

UNITED WISDOM

A family between two countries: deciding together when travel is not equally possible

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-22-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A family between two countries: deciding together when travel is not equally possible

Epigraph

> *There is thy home*

Sui Sin Far [Edith Eaton], *In the Land of the Free*, in *Mrs. Spring Fragrance*, Part I, the mother's words at the story's opening. A short opening clause. The fictional scene establishes no modern border-crossing rules. Text.

What this article is about

Consider two sisters, Asya and Irina, living in different countries. Their mother wants to discuss who could stay with her for several weeks. Asya can travel relatively quickly; Irina does not yet know the conditions for returning after a visit. In the family conversation, this difference becomes an assessment of love: anyone who really cares will find a way. All characters and everyday scenes here are fictional. They make a question distinguishable rather than reporting a verified case or the authors' experiences.

How can a family decide together when closeness matters equally but travel, time, resources, and risk are unequally available? We consider different kinds of presence, the limits of a promise, the cost of assistance, and someone's right to participate in discussions of their own life. The primary references read are Sui Sin Far's story, Merla, Kilkey, and Baldassar's2020 research article, and *Analects* IV.19 in James Legge's translation. They retain different foundations. Our small map of a decision is editorial: it does not guarantee agreement and establishes no current migration, medical, or family-law rules.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. A question can appear shared until each person's conditions are named

At first, the sisters discuss when it would suit everyone to meet. That question assumes everyone chooses a date from roughly the same range of possibilities. For Irina, however, the availability of travel itself is uncertain. Asya has an available route but no free weeks. Their mother may need particular assistance while not wanting long-staying guests. The single word visit combines different conditions that have not yet been checked. Until they are named, coordinating calendars may look like solving a task the participants do not actually have.

It helps to separate the desired shared outcome from the availability of each action. We want to meet; someone is needed nearby on a particular day; help with a household matter is required; someone wants reassurance that the connection will not disappear. These wishes can be related, but a journey does not necessarily satisfy them all. Conversely, one call need not replace physical presence where that is needed. This distinction devalues neither travel nor conversation. It clarifies what task the family is trying to address and why a familiar proposal may leave some of its content unanswered.

Asya can say she can stay for two days rather than several weeks. Irina can say she first needs competent information about the journey's conditions. These are neither final refusals nor promises. They describe present knowledge. Their mother may clarify the particular help she expects and reject the sisters' convenient idea that any presence fully meets her wishes. In this scene, togetherness begins with several honest descriptions. It does not mean possibilities will subsequently coincide or that further discussion will be easy.

Conversation also has a cost. Not everyone is comfortable revealing documents, income, or personal risks to relatives. A meaningful limit can be named without explaining the entire situation. I do not know whether the journey is available; I can confirm two days; I do not want to discuss this question in detail. The family may not receive all the information it wanted, but missing details do not make a limit imaginary. Our map requires no public examination of reasons. It proposes avoiding a joint decision based on uncertainty silently filled with the most convenient assumption about another's freedom.

II. Being able to move is not a measure of family loyalty

Crossing a border is easier for Asya than for Irina. This does not establish that her connection with their mother is stronger. Nor does Irina's restriction describe everything about her wish to participate. Availability and intention are different questions; neither should be guessed from the other. Someone may want to visit without an acceptable route, have a route and decline, or not yet know what they want. When a family turns possibility into a moral ranking, real conditions disappear behind a demand to prove the correct feeling through one particular action.

In their2020 article, Merla, Kilkey, and Baldassar distinguish distant care from physical proximity while considering mobility conditions. Their three stories combine research and documentary materials: they are composite cases, not three unprocessed personal accounts. We use a distinction between possibilities rather than prevalence or current law. Historical visa descriptions are not transferred to today's route. Screen-mediated connection does not make physical presence unnecessary. Publication and PDF.

Irina may be able to participate in conversation but unable to do a task with her hands. Asya may be able to visit physically without enough income for every expense. This is no list of universal roles for people abroad. In our scene, it shows why contribution cannot be reduced to one number. Money, time, and presence differ in function. They can be discussed together without being declared equivalent or assigning one call a price in visiting days. A fair conversation first needs to establish what is required, then ask what offer is available.

Differences in conditions sometimes persist for a long time. The article does not promise to ease their pain through one clarification. The mother may continue wanting both daughters nearby. Irina may feel that her absence cannot be explained to full understanding. That loss can be acknowledged without assigning blame according to travel speed. If a meeting is not yet available, this is a factual limitation deserving its own name. It need not prove the family connection has ceased to exist, but a call should not be presented as completely resolving the loss either.

III. A home named by relatives and permission to enter belong to different orders

At the opening of *In the Land of the Free*, a mother and child arrive at the shore of their future home; the father meets them aboard. An administrative requirement then obstructs their shared life. This is a1912 fictional story associated with historical Chinese exclusion; it does not verify present procedures. We compare only the difference between calling somewhere the family's home and being externally able to arrive there together. Historical characters' political and racial assessments are not adopted as descriptions of people today. Selected context.

The mother may consider her dwelling Irina's home while her daughter remains uncertain whether she can visit. An affectionate name does not cancel external conditions; external conditions need not cancel a cherished connection with a place. Both can remain true simultaneously. Difficulty arises when factual availability is inferred from the first: if this is your home, simply come back. Or the second becomes a final verdict on closeness: if visiting is difficult, this is no longer home. In our scene, naming a place and determining a route need different conversations that should not silently replace each other.

The practical question about a route requires a current competent source. Family reassurance, an earlier journey, or a literary story establishes no right to cross or return. This article lists no required documents and offers no individual status advice. The unknown can be recorded separately and an appropriate means of checking chosen. Until an answer arrives, the proposal remains conditional. Naming it that way is more honest than buying a ticket to prove love and only later discovering that the family decision rested on an unconfirmed idea of actual mobility.

Waiting for a check does not prohibit the family from discussing its wish to meet. Irina can say she misses them without promising a date. Her mother can name an important place without guaranteeing passage across a border. Asya can offer another shared element without claiming it entirely replaces what was wanted. Different orders do not require emotional silence. They merely limit a promise's subject. Someone can acknowledge a connection with home and simultaneously say today's route remains unknown. That acknowledgment leaves the question unfinished, but avoids presenting love as permission governed by other conditions.

IV. Someone nearby should not disappear behind the story of distance

Discussion may keep returning to Irina's difficulties. Meanwhile, Asya buys groceries daily, addresses household questions, and also becomes tired. Making her work invisible is not fair because another daughter is far away. Recognizing that work, however, does not mean declaring Irina free from care or obliged to compensate for every hour with money. What is already being done, by whom, and at what cost needs naming. The family history can then include more than an absent person's feelings, without turning someone present into an unnamed extension of the household's arrangements.

Asya may explain a limit for next week even if she previously did more. A familiar contribution creates no endless supply of energy. The family can rely on it only insofar as it has actually been accepted and remains available. If a need is substantial, actual circumstances and suitable channels of assistance require consideration; this article establishes neither services nor care methods. Our distinction concerns conversation. A task is not resolved if work has simply been left silently with the nearby person before congratulating the family on unity between two countries.

The mother also participates in discussing her own day. If she is able and wants to express her view, she should not be reduced to the recipient of distributed care. She may prefer another schedule, decline some help, or name the inconvenience of constant guests. This is no universal instruction for complex medical situations, ages, or legal authority, which are not established here. In our ordinary invented scene, it is enough to avoid deciding her entire life between the sisters as though knowing a need automatically granted them the right to choose any arrangement acceptable to themselves.

Making the burden visible can make conversation harder. Asya says for the first time that she does not agree to continue at the former scale. Irina hears an accusation; their mother hears a threat of loneliness. Such reactions are possible, but the article predicts them for no particular family. The subject can be revisited: what task lacks someone to do it, and what actual offer exists? This does not cancel feelings. It prevents an answer being replaced by a dispute about the better daughter. If conversation is unavailable or unsafe, stop the exercise; necessary action and assistance should not await successful family coordination.

V. Assistance from afar needs a clear subject rather than power over every decision

Irina offers to pay a particular expense. This may ease the task if the conditions really fit. Money does not automatically determine the entire day of her mother and Asya, however. Additional conditions should be named before acceptance, rather than discovered afterward. The recipient may assess the proposal and decline insofar as that is possible. This article establishes neither transfers, financial rules, nor a specific budget. It discusses a contribution's limited meaning: helping address a named task rather than acquiring a permanent right to direct the lives of people who remain nearby.

Conversely, Irina's offer cannot become an endless obligation either. She named one expense and did not agree to finance every future need. Her own conditions may change. Help requires clarity about the extent of a commitment and opportunities for reconsideration consistent with the actual agreement. We establish no legal force for promises; significant questions require separate consideration. In everyday conversation, one voluntary step should not become an eternal family contract nobody discussed. Gratitude retains the value of what was done without writing every subsequent consent on someone's behalf.

Organizational involvement from afar has limits too. Irina can find information or arrange a conversation's timing with participants' agreement. She should not present unverified advice as a professional decision, and wanting to help does not entitle her to share her mother's personal information. Access to information differs from authority over it. Our practice establishes no confidentiality or power-of-attorney rules. It makes a question noticeable before action: what did the person permit, and what particular result is expected? If permission or precision is lacking, good intention alone cannot make the task complete.

Equal dignity does not require identical contributions. Asya can do a task locally, Irina perform an agreed part from afar, and their mother decide what is acceptable to her. Such distribution does not itself guarantee fairness. One contribution may become heavier than announced; one possibility may disappear. There needs to be room to clarify actual cost. A family need not continuously count every minute, but it can name a particular mismatch without an accusation of pettiness. Togetherness is not confirmed merely because everyone has received an attractively named role in a diagram.

VI. Family duty has a history that cannot become a modern prohibition

In *Analects* IV.19, a son's distant travel is considered in relation to living parents and a definite place to which he goes. The adjacent context discusses reverence and family conduct. This is a historical moral framework, not a recommendation that an emigrant abandon their life or a migration rule. We retain a distinction: care for relatives connects with distance, but the selected ancient teaching establishes no present duty for every adult. James Legge's translation.

Duty may matter deeply to Irina. She really wants her mother to know about her availability and not feel abandoned. That wish does not require accepting every historical condition of the teaching. Contemporary life has other circumstances, and the editorial framework preserves an adult's right to their own decisions. Someone can ask what care they consider theirs and how they can honestly offer it now. The answer belongs to the person and actual situation. A source should not speak a final verdict of loyalty or ingratitude on their behalf.

Family history also has no single mandatory reading. The mother remembers caring for her elders; Asya sees current daily work; Irina remembers support for her move. These memories may communicate important obligations without automatically forming the same contract. Gratitude, an accepted promise, and a new expectation should be distinguished. Declining a new request need not deny earlier help. It can nevertheless cause real disappointment, which should not be dismissed as unreasonable. A precise boundary does not remove feelings; it preserves the possibility of discussing the actual request without rewriting the entire family biography.

The opposite extreme is to call any family duty a meaningless old convention. That can fail to hear someone's free wish to participate. Irina may consider care a substantial part of her life rather than an obstacle to individual independence. Independence includes choosing a connection and acknowledging a commitment. Its measure simply should not be imposed from outside or made the sole condition of dignity. Comparing a historical tradition raises questions about distance and loyalty while retaining differing foundations. It does not make an ancient arrangement a hidden law of every contemporary family between countries.

VII. A family chat does not turn two countries' calendars into one

Everyone on the screen may be able to respond almost immediately, but their days are arranged differently. One has just awakened, another is finishing work, and a third is occupied with a necessary task. A quick reply does not necessarily mean readiness to discuss a difficult decision; delay does not necessarily imply indifference. These observations establish no law of digital behavior. In our scene, they prevent availability being inferred from membership in a chat alone. The timing of one conversation can be agreed rather than treating every new message as a demand for immediate participation across every time zone.

Sometimes a decision has a real deadline. What is needed by then should be named rather than requiring final shared clarity about everything. Asya needs to know whether she can be absent from work on a particular day; Irina needs an answer about the route; their mother needs to decide whether the offer fits. Timelines may conflict. The article does not promise a suitable compromise. Distinguishing them nevertheless shows which part remains conditional and what fact would change a choice. The general word later can conceal that waiting already costs one person something while another does not yet know the subject of their consent.

A preliminary option can be offered with a precise condition for reconsideration. If travel information has not arrived by a certain point, consider an available alternative without calling it a final rejection of meeting. This is an editorial example of language, not a mandatory family procedure. The condition needs to be clear to participants and create no unconfirmed guarantee. Irina does not promise resolution of an external question; Asya does not commit to keeping her calendar free forever. A limited agreement can mean something real while the overall future plan remains unknown and some wishes remain unachievable.

Reconsideration should not become a permanent test of trust. If conditions actually changed, that can be named without concluding that an earlier promise was a lie. Uncertainty, however, does not justify every abrupt change without attention to another's cost. A particular agreement and circumstances need consideration. There is no general verdict of blame here. Our text proposes retaining two questions: how well is the possibility known, and who bears the consequences of waiting? Family patience then avoids becoming an inexhaustible resource belonging to one person, used by others to avoid acknowledging the limit of their own information.

VIII. A child need not become proof of where the real family is

When a child belongs to such a family, adults may give travel an especially broad meaning. Visiting grandmother supposedly preserves roots; staying allegedly chooses the other side. A particular route does not describe an entire future affiliation, however. A child may miss people, love two places, not understand a decision, or want an ordinary familiar day. This article establishes no age, medical, or legal conditions for a minor's travel. In our editorial framework, the point is to avoid asking a child publicly to confirm loyalty to one country or resolve adults' disagreement with a simple answer about where they want to be.

Language used with a child may differ from adults' discussion of documents. The entire fear or cost of a decision need not be communicated, but a guaranteed meeting should not be promised while a route remains unknown. An available part can be named honestly according to actual circumstances: we want to meet, are checking the possibility, and have not established a date. This is an example rather than a tested educational technique. The article does not decide which explanations fit a particular age or situation. It merely avoids turning adults' incomplete knowledge into a promise the child will later be asked to consider fulfilled through a wholly different form of contact.

A child should not become a messenger carrying one adult's displeasure to another. Asking the child to tell grandmother she is unfair or persuade a parent to travel moves the dispute to someone who should not have to resolve it. This is our ethical boundary rather than a claim about every family's behavior. Relevant participants can discuss important matters if conversation is available. The child's own questions and feelings need no immediately useful answer. Their pleasure in a video call also does not prove the absence of a personal meeting no longer matters.

If travel occurs, it still need not become an examination of love. Exhaustion, unfamiliar daily life, and wanting time alone do not completely describe someone's relationship with relatives. A particular inconvenience and available solution can be noticed separately. The general text promises neither to remove tension nor replace needed specialist consideration. A child's connection between places is not created by an order to enjoy every visit equally. Honest adult responsibility includes refusing to make one child a living signature beneath an assertion that the family has finally agreed about two countries and every future return.

IX. A missed meeting can leave both a connection and a real loss

Irina could not visit at the chosen time. Everyone may be saddened even if the condition was honestly named. That sadness need not be corrected by claiming distance changes nothing at all. It changed a particular meeting. Nor should absence become a final conclusion about the family without grounds. Both facts can be named: personal presence was missing, and some form of available participation continued. Participants understand their relationship differently; the article prescribes no equal measure of satisfaction and demands no gratitude for an outcome insufficient to someone.

Asya may also feel her contribution went unrecognized. The mother may miss Irina while valuing Asya's help. This need not become a competition between daughters if feelings are not translated into rankings. What was done can be thanked separately, an unfinished wish named, and no promise of a next journey added. In our scene, discussing an outcome has several subjects. It should not require everyone to confirm overall success because one practical question was resolved. Honesty permits a completed task alongside a loss that the task could never remove.

The next decision can use acquired information without automatically repeating the distribution. Asya helped now; she is not therefore always available. Irina later obtained an opportunity to travel; it is not guaranteed for every year. The mother changed a wish; this does not cancel earlier gratitude. Family life proceeds through people's present answers. Memory may support trust without replacing consent to a new cost. Nor does every question require a long meeting: sometimes one clarification is enough; sometimes the absence of an available shared option needs acknowledgment and discussion needs to end.

A strong objection is that precise language removes no borders and returns no missed days. That is true. Our map does not eliminate external restrictions; it helps avoid adding an unconfirmed conclusion about another's love or an endless promise. Even that assistance is not guaranteed. If conversation increases pressure, it can be postponed. Appropriate information, necessary decisions, and protection do not await the exercise's result. Closeness creates no obligation to find an attractive explanation for everything lost. Sometimes it is enough to acknowledge a particular impossibility and preserve participants' right to an honest answer of their own.

X. A shared decision keeps each contribution and limit distinguishable

In the opening scene, the family seemingly needed only to choose a date. The subject is now more precise: what the mother actually needs, which actions are available to the daughters, what remains unknown, and who bears waiting's cost. Irina need not prove love with an unjustified journey. Asya need not silently accept everything requiring presence. Their mother need not pretend complete satisfaction when a desired meeting did not occur. None of these limits concludes the entire family question. They make it possible to discuss it without assigning someone a role to which they have given no present answer.

A good decision within this limited framework may be partial. One date was clarified, one form of assistance agreed, one external question selected for checking, or the absence of a shared option acknowledged. This is not necessarily a happy arrangement for the family. The result's significance concerns what became more available or intelligible for the next action. Human dignity does not depend on that result. Nobody earns the right to respect only after distributing distance successfully. People can remain a family without a shared country, shared calendar, or single form of care suitable for everyone at every moment.

Similarity between traditions is limited here to connection and the conditions of its enactment. A story shows conflict between an expectation of home and an administrative obstruction; research considers differing possibilities for proximate and distant care; historical teaching relates distance to family duty. They state no single identical truth and do not cancel each other. The editorial conclusion belongs to this article: before measuring loyalty, name the decision's subject and the actual possibility of participation. A reader may reject this comparison. They retain the right to seek another language for their life and decline the proposed experiment.

When closeness matters, it can be expressed through a limited honest promise. I will do this task; I can stay for this long; I want to visit but do not know whether I can; I am not ready to discuss more today. Such answers may disappoint while retaining content. A shared decision develops from real answers to a particular task, rather than identical resources. In our scene, this leaves each life its own limit. The countries remain different places while the family can name available participation without demanding proof of love through an ability to cancel distance whenever desired.

What this means in practice

If you wish and conversation is manageable, choose one small family task between places. Name the needed outcome, then separate desire, known possibility, and an unknown condition. You need not disclose documents, income, health, or every personal risk. Only a meaningful limit may be named. The practice replaces no current checks of a route, entry rights, medical decisions, adult authority, or available appropriate assistance. Necessities should not be postponed for an attractive shared agreement.

Offer one definite part of participation and identify what remains conditional. Ask the nearby person about the work's cost, the recipient about the meaning of help, and preserve your own limit too. Do not ask a child to resolve adults' dispute. Treat money as neither authority over every decision nor presence as an endless obligation. Stop under threat, humiliation, or coercion. Declining the experiment does not make someone disloyal to family or determine what they should do in a difficult situation.

After an available step, a narrow result can be checked: one date is known, a competent source found, a task agreed, or a lack of possibility acknowledged. No happy outcome that did not occur needs confirmation. The editorial map has no established effectiveness; agreement, safety, travel, and preservation of relationships are not guaranteed. An available contribution can be valued alongside sadness about a missed meeting. The next decision remains open, and an earlier small agreement signs no future family commitments on another person's behalf.

Key quotation

> *But ... he is my son*

Sui Sin Far, *In the Land of the Free*, Part I, the father Hom Hing's words after being told that the child must be left behind. An ellipsis replaces the narrator's intervening attribution. A fictional objection is not used as legal permission for a present journey. Text.

Connections between traditions

Read context	Limited question	Difference of foundation
Sui Sin Far, Part I	Family home and external ability to live together	Historical fictional conflict rather than a modern procedure
Merla, Kilkey, Baldassar2020	Proximate and distant care with unequal mobility	Composite research cases rather than prevalence or current law
Analects IV.19	Distance and family duty	Historical moral framework rather than a prohibition on an adult reader's emigration

Sources

1. Sui Sin Far [Edith Eaton]. Mrs. Spring Fragrance: In the Land of the Free. A.C. McClurg1912; Gutenberg62940, updated2024. Metadata, title, and selected Parts I–II of the story were read. The entire collection is not claimed as read; quotations belong to characters. Territorial rights in the version are not inferred from access.

2. Laura Merla, Majella Kilkey, Loretta Baldassar. Examining transnational care circulation trajectories within immobilizing regimes of migration: Implications for proximate care. Journal of Family Research32(3),2020,514–536, DOI10.20377/jfr-351. Metadata, the initial framework, composite-case method, selected story3.2, and closing context were read, not all cited studies. PDF.

3. Confucius. The Analects, IV.19, translated by James Legge. Gutenberg3330, updated2021; the separate English portion of *Chinese Classics*, whose exact print basis was not established here. Metadata and IV.18–24 context were read. Neither the Chinese original nor other editions were compared; this source is not directly quoted.

Tags

family, emigration, two countries, distance, care, mobility, travel availability, closeness, presence, family decision, conditions, promise, limit, uncertainty, calendar, assistance, time, money, participation cost, relatives' work, personal answer, right to decline, children, family duty, parent, home, route, Sui Sin Far, Edith Eaton, Laura Merla, Majella Kilkey, Loretta Baldassar, Confucius, Analects, United Wisdom

About the authors

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

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside 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.