

UNITED WISDOM

Consent Under the Pressure of Expectations

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-17-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Consent Under the Pressure of Expectations

Epigraph

> *the individual is sovereign.*

John Stuart Mill, On Liberty, Chapter I, the final words of the sentence about an adult's authority over their own body and mind. Project Gutenberg 34901. This short quotation does not remove responsibility for actions affecting other people.

What this article is about

Imagine Lena at a meeting of friends planning a small celebration in their courtyard. She intended to help with decorations, but the person leading the meeting unexpectedly announces that Lena will organise the entire evening. Everyone thanks her before she has answered. Declining now seems harder than accepting work for which she has no time. Nobody threatens her, yet an expectation has already been presented as a settled choice.

The scene raises a question about the quality of consent. Is a spoken yes sufficient when someone has not understood the task or has answered mainly to preserve good relationships? How can she clarify her decision without dismissing the shared project or describing every expectation as coercion?

We will distinguish requests, invitations, moral arguments and appointments made without permission. Historical texts draw attention to social approval and willingness; they do not decide a particular legal case. The practical exercise concerns ordinary, safe relationships between adults. It aims to make the terms of a choice visible, without promising that calm wording can remove every form of pressure.

I. An expectation is not yet a decision

Three different things happened in our hypothetical scene. Someone wanted Lena to organise the celebration. The group heard that hope as information about the future. Lena had not yet chosen what she could undertake. Combining these events gives another person's expectation the force of her promise. Restoring clarity begins by separating them, without having to prove that her friends acted maliciously. Someone may simply have rushed ahead and overlooked the limit of their authority to speak for another person.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Lena can support the celebration while declining the organiser's role. This distinction matters: refusing a particular function does not mean refusing friendship, the common purpose or every possible contribution. If the discussion allows only complete involvement or a charge of indifference, the request has become a test of belonging. The question is no longer about an evening, but whether a person may remain part of the group while making a different decision.

Not every expectation works this way. People may rely on agreements, and participants in a project may expect accepted roles to be fulfilled. If Lena previously promised to run the evening, others can remind her and explain the consequences of withdrawing. The grounds therefore need checking: did the expectation arise from her definite commitment or from the habit of appointing whoever is most helpful? The same visible disappointment can accompany very different relationships of responsibility.

A useful question is therefore concrete: when did I agree, and to what? It does not require perfect independence from emotion. People choose with friendship, gratitude, interest and discomfort in mind. Taking others seriously must nevertheless leave room for one's own answer. If no answer has been given, a pause does not break a nonexistent promise. If an answer has been given, clarification should honestly consider the reliance it created. Start by acknowledging the common purpose and identifying exactly where a decision was prematurely treated as complete.

II. Refusal can carry different costs

Lena feels uncomfortable: everyone is smiling and waiting for a grateful yes. This is a real social cost, although it is not equivalent to a threat to safety. Her friends may be disappointed, surprised or argumentative. Living through such differences is part of ordinary relationships. If every disappointment is automatically called violence, we lose the ability to distinguish a difficult discussion conducted in good faith from circumstances in which refusal is genuinely dangerous.

In the first chapter of On Liberty, Mill considers the influence of prevailing opinion as well as state power. His question helps us notice pressure operating without an official order. The historical text does not, however, diagnose our friends. Mill also makes exclusions of his own, including colonial ones, which we do not adopt as a norm. For this scene, the relevant question is how far social approval governs what someone experiences as their own decision.

Describe the expected consequence as specifically as possible. Awkwardness at a meeting is one thing. A threat to remove essential support, deprive someone of income or cause harm is another. A professional role, whose powers and duties are not defined by preference alone, is different again. A universal sentence about boundaries cannot settle these circumstances.

When safety, access to the means of living or specialised duties are at issue, the exercise offered here is insufficient.

In an ordinary situation, Lena can examine the group's actual response to a pause as well as her fears. Is she allowed to understand the work? Can she offer a different contribution? Does the discussion become more specific, or does every question provoke another accusation? These are observations about a conversation, rather than a final judgment on anyone's character. They help her choose the next step: continue clarifying, postpone an answer or limit her participation. Expected discomfort should be recognised without automatically becoming evidence either of free choice or of complete unfreedom.

III. What is she being asked to accept?

Agreement with an overall idea rarely describes all the conditions of the work. Organising a celebration might include invitations, collecting money, purchasing supplies, cleaning the courtyard and staying until the evening ends. Lena may have imagined one task while the others imagined five. Uncertainty then exists even without social pressure. Good intentions do not replace a description of the agreement, and yes does not automatically reveal the meaning each side attaches to it.

Clarify the scope, time, expenses and authority to make decisions. The last item is easy to overlook. Someone may be made responsible for an outcome while the group retains every decision. If choosing music, suppliers or expenses requires endless approval, Lena receives responsibility without enough room to act. This does not mean an organiser should have uncontrolled authority. There needs to be proportion between what they will answer for and what has actually been entrusted to them.

Distinguish exploratory involvement from a complete promise. Lena might agree to review the task list by Friday. That is not a promise to organise the entire celebration. A plan can be discussed first and the role confirmed separately afterwards. This sequence is not an ingenious escape from responsibility: it protects the group from false certainty. A problem arises when someone deliberately preserves ambiguity, intending later to use it against an expectation they knowingly encouraged.

In Book XV of the Analects, in Legge's translation, sincerity in words is connected with care in action. We do not derive a contemporary contractual standard from this, but the comparison is useful: clear speech should be supported by conduct after the conversation. If Lena promises only decorations, she should identify that role in the group messages too. If the meeting's leader continues to introduce her as the main organiser, silence will expand the expected task again. Checking consent ends with a shared understanding of the next action and limits of participation, rather than with an elegant sentence.

IV. A good purpose cannot choose for someone

The celebration may genuinely benefit the neighbours. That is a substantial reason to participate, but it does not tell us who must do every job. A valuable purpose can allow divided roles, limited contributions and additional volunteers. If its value is used as the final answer to every refusal, concern for the outcome becomes confused with authority over a particular person. The most responsive participant becomes an available resource precisely because she cares.

In the introduction to his account of virtue, Kant distinguishes one's own moral perfection and the happiness of others as ends of duty. He does not propose taking over another person's moral choice. At the same time, care does not become a whim that convenience can abolish completely. This is a limited comparison with our scene: we can discuss moral reasons for helping, but should not announce that someone's virtue requires precisely the role we currently wish to assign them.

For her part, Lena does not end all reflection by saying it is her private business. A shared project affects others; if she has accepted an obligation, her word matters. If neighbours need help, she can consider what contribution is possible. This differs from a demand to accept everything immediately. Responsibility involves examining grounds and consequences, rather than necessarily agreeing with the loudest proposal or choosing whatever ends an uncomfortable conversation fastest.

In the Christian letter about a collection for a community, Paul discusses willingness to give, participants' means and giving without compulsion. This is a religious appeal carrying expectations of its own, rather than a modern theory of autonomy. It nevertheless shows a tension within a good purpose: helping people in need does not make the way assistance is obtained irrelevant. The conclusion for the celebration is more modest and specific. Name the purpose, distribute the work and obtain agreement. Neither the event's value nor friendly gratitude can perform the last step in another person's place.

V. A pause keeps the conversation focused

Once gratitude has been expressed, a pause can feel ungrateful. Lena may think a delay will spoil everyone's pleasure. Yet immediate agreement to an unclear task carries costs too: later she may need to cancel jobs, find substitutes or conceal dissatisfaction. In a safe situation, a short pause allows a more dependable decision. It is meant to check available participation, rather than punish friends with uncertainty or invite them to persuade her more forcefully.

Connect the pause to a definite time and action. Lena can receive the list today, check her calendar tomorrow and answer that evening. She does not promise more than she has

decided, but helps the others plan. If time is genuinely short, she can acknowledge that she cannot make a complete decision by the requested deadline. Urgency makes that limit important to the project; it does not automatically enlarge her capacity. A plan needs real participation, rather than a convenient hope.

A pause is especially useful when the discussion takes place before a group. An answer given privately may differ from a public yes because the conditions of choosing differ, not because someone is concealing their true character. Roles could be confirmed after the meeting, once tasks are clear. Such a common procedure can reduce personal confrontation. It does not guarantee freedom, however: if refusal afterwards still leads to threats or exclusion, moving the conversation has not resolved the problem.

Nor should a pause become a way of denying a decision already understood. If Lena knows she cannot organise everything, she should say so instead of sustaining hope until the last moment. Only a smaller contribution need remain open. Honest uncertainty concerns what has yet to be established; it is not a polite label for a concealed refusal. The group then receives usable information, while Lena can choose an available contribution without a later dispute about why everyone expected something else.

VI. When yes has already been spoken

Suppose Lena initially agreed, then realised that evening that she could not fulfil the role. The difficulty does not disappear simply because her friends were watching her. Distinguish the degree of pressure, unclear conditions and consequences of her word. Ordinary awkwardness does not make every promise empty. A promise made without understanding its subject nevertheless calls for clarification, rather than silent acceptance of an endlessly expanding assignment.

First tell whoever is planning the work about the mistake. The earlier accurate information is available, the fewer unsupported expectations can accumulate. Lena can acknowledge answering too quickly, describe the scope she understood and explain the contribution she can make. This is not a confession of bad character. It is responsibility for a specific inaccuracy that has affected others. If supplies were ordered on the strength of her confirmed promise, discuss those consequences separately instead of dissolving them into a conversation about feelings.

In Book I of On Duties, Cicero examines performance of promises alongside harm, the common good and circumstances. He separately mentions intimidation and deception. These categories cannot simply be transferred to our friendship scene. Still less can a difficult agreement be declared invalid on the authority of an ancient work. The comparison only reminds us that

fidelity to one's word involves its content and situation, rather than mechanical performance of every proposal once accompanied by yes.

Revision may result in limited confirmation, transferring some tasks or withdrawing from the role while discussing costs already incurred. No outcome guarantees freedom from disappointment. More importantly, the new decision should be understandable, create no further false hope and require no pretence of continued willingness. If the others reject all clarification, that fact matters for future participation. Lena should also remember her own haste: next time she can ask for a task description before answering, instead of expecting others to know the limits of her time.

VII. Hearing another person's answer

So far we have seen the scene through Lena's eyes. Now imagine the reader leading the meeting. They genuinely want a good celebration and sincerely consider Lena the best organiser. That confidence can hide a substitution: a suitable person is not yet a consenting person. Advance gratitude, jokes about being indispensable and public announcements of a role can narrow the available answer, even when the intention is kind and people enjoy having their abilities recognised.

A responsible invitation separates a proposal from an appointment. Describe the job, ask whether it is possible and wait for confirmation. There is no need to promise that refusal will disappoint nobody. It is fair to say participation would help. But preserve the distinction between explaining a need and passing moral judgment on someone who declines the role. After refusal, return to the plan: who else could contribute, which tasks could be reduced, what can move and how the load could be distributed.

The Confucian principle of reciprocity in the selected Book XV passage suggests refraining from imposing what one would not want oneself. It belongs to a historical order of relationships and is not identical to modern informed consent. It nevertheless prompts the meeting's leader to examine their own position. Would they want their time, money and reputation publicly allocated without consultation? This does not mean Lena must want the same things they do. Reciprocity opens attention to another person; it does not replace their answer with our imagination.

The quality of the arrangement is particularly visible after refusal. Can someone remain in contact without continual reminders of insufficient loyalty? Is a smaller contribution recognised as the agreed form of participation? Does the announced role change in the group chat? If so, the group learns to distinguish dependability from unlimited availability. If not, talk of willingness remains formal. This observation does not require ending a friendship after one

poor conversation. Begin by correcting the specific appointment and checking consistently whether the parties are hearing one another.

VIII. Consent people can rely on

A free decision does not arise outside relationships and feelings. Lena may choose a demanding role precisely because her friends matter to her. Gratitude or a wish not to let people down does not itself invalidate her choice. The important point is that these motives should not conceal the subject of agreement or the alternatives available. Someone can prefer a difficult contribution to an easy evening; autonomy does not require choosing the least demanding option. The problem begins when every alternative is pronounced morally impermissible before its grounds are considered.

Dependable consent makes clear what has been accepted, which conditions matter and what information the parties rely on. It allows an honest question before an answer. It also preserves responsibility after the answer: participation cannot be cancelled arbitrarily as though nobody planned around one's word. This reciprocity protects Lena and the group. Respect does not require the absence of expectations. It requires identifiable grounds for them and room to discuss changes in circumstances.

A good outcome need not consist in Lena refusing. She might agree to organise a limited part of the evening if two other participants join and the budget is clear. She might choose decorations as originally intended. Or she might examine the tasks and accept the full role. Different answers can be responsible. Their quality depends on whether the statement reflects her real decision and whether others understand what they can rely on, rather than on winning the dispute.

Afterwards, check the next action. If the shared plan still makes Lena responsible for everything, clarification has remained a private statement without effect. If the new roles are identified, work can begin. Consent grows stronger when people need not guess hidden obligations or prove friendship through unlimited availability. This does not promise a life without conflict. It offers a more modest possibility: discussing real tasks while preserving the difference between what people expect and what we have actually undertaken.

IX. What happens with the next request?

One successful clarification is not enough if roles continue to be allocated in the same way. After the celebration, the group might approach Lena as though her involvement in every future evening were settled. A new expectation appears: last time went well. Successful performance of one task is not indefinite agreement to similar tasks, however. Distinguish a recurring role from a single event beforehand. This is especially important when good results make someone's work almost invisible: others see a completed evening and forget the time it took.

Lena might also enlarge her own promise. Praise makes it pleasant to feel needed, and she begins saying she will always help. Such words belong to a warm conversation, but others may hear a particular future obligation. There is no need to forbid gratitude or make every conversation resemble a contract. Notice the point where an emotional expression of willingness becomes a promise of definite work. If the wording exceeds the real decision, clarify it before another plan develops.

The group could agree on a rule for the next meeting: propose roles, let participants state conditions, then include them in the plan. Nobody needs publicly to prove that their reason for a smaller contribution is serious enough. Confirmed tasks nevertheless remain visible, and changes are communicated in time. This arrangement combines the possibility of refusal with dependability in performance. Freedom does not become permission to leave others uninformed after they have begun relying on particular participation.

The leader might notice another mistake: requests repeatedly go to whoever objects least, rather than whoever has actual capacity. Quiet participants then receive more work, while outspoken ones receive more choice. Correct the allocation process instead of morally condemning every individual. Ask everyone separately, make the load visible and avoid treating initial silence as confirmation. For an ordinary voluntary group this is a practical suggestion, rather than a proven universal technology of fairness.

After several meetings, return to actual experience: which agreements were clear, where did a role expand and how was that corrected? There is no need to keep a tally of concessions for future accusations. Retain one observation that can improve the next conversation. In our scene, that could be a simple connection: when Lena confirmed a definite scope after reviewing the list, the group obtained more dependable participation. This is a hypothetical result in the example, not research evidence. It invites readers to examine their own circumstances and preserve the possibility of a different answer to a new request.

What this means in practice

Choose one safe, ordinary situation in which you are still uncertain about your consent. Do not start with the most serious circumstances. If refusal involves threats, violence, loss of essential access or specialised professional duties, this exercise cannot determine an appropriate response. It concerns conversations in which the parties have a real opportunity to clarify conditions and choose a next step.

Write down the request, your actual promise and what others probably expect as separate items. Use specific actions and dates. Helping with a celebration and taking responsibility for all purchases are different entries. Next mark what you know about time, expenses and authority, and what you are only assuming. Formulate one concrete question for each unknown element. You need not explain your whole character or prove that your feelings are serious enough.

Check the cost of refusal. Identify the expected response without exaggerating or minimising it: disappointment, disagreement, finding another participant. If there is reason to expect more serious consequences, stop and consider what support or information you need before the conversation. Public courage is not the sole measure of a sound decision.

Prepare a short clarification. Acknowledge the purpose, identify the limit of what is already accepted and state an available next step. If you have not answered, give a decision time. If yes was too quick, acknowledge that and discuss reliance on your word. Do not offer a new role merely to end the discomfort quickly.

Afterwards, check one observable result: does the shared plan match your confirmed participation? Clarify the record if necessary. Also identify who needs the updated information: a private clarification does not always reach whoever allocates the work. The aim is a more understandable agreement, rather than the absence of uncomfortable feelings. This is an exercise designed by United Wisdom; its efficacy has not been established by a separate study.

Key quotation

> *not grudgingly, or of necessity*

2 Corinthians 9:7, short excerpt, King James Version. Paul is discussing a gift for a religious community. The comparison concerns how assistance is obtained, without declaring every social obligation optional.

Connections between traditions

Connection	What it clarifies and where the comparison ends
Mill, On Liberty I / a friendship group's expectations	Social opinion can narrow independent choice. Not every disappointment is tyranny; Mill's historical exclusions are not adopted as norms.
Kant, Introduction IV and V(B) / assigning a good task	Another person's moral choice cannot be made for them. Kant's account of duty is not a contemporary volunteering agreement.
2 Corinthians 8:8–15 and 9:7 / a willing contribution	A good purpose should be considered alongside willingness and capacity. The religious letter does not cancel accepted, particular obligations.
Cicero, On Duties I.10 / revising a hurried answer	Fidelity is considered alongside a promise's content and harm. Ancient discussion of intimidation does not decide a friendship agreement's legal status.
Analects XV.5 and XV.23 in Legge / hearing another's answer	Sincerity and reciprocity direct attention to conduct after speech. Historical role ethics does not replace obtaining consent.

Primary sources

• John Stuart Mill. On Liberty, Chapters I and IV, Project Gutenberg 34901. Selected continuous paragraphs on social pressure, independence and duties to others were read. Mill's text is distinguished from Courtney's introduction. A normative philosophical work; colonial exclusions are not used as present guidance.

• Immanuel Kant. The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics, Thomas Kingsmill Abbott translation, Project Gutenberg 5684. Introduction IV, V(B), VII and VIII(2) were read. The distinction between one's own moral ends and others' happiness supports a philosophical comparison, rather than validation of the exercise.

• Cicero. De Officiis, Book I, X and XIV, Walter Miller translation, Project Gutenberg 47001. Selected continuous discussions of promises, harm, justice and generosity were read. Historical legal examples are not transferred to contemporary circumstances.

• 2 Corinthians, King James Version, Wikisource. The contexts of 8:1–24 and 9:1–15 were read. A religious primary source about collecting assistance; the short quotation is the identified excerpt. Worldwide rights in this edition are not asserted.

• Confucius. The Analects, Book XV, James Legge translation, Project Gutenberg 3330. Selected XV.11–29 context was read; numbering follows Legge. Sincerity and reciprocity are compared without importing the historical social hierarchy. Complete source texts are not ingested.

Tags

consent, expectations, request, pressure, willingness, choice, friendship, community, participation, pause, promise, responsibility, clarification, boundaries, role, authority, time, resources, refusal, respect, autonomy, ethics, reciprocity, sincerity, Mill, Kant, Cicero, Confucius, Pauline letters, agreement

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.