

UNITED WISDOM

Accessibility as a Condition of Independence

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-28-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Accessibility as a Condition of Independence

Epigraph

> *our experiences are different*

Helen Keller, The World I Live In, I, p. 5. A short fragment of her autobiographical comparison, concerning Keller's own account rather than everyone with similar circumstances.

What this article is about

Someone arrives to sign up for a class. The door is open, but the information is on a high counter, instructions are spoken only, and an application must be completed within minutes. A staff member gladly offers to do everything for the visitor. That assistance may be useful now. Yet independence remains an open question: nobody has asked which parts the person can do, which method suits them, or whether they want someone else to complete the form.

Independence is often imagined as managing without people. Any help then looks like defeat, while an environmental obstacle becomes a test of personal strength. We will consider another framework: people can retain authorship of a decision while using chosen support and an accessible environment. The amount of assistance matters, as do the answers to several questions: who defines the task, who controls the action, and who can change how it is done?

This article does not assess health, establish legal requirements for a particular country, or describe everyone's experience of the same characteristic. We examine actions: getting information, entering, choosing, completing, asking, and refusing. In each case, it helps to ask what obstructs the task, which methods are available, and what the participant prefers. Accessibility is a question of organising the possibility of action, rather than a reward for exceptional persistence.

I. Independence always concerns something specific

Calling someone independent sounds like a general description. In a particular situation, however, it divides into actions. A person can choose a course themselves and ask someone else to type. They may complete a form themselves while needing a clear explanation of its fields. They may use a reading device without needing a spoken summary. Such differences prevent one difficulty from becoming a verdict about the whole person.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Begin with the task: what does the person want to do now? Others sometimes choose another task before asking. A visitor wants the timetable, but someone starts arranging an annual membership. A participant wants to attend a meeting, but an organiser proposes watching a recording at home. The offer may be benevolent, yet it changes the goal. Before improving a method, check whether the chosen action is being preserved.

The next question concerns stages. Obtaining information, comparing options, expressing a choice, and carrying out a procedure may require different kinds of access. There is no need to hand over everything when one stage is difficult. Discomfort with handwriting does not establish inability to choose an answer. Difficulty hearing instructions in a noisy room does not establish inability to understand their content in another format.

This analysis also changes expectations of assistance. Help no longer has to be measured as one total quantity. Someone can offer to read one field, show a button's position, or allow more time. An obstacle may be removed so that further personal assistance is unnecessary. The person can also be asked whether help is wanted at all. Each proposal belongs to a specific part of the task and remains open to an unexpected answer.

Specificity protects against two extremes. Nobody has to demonstrate complete independence in every action for their choice to count as real. Nor should others call an action accessible merely because they are willing to perform it on the person's behalf. Choosing for oneself and choosing to delegate are related possibilities, but they are not identical. An accessible environment preserves both where possible, allowing the person to choose between them.

II. An obstacle concerns an action in an environment

A heavy door obstructs a particular entrance, not abstract dignity. An unclear notice makes it harder to learn a meeting time. A form with uniformly small print may complicate reading, while a compulsory telephone call may obstruct someone who prefers another channel. Noticing an obstacle does not require first reaching a judgement about the person. We can examine what the task demands and which ways of completing it are actually provided.

This does not make individual differences disappear. One person needs another text size, another a quieter time, and another the option to use their own device. A universal offer of help may fail for precisely this reason. An environment interacts with a particular method of action. A good solution for one participant does not automatically serve everyone, and general principles do not replace feedback about a specific situation.

Imagine a reading room where materials are available only after making a spoken request through a noisy queue. Changing the request channel can enable another way of acting without changing the person. But a written form alone does not solve everything: where is it,

how will readiness be announced, and what happens after an error? Accessibility concerns the whole route rather than the presence of one convenient object.

Sometimes time creates the obstacle. An action is technically possible, but the allotted interval does not permit it through the chosen method. More time may then be an important condition of independence. It should not automatically be assumed to be the only change needed. If instructions are unclear, a longer interval simply prolongs uncertainty. Examining stages reveals where time, information, or a genuinely different procedure is required.

Attention to the environment limits hurried personal conclusions. Not managing here and now does not establish inability to perform the action anywhere. At the same time, we cannot promise that every barrier disappears with a small change. Resources, space, and tasks have real limits. Name those honestly and discuss alternatives with the participant, distinguishing an actual constraint from an assumption that has not been tested.

III. Another form of access is not a lesser life

In the first chapter of The World I Live In, Helen Keller describes touch and the hand in her own connection with the world. This autobiographical account presents another way of perceiving without representing every blind or deaf person's experience. Here it helps keep differences of method visible without automatically ranking their fullness. Keller, The Seeing Hand, pp. 4–6.

When a familiar method is treated as the only authentic one, an alternative begins to look secondary. A text read through software supposedly counts for less than one seen by the eyes; a question typed beforehand seems less personal than one spoken aloud. Yet authorship of thought is not established by a single channel of expression. Ask whether the required meaning is conveyed and the person controls their participation, rather than ranking methods by the observer's familiarity.

Differences should not be romanticised either. Another form of access may require additional time, equipment, or effort, and an unsuitable environment can complicate its use. Recognising someone's experience does not mean declaring every difficulty an advantage. An account of accessibility needs both respect for a chosen method and attention to its actual conditions. Admiration for unusual experience does not replace working instructions and the ability to use them without a public test.

One participant may prefer reading independently, another help from someone familiar, and another a combination. Preferences can change between tasks and days. Requiring a permanent choice is unhelpful: assistance accepted yesterday does not bind someone to accept it today. Independent completion yesterday does not create a duty to repeat it at any

cost. Authorship includes being able to change methods when conditions or personal priorities have changed.

Questions about access are therefore best asked without a hidden examination. How would you prefer to receive the information? Would help with this part be useful? Does this format work? Someone may not wish to explain their circumstances in detail. An ordinary adjustment sometimes needs the stated requirement rather than a full life history. Special rules must be examined separately; this everyday discussion should not be mistaken for a legal procedure.

IV. Assistance can preserve authorship

One person dictates an application while another types. The second person's presence alone does not establish who owns the choice. Who determined the content, can check the record, and can correct it? If the helper starts selecting answers for convenience or presumed good judgement, the role changes. A task may be formally completed while authorship has shifted to the person handling its technical part. Speed is therefore not the sole measure of good assistance.

Chosen support generally has an understandable subject and boundaries. Someone asks for one line to be explained, rather than the entire application to be controlled. The helper clarifies content without replacing it with a preferred answer. The recipient can stop, change the request, or choose someone else. Assistance in this arrangement is compatible with independence. It becomes a means used for one's own goal, alongside a tool or a comprehensible map.

The word consent does not resolve everything automatically. In a crowded queue, refusing imposed assistance may be difficult, especially when a staff member controls the next stage. A genuinely available alternative helps: completing the form later, using another format, or checking the finished text. Consent then has practical support. Being able to refuse should come with an understandable continuation rather than the end of all access.

Sometimes a person deliberately delegates the whole action. They do not have to choose the most demanding method to prove independence. Everyone has tasks that are more convenient to delegate. Delegation differs from loss of choice through the ability to define the assignment and its terms, rather than the quantity of another person's work. Specific legal questions of representation require separate examination; this framework does not replace documents or applicable rules.

Good assistance leaves room for feedback. Did the explanation help? Was the answer recorded correctly? Should we continue? These questions need not follow every movement; excessive checking can also interfere. What matters is that the person can report an

inaccuracy and be heard. Help preserves authorship when its recipient remains a participant rather than an object rapidly taken through a route already decided for them.

V. Accessible information includes the ability to act

W3C WAI's Accessibility Principles distinguishes perceiving, operating, understanding, and technological compatibility in web access. Examples include text alternatives and different ways of using content. This is a technical framework for the web, not a legal assessment of every building. Here it reminds us that encountering information and using it are different stages. W3C WAI, Accessibility Principles.

Imagine a meeting registration page. The timetable is readable, but choosing a time requires an unsuitable control. Or a button is usable, but it is unclear whether the application was sent. In the first case, information access does not enable action; in the second, action lacks clear feedback. Examining the entire route is more useful than declaring accessibility on the strength of one readable heading or a large font.

Understandability also belongs to the task. A person may read demanding books easily while not understanding what a particular form expects. This is no basis for judging their abilities generally. Explain a field's purpose, offer an example without personal data, and distinguish compulsory from optional information. It is particularly useful to describe what follows: who will respond, how to check the result, and how to correct an error if one is found.

An alternative format should not exist only as a promise. If it requires extensive justification, access again depends on the ability to pass an additional procedure. A small project may be unable to prepare everything beforehand, but it can honestly describe an available contact route and its limitations. Promising any format without the capacity to provide it is less useful than clearly describing an actual method and response time.

Transferring the technical example to everyday organisation requires a boundary. We are not declaring a web standard a rule for every life situation. We ask our own questions about the route: can someone obtain information, perform their chosen action, understand the result, and correct an error? Answers require checking the actual setting. The general idea directs attention without certifying the accessibility of something we have not examined.

VI. Goodwill does not replace an organised opportunity

An organiser may sincerely enjoy helping. They greet visitors, solve problems, and willingly complete an awkward procedure for them. That matters in a particular case, but it need not make the process itself accessible. If everything depends on one responsive person's presence, their absence closes the route again. A more stable arrangement preserves information and options where possible without depending on one helper's mood or heroic effort.

Accessibility should not depend on making a favourable impression either. People do not need to be grateful, charming, or especially persuasive for a practical need to be considered. Otherwise a usable process becomes a prize for winning an employee over. Ordinary organisation benefits from a clear way to report a barrier, an understandable response, and a way to check what changed. The aim is to reduce arbitrariness in access, rather than promise a solution to everything.

Personal assistance and environmental changes can complement each other. Today a staff member explains the procedure; tomorrow the instructions become clearer; later a participant requests another format. We cannot decide in advance that process changes are always better than direct support, or the reverse. The task and the person's preference matter. Sometimes help is needed in a well-organised environment; sometimes a small change removes the need to ask repeatedly for the same thing.

Requesting an adjustment should not require public disclosure of personal circumstances. A participant can explain a need privately to an organiser without telling everyone present. Where information is genuinely required for a procedure, it helps to explain why and who receives it. This article does not establish data-handling rules, but it distinguishes requesting a usable form of participation from agreeing to make one's history part of a group discussion.

Goodwill becomes especially useful when it supports clear changes. A helper does more than guide someone through: they notice an unnecessary barrier, agree an adjustment, and check whether it works. Feedback should not make the recipient a permanent unpaid consultant. Invite participation in a check and accept refusal. Accessibility should not create a new duty to continually teach others in order to benefit from an adjustment already made.

VII. Participation costs may remain outside the visible action

At a meeting, someone appears entirely independent. They arrive on time, ask questions, and complete documents. Others see the final action without knowing the hours spent preparing a route, finding suitable transport, or translating materials beforehand. The person has no duty to disclose all preparation. Organisers should nevertheless remember that an absence of visible difficulty does not prove participation was equally convenient for everyone.

Some additional costs can be noticed without entering private life. How many handovers does a procedure require? Can materials be received beforehand? Is another visit required for one signature? These questions concern the process. They reveal extra work without assessing who is strong enough to endure it. A change may help several participants, but its usefulness should still be checked rather than assumed because the idea sounds attractive.

Invisible costs can involve money, time, and coordination. They do not have to be reduced to one scale. An extra hour may suit one person and be unavailable to another; another journey may require rearranging responsibilities as well as paying a fare. A supposedly inexpensive solution therefore needs clarification: inexpensive for whom, and from which point in the route? This concerns practical feasibility rather than accusing its proposer of deliberate cruelty.

There is a risk of demanding proof of difficulty through visible failure. While someone manages, changes supposedly are unnecessary; once they stop managing, they are declared insufficiently prepared. That framework makes support unreachable. It is more useful to consider a reported barrier and possible adjustment before the action breaks down. Eligibility for specialised services must be examined separately; the ethical point does not replace their actual criteria.

Preserving dignity includes not turning every convenience into evidence of weakness. Receiving materials early, choosing writing, or requesting a pause can be sensible ways to participate. Nobody should have to exhaust themselves before an adjustment becomes acceptable. An organisation can discuss capacity limits while respecting the request, without turning it into a general conclusion about the applicant's character or independence.

VIII. A shared format can allow different routes

Shared action needs some coordination. A meeting has a time, an assignment a goal, and a room limitations. Accessibility does not mean removing all shared conditions. The question is which conditions are necessary for the task and which merely repeat a habit. If a substantive answer matters, must it be handwritten? If material needs discussing, must it be distributed only when the meeting begins?

Distinguishing goals from methods helps without accusation. An organiser may overlook alternatives because the current format suits them and many participants. Considering a specific request expands the picture. Could another form retain the meaning? How would it affect others? How would receipt be confirmed? These questions help agree a change without declaring all existing rules pointless or all requests automatically feasible.

Sometimes several routes are useful: a question sent beforehand or asked in the room, an electronic or paper form, common material or an additional explanation. The number of options does not establish success. If descriptions are unclear or some routes do not work, choice is absent in practice. A few checked methods are better than a long list of promises. Participants need to use a suitable option before the task ends.

Different routes need not be presented as exceptional favours. An opportunity available on clear terms reduces the need to request personal indulgence. But a general offer also has limits: some requirements need an individual conversation. Avoid creating a new demand for sameness. General access and personal clarification can coexist, provided the latter is not used to remove someone unjustifiably from the shared space.

This differs from promising equal ease for everyone. Experience and circumstances continue to vary. We can reduce an unnecessary obstacle, clarify a method, and preserve participation in the common goal. That is already a concrete result worth checking. A modest statement makes it possible to see what changed and where a limit remains, requiring another decision or an honest explanation, without claiming universal success.

IX. Checking begins with the participant's response

Instructions have been printed, the door is lighter, and the form redesigned. An organiser may consider the work complete because the changes exist. Yet an object's existence and its fitness for the task are different facts. Someone may not find the instructions, understand the new response, or get past the next barrier. A check asks whether the change helped perform the chosen action, as well as whether it was made.

Feedback should concern a particular experience. Where did difficulty arise? Which method was used? What worked and what remained inaccessible? This conversation does not require evaluating the whole person. Nor does one successful case establish suitability for everyone. An individual response provides important evidence about a checked situation rather than a final certificate of universal accessibility.

An invitation to help check should respect refusal. Someone may have come to learn rather than explain a process. If they agree to comment, tell them what changed and what remains impossible. Otherwise feedback becomes repeated descriptions of the same difficulty without

an understandable continuation. Participation in improving an environment should not become a condition of ordinary access to it.

An unsuccessful adjustment can be acknowledged without defending one's goodwill. We wanted to help and chose an unsuitable method: these facts are compatible. Clarification does not require declaring the organiser a bad person, and the organiser need not prove good intentions instead of making a correction. A more useful response concerns action: what will be checked, what can change, which option is available now, and how the result will be communicated.

This cycle does not promise final perfection. Tasks, participants, and technologies change. Accessibility remains a maintained practice rather than an institution's completed moral status. That does not require endless redesign without a reason. A working adjustment can be used, returning to examination when a new task or barrier arises. Readiness to clarify differs from constantly requiring everyone to prove their need again.

X. Independence can be supported together

Return to the visitor asking about classes. They receive information through a suitable method, choose a course, and decide whether to complete the application themselves or request typing. The organiser neither chooses for them nor requires refusal of help as proof of independence. Support and the process work together. Independence here concerns authorship of action rather than the absence of every relationship with other people.

This understanding does not promise to remove every limitation. An available option sometimes preserves only part of the possibilities; another route may be needed; the action may currently be impossible in this setting. Name the limit instead of replacing it with a description of the person. We lack a suitable method now differs from you cannot participate. The former leaves something to resolve; the latter closes it prematurely with a general verdict.

Assistance can be substantial and still chosen. It can be slight and still imposed. Asking about control, consent, boundaries, and feedback is therefore more useful than counting another person's movements nearby. Someone can use a resource, delegate a stage, and retain their goal. Refusing support is also possible, but refusal should not become the only way to earn respect for independence.

An accessible environment can reduce energy spent repeatedly overcoming something unrelated to the task's substance. People may then direct that energy towards learning, discussion, work, or rest according to their own choice. There is no promise that an easier route ensures success. The more modest aim is to avoid turning an unnecessary barrier into a hidden entrance examination or confusing its completion with a participant's dignity.

Independence supported together remains independence when relationships preserve authorship. Recognising this means seeing a person, an action, and its conditions at the same time. There is no need to choose between a hero managing without everyone and a recipient for whom everything is decided. Many concrete ways of participating, asking, refusing, using, and changing exist. Good organisation leaves room for that choice and checks whether the room exists in practice.

What this means in practice

Choose one task in a familiar setting: finding a timetable, receiving material, or submitting an application. Describe its stages without evaluating the whole participant. Where is information obtained? How is choice expressed? How is the action carried out? How is its result checked or corrected? This identifies a specific obstacle. It is not a medical assessment or a judgement of legal compliance.

If the task concerns someone else, ask which method suits them and whether help with a particular part is wanted. Offer choice without an independence test. Do not demand a detailed personal history for an ordinary format adjustment. Where special rules or limitations apply, name and check them separately. Do not promise an unavailable option or present your preferred method as the only reasonable one.

Choose a small feasible change: clear instructions, another channel, materials available beforehand, or different feedback. Check the whole route rather than just the new element. If another person assists, clarify the assignment, how it can be checked, and how it can be stopped. Technical assistance should not silently become choosing the content without the participant's agreement.

After making the change, offer a specific check and accept refusal. If feedback is received, distinguish the tested case from a universal conclusion. Explain what was corrected and which limitation remains. Do not replace a comment with an account of good intentions. The aim is to make the chosen action more accessible while preserving authorship, rather than obtaining proof of the organiser's moral perfection.

For yourself, ask whether you decline useful support because it does not suit you or because you consider it incompatible with independence. The answer does not oblige acceptance. It helps you choose without an unnecessary general verdict. You may use support, change its boundaries, and enjoy an action completed successfully without denying the environment's and other people's contributions.

Key quotation

> *the hand is supreme*

Helen Keller, The World I Live In, I, p. 4. A short fragment of her invitation into the world she describes. This image concerns her own connection with her surroundings, rather than a universal ranking of senses.

Connections between traditions

Keller's autobiographical testimony retains the specificity of a form of perception. W3C WAI's contemporary technical framework considers stages of web access. Their purposes differ: personal experience is not a technical standard, and a standard does not describe a whole life. Our framework of authorship and chosen support is an editorial comparison of these different directions of attention.

The connection does not prove all help useful or every process accessible through one adjustment. It helps distinguish a familiar channel from the only adequate one, information's presence from the ability to act, and goodwill from a checked result. A specific decision needs participants' responses and facts about the environment; differences of experience remain important.

Sources

• B17-R-28-N03-S1. Helen Keller. The World I Live In. I, The Seeing Hand, pp. 4–6. Selected context in I, pp. 3–6, and XII, pp. 153–156, read; not the whole book. Personal testimony, not universal psychology.

• B17-R-28-N03-S2. W3C WAI. Accessibility Principles. Selected sections on principles and text alternatives read. Technical scope is the web; no legal qualification of the environment is made.

Tags

accessibility, independence, autonomy, environment, participation, assistance, support, choice, authorship, task, information, feedback, obstacles, format, perception, action, consent, delegation, dignity, organisation, learning, communication, time, route, limitations, checking, touch, Helen Keller, W3C WAI, 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.