

UNITED WISDOM

What we pass on to children through our response to differences

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-15-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

What we pass on to children through our response to differences

Epigraph

> *We are the guides of these travellers…*

Maria Montessori, *The Montessori Method*, chapter XV, page 237, translated by Anne E. George, 1912. A short sentence fragment with its continuation omitted from her own educational discussion of adults accompanying children's observation. This historical image does not establish a modern outcome for a particular child.

What this article is about

In a fictional scene, Sergei and his daughter Nika are returning home after buying bread. The shop assistant spoke with an accent unfamiliar to Sergei. Outside, the father imitates one phrase, then notices his daughter watching him closely. That morning he explained that everyone deserves respect. Now she has another event available to her: an adult has turned a particular person's way of speaking into entertainment. We do not know what Nika will make of it. We can, however, examine what her father demonstrated, who was allowed to laugh, and what remained beyond his knowledge of the assistant.

This article considers adults' example in responding to differences: other people's language, habits, appearance, resources, and beliefs. It does not promise to derive a child's future character from a single remark or offer a validated method of correcting prejudice. Montessori's historical educational text, the abstract of modern experiments, and the normative Convention answer different questions. We will follow how a description becomes a judgment about a person, why respect can coexist with disagreement, and how an adult can change an action without making a child the examiner of the family's virtue.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Children witness our treatment of people as well as our explanations

Sergei remembers the conversation that morning and does not see himself as someone who looks down on others. That belief may be sincere. But a separate action took place outside the shop, and good intentions do not make it disappear. His daughter heard the tone, saw her father's smile, and knew that the assistant was no longer nearby. We can name these accessible circumstances without assigning her an unspoken reaction. She may have found the phrase funny, awkward, incomprehensible, or been distracted altogether. The distinction begins with the adult's event: what he did with a noticeable feature of another person, rather than a prediction of what the child must now become.

An example does not always contain an explicit rule. Nobody said that a person with that accent was inferior. Yet in this scene, that person's speech received a particular treatment: it could be reproduced for amusement without asking its speaker. In another situation, the same adult might calmly clarify an unfamiliar word. These possibilities differ in action, even if the explanations following them are equally well meant. The article does not claim that any smile from a child signifies acquired hostility. We examine what the adult makes available for observation, leaving the child's later understanding open rather than turning her into an instrument for measuring our intentions.

An adult might begin by asking: if my explanations were removed, what treatment would remain visible? This is an editorial way of examining an event, rather than a scientific test for hidden prejudice. It can identify a particular subject: a joke, avoidance, patient clarification, or denying someone a turn to speak. An action can have different reasons. Hurry is not contempt, and one awkward expression does not describe the whole person. Nevertheless, naming a reason does not replace attention to the action. Sergei can acknowledge the imitation without declaring himself hopeless or asking his daughter to confirm that nothing significant happened.

II. A difference does not establish a person's rank

The assistant's accent exists as an audible feature of speech. It does not establish how attentive, honest, educated, or capable of helping a customer that person is. In the fictional scene, Sergei understood the question about bread and obtained his purchase. Those facts do not contain an additional account of what people with that accent are usually like. Such an account comes from a different basis, which would need to be named separately. We may not know where an accent comes from and may not need that knowledge for respectful interaction. Not every difference requires a biographical investigation; a person need not explain their life to an unfamiliar customer to stop their speech being used for entertainment.

Differences can have practical importance. If a phrase is difficult to understand, we need to ask again; if different rules are proposed for a shared activity, the conditions need clarification. Respect does not require pretending that everything is identical or equally suitable. What needs examination is the particular possibility of action. Is the question clear? Has the agreement been fulfilled? Is another explanation needed? A person's rank does not follow from the answer. The assistant may give the wrong change, but that requires checking the amount and correcting it, rather than drawing a conclusion about a whole group. This is an ethical distinction, not a promise that calm conversation can solve any problem.

When an adult connects a feature with an overall judgment, that connection becomes available to the child. We do not know whether the child will accept it, but we can avoid presenting it as self-evident fact. A comment about unfamiliar speech and a comment about people who cannot be trusted have different scopes. The first may describe the speaker's perception; the second claims knowledge about many people. It needs its own basis, which a single encounter cannot provide. The father can explain this difference without a lengthy lesson about everyone's perfection. Acknowledging what is unknown leaves room for specific caution while avoiding the use of another person's feature as proof of inferiority.

III. A modern experiment asks a narrower question

The abstract of the article by Allison Skinner, Andrew Meltzoff, and Kristina Olson describes two experiments involving adults' biased nonverbal signals. In the first, children watched a brief video showing different treatment of two people; researchers then assessed preference and prosocial behaviour toward those characters. In the second, the authors report the spread of the resulting preference to other people. This is a defined experimental situation, rather than observation of an entire family's life. The complete publisher abstract was read here, but not the methods, data, or full article. We therefore add no sample size, effect size, individual prediction, or details absent from the material actually read.

For our question, the research provides limited support: adults' treatment of others can be studied as an observable signal, rather than only an explicit rule. It does not establish that Nika will repeat the imitation or retain a particular view for years. Nor does it establish the effectiveness of Sergei's subsequent conversation. A brief video and a living family differ in circumstances, participants, and time. We cannot close that distance with a confident phrase about the transmission of a pattern. The research abstract helps frame a more precise question about the available example; it does not make the fictional daughter an experimental participant or disclose her future relationships.

A further limit concerns generalisation. The article's subject extends beyond what those authors tested: speech, money, religious disagreement, habits, and particular encounters. We do not claim that the results apply equally to all these differences. An ethical examination of

the adult's action remains possible without that extension. Sergei only needs to know that he mocked the speech of an absent person. Deciding to change his treatment does not require proving that his daughter has already been harmed or acquired a lasting prejudice. A research question and personal responsibility can stand alongside each other without substitution. The more precisely we retain the scale of the evidence, the less need we have to present an ethical decision as an established psychological law.

IV. A guide does not own the child's future perspective

In chapter fifteen of *The Montessori Method*, Montessori discusses observation, language, and adults' assistance to children. She considers individual differences and differing kinds of help. This historical educational context matters precisely for its subject: adults direct children's attention toward the world, while encountering separate observers. We read Anne E. George's English translation in the 1912 edition, rather than a modern experiment about tolerance. The old educational judgments and exercise descriptions do not become instructions for today's family here. The connection is limited to how an adult presents the world while leaving a child room to see and understand it differently.

Sergei can tell his daughter that people speak in different ways without requiring her to repeat the correct formula immediately. Nika may ask why some words are hard for her to understand. Such a question does not necessarily signify hostility. If her father hears every difference as a threat to good upbringing, he may punish the very attempt to understand. It is more honest to distinguish curiosity, mockery, and an actual action toward another person. That distinction depends on accessible context, rather than a label issued in advance. The adult does not know the entire meaning of the question and can clarify it while remaining willing to hear an answer unlike the one expected.

A guide also need not have a ready explanation for every tradition or language. It is possible to say that the origin of a feature is unknown and was unnecessary for buying bread. If the family wishes to learn more, it needs an appropriate source and the voluntary participation of people it asks. A stranger need not become the unpaid representative of an entire people in front of a child. The adult's role retains its limits: explaining what is available, acknowledging ignorance, and answering for one's treatment. It does not include determining the daughter's final perspective. The historical travel image brings companionship into view; it does not give adults a map of everyone else's biography or guarantee that a child's route of thought will match their own.

V. Respect for differences allows substantive disagreement

That evening Sergei discusses another subject with a relative and hears an opinion he considers wrong. He may be tempted to demonstrate a good example by treating differences as something always to pass over in silence. But respectful treatment does not require agreeing with a claim, accepting an inconvenient rule, or approving a harmful action. We can identify exactly what we disagree with and why. A factual claim requires factual grounds; a limit on behaviour in one's home needs an explanation of the applicable boundary. A speaker's language or origin does not replace the grounds for objection. Such precision does not guarantee peace, but it avoids turning a dispute about one subject into a judgment on an entire person.

Nika may witness disagreement and see different ways of handling it. Her father can clarify a claim, decline to continue an argument, or state that certain treatment is unacceptable around him. He can also resort to a humiliating nickname that makes the subject of the argument disappear. We need not regard the first action as flawless to distinguish it from the second. Adults become irritated and may need a pause. A pause need not prove contempt, and a confident answer does not establish correctness. The article proposes examining grounds and action separately from a participant's social category, leaving room to be mistaken and subsequently correct a particular claim.

Some situations make ordinary discussion inappropriate: threats, violence, pressure, or danger in continuing contact. Respect for differences does not require enduring these or presenting a child as proof of openness. Appropriate protection and help in the particular circumstances are needed; this article does not verify local services or provide a safety protocol. Refusing contact may concern an action and a risk without declaring everyone who resembles the person dangerous. An adult can retain a necessary boundary. That boundary need not be accompanied by humiliation of someone else's origin, and a child should not be forced into a risky encounter for the sake of an attractive idea of intercultural agreement.

VI. Our own belonging does not need someone else's humiliation

Sergei has a language, family habits, and favourite ways of celebrating. Recognising someone else's dignity does not require giving these up. His daughter can learn her own history while hearing that another history is not a mistake simply because it differs. Article 29 of the Convention connects the educational goal of respect for one's own cultural identity with respect for other civilisations. This is a normative orientation in the document, rather than research on family conversations. No procedure for teaching religion or current legal process in every country is established here. Our question is more modest: can we describe an experience we treasure without making someone else's experience an inferior backdrop to its greatness?

For example, a family may prepare a familiar dish and not wish to replace it. That does not require claiming that people who eat differently do not know how to live. We can explain what we like, which conditions matter, and what belongs to personal habit. If the child wishes to try something else, the question concerns available food, circumstances, and necessary limitations, rather than a test of loyalty to ancestors. The article gives no dietary recommendations and does not cancel examination of a particular risk. It distinguishes the grounds for one's choice from humiliation of an alternative. Belonging remains meaningful when described without competition for the only correct way to be human.

The opposite extreme is to demand that children conceal their own features so nobody else feels uncomfortable. Nika need not become anonymous in order to respect others. Differences in language, clothing, or conviction do not require identical participation in every event. An available way of acting together can be offered while differences remain. The normative protection of nondiscrimination and children's cultural life in Articles 2 and 30 of the Convention has its own addressees and conditions; it does not establish the effectiveness of this suggestion. The editorial conclusion concerns adults' example: respect is not distributed as a reward for resembling us, and a child's belonging is not granted only after renouncing every new question.

VII. Conditions for meeting differ from judgments of human worth

Not every invitation suits everyone involved. A family celebration may need a quiet place, a different time, or an explanation of an unfamiliar custom. An adult can discuss these conditions without making a guest an exceptional problem. Good intentions do not guarantee that the chosen assistance fits, however. A specific offer can be clarified with its recipient without publicly asking for every private reason. If an answer is unavailable, our guess should not be declared an established need. A daughter may see adults revising a format without judging the guest or making a loud account of their own generosity. This is a conditional possibility, rather than a measured educational result.

Differences in income are particularly easy to conceal within judgments about desire. A person's absence from an expensive trip does not establish how important friendship or company is to them. We do not know their circumstances, and they need not disclose a budget to prove respect for the hosts. Another accessible format can be offered without presenting it as charity for an inferior participant. Yet a cheaper option may be unsuitable too. One invitation need not repair everything. Adults' example also lies in accepting a refusal without mockery and avoiding judgments of laziness, coldness, or ingratitude about an entire group on the basis of one person's absence.

It matters to retain the distinction between possibility and obligation. A family has its own resources, and another person can decline an offer. Attentiveness does not create an unlimited duty to organise any format at one's expense. Limits can be stated honestly and the question left open. Nika should not become a mediator between adults, obtain private explanations, or persuade a guest to agree. The example concerns her father's actions, rather than an assignment for his daughter to repair society. Conditions for meeting may remain incompatible; that does not justify converting a mismatch into a human rank. Shared life allows real limitations without needing a humiliating account of another participant.

VIII. Correcting the example starts with one's own action

Sergei can return to the morning's scene without announcing that he has now understood everything forever. He knows he imitated the speech and can name that action. He need not tell Nika she should feel ashamed for smiling or ask her to reassure him with kind words. Responsibility concerns the adult's own action. If he wants to change his treatment, it matters to consider the next similar situation: clarifying what was unclear, avoiding imitation for amusement, or objecting on the relevant grounds. These possibilities do not guarantee a new conviction in the child. They make the change concrete without turning acknowledgment into another performance about the father's superior character.

Correction does not always require public contact with the person discussed. The assistant may not know about the joke, may not want a conversation, or may lack time for a customer's family explanation. A well-meant apology does not grant the right to use someone for teaching a daughter. We can examine what action is really addressed to that person, what is necessary, and what contact is appropriate. We prescribe no universal decision to meet. An adult can stop their own mockery without requiring a stranger to participate in repairing their self-image. If contact takes place, the other participant retains the right to their own response, including declining to support the proposed conversation.

Nika may respond unexpectedly: say she did not notice the joke, ask about something else, agree, or disagree with her father. This response need not become a test of tolerance. An adult can leave room for questions without demanding acknowledgment that the family has already improved. Nor can the daughter's later behaviour be explained only by this correction. She has other encounters, information, and her own understanding. An honest adult example includes that limitation: I can answer for my action without owning its entire result for someone else. This is a relational position, rather than withdrawal from care or a promise that acknowledgment alone is sufficient.

IX. Different grounds do not add up to guaranteed upbringing

Within a historical educational project, Montessori discusses accompanying children's observation and differing assistance. Modern authors test a defined effect of nonverbal signals in two experiments. The Convention articulates normative goals and protection of dignity. Useful connections exist between these grounds, but they do not provide one validated method for every family. Their proximity cannot establish that children inevitably copy adults, that correct language eliminates prejudice, or that every difference is harmless. The new article retains a separate ethical question: what treatment of people do I make visible, and what grounds do I attribute to a feature of another person?

Such a question does not require constant observation of a child for a hidden defect. One can examine a particular remark or decision without establishing the overall quality of upbringing. A convenient division into good and bad parents would repeat the same mistake of ranking a person by a single feature. Responsibility for an action remains, but it need not become a complete judgment of personality. If a family has a serious concern about a child's condition, appropriate attention is needed separately. This article does not diagnose their views, development, or reasons for behaviour. Ordinary ethical reflection does not replace necessary professional help or require an attractive outcome to present to others.

The idea of difference itself also has limits. Some differences concern preferences that do not harm others; others involve actions that cross another person's boundaries or create risk. They cannot be combined under one call to accept everything. We can respect human dignity and

reject a particular action. In our example, that means avoiding the use of unusual speech as proof of vice while still checking the price, change, or conditions of purchase. Respect remains attention to a participant, and examination remains attention to the subject. Neither automatically certifies the other. When the grounds are named, a more precise example is available to the child, although their later response remains unknown.

X. The lesson may remain unfinished

A few days later Sergei and Nika return for bread. Her father stages no exemplary encounter and requires no particularly friendly greeting from his daughter. He addresses the assistant about the purchase and calmly asks again if a word is unclear. In this fictional scene, there is no confirmation that Nika has changed or that the assistant feels justice restored. There is a different adult action, which can be named without a broad conclusion. The precise change may be small: distinctive speech has stopped being material for entertainment, while an unclear question has become something to clarify. The event can retain its actual scale without becoming proof of a new family era.

Later, Nika may make an awkward joke herself or challenge her father on an important subject. That will call for examination of a new event, rather than a declaration that the earlier conversation was useless. One example need not explain the entire sequence. The daughter may ask about a cultural habit her father does not know; he can find appropriate information or acknowledge his limit. Adults' confidence is not the only permissible outcome of encountering the world. Responding to differences includes learning, revising descriptions, and keeping a clear boundary where there is an actual risk. It does not require a child to provide constant proof of the family's good views or grant adults final ownership of their thoughts.

What we pass on does not always match what we intended to explain, and does not always become what a child accepts. A distance remains between intention, an available example, and someone else's understanding. That is not a reason for inaction; it is a limit on promises. We can answer for a remark, its chosen grounds, and our subsequent treatment. We can support belonging without humiliating others, disagree without an overall label, and stop dangerous contact without declaring an entire people a threat. A child's later perspective remains their developing experience, rather than our finished creation. Such openness does not guarantee harmony, but it permits more precise adult action within the part of the relationship that actually belongs to us.

What this means in practice

If appropriate, choose one ordinary, safe episode in which a child witnessed your treatment of another person. Name only the accessible action: what was said, what choice was made, who was asked, and who was discussed without participating. Avoid deriving the final result of upbringing from the child's reaction. Separately identify the difference you noticed and the judgment you added. An accent, income, or unfamiliar custom does not necessarily explain someone's reliability. If the subject needs examination, name that subject and the information required. What is unknown can remain unknown; this practice is neither a prejudice test nor therapy.

Then examine one possible change in your own action. You might clarify a word instead of imitating it, explain disagreement on relevant grounds, offer another accessible format, or acknowledge an unfounded conclusion. Do not make the child an examiner or require another person's participation in your educational scene. The need, appropriateness, and safety of contact are considered separately. In danger, this ordinary reflection does not prescribe continuing a relationship or disclosing plans to a dangerous participant. Help and protection depend on the particular place and circumstances; this article does not verify their availability or replace that verification.

After the event, you can identify what actually changed and leave unknown what you do not know. A conversation does not guarantee the absence of prejudice, the child's agreement, or family closeness. It can be declined, stopped, or revisited later. If a child asks a question, its meaning can be clarified and a limit of knowledge acknowledged. What matters is not a perfect account of tolerance, but the distinction between one's own grounds, actual action, and someone else's independent understanding. Supporting one's history and respecting another do not require identical beliefs. They can begin when a person's feature stops serving as convenient proof of lesser worth.

Key quotation

> *very different kinds of help*

Maria Montessori, *The Montessori Method*, XV, page 231, Anne E. George translation 1912; a contiguous phrase within her own sentence about individual differences requiring different help from a teacher. The phrase retains that educational context; it does not diagnose a child's need or prove the usefulness of any offered help.

Connections between traditions

Basis	Connection with the question	Difference and limit
Montessori, XV	An adult accompanies a separate child's observation	A 1912 educational text in translation, not an experiment on the transmission of prejudice
Skinner, Meltzoff, Olson	Adult treatment is examined as an observable nonverbal signal	Two experiments' abstract was read, rather than a prediction of a particular child's destiny
Convention, Articles 2, 29, 30	Normative grounds for nondiscrimination, one's own culture, and respect for others	The document does not test a family conversation's efficacy; local procedures remain separate
Editorial reflection	Distinguishes a feature, judgment, subject of examination, and one's own action	A voluntary reflection, rather than the sources' common doctrine or a diagnostic method

Historical education, an experimental question, and a normative goal do not form a single tradition or guarantee an outcome. Their comparison retains distinct grounds.

Primary sources

1. Maria Montessori. *The Montessori Method*, translated by Anne E. George, New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1912. Project Gutenberg 39863. Actual reading: title/preface metadata and selected chapter XV context including pages 231–238; not the whole book or original Italian critical edition. Historical education, not current efficacy evidence. Rights UNKNOWN; no universal licence inferred. Actual text.

2. Allison L. Skinner, Andrew N. Meltzoff, Kristina R. Olson. *“Catching” Social Bias: Exposure to Biased Nonverbal Signals Creates Social Biases in Preschool Children*. Psychological Science 28(2), 216–224, issue February 2017, first online 21 December 2016. DOI 10.1177/0956797616678930. Actual reading: complete publisher abstract and metadata/open-practices/rights notice; methods, data, and full paper unread. No direct quotation; rights UNKNOWN. Publisher record and abstract.

3. United Nations. *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, adopted 20 November 1989, entered into force 2 September 1990; official text hosted by UNICEF. Actual reading: identification and selected Articles 2, 29, 30 with returned surrounding context. Normative document, rather

than parenting-effect evidence; local application and services not checked. Direct quotation zero; rights UNKNOWN. Official text.

Tags

children, parents, adult example, differences, respect, accent, speech, belonging, culture, dignity, prejudice, observation, nonverbal signals, disagreement, grounds, action, family life, unknown, clarification, boundaries, safety, voluntary participation, responsibility, income, accessibility, Montessori, education, Skinner, Meltzoff, Olson, Convention, 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 coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to examine these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.