


UNITED WISDOM

# Rights, Obligations, and the Good We Do Beyond Duty

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-14-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# Rights, Obligations, and the Good We Do Beyond Duty

## Epigraph

> *Virtue is the strength of the man's maxim in his obedience to duty.*

Immanuel Kant, The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics, Introduction, IX; translated by Thomas Kingsmill Abbott. Kant is discussing the inner principle of action. The sentence does not grant other people a right to demand any sacrifice they choose.

## What this article is about

Imagine an ordinary situation. Irina has agreed to buy groceries twice a week for an elderly neighbour. A month later, the neighbour asks her to come every evening, sort out bills, and accompany her to appointments. Irina cares, but she already spends her evenings looking after her own child. Someone says that a good person would never refuse. The original help seems to have become an obligation with no clear limit.

Several questions need separating. What can the neighbour legitimately expect under their agreement? What did Irina actually promise? What help deserves appreciation while remaining a freely chosen additional act? Can a particular refusal be permissible without implying indifference to another person's needs? These questions reach beyond a simple opposition between selfishness and self-sacrifice.

This article considers a right to demand something, a definite obligation, a general duty to help, and goodness beyond a particular duty. We will examine when a boundary protects someone and when it becomes a convenient escape. Philosophical and religious texts offer different perspectives; the practical conclusions remain our own reasoning about everyday relationships. This is neither a legal determination of obligations nor a test of a person's moral worth.



@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

## I. A request does not yet establish a right to demand

The first distinction concerns the basis on which one person approaches another. Someone can ask for help, hope for it, and consider it especially desirable. This does not yet establish that the person approached must provide exactly the requested amount. Irina can acknowledge her neighbour's need without agreeing to every additional evening. Recognising someone's difficulty and accepting a particular task are different actions. When they are merged, any expression of sympathy starts to sound like a promise of unlimited involvement.

In our hypothetical situation, there is an established agreement: buying groceries twice a week. It gives the neighbour a reason to expect that particular help while the agreement remains in force. She can ask why Irina missed an agreed day. But grocery shopping does not automatically create an obligation to sort out bills or handle every practical problem. An additional request expands the discussion. It can be accepted, adjusted, or declined while responsibility for the existing promise remains. The boundary becomes specific rather than arbitrary.

In Chapter V of Utilitarianism, John Stuart Mill connects duties of perfect obligation with another person's corresponding right; other moral duties do not create that particular claim. This is a philosophical distinction within his theory, rather than an account of current legislation. It gives us a useful question: is there a specific person entitled to specific performance, or are we discussing a generally desirable direction of conduct? The answer depends on promises and relationships, not simply on how strongly the request is made.

The opposite mistake is possible too. Irina should not label every inconvenient request optional merely because fulfilling it feels unpleasant. She may have previously agreed to accompany someone, received money for purchases, or accepted possessions for safekeeping. These facts supply further grounds of responsibility. The claim that we owe nobody anything conceals real grounds as readily as demands for limitless sacrifice invent nonexistent ones. Useful clarity begins with the actual content of the relationship: what was entrusted, accepted, promised, and to whom.

## II. An obligation does not mean the greatest possible effort

When an obligation exists, the next question is what it requires. Keeping a promise does not always mean doing everything a person could theoretically manage. Irina promised purchases on certain days; she did not promise permanent availability. Someone can perform an obligation conscientiously while having a limit on their time. Maximum effort and sufficient performance are different. Without this distinction, every completed step becomes evidence that another step is possible, and the obligation never comes to an end.

Suppose the neighbour asks Irina to buy additional medication that was not previously discussed. Irina needs to clarify the task, her ability to undertake it, and any relevant authority; this article offers no medical advice. She can say that she will buy groceries from the list but cannot handle the new matter now. This does not cancel their agreement. It separates what she has already accepted from what is new. If the agreed shopping list becomes substantially larger, the change deserves discussion, because earlier consent does not necessarily cover every future amount.

In Section VII of Kant's Introduction, an ethical duty directed towards an end leaves latitude in how and how much one does. Kant does not thereby permit abandoning the governing principle. The distinction is limited: a general commitment to helping does not prescribe every individual act of help for every possible recipient. Nor does it coincide exactly with the modern notion of an act beyond duty. We should avoid deriving a more convenient permission from the text than it actually offers.

For Irina, declining one extra evening can be considered alongside her overall participation. If she keeps the agreement, explains her limits beforehand, and accounts honestly for money received, the decision has intelligible grounds. If she repeatedly invokes freedom of choice to avoid any help she has accepted, the phrase becomes an excuse. We are considering actions and obligations rather than assigning a diagnosis to a person. Specificity helps distinguish a reasonable limit from the disappearance of responsibility.

## III. Goodness beyond duty can be appreciated without being appropriated

An additional action can matter morally even when it cannot be demanded. On a free Saturday, Irina helps her neighbour organise papers, although she never promised to do so. It makes a difference, demonstrates attentiveness, and deserves gratitude. But the value of the act does not necessarily create an obligation to repeat it every Saturday. Yesterday's generosity describes yesterday's choice; a new expectation calls for another conversation. Otherwise, appreciation becomes a means of appropriating someone else's time.

An act described as supererogatory is considered good and praiseworthy while remaining beyond what is obligatory under the relevant assessment. Ethical theories draw this boundary differently. Some question whether there can be a morally better action that is nevertheless not required. We therefore cannot present three categories as a universally accepted table for every tradition. Here, the distinction is a working aid for discussing everyday help. It does not decide in advance where each particular action belongs or how substantial an existing obligation may be.

Praise should preserve the freedom of an additional act. Someone can say that the help mattered and was deeply appreciated. A different response—we now know you can do it, so you must—changes the relationship's basis. It turns a good deed into evidence of a future debt. Something similar happens when a person acquires a reputation as the dependable helper and any subsequent limit appears to betray that role. A reputation should not silently replace particular consent and the conditions of involvement.

Yet freedom to undertake an additional act does not eliminate responsibility for its consequences. If Irina takes the papers and promises to return them tomorrow, the new promise matters. The beginning was voluntary, but entrusted possessions and spoken commitments create a relationship that cannot simply disappear. Goodness beyond the original duty can generate a definite obligation while the act is being carried out. It helps to separate the freedom to begin, responsibility for the method chosen, and agreement about future involvement. These questions concern different moments.

## IV. General care does not vanish with a particular refusal

A permissible refusal of a specific request does not mean that another person's needs cease to matter. Irina can decline daily visits while discussing more carefully what she can provide. Perhaps the neighbour needs a different way to arrange shopping, greater opportunity to choose items herself, or help from several people. But Irina does not have to guarantee replacements for everything she declines. Her participation has limits. Care can appear in the honesty of those limits as well as in fulfilling a request.

An appealing but unreliable compensation is easy to offer here. Someone says they will find another helper, although they have no intention of doing so and know of no suitable options. The promise makes the conversation easier for a moment while moving the problem into the future. A precise refusal can be more considerate than a vague assurance. One can name an available action: sharing a contact with that person's permission, passing on checked information, or discussing the shopping list. If none is available, uncertainty is better preserved than filled with invented reassurance.

In Kant's discussion of the happiness of others, people themselves determine what they regard as their well-being. This philosophical point limits the temptation to decide on the neighbour's behalf what help she needs. Irina can offer another method without presenting it as compulsory for its recipient. The neighbour may not want the new arrangement. Her refusal does not make Irina's offer meaningless; it shows that the offer and the need do not match. What remains is to state what is available honestly, without treating an unachieved agreement as settled.

The difference between a particular duty and general care matters especially after a refusal. A long justification is unnecessary as proof of one's goodness. Irina can confirm what remains: the agreed shopping and willingness to discuss changes within her capacity. She can acknowledge the inconvenience to her neighbour too. Recognising a consequence does not mean agreeing to repair it at any cost. There are still two people with their own responsibilities. Clarity helps prevent one of them from becoming solely responsible for the entire situation.

## V. When need changes the weight of a decision

Requests differ. An extra journey for convenience and a request involving immediate serious danger raise different questions. This article concerns ordinary relationships of help; it does not establish emergency procedures or professional obligations. Even in everyday situations, urgency, the gravity of possible harm, and the availability of alternatives matter. The question cannot be settled by saying that something was never promised without examining what is happening. A boundary calls for substantive assessment rather than an automatic answer.

Imagine two versions of our situation. In one, the neighbour wants another shopping trip for a different brand of biscuits. In the other, the agreed purchase turns out to be her only available food until tomorrow. These circumstances might change Irina's decision even though the agreement has not expanded. Limits on knowledge matter as well: she can clarify the need without presuming either manipulation or complete helplessness. A brief check can sometimes change the request's meaning. It does not require an investigation into every everyday difficulty.

In the Gospel's parable of the Samaritan, Luke 10:25–37, help reaches someone in serious distress beyond familiar closeness. It is a religious narrative about mercy and neighbourliness, rather than an algorithm for allocating every obligation. Its relevant challenge to our situation is that the absence of a prior agreement does not exhaust the moral question. Yet it cannot establish that one passer-by must permanently take responsibility for all future needs of every person encountered.

When considering need, it helps to distinguish changing one's own decision from declaring a universal obligation. Irina can freely do more today because she has recognised unusual circumstances. This does not establish that every refusal by every person in an outwardly similar situation is equally blameworthy. Capacities, information, and other commitments differ. Demanding identical sacrifices from people with different resources and calling it equality misses this difference. Another person's serious need deserves attention; it does not give observers complete knowledge of the cost of helping for a particular person.

## VI. Gratitude is not payment in submission

Help changes relationships without necessarily creating an indefinite debt of gratitude. The neighbour can appreciate Irina and still want a different shopping list. Irina can welcome kind words while declining another request. Gratitude recognises what was received; it should not remove someone's voice in what happens next. When a helper uses a previous action to justify controlling another person's choices, the value of the help becomes mixed with a demand for submission. The conversation then concerns more than the original service.

Suppose Irina requires her neighbour to let her decide what the neighbour should eat and whom she should meet. This claim does not follow from buying groceries. Participation can have conditions, particularly concerning expenses and time, but they need to be stated before agreement and related to the task. Explaining that Irina cannot pay for purchases from her own budget concerns her resources. Requiring a change of friends as proof of gratitude concerns someone else's life and would need a different justification.

The reverse problem also occurs. A recipient can assume that expressed gratitude makes an agreed repayment or accounting for entrusted money unnecessary. But appreciation does not substitute for definite performance. If the neighbour gives Irina money for purchases, Irina must handle it for the agreed purpose. If Irina lends money, the matter of repayment cannot dissolve into general goodwill. This article does not determine the legal force of such agreements. It explains why an emotional assessment of a relationship does not make its specific agreements irrelevant.

In Analects IV.16, attention to what is right is contrasted with attention to gain. This historical Confucian perspective does not coincide with modern autonomy among equal participants. It can nevertheless prompt a question: has an action presented as good become a way to secure a convenient advantage? We are not attributing our analysis of neighbouring households to Confucius. The comparison is limited to motive and gain. The boundaries of help are justified separately here through consent, agreed content, and consequences for both people.

## VII. A refusal can be spoken without a verdict on someone

A precise boundary is often lost in how it is communicated. Irina might say that her neighbour is too demanding and appreciates nothing. This claim about a person reaches beyond a description of additional requests. Alternatively, she can say that she can buy groceries twice a week but cannot come every evening. The second statement makes the matter clear. It does not guarantee a calm response, but it leaves less room for arguments about presumed hidden motives. The boundary is expressed as a decision and an available amount of involvement.

There is no need to present the refusal as a gift to the neighbour or insist that it must benefit her independence. Irina may not know that. Her own commitments and resources can provide an honest basis for a limit. Sometimes the claim that a refusal is for someone's development conceals an uncomfortable truth: a person no longer wants or can manage the involvement. Direct communication can be kinder when it does not claim authority to explain another person's entire life. The neighbour can assess the refusal differently without automatically invalidating the boundary.

A limit can be communicated in advance while preserving what has already been accepted. For example, shopping might continue until the end of the month, followed by a new conversation. If this date changes an existing agreement, it should be named as a change rather than described as what was always understood. Ending help can inconvenience someone who has come to rely on it. That consequence deserves attention. Attention, however, does not mean indefinite continuation: warning, completion of the current promise, and honest handover of entrusted responsibilities may be possible.

Finally, a refusal should not require an endless moral examination of both parties. Irina can explain her reasons once and clarify a specific question if there has been a misunderstanding. Her neighbour is allowed to be upset without thereby becoming manipulative. Irina is allowed a limit without thereby becoming heartless. These permissions do not establish the correctness of every act, but they protect the conversation from a total assessment of character. What can be discussed is what actually changed: frequency, content, timing, money, the remaining promise, and available next actions.

## VIII. Do not turn a distinction into permission for indifference

A table of obligations helps only while it supports attention to relationships. One can swiftly place every request in the optional category and stop noticing anything else. This defeats the distinction's purpose. The question is how real grounds operate and what choice follows from them. Sometimes clarification leads someone to do more. Sometimes it reveals a larger promise than they remembered. Sometimes it supports continuing limited help without accepting further involvement. The distinction should make these different conclusions possible.

Irina can check whether she treats grounds consistently when asking for help and responding to a request. If her own expectation automatically seems a right while another person's always seems a mere wish, the distinction is being applied selectively. This check does not require symmetry in every circumstance: relationships and promises can differ. It requires honest description. The same fact of an accepted agreement should not be treated as significant for someone else and insignificant for oneself without explaining a relevant difference in circumstances.

There is also an opposite escape: declaring every good action obligatory to avoid the uncertainty of choice. Then a person only obeys an endless demand. Yet an opportunity to do something good does not always establish a duty to do that particular thing now. Choosing between useful actions requires acknowledging limits. Irina has a child, work, and needs of her own. They do not automatically matter less because the neighbour's request is louder or accompanied by a moral accusation. Responsibility includes recognising these other commitments accurately.

We can return to the opening situation with a more precise response. Irina keeps the agreed shopping, separately declines daily visits, and remains open to discussing a particular additional task. Her neighbour can ask and be dissatisfied, but the request does not rewrite another person's consent. Extra help can remain valuable without becoming a lifelong assignment. Moral clarity here consists in preserving actual obligations and the freedom of a new act. It does not remove every inconvenience. It does avoid making the disappearance of one's boundaries the price of sympathy.

## What this means in practice

Choose one ordinary request in which sympathy and obligation have become mixed. Describe its subject first: what action is wanted, how much of it, by when, and for whom? Separately write down what has already been promised or accepted. Avoid replacing these facts with a general description of yourself as dependable, good, difficult, or selfish. This exercise distinguishes grounds for a particular decision. When a matter concerns law, medicine, or serious danger, this author-designed exercise is insufficient for a specialised decision.

Consider the basis of the other person's expectation. Is it a clear agreement, entrusted money or possessions, a role with defined responsibilities, a general hope for support, or a new request? Categories can overlap. If the agreement's content is unknown, clarify it first. Do not treat uncertainty as the absence of an obligation. Equally, another person's strong emotion does not by itself prove consent to an additional task. Returning to the subject and timing can be more useful than immediately debating anyone's moral character.

Name your available resources alongside existing commitments. You may decide to do more, but the additional action needs a clear limit. If it involves a new deadline, expenses, or the safekeeping of someone's possessions, clarify this before beginning. Freedom to agree does not remove responsibility for a resulting promise. If you decline, explain what remains in force and what changes. Do not promise to find a replacement merely to soften the conversation. That promise too calls for performance or timely reconsideration.

Afterwards, you can check one consequence: whether you understand the remaining agreement in the same way. You do not have to obtain gratitude or persuade someone that

your boundary benefits them. Clearing up a specific misunderstanding is enough if one has arisen. Additional goodness can be valued without demanding repetition. A definite duty can be fulfilled without turning it into the limit of an entire life. Between these actions remains room for care: noticing another person's need, stating one's capacity honestly, and choosing involvement without appropriating their ability to decide.

## Key quotation

> *we have done that which was our duty to do.*

Luke 17:10, concluding clause, King James Version. The religious context concerns service and a claim to merit before God. Here, the quotation brings attention back to actual performance. It does not establish a neighbour's right to demand unlimited help or endorse a modern theory of supererogatory acts.

## Connections between traditions

| Comparison | Similarity and boundary |
|---|---|
| Mill's definite obligation and another person's right / our shopping agreement | Both invite us to name what is owed and to whom. The philosophical theory does not determine the legal force of the hypothetical agreement. |
| Kant's latitude in fulfilling an ethical end / Mill's duties without a definite corresponding right | Both distinguish forms of obligation. Their grounds differ: a Kantian maxim is not derived from utility, and latitude in method does not mean complete release from duty. |
| Luke 10:25–37, mercy towards someone injured / Kant's happiness of others as an end | Another person's need matters beyond the helper's convenience. A Gospel narrative and a philosophical justification of an ethical end remain different teachings. |
| Luke 17:7–10, service without a special claim to merit / voluntary additional help | Both allow reflection on the basis of praise. The verse does not affirm the category of optional action beyond duty; this is precisely the comparison's limit. |
| Analects IV.16, right and gain / the handling of gratitude | Both invite scrutiny of whether help becomes a way to gain advantage. Historical Confucian roles do not establish modern rules of consent between neighbours. |

## Primary sources

• Immanuel Kant. The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics, Thomas Kingsmill Abbott translation, Project Gutenberg 5684. Selected Introduction sections VII, VIII(2), IX, and the context defining others' happiness were read. A philosophical primary text on obligation and ethical ends; no empirical validation of the exercise. The page's heading date of 1780 is not used as the date of The Metaphysics of Morals. The brief epigraph follows the checked translation.

• John Stuart Mill. Utilitarianism, Chapter V, Project Gutenberg 11224. Selected discussions of impartiality and passages on perfect and imperfect duties, rights, and justice were read. A historical philosophical theory, rather than legal advice or a universal ethical consensus.

• The Gospel according to Luke, King James Version, Wikisource. Luke 10:25–37 and 17:7–10 were read with context. A religious primary text; the key quotation is the concluding clause of 17:10. The legal status of this particular reproduction outside the United States is not declared established.

• Confucius. The Analects, IV.16, James Legge translation, Project Gutenberg 3330. Selected context IV.15–26 was read. The distinction between right and gain is used; historical hierarchical requirements are not transferred into the reader's practice. Paraphrase without importing the full text.

## Tags

rights, obligation, duty, help, care, promise, agreement, consent, boundary, request, expectation, gratitude, generosity, autonomy, responsibility, performance, choice, morality, justice, mercy, virtue, supererogation, resources, neighbours, Kant, Mill, Confucius, Gospel of Luke

## 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.