


UNITED WISDOM

# Unasked-for help: care or intrusion?

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-07-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# Unasked-for help: care or intrusion?

## Epigraph

> *“I want to try for myself”*

Louisa May Alcott, *Work: A Story of Experience*, Chapter I; a fragment of the fictional Christie's speech to Aunt Betsey. The speech expresses the character's wish, not the author's universal view of help.

## What this article is about

You notice someone's difficulty before they ask for help. You want to call, buy something, arrange things or offer advice straight away—not because you want power, but because you care. Yet the action may surprise its recipient: they have not decided what they want, do not regard the situation as a problem, or are not ready to involve you in that part of their life. Where does attention become interference when no request has been made?

This article does not suggest becoming indifferent and waiting for a perfectly worded request. It considers different degrees of initiative: noticing, asking, offering, agreeing and acting. There are transitions between them that it helps to preserve. We will consider mistaken assumptions, declined offers, help as a gift, the involvement of others and repairing an intrusion that has already occurred. The imagined scenes are not statistics; historical philosophical and religious texts do not establish clinical rules. Our subject is ordinary situations between adults. When there is an immediate danger, priorities change; that must be distinguished from anxiety about someone else's way of life. In a calm situation, care can begin before a request while still leaving the other person room to answer.

## I. A difficulty you notice does not yet describe someone else's need

Observation tells us what we saw; a need calls for further understanding. Someone falls silent after a meeting, does not reply to a message, keeps postponing a purchase or chooses an activity unfamiliar to us. Each action admits different explanations. We may notice an inconvenience without knowing whether the person regards it as inconvenient or what change they would like.

Imagine a fictional scene. Anna sees her neighbour Sergey eating alone several evenings and decides to invite him to shared dinners. Perhaps he is lonely and would welcome the offer. Perhaps he values those quiet evenings. Perhaps he is occupied with work he does not want to

discuss yet. The observable fact is dinner alone. The meaning Anna gives it is not yet a message from Sergey. This distinction does not devalue her attention; it shows where an answer is needed.

In “On a Certain Blindness in Human Beings”, William James considers the limitations of judging from outside what makes another person's life meaningful. It is a philosophical essay with examples, not an experiment. For our purposes, it reminds us that closeness and good intentions do not provide complete access to what a situation means to somebody else.

Sometimes the observation goes beyond a guess: the person has said they are struggling, but has not requested intervention. The need is partly known; suitable help is not. A story about an expensive service might invite discussion of options, express frustration or report an unaffordable expense. Paying immediately resolves one question and may create another: the person must now accept a gift, explain a decision or disclose details they did not want to discuss.

It therefore helps to distinguish three layers: what happened, what we assume about it and what we can offer. These can fit into a brief conversation. We do not have to present our hypothesis as truth in order to care. We can name a fact without diagnosing, ask whether a conversation would help and allow time. The less we replace the answer with a finished story of someone else's misfortune, the easier it becomes to obtain information that changes the next step. Sometimes the answer shows that no help is needed now; that is also a result of attentive contact.

There is also a difference between attending to someone and keeping them under constant observation. Asking about available help does not usually require monitoring a schedule, collecting other people's messages or checking every habit against our own picture of a normal life. Expanding our information in this way can itself become a burden. We can notice one episode and ask one question without becoming the keeper of a complete account. A person's freedom not to disclose details remains even when our guess seems convincing. Sometimes uncertainty marks the limit of our involvement rather than a task to gather more information.

## II. Initiative can be an invitation or an accomplished fact

An offer leaves the action in the future, where it can still be agreed. An accomplished fact has already changed the circumstances. The difference is particularly visible when help touches time, money, access to possessions or relations with other people. A message offering assistance and registering someone for an event involve different degrees of participation, even when both arise from the same concern.

In our imagined scene, Anna can invite Sergey to dinner without demanding an explanation if he declines. This remains an invitation. If she tells the neighbours he must be included and buys him a ticket for a group outing, the situation changes. Sergey must now respond to the group's expectations as well as to Anna. The cost of declining has increased before he answered. Recognising an intrusion does not require saying Anna intended to control him. Describing the obligations created is enough.

One useful measure of initiative is how easily the person can decline before consequences arise. A small offer with a clear limit usually allows more room than a large service already performed. But size is not the only criterion. Even a little advice can intrude when repeated after a refusal or used to correct someone publicly. A large action can be appropriate when it follows an arrangement agreed beforehand, such as routine help while someone is away.

A warm manner should not conceal the expectation of agreement. An offer that cannot be declined without an accusation of ingratitude already carries a condition. Helpers can notice this in themselves: am I offering an option, or trying to secure a particular answer? This is a question about one action, not a reason to condemn all one's care as impure. Human participation may combine different wishes. Precision lets us avoid carrying out each of them at another person's expense.

Room to answer includes a pause. A person need not immediately know whether they need help. We can give a genuine deadline after which the offer will no longer be available. But inventing urgency to obtain agreement is another matter. A clear limit helps both parties; artificially compressed time substitutes pressure for discussion. Initiative remains an invitation when the recipient can learn the conditions, think and answer without the consequences of their answer having been arranged as punishment.

## III. Good intentions do not establish a suitable method

An intention explains what the helper wanted; it does not determine what happened for the other person. We can want to make life easier and increase obligations, want to support someone and expose them to public attention, or want to give them rest and occupy their only free evening. There is no need to choose between a good intention and an unpleasant consequence: both can be real.

Imagine a gift. Friends collect money for someone's trip because they believe the person needs a break. The recipient wants to finish their own work and does not want to travel. The gift has a price, and declining feels awkward. Help has become difficult neither because travel is harmful nor because the friends are necessarily coercive. They did not check whether their method fitted the recipient's task. Now they must repair both the plan and the expectation that gratitude would take the form of going on the trip.

In Epictetus's Enchiridion, §42, translated by Elizabeth Carter, another person's action is considered in relation to what seems right to the person acting. The Stoic conclusion concerns one's moral position and response to offence. It does not require tolerating intrusion or prove every good intention harmless. For this comparison, it is enough to distinguish someone's assessment of an action from the action and its consequences.

In practice, this makes it possible to talk without putting motives on trial. We can acknowledge that somebody meant to help and say that this method does not fit. A helper can hear about consequences without being required to abandon their understanding of themselves as caring. Repair becomes simpler when no one must first prove malice. Changing a particular action often requires only recognising that it was not agreed and affected another person's life.

Yet caution about judging motives should not make consequences invisible. If assistance creates expenses, discloses information, cancels decisions or includes threats, these can be named plainly. Calling it care does not remove the question of what to do now. Nor does intention provide a permanent excuse: after a clear refusal, a repeated action occurs with different information. We may not know its inner cause and still see that a request to stop has gone unheeded. That is grounds for reconsidering involvement without claiming knowledge of the other person's entire character.

## IV. Sometimes there is no request because no offer has been available

The absence of a request does not always mean the absence of need. A person may not know about our resource, may not understand what they can ask for or may simply not regard the matter as appropriate for this conversation. These possibilities cannot be presented as established hidden causes. But they explain why respecting choice does not require silence until a perfectly formulated request appears.

Making the offer concrete helps. Instead of promising to help with everything, we can name one available action: transport an item tomorrow, look at a text, list services or bring a purchase during our own trip. The recipient need not guess the limits and price of our involvement. They can answer about a particular thing rather than decide at once whether to disclose their whole situation. A limited offer is often easier to accept or decline; it requires no more disclosure than the action needs.

In the fictional scene, Anna can say she is preparing a shared dinner on Friday and would be glad to see Sergey if he wants to come. She need not first declare him lonely. If he says being alone suits him now, that does not establish illness, coldness or a hidden request for insistence. Future invitations can remain possible without turning today's refusal into a

separate rescue project. Anna also retains the freedom to decide how often she is willing to invite him.

An unclear answer can be harder. The person says they do not want to be a burden, but does not answer the concrete offer. We can clarify the terms once: the action is available, its extent is acceptable, and no extra payment or return service is expected—if that is true. Then it helps to return the answer to the person. Endless persuasion gradually turns an available option into an obligation to accept care. Grateful agreement obtained after prolonged urging does not establish that the method was suitable.

Respecting choice also allows a person not to explain a refusal completely. They may not want to reveal financial, family or personal reasons. Often, saying the offer does not fit is sufficient to end it. If an action cannot be performed without certain information, the helper can state that condition and decline to participate. There is no need to demand access to the entire story while calling that access a free addition to a small favour. The task determines which information is actually needed.

If the offer involves a gift, it helps to say beforehand exactly what is offered and whether there are conditions. A recipient may accept a book and decline an expensive trip, accept help with one expense and decline regular support. This is not an inconsistency that must be corrected. Different kinds of involvement change different parts of life. Helpers may also discover that their supposed gift actually requires a response they have not named. Discussing a mutual arrangement is then more honest than presenting an expectation as a disinterested act. Clarity does not reduce generosity's value; it shows which step the person is being invited to answer about.

## V. Privacy remains when we want to gather support

Involving other people changes the extent of help. A person begins by discussing a situation with one listener, then discovers that relatives, colleagues or neighbours know about it. Even if everyone means well, the recipient must respond to a new circle of attention. It therefore helps to distinguish the question of sharing information from the question of whether our goal is good.

In the imagined story, Anna tells the group that Sergey needs company. She may regard this as harmless organisation of support. But he now receives invitations, questions about how he is doing and discussions of his habits. Anna has turned her guess into a shared description of the person. If Sergey did not agree, repair requires more than stopping the invitations: it requires acknowledging which information and interpretations were passed on. Explaining that everyone acted out of care cannot restore his previous privacy.

Helpers sometimes have a real need for advice themselves. They do not know how to offer participation and want a consultation. They can discuss a general question without identifying details, disclose only what is necessary or separately ask permission. These options do not guarantee complete anonymity, especially in a small circle, so it should not be promised without grounds. It helps to notice beforehand what would allow others to identify the person and whether this is needed for advice.

In Matthew 7:3–5, correcting another person is connected with attending to one's own position. This is Christian moral teaching, not a rule of confidentiality. Its limited connection to our subject concerns the hasty position of someone correcting another; its religious meaning cannot be replaced with a communication technique.

Sharing information is sometimes necessary for an agreed action: making an appointment, checking a service's availability or arranging travel. Then it helps to say who will receive what before acting. Permission for one contact does not automatically extend to the next. A useful measure is whether the information matches the task. A helper need not collect a complete biography to check opening hours or explain the recipient's character to arrange a delivery. A precise task makes it easier to preserve privacy and avoid accidentally enlarging the circle of people who already consider themselves participants in somebody else's situation.

## VI. A refusal marks the limit of an offer, not necessarily of a relationship

A no says that particular help has not been accepted. It may mean the timing is wrong, the method inconvenient, the action unnecessary or that the person wants to act differently. Sometimes it does express a wish to avoid closeness, but one refusal cannot establish that. It helps to hear what the answer concerns before using it to explain the entire relationship.

Helpers may feel disappointed when their care is not accepted. They expected to bring relief, feel close or complete a familiar task. These are possible feelings to acknowledge without accusing the recipient. The person need not accept a service to relieve us of awkwardness. We can speak of our reaction separately without making it an offer's hidden price. Helpers also need not keep inviting indefinitely if this form of contact no longer suits them.

Our fictional Anna may see that Sergey willingly greets her and talks in the courtyard but does not attend dinners. This need not be ingratitude. Perhaps that form of contact suits him well enough. If Anna wants something else, she can offer another possibility and accept the absence of agreement. An adult relationship does not require every interest to coincide. The difference between wanting closeness and having a claim on another person's time remains even when we like them very much.

After a refusal, repetition matters particularly. Clarifying an unclear condition once and repeatedly returning to an already clear answer are different actions. There is no universal permissible number of offers. What matters is the content of the answer, whether circumstances have changed, whether new information exists and whether it remains possible to decline calmly. If repetition brings public resentment, comparisons or accusations, the cost of answering rises. Initiative then looks less and less like an invitation.

Sometimes a recipient is uncertain and returns to the offer later. A previous refusal does not prohibit a new conversation or oblige the helper to preserve a resource indefinitely. Conditions can be clarified again. Both parties have this important freedom: to change their answer as circumstances change, and not to present an earlier offer as an eternal guarantee. Respecting refusal does not close the relationship; it preserves the difference between yesterday's decision and today's. Help becomes more precise when a new episode is not used to prove that the person should have been forced to agree earlier.

## VII. Repair begins with the action performed

If help has already become an intrusion, beginning with the fact rather than defending the intention helps. What was sent, paid, disclosed, changed or promised in somebody else's name? Which consequences can still be stopped? Which have already occurred? Describing this does not require declaring oneself a bad person, but it does require recognising one's own action as part of the situation.

In the fictional story, Anna can tell Sergey that she shared her guess about his loneliness with the neighbours although he had not asked her to do so. She can ask whether he wants her to clarify to the group that she has no authority to describe his needs. But repair must also be agreed: another public message could draw even more attention. First she can offer a concrete option and say what it would change. Sometimes the best available measure is to stop further retelling without requiring the recipient to join in our self-justification.

An apology does not guarantee restored trust. The person may decline discussion, accept the explanation partly or change the extent of future contact. These answers do not prove repair useless. It has a limited task: to acknowledge the action, stop what can still be stopped and agree possible restoration. We cannot honestly promise to erase information already circulated or return every option the person lost. Acknowledging that limit is more precise than another grand service.

Recipients can also explain what did not suit them. Not every unexpected form of help is experienced alike. One person dislikes the amount of money, another the involvement of others, a third the need to change plans. When speaking is safe and appropriate, identifying the specific difference helps a future offer. But being affected by an action does not

automatically oblige the recipient to educate the helper in detail. Declining to explain does not make the action agreed after the fact.

Repair is tested by a changed method, not only by the tone of acknowledgment. If messages are again sent in someone else's name after an apology, an improved sentence has not changed the sequence. We can observe more modest signs: new actions are discussed first, disclosed information is limited to the task, and refusal no longer prompts persuasion. This does not prove a relationship fully restored. Yet these are real changes in what the helper is responsible for; they need not possess the other person's reaction to matter.

## VIII. Care can be attentive and unfinished

Care does not always end in an action visible from outside. Sometimes it consists in an available offer, an attentive question or respect for a choice unfamiliar to us. This does not make every instance of inaction wise. It matters to distinguish refusing to notice someone from declining to carry out an unconfirmed plan on their behalf.

For Anna, the outcome may be simple: Sergey knows about the invitation, comes once and eats alone on other days. She no longer describes his dinners as a problem without his answer. They have a clear form of contact. It need not be declared a perfect friendship or proof that offering is always better than acting. In this particular scene, an unnecessary authority has disappeared: Anna no longer determines for Sergey how much company should make his life right.

A significant counterexample is immediate danger. If someone has lost consciousness or there is an evident current threat, the ordinary sequence of making an offer cannot be a general instruction to wait for a calm answer. The priority becomes available, safe emergency assistance according to local procedures. It does not follow that another person's way of life, a choice inconvenient to us or a declined evening is automatically an emergency. This article gives no medical algorithm and does not determine someone's ability to make decisions. Those separate questions require appropriate expertise and verified local information.

In an ordinary episode, unfinished help can be honest. We offered a resource and do not yet know whether it will be needed. We learned that our method does not fit and have no other. We heard about a difficulty but cannot solve it. Attention can remain without a promise to put an entire life right. Such a limit may hurt a helper accustomed to judging care by visible results. But visible results are not the only possible form of a relationship, and uncertainty does not authorise acting for somebody else.

Care therefore offers more possibilities than intervening or turning away. Between them is a sequence: notice, distinguish a guess from a statement, offer a limited action, await an answer, clarify conditions and attend to the outcome. We can stop at any stage. The sequence

guarantees no closeness and removes no real limitations. It makes one contact more precise. An unasked-for good act can become suitable help when the person retains the possibility of deciding whether that particular good suits them.

## What this means in practice

If you wish, recall one ordinary situation in which you intend to help without a request. Write the observable fact separately from your interpretation. For example, somebody cancelled several meetings; the idea that they are lonely or need organised leisure remains an assumption. You need not first prove their life wrong to offer one available option.

Formulate a small offer that creates no obligations before the answer. Name the action, timing and significant conditions. If it involves money, disclosing information or contacting others, say so beforehand. Allow refusal and a pause; do not demand a detailed explanation where performance does not require it. You can also limit the offer to your actual resources.

After the answer, look at what is really known. Agreement to talk is not agreement to a call to a third party. Declining one evening does not establish rejection of all relationships. If you have already expanded your involvement, you can acknowledge the particular action and offer repair without another intrusion. This practice is voluntary and does not guarantee trust. It concerns calm situations; immediate danger requires a separate safe route. Its result may be modest: care became an offer the other person could answer in their own words.

## Key quotation

> *“What can I do for you?”*

Louisa May Alcott, *Work: A Story of Experience*, Chapter XVII; the fictional Christie asks the wounded Fletcher. The question about needed help is selected here; the historical nursing scene is not offered as modern medical instruction.

## Connections between traditions

| Comparison | Shared question and limit |
|---|---|
| James ↔ the editorial distinction between observation and need | Another person's meaning is not fully visible from outside. A philosophical essay establishes neither a diagnosis nor a hidden motive. |
| Epictetus §42 ↔ the consequences of help | What seems right to the person acting may not suit another. The Stoic ideal does not require tolerating intrusion. |
| Matthew 7 ↔ the position of the person correcting | Before correcting another, considering one's own position matters. Christian teaching is not a confidentiality rule. |
| James ↔ Epictetus | The limits of one's own perspective. Their philosophical foundations and conclusions about response differ. |
| James ↔ Matthew 7 | Caution in judging from outside. Pluralism and religious moral speech do not constitute one doctrine. |

Five rows compare three works; this is a map of questions, not a claim that traditions agree universally.

## Sources

• Louisa May Alcott. Work: A Story of Experience. Boston, 1901, verified title page of the digital version. Selected Christie's speeches from Chapters I and XVII with context; a novel, not a study or treatment algorithm.

• William James. Talks to Teachers on Psychology and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals. Henry Holt, 1925; copyright 1899/1900. Selected opening and ending of “On a Certain Blindness” and opening of the following essay, “What Makes a Life Significant.” Philosophical argument, not a contemporary experiment.

• Epictetus. Enchiridion, §42. Elizabeth Carter translation, Internet Classics Archive; the exact print year underlying this version was not established. The selected paragraph and surrounding context were checked.

• Matthew 7:1–5. Updated World English Bible, eBible.org; selected verses and context checked. Christian teaching, not a clinical or legal rule.

• St John Ambulance. How to handle difficult first aid situations. Clinically reviewed 28 April 2025; Emergency advice / What to do read. A British source for the limit concerning danger and the helper's safety; its telephone numbers are not presented as international numbers.

## Tags

unasked-for help, care, intrusion, initiative, offer, agreement, refusal, observation, hypothesis, need, choice, relationships, privacy, trust, intention, consequences, gift, expectations, third parties, boundaries, repair, respect, attention, James, Epictetus, Stoicism, Christianity, Matthew, practice, United Wisdom

## About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, unity across traditions, intercultural dialogue and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki