

UNITED WISDOM

Living With Limitations: Capacities, Environment, and Dignity

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-17-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Living With Limitations: Capacities, Environment, and Dignity

Epigraph

> *Individual autonomy.*

UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Article3(a), a fragment of the English text. Here autonomy concerns the right to personal choice; it does not require performing every action without others' participation.

What this article is about

Inna wants to attend a novel discussion at the library. She has read the book, prepared a question, and knows several participants. But six steps lead to the meeting room; Inna uses a wheelchair and cannot reach it by that route. The organizer sympathetically suggests watching a recording. That offer might help, yet changes the participation itself: Inna intended to ask questions and respond in a shared conversation. Her capacity to discuss the book has not disappeared. A particular way of reaching the place where she could use that capacity with others is unavailable.

Name a limitation precisely without turning it into either a characteristic of the whole person or a problem supposedly overcome through the correct attitude. This article distinguishes capacities, participation conditions, and human dignity. That distinction allows discussion of support, changing the environment, declining an unsuitable option, and one's relationship to loss. It promises no removal of every obstacle. Human rights as normative grounding are separated here from clinical explanation: the scene establishes no diagnosis, prognosis, or individual treatment, while particular legal procedures depend on a separate situation.

I. A Limitation Concerns an Action, Rather Than the Whole Person

"Inna cannot participate" appears clear until we specify what is impossible. She can read the text, formulate an opinion, hear another speaker, and respond. She cannot reach this room by this route under current conditions. Those facts do not cancel each other. A more accurate account reveals the mismatch's location instead of a general conclusion of incapacity. It also does not diminish the obstacle's reality: without changing the route, room, or format, the desired participation still will not happen, however many other actions remain available.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

A limitation can be lasting, temporary, changing, or unclear. A particular conversation need not immediately assign a final category. Inna reports a condition for the coming meeting. The organizer can ask which arrangement fits but should not determine the limit of her entire future life from one report. Equally, Inna need not promise that she will eventually stop using the chair for today's question to be taken seriously. Participation planning should use the present condition; an unknown future can remain unknown.

This account also differs from requiring a list of every retained capacity. Inna need not prove she is sufficiently talented, useful, or independent before entrance is discussed. Her knowledge of the book belongs in the scene because it clarifies the meeting's subject. It is not payment for considering access. Someone with different preparation can also want to attend, listen, or meet the group for the first time. Discussing participation should not quietly introduce an examination of the worth of someone needing a different route.

If a particular operation really is unavailable, acknowledge it directly. Dignity requires neither denying difficulty nor replacing it with an assertion that the person can do everything. Inna cannot reach the room up the steps alone; assistance with that action might be unsuitable or unsafe under particular conditions. No universal carrying method is proposed here. Preserve the limitation as fact and the open question of participation options. A false promise of omnipotence deprives conversation of accuracy just as a general declaration of incapacity for every shared activity does.

The first useful change in language is therefore small: name the action, route, and present condition. Questions then become distinguishable: what someone does, what prevents it, who can change the arrangement, and which option they choose. No answer follows automatically from another. Reading capacity does not create an accessible staircase, a staircase does not determine thinking capacity, and a helper's participation establishes no authority to decide for Inna. Accuracy connects these parts of the situation while retaining each in its place.

II. The Environment Belongs in an Account of Possibility

Imagine the same group meeting on the ground floor. Inna arrives, asks a question, and disagrees with another participant about the ending. In this imagined example, her capacities have not changed; the path to a shared activity changed. That shows why describing possibility requires considering the environment. It does not prove that every limitation is created solely by surroundings or that changing a building resolves every difficulty. It reveals one obstacle where a general conclusion about the person previously stood, as though the room had no part in the outcome.

In Articles1 and3 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, limitations of participation are considered in interaction with barriers; dignity and autonomy appear among

the principles. This is a normative disability rights document, rather than a clinical model of the causes of a person's condition. It establishes neither our library's actual accessibility nor resolution under local law. Subsequent examples are independent editorial reasoning, rather than a retelling of other Convention provisions or ready-made instructions for applying law.

Environment includes more than entrance. A meeting might have an accessible route but an announcement in a format someone cannot read; speakers might talk simultaneously, or registration require an action without a suitable device. Each condition concerns particular participation. The question in these imagined examples is where an obstacle appears. We need not find one general guilty factor in advance. Different changes are sometimes needed, and participants' preferences sometimes conflict, requiring separate agreement on how a shared activity will work.

Naming a barrier does not mean declaring the organizer a bad person. They might not have checked the room, assumed a recording sufficed, or not known which condition matters to Inna. These are possible explanations, rather than an established reading of motives. Nevertheless, not knowing does not make steps accessible. Discussion can preserve goodwill while requiring a factual answer about the room. If everyone concentrates on proving good intentions, participation remains unresolved. The arrangement's result matters here and cannot be replaced by an emotional assurance, however sincere that assurance was.

An environment cannot always change immediately either. The library has no other room that evening and the neighbouring venue is occupied. Acknowledge that fact without declaring Inna's need excessive. The imminent meeting and the group's long-term arrangement become two questions. Today's option might not fit while the next meeting could be organized differently. A partial solution need not be portrayed as final accessibility success. Accurate conversation preserves particular inaccessibility and a possible future action without promising that resources will certainly appear.

III. Changing Conditions Need Not Portray Repairing a Person

Moving the meeting to the ground floor neither cured Inna nor taught her to overcome stairs. The room changed, allowing the use of already available capacities. This distinction clarifies a result without an unnecessary story of personal transformation. The condition itself might need separate professional support if the person wants it and a corresponding task exists. But it does not absorb the organizational question. Choosing a room need not first require medical history or proof that the participant is trying hard enough to become different.

A technical adaptation has a particular function too. It might change opening a door, reading an announcement, or hearing conversation. Using it does not make someone a less real participant. In our scene Inna arrives in a chair and joins the discussion; the chair does not

occupy the place of her opinion. Yet which device fits her cannot be decided from afar. An offered tool needs examination of accessibility, conditions, and the user’s consent. Naming an adaptation alone does not confirm removal of a particular obstacle.

A person’s assistance differs from changing a shared arrangement. A friend might accompany Inna while the library chooses an accessible room. Both actions can help but address different parts of the task. If entrance always depends on the friend being free, that participation condition remains significant. It cannot be considered absent simply because one meeting happened. Inna can prefer a more definite route; the friend can decline a permanent role. Discussion should see each participant’s resources rather than portraying someone’s kindness as inexhaustible infrastructure.

Sometimes offered help does not fit because of the action itself. Inna does not want strangers carrying her up steps. Refusal need not accuse them of bad intentions. She can name that the offered method was not chosen and ask to discuss another. The organizer can also report unavailable options. Agreement need not end in overlap. But the person’s right to answer an offered method matters: participation should not begin by surrendering control of their body or personal decisions to others without consent.

Assess an alternative format against the desired action. A recording allows hearing discussion but not asking a question. An online connection might include Inna if participants and technology are ready. A separate call afterward offers another kind of conversation. These options cannot be declared equivalent or useless in advance. Inna can choose one, decline, or note that a needed part remains unresolved. An adaptation can be a partial solution without being embellished into an assertion that every original possibility has been fully restored.

IV. Receiving Support Is Compatible With Choosing for Yourself

Inna agrees to a friend helping with the journey. On the way the friend suggests composing her question to the organizer beforehand. This might be wanted participation if Inna requested it, or an unnecessary decision if her question is ready. Help with one step does not determine all other authority. Clarify who handles the journey, who contacts the library, and who speaks on her behalf. This concerns neither compulsory performance of everything alone nor an independence contest, but a clear distribution of agreed actions and deciding responses.

Someone might want to transfer part of a decision. Inna asks her friend to check two routes and choose the more convenient one with her. That is her choice of support’s form. Autonomy does not demand doing everything without advice, information, and participation. Yet agreeing on a particular route choice does not authorize the helper to decide whether she should attend at all or continue reading the novel. Expanding the subject requires another conversation.

Accepted support remains conditional and definite even in trusting relationships with unpaid assistance.

Other people’s assumptions about the best option do not replace asking Inna. The organizer might believe staying home is calmer; the friend might insist on attendance to set an example. Both offer their own meanings of participation. Inna might want an ordinary conversation about a book, demonstrating neither tranquillity nor strength of character. Her answer need not coincide with a well-intentioned version of what a limitation should mean. Her desire deserves a separate place even when others have prepared an attractive explanation of her situation.

Inna herself might not know which option she will choose. Uncertainty does not transfer the decision to the first confident speaker. Obtain information, try the connection, or postpone an answer until the room is clarified. Name a decision deadline when one exists. Conditions sometimes leave only unpleasant options; choosing among them does not make a limitation freely chosen. Support can distinguish available actions without portraying every outcome as complete control over circumstances that someone did not create and could not remove.

The right to choose does not make others’ participation compulsory without conditions. The friend might be free only until a particular time and the organizer lack control over the next room. These limits need acknowledgment too. Inna may report that the offered amount is insufficient and retain an unresolved question. Participants might find no shared solution. That outcome cancels neither her dignity nor proves insufficient care in every person nearby. It shows a particular mismatch of capacities that can be discussed further or left visible without becoming a judgment of the whole personality.

V. Dignity Does Not Depend on a Heroic Image

After the meeting Inna is called remarkably strong for attending despite circumstances. Perhaps the attention pleases her; perhaps she wants to return to the novel. Her reaction cannot be determined for her. Participation does not oblige someone to exemplify overcoming obstacles, while declining attendance would not mean insufficient strength. When human dignity is tied to an impressive action, the ordinary right to be present becomes a reward. Someone then has to produce inspiration for others before participation is noticed as significant and deserving attention.

The opposite image narrows a person too. A sympathetic speaker sees only difficulty, addresses the friend instead of Inna, and explains in advance why disagreement would be hard for her. In the scene this replaces someone’s prepared opinion with an assumption about their condition. Sympathy can fit without supplying knowledge of every capacity and desire. Asking the participant directly is a particular action requiring no prior denial of difficulties. Her

words can be taken seriously without making every remark a report about a limitation or the feat of overcoming it.

Difficulty need not be replaced by a compulsory positive story. Inna might regret the unavailable familiar path, resent extra planning, or not want to explain the situation again. Those experiences do not prove inability to live with dignity. They also give no right to humiliate another participant. Distinguish a relationship to the obstacle from ways of treating others. A person can have a complicated reaction while answering for particular words and actions, without having to be permanently grateful or continually courageous.

Loss can be real after a successful environmental change. The meeting happened, but Inna spent more time organizing than others or abandoned a desired route through the park. Improvement does not erase that cost. Naming it does not reject a useful solution or spoil success. It preserves a full account: access appeared and some inconvenience remained. If another conversation is needed, it can address that part rather than begin by proving that the help already received has no value whatsoever.

Dignity therefore needs no confirmation through happiness, carrying oneself, or intellectual brilliance. It sets a normative boundary for treating someone, rather than assessing a successful performance. In our independent editorial discussion, this means asking what was chosen, naming the real obstacle, and not assigning a role for other people’s impressions. That position promises no pleasant relationship with every listener. It reveals substitution when the right to participation depends on producing a convenient or inspiring image for others.

VI. A Shared Task Needs Visible Participants and Authority

The organizer decides to move the next meeting. They must arrange this with the library, tell the group the new location, and check changed conditions for others. Inna can join discussion without having to do all the work of changing a shared activity herself. Her report revealed an obstacle; it does not automatically appoint her accessibility coordinator. If such a role is offered, separate conditions and consent are needed. Someone affected by a problem does not acquire an endless duty to fix it merely by describing it clearly.

Nor should Inna be excluded from the later decision on the assumption that specialists already know everything necessary. Checking the result with the person needing participation helps precisely because conditions are particular. She might report that the entrance fits but room acoustics impede discussion. That is task information, rather than an ungrateful change of requirements. Yet her experience does not become knowledge about every other participant. Differences within the group remain real; one fitting option does not establish universal suitability or remove every need for further checking.

Name resources without hidden distribution too. A friend spending every evening accompanying her contributes their participation. A library assigning a staff member or room takes organizational action. Inna paying for additional transport bears her cost. The visible result belongs to no single hero of help. This map supports discussion of continuing, changing, and accessing the next meeting. It is no calculation of moral superiority and does not force the recipient continually to prove that others' contributions paid off through sufficient enjoyment of the activity.

A complex conflict does not always have an easy solution. The new room is accessible for Inna but farther from another participant's home. Another day, two formats, or abandoning that room might be needed. One person's need cannot be declared more real in advance because it is more visibly obvious. Clarify particular conditions and the roles of decision-makers. This is an independent editorial approach to conversation, rather than a universal legal formula. It retains conflict instead of promising that respectful language will necessarily create an option equally suitable to everyone without cost or compromise.

Without shared resources, declining the meeting might be Inna's choice today. That should not become consent to permanent inaccessibility. Retain the next arrangement as a separate question, approach the organizer about a particular task, or seek another activity. A particular legal approach needs current local rules and circumstances, which were not researched here. Our discussion simply avoids treating personal refusal as proof that the former room suited someone, or that a need for different participation no longer matters to conversation.

VII. Examine Participation, Rather Than an Attractive Explanation

At the next meeting entrance is accessible, but the camera is distant and online participants cannot hear questions. If Inna chose a connection, a formal link alone does not mean participation happened. Consider the desired action: could she hear and respond? This question accuses no entire technology and requires no ideal arrangement. It examines the particular result of an offer. If listening works but speaking does not, name partial access instead of portraying a communication channel's existence as restoring the whole original conversation.

Alternatively, Inna attended and chose only to listen. The absence of her question then does not prove failed accessibility. She might have changed her desire, tired of the discussion, or preferred others' remarks; the reasons are unknown. Examination should not become a requirement to use every created possibility. Accessible entrance allows participation without obliging a performance. Maintain the distinction between a usable condition and an obligation to demonstrate sufficient usefulness to organizers through a particular personal outcome.

Feedback can therefore be brief and definite. Inna reports entering without the previous obstacle and hearing conversation but being unable to open the next door independently. This is route information, rather than a catalogue of flaws for continuous criticism. The organizer can clarify who controls the door and which option exists. An unknown answer need not be concealed by a ready-made moral story. The unfinished operation remains visible, while completed changes retain significance without exaggeration or cancellation of the remaining obstacle.

A result need not be measured by independence from everyone. Inna can want to attend with a friend even when entrance is entirely accessible. That is chosen company, rather than proof of insufficient autonomy. She can want to arrive alone and find an offer of accompaniment unsuitable. Both options need her answer. For our editorial question, what matters is agreeing on chosen participation rather than counting absent helpers. Complete independence cannot be used to declare shared life less dignified or force someone to abandon a desired connection.

Examination has limits too. One successful meeting establishes no entire future accessibility of the library; one failure establishes no impossibility of every activity. Retain information about this room, day, and action. Such limits help plan a next step without deriving a biographical verdict. Someone can acknowledge that this group currently does not fit and choose another activity. That is a particular decision on actual conditions, rather than compulsory surrender to limitations or abandonment of dignity that existed before every organizational outcome.

VIII. Life Is Not Reduced to Overcoming One Obstacle

Inna discusses the novel, disputes its character, and later decides whether she wants to read the next book. These actions need not derive meaning only through the chair and entrance. A limitation remains part of conditions without becoming the meeting’s or life’s only content. Someone may have ordinary interests, dull tasks, changing tastes, and disagreements without making them a symbolic account of strength. That space does not arise through denying difficulty. It arises when difficulty is named precisely enough to stop replacing every other question that also needs room.

Nor must someone stop thinking about a limitation. Inna can devote much attention to it if it really affects daily life. Advice not to define oneself through difficulty can become another outside demand if it forbids communicating actual costs. Our discussion concerns the possibility of distinguishing, rather than a correct proportion of thoughts. Someone can discuss an obstacle, choose environmental change, and discuss a book at different times, without proving they have already successfully moved beyond their situation inwardly and finally.

A medical domain remains when a question about a condition needs professional inquiry. An organizational distinction establishes no cause, cancels no illness, and replaces no support chosen on clinical grounds. Yet a clinical name alone says neither whether library entrance is accessible nor which format the participant wants. This article makes no particular medical conclusions. Two questions remain separate: about the condition and possible participation. Both can be considered without turning normative dignity into a treatment guarantee or a diagnosis into an account of the whole life.

Environmental change requires no complete reconciliation with losses either. Inna can choose a convenient entrance and keep regretting certain former capacities. Dignity does not await emotional completion of that process. It rises neither with acceptance nor falls with irritation or grief. Someone answers for particular actions among others without having to produce one correct relationship to their position. That boundary allows discussing reality without first becoming an inspiring example, a tranquil recipient of help, or an ideal participant in every available activity.

A next step can concern one door, one contact method, or one offer of participation. It neither resolves an entire life nor needs to portray doing so. What matters is that the person authors their answer, environment joins discussion, and difficulty is not presented as deficient human worth. An obstacle that remains can retain its accurate description. Participation that happens can be named as an actual result. Dignity does not appear at a successful story’s end: it sets conditions for a conversation where both success and incompletion can remain real.

What this means in practice

Choose one desired participation and name an action: entering a room, reading a message, hearing discussion, or responding. Clarify where an obstacle arises and what is known about today’s condition. No complete cause of the state or list of capacities proving sufficient worth is required.

Separate possible changes: someone’s own action, a helper’s participation, and environmental arrangement. For each option ask what really changes, who controls the decision, and whether consent is needed. An alternative format might preserve only part of desired participation. If that part does not fit, name refusal directly without denying the offerer’s good intentions.

Retain the person’s answer in agreement. Assistance with a route appoints no helper to decide every other question. Without resources, preserve the particular unfinished task; respectful conversation does not automatically create a room. Legal approaches and clinical inquiry need their own grounds, which this practice does not replace.

After a chosen action, describe the result within its scope: what became accessible, what remained difficult, and what someone now wants. Do not measure success through

compulsory happiness, speaking, or complete absence of helpers. This is an independent editorial practice of accurate conversation about participation. You can stop at one operation without turning a limitation into a moral examination or promising to overcome the entire situation immediately.

Key quotation

> *Their inherent dignity.*

UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Article1. A brief fragment of the English text concerning the document’s purpose. Normative grounding establishes neither actual implementation of rights nor a medical outcome for an individual.

Connections between traditions

Basis	Independent editorial question	Boundary
UN Convention, Articles1 and3	Which conditions preserve a participant’s answer?	A normative right is neither clinical explanation nor evidence of local implementation.
Imagined library scene alongside normative grounding	What exactly prevents the desired action?	An authorial example is neither a study nor a universal environmental change procedure.

The document is compared with independent reasoning; the imagined example is not presented as a separate historical teaching or empirical source.

Primary sources

• S1. United Nations. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, official multilingual text from the UN Treaty Collection, English section, Articles1–3, PDF pages35–36. The extracted text of these articles was read completely October5,2026; particular provisions were checked against indexed UN Enable pages. Neither the entire Convention, its implementation practice, nor current local procedures were read. Several UN/OHCHR HTML endpoints returned403; the stated Treaty Collection document was accessible. The particular file’s licence and global permission to import were not established: UNKNOWN. Two short English fragments were used with the Russian version’s own translations identified.

Tags

limitation, capacities, environment, dignity, participation, accessibility, choice, autonomy, support, consent, privacy, barrier, library, reading, conversation, room, route, help, human rights, normative grounding, loss, responsibility, format, partial result, adaptation, personal answer, incompletion, disability, CRPD, United Wisdom

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 coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to examine these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.