

UNITED WISDOM

Safety and permissible restrictions on freedom

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-27-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Safety and permissible restrictions on freedom

Epigraph

> *equal freedom*

Herbert Spencer, *Social Statics*, chapter *The Right to Ignore the State*, Freedom Press extract. Short fragment from §1. It belongs to a radical historical argument about the state's limits, rather than a current legal rule.

What this article is about

Shared work may need restrictions, such as a rule for access to information people have voluntarily provided. Yet the word safety does not itself explain what may be prohibited, for whom, or for how long. A measure may block one route to harm, create a new inconvenience, and give someone additional power. These subjects deserve separate consideration. This article offers that examination through a hypothetical voluntary reading archive. It is the article's own editorial reasoning, rather than a legal test, a study of protective effectiveness, or advice for a dangerous conflict. Spencer's historical argument helps raise a question about the limits of authority; his conclusion about withdrawing from the state is not adopted as an instruction. The narrower task is to connect a restriction to an identified risk, define its scope, notice its cost, and leave an intelligible route to reconsideration. Threats or coercion end the trial; it requires no disclosure of vulnerable information.

I. A restriction begins with the subject of protection

Imagine a voluntary archive of book recommendations. Participants leave notes, sometimes sign them, and provide suitable times for reading together. In this invented situation, a list of names and contact details has become accessible through a shared link. It is not yet known who opened it or whether specific harm occurred. The organizer proposes closing the whole archive to everyone except two assistants. The intention to protect participants is understandable. However, the proposal covers contact details, ordinary recommendations, and people's ability to read their own entries. The concern first needs a name: unwanted circulation of contacts, access to private notes, or use of a name without consent. Different subjects may require different measures. This distinction does not promise a completely safe arrangement; it makes the question addressed by the restriction visible.

Even here, a fact, a supposition, and a future possibility have different grounds. The fact is that the link was accessible. A supposition that information has already been used requires separate confirmation. Possible recurrence depends on how access works from now on. Combining all three into an indefinite sense of danger makes the restriction's limit hard to describe. Any objection can then look like an underestimation of risk, while every further prohibition appears to extend protection. A more precise account leaves room for ignorance: the list was open, consequences remain unestablished, and further unnecessary access needs to stop. It does not require participants to prove the absence of every future harm. Nor does it authorize inaction: uncertainty about consequences does not remove the need to close a particular route of circulation.

Protection also concerns the people for whom the measure operates. Consent to provide a contact for one meeting is not consent to display it throughout the archive. Joining the project creates no duty to explain why a contact should remain private. An access error can be acknowledged without examining everyone's personal history. Nevertheless, protection does not automatically authorize the organizer to speak for everyone's preferred arrangement. One person may want the contact removed, another may want their entry returned, and someone else may prefer to end participation. These responses establish no hierarchy of personal seriousness. They identify different limits on a provided resource. Freedom already appears here as something concrete: the ability to determine further use of one's information within a voluntary activity.

II. The connection between a measure and a risk needs explanation

A restriction can address the identified risk directly: the previous shared link no longer opens the contact list. Closing book recommendations addresses it less directly if those notes contain no private information and are separately accessible. Perhaps the organizer cannot yet separate the lists and therefore proposes closing everything temporarily. The ground then includes a limitation of technical capability alongside the risk. That is an essential part of the explanation. Participants are being asked to bear inconvenience because of the archive's particular arrangement, rather than because reading recommendations has become dangerous in itself. A named limitation can subsequently be reconsidered. Without this clarification, a temporary means can turn into the belief that only a closed archive is compatible with responsibility toward people.

Explaining the connection need not include details that expose contacts again or assist a protective bypass. It can name the kind of information, the discovered route of circulation, and the action that closes that route. An intelligible ground is not the same as revealing every vulnerability. Secrecy also has a limit, however: one can withhold the list itself while explaining

what is being closed, who retains access, and when the question will return for consideration. Withholding sensitive details does not mean withholding the ground. Distinguishing these helps someone understand a decision without supplying additional private material. Clarity serves the ability to assess a particular measure, rather than curiosity about another person's situation.

One can ask what new action becomes impossible after the restriction. If the answer concerns circulation of contacts, the connection is specified. If it means nobody can discuss the organizer's mistake, a different subject is being protected. Both tasks can sometimes hide inside one measure: the archive closes and messages about the problem are removed under the same explanation. They should be considered separately without automatically attributing malicious intent. Discussion of a particular defect differs from recirculating a private list. Prohibiting the latter does not establish grounds to prohibit the former. Participants need not enter a dispute to preserve dignity or demonstrate freedom. Noticing the distinction may take the form of a calm written question, declining to provide more information, or ending voluntary participation, where that is available without threat.

III. The scope of prohibition differs from the scope of authority

Suppose an assistant is tasked with removing the open link. They need access to publication settings, but not necessarily to all participants' personal notes and correspondence. Assigning a task does not transfer every action that might be convenient under the name of protection. The task, necessary capabilities, and duration of their use can be distinguished. This examines the arrangement of a voluntary project; it establishes no rule of state authority. In our archive, the questions are concrete: what must the assistant change, what information is actually needed, and who checks completion? Restricting other participants' access does not remove the need to limit the protective worker's access too. Otherwise protection from one route of circulation creates another, less visible route.

Technical capability differs from received consent, particularly when the assistant can open more than the task requires. They can see every field because the interface works that way, but the group has not therefore assigned them to study every entry. Limited separation of roles can be acknowledged as a present tool limitation. It does not authorize endless expansion of the work's subject. It helps to specify what requires a new ground: copying information privately, passing it to a third person, or using contacts for a separate invitation. One declaration is not a promise to remove every risk. It makes a breach of the assignment distinguishable. Participants gain something to check and correct that does not depend on the assistant's general reputation for reliability.

Authority is also a question for the organizer. Who accepted this role, what access arrangement existed before, and does the trust received extend to the new storage of a closed

list? An absent answer cannot be filled with the assertion that a caring person may decide everything. Urgent measures cannot always be discussed in detail beforehand. But urgently stopping open access differs from deciding permanently who will hold the information. The discovered link can be closed, the reason communicated, and a continuation arrangement proposed separately. Separating these decisions allows action in a present difficulty without turning that difficulty into unlimited authority. It also gives the worker a clearer boundary: completing the necessary action does not mean accepting responsibility for the group's entire future safety.

IV. The cost of protection is distributed among people

A closed archive may reduce unwanted access while making ordinary participation harder. Someone can no longer see their note, check a corrected name, or obtain a recommendation without contacting an assistant. These consequences do not cancel the concern about contacts. They show that a protective measure has its own cost, borne by people who may not have chosen it. Closure simplifies one assistant's work, increases another's requests, and makes a reader's access depend on somebody else's free time. Speaking only of shared peace of mind hides those differences. Cost includes more than minutes: dependence, the need to explain a request, and loss of an independent check also matter. They can be considered without promising to calculate a uniquely correct balance.

Separating contacts from general book notes could reduce some inconvenience in our hypothetical case. Yet separation requires work and may not be possible immediately. Who will do it, using what available resource? A proposal to make everything open and impeccably protected can hide an assistant's unpaid labor. A proposal to close everything forever can hide a reader's lost access. Neither cost disappears through a strong appeal to freedom or safety. Each needs to sit beside the expected benefit of this particular measure. An unavailable improvement does not establish that the present arrangement must become permanent. It may call for a limited temporary decision and an honest acknowledgment of what remains unresolved.

The group's consent does not prove identical acceptability for everyone. Someone may agree because they do not want to delay closure of the link, yet prefer to reclaim their information afterward. Another person may lack time for reconsideration while still needing access to an entry. Naming a cost does not require disclosure of the reason for personal vulnerability. A practical consequence is enough: I cannot check my entry; I need a way to remove it; this request arrangement is inaccessible to me. Considering such a message does not oblige the project to retain the earlier risk. It helps identify a further step needed after protection. An inconvenience may remain, but it ceases to be an invisible contribution through which others obtain an easier working arrangement.

V. A temporary measure needs a condition for ending

Until circumstances are clarified sounds temporary, but establishes no moment of reconsideration. Which circumstances, who can investigate them, and what counts as a sufficient answer? Without those details, access can stay closed because absolute certainty never arrives. The archive could limit its initial measure through a review date or a particular action: separate contacts and recommendations, check the old link, or let participants remove an entry. This does not mean everything must automatically reopen on the chosen date. It means the question returns for consideration on current grounds. Extension becomes a separate decision requiring its own explanation. Time no longer functions as silent consent to an earlier prohibition.

A condition for ending differs from a promise that risk will disappear entirely. A check might establish that the earlier link no longer opens contacts while proving nothing about possible past copies. Both facts can be stated honestly. The present route is closed; earlier copying remains unknown. Uncertainty about the past does not automatically justify every future restriction. A new decision needs a separate subject: what might happen now, and how does the proposed measure relate to that possibility? This arrangement does not exclude difficult decisions. It prevents unavailable knowledge of the past from becoming a universal ground for controlling later action. It also recognizes completion of a specific job without assigning the worker an impossible duty to remove all consequences of an event that has already occurred.

Reconsideration needs accessible participation, but not compulsory attendance at a lengthy discussion. The question can be announced in advance, a short way to identify practical consequences provided, and deletion of personal information kept separate from the collective decision. If review is accessible only to someone skilled in public argument, less conspicuous costs remain unrepresented. Silence should not automatically be read as dissent or fear either. It is an absent expressed response whose reasons may be unknown. A simple corrective route matters precisely because it requires no explanation of silence. Someone may use it later within a stated limit. The project then considers a definite request instead of judging whether a person has defended their own freedom energetically enough.

VI. Spencer raises a question without replacing the decision

In the chapter read here, Spencer derives a radical right to withdraw from connection with the state from equal freedom. In §2 he rejects treating legislative power as an independent moral absolute and describes its authority as received. This is nineteenth-century philosophical reasoning. It helps this article distinguish an institution's strength from its ground of authority. The whole conclusion is not adopted: withdrawal from the state, refusal to support it, and the depiction of government as inherently evil do not become instructions to the reader. Moving from a philosophical foundation to current duties would require other sources and a definite context. Our voluntary archive has a substantially different scope; the analogy raises only a question about the limits of an assignment.

The tension within the chosen source must remain visible. Its principle considers another person's freedom; it does not turn every wish of an acting individual into an indisputable right. In our scene, freely circulating a list affects other people's information. Protecting their boundary may require restricting that particular action. Meanwhile the restriction should stay connected to its subject rather than becoming an organizer's general right to determine participants' whole conduct. This is the article's own editorial move from a historical question to a hypothetical case, rather than a summary of Spencer's ready-made solution. The source establishes neither effective list separation nor the permissibility of any intervention. Its role is to prevent an institution's name or a shared protective purpose from entirely replacing an explanation of authority.

Short quotation fragments cannot convey the chapter's whole complex, contested argument. A specific source and reading scope are therefore provided, and the contemporary distinctions are identified as this article's reasoning. Spencer is not combined with other traditions into imagined unanimity. Nor does protection of information in present organizations receive a historical certificate of correctness. A narrower demand on our own thinking follows from the passage: when power to stop an action appears, consider separately where that authority came from and what limits it. That is a question useful for describing a situation. It does not promise resolution without remainder and asks nobody to expose themselves to danger for the consistent application of a philosophical principle.

VII. Protective work also needs accessible correction

Suppose the assistant accidentally deletes a book note along with its contact details. The participant notices the loss and requests restoration. Saying everything was done for safety does not describe the new request. The original reason for restricting access remains, but an execution error now needs consideration. Correction is not permission to bypass protection. A particular entry can be checked and returned to the accessible archive, if possible without exposing contacts again. If restoration is impossible, that should be stated directly. A good original intention does not promise complete compensation. The participant receives an intelligible response to a definite loss and can consider further participation in light of that response.

Correction needs a recipient, but that recipient should not become the sole owner of all knowledge about the event. An assistant can receive a message, the organizer consider a disputed arrangement, and the participant confirm their desired use of an entry. Roles remain distinguishable even if two people fill them. If independent reconsideration is unavailable, it cannot be declared complete merely because the same worker reconfirms their own decision. The limitation can be named honestly and an available action offered: explanation, deletion, ending storage, or renewed discussion. Not every disagreement requires an elaborate proceeding. Yet the absence of such a possibility is also a feature someone needs to understand before providing information again.

Correction helps the worker too. Protecting participants does not turn them into someone forbidden to admit a limited mistake. If each defect is treated as proof of general unreliability, an additional reason to hide particular failures appears. The article asserts no psychological law about such behavior. It examines editorially how a general verdict obscures an individual subject: an accidentally deleted note, an unclear ground, or overly broad access. A decision can be assessed and change requested without saying the mistake exhausts the person. This removes no responsibility. It makes responsibility more precise and allows correction to finish when a definite task is complete, rather than when participants reach a common judgment about the organizer's character.

VIII. Leaving participation does not replace discussion of a measure

A voluntary participant may choose to leave the archive. That is a significant response, but does not automatically establish whether the restriction is right or wrong. They may reject the new arrangement, lack time for review, or no longer need the shared activity. Their reason may remain private. The availability of departure cannot justify every condition: being able to leave does not make all restrictions on those remaining fair. Exit also has a cost, such as loss of one's accumulated entry or connection with readers. That cost deserves separate consideration. Ending voluntary participation preserves a space of choice, but does not replace a measure's need for an intelligible ground, a limit, and correction inside the project.

If leaving requires further disclosure or prolonged public defense of a decision, its accessibility becomes doubtful. Our hypothetical scene can specify in advance what happens to an entry: deletion, retention without a name, or return of one's text. These options are considered through consent and the project's actual capabilities; no legal storage procedure is established here. The organizer need not promise something technically impossible. But the impossibility must be named so that someone does not choose on the basis of an imaginary service. Clear completion concerns the resource left with the project as well as the person's departure. Ending participation and ending storage do not always happen through the same action.

Threats, pressure, or concern for personal safety create no duty to test exit through argument. Such circumstances lie outside this voluntary trial. Discussion can end without providing more information; further actions depend on circumstances and available help. This is no universal method for safely resisting authority. Declining a risky test does not establish insufficient commitment to freedom. The limit also matters in a calm situation: the project cannot require a participant to endure conflict as a condition for recognizing their boundary. A formal ability to send a message does not itself describe the action's cost. That cost may remain private, and participation may depend on someone's limited available resources.

IX. A decision may remain limited and unfinished

Examination may produce no ideal arrangement. Contacts are closed, recommendations are temporarily inaccessible, and separation requires an assistant's free evening. This intermediate condition can be described honestly: a particular route of circulation has stopped, some access has been lost, the next job has an executor and a limit, and residual risk is unknown. It differs from both a promise of overall safety and an admission of complete helplessness. A limited decision can retain a visible remainder. The participant can ask about their entry and continuation. The organizer can complete a definite task. Neither must prove all possible consequences have been eliminated to recognize completed action and the remaining subject of consideration.

Freedom here is more than absence of prohibitions. It appears in knowing a condition's scope, determining use of one's resource, declining an automatically expanded role, and raising a particular error. Safety likewise involves more than the number of closed doors. Which route to harm do they block, and what dependence do they create? This is an editorial distinction, not a measure of institutional quality. A narrower measure may sometimes be available; present capability may sometimes be cruder than desired. Its ground and duration remain questions. An imperfect decision can have an intelligible boundary, while a convenient one may require reconsideration if its subject quietly expands beyond the group's initial consent.

The examination does not end with one general word defeating another. Its smaller result is a named risk, an explanation of the measure's connection to it, a scope of authority, a distribution of cost, and a condition for returning to the question. These may remain disputed. But disagreement then concerns a definite action rather than a participant's entire human position. This conversation cannot promise to preserve the project or remove conflict. It can check whether something formerly hidden by a general demand for protection has become visible. A further decision might correct access, specify a duration, end storage, or acknowledge an inability to continue under present conditions. Each remains within its own scope, without demanding sacrifice of all freedom for shared peace of mind.

What this means in practice

For one voluntary situation, choose an already proposed restriction and describe it in ordinary words. Specify what is being protected, which action the measure stops, and which information or capabilities it covers. Name present unknowns separately. The record should contain no private information itself: a subject and an access route suffice. If the explanation still consists of general anxiety, leave its ground unresolved rather than declaring it established. The trial requires neither a dangerous demand for openness nor testing a vulnerability on somebody else's data.

Then identify the worker, their available scope, and the cost for others. Choose one condition for reconsideration: a review date or a definite completed job. It does not guarantee that the measure will be removed; it requires returning to grounds for continuation. Name an available request for correcting one's entry or ending its storage. If no route exists, record that absence instead of a promise. Limited resources can end the trial at this description, without requiring design of a new arrangement.

The result is distinct subjects within one decision. It establishes no legality, measures no residual danger, and confirms no participant's maturity. Participation can be declined without disclosing a personal reason. Threats, coercion, or a need to provide vulnerable information end the trial. A question may remain open afterward, or voluntary participation may end where that is available. Recognizing a limit is part of an honest decision, rather than proof that freedom and safety are necessarily incompatible.

Key quotation

> *at the best, borrowed*

Herbert Spencer, *Social Statics*, *The Right to Ignore the State*, §2, second visual paragraph, the author’s prose after the opening Blackstone quotation. Short fragment concerning institutional power. The preceding quotation from Blackstone is not used as Spencer's own speech.

Connections between traditions

Spencer's historical argument asks about an institution's relation to equal freedom and its received authority. The article examines a different, limited subject: voluntary storage of information and a particular protective assignment's boundary. The connection concerns the ground of power, rather than an identity between a state and a small project. Separate consideration of risk, cost, and reconsideration is the article's editorial contribution. Other traditions are neither represented as read nor declared in agreement. This limit leaves the source as a contested philosophical support and leaves readers able to assess the contemporary reasoning without accepting its entire historical conclusion.

Sources

Herbert Spencer. *Social Statics* (1851), chapter *The Right to Ignore the State*. Extract published by Freedom Press (1913): Project Gutenberg, no.34649. Continuous §§1–4 were read; the whole book was not. Quotations use the author's own prose in §§1–2, rather than the embedded Blackstone passage. The edition notes the chapter's omission from Spencer's later revision; this article uses this early historical text. Its conclusions are not current rules or contemporary findings. Short Russian fragments were translated for this article.

Tags

safety, freedom, restriction, risk, authority, consent, archive, information, privacy, access, assignment, boundary, reconsideration, duration, cost, dependence, correction, entry, voluntary participation, refusal, completion, resource, uncertainty, grounds, organizer, participant, protection, Spencer, shared work, United Wisdom

About the authors

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

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