

UNITED WISDOM

A couple outside familiar family norms: dignity, support, and everyday agreements

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-13-N06 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A couple outside familiar family norms: dignity, support, and everyday agreements

Epigraph

> *“sincere and dispassionate observation”*

Edward Carpenter, *The Intermediate Sex*, introductory chapter, p. 12. A fragment of the author’s own statement. His historical explanations of sex and character are not adopted here as contemporary knowledge.

What this article is about

Two adults may build a life together while also facing questions about why their relationship does not resemble the pattern familiar to their families. This can arise around a same-sex couple, an unmarried partnership, different religious affiliations, or a decision not to have children. These situations differ; one article does not establish a common legal status for them. In each, however, we can distinguish a person’s dignity, other people’s views of the relationship’s form, and particular agreements within the couple.

Consider an imagined story about Dina and Alina. They live together, share expenses, and look after their home. Dina has been invited to a family birthday celebration, while discussing Alina’s attendance has been deferred. They now need to decide more than whether to attend: whom to speak to, what information to share, who is willing to have the conversation, and what to do about their common plans. This article does not ask them to prove that their lives are acceptable. It explores preserving both people’s dignity and voice, finding particular support, and arranging everyday life without compulsory disclosure, agreement from every relative, or a promise of a good outcome.

I. Dignity is not a reward for making a convincing case

Dina could prepare a long explanation: they do not interfere with others, they work, help relatives, and know how to care for each other. Each statement might be true, yet the form of this defence introduces an uncomfortable condition. Respectful treatment seems to require exemplary conduct first. An ordinary disagreement about dishes then becomes evidence against the relationship, and tiredness becomes a failing of an entire category of people rather than a human limitation. We do not have to accept this order of reasoning.

Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights begins with equal dignity and rights for all human beings. For our question, that is a principle for treating a person, rather than a ready answer about a particular country's legal recognition of a partnership. Both limits matter: dignity should not be reduced to social approval, and a general document should not be presented as legal advice. Dina and Alina can discuss an invitation without first passing an examination for the right to have a voice.

This does not make every action by a partner acceptable. Respect for a person can coexist with questions about a particular promise, consent, expenses, or harm caused. If Alina spent shared money without agreement, that is something for them to discuss. Outside disapproval does not release her from responsibility. But an argument about money does not establish that Dina deserves humiliation or that all couples of their kind are incapable of making agreements. The generalisation changes the subject and deprives both people of the chance to answer a specific question.

We can therefore begin with a simple distinction. There is how someone is treated; there are different views about a partnership; and there is the action actually being discussed. Mixing them makes a conversation endless: a question about guests becomes a dispute about an entire life. Distinguishing them does not remove another person's beliefs or guarantee a respectful response. It only helps us notice where a practical question has quietly become a demand to justify our own existence, and decide whether we are willing to continue that particular conversation.

II. A shared life does not have to become public evidence

Before the invitation, Dina and Alina had ordinary things to do. They needed to order groceries, check a housing payment, and collect repaired items. After the message, Dina wants to explain their relationship to her relatives in detail. Alina wants to finish her working day first and keep the evening from becoming preparation for a presentation. Neither wish, by itself, establishes who values the relationship more. One person seeks recognition through conversation; the other wants to preserve a place where their life together exists without having to prove itself every day.

It helps to ask which matter is actually shared now. Discussing whether they will attend the celebration is shared. Sending photographs of them to relatives is a separate decision about personal information. Telling everyone the story of how they met is another decision. Agreeing to live together does not mean agreeing to every form of public visibility. Wanting to introduce a partner does not confer the right to involve them in an explanation without their participation. The issue is precise present consent, rather than a test of courage.

Alina may say that she is not ready for a family discussion. This does not establish a permanent ban on Dina speaking about her own life. Yet Dina's account may contain information about Alina, so personal freedom to speak intersects with another person's privacy. The overlap deserves particular attention: what can be shared, with whom, in what form, and where agreement remains absent. Sometimes the answer may be a limited account about oneself; sometimes it may be postponing the conversation. This article does not prescribe one degree of openness for every couple.

An uncomfortable counterexample matters too. A request for privacy may become a permanent demand to hide a partner in every situation. Its consequences for their life together can then be discussed: which events one person keeps experiencing alone, what the other expects, and whether they are willing to continue that way. Naming those consequences differs from forcing disclosure. Both retain the right to determine their participation. An agreed limit on public visibility needs room for disagreement, rather than only a promise to endure uncertainty.

III. What a historical defender of difference can offer

In the introductory chapter of The Intermediate Sex, first published in 1908, Carpenter asks for more attentive consideration of people and acknowledges limits to his certainty. Neighbouring passages, however, use outdated typologies, associate sex with particular character traits, and speculate about evolution. We do not carry those explanations into a contemporary account of a person. A historical argument against hasty condemnation does not make its entire conceptual framework reliable science.

The question relevant here is narrow: can we encounter a person before defining them through a category? Dina does not have to fit an image of a decisive woman, nor Alina an image of a gentle one; their abilities and wishes cannot be inferred from their partner's sex. Even a favourable description of an entire group can become a demand. If a couple is welcome at the table only because its members are supposedly especially caring, permission to make an ordinary mistake remains withheld. This is an authorial application, rather than a contemporary finding established by Carpenter.

Reading this way requires an honest account of what we accept and what we leave within the historical text, rather than selecting one convenient attractive sentence. A request to avoid hasty judgment may help formulate our own position. Outdated explanations of attraction, medical speculation, and rankings of people are not used here. A short quotation must not hide that separation. Otherwise, an old source quietly acquires authority to answer questions for which we have not verified it and which this article does not investigate.

In a conversation with a relative, the distinction is more modest than a historical programme. We can ask them to stop inferring Alina's character from an existing idea about such relationships and find out what she wishes to share herself. We can also decline a request for intimate details as a condition of getting acquainted. Interest in a person differs from access to their private life. We cannot know beforehand whether the relative will accept that boundary. We can identify the kind of introduction being proposed and the kind we are willing to support.

IV. Support becomes specific through one action

Dina messages an acquaintance to say she needs support. The acquaintance replies that she is completely on Dina's side. Dina may value that response, yet it does not establish whether the acquaintance is willing to talk that evening, meet after the celebration, or intervene in a family dispute. The general word can have several meanings. Rather than testing closeness through guesses, Dina can name one action: listening, helping draft a message, or being present after a conversation. The other person can agree to that action or state a limit.

The helper also has a voice. They may be willing to listen but not mediate, or willing to meet but unwilling to keep information confidential when that expectation was not explained before they received it. Clarity matters before participation. Dina does not need to prove that her difficulty is sufficiently serious to be entitled to ask. However, the request itself does not oblige another person to provide every kind of help. Distinguishing dignity from capacity makes support less like a loyalty test in which declining one part immediately becomes betrayal.

Useful support for Alina may mean something quite different. She does not want another discussion about the relationship; she needs not to be left finishing the household tasks alone that evening. If Dina offers only conversation, goodwill does not match the particular need. A partner can ask what participation is wanted rather than infer it from the couple's general situation. The same outside event does not create the same request for both people. Not being ready to talk now should not be translated into the claim that someone needs nothing.

Where there are threats, coercion, or dependence on someone else's housing, the voluntary practice in this article may not be applicable. That is a reason not to demand an open conversation as proof of honesty. We do not assess a specific danger here or propose a universal protective method. A decision to act requires attention to circumstances and suitable local assistance; its availability is not assumed. Finding someone willing to listen does not guarantee safety either. They may be one participant in support, rather than evidence that a proposed conversation should take place.

V. A couple has tasks that are not reducible to outside attitudes

After a difficult day, Alina discovers that Dina has not paid a bill she had agreed to pay. Dina replies that she was having an important family conversation for both of them. It becomes tempting to leave the practical question unanswered: discussing it seems petty beside relatives' disapproval. Yet the promise about payment remains specific. The difficulty of the day can be acknowledged without cancelling the shared task or requiring Alina to prove that a bill matters more than family relationships.

Clarification begins with facts available to the participants: who accepted the task, what has been done, what remains undone, and what new participation is possible now. If Dina cannot finish it today, she needs to propose a change to the agreement rather than regard that change as already accepted. Alina can agree to help, decline, or state a condition. Everyday life thereby retains its own structure. The couple does not owe the outside world a flawless household, but agreement within it cannot be replaced by a claim that all difficulties should disappear before a common opponent.

This is particularly visible where roles are uncertain. The absence of a familiar family pattern may leave more questions about expenses, guests, rest, and responsibilities. An absent pattern does not mean an absent right to ask. The task is not to invent who must perform a husband's or wife's role, but to identify a particular task and participation. Who notices groceries running out, chooses when to shop, places the order, and checks its arrival? The answer cannot be derived from sex, age, or who finds it easier to defend the relationship before relatives.

An arrangement may be temporary and unequal in amount. One person is working more now while the other has time; their circumstances may change in a month. Inequality alone does not describe consent, available capacity, or fairness. What matters is whether each understands the participation accepted and whether the question can return for discussion. Dina and Alina receive no automatic solution from their partnership's unfamiliar form. As participants in a particular shared life, they need to distinguish a task, a promise, the completed part, and a limit actually stated.

VI. A couple's visibility involves different decisions

Return to the invitation. For Dina, attending without Alina means agreeing to her partner's disappearance from the family picture. For Alina, attending a celebration to which she was not invited means seeking a place for herself. Understanding both meanings does not yet select an action. They could first ask the organiser whether both are invited and separately decide whether they wish to attend. Clarifying a guest list does not have to become a dispute about worldviews, although the answer may reveal a real limit to hospitality.

Each also has relationships with relatives of her own. A requirement always to attend together may deprive Dina of a meeting she wants, while always attending separately may turn Alina's exclusion into a permanent norm. A ready rule misses their different participation. They can discuss this celebration: what a decision means to each, which consequences they are willing to accept, and what they are not promising. One decision should not automatically extend to all future occasions when no such agreement has been made.

Someone else's disrespect does not make every internal request fair. Dina does not acquire the right to demand that Alina speak publicly for the sake of Dina's reconciliation with her family. Alina does not acquire the right to prescribe an indefinite break with all relatives as the only proof of love. Between those demands there may be a difficult, imperfectly satisfying arrangement. The article does not promise that a respectful discussion will produce an option without losses. Naming each option's cost is preferable to hiding it behind one supposedly correct image of a loving couple.

Sometimes a shared decision cannot be found now. It then matters to distinguish absent agreement from another person's consent to tolerate the proposed arrangement. Silence after an exhausting argument does not automatically close the question. They can say directly that attending together has not yet been agreed and that the organiser has set a deadline for a response. This is neither a threat nor a technique for obtaining consent. It describes the actual situation from which each determines her next step and willingness to continue discussing it. That step's consequences cannot be declared harmless in advance.

VII. Religious difference does not disappear behind a shared word about respect

In Amoris Laetitia, §§250–251, Francis calls for respect for people's dignity regardless of sexual orientation and rejects unjust discrimination, aggression, and violence. The following paragraph also maintains Catholic opposition to equating same-sex unions with marriage as understood in the doctrine presented. These positions cannot be summarised as full approval of every partnership or permission to humiliate someone when their union is not approved. The source preserves its own distinction.

This does not establish a single answer from all religions. We read a particular Catholic document, rather than a study of every believer's or community's views. In an everyday conversation, a relative may share its positions, understand them differently, or speak from another tradition. Attribution needs precision. Citing a spiritual authority does not tell us that person's motives; their words and actions remain a separate subject. The document's support for dignity does not guarantee respectful conduct by a particular family either.

For Dina, the distinction may hurt: she wants a relative to recognise both her presence and her relationship. She can name that wish. Yet the practical question of whether Alina will be welcome at the table and how she will be treated does not necessarily require immediate theological agreement. This is not an obligation to settle for minimal respect. It is an opportunity to establish which conversation is taking place: one about particular treatment, religious recognition of the union, or both subjects at once.

If a proposed compromise requires denying one's life or tolerating humiliation, describing it as a difference of views does not automatically make it acceptable. Nor does demanding immediate abandonment of faith establish mutual respect. A person retains a choice about participation and a limit to discussion. We do not decide which limit the couple should maintain. They can leave the doctrinal dispute unresolved while clearly naming an action they reject, a condition of attendance, or an unwillingness to attend the next meeting. Whether such a conversation is possible depends on circumstances.

VIII. Privacy should not become secrecy from each other

There is another uncomfortable case. Dina told relatives that Alina was simply an acquaintance, despite promising not to describe her that way. She then asks Alina to understand: otherwise the conversation would have become too difficult. The difficulty may be real. But the breach of a particular promise is real too and does not disappear because of outside pressure. The subject now is not judging Dina's character but what she said, why the arrangement was not reconsidered beforehand, and whether anything can be corrected without further disclosure.

A correction does not automatically mean a public announcement. It may involve information about Alina and consequences for her. Her participation and consent to the proposed action are needed first. Even a truthful statement does not become unconditionally right in every form and for every audience. Alina may want clarification or decline further circulation of the story. The article does not give openness a general priority over privacy. It keeps responsibility for an accepted promise alongside the other person's right to participate in decisions about her own information.

The reverse situation is possible too. Alina told an acquaintance about the family conflict and disclosed personal details about Dina. Wanting support does not confer an unlimited right to tell someone else's life. She can consider which details help actually requires and which were not agreed. Sometimes she can describe her own difficulty without another person's name and particulars. This is an authorial question for voluntary reflection, rather than a rule obliging someone to remain without assistance or stay silent about harm done to them.

Privacy therefore differs from concealing problems within a couple. A person can tell their partner that speaking to a particular helper requires information they previously did not intend to share, and discuss an available limit. At the same time, a partner's refusal cannot be treated as a final prohibition on seeking appropriate assistance. We do not examine legal or professional confidentiality rules here. Our task is narrower: to notice when support requires a new decision about another person's information, rather than declare that decision already made for both.

IX. An unfamiliar partnership does not explain every difficulty

When Dina and Alina argued about money, an acquaintance said that they were struggling precisely because their relationship was unusual. That answer says nothing about the bill, promise, or available capacity. It replaces a specific examination with a general cause that nobody has established in this scene. We can recognise that other people's attitudes have become a separate difficulty without attributing every internal conflict to them. The outside context and the particular action deserve consideration alongside one another, with their distinction preserved.

The reverse inference is unwarranted too: discussing the influence of surrounding people does not necessarily mean finding excuses for every action. If Dina spent the evening explaining things to relatives, that is one part of the circumstances. If she promised to pay a bill, that is another. Both can be acknowledged. The conversation then does not force a choice between loyalty to the couple and responsibility to a partner. It asks what action is needed now, who can carry it out, and how to report changed capacity in future before the other person discovers an unfinished task.

Outside recognition does not automatically solve everything either. Imagine that relatives invite both women and treat them respectfully. Alina may still want a different allocation of time, and Dina more participation in planning. Those questions do not become ingratitude after a successful celebration. Improvement in one part of the situation does not cancel the others. Nor does an unsuccessful visit make every household request inadmissible. Shared life has several subjects that need conversations of their own, sometimes at different times and with different participants.

A couple can be compared with an ideal indefinitely. A more specific question asks what exactly these two people agreed and what happened to that agreement. It makes room for warmth, refusal, and reconsidered participation. The answer may reveal a serious mismatch that one practice cannot resolve. Yet we do not need first to establish an ideal form of partnership to distinguish a fulfilled promise from an unfulfilled one, wanted help from imposed help, or support for a person from management of their life. That is already an available task of attention.

X. Returning to people rather than an examination of normality

A few days later, Dina and Alina return to the invitation. They might ask about the guests, choose separate attendance, both decline, or defer a final answer until the stated deadline. No option, by itself, proves their relationship sufficiently real. How it is decided matters: whether consequences for each have been heard, whether consent is known, and what nobody has promised. A successful formulation does not guarantee family recognition or remove the possible cost of their chosen decision.

Afterwards, an ordinary evening remains. They need to eat, finish work, and arrange tomorrow’s time. That everyday life is not trivial beside a public dispute. It shows how partners treat each other, fulfil an accepted part, and notice changed capacity. Dignity should not require an ideal home. But respect within a couple has actions that cannot be replaced by the right statement about freedom in relationships. Alina can speak about an unfinished task, Dina about limited energy, and both about what they never agreed to.

The text does not decide which partnership a reader should choose. Nor does it propose compulsory reconciliation with relatives or abandonment of them. The sources read and the imagined scene support a narrower distinction: a person is not someone else’s category, respect is not approval of every action, and life together is not a public defence of its arrangement. Support becomes specific through agreed participation; negotiation is possible only about what has not been declared another person’s duty in advance.

Returning to the beginning, Dina now has more than one task of explaining everything to her family. There are several questions: what she wants to share about herself, which information also belongs to Alina, what answer is needed about the invitation, and what assistance is available today. They may not resolve everything at once. Pausing with one specific question does not promise relief, but preserves each person’s voice. The relationship continues through actual actions, refusals, consent, and agreements still unmade, rather than proof of conformity to a pattern.

What this means in practice

If circumstances allow voluntary reflection, choose one approaching event in which an outside attitude has affected your shared life. It may be an invitation, a conversation with a relative, or a message to an acquaintance. There is no need to examine the entire partnership’s arrangement. First record separately what is known: who proposed what, which information has already been shared, and what deadline exists for an answer. Then distinguish your interpretation from those details. A guess about another person’s motive does not become an established fact through the strength of a feeling.

Name three different subjects: the treatment you want, a decision about information to disclose, and a particular participation by your partner. For one subject, formulate a question the other person can answer, decline to answer, or meet with a limit of their own. For example, ask whether they are willing to find out the guest list together; do not prescribe attendance or speaking publicly beforehand. Check that the question contains no hidden decision on your partner’s behalf and does not require them to deny consequences for themselves.

After the response, distinguish the agreed part from the uncertainty that remains. An unaccepted proposal does not become an agreement because it seems reasonable. An action accepted this time should not automatically carry over to the next occasion. The practice does not test a partnership’s correctness, guarantee acceptance by surrounding people, or replace suitable assistance under threats or coercion. You may decline to use it. Its limited result is greater clarity about what has actually received consent and where the other person’s voice has not yet been heard.

Key quotation

> *“patient consideration”*

Edward Carpenter, *The Intermediate Sex*, introductory chapter, p. 15. A fragment of the author’s appeal. Here it denotes attention to a person, rather than adoption of the historical typology or a promise of other people’s agreement.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question	Substantial difference	Limit of application
Carpenter's historical argument and the authorial examination	Can a person be heard first?	Carpenter uses outdated typologies; the article considers particular consent and action.	The historical text supplies neither contemporary diagnosis nor evidence of effectiveness.
Declaration of Human Rights and everyday agreement	How can a participant's dignity be maintained?	A general principle of dignity differs from chosen participation in one task.	The article does not establish a partnership's legal status in a particular country.
Catholic document and secular examination of a couple	Can treatment of a person be distinguished from evaluation of a union?	Amoris Laetitia retains its own teaching about marriage; the article requires no shared doctrine.	Respect in a document does not guarantee a family's conduct or mean agreement among all traditions.
Privacy and seeking support	How can people retain a voice about their information?	A decision to speak about oneself may involve another person's details.	There is no compulsory disclosure or general prohibition on seeking assistance.

Sources

1. Edward Carpenter. *The Intermediate Sex: A Study of Some Transitional Types of Men and Women*. First published 1908; the displayed George Allen & Unwin edition lists reprints through 1921. Project Gutenberg no. 53763, updated 23 October 2024, prepared by Turgut Dincer and the Distributed Proofreading Team from Internet Archive images. The introductory chapter, pp. 9–15, was read in full; only the appeal for attention and limits of the author's certainty are used. Outdated typologies, medical and evolutionary speculation are not adopted as contemporary facts. Text.

2. United Nations. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, 1948, resolution 217 A (III). English text on the official website of Thailand's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, page dated 16 September 2017. All thirty articles were read; article 1's general principle is used. This is no conclusion about a particular country's legislation or recognition of every partnership form. Official reproduction.

3. Francis. *Amoris Laetitia*, 19 March 2016, official Vatican English PDF. Sections 247–252 were read; sections 250–251 are used: dignity regardless of sexual orientation and distinct Catholic teaching about marriage. A theological and pastoral document is neither research into support effectiveness nor an account of all believers' views. Document.

Tags

couple, dignity, relationships, family norm, consent, privacy, support, kinship, relatives, invitation, everyday life, agreement, promise, responsibility, personal information, disclosure, religion, differing views, treatment, assistance, shared life, expenses, household, participation, refusal, boundaries, Carpenter, human rights, respect, choice

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh and **Maria Evilkut** are the authors of United Wisdom. We bring knowledge from different traditions into conversation with questions of everyday life, preserving differences between sources and the reader's right to make their own decision.

For feedback and further conversation: **@andrey.zarinsh** and **@ilkutki**.