

UNITED WISDOM

Gratitude to parents and the freedom to choose differently

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-11-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Gratitude to parents and the freedom to choose differently

Epigraph

> *I love my father.*

George Gissing, *A Life's Morning*, chapter XII, Emily Hood speaking to Dagworthy. She names her love for her father while speaking to someone who is using his predicament to pressure her into marriage. This is a fictional context, not an instruction to endure coercion.

What this article is about

Imagine a family evening. Pavel announces that, after several years in the family workshop, he wants to enter another profession. His mother, Anna, reminds him of the extra shifts she worked to pay for his education. Pavel remembers them. That is precisely why he finds it difficult to answer: every explanation of his new choice sounds to him like an attempt to diminish her effort. To Anna, meanwhile, it seems that her son is rejecting the whole history that enabled him to grow up, rather than simply leaving the workshop.

In this fictional example, three matters are being disputed at once: the meaning of the past, present commitments, and the direction of a future life. They are connected, but an answer to one cannot settle the others. We can acknowledge care without treating it as a contract to repeat a parent's life. We can choose differently and still answer for a particular promise. This article examines gratitude between generations: what cannot be returned, what can be carried forward, and where the memory of help becomes a demand to live according to someone else's design. It offers neither a legal calculation of family debt nor a promise of agreement.

I. Gratitude begins with what actually happened

Pavel remembers particular events rather than an abstract image of parental greatness: Anna drove him to classes, looked for suitable books, and stayed beside him when he feared an examination. Some actions mattered in ways he understood only later. He can name them without concluding which profession he must now choose. The first question concerns acknowledging a real contribution, rather than agreeing to a demand made on its basis. Keeping acknowledgment this specific makes gratitude more accurate, although it does not necessarily make the conversation easier.

But a memory does not become honest because it is required to sound positive. Suppose Anna really did work hard, while also humiliating her son over poor grades. Pavel need not treat one fact as proof that the other never happened. Recognizing help does not refute harm; naming harm does not automatically deny every instance of help. What is needed is attention to the history he actually knows, rather than a predetermined portrait of a good parent. This article does not dictate what someone must feel toward the person who raised them, or require them to find goodness in order to excuse abuse.

In books VIII and IX of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle considers the parental relationship through origins, upbringing, and unequal benefits. This is a substantial reminder that people do not begin life in equal positions. His historical model also includes paternal authority and other hierarchical assumptions. We cannot transfer it wholesale into a contemporary family. For our subject, the useful question concerns the different grounds of gratitude; how decisions should be distributed today remains a separate ethical argument made by this article.

Anna can therefore describe what was difficult for her without turning the account into a bill. Pavel can acknowledge that effort without agreeing that her account exhausts their shared history. Each has access to a partial truth about the past. The son is not required to feel her sense of sacrifice to the same degree; the mother is not required to remember childhood as he does. Gratitude does not require perfectly matching memories. It does require refraining from cancelling another person's experience for the sake of a convenient collective portrait.

II. A childhood cannot be repaid with an entire biography

A financial debt may have an amount and terms. Many important parental actions have no comparable measure: a child did not commission their birth, choose their degree of dependency, or agree in advance on the price of care. This does not make care insignificant. On the contrary, its importance may exceed what a reciprocal service could express. Yet the impossibility of exact repayment does not entitle a creditor to choose the recipient's whole future. The immeasurable value of a benefit and unlimited authority are different claims; moving from one to the other requires an argument.

If Pavel stays in the workshop purely as repayment, what would count as enough? Five years, ten, or working there until retirement? Who determines the outstanding balance, and what happens if Anna still feels abandoned? The terms change with feelings, while completion keeps receding. An endless examination emerges: the son's choices must repeatedly prove that his mother's past efforts were worthwhile. The difficulty is not simply that gratitude is too strong. Gratitude has been assigned the undefined task of governing a life.

In book IX, chapter II, Aristotle considers the different claims of parents, friends, and benefactors, rather than assigning every possible claim to one person. His priorities differ from

those proposed here. Nevertheless, the need to distinguish claims already challenges the simple formula that the greatest past contribution decides every present question. This is a philosophical argument within a particular ethical system, not a contemporary rule on supporting parents. It helps us ask whether a specific demand concerns the benefit received, or merely borrows its moral weight.

Pavel may want to help Anna out of gratitude. That choice need not be small or symbolic. It may require time, money, and inconvenience. But assistance retains a subject: a particular task, a known capacity, a named contribution. Living the life his mother once could not live is a different undertaking. Even agreeing to it would not establish that it is the only honest expression of gratitude. What matters is noticing where a personal wish to contribute becomes an obligation to fulfil another person's biography, with neither boundaries nor an endpoint defined.

III. A parent's sacrifice may be real while its meaning remains disputed

Anna says she gave up several opportunities for her son. Pavel believes that some of those decisions were difficult. He need not immediately search for a hidden advantage in them to escape an uncomfortable feeling. Yet his mother may have seen those decisions as necessary, chosen among poor alternatives, or understood them as expressions of her love. Calling something a sacrifice does not settle its meaning for her. Still less does it make her son the author of every lost opportunity of which he knew nothing at the time.

It matters here to distinguish acknowledging a cost from assuming responsibility for it. Pavel can say that his education required considerable effort from his mother. That does not amount to admitting that he deliberately deprived her of another life and must now compensate her. A child can depend on an adult's decisions without choosing those decisions. The adult son cannot now consent retrospectively to all the conditions of his childhood. He can treat his mother with care without supplying consent that could not have existed during that period.

In the introduction to *The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics*, Kant distinguishes cultivating our own perfection from furthering other people's permissible happiness. One person cannot make another person's purpose internally their own on that person's behalf. This does not explain Anna psychologically or authorize disregarding every need. A narrower distinction matters to our question: helping someone and realizing their life project for them are different undertakings. The existence of ethical duties does not erase the distinction between the people who act.

Anna, too, need not prove the value of her years by ensuring that Pavel stays in the workshop. Perhaps she wants the business to continue; perhaps she fears being left to manage it alone.

Such possibilities must be considered through what she says, rather than declared to be her established motives. Her son can ask about the actual subject of her request. If more hands are needed, the subject is work. If recognition is wanted, the subject is recognition. Neither conversation promises complete comfort. Separating them merely resists making the cancellation of her son's future the sole answer to every loss.

IV. Inheriting a value need not mean repeating its form

Pavel wants to teach practical craft skills. Anna hears that he no longer needs the family workshop. He, however, connects his new choice with what he learned beside her: attention to materials, patience, and respect for other people's labour. Continuations can look unlike their source. Here, too, we can rush to declare any new path the true embodiment of parental values. The son may see that connection while his mother does not. She is not obliged to approve a pleasing explanation simply because it preserves her positive place in the story.

Another choice is possible: Pavel genuinely no longer shares some family beliefs. In that case, he need not invent profound continuity to keep peace at the table. Gratitude for instruction can coexist with rejecting some of the rules learned. He can acknowledge that something helped him before but no longer determines his choices. That acknowledgment may hurt more than a reassuring statement about continuing a tradition. It nevertheless avoids requiring both people to maintain a fictional agreement that every later action will contradict.

In the *Analects*, IV.18, reverence permits gentle remonstrance, alongside strong demands of filial piety. In IV.20, preserving the father's way has its own moral importance. These passages cannot be presented as an ancient justification of complete independence for a contemporary adult. They reveal another tension: continuing a family's established order could itself be considered an expression of virtue. Our distinction between gratitude and repetition disagrees with part of that order; it does not attribute a ready-made agreement with us to Confucius.

A map of inheritance should therefore serve neither as an accusation nor as advertising for a new choice. Pavel can consider which skills and meanings he carries forward, which he changes, and which he rejects. He need not find a predetermined number of similarities. Sometimes a connection becomes apparent years later; sometimes it never does. A private note may help him name his reasons more accurately. It does not prove to his mother that her hope has already been fulfilled. Another person's disappointment does not automatically disappear when continuity is described well.

V. Leaving a project does not cancel a particular promise

Pavel has promised to finish an order by the end of the month. If he leaves the workshop tomorrow, Anna retains a commitment to the client. This is a real present matter that cannot be dissolved into a dispute about lifelong gratitude. The son can reject a continuing career while considering how to complete, transfer, or openly revise the task he accepted. Freedom to choose a direction does not establish that every previous commitment loses its meaning. Nor does a failure concerning one order give his mother decision-making authority over all his future professions.

This specificity protects the parent as well. Anna does not need to invoke sleepless nights twenty years ago to ask about the current order. If a promise was made, the conversation has a basis of its own. Perhaps her son overestimated his capacity; perhaps the deadline changed; perhaps she heard a promise where he expressed an intention. Those details need to be established. This article does not resolve contractual or financial disputes. It does show why examining a known agreement should not be replaced with a general judgment about whether someone is sufficiently grateful for their childhood.

Kant's distinction between ethical duties and external constraint gives importance to internally setting an end. It does not follow that consequences for other people vanish when someone no longer likes a commitment. Our inference is more modest: consider the accepted task under its actual conditions, without adding a requirement to continue the family business forever. Revising it may be inconvenient and may not satisfy the other person. We cannot promise that making the distinction correctly will make leaving painless, cost-free, or harmless to every part of the trust that previously existed.

Pavel may find he can finish the order but cannot work for another year. Anna may recognize the difference and still be unhappy. An adult conversation need not end in mutual admiration. A more limited result is that both understand which promise is being considered and which future was never promised. If the mother needs another employee, a separate practical matter begins. Her son may choose to help find someone. Having been raised and taught does not make him the only permissible replacement for himself.

VI. Remembering goodness does not require the same feeling every day

After the difficult evening, Pavel notices his irritation and decides that all his gratitude must have been false. That is too large a conclusion to draw from one state. He can remember care while not wanting a conversation now; he can value instruction while being angry about the demand made. This article neither explains the origins of those experiences nor diagnoses them. It distinguishes a present feeling, a judgment about the past, and a present action. They may diverge without automatically making someone either a cold debtor or a perfectly loving son.

Anna, too, may feel pride and resentment at once. She is not required to become a calm supporter of the new path immediately. Yet a feeling need not take the form of deciding for her son. Between emotion and demand, there is room for her own response: saying that it is difficult, asking for time, declining the conversation now, or naming a particular need. These are possibilities, not a technique proven to reduce family tension. Their value here is ethical: a person retains their voice without turning its intensity into a measure of who should govern whom.

Kant does not reduce ethical action to a pleasant experience. His account of duty is far stricter than the everyday note proposed here and does not validate every contemporary idea of emotional comfort. It nevertheless challenges a simple substitution: if gratitude does not feel warm today, acknowledging the past must be impossible. Pavel may retain his intention to treat his mother attentively while feeling irritated. He may also decline close contact for reasons that matter to him. The source does not prescribe a mandatory level of contact for a particular family.

A pause does not cancel known goodness, and remembering it does not establish an obligation to answer immediately. Sometimes this distinction can prevent promises made to relieve guilt quickly. Sometimes it changes nothing in a conversation with a parent. Gratitude need not be a continuously available performance. It can be expressed later, in another way, or privately. The absence of a public expression does not enable this article to determine what someone feels. Nor does an eloquent expression prove agreement to a subsequent demand.

VII. When the past becomes leverage, the conversation changes its subject

Suppose Anna stops discussing the workshop and repeatedly says her son must prove his love by giving up the new job. This still does not justify describing the whole family with a diagnosis. But the particular demand can be examined: acknowledgment of the past is accepted only together with surrendering the future. Pavel is being offered a specific decision as the sole proof of gratitude, rather than gratitude itself. If he discusses only the size of his feeling, the substitution stays hidden. Asking what is wanted from him now brings the conversation back to action.

In chapter XII of Gissing's *A Life's Morning*, this substitution appears in an extreme fictional situation. Dagworthy uses a threat against Emily's father to try to obtain marriage with her. Emily retains her love for her father but refuses the proposed price of saving him. Ordinary family distress cannot be equated with this coercion. The scene matters as a counterexample to faulty reasoning: the strength of an attachment does not establish the permissibility of every demand made in the name of a loved person. The novel is not research on the effectiveness of refusal.

Where threats, restrictions on movement, or other present risks exist, discussing gratitude together does not become a mandatory experiment. NHS describes abuse and control within families as well, including restrictions on work and access to resources. This is a British information page, not an assessment of a particular home or verification of services local to the reader. The article does not require immediately exposing another person or announcing a departure. In danger, available specialist support and safety in the actual location take priority.

A boundary may remain an internal distinction until acting differently becomes possible. Dependence on housing or money does not disappear through a declaration of freedom. Pavel may understand that a demand is excessive while still lacking a safe way to refuse. That does not refute his understanding or justify accusing him of insufficient adulthood. Gratitude should not justify enduring a threat. An article about gratitude should not add a second demand either: requiring a person to prove independence through abrupt action without considering what they can actually do.

VIII. Care can continue in a different form

Anna wants to see her son more often. Pavel is willing to help with supplies but not to work at the workshop every day. His offer may express attachment, yet fail to address her actual request. We cannot consider every substitute sufficient simply because it suits the person proposing it. Meaning, capacity, and agreement must be distinguished. Anna can say that she does not need help with supplies. Her son can maintain the limit of his contribution. An offer remains an offer, rather than proof that the other person has already received everything they could have hoped for.

It is useful to notice whether a reciprocal action has become a hidden bargain. Pavel helps so that his mother will never express dissatisfaction again; Anna accepts help while expecting him to return to the business. Neither aim becomes shared without discussion. Gratitude that purchases another person's permanent peace once again acquires an undefined price. Someone can wish to maintain contact without promising an absence of distress. Someone can show care without receiving approval in return. This difficult distinction establishes no obligation to tolerate humiliation or continual demands.

Aristotle's account of family friendship attends to different kinds of relationship, while Confucian teaching attends to the quality of reverence. Neither is equivalent to agreeing on feasible help today. They permit a question about the form of participation but supply no ready-made family schedule. Our proposed step is to look for an action that makes sense under present circumstances. It may be small, substantial, or not yet available. A person's moral worth cannot be measured solely by the number of calls or the amount of money transferred.

Pavel can sometimes help at the workshop if he wants to and understands the limit. Returning for a day would not then mean abandoning his new profession. Anna, too, can stop discussing the business with her son while retaining other subjects of closeness. A partial relationship need not represent defeat. Yet neither person is obliged to find a new form at any cost. Sometimes the relationship stays limited or ends. This article preserves that possibility without presenting it as everyone's desirable outcome, or as proof that gratitude and independent choice are fundamentally incompatible.

IX. A new choice need not prove a parent's life was mistaken

Pavel could defend his departure by declaring the family workshop pointless. Anna would then have to defend decades of labour, rather than just her expectation. A different direction does not require that judgment. Her son can respect what was accomplished without wanting to do the same. The difference arises between people with different circumstances, interests, and opportunities. It need not identify a winner in a contest between biographies. Another person's life should not be considered a failure merely because it did not become the next generation's desired model.

Respect does not, however, require concealing a personal judgment. If Pavel finds some working methods unacceptable, he can identify those methods. Gratitude for instruction does not require portraying the workshop as flawless. What matters is not extending a particular conclusion into total devaluation of a person. Anna can likewise criticize the new plan without declaring her son a negation of the family's whole meaning. A specific objection leaves a subject to consider. A general verdict often requires only one person's surrender, even when it is called an honest conversation.

In Gissing's novel, Emily's refusal has particular historical moral foundations that do not wholly coincide with contemporary understandings. We therefore cannot make her a ready-made example for every family. A more accurate reading preserves her two simultaneous actions: attachment remains, and agreement to an imposed future does not arise. We use a literary counterexample, rather than proving that every choice against parental expectations will be right. An independent decision can be unwise. Its quality must be examined through reasons and consequences, rather than solely by how far it differs from parental wishes.

Sometimes the mother's best response will indeed change Pavel's plan. He may learn an important detail, see a risk, or acknowledge that he overlooked a shared commitment. Reconsidering does not destroy his adulthood, just as stubbornly maintaining the plan does not automatically prove it. Freedom to choose differently includes choosing the same course after considering it for oneself. Gratitude neither disappears nor determines the result in advance. It becomes one significant relationship in a person's life, rather than the only way to decide which option they may call their own.

X. Gratitude can remain unfinished

At the evening's end, Anna does not say she understands her son. Pavel receives neither a blessing nor an exact account of his remaining obligation. Yet the conversation may end without a new promise to stay forever. This is a modest, ambiguous result. His mother still experiences the loss of an anticipated continuation; her son still seeks words to recognize her effort. This article does not promise that clear distinctions will quickly create warmth. Sometimes they first reveal a mismatch previously concealed by the shared word gratitude and the family's familiar distribution of roles.

Pavel need not settle his internal account before taking an independent step. He may not know how to express appreciation while clearly knowing he does not want to remain in the workshop. Anna may reject his explanation without thereby becoming someone whose pain is illegitimate. Unfinishedness concerns the relationship, rather than automatically the capacity to decide a particular matter. Waiting for complete agreement can keep both people in the old arrangement, where every movement requires permission that must also be emotionally flawless.

Uncertainty should not be romanticized, however. A particular promise about the order still requires separate consideration. A real need for support on the mother's part can be discussed separately. If contact is dangerous, general unfinishedness does not justify continuing a dangerous conversation. Distinguishing matters preserves each one's importance without turning it into authority over everything else. A family may lack a unified account of what happened. Its members may still find particular honest actions, limited by known capacities and agreement.

Returning mentally to that first evening reveals a different task. Pavel need not prove that Anna gave him nothing. Anna need not demand a repetition of her life for her effort to remain real. Between denying the past and surrendering the future, many responses are possible, but none is guaranteed. Gratitude can retain the name of the goodness received; independent choice can retain the name of the person who received it. Their compatibility is not an accomplished family success. It begins by refusing to treat either name as the cancellation of the other.

What this means in practice

If this subject is relevant and safe, you can choose one small disputed matter. In a private note, separate three questions: what specifically mattered to me in past care; what promise I actually made now; and what future choice the other person connects with gratitude. Do not record your answers as an objective verdict on the family. Some events are known only through another person's account, some are remembered differently, and some cannot yet be examined. You can keep the note private, postpone it, or choose not to make it.

Then consider the measure of the supposed repayment. Does it have a definite subject and endpoint, or must appreciation be proved with the rest of your life? Do not rush to call every request control. A parent may have a real need, and you may have a known commitment. But do not turn every need into proof that your whole path must change. This is ethical consideration, not a legal calculation, medical assessment, or prescription of a mandatory amount of assistance.

If a conversation is possible and wanted, you can recognize one known contribution, name your present choice, and discuss particular participation separately. Do not promise that your parent will hear gratitude in your words. Do not require their happiness as proof that they respect your adulthood. Afterwards, examine only what actually happened: whether you made a new unworkable promise, dismissed someone's help to feel relief, or left a matter requiring a separate decision. Where threats exist, this conversation is not prescribed. You can stop and seek safe support without making reconciliation a required goal.

Key quotation

> *I wish to leave you.*

George Gissing, *A Life's Morning*, chapter XII; Emily Hood addresses Dagworthy, who is keeping the conversation within a coercive arrangement. The last sentence of her speech is selected. It is not addressed to her father or a universal instruction to leave danger immediately.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Similarity and limit
Aristotle's different family claims ↔ a particular present matter	A past benefit matters, but does not replace examining different claims; the historical hierarchy is not adopted wholesale.
Confucian filial reverence ↔ acknowledgment of parental contribution	Respect has substance; demands to continue a father's way differ substantially from the article's contemporary independence.
Gentle remonstrance in the *Analects* ↔ disagreement with continuing respect	Objection can exist within a relationship; the source retains hierarchical limits and does not establish conversational safety.
Kant's setting one's own end ↔ the limit of a parental life project	Another person cannot make an aim internally mine on my behalf; this is a philosophical distinction, not a psychological technology.
Gissing's Emily retaining attachment while refusing coercion ↔ gratitude without surrendering the future	A literary counterexample separates love from imposed consent; it does not establish the effectiveness of a family practice.
NHS support concerning control ↔ the limit of discussing matters together	Safety requires separate attention; British information does not verify a service's availability in the reader's location.

This map establishes no agreement among all traditions. Philosophical argument, historical instruction, fiction, and contemporary support information perform different tasks. The proposed practice is the article's application of distinctions, with neither proven effectiveness nor a guarantee of restored relationships.

Sources

1. George Gissing, *A Life's Morning*, chapter XII. English original, novel published in 1888; Gutenberg 4312, digital version updated 27 December 2020. Chapter XII's context and an adjacent passage from XI were read; reading the whole novel is not claimed. Both short quotations are Emily Hood's speech, with original Russian translations in the paired edition.

2. Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, VIII.11–12, IX.1–2. Translated by D. P. Chase, Gutenberg 8438, updated 27 March 2021. Selected passages and their context were read. A historical philosophical model, not contemporary law.

3. *The Analects of Confucius*, IV.18–20. Version from the *Chinese Classics*, translated into English by James Legge; the selected book IV context was read. Comparison preserves differences concerning hierarchy; the complete corpus was not used.

4. Immanuel Kant, *The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics*, Introduction, I–V. Translated by Thomas Kingsmill Abbott, Gutenberg 5684, updated 27 January 2021. Selected sections concerning freely setting ends, duty, and other people's happiness were read. The digital heading's date of 1780 is not used as a verified date for the original *Tugendlehre*.

5. NHS, *Domestic violence and abuse*. Reviewed 23 June 2026; sections on family abuse, control, support, and safety concerning departure were read. British context; services local to the reader were not verified.

Tags

gratitude, parents, adult children, generations, choice, independence, family memory, care, recognition, past, future, responsibility, promise, sacrifice, debt, inheritance, values, profession, family business, assistance, agreement, disagreement, respect, boundaries, safety, control, reconciliation, Aristotle, Kant, Confucius, Gissing, United Wisdom

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.