

UNITED WISDOM

Fair rules: why good intentions are not enough

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R46 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Fair rules: why good intentions are not enough

Epigraph

> *and I will choose*

James Harrington, *The Commonwealth of Oceana*, preliminary argument, cake-division example, web176. A short fragment from the exact Project Gutenberg 2801 version. A historical model, not a ready-made contemporary fund procedure.

What this article is about

The organisers of a small cultural fund want to allocate support honestly. They know participants personally, try not to offend anyone and are willing to help those facing greater difficulty. With few applications, decisions seem natural. Then one project receives an exception to a deadline while another is rejected for an equivalent delay. The explanation sounds benevolent: the first person genuinely needed help. Yet the second does not know who can grant exceptions, which grounds are considered or why their circumstances went unread. Good intentions may be real; they do not establish the fairness of arrangements for distributing a shared resource.

This article concerns an imagined voluntary fund, not a country's law or an existing organisation. Fairness here raises questions about explainable grounds, authority, consistent application and an available opportunity to correct a decision. These features are no universal test guaranteeing a fair outcome. Harrington's historical example helps compare personal intentions with allocated roles. Limits remain: procedures can also be unfair, formal equality resolves less than everything, and extensive examination has costs. Readers are not asked to suspect benevolent people or turn every small collaboration into a substantial administrative system.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. A shared resource needs a specified decision subject

In our imagined fund, Lev receives applications for modest support of artistic projects. Elena helps select works, while Daria keeps records. They say they choose deserving participants. A person's dignity nevertheless differs from a project's suitability for particular support. An artist can be respected without their current work being funded, and another format offered where available. Without these distinctions, rejection sounds like a personal verdict and approval like recognition of overall moral worth. Ordinary questions about amounts and grounds then require defending one's entire claim to respect.

The resource first needs identifying: money for materials, a place in a programme, a consultant's time or public presentation? Each has its own constraints. A suitable materials criterion may not suit specialist time. Lev might promise support for an idea while a participant hears a promise of payment. An unspecified benevolent intention does not become an identical commitment to everyone. A defined subject reveals who can decide and how other applications are affected. No elaborate document is required, but general language cannot replace the actual scope of available assistance.

The fund may also have a limited purpose. Supporting preparation of one exhibition does not make refusing another project a denial of its value. The purpose should nevertheless be known and relevant to selection, rather than appearing after an inconvenient question. Elena can clarify future programme aims without portraying a new criterion as longstanding. An earlier decision is considered against grounds actually available then. The issue becomes specific: which resource was allocated for which work under which declared grounds? It need not become a general competition in organisers' benevolence and recipients' gratitude.

II. A criterion differs from an impression of someone

Elena finds one project persuasive because its creator is reliable and previously helped the fund. That may bear on execution where the experience concerns the current task. Familiarity nevertheless does not automatically establish an accurate budget or available premises. Another applicant may have good work without a history of acquaintance. The actual grounds supporting selection need identifying. Impressions are not forbidden; they retain their scope. If earlier performance counts, what is assessed and why can be stated, rather than calling personal liking a complete check of every project condition.

A criterion can be inadequate even when consistently applied. Suppose only projects with attractive presentations receive support. All applications were assessed alike, but presentation may reveal little about whether the work can be completed. This article establishes no best artistic criterion and does not promise objective measurement of artistic value. It proposes examining the connection between selection rules and stated purpose. What does this ground

establish, what does it leave unknown and what does it cost participants? Formal consistency does not remove that question. A condition poorly related to the resource can be applied equally.

The opposite difficulty is criteria so vague that any decision can be justified afterwards. A strong idea or particular need can be substantive, but requires explanation in this case. Art need not become an assessment machine. Judgement can remain while its grounds, limits and responsible person are identified. The decision remains human without claiming mathematical indisputability. Participants understand what was considered even when disagreeing. Dignity requires no promise of equal support to everyone; fair arrangements should not require trusting good motives as the only available answer to every particular choice.

III. Dividing and choosing: a limited historical model

In *The Commonwealth of Oceana*, Harrington uses a cake example: one party divides, another chooses. In the preliminary argument read, division and choice concern decision-making arrangements rather than only the divider's good character. This is historical political reasoning, not a proven universal fairness technology. Its wider system cannot simply be transferred to a present fund, or its participation restrictions adopted as contemporary norms. A narrow comparison helps: does allocation depend entirely on someone who sets the standard and receives a favourable result?

Lev may write programme terms and submit a project himself. Good intentions do not remove the connection between roles. He may honestly consider his proposal best; others still have difficulty examining grounds if he alone decides, reads objections and changes rules. Particular functions might be separated where people and opportunities exist. Lev could specify the purpose, Elena consider projects and Daria retain decision histories. Three names do not establish independence: participants may share an advantage. Each person's actual work needs understanding, rather than treating distributed signatures as established impartiality.

A small fund may lack full separation. Acknowledging combined roles and their limits is then more honest than pretending to have a complex institution. Lev might abstain from considering his application where possible, or the programme might abandon this allocation method. These are editorial options, not compulsory legal procedures. The historical example remains expressive while revealing authority's relationship to interests. It does not promise a fair outcome from every separate choice. Elena can err and Daria misrecord grounds too; role arrangements do not replace examination of actual actions and decision contents.

IV. Consistency does not mean prohibiting every exception

Artem's application arrives late. Lev permits consideration because the invitation reached him after the declared deadline. That may support an exception. Correcting unavailable notification differs from personal preference. Another late application from Sofia needs its own consideration: notification may have arrived on time and conditions may differ. Equal delay does not establish an identical situation overall. Fairness need not ignore differences, but must identify those relevant to the rule. One exception cannot be justified solely by a good applicant while another refusal invokes rules being identical for everyone.

If exceptions are accessible only through acquaintance with Lev, the programme retains a hidden entrance. Its published deadline then describes only part of the arrangement. The circumstances considered, recipient and actual possibilities can be communicated where within the fund's authority. Approval cannot be promised for every appeal. Nor should an entire personal history be required for one notification date. Necessary grounds differ from excessive information. Access to a correction question should fit its subject instead of becoming competition in closeness to an organiser or eloquent accounts of need before a large audience.

Sometimes no exception exists and the resource is already allocated. Sympathy alone cannot let Lev promise a place belonging to another project. The limitation can be acknowledged, future arrangements corrected or another available resource considered. This does not remove the inconvenience of refusal. An honest partial answer is better than fictitious help quietly transferring costs to someone else. Fair consideration includes not only the person before the organiser, but those whose commitments already rely on a decision. Their interests cannot be dismissed merely because they are absent and do not tell their stories personally.

Another counterexample is an apparently caring exception that changes the programme's very subject. Lev permits an acquaintance to receive money for a personal trip although support was intended for exhibition materials. The trip may matter, but its value does not establish authority to use this particular resource. A separate purpose decision needs consideration where possible, rather than concealment within a minor deadline amendment. An exception can correct application or effectively replace a rule; these actions need different grounds. Someone can sympathise with the acquaintance while opposing the expense without generally rejecting help. Defined scope retains both the possibility of support and responsibility for its source.

V. Applying a rule has an author and costs too

The fund publishes its terms, but Elena is busy and reads only familiar applications. A rule's existence does not establish its application. Who actually does the work, within which scope and by when needs determining. Daria may save every file without its content being considered. Lev may announce results without equal access to assessment being established. Documents, reading, decisions and communicating outcomes are separate actions. If one is absent, attractive terms should not portray the process as complete. Fair arrangements concern available performance, rather than merely a well-written promise.

Examination costs something. A small programme may lack resources for lengthy individual responses. Its commitment then needs reducing or honestly specifying: brief grounds, a clear result category and a period for significant clarification. Individual research cannot be promised where nobody can perform it. Limited time nevertheless does not automatically make any selection method fair. Application numbers, workload allocation or the programme might change where possible. Organisers can decline excess commitments, while applicants can know the actual arrangement before spending substantial time participating.

The person asking also bears a burden. If correcting an obvious name error requires a large public account of a project, response costs are disproportionate. A contested complex assessment may require additional grounds. These cases differ. A universally easy entrance does not guarantee substantive consideration, and a difficult entrance establishes no quality. Required information should fit the possible amendment. Procedures need not become obstacles demonstrating organisers' seriousness, or promise to resolve everything from a brief message when relevant information is actually missing.

Organisers sometimes underestimate labour because work is voluntary. Daria is assigned to retain every ground, answer everyone and prepare evening reports without her agreement to that scope being established. A good rule for applicants then relies on another participant's unspecified commitment. Fairness does not end at the programme entrance. Available hours can be agreed, promises reduced or another person involved where possible. Unpaid work does not establish indefinite willingness to help. Daria can state limits and the fund adapt its programme. Declining extra work neither erases retained history nor establishes irresponsibility as a quality of the person's whole character.

VI. Considering an error needs a separate subject

Sofia learns that her budget's unit price was read as a price for the whole set. This is a specific possible error rather than general disagreement with an artistic selection. She needs a route to identify the line and calculation unit. If the fund says decisions are not discussed, the error remains concealed beneath finality. Checking the budget does not require accepting the whole project. A numerical ground can be corrected while another outcome remains under a different declared criterion. What changed and what remains open should be shown, without promising support merely because an inaccuracy was found.

The recipient must understand their scope. Daria can compare two entries and correct a record without authority to reallocate funds. Elena can reconsider an assessment without changing programme aims. Lev can amend future terms without declaring past decisions already made under them. Defined authority makes responses less arbitrary. Another perspective helps where actually available and relevant. An extra signature is not automatically independent. Sofia should not have to repair the fund's entire arrangements before one known price error is considered within present documents.

Reconsideration sometimes affects an approved project. Its position, possible changes and promised limits then matter. This article sets no legal consequences and authorises no cancellation of others' commitments without consideration. An error can be discovered and acknowledged while full restoration of allocation remains unavailable. That mixed result should be named. Procedures do not guarantee effortless repair of the past. Their practical meaning may be narrower: retain accurate history, stop using an erroneous budget and amend future arrangements. This is neither complete restoration for organisers' reassurance nor a reason to dismiss every limited correction.

VII. Rules can change while retaining their history

After Sofia's case, the fund adds clarification of calculation units. This changes future arrangements without establishing that earlier applications were correctly read. Daria retains the date and scope. Participants benefit from knowing which version applied to their decision. A vast archive of every administrative thought is unnecessary. A significant transition deserves retention in an available form, especially when expectations change. Otherwise identical terms tell different histories, and organisers may unintentionally judge an earlier action by a new standard they believe always existed and was clear to everyone.

Changes can be necessary before a programme ends. Access to the new version and who it affects then need consideration. One group may already have prepared an application under earlier terms; another is just starting. No universal transition arrangement is specified here. Earlier commitments might be retained, extra clarification opened or a current limitation

acknowledged where resources permit. The change must remain visible. New good intentions do not remove consequences of earlier promises. Fairness concerns both present terms' reasonableness and how people could rely on them over time.

A rule may also remain after examination. Dissatisfaction does not always establish a need for change. Where a criterion fits the purpose, is known and applied within scope, the fund may retain its choice despite an unpleasant response. An applicant need not favour it or remain involved. Organisers need not amend a programme until everyone is grateful. Available consideration differs from a compulsory preferred outcome. Procedures must allow a supported refusal as well as correction. Otherwise they promise acceptance of every sufficiently persistent appeal, reallocating resources through personal pressure rather than stated grounds.

VIII. A benevolent organiser should not be an indefinite condition of order

Lev decides to leave the fund. If he alone knows exception grounds, applicant contacts and commitment states, a successor inherits uncertainty. Sound arrangements need a proportionate handover: what was promised, allocated, left open and where necessary records are held. This does not require disclosing personal information to everyone. Access follows role and subject. Lev remains the author of earlier decisions, the successor the performer of specified further work. Replacement erases no history and makes nobody responsible for unknown motives behind every past exception.

Transferability also protects the organiser. Gratitude should not become an obligation to maintain the programme indefinitely because nobody else manages it. Rare competence may be difficult to transfer quickly. Activity could then be reduced, tasks shared or particular commitments completed before another programme where possible. The article does not promise survival of the fund at any cost. Sometimes a pause is the honest outcome. A good cause acquires no indefinite claim over someone because others like their intentions. Fair arrangements include their own labour costs, rather than only generosity towards recipients.

The opposite case is a completed formal handover with unintelligible records. Daria saves numerous files disconnected from decisions, and a successor cannot identify current results. Document quantity does not establish accessible history. A comprehensible link between commitments, grounds and present state is needed within programme scope. Rules can then continue beyond one benevolent person's memory. Future fairness remains unguaranteed: the next person can err too. The fund nevertheless stops presenting irreplaceable personal goodness as the sole basis for decisions affecting many people and continuing after a role changes.

A handover can also reveal an earlier promise absent from shared records. An applicant says Lev personally confirmed participation; the successor sees only a refusal. The convenient version cannot automatically be selected, or one party labelled dishonest. Available messages, timing and authority need establishing while disputed history remains disputed. A new agreement may settle future action without becoming a recovered past fact. An untraceable confirmation is its own historical limitation. Future promises can be recorded differently without portraying the old case as fully established because a new form exists. Handover thus also examines institutional memory's boundaries, without demanding impossible certainty for a tidy final report.

IX. Assessable arrangements remain a human choice

Returning to the late application, several outcomes are possible. An exception receives clear grounds. Another refusal remains after checking. A budget is corrected without funds being reallocated. Future terms become clearer while earlier error costs remain. These differ. Each cannot be called a complete triumph of fairness or proof of a malicious arrangement. What was established and which limitation remained need attention. Participants can experience outcomes differently. An accurate record demands no simultaneous gratitude, and discomfort does not justify abandoning consideration of every factual detail.

Procedures can themselves help evade responsibility. Lev says everything followed the rules although he selected a weak criterion, closed correction routes and failed to state limitations. Invoking arrangements then gives an insufficient answer. Rules have authors, subjects, applications and consequences, which can be considered where available. Equally, every arrangement need not be rejected for lacking a perfect outcome guarantee. Shared work needs clarity and people need promises they can rely on. The question concerns what makes this choice explainable and correctable at its actual scale, rather than paperwork defeating people.

Good intentions retain value. They may prompt someone to read a difficult question, avoid humiliating an applicant and acknowledge an error. They do not replace information about resources, authority and performance. Historical separation of roles offers a limited reminder; the contemporary scene needs its own grounds. A fund can become clearer without becoming infallible. Organisers can remain benevolent through uncomfortable reconsideration, applicants retain dignity through refusal. Further choices are not prescribed: participating, proposing amendments, accepting limits or leaving requires actual conditions and consequences our imagined account cannot establish beforehand.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose a small allocation rule in available voluntary work. Identify the resource, purpose, grounds and person actually deciding. Then separate writing terms, considering a case, recording results and possible correction. These may be combined; signature counts should not portray independence. Retain uncertainty and avoid beginning with assessments of participants' benevolence. This editorial exercise is not a legal examination, scientific fairness test or guaranteed technique for improving an institution.

Consider one counterexample: an exception, a contested calculation unit or a change of person. What requires clarification and who receives it? Match necessary information to the issue without demanding excessive personal history. Where correction affects someone else, identify costs and available work's limits. Direct contact is not prescribed under threats, and procedures do not guarantee protection. Pausing, limiting participation or choosing no step remain possible. Dignity does not depend on successfully repairing an entire fund alone.

Later, check a particular result: grounds read, a record changed, authority clarified or a promise handed to a successor. One file does not establish the whole history. A supported refusal remains possible and demands no compulsory gratitude. Consideration links good intentions to actual work for which someone can answer within stated scope. Fairness remains an open human question rather than a permanent property acquired through adopting a useful document. The next decision needs its own grounds and regard for those it actually affects.

Key quotation

> *Dividing and choosing*

James Harrington, *The Commonwealth of Oceana*, preliminary argument, web190; a short fragment of his own explanation. Historical allocation of functions does not guarantee a contemporary fair outcome.

Connections between traditions

Basis	Comparison subject	Limit
Harrington's cake example	Division and the chooser's interests	Historical political illustration, not an experiment
Harrington's distinction between functions	Who proposes and who chooses?	His wider system is not adopted as a universal contemporary norm
Imagined fund	Grounds, application, correction and handover	Our editorial distinctions; fairness and effectiveness unguaranteed

Sources

1. James Harrington. *The Commonwealth of Oceana*, underlying work 1656; exact Project Gutenberg digital version, eBook 2801. The continuous selected preliminary argument, web170–195, including the author's cake-division example, web176, and explanation of dividing and choosing, web190, was personally read. No whole-work reading claimed. Exact digital version's print basis unestablished; rights UNKNOWN. Short attributed fragments and bounded paraphrase, no full-source import. Embedded quotations from other authors were not selected. A historical normative model does not establish current procedural effectiveness; the wider political system's restrictions are not adopted as modern norms.

Tags

fairness, rules, intentions, institution, shared resource, fund, allocation, purpose, criterion, grounds, role, authority, interest, exception, consistency, application, consideration, error, correction, budget, history, version, commitment, handover, examination costs, privacy, dignity, voluntary participation, Harrington, Oceana, 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 the 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.