

UNITED WISDOM

The right to private space in close relationships

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R18 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

The right to private space in close relationships

Epigraph

“the supply creates the demand”

Samuel Warren and Louis Brandeis, The Right to Privacy, 1890, p.196; an excerpt from their own argument about the trade in gossip. The Russian translation is editorial. This is a historical observation, not an established contemporary law of behaviour. Primary text.

What this article is about

In a fictional scene, Alya leaves her phone on the kitchen table and goes to shower. Nikita sees a message from her friend, then opens the conversation to understand it. He does not intend to publish anything and believes there should be no closed subjects between close people. When Alya returns, the argument is not about the message's contents. What matters to her is that nobody asked permission to read it. Nikita interprets her objection as distrust: why protect something from him if, as she says, it contains nothing wrong?

Different understandings of closeness collide. In one, everything available to the eye is shared. In another, shared life does not remove the possibility of personal correspondence, time, thoughts, and conversations. Between them is a concrete question: who agreed to which access, for what purpose, and for how long? This is more precise than competing in transparency, where privacy must be justified by the faultlessness of every concealed message.

The article considers private space as a subject of respect and agreement rather than a ready-made universal legal answer. Privacy does not release somebody from accepted shared obligations. But closeness alone grants no permanent permission to read, retell, and inspect. Distinguishing these sides matters if trust is to be discussed without compulsory cancellation of an independent life or concealment of real unreliability behind the attractive word boundary.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Availability does not establish permission

The phone was on a shared table, its screen lit up, and the message was visible. These circumstances explain how Nikita became aware of it. They do not answer whether he had consent to open the conversation further. Availability is often mistaken for permission in ordinary life: an unlocked door, a book on a bedside table, a letter left in sight. Ease of entering a space and an invitation to enter are different events. The distinction does not depend on finding something objectionable inside.

A specific action can be examined. Did Nikita accidentally see a notification or deliberately open messages? Was there an agreement to use each other's phones? If Alya once asked him to read a delivery address, did that cover the whole archive? Without clarification, discussion quickly generalises: she is hiding something; he respects nothing. Labels may express pain but do not replace an account of what people actually accepted.

Permission has a subject. Taking a device to make a call does not necessarily mean reading personal letters. Opening one photograph does not necessarily mean browsing the rest. Describing an experience to one person does not necessarily make it material for the family chat. These are editorial ways of discussing consent, not replacements for law or a technical access policy. Everyday discussion needs permission's limits to be understandable before an action has happened and requires justification.

If conditions were never discussed, this may explain the disagreement without making clarification pointless. Different assumptions can be acknowledged and a future rule stated. A habit need not remain merely because one person considered it normal. Alya can withdraw previously unrestricted access to correspondence. Nikita can say the change is difficult. His difficulty calls for discussion but does not itself restore permission that is now absent.

II. Privacy need not prove innocence

Somebody may have draft thoughts they are not ready to explain. A letter to a friend may contain that friend's difficulties. A diary may record irritation rather than a final decision about a partner. Reading something outside its circumstances does not automatically produce an accurate account of intended action. A demand to see everything to verify honesty therefore affects more than one hidden secret: it affects the possibility of thinking, trying words, and speaking differently with different people.

Somebody can retain private space while respecting shared agreements. Somebody can conceal an important breach and call it privacy. The first does not establish the second; the second does not make all privacy suspicious. The question needs an action: what specifically affected the other's consent to participate in shared circumstances? For a shared expense,

information about that expense matters. For another person's conversation about private grief, every detail may be unrelated to a couple's shared decision.

Every private fragment need not be examined for a sufficient reason to close it. Somebody can want time alone without an impressive explanation. A return time for an agreed shared task can be discussed without requiring an account of every minute alone. Respect concerns a separate participant in the relationship. Their independence should not depend on whether their partner considers reading, walking, or speaking with a friend sufficiently useful.

This does not mean that saying it is private ends any disagreement. If somebody promised to collect a child and disappeared without notice, performance remains at issue. If shared money was spent against an agreement, the circumstances matter. Preserving privacy requires distinguishing necessary shared information from complete access to a life. Somebody can answer for a particular action without accepting indefinite inspection of all messages as the only way to prove suitability for a close relationship.

III. Historical protection is not contemporary law

In The Right to Privacy, published in 1890, Samuel Warren and Louis Brandeis discuss photography, newspapers, and disclosure of private life. They consider protection of personality against unwanted publicity rather than material property alone. The selected passages read examine letters, images, confidence, and publication limits. This is a legal argument of its period, constructed around contemporary judicial decisions. It does not establish an operative rule for every modern family conflict. Source.

The distinction between receiving information and permission to distribute it is comparable with our scene. If Alya tells Nikita about a difficult conversation, whether it can be retold to friends remains a question. If he reads a letter at her request, permission to show it to others does not necessarily follow. The authors seek a broader basis of protection than a specific contract. Our household comparison is smaller: individual permission need not quietly become permission for every subsequent use.

Warren and Brandeis also discuss limits of the proposed protection, including public interest and particular circumstances of communication. Extracting an absolute instruction never to disclose anything would therefore be inaccurate. Contemporary legal questions need their own jurisdiction and current primary foundations. This article derives no instructions about recording conversations, accessing devices, or disclosure duties from the historical essay. A dispute with legal consequences needs more than a general reflection on closeness.

The epigraph comes from the authors' own argument about commercial distribution of gossip. It cannot prove that every phone inspection inevitably increases control. But it opens an editorial question: what arrangement is maintained by repetition? If every conflict ends with

broader access, is the original concern still being discussed, or is constant inspection becoming normal? The answer needs the couple's actual actions; a historical thought opens the question without deciding it empirically.

IV. Shared life needs shared information

Alya and Nikita rent a flat together and share some expenses. They need information about their agreements: who transfers money, when guests arrive, who will be home for repairs. This helps both act. Private space should not leave somebody without information that was promised. But needing a guest's arrival time does not entail reading the entire correspondence with them. The necessary scope can be tied to the shared task.

That task can be named before requesting access. Is Nikita worried that a shared payment failed? Then the question concerns the payment. Does he not know whether the evening is booked? Then the question concerns plans. Concern about trust after a specific breach is wider but still needs description. A complete message archive may contain abundant information yet provide no intelligible answer to the original disagreement. Quantity seen is not clarity about agreed conditions.

An openness agreement can be voluntary, limited, and revisable. People might share information about common expenses while keeping private conversations separate. Consent from both, the subject of access, and the possibility of saying that earlier terms no longer fit matter. If refusing access brings threats of losing housing or money, formal agreement is insufficient for a safe experiment. The issue then concerns real options and support rather than merely choosing a suitable word.

Sometimes a sufficient scope of information cannot be agreed. One person regards constant inspection as necessary, and another will not live with it. This is a substantial mismatch that cannot be repaired by declaring one person insufficiently loving. The difference can be acknowledged and available next decisions considered. This article requires no preservation of the couple and promises no restored trust through limited access. Agreement must be examined through responses and actions rather than assumed from closeness itself.

V. Solitude can form part of participation

Private space concerns more than information. Somebody may want to eat quietly, finish a letter, pray, or simply sit without conversation. This need not mean rejecting another person forever. But where a shared task exists, stating when somebody will be available again or what they cannot currently perform helps. It distinguishes limited solitude from indefinitely disappearing from accepted obligations. The answer need not include a complete account of inner life.

Matthew 6:1–6 contrasts religious display with an address to God without spectators; the passage read concerns almsgiving and prayer. A meaningful action need not always require public witness: this is the available comparison. However, the text is religious instruction, not research into solitude's benefits or a general rule of family access. It proves neither that every closed door serves good nor that a separate room helps every conflict. Source.

Not everybody has a room of their own. Sometimes separate time is available only through a walk, headphones, or an agreed quiet hour in shared space. These are discussion examples rather than universal recommendations: possibilities depend on housing, care, and work. Privacy should not become a privilege solely for whoever controls the space. If one can always close a door while another remains responsible for shared tasks, discussion needs participation's distribution as well as the door.

Alya can say she wants twenty minutes without messages or conversation before returning to dinner plans. Nikita can communicate a genuinely urgent decision needed now, if there is one. Both can examine circumstances without calling every pause rejection. Separate time and reliable agreed participation need not destroy each other. Combining them does require specifics: who takes responsibility for what and which circumstances change the original plan.

VI. Asking means leaving room for an answer

A request for permission differs from a ritual after which the action happens anyway. If Nikita asks to show a photograph but punishes refusal, the question may merely formalise an existing decision. Safe agreement needs the answer to be able to change the action. This applies to small matters too: retelling a funny incident, sharing a family picture, or using a personal possession. Prior discussion guarantees no unanimity, but makes visible what would otherwise be assumed.

Quran 24:27–29 relates entering another's home to permission and greeting, while distinguishing circumstances of entry. This is a religious norm about houses rather than a direct instruction for smartphones or relationships within a family. The comparison concerns permission before entering. It establishes neither the same position in every religion nor a universal technical access policy. The verse and displayed adjacent context were read for this article, not the complete commentary. Source.

Instead of a general question, the action can be described: I want to forward this message to this person for this task. Alya can then accept one version and refuse another. Perhaps the necessary portion can be retold without details. Perhaps the friend should be asked because the message contains her information. Clarification need not turn a relationship into endless bureaucracy. It matters especially when an action gains a new audience or purpose not anticipated by the initial conversation.

Consent to publishing one photograph is not always consent to any caption or future picture. An established habit can be revised from a particular point. Information already circulated cannot be guaranteed to disappear, and this article promises no technical deletion. Limited subsequent control does not make prior permission unnecessary. It helps show why scope and recipient can usefully be discussed before distribution, while a choice can still affect the action.

VII. Other people participate in a story

This also concerns one's own account of a couple. One person may find an episode amusing and want to share it; another may not want that audience for their mistake. The account's form can be discussed, identifying details removed, or publication declined. Yet another's privacy does not automatically prohibit seeking help for oneself. If these purposes conflict, the recipient, purpose, and necessary information require consideration. Describing difficulty to a professional and making an entertaining public post have different conditions. Both cannot be declared identical merely because they contain family information.

The friend's message contains more than Alya's private life. The friend describes her family and may have expected a particular listener. If Nikita demands the conversation as proof of loyalty, another person outside the argument is affected. Trust within a couple should not automatically make friends' trust a shared resource. Alya can describe the subject sufficiently for an appropriate shared question without handing every detail of another's life over for inspection.

When seeking support, some disclosure may be necessary. Privacy need not mean silence about one's difficulties, especially with threats or violence. But considering which information somebody needs to help and which merely expands the story is useful. Roles can replace names, the entire archive need not be shown, and observation can be distinguished honestly from supposition. These are editorial ways of reducing unnecessary disclosure rather than promises of complete anonymity or universal rules for professional assistance.

If Nikita has already forwarded the message, the original question changes: an action now requires accountability. He can acknowledge it specifically, say who received it, and discuss available next steps without guaranteeing deletion. An apology need not demand that Alya immediately restore earlier trust. She may not be ready to disclose more. Fresh voluntary openness should not become payment for somebody acknowledging earlier access beyond the permitted scope.

Protecting third parties should nevertheless not become a convenient cover for one's own unreliability. If a shared question concerns Alya's action, she can describe it herself without exposing her friend entirely. Whether information can be separated this way depends on the

event. Professional advice may be needed where law, employment, or safety is involved. Our purpose is to retain different subjects of accountability so that one necessary conversation does not automatically permit everything else.

VIII. Trust after a breach is not repaired through access alone

Where a particular agreement was broken, a request for openness may have an understandable history. It need not immediately be called meaningless jealousy. But what is to be restored, and through which actions can it be noticed? Constant device inspection does not itself demonstrate a fulfilled promise or more reliable participation. This is no reported research finding; it is an editorial distinction between an observation method and the subject of a promise.

People can freely agree on a temporary scope of information. The period, purpose, and possibility of revision then matter, rather than making a permitted inspection a lifelong condition of closeness. Third-party information matters too. If terms are not freely accepted or refusal is dangerous, the experiment is unsuitable. Increasing transparency cannot be required as the only path to moral justification. Discussion of a breach's consequences may be necessary, while its form still requires separate agreement.

Every agreement has limits. Nikita may see messages and remain anxious. Alya may keep a conversation closed while reliably participating in shared tasks. One kind of access guarantees nobody another's honesty. If trust does not return, that is a substantial circumstance that can be considered with suitable support. This article proposes no inspection until complete calm and determines no psychological cause of distrust from a scene with a phone.

Returning to shared life is possible only through participants' actual willingness, rather than as a compulsory outcome in advance. Sometimes new agreement clarifies conditions. Sometimes it reveals incompatible expectations. Sometimes separate support comes first. Privacy requires no preservation of every couple, and responsibility requires no acceptance of every form of control. These limits leave people able to consider next steps in their circumstances without promising that correct words will remove the significance of an earlier breach.

IX. A small rule shows a larger difference

In the original fictional scene, Alya asks Nikita not to open her correspondence without permission again. He says that accepting this separateness is difficult, but agrees to ask first about needed information. The following week he sees a notification and does not open it. This is one fictional example of an action. It establishes no complete restoration of trust and promises no similar outcome for every couple. But the condition is now distinguishable in behaviour.

The rule concerns both. If Alya reads Nikita's messages herself, she needs to consider her access too. Reciprocity does not necessarily mean identical settings on every device: tasks and voluntary terms may differ. The right to participate in discussion should belong to both. Where the person setting rules retains privacy while another's every refusal is called suspicious, the shared arrangement requires separate examination.

Private space can be quiet and unheroic. Finish a letter without explaining every draft sentence. Do not forward somebody else's difficulty for dinner discussion. Ask before telling a family story. Return to an accepted shared task at the agreed time. These actions guarantee no perfect closeness. They help distinguish participation from absorption, necessary information from everything available, and a request from a demand. Such distinction leaves more room for specific trust expressed through more than disclosure.

Respect for privacy does not mean permanent closure. Alya may choose to tell Nikita more later. What matters is that new openness has an author and conditions rather than being obtained by proving a right to demand it. Separateness is not competing with closeness over the quantity of secrets. It allows two people to participate in shared life without ceasing to be separate participants whose consent concerns a particular action rather than disappearing once love is declared.

What this means in practice

One small area of access that is safe to discuss can be chosen voluntarily: personal possessions, photographs, or time without conversation. This is an editorial practice, not a trust diagnosis or validated method of repairing relationships. With threats, violence, or danger for refusing, joint discussion and demonstrative rule changes may be unsuitable. Support and accessible safety options matter first. Silence under danger cannot be treated as freely given consent.

First describe the existing situation without a general label. Who currently takes, reads, retells, enters, or expects an immediate reply? What was explicitly accepted and what merely assumed? Mark unknown conditions as unknown. Private contents need not be exposed to describe access. You can say that correspondence is involved without showing it or turning another's information into exercise material.

Then name a shared task, if there is one: communicating guest times or a joint payment's status, for example. Separately name what the task does not require: a complete conversation with a friend, all notes, or constant availability. This distinction can be proposed for discussion rather than declared an accepted contract. The other participant can clarify what information is needed and why. Both can pause and return later if safe.

If agreement is possible, choose one precise rule for a short period. Ask before forwarding a particular picture. Do not open messages after a request merely to find an address. Agree on a return time after a brief pause. Examples are optional and do not cover legal situations. Clarify what happens with a new task, whose information is involved, and whether the condition can be revised. The rule need not become a concealed test of love.

After a few days, consider an available observation: was permission requested, necessary information communicated, unnecessary disclosure created, and the condition kept voluntary? Complete disappearance of anxiety need not prove success. If the rule is not followed, acknowledge that event and consider available options rather than automatically increasing inspection. The practice promises no mutual understanding and requires no reconciliation. Its modest aim is to name one access and one accepted participation more clearly.

Key quotation

> *“the supply creates the demand”*

Samuel Warren and Louis Brandeis, The Right to Privacy, 1890, p.196; the same excerpt returns to the question of which arrangement repetition supports. The Russian translation is editorial; household application is a comparison rather than an established mechanism of control. Primary text.

Connections between traditions

Warren and Brandeis defend private life against unwanted publicity in a specific historical legal context and discuss protection's limits. Their argument allows access and subsequent distribution to be compared, but replaces neither current law nor a particular family's rules.

Matthew 6:1–6 concerns almsgiving and prayer without a performative audience. An action not intended for spectators is comparable; the passage supplies no clinical evidence for solitude's benefits or justification for avoiding shared responsibility.

Quran 24:27–29 relates entry into another's home to permission and distinguishes situations. Comparison with other access is limited: there is no direct smartphone rule or common position of every tradition on family privacy here.

Similar questions do not erase differences between a historical legal argument, religious instruction, and editorial household practice. These texts establish no efficacy for the proposed exercise.

Sources

1. Samuel D. Warren, Louis D. Brandeis. The Right to Privacy. Harvard Law Review, volume IV, no. 5, 15 December 1890, pp. 193–220; Project Gutenberg 37368. Selected passages on pp. 193–197 and 207–217 concerning publication, personality, confidence, and limits were read. Primary text.

2. Matthew 6:1–6. King James Version, BibleGateway; the specified passage on almsgiving and prayer was read. Primary text.

3. Quran 24:27–29. English translation by Dr. Mustafa Khattab, The Clear Quran, Quran.com; the precise printed edition is unestablished. The verse and displayed adjacent context were read, not the complete tafsir. Primary text and translation.

Russian exposition and the brief Russian quotation translation were prepared editorially. The historical essay is not used for contemporary universal legal instructions; the practice is an editorial proposal.

Tags

privacy, private life, closeness, relationships, boundaries, consent, permission, correspondence, trust, solitude, access, information, photographs, publication, personal possessions, shared life, responsibility, agreement, reconsideration, safety, autonomy, third parties, clarity, Warren, Brandeis, Matthew, Quran, United Wisdom, Maria Method, practice

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 test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.