

UNITED WISDOM

Different memories of one tragedy: speaking without a shared verdict

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-24-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Different memories of one tragedy: speaking without a shared verdict

Epigraph

“Passion passes away.”

Romain Rolland, Above the Battle, XII, Our Neighbor the Enemy, March 15, 1915, printed page 143; a short sentence in the author's own voice in C. K. Ogden's translation. This is a wartime moral appeal, rather than a forecast of how long someone else's distress will last. Primary text.

What this article is about

In an invented scene, Dina and Oleg are preparing a small remembrance evening about a fire at a local business long ago. Dina's grandmother lost her brother. Oleg's grandfather helped rescue people, and his family preserves an account of his shift's courage. Dina wants to name the loss and remaining questions about work organization. Oleg fears the evening will make every worker at the time guilty. This is an invented history, rather than a report of an actual fire. The article establishes neither circumstances, responsibility, nor numbers of deaths.

The participants discuss one event, but their memories connect to different people, places, and questions. Difference need not be contradiction. A rescue account does not cancel a death, and loss does not automatically establish every worker's actions. Yet different emphases can conceal a genuine disagreement about fact or responsibility. Asking people simply to remember together is therefore insufficient. We need to know what is proposed for acknowledgement, who can speak, and what agreement the shared format requires.

The article considers conversation and shared public remembrance. It offers no hidden-memory recovery, treatment for difficult experience, or mandatory reconciliation. Someone can remember differently, decline the evening, or keep private material undisclosed. A conversation requires attention to facts, loss, and freedom to answer. It gives accounts no identical evidential support and does not make a moderate tone the sole measure of being right.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. One day leaves different objects of memory

For Dina, her relative's name identifies a person rather than part of a total. Oleg's grandfather's account concerns a particular colleague rescued. Both memories can concern the same day while preserving different parts. Before arguing, it helps to identify the object: personal loss, a specific act, family account, causes, or subsequent life. Different objects do not require an immediate choice of the more correct family. They help show which assertion actually needs comparison and which information is still missing.

If Dina speaks about the death, Oleg need not reply with rescued people as though one outcome repairs the other. If Oleg describes a rescue, Dina need not take it as justification of the whole business. Yet context matters. Courage offered instead of considering the causes of death may indeed evade that question. Loss offered instead of checking a particular accusation may also change the subject. We need to examine the transition, rather than an isolated sentence detached from the exchange.

We can ask which question is open now. Who died? Who performed a particular act? Which circumstances are confirmed? How does a family wish to name its relative? Answers rest on different grounds. A name's personal meaning establishes no entire course of the fire. A checked chronology determines no required family feeling. Distinguishing these does not reduce tragedy to convenient items. It protects a private voice from having to explain everything at once and a general fact from becoming a verdict on every life.

Sometimes the objects cannot be separated completely. Dina's loss connects to a question about the decision that left her relative inside. Then a historical detail directly matters to memory and should not be relegated elsewhere merely to keep the evening calm. Distinction identifies that connection rather than prohibiting it. Remembering a person can include questions about their death. A format should honestly identify the questions it considers and those it cannot resolve, instead of promising to contain everything.

II. Sympathy does not confirm every explanation

Dina may say the family account is difficult to hear. This describes a present relationship requiring no completed historical investigation first. Oleg can receive it attentively while not knowing who made the disputed decision. Neither complete endorsement nor disregard for loss is required. Sympathy concerns a person and the difficulty named. A historical assertion concerns circumstances and needs appropriate grounds. One act can accompany the other without replacing it or making disagreement about a detail a refusal to care.

Trust also needs specificity. We can trust someone's sincerity in describing a current memory and retain a question about a date. We can find a document reliable about timing without

accepting its explanation of every participant's motives. This does not demand permanent suspicion of memory. It considers the task a source performs. Family testimony can contain checkable information; it cannot be reduced to feeling in advance merely because it belongs to relatives of someone who died.

If participants differ about a fact, acknowledging loss does not require concealing that difference. A precise claim and degree of knowledge can be named without judging the narrator's character. If information refutes a version, that version gains no equal share of truth through a respectful tone. Yet a mistaken detail does not devalue a family's life or make its feeling fictitious. Proportion works both ways: confirming one statement does not validate every explanation, and refuting one does not cancel everything else.

A conversation may end without a historical answer. Oleg hears the name and understands why Dina wants to say it. He still does not know the circumstances of the disputed instruction. Both results can remain: a voice was heard, and a question stays open. That is less than complete agreement without necessarily being less valuable. The article promises neither reduced pain nor restored trust. The distinction permits an accurate account of what happened between people without claiming that the tragedy has been concluded.

III. Rolland speaks from a particular wartime setting

At the beginning of XII in Above the Battle, Romain Rolland defends human fraternity during war and describes hostility towards those refusing hatred. This is his moral position, rather than a neutral historical overview of all sides. The English text is C. K. Ogden's translation, published in Chicago in 1916. Selected short fragments belong to Rolland's own speech; statements embedded from other organizations are not quoted as his words. Source.

The source offers a limited question for our scene: must memory of loss include hatred of everyone connected to another history? Rolland's answer is definite, but establishes no duty for Dina to forgive, stop feeling distressed, or accept every worker's innocence. A historical appeal cannot quietly become a demand on someone affected. The article editorially compares refusal of universal hatred with retaining a specific assessment of action, without deriving a ready conversational outcome from a philosophical phrase.

The thought about passing passion does not promise that a difficult feeling will pass by a deadline convenient to organizers. Preserving reason gives listeners no right to call another person's pain unreasonable. Loss may remain significant and a disputed act require checking. If a quotation stops an inconvenient question, its conversational role has changed. That use can be declined while the source remains worthy of attentive reading. Its value does not require carrying every historical expression into a contemporary private life or using it to determine someone's recovery.

Rolland serves as a moral interlocutor, not a witness to our fire or a specialist in consequences of distress. His wartime text confirms neither equal responsibility nor an evening's effectiveness. Readers need those differences: an author states his position, an invented scene shows possible disagreement, and editorial practice offers voluntary description. Related subjects do not turn three roles into a validated procedure or promise identical inner change to every participant who agrees to take part.

IV. Kinship appoints no single voice

Dina need not represent every relative of the dead man. One person wants his name spoken publicly, another prefers a family gathering, and another is not ready to participate. These responses need not coincide for memory to matter. Oleg does not automatically speak for his grandfather's whole shift or the present business either. Kinship supplies no unlimited representation. The evening should distinguish personal accounts, agreed material, and authority to speak for others, particularly when organizers will name those others in the programme.

When someone says the family remembers an event this way, the scale matters. This might mean conversations with two relatives, one surviving text, or an agreed position among invited people. No survey of everyone is required before telling a personal part. But private access cannot be expanded into every descendant's voice. That transition matters especially in publication, where readers can no longer ask whose opinion they heard or who agreed to the manner in which it was presented.

Difference within a family proves neither poor memory nor disloyalty. People may have different information and wishes about publicity. One experienced the event, another learned later, and another connects through a name. These positions cannot become a single scale of entitlement to feel. Direct participation can nevertheless matter for particular testimony. Its role should be named without turning it into authority over everyone else's experiences and choices. Greater access to one circumstance does not establish every other question.

Dina can offer her account while saying permission for a family photograph remains unobtained. Oleg can describe his grandfather's testimony as a later retelling. Such limits do not prevent an evening; they make its composition visible. If organizers demand a single family response to simplify the programme, conditions can be reconsidered or participation declined. A shared format acquires no right to appoint internal unity merely because participants were offered one line on a poster or one place in the discussion.

V. Different harm is not equalized by speaking time

Five minutes each may be a reasonable organizational choice. Equal time nevertheless establishes no equal extent of loss or responsibility. One account concerns a death, the other a rescued person and a rescuer. They cannot be exchanged as though courage removes someone else's loss. Recognizing difference requires no complete historical hierarchy beforehand. It requires avoiding a symmetrical schedule as proof that events and consequences were symmetrical, or that every accusation must receive an equally strong counter-accusation for the format to look balanced.

A question about a manager's decision need not distribute it equally across everyone nearby. Information may show different roles, knowledge, and opportunities. Until known, responsibility cannot be predetermined. When known, it cannot be blurred by saying everyone had difficulties. Those difficulties can be real without cancelling an act. Sympathy for one participant does not excuse another by default; an established assessment of action requires no hatred of all relatives. Both the act and the limit of attribution should remain visible.

A respectful format permits inconveniently unequal questions. Dina may ask about the cause of death; Oleg may lack the information and not be the business's respondent. The question stays significant while its address changes. Organizers should not demand immediate admission of something he does not know, or forbid the question for his comfort. Separate investigation or another participant may be needed. A remembrance evening cannot resolve every task simply by allocating replies or treating every person as the representative of a whole institution.

Inequality also exists now. Organizers control microphones, recordings, headings, and invitations; participants may only accept the place offered. If publication conditions are hidden until the end, willingness is incomplete. If declining recording is called an insult to memory, choice becomes formal. Such circumstances need assessment through acts rather than the image of a kindly gathering. This article sets no legal event rules, but asks who controls access and what answering differently costs the person directly involved.

VI. Incomplete memory should not become a completed plot

Dina may lack the exact sequence of her grandmother's account. She remembers words without knowing when she first heard them. That marks accessible material's limits, rather than the hidden content of a missing scene. There is no need to imagine missing details to complete the evening, or infer no event from absent detail. An honest account can end with uncertainty. Incompleteness does not remove the right to name someone, describe loss, or choose the extent of participation in remembrance.

A later retelling has origins too. Oleg may remember a rescue account without a recording or exact words. The source should then be identified as retelling; reconstructed speech cannot be published as verbatim testimony. Literary form can produce a clear account without establishing historical accuracy. If organizers propose rebuilding dialogue through plausibility, an invented artistic depiction must be distinguished from an event claim. A short account is preferable to attributing words to someone merely to make a scene convincing.

A new paper can clarify a detail without revealing the entire inner meaning or making families feel alike. A checked date might change the programme without determining how someone should experience an anniversary. New information can be accepted while a relationship remains. It may contradict a cherished account and require revision of that part. Correction does not require abandoning memory entirely; preserving memory does not require protecting every detail from any available check. The scope of revision should correspond to what was actually established.

The article offers no hidden-memory extraction, repeated immersion in distressing scenes, or reading the body as a detector of the past. Serious or lasting difficulties disrupting life can be discussed with suitably qualified support. Such help need not begin with a complete public account. Historical checking and support for present distress have different tasks. Even an attentive organizer gains no expertise in both by gathering people. Their role should be named without promising healing through participation or making attendance a test of readiness.

VII. Agreement concerns form and continuation

Accepting an invitation need not mean accepting recording, photograph publication, later editing, or representation of the family. These acts need separate attention to actual terms. Dina may wish to say a name without showing a letter. Oleg may permit a short retelling without having it declared the business's official position. The article gives no universal legal ruling about materials. It distinguishes participation's objects so a kindly event name does not conceal changes in what someone has actually accepted.

Someone who initially agrees to speak can then stop; earlier agreement does not become a duty to finish the story. Important reasons for pausing need not be disclosed publicly. Organizers need no guess about hidden meaning; the available answer's limit can be accepted. A pause implies neither admission, abandonment of memory, nor ingratitude. Nor can withdrawing already published material be promised as universally simple technically or legally. Actual circumstances require separate assessment, with terms clarified beforehand where possible instead of relying on an assumed shared understanding.

The final publication's heading particularly matters. Calling the evening reconciliation between families expands the format if participants agreed only to remember relatives. Treating

agreement about a date as agreement about the tragedy's explanation expands content. Such transitions may lack malicious intent, but intention does not establish the promised scope. Participants may clarify their role and request correction. Whether correction is possible depends on circumstances and cannot be guaranteed by a general appeal to respect after the material has already been used.

Where threats, violence, humiliation, or dependence exist, direct public objection may be unsafe. Participation is not required to prove willingness for dialogue. Available support, another way of remembering, or no contact may be chosen. These responses establish no final historical verdict on everyone; they address present conditions. An outside audience cannot assign someone risk for a beautiful photograph of agreement. The seriousness of memory is not measured by willingness to endure any treatment within its public format or to disclose more than is freely chosen.

VIII. A common task can retain disagreement

Dina and Oleg might agree to name confirmed deaths and identify materials in the programme. That limited agreement does not close the question of causes or require treating family accounts as equally accurate. Its value lies in a clear object: what will be done, on which grounds, and in which role. If free responses are possible, the work can be real without declaring that families now possess one memory or an identical assessment of the past. The agreed act need not carry that larger claim.

Sometimes a narrow task conceals the main issue. If organizers allow only names to exclude responsibility forever, the limit serves another purpose. Not every subject belongs in one evening, but exclusion from a programme does not make it insignificant. The event's limits and separate consideration can be stated honestly if that possibility actually exists. It cannot be promised decoratively to secure silence today. Remembrance and checking may follow different routes without prohibiting either for the sake of the other.

A shared task may be unavailable. Participants differ even about names, recording terms, or the event's title. This proves no inability to converse as adults. Information, another format, or separate gatherings may be needed. Sometimes one side will not recognize a fact and a joint programme would mislead audiences. Declining can preserve accuracy. The article does not require always finding minimal agreement: its cost matters too, particularly if a private voice or factual question disappears as the price of making the shared format possible.

When agreement exists, remaining differences should be retained in words actually accepted. Dina can say a question about the manager's decision remains open. Oleg can identify the limits of his grandfather's account. They need not then argue all evening or judge each other's personality. A programme can present different material without promising a complete

historical answer. That establishes no inner convergence. It says only that a particular public act became possible under specified conditions while certain questions remained.

IX. A result requires no obligatory relief

Afterwards Dina may still feel sadness, Oleg fatigue, and the organizer satisfaction. No feeling establishes the evening's overall effect. Names, altered wording, and compliance with material-use terms can be checked separately. These are observable questions. Relief, reconciliation, or reduced hostility need other grounds if asserted as results. Our scene measures none of them; one person's favourable impression identifies no one else's inner state. Accurate arrangements can coexist with lasting pain without thereby proving the arrangements useless or the person unready.

An unpleasant outcome does not make memory wrong. Someone may regret the extent disclosed, discover an inaccuracy, or decline future events. Those causes require different answers: a caption corrected, terms clarified, or participation ended. No step guarantees restored trust. An unfulfilled organizational promise is present responsibility for a specific act. It should not disappear into tragedy's general difficulty as though a painful past released people from accuracy in current dealings. The relevant failure should be named at its own scale.

New historical material may appear later. A particular claim can then be revised while noting what was previously known. Revision is not inherently betrayal of a relative; its assessment depends on content and grounds. Neither changing everything for a rumour nor retaining a checked error for programme consistency is required. Public memory continues to involve material, people, and conditions rather than one finished work that cannot be clarified without accusing everyone who took part. An amendment can concern one statement rather than the whole event.

Leaving the conversation matters too. Dina can continue remembrance within the family and Oleg work separately with documents. Their paths need not cross again. A shared evening creates no indefinite duty to remain connected or reassure organizers about success. Continuation needs a new object and conditions. Otherwise the result can be described narrowly: memory was presented in a particular format; some questions remained. That is more honest than promising one gathering permanently changed everyone's relationship to the tragedy.

X. Different memories do not cancel humane treatment

Dina initially feared loss disappearing behind heroism; Oleg feared collective accusation through shift membership. Their concerns establish no facts but identify possible transitions. Loss can be acknowledged without accusing everyone nearby, and rescue testimony retained without excusing every company decision. Confirmed responsibility deserves specific consideration. Unknown responsibility remains unknown rather than becoming a convenient verdict or compulsory innocence for everyone. Each attribution needs its own grounds rather than being decided by which family account was presented first.

Humane treatment needs no identical memory. It can include naming one's subject, clarifying grounds, declining disclosure, and retaining an important question. This is an editorial account of our conversation's conditions, not a proven universal reconciliation mechanism. Sometimes conditions fail and contact should end. Sometimes they hold while disagreement remains sharp. Respect cannot be assessed solely through converging conclusions. Facts can be disputed without humiliation; silence can be demanded politely, and calm appearance then tells us nothing about freedom to answer.

Rolland's selected text does not finish the question for participants. His moral voice permits reflection on general hatred while remaining distinct from examination of a particular act. Dina's family need not adopt his language to remember. Oleg gains no protection from every historical question through it. The source remains an independent interlocutor with context and limits. It can be read attentively without turning literary authority into another admission condition or a demand to experience tragedy in the correct way.

One tragedy may remain connected with several accounts, different wishes, and open questions. Shared history need not become shared feeling. Difference permits no abandonment of accuracy, and accuracy requires no single public ritual. A next step belongs to people and conditions: investigate material, preserve separate memory, clarify the programme, or end participation. Peace is not guaranteed. The possibility is to avoid making someone else's loss the price of convenient agreement or someone's membership a predetermined answer about their actions.

What this means in practice

If a small, safe conversation is voluntarily available, write one object: a name, circumstance, material, or condition you wish to discuss. This is an editorial exercise, not therapy or memory recovery. Detailed return to distressing scenes is unnecessary. You may stop, make no note, or preserve memory separately. Under threats, shared contact is not a mandatory step; actual safety conditions and appropriate support come first rather than demonstrating conversational courage.

Separately name an experience statement, an event claim, and a request for present action. What grounds support the claim? What remains unknown? Whom do you actually represent? For a proposed shared format, clarify recording, materials, title, audience, and ending participation. Agreement about one object should not quietly become agreement about everything else. Require neither disclosure, forgiveness, identical feeling, nor admission concerning matters still unsupported. A person may accept one part and decline another without having to complete a universal account.

Afterwards check a limited result: a name stated accurately, source clarified, condition accepted, or shared format unavailable. Preserve remaining difference without inventing another person's inner state. A next question, separate path, or ending can be chosen. The exercise does not guarantee relief or reconciliation. It makes the accessible part clearer without assigning one memory to everyone or turning uncertainty into a completed story merely for a listener's convenience.

Key quotation

> *“Reason remains”.*

Rolland, the same paragraph in XII, page 143; the opening of the next sentence in Ogden's translation. His appeal measures no one else's pain and makes no equivalence between responsibilities. Primary text.

Connections between traditions

Rolland's wartime moral text considers refusal of universal hatred. It is an independent position, rather than a neutral war overview or a duty for someone affected to forgive.

Family testimony identifies its own part and origins; historical checking examines particular claims; public remembrance needs separate agreement about participation. This is an editorial comparison of roles, not evidence that all traditions unite.

Memory, establishing responsibility, and support for present distress do not become one procedure. Different accounts prove no equality of facts or harms; a shared format confirms no psychological effect.

Sources

1. Romain Rolland. Above the Battle. Translated by C. K. Ogden. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1916. Project Gutenberg 32779. Personally opened title information, lines 41–61; read a selected continuous passage, web lines 615–636, including the transition to XII, Our Neighbor the Enemy, March 15, 1915, printed pages 142–143. Quotations come from the author's own speech in line 636. No complete chapter or book reading is claimed; embedded organizational statements are not quoted. Primary text.

Short Russian translations were prepared editorially from the English version. The source establishes no circumstances of the invented fire, validates no exercise, and is no clinical guidance.

Tags

memory, tragedy, loss, testimony, family, history, fire, remembrance, conversation, difference, responsibility, fact, source, retelling, uncertainty, agreement, recording, publicity, representation, power, safety, boundaries, forgiveness, hatred, Rolland, literature, reason, ethics, United Wisdom, Maria Method, practice

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 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.