

UNITED WISDOM

The Limit of Our Obligation to Help Strangers

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-18-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The Limit of Our Obligation to Help Strangers

Epigraph

> *the resources of individuals are limited*

Cicero, On Duties, I.52, a short fragment in the discussion of general generosity, in Walter Miller's English edition. Limited resources are acknowledged within consideration of assistance, rather than as advance permission to disregard every stranger's difficulty.

What this article is about

In a hypothetical editorial scene, Ilya is going to collect his daughter after a class. Near a crossing, a stranger asks for help finding a bus stop: his phone is flat and the street names unfamiliar. Ilya could point the way in a minute, walk him there in ten or stay to work out the rest of his journey. His daughter expects him at an agreed time; he is already late. The stranger's need seems small, yet several people enter the decision. Ilya feels that passing silently would be wrong, while fearing a commitment he lacks time to fulfil.

This article considers ordinary assistance to an unfamiliar adult able to state a request; the scene involves no immediate medical or other danger. The question is the limit of participation: available action, existing commitments and grounds for refusal beyond “a stranger.” Equal human significance does not mean equal availability for every task. Comparing Cicero with the Gospel parable preserves philosophical duties and religious mercy. The editorial exercise clarifies action and limits; it establishes no legal standard, replaces no professional rules and promises no infallible resolution.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Another Person's Need Becomes Concrete through Circumstances

Ilya need not first construct a general theory of helping every stranger. One person stands before him with a specific request. He can hear that the man is looking for a bus stop and clarify the route's name. Such attention does not yet mean agreeing to accompany him all day. It allows him to distinguish a small difficulty, a more complex situation and a request he has not understood. “Help” sometimes conceals different actions: supplying information, carrying an object, spending money or accepting responsibility for further contact. Until an action is named, the boundary seems to lie between complete self-sacrifice and cold refusal. Specificity makes other options available.

In the hypothetical scene, the man may know the bus number and be uncertain only about which side of the road to use. Ilya's answer then takes a few words. If the number is unknown, another resource is needed: a route map, working phone or information service employee. The extent of assistance depends on the actual difficulty, rather than only on the strength of a general call to kindness. Ilya may discover that his own information is unreliable. Naming this matters: confidently sending a stranger the wrong way does not become useful because an answer was quick and well-intentioned. The ability to help presupposes at least a reasonable connection between the action and the identified need.

Leave room for clarification by the person asking. Perhaps he does not want company because he awaits an acquaintance, or needs a stop with particular accessibility. Ilya may offer more than necessary and make participation inconvenient. Respect for a stranger includes hearing a limited request. Helping does not automatically justify questions about an entire biography, demands for proof of a proper life path or keeping someone in conversation after the difficulty has been resolved. Attention to circumstances preserves the person as a participant in a specific matter. It does not turn everyone who asks into a continuing object of personal control.

The encounter matters, but does not exhaust assessment. Ilya happened to be nearby and heard the request; another passer-by did not notice it. This may make his participation more available, without establishing that he alone must perform every subsequent task. Proximity to a specific difficulty deserves attention. Further responsibility depends on possible action, who else can participate and what has already been promised. The question about strangers thus retains its human urgency without becoming an indefinite demand to take responsibility for the whole world whenever one part of it appears before our eyes.

II. Unfamiliarity Does Not Cancel Human Significance

The quickest defence against an inconvenient request is “He is nobody to me.” Usually this names the absence of a personal relationship. An absent relationship does not immediately establish the absence of every reason to help. A stranger can experience need, understand an explanation and benefit from an action available to Ilya. If pointing to the correct side of the road suffices, a family acquaintance would not make the information more useful. Relationships matter to some duties, but simple human participation need not always await friendship. Ask what justifies refusal in this case, apart from the person's membership of the unfamiliar circle.

In I.50–52, Cicero considers humanity's shared connection through reason and speech, and assistance to a stranger where it does not deprive the giver of resources. His argument also retains private property and duties within closer relationships. This is an ancient philosophical construction rather than a modern promise of equal access to every private resource. Our limited comparison concerns the availability of a small action: participation in common human life may be expressed through something easily given. The editorial question is whether personal liking is being required where the subject is straightforward, intelligible and manageable assistance.

Human significance cannot be measured by how pleasant the conversation proves. The man may be tired, speak sharply or fail to phrase a request politely. This does not make every demand acceptable, but allows manner and need to be assessed separately. Ilya can set a boundary to the conversation while naming the stop. He can decline an insulting continuation without declaring the initial difficulty invented. Recognizing someone does not require tolerating every behaviour. It requires avoiding the conversion of one unpleasant detail into proof that their situation deserves no attention and that an available action loses its purpose because the request was insufficiently agreeable.

The reverse mistake is possible too: a charming stranger obtains a promise Ilya cannot fulfil, while a quieter person would be refused a minute's explanation. Ease of communication subtly replaces proportionate participation. To see this, imagine the same request in a less attractive form while retaining every relevant circumstance. Has the available resource changed, has a risk emerged or has a reason to doubt the action appeared? If only the pleasure of playing a kind helper has changed, the decision deserves further attention. Human participation may consider features of the conversation, but should not depend entirely on how pleasing it is to see oneself beside a particular person asking for help.

III. The Ability to Act Has an Extent and a Cost

Ilya has specific time, knowledge and access to a location, rather than an abstract ability to help. He can point the way, but does not know every route. He has a phone, but little time for a long search. Other passers-by may possess information he lacks. Assessment becomes more precise when a resource is named without exaggeration. “I can show you where the map is” differs from “I will sort everything out.” The first offer is limited and checkable. The second may create an expectation difficult to withdraw after the man stops seeking another source and starts relying only on Ilya.

Participation costs also need specificity. Ten minutes may be a free interval, or mean a child remains waiting without an intelligible explanation. A small sum for one person may be another's essential expense. Not every cost can be declared negligible because an action looks simple from outside. At the same time, an indefinite feeling that “this is too much” needs examining: which part of the resource is unavailable, and why? In Ilya's scene, a one-minute explanation can be distinguished from ten minutes of accompaniment. This guarantees no error-free choice, but prevents the cost of a larger action from becoming grounds to refuse every smaller one.

Consider the cost of error too. If Ilya poorly knows the stops, his answer may lengthen the man's journey. An honest acknowledgment of limited knowledge is more useful than confident directions. Where help requires a skill he lacks, participation can mean approaching someone appropriate rather than performing the task himself. The article sets no professional procedures, but preserves the general question of matching action to ability. A wish to avoid appearing indifferent sometimes encourages promises of competence beyond what is available. Responsibility for limited assistance begins with naming a personal boundary, without turning it into an excuse for complete inaction or a reason for ostentatious courage.

A personal resource also differs from someone else's. Ilya can spend an available minute, but cannot promise that a shop employee will certainly accompany the man. He can ask for assistance or indicate where information is normally found. Obtained agreement cannot be replaced by assumptions about another person's kindness. If an action transfers costs to a third party, make that transfer visible. Otherwise, the helper concludes their part with an attractive promise while consequences remain with someone who promised nothing. Manageable participation considers Ilya's limits and other people's ability to agree, decline or suggest another available method.

IV. An Existing Commitment to Someone Close Deserves Attention

Ilya's daughter expects him at a previously agreed time. This circumstance concerns a commitment already accepted, rather than whether he loves the stranger. Collecting a child cannot be portrayed as mere personal comfort to make refusal of accompaniment easier to condemn. Someone relies on Ilya's arrival and may have no other means of leaving. Duties towards absent people remain real when their need is not visible on the street. The force of the present request can eclipse people who are not there to remind us. Consideration should therefore include those whose expectations our promise has already created.

In I.53–60, Cicero distinguishes the closeness of social bonds from the demands of specific circumstances. His priorities, including country and family, retain their historical form; we do not turn them into an unchanging modern ranking of human value. The relevant question concerns the help needed and what someone can obtain without us. The daughter may need Ilya specifically, whereas many people can identify a stop. In another case, the stranger's need may be more serious and urgent. “Family” alone settles no collision, but an accepted responsibility needs concrete weight rather than disappearing under a general call to help.

Name any possibility of changing the previous commitment. Ilya could notify his daughter or arrange another adult's participation if that is genuinely available and appropriate. “Someone will collect her” is not an agreement. A responsible revision requires actual consent and an intelligible new arrangement. Sometimes none is available, making participation limits at the crossing clearer. This need not release him from every small action: he can point the way while keeping his promise. It may rule out accompaniment. Attention to an existing commitment helps identify a limited response, instead of colliding unconditional demands that cannot both be fulfilled.

This approach should not become a convenient mechanism of permanent refusal. Almost everyone has plans, relationships and other people's expectations. If any one automatically cancels attention to a stranger, the limit will never be considered on its merits. Distinguish a promise, an ordinary intention and a preference. “My child expects me and has no other escort” differs from “I wanted to get home a little earlier.” Both circumstances are real but have different characters. An honest description preserves the possibility of declining without exaggerating one's own side to make it more important. It also need not devalue loved ones to demonstrate openness to every passer-by.

V. Urgency Changes the Question without Creating Every Ability

The bus-stop scene allows calm clarification. Immediate danger requires another pace and suitable action; this written examination is not intended to delay necessary assistance. Even great urgency does not give Ilya every skill. A duty to respond can exist without making him capable of solving the whole problem himself. Distinguish an absence of indifference, a specific available step and professional action. This article offers no medical, rescue or legal algorithm. It preserves the question of avoiding both a display of confident intervention that conceals lack of competence and using that lack to refuse every form of participation.

Urgency can also be real in ordinary cases: a bus is leaving, an office is closing, help is needed before a particular time. Not every “now” involves equally serious consequences. If Ilya points towards a later bus, the man may still arrive in time or lose an important opportunity. Clarifying the subject reveals the deadline's significance. Someone need not disclose an entire life for a request to be heard. Only circumstances relating to the action are needed. Ask about timing or location while preserving boundaries around personal history. Urgency calls for attention to facts, not necessarily broader control of the person.

An urgent demand can sometimes accelerate agreement: “If you are a decent human being, drop everything right now.” The appeal itself establishes neither the seriousness of need nor the correct method of action. Ilya can acknowledge the request and clarify what is available. A boundary should not depend only on an accusation's force. At the same time, irritation at pressure does not prove the need insignificant. Assess the circumstance separately from the way assistance is demanded. One can decline an imposed complete role while taking a manageable step if it is actually needed. Participation remains related to the situation rather than becoming a retaliatory struggle for moral superiority.

Waiting for perfect certainty has a cost as well. The man clearly asks for directions, while Ilya mentally examines every reason why strangers' requests can sometimes be deceptive. The general possibility of error does not cancel available knowledge about a particular action. A limited question can be answered without accepting a financial commitment or disclosing personal information. A specific reason for doubt should be considered. An abstract one cannot be presented as an established risk. Proportionate attention distinguishes real uncertainty needing clarification from endless demands for proof through which no ordinary response can ever take place.

VI. A Circle of Neighbours Can Expand through Action

The parable in Luke 10:25–37 begins with a question about eternal life and love of God and neighbour. The answer involving the Samaritan directs attention to mercy shown; its religious meaning is not reduced to convenient calculation. What matters for our subject is that acquaintance with the person in need is no preliminary condition of assistance. The character's Samaritan identity disrupts familiar boundaries of an expected own circle. This supplies neither a modern passer-by's instruction nor a numerical standard of self-giving. Comparison preserves the question: a neighbour can sometimes be discovered in a relationship created through action, beyond an advance list of people counted as one's own.

Ilya can point the way without becoming the man's permanent companion. A limited action does not cancel the fact that another person has momentarily ceased to be a faceless obstacle. No special feeling of spiritual elevation is required. A simple conversation can occur after which the parties never meet again. If kindness is assessed only through the duration of a new relationship, small assistance begins to seem insufficient. Yet an event can have an intelligible meaning within one minute: someone received needed information and another person kept a promise. Relating to a stranger need not always become friendship in order to cease being complete indifference to an actual need.

This expansion should not depend on demanding gratitude. The man may hurry to the bus without time for elaborate thanks, or express appreciation poorly. Ilya may feel dissatisfied, but the explanation's initial usefulness does not vanish. If helping strangers is organized entirely around an agreeable response, the encounter becomes a search for confirmation of personal kindness. Particular instances of rudeness can be remembered and considered in conversation, but establish no truth about all unfamiliar people. The inability to control gratitude belongs to the limits of participation. It need not cancel help as soon as an outcome stops belonging entirely to the helper.

Another boundary remains: an account of someone's difficulty does not necessarily belong to the person who helped. Ilya may want to describe the encounter online to inspire acquaintances. A name, face, precise route or personal circumstances raise additional questions of disclosure. A small kind act establishes no general authority to turn another person into a public example. Reflect on one's own decision without displaying the person or inventing their feelings. This article explicitly labels its scene hypothetical, so it presents no unknown person's story as documentary evidence. Respect for a stranger continues after the immediate action ends.

VII. Express Limits through Action rather than Devaluation

“I can show you the way, but cannot accompany you now” communicates an offer and a boundary together. The man knows what is available; Ilya need not construct an accusation to justify a limited response. “Normal people charge their phones beforehand” adds a judgment that neither identifies the stop nor explains a time limit. Perhaps the man could indeed have prepared better. That does not create ten free minutes for Ilya or make a minute's explanation wrong. An honest refusal is easier to assess when connected with a resource or commitment. Devaluing someone often broadens the conversation unnecessarily for the decision.

A limit can be final or temporary. “I do not know this route” differs from “Right now I can only point out where the map is.” State a temporary possibility without making a promise one does not intend to fulfil. Ilya need not say “another time” if no further encounter is contemplated. Polite ambiguity sometimes leaves someone awaiting unavailable help. A simple account of the present situation is more useful. Offer an available alternative as an option rather than a guaranteed result. Indicating an information desk does not mean it will resolve every question. It identifies only a checkable opportunity to approach an appropriate place.

Once assistance has begun, leaving requires greater clarity. Ilya may have opened a map and allowed the man to expect further searching. If time runs out, explain which part has been established and what remains unknown. A conversation cannot be declared finished as if the task were complete when only a probable stop has been identified. Another person's agreement to continue can be confirmed; where nobody agreed, acknowledge the absence of a handover. A responsible boundary need not include a complete solution. It includes accuracy about what can be relied on after participation stops. Expectations created through help deserve attention even with limited resources.

This conclusion matters to internal assessment too. Ilya may leave feeling uncomfortable despite completing an available step and keeping his commitment to his daughter. The feeling is no automatic verdict. It may indicate regret, an unspoken possibility or a need to reconsider habitual limits. Look at facts: what was heard, done and promised, and what actually remained available. Discovering that necessary information could have been supplied without cost gives grounds to change subsequent behaviour. If no solution was available, acknowledge the limit without inventing a defence. Consideration need not declare every unpleasant residue proof of moral error.

VIII. Continuing Willingness to Help Needs a Form

A single encounter does not exhaust assistance to strangers. Some people repeatedly encounter requests through work, neighbourhoods or voluntary activity. If each is decided only through a present feeling, participation may become unpredictable: one person receives extensive attention and the next an exhausted refusal. Define an available form of support in advance: consultation time, a small separate resource, readiness to explain directions or participation in a particular group. Such a form proves no sufficiency for every need. It helps name what can actually be offered and see when a circumstance requires separate consideration rather than mechanical application of a familiar restriction.

A rule should not become a way to avoid hearing someone. If Ilya normally does not accompany strangers, he can still distinguish accompaniment from a simple question about the road's side. A group assisting only through a particular method should explain its limit without promising universal support. A rule helps when it reduces concealed promises and arbitrary expectations. It becomes questionable when it preserves only the helper's convenience and excludes attention to meaningful differences between cases. Organized participation and assessment of actual circumstances need not conflict. They require distinguishing an ordinarily available form from grounds for its possible reconsideration.

Repeated requests also require honesty towards those supplying resources. Ongoing participation cannot be promised to strangers at a family's, colleagues' or donors' expense without discussing their contribution. One person's kindness does not cancel others' independence. Assistance can expand together through intelligible agreement, or remain within one's own available resources. If actual need greatly exceeds a group's capacity, acknowledge this in a clear description of the task. A shortage of funds need not make people undeserving of help, and respect for them need not create an appearance that funds exist. Between these acknowledgments, work towards another available method may become possible.

At the end of the hypothetical scene, Ilya clarifies the bus number, points out the correct side and explains where the map stands. He says he must collect his daughter and cannot accompany the man further. The man receives limited information; Ilya does not know the journey's subsequent outcome. This is no account of a life certainly saved or proof of a successful technology of kindness. Only the completed step and clearly stated limit can be confirmed. Such precision connects openness towards a stranger with responsibility towards those already promised participation. The boundary becomes an honest decision rather than a convenient name for complete indifference or obligatory endless self-sacrifice.

What this means in practice

An ordinary stranger's request can be examined through a few short notes. This editorial exercise has no established efficacy; under immediate danger it should not delay necessary assistance and approaching appropriate people. Choose a specific situation where there is time to clarify an offer.

Record the difficulty actually stated. Separate it from a presumed wider role: “identify the stop” and “arrange the entire journey” do not have equal scope. If the request remains unclear, ask a relevant question. Do not turn clarification into a demand for personal history when location, timing or the route name suffices.

List available actions and their costs. Name knowledge, time, personal resources and competence limits. Separately identify a commitment already accepted towards someone else. Ilya's example can read: “I can explain the direction in a minute. I cannot spend ten minutes accompanying him now: my daughter relies on my arrival and no replacement has agreed.” This describes availability rather than ranking people's human importance.

Consider a smaller action or someone else's participation. If help is transferred, distinguish locating a place, making a request and obtaining agreement. “Information may be available there” does not mean “your question has already been resolved.” Promise no stranger's resource without their answer. Where no suitable route exists, acknowledge the absence of a solution honestly.

Compose the offer and boundary in one clear message. After hearing the response, check whether the request's subject matched the action's subject. Conclude by naming only what is confirmed: information was given, an object carried, a request received or a search remains incomplete. Add no unknown gratitude, successful arrival or moral transformation of the recipient.

Finally ask what grounds refusal of additional involvement: an unavailable resource, previous commitment, substantial risk or merely the fact that this is a stranger. The answer supplies no automatic verdict. It identifies the subject for further reflection and allows a particular rule to change if it proved excessively broad. The aim is clarity about participation and its boundary; agreement by everyone and freedom from unpleasant feelings are not promised.

Key quotation

> *Go, and do thou likewise.*

Luke 10:37, the short concluding phrase of Jesus' answer, in the King James Version. It ends the parable of the Samaritan's mercy within discussion of eternal life and love of God and

neighbour. The fragment sets no numerical assistance limit for every contemporary circumstance.

Connections between traditions

Source	Its own question	Limited comparison	Boundary
Cicero, I.50–52	Shared human connection	Unfamiliarity does not cancel participation	Ancient construction through reason and speech
Cicero, I.52	Limited generosity	Extent of an available resource	No fixed standard for every form of help
Cicero, I.53–60	Bonds and circumstances	Commitments already accepted	Historical priorities remain explicit
Luke 10:25–37	Love and mercy	A neighbour emerges through action	Religious meaning is not reduced to convenience

Sources

• Cicero. On Duties, Walter Miller, 1913, Project Gutenberg 47001. The English passages of the continuous I.50–60 context in the parallel Latin-English edition, displayed web lines 484–552, were read. The epigraph is a short I.52 phrase about limited resources. Historical priorities among social relationships are not declared a universal contemporary rule; worldwide rights in the edition are not established.

• The Gospel of Luke, King James Version, Wikisource. The continuous 10:25–37 context, displayed web lines 1006–1024, was read. The key quotation is the concluding phrase of 10:37. Ilya's scene and the exercise are original and hypothetical; the parable retains its own religious subject. Full source texts are neither imported nor indexed.

Tags

help, stranger, obligation, limit, participation, need, resource, time, knowledge, circumstance, loved ones, promise, child, urgency, competence, risk, mercy, neighbour, generosity, responsibility, refusal, handover, consent, gratitude, attention, dignity, Cicero, Luke, ethics, society

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.