

UNITED WISDOM

Rescuing and a genuine emergency need

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-07-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Rescuing and a genuine emergency need

Epigraph

> *“Self-discipline and self-control are the beginnings of practical wisdom”*

Samuel Smiles, *Self-Help*, Chapter XI, a fragment of his own sentence about self-discipline and self-control. Popular Edition, London: John Murray, 1897. This is historical moral reflection rather than contemporary first-aid instruction.

What this article is about

Some requests make us lose the ability to distinguish the scale of involvement. Answer immediately, come today, take everything on, or something irreparable will happen. Sometimes danger really is immediate. Sometimes catastrophe refers to a disrupted plan, an unpleasant discussion or another person's expectation. The difference matters: assessing ordinary helping boundaries and acting where life is threatened require different routes.

Yet the word rescuing can itself become a way of overlooking circumstances. It can explain away every action by someone who notices trouble first. It can also justify interference by claiming that circumstances allowed no choice, although the recipient could decide. This article considers a particular action, its necessity and its limit. It identifies no personality type and judges no inner purity of motive. A contemporary first-aid source is used within a limited scope, with its British jurisdiction identified. Historical and religious works raise moral questions while retaining their differences. The closing practice is for calmly reconsidering an ordinary episode afterwards, never delaying assistance where danger is real.

I. A role's name does not describe what is happening

Imagine a fictional story: Pavel often helps his acquaintance Denis with household matters. One day Denis says he cannot collect an order and urgently asks Pavel to abandon his work. Pavel is already preparing to go, although he knows neither the collection point's closing time nor whether collection can be postponed. Afterwards another acquaintance says he is rescuing everybody again. The observation may feel familiar, but it explains neither Denis's need nor Pavel's available action.

It is more useful to see the sequence. What happened? Which task needs resolving? What exactly is the helper being asked to do? Which consequence is expected from a delay? These

questions require no investigation of an entire life. They keep inconvenience, threat and compulsory personal participation from becoming one picture. In our example the order can be collected tomorrow, but Denis has not checked. This information changes the discussion's subject without establishing Denis as dishonest. Perhaps he rushed and misunderstood the terms himself.

In another episode the same Pavel finds himself beside someone who has lost consciousness. A conclusion about ordinary delivery cannot now be transferred to a dangerous situation while his inclination to help is discussed first. Both events seem to demand immediate attention; their grounds differ. A label applied to Pavel is no reliable method for assessing the urgency of the next event. Somebody can intervene excessively in one situation and appropriately in another.

Likewise, a strong desire to participate does not prove help unnecessary. Someone can want to be useful and see genuine trouble simultaneously. Mixed motives do not erase observable need. Assessment should consider action: did it help reach the appropriate participant, preserve available choice and fit what was known? In ordinary circumstances, clarify the offer. With an immediate threat, priorities change and contemporary competent guidance is needed alongside moral reflection.

Naming an action leaves room to reconsider it. Pavel can decline the journey and help check the deadline. He can agree to travel if it is actually manageable and needed. Both discussions concern resources and a task. Describing him as permanently a rescuer closes this distinction too early. It turns useful doubt into a completed explanation of a person before circumstances or options are known. More precise language makes excessive interference and necessary assistance visible without changing an overall label.

II. Urgency is assessed through consequences and timing

In an ordinary request, distinguish a preferred deadline from the time after which circumstances materially change. Denis would prefer his order today, but this establishes no immediate danger. Another household delay may produce a real loss: an available opportunity closes or a response deadline expires. Such losses deserve attention. Yet financial or organisational urgency does not automatically equal a threat to life or make one acquaintance the obligatory participant.

A statement that everything will be lost can be clarified calmly. What exactly changes, and when? Is there a contact who can answer? Who is already involved? Clarification should not become an examination of somebody's right to need assistance. Its purpose is to establish the subject of help. An answer may reveal a more serious problem requiring another resource, or show that time remains. Both possibilities stay open until a question is replaced by predetermined suspicion.

Sometimes information is sparse and delay's consequences could be dangerous. The article then proposes neither waiting for certainty nor discussing boundaries before seeking emergency support. A suspected immediate threat requires the appropriate local route and competent clarification. A witness's lack of a precise diagnosis does not justify declaring the situation ordinary. Describe what can be observed rather than confidently identifying a cause beyond one's ability to establish.

Still, an alarming message does not justify every requested action. A request to come alone to an unsafe location may involve genuine trouble, yet the helper's risk remains part of the situation. Appropriate services or other competent participants can be involved; known facts can be reported and personal safety considered. Declining one form of participation does not always mean declining assistance altogether. This distinction matters especially when pressure is applied to become the only available solution.

The more precise question is which next step fits the known risk. For an order, this could mean checking times and agreeing on postponement. For a threat to life, it means promptly contacting the local emergency service and acting on current instructions within one's capabilities. Many serious circumstances between these cases require professional or organisational participation without an immediate medical emergency. The world need not be divided into trivialities and catastrophes. Naming the scale allows a manageable action without denying difficulty or promising to resolve everything personally.

III. Immediate danger requires a different sequence

In its advice on difficult first-aid situations, the contemporary British organisation St John Ambulance considers risks to everybody, clear communication and prioritising life-threatening conditions. Its overview describes unresponsiveness together with abnormal breathing as grounds for immediately seeking emergency help. This is one example of a serious observable sign, not a complete list of dangers. If events are happening now, reflection on rescuing must not delay appropriate local emergency assistance.

The article's scope matters here. It neither teaches recognition of every condition nor gives treatment instructions or replaces first-aid training. A number appearing in a British source is not transferred worldwide. Use the emergency service for the country and locality where you are, follow its current instructions and avoid putting yourself in danger. A witness can report the location, observable event and available circumstances. Inventing a medical cause is unnecessary to make a report convincing.

In the imagined dangerous episode, Pavel need not first establish that he is selfless. He can seek appropriate assistance, involve someone available and act within his actual training and instructions. Fear or confusion does not morally diminish that contact. No ideal inner condition

is demanded before a necessary step. The relevant assessment concerns what he sees and does rather than whether he can later explain himself as the correct kind of person.

The source also notes that frightened people's behaviour may differ from their usual conduct. A sharp response in danger supplies no complete explanation of character. This qualification does not require enduring risk or continuing unsafe contact. Information can be passed to the appropriate participant with local conditions considered. Calm speech is useful for communication, not a guarantee that others become calm or assistance ends well. Outcomes depend on circumstances beyond the witness's control.

Questions about workload, agreement and continuing participation can return after danger passes. Postponement does not cancel them. First comes a route for the immediate threat; later, remaining tasks can be distinguished. This sequence establishes neither a universal legal conclusion about every passer-by's duty nor an obligation to sacrifice personal safety. It marks the article's conceptual boundary: ordinary availability discussions are no reason to delay emergency contact, while an emergency does not automatically create an indefinite right to direct the helper's life.

IV. Decisiveness needs to match capability

The image of action can attract us: somebody who intervenes immediately seems braver than someone who calls a trained participant. Yet visible scale does not establish suitability. A helper can do much and complicate matters by taking on an unfamiliar task. They can do less yet provide an important transition to competent help. The question is not whether participation looks sufficiently impressive, but whether it fits need and available capability.

In Chapter XI of *Self-Help*, Smiles connects practical wisdom with self-discipline and self-control, and knowledge with its purpose and action. His moral programme is historical; confident generalisations about character, success and poverty are not adopted as demonstrated patterns. Our limited point concerns the connection between composure and applying knowledge. It does not establish that a persistent amateur always succeeds or must overcome every resource limit.

Pavel may organise a journey well without having training for another task. Acknowledging this does not mean abandoning all participation. He can contact an appropriate person, check an access procedure or perform a particular agreed action. Such help may be unobtrusive. Its value requires no heroic biography. Nor do we promise that a handover is always available or works quickly: sometimes an important task remains open and further effort is needed.

In ordinary interaction, competence boundaries include authority to decide as well as ability. Somebody may know how to complete a form without being entitled to choose another person's answer. They may understand a purchase process without controlling somebody

else's money. Agreement to technical help does not grant complete access to decisions. Where recipients can participate, retain their answer where it is necessary. This is not delay for principle's sake but precision in distributing actions.

Self-control should not become another demand for perfection. A person can worry, speak imperfectly and still perform an important step. Afterwards they can notice an error and correct an available part. In our editorial interpretation, moral discipline also includes admitting what is unknown and declining an excessive promise. It does not automatically make assistance safe. It helps prevent verifiable action being replaced by a performance of bravery where another person's need serves only to confirm one's own image.

V. Trouble cannot be reduced to a question of dependence

The Samaritan parable in Luke 10:30–37 describes somebody severely harmed and another person stopping to care. Further care is also entrusted to an innkeeper. This is a Christian narrative about mercy and one's neighbour, not a contemporary treatment protocol. Its oil and wine are not proposed as first-aid remedies. The moral meaning does not remove the need for current competent guidance.

In this story, respect for the injured person's independence cannot alone explain a failure to participate. His condition raises another question. This boundary matters: refusing involvement is sometimes justified as helping someone learn to manage alone, although they cannot perform the necessary step now. Independence is no obligation instantly to manage without any help. Available choice depends on circumstances; it should not be demanded where safety and support are first needed to make it possible.

Nevertheless, a dangerous episode does not establish complete control of a recipient's subsequent life. The narrative's handover makes arrangements for continuity visible without setting their contemporary conditions. In our ordinary story, Pavel can help Denis with a particular difficulty and return other decisions to him. Past help requires no continuous supervision of all orders. If continuing accompaniment has been agreed, name it separately rather than derive it from one significant event.

Sometimes a recipient needs help longer than expected after a serious situation. The initial participation's limited extent does not erase that need. Actual conditions, available services, participants' agreement and a competent transition must be discussed. The article proposes no abrupt withdrawal of necessary care to demonstrate respect for freedom. Nor does it make one acquaintance the natural owner of every subsequent task. Continuation requires its own arrangements rather than arising solely from the first action's moral meaning.

The comparison leaves two distinguishable errors. Any help can be labelled a suppression of independence, allowing genuine trouble to be ignored. Any trouble can be treated as grounds

for directing someone after it ends. Religious mercy and our editorial distinction between stages have different foundations. They meet in a question about particular need without becoming a common medical or legal theory. Keeping that distinction prevents an attractive moral image from displacing circumstances, agreement and the conditions of available action.

VI. Preventing difficulty differs from managing a person

Chapter 64 of the *Tao Te Ching* attends to small beginnings and action before disorder develops. In James Legge's translation, images of growth stand beside a caution about action with an imposed purpose of one's own. This philosophical work has its distinctive language of action and non-action. It offers no guarantee that an unforced manner eliminates every danger, and supplies no reason never to intervene where life is threatened.

For ordinary help, it raises a question about preparation. Pavel and Denis can check collection deadlines beforehand, retain a contact and discuss who can travel. A future delivery may then depend less on an unprepared last-minute decision. This is an editorial household example rather than an empirically proven effect of the ancient text. Preparation may fail to prevent another difficulty: schedules change, contacts do not answer, another condition appears. Still, it makes some information available earlier.

Recipient participation shows the difference between preparation and control. A shared contact record helps Denis act himself. Requiring reports to Pavel about every order may create dependence on his checking. Even a useful proposal grants no right to expand monitoring without discussion. If Denis rejects the proposed arrangement, Pavel can describe his own helping conditions. He need not either accept the whole workload or force his acquaintance into the sole supposedly correct arrangement.

Someone may refuse preparation discussions and then repeatedly request last-minute assistance. This supports reconsidering availability without proving a hidden intention. Describe the repeated event, name manageable participation and propose another method. Repetition can have different causes, not all available to an observer. Declining a psychological explanation does not require agreeing to everything. It retains the subject: what a helper will do under a known condition and what remains the recipient's decision.

Ancient philosophical caution and contemporary planning are not identical. We do not turn non-action into a universal risk-management method. A limited comparison helps notice when preventing trouble becomes permanent direction. Sometimes available preparation means a contact, a clear deadline and an accepted distribution of participation. Sometimes a professional plan is needed that household discussion cannot replace. Preparation's scale should fit the task; not every inconvenience requires supervising an entire life, and not every danger is resolved by one advance message.

VII. An acute need's end creates no indefinite debt

Important participation can bring a relationship closer. A recipient feels grateful, a helper relieved, and others notice the action. There is no requirement to find a problem here. Yet recognition differs from a new obligation. Denis can value Pavel's help without surrendering subsequent decisions. Pavel can retain friendship without being available for every new request. Gratitude has meaning without becoming a permanent transfer of authority.

If continuing participation is agreed, specify its subject and timing. What is now needed? Which actions does each person accept? When will involvement be reconsidered? An acute event can leave lengthy organisational work or conclude with a particular result. No convenient version should be selected beforehand. Clarification makes an unfinished task visible without combining it with a general demand for gratitude or treating a past action as proof of limitless willingness.

Pavel may notice difficulty accepting his role's end. Previously he knew what to do; now Denis chooses differently. This feeling establishes no diagnosis or falsity of previous assistance. It identifies another subject: staying nearby without the former need for one's participation. He can offer contact, acknowledge changed conditions and require no new problem to preserve closeness. Recipients need not keep needing assistance to confirm the value of what was done.

Elsewhere a task remains unfinished while the helper's former resources are unavailable. An available transition matters, especially where stopping creates danger. Names of possible replacements do not constitute a completed handover. Actual agreement and appropriate competence are needed. Nobody can promise that a local service immediately accepts the task. An unresolved situation must be named. It neither disappears through an attractive statement about independence nor increases the former participant's resources by itself.

Precision prevents past emergency circumstances becoming a future rule. Each episode has its own conditions. One needs ordinary agreement, another professional participation, a third immediate emergency help. Human connection remains across them without a permanent mode of operation. Leaving an indefinite role does not diminish the action's value. It means distinguishing need, accepted promises and actual capacity again. Gratitude then need not become authority, and remembering assistance need not prevent discussing the present.

VIII. Action can be assessed without judging motives

After a calm episode, consider what was known, which decision was made, whose it was and what changed. This is no search for a final verdict on the helper's goodness. The same journey can involve care, desire for recognition and a habit of acting faster than others. Every inner element cannot be resolved before the next household step. A concrete assessment remains available even with mixed motives.

Pavel may see that he failed to check timing, cancelled important work of his own and then resented Denis's lack of gratitude. An available correction is earlier discussion of timing and scope. He need not declare himself dependent on rescuing others. Denis may see that he called the request an emergency without checking. His available correction is reporting known conditions more accurately. These observations explain neither personality nor demand public confession as the price of continuing friendship.

Sometimes assistance was necessary while one part was excessive. Pavel correctly found a contact and then changed another plan without asking Denis. Distinguish the actions. Acknowledging interference does not reject every contribution. Detail makes correction specific: return a decision, clarify consequences and avoid repeating the expansion. Saying that he rescued someone again does not identify where accepted help ended and directing another person began. Sometimes it even hides the useful result retained.

Reconsideration after real danger may require time and an appropriate listener. We do not propose immediately analysing each action's morality with the injured person. The contemporary source mentions professional support where difficult unsettled feelings persist. This diagnoses no reader and promises no particular outcome from seeking support. Discussion of further involvement depends on people's condition and circumstances. Respect also means allowing an experience not to become an immediate lesson about correct boundaries.

Rescuing can be a useful opening for doubt when facts follow. It obstructs discussion when it closes it beforehand. Genuine emergency need also requires attention to circumstances, but along a route of timely competent assistance rather than slow moral analysis. Readiness to notice trouble can coexist with limits on ordinary participation. No single role for every case is required. Distinguishable actions, honest acknowledgement of what is unknown and a willingness to change the method as circumstances change are needed.

What this means in practice

If you wish, choose one completed ordinary episode where a request seemed urgent. Avoid an event with continuing danger: this practice must not delay local emergency or other necessary competent assistance. Record what was directly known, what you assumed and which consequence was expected from delay. Do not use the record to determine another person's character.

Name the need, the action requested from you and an available alternative separately. The alternative may be unknown or unavailable; this is also an accurate result. Consider what was agreed, where you decided for the recipient and what remained within your capability. Choose one small correction for a similar ordinary request: check timing, identify scope or retain an appropriate contact. Do not turn that correction into a rule never to participate.

In the next calm episode, assess only that part. Is the need clearer, and who makes the decision? Has new information appeared? This voluntary practice promises neither freedom from anxiety, restored relationships nor correct identification of every danger. Its modest result is fewer conclusions from one label and greater precision in available action. Contemporary first-aid guidance, the local emergency route and professional preparation remain separate from this moral record.

Key quotation

> *“our best thought action”*

Samuel Smiles, *Self-Help*, Chapter XI; a fragment of his own sentence about moving from reflection into life and action. Here, action includes contacting a competent participant; an impressive personal feat is not its only possible meaning.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question and limit
Smiles ↔ editorial assessment of action	Knowledge connects with application. A historical character programme is not contemporary psychological diagnosis.
Luke 10 ↔ immediate need	Care responds to serious trouble. The narrative does not replace today's medical training.
Tao Te Ching 64 ↔ preparation	Small beginnings are noticed before difficulty expands. The philosophical text guarantees no prevention of danger.
Smiles ↔ Tao Te Ching 64	Composure and the extent of participation. Active self-development differs from the Daoist language of non-action.
Luke 10 ↔ editorial distinction between stages	A first step can differ from continuing arrangements. Contemporary agreement and handover conditions are not derived entirely from the parable.

Five comparisons concern three historical works. St John Ambulance is used separately for limited contemporary safety information, not as a spiritual tradition.

Sources

• Samuel Smiles. Self-Help, with illustrations of Conduct and Perseverance. Popular Edition, London: John Murray, 1897, Gutenberg 935. Title details, preface and selected Chapter XI paragraphs checked. Historical generalisations about success and character are not presented as studies.

• Luke 10:25–37. Updated World English Bible, eBible.org. The question about one's neighbour, parable and conclusion checked. Historical care methods are not recommended as contemporary treatment.

• Tao Te Ching, Chapter 64. Attributed to Laozi; James Legge translation, Internet Classics Archive. The selected chapter was read; this version's exact print basis was not established.

• St John Ambulance. How to handle difficult first aid situations. Checked 6 October 2026; stated clinical review by Dr Lynn Thomas, 28 April 2025. British guidance concerning participant safety, communication, life-threatening priorities and emergency contact.

• St John Ambulance. First aid advice. Opening and selected categories checked, including unresponsiveness with abnormal breathing. This is no complete danger list or treatment instruction in this article; local numbers and arrangements require separate determination.

Tags

help, rescuing, urgency, danger, first aid, safety, choice, agreement, resources, competence, responsibility, limits, request, pressure, action, self-discipline, self-control, mercy, preparation, handover, arrangement, independence, relationships, Smiles, Luke, Daoism, Christianity, practice, observation, United Wisdom

About the authors

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

Maria Evilkut is a 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