

UNITED WISDOM

Respecting a tradition without agreeing with every rule

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-23-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Respecting a tradition without agreeing with every rule

Epigraph

> *Hands off*

William James, *Talks to Teachers on Psychology; and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals*, "On a Certain Blindness in Human Beings," the author's concluding paragraph, web line 1144. A brief fragment restraining overconfident control of another life rather than evaluation of every action.

What this article is about

Irina helps organize an open cultural evening at a small community centre. She enjoys the music, the stories, and the chance to hear people whose experience differs from her own. Before the event, the organizer asks guests to follow a particular greeting procedure. Irina is willing to learn it. Then she discovers that one invited person may not ask questions: in the order presented by the organizer, someone in that position must only listen. Irina disagrees. She worries that any objection will sound like contempt for the whole culture, although her question concerns one requirement. This is a hypothetical scene for reflection, not an account of a particular people, religion, or real event.

Can we attend carefully to a tradition while considering a particular rule unacceptable? Answering requires distinguishing understanding its meaning, respecting people, participating in an action, and agreeing with its basis. This article examines a public intercultural encounter: who presents a custom, whose participation it restricts, and what response is possible without taking over another person's voice. Understanding does not promise a shared decision, while disagreement requires no final verdict on the entire tradition.

I. Respect has several objects

When Irina speaks of respect, it matters what she means to respect. She can respect the dignity of those present, listen carefully to a custom's history, handle an object with care, and recognize people's ability to continue their own practice. That does not yet mean she considers every proposition true or is willing to meet any requirement. One broad word can hide different actions. Agreement then becomes the definition of respect, and declining agreement becomes a refusal to recognize a person. To keep conversation possible, each response needs its specific object again.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Suppose the organizer asks people not to photograph an object the participants regard as sacred. Irina can agree without accepting the teaching about its origin. This agreement concerns handling an object and the conditions of an invitation. In another case, she is asked publicly to affirm a belief she does not share. The object has changed: what is required is a statement in her own name, rather than careful conduct. The requests' outward similarity does not make them identical. Respect for another person's belief needs no false testimony about one's own; otherwise, those present receive a mistaken impression of agreement.

There is also an uncomfortable counterexample: polite language can accompany actual disregard. A visitor praises a tradition but takes a photograph after a clear refusal, or demands that the host immediately explain everything in the language most convenient for the visitor. The correct expression of respect does not erase the action. Conversely, a specific objection may be more attentive than general enthusiasm if it accurately names the rule and its consequences. This does not make every criticism an act of care. It asks us to examine conduct: who is heard, what is attributed to someone, and what agreement has actually been obtained.

Respect need not look identical for everyone present. One person speaks directly; another prefers a brief explanation; a third shows attention by helping with available work. Style alone neither confirms agreement nor exposes its absence. If the organizer recognizes respect only in a familiar form, a visitor has difficulty offering another response. Yet the visitor should not demand that their manner immediately count as sufficiently clear. Where appropriate, they can describe the action: I am willing to listen carefully, but not to affirm that belief. This is no universal formula, only a way to avoid leaving an important matter entirely to guesswork.

II. Understanding a basis does not mean accepting it

A custom's history can alter a first impression, but it does not make the listener's final decision. The organizer explains that the greeting recalls people who once supported the community. Irina previously saw only an unfamiliar movement. Now she has a context. She can appreciate its significance while still not considering participation obligatory for every guest. An explanation makes a requirement more intelligible; it does not turn another person's history into her own promise. Attention to the past remains, and a present response does not disappear into gratitude for the story.

In the selected concluding context, William James warns against confidently judging another life from outside. The next section retains a boundary: another way of living receives no permission to interfere violently with ours. This is philosophical reasoning, not a study of a cultural evening or proof of a custom's safety. It supports caution about claiming complete understanding, while requiring no equal approval of every action.

Irina can revise a mistaken assumption: she thought the greeting tested submission, then heard a different meaning. But the story she hears also needs its proper status. It is this organizer's explanation; he may know the custom well, select one version, or lack some circumstances. Clarification does not mean suspecting every storyteller. It means refusing to treat one voice as a complete account of everyone. Where origins are disputed, they can remain disputed without filling the gap with a convenient legend. Where a rule prompts disagreement, that disagreement need not vanish behind the history's confirmed interest.

III. A representative is not the whole tradition

Someone who describes a culture does not automatically become every participant's voice. At the evening, one organizer calls the procedure unchanging, while another guest remembers a different version. This does not yet prove error or deception by the first. They may be speaking about different places, periods, families, or purposes of a ritual. Irina can ask which practice is being presented here instead of choosing the authentic bearer by confidence of delivery. A more precise account allows difference without requiring an observer to decide who deserves to belong to their own history.

Sometimes a person really is authorized to organize a particular event. Their authority to set a programme and their capacity to represent a tradition exhaustively remain separate questions. They can choose which part of the evening happens without having to speak for everyone of their background. Irina likewise gains no right to appoint the second participant the correct representative simply because she prefers their answer. Such an appointment quietly turns respect into the search for a convenient ally: another culture's complexity is allowed only while confirming our predetermined view of how that culture ought to be.

Where views differ, an immediate public examination of authenticity is unnecessary. Versions can be named and the question left open. But openness must not conceal the actual decision: at this evening, a particular guest is prohibited from asking questions, regardless of the rule's prevalence. Assessing the present condition does not always require finishing an investigation of an entire cultural history. Irina can say she does not accept this restriction here while retaining uncertainty about its origin and declining the broader claim that every bearer of the tradition necessarily supports such treatment.

Translation introduces an additional difficulty. The organizer uses a word rendered in English as obligation, although the explanation also conveys a wish and a customary recommendation. The translator is not necessarily wrong: words may lack exact equivalents. Yet a dispute about a requirement cannot be settled by one selected equivalent. Irina can ask what will happen if someone declines and what action is actually expected. This checks meaning within the situation, leaving the original term unresolved where understanding remains incomplete. It does not require an invited person immediately to teach every subtlety of their language.

IV. Courtesy requires no false agreement

An encounter can include actions that make shared presence convenient and actions that express conviction. Their distinction depends on meaning for the participants, rather than only one's own impression. Irina is willing to remove her shoes in a room if that is possible and intelligible as a condition of the space. But reciting a particular formula may affirm faith or accept a role. Her wish not to offend should not then produce a false declaration. She can ask whether observing without participating, or another sign of attention, is possible. The answer may be no; a suitable alternative is not guaranteed.

Participants may also understand a gesture differently. For a visitor, a small bow is ordinary courtesy; for the host, it seriously affirms a particular order. If the difference matters, the visitor should not declare the action an empty formality on someone else's behalf. Otherwise, they seem to retain their beliefs while securing convenience through a mistaken impression in others. They can decline the gesture, choose an agreed alternative, or not attend. Every path carries a cost. This article does not present observation as a universal solution or promise that it will be accepted as equivalent to full participation.

Some situations need no elaborate clarification: people know each other, a condition is clear, and it causes no difficulty. Every visit need not become a debate about agreement's nature. Our question arises where silence or a gesture begins to mean more than someone is willing to accept. Then it helps to state the extent of one's action. Irina can attend the musical part without joining a declaration. This is a limited proposal, not an already agreed programme. The organizer can decline it; Irina can decline to enlarge her response merely to make disagreement look resolved.

The duration of agreement also matters. Irina can perform a gesture she understands once and choose observation at a later event. The organizer should not regard past participation as permanent affirmation of belief; she should not treat a changed response as proof that earlier participants were mistaken. New information may have appeared, conditions may have changed, or Irina may understand her own basis differently. Such a change need not become a public story of spiritual development. It is enough to retain the present extent of her response and separately acknowledge a promise actually made for a specific event. A photograph of a past gesture cannot decide for a living person.

V. An invitation's conditions affect more than the visitor

A rule also needs consideration through those it affects. Prohibiting photographs of a shared object and prohibiting a person's questions work differently. The first concerns handling something and access to an image. The second distributes the ability to speak. A tradition's name does not establish in advance that both conditions have the same basis. Irina can acknowledge the hosts' wish to protect an object while separately objecting to a guest's restriction. This requires neither cancellation of the entire evening nor treating every request by the organizer as inherently suspicious.

In UNESCO's 1995 Declaration of Principles on Tolerance, sections 1.2–1.4 connect respect for difference with fundamental rights rather than abandoning convictions or tolerating injustice. This is a normative document, not an experiment or a legal ruling on our hypothetical scene. It supplies no ready answer about an event's legality. The narrower boundary relevant here is that giving an arrangement a cultural name does not complete the assessment of what it does to someone's participation.

The restricted person may themselves wish to remain at the encounter. Irina should not declare that wish evidence of insufficient independence or displace them with her own intervention. She can describe her own disagreement or offer support where appropriate without taking over another person's decision. Yet their agreement need not settle her assessment either. People can respond differently to the same condition. Respect here means retaining both separate responses: not speaking for the guest, and not presenting her own approval as established simply because they have chosen different participation.

VI. Keep disagreement at its actual scale

Irina disagrees with one rule of the evening. If she says the entire tradition rejects human dignity, the claim's scale changes sharply. That generalization needs other grounds, which the hypothetical scene does not supply. She can identify the action, its recipient, and the reason for her refusal without accusing everyone of the same background. This is no duty to soften an important objection. Specificity can instead prevent it from disappearing into an argument about whether the culture is good overall. The prohibition remains open to criticism even if the music is beautiful and most guests are pleased.

The opposite extreme is to shrink an objection to personal taste when it concerns distribution of participation. Irina can say the arrangement does not suit her, but she need not pretend unfamiliarity is the sole issue. If she considers exclusion significant, she can say so. At the same time, her assessment does not establish someone else's intention. The organizer may not intend humiliation; that intention's absence does not erase the restriction. Conversely, an

existing restriction gives Irina's explanation of a concealed motive no factual status. Conduct, basis, consequences, and assumptions about intention need different words.

An answer can remain irreconcilable. The organizer considers the rule central and will not run the evening differently. Irina does not want to help in that format. They may understand each other's positions while finding no common version. Clarity requires no description of this as mutual enrichment. Sometimes it permits withdrawal while retaining an accurate account of what has not been accepted. They can continue acquaintance in another form if both want it, or not continue. Neither respectful language nor detailed context guarantees a relationship, an event, or everyone's satisfaction.

VII. Familiarity grants no authority over another practice

Criticizing a condition does not make a visitor the tradition's new organizer. Irina can decline to help, propose another format, or ask about possible changes. But declining an action differs from having authority to rename a ritual, alter its meaning, and declare the new version correct for everyone. Even a good idea must remain a proposal to the people whose actions it affects. Otherwise, the visitor's independence is obtained at the expense of theirs. A familiar substitution follows: someone opposes imposed agreement, then immediately prescribes the response they consider more enlightened for those around them.

The organizers can choose a closed event with a different composition, while Irina creates her own open evening. This does not make every closed event permissible on any grounds; the article settles no such broad question. Yet her own format need not masquerade as other people's corrected authentic tradition. It can be named honestly as intercultural discussion, an independently devised meeting, or a new project. The sources' history and the new decision then have different names. Participants can assess the invitation as it is, without a promise that an entire cultural world already approves the proposed arrangement.

Belonging to a tradition does not make internal objections automatically less significant than a recognized representative's words. Someone may wish to change a practice from within while retaining their connection to it. Irina can hear that voice, but should not use it as proof that her own control is now authorized. Support, collaboration, and replacing someone's authorship differ. She can ask what help is actually wanted and accept a limited answer. Participation may be small. The person may not want their disagreement turned into a public story for someone else's cultural project.

If people do create a new shared format, it helps to name each decision's origin honestly. The hosts proposed the music; invited participants suggested the discussion method; together they agreed the question procedure. The result need not appear as a pure expression of one tradition or as the most visible organizer's personal invention. Accurate authorship preserves

further conversation: which part is inherited, which adapted, who agreed, and who has yet to participate in deciding. This certifies no cultural authenticity. It offers a limited description of shared work, preventing one successful evening from quietly acquiring authority to speak for everyone.

VIII. Reciprocity is not measured in identical concessions

Two sides may make different changes because their positions differ. Irina received the programme in advance and can decline. Another guest depended on the organizer for participation and learned the restriction only on arrival. An identical request for flexibility can then hide different costs. Considering a condition requires seeing specific possibilities: who sets the procedure, who can leave, who has information, and whose voice is heard. This describes a situation rather than ranking participants' moral worth. It provides no ready rule for how many concessions each person must make.

Suppose Irina asks only to change the time of her contribution, while the organizer experiences this as destruction of a custom. The change may indeed be serious for him. Yet the seriousness of that experience does not establish Irina's only permissible response. Nor does her practical difficulty prove his meaning empty. They can acknowledge both costs and see whether an encounter is possible. Sometimes another day works; sometimes it does not. Reciprocity consists less in compulsorily balancing losses than in refusing to declare another person's loss nonexistent for the convenience of one's own proposal.

Some relationships make discussion unsafe or expose a person to coercion. This article requires no direct declaration of disagreement to someone making threats and offers no universally safe procedure. A person can limit disclosure of their reasons, seek suitable support, or refrain from discussion for now. Understanding a tradition does not confirm a particular group's safety. Respect must not become an additional test to pass by risking oneself. Our voluntary question is useful only where its actual conditions allow reflection and choice, without promising a known outcome.

IX. Revision is possible in both directions

Irina may discover that she misunderstood the rule. The prohibition concerned one part of a presentation, where the speaker asked not to be interrupted, and did not exclude the guest from later discussion. If clarification is confirmed, the earlier objection can change. This is revision in light of new information rather than surrender to a tradition. Yet hearing an explanation does not mean the promised later opportunity actually happens. Stated procedure and actual participation need distinction. An agreed programme, its execution, and inward approval remain separate results even after a good conversation.

The organizer's position can change too. He acknowledges that not all invited participants accept the rule and allows another form of participation. Irina should not present this as victory over a backward culture when the change concerns one evening. A person can accept a new arrangement through their own consideration. Their agreement does not oblige all other bearers of a tradition to do likewise. A local decision remains local. It confirms neither a historically finished dispute, a transformed whole community, nor a format suitable for every later event with a similar name.

Sometimes there is no revision. Irina better understands the custom's significance and still declines. The organizer better understands her objection and retains the rule. This may be more honest than apparent agreement, but not necessarily pleasant. The article proposes no celebration of every disagreement as an achievement. It retains a precise outcome: a basis became known, particular participation was accepted or declined, and other questions remained open. At a later meeting, conditions can be reconsidered. A past refusal requires no permanent hostility, while past attendance creates no indefinite agreement.

X. An unfinished conversation can also deserve respect

Return to the cultural evening. Irina decides not to help with the part where one guest cannot ask questions, but offers to prepare the exhibition if her assistance is still wanted. The organizer may accept the limit, decline the entire offer, or postpone answering. We do not know what happens: the scene is no tested negotiating technique. Yet the object is visible. Irina has not declared the music and stories meaningless, asserted another person's agreement, or turned admiration for a culture into an obligation to do everything presented under its name.

If the other guest wants to discuss their position, their account has its own value. Irina can hear it without immediately using it to confirm her own correctness. They may support the arrangement, oppose it, or not want discussion. Each state matters at its actual extent. Intercultural understanding is not completed when everyone supplies an answer convenient for the listener. It requires allowing another person's separateness while retaining evaluation of a specific action and one's own grounds for participating. An unknown opinion need not be filled with presumed cultural unity.

A tradition can remain significant after a particular objection. It can also contain a rule someone seriously rejects. These propositions have no ready, convenient balance for every situation. There is the work of attention: learning what is being presented, not taking a representative for everyone, distinguishing custom from demand, seeing consequences for participants, and naming one's own decision. Respect then preserves people's dignity and historical accuracy. Agreement remains a separate response, unobtainable merely by demanding respectfulness. An unfinished conversation excuses no coercion and removes no right to stop.

What this means in practice

If this subject fits, choose one troublesome rule and describe it without judging a whole culture. Who asks for which action, whom does it affect, and what about its meaning is actually known? Separate an explanation you heard, your own assumption, and what remains unknown. You need not prove a custom's complete history before recognizing disagreement with a present condition. But broad factual claims about a tradition cannot be inferred from one encounter or representative.

For your own response, distinguish attention to people, understanding a basis, possible participation, and agreement with a proposition. You can accept one without accepting another. If clarification is voluntary and appropriate, ask about a gesture's specific meaning or observing without a statement in your name. Do not promise that the hosts will accept that alternative. Do not name your proposal an already shared decision or portray another participant as lacking independence because they chose differently.

After the response, note what is actually agreed and what remains disputed. Clarification, refusal, limited participation, and no suitable format are all possible. This personal work measures no maturity, is neither therapy nor legal advice, and does not guarantee reconciliation. Where threats and coercion exist, direct discussion is not prescribed. You can stop at an inward distinction or choose suitable support. Respect for a tradition requires no false agreement with every rule and grants no authority over another life.

Key quotation

> *insight into all the ideals*

William James, *Talks to Teachers*, “What Makes a Life Significant,” authorial reasoning, web line 1148. A noun-phrase fragment: the author says nobody possesses this complete insight. The nearby condition about violent interference is retained in the article; the fragment replaces no assessment of a specific requirement.

Connections between traditions

Material actually read	Comparative question	Difference and boundary
James, two addresses to students	What remains invisible to an outside observer?	A philosophical argument limits overconfidence; it makes no rule automatically acceptable
UNESCO, Declaration of 1995, sections 1.2–1.4	Does tolerance require abandoning convictions?	A normative rights framework differs from James's philosophy; it does not assess an encounter's legality
The article's hypothetical intercultural encounter	What does a particular gesture mean to participants?	An invented example describes no people's custom and establishes no negotiating effectiveness
A person's dignity and assessment of a rule	Can respect coexist with disagreement?	An editorial distinction retains both responses without promising painless compatibility

Sources

1. William James. *Talks to Teachers on Psychology; and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals*. Project Gutenberg no. 16287. The version actually opened has a Henry Holt, New York, 1925 title page, copyright 1899/1900. Read the preface, web lines 44–56, and selected context 1135–1156; the author's conclusions at 1143–1148 are used. Not the whole book. A philosophical argument, not empirical validation of our practice. Rights UNKNOWN; PG availability is not treated as universal permission.

2. UNESCO. *Declaration of Principles on Tolerance*, adopted 16 November 1995, Paris. Official text. Read the displayed English page, web lines 64–154; only article 1, sections 1.2–1.4, is used. A normative declaration, not an experiment or a ruling on law applicable to the hypothetical scene. No direct quotations from the document; Rights UNKNOWN; no full third-party source text is imported into our packet.

Tags

tradition, respect, agreement, disagreement, intercultural understanding, cultural evening, custom, rule, dignity, participation, conviction, gesture, representative, internal difference, context, origin, history, tolerance, rights, voluntary choice, restriction, refusal, invitation, observation, coercion, independence, James, UNESCO, philosophy, normative framework, United Wisdom

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

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 her 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.