


UNITED WISDOM

# Money, boundaries and offices: how social realities exist

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W43 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# Money, boundaries and offices: how social realities exist

## Epigraph

> *some lasting thing that men might keep without spoiling*

Clause within Locke, Second Treatise of Government, V, §47, discussion of money's use. Gutenberg English text; excerpt from an argument rather than a complete currency definition.

## What this article is about

A piece of paper can be weighed, but its role as a pass or monetary sign cannot be explained by weight alone. A line on a plan may mark a boundary, and someone holding a key may perform an assigned task. Yet ink and keys do not themselves disclose who recognises a rule or what it covers. These distinctions help us consider social realities involving people, material objects, actions, and established relationships. Dependence on recognition does not make consequences imaginary, but uttering a name cannot create any authority one desires. This article considers bounded passages from Locke and Hobbes and a publisher's extract from Searle. Through an invented community, it distinguishes objects, rules, records, commissions, and possibilities of performance. This is philosophical inquiry rather than legal instruction or an assessment of actual money and borders. Its purpose is to name the relationship and the limits of our conclusion.

## I. What an object shows and what it cannot disclose

Imagine a small invented community that meets in a room and exchanges books. A wooden token lies on the table. Its colour, size, and crack can be described independently of its purpose at the meeting. But "Does it allow someone to take a book?" concerns a different relationship. Perhaps participants agreed to use it that way; perhaps it is an old souvenir; perhaps the rule applied only yesterday. The object retains properties while its role needs additional grounds. Calling it a token does not yet recover those grounds. In our example, they are supplied by the authors rather than discovered in research on an actual community.

This does not make the material side irrelevant. The token may be lost or broken, the book absent, and the room inaccessible. Even a recognised rule cannot deliver an object that is not there. Conversely, an available object does not establish permission to use it. Physical possibility and recognised grounds for action can diverge. Someone may open a door with a suitable key without acting on the group's behalf. Being asked to open the room does not



@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

provide a key either. Asking about both sides prevents one answer being substituted for the other. An explanation of capacity is not already an explanation of authorisation.

The social question concerns the object's relation to people and actions. Who recognises its role? In what situation? What counts as performance, and what happens upon refusal? We need not immediately establish one theory of every society. We can begin with a limited distinction within the available story. If a participant calls her own token a universal pass, the name alone does not make that rule shared. If others agree on a use, their agreement also has a boundary: the chosen meeting and its conditions. Extending beyond that boundary needs further grounds, rather than a more impressive title for the object.

## II. Dependence on people does not mean unreality

In the accessible publisher's extract of What Is an Institution?, Searle raises a distinction between economic and physical subject matter: the economic reality being investigated depends on human beliefs and attitudes. Only that extract was consulted here, rather than his complete theory. It permits beginning with a question of dependence without attributing every later conclusion in our story to Searle. What changes if participants cease recognising the token's role? The wood remains wood, but previous grounds for exchange may disappear or become contested. This is an authorial illustration of a question, rather than a test of an entire philosophical system.

Dependence does not mean yesterday's consequences can be reversed by a thought. If a book was handed over, another person now has it. If a participant spent time performing a task, that time has passed. If access was refused, someone may have missed the meeting. Our example is invented, but within its conditions the distinction is clear: relationships established by people can direct actual actions with material consequences. The word convention should not quietly mean that nothing happened. It can concern a role's basis rather than the absence of an event. Recognition and the reality of a result answer different questions.

Nor should dependence on people become a promise of unrestricted freedom for each participant. One may disagree with a rule but encounter others refusing to provide a book. Someone may have greater ability to set conditions. Establishing a rule, recognising it, assessing its fairness, and being able to refuse are different subjects. The word collective does not settle them together. In our room, identify who proposed the rule, who agreed, whom it affects, and what participation choices remain. That account does not certify the relationship's moral correctness. It makes grounds visible so that consequences and the need for change can be discussed separately.

Existence of a relationship also differs from knowledge of it. A new visitor may not know the exchange conditions. Her ignorance does not mean that other participants never agreed on

anything. Their agreement does not automatically establish what expectation should be addressed to her either. She needs an accessible explanation, while assessing the situation needs information about participation boundaries. Even in a small group, “Everyone understands” needs care. What established participants know, what a newcomer was told, and what she accepts are different situations. The example provides no obligatory answer for every community; it distinguishes personal knowledge, shared practice, and the scope of a rule.

## III. A durable object and an agreed use

In sections 46–50 of Chapter V of the Second Treatise, Locke discusses spoilage and preservation, then money, durable objects, and their agreed use in exchange. The brief selected phrase in section 47 concerns something that can be kept without spoiling. This is historical philosophical reasoning about property and money. We do not treat it as the verified sole history of every currency’s emergence, or transfer colonial characterisations in neighbouring text to contemporary societies. Bounded reading raises a question: a material property can facilitate a use without being identical to common recognition of value and exchange conditions. These are related elements, rather than one self-explanatory fact.

Our wooden token can also be kept. That does not make every durable object an exchange medium automatically. Participants must know what they are willing to do for it. One agrees to lend a book for a week, another accepts a token only after the next meeting, and a third never accepts it. Conditions matter more than an attractive name. If we call the token a conventional means of exchange in this story, that limited setting needs preserving. We do not establish actual currency, legal tender, or a promise of every service. Our invented agreement does not determine those real statuses.

Even within the example, preserving the wood does not guarantee preserving the relationship. A rule may change, meetings may cease, and the person promising a book may refuse or no longer have it. Material durability and an obligation’s stability do not coincide. A previous sign can survive a previous opportunity. “Why does this object matter?” can therefore be supplemented by “What action is now possible on the stated grounds?” Not every discrepancy means deception. Circumstances may have changed, or participants may remember conditions differently. Understanding the discrepancy requires returning to those conditions, rather than declaring the sign permanently powerful or empty from the beginning.

## IV. A record indicates a relationship but needs grounds

Our group writes that one token allows one available book to be borrowed until the next meeting. Two participants sign the paper. A record helps recover wording, but does not automatically answer every question. Who could agree on the conditions? Do they cover other people’s books? Did a new visitor participate? What does availability mean? Accuracy of a record differs from sufficient grounds for its operation. A copy may repeat wording without recovering circumstances. There is no actual contract or legal assessment of signatures here. The example shows that a relationship is not exhausted by visible letters, even when those letters are copied precisely.

Suppose a book that was never in the room is mistakenly entered on the list. The record remains an actual object, but the presence it reports may be false. A document’s social role therefore does not make every entry true. Sometimes the object needs checking; sometimes a participant’s grounds for making an entry; sometimes the established meaning of the record. Calling all those questions official can conceal the error. Correction also has a scope. Removing a wrong book title need not abolish the exchange rule. Identify the part of the relationship that requires clarification instead of treating one correction as a verdict on everything.

The reverse is possible too. A person hands over a book, but the record is not updated. An absent entry does not yet mean an absent event. Appropriate confirmation needs seeking rather than choosing paper or memory as an unconditional answer to everything. Within the invented story, the record, participants’ accounts, and the object’s present location can be compared. Each has a purpose and limit. This is not a universal procedure for settling actual disputes. It shows why a material trace, an action, and a recognised relationship should be distinguished, even when everyday speech expresses them with one short name.

A record sometimes marks a new decision rather than only describing the past. If the group agrees on another return date today, the paper may indicate that change. The question becomes whether the stated decision occurred and what it concerns. “The deadline changed” and “The book was returned” perform different tasks. One can express an established condition; the other reports an action involving an object. Neither certifies the other. This avoids treating an announced arrangement as an accomplished action, or every record as a neutral copy of the past. Understanding the document’s role requires knowing which relationship participants use it to indicate.

## V. An office differs from a person and a capacity

In Chapter XVI of Leviathan, Hobbes distinguishes a person acting on his own behalf from one representing another's words or actions. The argument includes relations between author, actor, and authority. In the bounded consulted passage, action under a commission is considered within its limits. This is historical political philosophy, rather than current law or unconditional moral permission for obedience. We take a question of representation: when can one person's action be attributed to another or to a group, and on what grounds? The short quotation about limits retains that context rather than becoming a universal answer to every present office.

In our room a participant is asked to open the premises and maintain the book list. The group might call her the meeting's keeper. That title does not automatically allow her to change every rule or dispose of visitors' possessions. The role should be described through assigned actions. Physical ability to move someone else's bag does not establish recognised grounds to do so. The keeper's personal opinion does not become a collective decision merely through office either. At the same time, she does not disappear behind the role. Her own questions, consent, or refusal remain possible. An office indicates a relationship rather than exhausting the person.

The boundary becomes particularly visible when the role changes hands. A new person can receive a key without receiving the conditions. He can remember previous rules without having a new commission. Continuing the role requires identifying what was transferred. Sometimes a clear shared decision is enough in our story; sometimes disagreement remains. This example does not settle actual appointment rules. It distinguishes the object transferred, grounds for representation, and range of actions. "He is in charge now" then stops hiding several questions. Clarification need not destroy cooperation; it can make clearer who performs which part of the shared undertaking.

## VI. A commission's limit appears in a particular action

Participants ask the keeper to confirm which books are in the room. He reports that one book is present, then adds that its owner agrees to give it away permanently. The first assertion may fall within his commission; the second needs another basis. The range of authority cannot be checked through one general signature beneath a message. Name the action: confirm presence, report another person's consent, change a deadline, or hand over an object. The example determines no legal effect of the message. It helps distinguish an action within a role from an added assertion the role cannot itself establish.

For Hobbes, the question of limits belongs to his argument about authorisation and attribution of actions. Our contemporary reading question is narrower: what commission was identified,

and what happened? That is deliberate restriction rather than a retelling of the entire theory. Even if an action fits the accepted commission, the fairness of its conditions remains open to discussion. Conversely, a sensible personal initiative does not automatically become the group's official decision. Grounds for representation and assessment of conduct may align, but need different arguments. One should not substitute for the other just because both concern the same person performing the same action.

When a discrepancy appears, participants can recover conditions and allow people to explain their understanding of the role. A recording error, an ambiguous commission, and a deliberate extension of action are different possible explanations. Before checking, the most accusatory explanation need not be selected. A future action can be clarified: who will confirm the owner's consent, who will update the list, and when others will learn of the change? This is our proposal for discussion within an invented story. It neither promises to settle every institutional conflict nor requires accepting every existing authority. A limited clarification preserves the possibility of examining the broader arrangement separately.

## VII. A boundary indicates the distinction that applies

A line on the room's floor separates exchange books from personal belongings. It can physically be crossed. Its significance concerns a rule for using the space. If it fades, the agreement need not disappear; if a new mark appears, the rule need not have changed. Ask who explained its purpose and which area is intended. This boundary is an authorial example inside a room. It does not describe actual national borders, their history, or legal status. Transferring a conclusion to that setting would require different evidence and questions. Similarity in the word boundary does not provide them automatically.

The distinction could also be maintained without a line, through two tables or an understood name for a zone. Material means can change while the purpose remains. A new designation may nevertheless confuse a visitor unfamiliar with the previous rule. The question then concerns not only recognition but access to explanation. A participant might put a personal book on a shared table accidentally. Its position does not yet report agreement to hand it over. Within our example, clarifying the action and intention is preferable to treating an object's location as complete confirmation of another person's consent. A visible arrangement can prompt a question without already answering it.

Distinguish a boundary of meaning from a limit of physical possibility. A locked door restricts access but does not itself explain why it is locked or who decides. A drawn line marks a zone without holding an object in place. Shared-use conditions can also be contested. These distinctions neither make every boundary optional nor certify every existing one. They help formulate the question: are we discussing an obstacle, a recognised rule, its grounds, or

fairness in applying it? Otherwise, an objection about ink can be mistaken for an answer about rights, and pointing to a rule for an explanation of all its consequences.

## VIII. Agreement, action, and fairness do not coincide

In Locke's selected argument, money concerns agreement on its use and the possibility of increasing possessions through a durable medium. This belongs to a particular philosophical account of property. Our reading does not confirm that every present monetary relationship arose through free agreement by everyone affected. Historical argument, description of current practice, and moral assessment need different grounds. In our invented group we can specifically stipulate participants' agreement as a condition. Beyond the example, agreement cannot simply be announced as discovered because a sign is used or a rule followed. Performance alone leaves the circumstances of participation open.

One visitor follows conditions because they suit her, another because they are the only way to enter, and a third because he knows no alternative. These are possible positions within the story, rather than measured motives of actual people. Repeated action does not establish identical attitudes among participants. If fairness matters, ask about participation, refusal, reconsideration, and consequences. These questions are proposed by the article's authors. They are not extracted as a complete shared answer from one historical text. Neither do they require declaring all relationships fair or unfair in advance. They keep evaluation open to the relevant circumstances.

Refusal has a limited implication too. One person declining a token need not abolish its use by everyone else. Refusal may nevertheless reveal that the scope of recognition was described too broadly. "This applies to everyone" can become "These participants accept it under these conditions." That correction matters because it changes whom an expectation can reasonably address. A person remains a person upon refusing a role or exchange. Dignity should not depend on recognising this particular rule. That is a contemporary authorial ethical boundary, rather than an historical norm we have established for every institution. It identifies our proposal without disguising it as universal source agreement.

## IX. Change requires identifying what changes

Suppose the group abandons tokens and keeps an oral account instead. The objects remain, but their previous role changes. Books borrowed before the change still raise a question. A new designation does not return them automatically. Previous actions, present relationships, and future conditions need separate discussion. No obligatory procedure for actual contracts is established here. The example shows why changing a sign, changing a rule, and removing consequences are different tasks. Confusing them can burden a simple transition with a promise no name can fulfil. Identifying the task helps the group discuss what it can actually accomplish next.

The group can change an officeholder while retaining conditions, change conditions while retaining the same person, or correct an entry without changing the role. Each situation needs a question. What was decided? Who knows? Which actions does the decision cover? Which objects or circumstances remain? These distinctions prevent enlarging a small correction into complete abolition, or reducing a substantial change to a replacement signature. Answers may be simple within the invented community. Elsewhere, suitable sources are needed because the example does not provide ready knowledge of every organisation. A shared word such as change does not make their processes identical.

Decision can also diverge from possibility. The group may designate new premises for the next meeting without obtaining access. The designation then exists as an accepted proposal, while the meeting has not occurred. Naming that distinction is more useful than calling the decision nonexistent or the gathering already held. Relationships can have different states: proposed, recognised, performed, or contested. These are working terms for our story rather than a universal classification. They preserve the connection between meaning and action while revealing which part of a change occurred and which needs further grounds or actual performance. An announced future can remain real as a proposal without becoming a completed event.

## X. Relationships are real and remain discussable

Money, boundaries, and offices differ in purpose and scope. Here they are compared at the level of a question about object and relationship. Durability does not disclose all value, a sign all conditions, or capacity all commission. Humanly established relationships can nevertheless direct actions with actual consequences. Understanding a particular case needs material circumstances, participants, conditions, records, and events to be named. This is a limited philosophical way of asking questions. It does not replace history, law, economic investigation, or checking facts about an actual institution. The comparison opens inquiry while leaving those domains their own evidential requirements.

Locke helps raise questions of preservation and agreed exchange within his argument about property. Hobbes raises representation and authorisation limits within his political philosophy. Searle's publisher extract raises the dependence of institutional subject matter on human attitudes. They cannot be combined into a claim that three authors agreed on one definitive contemporary theory. Differences remain visible, while tokens, the room, and the keeper provide our original example. The comparison can begin a conversation if it is not presented as a complete survey of schools and the limits of consulted material remain clear. Its value lies in the specific questions made available.

Participants can continue exchanging, change conditions, or decline. Each choice requires understanding what is proposed and whom it affects. Being able to discuss a relationship does not mean its consequences have disappeared. Actual consequences do not mean the relationship cannot be reconsidered. Between those statements there is room for a precise question and free decision. A person can recognise the significance of a shared arrangement and still ask about the grounds of a particular action. A role then becomes more intelligible without absorbing the whole person, and a shared sign more useful without acquiring unexplained authority over every next step.

## What this means in practice

Choose a small familiar situation: a queue, a reading meeting, or a commission to open a room. Identify the material object separately from its proposed role. Ask who recognises that role, for which action, and on what conditions. Do not transfer the answer to another organisation without suitable grounds.

Write four short lines: what is physically available, what is established as a rule, what a record says, and what was actually done. If they diverge, select one question to clarify. An absent object, an incorrect entry, an unclear commission, and disagreement with conditions may require different conversations. Do not select an accusation before establishing facts.

Name your proposal separately: preserve the rule, clarify it, or discuss change. Consider whether it affects another person's possession, agreement, or role, and leave room for an answer. This is an optional authorial exercise in philosophical distinction, not a legal procedure, financial assessment, or measured technique for improving a community. A possible result is a clearer relationship and next question. Actual contracts, offices, or public borders need sources and competence appropriate to those domains; the invented example cannot establish them.

## Key quotation

> *so far-forth as is in their Commission, but no farther.*

Clause within Hobbes, Leviathan, XVI, sentence about action under a commission and its attribution. Gutenberg English text; historical representational setting retained.

## Connections between traditions

1. **Locke / Hobbes:** agreed use of a durable object and representation under a commission open questions about human relationships. Property, exchange and authorisation retain different inquiries and historical systems.

2. **Locke / Searle's extract:** an object's significance concerns human use. Historical reasoning about money does not become a verified history of all currencies, and a publisher extract does not replace complete institutional analysis.

3. **Hobbes / our keeper:** a commission's limits help identify the role's scope in our illustration. Historical political philosophy does not determine current law or the moral obligation of every command.

4. **Searle's extract / our room:** dependence on people differs from absence of consequences. This is a bounded comparison; subsequent tokens, records and boundaries are ours rather than an account of Searle's complete theory.

5. **Three sources / free discussion:** the article authors distinguish material conditions, relationships, records and actions. Voluntary practice and the dignity boundary are not presented as the philosophers' jointly agreed conclusion.

## Primary sources

1. Locke. Second Treatise of Government, V, §§46–50; Project Gutenberg English text. Bounded argument on preservation, money and agreed use consulted.

2. Hobbes. Leviathan, XVI, bounded opening passage on person, representation and commission, including its limit. Gutenberg English; not the complete treatise or current law.

3. Searle. What is an institution? Journal of Institutional Economics, 1(1),2005,pp1–22,DOI10.1017/S1744137405000020. Only complete publisher extract consulted in search display; full paper not obtained.

## Tags

social reality, money, boundary, office, rule, recognition, relationship, object, record, action, commission, authority, representation, authorisation, agreement, refusal, fairness, material possibility, durability, exchange, Locke, Hobbes, Searle, institution, community, personal dignity, change, consequences, voluntary participation, philosophical exercise

## 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.