

UNITED WISDOM

Caring for a Place We Use Temporarily

Freedom and Action

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

A-20-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Caring for a Place We Use Temporarily

Epigraph

> *While he gives it to you to possess, take care of it;*

Epictetus, The Enchiridion, 11, Elizabeth Carter's translation; a short literal fragment. A Stoic reflection on temporary possession, rather than an instruction to abandon the defence of one's rights.

What this article is about

Denis receives the keys to a small room for three weeks. He holds meetings, rearranges tables and leaves materials for the following day. His work has made the room convenient. When the period ends, spending his last evening restoring the previous arrangement feels unfair: he is not the owner, and the next person will surely arrange things differently anyway. He also wants to leave shelves he attached as a gift. Neither the owner nor the future user has yet agreed to this change.

This hypothetical scene contains no major conflict with nature, but it poses a familiar moral question. How can we use something that does not permanently belong to us without turning temporariness into permission for neglect or claiming authority to improve somebody else's space without asking? A place includes more than walls and objects. It includes another person's ability to enter, work, rest and understand what they have received.

Care begins by distinguishing access, authority and responsibility for our actions. We can appreciate the freedom provided, discuss reasonable changes and recognise limits. Yet the end of our stay should not make our presence's traces invisible. Considering them early leaves time for agreement and completion.

I. Temporary Access Creates a Real Relationship

The keys allow Denis to enter and use the room. They do not mean he is responsible for the building's entire history or authorised to determine every aspect of its future. Yet the absence of permanent ownership does not make his actions morally empty. He moves objects, occupies space and creates new conditions. While this happens, a real relationship exists between him and other users. Temporariness limits his authority and period of participation, but does not cancel the consequences of choices made during that period.

We often notice care within our own home and call it natural. In somebody else's or a shared space, the same question can sound like an additional favour. Yet if we created a mess or

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

alteration ourselves, completion belongs to our action rather than necessarily being a voluntary kindness. This does not mean every use must restore a place to an immovable original state. It means considering a change together with the person receiving its result and the conditions under which they receive it.

The place might be a rented room, a site for a temporary event, a desk, a guest house or a shared kitchen. Rules and authority differ. One legal obligation therefore cannot be derived from the general word care. Moral accuracy begins with describing specific access: what may I use, what did I promise and what limits do I know? Questions needing clarification can then be distinguished from those already settled. A person should not have to guess an entire arrangement when they can ask about it.

For Denis, a simple change of question helps: what will I leave after three weeks? It does not remove the pleasure of present use. It includes completion within the same period of responsibility. If the last meeting runs right up to handing over the keys, time may be lacking for restoration or an agreed alternative. Care therefore begins in the schedule, rather than only in good intentions. Participation has an entrance, a middle and an exit, each affecting other people.

II. Use and Alteration Require Different Authority

Permission to place a cup on a table does not necessarily include permission to attach a shelf to a wall. Being allowed to move furniture for an evening does not necessarily establish agreement to leave a new layout. The difference may seem minor to someone who finds the change convenient. It may matter to an owner or the next user. Distinguish ordinary use within known limits, reversible temporary adjustments and alterations that will remain after us. The last particularly needs intelligible agreement before action.

Denis considers the shelves an improvement because he knows their usefulness during his meetings. Yet that knowledge concerns one purpose. The next person might use the wall differently, while the owner may reject the alteration for reasons Denis does not yet know. Care does not require assuming those reasons are correct in every respect. It requires refusing to present personal usefulness as somebody else's consent. A proposal remains a proposal until the person whose authority is affected receives significant information and answers.

Agreement should identify what will change, for how long and who will complete the work if a different decision is made. Saying I improved it a little does not explain this. If an action occurred without necessary consent, a later request to retain it cannot turn the past into a process agreed in advance. Yet honest conversation remains possible. Name what was done, explain the remaining options and avoid forcing the other person to choose between gratitude and appearing an ungrateful destroyer of somebody else's labour.

The reverse also matters: permission for a particular alteration does not make us the place's permanent manager. If the shelves are agreed, that does not authorise controlling every subsequent change or preventing someone else from using the room differently. Care may leave an object while releasing control over its further life within agreed limits. This departure can be harder than physical cleaning. We want our work to endure, but a claim to recognition differs from a right to control someone else's future use.

III. A Clean Appearance Does Not Exhaust a Good Handover

A room may look tidy and still be difficult for the next person to use. Needed objects have been moved somewhere unknown, the cupboard key sits in a personal bag and materials are stacked without explanation. Visible cleanliness is one aspect of its condition; intelligibility and access are others. We cannot automatically conclude that a place was handed over well because a photograph shows no mess. Handover concerns possibilities for using a space, rather than merely the appearance of its surfaces.

Denis should imagine an ordinary first entrance, rather than an ideal future guest. Someone opens the door and tries to understand what belongs to the room, what was left temporarily and whom to ask a question. This perspective does not require guessing their tastes and plans. It draws attention to information Denis possesses after three weeks of use. If useful knowledge remains solely with the departing person, the next user receives additional work reconstructing an arrangement that outwardly seems already established.

However, necessary information should be handed over, rather than every personal detail of the meetings. Care for a place does not justify disclosing other people's notes or retaining materials that should be returned to participants. Sometimes a good departure means removing information that cannot be left and clearly identifying what remains. This concerns boundaries, rather than maximising explanations. The person passing on a space must distinguish knowledge about using the place from the private lives of people who spent time there.

Handover conditions can be agreed in advance: which objects must remain accessible, what returns to its earlier position, which alterations are accepted and what remains open. This conversation need not turn care into an elaborate ceremony. A few precise points are enough for a small room. The record must reflect actual agreement and condition, rather than an ideal outcome nobody checked. A good handover allows another person to begin using a place without silently untangling somebody else's unfinished work.

IV. Not Mine Does Not Mean Needed by Nobody

A shared place is sometimes perceived as a space with no identifiable recipient of care. No owner is nearby, and we hope somebody else will do the necessary work. In the selected part of Book Two of Politics, Aristotle discusses difficulties of common possession and attention to duties expected of others. His reasoning concerns criticism of an ideal state and ancient conceptions of family. It is not contemporary behavioural research or proof of inevitable neglect in every shared space.

A limited question is useful for our scene: whom does Denis rely on when he says the next user will rearrange everything? Does that person exist, do they know about the work and have they agreed to accept it? If not, the future user becomes a convenient invented figure. Everything we do not wish to finish today can be transferred to them. The moral limit is not Denis's lack of a right to leave, but the unsupported assumption that someone has already accepted his unfinished work.

Shared responsibility can be organised well. A room may have a responsible person, a known cleaning arrangement and agreed conditions for returning objects. Using this arrangement is not shameful, and additional work should not be duplicated merely to display personal care. Yet the process's existence must be established. An imagined system that supposedly repairs everything after us differs from an actual agreement. Learning the arrangement is sometimes more important than making an impressive gesture that disrupts it on our own initiative.

Not mine can mean limited access, rather than absence of value. We need not make a place our own to respect other people's ability to use it. That respect may be thoroughly ordinary: return an object, report a change, leave understandable conditions and finish an agreed part. It does not give the departing person an exceptional moral status. It sustains a connection between an opportunity received and the way it is completed. Through that connection, a shared space ceases to be ownerless within our attention.

V. Care Does Not Require Repairing Every Earlier Problem

The room may have shortcomings Denis did not create. An old cupboard is inconvenient, finishing is damaged or storage arrangements are unclear. Attention to the place does not imply an obligation to repair all of this within three weeks. Otherwise, temporary access becomes an endless debt whose content grows with every observation. Distinguish one's own traces, accepted duties and a noticed task belonging to others or the community. These can overlap, but should not automatically become one list of personal work.

If Denis notices a significant problem, a manageable contribution may be reporting it to the responsible person. This differs from resolving it, and the record must preserve the distinction.

He should not declare the matter settled merely because he sent a message. Nor may its recipient treat the observation as agreement to perform all the work. Care allows a precise statement: I can report and discuss this, but am not accepting this additional task. A boundary helps responsibility remain real.

Sometimes a participant wants to do more. They can offer time, resources or a small repair within an agreed scope. The offer has moral value, but does not authorise acting on others' behalf and should not become a condition of ordinary respect. If access to a room was granted under known conditions, a later expectation of an unannounced service needs discussion. Gratitude for access does not constitute agreement to every new duty. Honest participation combines appreciation with the ability to clarify significant requirements.

This distinction protects both Denis and the place. Someone who accepts an impossible scope in advance may leave unfinished work and obstruct the next person's access. A limited obligation is easier to agree and check. If it needs alteration, that should be communicated before handover, with real options proposed. We are not considering contract law or deciding compensation disputes here. We are discussing how to avoid turning a good intention into a promise others rely on without sufficient grounds.

VI. Temporariness Can Teach Attention Without Appropriation

In section 11 of The Enchiridion, Epictetus joins temporary possession with an appeal to care for what is provided. The entire selected section also includes the death of loved ones and the loss of an estate within a Stoic religious and philosophical understanding. These strong assertions are not transferred into this article as prescriptions for people experiencing loss. Our comparison is narrower: releasing a claim to permanent possession need not mean abandoning attention to what we currently use. Care and appropriation differ.

Denis may feel attached to the room because important meetings happened there. This is not an error to remove for the sake of correct philosophy. Attachment can help him notice the place's value, but does not itself confer extra authority. Memory can be retained, gratitude expressed and an acceptable trace agreed. The next person may nevertheless have their own purposes. Respecting their opportunity means not requiring the room continually to confirm the significance of our past participation.

Care without appropriation can be particularly visible in a modest departure. We return keys, remove our belongings, leave an agreed explanation and do not demand a promise that the arrangement will last forever. This is not indifference to the result. It recognises that after an accepted handover, control passes to another person within known limits. If some responsibility remains ours, it must be named separately. Feeling connected to a place should not quietly become either permanent control or permanent debt.

Temporariness then becomes a useful limit. It helps us ask what actually falls within our participation and complete it proportionately. We need not declare ourselves merely guests in the world to acquire such attention. Nor must all ownership be considered evil. The distinction is more practical: use can be serious even when it ends, and completion can be caring even when we recognise that we will not determine the place's subsequent future.

VII. An Improvement Should Be Offered to Those Who Will Live With It

A gift to a space differs from a gift to an identified person. Shelves, plants or materials left behind alter conditions for people who may be absent when the decision is made. Find someone authorised to accept the alteration who understands the future work. In our hypothetical scene, Denis should not seek convenient approval from a random participant who does not control the room. A positive answer from someone lacking authority does not settle the matter simply because it was kindly expressed.

A proposal to improve a place should include more than its attractive side: maintenance, storage, the possibility of refusal or restoration of the earlier condition. Ordinary conversation need not contain every technical detail. Yet significant consequences must be intelligible. If future work is unknown, say so rather than conceal it within the word gift. Freely accepting something requires being able to see what is accepted. An initiator need not predict the whole future process, but must not hide known conditions.

The recipient may decline the improvement without denying Denis's good intention. Perhaps it does not fit the room's purposes, creates extra work or is simply unnecessary. That answer does not make the labour morally worthless. It reveals a limit of agreement. Denis can restore the previous arrangement, revise his proposal or retain only the agreed part. Gratitude for effort and consent to an alteration are different answers; confusing them makes refusal emotionally more costly than necessary.

If the improvement is accepted, clarify what counts as handover. An object left behind, a description of conditions and confirmation by the responsible person may have different statuses. There is no need to demand ceremonial gratitude, but we need to know whether our part is complete. Until then, retain an available way to finish if agreement is absent. Care appears in the clarity of transfer, rather than an ability to persuade others to accept everything we consider useful. A gift becomes a gift through acceptance, rather than insistent assignment.

VIII. Respect for a Place Cannot Replace Respect for Its Users

Sometimes an arrangement is defended so insistently that people find the space difficult to use. Every object acquires a prohibition, any rearrangement sounds like a violation and the previous user's convenience becomes the only correct setup. Care for a place can then become care for one's authority over it. Ask which opportunity a rule sustains and whom it obstructs. Preservation has real value, but it must be considered alongside the space's purpose and other people's access to participation.

Someone using the room differently is not necessarily less attentive. They may need a different passage, seating arrangement or absence of objects left behind. Our experience provides information, rather than a measure of every future need. Discussing a significant condition is enough for agreement; a full confession of reasons is unnecessary. Attention to people keeps a place fit for living. It need not permit every action, but lets limits be explained through their subject rather than the previous participant's moral superiority.

In the selected passage from Leviticus 25, land is considered within the religious arrangements of the sabbatical and jubilee years; verse 23 connects human residence with God's ownership of the land. This is a particular biblical context, rather than a modern rental rule. It provides no legal answer for Denis. The comparison concerns the limit of an ultimate human claim. A question about place remains connected with relationships and their order, rather than being reduced to the convenience of today's user.

This text can be compared with the Stoic reflection without declaring them one doctrine. In both selected contexts, permanent possession is not the sole perspective, while reasons, purposes and rules differ. Our original step is to ask about people who continue using the place after us. The question does not require a shared religious belief. It requires attention to access, authority and the completion of a specific action. The sources' differences remain and prevent an image from becoming an unsupported prescription.

IX. Describe the Traces of Your Presence Honestly

Before leaving, Denis may want to call everything ordinary wear, or alternatively take responsibility for everything imperfect. Both responses obstruct accuracy. Record known changes and matters whose origins have not been established. Things noticed earlier, things we created and things discovered at departure are different categories. They allow conversation without automatic accusation or false admission. Yet a lack of complete certainty should not be used to conceal an action we genuinely know about.

If Denis altered the arrangement of objects himself, he can describe that directly. If he does not know when another problem arose, he need not invent a history for a convenient

explanation. Such honesty does not settle a legal dispute or establish the technical cause of damage. It provides a basis for further conversation. The responsible person receives information, while Denis preserves the limits of his knowledge. Serious care can say I do not know without turning this into refusal to report what is known.

Reporting must also be distinguished from an accepted outcome. Sending a photograph does not always establish that the recipient examined the condition and agreed to handover. Where agreement matters, obtain an intelligible answer or follow a previously known procedure. If no response has arrived, that status should remain in the record. It cannot be replaced with certainty that everything surely suits the other person. Completion requires appropriate grounds, rather than merely relief felt by someone wanting to exit the process.

Proportionate accuracy should not make a small use into an endless inspection. For an ordinary room, an established procedure and significant information suffice. Detail matters where it helps another person use the place or clarifies real responsibility. If a new question exceeds Denis's knowledge and authority, identify it and address it to someone able to continue. Care does not improve simply through more records. Its quality depends on how accurately they reflect reality and help an intelligible handover.

X. A Good Departure Completes Use and Leaves the Next Person Free

Denis can agree to retain part of the rearrangement, remove his materials and restore unagreed alterations to a known condition. The next person receives a room with intelligible arrangements, rather than a duty to continue somebody else's project. This result joins participation with release. Denis need not vanish from the place's memory, but should not remain its invisible manager after his period ends. His care can support someone else's beginning without demanding that it repeat his own.

Gratitude for the opportunity also matters. It can be simple: recognise that the place allowed meetings to happen and complete the agreed work. Gratitude does not require an additional gift, particularly if it creates an unaccepted burden. Sometimes the most attentive response is returning access in an understandable condition. Nothing outwardly exceptional is involved, yet it respects those who provided the space and continue sustaining it. Ordinary completion does not lose value because it is difficult to present as an achievement.

If everything cannot be completed in time, departure should not begin with a silent hope that the question disappears. Name the obstacle early, discuss available options and retain the status of remaining work. The other person may accept a new arrangement or decline. Their answer cannot be treated as secured before conversation. We offer no universal solution to

access conflicts. We suggest not hiding incompleteness behind temporary use: a deadline explains participation's limits, but does not replace an agreed departure.

Care for a temporary place reveals a mature relationship: use without neglect, alter without appropriating authority and leave without secretly transferring one's work. It does not require becoming the owner of the entire space or repairing its whole history. Taking the received opportunity and one's own traces seriously is enough. Temporarily then ceases to mean morally unimportant. It means a defined period within which our attention can sustain present convenience and the freedom of the person entering next.

What this means in practice

Choose one place you use for a limited period. Briefly record known access conditions, your changes and the moment of departure. Distinguish ordinary use, temporary adjustments and what will remain after you. For the last category, clarify an authorised person's consent before acting. If a change already happened, name it directly and offer an available way to finish, without demanding gratitude as a form of consent.

Consider handover through the eyes of someone entering after you for the first time. Is it clear where necessary objects are, what was left and which information concerns use of the place? Remove private materials that cannot be transferred and retain necessary explanations. Separately identify a shared problem you noticed but did not create or accept as your task. Reporting it should not look like confirmation that it was resolved.

Leave time for an agreed departure. Check the specific arrangement and the status of a remaining question; do not treat silence as confirmation where an answer is needed. After an accepted handover, release control within agreed limits. This is an original exercise in attentively completing ordinary use, rather than a proven way to prevent conflict. Specialist work, contractual disputes and technical questions need appropriate conditions and competent consideration.

Key quotation

> *for ye are strangers and sojourners with me.*

Leviticus 25:23, King James Version; a short literal fragment. The religious basis of the relationship to land remains explicit; the quotation does not establish contemporary ownership or rental status.

Connections between traditions

Source or perspective	What it helps us notice	Limit of comparison
Epictetus, The Enchiridion, 11	Temporary possession can coexist with care	A Stoic approach to loss does not become advice to people grieving
Aristotle, Politics, II, III	Expectations of others' care need specific consideration	Ancient criticism does not prove inevitable neglect in shared places
Leviticus 25:1–28	Human claims to land are placed in a religious order	Biblical rules do not replace a contemporary agreement
United Wisdom	Access, alteration and handover require distinctions in authority	Original practical reasoning, without efficacy guarantees

Sources and notes

1. Epictetus, The Enchiridion, Elizabeth Carter's English translation, Internet Classics Archive, section 11 read in full, displayed line 44. Only a brief fragment about care during possession is used. The deaths of loved ones and loss of property belong to the original context; they are not transferred as psychological advice or abandonment of rights.

2. Aristotle, Politics, Book Two, Benjamin Jowett's translation, Internet Classics Archive, Part III, displayed lines 42–49 read continuously in full. The argument concerns criticism of Plato's common family and property. Historical hierarchical conceptions and generalisations are not adopted as contemporary norms; the text is not used as empirical research.

3. Leviticus, King James Version, 25:1–28 read continuously, displayed lines 457–466; key fragment at 25:23. The context of sabbatical and jubilee years, return of possession and religious ownership of land is retained. The rest of the chapter is not claimed as read; contemporary ownership rules are not derived from it.

Reading checked on 10 October 2026. United Wisdom translated the Russian quotations from the named English versions. Worldwide rights for specific versions have not been established; links, brief quotations and limited paraphrase are used. Full source texts are neither imported nor vectorised. The hypothetical scene and practice are original; no scientific efficacy guarantees are asserted.

Tags

care for places, temporary use, handing over space, authority, consent, other people's space, shared places, respect, completion, responsibility, access, alteration, gifts, gratitude, limits of care, personal traces, incompleteness, shared work, temporariness, nonappropriation, intelligibility, private information, handover conditions, another person's freedom, practical ethics, Epictetus, Aristotle, Leviticus, United Wisdom, next user

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.