

UNITED WISDOM

Duties to Those Close to Us and Fairness towards Strangers

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-16-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Duties to Those Close to Us and Fairness towards Strangers

Epigraph

> *Thou shalt love him as thyself.*

Leviticus 19:34, short fragment concerning a stranger, King James Version. The verse connects treatment of a stranger living among the people to remembrance of Egypt and the LORD, rather than a contemporary assistance-allocation regulation.

What this article is about

In a hypothetical scene, Pavel volunteers for a small fund paying for journeys to important everyday appointments. He receives applications and helps arrange their order. His mother also needs a journey, while funds cannot cover every request. He wants to move her application ahead: he knows her circumstances better than strangers' situations. Yet the fund agreed to consider urgency and absence of other transport, rather than familial acquaintance. Pavel feels a duty towards his mother while understanding that the resources are not entirely his own.

The dilemma does not make closeness itself suspect. Relationships create particular expectations, promises and care. Special involvement with someone close does not automatically permit changing a shared resource's conditions at strangers' expense. This article distinguishes personal help, an accepted stewardship role and equal consideration of significant circumstances. It determines no charity law, assesses no medical urgency and demands no identical feelings for everyone. It asks how to care for one's own person without making unfamiliarity grounds for worse treatment, or hiding behind impartiality to abandon already accepted personal responsibility. The scene preserves both duties instead of making one disappear through a convenient general formula.

I. A Particular Bond Has Grounds but Not Every Power

Pavel has known his mother for years and may have specific obligations: driving her, helping apply or discussing costs. These differ from general goodwill towards anyone. A promised journey links personal closeness with accepted action. Equal human significance cannot simply cancel a promise without considering her reliance. Yet the relationship does not determine which resource fulfils the obligation. One may owe help without being entitled to take money entrusted for another agreed purpose.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Distinguish Pavel's three roles: son, volunteer and temporary participant in fund allocation. As a son, he can spend his own time and money within capacity. As a volunteer, he performs agreed work. As an allocator, he makes decisions affecting applicants. These roles may support or conflict with one another. Moving his mother ahead solely as a son still happens within a queue he controls as an allocator. He cannot change a role's moral basis at a convenient moment while retaining its powers.

Understanding need differs from permission to grant priority. Pavel knows why his mother cannot use a bus. That knowledge may help present her application accurately. It does not establish that others need less. Their situations may be equally serious and merely less familiar to him. Obtain comparable information relevant to the accepted criterion without demanding excessive disclosure. Closeness grants access to information, rather than entitlement to treat absent information about others as absent need.

Relationships also involve expectations not all accepted. His mother may hope her son will somehow solve the matter through the fund. That hope deserves conversation without becoming permission to control others' donations. Pavel can recognise her need and state his role's limit without cold distance. He can seek personal help while preserving shared conditions. Responsibility becomes more precise where a particular bond is acknowledged without automatically extending its weight to every power a person possesses in another capacity.

II. Personal and Entrusted Resources Differ

Paying from his own money may give Pavel stronger grounds to prefer his mother to an incidental applicant. Such preference is not automatically unfair. There is a relationship history and possibly a promise. Ownership does not remove every moral question: helping one person can leave another accepted obligation unfulfilled. Nevertheless, the initial subject differs from allocating a shared fund. Fund money comes with purposes and conditions that cannot be replaced by an allocator's personal wish. Closeness should be considered within a resource's nature rather than a detached formula about whom always to love first.

Utilitarianism V explicitly distinguishes preference to family and friends in good offices from impartiality concerning rights and a decision's proper grounds. This does not erase Mill's utilitarian framework or make him defend every family privilege. The comparison is specific: relationships may matter to personal help without becoming appropriate grounds for every allocation. Ask which considerations should influence this case. The article derives no ready-made fund rules or contemporary legal entitlement for applicants from the passage.

Entrusted resources include more than money. Pavel controls other volunteers' time, vehicle access and application information. Scheduling his mother's journey outside agreed terms

uses others' participation. His willingness to work extra hours may not compensate: another application may need the vehicle. Consider the real combination of resources and agreements. Personal motivation does not make assistance personal where it needs time, property or consent from people never asked about the new priority.

Clarity helps his mother too. Pavel can explain that her application will receive the same grounds of consideration and that he will organise a personal journey separately if able. Inability should be acknowledged rather than replaced by a concealed privilege. If the fund permits a distinct transparent family-assistance arrangement, it can be discussed as a rule for every eligible case. That differs from quietly moving one relative ahead. Distinguishing resources lets him seek help without making particular care an undisclosed condition of access to a shared good.

III. Equal Consideration Does Not Mean Identical Outcomes

Urgency and absence of other transport can place one application ahead of another. A different result does not by itself violate equality. Examine the criterion's relevance and equal application to comparable circumstances. If his mother's journey genuinely meets a more urgent need, she should not be delayed merely because she is Pavel's relative. Impartiality need not punish someone close to demonstrate honesty. Distinguish an actual criterion from a convenient exception and a conspicuous refusal of fair consideration.

An identical form does not necessarily create identical access. One person easily explains circumstances; another struggles with questions or the interface. Helping complete it can preserve criteria if offered on understandable grounds. This does not presume that every unfamiliar person needs special support or require Pavel to solve access alone. Attend to process: is skill at describing a request mistaken for need's significance? This examination concerns a particular role rather than research proving an allocation method's efficacy.

Leviticus 19:15 connects impartial judgement to refusal to favour poverty or power; 19:33–34 separately addresses a stranger living among the people. These religious precepts retain their historical context rather than establish modern social policy. Limited comparison challenges status as a ready-made decision. Poverty, power, kinship and foreignness cannot replace examination of the subject. Need can still be a significant criterion for this fund. The article does not claim that an ancient verse abolishes every poverty programme; judgement and distribution according to an agreed purpose remain distinct.

Pavel should compare circumstances rather than feelings. He may care more intensely for his mother while following the accepted criterion. He need not manufacture equal emotional closeness to every applicant or reject his feeling to make a decision right. Do not turn the intensity of experience into grounds for shared priority without examination. This is more

modest than promising complete inner impartiality and more concrete: queue decisions can be explained through circumstances applicable to an unfamiliar applicant too.

IV. A Stranger Need Not Earn Visibility

Pavel's mother has a face, voice and history; another application may appear as a few lines. This difference does not establish inevitable unfairness, but raises a question: does a close person's detailed story become the only way to receive attention? The accepted criterion needs particular facts rather than competition between moving biographies. A stranger need not reveal an entire life simply to make need equally tangible to the allocator. Sufficient information should relate to the decision while respecting what the fund does not require.

Leviticus 19:34 connects treatment of a stranger to remembrance of living in a foreign land. This particular religious ground cannot dissolve into a general empathy formula. A limited perspective check applies: what would the process look like if Pavel's family were unfamiliar to its allocator? Could they explain significant need or lose to that person's acquaintances? This change of position establishes no application's urgency. It reveals whether personal-circle membership became a hidden access condition that cannot honestly be stated to others.

Unfamiliarity does not establish greater moral worth either. Someone may consider helping distant people invariably superior to fulfilling an ordinary promise to a relative. Public good can then become a convenient way to leave an unnoticed personal duty behind. Pavel may volunteer actively while forgetting promised accompaniment for his mother. Fairness to strangers does not eliminate a son's particular obligation. Examine both actions in their respective resources and limits. Universal concern should not become an elevated description of avoiding conversation about a relative's reasonable reliance.

Two checks follow. Am I favouring someone close through an entrusted resource contrary to its terms? Am I abandoning my promise to someone close behind general fairness? Answers may require reduced volunteering or agreed help from others. Personal resources may be exhausted, requiring honest revision of a promise. Everyone's satisfaction is not guaranteed. Decision quality depends on neither stranger nor relative disappearing behind Pavel's convenient identity as a fair allocator or caring son.

V. Traditions Understand Relationships Differently

Enchiridion XXX derives duties from relationships including father, brother, neighbour and citizen. Its Stoic framework concerns a will conforming to nature and includes obedience that cannot automatically transfer to modern relationships. It especially cannot demand endurance of every harm or blame those harmed. The limited relevance is that moral questions arise through particular relationships, beyond identical treatment of abstract people. The article's present-day limits on authority are not attributed to the source itself.

Analects IV.18 permits gentle remonstrance with parents while preserving reverence. This differs from contemporary adult autonomy and resolves no fund allocation. It expresses a relationship where disagreement and connection do not exclude each other. If Pavel's mother requests priority, care need not mean compliance. He can explain the restriction and seek another route. This editorial conclusion is not offered as complete interpretation of Confucian filial piety. Historical hierarchy remains different, while the modern scene is examined through agreed resources on its own grounds.

Mill explains impartiality through a decision's proper grounds and general utility; Leviticus connects judgement and strangers to God and communal memory. These grounds cannot merge into one theory invariably prescribing one queue. Comparison reveals questions of role, fair grounds, particular ties and the significance of unfamiliar people. The closing table establishes no universal agreement. It identifies limits of each transfer and leaves participants responsible for grounding a modern allocation rule.

Pavel cannot dismiss responsibility through whichever quotation is convenient today. Using a son's Stoic role to justify privilege, then impartiality to refuse his mother tomorrow, is no consistent engagement with traditions. Decisions need actual subjects and honest treatment of their grounds. A particular obligation can remain, shared resources can have limits and unfamiliar need can matter simultaneously. Tension may persist. Moral work avoids destroying one side for an attractive formula or declaring complexity permission for concealed action.

VI. An Open Interest Is Better Than a Hidden Exception

Pavel can tell other allocators that an application concerns his mother. Disclosure does not establish the correct decision, but permits considering who should assess it. Passing this application to another participant may be reasonable. That need not require abandoning all work or guarantee accuracy. It reduces confusion between son and allocator. Transfer should not carry a concealed request to secure priority anyway. A formal change of assessor solves nothing where pressure preserves the earlier outcome under another name.

Transparency does not mean publishing the family's entire history. Kinship and Pavel's involvement may sufficiently identify the interest. His mother's circumstances should be examined only as needed for the application and actual fund conditions. She need not tell a public story to prove her son's honesty. Strangers' applications should not be exposed to demonstrate how their needs differ either. Responsibility for fairness includes handling entrusted information. Visible conflict of interest should assist judgement rather than create an audience for private circumstances.

Where all participants manage jointly, simple transfer may be impossible. Discuss the subject and accepted criterion while limiting personal influence through available means. This article establishes no mandatory organisational procedure. It distinguishes lack of an ideal mechanism from permission for a secret exception. A small group can identify the subject, sufficient facts and grounds applicable to a similar case. Unclear rules are a separate problem, not something to settle only after a relative applies and only to their advantage.

Preserve actual states afterwards: Pavel disclosed the bond; another participant assessed; criteria were applied; a journey was or was not assigned. Discussion does not establish removal of priority. An assigned journey does not establish privilege where the circumstances genuinely meet shared grounds. Proportionate examination is needed rather than inference from outcome. Openness remains a means of responsibility rather than a ritual after which every result is pronounced fair because kinship was mentioned beforehand.

VII. Personal Care Can Take Another Route

Without priority under shared grounds, Pavel can still consider personal assistance. He may offer a journey in free time, pay some cost or request agreed help from a relative. Real life determines opportunities, and they are not guaranteed. No easy alternative exists for every limit. Yet distinguishing shared and personal resources opens a question concealed queue changes had closed. Instead of deciding for absent people, he seeks assistance grounded in the actual consent of those whose time and money are needed.

Requests to relatives should not appropriate their participation either. Explain need and ask capacity rather than assign everyone equal duty based on one's anxiety. A promised journey creates responsibility; refusal leaves motive unestablished. One response does not diagnose indifference. Consider accepted agreements and new contributions separately. Closeness raises moral questions without granting one family member power over everyone's resources. This is a present-day editorial distinction rather than a common conclusion attributed to all traditions.

Where personal assistance is impossible, a limit needs honest discussion. Pavel can acknowledge failure to achieve the desired result and identify what remains available.

Powerlessness should not be compensated with impossible promises or blame of other recipients. Their assigned journeys do not cause his failure merely because he preferred another queue. A limit should not hide a broken promise either. If his mother relied on particular action, he should separately recognise its change and discuss consequences instead of referring only to the fund.

Care after refusal may be modest: help understand options, remain in conversation or clarify future involvement. This guarantees no fulfilled need and replaces no necessary professional assistance. It preserves the relationship without purchasing priority through others' terms. Fairness in a shared role need not end closeness. It prevents the powers of that role becoming an invisible extension of personal care. Personal care likewise leaves respect due to those promised access to shared resources on understandable grounds.

VIII. Two Outcomes Need Separate Examination

Suppose his mother received a later journey than another applicant, while Pavel helped independently before that day. This is a hypothetical conclusion, not a promise of harmony. She might remain dissatisfied and he exhausted. Examine outcomes separately: the queue followed agreed grounds; personal help used actual resources; unnecessary information remained private. A good outcome in one part proves nothing about the other. A completed journey leaves fairness unresolved if the queue was secretly changed. A fair queue leaves care unresolved if a personal promise was forgotten.

Read the decision's explanation afterwards. Can it apply to an unfamiliar person with comparable circumstances? Does a special expression work only for family? Was a relative deliberately pushed lower to display impartiality? These checks concern grounds rather than equal feelings. Examine personal duty separately: what was accepted, fulfilled or changed? A queue error needs correction within Pavel's real role; a promise error needs discussion with his mother. Neither can be replaced by a general admission that the situation is complicated.

The fund may clarify family-application rules and ways to identify an interest for future cases. This does not authorise Pavel to set everyone's rules alone; the group adopts its agreement. A new rule makes no past decision automatically correct and guarantees no implementation. Clear scope nevertheless gives future situations known grounds. Pavel's personal involvement may also need a changed workload. Responsibility is not measured by the number of roles accepted: too many promises can make care unreliable even where each intention is good.

Duty to relatives and fairness to strangers need not become enemies. Conflict arises where one role's grounds move unchecked into another. Traditions express relationships and impartiality differently; those differences remain. The editorial conclusion demands neither equal love nor invariably choosing family. Name resource, role, promise and grounds. A

relative then does not vanish under universal fairness, while a stranger retains significance without a personal history. Care acquires a subject one can answer for without appropriating every shared decision.

What this means in practice

Consider an ordinary situation where you want someone close to receive priority. This editorial exercise has no established efficacy. Identify resources: your money and time, entrusted shared means, others' participation or decision access. List your roles. What promises have you accepted personally? What task have you accepted as allocator or participant in shared work? Do not confuse another's hope with your actual agreement. Avoid recording private details where storage creates unnecessary disclosure.

Describe grounds for the shared decision. Can they apply to an unfamiliar person in comparable circumstances? Which facts are needed, and which merely make a story moving? Where kinship creates an interest, consider available ways to disclose it and limit your influence. Transfer should not carry a concealed request for the same priority. Unclear rules need examination separately from wishing to help one person. The exercise establishes no charity procedure or medical urgency.

Return to personal obligation afterwards. What can be done with your resources and others' actual consent? What is impossible and requires honest revision? Check two outcomes separately: fair allocation grounds and personal care's fulfilment. Failure in one part justifies no secret change in the other. Name any correction precisely: queue error, unnecessary disclosure or broken promise. Examination should clarify limited action rather than make other lives compete for worthiness of your feelings.

Key quotation

> *Duties are universally measured by relations.*

Epictetus, Enchiridion XXX, first sentence, Thomas Wentworth Higginson translation. Its historical Stoic framework includes obedience and a will conforming to nature; it does not transfer automatically to modern family powers or justify harm.

Connections between traditions

Source	Its own question	Limited comparison	Boundary
Epictetus, XXX	Relational duties and Stoic will	Particular ties carry moral weight	No modern unconditiona l-obedience demand
Confucius, IV.18	Filial reverence and gentle remonstrance	Care and disagreement may coexist	Historical hierarchy differs from adult autonomy
Mill, V	Impartiality and proper decision grounds	Personal preference differs from shared resources	No ready-made fund regulation
Leviticus19:15,33–34	Judgement, strangers and remembrance before God	Unfamiliarity does not erase significance	No modern social policy
United Wisdom	Hypothetical fund and personal help	Separate roles, resources and two outcomes	Exercise without empirical promise

Sources

• Leviticus, King James Version, Wikisource. Continuous 19:13–18 and 19:32–37 contexts were read. 19:15 and 19:33–34 are used; the epigraph is a six-word English fragment within 19:34. Religious remembrance and accountability before God remain.

• Epictetus. The Enchiridion, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Project Gutenberg 45109. XXX was read in full, two paragraphs; its first sentence is the key quotation. Historical obedience does not become modern permission for harm. The later edition and Albert Salomon introduction are distinguished from Epictetus.

• Confucius. The Analects, James Legge, Project Gutenberg 3330. IV.17–21 context was read; IV.18 is used. No unified theory of the traditions is asserted.

• John Stuart Mill. Utilitarianism, Project Gutenberg 11224. Selected continuous Chapter V paragraphs on family preference and impartiality, web 340–343, were read. Full sources are not imported; worldwide edition rights are not declared established.

Tags

relatives, strangers, fairness, care, duty, family, promise, role, resources, fund, queue, urgency, preference, impartiality, kinship, trust, authority, equality, dignity, stranger, consent, boundary, allocation, responsibility, Epictetus, Confucius, Mill, Leviticus

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.