

UNITED WISDOM

When a rule becomes intelligible: obedience and cooperation

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-12-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

When a rule becomes intelligible: obedience and cooperation

Epigraph

> *We must all collaborate.*

Dorothy Canfield Fisher, *A Montessori Mother*, preface, short authorial remark in the English original. This is a historical address to adult readers, rather than evidence that a particular parenting method works.

What this article is about

Nina asks her daughter Sasha to clear the toy railway from the corridor before visitors arrive. Some time later, the rails remain where they were. Her mother sees an unfulfilled instruction and is ready to call it disobedience. But Sasha understood the task differently: the train still needs to reach its final station, and the large box of pieces is too awkward to lift as a whole. Moreover, her mother said to remove the railway when she needed a clear passage. Several questions have merged into one conclusion about the child's character. Understanding the situation requires more than asking whether an order was followed; its subject, an accessible way of acting, and what participants actually understood need establishing.

The article distinguishes outward compliance, cooperation, and understanding a particular rule. It promises neither to remove childhood conflicts nor to set age norms or assess development. Fisher's historical reflection helps notice the difference between an available ability and willingness to follow an instruction; the Convention on the Rights of the Child retains participation alongside guidance and protection. Our household scene is fictional. We consider a rule's grounds, honest choice, available help, and limits to discussion where threats exist. Obedience may be needed for immediate action, but one action cannot certify understanding, trust, or a participant's overall moral quality.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. One visible result permits different explanations

Rails in a corridor are an observable result. They do not yet establish why a task remains undone. Sasha may not have heard, understood a different deadline, lacked a place for pieces, struggled with the box, or deliberately preferred not to interrupt play. These are possible explanations of a fictional scene, rather than a diagnostic list. Nina can notice an unfulfilled action, but precision requires not presenting a guessed cause as an established fact. A rule exists in a particular situation; considering it begins with what was said, what is available now, and which part of a result can actually be seen.

The opposite mistake is to explain every unfulfilled instruction solely through difficulty and declare that disagreement never exists. A child’s actual perspective is lost here too: the adult assigns a convenient exonerating account instead. Several possibilities can remain open while a subject is clarified without an interrogation about personal goodness. In our scene, Sasha mentions the station and box. This new information concerns the action; it does not prove that every earlier household rule was mistaken. Its scale can be accepted while the next part of a task is considered. Moral attention requires neither immediate accusation nor a ready-made justification for everything happening.

Nina notices that disobedience too quickly combined the visible rails, a presumed motive, and an assessment of the relationship. Outward compliance also permits different grounds: a child may understand the purpose, want to help, fear a sharp reaction, or merely follow a habit. The article does not establish these causes from an expression or speed of action. The distinction supports a modest conclusion: one result does not confirm everything at once. Understanding needs a question about the rule’s content. A clear passage is a separate practical task. Both need not be settled through an overall verdict on obedience.

II. A rule’s purpose must withstand its own explanation

The mother discovers she needs a passage, rather than perfect room tidiness. These purposes require different actions. Rails could be safely moved to an accessible place without dismantling the entire game if conditions permit. If an obstruction remains, attractive reflection on cooperation does not resolve it. Precision matters: which condition must change, and why? An overall phrase about order sometimes conceals several expectations: a clean floor, readiness for visitors, silence, and confirmation of parental authority. A child is asked to guess the package and then assessed for not fulfilling unnamed parts.

Nina can name the actual reason in ordinary words without turning it into a long lecture. An explanation should not prove that every adult preference concerns safety. Limited time or shared space can be named as such. A rule addressing a verified threat has different grounds and a different limit to freedom. No universal message format for every age is proposed here.

The adult should understand their own requirement. Imprecision cannot be compensated for through volume, and an existing household order does not remove the need to consider whether this requirement concerns the present situation.

Sometimes an explanation makes a rule look excessive. The mother wanted the entire train removed only because children’s things seem untidy around visitors. She can retain the necessary passage and reconsider the rest. Reconsideration need not mean losing an adult role. It shows that a rule has a subject and grounds, rather than existing solely to confirm authority. But a child should not have to win an argument every time to receive necessary care. Some conditions are determined by an adult and should be named honestly. An explicable rule does not turn family life into an endless contest of arguments and does not promise that everyone will assess the outcome alike.

III. Ability and willingness are different questions

Fisher’s chapter on obedience separates handling a glass from willingness to follow an instruction. For us, this is a historical pedagogical question, rather than contemporary evidence of age-related abilities. Her categorical claims about behavioural causes, the method’s outcomes, and health are not accepted as verified information. A limited distinction applies to our scene: if Sasha cannot lift the box conveniently, repeating a requirement does not create a missing means. This does not yet establish whether she agrees to clear the passage. Action, available means, and an expressed attitude can be considered separately without deriving a psychological mechanism from an old observation.

Nina can reduce a particular difficulty: move the heavy box herself, offer another place, or work out together how to preserve an assembled part. These are possibilities within a fictional safe situation, rather than load-handling instructions for any child. Appropriate objects, movement, and extent of assistance depend on actual conditions. A child should not be assigned an action whose necessary means have not been provided. Conversely, help with one step should not silently replace all participation where a personal way of acting is available. A task can be divided while the adult retains responsibility for assessing conditions, rather than turning difficulty into an overall label of incapacity.

If the child still does not want to interrupt play after a difficulty is removed, a further question arises that cannot be declared settled retrospectively. Skill does not equal agreement. Sasha may understand the task and have another wish. The adult can retain a necessary limit and discuss an accessible transition without promising that correct assistance automatically creates willingness. The distinction does not cancel shared rules. It prevents assigning an intervention more achievement than actually occurred. We helped with the box; we have not established every ground of the next response or proved that the family’s obedience problem is now resolved.

IV. Understanding concerns meaning, rather than a ritual

An adult’s phrase can be repeated without understanding its application. Sasha says the railway must be removed but thinks this should happen after play ends, when visitors are already at the table. Nina meant a clear corridor for their arrival. Both hear familiar words while the timing differs. In an ordinary situation, what should happen and when can be clarified. This is neither an intelligence examination nor grounds for demanding a perfect explanation. Available understanding of a particular task matters. If a condition was not fully expressed, its subsequent breach cannot be presented as proved deliberate disregard.

The proposed location for pieces can be shown, or the next accessible step discussed. Even a successful answer does not certify the ability to follow a rule in every other situation. A small household clarification is not a scientific test of understanding or a universal communication method. Different children and situations may need different conditions, to be established appropriately. The mother may also understand her own formulation only during discussion. A mistake does not necessarily belong to the recipient of an instruction. Adult clarity is part of a shared task, although participants’ roles and duties do not thereby become identical.

After clarification, Sasha proposes leaving the final station beside the wall. If the passage is genuinely clear and the adult has assessed conditions, this may fulfil the purpose without matching the first literal requirement. Compliance with a formulation differs here from cooperation around its subject. A different means is not always permissible: some rules contain precise essential conditions that cannot be replaced by a similar result. The article does not authorise arbitrary substitution for any safety requirement. It invites noticing where a means follows substantial grounds and where an adult habitually mixed a purpose with their single preferred execution. Particular verification is needed, rather than attractive confidence in a creative solution.

V. Cooperation does not make every duty equal

The Convention combines expressing a child’s perspective with guidance consistent with evolving capacities. We use this as a normative basis, rather than a household law applying identically in every country. In our scene, the daughter helps choose an accessible means while the mother remains responsible for organisation and protection. Cooperation does not allow Nina to transfer every risk of a shared decision to a child and then blame a poor choice. Nor does it require a child to share every adult motive. People can act together around a particular subject while retaining different roles and disagreeing in some assessments.

When Misha chose a drawing in another article, authorship of his participation was central. This subject is narrower: a rule about a passage and an accessible action that fulfils it. Sasha can suggest a means without gaining permission to block a shared route merely because play

matters. The adult likewise gains no authority to call every visible order cooperation. If a result was obtained through constant threats, understanding is not certified by a clean floor. The article does not diagnose a relationship from one episode; it distinguishes a result from its grounds. Calling an action collaborative is insufficient: which participation actually existed needs considering.

Cooperation can coexist with partial disagreement. Sasha still thinks the visit ill-timed but understands that others need the corridor and chooses an accessible place for the station. Nina need not obtain enthusiasm for a rule to have meaning. A child need not portray reluctant disappointment as joyful agreement. We do not claim this conversation guarantees willingness to act. It merely prevents expanding a requirement beyond its subject: clearing a passage and loving every adult decision are different tasks. Shared life can retain a necessary action without requiring complete management of another person’s attitude towards it.

VI. A choice should not conceal an assigned answer

The mother offers a choice: move the railway now or after lunch. But visitors must pass before lunch, and she will not accept the second answer. A choice that does not actually exist emerges. A child may spend effort discussing a possibility and then learn that only the first was correct. It is more honest to name an essential limit and offer freedom only within a genuinely open subject. For example, where conditions have been checked, the station’s accessible location or two steps’ order could be discussed. This is no universal parenting technique. What matters is correspondence between adult words and what they actually allow, rather than the number of options offered.

Sometimes no choice exists in this action now. A collaborative decision need not be portrayed merely for attractive language. Nina can explain necessary clearance, fulfil her own part, and leave further discussion until its subject is available. But calling something necessary does not certify its grounds. A real limit differs from an adult’s reluctance to spend time. Where conditions are dangerous, the article does not require voluntary agreement before protection. Adult convenience should be named separately. An honest limitation preserves scale: one necessary action does not declare a child’s entire life permanently closed to participation.

Nina can also acknowledge that she offered a false option habitually. This should not become a scene requiring Sasha to forgive an adult and confirm their goodness. A particular message can be corrected, followed by an accessible action. An adult’s responsibility does not disappear through a formulation error; a child does not become responsible for repairing its emotional consequences. Ordinary acknowledgment permits an incomplete result. The daughter may remain angry or decline further discussion. Cooperation does not promise closeness after every correction or require using a child as immediate confirmation that an adult has successfully mastered respectful communication.

VII. Urgent protection differs from subsequent explanation

Until now, the scene allowed stopping and clarifying. Immediate danger may leave a different amount of time. The article does not propose arguing over intelligibility instead of necessary protection or permit a risky test of obedience. What constitutes danger and which action is appropriate depend on conditions and specialist information. A general moral idea does not determine procedures for medical care, travel, or dangerous objects. An adult must not deliberately create a threat so that a child learns through experience why an instruction existed. Responsibility for checking safety cannot be transferred through attractive words about learning to listen or independently feeling consequences.

Once an urgent situation has actually ended, an explanation may concern another subject: what happened, which limit applied, and which conditions need changing. It need not prove every earlier adult demand correct. Immediate protective action does not create indefinite authority without grounds. In a fictional family, a particular event can be revisited where safe and accessible, preserving the distinction between preventing a threat and an educational conversation. We do not promise that explaining removes fear or restores trust. Necessary separate support should be considered through actual conditions, rather than assigning conversation as a universal treatment.

If an adult themselves inflicts violence or uses threats, the article does not instruct a child to explain disagreement better and thereby resolve dangerous relationships. Appropriate local protection and assistance are needed; their availability was not verified here. The Convention’s protection from violence names a normative limit to the ordinary scene. It makes a philosophical exercise neither a functioning service nor justification for disclosing plans to a dangerous person. A child’s dignity does not depend on successfully proving their case. Discussion of cooperation should stop where its conditions are unavailable, rather than demanding ideal participation from someone under threat.

VIII. A rule also applies to adult grounds

After clearance, the mother discovers her own bags remain in the corridor. If a clear passage was the purpose, they concern it too. This does not make adult and child duties identical or require a competition of mutual breaches. It means a rule’s grounds cannot disappear without trace when an adult is involved. Nina can move the bags and name her own unfulfilled part. Sasha need not prove perfection before her mother attends to her own action. An intelligible rule retains its relation to a subject; it does not become a requirement applying solely to a less powerful participant.

An adult breach does not automatically make every child action safe or appropriate. If both sides obstruct a passage, the practical question remains. Both parts can be corrected without

delaying a necessary step until someone else's fault is acknowledged. This limited consideration is neither a child's duty to accept double standards nor a legal procedure for family disputes. The adult should retain responsibility instead of assigning a child to monitor everyone at home. Sasha can name an inconsistency without becoming a family inspector. A rule has a purpose; people have separate actions that cannot be reduced to an overall contest for moral victory.

Nina can reconsider the regular arrangement too: where a box is stored, how play space is left beforehand, and which expectations are actually accessible. Changing an environment does not mean explanations are unnecessary or every future conflict will disappear. It addresses a particular difficulty discovered. Elsewhere, an earlier condition may remain necessary. A conclusion should not expand: we changed the pieces' location without proving permanent maturity. Practical support and moral consideration work with an event's scale. If they become a promise of complete parenting success, the particular situation disappears behind an overall label again.

IX. Disappointment does not necessarily mean misunderstanding

Sasha moves the station and is angry. Her mother may conclude the rule was not understood because her daughter did not agree joyfully. But understanding content, performing an action, and an attitude towards interrupted play differ. We do not establish them from one gesture, yet need not declare a negative feeling evidence of moral failure in advance. An adult can retain a necessary limit without demanding immediate gratitude. This does not promise that every expression of disappointment is permissible for everyone present. Particular actions affecting others need consideration too. Distinguishing experience from action helps avoid cancelling the first to assess the second or justifying the second solely through the first.

In the fictional scene, the daughter does not want to tell visitors that she is now excellent at tidying. She may have cleared a passage without wanting to become an example of good parenting. Nina can abandon a public report without making this a reward for further obedience. An audience changes the event's subject: a household action does not automatically permit disclosure of someone else's disappointment. R34 considers overall distinct personhood and privacy further. Here it suffices not to turn an intelligible rule into an obligation to demonstrate that it was liked. The actual result is smaller: the route is clear while an attitude towards interrupted play remains mixed and needs no invented happy ending.

The opposite outcome is possible too: discussion did not help, the task was done only by an adult, and both became tired. The article declares neither concealed success nor evidence of a wrong child. Absent desired cooperation can be named, and discovered conditions considered separately. Assistance with communication or development requires an appropriate approach, rather than diagnosis from our story. An unsuccessful episode does not oblige repetition until

achievement is acknowledged. We do not propose abandoning necessary care; we propose not replacing unknowns with a confident parenting verdict or considering one good principle a guarantee of another participant’s behaviour.

X. The next rule needs its own consideration

By evening, the railway lies elsewhere. Nina understands that she previously demanded a clear passage, interrupted play, and a convenient story for relatives without distinguishing these subjects. Sasha understands clearance timing better and still prefers no visitors today. This mixed result can remain mixed. It does not confirm that every rule will now work alike. The next requirement may concern another ability, risk, or shared duty. It cannot automatically be considered understood because the corridor was clarified once. Moral attention remains work with a particular subject, rather than a certificate of good communication obtained once and for all.

Neighbouring R17 distinguishes requests, demands, and agreements among relationship participants; here that map concerns the particular situation of a minor with continuing adult care. R-08-N03 considers authority in intimacy more broadly. R34 offers an overview of a child as a distinct person, and R-12-N02 separately discusses mistakes within safe limits. Our subject is a rule’s content, available ability, outward compliance, and cooperation. One distinction need not become the whole parenting canon. General words about freedom do not cancel child protection, and adult responsibility does not certify understanding of every confidently delivered instruction.

Fisher reminds us to ask whose will should develop, but her historical optimism does not prove our outcome. We retain our own limit: a rule can be explained more precisely, means checked, participation named more honestly, and a desired response still not obtained. That does not make consideration meaningless. It changes what an adult actually answers for in speech and organisation. A child remains a participant whose understanding cannot be replaced by ritual and whose duties cannot be established through a guess about character. An intelligible rule has a subject, grounds, and conditions; cooperation requires actual participation, rather than merely a convenient name for a completed action.

What this means in practice

In an ordinary safe situation, choose one rule and name its actual purpose. Separate an observable result from its presumed cause: non-compliance does not immediately prove unwillingness, nor compliance understanding. Clarify what was said about subject and timing, which means are available, and which help is really needed. Do not turn clarification into an examination of good character. The article assigns neither age-related abilities, medical explanations, nor a universal communication format; significant uncertainty needs appropriate information and separate help.

Distinguish an essential limit from an open choice of means. Do not offer an option you will not actually accept. Check whether grounds concern protection, shared resources, or adult convenience, and name them honestly. Where a task needs necessary immediate action, the article does not prescribe delaying protection for discussion. Urgency does not justify creating danger as a lesson or declaring every future instruction indisputable. Where an adult threatens a child, an ordinary shared exercise does not apply: a child is not assigned to resolve dangerous relationships alone or disclose plans to a dangerous person.

Afterwards, name the result’s scale: an action completed, a condition clarified, help provided, or desired cooperation absent. Disappointment can remain disappointment without public gratitude being demanded. Consider the adult’s own part too: a clear requirement, prepared means, and applying grounds to their own actions. This voluntary consideration does not guarantee obedience, trust, closeness, or developmental pace. It is neither treatment nor an overall parenting assessment. Its purpose is preserving actual subjects and participants so that a subsequent decision does not begin with an overall label where a particular question remains necessary.

Key quotation

> *their will-power, be it remembered, not our own.*

Dorothy Canfield Fisher, *A Montessori Mother*, chapter XI, an internal fragment of her own authorial reflection on children’s will. English original. The chapter’s historical claims about effectiveness, age, and behavioural causes are not accepted as contemporary evidence.

Connections between traditions

Basis	Distinct question	Limit
Fisher, chapter XI	Ability to perform an action differs from willingness to obey	Historical pedagogy is not contemporary age-related or therapeutic guidance
Convention, articles 5 and 12	Participation remains alongside proportionate guidance	Local law and individual capacities are not established by this text
Convention, article 19	Protection limits the ordinary cooperative scene	Resolving a threat through a child's explanation is not prescribed
United Wisdom, rule content	Purpose, means, timing, and visible result differ	No universal understanding test based on one action
United Wisdom, R17 and R-08-N03	Requests and authority have different subjects	A minor is not a fully independent adult
United Wisdom, R34 and R-12-N02	Overall distinct personhood and safe mistakes are considered separately	A rule is not the whole parenting canon

Sources

1. Dorothy Canfield Fisher. *A Montessori Mother*, Project Gutenberg no. 61045, English original. Identification, preface, and chapter XI were read with neighbouring context. Printed basis: Henry Holt, New York, 1913; copyright and first publication 1912. Digital release 29 December 2019, updated 17 October 2024. The sole directly quoted work; short Russian fragments were translated by the article author. Fisher's own voice is distinguished from nested quotations of other authors.

2. United Nations. *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, official text hosted by UNICEF; selected articles 5, 12, and 19 were read with identification and neighbouring context before theses in this author group. Normative grounding, rather than evidence of conversational effectiveness or verification of local law and assistance.

The household scene is fictional. Fisher's historical medical, statistical, and age-related claims are not used as current guidance. Particular risks, educational, and medical questions need separate specialist verification; philosophical consideration does not replace it.

Tags

rule, child, parents, obedience, cooperation, understanding, purpose, ability, means, timing, household order, shared passage, assistance, own participation, honest choice, adult guidance, safety, protection, unknowns, disappointment, action, grounds, responsibility, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Montessori, historical pedagogy, Convention on the Rights of the Child, UNICEF, United Nations, moral consideration, United Wisdom, open outcome

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.