every wish without limits. The question is how existing limits connect to the subject. Insufficient travel funds do not prove an imaginary city inferior to a landscape; a busy mother does not make her son's interest unserious. The idea can remain respected while this particular form of showing it is declined. Such a decision may disappoint a child, and a respectful reason does not oblige immediate happiness about it.

Other participants' work also exists. A child gains no permission to ruin someone else's drawing, appropriate shared space, or endlessly change verified arrangements merely because their voice matters. Shared life contains several people and subjects of responsibility. Here we consider mutual attention, rather than a legal agreement between equal adult and

child. The adult retains their role and should explain an applicable limit accessibly, as far as possible in the situation. Another participant does not disappear from moral consideration either. But breaking one rule does not invalidate every preference or justify discussing the child as an entirely bad person.

Lidia discovers she promised the grandmother a landscape. That was her promise, made before speaking with its author. Misha need not automatically fulfil it solely to preserve an adult reputation. His mother can explain a change to her relative or acknowledge that she rushed. This does not guarantee an absence of awkwardness, but returns responsibility to the action actually taken. Elsewhere, part of a decision may genuinely have been agreed beforehand. The specific meaning of agreement then needs establishing, rather than applying one story to every family. A child’s perspective has room alongside commitments; adult words should not silently create commitments on a child’s behalf.

VII. Privacy is not a gift for good behaviour

After the exhibition, the mother wants to publish the drawing with a detailed account of her son’s fear of speaking. For her, it is a story of overcoming difficulty; for Misha, it is information he did not want to share with strangers. Displaying work in a hall and distributing a personal account have different audiences and consequences. Participation in the first does not automatically mean agreement to the second. No universal legal rule about children’s images and digital publication can be offered here: it depends on place and needs separate verification. A moral question is already available: was this particular publication discussed, and is this particular information necessary?

Article 16 of the Convention identifies privacy protection. It does not turn this article into guidance for every family digital situation. We take a normative basis for attending to an audience while leaving specific legal procedure separate. The mother could show work to relatives without an account of fear, choose another way of mentioning the event, or avoid publication. These are options in a fictional scene, rather than guaranteed safe decisions for every family. If information has already spread, what happened and the possible limits of repair need naming honestly; promising removal from every memory would be false.

Privacy also does not oblige an adult to conceal real danger or abandon necessary appropriate help. Seeking support differs from using a vulnerable episode as a family performance. Purpose, audience, and necessary extent of information can be considered. A child should not have to disclose experience to prove trust in a parent. Trust is not certified by access to an entire inner life. If a child is silent, we do not establish a cause from that single sign. Recognising a boundary allows unknowns to remain while necessary care continues, without calling every closed part of life secrecy or ingratitude.

VIII. Care requires support for the adult too

Lidia reaches this thought in the evening, already tired from work and organising the journey. Moral distinction creates no extra time. If an article assumes one person’s endless patience, it too ceases to see an adult’s distinct personhood. The mother has limits and needs help; a child need not become her sole comfort or manager of the family’s condition. Accessible distribution of practical tasks among adults and appropriate outside resources can be sought. Their availability has not been verified for every country and family. Absent help should not be presented as a personal failing of a parent who has not mastered the right philosophy.

Discussion of support does not remove responsibility for harm caused. Fatigue may explain a sharp remark without making humiliation a necessary instrument of care. Lidia can acknowledge her action and change a particular organisational approach without requiring her son to comfort her for that acknowledgment. Apology and subsequent action perform different tasks, considered further in R26. The limit here is that a child is not assigned responsibility for restoring an adult’s image as a good parent. Recognising personal limitations permits assistance and reconsideration. It does not permit leaving a child without necessary care or repeating harm under cover of sincerity.

If violence or a serious threat continues in a family, the ordinary drawing-choice scene is insufficient. The article does not instruct a child to resolve relationships alone, prove distinct personhood to an adult, or disclose plans for seeking help to a dangerous person. Appropriate protection and support in the particular place are needed; this text does not assess them. The Convention’s protective principle matters as a limit to ordinary reflection but does not replace a functioning service. Adult support and child safety need considering together. Neither independence, good intention, nor an attractive family conversation certifies that actual danger has been removed.

IX. A child need not become a persuasive parenting result

At the exhibition, Misha may stand aside, leave the bridges unexplained to visitors, and want to go home early. This disrupts a parental scenario of vivid success, but does not yet show that the event failed or the child does not value care. The article does not declare every outcome a useful lesson: the trip may genuinely have been unsuccessful. What happened can be named without turning a child into a report on adult merit. His drawing need not confirm every family decision. When a child can only be proof of good parenting, their perspective is permitted only in a form advantageous to whoever presents the result.

An open outcome is harder than a convenient formula. Lidia may have heard her son, fulfilled the organisational part, and still received disappointment instead of expected joy. Respect is not a transaction requiring a child to show gratitude in a prescribed way in return for

participation. An adult can notice their own sadness and fatigue without declaring them the child's debt. This is moral consideration, rather than a claim about inevitable psychological effects. We do not promise that this approach will make relationships close. It merely helps avoid creating a new obligation where an opportunity to show one's own work was initially offered.

Care's meaning does not disappear because a response is unpredictable. Particular actions can be considered: was necessary organisation provided, an accessible perspective heard, actual limits retained, and unnecessary publication open to refusal? This is neither a complete parenting-quality test nor a final verdict based on one day. Some questions remain unknown. A child may change their mind; an adult may discover mistaken grounds. Distinct personhood leaves room for such movement without continual proof that the chosen approach has already produced perfection. A moral principle remains a guide for the next consideration, rather than a guarantee of reward.

X. The next step follows a subject, rather than an overall label

After the trip, mother and son can return to particular questions: which work he wanted to show, what was possible, what was done on his behalf, and which help was really needed. The day need not end with an overall conclusion that Misha is now independent or still entirely little. Such labels can conceal a mixed result. He chose content and needed transport; did not want to speak to visitors and wanted to keep his drawing; his mother arranged a place and rushed her promise to the grandmother. Several facts can remain together. None needs to swallow the others to produce an intelligible family grade.

R34 offers an overall map while leaving neighbouring articles their own subjects. R-12-N01 distinguishes obedience, cooperation, and understanding a particular rule. R-12-N02 considers mistakes within safety limits checked beforehand. R14 examines overprotection in detail; R31 concerns adult children, where duties and decision-making authority change differently. These distinctions prevent a successful phrase from independent adults' relationships being transferred to any childhood situation. Here, distinct personhood accompanies a continuing duty of care. Participation is considered by actual subject and available conditions, rather than awarded as complete independence after a correct conversation.

Misha finally takes home a city the adults have not fully understood. This is a fictional open ending, rather than confirmation of effectiveness. Lidia knows more about what mattered to him and is less certain that her success story matches his experience. She remains responsible for her part of care; he need not become an adult immediately to have his own perspective. The next step remains particular and assessable. Harmony, accelerated development, and an absence of future conflict need not be promised. It is enough not to replace a living participant with a ready-made family role or transfer responsibility an adult must still bear.

What this means in practice

In an ordinary safe situation, choose one actual subject of decision. Separately name what concerns a child’s perspective, what shared resources limit, and what needs adult safety verification. Do not offer an open choice where an answer has already been sent or an outcome assigned. If an action was taken beforehand, acknowledge it and establish what can still change. Participation needs to be accessible to the particular child; this article sets neither age norms nor a universal conversational format. Unknowns about capacities and risk need appropriate information, rather than a confident explanation derived from general moral principles.

When organising, distinguish personal convenience, unverified anxiety, and a particular protective ground. A necessary limit can remain while a manner of address changes. Clarify the audience before distributing a personal story, and do not demand openness as proof of trust. Also name an adult’s need for support without assigning a child responsibility for mood or reputation. Where a threat continues, an ordinary shared exercise does not apply: appropriate local protection and help are needed. A child is not instructed to resolve dangerous relationships alone or disclose plans to a dangerous participant.

After the event, consider the actual outcome without an overall maturity label: which decision was the child’s, which help was needed, what remains unknown, and where an adult rushed. This voluntary moral consideration does not guarantee obedience, closeness, gratitude, or a particular developmental pace and is not a parenting diagnosis. Disappointment can be acknowledged while preserving the scale of what happened. A child’s and an adult’s distinct personhood do not cancel shared life; they help identify participants, grounds, and responsibility that cannot be transferred merely through attractive words about independence.

Key quotation

> *It does make a difference*

Kate Douglas Wiggin, *Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm*, chapter I; a short internal fragment of Rebecca’s own remark about the farm’s name. English original. It identifies her distinct perspective without proving the safety of a historical journey or the correctness of any child’s demand.

Connections between traditions

Basis	Distinction	Limit
Wiggin, chapter I	Adult and child have different perspectives on one situation	Literature is not developmental research or a contemporary travel protocol
Convention, articles 5 and 12	Participation and proportionate guidance are compatible	No universal age of full independence
Convention, articles 3, 18, and 19	Care and protection retain their importance	Local procedures and services have not been verified here
Convention, article 16	Audience and privacy need attention	Specific digital law needs separate verification
United Wisdom, R14 and R31	Overprotection and adult children's relationships have different subjects	Childhood dependence is not overall adult autonomy
United Wisdom, R-12-N01 and R-12-N02	A rule and a safe mistake are considered separately	An overview does not replace assessment of a particular risk

Sources

1. Kate Douglas Wiggin. *Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm*, English original, Project Gutenberg no. 498. Headings and the first chapter were read, rather than the entire novel. Version catalogue: released 1 April 1996, updated 20 November 2024; the HTML's printed basis was not established. The sole directly quoted work; the short Russian fragments were translated by the article author.

2. United Nations. *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, official text hosted by UNICEF; adopted 20 November 1989, entered into force 2 September 1990. Identification and selected articles 1–5, 12, 16, 18–19, 29, and 31 were read with neighbouring context. A normative document, rather than empirical evidence of a parenting method; applicability of local law and services was not verified.

The fictional scene is original. No age timetable, diagnosis, medical prescriptions, or promised outcomes are offered. Legal, educational, and risky decisions need separate specialist verification; literary and Convention-based grounding do not replace it.

Tags

child, parents, care, distinct personhood, participation, independence, responsibility, safety, own perspective, choice, drawing, family resources, audience, privacy, adult support, dignity, right to be heard, guidance, unknowns, conditions, shared household, open outcome, Kate Douglas Wiggin, Rebecca, Convention on the Rights of the Child, UNICEF, United Nations, moral consideration, overprotection, boundaries, United Wisdom, relationships

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 relationships between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.