

UNITED WISDOM

Gratitude to a teacher after a divergence of views

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-17-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Gratitude to a teacher after a divergence of views

Epigraph

> *...mastery of his tools*

Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams*, his own Preface, 1907; a short fragment of the first sentence of the paragraph about the tools of education. The historical author discusses a young man's preparation rather than establishing a rule of relationships for every student.

What this article is about

Nina learned to read manuscripts carefully with Sergei. He noticed awkward transitions, asked her to distinguish evidence from conjecture, and returned pages with precise questions. Several years later, Nina became an editor and ceased to agree with his understanding of literature's purpose. An invitation to a graduates' gathering presented an unexpected difficulty: how could she thank someone for what she had received when significant disagreement now existed alongside her gratitude? She felt that any warm word would be heard as a return to his school, and any objection as a denial of all her education.

This is an invented situation rather than a description of a typical teacher. The article examines the relationship between past help and present judgment: what survives a divergence, where acknowledgment is replaced by a promise of allegiance, and what actually calls for a response. It neither establishes the student's correctness nor prescribes a meeting, and offers no technique guaranteed to reconcile people. A teacher can be wrong about one question and right about another; so can a student. Gratitude does not decide the dispute beforehand. It allows what was received to be named while leaving examination of the argument a separate task.

I. What was received can be named without rejoining the school

Nina finds it easier to begin with a particular episode: Sergei showed her how to check a claim against a text when she trusted an attractive retelling too readily. This help has a subject, a time and an outcome that she recognizes in her own work. Acknowledging it does not require accepting all her teacher's views again. Judgment about the past concerns a particular action, while agreement today concerns a particular claim. They are connected in a person's biography, but their logic differs. Acknowledging one does not amount to signing the other, even if that is precisely the confirmation the other person hopes to hear.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Specificity also protects against exaggeration. Nina need not say that without Sergei she would never have become an editor: she does not know that. Other people, her own efforts, access to books and chance opportunities also contributed to her education. An important contribution can be acknowledged without declaring someone the sole author of one's entire life. If the teacher really helped at a decisive moment, an accurate account does not diminish its significance. But conjecture about an unknown alternative biography should not become the basis of an indefinite debt. Memory of help can be strong without claiming that every good thing happened because of one person alone.

Sergei himself might find this limited acknowledgment cold. He remembers years of teaching, while Nina names one way of reading. His disappointment need not indicate a wish to control her; perhaps he wants to see a broader trace of his work. His account can be heard, if a meeting is wanted and safe, without promising to agree with every assessment. Gratitude does not require both people to measure the past identically. It allows differences in scale and memory. Nor is anyone obliged to prove sincerity by listing more and more benefits until the other person is finally satisfied.

The arrangement under which help was given also matters. Teaching may have been paid work, voluntary participation or part of a teacher's duty. Payment does not cancel gratitude for attention beyond a formal minimum; generosity does not automatically create a new agreement about the future. Nina need not first decide whether every lesson was a gift in order to examine a present argument. Known conditions nevertheless help avoid portraying ordinary fulfillment of a role as personal rescue, or diminishing genuine additional participation as merely a service. Work can be respected while accurately seeing the relationship in which it was offered.

II. Changing a conviction does not rewrite the history of learning

Nina rejects her former belief that good literature must lead a reader toward a predetermined moral conclusion. She now also values a question that receives no final answer. This is her present position, rather than proof that every earlier lesson was useless. Perhaps the habit of distinguishing reasons itself allowed her to revise the general thesis. Perhaps other reading led to the revision. There is no need to choose an attractive story in which a teacher necessarily produced his own opponent. It is enough not to destroy known, particular events for the sake of a more convenient explanation of the present.

The reverse substitution is also possible: Nina says that she always understood the limitations of the school's approach and merely pretended to agree. Sometimes this is true; sometimes today's conclusion retrospectively makes her earlier self unusually perceptive. An honest acknowledgment can sound less impressive: I shared these views then, and I do not share them now. Change brings no automatic moral superiority over one's former self or someone

who retained a position. It needs reasons. A conviction's more recent date does not by itself make it freer, more accurate or more caring.

In chapter XV of Henry Adams's *The Education of Henry Adams*, Charles Lyell's help exists alongside the narrator's doubts about the explanations offered. Adams remains interested in the work without arriving at inward agreement. This is a retrospective, ironic account bearing its author's own limitations, rather than a contemporary assessment of evolutionary science. What matters here is the form of divergence: access to a teaching, participation and doubt can coexist. His historical doubts provide neither an argument against present scientific evidence nor a model of competent objection in every field.

III. Gratitude concerns a benefit; agreement concerns an argument

Suppose Sergei says that rejecting his approach is ungrateful. This sentence joins two different subjects through a single moral word. Nina may genuinely have received help; his present claim still requires separate examination. A thesis cannot be confirmed by the number of hours a teacher once gave a student. Neither can it be refuted simply because he invokes gratitude. An unsuitable basis for a demand does not make every contrary answer correct. The question needs its content back: what are we disputing now, what evidence and meanings carry weight here, and what remains unknown?

Nina may have no prepared objection. She feels she no longer belongs to the school but cannot yet explain why. This does not require feigned certainty as proof of adulthood. Personal disagreement can be distinguished from a justification that remains incomplete. If Sergei identifies a genuine weakness in an argument, it deserves substantive consideration. Gratitude does not oblige her to accept criticism without examination; the desire to escape a debt does not excuse her from examining criticism. Otherwise her teacher's former authority survives in reversed form: every proposition he offers must be rejected in advance for a new choice to count as her own.

In *The Analects*, XV.22 in the numbering of the accessible James Legge translation distinguishes assessment of a person from the weight of their words. In XV.35, responsibility for virtue is not surrendered even to one's teacher. These statements belong to a historical teaching in which respect and order have substantial roles. They do not amount to a modern right to choose any value, and do not prescribe a dispute where it is unsafe. But they show that respect for a mentor and personal moral action need not become complete substitution of one for the other.

IV. What a teacher's name belongs to

Nina continues using a way of examining a manuscript learned in class. Must she explain every time that she no longer accepts Sergei's other views? Not necessarily. Acknowledging a skill's origin does not require continual general justification. Particular work may nevertheless involve rules of citation, authorship and professional use. These need to be followed under the actual conditions, rather than replaced by personal gratitude or dissatisfaction. The article does not settle rights to a method, establish a license or permit appropriation of someone else's publication. Such questions have grounds of their own and need separate checking.

A teacher's name can also remain in private memory. Nina notices herself asking a manuscript a familiar question and recognizes Sergei's influence. She need not announce gratitude publicly for that influence to remain real. Yet silence in a situation where an idea's source should be accurately named does not automatically constitute freedom from personal dependence. The right not to participate in a ceremony of acknowledgment must be distinguished from the need for correct attribution. The first concerns contact and expression of a relationship; the second concerns the origin of content being used. Neither should conveniently conceal a breach of the other.

In his own Preface, Adams considers education through tools, models and obstacles. His image permits further changes to acquired means; a person need not remain forever the manikin of an educational suit once fitted. Yet discarding a tool cannot simply be transferred to a person who helped someone acquire it. People are not used implements. The article's distinction preserves both subjects: a method can be reconsidered, and a historical contribution can be named. It also preserves the possibility of discontinuing contact without declaring a teacher an object to be thrown away once the desired result has been achieved.

V. Disagreement can have different scales

Nina and Sergei may diverge on one professional question while retaining an interest in literature. An overall verdict on their entire relationship would then be excessive. They can keep discussing particular manuscripts if both agree, without portraying unity where it does not exist. Limited contact is not always possible, however. Sometimes the difference concerns how students are treated, the acceptability of humiliation, or a demand to conceal something important. Explaining this as merely different tastes diminishes the real subject. The scale of divergence should be established through facts and values, rather than chosen to produce an attractive ending.

One can privately note where a position has changed: a conclusion, a method, assessment of the relationship, or an available form of contact. Such a note does not diagnose Sergei or promise to unravel an entire biography. Its purpose is only to avoid presenting a dispute that

does not actually exist, or replacing an important dispute with a convenient minor one. Nina might, for instance, agree with an observation about composition while refusing to participate in an event where people are publicly shamed. Agreement about a text does not cancel a separate choice concerning her participation.

In IX.3 of *The Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle considers changes in the grounds of friendship and differences between a person's former and present character. His moral assessments and understanding of friendship do not coincide with today's professional relationship between a teacher and a graduate. The source does not establish when Nina should stop meeting him. It helps ask a narrower question: what basis of the relationship survives the change? If a shared subject has disappeared, invoking the past does not itself create a new one. If something remains, disagreement need not cancel everything else without separate consideration.

VI. Acknowledgment does not pay for indefinite allegiance

Sergei asks Nina to sign a statement defending his school. She remembers his help and also disagrees with the statement's content. Here gratitude can particularly easily become a vote for a specific assertion. A signature has its own meaning: it can be understood as agreement with a text, rather than merely respect for the past. Nina needs to read what she is being asked to support and consider consequences under the actual conditions. The article prescribes no political or professional position. It simply prevents acknowledgment of past work from silently replacing a decision about a new public action.

Refusing to sign does not prove an absence of gratitude. Agreeing to sign does not prove Nina lacks freedom: perhaps she genuinely agrees with the text. Both people may also have particular promises that are not reducible to a worldview. If Nina agreed to prepare materials for the gathering, her current disagreement requires honest consideration of that agreement rather than silently disappearing. But a promise to finish materials is not a promise to support every future position of the school. Each action has a subject, a known scope and conditions for revision. An undefined lifelong allegiance may have no such boundaries.

Nor can gratitude become an obligation to defend a teacher against all justified criticism. If Nina knows significant facts about particular harm, memory of a good episode does not refute them. The article nevertheless prescribes no public exposure, assesses no legal duty to report and does not promise the safety of speaking out. Information, powers, risk and available support require separate consideration. Acknowledgment can remain part of a complex history containing both help and harm. It should not determine in advance which facts a person is permitted to know or privately recognize.

VII. A teacher may not acknowledge the new position

Nina hopes to find words that will make Sergei agree that she remains grateful. Yet this outcome also depends on his own response. He may reject her distinction, consider allegiance an essential part of education, or simply not want to continue the conversation. Accurate words confer no power over his judgment. Known help can be expressed and present disagreement retained without a guarantee of recognition. This does not mean endlessly tolerating a humiliating discussion. Nor does it oblige the other person to feel joy at a change that has proved difficult or unwelcome for them.

A teacher also has a separate question available: can he name his disappointment without turning it into evidence of a graduate's bad character? His work does not become meaningless because a student uses a skill differently from what he expected. The article does not promise that this thought will console Sergei, however. Perhaps he genuinely wanted a particular enterprise continued, rather than only Nina's development. The difference between those purposes then needs acknowledgment. Not all education amounts to a neutral transfer of tools; historical and modern schools can have values, rules and purposes of their own that require open consideration.

Nina can decline an endless process of obtaining a certificate of gratitude. If she has already said what she wanted and was able to say, a lack of approval does not require further concessions. This is no universal rule to end a conversation after one sentence. Sometimes continuation is desired and clarifies something unknown. Sometimes a pause is useful only as an option; sometimes contact is unsafe. A person chooses under actual conditions, rather than according to a prescribed number of attempts. Gratitude need not receive a final joint verdict before a separate decision about one's own work becomes possible.

There is also a distinction between a personal address and a public testimonial. Nina's words at a gathering might enter a recording, an invitation to new students or the school's advertising. If she knows this, she should consider whether she agrees to that use and what her participation will mean. The article does not determine legal rules of recording. Its ethical distinction nevertheless remains: gratitude for one's own past experience is not identical to recommending present classes to unfamiliar people. A public form may require greater precision, and declining it does not make private memory of what was received false.

VIII. Where the relationship is unsafe, acknowledgment requires no meeting

Sergei may retain real powers: a recommendation, access to a professional platform, influence over assessment. A declaration of inward freedom cannot cancel them. If disagreement is followed by threats, coercion or harassment, jointly clarifying gratitude does not become a compulsory practice. Nina need not prove autonomy through a risky dispute. Actual conditions, available safe support and formal means of protection, if any, need consideration first. The article has not checked services in the reader's location and offers no ready legal solution. The option not to enter a conversation remains part of its ethical framework.

Acknowledgment of the past can remain private. A letter can be written without being sent, or no note need be made. No one should be required to find goodness in a dangerous relationship as proof of spiritual maturity. If memory of help is too difficult now, the article sets no deadline for processing and expressing it. The right to refuse a meeting does not require first declaring a teacher wholly bad. Nor does acknowledgment of one useful lesson establish an obligation to reopen access to oneself. These distinctions do not remove dependence, but they add no moral demand to take risks.

Safety also concerns other people's histories. Nina can thank Sergei for her experience without thereby declaring that other students could not have been harmed. Their reports require examination on their own grounds. Her favorable memory provides no universal exoneration; their unfavorable memory does not allow the article to determine every detail of hers. People can have different relationships with the same teacher. Complexity gives no reason to silence particular harm. It only prevents an excessive conclusion from one piece of testimony when personal gratitude is used as a final verdict on every other participant.

IX. A new path does not have to be the opposite

Nina notices that she sometimes rejects a useful observation by Sergei simply because she does not want to feel like a student again. If this happens, asking about the observation's content can be useful without diagnosing herself. An accurate observation can be used without returning to a former system of views. Autonomy is not measured by distance from a teacher. It concerns how someone participates in a decision, rather than requiring an opposite outcome. Sometimes one's own examination leads to the same conclusion, sometimes to another. Both possibilities must remain open; otherwise disagreement becomes a new compulsory allegiance in advance.

But the possibility of agreement should not oblige Nina to seek a shared position at any cost. She can clearly reject a particular value of the school without needing another round of

checking every old argument. There is a difference between attending to a significant objection and endlessly revisiting a decision to keep someone else comfortable. The article does not determine that boundary for a person. Subject, known reasons, the cost of continuation and consent matter. The ability to hear a teacher does not require making him the permanent final judge of all subsequent work, every publication or any change in life.

In practical work, gratitude might appear indirectly: Nina reads other people's manuscripts with the same care, although she does not reproduce Sergei's teaching. This is her possible continuation, rather than proof that she fulfilled his true dream. The teacher may not recognize his school in it. His agreement need not be appropriated for an attractive story of continuity. Nina can name the connection she sees and leave his assessment to him. Acquired knowledge participates in new work alongside other reasons. It need not remain unchanged for earlier education to remain a real event in her life.

X. More than a dispute remains after divergence

At the gathering, Nina might briefly name what she learned without starting a major discussion of worldviews. If the event requires a joint declaration, she can decline that separately. If Sergei offers to discuss a manuscript, she can agree to a particular subject. If contact is unwanted, the meeting may not happen. No outcome is declared best for everyone here. The article preserves different forms of relationship after divergence: cooperation, limited contact, private memory or distance. Each needs its own conditions, rather than a single ceremony that reconciles past and present once and for all.

Nina may also discover an error in her new conviction. Revising it would not force her to admit that gratitude always required complete obedience. The quality of a present argument and the scope of authority one should give someone else remain different subjects. A teacher can help again; a student can accept particular help. This does not automatically restore the former structure of the school. An adult relationship can change, but need not become an ideal friendship between equals. Formal roles, knowledge and real opportunities can remain unequal even when both people address each other respectfully.

At first Nina feared she would have to choose between destroying the past and returning to her former views. A more precise subject is now visible: what she received, where she disagrees, and what she actually promised. This is no ready emotional success or relief from pain. Sergei may remain disappointed, and Nina may doubt her words. Yet gratitude can retain the name of particular help without becoming a lifelong subscription to another person's convictions. Disagreement can retain reasons of its own without requiring that a teacher never did anything significant for a student.

A teacher's change can also be acknowledged. Nina may know his former lessons without knowing his present school; Sergei may judge her by a student manuscript he read long ago. Former closeness cannot be portrayed as complete knowledge of the other person's present. A current assessment of work would require current materials and particular criteria. If no such assessment is requested, gratitude can remain an account of the past without claiming present expertise. This preserves both the value of known experience and the limit of knowledge, rather than turning memory into an unlimited testimonial about the quality of an entire present enterprise.

What this means in practice

If the subject fits, choose one known contribution by a teacher and one present subject of disagreement. Note them separately without turning the note into an overall verdict on a person. Identify what is known from personal experience, what is only assumed, and what requires checking. Then consider whether there is a particular promise, a professional rule of attribution or an obligation that cannot be replaced by a discussion of gratitude. This voluntary note is not a researched psychological technique. It can be omitted, kept private or postponed, especially if revisiting the history currently creates an unnecessary burden.

Before a possible expression of gratitude, clarify its subject. Are you naming help, supporting a particular text, promising participation or agreeing to continue a relationship? If actions have been joined, they can be examined separately. Do not promise a teacher never to change your views again if you have made no such decision. Do not expect accurate expression to be automatically accepted. Where threats exist, a meeting and explanation are not prescribed. Available safe means of support and protection depend on the actual location, powers and circumstances, which the article has not checked.

After a desired conversation, check only what happened: whether a contribution was named without a new undefined promise, whether the subject of disagreement remained, and whether a particular task was genuinely accepted. Lack of approval does not prove insincerity. Approval does not make a new view correct. Further reading, work on an argument or revision of an agreement may be needed. There may be no further joint conversation. Gratitude need not complete all these tasks simultaneously. It remains a way to acknowledge what was received, rather than a universal power to decide a person's future for them.

Key quotation

> *...partly the clearing away of obstacles...*

Henry Adams, his own Preface to *The Education of Henry Adams*, the paragraph about the tools of education; a fragment from the middle of the sentence about training. In the source,

this is one side of education alongside the application of effort, rather than a promise to remove all life's difficulties.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Similarity and substantial boundary
Adams's educational tools ↔ a particular acquired skill	An acquired means can be named; the historical model of a young man does not describe every learner.
Adams's doubts alongside Lyell's help ↔ acknowledgment without full agreement	A retrospective account shows divergence; it is no contemporary scientific appraisal.
Aristotle IX.3 ↔ a changed basis of relationship	What survives is a significant question; ancient friendship is not the present teacher's role.
The Analects XV.22 ↔ examining an argument separately from a person	The weight of words is not exhausted by assessment of their speaker; historical order does not become modern neutrality of values.
The Analects XV.35 ↔ one's own moral action	A teacher does not replace a student's action; this demands particular virtue rather than endorsing any choice.
The author's separation of gratitude and promise ↔ the limit of allegiance	A particular obligation is considered separately; the practice does not guarantee agreement, safety or restored contact.

Differences are retained here. Historical autobiography, ancient ethics of friendship, Confucian teaching and a contemporary authorial application do not form a single proven system. The map helps distinguish questions without prescribing one answer for every educational relationship.

Sources

1. Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams*, own Preface; chapter XV. His own Preface is dated February 16, 1907; the accessed Massachusetts Historical Society edition is 1918, with an editor's preface by Henry Cabot Lodge; Gutenberg2044. The author's Preface was read in full, and a selected continuous context of chapter XV concerning Lyell and doubts was read, rather than the entire book. Only two brief fragments of Adams's own Preface are quoted, rather than embedded words of Rousseau or other authors.

2. Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, IX.3. W. D. Ross translation, Internet Classics Archive; underlying print edition not established. The entire chapter was read in this batch; the philosophical distinction concerning a changed basis of friendship is used with historical assessments retained, rather than as a modern rule for ending relationships.

3. *The Analects of Confucius*, XV.22 and XV.35. James Legge translation, the version from *Chinese Classics*, Gutenberg3330. Both short chapters and surrounding XV.18–41 context were read using the translation's numbering. Authorial paraphrase retains the moral and hierarchical framework; neither the complete corpus nor modern educational research is claimed.

Tags

gratitude, teacher, student, education, disagreement, views, acknowledgment, help, tools, skills, continuity, memory, past, present, argument, examination, allegiance, promise, responsibility, attribution, respect, autonomy, contact, distance, safety, powers, professional relationships, Adams, Aristotle, Confucius, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, unity among traditions, intercultural dialogue and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.