

The Freedom to Exist

Collected Edition · Volumes I–VII

Juan Segurola

First edition · v1.0 · EN

© 2026 Juan Segurola

All Rights Reserved

About this edition

This collected edition brings together the complete texts of Volumes I-VII in their v1.0 editions. The individual contents pages have been replaced by a general contents list. Page numbering is continuous throughout this edition. Each volume retains its own title, chapter numbering, introductions, conclusions and references. Reference numbers are local to their respective volume; they do not refer to the bibliography of another volume. The preface and epilogue to this collected edition are new.

The general contents identifies chapters by volume and local chapter number (for example, III.4). This notation leaves the original chapter titles and numbering unchanged in the text.

General Contents

Preface to the Collected Edition · A Life of One's Own in a Shared World	7
Volume I · The Freedom to Exist	9
General Foreword to the Seven-Volume Series	10
Foreword to Volume I	10
The Seven Volumes of the Series	10
PART I · THE EXPERIENCE OF EXISTING	11
Chapter 1 · Existence Before Explanations	11
I.2. The Reality We Experience Is Subjective	13
I.3. The Body as a Condition of Our Experience	15
I.4. Thinking, Feeling, and Interpreting	16
PART II. THE FORMATION OF OUR BELIEFS	18
I.5. From an Idea to Identification	18
I.6. The Need for Certainty	19
I.7. Conceptual Attachment and Dogmatism	20
I.8. Fruitful Thought and Rumination	22
PART III. Individual Freedom	23
I.9. Orphaned from Our Existential Freedom	23
I.10. Self-Sufficiency as a Vital Principle	25
I.11. The Responsibility of Choosing	29
I.12. The Freedom to Say No	30
I.13. Integrity in the Face of Obedience	31
PART IV. Living from One's Own Center	32
I.14. Independence of Judgment	32
I.15. Equanimity in Practice	34
I.16. Freedom in the Face of Our Mistakes	35
I.17. Feeling Existence Here and Now	36
I.18. Thinking in Order to Understand and Act	38
PART V · PHILOSOPHICAL SYNTHESIS	39
I.19. Freedom and Its Limits	39
I.20. Life as Experience, Not as Doctrine	42
I.21. Self-Sufficiency, Responsibility, and Presence	43
References and Further Reading	44
Volume II · The Art of Understanding	46
Preface · Understanding without domination	47
I. The difficulty of understanding	47
II.1. Understanding without taking possession of another person's experience	47
II.2. Listening Before Interpreting	50
II.3. Empathy, Difference, and the Limits of Projection	51

II.4. Understanding Is Not Justification	52
II. Judgment and equanimity	53
II.5. Disagreement Without Contempt	53
II.6. Equanimity in Conflict	54
II.7. The Freedom to Say No Without Hostility	55
II.8. Recognizing Our Own Mistakes	56
III. Relationships and care	57
II.9. Care, Reciprocity, and Boundaries	57
II.10. Vulnerability and Autonomy	59
II.11. Helping Without Controlling	60
II.12. Forgiveness, Repair, and Their Limits	61
IV. Living with pluralism	62
II.13. Coexisting Across Different Perspectives	62
II.14. Dialogue, Evidence, and Reasonable Disagreement	63
II.15. Group Pressure and Independence of Judgment	64
II.16. Institutions, Power, and Unequal Voices	65
V. Ethics of Shared Existence	66
II.17. Justice Beyond Private Goodwill	66
II.18. Responsibility, Complicity, and Omission	67
II.19. Conflict, Cooperation, and Everyday Practices	68
II.20. Understanding as an Unfinished Discipline	68
Scope and interpretive limits	69
Bibliography	69
Volume III · Less Is More	71
Part I · The Meaning of Enough	72
III.1. Enough as a Deliberate Choice	72
III.2. Needs, Desires, and Expectations	73
III.3. Freedom from Consumption	74
Part II · Dependence and Practical Autonomy	75
III.4. Practical Skills and Everyday Autonomy	75
III.5. Delegating Without Losing Agency	76
III.6. Time of Our Own and Commitments	77
III.7. Simplicity Without Imposition	78
III.8. Choosing What Deserves to Remain	79
Part III · Security, Work, and Tools	79
III.9. Security, Uncertainty, and the Desire to Accumulate	79
III.10. Comfort, Dependence, and Resilience	80
III.11. Work, Money, and a Sense of Enough	81
III.12. Technology as a Tool, Not a Master	81
Part IV · Places, Relationships, and Responsibility	82
III.13. The Home as a Practice of Freedom	82

III.14. Relationships Beyond Possession	82
III.15. Ecological Limits and Unequal Responsibility	83
III.16. Care and Material Interdependence	84
Part V · Limits and Synthesis	84
III.17. Voluntary Simplicity and Social Injustice	84
III.18. When Less Is Not Better	85
III.19. Building a Sustainable Personal Practice	86
III.20. Sufficiency, Autonomy, and a Life of One's Own	86
Epilogue · A Sufficiency That Can Be Revised	87
Bibliographic context	87
Additional bibliography	88
Volume IV · The Gift of Being Alive	89
Foreword	90
IV.1. The Extraordinary Fact of Being Alive	90
IV.2. The Feeling Body	91
IV.3. Perceiving the Everyday World	92
IV.4. Joy Without Obligation	93
IV.5. Nature and Contemplation	94
IV.6. The Pleasure of Small Experiences	95
IV.7. Pain, Loss and Care	96
IV.8. Inhabiting the Present Without Monitoring It	97
Epilogue · Appreciating Without Demanding	98
References	99
Volume V · Solitude, a Divine Treasure	100
Foreword	101
V.1. The Difference Between Solitude and Isolation	101
V.2. The Need to Belong	102
V.3. Approval as a Form of Dependence	103
V.4. Learning to Be with Oneself	104
V.5. Thinking Differently from the Group	105
V.6. Freely Chosen Relationships	106
V.7. Asking for Help Without Surrendering Judgment	107
V.8. Solitude as a Possibility	109
Epilogue	110
References (Vancouver)	110
Volume VI · Flowing with Existence	111
Foreword	112
VI.1. Thinking to Discover	112
VI.2. From Idea to First Step	113
VI.3. Experimenting Without Fear of Mistakes	114
VI.4. Self-Chosen Discipline	115

VI.5. Persevering and Changing Course	116
VI.6. Creating with Others	117
VI.7. Rest Along the Way	118
VI.8. Fulfillment Beyond Results	119
Epilogue	121
References	121
Volume VII · The Root of Conflict	122
Preface	123
VII.1. How Conflict Begins	123
VII.2. Beliefs, Identity and Belonging	124
VII.3. Interests, Resources and Inequality	126
VII.4. Power, Obedience and Legitimacy	127
VII.5. Violence and Its Justifications	128
VII.6. Understanding and Responsibility	130
VII.7. Cooperation Without Submission	131
VII.8. Conditions for Just Coexistence	132
References (Vancouver)	134
Epilogue to the Collected Edition · Freedom as an Open Task	135

Preface to the Collected Edition · A Life of One's Own in a Shared World

The Freedom to Exist brings together seven explorations of a common question: how can we live with independent judgment while recognizing that our lives depend on a body, on other people, and on conditions we do not entirely choose? The question connects matters we often keep apart: the beliefs that guide us, the way we listen, the desire to accumulate, the enjoyment of ordinary experience, solitude, action, and conflict. Reading them together reveals both their connections and their limits.

A life of one's own is not built outside every relationship. We learn words, receive care, use knowledge developed by others, and act within institutions. The autonomy explored here involves examining these dependencies, distinguishing support from subordination, and participating in decisions that affect us. It does not require rejecting help or treating the need for care as a moral deficiency.

The first volume begins with consciousness, beliefs, and the responsibility of choosing. The second turns toward other perspectives: understanding requires listening, acknowledging the possibility of error, and maintaining boundaries. Understanding does not erase judgment about conduct, just as a firm conviction does not license contempt for those who disagree.

The third volume asks what it means to have enough. Its account of simplicity concerns choices that remain open to revision, not the justification of imposed deprivation. The fourth considers feeling, contemplation, and the enjoyment of existence. Appreciating an experience is not an obligation to be happy: pain, loss, and the need for care belong to the life we are trying to understand.

The fifth volume examines solitude as a possibility for inner independence, distinguishing it from unwanted isolation. The sixth follows thought into action, chosen discipline, and the capacity to revise a project. Resting, asking for help, or leaving a path can be responsible decisions; the value of a life is not exhausted by its visible achievements.

The seventh volume places these questions within conflict. Differences of interpretation interact with identities, interests, resources, and relations of power. Coexistence therefore cannot depend only on individual goodwill. It also requires material conditions, protection from harm, and procedures through which people can disagree without being excluded.

The collected edition allows the reader to follow this movement from personal experience toward shared existence. It need not be read as a closed sequence. One can begin with a particular concern and return later to its foundations. Recurrent themes preserve the context of works originally intended to stand on their own; a principle takes on different implications when applied to consumption, friendship, or an unequal relationship of power.

The proposals in these pages invite examination. In each case, we should ask what reasons support them, whom they may serve, and which circumstances limit their application. A philosophy of freedom would lose its purpose if it demanded obedience to its own formulations. The reader retains the task of judging, accepting, correcting, or rejecting what appears here. The unity of the book lies in that willingness to reflect on life without claiming to replace it.

THE FREEDOM TO EXIST

Volume I

The Freedom to Exist

Consciousness, Beliefs, and Personal Autonomy

Juan Segurola

First edition · v1.0 · EN

© 2026 Juan Segurola
All Rights Reserved

General Foreword to the Seven-Volume Series

Some books try to explain existence; others aim to guide the way we live it. This series arises from the meeting of both tasks. It presents neither a closed doctrine nor a promise of universal well-being: it proposes to examine, through experience and critical reflection, what it means to live by one's own judgment without losing sight of others.

Its seven volumes share three principles: self-sufficiency, responsible freedom, and attention to the experience of the here and now. Self-sufficiency does not mean being wholly sufficient unto oneself; responsible freedom does not deny our ties to others; and the present does not require us to forget memory or renounce the future. Each principle acquires meaning precisely by recognizing its limits.

The itinerary begins with consciousness, beliefs, and autonomy. It then opens to understanding others, to chosen simplicity, and to the experience of being alive. It examines solitude as a possibility of inner independence, the relationship between thought and action, and, finally, the human and social roots of conflict.

The series can be read as a journey, but each book is conceived to sustain its own question. Overlaps between volumes are deliberate where they connect different questions; repetition should never replace analysis. The unity of the series comes not from repeating answers but from keeping the same disposition to ask.

Readers will find arguments they may accept, question, or reject. That freedom of examination is not a secondary concession: it belongs to the very purpose of the work.

Foreword to Volume I

Before asking what we ought to believe about life, we can recognize that we are already living it. This book begins with that experience and examines how we construct explanations that may eventually come to govern us.

The inquiry begins with perception and embodiment, considers certainty and dogmatism, and develops an account of autonomy that does not demand living without help or turning existence into a contest of self-sufficiency.

The freedom defended here does not mean always doing whatever one wants. It involves attending to the consequences of our actions, respecting others and retaining the ability to reconsider our convictions.

The chapters offer arguments and examples that readers may test against their own experience. They do not constitute a closed doctrine or claim to provide universal answers to differing circumstances.

The Seven Volumes of the Series

1. The Freedom to Exist — Consciousness, Beliefs, and Personal Autonomy
2. The Art of Understanding — Empathy, Equanimity, and Coexistence

3. Less Is More — Self-Sufficiency, Simplicity, and Freedom
4. The Gift of Being Alive — Feeling, Contemplating, and Enjoying Existence
5. Solitude, a Divine Treasure — Inner Independence and Freedom from the Group
6. Flowing with Existence — Thought, Action, and Personal Fulfillment
7. The Root of Conflict — Beliefs, Power, Resources, and Human Responsibility

Volume I contains the complete text. Volumes II-VII are planned; their proposed outlines may change.

PART I · THE EXPERIENCE OF EXISTING

Chapter 1 · Existence Before Explanations

Before asking ourselves about the meaning of life, we are already living. Experience does not wait for a finished explanation of the universe. We perceive, learn, form relationships, and act before developing a philosophy. This existential priority does not require a radical separation of feeling and thinking: experience comes to us from an embodied, situated perspective. It means that what we live through is not exhausted by what we can express about it.

Our ability to explain greatly extends our understanding. We can investigate the origin of a sensation, test hypotheses, and revise a belief. Yet a description of rest does not replace resting, just as an explanation of flavor does not amount to tasting. Reflection and experience complement one another; neither should claim a monopoly over our relationship with existence.

The priority of experience does not prove that thought is dispensable. Immediate perception may be described as an embodied relationship with a meaningful environment, without that description establishing a precise cognitive mechanism. Rather than setting pure experience against interpretation as though the latter were a contaminant, we propose distinguishing degrees and forms of elaboration: sensing a temperature, recognizing a situation, assigning it value, and formulating a theory are related activities, but they are not equivalent. This distinction protects the original intuition from becoming an untenable psychological claim.

The phrase ‘living does not require believing’ has a precise meaning: it does not require allegiance to a doctrinal system concerning the ultimate meaning of existence. It does not mean that we can cook without expecting food to be edible, drive without anticipating the movements of others, or conduct research without holding revisable hypotheses. A critical philosophy of belief should not contradict our ordinary need to orient ourselves through knowledge and expectations.

Living does not require adopting a doctrine about the ultimate meaning of the world. We may hold religious, naturalistic, or agnostic convictions, or leave certain questions open. The value we find in an encounter, a creative task, or a quiet moment need not wait until metaphysics has been settled. Nor are we obliged to find satisfaction: suffering, loss, and uncertainty belong to the human condition.

Our first freedom is to allow ourselves to recognize the life taking place while we search for explanations. This does not mean abandoning knowledge, but avoiding the idea that understanding everything is a precondition for taking part in our own experience.

The fact that life comes first is not a metaphysical theory

When we say that living precedes explaining life, we are making an observation about the order of our experience, not a definitive claim about the ultimate foundation of the universe. A young child begins responding to the surrounding world before being able to express philosophical propositions. This observation does not prove that consciousness exists apart from physical processes, nor does it permit us to infer that all living beings have identical experiences. It indicates something more modest, and sufficient for our purposes: taking part in the world does not require us to wait until we have developed a personal theory about what the world is.

This distinction protects the argument from two confusions. The first would be to imagine that all experience is pure and free of interpretation. Describing an experience is never wholly separate from our ways of attending, distinguishing, and making sense. The second would be to believe that, because life precedes our explicit explanations, it directly provides infallible knowledge. Experiencing something does not guarantee a correct understanding of its causes. We may feel afraid on hearing a noise and be mistaken about its source. Experience deserves attention; inquiry allows us to correct the conclusions we draw from it.

Lived meaning and declared meaning

Someone may claim that the purpose of life is to accumulate achievements and yet experience their most valuable moments in a conversation, a task done with care, or the contemplation of a landscape. The reverse can also happen: someone may say they value simple things and discover that their decisions are governed by external recognition. What we say we value does not always coincide with where we devote our time.

This difference does not make every ambitious project misguided. It invites us to examine those projects. The meaning of an activity may emerge in its performance, not solely in the account we give of it. When asking whether we live in accordance with our values, it is worth looking at our actual decisions, our relationships, and our approach to ordinary tasks. Not to subject ourselves to a permanent moral audit, but to discover discrepancies we may be able to address.

The objection from suffering

Someone living through a painful illness or a serious bereavement might object that an invitation to enjoy being alive ignores their circumstances. They would be right if this philosophy demanded constant gratitude. It does not. The fact of existing is not necessarily experienced as a gift. There are circumstances in which life is felt as a burden, and in which seeking help and protection takes precedence over reflection about enjoyment.

Recognizing this objection requires us to frame our thesis as a possibility, not a command. Being alive opens a field of experiences, but it does not guarantee that they will be pleasant or within our control. Attention to ordinary life may be enriching when minimum conditions make it possible; when those conditions are absent, shared responsibility may mean helping to establish them. No personal philosophy replaces that practical responsibility.

Chapter 2. The Reality We Experience Is Subjective

We share a world, but we do not experience that world in identical ways. Our biographies and embodied situations help explain why we may interpret the same event differently. Two people may remember a conversation differently without this demonstrating the existence of two incompatible physical realities.

The subjectivity of our experience is a claim about our access to the world, not a denial of an independently existing reality. We can compare testimony, use instruments, and build intersubjective knowledge. We can be mistaken: the intensity with which we feel an interpretation is not, by itself, an adequate measure of its truth.

We must not confuse a situated perspective with subjective confinement. We share instruments, procedures, and language, and we can correct one another's mistaken perceptions. Scientific descriptions are not merely personal accounts, because they use public procedures for testing and revision. The subjectivity of our access does not entitle us to deny facts that disturb our convictions.

Philosophical Dialogue: Perspective and a Shared World

Maurice Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology helps situate this argument within a historical debate about perception and embodiment. Recognizing that we perceive from a particular situation is not the same as claiming that each person creates a separate, true, and incommunicable world. Experiences can be compared, corrected, and enriched through observation, dialogue, and inquiry. This comparison clarifies the limits of our thesis; it does not attribute authorship of that thesis to Merleau-Ponty (Merleau-Ponty, 1945; Toadvine, 2023).

The distinction between observation and inference has practical consequences. If a friend arrives late, we may know that they were not there at the agreed time, but not necessarily that they intended to disrespect us. The latter claim requires additional information. Caution in making such attributions does not prevent us from setting boundaries when the behavior recurs: it prevents us from prematurely confusing facts, intentions, and consequences.

The plurality of perspectives does not entail moral relativism either. The fact that people make different judgments does not mean that every action is equally justifiable. Understanding a form of conduct and evaluating its ethical consequences are different tasks.

An objection arises: recognizing many perspectives might lead us to suspend judgment indefinitely. The response is to form conclusions proportionate to the

evidence and revise them when the information changes. Openness is not systematic indecision.

The Problem of Perspective

Imagine two people watching a busy street from opposite ends. Both describe a real scene, but each sees elements concealed from the other. If they disagree about what lies around a corner, their differing reports do not establish that there are two incompatible realities. They may simply occupy different positions. Changing position, seeking testimony, or checking the facts allows them to broaden the description.

The analogy has limits, because our perspectives differ in more than spatial location. Learning, our senses, memory, attention, and the personal significance of what we observe all play a role. That is why it helps to distinguish three questions: what happened, how each person experienced it, and how each interprets its causes. We may agree on the first while retaining legitimate differences about the second. The third requires arguments and is open to criticism.

Humility Without Treating All Opinions as Equivalent

Recognizing that our perspective is partial does not require us to grant equal credibility to every claim. When someone states that an event occurred on a particular date, we can look for documents. When the effectiveness of a procedure is disputed, we can consult appropriate studies. When people describe the emotional meaning of an experience, we should listen to their accounts without pretending that we have direct access to their inner life.

Epistemic modesty is not intellectual weakness. It is a willingness to specify what we know, how we know it, and what remains uncertain. Its opposite is not conviction but a claim to infallibility. We can defend a well-supported conclusion firmly and revise it in the face of better evidence. We can also withhold judgment when information is insufficient.

Perspective and Living Together

Subjectivity can become an ethical resource if it encourages us to ask questions before attributing intentions. Silence may be interpreted as contempt; a brief response as hostility. Yet a clarifying conversation might reveal tiredness or inattention. Not every misunderstanding can be resolved in this way, and the possibility of alternative explanations does not oblige us to tolerate repeated disrespect. It simply prevents an initial inference from prematurely acquiring the status of a fact.

Recognizing different perspectives does not guarantee harmony either. Two people may understand their respective interests perfectly and still compete over a scarce resource. Agreements, standards of justice, or institutions may then be needed. Understanding can improve coexistence, but it cannot universally replace negotiation or protection against abuse.

Chapter 3. The Body as a Condition of Our Experience

From the standpoint of lived experience, we do not encounter the world as though we were minds detached from bodies. Breathing, movement, tiredness, and pleasure are part of our way of being in it. This is a phenomenological description, not in itself an explanation of the neurological mechanisms of perception.

We can attend to our readiness to act and to our need for rest. The expression “flowing with the body” names an original phenomenological proposal made in this book: attending to experiences of vitality, fatigue, and recovery without continuously imposing mental arousal on ourselves. It does not refer to supernatural energy or to a medically validated technique.

Interoception, the perception of internal bodily states, can be studied by distinguishing what a person believes they feel, the accuracy with which they detect internal signals, and the extent to which their confidence matches that accuracy. These dimensions do not necessarily coincide (Garfinkel et al., 2015), and measuring accuracy itself presents methodological difficulties (Desmedt et al., 2023). Listening to a sensation does not mean identifying its cause infallibly: we must integrate bodily information, background circumstances, and reasoned assessment.

Listening to the body is not obeying it without examination. A sensation may be ambiguous, and enthusiasm may coexist with physiological limits. We need to integrate experience, reliable information, risks, and commitments. Sometimes rest will be the most reasonable choice; at other times, continuing with proportionate effort will be.

Practical self-sufficiency includes looking after our ordinary needs, but it does not require doing everything alone. Cooking, cleaning, or learning to make a repair may expand our options; asking for assistance or cooperating can be equally autonomous. Dignity does not depend on the degree of bodily independence.

An objection is that obeying the body might mean avoiding unpleasant tasks. But the body does not dictate complete moral decisions. Meeting a responsibility or providing care sometimes requires effort; the proposal is not to turn that effort into a permanent hostility toward our bodily condition.

The Lived Body and the Observed Body

We can study our organism from the outside through physiological measurements and experience it from within through sensations. These two registers are not interchangeable. A measurement may reveal a change we do not yet perceive; an intense sensation may not arise from the cause we assume. Both provide different kinds of information. Our philosophy values the lived body without setting it against scientific knowledge of the organism.

The distinction between the lived body and the observed body is related to Merleau-Ponty’s *Phenomenology of Perception* (1945). In that work, one’s own body cannot be reduced to one external object among others: it participates in our practical openness to the world. This book adopts the distinction in a more limited

sense, without deriving a medical theory from it or opposing lived experience to scientific observation.

This distinction helps explain why listening to the body requires discernment. Fatigue may suggest rest, but its persistence, context, and any possible need for assistance should also be considered. Enthusiasm may motivate a task, but it does not guarantee that the activity is safe or advisable. Internal perception informs our decisions; it does not determine them by itself.

Chosen Effort

Flowing with the body does not mean eliminating every discomfort. Learning to swim, undertaking a demanding walk, or developing a skill may involve effort. The philosophical difference lies in our relationship to that effort. Chosen, proportionate, and revisable effort can expand our capacities. A permanent demand sustained by fear of disappointing others can restrict our freedom even when it produces visible achievements.

We can ask what an activity means to us, what resources it requires, and how it relates to our commitments. Sometimes we will decide to continue despite moderate tiredness. At other times it will be reasonable to reduce the intensity, seek help, or postpone the task. There is no single rule. The ability to adjust effort expresses autonomy better than an obligation to maintain a constant pace.

Bodily Capacity and Dignity

If we tied a person's worth to their strength, vitality, or functional autonomy, we would end up excluding those who need more support. Human experience encompasses diverse abilities, illness, aging, and changing circumstances. Some people can undertake tasks personally; others need everyday assistance. Dignity neither increases nor decreases in proportion to that independence.

For this reason, bodily self-sufficiency must be understood as a situated possibility. When we can preserve a skill, it makes sense to do so if it contributes to our lives. When we cannot, we can still exercise autonomy by expressing preferences, participating in decisions, and establishing respectful relationships of care. Receiving care does not automatically make anyone less free: what matters is how that care is organized and how much decision-making capacity it preserves.

Chapter 4. Thinking, Feeling, and Interpreting

Thinking enables us to remember, anticipate, argue, and create. To dismiss thought would be incompatible with a philosophy that defends independent judgment. What we need to examine is its relationship with experience and action, especially when mental repetition no longer helps us understand.

Prolonged reflection can be fruitful: research and creation take time. Rumination is not defined simply by duration but by certain forms of repetition that sustain distress or obstruct alternatives. Sometimes continuing to think is valuable; at other times, taking action, changing activities, or resting is preferable.

Visualization is an imaginative operation, not proof that the world must conform to our expectations. When we imagine a solution, we should move from the desired scenario to specific questions: What resources do we need? What risks have we overlooked? What small step could provide information? Imagination then becomes a tool without hardening into a rigid belief.

We can also listen to music or walk without continually putting everything that happens into words. This possibility is not a command to achieve inner silence. It means allowing life to be more than a constant running commentary.

Contemplation, theory, and silence are not justified solely by what they produce. The idea of thought and action needs a provision for freedom: there is valuable thinking without immediate action, and valuable experience without an objective that explains it.

Exploratory Thinking and Defensive Thinking

We can approach an issue with genuine curiosity, or use reasoning to protect a conclusion reached in advance. In the first case, we seek to understand which arguments withstand scrutiny. In the second, we select reasons that confirm our position and treat objections as nuisances. The same intellectual ability can therefore broaden or restrict our understanding.

This contrast supplies a useful criterion for the chapters on belief. Thinking extensively or possessing sophisticated arguments is not enough. We should observe whether we allow contrary information to change our conclusions. Intellectual autonomy includes the freedom to correct ourselves, not merely the freedom to formulate our own opinions.

The Pause as Part of Understanding

An intellectual difficulty is not always resolved by immediately increasing mental effort. Sometimes we need to gather information; sometimes to test a partial solution; and sometimes to rest. A pause does not necessarily mean giving up. It may allow us to return to a problem with a different quality of attention and recognize assumptions we had overlooked.

This does not mean that rest automatically leads to discoveries or that sustained work should be avoided. Human activities require different rhythms. The proposal is not to confuse perseverance with endless repetition. We can keep a problem in view without making it the sole content of our experience.

The Objection from Contemplation

A philosophy that recommends moving from thought to action might seem hostile to theoretical research or contemplation. That objection would be justified if we measured all reflection by its immediate productivity. But understanding can itself be a valuable activity. Mathematics, philosophy, and fundamental research need not justify every question through an imminent application. We can also reflect for intellectual pleasure.

What we wish to avoid is an involuntary relationship with mental discourse that occupies our time without providing what we seek. Moreover, action does not mean only producing objects: speaking with someone, changing a habit, or stopping can all be appropriate decisions. Thinking, acting, and contemplating do not form a fixed hierarchy. Our freedom lies in recognizing which of these possibilities best fits the situation.

PART II. THE FORMATION OF OUR BELIEFS

Chapter 5. From an Idea to Identification

Ideas help us organize what we experience. A belief, in the epistemological sense, involves accepting something as true and can be reasonable and revisable. Identification is different: a proposition can become part of our conception of who we are.

When a conviction becomes an indispensable sign of belonging, questioning it can feel like a personal threat. Yet not every collective identity is rigid, and not every firm conviction is dogmatic. We can share beliefs, relationships, and traditions while retaining the freedom to question and disagree.

An identity can be reflectively chosen and contribute to ethical commitment. Someone may identify with a cultural tradition while remaining open to criticism; another may assume a communal responsibility and strengthen their autonomy. Identification is therefore not inherently a defect. The problem is the closing off of examination, particularly when disagreement becomes a personal or social threat.

The transformation of an idea into dogma is not a universal psychological law. A belief may be only loosely connected to identity, and a strong sense of belonging can coexist with self-criticism. We should examine particular reasons, habits, and incentives before attributing closed-mindedness to a person.

We can have ideas without becoming those ideas. Intellectual freedom consists less in having no convictions than in retaining our ability to revise them.

The practical test is not whether we belong to groups, but whether we can acknowledge other people's reasons, revise a conviction, and maintain relationships without demanding unanimity.

Belief, Identity, and Evidence

Accepting a proposition because there are reasons to consider it true is not the same as making it the center of our identity. Consider a researcher who changes a hypothesis after observing results incompatible with it. Her commitment to knowledge may be firm precisely because she does not need to preserve every provisional conclusion. Another person, by contrast, might interpret an ordinary objection as a challenge to their worth or to the recognition of their group. The problem is not believing but the difficulty of distinguishing an idea's merits from the value of the person who holds it.

An Identity Can Also Be Emancipatory

It would be a mistake to assume that every collective identification diminishes autonomy. Some reflectively chosen identities make it possible to resist humiliation, organize mutual support, and claim rights. The pertinent question concerns the relationship we establish with them. Can we disagree with members of our own group? Can we acknowledge an injustice committed by one of its members? Can we still engage in dialogue with outsiders? Identity is compatible with freedom when it does not claim ownership over the whole of our judgment.

Disagreement as a Test of Freedom

Imagine two people who share a commitment to environmental protection but disagree about a particular measure. If each listens to the evidence, distinguishes ends from means, and accepts the possibility of changing course, commitment to the same cause has not eliminated their independence. If one interprets every doubt as betrayal, belief has become a means of discipline. It is not enough, then, to classify ideas by whether they originate in religion, politics, or science: we must examine how they are held, revised, and brought into our dealings with others.

Freedom Without Indifference

Critically revising beliefs does not mean holding them half-heartedly. We can commit ourselves deeply to a cause and bear personal costs to defend it. The aim is not to reduce every conviction to the same level but to prevent commitment from foreclosing recognition of our own mistakes. A belief that guides just action can strengthen autonomy; one that prevents us from recognizing the harm done in its name can undermine it.

Chapter 6. The Need for Certainty

Uncertainty can be uncomfortable. Anticipating risks, identifying patterns, and relying on well-tested knowledge help us live. Yet the desire for security can lead us to prefer definitive explanations over acknowledging what we still do not know.

A belief can provide comfort without that comfort demonstrating its truth. Nor does its emotional usefulness demonstrate that it is false. Separating psychological function from epistemic justification allows us to discuss religious, philosophical, and political convictions rigorously.

Religious faith is not a single phenomenon. It can take critical, communal, mystical, doctrinal, or hierarchical forms. Analysis should distinguish what a person believes from the institutional mechanisms governing their ability to dissent. Dogmatism should not be inferred from affiliation alone.

We can act reasonably under uncertainty: investigate until we have sufficient grounds, make decisions proportionate to their consequences, and revise them when new information becomes available. Not knowing can also be an intellectually honest position.

The Practical Value of Provisional Certainties

Everyday life requires a degree of trust. We cross streets assuming certain signals will be respected; prepare food relying on knowledge we have acquired; and undertake journeys based on forecasts that may prove wrong. It would be unreasonable to question every detail at every moment. Autonomy does not require permanent skepticism but rather matching our confidence to the available evidence, the reversibility of a decision, and the magnitude of its possible consequences.

Psychological Certainty Is Not Evidence

Two people can feel equally certain about incompatible claims. That subjective intensity does not decide which claim is correct. If the matter affects only a private preference, the disagreement may have little consequence. If a claim underpins an intervention affecting other people's health, education, or rights, the demand for reasons must be stronger. Respecting someone who believes something does not oblige us to grant equal credibility to every claim.

Living With Open Questions

We can acknowledge that some existential questions remain without conclusive answers and still build meaningful lives. Uncertainty about what happens to consciousness after death does not prevent us from caring for someone today. Lacking an ultimate theory of the universe's meaning does not deprive a friendship or a project of value. Uncertainty is difficult when we seek complete guarantees; it becomes more livable when we distinguish questions that require investigation from those that need not be settled before we act responsibly.

The Legitimate Role of Consolation

Shared narratives can accompany grief, sustain relationships, and provide language for difficult experiences. Recognizing that function does not require accepting all their claims as knowledge. Nor does it authorize us to disparage those who find support in them. We can separate the human value of a practice, its possible factual truth, and the way an institution administers it. This threefold distinction allows rigorous criticism without turning criticism into personal disparagement.

Chapter 7. Conceptual Attachment and Dogmatism

Dogmatism is not defined by the strength of a conviction, but by its unjustified resistance to critical scrutiny. A well-grounded conclusion may be upheld firmly while remaining open to revision; a weak claim may be defended as unquestionable.

When protecting an identity matters more than understanding an argument, we may select evidence that confirms our position and turn disagreement into hostility. Groups can reinforce this tendency, but they can also provide spaces for debate, support, and learning. Belonging is not, in itself, a defect.

Criticism of dogmatism should not become an identity based on superiority. Saying “I do not believe” can become as rigid a gesture as asserting “only my belief is true” if it prevents us from listening to reasons. The consistency of this book is tested when it faces objections from religious people, political groups, or traditions the author does not share.

Disagreement may reveal a genuine contradiction, not merely a diversity of perspectives. It is therefore legitimate to argue, request evidence, and denounce harm. Respecting another person does not require us to suspend all assessment of that person’s claims or practices.

Criticism should target mechanisms of coercion, imposition, and intellectual closure, not entire groups of people. We can respect someone who holds a belief while questioning their arguments or conduct. Understanding the causes of an action does not amount to justifying it.

The test of consistency is whether we apply this criticism to our own philosophy. If self-sufficiency becomes an identity that forbids asking for help, or opposition to dogmatism demands absolute allegiance, we will have recreated what we criticize.

We must avoid a common inference: if an ideology has been used to justify violence, it does not follow that it is the sole cause. Conflicts often combine power, territory, resources, institutions, and group membership. Conceptual attachment may intensify them without explaining them completely.

Strong Conviction Is Not the Same as Dogmatism

Someone who firmly holds that a particular action causes harm may do so on the basis of solid evidence and revisable arguments. Such a person does not become dogmatic merely by remaining firm when faced with a weak objection. Critical openness does not require permanently suspending judgment or treating all arguments as equally persuasive. Dogmatism emerges when protecting a conclusion systematically replaces the evaluation of reasons. We must avoid both rigidity and a false equanimity that treats evidence and passing opinion as equivalent.

The Social Cost of Dissent

Questioning a shared belief can carry costs beyond intellectual disagreement: the loss of friendships, opportunities, or recognition. It is not enough to tell someone to think freely if their environment punishes dissent. Autonomy has a relational dimension. It is reasonable to argue that environments where questioning, dissent, and revision are possible offer better conditions for exercising independent judgment. The size of that effect in particular contexts would require empirical research. This observation applies equally to secular and religious associations, academic institutions, and professional organizations.

When Criticism Mirrors What It Criticizes

A philosophy opposed to dogmatism can itself harden if it labels every religious believer ignorant or alienated. Criticism then stops examining particular practices and attributes a general inferiority to an entire group. Our standard must be symmetrical: question claims through reasons, denounce demonstrable coercion, and recognize that there are religious believers capable of critical deliberation, just as there are non-religious people who cling to dogmas.

Understanding and Limits

We may ask how someone came to justify abusive conduct and use what we learn to prevent it. Yet understanding causes does not excuse harm. The defense of rights, protection of victims, and repair remain necessary. Likewise, recognizing the dignity of someone who holds an opinion does not require accepting threats or impositions. Freedom of conscience protects belief; it does not make every action undertaken in its name legitimate.

Chapter 8. Fruitful Thought and Rumination

We can use reflection to explore hypotheses, clarify problems, and plan activities. Its fruitfulness is not measured exclusively by immediate results. Theoretical research or philosophical contemplation can be valuable in themselves.

Repetitive thought may become unhelpful when it circles around the same worries without producing new information or perspective. Not all sustained thinking is rumination, and we cannot always interrupt it through voluntary choice. We should avoid turning the ideal of thinking less into a new source of guilt.

Psychological research on rumination examines patterns of repetition associated with distress and difficulties in problem-solving. The expression “blah, blah, blah” is a personal metaphor, not a diagnosis of someone who thinks a great deal. The aim is neither to stigmatize reflection nor to demand perfect mental control (Nolen-Hoeksema, Wisco, and Lyubomirsky, 2008).

Creative activity can coexist with uncertainty. We can begin with reversible actions that yield information and learn in the process. When a problem has major consequences, however, more preparation may be advisable before acting. A philosophy of thought and action does not prescribe the same decision-making speed in every circumstance.

One possibility is to ask what reflection is contributing now: does it clarify a situation, enable a decision, or explore a meaningful question? In other cases, a proportionate action can teach us what we could not anticipate. Experience corrects our mental models.

Nor is doing something always better than doing nothing. Rest can be a worthwhile choice. Paying attention to someone we love or contemplating a work of art can be worthwhile too. A good life cannot be measured by the quantity of things accomplished.

Lengthy Reflection Can Be Fruitful

Scientific research, writing, or resolving a complex conflict may require returning to the same question many times. Apparent repetition is not necessarily rumination: each return may introduce a distinction, evidence, or another perspective. The practical criterion is not duration, but the relationship between reflective effort, the novelty it contributes, and its effects on our capacity to understand. Even a period of apparent stagnation may form part of a valuable exploration. This distinction between constructive and unconstructive forms of repetitive thought can be read alongside Watkins's review (Watkins, 2008).

Rumination Cannot Be Stopped by Command

Telling ourselves "stop thinking" may become another worry. Nor is it responsible to depict every form of repetitive thinking as a simple choice. Some forms of rumination are associated with emotional difficulties that may call for professional support. This philosophical proposal is not a clinical intervention. It can invite us to recognize the difference between working through a problem and repeatedly going around the same circuit, but it must respect that this difference cannot always be managed through immediate willpower.

Deliberation in Proportion to Risk

Not all decisions warrant the same amount of time. For an easily reversible choice, a cautious attempt may suffice; for a decision with serious consequences, research and consultation may be indispensable. Thought and action means adapting deliberation to the situation, not indiscriminately accelerating behavior. We can also decide not to act if the information is insufficient or if intervening would cause harm. Pausing is a deliberative option and not necessarily a renunciation.

Creation as a Non-Instrumental Experience

We can write without intending to publish, grow plants without quantifying results, or study a question out of curiosity. These activities need not be translated into economic productivity to be worthwhile. At the same time, ambitious projects demand discipline and sustained work: enjoying the process does not mean every moment is pleasant. Creative freedom consists in choosing commitments, recognizing their costs, and keeping a proportionate relationship with the outcome. Sometimes continuing expresses autonomy; at other times, stopping does.

PART III. Individual Freedom

Chapter 9. Orphaned from Our Existential Freedom

Early in life we depend on others for many forms of care. Over time, and in different ways according to our capacities and circumstances, our opportunities to take part in decisions may expand. We propose that education should enable this participation gradually and proportionately, without assuming that everyone follows one universal path toward autonomy.

Many adults may retain the habit of seeking authorization: we need approval before choosing, fear disappointing others, and delegate matters that we could examine ourselves. “Orphaned from our existential freedom” names this paradox: having opportunities for autonomy while living as though they constantly required someone else’s permission.

Speaking of being “orphaned from our existential freedom” is a critical metaphor, not a diagnosis of a population. It describes situations in which we delegate our judgment out of habit or fear of exclusion. These must be distinguished from imposed dependencies and from support that genuinely makes choice possible.

The habit of delegating our judgment can be placed in dialogue with Kant’s invitation to emerge from self-incurred immaturity in his essay on Enlightenment (1784), and with Fromm’s examination of the fear that can accompany freedom (1941). The metaphor of abandonment also recalls Sartre’s existential reflection (1946). Here we propose neither a universal psychology nor a derivation from these authors: we distinguish between necessary dependence, voluntarily delegated deliberation, and avoidable subordination.

It may be rational to accept advice from someone with greater expertise. Autonomy is not lost through learning from others, but when authority unjustifiably replaces our ability to question, understand, and decide in matters that belong to us.

Belonging can offer affection and cooperation, but it can also inhibit dissent if acceptance depends on obedience. We do not need to abandon communities in order to think freely. We can contribute to them as individuals who are able both to agree and to disagree.

As an educational proposal, we argue that freedom can also be cultivated through real opportunities to decide: taking part in proportionate matters, facing consequences with support, and seeking guidance when useful. Complete independence does not exist, nor is there a single valid developmental path for everyone.

Initiative can be recovered gradually through proportionate decisions. Not every form of emancipation is immediately possible, and the costs of dissent are not equal for everyone. A responsible philosophy cannot demand courage without considering the person’s resources and potential reprisals.

Formal Freedom and Effective Freedom

A person may have a recognized right to decide and yet have alternatives so limited that exercising that right is difficult. Freedom of conscience can coexist with severe economic dependence; the ability to dissent may be restricted by threats of exclusion. Thus, when we speak of recovering our initiative, we must distinguish between voluntarily renouncing a decision and genuinely lacking possibilities. Confusing the two would attribute to the individual a responsibility that is not wholly theirs. Philosophical reflection must ask about the conditions that allow a nominal freedom to become a freedom that can actually be exercised.

Reflective Belonging Is Not Servitude

A group can provide not only refuge but also tools for emancipation. We learn to argue with others, acquire skills through cooperation, and may find support when challenging abusive authority. The problem is not identifying with other people or shared projects, but ceasing to review the terms of that identification. Belonging that is compatible with autonomy allows disagreement, reasonable exit, and the transformation of its own arrangements. The opposite occurs when dissent is punished or collective identity becomes the only permitted answer to the question of who we are.

An Everyday Test of Autonomy

We can examine a simple decision that we habitually delegate: organizing our time, handling an administrative task, or expressing a preference. First, we distinguish whether we genuinely need guidance or are avoiding the discomfort of deciding. Next, we identify the consequences and legitimate commitments involved. Finally, we choose, even if the choice is to ask for help. The exercise does not guarantee a perfect decision; it can show us that we are able to recognize our own part in it. Freedom understood in this way is not heroic self-sufficiency but proportionate responsibility.

Chapter 10. Self-Sufficiency as a Vital Principle

We call existential self-sufficiency the disposition to develop, preserve, and exercise capacities for understanding, deciding, and acting within our circumstances, while seeking to avoid forms of subordination and dependence that unjustifiably restrict our autonomy, without denying the value of cooperation or the legitimacy of receiving help. The term is used here in this stipulated sense: it means neither isolation nor a requirement to do without other people.

Being able to prepare a meal, make a simple repair, or handle an everyday administrative task expands our alternatives, but it does not oblige us always to carry out those tasks ourselves. We may delegate them for reasons of interest, time, accessibility, or a reasonable division of responsibilities. The possibility of choosing, rather than the accumulation of tasks performed personally, is the criterion of autonomy here.

Reciprocity and interdependence are not exceptions to self-sufficiency but part of its actual conditions. A person with a disability can make meaningful decisions with appropriate support. An institution may enable autonomy rather than extinguish it. Dignity must therefore never be measured by how many tasks a person performs alone.

Philosophical dialogue: relational autonomy

Contemporary discussions of relational autonomy challenge the automatic identification of self-government with isolation. A person may decide for themselves while maintaining relationships of care, learning, cooperation, or chosen dependence. What matters is not the absence of ties but the conditions shaping their effective ability to decide, reconsider, and act. This argumentative affinity does not establish any historical influence on the present proposal (Christman, 2025).

A dependence does not become unnecessary merely because another way of living can be imagined. Evaluating it requires attention to abilities, effective alternatives, costs, informed preferences, and the possible effects of coercion. Consensual support may increase autonomy; dependence imposed by a lack of alternatives may diminish it.

Self-sufficiency does not mean doing everything

In its more demanding sense, self-sufficiency cannot be measured by the number of tasks we perform without help. Someone may cook, repair their home, and manage their accounts while allowing a community to determine their fundamental convictions without scrutiny. Another person may need daily assistance to move around yet retain remarkable intellectual and moral independence. If only the first person counts as self-sufficient, we confuse instrumental skill with self-government. Our claim is different: practical capacities matter because they broaden possibilities, but their existential value lies in the effective freedom to use them and decide how we wish to live.

A necessary distinction: capacity, dependence, and subordination

Three levels should be distinguished. Capacity is what a person can do, even when they choose not to do it. Dependence describes a relationship in which a need or activity requires another person's involvement. Subordination arises when such a relationship unjustifiably restricts the capacity to choose, disagree, or change its terms. These levels do not coincide. Knowing how to cook broadens our options even if we share cooking duties. Relying on a professional for a complex procedure does not entail subordination. By contrast, receiving assistance under a threat that essential goods will be withdrawn unless we accept a doctrine may seriously compromise our autonomy. Self-sufficiency seeks to develop capacities and reduce avoidable subordination, not indiscriminately abolish every dependence.

Who decides which dependence is unnecessary?

The word “unnecessary” expresses a contextual judgment and should not become an external command. A task may be easy for one person and extremely costly for another. Available time, pain, knowledge, disability, family responsibilities, and financial resources change what is reasonable. Even someone who knows how to perform an activity may legitimately delegate it. The decisive question is not whether an observer thinks that person could do it alone, but whether they have genuine alternatives, understand their consequences, and participate adequately in the decision. A philosophy of autonomy that imposed the same list of tasks on everyone would reproduce the paternalism it seeks to challenge.

The meal thought experiment

Imagine three situations. One person learns to cook and enjoys preparing their food, developing an ability and an experience they value. Another knows how to cook but agrees with their partner to divide tasks differently because both prefer it. A third cannot cook because of a functional limitation and needs assistance to eat, while retaining control over mealtimes and preferences. There is no reason to rank these lives on a simple scale of greater or lesser dignity. What matters is the quality of the decision and of the supportive relationship. In the first case, doing the task personally expresses autonomy; in the second, voluntary cooperation does; in the third, autonomy may be expressed precisely through receiving help that enables the person to exercise their preferences.

Emotional autonomy without insensitivity

Reducing excessive dependence on others’ approval does not mean ceasing to need affection. Relationships matter, and criticism may hurt even when we know it is poorly founded. The aim is not to become emotionally immune to those around us but to avoid granting every external judgment the authority to define our worth or direct our choices. We may listen to someone who knows us, recognize their concern, and maintain our decision. We may also admit that their judgment reveals our own mistake. Emotional independence means neither feeling nothing nor obeying every feeling: it means retaining the possibility of examining our responses rather than turning them automatically into obedience.

Self-sufficiency as a possibility, not an obligation

The capacity to do something ourselves does not, by itself, create a duty always to do it. If learning a skill offers alternatives, turning its exercise into a permanent command may restrict those alternatives again. We may prefer to cook today and share the preparation tomorrow. We may enjoy solitude without rejecting company. We may develop a project on our own initiative and accept specialist collaboration. Self-sufficiency ceases to be liberating when it becomes an identity we must demonstrate to others. The criterion should be an increase in reasonable possibilities, not a display of independence.

Responsibility does not resolve structural injustice

We must acknowledge a political and social limit. Some individual possibilities are conditioned by barriers that personal perseverance cannot remove. Poverty, unjust restrictions of rights, and lack of access to support can limit autonomy even for competent and responsible people. It would be wrong to turn self-sufficiency into an explanation of why someone cannot escape those circumstances. Personal initiative and collective responses are not incompatible. We can assume responsibility for what lies within our power while also defending institutions and relationships that broaden the possibilities available to others.

A criterion for personal reflection

Self-sufficiency can be considered through questions rather than a universal list of duties. Do I have enough information to understand this decision? Can I disagree without fear of disproportionate retaliation? Do I have viable alternatives? Am I transferring a task to others through a conscious choice, or because I have stopped cultivating a capacity I want to retain? Does my decision unfairly affect someone else? These questions do not guarantee easy answers. Their advantage is that they prevent us from confusing the author's preference with a general rule. Each person can examine their situation without subscribing to a uniform model of existence.

The thesis in summary

The thesis can be summarized as follows: it matters to broaden our effective capacity to direct our own existence and reconsider our dependencies, without turning independence into a duty or overlooking inequalities in actual circumstances. Chosen cooperation can strengthen rather than weaken that capacity.

Why is that capacity worth protecting? The bodily and situated experience examined in Part I is always lived from some particular perspective. No normative conclusion follows automatically from this fact: further reasons are required. One is that, except where others are unjustifiably affected or duties of protection apply, being able to take part in decisions that shape our experience makes possible a life we can recognize as our own. Being subject to another person's arbitrary will deprives us of that participation and increases our vulnerability to decisions we cannot challenge. This is a reason in favor of autonomy, not proof that it must be exercised in one particular way. It connects the experience discussed in Part I with the responsible freedom explored in the following parts.

There is also a reciprocal reason: if we consider it valuable to be able to examine decisions that affect us, we must explain why we would deny others a comparable opportunity. The argument does not settle disagreements about justice or turn every desire into a right. It requires us to offer publicly defensible reasons for limitations and to distinguish care, cooperation, and subordination.

Dependence, support, and domination

The word “dependence” covers very different situations. We may depend on medical treatment, a supply network, or another person’s voluntary care. None of these circumstances necessarily entails domination. By contrast, a relationship in which someone uses an indispensable resource to impose their preferences does raise a question of freedom. The relevant distinction is therefore between needs and subordination, not between doing something individually or with help. Self-sufficiency should promote decision-making capacity and access to alternatives while recognizing that some needs will be permanent.

When the principle turns against its defender

If someone refuses necessary assistance solely to preserve an image of independence, the principle of self-sufficiency has lost its function. Instead of expanding options, it has become an identity requirement. The same would happen if we used our abilities to judge those living with disability, poverty, or different circumstances. The test is straightforward: does this choice reasonably increase our participation in our own life, or does it merely protect the idea that we ought to do everything without help? Answering requires examination of facts and needs, not repetition of a slogan.

Chapter 11. The Responsibility of Choosing

Choosing has consequences in a shared world. We do not control every outcome, but we can try to anticipate foreseeable harm and answer for our commitments. Freedom does not mean the absence of obligations, nor can responsibility be reduced to obeying others’ expectations.

We should distinguish chosen commitments, duties arising from our actions, and demands imposed without justification. Not every request from another person becomes our responsibility; nor may we arbitrarily abandon legitimate obligations simply because they no longer please us.

A decision should be judged in light of the information reasonably available when it was made, not solely by its outcome. A prudent action may end badly because of factors nobody controlled, while recklessness may escape consequences through chance. Responsibility requires distinguishing intention, foreseeability, ability to intervene, and results.

In some popular interpretations, “karma” is used as though it named a force distributing rewards and punishments in proportion to merit. Hindu, Buddhist, and Jain traditions have developed different and far more complex accounts of the relationships between action, intention, and consequences. Our criticism is directed only at the simplification of karmic ideas into automatic retribution: suffering an injustice is never, by itself, evidence that someone deserves it. That actions have consequences does not imply that outcomes are fair.

We can correct mistakes, repair harm, and learn. Responsibility requires acknowledging what happened, but not making a mistake into a permanent

identity. Self-compassion is meaningful when it accompanies rather than replaces reparation.

Personal responsibility does not eliminate duties we did not explicitly choose, including some obligations of care or the duty to repair harm. Practical autonomy operates within a framework of rights and responsibilities that requires justification in its own terms.

Legitimate obligations do not vanish when they become inconvenient

Choosing our commitments does not mean that every obligation depends on our present wishes. Caring for someone for whom we are responsible, respecting agreements, and repairing damage may remain justified requirements even when meeting them is uncomfortable. Responsible freedom is not a license to withdraw cooperation arbitrarily. But it does not demand unlimited obligations either: we must consider our abilities, the fairness of an agreement, and consequences for third parties. Honestly revising a commitment may be more responsible than maintaining it through promises we cannot keep.

Chapter 12. The Freedom to Say No

We may agree to demands out of affection and cooperation, or out of fear of losing recognition. Persistent people-pleasing diminishes the authenticity of our commitments when we stop considering our own possibilities and wishes.

Saying no allows us to establish boundaries, but it does not cancel legitimate duties we have assumed or the rights of those who depend on us. Refusal calls for discernment: distinguishing an arbitrary social expectation from a genuine responsibility.

We can communicate boundaries without requiring the other person to approve of them emotionally. A refusal may be respectful and still cause disappointment. The aim is not to control other people's reactions, but to communicate clearly and accept proportionate consequences.

Understanding another person's difficulty does not mean always solving it for them. We may offer attentive listening, guidance, or proportionate help while respecting their initiative. In emergencies and where essential needs are unmet, direct assistance may be indispensable.

Firmness need not be hostile. We can state a decision clearly, hear disapproval, and maintain reasonable composure. We do not need to become the "good child" who seeks approval at any cost.

Disagreement is not aggression

A refusal may disappoint without being unjust. If we mistake every instance of another person's sadness for harm we must prevent, we will end up yielding even when our reasons are legitimate. Conversely, the right to set boundaries does not justify expressing them with contempt. Saying no clearly means accepting that another person has wishes of their own and that these do not always coincide with ours. Responsible coexistence requires enduring some mutual frustration without turning it into a moral accusation.

Boundaries and the duty of care

There are situations in which someone depends on us because of prior agreements, caregiving responsibilities, or a lack of immediate alternatives. In such cases, saying no may have serious effects. Merely invoking autonomy is not enough to ignore them. We may need to negotiate a replacement caregiver, seek support, or arrange a responsible transition. Personal boundaries protect our lives, but they must also take account of the legitimate commitments we have created. Responsible firmness is not abandonment.

Approval is not the only criterion

We may receive sound criticism and feel uncomfortable. We may also be praised for conduct that harms someone. Neither the pleasure nor the rejection we elicit can, on its own, determine whether our decisions are just. Applied equanimity means examining reasons, facts, and consequences before changing our position. If we discover an error, correcting it expresses independence of judgment. If disapproval offers no new reasons, we can calmly maintain our boundary without seeking victory over the other person.

Chapter 13. Integrity in the Face of Obedience

Institutions make coordination possible, but an order does not automatically make an action just. We remain responsible for examining, as far as we are able, the legitimacy of what we take part in.

Refusing to cooperate with abuse may involve risks. Integrity does not require reckless exposure: seeking support, documenting a situation, using institutional protections, or limiting our involvement may be responsible options.

From an ethical standpoint, obedience does not automatically remove moral responsibility. In evaluating conduct, we should consider the knowledge available, the actual freedom to act, and the risks involved. We should not demand reckless heroism from people under threat; sometimes only gradual forms of resistance or protection are possible.

Making assistance conditional on conversion or ideological allegiance raises serious problems when the recipient has too few alternatives. But many religious and secular organizations help without imposing such conditions; it would be false to attribute the same practice to all of them. Criticism must be specific.

We can act for the sake of justice without expecting supernatural reward or recognition. Even so, good intentions are not enough: we must consider the needs of those receiving help, the means we choose, and the foreseeable consequences. Firmness and tenderness can coexist.

Understanding the person who caused harm does not require the victim to forgive or reconcile. Protecting those who suffer, seeking possible reparation, and acknowledging responsibility remain essential.

Causal Understanding and Ethical Judgment

To explain an action is not to justify it. We can investigate how someone learned to obey harmful orders, the pressures they experienced, and the opportunities they had to act differently. This information makes the attribution of responsibility more accurate, but does not remove the obligation to protect those harmed. An ethics of understanding must retain two perspectives at once: attention to the causes of conduct and attention to the rights of those affected. Neglecting either impoverishes our judgment.

Respectful Assistance and the Recipient's Autonomy

Generosity is not defined solely by the giver's intention. The recipient's needs and understanding of the intervention also matter. Urgent help can resolve a crisis without creating unjust dependence. At other times, imposed assistance may displace people's capacities or demand gratitude and obedience. Whenever possible, we should ask what support is wanted and what alternatives exist. Making basic needs conditional on religious or ideological allegiance creates especially troubling pressure. Sharing convictions does not require exploiting another person's vulnerability.

Integrity Under Risk

Not everyone can oppose abuse in the same way. Someone dependent on a job, home, or institution may face threats an outside observer does not experience. Demanding heroism without considering those risks would be a form of moralism. Integrity can take the form of open refusal, seeking allies, documentation, reporting through safe channels, or gradually withdrawing from harmful cooperation. The point is to choose an ethical response proportionate to real capacities and risks, rather than publicly performing an idealized strength.

PART IV. Living from One's Own Center

Chapter 14. Independence of Judgment

Intellectual autonomy does not mean inventing all knowledge on our own. Much of what we know also depends on other people's testimony and shared practices of learning; learning from specialists does not require abandoning critical judgment. Thinking for ourselves means examining grounds for belief and recognizing the limits of our expertise.

Independence does not require habitual disagreement. Rejecting every piece of advice may itself be a way of remaining dependent on whatever one opposes. We can accept sound arguments without surrendering unconditional obedience to the person offering them.

When a decision calls for expertise, placing reasonable trust in it can be part of good judgment. Freedom does not require us to reproduce every investigation personally. It requires distinguishing competence, evidence, uncertainty, and the limits of authority.

Changing our minds in response to better reasons is an ability, not a defeat. A deeper consistency lies in retaining the willingness to correct our conclusions. Our decisions should reflect the best understanding available.

Nor do we need to persuade everyone. We can make an argument, listen, and recognize when disagreement no longer adds to understanding. Our freedom includes respecting other people's freedom not to agree.

An Objection to Independence of Judgment

If all human knowledge develops through learning and cooperation, how can we distinguish our own judgment from merely repeating someone else's ideas? We cannot answer by asking who first expressed a thought. What matters is whether we understand the reasons supporting it, can identify its limits, and can explain what would make us revise it. A student can genuinely understand a scientific finding without personally repeating every experiment, because the student grasps the difference between trusting a testable procedure and obeying a claim on the basis of prestige. Independence of judgment does not require starting from nothing: it requires critically evaluating what we receive.

Disagreement Is Not Always Courage

Someone may systematically reject relatives' recommendations and yet still organize every decision around them. Their behavior depends on opposition rather than independent deliberation. The same can happen when contradicting the majority becomes an identity. We may agree with an authority on some matters and disagree on others. Neither consensus proves truth nor dissent guarantees insight. The relevant question is what reasons support each position and how we might test them.

Judgment Under Uncertainty

In matters of health, justice, or safety, our decisions may call for specialized knowledge. Asking for help and weighing evidence need not mean failing at autonomy; they may be its most responsible exercise. The degree of scrutiny should match the significance of the decision: choosing what to read does not demand the same investigation as accepting an intervention with lasting consequences. Our judgment improves as we learn to recognize what we know, what we do not know, and whom it is reasonable to consult.

Independence Also Means Accepting Correction

Some past choices become part of our public identity: a profession, a conviction, or a position we have defended openly. Revising them may bring embarrassment or fear of disappointing others. Yet persisting solely to preserve an image is not necessarily integrity. Worthwhile continuity lies not in maintaining every conclusion, but in remaining prepared to offer reasons and take responsibility for change. Being free to learn includes being free to acknowledge that we were mistaken.

Chapter 15. Equanimity in Practice

Equanimity does not mean the absence of emotion. We may feel fear, enthusiasm, sadness, or anger and still retain room for choice. An emotion provides information about our experience, but is not, by itself, an instruction we must obey.

Recognition can feel good; criticism can hurt. Emotional independence means listening to these responses without automatically treating them as measures of our personal worth. We can learn from one observation and reject another without defending an image of perfection.

Equanimity is an orientation toward regulation, not a ban on feeling. Pain, loss, and injustice may provoke intense emotions. Experiencing them is not a philosophical failure. We can retain some capacity to decide even when we cannot achieve perfect calm.

We do not control other people's approval, although we can try to express ourselves clearly and considerately. Equanimity in practice offers quiet firmness, not indifference.

Being equanimous does not mean neutrality toward abuse, either. Ethical firmness and sensitivity to suffering can coexist with an effort to avoid needless hostility.

Equanimity enters into dialogue with the Stoic tradition, for example Epictetus's distinction between what is and is not up to us (*Enchiridion*, §1). It may also be compared, without equating the two, with the equanimity cultivated in Buddhist traditions under the term *upekkhā*. Here, neither emotional indifference nor acceptance of injustice is required: the proposal is to examine how we might respond without losing the legitimacy of feeling, dissenting, and protecting ourselves.

Equanimity in the Face of a Real Offense

Not every strong emotion arises from a mistaken interpretation. An offense, loss, or injustice can warrant sadness, anger, or protest. Balance does not mean denying the seriousness of what happened; it means preserving enough capacity to choose a response. We can call out abuse, seek protection, or demand reparation without feeling compelled to turn conflict into permanent enmity. Calmness may help, but it is not a condition for our complaint to be legitimate.

Dependence on Approval Comes in Degrees

Wanting recognition is human. The problem begins when it becomes an indispensable condition for acting. Consider someone who accepts additional work because they fear disappointing others: the response may appear kind while leaving no time to recover. Examining this behavior does not mean forbidding ourselves to please people, but asking whether there is a genuine choice, whether the obligations are legitimate, and whether the cost is proportionate. A respectful refusal may preserve a relationship better than an acceptance accompanied by resentment.

Do Not Confuse Acceptance with Resignation

We can accept that a situation is happening without believing it ought to continue. Acknowledging tiredness does not require abandoning every commitment; recognizing injustice does not mean tolerating it. This distinction protects equanimity from passivity. Clarity about the facts can precede firm action: documenting what happened, negotiating, seeking support, or setting limits. Prudent action does not require perfect inner calm.

The Right to Imperfect Emotion

When a philosophy promises uninterrupted serenity, it can impose a second burden: in addition to suffering, we believe we have failed by suffering. Applied equanimity should avoid that cycle. We can be upset and still make a reasonable decision; we may need time to understand our response. Emotional regulation is not a test of personal purity. It is a variable capacity, shaped by circumstances, which can be exercised imperfectly without losing its value.

Chapter 16. Freedom in the Face of Our Mistakes

We can develop abilities through teaching, observation, and practice; these routes can complement one another. Direct experience may reveal difficulties we had not anticipated, but we do not need to make dangerous mistakes in order to develop our abilities. Protection and autonomy should be adjusted to the circumstances.

A child may try to stand up after a minor fall while an adult remains attentive. This does not justify withholding help when there is pain or danger. Offering support without unnecessarily taking over can encourage learning.

A learning experience requires protection proportionate to the actual risk. Allowing someone to try a reversible task may strengthen their skills; exposing them to injury for the sake of a lesson would be irresponsible. There is no inherent virtue in making mistakes.

Self-compassion and responsibility need to develop together. Understanding the circumstances that contributed to a mistake does not mean denying the harm. We can acknowledge it, apologize, make amends, and change our behavior without turning guilt into a permanent identity. Research on self-compassion provides relevant empirical context (Neff, 2023); the duty to make amends is argued here on independent ethical grounds.

Making a mistake does not mean that our whole person is a mistake. We can recognize a wrongful action, identify its causes, and change it. When it has harmed someone, we should attend to the person affected, not only to our own wish to feel better.

Forgiving ourselves does not mean declaring ourselves innocent or demanding forgiveness from others. It may mean relinquishing indefinite inner punishment after assuming responsibility and repairing what we reasonably can.

Learning Without Romanticizing Harm

A minor stumble may offer an opportunity to learn; serious harm need not be justified by the experience it produces. Children's autonomy requires appropriate supervision, and adult learning requires recognition of safety limits. We can learn from simulations, instructions, and other people's mistakes. Constructive experience arises when we observe, understand, and adjust our actions, not simply because we get something wrong.

Making Amends Before Seeking Peace of Mind

If our decisions have harmed someone, the first question should not be limited to how we can stop feeling guilty. We should acknowledge the harm, listen to those affected when appropriate, and consider possible ways to make amends. Apologizing may be part of the process, but it does not guarantee reconciliation. No one is obliged to restore trust. Self-compassion is ethically defensible when it does not replace responsibility but helps us face it without reducing our identity to the mistake we made.

Beginning Again Without Erasing the Past

Learning does not mean pretending that nothing happened. Some decisions leave lasting consequences; acknowledging them may change our future boundaries and commitments. Even so, we can continue. We can develop different habits, seek guidance, or establish procedures that reduce the risk of repeating the harm. Progress need not be fast or linear. Step by step, we build an experience that integrates the past without being paralyzed by it.

Chapter 17. Feeling Existence Here and Now

Remembering and planning are valuable abilities. Living in the present does not require eliminating them or constantly checking whether we are paying attention. We can simply recognize the activity in which we are engaged and allow it to be part of our experience.

Everyday life is not merely a waiting room for future achievements. Cooking, looking after our home, walking, and resting are real moments of existence. They need not all be pleasant, but neither are they devoid of value because they are ordinary.

Attention to the present is not a mandatory technique of self-observation. For some people, and in certain circumstances, intensely observing internal sensations can

be unpleasant. Being present can also mean engaging with an external task or a relationship.

Enjoying ordinary activities is a possibility, not a duty. Cooking may be pleasurable for one person and burdensome for another. Freedom means recognizing these differences rather than prescribing the same way of life to everyone.

“Flowing with the body” means taking fatigue and readiness for action into account, not assuming that every sensation is infallible. Excessive attention to the body can be uncomfortable in some circumstances; we can also turn toward tasks, relationships, and the world around us.

The journey is also life itself. We can enjoy the steps of a project without making all our satisfaction dependent on its completion. Gratitude and presence are possibilities, not emotional obligations.

The Present Is Not an Ideal of Perfect Attention

The mind remembers and anticipates because these functions help us live. If we try to banish them in order to remain continually present, we impose a form of vigilance that contradicts the spontaneity we seek. A person can cook while remembering a conversation and still experience the act of cooking. There is no moral boundary between being present and being distracted. The proposal is to notice when inner discourse monopolizes our attention without offering anything useful and to allow other ways of experiencing life.

The Ambiguous Value of Everyday Tasks

Cooking, cleaning, or looking after a space can be satisfying and may support practical autonomy. They can also be burdensome, repetitive, or unfairly distributed. Their philosophical value must not be used to demand that a particular person perform them. We may share tasks, hire help, or organize them collectively. What matters is that the decision is sufficiently free and that we recognize the work that makes everyday life possible, whether we perform it ourselves or others perform it.

Presence and Suffering

There are days when the present contains pain, grief, or worry. Telling someone to enjoy the moment can become a cruel demand. Being in touch with experience does not mean finding it pleasant.

Sometimes the responsible response is to seek protection, company, treatment, or simply rest. The possibility of enjoying existence also depends on circumstances we did not choose. Gratitude may arise spontaneously; it should never be required as the correct response.

The Path Is Made by Walking—and Also by Pausing

A project can fill the future with expectations. Recognizing the journey as experience means that learning, correction, and rest are not merely obstacles between ourselves and the final outcome. Sometimes changing direction reveals a more accurate understanding of our abilities. Even abandoning a goal can be a free choice when done with discernment. The path is not simply uninterrupted progress: it also includes the possibility of observing and deciding anew.

Chapter 18. Thinking in Order to Understand and Act

Imagination allows us to conceive possibilities and anticipate projects. Turning an idea into reality requires considering resources, abilities, and risks. Some difficulties become apparent only during implementation; experience may correct our predictions.

An ambitious goal may be reasonable if it allows for stages of learning and revision. Realism does not mean resignation. We may also abandon or transform projects when their costs are no longer appropriate.

Creativity encompasses free imagination and practical realization. An idea may be valuable even if it never becomes a product. When we choose to pursue it, we should consider resources, risks, stages, and opportunities for correction.

Ambition is not incompatible with simplicity. We may undertake difficult work out of genuine interest and enjoy the steps involved. The problem arises when the expected outcome becomes the only condition for our satisfaction or an obligation to perform without pause.

Personal fulfillment may emerge from creating, researching, repairing, or understanding. It need not be measured exclusively by money, recognition, or productivity. Theoretical reflection and contemplation also have value without immediate results.

Activity itself can become another dependency when we feel we must always be productive. Thinking in order to act does not forbid us from stopping. We may persevere, change pace, rest, and enjoy our existence without producing anything.

Stopping can be as rational as persevering. The cost of continuing, new information, and our commitments should all enter into that decision. We do not need to prove determination by maintaining projects that no longer make sense.

Creativity Is Not Exhausted by Production

We can imagine possibilities without immediately turning them into products, income, or recognition. An exploratory conversation, reading a work, or considering a still-immature hypothesis may be valuable in itself. Our defense of thought oriented toward action should not disparage such processes. The relevant difference is not between thinking and producing, but between exploring freely and becoming trapped in a repetition we no longer want. Contemplation, too, can be a form of fulfillment.

A Project and the Conditions for Its Feasibility

A difficult aspiration is not necessarily unrealistic. We can divide it into stages, identify missing capabilities, seek cooperation, and define indicators that would justify continuing or revising our approach. Reasonable ambition accommodates uncertainty. Anyone building something over the long term must consider not only the result but also resources, time, and personal costs. A goal may deserve great effort without turning that effort into unlimited sacrifice. Planning should serve our life project, not replace it.

Sufficient Action, Not Permanent Activation

At times we confuse subjective energy, urgency, and genuine readiness to act. An exciting idea can lead us to ignore fatigue. At other times responsibility requires us to act even without enthusiasm. Flowing with the body means examining these differences: listening to signals, comparing them with context, and adjusting our effort. It does not mean always waiting for spontaneous inspiration, but avoiding a situation in which every action depends on excitement or self-imposition. Rest belongs to the same life as work.

The Decision to Finish

Knowing when to conclude an activity deserves as much attention as knowing how to begin it. We may spend indefinite time perfecting a task because we fear judging the outcome insufficient. In other cases, we persist because of what we have already invested, although the circumstances have changed. Stopping may be a reasonable decision: delivering a sufficiently good version, changing projects, or resting. Personal fulfillment does not depend on keeping every possibility open. Choosing also means accepting limits and relinquishing alternatives.

PART V · PHILOSOPHICAL SYNTHESIS

Chapter 19. Freedom and Its Limits

Freedom is exercised in concrete circumstances: bodily, economic, legal, and social conditions can facilitate or restrict our options, and not all of them depend on our decisions. A philosophy that attributed every personal difficulty to a lack of initiative would therefore be ethically unjust and conceptually incomplete.

Personal autonomy coexists with the rights of other people. Being able to decide to do something does not establish that doing it is justified. Recognizing comparable freedom in others offers a starting point of reciprocity and non-domination, although it does not resolve every moral conflict.

The freedom we defend is not exhausted by the absence of interference. Berlin (1958) distinguished meanings of liberty that help us formulate this limit; Sen (1999) examined the importance of capabilities and real opportunities; and Pettit (1997) developed freedom as non-domination. Our distinction among capacity, dependence, and subordination enters into dialogue with these approaches without claiming to be reducible to any of them. With Sen it shares the view that capacity

matters, not merely its exercise; with Pettit, an awareness of dependence on another person's arbitrary will. Its purpose is more modest and practical: to distinguish, in everyday decisions, dependencies that do not diminish autonomy from those that become subordination.

Philosophical Dialogue: Pluralism and Relativism

The diversity of experiences, cultures, and doctrines does not logically imply that every form of conduct is morally justifiable. We must distinguish the descriptive fact of disagreement, metaethical theses concerning moral truth, and the normative question of the limits of tolerance. Defending freedom of conscience requires arguing why coercion, manipulation, or unjustified harm may be restricted without turning doctrinal disagreement into an offense. These distinctions form part of contemporary philosophical debate without, by themselves, settling all its controversies (Gowans, 2026).

Understanding individual and collective circumstances does not mean approving every behavior. Disagreements may require mediation, fair procedures, and effective protection. Empathy helps us assess perspectives, but it cannot replace institutions or safeguards.

Reciprocity Is Not Merely a Slogan

If we claim freedom to choose our beliefs, we must explain why arbitrarily denying that possibility to others would be legitimate. The argument from reciprocity begins by recognizing that other people have interests, experiences, and vulnerabilities of their own. The fact that a preference is ours does not automatically give it priority over a comparable preference held by someone else. This reasoning does not resolve every moral disagreement: rights can conflict, abilities can differ, and responsibilities can be asymmetrical. Nevertheless, it prevents us from justifying an imposition solely on the basis of our membership or convictions. It calls for reasons that can be examined beyond the group that puts them forward.

Understanding Does Not Remove the Need for Protection

Understanding the causes of a behavior can help us prevent its recurrence. But recognizing the history of a person who causes harm does not authorize us to abandon the person who suffers it. An ethics of empathy that attended exclusively to the aggressor would be incomplete. We can consider circumstances while demanding protection, reparation, or proportionate intervention. Forgiveness must not be imposed on victims as proof of maturity. Nor does tolerance require acceptance of coercion or violence. Respecting people and critically evaluating their actions are compatible demands.

Religious Neutrality and Precise Criticism

Freedom of conscience protects both the possibility of believing and the possibility of not believing. A secular philosophy need not become generally hostile to religions. Religious traditions and communities have performed varied functions; to evaluate a controlling practice or conditional assistance, we must identify specific conduct, context, alternatives, and consequences. Emergency aid offered without conditions differs from essential support tied to accepting a doctrine. Criticism gains rigor when it describes that distinction and loses value when it turns all believers into a morally homogeneous category.

The Limits of This Philosophy Itself

The criticism of dogmatism must apply to this very work. If self-sufficiency is presented as a universal obligation, if rest becomes a technique that we must perform perfectly, or if readers are required to share the interpretation offered here, the book contradicts its purpose. An open philosophy is not devoid of principles: it provides arguments for them and recognizes that they can be revised. Readers retain the freedom to question our conclusions. The aim of this work is to help them think, not to secure their allegiance.

The Objection of Insufficient Consent

Formal acceptance does not always express autonomy. A person may agree to conditions because they lack viable material alternatives. For example, someone dependent on indispensable assistance may feel obliged to accept ideological demands in order to retain it. The mere possibility of refusing an offer does not settle whether the choice is sufficiently free. We should examine vulnerability, available information, the severity of the need, and the cost of saying no. This qualification alters our criticism of paternalism: we must neither arbitrarily override another person's will nor pretend that every apparently voluntary transaction is free from pressure. Responsible assistance avoids exploiting dependence to obtain allegiance.

Justice Cannot Be Reduced to Good Intentions

Reciprocity provides an initial reason to limit our conduct, but it must be translated into procedures and safeguards. Two people can act with sincere intentions while holding incompatible interpretations of how a resource should be distributed. Recommending empathy alone will not suffice: rules must be agreed, needs examined, and those bearing the consequences allowed to participate in decisions. Justice asks not only what we wish to offer or receive, but also how benefits, burdens, and opportunities are distributed. An existential philosophy centered on the individual cannot resolve these institutional questions on its own; acknowledging that limit prevents self-sufficiency from being presented as a universal answer.

Freedom as an Effective Opportunity

Having a right to engage in an activity is not the same as possessing the means to pursue it. We may say that someone is free to learn, work, or travel and then discover that physical, economic, or social barriers severely constrain their real options. This does not make every limitation an injustice, but it requires us to distinguish natural constraints, historical circumstances, and collective decisions that can be changed. The ideal of autonomy defended here is compatible with removing unjustified obstacles and with lasting support for those who need it. A person's worth does not depend on how much they can do without assistance.

Chapter 20. Life as Experience, Not as Doctrine

A philosophy that questions rigid ideas risks becoming another doctrine. If we require readers to be self-sufficient, remain calm, enjoy the present, or create without rest, we reproduce the very subordination we set out to resist.

We defend freedom of conscience, for religious belief and its absence alike, as a normative principle. Its concrete legal protection depends on the applicable legal system and on whether its provisions are effectively upheld. Criticism should address arguments and practices of coercion or imposition, without attributing dogmatism to entire communities. Understanding does not imply approval or giving up the protection of those who suffer abuse.

The body is not an oracle, and presence is not surveillance. We can examine every principle in this book, including self-sufficiency, without treating any of them as commandments. Their value lies in the questions they illuminate and the reasonable possibilities they open.

Disagreement Among Reasonable People

Two people may honestly examine their convictions, understand relevant arguments, and still disagree. Freedom of conscience requires admitting this possibility without concluding that both claims must be true. We can test evidence, challenge inferences, and acknowledge uncertainty, yet agreement will not always follow. This philosophy must therefore not confuse respect for a person with the suspension of all criticism. We respect each individual's capacity to form their own judgment while retaining the possibility of explaining why we regard a claim as mistaken or a practice as unjustified. Mature coexistence needs both capacities.

An Example That Prevents Presence from Becoming a Command

Imagine someone who cares every day for a dependent person and has very little free time. Telling that caregiver to enjoy every moment or to cook personally in the name of self-sufficiency may ignore the burden they actually bear. Their freest decision may be to delegate a task, request respite, or devote the available time to rest. A philosophical maxim is useful only when applied with discernment. When it creates guilt for failing to achieve an abstract ideal, it has ceased to guide freedom and has begun to restrict it.

Criteria for Revising This Work

The openness of our proposal cannot rest solely on a declaration of modesty. We must say what would require us to correct it. An argumentative contradiction, a systematically harmful consequence, an unjustified generalization about human groups, or empirical evidence contrary to a factual claim are reasons to revise a passage. The author's preferences for how to live must, for their part, be recognized as preferences rather than raised without argument into universal norms. Readers may disagree with the ways in which we find fulfillment and still retain their full autonomy. This willingness to revise is part of the thesis itself, not a concession added at the end of the book.

Chapter 21. Self-Sufficiency, Responsibility, and Presence

This volume began by distinguishing life from the explanations we construct about it. Experience is mediated by our embodiment, and our knowledge is revisable. Beliefs can guide us, but rigid identification with them can narrow our freedom.

Self-sufficiency invites us to develop the capacities available to us without denying interdependence. Responsibility requires us to attend to our decisions and to the freedoms of others. Presence reminds us that living is not only preparation for a future: it is also the everyday journey.

Self-sufficiency, responsibility, and the here and now are orientations, not commandments. Their relationship is dynamic: capacities expand possibilities, responsibility considers consequences, and presence prevents the whole of life from becoming a wait for an ideal future.

We can think in order to understand, act in order to accomplish, reconsider mistakes, and rest without demanding perfection of ourselves. We can need other people and remain active participants in our own existence. We can choose solitude and build relationships without contradiction.

Three Principles and a Shared Limit

Self-sufficiency, responsible freedom, and presence support one another, but none can resolve every dimension of existence. Self-sufficiency expands our capacities without eliminating the need for cooperation; responsibility guides our decisions without allowing us to foresee every consequence; presence returns us to experience without replacing knowledge of the past or planning for the future. Their shared limit is the temptation to turn them into recipes. The principles work as practical questions, not automatic answers: What can I really choose? Whom does this decision affect? What am I experiencing as I make it?

A Scene of Ordinary Freedom

A person ends a working day feeling tired. They had planned to make progress on a personal project but realize that they need rest. They can acknowledge the importance of commitment, consider whether they have an immediate obligation to others, and decide to postpone the task without punishing themselves. The following day, feeling more ready, they return to the project, encounter a difficulty, and ask for specialist help. None of these actions contradicts their autonomy: deciding, resting, continuing, and cooperating are all possible ways of exercising it. Freedom lies not in always following the original plan, but in taking responsible part in revising it.

The Book Does Not Replace Life

We do not need to recall these pages while performing every activity. Reflection has served its purpose when it helps us recognize a dependency, understand a conflict, or make a more informed decision. Then we can leave it behind. The kitchen is once again simply a kitchen; a walk, a walk; silence, silence. We can also return to these ideas when a new difficulty arises. An open philosophy accompanies life without trying to administer it. If it invites readers to think for themselves, it must accept that each may continue along a different path.

The book does not demand allegiance. Its value will depend on whether it helps us examine arguments, recognize unjustified dependencies, and exercise freedom compatible with the freedom of others. As Antonio Machado wrote in “*Proverbios y cantares*,” the path is made by walking.

References and Further Reading

• Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Wisco, B. E., and Lyubomirsky, S. (2008). Rethinking rumination. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(5), 400–424. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00088.x> • Neff, K. D. (2023). Self-compassion: Theory, method, research, and intervention. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 74, 193–218. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-032420-031047> • Desmedt, O., Luminet, O., Walentynowicz, M., and Corneille, O. (2023). The new measures of interoceptive accuracy: A systematic review and assessment. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 153, 105388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2023.105388> • Garfinkel, S. N., Seth, A. K., Barrett, A. B., Suzuki, K., and Critchley, H. D. (2015). Knowing your own heart: Distinguishing interoceptive accuracy from interoceptive awareness. *Biological Psychology*, 104, 65–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2014.11.004> • Watkins, E. R. (2008). Constructive and unconstructive repetitive thought. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(2), 163–206. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.2.163>

Philosophical Sources for Context

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945). *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Gallimard.

Toadvine, T. (2023). Maurice Merleau-Ponty. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/merleau-ponty/>

Christman, J. (2025). Autonomy in Moral and Political Philosophy. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/autonomy-moral/>

- Gowans, C. (2026). Moral Relativism. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/moral-relativism/>
- Kant, I. (1784). Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung? Berlinische Monatsschrift.
- Fromm, E. (1941). Escape from Freedom. Farrar & Rinehart.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1946). L'existentialisme est un humanisme. Nagel.
- Berlin, I. (1958). Two Concepts of Liberty. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sen, A. (1999). Development as Freedom. Oxford University Press.
- Pettit, P. (1997). Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government. Oxford University Press.
- Epictetus. Enchiridion (Handbook), §1. Canonical reference to the ancient text; no particular English translation is cited.
- Machado, A. (1917). "Proverbios y cantares," XXIX, in Campos de Castilla (expanded edition).

THE FREEDOM TO EXIST

Volume II

The Art of Understanding

Empathy, Equanimity, and Coexistence

Juan Segurola

First edition · v1.0 · EN

© 2026 Juan Segurola
All Rights Reserved

Preface · Understanding without domination

Understanding another person is not the same as adopting their interpretation of events. It is an inquiry into what they have lived, what they believe, and what circumstances make a course of action intelligible. That inquiry can be careful without presuming access to another person's inner life.

This volume explores the tension between empathy and impartial judgment, between care and autonomy, and between individual goodwill and institutions. Its central claim is modest: coexistence improves when listening, evidence, proportional responsibility, and limits are practiced together rather than turned into competing absolutes.

The chapters are philosophical arguments, not clinical protocols or claims that one moral framework can settle every case. Illustrative situations are not empirical findings. Ethical conclusions depend on circumstances, including power, consent, safety and the claims of third parties.

I. The difficulty of understanding

1. Understanding without taking possession of another person's experience

To understand another person is not to become that person. We never gain direct possession of someone else's sensations, memories, fears, or intentions. What we have are their words, their gestures, the situation in which we encounter them, and our own fallible attempts to interpret what they communicate. This limitation is not a defect that can be eliminated by greater sensitivity. It is a permanent feature of life among distinct people, and one reason why ethical understanding calls for humility.

We often speak as though empathy could dissolve the distance between two lives: "I know exactly how you feel." Such confidence can be comforting, but it can also conceal an appropriation. The speaker may substitute a familiar experience for what the other person is actually living. Similar circumstances do not guarantee similar meanings. The loss of a job, a disagreement with a parent, or a sudden illness can be endured with grief, relief, shame, fear, or several feelings at once. The other person's response need not replicate our own in order to deserve attention.

Understanding therefore begins with a double movement. We approach the other person closely enough to care about what is happening, while maintaining enough distance to avoid treating our interpretation as their truth. Closeness without restraint risks projection; distance without concern becomes indifference. An attentive relationship requires both. We may offer a tentative interpretation—"It sounds as though that conversation left you feeling excluded"—and remain ready for the reply: "No; I felt angry because I was not allowed to explain." The correction is not a failure of empathy. It is one of its conditions.

Listening is more demanding than remaining silent while planning our answer. It includes noticing what has been said, what remains uncertain, and what we are adding ourselves. We should distinguish observation from inference: a person who avoids eye contact may be uncomfortable, distracted, tired, or simply accustomed to a different conversational style. An interpretation may be reasonable without being established. Asking a careful question is often more respectful than offering a confident diagnosis of someone's motives.

There is also an asymmetry that moral advice can overlook. The person who describes an experience may not be able, willing, or safe to explain everything. Trauma, fear of retaliation, linguistic barriers, and unequal authority can all affect what can be shared. Respecting another person's perspective does not mean demanding disclosure. Sometimes the appropriate response is to acknowledge uncertainty, make a practical offer, and leave the decision in their hands. Privacy is not an obstacle to be conquered by an insistence on intimacy.

Empathy does not, by itself, settle the question of what is right. We can understand why someone acted harshly without endorsing the harm. We can recognise an offender's fear while affirming the injured person's right to safety and redress. Conversely, intense identification with one individual may narrow our attention and leave out people beyond that relationship. Caring well calls for more than feeling strongly: it requires evidence, proportion, fair consideration of those affected, and attention to consequences.

It is useful here to distinguish three activities. First, we try to grasp what another person reports and the context in which their experience takes shape. Second, we evaluate claims about events using the best information available. Third, we judge actions and responsibilities in light of ethical commitments. These activities influence one another, but they should not be confused. A sincere account of distress deserves respectful attention; it does not automatically establish every factual inference attached to it. An accurate account of events, in turn, does not remove the need for moral judgment.

The body complicates these distinctions without dissolving them. Our reactions—tightness in the chest, agitation, withdrawal, or a moment of ease—can alert us to what a conversation means to us. They are not instruments that reveal another person's hidden intentions. Someone may make us uneasy because they have behaved threateningly, because they resemble a person from our past, or because we are exhausted. Bodily awareness is useful when treated as information about our own state, rather than as infallible proof about the world.

Consider an ordinary disagreement between colleagues. One insists that a deadline is unrealistic; the other hears this as a lack of commitment. If both defend their initial interpretations, the discussion can rapidly become a contest over character. A different response would separate the shared practical problem from the attribution of motives: Which tasks remain? What resources are available? What is the consequence of delay? Each person can state a concern without claiming to know what the other secretly intends. Understanding does not guarantee agreement, but it can prevent unnecessary humiliation.

The same care is required in closer relationships. Loving someone does not confer authority over their inner life. A friend can say, “I am worried about you,” without insisting, “You are afraid of change, and that is why you refuse.” A parent can attend seriously to a child’s account without abandoning the duties appropriate to the child’s age or safety. A person receiving support can value that help and still disagree about the best course of action. Respectful understanding protects agency even where people depend on one another.

No universal conversational formula can substitute for context. Sometimes an explicit question is welcome; at other times it burdens someone already overwhelmed. Sometimes disagreement should be spoken clearly; at other times an immediate interruption is needed to prevent harm. Power matters: an employee may not be able to contradict a manager as freely as a manager can contradict an employee. Advice that assumes equal freedom can unintentionally reinforce the very inequalities it seeks to soften.

Nor is understanding an obligation to remain in a harmful relationship. A person may comprehend the history, insecurity, or suffering that contributes to another’s conduct and still need distance, protection, or legal intervention. Explaining behaviour does not transfer responsibility from the person who acts to the person who is harmed. The ethical task is not to dissolve every boundary in the name of compassion, but to judge which forms of contact are possible without abandoning dignity and safety.

We also need the humility to revise our judgments of ourselves. When someone challenges our account of a conversation, an immediate defensive impulse may appear: we remember what we intended, and we want that intention to settle the matter. Yet intentions and effects can diverge. We can acknowledge an unwanted effect, offer repair, and clarify our intention without declaring ourselves wholly guilty or wholly innocent. This is the practical work of coexistence, not a demand for perpetual self-accusation.

The art of understanding, then, is neither mind-reading nor endless agreement. It is a disciplined openness to another person’s reality, combined with a willingness to test interpretations, protect boundaries, and accept the responsibilities that follow from our actions. It makes room for curiosity without surrendering judgment, and for disagreement without reducing the other person to an enemy. Its first lesson is simple but difficult: another life is always more than the story we tell ourselves about it.

Imagine someone remaining silent in a meeting. Reading silence as agreement may be as premature as reading it as fear. Responsible understanding asks what conditions allow people to speak, distinguishes the absence of objection from consent, and accepts that the person may choose not to disclose their reasons. The interpretation remains revisable.

2. Listening Before Interpreting

Listening is a form of attention that temporarily suspends the urge to decide the meaning of what we hear. It does not require us to abandon judgment or accept every account as true. It means allowing a person to express an experience before turning it into a familiar category: exaggeration, complaint, threat, irresponsibility, or lack of interest.

Interpretation is unavoidable and may be useful. We recognise patterns, anticipate risks, and connect what we hear to prior knowledge. The problem arises when we treat an initial interpretation as though it were a direct observation. “You arrived late” describes a fact that can be checked; “you do not care about our time” attributes an intention for which the evidence is far less certain. Confusing these statements often closes the conversation.

Careful listening distinguishes what was said, what we suppose was meant, and what it made us feel. This separation is particularly difficult when a conversation touches an old wound. One person says they need to be alone; the other hears rejection. The emotional reaction is real, but it does not establish that the first person intended exclusion or punishment.

Questions can open understanding when they do not become interrogation. “Which part worries you most?” leaves room to clarify a problem; “why do you always do this?” presents an accusation as a question. Form matters, though no technique guarantees a response. At times a person needs silence, time, or assurance that disagreement will not be punished.

Listening also requires attention to our position in the relationship. Under a hierarchy, an invitation to speak may not be free when the questioner controls pay, evaluation, or continued employment. Meaningful listening requires conditions: the possibility of saying no, protection against retaliation, and readiness to revise decisions. Kindness without such conditions is insufficient.

Silence calls for cautious interpretation. Not speaking can signify agreement, disagreement, exhaustion, prudence, fear, a lack of words, or simply a wish for privacy. Respect does not consist in confidently decoding silence. It means acknowledging that we do not know its meaning and declining to exploit that uncertainty.

Nor does listening oblige us to absorb another person’s distress indefinitely. We may establish times, request a pause, and recognise our limits without neglecting responsibilities that genuinely belong to us. Caring for a conversation also means caring for the conditions that make it sustainable.

In a household disagreement, for instance, one person says they shoulder too many tasks. The defensive response immediately lists the other person’s contributions. A more fruitful listener asks for examples, checks the actual distribution of work, and allows changes to be negotiated. Validating a feeling is not enough: if there is a verifiable inequality, listening should lead to reconsidering facts and practices.

Learning to listen, then, means delaying our appropriation of another person’s words. It is neither passivity nor submission but a discipline of attention that

distinguishes experience, evidence, interpretation, and decision. Such a pause can make fairer disagreement and better-informed action possible.

Listening requires checking both the content and the setting of a conversation. In a family disagreement, paraphrasing what we heard and asking whether we understood it can repair misunderstandings; yet this does not justify demanding endless explanations. Listening loses its value when it becomes interrogation or a requirement to disclose private matters.

3. Empathy, Difference, and the Limits of Projection

Empathy is often celebrated as though we could feel another person's life from within. In reality, even when we recognise a familiar emotion, the other person's biography, body, culture, and circumstances prevent perfect equivalence. Similarity can bring us closer; it can also tempt us to project our motives onto a situation that is not ours.

When someone loses a job, we may remember our own financial uncertainty. That memory may make us more attentive, but it does not entitle us to assume that the person experiences the same mixture of shame, relief, anger, or fear. Help improves when we move from "I know what you need" to a respectful question about what the person considers useful.

Not all differences are visible. The same situation affects people unequally depending on available resources, caring responsibilities, disability, legal security, or access to support. Understanding requires attention to those conditions without reducing anyone to a label. Two people who share a social circumstance may differ profoundly in priorities and aspirations.

Projection can even wear a benevolent appearance. We decide that someone "should" feel grateful for our assistance or that their refusal proves they do not understand their own good. At that point, apparent empathy approaches paternalism. Offering support respects autonomy when it permits preferences to be expressed, interventions to be declined, and arrangements to be reconsidered, within limits justified by safety and duties of care.

There is also a difference between emotional resonance and deliberate understanding. Sharing another person's pain may mobilise us, but it can also overwhelm us or favour someone who feels familiar. Ethical attention should not depend solely on how strongly a face or a story moves us. We can recognise legitimate needs even without an intense emotional response.

That distinction matters in public decisions. A moving narrative can reveal an injustice hidden by statistics, while rigorous evaluation can reveal people absent from familiar stories. Responsible understanding needs both perspectives: sensitivity to particular lives and critical examination of the wider effects of decisions.

These distinctions can be placed in dialogue with two different approaches. Edith Stein's account of empathy (1917) distinguishes access to another person's experience from living that experience as one's own. Paul Bloom (2016) warns that

affective empathy can focus attention selectively and may be a poor guide to impartial moral decisions. The argument developed here is not derived from either author: it treats empathy as a possible way of approaching another person, while requiring evidence, proportionate judgment, and fairness.

Empathy also needs boundaries. We are not required to guess thoughts or endanger our integrity to demonstrate understanding. Understanding the circumstances of someone who uses pressure or violence does not turn their demands into entitlements over us. Protection and distance may be compatible with humane judgment.

When we do not know what another person feels, acknowledging this is a strength, not a moral defect. We can say that we do not fully understand, ask without demanding disclosure, and offer assistance that can be withdrawn or adapted. Prudence matters especially when unequal power makes it difficult to refuse our proposals.

Mature empathy does not seek to erase difference. It allows us to remain attentive to an experience we do not own, revise inferences when evidence changes, and act considerately without usurping another person's voice.

Two people may assign different meanings to the same bodily or social experience. One shares a story seeking recognition; another seeks practical help. Before choosing a response, it is reasonable to ask what kind of support is wanted. Even a well-intentioned response may fail when it replaces expressed needs with the observer's preferences.

4. Understanding Is Not Justification

One persistent obstacle to understanding conflict is the fear that explaining conduct amounts to excusing it. Seeking the reasons why someone acted harmfully can make us appear indifferent to the person harmed. Yet explanation, evaluation, and response are separate tasks. Precisely by distinguishing them, we can examine causes honestly and take just consequences seriously.

To understand conduct is to reconstruct, from available evidence, the circumstances, beliefs, and decisions that contributed to it. To justify it is to claim that the conduct was acceptable under a moral or legal standard. A causal explanation may be accurate while also revealing that an action violated rights or caused harm that calls for repair.

Consider someone who humiliates a colleague out of fear of losing their position. Fear may be a relevant explanation, but it does not make humiliation legitimate. Ignoring the fear might prevent us from changing the competitive environment that encourages abuse. Attending only to the fear leaves the humiliated person unprotected. Understanding requires both dimensions.

A fair assessment considers intention, knowledge, genuine alternatives, severity of harm, and conditions of coercion. Not everyone has the same range of choices; nor does all responsibility disappear when circumstances are difficult. The ethical task

is to avoid both automatic condemnation and automatic absolution. Sometimes uncertainty must be acknowledged and judgment revised.

The distinction also applies to ourselves. Knowing why we responded in anger does not undo a hurtful remark. We can acknowledge exhaustion, shame, or a history of fear while still apologising, changing conduct, and repairing what we can. Self-compassion ceases to be responsible when it becomes a means of evading those obligations.

In abusive situations, insisting that the person harmed should “understand” the aggressor can reproduce the injustice. Understanding must not become a one-sided demand to relinquish boundaries, reportable facts, or protection. A person who has suffered harm retains the right to prioritise safety and decide what relationship, if any, to maintain.

Institutions need this distinction too. Investigating the social causes of conduct does not deny individual agency, while sanctioning without examining context can produce disproportionate or ineffective responses. A reasonable approach combines fair procedures, verifiable evidence, proportionality, prevention, and opportunities for repair where appropriate.

Understanding does not demand neutrality in the face of cruelty. We can hear different accounts without pretending that all are equally supported. We can respect the dignity of persons while rejecting false claims, threats, or practices of domination. Equanimity is not indifference: it is the attempt to judge carefully even when a firm protective decision is needed.

Ultimately, understanding and accountability are not enemies. More accurate understanding lets us address causes, establish proportionate boundaries, and avoid simplistic attributions. The aim is not to soften every consequence but to prevent our rejection of harm from blurring the distinctions among facts, explanations, justifications, and responses.

II. Judgment and equanimity

5. Disagreement Without Contempt

To disagree with someone is not to regard them as less worthy of respect. This distinction seems simple, yet it blurs when an opinion becomes a badge of belonging, a threat to our identity, or a judgment about who we are. We then argue to defend a personal position rather than to understand what is at stake.

Disagreement may arise because we have different information, interpret the same facts differently, or assign incompatible priorities to legitimate goods. It helps to identify which of these levels supports the dispute. A dispute about facts calls for evidence; one about values calls for clarification of reasons and consequences; one about interests may require negotiation.

Listening does not require treating every claim as equally valid. A position supported by strong evidence is not equivalent to an unsupported assertion.

Respect for the person making a claim requires precisely that we be able to examine the claim without confusing its validity with the speaker's dignity.

Contempt reduces the other person to a caricature. Instead of a complex human being, they come to stand for a defect: ignorance, selfishness, naivety, or bad faith. This simplification makes it difficult to recognize their partial reasons, doubts, or capacity to change their mind. It also shields us artificially from revising our own view.

Not every conflict is symmetrical. When someone coerces, discriminates against, or denies another person basic rights, demanding calm dialogue from the person harmed may itself be unjust. Rejecting contempt is not the same as giving up denunciation, firm boundaries, protest, or institutional avenues of protection.

We can begin a conversation by distinguishing what we think we heard from what was actually said. Restating another person's position in terms they recognize helps identify the precise disagreement. Asking "What evidence would change your mind?" is meaningful if we are willing to answer the same question ourselves.

Some discussions should not continue. Repetition, aggression, or an absence of good faith can turn an exchange into a source of exhaustion without learning. Ending a conversation clearly and proportionately is compatible with recognizing the other person's humanity. No one owes unlimited attention to someone who violates their boundaries.

In living together, the reasonable goal is not always consensus. Sometimes it is enough to agree on shared procedures, prevent harm, and sustain a civil relationship despite enduring disagreements. Mutual respect does not require identical beliefs: it requires recognizing that our differences unfold in a shared space.

Disagreeing without contempt is therefore an intellectual discipline and an ethical practice. It asks for precision in argument, caution when attributing motives, and firmness in the face of harm. It cannot guarantee harmony; it can, at least, prevent conflict from destroying the possibility of understanding at the outset.

Respectful disagreement does not require pretending that every assertion has equal evidence. For testable claims, we can ask for reasons and correct facts; for value conflicts, we can identify competing interests. Respect is owed to persons, not to an exemption of their arguments from criticism.

6. Equanimity in Conflict

Equanimity is not the absence of emotion. Anger at injustice, fear in the face of danger, or grief after a loss may inform our decisions. What requires care is not experiencing these emotions but mistaking their intensity for the accuracy of our interpretation or for proof that we should act immediately.

In conflict, the body may respond before we have formed a complete explanation. Breathing, attention, and tone of voice change; the range of options we perceive can narrow. Noticing these signals can help us decide whether to respond now, ask

for a pause, or seek support. Bodily sensations deserve attention, but they are not infallible evidence of another person's intentions.

Equanimity means holding several questions together: What happened? What do I actually know? What am I assuming? What harm might my words cause? What duties do I have to myself and others? The aim is not to postpone decisions indefinitely but to keep subjective urgency from replacing judgment.

Balance does not mean distributing blame or merit equally. In situations involving abuse or unequal power, automatic neutrality may reinforce harm. Equanimity requires listening and checking facts, but also identifying responsibilities, asymmetries, and conditions of safety. Calm evaluation need not entail a weak response when protection is required.

A pause can help when both parties have a safe way out and delay will not worsen the situation. By contrast, an immediate threat may call for action without prolonged deliberation: seeking help, leaving, or contacting appropriate services. No self-regulation technique should become an obligation to remain in danger.

Equanimity can also be practised after a conflict. We can review what happened without turning each mistake into a condemnation of our identity. Perhaps we were unfair, responded too harshly, or endured more than we should have. Examining these possibilities requires honesty, not self-punishment.

Long-term coexistence benefits from explicit rules: discuss concrete behaviour rather than attacking persons; allow pauses; distinguish requests from threats; agree on how to repair consequences. Such rules matter especially when one person controls resources, information, or decisions that affect another.

Equanimity is compatible with firm boundaries and vivid emotions. It does not aim at an image of perfect calm but at preserving our capacity to perceive, judge, and act in proportion to the facts. Sometimes its clearest expression is a patient conversation; at other times, a decisive refusal.

Equanimity cannot be measured solely by a calm tone of voice. Someone facing injustice may express legitimate anger, while someone who appears calm may be avoiding responsibility. What matters is whether the response preserves the ability to perceive facts, protect those affected, and act proportionately.

7. The Freedom to Say No Without Hostility

Saying no is part of personal autonomy, but its meaning depends on context. A refusal may protect time, health, integrity, or convictions; it may also evade a legitimate duty or unjustly abandon someone who depends on our care. Responsible freedom requires distinguishing these cases before treating every act of resistance as a virtue.

Many people delay a refusal because they fear disappointing expectations. They confuse kindness with permanent availability and assume disagreement will be interpreted as personal rejection. Yet a relationship sustained only while one party agrees to every demand does not rest on robust consent.

A clear refusal often requires less explanation than a lengthy defence. “I cannot take on that task,” “I do not consent to that treatment,” or “I need to reconsider” communicate different boundaries. Courtesy may make it easier for another person to listen, but the right to set a legitimate boundary does not depend on finding a flawless phrase.

We should not confuse an absence of hostility with an absence of conflict. Someone who benefits from our compliance may respond with pressure, guilt, or anger. The fact that a refusal causes discomfort does not prove it unjust. Nor does it prove it right: we still need to examine the commitments and consequences involved.

Reciprocity matters. We can ask others to respect our boundaries while also listening to theirs. Our own boundary is not a licence to disregard agreements, break promises without explanation, or shift responsibilities onto someone else. When a commitment cannot be fulfilled, we should communicate that and seek proportionate alternatives.

In some relationships, saying no carries real risks: economic dependence, coercion, violence, or institutional retaliation. In such cases, the abstract advice to “set boundaries” is insufficient. Safety, available support, and the possibility of leaving the situation must take priority over any ideal of direct confrontation.

Saying no without hostility also means learning to accept another person’s refusal. Not every declined request expresses a lack of love, selfishness, or contempt. The other person may have unseen obligations, personal needs, or priorities unknown to us. Receiving a refusal without demanding unlimited access to their reasons is a form of respect.

The aim is not to say no more often, but to choose more consciously when to accept, negotiate, or refuse. Mature autonomy is measured not by the number of refusals but by the coherence between decisions, responsibilities, and consideration for those who share our lives.

The legitimacy of a boundary also depends on context. Declining a social invitation is not equivalent to abandoning someone dependent on our care. A responsible refusal may require arranging alternatives, communicating in advance, or seeking resources, without turning a duty of care into unlimited availability.

8. Recognizing Our Own Mistakes

Understanding others requires acknowledging that our own interpretations of the world are fallible. We may err in remembering an event, attributing a motive, evaluating conduct, or anticipating an outcome. A willingness to correct ourselves need not weaken our convictions; it can make them more responsible.

Mistakes are difficult to admit when we confuse an opinion with our identity. If revising a belief feels like losing personal worth, every contrary piece of evidence can seem like an attack. Separating our judgment from the dignity we retain creates room to revise hypotheses without abandoning ourselves.

Recognizing a mistake calls for precision. It is not enough to declare vaguely that “no one is perfect” when a concrete decision caused harm. We should establish

what we did, what we knew at the time, what we ought to have checked, and what consequences remain unresolved. An accurate account avoids both automatic excuses and indiscriminate guilt.

Repair is not the same as remorse. An apology may be appropriate, but it does not replace returning what was taken, correcting false information, changing a procedure, or ending harmful behaviour. A person who has been harmed retains the autonomy to decide whether to accept an apology, rebuild trust, or maintain distance.

Not all mistakes have the same gravity. An awkward interpretation in an ordinary conversation is not equivalent to repeated negligence with consequences for others. Responsibility should be proportionate to foreseeability, effective control, duties undertaken, and the harm caused.

Self-compassion, understood as a willingness to acknowledge our vulnerability without denial or cruelty, can make correction possible. It does not require minimizing responsibility. On the contrary, it can prevent fear of being defined by a failure from stopping us from facing it and taking reparative action.

We can cultivate simple habits of review: listen to dissenting voices, keep records when decisions matter, explain what evidence supports our conclusions, and acknowledge a correction publicly when the mistake was public. Intellectual humility requires verifiable practices, not merely statements of intent.

In shared life, admitting mistakes changes our relationship to authority. Someone who never corrects course may project certainty and discourage questions. By contrast, a person who corrects transparently shows that the legitimacy of a decision rests not on the decision-maker's infallibility but on reasons open to review.

Recognizing our mistakes does not mean obsessively reviewing every word or pursuing impossible moral purity. It means remaining ready to learn and repair when sufficient reasons arise. Understanding others more fully often begins by giving up the fiction that our own perspective is without limits.

III. Relationships and care

9. Care, Reciprocity, and Boundaries

Care begins by recognizing that another person has needs and a history that we do not fully know. It is expressed not only in feelings but in sustained attention, practical acts, and the willingness to adjust our conduct. Yet care does not grant ownership of the person we care for. Its quality is measured partly by whether it protects the other person's capacity to speak and choose.

Reciprocity matters because relationships become fragile when responsibility is continually transferred to one side. But reciprocity is not an accounting ledger. A child, a person with significant support needs, or someone facing a temporary crisis may be unable to return care in equal measure. Fairness must be assessed

over time, with attention to capacities, circumstances, and the asymmetries that are sometimes unavoidable.

An ethic of care does not demand unlimited availability. The value of attending to particular needs, explored by Gilligan (1982) and Noddings (1984), must be considered alongside the fair distribution of care work. When one person shoulders every family duty, praising their generosity is not enough: we must ask who can rest, who decides, and what support is missing. The historical association of care with femininity concerns contested social roles; it does not establish an innate moral aptitude based on sex.

Boundaries prevent care from becoming exhaustion, resentment, or coercion. A boundary identifies what one can responsibly offer and what one cannot undertake without disproportionate cost. It should be expressed as clearly as the situation permits: what help is available, for how long, and what alternatives can be sought. Refusing an impossible demand is not necessarily abandoning someone; nevertheless, urgent vulnerability can generate duties that a convenient appeal to personal freedom does not erase.

There is an important distinction between a request and an obligation. Some duties arise from explicit promises, parenthood, professional responsibility, or having caused harm. Others belong to the sphere of voluntary solidarity. Confusing them creates moral pressure; separating them requires judgment rather than a formula. The question is not simply whether I wish to help, but what I owe, what I can do, and who else ought to share the burden.

Consider an older relative who needs increasing assistance. Immediate availability may appear generous, yet an arrangement dependent on a single exhausted family member is often unsafe for everyone. A more responsible response might involve conversations about preferences, accessible services, shared schedules, and periodic review. The aim is neither to withdraw affection nor to promise unlimited availability, but to make care sustainable and accountable.

A relationship becomes more humane when limits can be discussed without humiliation and needs can be named without manipulation. Care, reciprocity, and boundaries are therefore not rival values. They correct one another: care prevents indifference, reciprocity checks exploitation, and boundaries protect the conditions under which help can continue.

In long-term care it is worth asking who decides, who bears the cost, and what support is available. An affectionate relationship can become unsustainable when the entire burden falls on one person. Reciprocity need not mean symmetrical exchange: it may also take the form of recognition, adjusted expectations, and socially shared support.

10. Vulnerability and Autonomy

Human vulnerability is not an exceptional defect affecting only a few people. Bodies change, plans fail, and every life depends at times on knowledge, infrastructure, affection, and material support provided by others. Recognizing this condition does not mean denying agency. It means abandoning the false choice between absolute independence and total dependence.

Autonomy is better understood as the practical ability to participate meaningfully in decisions that affect one's life. That ability can be strengthened by accessible information, time to reflect, communication aids, reasonable accommodations, and trustworthy advice. Dependence on a support person does not automatically transfer the right to decide to that person. Assistance should enlarge the range of real choices wherever possible.

Effective autonomy is tested when someone needs assistance to deliberate, communicate, or carry out a decision. The question is not whether help is present, but whether real opportunities remain to express and revise preferences. The capabilities approach associated with Sen and Nussbaum offers a vocabulary for examining such opportunities; it does not, on its own, supply a rule that resolves every family or clinical disagreement. Where serious risks exist, protective measures require proportionate and reviewable justification.

Vulnerability also creates opportunities for abuse. A person who controls transport, money, medication, communication, or access to information may exercise power even without overt threats. Good intentions are insufficient safeguards. Transparency, independent advice, opportunities to contest decisions, and attention to the person's expressed preferences help prevent support from becoming domination.

Not every choice has the same stakes. Ordinary preferences about clothing, leisure, or social contact should not be overridden merely because observers disagree. Decisions involving serious, foreseeable harm may call for protective measures, but those measures require legal and ethical justification and should be proportionate and as little restrictive as possible. Capacity is often decision-specific and context-sensitive, not an all-or-nothing label.

Imagine a person recovering from an accident who needs daily assistance but wishes to return to work. Treating this wish as naïve ignores personal purpose; promising that everything will be simple ignores genuine obstacles. Respectful support explores accessibility, safety, costs, fatigue, available adaptations, and alternative paths, while keeping the person central to the decision.

A society that takes autonomy seriously must therefore ask not merely whether individuals appear self-sufficient, but whether they have the conditions to exercise a voice. Vulnerability is not the opposite of freedom; it is one of the circumstances within which responsible freedom must be built.

The autonomy of someone who needs assistance is not assessed by counting tasks performed without help. A person may decide clearly what they prefer while needing support to carry it out. A respectful framework distinguishes decision,

execution, and material access, and recognizes that environmental barriers may restrict choices without reducing personal worth or dignity.

11. Helping Without Controlling

Help has an ethical paradox: the more resources or expertise the helper possesses, the easier it becomes to replace the recipient's judgment with the helper's own. What begins as an offer can turn into a rule, and gratitude can be demanded as the price of assistance. To help well, we must distinguish providing means from appropriating another person's purposes.

Before intervening, three questions deserve attention: Has the person asked for help? What kind of help would actually be useful? What risks or obligations would remain if we did nothing? These questions are not a mechanical checklist. Immediate danger may demand action before consent can be obtained; ordinary uncertainty usually calls for listening rather than taking over.

An offer respects autonomy when the recipient can decline it without being punished, shamed, or excluded from other opportunities. Conditions may nevertheless be legitimate: a lender may require repayment, a professional may follow safety procedures, and a public service must apply fair rules. The crucial issue is whether conditions are relevant, transparent, proportionate, and open to scrutiny, rather than hidden instruments of obedience.

Expert knowledge introduces a further responsibility. A clinician, teacher, or technical adviser should communicate what is established, what remains uncertain, and which decisions depend on the other person's values. Simplifying explanations is useful; suppressing reasonable alternatives is not. Professional authority is most defensible when it helps others understand options, not when it shields decisions from questions.

Consider a friend who struggles with debt. Taking control of every purchase may appear effective, but it can produce secrecy and dependency. A less intrusive response may combine an agreed budget, practical information, clear limits on loans, and the freedom to review the arrangement. Where serious risks exist, the degree of intervention should still match the evidence and applicable duties.

Helping without controlling is not passive indifference. It involves effort, patience, sometimes difficult disagreement, and willingness to remain present after an offer is refused. Its ethical ambition is to make the helper progressively less central whenever circumstances permit.

In professional settings, offering clear alternatives and checking understanding protects autonomy better than securing hurried agreement. Consent cannot simply be inferred from a signed form: language, time pressure, unequal information, and the genuine ability to refuse an option all matter.

12. Forgiveness, Repair, and Their Limits

When someone causes harm, several distinct questions arise. What happened? Who is responsible? What can be repaired? What protection is now necessary? Is reconciliation possible or desirable? Treating all these questions as one produces confusion. An apology, forgiveness, restored trust, and reconciliation are different acts; none automatically entails the others.

An apology has moral substance when it identifies the conduct, acknowledges its effects without defensive qualifications, and accepts a feasible duty to change. “I am sorry you felt hurt” may avoid naming what was done. By contrast, taking responsibility requires listening to the person harmed without demanding that they immediately make the offender feel better.

Repair may be material, relational, institutional, or symbolic. It can involve returning money, correcting a false allegation, changing a workplace practice, or acknowledging a public wrong. Some losses cannot be undone. In such cases, honesty about irreversibility is preferable to promises of complete restoration. Where violence or coercion is involved, safety and accountability take priority over pressure to reconcile.

Forgiveness, when freely chosen, may release a person from a consuming desire for retaliation. But it is neither a universal psychological prescription nor an obligation owed to someone who has caused harm. Not forgiving does not prove moral immaturity; forgiving does not require renewed contact. A person may wish another no harm while maintaining firm distance and pursuing lawful remedies.

Restoring trust demands evidence over time. Repeated conduct, transparent agreements, boundaries, and the possibility of independent support matter more than dramatic declarations. In relationships marked by a severe imbalance of power, invitations to “move on” can disguise a demand for silence. The perspective of the harmed person must therefore carry weight in any proposed process of reconciliation.

An ethics of understanding does not dissolve responsibility in compassion. It seeks to understand the conditions of harm precisely so that they can be changed, while preserving the harmed person’s freedom to decide what relationship, if any, remains possible. Sometimes the most humane outcome is renewed cooperation; sometimes it is an honest and protected separation.

IV. Living with pluralism

13. Coexisting Across Different Perspectives

Human plurality is not an anomaly to be corrected before we can live together. People who share a neighborhood, school, workplace, or family may interpret the same events differently even when they have access to similar information. Experiences, expectations, loyalties, and fears act as filters. Acknowledging this does not require abandoning tests against reality: an interpretation may be mistaken, and an action may cause verifiable harm, even when its defender feels that it is profoundly true.

Coexistence begins when we stop treating disagreement as a threat to identity. We can ask what the other person means precisely, what problem they are trying to solve, and which experience they regard as decisive. Such questions do not amount to accepting their conclusions. They help reveal shared assumptions and locate the real point of contention. We often argue over words—respect, justice, freedom, security—that each speaker uses in a different sense.

Understanding other perspectives also requires distinguishing negotiable differences from limits that protect dignity. Tastes, habits, and many life projects allow flexible arrangements. Violence, intimidation, and the arbitrary deprivation of rights are not mere conflicting preferences to be divided evenly. This distinction prevents a misplaced idea of tolerance from turning into indifference toward harm.

Consider two neighbors in conflict over noise. One needs to sleep after a night shift; the other considers musical practice essential. Both have understandable reasons, but neither need automatically cancels the other. Agreeing on hours, exploring sound insulation, and allowing exceptions may be more productive than accusing one another of selfishness or intolerance. Cooperation asks us to translate fixed positions into specific needs without pretending that every interest can be fully satisfied.

Not every difference ends in agreement. Sometimes the responsible outcome is to maintain respectful distance, establish public rules, and keep a process of revision available. Living together does not mean feeling close to everyone or turning each disagreement into friendship. It means creating conditions under which no one must erase their individuality to be treated fairly.

This attitude has an inner dimension. Confidence in our own outlook need not depend on persuading others to reproduce it. We can hold firm convictions, open to revision in the light of evidence, while recognizing that shared life requires intelligible rules and a minimum willingness to reciprocate.

In a plural community, coexistence does not mean erasing profound differences. It means agreeing on procedures for resolving disagreement, protecting rights, and allowing people to hold different convictions. When a position seeks to deny equal freedoms to others, an abstract appeal to tolerance is insufficient; institutional limits must be examined.

14. Dialogue, Evidence, and Reasonable Disagreement

Dialogue is not simply taking turns to deliver speeches. Genuine dialogue requires attention to another person's reasons and a willingness to let some of them alter our understanding. This does not place every opinion on the same epistemic footing. Some claims can be tested, others express preferences, and still others propose values or collective choices. Confusing these levels turns conversation into an endless exchange of subjective certainties.

A basic practice is to identify the kind of question first. When discussing a health or environmental risk, we need data, methods, and an appraisal of uncertainty. When deciding how burdens should be shared, normative criteria also matter: fairness, need, responsibility, and protection of those with the least room to choose. A sound argument makes explicit which facts it assumes and which values it prioritizes.

Reasonable discussion is not merely a tally of arguments without regard to who can make them and who will be believed. Fricker (2007) distinguishes credibility harms connected to prejudice; this calls for listening to testimony without assuming that every perception is accurate. A fair procedure combines respect, scrutiny of evidence, and means to correct mistakes. Invoking "neutrality" when participants risk retaliation can preserve inequality rather than resolve it.

Rigorous listening involves reconstructing another person's position in terms they would recognize before responding. We might ask, "Is it fair to say that your main concern is this?" Often this reveals that we had been arguing against an exaggerated version of their position. Equally, it is legitimate to request precision, expose contradictions, and ask for sources when an assertion purports to describe facts.

Evidence has limits and degrees. Personal experience may disclose an overlooked need or suggest a hypothesis; by itself it does not establish how common a phenomenon is or how effective an intervention will be in general. A published study is not immune to error either. Design, replication, measurement quality, studied populations, and the possibility of contrary findings all matter. Admitting uncertainty is not a weakness in argument: it is a recognition of the actual conditions of knowledge.

In reasonable disagreement, people may reach different conclusions even after sharing the facts. Some give priority to preventing serious harm; others fear excessive restrictions on autonomy. The task is not to declare every criterion neutral, but to set out the costs of each option and explain why a particular solution is proportionate. Deliberation improves when those affected have a voice and understand how a decision will be made.

We must also recognize when dialogue is no longer viable. If one side manipulates evidence, makes threats, or turns every question into a personal attack, continuing without boundaries can enable abuse. Ending a conversation, documenting facts, or seeking mediation does not contradict intellectual openness. Honest dialogue requires both a willingness to learn and protection from coercion.

Deliberation improves when it distinguishes verifiable facts, plausible inferences, and normative preferences. A figure may be verifiable, while its policy implications remain open to discussion. This separation limits the temptation to present a personal value as a technical necessity, or empirical uncertainty as proof that every position is equally defensible.

15. Group Pressure and Independence of Judgment

Belonging offers security, recognition, and opportunities for cooperation. None of these goods is trivial: we need relationships to develop and to withstand difficult periods. Yet the same need to belong can lead us to suppress doubts, repeat an opinion, or join in conduct we would not approve of alone. Conformity is not always imposed by orders; it often appears through disapproving gestures, silence, or implicit promises of acceptance.

Group pressure may be explicit, such as a threat of exclusion, or subtle, such as the expectation that we show enthusiasm for a decision already made. Even communities that celebrate independent thought may punish dissent when it challenges their central symbols. Detecting this pressure means asking which questions can be raised without disproportionate social sanctions, and which doubts disappear from meetings only to reappear in private conversations.

Keeping one's own judgment does not mean automatically rejecting majority views. Collective decisions may draw on information and experience that no single member possesses. Independence means being able to examine reasons, recognize others' expertise, voice reservations, and revise one's position without making it dependent on the rewards or penalties of belonging. An independent person does not need to go against the majority; they need to be able not to.

Imagine a team proposing an improbable delivery date to a customer. Each participant assumes that others possess information justifying the promise, and no one wants to appear uncommitted. A single person asking what evidence supports the schedule may bring shared doubts into the open. Creating spaces in which informed dissent does not invite retaliation improves both decision quality and collective accountability.

Freedom of judgment depends on practical resources: time to think, access to diverse information, relationships beyond the dominant group, and some capacity to endure disapproval. It becomes harder when livelihood, housing, or care depend on an authority able to withdraw support arbitrarily. We should therefore avoid turning resistance to group pressure into a heroic demand placed on those who have the least protection.

Living together well means fostering conditions in which a reasoned objection is heard before it is branded disloyalty. The strongest cohesion is not enforced unanimity, but confidence that disagreement can be expressed and resolved without humiliation.

When a group rewards unanimity, a minority view may disappear from discussion without being rebutted. Supporting dissent requires concrete procedures: opportunities to speak, protection from retaliation, and examination of objections

before decisions. Independence of judgment does not mean ignoring the group, but being able to disagree without exclusion.

16. Institutions, Power, and Unequal Voices

Human relationships do not take place in a vacuum of power. A conversation between equals is not the same as one between employer and employee, clinician and patient, administration and citizen, or adult and child. Institutional rules distribute resources, authority, and opportunities to challenge decisions. Ignoring such asymmetry and merely asking everyone to “listen” can conceal that one party faces much greater costs for speaking.

Authority serves legitimate purposes. Coordinating services, applying specialized knowledge, and protecting rights require decisions to be delegated. Yet the legitimacy of a role does not make every decision of the person holding it unquestionable. Authority should be able to explain its criteria, acknowledge conflicts of interest, correct mistakes, and answer to proportionate procedures of review.

Institutions can offer impersonal rules that protect against favoritism, yet rules alone are insufficient when participation is unequal. Before celebrating an agreement, we should ask who set the agenda, who could challenge it, and what resources existed to appeal decisions. The deliberative ideal is offered here as a normative criterion, not an empirical description of every real institution. Safe withdrawal must also remain possible when negotiation becomes coercive.

Listening to someone in a vulnerable position requires more than granting a few minutes to speak. They must understand the process, receive accessible information, have enough time, and possess a route for complaint without retaliation. Sometimes they need linguistic, technical, or legal support. Participation is meaningful only when it can reasonably influence decisions or, at least, leave a reviewable record of dissent.

Consider someone unable to understand an administrative decision affecting an essential benefit. Repeating regulatory language may satisfy a formality while leaving that person equally defenseless. Explaining reasons clearly, indicating deadlines, and offering an effective appeal turns a one-sided relationship into a more accountable process. Institutional understanding is also measured by an institution’s ability to hear the unforeseen consequences of its own rules.

Power should be neither idealized nor demonized in the abstract. Some restrictions protect people who would otherwise suffer harm through others’ choices; others perpetuate privilege or impose unnecessary control. Evaluating them means asking whom a rule benefits, who bears its costs, what alternatives exist, and whether affected people can challenge it. Equanimity does not mean standing halfway between authority and subordinate; it means assessing reasons and the actual distribution of risks.

An ethics of coexistence links interpersonal courtesy with procedural justice. Listening well matters, but so do the rules that make it possible to speak, dissent,

and seek repair. Without these conditions, appeals to empathy may remain an agreeable ideal that leaves relationships of domination unchanged.

V. Ethics of Shared Existence

17. Justice Beyond Private Goodwill

Goodwill matters, but it cannot replace the conditions that allow people to live with dignity. We may treat someone courteously while taking part in institutions whose rules make it difficult for that person to be heard. An ethics of understanding must attend both to personal conduct and to the structures that distribute power, opportunity, time, and recognition.

Justice does not require everyone to receive exactly the same thing in every circumstance. It requires asking which differences are relevant, which needs demand a response, and whether rules can be justified to those who bear their consequences. Equal respect can coexist with different forms of support when starting circumstances are unequal.

Imagine a service designed for people who have free time, internet access, and administrative skills. Someone lacking any of these resources may be excluded without anyone insulting or treating them with hostility. Listening to their experience helps distinguish an apparently neutral rule from its real effects.

Understanding also requires caution about our own perspective. Not every inequality is, by itself, evidence of injustice, and not every difference can be removed through a simple intervention. We should examine causes, hear those affected, compare alternatives, and consider unintended consequences before claiming to know which reform is right.

Concern for justice does not oblige us to turn every everyday encounter into a moral trial or to assume unlimited responsibilities. We can act within our spheres of influence, cooperate with others, and acknowledge limits of resources and knowledge. A modest contribution need not be an insignificant one.

To understand someone is sometimes to recognize that their difficulty does not arise solely from private choices. Living together improves when courtesy and empathy are accompanied by clear procedures, genuine avenues for appeal, and ways to correct errors made by those who exercise authority.

Justice requires attending not only to the intentions of those who help, but also to conditions that enable or prevent participation. Charitable intervention may relieve an immediate need without changing the barrier that reproduces it. It is therefore worth examining urgent relief, institutional design, and the right of affected people to take part in decisions together.

18. Responsibility, Complicity, and Omission

Our actions have visible consequences, yet we also participate in practices whose effects are distributed among many people. The difficulty of assigning responsibility is no reason to treat every contribution as equivalent. Available knowledge, freedom of choice, degree of involvement, and realistic opportunities to prevent harm all matter.

Deliberately causing an injury is not the same as maintaining a harmful practice through ignorance, fear of losing one's job, or lack of reasonable alternatives. Distinguishing these situations does not automatically excuse any of them; it allows prevention, repair, and necessary changes to be more accurately directed.

Responsibility for structural injustice is not allocated as though everyone caused the same harm. Young (2011) proposes considering our connections to social processes and our capacity to help transform them. This does not replace the concrete duties of someone who has coerced or injured another person. Distinguishing shared political responsibility, legal culpability, and individual repair avoids both indiscriminate exculpation and abstract blame directed at those without power.

Omissions, too, may matter morally. If we witness serious harm and have proportionate means of intervening without creating greater danger, indifference deserves scrutiny. But not everyone has an identical duty to intervene, and a duty to help does not demand unlimited sacrifice of one's safety or that of dependants.

Consider someone who notices repeated errors in access to a service. They might document the errors, report them through a safe channel, request a review, or cooperate with those empowered to correct them. Such responsibility is easier to exercise when institutions protect people who report problems from retaliation.

Diffuse guilt can paralyse us. Blaming ourselves for every injustice in the world obscures what we can actually change; claiming that none of it concerns us obstructs cooperation. Between these extremes lies situated responsibility: examining our practices, taking credible signs of harm seriously, and responding proportionately.

Understanding the pressures that constrain conduct does not remove accountability. A productive ethics of responsibility combines care in attributing fault, support for people who need to change, and a willingness to repair the effects of what has happened.

Not having directly caused harm does not always settle the question of responsibility. The genuine capacity to intervene, the risks of doing so, available information, and one's position all matter. Analysis must avoid two extremes: assigning unlimited guilt for others' suffering and using causal distance as a universal excuse for inaction.

19. Conflict, Cooperation, and Everyday Practices

Living together does not depend only on abstract convictions. It takes shape in repeated habits: how we ask questions, share tasks, respond to interruptions, and react when another person rejects a proposal. These may be small acts, yet their repetition creates a climate of trust or surveillance.

In conflict, it helps to distinguish stated positions, underlying needs, and non-negotiable boundaries. Two people may argue about schedules when the real issue is an unequal distribution of care. Recognizing that difference can open possibilities, though it cannot guarantee a solution acceptable to both.

Cooperation requires reciprocity, but reciprocity cannot always be measured transaction by transaction. A person who is ill may need more help for a time; another may contribute in less visible ways. Fairness must account for abilities and circumstances without requiring anyone to remain indefinitely in an abusive relationship.

One useful practice is to describe events before assigning motives. “We agreed on a task, and it was not done” allows us to ask what happened; “You never care about anyone” closes the exchange with a sweeping accusation. It also helps to make requests that can be checked and to agree when to revisit them, without turning respectful communication into a method of manipulation.

Some conflicts cannot safely be addressed through direct dialogue. Where there are threats, coercion, or a severe imbalance of power, firm boundaries, witnesses, appropriate mediation, or protective mechanisms may be necessary. Insisting on dialogue must not displace safety measures or force a harmed person to reconcile.

Everyday practices cannot, by themselves, resolve institutional inequality, but they can sustain wider changes. Cooperation means building conditions for acting together without demanding unanimity, recognizing others’ contributions, and accepting that some disagreements will persist in civil form.

Everyday cooperation is tested less by grand declarations than by small rules: how tasks are shared, what follows a broken promise, and whether agreements can be revised. Repeated conflict may reveal incompatible unspoken expectations; making them explicit allows negotiation without confusing every disagreement with personal disloyalty.

20. Understanding as an Unfinished Discipline

Understanding is an unfinished task because people change, contexts shift, and no single perspective exhausts what is happening. Empathy may bring us closer to another person’s experience, but it can also mislead us when we mistake our imagination for their testimony.

Equanimity does not mean neutrality in the face of harm or the absence of emotion. It means trying to let emotion inform judgment without monopolizing it, allowing convictions to be examined, and recognizing that firmness need not entail

contempt. It is compatible with denouncing abuse, protecting boundaries, and acting urgently when circumstances require it.

Nor can coexistence rest on a duty to understand everyone at every moment. We need rest, distance, privacy, and freedom to decide with whom we share our lives. Respecting others' autonomy includes accepting that their experience is not ours to claim.

We might summarize this orientation in four revisable movements: listen before concluding, test interpretations against facts, acknowledge the consequences of our actions, and adjust relationships when new information emerges. None offers an infallible formula; together they help resist rigidity.

What this volume explores is connected to personal freedom in the first. Being free does not mean living without obligations; understanding others does not require abandoning our own judgment. Autonomy and coexistence reinforce one another when relationships make room for dissent, cooperation, requests for support, and repair without humiliation.

The art of understanding is, finally, a practice of responsible attention. It promises neither permanent harmony nor a humanity without conflict. It proposes something more modest and more demanding: keeping open the possibility of learning, acting justly when we can, and recognizing the dignity of people we will never know completely.

A responsible discipline of understanding includes the possibility of stopping. Not every relationship can be repaired, and not every interpretation must be resolved before action. Sometimes the best response is to seek more information; at other times it is to establish distance or protect someone at risk. Intellectual openness does not require suspending moral judgment indefinitely.

Scope and interpretive limits

The examples are conceptual scenarios, not empirical studies. Interpretations are the author's own unless expressly attributed.

Bibliography

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics* (ancient). Cambridge University Press, Roger Crisp translation, second edition 2014.

Immanuel Kant. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785). Cambridge University Press, Mary Gregor translation, *Practical Philosophy* (1996).

John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor Mill. *On Liberty: With Related Writings* (Hackett, 2026, edited by P. Norris Turner et al.). Original work 1859.

Hannah Arendt. *The Human Condition* (1958). University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Carol Gilligan. *In a Different Voice* (1982). Harvard University Press, 1982.

Nel Noddings. *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education* (University of California Press, 1984).

Martha C. Nussbaum. *Frontiers of Justice* (2006). Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006.

Amartya Sen. *The Idea of Justice* (2009). Harvard University Press, 2009.

Miranda Fricker. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing* (2007). Oxford University Press, 2007.

Jürgen Habermas. *The Theory of Communicative Action*, vol. 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society (Beacon Press, 1984; translated by Thomas McCarthy; German original 1981).

Iris Marion Young. *Responsibility for Justice* (2011). Oxford University Press, 2011.

Kwame Anthony Appiah. *The Ethics of Identity* (2005). Princeton University Press, 2005.

Edith Stein. *Zum Problem der Einfühlung* (Halle, 1917). English translation: *On the Problem of Empathy*, trans. Waltraut Stein (Washington, DC: ICS Publications, 1989).

Paul Bloom. *Against Empathy: The Case for Rational Compassion* (New York: Ecco, 2016).

THE FREEDOM TO EXIST

Volume III

Less Is More

Self-Sufficiency, Simplicity, and Freedom

Juan Segurola

First edition · v1.0 · EN

© 2026 Juan Segurola
All Rights Reserved

Part I · The Meaning of Enough

Chapter 1. Enough as a Deliberate Choice

The phrase “less is more” is useful only if it remains a question rather than becoming a command. Less of what, for whom, under which circumstances, and at what cost? A person who has no reliable access to shelter, food, healthcare, or time is not made freer simply by being asked to want less. The question of sufficiency becomes meaningful when it starts from actual needs and opportunities instead of an aesthetic ideal of emptiness.

To say “this is enough for me” can be an act of self-government. It is a way of identifying the point at which an additional purchase, obligation, achievement, or possession ceases to contribute meaningfully to one’s life. But that point cannot be specified once and for all: it changes with age, disability, caregiving, employment, community, and unforeseen events. The freedom to judge what is enough includes the freedom to revise the judgment.

Sufficiency is not the same as deprivation. Deprivation names an absence of goods or opportunities that are needed to live with dignity; sufficiency names a considered relationship to goods and opportunities once their role has been examined. The distinction matters because a voluntary decision to reduce one’s possessions cannot be equated with involuntary poverty. Their outward appearance may resemble each other while their conditions of choice are radically different.

Nor does deciding what is enough entail withdrawing from shared responsibility. A lighter private life may coexist with extensive commitments to children, relatives, neighbors, or a profession. It may even make those commitments more sustainable by reducing avoidable demands. The relevant measure is not the number of objects left on a shelf but whether the resulting arrangement increases the capacity to act with integrity, attention, and fairness.

Consider two households that choose to own fewer objects. One has strong public services, secure income, and convenient access to repairs; the other has unstable employment and must travel far for basic services. What looks like the same lifestyle choice will involve different degrees of risk and effort. A philosophy of simplicity must be sufficiently attentive to context to avoid treating privilege as universal wisdom.

A useful first practice is therefore descriptive, not moralizing: identify what is essential, what brings genuine pleasure, what supports relationships, what is held only out of habit, and what creates burdens that exceed its value. The aim is not to produce the smallest possible life but one that can be inhabited more deliberately. Enough is a revisable boundary drawn in service of living, never a verdict on the worth of those who draw it elsewhere.

The question of what counts as enough has an established philosophical context. Harry Frankfurt’s argument that economic equality lacks intrinsic moral importance and that sufficiency is morally central distinguishes the moral

importance of having enough from comparisons between persons. This book similarly asks about thresholds, but insists that a threshold must remain sensitive to access, caregiving obligations and the capacity to refuse exploitation. This is a thematic dialogue, not a claim that its argument derives from Frankfurt. [1]

A choice is not fully autonomous merely because nobody commands it. The relevant counterfactual is whether a person could reject the option without losing housing, health care, or social standing. A sufficiency threshold must therefore be revisable and protected by institutions, not only by individual resolve.

Chapter 2. Needs, Desires, and Expectations

Human needs, desires, and expectations overlap, but they are not interchangeable. A need concerns conditions whose absence can seriously impair life or agency; a desire identifies something attractive; an expectation adds a prediction or felt entitlement about what should occur. Distinguishing them does not belittle pleasure or aspiration. It makes visible the very different reasons that can lie behind the same impulse to obtain something.

A desire does not become illegitimate merely because it is not necessary. Music, travel, beauty, tools, celebrations, and play may enlarge human experience beyond mere survival. The difficulty emerges when a desirable possibility hardens into a condition for self-respect: “unless I obtain this, my life is incomplete.” That transition can turn an optional good into a continuing source of pressure.

Expectations are especially powerful because they often remain unexamined. We may expect our income to rise every year, our home to resemble those we see online, or our free time to be filled with memorable experiences. None of these predictions is guaranteed, and many depend on conditions outside individual control. Disappointment becomes more manageable when we ask whether an expectation was a promise, a reasonable plan, a social comparison, or merely a habit of thought.

The categories must nevertheless remain open to individual circumstances. A device that is a luxury for one person may be indispensable for someone who relies on assistive technology. Reliable transport may be essential where accessible public services are absent. It would be careless to classify goods from their appearance alone, without examining how they contribute to the practical freedom of a particular person.

Imagine wanting a larger home. The desire might reflect social comparison, a legitimate need for accessibility, a crowded family, or the wish for a quiet workspace. Advice to “simplify” given before understanding those reasons is shallow. A more responsible inquiry asks what problem the additional space would solve, whether alternatives exist, and which financial and relational commitments the change would create.

A practical distinction is to formulate each wish in three sentences: what I need to protect, what I would enjoy, and what I am assuming will happen. The exercise will not always yield a neat answer. Its value lies in preventing all three kinds of reason

from merging into an unquestionable demand. We can remain ambitious and appreciative while declining to let every passing wish govern our decisions.

The ancient discussion of desires, especially in Epicurus' Letter to Menoeceus, offers a useful comparison: distinguishing desires can support judgment without condemning pleasure. The distinction proposed here between needs, desires and expectations is a contemporary working tool, not a reconstruction of Epicurus' categories. Its test is whether it clarifies individual situations rather than prescribing a single austere life. [2]

Desires cannot be sorted permanently into authentic and manufactured categories. A wish acquired through imitation can mature into a valued project; an apparently spontaneous preference can conceal pressure. The better test asks whether the desire survives reflection on its costs, alternatives, and impact on others.

Chapter 3. Freedom from Consumption

Consumer societies do not merely provide objects; they also circulate stories about what objects say about their owners. A purchase may promise status, security, novelty, belonging, or a temporary reprieve from discomfort. Those meanings are not wholly imaginary—goods can genuinely enable work, communication, and pleasure—but their symbolic promises deserve scrutiny when they begin to define personal worth.

Freedom from consumption does not require hostility to commerce, invention, or material comfort. It means retaining the ability to distinguish a purchase that serves a chosen purpose from one that mainly answers manufactured urgency. Advertising can inform and manipulate; both possibilities should be acknowledged without imagining that consumers are entirely passive or that all choices are equally unconstrained.

Price is only one dimension of a decision. There is also the cost of maintenance, storage, attention, disposal, debt, and the time needed to earn the purchase price. An inexpensive object can become costly when it breaks quickly; an expensive but durable tool can be sensible when it is used often and repaired. Simplicity asks us to evaluate the total relationship rather than obey a rule of always spending less.

Social comparison intensifies the problem when another person's visible possessions become the standard for our unseen lives. Yet the reverse comparison is equally suspect: treating a sparse household or a low expenditure as evidence of moral superiority. One may buy too much out of insecurity or display austerity for the same reason. Neither exterior establishes the quality of judgment or care.

Consider replacing a working phone. It may be reasonable if security updates end, accessibility needs change, or the device obstructs work; it may also be an impulse driven by novelty. The important question is not whether replacing it is virtuous or sinful, but what reasons one can actually defend after allowing the initial excitement to fade. A short delay is sometimes enough to reveal the difference.

This freedom is also collective. Product design, consumer protection, repair rights, labor conditions, and the availability of public alternatives shape which options are

realistically accessible. Personal reflection matters, but it should not conceal the responsibilities of institutions and firms. A less extractive life is not created by individual restraint alone; it also requires conditions that make responsible choices feasible.

An external point of comparison helps clarify the distinction between consumption and a good life. The OECD's How's Life? 2024 framework treats well-being as multidimensional: income and wealth matter, but so do housing, health, social relationships, work-life balance, environmental quality, and inequality. This is empirical context, not proof that any particular minimalist lifestyle is preferable. The philosophical claim made here is narrower: purchases should be assessed by the functions and freedoms they support, rather than treated as reliable measures of personal worth. [3]

A consumer can refuse a product yet remain locked into an infrastructure built around it. Owning fewer devices does not remove requirements imposed by employers, schools, banks, or public administrations. Consequently, personal restraint and collective redesign answer different parts of the problem.

Part II · Dependence and Practical Autonomy

Chapter 4. Practical Skills and Everyday Autonomy

Practical self-sufficiency begins with a simple question: what can I learn to do that would give me more reliable choices? Cooking a few meals, maintaining basic equipment, understanding a bill, organizing documents, or recognizing when a professional is needed can reduce unnecessary helplessness. The objective is not to become expert at everything, but to avoid losing all judgment whenever a task is unfamiliar.

Knowing how to do something differs from being obliged to do it alone. A person may understand a repair and still sensibly hire a technician because of safety, cost, disability, available time, or legal requirements. Competence supports informed delegation; it does not require heroic independence. The freedom gained may consist precisely in recognizing the limits of one's expertise.

Learning is most durable when linked to actual purposes. Memorizing a list of household skills to satisfy an ideal of self-sufficiency can become another burden. Understanding how to prepare food for one's needs, manage a modest budget, or ask informed questions about a service has a clearer connection to agency. Each skill should be judged by the options it opens, not by whether it belongs to a traditional image of domestic virtue.

The division of practical work also has ethical dimensions. If one member of a household is celebrated as independent while another performs the invisible cleaning, planning, childcare, or emotional coordination, the apparent independence may rest on an unequal distribution of labor. A credible practice of simplicity makes those contributions visible and distributes duties with attention to capacities and consent.

A useful exercise is to map three types of dependence: the skills we can reasonably acquire, the services we should keep using, and the relationships of mutual support we ought to protect. This map reveals that autonomy is never the absence of dependence. It is a way of organizing dependencies so that they remain intelligible, negotiable, and compatible with dignity.

Practical learning can itself be pleasurable. Repairing a small object, growing a plant, preparing a meal, or understanding a process may offer satisfaction independent of measurable efficiency. Yet an activity does not have to become a hobby, a source of income, or a duty to improve oneself. Freedom includes the possibility of learning slowly, resting, and deciding that a particular skill is not worth acquiring.

Learning every domestic skill can itself become an expensive hobby of the privileged. The opportunity cost of time must enter the calculation: repairing an appliance may be worthwhile for one household and unsafe or financially irrational for another.

Chapter 5. Delegating Without Losing Agency

Delegation is often treated as the opposite of self-sufficiency, but this contrast confuses doing everything oneself with remaining capable of choice. An autonomous person can ask for expertise, share responsibilities, and rely on public institutions without surrendering the right to understand, question, or reconsider the arrangement. Dependence becomes domination when alternatives are concealed, decisions are imposed, or the cost of leaving is made intolerable.

Good delegation requires clarity about the result, the limits of authority, and the information that must remain available. When hiring a professional, it can be reasonable to ask what the proposed work includes, what could go wrong, which alternatives exist, and how success will be evaluated. Such questions are not a refusal of expertise. They are a way of cooperating with expertise while retaining responsibility for decisions that properly belong to us.

Of course, not everyone has equal bargaining power. Age, disability, poverty, language, fatigue, and the urgency of a situation may make independent scrutiny difficult. In those circumstances trustworthy assistance, accessible explanations, shared decision-making, and enforceable rights matter more than advice to “be independent.” A philosophy of sufficiency must account for the supports that make agency possible.

Imagine an older person delegating online banking to a relative. Convenience may be real, yet safeguards are needed: understandable records, defined permissions, safeguards against coercion, and the possibility of changing the arrangement. Delegation is successful not when the relative controls everything efficiently, but when the older person receives appropriate support and retains as much effective authority as possible.

We can therefore distinguish between delegation that expands options and delegation that quietly removes them. The relevant question is not simply “Can I do this alone?” It is “Can I understand the arrangement, make meaningful choices

within it, and obtain help or leave without unfair penalty?" Self-sufficiency often grows through trustworthy interdependence.

Delegation has at least three dimensions: competence to specify a goal, authority to change the instruction, and practical access to an alternative provider. Contracts can preserve the first two while fees or geography remove the third.

Chapter 6. Time of Our Own and Commitments

Time is not merely a container to fill efficiently. It is also the condition in which attention, affection, rest, practical tasks, and projects become possible. A life with fewer possessions can still be overwhelmed by obligations; conversely, a full schedule may express freely chosen care or meaningful work. The issue is not the number of appointments but whether the pattern of commitments remains understandable, proportionate, and revisable.

Personal time is never entirely detached from others. Parenting, disability support, paid employment, and collective responsibilities place demands that cannot simply be canceled by declaring a preference for simplicity. This is precisely why a fair distribution of labor matters. Leisure secured through another person's invisible work is not a complete achievement of autonomy; it may merely move the burden elsewhere.

Expectations can multiply without explicit consent: an immediate answer to every message, an extra task because we are competent, or an ongoing favor that becomes a permanent duty. Identifying such patterns does not mean treating every request as an intrusion. It allows us to distinguish urgent needs from convenience, mutual commitments from one-sided assumptions, and genuine solidarity from habitual overextension.

Consider someone who tries to protect one evening a week for reading or walking. A rigid rule that never yields would ignore emergencies; a boundary that always yields would cease to exist. The more useful practice is to explain the commitment, make room for legitimate exceptions, and review whether responsibilities are shared fairly. Boundaries can be firm without becoming hostile or absolute.

To recover time, one might remove an unnecessary subscription, combine routine errands, decline a recurring obligation, or seek assistance. Yet efficiency is not the only measure. Conversation, contemplation, play, and simply being present are not failures of productivity. A sufficient life includes time that does not need to justify itself through measurable output.

Protecting personal time creates a distribution question: whose work expands when someone else declines a commitment? An individual boundary is justified when it corrects exploitation, but not automatically when its cost is transferred to an already overburdened caregiver.

Chapter 7. Simplicity Without Imposition

Simplicity is most defensible as an invitation to examine one's own needs, not as a standard by which to rank other people. A small home, few possessions, or a repetitive routine can be liberating for one person and restrictive for another. Access needs, family structures, histories of scarcity, climate, culture, and personal pleasure all change what a reasonable life requires.

A principle becomes dogmatic when its followers stop noticing circumstances. Someone who has experienced deprivation may understandably value reserves, decoration, or the security of ownership. Someone caring for children or relatives may need equipment that appears excessive to an outsider. To interpret every additional object as moral weakness would convert a practice of freedom into a new pressure to conform.

Nor should simplicity become a disguise for withdrawing from social obligations. Using less can reduce some environmental burdens, but collective problems also require fair institutions, durable products, accessible transport, and public infrastructure. Individuals differ greatly in their power to change these conditions. Responsibility should be proportionate to capability, influence, and available alternatives.

An argument about simplicity can be offered without contempt: describe the concrete benefit, acknowledge the trade-offs, and leave room for disagreement. A friend may choose to travel frequently because it sustains relationships; another may prefer a quieter local life. Their choices can be discussed in terms of effects and obligations without assuming that a single lifestyle embodies wisdom for everyone.

The test of voluntary simplicity is whether it leaves us more attentive, capable of care, and able to choose again. When it produces shame, fear of enjoyment, or an obsession with counting possessions, it may have become another form of dependence. The freedom to have less includes the freedom to decide that, in a particular circumstance, more is genuinely needed.

Voluntary simplicity also belongs to a documented intellectual tradition: Richard Gregg used the expression in the twentieth century, and Duane Elgin developed the theme further. The present argument does not infer a moral duty to simplify from either work. It asks instead under which conditions a freely chosen reduction actually enlarges autonomy and protects those who cannot choose deprivation away. [4, 5]

A simple life can be aesthetically attractive and ethically demanding without becoming a badge of virtue. The danger arises when observers infer character from visible possessions while ignoring invisible dependencies, such as outsourced cleaning or family wealth.

Chapter 8. Choosing What Deserves to Remain

Removing objects is easy compared with deciding what deserves a lasting place in one's life. The important question is not how much we can discard, but what we wish to preserve: tools that enable action, books that sustain thought, relationships of mutual care, meaningful rituals, reliable records, and spaces where attention can settle. Sufficiency includes maintenance and commitment as well as subtraction.

An object may be valuable through repeated use, emotional meaning, accessibility, or its role in a shared history. We should not assume that sentimental value is irrational. Nor must we preserve everything associated with the past. Memory can survive through selected objects, stories, photographs, or relationships; choice matters more than a universal rule about what should be kept.

Possessions also carry future obligations. A purchase needs storage, repair, insurance, energy, and eventually disposal. Conversely, keeping a well-functioning tool may be more responsible than replacing it with a supposedly simpler alternative. A coherent decision considers the full life of an item, including environmental and financial costs that are not immediately visible.

Imagine deciding whether to retain equipment for an occasional activity. Selling it might free space, but renting may be expensive, inaccessible, or impractical; keeping it might enable an independent practice. The decision requires attention to frequency, resources, alternatives, and the pleasure or security involved. Minimalism offers no automatic answer.

What deserves to remain changes over time. Health, relationships, work, interests, and material conditions develop. Reviewing commitments periodically should therefore be gentle rather than punitive. The point is not to finish life with the fewest possible things, but to create room for what is worth doing, understanding, sharing, and experiencing.

Retention and disposal have asymmetric consequences. Discarding an object may create waste now; keeping it can impose a continuing attention cost; replacing it later can be expensive or impossible. A rule based solely on present use therefore fails.

Part III · Security, Work, and Tools

Chapter 9. Security, Uncertainty, and the Desire to Accumulate

Accumulating resources can be a reasonable response to uncertainty. An emergency fund, essential medicines, or regularly used tools can protect our capacity to choose. The problem cannot be identified simply by counting objects, but by examining when an adequate reserve becomes an unlimited search for certainty: no inventory can remove illness, loss, or change entirely.

Security is also social. It depends on access to housing, income, health care, reliable relationships, and enforceable rights. Telling someone with precarious

resources to own less confuses voluntary simplicity with involuntary exposure to risk. An ethics of sufficiency must begin by asking what risks actually exist and who has the means to face them.

We can ask how large a reserve covers an identified risk, for how long, and at what maintenance cost. This helps distinguish proportionate preparation from accumulation that consumes time, attention, and space without appreciably improving security. Thresholds will differ for someone living alone, a family dependent on one wage, or a person with ongoing care needs.

Sufficiency does not require indifference to the future. It proposes preparing for what we can and acknowledging the limits of control. Learning to revise plans when facts change is a sounder form of prudence than obeying a fixed target for savings, possessions, or consumption.

The demand for security is rational when risks are correlated: job loss, illness, and housing costs can rise together. Accumulation becomes counterproductive when an ever-higher private buffer substitutes for any discussion of insurance, mutual support, or public safeguards.

Chapter 10. Comfort, Dependence, and Resilience

Comfort frees energy and time; it is therefore not automatically an enemy of autonomy. A washing machine, a ramp, or a transport service can expand the activities available to us. Condemning all technological or social dependence would ignore that human capabilities rely on shared infrastructures.

Resilience does not mean doing everything without help. It consists partly in retaining alternatives when a provider, connection, or routine fails. Knowing how to repair a simple object, keeping information accessible, and building cooperative relationships are complementary resources, not proof of absolute self-sufficiency.

Alternatives have costs. Maintaining every skill, duplicating equipment, or distrusting every service can consume more resources than such measures protect. The useful question is not whether we depend on others, but whether dependence is transparent, revisable, and consistent with our dignity.

Shared resilience includes neighbors, public services, and professional networks able to respond to a crisis. Mature simplicity does not glorify isolation: it seeks to reduce avoidable vulnerabilities without turning self-sufficiency into an obligation that excludes people who need support.

Resilience is often praised as a personal quality, yet redundant infrastructure and reliable institutions may matter more than heroic improvisation. A person without savings cannot simply choose resilience by adopting a better attitude.

Chapter 11. Work, Money, and a Sense of Enough

Money expands options, but its value also depends on how it is earned and used. Higher income may provide security, health care, or education; it may also demand working hours that erode rest and relationships. A sufficient life is defined neither by maximizing income nor by renouncing it.

Work deserves examination along several dimensions: pay, social usefulness, safety, autonomy, learning, and available time. Some indispensable occupations receive unfair compensation. Presenting precarious employment as an opportunity to practice simplicity would confuse inequality with personal preference.

In a concrete decision we can compare additional income with commuting costs, health, caring duties, and opportunities to negotiate conditions. There is no universal formula: changing jobs, reducing hours, or accepting demanding responsibilities may each be reasonable in different circumstances. The aim is to make visible the trade-offs that abstract notions of success often conceal.

The meaning of enough must also be allowed to change with age, obligations, and uncertainty. It is not a moral figure we can impose on others. It is a reflective practice that recognizes both material needs and the value of time not sold.

Questions about earning and time cannot be resolved by assuming that less paid work always means more freedom. The OECD identifies work and job quality, income and wealth (including financial insecurity), housing, and work-life balance as distinct dimensions of well-being. Reducing hours may be a genuine gain when income and caring duties remain sustainable, but it can also increase precarity or transfer uncompensated labor to someone else. The relevant test is not a single number of working hours; it is whether the arrangement preserves meaningful choice and fair participation. [3]

Paid work buys security while also consuming scarce time and attention. A decision to reduce hours should therefore be evaluated against future pension rights, career penalties, care obligations, and bargaining power, rather than against present income alone.

Chapter 12. Technology as a Tool, Not a Master

Technology can simplify daily life while quietly shaping our choices. An application that streamlines a task may also demand constant attention, collect data, or prevent the use of alternative services. Evaluating a tool requires looking beyond novelty and considering who sets its rules.

Not every delegation of memory, calculation, or coordination impoverishes thought. Outsourcing repetitive tasks can free resources for learning and caring. Risk arises when we lose the capacity to understand a consequential decision, correct an error, or reject an automated recommendation.

Four questions can help us decide whether a technology serves us: what problem it solves, what resources it consumes, what data it requires, and what happens if it stops working. People may choose different solutions according to accessibility,

disability, costs, and technical skills. Simplicity does not always mean choosing the analog option.

Maintaining a free relationship with technology also requires accountability from manufacturers, platforms, and public authorities. User protection cannot rest on individual decisions when designs, monopolies, and incentives shape the available options.

Ivan Illich's account of convivial tools supplies a relevant comparison for judging technology by what it enables people to do for themselves and with others. That comparison does not establish that every complex tool is oppressive. The practical distinction pursued here is whether a technology remains intelligible, contestable, repairable or replaceable in the circumstances in which it is used. [6]

An efficient digital service can reduce friction while increasing surveillance or concentrating decision-making power. Convenience and autonomy are not interchangeable: the same platform can save time and make exit difficult.

Part IV · Places, Relationships, and Responsibility

Chapter 13. The Home as a Practice of Freedom

A home is not simply the sum of its objects. It is an environment in which we seek rest, security, privacy, accessibility, and opportunities to meet others. Its quality depends on how it lets us live, not on how closely it resembles an image of austerity or luxury.

Tidying can facilitate activities, but a rigid ideal of order can turn domestic space into a place of surveillance. Families and people sharing a home need not have identical routines; they need proportionate agreements about cleaning, common use, care, and privacy.

Design also affects autonomy. Lighting, ventilation, accessible furniture, repairability, and energy costs can matter more than the number of objects. Housing decisions are constrained by prices, planning rules, and employment conditions; they are not always freely chosen.

Practicing simplicity at home may mean retaining what is useful, removing obligations that add no value, and reserving room for meaningful activities. Yet a small dwelling that obstructs care, work, or rest does not become sufficient merely by being labeled minimalist.

A smaller home might free resources yet intensify conflict when occupants need privacy, mobility support, or a quiet place to work. Square meters alone cannot measure domestic sufficiency.

Chapter 14. Relationships Beyond Possession

The logic of possession can enter our relationships when we confuse affection with constant availability or commitment with control. No person is an object in our life story; each retains desires, boundaries, and projects that may differ from our own.

Reducing expectations of control does not require indifference. Loving often involves keeping promises, negotiating sacrifices, and responding to legitimate needs. The challenge is to distinguish an accepted obligation from a unilateral demand that silences another person.

A simple relationship is not necessarily one with few meetings or few words. It may be intense, complex, and long-lasting. Its simplicity may lie in clear agreements, the ability to disagree, and the refusal to use guilt or dependence as instruments of domination.

Where violence or coercion exists, recommending calm communication or detachment is not enough. Protection, specialist support, and the material means to leave a dangerous situation take priority. Interpersonal freedom needs boundaries that are real, not merely ideal.

Relationships are not objects, but the language of decluttering can misleadingly turn human obligations into disposable burdens. Boundaries are necessary when a relation is harmful; they cannot replace duties to children or people who genuinely depend on us.

Chapter 15. Ecological Limits and Unequal Responsibility

Materials, energy, and the capacity of ecosystems to absorb impacts impose physical limits. Recognizing them allows us to discuss needs, durability, repair, and less resource-intensive forms of well-being. It does not, by itself, establish that everyone should reduce consumption in the same proportion.

Responsibilities vary with consumption levels, decision-making power, associated emissions, and available alternatives. A person without public transport does not have the same options as someone served by accessible services. Individual action matters, but infrastructures and policies determine many possibilities.

Buying a repairable product, sharing tools, or reducing waste may be beneficial. Yet full life cycles should be considered rather than replacing evaluation with symbolic gestures. A repair that is extremely resource-intensive, for example, is not automatically preferable to every replacement.

The ecological case for re-examining demand has a firmer empirical basis than a universal instruction to own fewer things. UNEP's Global Resources Outlook 2024 documents growing resource use and the environmental pressures associated with it. IPCC Working Group III examines mitigation through changes in service provision, infrastructure, and demand, emphasizing that individual choices interact with broader systems. These findings support examining the material consequences of arrangements, not blaming individuals equally or claiming that every instance of reduction produces an environmental gain. [7, 8]

Ecological simplicity has a political dimension: product standards, environmental protection, housing, energy, and the distribution of costs. Avoiding indiscriminate guilt supports a more demanding ethics by directing responsibility toward decisions and structures that can actually be changed.

A voluntary reduction in demand can help, but its effect depends on supply chains, rebound effects, and infrastructure. Money saved on one purchase can finance a more resource-intensive activity; an efficient product can encourage greater use.

Chapter 16. Care and Material Interdependence

Everyday life depends on visible and invisible work: food provision, cleaning, care, maintenance, and emotional support. Speaking of self-sufficiency without recognizing this labor can obscure how our freedom rests on other people's efforts.

Interdependence does not mean that every obligation is without limits. Caregivers need rest, resources, and agency; those receiving care retain, as far as possible, their own voice. Fair distribution should consider the intensity, duration, and voluntariness of responsibilities.

Consider a family seeking to reduce expenses by doing more household tasks. If the savings depend on silently shifting hours of work to one person, the household may not have gained autonomy. An account of sufficiency must include time, effort, and lost opportunities, not money alone.

A simpler life can free time for care, but it also requires services and institutional arrangements that prevent private overload. Goodwill cannot substitute for fair material conditions.

Care exposes the limits of an ideal of complete independence. Every person moves through periods of receiving and providing assistance, although burdens are distributed unequally by gender, income, and policy.

Part V · Limits and Synthesis

Chapter 17. Voluntary Simplicity and Social Injustice

The same lack of possessions may express freedom or deprivation depending on whether it is chosen or imposed. Reducing possessions from a position of security is not equivalent to lacking reliable access to housing, food, or health care. An ethics of simplicity loses credibility when it erases this distinction.

Personal responsibility does not disappear in the face of structural injustice, but neither can it replace structural action. Choosing purchases carefully may be reasonable; securing dignified working conditions and essential services requires collective decisions and accountability mechanisms.

The difference between voluntary simplicity and enforced deprivation also matters analytically. The OECD's well-being framework explicitly considers inequalities and deprivation alongside national averages, and distinguishes present well-being from the resources needed to sustain it. A person lacking safe housing or adequate care cannot be assessed through the same moral lens as someone choosing to forgo discretionary purchases. The argument of this chapter therefore concerns fair access to basic capabilities before aesthetic preferences for austerity. [3]

Proposals to reduce consumption should assess whom they affect. A uniform increase in the price of essential resources can harm those least able to adapt. A fair policy distinguishes essential from luxury uses, ability to pay, and genuine alternatives.

Voluntary simplicity is valuable when it expands options, not when it legitimizes the idea that some people must settle for fewer rights. Our freedom to choose a modest life must be accompanied by recognition of others' right to escape deprivation.

Kate Raworth's distinction between a social foundation and an ecological ceiling offers a framework for seeing why minimum material security and ecological restraint must be discussed together. The capability approaches associated with Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum further clarify why nominally equal opportunities may not permit equal real choices. The book engages those ideas as points of comparison; its judgments about responsibility remain the author's own. [9, 10, 11]

The same instruction to consume less has opposite meanings when addressed to an affluent household and to one already unable to meet basic needs. Symmetric rhetoric can hide asymmetric capacity and responsibility.

Chapter 18. When Less Is Not Better

The rule of reduction fails when scarcity damages important capabilities. Less food, rest, care, accessibility, or information can mean less freedom, not more. Even apparently superfluous objects may sustain an identity, relationship, or activity essential to someone.

Sometimes redundancy protects us: spare medicines, document backups, or accessibility devices. At other times, an extra system creates dependence and upkeep. There is no contradiction in deciding that more resources are needed in one domain while fewer are preferable in another.

Reduction can also become a moral competition. Counting possessions, displaying austerity, or judging others' habits reproduces the search for approval that simplicity was meant to question. When a means hardens into a rigid identity, it ceases to serve life.

The productive question is what combination of resources, relationships, and commitments makes a responsible life possible. Sometimes the answer will be to reduce; at other times, to invest, seek help, or maintain something complex because it serves a valuable purpose.

There are situations in which more is unambiguously better: insulation in an unsafe dwelling, access to medication, mobility equipment, or protection against violence. An abstract preference for less must yield to these concrete goods.

Chapter 19. Building a Sustainable Personal Practice

A philosophy of sufficiency needs to move from general declarations to revisable decisions. We might begin by identifying three sources of friction: an expense that adds little well-being, an obligation accepted by inertia, and a practical skill we would like to develop. No single list fits everyone.

Before changing anything, it helps to establish which functions must be preserved: health, care, economic security, participation, and rest. Improvement should be assessed through consequences, not the number of objects removed. A small, reversible, time-limited trial offers more reliable information than a vow of permanent austerity.

A review may ask whether the change freed time, lowered costs without shifting them to someone else, improved attention, or reduced an actual risk. If it did not, revising the decision is not failure: it expresses independence from a rule that no longer served its purpose.

The process must leave room for pleasure, culture, and connection. A practice that removes what makes existence worth living eventually betrays its foundation. Sustainable sufficiency adapts to our situation and to care for others.

A sustainable practice needs feedback rather than an irreversible pledge. A household might review spending and obligations each quarter, record unintended consequences, and reverse a change when health or relationships suffer.

Chapter 20. Sufficiency, Autonomy, and a Life of One's Own

Less is more only when what we remove makes room for something valuable. The phrase does not state a universal law; it invites us to examine the cost of what we own, pursue, or maintain through habit. The final criterion is not austerity, but responsible freedom.

Throughout the volume we have distinguished need from expectation, preparation from accumulation, comfort from dependence, and cooperation from subordination. We have also recognized that individual choices take place within social and ecological structures that distribute resources and opportunities unequally.

A life of our own does not require resolving these tensions once and for all. It requires enough clarity to recognize them, act prudently, and change course when conditions change. Learning, seeking help, and accepting legitimate obligations are compatible with autonomy; isolation and absolute self-sufficiency are not necessary ideals.

The practical conclusion remains open: retain what sustains existence, release what constricts it, and care for the relationships and material conditions that make choice possible. Ultimately, simplicity means not spending our entire life managing what was supposed to help us live it.

Sufficiency is not an end-state where further deliberation ceases. It is a political and personal method for deciding what deserves protection when resources, desires, and obligations compete.

The conclusion is deliberately conditional: a freer life cannot be inferred from fewer possessions without examining capabilities, institutions, and relationships.

Epilogue · A Sufficiency That Can Be Revised

This book offers no single measure of enough. It invites us to recognize the instrumental value of resources: they should support experience, judgment, care, and genuine opportunities to act.

The decision to live with less must not be imposed on those who already lack necessities or become a test of moral superiority. Retaining the ability to change our minds is part of the freedom that simplicity seeks to protect.

Bibliographic context

Interpretations are the author's own unless expressly attributed; the works listed indicate thematic points of dialogue, and institutional reports provide empirical context. No precise page-level verification of the philosophical works is claimed.

References Numbered references follow the order of first appearance. References 12 to 14 provide additional bibliographic context.

[1] Frankfurt HG. Equality as a moral ideal. *Ethics*. 1987;98(1):21-43. doi:10.1086/292913.

[2] Epicurus. Letter to Menoeceus. In: Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of eminent philosophers*. Vol. 2. Hicks RD, translator. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 1925. Book X, sections 122-135.

[3] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. *How's life? 2024: well-being and resilience in times of crisis*. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2024. doi:10.1787/90ba854a-en.

[4] Gregg RB. *The value of voluntary simplicity*. Wallingford (PA): Pendle Hill; 1936. (Pendle Hill Pamphlet; no. 3).

[5] Elgin D. *Voluntary simplicity: toward a way of life that is outwardly simple, inwardly rich*. New York: William Morrow; 1981.

[6] Illich I. *Tools for conviviality*. 1st ed. New York: Harper & Row; 1973.

[7] United Nations Environment Programme. *Global resources outlook 2024: bend the trend: pathways to a liveable planet as resource use spikes: summary for policymakers*. Nairobi: UNEP; 2024.

[8] Creutzig F, Roy J, et al. Demand, services and social aspects of mitigation. In: *Climate change 2022: mitigation of climate change*. Working Group III contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report of the IPCC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2022. Chapter 5. doi:10.1017/9781009157926.007.

[9] Raworth K. *Doughnut economics: seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist*. White River Junction (VT): Chelsea Green Publishing; 2017.

[10] Sen A. Development as freedom. New York: Alfred A. Knopf; 1999.

[11] Nussbaum MC. Creating capabilities: the human development approach. Cambridge (MA): Belknap Press of Harvard University Press; 2011. doi:10.2307/j.ctt2jbt31.

Additional bibliography

[12] Veblen T. The theory of the leisure class: an economic study in the evolution of institutions. New York: Macmillan; 1899.

[13] Kittay EF. Love's labor: essays on women, equality, and dependency. New York: Routledge; 1999.

[14] Kasser T. The high price of materialism. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press; 2002. doi:10.7551/mitpress/3501.001.0001.

THE FREEDOM TO EXIST

Volume IV

The Gift of Being Alive

Feeling, Contemplating and Enjoying Existence

Juan Segurola

First edition · v1.0 · EN

© 2026 Juan Segurola
All Rights Reserved

Foreword

This volume examines the lived experience of existence rather than seeking a single formula for happiness. It begins with the fragile fact of being alive and moves through embodiment, perception, joy, nature, ordinary pleasure, suffering, and presence. These eight inquiries share a conviction: appreciation cannot be coerced, and responsible freedom has to remain compatible with vulnerability, social difference, and the need for care. The book proposes arguments and practical distinctions, not clinical interventions or promises of wellbeing.

1. The Extraordinary Fact of Being Alive

Being alive is ordinary because it is the condition of every ordinary day; it is extraordinary because none of our plans, theories, or possessions would matter without it. To notice this does not require treating existence as a miracle or asserting that life has an assigned purpose. It requires distinguishing the event of living from the explanations by which we try to possess it. The recognition may interrupt habit without making habit an enemy: making breakfast, answering a message, or meeting a friend are already ways of inhabiting a finite life.

The fact of mortality can sharpen attention, but it can also provoke anxiety. It would be careless to prescribe gratitude to someone who is grieving, ill, or exhausted. A defensible appreciation of life must include the possibility of not feeling appreciative. Existential worth is not a performance and cannot be measured by visible enthusiasm. An individual may affirm the value of continuing to live while experiencing sorrow, uncertainty, or emotional numbness.

There is an important difference between wonder and certainty. Wonder makes room for questions that cannot be immediately settled; certainty sometimes closes that room. The claim that existence deserves attention is an ethical invitation, not a proof of a cosmic design. It is therefore compatible with religious, secular, scientific, and undecided interpretations, provided none is imposed as the price of belonging.

A practical exercise is not to search for a spectacular experience but to observe one unremarkable transition: the light changing across a wall, the start of a conversation, the end of a task. Then ask what the moment reveals about dependence and possibility. The answer may be small. That smallness is not a failure; the purpose is to resist equating the significance of a life with the intensity of its exceptional episodes.

The language of a gift introduces a moral problem: gifts ordinarily come from a giver, and they can create a debt. Existence need not be treated that way. Someone who is alive through no choice of their own can still find value in a particular relationship, task or sensation without accepting an obligation to celebrate life in general. Gratitude, when present, can be directed toward concrete acts of care rather than demanded as a response to existence itself. This distinction protects the image of a gift from becoming an accusation against people who are suffering.

A second objection concerns meaning. If mere existence were sufficient for flourishing, conditions of exploitation, abandonment or fear would be philosophically insignificant. They plainly are not. The claim defended here is narrower: there is value in making room to encounter experience, but the possibilities of encounter depend partly on social arrangements that can be improved or damaged. Wonder cannot substitute for housing, care, time or justice; nor must a just society prescribe wonder as its emotional outcome.

Consider two neighbours who receive the same diagnosis. One reassesses how to spend an afternoon; the other becomes overwhelmed by apprehension. Neither response is evidence of a superior grasp of existence. What matters ethically is whether they can make decisions, receive support and give an honest account of what the event means to them. The possibility of gratitude should remain an invitation rather than a standard imposed from outside.

To describe life as a gift is ethically delicate when starting conditions differ radically. Someone born into safety, someone living with chronic illness, and someone threatened by violence do not receive an interchangeable range of possibilities. Wonder at the fact of existence should therefore never become a judgment on those who cannot experience wonder. Its responsible form connects appreciation with obligations to reduce avoidable suffering. A person may affirm life while rejecting the injustice of the conditions in which it is lived.

The phrase “gift of being alive” is a philosophical metaphor, not a claim about a giver or a debt. It differs from arguments that treat existence as a moral obligation to feel thankful. Discussions of giftedness by Michael Sandel raise related questions without settling the distinct argument made here. [1]

2. The Feeling Body

We do not encounter the world as detached observers. Hunger, warmth, fatigue, movement, and physical vulnerability shape what appears possible and urgent. The body is not merely an instrument that a mind operates; it is part of how situations acquire meaning. A steep staircase means something different to a rested person, someone with pain, and someone carrying another person. No account of freedom is complete if it ignores those differences.

Attention to bodily experience can clarify a need before it becomes an argument. Yet sensations are not infallible commands. Fear can signal a real danger or amplify an imagined one; comfort can be restorative or encourage avoidance. Listening to the body therefore requires interpretation, context, and sometimes external support. Bodily self-knowledge is not a competition in sensitivity and does not justify distrusting medical evidence.

People do not share the same physical circumstances. Disability, ageing, work demands, chronic illness, and access to care profoundly influence what someone can do. A philosophy of enjoying existence must not turn bodily capacity into a moral ranking. It should instead defend the conditions that make participation possible and recognise forms of pleasure and engagement that differ from the energetic ideals promoted by advertising.

An everyday practice is to ask what a bodily signal requests and what it does not prove. Tiredness might call for rest; it does not prove weakness. Tension might call for a pause; it does not prove that a conversation is wrong. This distinction allows bodily attention to support judgment instead of replacing it.

Bodily signals require interpretation. Pain can be shaped by several interacting factors, and persistent or severe symptoms warrant appropriate professional assessment rather than a purely introspective answer.

The lived body is also social. Whether a person can rest after fatigue, eat when hungry or step away from noise depends on income, work, care obligations, architecture and relationships. A philosophy that advises someone simply to listen to the body while ignoring these constraints risks individualising structural problems. A more demanding account asks both what the person can change and what institutions owe to people whose bodies are vulnerable. Autonomy here is practical and supported, not a fantasy of bodily independence.

A person with chronic pain may be encouraged to inhabit the present, yet attention to every sensation may worsen suffering. They may benefit more from alternating rest, movement, distraction, treatment and contact with others. Embodied presence must leave room for such strategies; it cannot be reduced to the injunction to feel more intensely. Care consists partly in learning which forms of attention help this particular person, here, under these conditions.

Accounts of embodied perception associated with Maurice Merleau-Ponty illuminate why the body cannot be treated simply as an instrument directed by a detached mind. This conceptual affinity is not a claim that bodily sensations are always reliable. [2]

3. Perceiving the Everyday World

Familiar environments become almost invisible through repetition. The street taken each morning, the sound of a familiar voice, or the pattern of a table can disappear behind the tasks attached to them. Yet perception is neither a passive recording nor a sovereign act of invention: our expectations select features, while the world can still surprise and correct us. Attentiveness begins by acknowledging both sides.

To perceive more carefully is not necessarily to perceive more intensely. A person preparing food may notice the texture of a fruit, but there is no obligation to turn the kitchen into a spiritual laboratory. Excessive monitoring can make simple activities laborious. The value of attention lies partly in its discretion: it improves contact with reality without demanding that every sensation become a meaningful event.

Our environments are unequal. Noise, unsafe housing, exhausting travel, or precarious schedules limit opportunities for quiet observation. Advising someone simply to slow down can conceal the economic and social forces that speed them up. Personal attention has value, but it should not become a substitute for improving shared conditions.

The test of perception is often relational. Noticing a friend's hesitation, the discomfort of a colleague, or the fragility of an object can change how we respond. The everyday world is not a private collection of pleasing impressions; it is also the place where other lives make claims upon our consideration.

Habit is not merely a failure of attention. Its efficiency makes sustained activity possible: we could not deliberate anew over every familiar route or movement. What matters is the capacity to interrupt habit when circumstances change, especially when another person is affected. A commuter who notices that a staircase excludes a neighbour with reduced mobility has not merely enjoyed a richer perception; that observation creates a reason to discuss accessibility. Attention becomes ethically significant when it allows neglected facts to alter our judgements.

Yet sustained alertness can become exhausting. People who work under threat or carry constant care responsibilities may already attend intensely to their surroundings. It would be mistaken to prescribe more observation as a universal remedy. Sometimes the humane condition for noticing is reliable safety, so that vigilance can relax. The aim of this chapter is selective receptivity rather than permanent sensory effort: perceiving enough to respond well without turning ordinary life into a monitoring exercise.

Imagine a terse message from a colleague. It may sound dismissive to the recipient while the sender was merely rushed. The hurt is real even when the inferred intention is mistaken. A constructive conversation can recognise both facts: how the message landed and how it was intended. This separation of experience from interpretation turns ordinary perception into a practice of intellectual humility.

The care of attention in ordinary life has an affinity with Iris Murdoch's work on seeing others justly; attention here also includes access, fatigue, and the conditions that make sustained noticing possible. [3]

4. Joy Without Obligation

Joy is valuable precisely because it cannot be commanded. A social rule to remain positive converts a possible experience into another duty. It also divides people into those who display the expected emotion and those who supposedly fail. A humane account of joy must allow sadness, boredom, anger, and ambivalence without considering them defects of character.

Enjoyment and approval are different. We can enjoy a conversation without turning it into evidence of success, or find pleasure in a simple activity without proving that our lives are well organised. Once every pleasant experience must justify itself, enjoyment becomes a project under permanent evaluation. The result is often more anxiety, not greater freedom.

This does not mean that joy should be romanticised as spontaneous and independent of conditions. Rest, safety, companionship, health, and material security affect its accessibility. Policies and relationships can foster the conditions of enjoyment even though they cannot prescribe the emotion itself. Freedom from emotional coercion and responsibility for shared conditions belong together.

When pleasure arrives, it need not be extended, recorded, or repeated. Sometimes a brief moment is complete as it is. When it does not arrive, existence has not lost its legitimacy. This modest freedom protects joy from becoming a new ideology.

An imperative to be happy can make other emotions socially invisible. Grief, boredom, ambivalence and quiet satisfaction are not merely defective forms of joy; each can disclose aspects of a situation that cheerful language would conceal. Imagine a family gathering after a death. Warmth may coexist with sadness, and no participant must choose the authorised emotion for the occasion. A humane account of enjoyment leaves room for mixed feelings and avoids converting another person's silence into a problem requiring correction.

There is also a political dimension to emotional expectations. Workplaces and institutions may ask individuals to display optimism while leaving harmful conditions untouched. Positivity then becomes an instrument of compliance rather than a form of freedom. Resisting that demand need not entail pessimism; it means allowing feelings to inform judgement without making emotional display a substitute for fair treatment. Joy remains welcome precisely when it is not treated as a measure of moral worth or personal competence.

A caregiver may feel affection and resentment on the same day. Insisting that love must cancel resentment deprives that person of language for overload and for asking for help. Equally, a celebration can offer relief without solving the structural difficulty that surrounds it. Accepting mixed emotions makes joy more credible: it need not pretend to be an answer to everything.

Sara Ahmed's discussion of the promise of happiness and Arlie Hochschild's work on emotional labor provide important neighboring analyses of norms that regulate which emotions are acceptable. [4, 5]

5. Nature and Contemplation

Nature can interrupt the illusion that the human world is made only of our purposes. Weather, plants, water, and other living beings follow processes indifferent to our schedules. Contemplation can make those processes perceptible without requiring a mystical account of them. Watching a tree move in the wind may restore proportion: our concerns are important, but they do not exhaust what exists.

The contrast between nature and civilisation should not be made absolute. A park is shaped by public labour; a path may be accessible because someone maintains it. Moreover, ecosystems are not always gentle. Storms, infection, predation, and scarcity belong to nature too. To appreciate the living world is neither to deny danger nor to claim that everything natural is morally good.

Access is a political question as well as a personal one. Many people live far from green spaces or cannot reach them because of transport, work, or mobility restrictions. A philosophy that recommends contemplation must recognise those constraints and support shared access rather than treating it as a private achievement.

Contemplation becomes ethically richer when it changes conduct: caring for a place, reducing avoidable damage, or respecting the people who depend on an ecosystem. Admiration alone can coexist with destructive habits. The challenge is to connect perception to responsibility without reducing every encounter with nature to a moral assignment.

Contemplation can be participatory rather than detached. Learning the seasonal rhythms of a nearby wetland, volunteering to restore a path or listening to local knowledge may deepen attention while accepting obligations to other people and living systems. This differs from treating landscapes as backdrops for private restoration. If appreciation changes nothing in our conduct, it risks becoming consumption by other means. A contemplative relation can acknowledge ecological interdependence without claiming that a walk or a view resolves wider environmental problems.

Nor is a pristine wilderness the sole setting for this experience. Cities contain complex ecologies, and cultivated places are not less real because human labour shaped them. However, the opportunity to enjoy safe green space is unequally distributed. Public policy, accessibility and collective care matter alongside personal intention. Contemplation, then, is neither a luxury prescribed to everyone nor a replacement for environmental action; it is one possible mode of perceiving value that can inform how common places are protected.

One person reaches a quiet park in minutes; another needs paid transport or must cross inaccessible terrain. Calling both equally free to contemplate nature overlooks material conditions. A responsible account joins the quality of attention to the politics of access and environmental protection. The everyday practice might begin with looking carefully at a plant, while the collective practice asks who can safely enjoy such places.

Iris Murdoch's account of attention offers one philosophical point of contact, but the questions of urban access and environmental care extend beyond personal contemplation. [3]

6. The Pleasure of Small Experiences

Pleasures differ in scale, duration, and significance. A shared meal, an uninterrupted afternoon, a familiar melody, or the completion of modest work may contribute to a good day without constituting a grand narrative. Calling them small does not make them trivial; it merely releases them from the demand to be transformative.

It is tempting to oppose such pleasures to ambition, as if a person had to choose between a demanding project and simple satisfaction. That opposition is false. Work, artistic effort, scientific inquiry, and caregiving may be difficult and deeply satisfying. Simplicity concerns the quality of our relationship to experiences, not the abolition of complexity or aspiration.

Neither thrift nor consumption provides a universal measure of enjoyment. Paying for a concert can be reasonable; declining it can also be. The question is whether a choice responds to values, circumstances, and consequences or to an imposed need

to display a particular lifestyle. The same outward behaviour may express freedom in one situation and deprivation in another.

Small pleasures matter most when we resist turning them into an inventory. Counting every moment of pleasure can reproduce the logic of accumulation in another form. A richer practice is simply to recognise what matters, share it when appropriate, and let the moment end without demanding a permanent return.

Small pleasures should not become a command to settle for less than one needs. Telling an underpaid worker to appreciate a cup of tea can be insulting if the speaker uses that appreciation to excuse unjust wages. The distinction is between recognising value that does not depend on spectacle and denying legitimate claims to security or opportunity. A modest experience can be satisfying without becoming an argument against fair pay, education, medical care or social participation. The scale of a pleasure says little about the justice of the conditions surrounding it.

Nor must small pleasures compete with long projects. A musician practising for years may value a brief conversation after rehearsal precisely because the larger commitment is difficult. Enjoyment is not confined to outcomes or to pauses between them; it can appear within effort, cooperation and imperfect progress. The practical question is not how many pleasures have been collected, but whether one's habits leave room to recognise experiences that are already meaningful without needing to possess, rank or reproduce them.

Consider someone who pauses to drink water after a demanding shift. The pause may restore a sense of agency, but it cannot compensate for unsafe working conditions or inadequate wages. We should be able to value the moment without allowing it to conceal what must change. This dual attention—to an immediate good and to its social limits—prevents the celebration of simplicity from becoming complacency.

The concern for everyday sufficiency should not be confused with advising deprived people to accept deprivation; the distinction is developed more fully in Volume III.

7. Pain, Loss and Care

Any philosophy of living well that speaks only about pleasure is incomplete. Bodies are vulnerable, people leave, relationships change, and loss can alter the horizon of an entire life. It would be unjust to translate suffering immediately into a lesson or opportunity. Some losses offer no compensating wisdom, and no one owes the world a narrative of personal growth.

Care is more than a sentiment. It includes attention, time, practical assistance, boundaries, and institutions capable of responding to vulnerability. It can require saying no to an unreasonable demand so that support remains sustainable. The freedom to exist does not end when dependence begins: receiving help and retaining a voice in decisions are compatible forms of dignity.

Pain also resists easy comparison. People differ in histories, resources, and bodily capacities; the same event may have distinct meanings and consequences. Respect asks us not to rank grief from a distance.

It asks instead what forms of presence are welcome, what assistance is needed, and what should be left unsaid.

There may be moments when enjoyment returns amid sorrow: a joke, a meal, a glimpse of beauty. Such moments do not cancel the loss or betray the person who is missed. Allowing contradictory feelings is part of treating human experience as complex rather than as a sequence of mutually exclusive moral states.

Care is often described as freely given affection, yet its daily practice includes labour, coordination and unequal burdens. A person who assists a relative for months may love them and still need time, support and a limit on what they can carry alone. A philosophy of presence that praises limitless sacrifice can conceal exhaustion. Good care may require asking others to share responsibility, negotiating consent and accepting institutional help. Responsibility is not measured by the disappearance of the caregiver's own needs.

Loss also resists simple lessons. Some bereavements eventually become part of a person's narrative; others remain disruptive and cannot honestly be transformed into gratitude or growth. It is more respectful to distinguish being present to pain from claiming that pain is beneficial. Companionship may consist of practical help or quiet acknowledgement rather than interpretation. This chapter therefore rejects both compulsory resilience and an ideal of invulnerability: a worthwhile life includes dependence, and the terms of that dependence deserve ethical scrutiny.

After a bereavement, one friend offers a philosophical interpretation while another prepares food and remains available without demanding conversation. Neither gesture is intrinsically forbidden, but the second may better respect the mourner's present needs. The right response depends on what is invited, not on the helper's desire to turn loss into a reassuring story.

Joan Tronto and Eva Feder Kittay have argued for taking dependency and care seriously in ethical thought. The present chapter emphasizes that caregivers also have legitimate needs and limits. [6, 7]

8. Inhabiting the Present Without Monitoring It

The invitation to live in the present contains a paradox. When we constantly ask whether we are present enough, we begin observing ourselves instead of taking part in what we do. A conversation becomes a test of concentration; a walk becomes a measurement of inner calm. Presence can then become another demand to perform well.

Living in the present does not require forgetting the past or abandoning plans. Memory helps us honour commitments and learn from errors; foresight allows us to care for others and prepare for difficulties. The problem begins when recollection and anticipation become so dominant that they crowd out every

possibility of engagement. A balanced life moves among memory, planning, and participation.

No attentional technique suits everyone. Some people may experience close monitoring of sensations as unhelpful or distressing; others may find it supportive. Neither response should be universalized, and clinical needs must be considered separately.

The more generous understanding of presence is unforced participation. We are present when we respond to a child, concentrate on a task, notice fatigue, or change our mind in an honest discussion. We need not inspect the quality of our attention at every turn. Sometimes the deepest sign of engagement is that we cease thinking about how engaged we are.

Attention to the present becomes paradoxical when it is constantly checked. A person can ask every few minutes whether they are sufficiently mindful, thereby replacing direct experience with an audit of experience. The same happens when every walk, meal or conversation is evaluated for psychological benefit. An alternative is intermittent, ordinary return: noticing that one has drifted, responding to what matters and then allowing the question of one's own awareness to recede. Presence is not an achievement requiring continuous proof.

The present is also inseparable from memory and anticipation. Planning for a child, remembering a promise or preparing for an uncertain future need not be forms of escape from the now. They may be precisely what responsible attention requires today. What deserves criticism is not reflection across time, but its becoming so coercive that it disables action or relationship. A balanced account permits recollection, imagination and rest. It does not impose a perpetual state of absorption or claim that contemplative practice suits everyone.

A musician absorbed in playing is not necessarily narrating each moment of awareness; a parent arranging tomorrow's medicine is attending to the present through concern for the future. These forms of involvement demonstrate that presence is not identical with continuous self-observation. A sound practice allows absorption, deliberate thought and periods of not paying special attention to oneself.

Volume I discusses embodiment and presence. The argument here is narrower: participation in ordinary activity need not be measured continuously as a success or failure of attention.

Epilogue · Appreciating Without Demanding

To enjoy existence is not to enjoy everything that happens. It is to keep open the possibility of relation to a world that can be beautiful, indifferent, demanding, and painful. This position resists both compulsory optimism and blanket despair. It asks for attention without surveillance, autonomy without isolation, and gratitude without obligation. The invitation is modest: allow experiences to count without forcing them to prove that a life has succeeded.

References

The references below document conceptual affinities; the cited passages have not been verified line by line against original editions.

1. Sandel MJ. The case against perfection: ethics in the age of genetic engineering. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 2007.
2. Merleau-Ponty M. *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Gallimard; 1945.
3. Murdoch I. The sovereignty of good. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; 1970.
4. Ahmed S. The promise of happiness. Durham (NC): Duke University Press; 2010.
5. Hochschild AR. The managed heart: commercialization of human feeling. Berkeley (CA): University of California Press; 1983.
6. Tronto JC. Moral boundaries: a political argument for an ethic of care. New York: Routledge; 1993.
7. Kittay EF. Love's labor: essays on women, equality, and dependency. New York: Routledge; 1999.

THE FREEDOM TO EXIST

Volume V

Solitude, a Divine Treasure

Inner Independence and Freedom from the Group

Juan Segurola

First edition · v1.0 · EN

© 2026 Juan Segurola
All Rights Reserved

Foreword

This volume examines solitude not as a doctrine of separation but as a condition in which people may exercise independent judgment without denying their dependence on relationships, care and shared institutions. It distinguishes a chosen interval of privacy from imposed isolation. The argument is philosophical rather than a clinical protocol.

1. The Difference Between Solitude and Isolation

Solitude names the circumstance of being with oneself; isolation names a loss or absence of meaningful connection. The two can coincide but do not imply each other. One can be alone, settled and open to others; one can also be surrounded by people and feel profoundly excluded. The mistake is to evaluate an experience solely by counting the people present.

This book therefore defends the capacity for solitude, not a duty to prefer it. Reversibility offers a useful, though not decisive, criterion: can a person move between being alone and being with others without fear, coercion or the loss of meaningful relationships? The question does not turn solitude into a universal prescription; it tests whether the apparent choice is genuinely available.

The distinction between solitude and isolation is in philosophical proximity to Hannah Arendt's discussion of isolation and loneliness [1] and D. W. Winnicott's account of the capacity to be alone [2]. Their analyses are not presented as sources of the tests proposed here; the argument developed in this chapter is the author's own.

Chosen solitude can offer a space in which preferences emerge without the immediate demand to justify them. Yet choice matters: the same quiet that restores one person can burden another whose separation is imposed by illness, discrimination, poverty or bereavement. Calling every withdrawal liberating ignores the social conditions under which withdrawal happens.

A person may choose an evening alone after a demanding working day, while another may spend the same evening without company because transport, money or health makes social participation difficult. Looking only at the number of hours alone erases this difference. The relevant features are access to relationships, freedom to end the solitude and the person's own account of its meaning. A philosophy of independence must therefore ask about the conditions of choice, not simply celebrate the outward appearance of withdrawal.

A practical ethic of solitude consequently has two simultaneous demands. Individuals should be permitted periods without social performance or constant availability; communities should maintain meaningful routes back to companionship. The freedom to close one's door is incomplete if one cannot also open it and be welcomed. Independence, properly conceived, requires both privacy and accessible relationships.

Silence has no moral value merely by being silent. It may support deliberation, but it can also prolong avoidance of a conflict that needs attention. Judgment depends

on the reasons for withdrawal, its duration, its consequences and the opportunities to return to conversation. A careful defense of solitude protects room for choice without turning social isolation into a virtue.

A difficult objection follows: people do not always know whether their solitude is chosen. Shame, exhaustion or disappointment may be narrated as independence, and an unwelcoming community can make retreat seem preferable to repeated rejection. This does not invalidate the experience of peace a person may discover alone. It means that self-description cannot be the only criterion. A more demanding test asks whether the person can seek contact without humiliation, can leave solitude without losing dignity and has realistic opportunities for relationship. Where these conditions are absent, praising independence risks converting a social failure into a private virtue. Freedom requires a world in which more than one form of life is genuinely available.

2. The Need to Belong

Belonging is not an obstacle to autonomy by definition. Relationships transmit language, practical knowledge, affection and care. A person who says “I need no one” may mistake a moment of self-sufficiency for the whole history of support that made it possible. Research on belonging has argued for the broad significance of stable interpersonal bonds [3]; that finding does not dictate the form each relationship ought to take.

The relevant question is what belonging costs and what it makes possible. A group can provide shelter while requiring silence about injustice. Another may welcome dissent and help its members grow. Neither constant agreement nor permanent disagreement proves that a relationship is healthy. The quality of a bond is tested when disagreement, need and limitation appear.

Independence should therefore be understood as independence of judgment within an interdependent life. We depend on infrastructure, institutions and other people without surrendering every decision to them. To acknowledge dependence honestly can be more emancipatory than pretending it does not exist. This is consistent with Deci and Ryan’s distinction between autonomy and relatedness [4].

The wish to belong can protect people against arbitrary treatment by placing them within networks of mutual recognition. It can also press them to accept norms that they would reject under calmer examination. These tendencies coexist. A workplace team may offer support during a crisis while discouraging a member from identifying an unsafe practice. The moral task is not to choose between all belonging and no belonging, but to distinguish obligations of care from demands for uncritical loyalty.

Belonging becomes more compatible with autonomy when dissent does not entail social annihilation. Groups can establish practices of reason-giving, appeal and respectful exit. At the personal level, maintaining relationships outside a single circle reduces the temptation to mistake one community’s judgments for the whole world’s judgments. Such plural belonging does not eliminate dependency, but it can make dependency more negotiable.

The problem becomes concrete when a group makes acceptance conditional on repeating a judgment one considers false. Remaining may protect important relationships, while dissent may protect intellectual integrity. There is no cost-free formula. A responsible decision examines the seriousness of the disputed claim, the realistic options for reform within the group and the personal consequences of leaving. It also recognizes that some people, especially those dependent on family or community resources, cannot depart as freely as the rhetoric of choice suggests.

The need to belong becomes visible when a community treats agreement as the price of admission. A new colleague may discover that joining informal conversations requires endorsing jokes or judgments they find unfair. Refusing carries a cost: invitations may diminish and everyday cooperation may become more awkward. The choice is not between being a fearless individual and becoming a submissive member. It is between different ways of negotiating a legitimate need for connection while preserving limits on what can be asked of a person. Recognizing belonging as a human motivation, as discussed in [3], does not imply that every group practice is justified. A genuine community can sustain disagreement without threatening expulsion for every divergence.

There is also a converse error: treating the desire for belonging as evidence of weakness. Membership in a family, association, profession or friendship network can support learning, mutual correction and protection against arbitrary power. Independence is not the absence of obligations; it is the ability to understand, question and responsibly accept them. A person may freely identify with a group and still retain judgment about its decisions. The practical standard is not emotional indifference to approval but the possibility of dissent, repair and exit. Social institutions should make those possibilities credible rather than merely proclaiming that everyone is free to disagree.

3. Approval as a Form of Dependence

Approval can inform us that an action helped someone or that our reasons are intelligible. The difficulty begins when approval becomes the condition for recognizing our own worth. Then silence is interpreted as rejection, criticism as an existential threat, and ordinary difference as proof that we have failed.

Consider a person who changes an opinion in a meeting after hearing better evidence. From outside, that change can look like conformity, yet it may express intellectual responsibility. Another person keeps an opinion merely to appear courageous: that apparent independence is also captivity to an audience. The decisive difference lies in the reasons for changing or staying, not in the visible gesture.

Approval is useful feedback only when its grounds can be examined. A student praised for an elegant solution may learn something; a student praised for never questioning a teacher may learn that obedience is the price of safety. The same outward compliment thus carries very different implications. What matters is whether another person's evaluation enlarges a person's understanding or replaces the process of judging with an expectation of reward.

There is an objection to excessive emphasis on independence: criticism from others frequently reveals errors that private reflection cannot detect. We do not become autonomous by discounting every external judgment. Instead, we become more capable when we ask which part of a response is evidence, which part expresses a value and which part merely reflects status or habit. The difficulty lies in considering feedback seriously without granting it final authority over our worth.

A practical experiment is to separate a decision from the audience that will witness it. Before sharing a plan, write the reasons for and against it, including who may be affected. After receiving reactions, revise those reasons rather than merely counting supporters. This does not immunize anyone against the need for recognition, but it makes visible the difference between learning from others and being governed by applause.

A useful distinction separates approval of a deed from permission to exist as oneself. The first can be deserved, disputed and revised; the second should not depend on a favorable audience. In a workplace, a careful supervisor may commend a well-supported proposal and reject another without diminishing the author's dignity. Problems arise when evaluation extends from the merits of an act to unconditional loyalty, so that criticism is interpreted as proof of personal inadequacy.

Imagine receiving enthusiastic praise for a decision that violates a considered commitment. The immediate satisfaction of approval is real, but it may conceal a longer-term cost: an individual learns to use applause as evidence that a choice was correct. Over time, this shortcut can weaken the habit of providing reasons to oneself. The point is not that praise is corrupting. Recognition can be deserved, informative and sustaining. The difficulty arises when recognition replaces judgment rather than responding to it. One practical question is therefore whether a person could explain a decision in the absence of an audience, or whether its only justification is the expectation of being admired.

4. Learning to Be with Oneself

Time alone does not automatically yield self-knowledge. It can become a workshop for inquiry or a chamber for rehearsing the same fear. The difference emerges from what we do with attention: observe a feeling, identify the decision it concerns, and return to ordinary activity without demanding a final explanation of every thought.

Learning to be alone also involves modest skills: preparing a meal, arranging a day, tolerating a quiet interval, asking for support before exhaustion, and accepting that boredom is not necessarily a sign of emptiness. These skills are unequally available. Caring duties, unstable housing or disability may severely restrict the opportunity to enjoy unstructured time; philosophical advice must not ignore those constraints.

One objection is that attention to the self may become self-absorption. This is a genuine risk when reflection turns into an endless attempt to reach certainty about motives. The alternative is to connect introspection to conduct. Asking whether one

is generous becomes clearer when accompanied by an ordinary act of generosity; considering a boundary becomes clearer when one communicates it respectfully and observes the effects.

Learning to be with oneself therefore has a material and relational dimension. Having a safe space, enough rest and freedom from constant interruption changes what solitude can offer. Caring duties may make uninterrupted time scarce, so even a brief, reliable period can matter. The aim is not to prescribe a daily quota but to secure occasions in which thought, bodily experience and action can be considered without immediate pressure to perform for others.

Private reflection becomes more productive when it ends in a provisional action. One can identify a recurring difficulty, write down two plausible interpretations, seek information that could distinguish them and revisit the conclusion after a conversation or experience. The aim is not perfect access to an inner essence. It is the cultivation of a revisable account of oneself that remains connected to the world, other people and the consequences of choices.

An individual who has never been permitted an unscheduled hour may find the first available interval uncomfortable. Without instructions, a screen or an urgent obligation, attention searches for the next demand. It is tempting to interpret that discomfort as proof that solitude is unsuitable. An alternative reading is more modest: freedom requires practice in making small decisions without external reinforcement. Choosing whether to read, walk, rest or do nothing can disclose preferences that routine obligations have concealed. No special technique or promise of psychological transformation is required. The relevant experiment is an ordinary one, making a limited space in which an action need not be publicly explained.

5. Thinking Differently from the Group

Dissent has no inherent virtue if it consists only of reflexively contradicting others. An independent judgment considers a proposition, its evidence and its consequences before accepting or rejecting it.

Groups can be mistaken; solitary thinkers can be mistaken as well. Neither the majority nor the dissenter has a monopoly on reason.

John Stuart Mill treated pressures toward conformity in his discussion of individuality in *On Liberty*, chapter III [5]. The present symmetry test for dissent is a separate proposal, not a quotation or a result attributed to Mill.

In family life, professional settings or friendships, disagreement is complicated by legitimate obligations. Refusing an unsafe practice may be necessary; refusing a coordinated task simply to defend one's identity may be irresponsible. The freedom to say no therefore requires the courage to explain the no and the humility to revise it when warranted.

A workable test is whether a position can survive contact with a serious objection. Listening does not require capitulation; it reveals which parts of our judgment are

reasons and which are habits. Independence grows less from being unlike the group than from being answerable for what one believes.

Yet a demand to justify every dissent can be unfair when power is unequal. A junior employee may identify risk without having access to the data needed for a complete demonstration. A responsible institution must allow provisional concerns to be raised and investigated. Reason-giving should not be turned into an impossible burden placed on those with the least authority. The freedom to disagree depends partly on procedures that protect people from retaliation.

Classic experimental work by Asch investigated the tension between an individual judgment and an apparently unanimous majority under specific laboratory conditions [6]. It demonstrates that social pressure can affect public answers in the studied setting; it does not establish that every community is coercive or that opposition is inherently accurate. The philosophical lesson here is narrower: the number of people asserting a proposition is a different kind of information from the evidence supporting it.

Disagreement also has a relational form. A person can state an objection precisely, acknowledge the costs borne by others and leave open the possibility of correction. In contrast, theatrical dissent can make social recognition depend on being visibly contrary. The test of independence is symmetry: would I accept this conclusion if it were proposed by someone I dislike, and would I abandon my current position if a stronger argument appeared?

A practical challenge arises when dissent has consequences for people other than the dissenter. A professional who objects to an unsafe procedure should explain the risk and use accountable channels; a member who dislikes a harmless collective preference may reasonably compromise. In both cases judgment includes the likely effects of action. This is why courage needs to be distinguished from theatrical refusal. The aim is not to preserve an immaculate individual identity at any social cost, but to prevent convenience, fear or prestige from replacing reasons. The capacity to revise one's dissent after criticism is part of independence, not evidence that independence has failed.

6. Freely Chosen Relationships

A freely chosen relationship is not one without obligations. Commitment creates expectations, mutual adjustment and sometimes sacrifices that are not immediately pleasant. What distinguishes a respectful bond is the possibility of discussing those expectations without coercion or the threat of losing one's basic dignity.

Relationships can become constraining gradually: a small concession, then a habit of avoiding certain topics, then a fear of disappointing the other person. Yet the opposite error is to treat every compromise as submission. The ethical task is to identify the difference between reciprocal care and a pattern in which one voice systematically disappears.

The ability to spend time apart may strengthen a relationship precisely because it relieves the demand to perform constant agreement. But autonomy also requires accessibility: partners, friends and relatives should not have to guess whether help

will be offered in a moment of vulnerability. Respectful boundaries are explicit, revisable and attentive to consequences.

Relationships are seldom chosen under conditions of perfect freedom. Friendship develops through shared spaces, partnership through circumstances and care through histories that cannot be restarted at will. Calling a relationship chosen should therefore not conceal economic constraints, disability, unequal household labor or fear of losing a home. These factors alter the costs of speaking, leaving or asking for change. Autonomy in relationship must attend to those costs rather than merely assert a formal right to exit.

The emphasis on commitments negotiated under unequal conditions also meets debates on relational autonomy. It should not be mistaken for a claim that every relation can be assessed by unconstrained choice alone.

Freely chosen ties are strongest when both parties can renegotiate ordinary arrangements without treating negotiation as betrayal. Decisions about money, rest, friendships and shared work become occasions for joint reasoning. Space for separate pursuits can make togetherness more deliberate. In that sense the independence celebrated by this volume is not a competitive asset possessed against a partner, but a condition that can protect reciprocity.

The language of boundaries can itself be misused. A person may invoke “my independence” to avoid promises or the ordinary labor of repair. Equally, another may invoke loyalty to suppress disagreement. A more reliable criterion asks whether obligations are reciprocal, proportionate and open to explanation. Genuine autonomy does not exempt a person from accountability; it makes consent and responsibility more meaningful because they are not secured merely by fear of abandonment.

The phrase “freely chosen” can also obscure differences in bargaining power. A person who depends on another for housing, immigration status or essential care may formally consent while having few realistic alternatives. The moral test of a relationship therefore cannot stop at the initial declaration of choice. It must consider how disagreements are handled, whether boundaries can be renegotiated and whether the more powerful party bears responsibility for keeping the other’s options meaningful. Freedom in relationships is sustained through practices of mutual accountability, not established once and for all by a promise. Nor does the need for help diminish the standing of the person receiving it.

7. Asking for Help Without Surrendering Judgment

To ask for help is to acknowledge a limit, not to transfer ownership of one’s life. We routinely rely on expertise: a mechanic, a physician, a lawyer, a trusted friend. A good adviser clarifies options, uncertainties and consequences; a poor adviser replaces explanation with demands for trust.

There are circumstances in which immediate vulnerability limits meaningful choice. Children, people in acute crisis and those without access to resources cannot always negotiate assistance on equal terms. Defending autonomy therefore

includes building trustworthy institutions and protections, not merely instructing individuals to become stronger.

A practical question to ask an adviser is: which part of this recommendation is evidence, which part is interpretation, and what alternatives remain? The answer need not abolish dependence. It can transform dependence into a relationship where decisions are more intelligible and agency remains visible.

Seeking advice involves an asymmetry of knowledge: one person knows more about a particular question, while the other bears much of its consequence. Respecting expertise means acknowledging that asymmetry without treating expertise as unlimited authority. A financial adviser may understand a product's structure but not a family's tolerance for uncertainty; a clinician may know medical options while the patient knows the lived costs of treatment. Good decisions require these forms of knowledge to meet rather than compete.

A useful practical distinction separates requesting information, delegating a task and delegating a decision. These acts have different consequences. Someone can ask a trusted friend to gather options without giving the friend power to choose; conversely, someone can authorize another person to decide within stated limits. Making those boundaries explicit helps prevent an act of cooperation from quietly turning into a transfer of personal authority.

John Hardwig analyzed epistemic dependence in situations where expert testimony matters [7]. The distinctions developed here between requesting information, delegating a task and delegating a decision are the author's practical proposal, not Hardwig's terminology.

Expertise helps when its domain and limits are made explicit. A physician may offer evidence about likely benefits and harms; a friend may know personal values and constraints; a lawyer may identify legal exposure. None of these forms of knowledge automatically answers every other question. The person asking for help can retain agency by distinguishing the technical assessment, the value judgment and the decision about what trade-off to accept.

The same issue occurs in intimate relationships. Asking for support may expose vulnerability, and accepting support may create obligations of gratitude or reciprocity. Yet neither fact gives another person unlimited authority over one's decisions. A helper may appropriately set limits on what they can provide; the recipient may appropriately reject conditions that violate their dignity. Where care involves severe dependence, autonomy may require accessible information, representation and sustained safeguards, rather than the fiction that everyone is equally self-sufficient. The stronger form of independence is therefore compatible with interdependence because it treats responsibility and power as questions to be examined rather than denied.

8. Solitude as a Possibility

The book's argument is not that everyone should seek the same amount of solitude. Temperament, age, caregiving, culture and life circumstances differ. What matters is preserving access to a form of time in which a person is not constantly required to justify their presence, perform belonging or anticipate an audience.

The value of such time appears paradoxically when one returns to others. A decision considered without immediate pressure may be stated with greater care; an emotion allowed to settle may be discussed without accusation. Solitude can prepare encounter, but it can also become avoidance. The measure is whether life becomes wider and more responsible, not whether the calendar contains many empty hours.

Solitude is a divine treasure only when it remains one human possibility among others. It cannot replace justice, friendship, public life or care. Its philosophical promise is narrower and more demanding: to live with enough inner space to choose bonds deliberately, to disagree responsibly, and to recognize when we need another person.

A second limit concerns the romance of withdrawal. Solitude can help a person recover judgment, yet some problems require organized action rather than private clarity. Exploitation at work, discrimination and failures of public care cannot be repaired solely by adopting a serene attitude. Returning to the shared world is not a concession that diminishes inner independence; it is frequently the form in which considered judgment becomes responsible action.

The treasure of solitude is thus conditional and shareable in an indirect sense. Communities can respect private time, reduce compulsory visibility and refrain from interpreting every refusal as rejection. Individuals can cultivate a space for judgment while remaining responsible for the effects of their actions. The book closes on this double claim: belonging need not require self-erasure, and independence need not require disappearance from the lives of others.

If solitude is a possibility rather than a doctrine, its value can change across the course of a life. A student may need distance from a competitive peer group; a new parent may long for uninterrupted rest; a bereaved person may need both quiet and dependable companionship. It would be arbitrary to prescribe the same amount of solitude to each. What matters is whether people can shape their relationships to their circumstances and whether society allows room for those choices. In that sense the argument for solitude is inseparable from a commitment to humane workplaces, accessible communities and shared care responsibilities.

The book's central proposition can now be tested against a final objection: perhaps solitude matters only because it makes social relationships more effective. That instrumental view captures part of its value, but not all. A person may enjoy an unobserved landscape, consider an unanswered question or rest without preparing to return as a more productive member of a group. Experiences need not demonstrate public usefulness to deserve protection. At the same time, private freedom cannot justify neglecting people to whom one has undertaken serious

duties. The treasure is the freedom to move responsibly between presence and withdrawal, rather than the elevation of either into an absolute ideal.

Epilogue

Freedom in solitude is incomplete without freedom in relationship. The achievement is neither self-enclosure nor constant availability: it is a capacity to remain answerable for our judgments while acknowledging the people and circumstances that make life possible.

References (Vancouver)

1. Arendt H. The Origins of Totalitarianism. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich; 1973. Part III, chapter 13, Ideology and Terror: A Novel Form of Government.
 2. Winnicott DW. The capacity to be alone. *Int J Psychoanal.* 1958;39(5):416-420. PMID:13610513.
 3. Baumeister RF, Leary MR. The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychol Bull.* 1995;117(3):497-529. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497.
 4. Deci EL, Ryan RM. The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychol Inq.* 2000;11(4):227-268. doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01.
 5. Mill JS. On Liberty. London: John W. Parker and Son; 1859. Chapter III, Of Individuality, as One of the Elements of Well-Being.
 6. Asch SE. Studies of independence and conformity: I. A minority of one against a unanimous majority. *Psychol Monogr Gen Appl.* 1956;70(9):1-70. doi:10.1037/h0093718.
 7. Hardwig J. Epistemic dependence. *J Philos.* 1985;82(7):335-349. doi:10.2307/2026523.
- Bibliographic scope: [1] and [5] establish philosophical context; [2] offers a psychoanalytic proximity; [3] addresses belonging; [4] addresses autonomy and relatedness; [6] covers laboratory conformity; [7] examines epistemic dependence. Passage-level pagination has not been independently authenticated.

THE FREEDOM TO EXIST

Volume VI

Flowing with Existence

Thought, Action, and Personal Fulfillment

Juan Segurola

First edition · v1.0 · EN

© 2026 Juan Segurola
All Rights Reserved

Foreword

This volume examines the relation between thought, deliberate action, uncertainty, collaboration and personal fulfillment. Its philosophical proposals are arguments to be tested against experience, not clinical conclusions or universal recipes.

1. Thinking to Discover

Thought begins before a plan exists. A question, an irritation or an unexpected observation can expose the limits of what we already know. To think creatively is not merely to produce a novel object; it is to remain available to an interpretation that the habitual account excludes. The first discipline of discovery is therefore not certainty but attention. A problem named too quickly may be a problem badly understood.

An idea must be distinguished from the person who holds it. If criticism of a proposal is experienced as criticism of identity, inquiry loses its capacity to change direction. An independent thinker can defend an idea while deliberately searching for circumstances in which it would fail. Imagination needs this double movement: the willingness to venture beyond a familiar explanation and the willingness to return to evidence.

A useful test for a new idea is to give the most sympathetic possible account of the alternative it disputes. When we can explain why reasonable people might prefer another interpretation, our own thesis becomes both more precise and less dependent on victory in an argument. Consider someone who sees a poorly organized workplace and immediately proposes a new procedure. Before drafting that procedure, the person might ask whether the apparent disorder serves a purpose invisible from their position. Curiosity can prevent a technically elegant solution from becoming a practical mistake.

An inventive association can be valuable before anyone knows how to test it. Its value, however, is provisional: a plausible origin is not a justification. Consider a public project proposed after one striking complaint. The experience that prompts the proposal deserves attention, but the claim about its wider benefits also needs observations from people differently affected. Distinguishing those two stages allows imagination to remain active without granting the first impulse authority over the evidence.

The distinction between the origin of an idea and its justification has a philosophical history, especially in Reichenbach's analysis of discovery and justification [1]. Popper's account of critical testing likewise helps distinguish a proposal from its exposure to possible refutation [2]. Neither is claimed here as a new distinction, nor is scientific falsification a universal rule for ethical decisions. Dewey described reflective thought as active, persistent and careful consideration of beliefs rather than mere mental activity [3].

Creativity also needs a right to decline fashionable problems. When every conversation urges us to innovate, refusing an unnecessary novelty can express better judgment than producing another solution. A town deciding whether to

replace a familiar public space should compare maintenance, accessibility and the meaning of the existing place before praising novelty itself. The freedom to create includes the freedom to conserve when conservation is justified.

A second task of creative thinking is to examine who gets to define a problem. A manager describes delays as laziness; workers describe an unpredictable schedule; clients describe confusing instructions. Each account selects different causes, and each suggested remedy risks benefiting the person who controls the description. Rather than averaging these accounts mechanically, responsible inquiry asks what observations could distinguish them and who bears the cost of being mistaken. A creative proposal is not intrinsically generous because it is new. It becomes defensible when the people affected can challenge its assumptions and when the evidence against it is taken seriously. This requirement is especially important when the creator has more authority than the people who will live with the result.

There is also a practical test of intellectual generosity. When a colleague identifies a flaw in our proposal, we can either repair the argument or quietly change its definition until no objection seems to apply. The latter tactic preserves pride at the expense of clarity. A better practice is to write down the objection in terms the critic recognises, identify what evidence would change our view, and leave a visible record of revision. Discovery is not only the creation of alternatives; it is the ability to learn publicly.

2. From Idea to First Step

An intention is not yet an action. Between them lies a threshold of uncertainty: the possibility that the first attempt will reveal limitations that contemplation alone concealed. The threshold can encourage endless preparation. Planning is valuable when it clarifies a decision, but it becomes avoidance when each additional plan substitutes for contact with the situation.

A useful first step is small enough to be reversible and concrete enough to produce information. It may consist of writing a page, discussing a draft with a trusted reader or testing a feasible part of a larger design. These steps do not guarantee progress. They transform an imagined undertaking into a reality that can answer back.

The first step can be understood as a contract with reality rather than a promise of success. An aspiring writer, for example, may spend months outlining an ambitious book. Producing a short chapter creates a different kind of information: the voice may not carry the argument, the intended audience may be unclear, or the available time may be insufficient. None of these discoveries invalidates the purpose of writing. They make the next decision less imaginary.

A counterargument holds that caution at the beginning extinguishes audacity. There is genuine force in this concern: every meaningful undertaking risks embarrassment, wasted effort or disappointment. The distinction is not between risk and its absence, but between risks one may legitimately choose for oneself and risks imposed on others without adequate justification. Courage can coexist with clear limits.

An idea becomes action through a chain of limited promises. The first promise is to define what can be tested; the second is to identify the people affected; the third is to decide in advance which result would justify stopping. Consider a community library attempting longer opening hours. A temporary trial with voluntary participation, published criteria and an exit route creates knowledge without presenting expansion as an irreversible moral demand.

An objection deserves attention: some undertakings cannot be meaningfully tested on a small scale. Trust, public infrastructure and long commitments may depend on a sustained promise. A trial friendship is not simply a miniature friendship, and an unfinished bridge reveals little about its social value. Starting modestly is therefore a heuristic, not a law. Where scale changes the nature of the practice, the responsible first step may be a careful agreement about resources, obligations and exit conditions. What matters is replacing a vague declaration with a commitment proportionate to its consequences. Deliberation should neither become an alibi for refusing life nor a slogan that excuses exposing others to preventable loss.

The smallest step is not always the right step. A pilot that is inexpensive for the initiator may be costly for participants who have to reorganize their time, disclose information or absorb failures. Before acting, a responsible person asks who bears the experiment's risk, whether participation can be declined, and what will happen if the initiative stops. Reversibility must be assessed from the standpoint of every affected person, not simply from the perspective of the person directing the project.

A useful distinction separates readiness from permission. We may be intellectually ready to act while lacking the legitimate authority to commit a team, an institution or a family to our decision. The first step then is neither passivity nor unilateral action, but negotiation of scope. A person planning a community initiative could begin with a public explanation and an invitation to criticism rather than a fully designed solution imposed on neighbors. Action can begin with listening.

3. Experimenting Without Fear of Mistakes

An experiment exposes an assumption to possible disappointment. In research, craft and everyday decisions, the value of a trial often lies in what it rules out. An outcome that contradicts the initial expectation can still be informative, provided the procedure makes the result interpretable. The right ambition is not to enjoy failure but to stop treating every failure as a verdict on personal worth.

Yet error has unequal costs. A harmless draft can be revised; a clinical decision, financial commitment or irreversible intervention may expose others to harms they did not choose. In those settings, restraint, competence and external review are not enemies of creativity. Responsible experimentation asks what can safely be varied, which safeguards are needed, and who bears the risk.

Fear cannot be abolished by a slogan. It can sometimes be reduced by designing work around smaller commitments and clear criteria for stopping. An honest record of an unsuccessful attempt helps prevent the comforting fiction that effort

necessarily produces improvement. The aim is an informed relation to uncertainty, not a heroic posture toward it.

A failed trial is informative only under conditions that make failure interpretable. If an artist changes the medium, the audience and the purpose of a work simultaneously, disappointment reveals little about which choice mattered. The same lesson applies to ordinary projects: distinguish what was attempted, what was expected and what actually occurred. This does not require turning life into a laboratory. It requires enough memory and honesty to resist inventing an explanation after the fact.

Errors reveal something different depending on whether the underlying test was fair. When a person claims that an initiative failed because others resisted change, they might be concealing poor consultation. When a project succeeds only through uncompensated labor, the apparent success deserves a second evaluation. Describing outcomes demands attention to who bears the costs as well as to whether the announced target was reached.

Experiments are often praised because they permit error, yet errors are not all of the same moral kind. A painter can discard a canvas, but a clinician, teacher or employer cannot treat another person as disposable material. The right to learn through error ends where exposure to avoidable harm begins. This does not mean that every uncertain activity is prohibited. It means that competence, consent, safeguards and alternatives must be part of deciding whether to proceed. When a trial concerns a vulnerable person, the burden of explanation falls especially on the person proposing it. Calling an intervention exploratory does not reduce that burden.

The opposite error is to make perfect safety a condition for every useful activity. Ordinary learning necessarily involves mistakes, including some that inconvenience other people. A proportionate approach distinguishes minor, reversible setbacks from serious harms, and makes the costs visible instead of celebrating every setback as “growth.” What matters after an error is not a ritual statement of resilience but a candid description of what happened, whose interests were affected and what changes before another attempt.

4. Self-Chosen Discipline

Discipline is often portrayed as submission to a rule. Its more interesting form emerges when the person affected by the rule has examined and endorsed its purpose. A regular period of study or practice can protect an aspiration from the claims of immediate distraction. The rule serves freedom when it preserves the ability to act on considered priorities.

Not every demanding routine is freely chosen. Economic pressure, institutional evaluation and expectations of constant availability can make obedience look like dedication. It matters whether someone can question the routine, negotiate its costs and leave it without disproportionate punishment. A self-chosen discipline must remain open to revision when its consequences contradict its aims.

A freely adopted practice needs a procedure for reconsideration. Imagine a musician who chooses to practice every morning. The routine protects an aspiration, yet illness, a changed family duty or diminishing returns can make the same schedule destructive. Revising the practice is not necessarily disloyalty to music. It may be the only way to preserve the activity's place in a good life.

The strongest objection concerns habit itself. If every decision must be examined afresh, deliberation becomes exhausting and routine loses its protective value. This objection is right: thoughtful discipline may temporarily suspend reconsideration so that work can happen. Yet the suspension must not become permanent. Periodic review distinguishes a chosen commitment from a rule that has quietly taken control.

A chosen rule is ethically different from an imposed rule only when the chooser has real alternatives. Deci and Ryan [4] discuss autonomy, competence and relatedness in their account of self-determination. Their framework can illuminate the difference between an activity experienced as one's own and one maintained solely under pressure; it does not establish a universal prescription for discipline. The philosophical question here is how a person can remain answerable for a commitment when its original conditions change.

A useful test is whether a practice allows renegotiation without humiliation. A laboratory researcher may hold herself to exacting routines while rejecting a manager's demand for limitless availability. In that case, effort is not the problem; the absence of boundaries is. Commitment should be judged by its purposes, its costs and the possibility of responsible revision, not by the number of hours it occupies.

Discipline becomes oppressive when its purpose is no longer open to examination. A schedule can initially protect a meaningful project and later persist as an identity test: missing a session feels like moral failure even when illness, caregiving or changed priorities provide compelling reasons to stop. A freely chosen practice therefore needs intervals for reassessment. The question is not merely whether a person follows the rule, but whether the rule still serves a defensible end.

5. Persevering and Changing Course

Perseverance has moral prestige because it resists the temptation to abandon difficulty. But persistence can also defend an error. Money, time and identity invested in a project do not prove that further investment is justified. To decide whether to continue, one must distinguish the enduring purpose from the particular route first selected to reach it.

Changing direction is neither automatically defeat nor automatically growth. A change deserves reasons: new evidence, altered circumstances, a foreseeable cost to others or the recognition that the original ambition no longer expresses a genuine commitment. Otherwise, the language of flexibility can conceal unwillingness to face necessary effort.

A useful review asks three questions: what have we learned, what remains worth protecting, and which commitments can be released? The answers need not be

quick. Some undertakings demand patience precisely because their benefits develop slowly. The art is to preserve judgment while investing effort, so that perseverance does not become captivity.

The danger of perseverance is that it can change the question without our noticing. At first we ask whether a project serves a worthwhile purpose. Later we ask whether abandoning it would make the earlier sacrifice meaningless. The second question is emotionally understandable, but it cannot determine what should be done next. Past effort explains attachment; it does not by itself justify future expenditure.

There are also constraints on changing one's mind. A promise to collaborators is not infinitely revisable at one person's convenience. Freedom must account for dependency created by prior commitments. The ethical issue is not merely whether an individual feels motivated, but what transition can be arranged fairly for people who planned their lives around the undertaking.

Changing course can be an act of fidelity to an earlier purpose. A teacher who leaves a prestigious institution to work more effectively with disadvantaged students has not necessarily abandoned education; the institutional vehicle has changed. Conversely, invoking a noble purpose does not absolve someone who breaks commitments without repairing foreseeable damage. Freedom to revise includes duties of explanation and transition.

Imagine a cooperative project that has failed to attract participants after repeated revisions. Its founders may owe one another a final, explicit assessment rather than a demand to "believe harder." They should distinguish the value of the original aim from the effectiveness of the chosen method. A good aim can require abandoning a bad instrument. Changing direction preserves integrity when it protects the underlying responsibility instead of escaping it.

6. Creating with Others

Collaboration enlarges what a person can attempt. Different competencies can expose blind spots, distribute work and improve a shared product. Yet cooperation is not intrinsically harmonious. Unequal access to information, credit or resources can turn the language of teamwork into a cover for domination.

Good collaboration makes disagreement usable. Participants should know who decides, how contributions are recognized, what evidence would justify reconsideration and how unresolved conflicts will be handled. These safeguards do not replace trust; they allow trust to survive when expectations diverge. A group that cannot tolerate a reasoned objection deprives itself of one of collaboration's strongest benefits.

One practical test of a collaboration is how it treats the person who notices a problem. In a healthy team, identifying an error is not automatically interpreted as disloyalty. An objection can be documented, evaluated and answered, even if the final decision remains unchanged. Without such procedures, apparently unanimous agreement may record silence rather than conviction.

Credit is another site of tension. Shared work often includes visible inventors and less visible maintainers, editors, technicians or caregivers whose contributions enable the result. A fair account of achievement resists identifying the whole work with its most prominent spokesperson. At the same time, equal recognition does not require pretending that every contribution had the same content or responsibility.

Collaboration can also fail when the group becomes a substitute for individual judgment. A person may adopt an implausible proposal merely because it carries the group's enthusiasm. Responsibility does not disappear when decisions are collective. The best cooperative arrangements make room for disagreement, clear roles and a way to repair harm without reducing every conflict to a contest of personalities.

Creative work with others rarely follows the romance of solitary genius. Amabile's study [5] of creativity situates creative behavior within social and motivational conditions. This supports attending to the environments in which ideas develop, although it cannot decide which specific collaboration is just. Credit, access to information, opportunities to disagree and the allocation of invisible maintenance work remain distinct ethical questions.

Imagine a team whose central invention depends on a technician detecting a recurrent failure. If the public narrative credits only the presenter, future workers learn that telling the truth may cost recognition. A fair culture documents contributions early, allows dissent to be heard and gives people a route to challenge decisions. Cooperation should increase the reach of responsibility, not disperse it until nobody is accountable.

Nor is consensus always evidence of a healthy group. Silence can be purchased by fatigue, status differences or the fear of being labeled difficult. A responsible collective can protect disagreement by distinguishing decisions that need unanimity from those that need informed consultation, and by recording unresolved objections. Amabile's work on the social context of creativity gives a reason to take environments seriously; it does not imply that any particular managerial practice is universally optimal.

7. Rest Along the Way

Rest is not merely a reward granted after sufficient productivity. Bodies and attention have rhythms, and a life organized exclusively around output tends to forget the conditions that make action possible. Recovery may involve sleep, quiet activity, unstructured time or a temporary withdrawal from demands. None of these must be justified by a future increase in performance.

Nevertheless, the ability to rest is unequally distributed. Care duties, precarious work and material insecurity constrain choice. Advice about balance is incomplete when it overlooks these circumstances. The ethics of rest therefore includes institutions and relationships: how schedules, expectations and practical assistance make recovery possible or prevent it.

Rest can also be difficult for someone who identifies entirely with a project. Stopping exposes the fear that effort is the only source of value. A humane understanding of action recognizes that a person remains worthy of consideration during inactivity. A pause may clarify a decision, but it does not need to produce insight in order to be legitimate.

Still, the appeal to rest can be too easy when it comes from those with control over their schedules. A parent caring for a dependent relative, or a worker whose hours change without notice, may know perfectly well that rest matters while being unable to obtain it. Respect for human limits must therefore include the distribution of care work, predictable time and practical support. Personal discipline cannot correct every structural problem.

A further difficulty is deciding when stopping becomes avoidance. A pause can restore clarity, but repeated postponement may also preserve fear of completion. A person might ask what the pause is protecting, what obligations remain and whether a limited return to the task would clarify the question. Rest and responsibility are partners, not opposites.

The question of stopping also concerns our relationship to other people. If a family member is carrying an unfair share of work, my personal rest cannot simply be declared sacred without considering their condition. Conversely, demanding that caregivers never rest is unsustainable. Responsible arrangements distribute time and duties in ways that make restoration possible for each person, rather than treating exhaustion as a private failure.

How, then, do we distinguish rest from avoidant delay? The distinction cannot be made from a fixed number of hours. A necessary recovery may be long; a brief interruption may hide an unwillingness to face a difficult conversation. We can instead ask what responsibilities remain, whether the pause is freely chosen and whether returning to the task is possible without renewed harm. A person may discover that the right response is not renewed effort but a redefinition of the task. This makes rest a space for judgment, rather than a moral failing or an optimization technique. A life with no time for such judgment is unlikely to be genuinely self-directed.

8. Fulfillment Beyond Results

Outcomes matter. A bridge must stand, a promise must be kept and a contribution must answer to the people it affects. Yet achievements alone provide an incomplete account of a life. Results are shaped partly by chance, circumstances and the work of others. To measure personal fulfillment only by visible success is to surrender self-understanding to factors that no individual fully controls.

Fulfillment can include the quality of attention brought to a task, the relationships preserved while pursuing it, and the willingness to revise convictions without humiliation. This account must not romanticize deprivation or suggest that fair pay, safety or public recognition are dispensable. Material conditions support the possibility of meaningful activity.

To flow with existence is not to consent passively to whatever happens. It is to connect thought, experiment, commitment and rest without declaring any single result the final proof of personal worth. A project can matter deeply and still be one part of a larger life. Freedom consists partly in being able to continue, transform or release a project without losing the ability to begin again.

There is an important asymmetry between the quality of an action and its external reception. A carefully prepared work may go unnoticed; a mediocre result may be rewarded by fortunate timing. This does not make outcomes irrelevant. It means that public recognition is an unstable sole measure of a person's worth. Our responsibility lies partly in the care, honesty and competence of the process, and partly in responding to the actual consequences.

It would be wrong to use this argument to console people out of legitimate demands for material justice. Recognition, remuneration and safety can be conditions of a sustainable creative life. A worker who asks to be paid fairly is not confusing achievement with self-worth. The distinction between personal dignity and external success should strengthen, rather than weaken, the demand for just institutions.

The phrase "flowing with existence" must finally be protected against fatalism. Events do not speak with a moral authority of their own. A harmful institution may persist for decades; adapting comfortably to it is not necessarily wisdom. The responsiveness defended here is active: notice circumstances accurately, act for reasons, revise when warranted and sometimes resist what appears inevitable. Fulfillment may occur in a patient refusal as much as in productive movement. The point of this volume is therefore not to tell readers to surrender to the current, but to cultivate a form of agency capable of working with uncertainty without surrendering responsibility.

The term "flowing" is close to Csikszentmihalyi's concept of flow as deep absorption in an activity [6]. The present book uses the word differently: it means acting with revisable purposes under uncertainty, including the ability to interrupt absorption, question the activity itself and resist unjust demands. It is not a clinical technique or a promised state of optimal experience.

Fulfillment should be kept distinct from both pleasure and public success. A difficult obligation may be meaningful without being pleasant, while a prestigious achievement may produce little sense of ownership. The evaluation of a life involves more than a single emotional register. It asks whether the actions that shape a person's days are compatible with their considered commitments and whether those commitments can withstand criticism from affected others.

There remains a risk of turning "meaning" into a moral demand: people who are exhausted, grieving or surviving precarious circumstances may not feel fulfilled, and they should not be reproached for failing to transform hardship into purpose. This volume proposes neither permanent serenity nor a formula for success. Its narrower claim is that reflection, action and revision can make a life more answerable to reasons, even where outcomes remain uncertain.

Epilogue

What remains is a question of practice: how can a person act with conviction while still allowing events, evidence and other people to reshape the path? A life worth pursuing may be one in which the answer remains revisable.

References

1. Reichenbach H. Experience and prediction: an analysis of the foundations and the structure of knowledge. Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press; 1938. 410 p.
2. Popper KR. The logic of scientific discovery. London: Hutchinson; 1959.
3. Dewey J. How we think. Boston (MA): D.C. Heath & Co.; 1910. 224 p.
4. Deci EL, Ryan RM. The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychol Inq. 2000;11(4):227-268.
doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01.
5. Amabile TM. Creativity in context. Boulder (CO): Westview Press; 1996. xviii, 317 p.
6. Csikszentmihalyi M. Flow: the psychology of optimal experience. New York (NY): Harper & Row; 1990. 303 p.

THE FREEDOM TO EXIST

Volume VII

The Root of Conflict

Beliefs, Power, Resources and Human Responsibility

Juan Segurola

First edition · v1.0 · EN

© 2026 Juan Segurola
All Rights Reserved

Preface

This book argues that conflict has plural, interacting roots: incompatible interpretations, social identities, unequal resources, and contested authority. No one of these explains every case. The following chapters examine how each becomes consequential and what institutions can do without promising the disappearance of disagreement.

The previous volumes examine freedom, understanding, simplicity, the experience of being alive, solitude, and purposeful action. This volume addresses the tensions that arise when free people share a world. Its purpose is not to offer a doctrine or portray every conflict as equivalent, but to distinguish disagreement, inequality, coercion, and responsibility. Claims about particular authors are cited; the normative synthesis belongs to the author. The chapters invite scrutiny rather than allegiance.

1. How Conflict Begins

A conflict need not begin with aggression. It may arise when two people attach incompatible meanings to a decision, when a need is neglected, or when a rule distributes benefits and burdens unequally. Disagreement belongs to human plurality; hostility is only one possible development. Not every difference requires immediate settlement, and not every agreement is fair. Our first task is to identify what is actually disputed and who bears the consequences.

At least three dimensions interact: verifiable events, interpretations of those events, and material conditions that constrain available choices. One person may read a delay as disrespect while another sees an unavoidable obligation.

Checking the event may not resolve a need for recognition. Conversely, a respectful conversation does not create affordable housing, available time, or sufficient resources. Treating these dimensions as interchangeable leads to shallow remedies.

Research on conflict has examined the different directions encouraged by cooperative and competitive relationships. Deutsch investigated conditions under which conflict becomes constructive or destructive [1]. His approach does not allow us to predict an individual's behavior from one variable: trust, prior experience, and unequal power matter. Conflict is a process that can escalate or change, not an immutable property of people.

A useful first inquiry produces two accounts. One sets out what happened without moral adjectives; the other states what each participant believes those events mean. If someone says, "I was excluded," we can ask which decision created that experience, how it was reached, and whether participation was possible. This distinction does not dismiss distress. It makes it possible to investigate whether an unfair procedure, a misunderstanding, or both were involved.

Responsibility for initiating an action must also be distinguished from responsibility for escalating a dispute. A disproportionate reaction is not justified merely by an earlier grievance. Yet generic calls for dialogue can be inappropriate when a participant is experiencing intimidation or harm. Safety, boundaries, and protection must then precede any meeting between the parties.

No single cause explains all conflicts. Scarcity may intensify competition, yet wealthy institutions also quarrel over status, jurisdiction, and recognition. Identity can transform a small dispute into a symbolic threat, but groups with opposed identities may cooperate when their material arrangements are fair. The plural account is not an evasion: it requires asking which mechanism is active, at what scale, and through which feedback loops. An economic explanation can illuminate distribution without exhausting the meaning of humiliation; a psychological explanation can illuminate hostility without explaining who controls the rules.

An objection is that an account with several roots explains everything and therefore predicts nothing. That objection is justified if causes are merely accumulated. A useful plural account makes discriminating claims: where resource allocation is decisive, changing allocation should reduce the dispute; where a credible procedure is missing, resources alone may not restore trust; where sanctions punish dissent, private dialogue may conceal rather than settle the conflict. The task is to test such differences against evidence and to remain willing to revise the diagnosis.

A disagreement becomes a conflict when a preference is translated into a claim that others must acknowledge, resist or accommodate. This distinction matters because not every difference requires a negotiated agreement. Two people may disagree over meaning while leaving one another's choices untouched; a dispute over access to a shared resource necessarily changes what each can do. A useful analysis therefore identifies the object of contention, the parties capable of acting, the practical stakes and the institutions that distribute costs. It asks who may exit the relationship, who must remain, and whether remaining silent is genuinely voluntary. These questions help distinguish friction inherent in plural life from avoidable injury. They also guard against describing every disagreement as a failure of communication: some parties understand their interests perfectly and still pursue incompatible outcomes.

Understanding the origins of conflict does not require imagining a world without differences. The central task is to develop procedures that recognize disagreement before it turns into a struggle to deny the other's legitimacy. Explaining a mechanism is an exercise in responsibility, not an excuse for its outcomes.

2. Beliefs, Identity and Belonging

Beliefs help us navigate the world, but they can also become signs of membership. When an opinion ceases to be a revisable claim and becomes part of who we are, correcting it can feel like losing an identity. Disagreement is then experienced not simply as a challenge to a proposition but as a rejection of a group. This transition helps explain why apparently minor disputes can provoke unusually intense reactions.

Tajfel and Turner developed an influential approach to social categorization, group identification, and intergroup conflict [2]. Recognizing an in-group and an out-group does not necessarily generate hostility, but it may encourage comparisons that alter our evaluation of similar actions depending on who

performed them. This is not a claim that everyone in a community is prejudiced; it is a caution about unexamined evaluations.

Belonging also offers protection. Families, associations, and traditions provide language, solidarity, and continuity. A philosophy of autonomy that demanded abandoning every bond would confuse freedom with isolation. The problem emerges when membership requires surrendering critical judgment, remaining silent about abuse, or denying equivalent rights to outsiders. A mature community tolerates disagreement without automatically treating it as betrayal.

Three questions can help: “What do I believe?”, “Why do I think it is true?”, and “What do I fear losing if it changes?” The third does not disprove the belief, but may reveal emotional stakes that make revision difficult. Religious, political, and cultural disagreements deserve careful consideration on their merits; it would be unfair to reduce every serious conviction to a psychological mechanism.

Understanding motives complements, rather than replaces, evaluating reasons.

Language frequently intensifies antagonism. Phrases such as “they always” or “we never” turn contingent actions into essential properties of entire populations. A better approach identifies decisions, decision-makers, dates, and effects. Precision allows legitimate criticism of an institution without indiscriminate hostility toward everyone sharing an identity with its leaders.

An identity is not inherently an instrument of exclusion. Shared memories can sustain care and collective agency; the danger arises when loyalty is treated as an exemption from scrutiny. The analysis of solitude and belonging in Volume V concerned the individual's ability to differ from a group. Here the question shifts to institutions: can members challenge leaders, contest classifications, and leave an association without losing access to essential rights? A disagreement within a group tests not only personal independence but the rules through which membership is governed.

One might object that common identity is impossible if every commitment remains revisable. Yet disagreement need not dissolve a community; it can expose which obligations are shared and which are imposed. The requirement is not permanent skepticism about every custom, but a difference between mutual commitment and coerced unanimity. Communities need procedures for dissent, including reasons given in public and protection of persons who are treated as outsiders. Those procedures can strengthen belonging by making it less dependent on silence.

Collective identification can supply solidarity to those whose individual voices have been ignored. For that reason, it would be mistaken to regard belonging itself as a dangerous illusion. The critical threshold appears when a shared identity is treated as proof of an individual's intentions, when dissenters are described as traitors, or when membership is made conditional on repeating unexamined beliefs. A community can protect an inherited practice without requiring its members to endorse every explanation offered on its behalf. The practical test is whether participants can revise their beliefs, criticize their leaders and maintain relationships across internal disagreement without losing basic standing.

Freedom of conscience is tested when we defend another person's right to hold an idea we consider mistaken, provided their actions respect the rights of others. This does not require indifference to harm. It means separating a person's dignity from the quality of their arguments and creating conditions in which revising a view does not entail losing every relationship.

3. Interests, Resources and Inequality

Not all conflicts begin in interpretation. Some involve materially incompatible demands on limited space, housing, care time, or environmental resources. Courtesy can improve negotiation, but it cannot manufacture adequate resources. An exclusively psychological account risks blaming disadvantaged people for conditions they did not create and cannot control.

Inequality changes the practical meaning of choice. Two individuals may formally agree to a contract, while one cannot refuse without losing income, housing, or protection. Fairness therefore requires attention to each participant's real alternatives. Sen has emphasized assessing the lives people can actually lead rather than looking solely at ideal institutional arrangements [3]. We use that perspective as a normative orientation, not as proof of a specific empirical proposition about every dispute.

Shared resources create further difficulties. Individually rational uses of land, water, or infrastructure can undermine a common resource where legitimate rules and monitoring are absent. Ostrom documented different institutional arrangements through which communities have governed common-pool resources [4]. Her work warns against both naive faith in spontaneous cooperation and the assumption that one centralized solution will suit every context.

An analysis of distribution should specify the available resource, the relevant needs, the allocation rule, and the costs borne under that rule. In an apartment building, for instance, a major repair cannot always be settled fairly by counting votes alone. Technical urgency, residents' finances, structural safety, and feasible payment arrangements may all matter. An apparently equal contribution can impose radically unequal hardship.

Two symmetrical reductions should be avoided. The first is the claim that every dispute is ultimately economic. The second is the belief that changing attitudes alone will eliminate material inequality. Ideas can organize material interests, while resources can reinforce identities. Their interaction calls for contextual investigation and reliable evidence, especially when public policy is at stake.

A distributive conflict concerns not only how much each party receives but which risks each is made to bear. A formally equal rule can be unjust when one party has the reserves to endure delay and another loses housing, health, or income while a decision is pending. Hence procedures must consider asymmetries of exposure, information and bargaining power. The relevant comparison is often not between perfect equality and unlimited freedom, but between feasible arrangements that preserve different degrees of real agency.

An objection is that emphasizing inequality makes every unsuccessful negotiation evidence of injustice. That would confuse an unfavorable outcome with an unfair

process. The distinction requires examining baseline entitlements, accessible information, opportunities to contest a decision, and the burden of remedy. Nor should a disadvantaged person be made responsible for correcting the structure that constrained their choices. The purpose of diagnosis is to identify institutions capable of bearing responsibility, not to turn vulnerability into a moral failing.

Resource conflicts often contain a temporal dimension that is absent from immediate bargaining. An arrangement may benefit present participants while transferring environmental costs, debt or exhausted infrastructure to people not represented at the table. Future generations cannot consent, and displaced populations may have no voice in the institutions that administer the resource. This does not provide a mechanical formula for allocation. It does, however, require explicit attention to who bears delayed costs, how uncertainty is distributed and whether decisions can be revised before damage becomes irreversible. The lesson of common-resource governance is not that cooperation always succeeds, but that clear rules, credible monitoring and meaningful participation can change incentives that would otherwise reward unilateral appropriation.

Responsible resolution does not promise to fulfill every desire. It makes trade-offs visible, distributes burdens by defensible criteria, and allows decisions to be challenged. A fair society cannot abolish scarcity; it can refuse to turn scarcity into a standing permission for arbitrary treatment.

4. Power, Obedience and Legitimacy

Power is not limited to issuing orders. It also includes setting agendas, deciding which problems deserve attention, controlling information, and shaping which alternatives people can imagine. Power can enable legitimate coordination, including in emergencies, but it can also conceal privilege behind claims of technical necessity. The question is not simply whether authority exists but how it is justified, constrained, and corrected.

Obedience serves everyday purposes. Traffic rules, clinical protocols, and deliberative procedures allow different lives to coexist. Yet obeying a command is not the same as establishing its moral legitimacy. Hierarchy does not dissolve personal responsibility when a decision harms others. Integrity requires attention to ends, means, and the rights that may be affected.

Arendt offered an influential conceptual distinction between power and violence, although her account has prompted different interpretations and objections [5]. The distinction helps resist the assumption that coercive force alone establishes authority. A government may suppress open disagreement without generating trust; an institution may be obeyed through fear while lacking a sufficient public justification for its actions.

Legitimacy depends on recognizable procedures: accessible rules, opportunities to respond, public reasons, and safeguards against abuse. But a formally regular decision may still violate fundamental rights. Legality is significant without being an automatic guarantee of justice. Institutions must permit review, repair, and effective constraints on their own power.

Within a workplace, technical authority deserves respect when it supplies reasons that can be checked. Expertise should not become immunity from error. An experienced person may be mistaken, and someone who notices the mistake needs a safe route to report it. Organizational trust rests on competence and on the genuine possibility of dissent without retaliation.

The power to set an agenda differs from the power to win an open vote. Bachrach and Baratz made the exclusion of issues from decisions a problem of political analysis, while Lukes examined how power can shape the very terms in which interests are understood. These are conceptual proximities, not claims that this book derives from either theory. They warn that an institution cannot demonstrate legitimacy solely by pointing to the fairness of decisions made after some questions have already been ruled inadmissible. [6, 7]

Obedience is not automatically legitimate because a command is lawful, and refusal is not automatically justified because a person sincerely disagrees. Civil disobedience may seek public correction of a serious injustice through constrained, accountable action; conscientious refusal raises a related but distinct question about complicity. The objection is that tolerated disobedience undermines every rule. The response is that a stable constitutional order needs ordinary compliance alongside lawful avenues of challenge, judicial review and, in exceptional cases, principled resistance. The burden of justification increases with the foreseeable harms of resistance and with the failure to try peaceful remedies first. See also Rawls on civil disobedience [8].

Authority and legitimacy are related but not identical. An official may possess lawful power while applying it arbitrarily; a community representative may enjoy trust without having a recognized legal mandate. Consent also needs careful interpretation. The absence of protest does not prove agreement when dissent brings loss of employment, exclusion or violence. A more demanding test asks whether decisions are publicly justified, whether affected people may contest them and whether officeholders are subject to rules they did not write solely for their own benefit. Accountability must extend beyond symbolic consultation: criticism should be capable of producing correction.

Autonomy does not require rejecting authority as such. It requires retaining moral judgment rather than delegating it without scrutiny. Responsible obedience acknowledges legitimate roles while keeping proportionality, rights, and accountability open to question. Without those conditions, apparent order may be only a silenced conflict.

5. Violence and Its Justifications

Violence represents a qualitative break: disagreement becomes imposition through harm or threatened harm. It can appear as physical assault, intimidation, coercion, and other forms of serious deprivation. The term should not be stretched so far that every discomfort counts as violence. Nor should it be narrowed to the point where systematic harms embedded in institutions become invisible.

Galtung proposed a distinction between direct and structural violence in a classic article in peace research [9]. This framework has been influential, but it cannot

replace case-specific legal or causal analysis. Its value here is conceptual: it prompts us to ask whether harmful circumstances follow from identifiable actions, persistent social conditions, or their interaction.

Justifications of violence are often framed as exceptions: an extraordinary threat, a superior purpose, or the alleged inferiority of an opponent. Not every case is morally equivalent. Protecting a person under attack is not identical to initiating an attack. Even where coercive intervention might be justified, however, necessity, proportionality, protection of third parties, and oversight remain crucial. Declared ends do not render every means acceptable.

In ordinary life, escalation may begin with the normalization of contempt. Repeatedly saying that a group deserves humiliation does not mechanically produce assault, but it may lower barriers to excusing harm. Criticism of a policy, belief, or action remains legitimate; portraying people as inherently inferior undermines the reciprocity needed for disagreement.

Responding to violence does not always mean bringing victims and perpetrators together to “understand each other.” It may instead require separation, independent support, fact-finding, immediate protection, and access to justice. Restorative approaches, where appropriate, need safeguards, voluntary participation, and accountability. They must never displace the protection of people at risk.

Self-defense and resistance to unjust rule cannot be reduced to slogans about violence being either always necessary or always forbidden. The questions include immediacy of threat, necessity, proportionality, alternatives and responsibility to people not participating in the conflict. A state's claim to the legitimate use of force is a claim requiring institutional constraint, not proof that each exercise of force is legitimate. Conversely, naming injustice does not grant an unlimited mandate to use force in its name. The state-claim terminology has an acknowledged proximity to Weber [10].

A serious objection to the language of structural violence is that it can become so broad that all preventable suffering is treated as violence, erasing crucial differences between neglect, exclusion and deliberate assault. The distinction between direct coercion and institutional patterns should therefore remain explicit; the analysis should specify an actor or process, a causal mechanism and a possible remedy. Yet insisting on conceptual precision does not require ignoring predictable harms produced without a single identifiable aggressor. It requires describing them accurately.

Public arguments about force frequently collapse several distinctions. Self-defense is different from punishment; immediate protection differs from retaliation; restraint differs from the desire to humiliate an adversary. The moral vocabulary of necessity, proportionality, discrimination between legitimate and illegitimate targets and accountability is useful precisely because intentions described as protective can coexist with disproportionate means. These criteria do not settle every emergency, and people facing real danger may have limited information. Nevertheless, uncertainty strengthens the duty to avoid simplistic declarations that every use of force either proves courage or constitutes moral failure.

A culture of peace cannot promise a total absence of conflict. Its goal is to prevent force from being treated as the final argument and humiliation from being mistaken for virtue. The ethics of a cause are revealed especially clearly in how it treats those who oppose it.

6. Understanding and Responsibility

Understanding does not mean absolving. We can explain the experiences, fears, and incentives surrounding an action while recognizing the harm it caused. Confusing explanation with justification weakens judgment: if every cause excused a deed, responsibility would disappear; if understanding were forbidden, opportunities to prevent repetition would be lost. Responsibility requires both a careful description and a normative standard.

Intention, conduct, consequence, and repair should be distinguished. Good intentions can produce harm; severe harm does not by itself prove malicious intent. These distinctions do not automatically settle legal duties, but they guard against impulsive judgments. Asking what was known, what could reasonably have been foreseen, and which alternatives were available helps identify relevant responsibilities.

Listening sometimes means presenting the strongest fair version of another person's position without inventing arguments they have not made. We may recognize a legitimate need behind an unreasonable demand, or a real fear behind a mistaken conclusion. Recognition does not compel agreement. We can say, "I understand what you need and why this decision worries you; I do not accept your proposed solution."

Where power is unequal, requiring identical composure from all sides may conceal different obligations. Those controlling resources, decisions, or protective institutions have additional responsibilities. Impartiality is not the automatic division of blame into equal shares; it is the consistent application of reasons to evidence, including the perspectives of people excluded from ordinary decision-making.

Repair involves more than an apology. Depending on the circumstances, it may require restitution, revised rules, public acknowledgment, or safeguards against further violations. Sometimes it means recognizing that trust will not immediately return. A harmed person retains the right to distance and protection; reconciliation cannot be demanded as a debt.

Explanation and excuse answer different questions. To explain an act is to investigate how it became possible; to excuse it is to judge whether responsibility should be reduced. This distinction matters especially when institutions investigate misconduct: an inquiry that refuses to understand incentives will repeat preventable failures, while one that treats context as complete absolution will deny agency and injury. The decision must be reasoned with regard to coercion, knowledge, alternatives and consequences.

A familiar objection is that listening to all sides grants equal standing to a threat and to the person threatened. It need not. Listening is an epistemic practice, not an allocation of moral equivalence. Where there is a credible danger of retaliation, protection and independent investigation can precede direct

encounter. Responsibility can then be assigned without requiring a harmed person to participate in reconciliation. A process oriented to truth is not automatically a process oriented to forgiveness.

Understanding another person's motives can improve prediction and reduce needless escalation. It can also become a burden unfairly placed on people already injured. A victim need not interpret an aggressor charitably before asking for protection or restitution. Explanatory understanding is different from excuse: learning how fear, ideology or incentives shaped a decision does not erase the agent's obligations. At the same time, responsibility does not require imagining that people acted under perfectly equal conditions. The relevant inquiry connects capacity, foreseeable consequences, coercion, available alternatives and duties owed to others, rather than choosing between total blame and total exoneration.

Understanding conflict expands the tools of judgment. It does not oblige us to abandon convictions, but it does require distinguishing what we know from what we suppose, and the motives we attribute from the effects we can examine. This discipline allows firmness without treating hostility as a virtue.

7. Cooperation Without Submission

Cooperation is often presented as an unconditional good. Yet calls to cooperate can also demand conformity or transfer burdens to people with little room to refuse. A genuinely cooperative arrangement preserves participants' voices, boundaries, and ability to revisit the agreement. Collaboration is neither unconditional obedience nor abandonment of legitimate interests.

Fisher, Ury, and Patton popularized negotiation methods that separate people from problems, explore interests, and favor objective criteria [11]. Their approach offers a practical repertoire, not a guarantee of equitable agreement in every context. Threats, manipulated information, or extreme dependence may require external safeguards before negotiation can be meaningful rather than a ratification of pre-existing inequality.

Any proposal can be evaluated by asking which needs it meets, which obligations it creates, how future disagreements will be addressed, and what happens if someone wants to leave. Clear recognition of disagreement is safer than vague celebrations of harmony. Ambiguous commitments can look cordial today and produce resentment tomorrow because participants believed they agreed to different things.

Cooperation calls for reciprocity, not identical contributions in every moment. Within families, capacities and needs change with age, illness, or employment conditions. Justice does not require everyone to perform exactly the same tasks. It requires recognizing effort, distributing responsibilities reasonably, and keeping arrangements open to revision.

Conflict may correct failures within cooperative relationships. A member who challenges an inefficient or discriminatory rule does not necessarily damage the common project; their objection may prevent apparent obedience from hiding deterioration. For this reason, processes for raising objections, recording dissent, and revising decisions without retaliation are essential.

Hirschman's distinction between exit and voice is a useful proximity for thinking about participation: people may leave an organization, or try to change it from within. Here the institutional question extends the personal freedom developed in Volume V. Exit is not a meaningful safeguard if departure means losing indispensable services; voice is not effective if complaints are recorded but cannot affect decisions. Volume VI discussed recording unresolved objections in collaborative work. In public institutions, such a record also needs a rule specifying who must respond, how, and with what prospect of remedy. [12]

One might object that demanding these safeguards makes cooperation slow or paralyzes leadership. Yet the absence of challenge may only shift costs onto those least able to object. A workable design can distinguish decisions requiring urgent action from those allowing consultation, preserve an appeal route, and make the reasons for exceptions reviewable. Cooperation without submission is not consensus at every moment; it is a distribution of authority that remains contestable after a decision.

There are also occasions when compromise is ethically insufficient. Dividing a disputed good may be reasonable; splitting the difference between equal protection and systematic discrimination is not an acceptable middle ground. Non-submissive cooperation can include organized dissent, strikes, litigation or refusal to participate in an exploitative arrangement. These actions need assessment of their consequences and proportionality, but they should not automatically be treated as breakdowns of dialogue. Cooperation and resistance are sometimes complementary: a fairer institutional settlement may emerge precisely because those excluded from previous agreements develop collective power to demand negotiation on different terms.

Free cooperation requires an effective right to say no. Coordination may survive when that right disappears, but its moral basis is weakened. The strength of a community is not measured by the absence of visible disagreement but by how it treats those who express it.

8. Conditions for Just Coexistence

Just coexistence does not depend on everyone sharing one philosophy of life. It depends on rules that allow different people to live without subjection, resolve disagreements, and demand explanations from those exercising power. This common ground requires rights, reliable institutions, and everyday practices of respect. Inner goodwill is insufficient unless expressed through material and procedural arrangements.

Rawls developed an influential theory concerning the principles and institutions of a just society [8]. His framework does not settle every contemporary debate, but it helps explain why immediate majority satisfaction cannot be the only standard. Basic liberties, the position of disadvantaged people, and the conditions under which rules are negotiated also deserve attention.

Practicable coexistence needs understandable information, participation proportionate to the impact of decisions, and protection against retaliation. Rules lose legitimacy when applied selectively or when remedies are inaccessible.

Formal equality before the law matters, but exercising rights requires time, resources, and genuine opportunities to bring a claim.

It also requires limits on our own cause. Being convinced that we defend something valuable does not exempt us from justifying our means. Personal autonomy cannot ignore its effects on others; appeals to the common good cannot legitimately erase particular individuals. There is no universal formula that settles every case. Public, revisable reasoning must remain attentive to context.

In personal relationships, we can practice modest versions of these principles: explain decisions before imposing them, record agreements, acknowledge mistakes, and correct unfair distributions. Within organizations and societies, such habits need persistent procedures. Individual virtue does not replace suitable institutions, yet institutions cannot function without people willing to demand and respect reasons.

Reasonable pluralism, central to Rawls's later political liberalism, highlights that durable institutions cannot depend on agreement about a single comprehensive philosophy. Republican accounts of non-domination, associated with Pettit, and Margalit's concern with non-humiliation identify nearby standards for assessing the treatment of persons. These are acknowledged proximities rather than declarations of intellectual derivation. The institutional task is to secure conditions under which disagreement does not imply arbitrary dependence or degradation. [13, 14, 15]

Tolerance has limits. An actor who uses the liberty of association to intimidate others or abolish their equal standing cannot claim immunity from proportionate legal constraint in the name of pluralism. But a second objection arises: who decides where tolerance ends, if the procedures themselves are disputed? Their legitimacy must be earned through accessible reasons, independent challenge, equal standing and the possibility of amendment. No procedure eliminates conflict; a defensible procedure changes how conflict can be contested without domination. The plural-root account defended here closes with an open task: maintain institutions capable of learning which harms their own rules produce.

A just coexistence cannot be reduced to the expectation that people will be kind. It needs institutions capable of protecting rights when goodwill fails.

Independent review, transparent reasons for decisions, predictable procedures and accessible remedies are safeguards against the concentration of discretionary power. They should be judged by how they operate for those with the least influence, not solely by what their formal charters promise. Yet institutions can also become rigid. A well-designed system must therefore make its own failures visible and permit revision without demanding that every conflict threaten the entire political order.

This discussion returns to a theme of the collection: the experience of existing among others. Freedom to think, feel, and act gains depth when we recognize that other people also seek lives free from humiliation and domination. We do not have to abolish every tension to coexist. We must prevent difference from becoming permission to deny another person's dignity. Conflict has many roots; responsible action begins by refusing to make the other person voiceless.

References (Vancouver)

1. Deutsch M. The resolution of conflict: constructive and destructive processes. New Haven (CT): Yale University Press; 1973.
2. Tajfel H, Turner JC. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In: Austin WG, Worchel S, editors. The social psychology of intergroup relations. Monterey (CA): Brooks/Cole; 1979. p. 33-47.
3. Sen A. The idea of justice. Cambridge (MA): Belknap Press of Harvard University Press; 2009.
4. Ostrom E. Governing the commons: the evolution of institutions for collective action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1990.
5. Arendt H. On violence. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World; 1970.
6. Bachrach P, Baratz MS. Two faces of power. *Am Polit Sci Rev.* 1962;56(4):947-52. doi:10.2307/1952796.
7. Lukes S. Power: a radical view. 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; 2005.
8. Rawls J. A theory of justice. Rev ed. Cambridge (MA): Belknap Press of Harvard University Press; 1999.
9. Galtung J. Violence, peace, and peace research. *J Peace Res.* 1969;6(3):167-91. doi:10.1177/002234336900600301.
10. Weber M. Politics as a vocation. In: Gerth HH, Mills CW, editors. *From Max Weber: essays in sociology.* New York: Oxford University Press; 1946. p. 77-128.
11. Fisher R, Ury W, Patton B. Getting to yes: negotiating agreement without giving in. 3rd ed. New York: Penguin Books; 2011.
12. Hirschman AO. Exit, voice, and loyalty: responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 1970.
13. Pettit P. Republicanism: a theory of freedom and government. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1997.
14. Margalit A. The decent society. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 1996.
15. Rawls J. Political liberalism. New York: Columbia University Press; 1993.

Epilogue to the Collected Edition · Freedom as an Open Task

Across these seven books, freedom appears less as a permanent possession than as a task that changes with circumstances. At times it requires a decision; at others, a pause. It may take the form of a refusal, a collaboration, the revision of a belief, or the acknowledgment that we need help. None of these gestures guarantees a just life by itself, but each may contribute to one.

The paths through this work suggest three questions for a concrete situation. What am I taking to be true, and why? What real possibilities are available to the people affected? What foreseeable consequences will my decision have? These are not an infallible method. They help prevent a personal preference from being presented as a universal truth.

It also matters to recognize when reflection must become a practical measure. Listening does not replace repairing harm. Understanding a cause does not absolve conduct. Chosen simplicity does not resolve imposed poverty, and individual composure does not replace protection from coercion. Attention to oneself and responsibility for the shared world need to correct one another.

Inner independence may help us tolerate disagreement, but it does not remove the need to test our interpretations. Belonging offers support and continuity, although it can also demand conformity. Between isolation and obedience lie relationships in which collaboration, dissent, and boundaries can coexist. Building them requires time, reciprocity, and conditions that make free choice possible.

An attentive life makes room for action and for experiences that need not become achievements. Creating, working, and persevering can give meaning to a day; so can rest, a conversation, or the experience of being present. There is no single form of balance. It depends on capacities, responsibilities, and needs that change over a lifetime.

Conflict finally reminds us that freedoms meet in a limited and unequal world. We will not always reconcile every aspiration. We can nevertheless examine how decisions are made, who can participate, and who bears their costs. Just coexistence requires more than an absence of argument: it requires that disagreement should not become a pretext for denying the dignity or voice of others.

The book ends where the reader's deliberation continues. Its chapters may accompany a choice, question a habit, or help articulate a question. They need not become an identity to defend. The freedom to exist remains open to experience, correction, and those who share our lives.