

UNITED WISDOM

Default trust and trust earned through actions

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-03-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Default trust and trust earned through actions

Epigraph

> *“Resolve to perform”.*

Benjamin Franklin, Autobiography, Part II, fourth virtue in the list, a fragment of the English original; Harvard Classics edition, 1909. Russian fragment translated by United Wisdom. This is moral resolve directed toward oneself, rather than a requirement to earn human dignity.

What this article is about

A hypothetical adult couple plans a weekend together. One offers to book accommodation and promises to send confirmation that evening. The other agrees but does not want to immediately provide access to their bank account. The response is: don't you trust me? An ordinary travel decision becomes an argument about the quality of their entire intimacy. Yet accepting an offer, relying on a promised action, and allowing someone to handle money are three different steps.

The expression “default trust” can mean willingness to hear someone without condemning them in advance. It can also mean deciding to rely on them in a matter about which we know very little. These meanings differ. The first concerns our starting position in conversation; the second concerns the consequences of a particular choice. Mixing them makes restricting access look like an insult, and respect like an obligation to accept any risk.

This article offers an editorial distinction between basic respect and trust in actions. We will consider philosophical, religious, and autobiographical sources without turning them into psychological measurements. Our question is how to remain benevolent, clarify promises, and change shared decisions without making the other person a permanent suspect or a candidate for approval.

Relationships here mean voluntary participation by adults. Trust does not impose a duty to stay, provide passwords, agree to intimacy, or prove innocence. It can differ across areas of life and change after events. This does not require declaring a partner wholly good or bad. Sometimes it is enough to identify precisely which action you are ready to rely on now and which decision you still make independently.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Respect is not an advance payment for access

Basic respect can precede experience of living together. We do not humiliate someone, allow that their words have meaning, and do not treat their background or another person's bad experience as proof of their intentions. This position leaves room for acquaintance. It says nothing yet about whether they can pay for a booking on time, keep someone's confidence, or observe an agreed spending limit.

Access has a subject and consequences. Giving someone an apartment key permits particular action in a particular place. Asking them to collect a parcel means relying on a small task. Describing a family conflict means choosing a listener and perhaps agreeing on confidentiality. These decisions can be made separately. Withholding one form of access does not deprive someone of respect in every other conversation.

In the opening scene, it helps to replace the general argument about trust with questions about the trip. Who books? What amount was agreed? When is payment needed? What information is actually required? You can transfer your share after confirmation, book separately, or decline the trip. A particular arrangement need not express a final moral verdict. It shows what participation currently suits both people.

The reverse matters too: caution does not justify a humiliating tone. You can decline financial access without demanding a list of every past mistake. You can request booking confirmation without a public interrogation. A boundary concerns your decision; an accusation concerns someone else's presumed intention. Clarifying the difference reduces the need to defend an entire personality instead of discussing one matter.

Finally, respect does not demand the same distance from everyone. You may end an acquaintance without a complete dossier or a proven violation. The other person may reject the proposed arrangement. Voluntary participation preserves the distinction between recognizing dignity and choosing a shared life. Neither intimacy nor declining it justifies treating a participant as an object to be held until an examination is finished.

II. Trust needs a complement: whom and in what

“I trust them” is often useful in everyday speech but becomes too broad in an argument. Someone may reliably care for pets while planning time poorly. They may keep personal information confidential while lacking experience of a shared budget. This difference does not make them duplicitous. It reminds us that different tasks require different actions and experience in one area does not automatically transfer to another.

For clarity, you can add the subject: I trust their information about arrival time; I rely on her to warn me about changed plans; I am not ready to delegate this purchase yet. The formulation

need not become an endless catalogue of qualities. Only the area where a decision is needed matters. The current trip does not require assessing every possible aspect of a future shared life.

In Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics, Book VIII, sections 2–3, the discussion of friendship includes mutually known goodwill and time of acquaintance. This is historical philosophical reasoning, rather than a test for couples. A limited parallel is useful: good intention and established acquaintance are related, but an immediate impression does not replace experience. Other features of the ancient classification should not be declared a contemporary relationship standard.

Being specific also protects against excessive generalization after a mistake. If booking confirmation never arrived, that is what is currently known. We need to establish whether the booking was made, circumstances changed, or the deadline was understood alike. We need not immediately conclude that all previous care was pretence. Avoiding that conclusion still does not oblige us to repeat a financial risk before clarification.

Trust in a particular matter can retain limits despite good past experience. A large sum, urgent deadline, or third parties may require another arrangement. Changed conditions do not necessarily mean a deteriorating relationship. Sometimes the task became harder. Clarifying the allocation of actions helps make a promise feasible, rather than admitting that the human connection has lost all value.

III. An action starts with a clear promise

An unfulfilled promise and an expectation nobody accepted cannot be assessed alike. One person thought accommodation was already booked; the other intended only to look at options. Both are disappointed that evening. Before discussing reliability, it helps to recover what was said: which action was offered, which response received, and what remained an assumption. This is ordinary clarification of a shared matter, rather than a court procedure.

An agreement includes the possibility of refusal. If someone agreed only under pressure, an outward yes does not make participation free. If they cannot perform the task, another contribution can be chosen. An adult promise does not demand guessing desires or confirming love through an unbearable burden. It allows people to assess their capabilities and communicate them before someone else builds dependent plans.

In Part II of Franklin's Autobiography, the list of virtues belongs to his own project of moral perfection. Under resolution, he connects intending to do what is right with carrying out an adopted decision. This is an autobiographical moral requirement addressed to himself. It certifies no method's effectiveness and does not appoint the reader to maintain a table of a partner's faults.

For our question, the sequence matters: first accept a definite commitment, then compare action with it. You can promise to send two affordable accommodation options by evening instead of providing a perfect holiday. You can promise to report a host's refusal instead of guaranteeing someone else's decision. Precision reduces misunderstanding and preserves the distinction between a participant's effort and circumstances beyond their control.

A promise can also be revised before it fails. If urgent work appears that evening, a participant can report that they cannot finish and propose another deadline. The other need not accept the change without objection: they have plans too. Early communication supplies material for a decision. Silence until the last moment removes that possibility. The discussion should concern action and consequences, rather than the sole correct image of a reliable person.

IV. A small matter: observation rather than a trap

In Luke 16:10, King James Version, faithfulness in small and large matters is placed in a moral relationship. We read the particular verse, rather than the entire surrounding account. It is religious counsel. It is no empirical rule by which a forgotten cup predicts betrayal or one successful action guarantees every future contribution.

Small matters provide experience only where participation has actual conditions. If you agree on a meeting time and someone warns you about a delay, a particular observation becomes available. If you deliberately leave false information to test honesty, you create another situation. The participant responds to an arranged trap while its author judges the response against a hidden criterion that was never discussed.

There is therefore no need to invent tests where life already requires clear decisions. A trip, household task, or small shared expense allows you to see how deadlines and limits are coordinated. The task should have independent meaning instead of serving as a secret examination. Then its outcome can be discussed openly: what worked, what changed, and which part should be allocated differently next time.

Observation does not require continuously collecting evidence. You can remember an important episode without an archive of messages and daily reports. You can clarify what affects a shared plan without searching someone else's phone. Checking the outcome of a joint task differs significantly from watching a partner's entire life. The boundary concerns subject, voluntary participation, and the possibility of limiting involvement.

If the criterion changes constantly, a successful result may not exist. Yesterday timely answers were required; today answers without a clarifying question; tomorrow anticipation of a mood. Such a system does not help identify trust. It leaves one participant as permanent examiner. Instead, it helps to define a real task, the limit of responsibility, and the point when both can freely decide whether to continue the agreement.

V. Benevolence does not cancel discernment

In Chapter 49 of the Tao Teh King, James Legge's translation, the sage remains good and sincere toward different people. This version uses the concept of sincerity; replacing it with contemporary financial trust would be inaccurate. Historical counsel describes the sage's position. It does not prove that giving everyone access will improve relationships or be safe.

This line creates useful tension with the language of earned trust. If benevolence is granted solely for good behavior, any broken promise may become an occasion for humiliation. Yet refusing to humiliate does not mean refusing to distinguish consequences. You can remain courteous toward someone to whom you no longer delegate bookings. You can acknowledge their explanation while paying for your own part of a trip independently.

Combining these positions is not always pleasant. The other may hear a limit as an affront, and you may wonder whether you are kind enough. It helps to state both parts without a hidden bargain: I am willing to listen; I am not providing this access now. The first does not buy acceptance of the second. The second does not cancel the first. The listener may object and choose whether this relationship arrangement suits them.

Benevolence cannot be demanded as an obligatory smile during threats. Someone may be angry, confused, or unready to talk. The editorial distinction concerns decisions and forms of treatment, rather than controlling feelings. The historical sage's ideal does not become a victim's duty to calm someone who frightens them. Safety and the possibility of ending contact have independent importance.

The connection between traditions is limited. Legge translates ancient counsel, Franklin describes working on his own virtues, and the gospel verse offers a religious evaluation of faithfulness. These are different tasks. We compare the question of our position toward a person with that of their actions. The resemblance helps reflection but confirms neither a unified teaching nor a scientifically established arrangement for every intimate relationship.

VI. Mistake, repetition, and the unknown

One episode may require a serious decision, especially when consequences are large. Yet delays do not all signify the same violation. There may be a memory lapse, an imprecisely accepted task, changed circumstances, or deliberate concealment of an important fact. An article's author cannot establish a particular couple's motives. Participants can first identify what is known and unknown instead of replacing a missing explanation with a convenient confident account.

Suppose confirmation was not sent because the booking was unfinished. You can ask whether the participant reported this, whether payments are refundable, and what step is needed now.

If they acknowledged a specific failing and corrected its consequence, this is another action that matters. Correction nevertheless does not erase the original event or oblige immediate restoration of the previous extent of delegation.

Repetition changes the conversation. If a promise repeatedly leaves the other person without necessary information, rearranging a shared plan may be a reasonable editorial suggestion. No diagnosis of character is required. You can say: I no longer build urgent plans on that deadline; let's separate our bookings. You describe your own decision based on available experience instead of declaring someone's unchanging essence.

The unknown sometimes remains unknown. Conversation does not always provide a verifiable answer. You can then choose less dependence, a pause, or the end of participation. You need not demand complete certainty from yourself before limiting risk. The other person also need not participate indefinitely in a relationship where every answer is considered untrustworthy in advance. Both can acknowledge that no suitable arrangement currently exists.

It helps to consider your own share of uncertainty too. You may not have named a deadline, accepted an ambiguous offer, or changed an expectation after the response. This does not remove someone's responsibility for an accepted promise. It merely separates areas of decision more accurately. Conversations about trust benefit from room for both people to correct formulations, rather than one assessing the other alone.

VII. Earning trust does not mean earning love

The word “earn” easily moves relationships into the language of rewards. A kept promise makes someone worthy of warmth; a mistake deprives them of compassion. This scheme mixes the reliability of an action with human value and another person's freely held feelings. You can appreciate a contribution without promising a particular love in return. You can be disappointed in an action without punishing someone through disrespectful treatment.

This is especially visible when help turns into a demand for access. Someone paid for the trip and now thinks they may read a partner's messages. Another agreed to cook dinner and expects obligatory physical intimacy. No contribution creates such permission by itself. Adult participation remains voluntary; feelings, agreements, financial help, and consent to particular intimacy concern different things.

Actions can change the desire to continue a relationship. If shared life becomes too uncertain, one participant may decline. That refusal need not be an educational measure with return conditional on enough good days. A person chooses an available arrangement. If restoration is discussed, its conditions should be clear and voluntary instead of keeping someone waiting endlessly for an assessment.

You also cannot force yourself to trust in exchange for an apology. You can acknowledge someone's effort and still be unready to depend on their decision again. Gratitude for correction does not equal granting access. What is needed is time and a separate choice, rather than commanding a feeling. The other may not accept waiting, which is also part of voluntary relationships.

In the opening scene, confirmed accommodation gives grounds for relying on this trip. It issues no partner certificate for all future decisions. Its absence does not make someone unworthy of any relationship. Such limits do not impoverish intimacy. They leave room to see actual contributions, discuss actual consequences, and avoid linking every household episode to a final verdict on love.

VIII. When checking becomes control

A shared purchase may need a receipt; an agreed meeting may need a message about time. Another situation appears when constant location tracking, message access, and explanations for every refusal are required. The official National Domestic Violence Hotline page on emotional abuse lists threats and constant monitoring among dangerous behaviors. This is specialist information, rather than diagnosis of a particular person from one example.

An editorial distinction can examine the possibility of choice. Can a participant refuse the proposed check without threats? Does the request concern a shared task? Is the duration of access clear? Is another way to communicate necessary information permitted? These answers form no clinical test, but help reveal the arrangement of a conversation. If one person's complete availability to the other is the sole acceptable outcome, the issue goes beyond coordinating a trip.

A voluntarily chosen arrival message does not make reporting around the clock obligatory. Permission to inspect one document does not extend to an entire device. Even a previous agreement can be discussed again. Changes to shared obligations nevertheless need clarity: if you no longer report a time, you can explain how the connected task will be handled. Revisiting consent does not confer a right to deliberately leave someone in dangerous uncertainty.

If refusal brings threats, there is no need to test a relationship's strength through further disclosure. You can skip this article's conversation. Suitable local help and a safe way to communicate without increasing risk become priorities. We propose no universal exit sequence and do not assess individual danger remotely. The possibility of declining an editorial exercise when its conditions do not fit matters in itself.

Control cannot be justified because someone truly broke a promise before. After a violation, you can limit your participation or end the relationship. That differs from a right to manage another person's everyday life indefinitely. If both choose to rebuild trust, this needs a

particular subject and possibility of revision. Otherwise, “restoration” may conceal an indefinite transfer of power.

IX. Reliability includes being able to say no

Sometimes the more reliable answer is refusal. Someone understands they cannot book accommodation in time and reports this before dependent plans begin. The answer disappoints but creates an opportunity to act. An unconditional promise accepted to win approval may look warmer while leaving the other without a clear decision. This is an editorial evaluation of participation's form, rather than a law about everyone's motives for agreement.

Declining a task differs from declining care altogether. You can decline booking while offering to check the route. You can withhold financial access while paying an agreed share yourself. An alternative helps when freely chosen. It should not become an obligatory ransom for the right to say no. Sometimes no suitable contribution is available now, and this must be acknowledged without immediate compensation.

Accepting refusal can also belong to the reliability of a shared arrangement. If one participant declares a free answer permissible and then punishes an inconvenient no, the promise's conditions change. The other no longer knows whether a limit can be reported honestly. Instead of requiring absolute sincerity, it helps to see what response a particular statement of inability receives. This concerns the present conversation, rather than a secret examination.

Reliability does not equal absence of change. Work, health, and family circumstances can change available participation; this article establishes no causes or diagnoses. What matters is how the new position is coordinated: which task moves, what remains agreed, and who takes the next step. Changed capabilities should not automatically become an accusation. The other may nevertheless acknowledge that the proposed new arrangement does not suit them.

Trust can thus develop in the ability to discuss a limit. It differs from expecting a partner to always fulfil every wish. In the opening trip, successful booking matters alongside the possibility of reporting a delay beforehand. Shared life becomes clearer where refusal and clarification have space before a crisis. They guarantee no wellbeing, but supply a subject for decision instead of demanding unconditional certainty.

X. Leave the decision open

Return to the weekend. Confirmation arrived, the amount matches the agreement, and both want to go. The discussion can finish so that they can enjoy the trip itself. A successful outcome need not be an occasion to increase access or invent another examination. Experience matters in its own area. It can be accepted without further proof that the relationship has now reached the highest degree of trust.

If confirmation is missing, you can choose independent booking or cancellation. The decision can be temporary or final. It need not carry a general accusation. Someone who disagrees with the new arrangement may say so. This reveals both the reliability of a promise and the compatibility of available forms of participation. Sometimes the honest outcome is that there will be no shared trip.

Aristotle's time of acquaintance, Franklin's attention to his own action, and the religious line of faithfulness offer different points of attention. Taoist counsel recalls a position that cannot be reduced to behavioral reward. Our connection is editorial: preserve the distinction between person, promise, and decision. No source removes the need to consider particular contemporary conditions and both participants' freedom.

Default trust can then mean an open possibility of meeting a person, while trust in actions means readiness to rely on particular action under given conditions. The meanings can coexist. You can be benevolent and cautious, close and independent, grateful and unready for new access. A choice need not finally conclude the story: the next agreement requires a free response again.

What this means in practice

If suitable and safe, choose one current shared matter. Note for yourself exactly what was offered, who agreed, and which consequence depends on the promise. Separately name your attitude toward the person and your decision about access. Do not keep a table of their worth. The task clarifies one agreement instead of certifying an entire personality.

You can discuss the subject directly: what result is needed, when it is needed, and what to report if circumstances change. Suggest an arrangement you are ready for and leave room for refusal or an alternative. Do not arrange a hidden test. If participation is not agreed, base your next decision on that fact instead of an imagined promise.

Afterward, consider the known outcome. What was performed? What changed? What remained unclear? Does the next shared step need rearranging? Do not treat one event as a universal forecast. You can accept good experience without expanding access and consider a mistake without humiliation. The other person retains the right to decline a proposed new agreement.

This is voluntary editorial reflection, rather than a clinically tested technique. You can skip it, stop, or replace it with an ordinary conversation. In the presence of threats and coercion, do not test safety through further concessions: consider suitable help and safe communication first. Basic dignity, feeling, promise, and permission to participate remain different things.

Key quotation

> *“perform without fail”.*

Franklin, Part II, another fragment of the same fourth virtue; English original, Russian translation by United Wisdom. The author's demanding standard is directed toward himself; it does not permit imposing a promise on someone else or assessing their human value by the outcome.

Connections between traditions

Lines	Editorial intersection	Boundary
Franklin ↔ clear agreement	A decision connects with action	An autobiographical project is no partner examination
Aristotle ↔ present experience	Acquaintance takes time	Ancient friendship is no contemporary clinical test
Luke 16:10 ↔ a small matter	Small participation matters	Religious counsel is no universal forecast
Tao Teh King 49 ↔ basic respect	A position toward someone is more than reward	Sincerity does not equal financial access
Franklin ↔ voluntary refusal	A commitment needs definition	Historical virtue does not cancel choice
Hotline ↔ limits of checking	Threats change priorities	The material does not diagnose a particular couple

Primary sources

1. Benjamin Franklin. Autobiography, Part II. Harvard Classics, Charles W. Eliot, editor, P. F. Collier & Son, 1909; selected paragraphs of the virtue project and list were read, rather than the whole work.

2. Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics, VIII, 2–3. W. D. Ross translation; selected friendship discussion, rather than the whole work.

3. Luke 16:10, King James Version. One verse and version label read; religious counsel, rather than relationship research.

4. Lao-Tze. Tao Teh King, Chapter 49. James Legge translation; three parts of the selected chapter read, rather than the entire text; historical attribution not independently established.

5. National Domestic Violence Hotline. What is emotional abuse?. Definition and examples of threats and monitoring read; statistics and clinical causal conclusions are not used.

Tags

trust, respect, actions, promise, reliability, agreement, intimacy, access, privacy, benevolence, sincerity, time, experience, mistake, repair, repetition, refusal, freedom, voluntary participation, money, shared plans, checking, control, safety, dignity, Franklin, Aristotle, Lao-Tze, adult relationships, editorial reflection

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.