

UNITED WISDOM

Coercion, necessity, and responsibility for an action

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-01-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Coercion, necessity, and responsibility for an action

Epigraph

> *“The apparently lesser evil.”*

Samuel Pufendorf, *On the Duty of Man and Citizen*, Book I, Chapter I, §16, paragraph on mixed actions. A short fragment from Frank Gardner Moore’s English translation. It concerns what appeared preferable to the person in an emergency, not a finding that the decision was harmless. Primary context.

What this article is about

The word choice sometimes describes very different situations. Someone may prefer a convenient option among several, accept an unpleasant responsibility for an important undertaking, or act under a threat they cannot safely remove. An action is visible in each case, but an identical outward form does not yet disclose identical freedom. When discussing responsibility, it matters to distinguish what happened, available alternatives, the cost of refusal, and who created the constraint.

This article asks a philosophical question rather than establishing legal culpability: how can we discuss someone’s action without erasing either coercion or the remaining space for decision? Pufendorf will be our historical interlocutor; the contemporary situations here are deliberately invented and hypothetical. We will consider physical force, threat, necessity, and inconvenience as different subjects, then distinguish assessing the past from an available next step. The closing exercise is voluntary and suitable only for a small, safe situation. A person under threat need not prove freedom through resistance, disclose what they experienced, or turn danger into a lesson in moral growth.

I. Describing an action does not yet explain its conditions

Begin with a hypothetical case. A participant handed a document to someone else. The description is true but incomplete: the document could have been handed over on their own initiative, under an understood agreement, following a persistent request, or under an immediate threat. The movement of a hand cannot establish their attitude toward every option. Discussing responsibility requires asking not only about the final event but also how the possibility of acting differently arose. This distinction belongs to the assessment’s subject itself, rather than being an additional excuse after a verdict has already been delivered.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Conditions should not be guessed from facial expression or the confidence of an account, however. A calm voice does not itself prove willingness, and visible agitation does not determine its cause. A more precise description can be retained: the transfer happened, while information about available paths remains incomplete. This neither cancels the event nor declares every explanation true in advance. It leaves room for significant facts without which a general conclusion about freedom would be premature. Sometimes those facts remain insufficient even after a conversation; uncertainty then remains part of an honest conclusion.

It also matters to distinguish an action from endorsement. Someone may carry out what they do not consider good if they see only an even more difficult alternative. Another person may support the intention without taking part in execution. Neither should automatically be treated as the other. In the hypothetical example, handing over the document does not necessarily mean sharing every purpose of its recipient. Yet a lack of endorsement does not automatically establish that there was no choice at all. Sequential reasoning begins here: establish the event, learn the significant conditions, distinguish participation from attitude, and acknowledge what is unknown. Only then can a particular contribution be discussed rather than a general label for the person. This sequence does not promise a convenient answer; it protects the question from replacing an observed act with presumed complete consent.

II. Physical force differs from deciding under pressure

If someone directly uses another person’s body as an instrument of action, that differs from a situation in which the person still makes a decision, even under severe pressure. Imagine two hypothetical scenes without details of violence. In the first, a stronger person physically moves another’s hand. In the second, they threaten a grave consequence while demanding a particular act. The outward result may be the same, but the mechanism differs. In the first description, bodily participation does not establish ownership of the intention; in the second, the threat and the actual availability of refusal need consideration. Coercion remains significant in both, and the distinction does not make a threat insignificant.

This distinction requires no examination in visible resistance. An absence of resistance known to an observer is not, by itself, sufficient evidence of safe, freely given consent. That is a limit to inference rather than a diagnosis of the harmed person’s condition. Historical ideas about which outward signs must accompany coercion cannot be imposed on every person as a requirement to prove their experience. One scene does not disclose all the conditions. Requiring a dangerous refusal to make an account convincing would add a new cost precisely to the person whose space is already constrained.

The distinction also matters for the responsibility of whoever creates pressure. The person who formed the dangerous situation does not disappear from its description after another’s act. Yet we need not establish every legal consequence in advance or call every strict request

a threat. That is a different level of work with specific facts and applicable rules. Here it is enough to preserve the philosophical subject: an outwardly performed act does not prove that the person freely chose all its conditions. When circumstances require separate examination, a general moral slogan should not replace it. Precision begins by acknowledging that forced bodily control, responding to a threat, and ordinary fulfilment of a responsibility call for different questions. Respecting that distinction does not require the harmed person immediately to explain or assess themselves.

III. A threat changes the cost of refusal

A threat matters not merely as an unpleasant statement but as a change in the anticipated cost of a particular response. In a hypothetical project, someone is asked to do additional work. They may freely decline if the offer really permits that answer. The situation changes when refusal is connected to a grave consequence the person making the request can cause. Outward agreement then cannot be described in the same terms as agreement to an understood voluntary request. Not every risk equals immediate coercion, but risk cannot be considered absent merely because someone nevertheless answered yes.

Discussion requires specificity. What exactly was made dependent on the answer? Who could cause the consequence? Was another path accessible, how much time remained, and what information was known? These questions are listed here as boundaries of reasoning rather than a mandatory procedure for questioning a harmed person. In a small, safe situation, someone may choose one significant question. Under continuing danger, reflection does not require arguing with the person making threats or experimenting with their readiness to carry them out. The possibility of analysis does not imply a duty immediately to gather proof of one’s position.

At the same time, a grave cost does not let us mechanically describe every subsequent action with one word. Sometimes a threat concerns only a particular response while a limited possibility remains to choose the time, means of transfer, or an available intermediary. Sometimes no such possibility exists. Preserving the distinction means neither demanding complete freedom where it was absent nor assuming a complete absence of every decision without knowing the situation. This is not a symmetrical contest about who is more to blame. It is an attempt to retain the actual extent of action. An available small fork does not justify a threat created by someone else; the threat itself does not disclose precisely which forks existed. The constraint needs describing first, before discussing what remained possible.

IV. Necessity does not always have an author

A constraint can arise without someone deliberately forcing another person. Suppose a room unexpectedly becomes unavailable in a hypothetical shared undertaking. The meeting must be cancelled, its format changed, or it must take place under less suitable conditions. No path matches the original wish, but that does not yet prove someone’s coercion. Necessity arising from the circumstances is at work here. A question about available paths should not be replaced by blaming an unknown culprit. At the same time, the absence of intentional pressure does not make every remaining option good or equally costly.

Someone may retain a decision among unfavourable alternatives. They choose not the desired option in general but what they consider permissible now. Such a choice cannot be called free of constraints; neither can it be described as the person automatically disappearing from the action. They can discuss consequences, consider others, and prefer to stop. Yet their response should be assessed through the situation in which it arose, rather than an imagined scene with a complete set of resources. If the original conditions are no longer available, remaining faithful to them does not restore the room or create the missing tool.

Necessity should not become a universal name for every difficulty, either. Sometimes a circumstance really cannot be changed in the required time; sometimes it is declared unchangeable without examination; sometimes an available solution requires effort no one has yet been willing to accept. Only a specific examination can distinguish these. An organizer may legitimately have limits, but those need naming: a deadline, a missing resource, or a commitment to third parties. A statement of inevitability without content closes the question before consideration. A more precise acknowledgement shows what is accepted as fact, what is a preference, and what remains unknown. It does not guarantee another option, but it prevents an inadequately explained arrangement from becoming a supposed natural law. A person retains the possibility of thinking about the particular situation even when the desired outcome is unavailable.

V. The historical source helps pose a limited question

In Book I, Chapter I, Pufendorf connects discussing responsibility with what lay within a person’s capacity to act. In §16 he distinguishes direct compulsion from choosing an unpleasant path under necessity, while §23 considers the limit of capacity with a qualification concerning impossibility previously created by the person. This is a limited reading of seventeenth-century natural-law philosophy. It does not establish contemporary legal rules, investigate responses to danger, or verify our hypothetical scenes.

We value a question that can be placed beside this argument: which particular action really was available, and who formed the condition? The answer must remain specific. One general

idea cannot establish a duty to overcome any threat through strength of character. The historical text has its own religious foundations and views of human qualities. They do not become contemporary psychology because a philosophical question remains significant. In particular, a description of outward resistance must not become a universal duty imposed on a harmed person or proof that consent was free when such a sign was absent.

The qualification concerning previously created impossibility also calls for careful independent consideration. In a hypothetical project, someone could have promised to supply material and then made it inaccessible themselves; lost access for an unknown reason; or never possessed it. These are different descriptions rather than three degrees of one character trait. Present impossibility does not erase the promise's history, but a past promise does not create a resource now. An earlier action can be discussed separately from what can no longer be done. This question preserves responsibility without demanding the impossible. It also does not allow an observer to invent earlier carelessness to avoid considering the present constraint. The source serves as a historical interlocutor; the boundaries of contemporary examples and conclusions remain the authors'. We do not declare the text a ready solution to every difficult case.

Such limited reading leaves room to disagree with the source. Respecting a historical interlocutor does not mean repeating every assessment. We can clearly name the question being used and separately state a contemporary authorial boundary. A dispute about attribution, for example, must not become a demand that a harmed person immediately recount everything, while their silence becomes proof that there was no threat. Someone may not wish to discuss the event with this listener. The listener then lacks sufficient grounds for a complete conclusion. Acknowledging this limit preserves both the seriousness of the event and the other person's right to decide their participation in a conversation. Reasoning remains open to facts but does not appropriate them where they have not been provided.

VI. Choosing a less difficult path does not make it good

Under constraints, a person may choose what appears to cause less harm. This does not imply that harm disappeared, that the decision was fully endorsed, or that the result proved the best of all possible outcomes. The assessment occurred with particular information and time. In the hypothetical situation of a cancelled meeting, a brief message may be preferred to an unprepared group conversation. The message may leave some questions open. The chosen path remains a limited way to avoid a more serious difficulty, rather than proof that everyone became comfortable.

It therefore helps to distinguish preference under those conditions from a personal goal outside them. Someone may agree to a temporary arrangement they do not wish to retain later. If a resource subsequently appears, a new discussion does not necessarily express

inconsistency. The situation to which the decision applied has changed. A temporary concession does not become indefinite permission to impose the same cost. The participant may nevertheless have specific commitments, and reconsidering them affects others. Consent for a limited period should be described accordingly, so that complete loyalty is not later demanded through endless repetition of an inconvenient action.

This distinction does not remove the question of consequences for third parties. One person’s unfavourable choice may affect another who took no part in creating the difficulty. Their experience should not be declared insignificant merely because the decision seemed compelled. Harm can be acknowledged while preserving the question of the acting person’s freedom. These are two subjects capable of existing together. Acknowledging harm is not a general verdict on someone’s whole person; limited freedom is not an absence of all concern for consequences. Sometimes only a small later contribution is available, sometimes a separate decision is needed, and sometimes information is insufficient. We obtain no ready formula. We do, however, retain the possibility of discussing what happened and available conditions without turning one person into the final explanation for the whole event.

VII. Ordinary inconvenience should not automatically be called coercion

Preserving the significance of a threat requires distinguishing it from the ordinary cost of an agreed action. Work can take time, a conversation can require attention, and an accepted responsibility can limit the next choice. Unpleasant effort alone does not prove that a decision was taken away. Imagine a hypothetical agreement: a participant earlier consented to prepare a short text by a particular date, understood its scope, and had access to material. Later they wish to do something else. The wish matters but does not automatically rewrite the original conditions. The question now concerns reconsidering a promise rather than necessarily being coerced when it was accepted.

The word ordinary nevertheless must not conceal an unknown grave cost. For one person an action fits available resources; for another it conflicts with an important commitment. The extent of constraint cannot be determined from our own schedule. We need precisely the conditions that change a response’s availability. Personal inconvenience can be a reason to decline a new offer even if it is not called coercion. Someone need not first prove danger to have the right to decline a voluntary request. Distinguishing kinds of constraint preserves that right too: refusal is possible without turning every unwillingness into an account of a threat.

The extent of inference matters. If an agreement had understandable conditions, that does not prove unconditional freedom in every other respect. If pressure was discovered, it does not mean every involvement in the same undertaking now has an identical character. A particular

request, an earlier commitment, and a new demand can be separated. That description is more useful than a general argument about whether someone was free at all. It allows the specific cost of reconsideration to be discussed, boundaries to be maintained, and what had already been accepted to be acknowledged. Responsibility remains connected to actions over time rather than an unchanging label. We do not promise an easy conversation, but we reduce the chance of distinct events being quietly combined under one convenient word.

VIII. Responsibility for creating a constraint remains a separate question

When someone creates a grave cost for another person’s refusal, their participation cannot dissolve into the other’s final response. In a hypothetical project, a supervisor could make an unexpected demand, knowing a resource was unavailable, then describe non-completion as the participant’s personal lack of organization. Even if small actions remained available to the latter, this does not remove the role of the person setting conditions. The question of personal contribution and that of how the demand was arranged exist simultaneously. Otherwise we would notice only the person at the chain’s end while leaving the decisions that determined the chain unexamined.

Different people’s participation should not be turned into identical responsibility by default, however. One set the rule, another transmitted information, a third performed an available part, and a fourth did not know about the change. Each question requires its own information about action and possibility. Membership in a shared organization does not itself explain a role. Likewise, lacking complete authority does not establish a complete absence of contribution. In a small, safe situation, particulars can be named: what was assigned, who changed it, who knew, and which part remained available. This is an authorial aid to clarity, not a universal investigation protocol.

Precise separation of questions also protects those who want to help. A helper need not promise to remove a constraint created by someone else; the participant need not accept every proposed exit. Sometimes help concerns information, sometimes a change to the procedure, and sometimes merely not adding another demand. Such limited help cannot be considered proof of indifference, yet neither can it be declared a sufficient solution without examination. The promise’s boundary matters: which contribution is real now, and which conditions depend on someone else? This reciprocity does not cancel differences in authority and the cost of refusal. It allows discussion of one’s role without appropriating another’s decision or assigning the harmed person sole responsibility to repair the entire arrangement that constrained their action.

IX. Later knowledge should not quietly replace earlier knowledge

After an event, a solution previously unknown often becomes visible. Another room, an available tool, or a participant willing to help may be discovered. This is useful knowledge for the next step, but it does not itself prove that the earlier person knew and could use that path. Assessment requires distinguishing a possibility's existence in general from its availability at the necessary moment. In the hypothetical situation, an alternative room existed, but information about it arrived after the meeting was cancelled. A future plan can be improved without declaring the past decision senseless merely because of new information.

At the same time, earlier ignorance does not justify declining every reasonable clarification in advance. Sometimes a person really had an accessible question that could change the decision; sometimes there was neither time nor a safe way to ask. These again are different circumstances. They cannot be assessed through one statement that someone could always have found out. What is established can be noted: which information was supplied, what was missing, and which inquiry remained possible. Where information is incomplete, the conclusion must retain its limitations too. What is unknown does not become proven carelessness because a simple cause is desired.

The distinction also matters in relating to oneself. Later clarity may help prepare another response, but it does not require replaying a dangerous episode as though today's map of possibilities had existed then. Examining the past may be postponed or not undertaken alone. In a small, safe case, one transition is enough: a condition is now known, and it changes the next promise. Someone may acknowledge an error, a constraint, or remaining uncertainty without a general conclusion about their worth. Responsibility in this description concerns particular acts rather than endlessly examining whether someone was strong enough. New knowledge becomes a resource for a future decision; it need not become an instrument for condemning the person who acted under different conditions.

X. A next step is not a final verdict

We have distinguished the event, the form of pressure, existing alternatives, their cost, and when information appeared. A limited question about further action can now be asked. What really lies within an available step: communicate a change, decline a new demand, clarify a condition, acknowledge particular harm, or discuss nothing for now? The list does not exhaust possibilities or require an immediate choice. It separates preparing a next action from a duty first to settle the whole history of moral responsibility. Sometimes detailed examination is needed separately, but it should not artificially close an already available small possibility.

No next step proves that the earlier constraint has disappeared. Someone may explain the situation and receive a refusal; acknowledge consequences while lacking a means to restore

everything; or state a boundary and encounter new pressure. The practical question therefore contains no promise of safety or successful agreement. Under danger, we do not propose testing someone else's reaction to resistance. In an ordinary small agreement, one available action can be considered with its consequences and one's right to stop. The possibility of acting within limits retains significance even without a guaranteed desired outcome.

Ultimately, responsibility becomes more precise when it requires neither complete power over circumstances nor the person's complete disappearance behind them. Someone may be affected by coercion and still have a separate small choice; may themselves create a constraint and answer for that part of the history; or may encounter necessity without an intentional author. We do not reduce these situations to one assessment. Distinguishing them permits acknowledgement of harm, preservation of a threat's significance, refusal to demand the impossible, and discussion of a particular contribution. Rejecting a general verdict does not cancel responsibility. It returns responsibility to actions, time, information, and available conditions. There we can seek the extent of a personal next step without requiring someone to prove their right to respect through a dangerous or inaccessible act.

What this means in practice

If you wish, consider one small, safe agreement that still allows clarification. Do not use this trial for threats, violence, or a painful examination of experienced coercion. There is no need to disclose private information, record someone else's statements, or test their readiness to carry out a threat. You may write nothing down and stop at any time.

Name only the established action and one condition that changes a response's availability. Distinguish the ordinary cost of effort from an inaccessible resource; if information is insufficient, retain it as unknown. Then ask whether one step is available now without requiring dangerous resistance or another person's unlimited assistance. The answer may be clarification, a limited promise, a pause, or refusal of new involvement.

If an earlier promise affects someone else, consider this in reconsideration where possible. A possible warning does not guarantee agreement or a convenient exit. The trial establishes no culpability and measures no moral maturity. Its purpose is only not to confuse the event, the conditions, and the next step. The right not to conduct the exercise remains; discovering a difficulty does not oblige someone to continue in order to prove personal strength.

Key quotation

> *"Things which exceed his powers."*

Pufendorf, *On the Duty of Man and Citizen*, Book I, Chapter I, §23, first sentence. A short fragment from Moore's translation. The following qualification concerns capacity previously

lost through one's own fault; it does not permit inventing such a history where circumstances are unknown. Complete paragraph.

Connections between traditions

In Book III of the Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle considers action in difficult circumstances and its relation to a particular moment. Pufendorf discusses attribution within natural-law theory. The shared limited question concerns how conditions relate to ownership of an action; ancient ethics and early modern legal philosophy are not declared an identical system or an applicable contemporary legal standard.

The nearest complete UW:A02 article considers a Stoic attitude to personal response and what is external. Here the subject differs: who created a constraint, which response was available, and at what cost? UW:A-01-N01 separately considers alternatives' feasibility before consent. Comparison does not turn coercion into a duty of inner growth or permit treating someone as the sole author of the situation imposed upon them.

Sources

1. Samuel Pufendorf. *De officio hominis et civis* (1673), *On the Duty of Man and Citizen*. Frank Gardner Moore's English translation,1927; Constitution.org identifies a1964 reprint and a1682 Latin basis. Book I, Chapter I, §§1–27 was read in full. The two short quotation roles occur in §§16 and23. The Russian reader fragments were translated by the authors from this English version. No reading of the whole book or Latin original, or application of historical rules as current law, is claimed.

2. Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book III, Chapters I–II. English translation by D. P. Chase, introduction by J. A. Smith; Gutenberg8438. The selected continuous context concerning actions under difficult circumstances and choice was read. It is used for limited comparison without new direct quotation. Ancient requirements of endurance are not imposed on a harmed person as a duty to take risks.

Tags

coercion, necessity, responsibility, action, choice, threat, constraint, freedom to respond, Pufendorf, natural law, Aristotle, history of philosophy, cost of refusal, physical force, available alternatives, lesser evil, information, time, possibility, impossibility, promise, reconsideration, ownership, role, consequences, boundaries, right to stop, hypothetical example, next step, respect

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, unity between 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.